WORKS
BY
THE LATE
HORACE HAYMAN WILSON,
M.A., F.R.S.,
MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETIES OF CALCUTTA AND PARIS, AND OF THE ORIENTAL SOCIETY OF GERMANY;
FOREIGN MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FRANCE;
MEMBER OF THE IMPERIAL ACADEMIES OF ST. PETERSBURGH AND VIENNA,
AND OF THE ROYAL ACADEMIES OF MUNICH AND BERLIN;
PH. D. BRESLAU; M.D. MARBURG, ETC.;
AND BODEN PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

VOL. X.
FIRST PART.

LONDON:
TRÜBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1870.
THE

VISHNU PURANA

A SYSTEM

OF

HINDU MYTHOLOGY AND TRADITION.

TRANSLATED

FROM THE ORIGINAL SANSKRIT,

AND

ILLUSTRATED BY NOTES

DERIVED CHIEFLY FROM OTHER PURANAS,

BY THE LATE

H. H. WILSON, M.A., F.R.S.,

RODEN PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

ETC., ETC.

EDITED BY

FITZEDWARD HALL.

VOL. V.
FIRST PART.

LONDON:

TRUBNER & CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1870.
The Second Part containing the Index will complete the Vishnú Puráña.
CHAPTER XVII.

Akrúra's meditations on Kṛishńa: his arrival at Gokula: his delight at seeing Kṛishńa and his brother.

AKRÚRA, having set off in his quick travelling-car, proceeded to visit Kṛishńa at the pastures* of Nanda; and, as he went along, he congratulated himself on his superior good fortune, in having an opportunity of beholding a descended portion of the deity. † “Now,” thought he, “has my life borne fruit; my night is followed by the dawn of day: since I shall see the countenance of Vishńu, whose eyes are like the expanded leaf of the lotos; ‡ I shall behold that lotos-eyed aspect§ of Vishńu, which, when seen only in imagination, takes away the sins of men. I shall, to-day, behold that glory of glories,|| the mouth of Vishńu, ¶ whence proceeded

---

* Gokula. † Namely, Chakrín, in the original. ‡ Here follows, in the Sanskrit, a stanza left untranslated:

चव मन सपलि चेति चव मन सपलां गिरि।
बसी परशुरानाथी दृढा विष्णु भविष्यति।

Śrīhara gives this stanza; but Ratnagarbha does not appear, from my MSS. of his commentary, to recognize it.
§ Literally, “the lotus-eye.”
|| धाम धामचाम। Variant, preferred by the commentator Ratnagarbha:

धाम देवानां, “lights of the gods”.
¶ The original has Bhagavat.

V.
the Vedas and all their dependent sciences.* I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; † who is worshipped as the best of males,‡ as the male of sacrifice§ in sacrificial rites. I shall see Keśava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aświns, the Vasus, Ádityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse.¹

¹ The commentator|| explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishńu with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book¶ of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great

* To render vedánga.
† Athilañhára.
‡ Purushottama. See Vol. I., p. 16, note ‡.
§ Yajna-purusha. See Vol. I., p. 162, note *.
|| The words of the commentator are, in common, simply अनन्तः।

हृदयोऽवः। But I show, presently, that they must be wrong
¶ The passage referred to is Chapter VII., 11, where Brahmá is the speaker. The original and Burnouf's translation are subjoined:

सति समास भगवान्वेयः
सारात्स यज्ञुर्वशस्यपनीयवर्णः।
कन्दौमयो महम्योऽविलितेवनाशः
वाचो वभूवशशि: खमातोऽस्म वासः॥

"Dans mon sacrifice, Bhagavat lui-même fut Hayagrîcha, le mâle du sacrifice, dont la couleur est celle de l'or, dont les Vénus et les sacrifices sont la substance, et les divinités l'âme; quand il respire, de ses narines sortirent de ravissantes paroles."

Professor Wilson's view of the meaning of the stanza just quoted is more than usually imaginative.
a lion,* will, this day, speak to me. Now, the lord of the earth, who assumes shapes at will, has taken upon him the condition of humanity, to accomplish some object cherished in his heart. That Ananta, who holds

sacrifice performed by Brahmá, and breathed from his nostrils the texts of the Vedas. The fourth Avatára is always, elsewhere, said to be the Vámana, or dwarf.†

In the Bhágavata-puráña, VIII., XXIV., 7, 8, it is said, that, as Brahmá slumbered, the Vedas slipped out of his mouth, and Hayagriva came, and furtively carried them off. Hari, or Vishńu, it is subsequently stated, at last slew Hayagriva.

According to Vol. II., p. 125, Vishńu is worshipped, in Bhadráswa, as Hayásiras,—the Hayásirsha of the verses cited above, and of the Bhágavata-puráña, V., XVIII., 1. For Áswárisas, as an epithet of Náráyana, or Vishńu, see the Mahábhárata, Sánti-parvan, Ṛl. 13100, &c.

With this divinity Professor Wilson has confounded the demon Hayagriva, for whom see Vol. II., p. 70, note §, and p. 210, note 1. Áswágriva, mentioned in the Mahábhárata, Adi-parvan, Ṛl. 2533, is, presumably, identical with the latter, who has a fellow in Áswárisas,—ibid., Ṛl. 2531 and 2646.

The passage in Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXXVI., where "Vishńu, as Hayagriva" is spoken of, I have not yet been able to verify. In the meantime, it may pretty safely be surmised that there is a mistake.

Hayásirsha, Hayásiras, and Áswárisas are, being interpreted, ‘Horse-headed’; Hayagriva and Áswágriva, ‘Horse-necked’.

In the Śadbakalpadruma, the first definition of Hayagriva makes him an epithany of Vishńu, for the sake of recovering the Vedas, which had been carried off by Madhu and Kaśábhá. The passage there quoted—Mahábhárata, Sánti-parvan, Ṛl. 13497—13503,—does not, however, mention Hayagriva at all, but Áswárisas.

My friend Mr. C. P. Brown informs me, that, in the Madras Presidency, Hayagriva is a not uncommon name for a Bráhman to bear. The fact is noteworthy. Hayagrivakhan, “Slayer of Hayagriva,” is an epithetical designation of Hayásirsha, i.e., Vishńu.

* Śínaka; which here denotes nrö-sínaka, the commentators say. See Vol. IV., p. 277, text and note †.

† See Vol. III., p. 18, text and note 1.
the earth upon his crest, and who has descended upon earth for its protection, will (this day,) call me by my name. Glory to that being, whose deceptive adoption of father, son, friend, brother, mother, and relative the world is unable to penetrate! Glory to him, who is one with true knowledge, who is inscrutable,* and through whom, seated in his heart, the Yōgin crosses the wide expanse of worldly ignorance and illusion! I bow to him, who, by the performers of holy rites, is called the male of sacrifice (Yajnapurusha); by pious worshippers† is termed Vāsudeva; and, by the cultivators of philosophy,† Vishnū. May he in whom cause, and effect, and the world itself is comprehended be propitious to me, through his truth; for always do I put my trust in that unborn, eternal Hari, by meditation on whom man becomes the repository of all good things.”§

His mind thus animated by devout faith, and meditating in this manner, Akrūra (proceeded on his road, and) arrived at Gokula a little before sunset, at the time of the milking of the cows.|| And there he saw Krishnā, amongst the cattle, dark as the leaf of the

---

* Ameya.
† Sātwata.
‡ Vedānta.

§ यथा तद जगद्दात्म धारतें ततःतिष्ठतम्।
सदसत्तेः स्वेन मध्यसी धातु सौभाग्यम्॥
कृष्णे सुकल्यकालाभाजणं यथ वाच्यं।
पुकुरसममेव निःभ्राः व्रजाभिः श्राणं हरिम्॥

|| The original here has “at the milking-place of the cows”, धारोहरे गवाम्। Śrīdhara’s and Ratnagarbha’s comment: धारोहरे द्राहन्सान।
full-blown lotos; his eyes of the same colour,* and his breast decorated with the Śrīvatsa† mark; long-armed, and broad-chested; having a high nose,‡ and a lovely countenance brightened with mirthful smiles; treading firmly on the ground, with feet whose nails were tinted red; clad in yellow garments, and adorned with a garland of forest-flowers;§ having a fresh-gathered creeper in his hand,∥ and a chaplet of white lotos-flowers on his head.¶ Akrúra** also beheld, there, Balabhadrā, white as a swan, a jasmine, or the moon, and dressed in blue raiment; having large and powerful arms,†† and a countenance as radiant as a lotos in bloom,—like another Kailása-mountain, crested with a wreath of clouds.

When Akrúra saw these two youths, his countenance expanded with delight,‡‡ and the down of his body stood erect (with pleasure). For this he thought to be supreme happiness and glory; this, the double manifestation of the divine Vásudeva. §§ This was the twofold gratification of his sight, to behold the creator

* प्रसादपद्मप्रजाश्रयः
† See Vol. IV., p. 268.
‡ प्रजामयिमासीनं तुष्णोरखशबुधसमः
§ चबुधप्रिवृथ्यजितम्.
∥ साद्रौनलसंताहसमः. Variant, accepted by the commentator Ratnagarbha: साद्रौनलमाचवाहम् तम्.
¶ सिताभोजावलंसकम्.
** Yadu-nandana, “descendant of Yadu,” in the original.
†† Add “and shoulders”.
‡‡ विकिरसप्रकुसरोजः.
§§ एतत्तत्त्वभास्यं धाम ततेतत्त्वभास्यं यद्यमविविचयः.
of the universe: now he hoped that his bodily form would yield fruit,—as it would bring him in contact with the person of Kṛishṇa,—and that the wearer of infinite forms would place his hand on his back; the touch of whose finger alone is sufficient to dispel sin, and to secure imperishable felicity; that hand which launches the fierce irresistible discus, blazing with all the flames of fire, lightning, and the sun, and, slaughtering the demon-host, washes the collyrium from the eyes of their brides; that hand into which Bali poured water, and thence obtained ineffable enjoyments below the earth,† and immortality, and dominion over the gods for a whole Manwantara, without peril from a foe. “Alas! He will despise me for my connexion with Kāṁsa,—an associate with evil, though not contaminated by it. How vain is his birth, who is shunned by the virtuous!‡ And yet, what is there,
in this world, unknown to him who resides in the hearts of all men, who is ever existent, exempt from imperfection, the aggregate of the quality of purity, and identical with true knowledge?* With a heart wholly devoted to him, then, I will approach the lord of all lords, the descended portion of Purushottama, of Vishńu, who is without beginning, middle, or end.”

Some of my MSS. have, instead of न मीनोपहर्त, भवमाणोपहर्तः। This variant is noted by the commentator Ratnagarbha, and appears in the text of Śrídharā.

* भानात्मकः क्षमशेषस्वराश्री-रपित्हदिरख सदा सुवदः।
विन्छ वा जगार्बध सम्पूर्णा-मन्नात्मकाशि ब्रह्म शिखरः॥
CHAPTER XVIII.

Grief of the Gopíś, on the departure of Kríshña and Balaráma with Akrúra: their leaving Gokula. Akrúra bathes in the Yamuná; beholds the divine forms of the two youths, and praises Vishú.

THUS meditating, the Yádava approached Govinda, (and addressed him,) and said “I am Akrúra,” and bowed his head down to the feet of Hari.* But Kríshña laid upon him his hand, which was marked with the flag, the thunderbolt, and the lotos, and drew him (towards him), and affectionately embraced him. Then Ráma† and Keśava entered into conversation with him, and, having heard from him all that had occurred, were much pleased, and led him to their habitation: there they resumed their discourse, and gave him food to eat, and treated him with proper hospitality.: Akrúra told them how (their father) Ánacakundubhi,§ the princess Devakí, and (even his own father,) Ugrasena had been insulted by the iniquitous demon,|| Kaúsa: he also related to them the purpose for which he had been despatched. When he had told them all these things, the destroyer of Keśin¶ said to him: “I

* चरणो नमाम शिरसा हरे: ।
† The original has Bala.
‡ सह ताम्यं तदन्तः करस्वाद्वासादिकः ।
भृतमोक्षो यथायायमाचवचि तत्तत्तयो: ॥
|| Dánava.
¶ Keśi-suídana. Compare the cognate epithet of Kríshña, Madhusúdana, “slayer of Madhu.”
was aware of all that you have told me, lord of liberal gifts.* Rāma and I will go, to-morrow, to Mathurā, along with you. The elders of the cowherds shall accompany us, bearing ample offerings.† Rest here to-night, and dismiss all anxiety.‡ Within three nights I will slay Kaúsa and his adherents.”

Having given orders, accordingly, to the cowherds, Akrúra, with Keśava and Rāma, § retired to rest, and slept soundly in the dwelling of Nanda. The next morning was bright; and the youths prepared to depart for Mathurā, with Akrúra. The Gopīs, seeing them about to set forth, were much afflicted; they wept bitterly; their bracelets were loose upon their arms; and they thus communed together:|| “If Govinda depart for Mathurā, how will he return to Gokula? His ears will there be regaled with the melodious and polished conversation of the women of the city. Accustomed to the language of the graceful females of Mathurā, he will never again endure the rustic expressions of the Gopīs. Hari, the pride of the station,¶ is carried off; and a fatal blow is inflicted upon us by inexorable destiny. Expressive smiles, soft language, graceful airs, elegant gait, and significant

---

* Here follows a stanza left untranslated:

करिष्यं च महाभाग यद्चौपितिं भतम् ।
विचिन्द्रं नान्यथेति विन्द्रं कर्त्सं हृतं मया ||

These verses are recognized, in their texts and comments, by both the scholiasts. Furthermore, they are found translated at length in Professor Wilson’s Hindu-made English version.

† Upāyana.

‡ निशीयं नीयता वीर न चिन्ताम कर्त्समहिः।

§ Balabhādra, in the Sanskrit.

¶ The translation is, hereabouts, free and expanded.

¶ Gosthā.
glances belong to the women of the city.† Hari is of rustic breeding; and, captivated by their fascinations, what likelihood is there of his returning to the society of any one amongst us?† Kesava, who has mounted the car, to go to Mathurā, has been deceived by the cruel, (vile), and desperate Akrūra. Does not the unfeeling traitor know the affection that we all here feel for our Hari, the joy of our eyes, that he is taking him away? Unkind that he is, Govinda is departing from us, along with Rāma. Haste! Let us stop him. Why talk of telling our seniors that we cannot bear his loss? What can they do for us, when we are consumed by the fires of separation? The Gopas, with Nanda at their head, are, themselves, preparing to depart. No one makes any attempt to detain Govinda. Bright is the morning that succeeds to this night, for the women of Mathurā; for the bees of their eyes will feed upon the lotos-face of Achyuta. Happy are they who may go hence without impediment, and behold, enraptured, Krishnā on his journey. A great festival will give pleasure, to-day, to the eyes of the inhabitants of Mathurā, when they see the person of Govinda.† What a blissful vision will be seen by the happy women (of the city), whose brilliant eyes shall regard, unchecked,

† भावगभंगितं वाक्यं विखलज्ञिता गति: ।
नागरीणामपवितत्करापविवितमे ।

† ग्राम्यो हरिरथं तासां विखलज्ञिन्नेवूर्युङ्गं ।
भवतीनां पुनः पाषे कः युक्ता समेयति ।

‡ ध्वजाति पथं चे कथामिती वाक्यविवागिता: ।
उद्धिष्ण्डं पुः खलकाशितम् ।
मधुरानगरपीरनयमाना महोत्सवः ।
गोविन्दावयवेश्तिरतीवाय भविष्यति ॥
the countenance of Kṛishṇa! * Alas! The eyes of the Gopīs have been deprived of sight by the relentless Brahmā, † after he had shown them this great treasure. In proportion as the affection of Hari for us decays, so do our limbs wither, and the bracelets slip from our arms. † And now the cruel Akrūra urges on the horses. All conspire to treat unhappy females with unkindness. Alas! alas! We see, now, only the dust of his chariot-wheels. And now he is far away; for even that dust is no longer to be seen." Thus lamented by the women, § Keśava and Rāma quitted the district of Vraja. 1 Travelling in a car drawn by fleet horses, they arrived, at noon, at the banks of the Yamunā, when Akrūra requested them to halt a little, whilst he performed the usual daily ceremonial in the

---

1 In the Bhāgavata, Hari Varṣa, &c., several adventures of Kṛishṇa, during his residence at Vraja, are recorded, of which our text makes no mention. Of these, the two most popular are Kṛishṇa's taking away the clothes of the Gopīs whilst bathing, and his liberating the Gopas from the mouth of Aghāsura, ||—disguised as a vast serpent,—into which they had entered, thinking it a cavern in a mountain. The omission of these two legends, or of any of the rest, is not much to be regretted.

---

* The original has Adhokshaja, for the signification of which word see Vol. I., p. 28, note †.
† Vidhāṭi, in the Sanskrit. Vide infra, p. 15, note ॥.

|| चनुरागिनः श्रीशिखिमक्षासु ब्रजता हरे।  
श्रीशिखिमनयनवायुज करेणू वल्यायचिप ||

§ द्रव्यवतित्रहारीन गोपोवनारीचित: ।

|| That is to say, Agha the Asura. He was Kaṁsa's generalissimo; and it seems that little more than this fact is known of him. See the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, X., Prior Section, Chapter XII.
river. Accordingly, the intelligent Akrúra bathed, and rinsed his mouth; and then, entering the stream, he stood meditating upon the supreme being. But he beheld (mentally,) Balabhaddra, having a thousand hooded heads, a garland of jasmine-flowers, and large red eyes, attended by Vásuki, Rambha, and other mighty serpents, praised by the Gandharvas, decorated with wild flowers, wearing dark-coloured garments, crowned with a chaplet of lotoses, ornamented with brilliant ear-rings, inebriate, and standing at the bottom of the river, in the water. On his lap he also

1 The noonday prayer, or Sandhyá.
2 By his Dhyāna, or force of meditation, in which it is attempted to bring before the mind’s eye some definite form of the object of adoration. In this case, Akrúra is compelled to see a form he did not anticipate. The Hari Vamsa, very clumsily, sets him to meditate upon the serpent Šesha, which spoils the story; intended, as that is, to exhibit the identity of Balaráma and Krišna with the Supreme.
3 Balaráma was, thus, visible in his real character of Šesha, the chief of serpents, the couch of Vishńu, and supporter of the world.
beheld, at his ease, * Krīshṇa, of the complexion of a cloud,† with full and coppery eyes, having an elegant form, and four hands, armed with the discus and other weapons, wearing yellow clothes, decorated with many-coloured flowers, and appearing like a cloud embellished with streams of lightning and the bow of Indra.† His breast was marked with the celestial sign;‡ his arms were radiant with bracelets; a diadem shone on his brow;§ and he wore a white lotus for his crest.||
He was attended by Sanandana¶ and other holy sages, who, fixing their eyes upon the tips of their noses, were absorbed in profound meditation.**

When Akrūra beheld Balarāma †† and Krīshṇa in this situation, he was much amazed, and wondered how they could so quickly have got there from the chariot. He wished to ask them this; but Janārdana deprived him of the faculty of speech, at the moment. Ascending, then, from the water, he repaired to the car; and there he found them both, (quietly) seated, in the same human persons as before. Plunging, again, into the water, there he again beheld them, hymned, as before,

---

1 Or, rather, he beheld Ghanaśyāma,—an appellation of Krīshṇa, who is so called from being as black (śyāma) as a cloud (ghana).

* Akliṣṭa.
† Śakra, in the original.
‡ To render śrivatsa. Vide supra, p. 5.
§ श्वेतस्वर्णस चाष्येक्ष्मुकुटोज्ज्वलम्.
|| Avatāṁsaka.
¶ See Vol. II., p. 226; and p. 227, note 1.
** समन्त्वान्वितस्मिनं विन्द्योगितक्षणे:।
विचिन्त्यमानं तत्क्षेणैवाह्यमश्लो:।
†† The Sanskrit has Bala.
by the Gandharvas, saints,* sages,† and serpents. Apprehending, therefore, their real character, he thus eulogized the eternal deity, who consists of true knowledge:

"Salutation to thee, who art uniform and manifold, all-pervading, supreme spirit, of inconceivable glory, and who art simple existence!§ Salutation to thee, O inscrutable, who art truth, and the essence of obligations!|| Salutation to thee, O lord, whose nature is unknown, who art beyond primeval matter, who existest in five forms,¶ as one with the elements, with the faculties,** with matter, with the living soul, with supreme spirit!†† Show favour (to me), O soul of the universe, essence of all things, perishable or eternal, whether addressed by the designation of Brahmá, Vishnú, Śiva, or the like. I adore thee, O god,‡ whose nature is indescribable, whose purposes are inscrutable, whose name, even, is unknown; §§ for the at-

* Muni.
† Siddha.

|| Havis.
¶ See Vol. I., p. 2, note 1, where this passage is referred to and enlarged on.
** Indriya.
†† Atman and paramátmán. The first is the same as jivátmán. See Vol. IV., p. 253, note *.
‡‡ Paraméšwara.

§§ Abhidhána here takes the place of the more ordinary náman, the term rendered "appellation", just below. See Vol. IV., p. 346, supplement to p. 267, note *.
tributes of appellation or kind* are not applicable to to thee, who art that,† the supreme Brahma, eternal, unchangeable, uncreated.‡ But, as the accomplishment of our objects cannot be attained except through some specific form,§ thou art termed, by us, Krishña, Achyuta, Ananta, or Vishṇu. Thou, unborn (divinity), art all the objects of these impersonations; thou art the gods, and all other beings; thou art the whole world; thou art all. Soul of the universe, thou art exempt from change; and there is nothing except thee in all this existence. Thou art Brahmā, Paśupati, Ar- yaman,|| Dhātrī, and Vidhātrī;† thou art Indra,*** air, fire, the regent of the waters, †† the god of wealth, ‡‡ and judge of the dead; §§ and thou, although but one, presidest over the world, with various energies addressed to various purposes. Thou, identical with the solar ray, createst the universe; all elementary substance is

---

* It should seem, from a collation of passages, that jāti, the expression here used, is synonymous with rūpa. Da nāmaṇ and jāti signify 'genus' and 'species'? See Vol. II., p. 328, text and note †; and p. 337, supplementary note to p. 59, l. 8.
† Aja.

|| कव्यनामते |

§ ततः कव्याचूतानन्तविष्णुसंलक्षाभिरदृशे |

|| Corrected from "Āryaman".
‡ Dhātrī and Vidhātrī are said to be Brahmā as protector and creator. See Colebrooke’s Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 191. In lieu of Dhātrī, some MSS. yield Vishṇu.
*** To represent tridaśapati, 'lord of the gods.'
†† Toyela; Varuṇa, to-wit.
‡‡ Dhana-pati; namely, Kubera.
§§ The original yields Antaka, who is one with Yama. See Vol. II., p. 216, note 1.
composed of thy qualities; and thy supreme form is denoted by the imperishable term sat (existence). To him who is one with true knowledge; who is, and is not, perceptible, * I bow. Glory be to him, the lord Vásudeva, to Sankarshaña, to Pradyumna, and to Aniruddha!"
CHAPTER XIX.

Akrúra conveys Kríshńa and Ráma near to Mathurá, and leaves them; they enter the town. Insolence of Karna’s washerman: Kríshńa kills him. Civility of a flower-seller: Kríshńa gives him his benediction.

THUS, the Yádava (Akrúra), standing in the river, praised Kríshńa, and worshipped him with imaginary* incense and flowers. Disregarding (all) other objects, he fixed his (whole) mind upon the deity; and, having continued, for a long time, in spiritual contemplation, † he (at last,) desisted from his abstraction, conceiving he had effected the purposes of soul. ‡ Coming up from the water of the Yamuná, he went to the car; and there he beheld Ráma and Kríshńa, seated as before. As his looks denoted surprise, Kríshńa said to him: “Surely, Akrúra, you have seen some marvel in the stream of the Yamuná; for your eyes are staring, as if with astonishment.” Akrúra replied: “The marvel that I have seen in the stream of the Yamuna I behold before me, even here, in a bodily shape; for he whom I have encountered in the water, Kríshńa, is, also, your wondrous self, of whose illustrious person the whole world is the miraculous development.§ But

---

* Mano-maya.
† Brahma-bhrúta.
‡ ततःरुखमिसिवात्वां मन्यमानो महामति: ।
This is in the same stanza with what immediately follows, and should have been connected with it, in the translation.
§ अगोद्विसहस्वस्यं कृप्यं यथा महाँत्र: ।
तेनाल्यंवर्षरिषाहं भवति कृष्ण संगत: ॥

V. 2
enough of this. Let us proceed to Mathurā. I am afraid Kaṁsa will be angry at our delay: such is the wretched consequence of eating the bread of another.” Thus speaking, he urged on the quick horses; and they arrived, after sunset, at Mathurā. When they came in sight of the city, Akrūra said to Kṛishṇa and Rāma: “You must now journey on foot, whilst I proceed alone in the car. And you must not go to the house of Vasudeva; for the elder has been banished, by Kaṁsa, on your account.”

Akrūra, having thus spoken, left them, and entered the city; whilst Rāma and Kṛishṇa continued to walk along the royal road. Regarded, with pleasure, by men and women, they went along sportively, looking like two young elephants. As they roamed about, they saw a washerman colouring clothes; and, with smiling countenances, they went and threw down some of his fine linen. The washerman was the servant of Kaṁsa, made insolent by his master’s favour; and he provoked the two lads with loud and
scurrilous abuse, until Kṛishṇa struck him down, with his head to the ground, and killed him. Then, taking the clothes, they went their way, clad in yellow and blue raiment, until they came to a flower-seller's shop. The flower-seller looked at them with astonishment, and wondered who they could be, or whence they could have come. Seeing two youths so lovely, dressed in yellow and blue garments, he imagined them to be divinities descended upon earth. Being addressed by them with mouths budding like lotoses, and asked for some flowers, he placed his hands upon the ground, and touched it with his head, saying: "My lords have shown me great kindness, in coming to my house,—fortunate that I am. I will pay them homage." Having thus spoken, the flower-seller, with a smiling aspect, gave them whatever choice flowers they selected, to conciliate their favour. Repeatedly prostrating himself before them, he presented them with flowers, beautiful, fragrant, and fresh.† Kṛishṇa, then, being much pleased with him, gave him this blessing: "Fortune, good friend, who depends upon me, shall never forsake you. Never shall you suffer loss of vigour or loss of wealth. As long as time shall last, your descendants shall not fail.§ Having long tasted various de-

* प्रसादपरमी नाथी मम वेदमुपागति।
† प्रणम्य, which implies nothing more than a respectful inclination of the head and uplifting of the hands.
‡ Amala.
§ याबहिनाचि ताबद्र न निश्चिति संतति।

This lection, Ratnagarbha's, is the one followed by the Translator. Śrīdhara's and that of nearly all my best MSS. begins the verse with the words याबद्राम।
lights (on earth), you shall, finally, obtain, by calling me to recollection, a heavenly region, the consequence of my favour. Your heart shall ever be intent on righteousness; and fulness of days shall be the portion of your posterity. Your descendants shall not be subject to natural infirmities, as long as the sun shall endure.”* Having thus spoken, Kṛishṇa and Rāma,† worshipped by the flower-seller, went forth from his dwelling.¹

¹ These incidents are told, with some unimportant differences, in the other accounts of Kṛishṇa’s youth.

* नोपस्मृदितं दौष्टु युप्तक्ष्यतंतिसंभवः ।
संप्राप्यति महाभाग यावत्सूयानि घरिष्यति॥
† Baladeva, in the original.
CHAPTER XX.

Kríshná and Balaráma meet Kubjá; she is made straight by the former: they proceed to the palace. Kríshná breaks a bow intended for a trial of arms. Kaúśa's orders to his servants. Public games. Kríshná and his brother enter the arena: the former wrestles with Chánúra, the latter, with Mushíka, the king's wrestlers, who are, both, killed. Kríshná attacks and slays Kaúśa: he and Balaráma do homage to Vasudeva and Devaki: the former praises Kríshná.

As they proceeded along the high road, they saw coming (towards them) a young girl, who was crooked; carrying a pot of unguent. Kríshná addressed her sportively, and said: “For whom are you carrying that unguent? Tell me, lovely maiden;* tell me truly.” Spoken to as it were through affection, Kubjá,† well disposed towards Hari, replied to him also mirthfully, being smitten by his appearance: “Know you not, beloved, that I am the servant of Kaúśa, and appointed, crooked as I am, to prepare his perfumes?ː Unguent ground by any other he does not approve of: hence I am enriched through his liberal rewards.” Then said Kríshná: “Fair-faced damsel, give us of this unguent,—

* Indívarā-lochanā.
† No proper name, here and near the top of the next page, but “the deformed girl”. The word kubjá is rendered “crooked”, above.

The name of the damsel, we are thus told, was Naikavakrá. In the Bhágavata-púrāṇa, X., Prior Section, XLI., 3, her name appears as Trivakrá. She was so called, the commentator Śrídha remarks, because triply deformed,—namely, in the neck, in the chest, and in the waist.
fragrant, and fit for kings,—as much as we may rub upon our bodies.” “Take it,” answered Kubjá. And she gave them as much of the unguent as was sufficient for their persons. And they rubbed it on various parts of their faces and bodies, till they looked like two clouds, one white and one black, decorated by the many-tinted bow of Indra. Then Kṛishṇa, skilled in the curative art, took hold of her, under the chin, with the thumb and two fingers, and lifted up her head, whilst, with his feet, he pressed down her feet; and, in this way, he made her straight. When she was thus relieved from her deformity, she was a most beautiful woman; and, filled with gratitude and affection, she took Govinda by the garment, and invited him to her house. Promising to come at some other time, Kṛishṇa smilingly dismissed her, and then

---

1 They had their bodies smeared in the style called Bhaktichchheda (भक्तीच्छेदः); that is, with the separating or distinguishing (chhedha) marks of Vaishnava devotion (bhakti), certain streaks on the forehead, nose, cheeks, breast, and arms, which denote a follower of Vishnu. See the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 83. ||

* The original here gives them the epithet purushahrshabha.
† Śauri, in the Sanskrit. See the original in the next annotation.

\[ \text{तत्त्वां चिदुक्षे श्रीरिक्रमनविधानविवित ।} \\
\text{उत्थुष्टोलयास स्यक्छेदैन्यपालिना ॥} \\
\text{चक्रवर्तर प्रजाः च तथा चक्षुवल रुक्षप्रेणस्वयम् ।} \\
\text{ततः सा चक्षुतां प्राप्ता तोषिवात्भिरहर ॥} \]

For some of the additions to the literal sense of the original, the Translator has drawn on Śrīdhara.

§ The Sanskrit has Hari.

|| Or Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. I., p. 41.
laughed aloud, on beholding the countenance of Bala-
deva.  

Dressed in blue and yellow garments, and anointed with fragrant unguents,† Keśava and Ráma proceeded to the hall of arms, which was hung round with gar-
lands.‡ Inquiring of the warders which bow he was to try, and being directed to it, he took it, and bent it.§ But, drawing it with violence, he snapped it in two;² and all Mathurá resounded with the noise which its fracture occasioned. Abused by the warders for breaking the bow, Kríshña and Ráma retorted, and de-
fi ed them, and left the hall.||

When Kaúnsa knew that Akrúra had returned, and heard that the bow had been broken, he thus said to Cháñúra and Mushtíka, (his boxers): “Two youths, cowherd boys, have arrived. You must kill them both, in a trial of strength, in my presence; for they prac-

---

1 The story is similarly told in the Bhágavata, &c.
2 The bending or breaking of a bow is a favourite incident in Hindu heroic poetry; borrowed, no doubt, from the Ráma-
ayaña, where, however, it has an object: here it is quite gratuitous.

* Ráma, in the original.
† भक्तिप्रदानिलिपिः। See note 1 in the preceding page.
‡ According to the original, in all my MSS., &c., the youths, not the hall, were thus adorned.
§ चायोगः च घनूःरः ताम्यां गृह्येष्व रजिमः।
चाक्ष्यां सहसा रथावी गृह्येवापूर्ववज्जुः।||
Instead of चायोगः च, the lection of Śridhara, Ratnagarbha has चायोगः, and says that we here have the name of the bow, Ayog ava. The commentators mention and explain other readings; and my MSS. supply still more.

|| रचितिसैं निलक्षोभी निक्षानेति कामुकालयात।
¶ Malla-yuddha. See note ¶ in p. 39, infra.
tise against my life. I shall be well pleased if you kill them in the match, and will give you whatever you wish; not else. These two foes of mine must be killed by you, fairly or unfairly. The kingdom shall be ours in common, when they have perished.” Having given them these orders, he sent, next, for his elephant-driver, and desired him to station his (great) elephant, Kuvalayāpīḍa,—who was as vast as a cloud charged with rain,—near the gate of the arena, and drive him upon the two boys, when they should attempt to enter.* When Kaṁsa had issued these commands, and ascertained that the platforms were all ready (for the spectators), he awaited the rising of the sun, unconscious of impending death.†

In the morning, the citizens assembled on the platforms set apart for them; and the princes, with the ministers and courtiers;‡ occupied the royal seats. Near the centre of the circle, judges of the games§ were stationed by Kaṁsa, whilst he himself sat apart, close by, upon a lofty throne. Separate platforms were erected for the ladies of the palace,‖ for the

* प्रोवाचोबृवेंध्या मञ्जसमाज्यारि कुषं्:।
ख्राण्य: कुवलयापीड़ितेन तो गोपदार्जी।।

Instead of मञ्ज, there occurs, as a common variant, the lection accepted by Śridhara, मष्य। This, mistaken for मष्य, with the supposition that लया was misread तोया, is the only ground that I have discovered for the Translator’s clause “who was as vast as a cloud charged with rain.”

† The original has चास्रत्मरण:, which only implies that his death was near, not that he knew it to be so.

‡ These two words are to represent अभित्या. Bhṛitya, ‘dependants’, is a variant.

§§ मञ्जसमाज्यिंकर्गः। Variant: मञ्जपास्यिंकर्गः।

|| Antahkura.
courtesans, * and for the wives of the citizens. ¹ Nanda and the cowherds had places appropriated to them, at

¹ The Bhágavata enters into even fewer particulars than our text, of the place set apart for the games. The Hari Vaṁśa gives a much more detailed description, which is, in some respects, curious. The want of any technical glossary, and the general manner in which technical terms are explained in the ordinary dictionaries, render it difficult to understand exactly what is intended; and any translation of the passages must be defective. The French version, † however, probably represents a much more splendid and theatrical scene than the text authorizes, and may, therefore, admit of correction. The general plan is nothing more than an enclosed space, surrounded by temporary structures of timber or bamboos, open or enclosed, and decorated with hangings and garlands. It may be doubted if the details described by the compiler of the Hari Vaṁśa were very familiar even to him; for his description is not always very consistent or precise. Of two commentators, one evidently knows nothing of what he attempts to explain; but, with the assistance of the other, the passages may be thus, though not always confidently, rendered:

"The king, Kaṁśa, meditating on these things, went forth, from his palace, to the place which had been prepared for the sight of the ceremonial (¹), to inspect the scaffolds (²) which had been constructed. He found the place close set with the several platforms (²) of the different public bodies (.), strongly put together, and decorated with roofed pavilions of various sizes, supported by columns, and divided into commodious chambers. (⁴) The edifice was extensive, ; well arranged, secured by strong rafters, (⁴) spacious and lofty, and commodious and secure. Stairs led to the different galleries. (⁷) Chairs of state (⁸) were placed in

* Vára-mukhyá.
‡ Sváyata. Variant: sváyuta.
§ The translation of the last two sentences educes much more from the original than even the commentaries warrant.
the end of which sat Akrúra and Vasudeva. Amongst the wives of the citizens appeared Devaki, mourning various parts of it. The avenues that conducted to it were narrow (9). It was covered with temporary stages and sheds, (10) and was capable of sustaining the weight of a multitude.

"Having seen the place of the festival thus adorned, Kaúsa gave orders, and said: 'To-morrow let the platforms, and terraces, and pavilions (11) be decorated with pictures, and garlands, and flags, and images; (12) and let them be scented with fragrant odours, and covered over with awnings. (13) Let there be ample heaps of dry pounded cow-dung (14) provided on the ground, * and suitable refreshment-chambers be covered over, and decorated with bells and ornamented arches. (15) Let large water-jars be securely fixed in order, capable of holding a copious supply, and provided with golden drinking-cups. Let apartments be prepared (16), and various kinds of beverage, in appropriate vessels, be ready. Let judges of the games be invited, and corporations, with their chiefs. Let orders be issued to the wrestlers, and notice be given to the spectators; and let platforms, for their accommodation, be fitted up in the place of assembly.'" (17)†

* Aksha-váta is the reading of my oldest MS., instead of the ordinary range-váta.
† Harivána, II. 4527—4537:

एवं राजा विचिन्त्यां निष्कम्य खगृष्टोत्साहः ।
प्रेशागारं अग्नास्य महानमवलोकः ॥
स दुह्षा सर्वपिन्यं प्रेशागारं नुपोत्तमः ।
शिरीरां तृत्यं पुरुष्यावर्तिनित्तमः ॥
सोत्तमागारं युक्ताभिर्विधभीमिवभूषितम ।
कुटीमिस्व प्राचिनिरशस्य भूषितम ॥
सर्वेऽसार्विकृतं स्थायं सुभृतितिः ॥
उद्याक्षियं सुशिख्यं वस्त्रारोहणमृत्तमम् ॥
नुपातानपरिचितं संवारपथं त्वः ॥
केहं तत्तद्विक्षितं मानवीयभिर्चनम ॥
स दुह्षा भूषितं रुस्मास्यापपं वुजितमानः ।
ञः सचिवः समाजाय सप्ताहस्वेदीवः ॥
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for her son,* whose lovely face she longed to behold, even in the hour of his destruction. When the musical

When the meeting takes place, the site of the games is thus described: "Upon the following day, the amphitheatre (18) was filled by the citizens, anxious to behold the games. The place of assembly (19) was supported by octagonal painted pillars, (20) fitted up with terraces, and doors, and bolts, with windows, circular or crescent; shaped, and accommodated with seats with cushions; (21) and it shone like the ocean, whilst large clouds hang upon it, with spacious, substantial pavilions, (22) fitted up for the sight of the combat; open to the front, (23) but screened with beautiful and fine curtains, (24) crowned with festoons of flowers, and glistening with radiance, like autumnal clouds. The pavilions† of the different companies and corporations, vast as mountains, were decorated with banners, bearing upon them the implements and emblems of the several crafts. (25) The chambers of the inhabitants of the inner apartments shone near at hand, bright with gold, and painting, and net-work of gems: they were richly decorated with precious stones, were enclosed below with costly hangings, (26) and ornamented above with spires and banners, and looked like mountains spreading their wings in the sky;

* Puñcagriññi, which means that Devaki loved her son.
† Mancha; previously rendered “scaffolds”; “pavilions” being used to represent vadabhī or valabhī.
instruments sounded, Cháňúra sprang forth, and the people cried "Alas!" and Mushtíka slapped his arms while the rays of light reflected from the valuable jewels were blended with the waving of white chowries and the musical tinkling of female ornaments. The separate pavilions of the courtesans were graced by lovely women, attired in the most splendid dresses, (27) and emulated the radiance of the ears of the gods. In the place of assembly there were excellent seats, couches made of gold, and hangings of various colours, intermixed with bunches of flowers; and there were golden vases of water, and handsome places for refreshment, filled with fruits of various kinds, and cooling juices, and sherbets fit for drinking. (28) And there were many other stages and platforms, * constructed of strong timber; and hangings, by hundreds and thousands, were displayed; and, upon the tops of the houses, chambers (29) fitted up with delicate jalousies, through which the women might behold the sports, appeared like swans flying through the air.

"In front stood the pavilion of Kaúsa, surpassing all the rest in splendour, looking like Mount Mera, in radiance; its sides, its columns, being covered with burnished gold; fastened with coloured cords, and every way worthy the presence of a king." †

* These two substantives are to render mancha. See note † in the preceding page.
† Harivádha, sl. 4642—4656:

तत्कालखणि निरुस्ति द्वितीये समुपस्किति ।
आपूर्यत महाराजः पौरियुष्णदिक्युण्मि ॥
सचिनाशापिचरणः सागृहारविद्धः ।
सगवाचार्यसुपूचु सत्कोत्सम्भूषितः ॥
प्राक्कु वैविख्यानिमृत्तितेऽक्षमावत्तितः ।
कल्यातिविवाहवाचः शारदेतिर तीर्थे ॥
सम्भागारि रुपितीत्तितेऽक्षमावत्तितः ।
समाजवाटः गुणोभि समिषोध द्वारणेतः ॥
सकस्मेतंचुक्ताभिः पताकामिति चिन्तरम ।
श्रेयोनां च गण्यानां च महा मात्यविच्छेदः ॥
in defiance. Covered with must* and blood from the elephant, whom, when goaded upon them by his

In justification of the rendering of the above, an explanation of the technical terms, taken either from dictionaries or from the commentators,† may be subjoined. (1) Kaúsa went to the Pre-
kshága (Préchágar), literally, ‘house of seeing;’ but it is evi-
dent, from its interior being visible to spectators on the tops of 
the houses,—as subsequently mentioned,—that it was not a

* This word, a popularized form of the Persian mast, ماست, is here used to translate mada, the ichor which exudes from the temples of a rutting elephant. Mast is an adjective, signifying ‘prond’, ‘in rut’.

† Nilakaupta and Arjuna Misra. To the scantlings of scholia, adduced in the following pages, that are taken from the former, I have annexed his name. The remaining elucidations which Professor Wilson indicates to be commentatorial are derived from the latter.
driver, they had slain, and armed with his tusks. Balabhadra and Janardana confidently entered the arena,

theatre, or covered edifice. If a building at all, it was merely a sort of stockade. One commentator calls it "a place made for seeing the sacrifice": धनुमेहमेच्छार्यं कर्तं धानम्। (५) Mancha-nam avalokakah (सच्चानामवलोकक्). The Mancha is commonly understood to signify a raised platform, with a floor and a roof, ascended by a ladder: see Dictionary. (५) Mancha-vāla (सच्चावाट). Vāla is either 'site' or 'inclosure,' and is used, here, without much affecting the sense of Mancha. The compound is explained, by the commentators; "prepared places" (रूचितभूमिः), or 'the sites of the platforms' (सच्चाभूमिः). (७) The Śreṇī (श्रेणी) associations of artificers practising the same art. One of the commentators understands the term to be here used to denote, not their station, but their labours: "The structure was the work of the artificers" (प्रयत् श्रेणीनाम). (७) Several words occur, here, of technical import. The passage is:

सीतामागारकुष्काधिकार्याविभूमिभिर्मूर्यितम्।§
कुटीभिंष्प्रवृद्धाभिरेक्षकालेन भूपितम्॥

Valabhi is said, by the commentator, to mean a structure with a pent roof, supported by six columns; Kuti, a circular one, having seven roofs (something, perhaps, like a Chinese pagoda,) and four columns. The Eka-stambha is a chamber, supported by one column: वल्लभीभवयो नमत्यवालाभिवर्गहृदीभि: पृथ्वाभिमः।
कुटीभिंष्प्रवृद्धाभिम: कोष्कः समवच्चिर्यानुसारभि:॥। (७) Sārāhīrvyūha

* गर्वलीखाविस्मोचितौ।
† Nilakaṇṭha.
‡ The ensuing definitions I find in Arjuna Miśra only.
§ Some MSS. begin this line with उत्तरागार्.
|| What is meant, here, as the first sentence is from Nilakaṇṭha, who therein explains, first, वल्लभीभि:, and then कुटीभि:, which he reads instead of कुटीभि:. The rest of the Sanskrit, giving a definition of the latter term, is, perhaps, altered from the same commentator.
like two lions amidst (a herd of) deer. Exclamations of pity arose from all the spectators, along with ex-
pressions of astonishment. "This, then," said the people, "is Kríṣhṇa. This is Balabhadrá. This is he

commentary renders it merely 'pleasant' or 'agreeable'(सुहळीत्या:).

(12) 'Covered above with cloths' (उपनीतोत्तरक्ष्ण:). The use of
the awning or Shamiyána is very common in India. (14) For the
wrestlers to rub over their bodies, to absorb the perspiration
(सकान्ता लेदापमार्गचार्यम्). (15) This is, all, rather questionable.
The passage is, most usually:

घण्टाकोऽरण्यशेषभाष वच्यविश्वासः।

Váli, or Bái, in one sense, means 'the edge of a thatch,' and
may be put for some sort of temporary structure—or a kind of
retiring or refreshment-room for the boxers and wrestlers. In some
copies, it is read पटाक्षरण्यशेषम्: "beautiful with cloths spread,"
on which the performers may sit, when disengaged; perhaps, a
sort of carpet on the ground. (16) The expression is, again, Váli
(वच्यविश्वासक्षेत्रनाम). Another sense of the word is "offering
of viands, or of the remains of a sacrifice, to all beings;"* but
that cannot be its purport here: nor is it ever used in the sense
of viands in general. The verb Kalp or Klíp also usually implies
'making'. (17) Mancháváá:† 'in the Samájá' or 'assembly'.
(18) Maháránga (महारंगः), "the great place of the performance."
Ranga is 'acting' or 'representation'; also, the place or site of
it. (19) All the copies consulted, except one, offer an irregularity
of construction, which, although defended by the commentators,
is a license scarcely allowable. The epithets of the first verse
are, all, in the plural number; they then occur in the singular,
to agree with the only substantive in the description, Samájáváá.
According to the commentaries, the plural term Mancháá (मच्छः)
understood is the substantive to the epithets of the first stanza;
and Samájáváá (the singular), to those of the other verses.
This awkwardness is, however, avoided by the reading of an old
and very good copy, which puts it, all, in the singular;‡ as:

† To render "platforms”. My oldest MS. has मच्छोभा:।
‡ So do the Calcutta edition of the Harivásha, my oldest MS., and,
so far as I knew them, MSS. generally.
by whom the fierce night-walker Pútaná was slain; * by whom the waggon was overturned, and the two

The expression is Charañā; literally, 'foot'; explained, by the commentator, † Stambha, 'post' or 'pillar'. (22) The reading of most of the copies is Sayanottama (शयनोत्तम), which may be taken as the sense of Talottama, 'couches or benches with cushiones.' (23) Manchágarāni (मंचागरानी), 'temporary houses.' (24) Or, 'froniting to the east' (पूर्ववर्त्तिके); (25) Nirnuktaśi (निर्नुक्तकि); explained, by the commentator, § to mean 'fine threads', 'net-work', or 'gauze', through which persons, females especially, may see, without being seen. (26) स्करंस्त्र ब्युङ्काहि: पताकाभि: | (26) "With ridges and projections" (सताङ्गूप्रगृहाशिष्य). The commentator || explains this: "with flags on the top of them" (उपरितिक्रमेण सप- ताकाभि). (27) This appears to be intended for an epithet of the women; although Astaraṇa is not usually applied to dress: आस्तराणाः: शोभिता वारुक्षाभिः: |।

(28) फलावदेशपूर्णाय चात्रिये: पानयोजित: |।
Phala, of course, is 'fruit'. Avadanśa is explained, in lexicons, "what is eaten to excite thirst:" one comment ** gives it, "what may be sucked," as tamarinds and the like. Chāngerī is explained "fluids for drinking, made with sorrel or acid fruits"; that is, sherbets. (29) Utkīnagārikà: or Uthāragārikà: is an epithet of the Prekshāgāra, † † or look-out house of the women (क्षीणां प्रेक्षागृहाः), situated on the tops of their houses, according

* See Vol. IV., p. 276.
† ?
‡ Nilakaṅtha.
§ Idem.
|| Idem.
¶ Parts of two lines. See the original, in p. 29, supra.
** Nilakaṅtha's.
†† The original exhibits the plural, as does the translation which Professor Wilson here annotates.
Arjuna-trees felled. * This is the boy who trampled and danced on the serpent Kāliya; † who upheld the mountain Govardhana for seven nights; ‡ who killed, as if in play, the iniquitous Arishta, § Dhenuka, ¶ and Keśin. ∥ This, whom we see, is Achyuta. ** This is he who has been foretold by the wise, skilled in the sense of the Purāṇas, as Gopāla, who shall exalt the depressed Yādava race. This is a portion of the all-existing; †† all-generating Vishū, descended upon earth, to the commentators; ‡‡ युहोपरि युहं यत्तदक्तमागारं तत्तम्वा: *

> **प्रेषाचृः**; an arrangement very compatible with the form of Indian houses, which have flat roofs, commonly enclosed by a trellis-work or jalousie of masonry. §§ It is observable, that, in the Vishū Puraṇā, and in the Mahābhārata, on various public occasions, the women take their places on the platforms, or in the pavilions, without curtains or screens.

---

* See Vol. IV., pp. 279 and 281.
† Ibid., p. 291.
‡ Ibid., pp. 315, 316.
§ Ibid., pp. 333, 334.
∥ Ibid., pp. 297, 298.
¶ Ibid., p. 340.
** Here the original, according to all my MSS., &c., has the following stanza, unrendered by the Translator, as in his Hindu-made version:

> अष्टे चास्क महाबाहृष्टवक्षदन्ति यजोऽयतः ||

> प्रयाति वीलया योषित्वात्स्यध्ययनन्दनः \[**\]

Both the commentators recognize these verses; and Ratnagarbha expounds them.

†† Sarva-bhistā. Ratnagarbha explains it by sarvatman.
‡‡ The words quoted are Nilakaṇṭha's. Arjuna Miśra has something different.

§§ Professor Wilson's translation of the two passages quoted in pp. 25, 26, and pp. 27, 28, supra, and his notes on the same, have suggested numerous remarks which I have withheld; the subject of this episodical matter not being one with which the Vishū-puraṇā is very intimately connected.
who, will, assuredly, lighten her load.” Thus did the citizens describe Ráma and Kríshña, as soon as they appeared; whilst the breast of Devakí glowed with maternal affection;* and Vasudeva, forgetting his infirmities, felt himself young (again), on beholding the countenances of his sons as a season of rejoicing. The women of the palace, and the wives of the citizens, wide opened their eyes, and gazed intently upon Kríshña.† “Look, friends,” said they to their companions; “look at the face of Kríshña. His eyes are reddened by his conflict with the elephant; and the drops of perspiration stand upon his cheeks, outvying a full-blown lotos in autumn, studded with glittering dew.‡ Avail yourself, now, of the faculty of vision. Observe his breast,—the seat of splendour, marked with the mystic sign,§—and his arms, menacing destruction to his foes. Do you not notice Balabhadra, dressed in a blue garment,—his countenance as fair as the jasmine, as the moon, as the fibres of the lotos-stem? See how he gently smiles at the gestures of Mushúka and Cháñúra, as they spring up. And now behold Hari advance to encounter Cháñúra. What! Are there no elders, judges of the field?|| How can the delicate form of Hari,—only yet in the dawn of

* उर्मिताप द्वीक्षा: चेष्टातपयोहधरम।
Here we have an expression of the idea, that, when a woman is deeply moved in her maternal feelings, she experiences a secretion of milk.

† द्रुश्यं न विराम तम।
‡ This sentence is somewhat interpolated, and otherwise freely rendered. Avakyáya, as appears from the context, here means, as the commentators interpret it, “hoar-frost,” rather than “dew.”
§ To render irivatsa. See Vol. IV., p. 268.
|| Yukta-kárin.
adolescence,—be regarded as a match for the vast and adamantine bulk of the great demon?* Two youths, of light and elegant persons, are in the arena, to oppose athletic fiends, headed by the cruel Chá'núra. † This is a great sin: in the judges of the games, for the umpires to suffer a contest between boys and strong men."

As thus the women of the city conversed (with one another), Hari, having tightened his girdle, danced in the ring, shaking the ground (on which he trod). Balabhadra, also, danced, slapping his arms in defiance. Where the ground was firm, the invincible Kríshña contended, foot to foot, with Chá'núra. The practised demon Mushñika was opposed by Balabhadra. Mutually entwining, and pushing, and pulling, and beating each other with fists, arms, and elbows, pressing each other with their knees, interlacing their arms, kicking with their feet, pressing with their whole weight upon one another,¹ fought Hari and Chá'núra. Desperate

---

¹ The terms here used are technical, and refer to the established modes of wrestling amongst Hindu athletes. § 1. Saininipáta (सैनिनिपत) is described "mutual laying hold of." || 2. Avadhúta (अवधूत), "letting go of the adversary." 3. Kshepañña (क्षेपण) "pulling to and casting back." 4. Mushñi-nipáta (मुष्टि-
was the struggle, though without weapons, and one for life and death, to the great gratification of the

निपात), * "striking with fists." 5. Kila-nipātana (कोजनिपातन), "striking with the elbow." 6. Vajra-nipātana (वज्रनिपातन), "striking with the fore-arm." † 7. Jānu-nirghāta (जानुनिरघात), ‡ "pressing or striking with the knees." 8. Bāhu-vighattana (बाहु-विघटन), § "interlacing the arms." 9. Pāloddhūta (पालोद्धृत), "kicking." ‖ 10. Prasṛishṭa ॥ (प्रसृष्ट), "intertwining of the whole body." In some copies, ** another term occurs, Aśma-nirghāta (अश्मानिरघात), "striking with stones," or "striking blows as hard as with stones;" for stones could scarcely be used in a

* The original has no such term, but सुषिंधि:, "with the fists."
† Aratni-āpaya. Aratni never, I believe, signifies "fore-arm"; and the definition of the fifth technicality shows that it cannot bear the import of 'elbow', its more ordinary signification, when it does not denominate a measure. Again, as it does not here mean 'fist',—one of its senses,—it seems likely that it must denote the ulnar side of the hand. So, indeed, the term is explained by Arjuna Miśra, where he comments on the Mahābhārata, Vana-parvan, sl. 15781. His words are: चरिलिणा।

करतलपञ्चिन।

‡ The Sanskrit has जानुमि:, simply. See note **, below.
§ I find a different reading. See note **, below. The Translator's definition, which is conjectural, is little likely to be correct.

|| पश्चातमृत्यूपशाम।परस्परं पाद्ग्रहतोडूनमस्। Ratnagarbha.

¶ Variant: prasṛishṭa.

** The subjoined verse is rejected, without remark, by Ratnagarbha, and is absent from my two old copies of the mere text, but occurs, though uncommented, in Śridhara's text, and in several of my MSS.:

जानुमिष्ठारमनिघिरिहस्य बाह्यिविघटितः।

Some excellent copies give, instead of अरमनिघिरिहः, अरमभिघिरिहः।

Professor Wilson, when he accepted, in his translation, the seventh and eighth technicalities, should have accepted aśma-nirghāta, also, which cannot be divorced from the other two, since it stands, in the original, between them.
spectators.* In proportion as the contest continued, so Cháñúra was gradually losing something of his original vigour;† and the wreath upon his head trembled from his fury and distress;‡ whilst the world-comprehending; Krishña wrestled with him as if but in sport. Beholding Cháñúra losing, and Krishña gaining, strength, Kaúsa, furious with rage, commanded the music to cease. As soon as the drums and trumpets were silenced, a numerous band of heavenly instruments was heard in the sky;§ and the gods invisibly exclaimed: "Victory to Govinda! Keśava, kill the demon Cháñúra!" Madhusúdana, having, for a long time, dallied with his adversary, at last lifted him up,

contest specified as "one without weapons"|| (अश्मन्तः ॐ युद्धम).¶

† Krishña contended with Cháñúra, "who, through distress and anger, shook the flowers of his crest:"

खेदावचालयता कोपान्विनशेष्करक्षयसमर्गः

The two last terms are explained: "the flower of the wreath on his head:" स्मिरिष्यापीढ़मूलं गुणम्.**

* अश्वमतिघोरं तत्तथोऽङ्गुं मुद्राशणमः
  वत्तमारणविनिष्पायं समाजीतसंयस्निधिः ||

† प्राणश्वाहिनिमाप्पा तात्तत्वाववशावशवम्

‡ Jagan-maya.

§ मुद्रानांदिपु तूरिष्यु प्रतिष्ठितिः तत्वशानतः
  केन संगतामवावन्तैवूपर्य्याश्वनेकः ||

|| As to the use of stones in the combat, which is designated as aśastra, we must suppose,—if the verse quoted above has not been foisted into the text,—that the term aśastra, embodied in this epithet, is employed technically, so as to comprehend those rude and ready missiles.

¶ See note *, above.

** Ratnagarbha.
and whirled him round, with the intention of putting an end to him. Having whirled Cháňúra round a hundred times, until his breath was expended in the air, Kríshña* dashed him on the ground, with such violence as to smash his body into a hundred fragments, and strew the earth with a hundred pools of gory mire.† Whilst this took place, the mighty Baladeva was engaged, in the same manner, with the demon bruiser,‡ Mushtika. Striking him on the head with his fists, and on the breast with his knees, he stretched him on the ground, and pummelled him there, till he was dead. Again, Kríshña encountered the royal bruiser§ Tosalaka,|| and felled him to the earth with a blow of his left hand. When the other athletes¶

* Called, in the original, not by his name, but by the epithet amitrájít.

† मूमावास्कोटितक्षिन चाणुरः सत्क्र त्रनः।
रक्षसीवमहापञ्जाँ चकार शतधा सुमनयः॥

‡ Malla.
§ Malla-rája, "prince of mallas". For malla, see note ¶, below.
|| Corrected from "Tomalaka". Professor Wilson's MS. may have shown a broken स. Most copies yield Tošalaka, the reading, apparently, accepted by Ratnagarbha, and that of the Bhágavata-puráña, which has, jikewise, the short form, Tosala. In very good MSS. of the Hari-váñcha I find Toshala and Toshalaka. Professor Wilson's Bengal translation has Salaka.
¶ Malla; which Professor Wilson renders, indifferently, by "athlete", "boxer", and "bruiser". The last two terms are inadequate, while the first is inadequate, as being much too wide for the occasion. 'Pancratiast', in an accommodated acceptation, may answer to represent malla; for the pancratiast fought nude, whereas it appears that his Hindu analogue contended clothed.

The fighting of Hari, Cháňúra, and Baladeva clearly evinces, that the malla-yuddha corresponded to the classical παγκράτιος or παμμύξιος,—not, indeed, the regular agonism, so much as the lawless description that was practised at Sparta,—the characteristic of which was a combination of boxing and wrestling.
saw Cháñúra, Mushi'ta, and Tosalaka killed, they fled (from the field); and Kríshna and Sankarshaña danced, victorious,* on the arena, dragging along with them, by force, the cowherds of their own age. Kaṁsa, his eyes reddening with wrath, called aloud to the surrounding people: “Drive those two cowboys out of the assembly: seize the villain Nanda; and secure him with chains of iron: put Vasudeva to death with tortures intolerable to his years: and lay hands upon† the cattle, and whatever else belongs to those cowherds who are the associates of Kríshna.”

Upon hearing these orders, the destroyer of Madhu laughed at Kaṁsa, and, springing up to the place

Nilakañña, commenting on the Mahábhárata, Vana-parvan, śī. 15779, quotes from some Niti-sástra, as follows:

चामपाशिकोट्यिदा भूमी नियमीव चलात्।
सुर्दशि पादयंहरणं जातुनौदरमसि।॥
मातुराकारया सुष्मया क्षणो इष्टताड्यनस्।
कालिणि चित्ते यथात्वत्वाचलताड्यनस्।॥
तालिक नुभे भामि मारवेय सृतमभय।
चतुर्भि: चतुर्विषयं ह्वात्याक्षेत्र्यं: चतुर्विषाधस्यान।
षड्‌तिविन्नं सर्वमितु युद्देष्यं संकरस्थिष्यान।॥

It appears, from this, that the Hindu panatrumum recognized eight modes of procedure: tearing out the hair, felling to the ground, kicking on the head, punching the belly with the knee, pommelling the cheeks with clenched fists, elbowing, slapping, and whirling round. Four of these modes of annoyance, counted from the first, are reckoned legitimate as against an ordinary Kshattriya; five, as against a reprobate or titular Kshattriya; six, as against a Vaiśya; seven, as against a Śúdra; and all eight, as against an adversary of mixed extraction.

Our modern fancy have nothing to learn, on the score of humanity, from their Aryan predecessors of the ring, any more than from the roughs of Sparta, among whom even biting and scratching were not accounted foul play.

* Harshita, ‘delighted.’
† Insert ‘the towns’, pur.
where he was seated, laid hold of him by the hair of his head, and struck his tiara* to the ground. Then, casting him down upon the earth, Govinda threw himself upon him. Crushed by the weight of the upholder of the universe, the son of Ugrasena (Kanîsa), the king, gave up the ghost. Krîshna† then dragged the dead body, by the hair of the head, into the centre of the arena; and a deep furrow was made by the vast and heavy carcass of Kanîsa, when it was dragged along the ground by Krîshna, as if a torrent of water had run through it.‡ Seeing Kanîsa thus treated, his brother Sunâman§ came (to his succour): but he was encountered, and easily killed, by Balabhadra. Then arose a general cry of grief from the surrounding

---

Et latum medium suleum didicit arenam.§

The yielding sand being furrowed into a ditch, or a water-course, by the dead bodies being dragged over it.

The text is:

श्रीरविख्यातिमहता परिखा तन्म ढथपता।
भंता कृसख टेष्ठ वेगेन्त्र महामस। ||

---

* Kirîta.
† Madhusûdana, in the original.
‡ Corrected from “Sumâlin”. This mistake is easily accounted for. In Professor Wilson’s favourite MS., which is carelessly transcribed, and has few of the copyist’s inadvertencies corrected, we read:

सुमालिनामा बलभद्रेष्ठ लीलविन निपातित:।

Professor Wilson’s Hindu-made version has Sumâli.

By striking out the syllables -मालिः, the verse is restored to its proper form. But the Translator, in due adherence to his copy, should have given the name as Sumâlinâman.

For Sunâman, see Vol. IV., p. 98.
§ This looks as if intended for Juvenal., Sat. I., 157:
Et latum media suleum didicit arenam.
|| Literally: “By the trailing body of Kanîsa, with its prodigious weight, a channel was made, as by the velocity of a great stream.”
circle, as they beheld the king of Mathurá* (thus) slain, (and treated) with (such) contumely, by Kṛishñā. Kṛishñā, accompanied by Balabhādra, embraced the feet of Vasudeva and of Devaki: but Vasudeva raised him up;† and, he and Devaki recalling to recollection what he had said to them at his birth, they bowed to Janárdena; and the former thus addressed him: “Have compassion upon mortals, O god, benefactor;‡ and lord of deities. It is by thy favour to us two, that thou hast become the (present) upholder (of the world). That, for the punishment of the rebellious,§ thou hast descended (upon earth,) in my house, having been propitiated (by my prayers), sanctifies our race. Thou art the heart|| of all creatures; thou abidest in all creatures; and all that has been, or will be, emanates from thee, O universal spirit.¶ Thou, Ačyuta, who comprehendest all the gods, art eternally worshipped with sacrifices: thou art sacrifice itself, and the offerer of sacrifices. The affection that inspires my heart, and the heart of Devaki, towards thee, as if thou wast our child, is, indeed, but error and a great delusion.** How shall the tongue of a mortal such as I am call the creator of all things, who is without beginning or

* See Vol. IV., p. 338.
† The original makes both the father and mother show him this honour:

उत्साह वमुदेवभाँ देवकी च जनार्दनम्।

‡ Varada.
§ Durvūtta.
|| Anta.

¶ प्रवर्तिते समस्तात्मांस्तव्तरी भूतभविषयति।

** साप्तनर्ममममनो वदेश्लिच्या जापते।

देवक्षात्मामाजप्रीत्या तद्वनाविदम्य।
end, son? Is it consistent that the lord of the world, from whom the world proceeds, should be born of me, except through illusion?* How should he, in whom all fixed and moveable things are contained, be conceived in the womb, and born of a mortal being?† Have compassion, therefore, indeed, O supreme lord, and, in thy descended portions, protect the universe. Thou art no son of mine. This whole world, from Brahmá to a tree,‡ thou art. Wherefore dost thou, who art one with the Supreme, beguile us? Blinded by delusion, I thought thee my son; and for thee, who art beyond all fear, I dreaded the anger of Kaúsa; and, therefore, did I take thee, in my terror, to Gokula, where thou hast grown up. But I no longer claim thee as mine own..§ Thou, Vishúu,—the sovereign lord of all,|| whose actions Rudra, the Maruts, the Aświns, Indra,¶ and the gods cannot equal, although they behold them; thou, who hast come amongst us, for the benefit of the world,—art recognized; and delusion is no more.”

* जगद्वेदन्तजगन्नाथ संभूतमहिं यत्: ।
कथा युक्ता विना मायां सोपान्त: संभविष्यति ॥
† स कौशोत्सङ्ख्ययो मनुष्याज्ञायति कथम्।
§ This sentence is not rendered very literally.
|| This phrase is to represent इत्या.
¶ The original has शतक्रतु। See Vol. I., p. 150.
CHAPTER XXI.

Krishna encourages his parents; places Ugrasena on the throne; becomes the pupil of Śāndipani, whose son he recovers from the sea; he kills the marine demon Panchajana, and makes a horn of his shell.

HAVING permitted to Devaki and Vasudeva (an interval of) true knowledge, through the contemplation of his actions, Hari again spread the delusions of his power* over (them and) the tribe of Yadu. He said to them: "Mother; venerable father; you have, both, been long observed, by Sankarshaṇa and myself, with sorrow, and in fear of Kaṁśa. He whose time passes not in respect to his father and mother is a vile being, who descends, in vain, from virtuous parents.† The lives of those produce good fruit who reverence their parents, their spiritual guides, the Brahmans, and the gods. Pardon, therefore, father, the impropriety of which we may have been culpable, in resenting, without your orders,—to which we acknowledge that we are subject,—the oppression we suffered from the power and violence of Kaṁśa."‡ Thus speaking, they offered homage to the elders of the Yadu tribe, in order, and, then, in a suitable manner, paid their respects to the citizens. The wives of Kaṁśa, and those of his father,§

* माया * वैष्णवीम।
† कुर्वत्तां चाति च: कालो मातापितीरप्रजनम।
तत्त्वद्विधमायुषो अर्थे साधुनामुपवायत॥
‡ This sentence is much expanded in translation.
§ मातरक्राख, "and his—Kaṁśa's—mothers," i. e., it seems, his mother and his mother-in-law.
then surrounded the body of the king, lying on the ground, and bewailed his fate, in deep affliction. Hari, in various ways, expressed his regret (for what had chanced), and endeavoured to console them, his own eyes being suffused with tears. The foe of Madhu then liberated Ugrasena from confinement, and placed him on the throne, which the death of his son had left vacant.* The chief of the Yádavas,† being crowned, performed the funeral rites of Kanîsa, and of the rest of the slain. When the ceremony was over, and Ugrasena had resumed his royal seat, Kríshña; (addressed him,) and said: “Sovereign lord, command, boldly, what else is to be done.§ The curse of Yayáti has pronounced our race unworthy of dominion;¹ but, with me for your servant, you may issue your orders to the gods. How should kings disobey them?”||

Thus having spoken, the human Keśava summoned, mentally, the deity of the wind,—who came upon the instant,—and said to him: “Go, Váyu, to Indra, and desire him** to lay aside his pomp,†† and resign to

---

¹ The curse pronounced on the elder sons of Yayáti, on their refusing to take upon them their father’s infirmities. See Vol. IV., p. 48.

* उपायनात्विवेद निजराज्ये हृतात्मजम्।
† Yada-sīthka.
‡ Hari, in the original.
§ उवाचकाराय बिनो यत्कार्यामविश्वाशितः।
|| मध्व भृगि खिति द्वानासाधायतु विन नूपे।।
¶ कार्यामानुषः।
** Vásava, in the original.
†† ‘Pride’, rather,—garva; namely, says Renugarbha, at the recollection of Kríshña’s having lifted up Mount Govardhana.
Ugrasena his (splendid) hall, Sudharman.* Tell him that Kṛishṇa commands him to send the royal hall, the unrivalled gem of princely courts, for the assemblage of the race of Yadu."† Accordingly, Vāyu went, and delivered the message to the husband of Śachi,§ who || (immediately) gave up to him the hall Sudharman; and Vāyu conveyed it to the Yādavas, the chiefs of whom, thenceforth, possessed this celestial court, emblazoned with jewels, and defended by the arm of Govinda.¶ The two excellent Yadu youths, versed in all knowledge, and possessed of all wisdom,** then submitted to instruction, as the disciples of teachers. Accordingly, they repaired to Sāndīpani—who, though born in Kāśi,†† resided at Avanti,‡‡—to study (the science of) arms, and, becoming his pupils, were obedient and attentive to their master; exhibiting

* Or the name may be read Sudharmā. Both forms are authorized.
† कण्ठी प्रवीणति राजाइंैवेद्वेशमपमण्डितम्।
सुधमोहका समाय युक्तमस्यां यदुभिरासितम्॥
‡ The Sanskrit has Pavana.
§ In the original, Śachipati, an epithetical designation of Indra. See Vol. II., p. 72, note 2.
|| Here the original calls Indra by his appellation Purandara.
¶ वाणुनोपजयतां दिय्यां सभां ते चदुपुष्यतः।
वुधुः स्वर्णवल्लां गोविन्दृभुजस्यश्रयत॥
The ordinary reading, and that accepted by Ratnagarbha, ends the second line with -संशयत॥
** Sarva-śāśva-nayaka.
†† Kāśya, "of the Kāśi tribe." See my Benares, &c., p. 9, note 1; also, Vol. IV., p. 345, supplement to p. 159, note ††. But the Translator has the support of both the commentators. Kāśya is the word used in the corresponding passage of the Bhājavatav-purāṇa, viz., X., Prior Section, XLV., 31; but Śridhara offers no explanation of it.
‡‡ The city so called. The Sanskrit has Avantīpurā. See Vol. III., p. 246. I have corrected "Avanti".
an example, to all men, of the observance of instituted rules.* In the course of sixty-four days, † they had gone through the elements of military science, with the treatises on the use of arms, and directions for the mystic incantations, which secure the aid of supernatural weapons. ‡ Sándípani, astonished at such proficiency, and knowing that it exceeded human faculties, imagined that the Sun and Moon had become his scholars. When they had acquired all that he could teach, they said to him: "Now say what present shall be given to you, as the preceptor's fee." § The prudent Sándípani, perceiving that they were endowed with more than mortal powers, requested them to give him his dead son, (drowned) in the sea of Prabhásá. 2

---

1 They read through the Dhanur-veda, || which treats of military matters; with the Rahasya, 'the mystical part,' † and the Sangraha, 'collection' or 'compendium', —said to be, here, the Astra-prayoga, ** 'the employment of weapons.'

2 Prabhásá is a place of pilgrimage in the west of India, on the coast of Gujerat, near the temple of Somanátha, and town of Puttan Somuath. It is also known by the name of Somatirtha; Soma, or the Moon, having been here cured of the con-

---

* "An example of the observance of instituted rules" is to translate dchéra. See Vol. III., p. 107, note †.
† Ahotátra, 'nycthemera.' The term, apparently, is chosen with a view to imply diligent studentship.
‡ These three expansions are to represent the expressions specified in note 1 in this page.
§ Guru-dakshiná.
‡ The mantras and Upanishads, the commentators allege.
** Śridhara and Ratnagarbha.
Taking up their arms, they marched against the Ocean. But the all-comprehending Sea said to them: "I have not killed the son of Sándípani." A demon† named Panchajana,‡ (who lives) in the form of a conch-shell, seized the boy. He is still under my waters.§ On hearing this, Kríshña plunged into the sea; and, having slain the vile Panchajana, he took the conch-shell,—which was formed of his bones, (and bore it as his horn),—the sound of which fills the demon-hosts with dismay, animates the vigour of the gods, and annihilates unrighteousness.|| The heroes also recovered the boy from the pains of death, and restored him, in his former person, to his father. Ráma and Janárdana

sumption brought upon him by the imprecation of Daksha, his father-in-law. Mahábhárata, Śalya Parvan; Vol. III.; p. 249.

* मृहिताक्षोऽतत्सतीं तु सार्ध्यपाची महीद्धिः।
उवाच न मया पुषो इति: सार्धस्पिनीशिरित॥

Various MSS. have, instead of सार्ध्यपाचि, सार्ध्येः, पाथ्याचि, ज्ञेनाति, and म्येनाति। It is impossible to say what reading the Translator accorded the preference to.

† Dailya.
‡ For his origin, see Vol. II., p. 69, note ||.
§ The Sea here addresses Kríshña as asura-sídána, "slayer of demons."
|| Professor Wilson has here omitted to translate a stanza, of some little importance, if only by way of connecting what precedes with what follows. It is recognized by both the commentators, and runs thus:

त पाण्डुज्यमार्गं गला यमपुरीं हरि:।
बलदे्यवस वलवाम्मिला वैस्वतं यमम॥

We learn, from this, that Hari blew Páñchajanyá,—the name of his newly acquired shell,—and proceeded to the city of Yama; and that Bálädeva conquered Yama, son of Vivasvat.

For the origin of Yama, see Vol. III., p. 20; for the situation of Yama's city, Vol. II., p. 239.
then returned to Mathurá, which was well presided over * by Ugrasena, and abounded in a happy population, both of men and women.¹

¹ The incidents of the two last chapters are related in the Bhágavata and Hari Varāha,—often in the words of the text, but with many embellishments and additions, especially in the latter. The Brahma Vaivarta, on the other hand, makes still shorter work of these occurrences than our text.

* Pālita.
CHAPTER XXII.

Jarásandha besieges Mathurá; is defeated, but repeatedly renew the attack.

PARÁŚARA.—The mighty Kaúsa had married the two daughters of Jarásandha, * one named Asti, the other, Prápti. † Jarásandha was king of Magadha; and a very powerful prince; ‡ who, when he heard that Krishña.§ had killed his son-in-law, was much incensed, and, collecting a large force, marched against Mathurá, determined to put the Yádavas and Krishña to the sword. || Accordingly, he invested the city with three and twenty numerous divisions of his forces. ² Ráma and Janárdana sallied from the town, with a slender, but resolute, force, and fought bravely with the armies

---

1 See Vol. IV., pp. 150, 151.
2 With twenty-three Akshauhiñís, each consisting of 109,350 ¶ infantry, 65,610 horse, 21,870 chariots, and as many elephants. ** The Hari Vaímśa †† enumerates, as the allies, or tributaries, of Jarásandha, a number of princes from various parts of India. But this is a gratuitous embellishment.

---

* See Vol. IV., pp. 150 and 173; also, note in p. 344.
† Corrected from "Asti" and "Prápti".
‡ Corrected, here and everywhere, from "Magadha". See Vol. IV., p. 151, note †.
§ Hari, in the original.
|| This sentence is rendered with great looseness.
¶ Corrected from "109,300".
** So say the commentators on the Amara-kośa, II., VIII., II., 49. For a venerable statement of the component parts of an akshauhiñí, see the Mahábhárata, Ádi-parvan, ñ. 292–296.
†† ñ. 5013–5022.
of Magadha.* The two youthful leaders prudently resolved to have recourse to their ancient weapons; and, accordingly, the bow of Hari, with two quivers filled with exhaustless† arrows, and the mace‡ called Kaumodakī,§ and the ploughshare|| of Balabhadra, as well as the club ℗ Saunanda, descended, at a wish, from heaven. Armed with these weapons, they (speedily) discomfited the king of Magadha and his hosts, and reentered the city, (in triumph).

Although the wicked (king of Magadha,) Jarāśandha was defeated, yet Krīśnā knew, that, whilst he escaped alive, he was not subdued; and, in fact, he soon returned, with a (mighty) force, and was again forced, by Rāma and Krīśnā, to fly. Eighteen times¹ did the haughty prince of Magadha** renew his attack

---

¹ The Bhāgavata †† and Hari Vamśa † say 'seventeen times.'

The latter indulges in a prolix description of the first encounter, nothing of which occurs in the Bhāgavata, any more than in our text.

---

* निन्द्रमन्यान्यपरीवारावृषी रामजनाइनी।
दुष्यधाते समे तस्म बलिनी बलिसेरिकैः।।
† Akshaya, 'indestructible.'
‡ Gaddā.
§ A present from Varuṇa, according to the Mahābhārata, Adi-parvan, ś. 8200. It takes its name from Kumodaka, an epithetical appellation of Krīśnā.
|| Hala, which means, ordinarily, 'plough.' For its synonym, sira, synecdochically used in the same way as in the text, see Vol. III., p. 332, note \.|.
¶ Musala; a weapon shaped like a pestle, it should seem.
** To render सागधी राजा।
†† X., Latter Section, I., 44.
§§ Śl. 5126.
upon the Yádavas, headed by Kṛishña, and was as often defeated and put to the rout, by them, with very inferior numbers. That the Yádavas were not overpowered by their foes was owing to the present might of the portion of the discus-armed Vishńu. * It was the pastime† of the lord of the universe, in his capacity of man, to launch various‡ weapons against his enemies: (for) what effort of power to annihilate his foes could be necessary to him whose fiat creates and destroys the world? But, as subjecting himself to human customs, he formed alliances with the brave, and engaged in hostilities with the base.§ He had recourse to the four devices of policy,—or, negotiation, presents, sowing dissension, and chastisement,||—and, sometimes, even betook himself to flight. Thus, imitating the conduct of human beings, the lord of the world pursued, at will, his sports.¶

* यदवर्ष यादवानां तिरंगितं यक्षरक्षः।
तातु संविधिमहात्म्यं विष्णुरंग्रह समक्षः॥
† Līlā. See Vol. IV., p. 325, note §.
‡ Aneka-rūpa.
§ तथापि यो सनवर्षाणां घम्मकमुखति।
कुक्कुलमवता संधिं ह्रमीश्च वपस्यासि॥
Ratnagarbha reads the first verse as follows:

तथा ये च सनवर्षाणां घम्मकमुखवर्षनम्।

Other variants, of little importance, might be added from my MSS. unaccompanied by commentary.
|| Sāman, upapradāna, bheda, and dāṇḍa-pāta. See, further, the Amara-kola, II., VIII., I., 20.
¶ सनवर्षाणां चिद्रागिनिमिश्रमगमन्ति।
सीखा जगत्तरंग्रहं चन्द्रत: संप्रवति॥
CHAPTER XXIII.

Birth of Kálayavana: he advances against Mathurá. Krishná builds Dwáraká, and sends thither the Yádava tribe: he leads Kálayavana into the cave of Muchukunda: the latter awakes, consumes the Yavana king, and praises Krishná.

PARÁŚARA.—Śyála* having called Garga,† the Brahman, whilst at the cow-pens, impotent, in an assembly of the Yádavas;‡ they all laughed; at which he was highly offended, and repaired to the shores§ of the western sea,|| where he engaged in arduous penance, to obtain a son, who should be a terror to the tribe of Yadú.¶ Propitiating Mahádeva, and living upon iron-sand** for twelve years, the deity†† (at last) was pleased with him, and gave him the (desired) boon. The king of the Yavanas, who was childless,

---

* On the credit of both the commentators, we here have no proper name, but the word for brother-in-law, śyála. According to Ratnagarbha, Śiśiráyana is thus alluded to, and proleptically; for Garga was still to marry his sister, Gauri.
† Corrected from “Gárgya”, with the suffrage of several MSS. Probably the Garga is meant who—as we read in the Bhágavata-puráña, X., Prior Section, Chapter XLV,—served as instructor to Krishná and Ba-laráma. See Vol. IV., p. 279. But Gárgya seems to be the reading of the Harvasáha, ii. 1957—1959.
‡ Two Gargas, then, are named in the present Chapter. See p. 58, infra.
§ There is no word for this in the Sanskrit.
|| Instead of dákshinápathá, the reading of Śrídhara, most MSS. have dákshinápatha, ‘the south’, the lection preferred by Ratnagarbha.
¶ युतमिक्षकसप्तकापद्ययुक्तक्रमयावहस्स | ** Ayá-sárá; ‘iron-filings’, more likely.
†† Hara, in the original.
became the friend of Garga; and the latter begot a son, by his wife, who was as (black as) a bee, and was, thence, called Kálayavana. 1 The Yavana king, having placed his son, whose breast was as hard as the point of the thunderbolt, upon the throne, retired to the woods. Inflated with conceit of his prowess, Kálayavana demanded of Nárada who were the most mighty heroes on earth. To which the sage answered "The Yádavas." Accordingly, Kálayavana assembled many myriads of Mlechchhas and barbarians, 2 and, with a

1 This legend of the origin of Kálayavana is given, also, by the Hari Vaṁśa.† The Bhágavata, like our text, comes, at once, to the siege of Mathurá by this chief; but the Hari Vaṁśa suspends the story, for more than thirty chapters, to narrate an origin of the Yádavas, and sundry adventures of Krişñá and Ráma to the south-west. Most of these have no other authority, and are, no doubt, inventions of the Dakhni compiler; and the others are misplaced.

2 So the Bhágavata describes him, § as leading a host of Mlechchhas (or barbarians) against Krişñá; but, in the Mahábhárata,—Sabhá Parvan, Vol. I., p. 330,—where Krişñá describes the power of Jarásandha, he admits that he and the Yádavas fled from Mathurá to the west, through fear of that king; but no account is given of any siege of Mathurá by Kálayavana. The only indication of such a person is the mention, || that Bhagadatta,

---

* स भाज्यामास पं च ते यवनेनि ज्ञानाविना: *

The original, it will be observed, does not here name Garga, which I have corrected from "Gárgya".

† खीरकोटिसहस्त्रायां सहस्रबंडकभिषु: *

‡ Chapter CXV.

§ It calls him Yavana the Asura.

|| ŚŚ. 578, 579:

मुखे च नरकं चैव मास्ति यो यवनाधिपः *

अपर्याप्ताय राजा प्रतीया वत्सो यथा ||
vast armament of elephants, cavalry, and foot, advanced, impatiently, against Mathurá and the Yádavas;

the Yavana king, who rules over Muru* and Naraka, in the west and south, is one of his most attached feudatories. This king is, in various other places, called king of Prágyotisha; as he is in a subsequent passage of the same book,—Sabhá Parvan, p. 374;† and this name is always applied to the the west of Assam;‡ His subjects are, however, still Yavanas and Mlecchhas; and he presents horses, caps set with jewels, and swords with ivory hilts,—articles scarcely to be found in Assam, which cannot well be the seat of his sovereignty. It seems most likely, therefore, that the story may have originated in some knowledge of the power and position of the Greek-Bactrian princes, or their Scythian successors; although, in the latter compilations, it has been mixed up with allusions to the first Mohammedan aggressions. See Asiatic Researches, Vol. VI., p. 306, and Vol. XV., p. 100.

महाराष्ट्र वृहत्व पितुः सर्वः।
स वाचा प्रत्यत्वा कार्यं च विमुखः।

Here, Bhagadatta—with the epithet aparyanta-bala, 'of boundless might',—is said to be paramount over Muru and Naraka, in like manner as Varuṇa rules the west. The direction of Bhagadatta's kingdom is not assigned.

M. Fauche's translation of this passage, while correcting Professor Wilson's view of its meaning, as to some points, turns an epithet into a king, and gives him what belongs to Bhagadatta:

"De lui relève encore le roi Aparyantabala, souverain des Yavanas, qui règne sur le Mourou et le Naraka, comme Varouña sur la plage occidentale;"

"Et Bhagadatta, le vieil ami de ton père, Bhagadatta, qui se couvre plus que toute autre, puissant roi, devant sa parole et son geste."

For the position of Varuṇa's city, see Vol. II., p. 239.

* It has more than once been conjectured that we should read Maru, in this place. But Muru and Naraka, I take it, are, here, not names of countries,—as is generally supposed,—but two demons, so called, at last slain by Kṛṣṇa. See Chapter XXIX. of this Book.

† Śl. 1836.

‡ I. e., to the ancient Kāmarūpa; for which see Vol. II., p. 132, and p. 133, note 1.
wearying, every day, the animal that carried him, but insensible of fatigue, himself.

When Kṛishṇa knew of his approach, he reflected, that, if the Yādavas encountered the Yavana, they would be so much weakened by the conflict, that they would then be overcome by the king of Magadha;† that their force was much reduced by the war with Magadha,† whilst that of Kālayavana was unbroken; and that the enemy might be, therefore, victorious:† Thus, the Yādavas were exposed to a double danger.§ He resolved, therefore, to construct a citadel, for the Yadu tribe, that should not be easily taken,—one that even women might defend, and in which, therefore, the heroes of the house of Vṛishṇi∥ should be secure; one in which the male combatants of the Yādavas should dread no peril, though he, himself, should be drunk, or careless, asleep, or abroad. Thus reflecting, Kṛishṇa¶ solicited a space of twelve furlongs from the ocean; and there he built the city of Dwārakā,¹ defended by high ramparts,** and beautified with gardens

¹ According to the Mahābhārata, he only enlarged and fortified the ancient city of Kuśasthali, founded by Raivata. Sabhā Parvan.†† See, also, Vol. III., p. 253, of this work.

* क्रष्णोऽपि चिन्तयामास चचिचितं चादं वलस् ।
यत्रमनि रङ्गेन सम्य मागधथ्य भविष्यति।
† Literally, "by the king of the Magadhas," मागधेन।
‡ A free translation; and so is much of what follows.
§ There is no Sanskrit for this sentence. It is taken from the commentaries.
∥ Vṛishṇi-purāṇa. For Vṛishṇi, see Vol. IV., p. 58.
¶ The original has Govinda.
** Mahā-vapra.
†† Śr. 614. M. Fauche, in his translation, converts Raivata into a mountain.
and reservoirs of water, crowded with houses and buildings,* and splendid as the capital of Indra, Amaravati.† Thither Janárdana conducted the inhabitants of Mathurá, and then awaited, at that city, the approach of Kálayavana:*

When the hostile army encamped round Mathurá, Kríshña, § unarmed, went forth, and beheld the Yavana king. Kálayavana, the strong-armed, recognizing Vá- 
sudeva, pursued him,—him whom the thoughts of per-
fect ascetics|| cannot overtake. Thus pursued, Kríshña entered a large cavern, where Muchukunda, the king of men, was asleep. The rash Yavana, entering (the cave), and beholding a man lying asleep there, con-
cluded it must be Kríshña, and kicked him; at which Muchukunda awoke, and, casting on him an angry 
glance, the Yavana was instantly consumed, and re-
duced to ashes.** For, in a battle between the gods and demons, Muchukunda had, formerly, contributed to the defeat of the latter; and, being overcome with 
sleep, he solicited of the gods, as a boon, that he should enjoy a long repose. “Sleep long, and soundly,”†† said the gods; “and whoever disturbs you shall be instantly burnt to ashes by fire emanating from your body.”†

---

* Prákára; ‘strong buildings’, Ratnagarbha says.
† See Vol. II., p. 240, text and notes.
§ The Sanskrit has Govinda. || Mahá-yogin. ¶ Sudarman. 
** दद्मासक्षु तेनासी ज्वाल यवनोदविना।
तत्कृष्णविन मीविय भक्तिभुततः तन्वशाल ||
†† These words are interpolated by the Translator. 
‡‡ Corrected from “Maṇḍhátrí”.

1 The name of Muchukunda, as one of the sons of Mándhátrí."
Having burnt up the iniquitous Yavana, and beholding the foe of Madhu, Muchukunda asked him who he was. "I am born," he replied, "in the Lunar race, in the tribe of Yadu, and am the son of Vasudeva." Muchukunda, recollecting the prophecy of old Garga, fell down before the lord of all, Hari, saying: "Thou art known, supreme lord, to be a portion of Vishnu;* for it was said, of old, by Garga,† that, at the end of the twenty-eighth Dwāpara age, Hari would be born in the family of Yadu. Thou art he, without doubt,—the benefactor of mankind; for thy glory I am unable to endure. Thy words are of deeper tone than the muttering of the rain-cloud; and earth sinks down beneath the pressure of thy feet. As, in the battle between the gods and demons, the Asuras were unable to sustain my lustre, so even am I incapable of bearing thy radiance.‡ Thou alone art the refuge of every

occurs in Vol. III., p. 268; but no further notice is taken of him. The Bhāgavata§ specifies his being the son of that king, and relates the same story of his long sleep as the text. The same occurs in the Hari Varma.|| The general character of the legends in this chapter is that of reference to something familiar, rather than its narration. In the Hari Varma the opposite extreme is observable; and there the legends are as prolix as here they are concise. The Bhāgavata follows a middle course; but it seems unlikely, that, in either of the three, we have the original fables.

* प्राह ज्ञाते भवार्थिषोरं रथं परमेश्वरः।
† विषोरं, some MSS. have विषणु: पूर्वः।
‡ ध्वाप्रि: महायुजि: देवसैि: महाभटाः।
§ X., Latter Section, II.
|| Chapter CXV.

\[\text{Instead of विषोरं, some MSS. have विषणु: पूर्वः।} \]
living being who has lighted on the world. Do thou, who art the alleviator of all distress, show favour upon me, and remove from me all that is evil.* Thou art the oceans, the mountains, the rivers, the forests; thou art earth, sky, air, water, and fire: thou art mind, intelligence, the unevolved principle,† the vital airs, the lord of life; the soul;‡ all that is beyond the soul; the all-pervading; exempt from the vicissitudes of birth; devoid of (sensible properties,) sound and the like; undecaying, illimitable, imperishable, subject neither to increase nor diminution:§ thou art that which is Brahma,—without beginning or end. From thee the immortals, the progenitors, the Yakshas, Gandharvas,|| and Kinnaras, the Siddhas, the nymphs of heaven,¶ men, animals,** birds, reptiles,†† deer,‡‡ and all the vegetable world, proceed; and all that has been, or will be, or is now, moveable or fixed. All that is amorphous, or has form; all that is gross, subtle, moveable, or stable, §§ thou art, O creator of the world; and beside thee there is not anything. O lord, I have been whirl-

* संत्तलद प्रपन्तार्तिहता हर ममाभुम।
† Āvyākṛta.
‡ Puḥsa.
§ Nāda.
|| Corrected from "Gandharbhas".
¶ Apsaras.
** Pāśu, which often means 'sacrificial animals'. Compare the title Paśupati; also, the terms paśubandha and nirūḍhapaśubandha, Vol. III., p. 40, note §, and p. 113, note †.
†† Sarisṛipa; rather "reptiles" than "insects", as it is rendered in Vol. II., p. 92.
‡‡ 'Wild beasts', rather; mṛīga.
§§ Ratnagarbha has, instead of सूचन चरर सखि, सूचतर तथा: and this reading gets rid of two tautologies; for "moveable or fixed" occurs just before.
ed round, in the circle of worldly existence, for ever; and have suffered the three classes of affliction;* and there is no rest† whatever. I have mistaken pains for pleasures, like sultry vapours; for a pool of water; and their enjoyment has yielded me nothing but sorrow.§ The earth, dominion,¶ forces, treasures, friends,¶ children, wife, dependants, all the objects of sense,** have I possessed, imagining them to be sources of happiness; but I found, that, in their changeable nature,†† O lord, they were nothing but vexation. The gods themselves, though (high) in heaven, were in need of my alliance. Where, then, is everlasting repose? Who, without adoring thee,—who art the origin of all worlds,—shall attain, O supreme deity, that rest which endures for ever? Beguiled by thy delusions, and

* These are alluded to in the opening stanza of the Sānkhya-kārikā:

दु:खचच्याभिषाताः जिज्ञासा तद्परातः हृति ।
इष्टे सापायः चेतानामावनों-भावायः ॥

“Because of the disquietude which results from threefold pain, there arises a desire to know the means of doing away therewith effectually. If it be objected, that, visible means to this end being available, such desire is unprofitable, I demur; for that these means do not, entirely and for ever, operate exemption from disquietude.”

The three sorts of pain, the ādhyātmika, ādhibhautika, and ādhidāivika, are, in the words of Colebrooke, “evil proceeding from self,” “from external beings,” and “from divine causes”. See his Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 238.

† Nirvātī.

¶ Mṛiga-trishāṇa, the mirage.

§ तथा नाथ मुक्तितानि तानि तापाय चाभवः ।

॥ Rādhāra.

¶ Insert ‘adherents’, paksha.

** शन्द्राया विस्मया: ।

†† परिशासि, ‘in the end,’ ‘at last,’ ‘after all.’
ignorant of thy nature,* men, after suffering the various penalties of birth, death, and infirmity, behold the countenance of the king of ghosts,† and suffer, in hell, dreadful tortures,—the reward of their own deeds. Addicted to sensual objects, through thy delusions I revolve in the whirlpool of selfishness and pride; and, hence, I come to thee, as my final refuge, who art the lord deserving of all homage, than whom there is no other asylum;‡ my mind afflicted with repentance for my trust in the world, and desiring the fulness of felicity, emancipation from all existence.”§

* अशोकविद्याय।
† Pṛetā-rāja, an epithet of Yama.
‡ घरमपरः यतो न विचित।
§ शिवाय शिवतपदाभि साभिष्टः।

This means: “longing for emancipation,—of uncreated glory.” So says Ratnagarbha, who also allows the epithet of ‘emancipation’ to signify “resort of perfect yogins”. Śridhara gives the second interpretation only.

The ‘emancipation’ of the Hindus is not release “from all existence”, but from consciousness of pleasure and pain. The distinction is, at all events, good, as a piece of idealism.
CHAPTER XXIV.

Muchukunda goes to perform penance. Kṛishṇa takes the army and treasures of Kālayavana, and repairs, with them, to Dwārakā. Balarāma visits Vraja: inquiries of its inhabitants after Kṛishṇa.

THUS praised by the wise Muchukunda, the sovereign of all things, the eternal lord, Hari, said to him: “Go to whatever celestial regions you wish, lord of men, possessed of might irresistible, honoured* by my favour. When you have fully enjoyed all heavenly pleasures, you shall be born in a distinguished family, retaining the recollection of your former births; and you shall, finally, obtain emancipation.”† Having heard this promise, and prostrated himself before Achyuta, the lord of the world, Muchukunda went forth from the cave, and, beholding men of diminutive stature, now first knew that the Kali age had arrived. The king, therefore, departed to Gandhamadana;‡ the shrine§ of Naranārāyaṇa,|| to perform penance.

Kṛishṇa, having, by this stratagem, destroyed his

* Upābhṛdhita.
† Bhūkha bhogadadhīvādānātātītātītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītītी
enemy, returned to Mathurá, and took captive his army, rich in horses, elephants, and cars, which he conducted to Dwáráká,* and delivered to Ugrasena; and the Yadu race was relieved from all fear of invasion.† Baladeva, when hostilities had entirely ceased, being desirous of seeing his kinsmen, went to Nanda’s cow-pens;‡ and there again conversed with the herdsmen and their females, with affection and respect. By some, the elders, he was embraced; others, the juniors, he embraced; and with those of his own age, male or female, he talked and laughed.§ The cowherds made many kind speeches to Haláyudha;‖ but some of the Gopís spoke to him with the affectation of anger,¶ or with feelings of jealousy, as they inquired after the loves of Krishná with the women of Mathurá. “Is all well with the fickle and inconstant Krishná?” said they. “Does the volatile swain, the friend of an instant, amuse the women of the city by laughing at our rustic efforts (to please him)? Does he ever think of us, singing in chorus to his songs? Will he not come here once again, to see his mother? But why talk of these things? It is a different tale to tell, for him without us, and for us without him. Father,

---

* The original has Dwárávatí, of which “Dwáráká” is a synonym.
† Pardbhitava.
‡ Nanda-gokula.
§ कृष्णापि संयोगवः कांचित्स परिषल्ये।
हास्य च चन्द्र समं कृष्णाग्निधिपिजस्वतः।‖
The Translator’s specifications of “elders”, &c., are taken from the commentators.
‖ “Ploughshare-weaponed,” literally; a name of Baladeva or Balabhádra. Vide supra, p. 51, text and note ‖.
¶ Frema-kupíta. Compare the terms in Vol. IV., p. 323, notes § and **.
mother, brother, husband, kin,—what have we not abandoned for his sake? But he is a monument of ingratitude. Yet tell us, does not Krishṇa talk of coming here? Falsehood is never, O Krishṇa, to be uttered by thee. Verily, this is Dāmodara,† this is Govinda, who has given up his heart to the damsels of the city,—who has, no longer, any regard for us, but looks upon us with disdain."; So saying, the Gopīs, whose minds were fixed on Krishṇa,§ addressed Rāma, in his place, calling him Dāmodara and Govinda,|| and laughed, and were merry; and Rāma consoled them by communicating to them agreeable, modest, affectionate, and gentle messages from Krishṇa. With the cowherds he talked mirthfully, as he had been wont to do, and rambled, along with them, over the lands of Vraja.¹

¹ This visit of Balarāma to Vraja is placed, by the Hari Vaṁśa, anterior to the fall of Mathurā; by the Bhāgavata, long subsequent to the establishment of the Yadus at Dwārakā.

* अतःत्रजयजः।
† See Vol. IV., p 281.
‡ दामोदराः सर्वोपसाध्य: पुरस्त्रीसज्जानाः। चबेत्मयितिगत्रीयम् सुदैवः प्रतििपात:।
 "Of this Dāmodara, or Govinda, whose heart is attached to the women of the city, the love has departed, as towards us; and, therefore, he is hard to be seen. And yet he delights us."
 Ratnagarha has दामोदरासि; i.e., he puts 'Dāmodara' in the vocative. By reading, also, अमेत्मयिति:,—in which, likewise, he is peculiar,—he gives the sentence a very different meaning; but his explanation of this expression by गत्मयिति: can scarcely be accepted.
§ Hari, in the original.
|| The Sanskrit has Krishṇa.

¹ अरम्भित: स कश्चिति गुनस्यामेद्यरूपित:।
 जब्जस्य: बुङङः गोष्ठी हरिषण हुतंगेतः।
CHAPTER XXV.

Balaráma finds wine in the hollow of a tree; becomes inebriated; commands the Yamuná to come to him, and, on her refusal, drags her out of her course: Lakshmi gives him ornaments and a dress: he returns to Dwáraká, and marries Revati.

WHILST the mighty* Śesha,† the upholder of the globe, was thus engaged in wandering amidst the forests, with the herdsmen, in the disguise of a mortal, —having rendered great services to earth, and still considering what more was to be achieved,—Varúna,‡ in order to provide for his recreation, said to (his wife,) Váruñí§ (the goddess of wine): “Thou, Madirá,∥ art ever acceptable to the powerful Ananta. ¶ Go, therefore, auspicious and kind goddess, ** and promote his enjoyments.” Obeying these commands, Váruñí went and established herself in the hollow of a Kadamba-tree, in the woods of Vrindávána. Baladeva, roaming about, (came there, and,) smelling the pleasant fragrance of liquor, †† resumed his ancient passion for strong drink. The holder of the ploughshare, ‡‡ observing

---

1 The great serpent, of whom Balaráma is an incarnation.

* Mahátmán.
† See Vol. II., pp. 74, 85, and 211, note 1.
‡ See Vol. II., p. 85.
§ See Vol. I., p. 146, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 212.
∥ Different, of course, from the Madirá named in Vol. IV., p. 109.
¶ The same as Śesha. See Vol. II., p. 211.
** गच्छ सुद्र गुभे। Ratnagarbha reads, instead of सुद्र, सुदुर।
†† Madirá.
‡‡ Lángalin, in the original; the same, in effect, as Haláyudha. Vide supra, p. 63; note ||.

V. 5
ing the vinous drops distilling from the Kadamba-tree, was much delighted, (and gathered) and quaffed them, along with the herdsmen and the Gópís; whilst those who were skilful with voice and lute celebrated him in their songs. Being inebriated (with the wine), and the drops of perspiration standing like pearls upon his limbs, he called out, not knowing what he said: "† Come hither, Yámuná river. I want to bathe." The river, disregarding the words of a drunken man, came not (at his bidding). On which, Ráma,‡ in a rage,

1 There is no vinous exudation from the Kadamba-tree (Nau-clea Kadamba); but its flowers are said to yield a spirit, by distillation;—whence Kádambarí§ is one of the synonyms of wine, or spirituous liquor. The grammarians, however, also derive the word from some legend; stating it to be so called, because it was produced from the hollow of a Kadamba-tree on the Gomanta|| mountain: गोमन्तपर्वते कदमब्कोटराज्यातः। The Hari Vañśá,¶ which alone makes the Gomanta mountain the scene of an exploit of Kríshńá and Ráma, makes no mention of this origin of wine; and the Bhágavata** merely says, that Váruńí took up her abode in the hollow of a tree.†† There must be some other authority, therefore, for this story.

* उपमीयमानो जनित गीतवाभिष्णार्द्दः।
This verse, it is observable, has an excessive syllable at the end of its first half.
† Víkhwala.
‡ The Sanskrit has Lángalin. See the preceding page, note ††.
§ Personified, Kádambarí is said to be daughter of Chitrarátha and Madirá. For Chitrarátha, see Vol. II., p. 86, note 1.
|| Corrected, here and below,—and in the Sanskrit,—from "Gomantha". For the mountain in question, see Vol. II., p. 141, note 2, ad finem. The Harívañśá places it near the Sahya mountains.
¶ Chapter XCVII.
** X., Latter Section, XVI., 19.
†† Compare the Harívañśá, Chapter XCVIII.
took up his ploughshare, * which he plunged into her bank, and dragged her to him, calling out: † “Will you not come, you jade? ‡ Will you not come? Now go where you please, (if you can).” Thus saying, he compelled the dark river to quit its ordinary course, and follow him whithersoever he wandered through the wood. § Assuming a mortal figure, || the Yamunā, with distracted looks, approached Balabhadrā, ¶ and entreated him ** to pardon her, and let her go. But he replied: “I will drag you with my ploughshare, in a thousand directions, since you contemn my prowess and strength.” †† At last, however, appeased by her reiterated prayers, he let her go, after she had watered all the country. ¹‡‡ When he had bathed, the goddess

---

¹ The Bhāgavata and Hari Vaṁśa §§ repeat this story; the latter, very imperfectly. The former adds, that the Yamunā is

---

* Hala. Vide supra, p. 51, note ||.
† गृहीता तां तरे तेन चक्ष्ये मद्विग्न:।
‡ पपा।
§ सा छट्टा सहसा तेन मार्गिण संख्यस्व निम्बन।
युष्मेण बलभद्रोऽसि स्वायामास तद्रनस॥
Śridhara, like one of my MSS. unaccompanied by commentary, has, not छट्टा, but क्षण, the reading followed by the Translator.

|| श्रीरिषी।

¶ Rāma, in the original.
** The Sanskrit here exhibits Musalāyudha, “Bludgeon-armed”, a name of Baladeva. Vide supra, p. 51, note ¶.
†† सोंस्रवीद्वारानासि सम धीरचंबले यदि।
सोंस्रवे लां हृदपातित विनेयामि सहखथा॥
‡‡ इशुक्षयातिसंतानात्यथा गया प्रसादित।
भृगुच्छ प्रातिते तस्क्रुपीतो यथुवनं जल॥

§§ Chapter CIII.
of beauty, * Lakshmī, came, and gave him a beautiful lotos to place in one ear, and an ear-ring for the other; † a fresh necklace of lotos-flowers, sent by Varuṇa; and garments of a dark blue colour, as costly as the wealth of the ocean:‡ and, thus decorated with a lotos in one ear, a ring in the other,§ dressed in blue garments, and wearing a garland, Balaráma appeared united with loveliness. Thus decorated, Ráma sported two months in Vraja, and then returned to Dwáráká, where he married Revati, the daughter of King Raivata,|| by whom he had (two sons,) Niśátha¶ and Ulmuka.¹

still to be seen following the course along which she was dragged by Balaráma. The legend, probably, alludes to the construction of canals from the Jumna, for the purposes of irrigation; and the works of the Mohammedans in this way—which are well known, —were, no doubt, preceded by similar canals, dug by order of Hindu princes.


* The Sanskrit has only Kánti for “the goddess of beauty.” It is a name of Lakshmī, who is mentioned, in the original, several stanzas further on.

† चरतांसितस्य चाछ गृहीतिक च कुष्कलम्।

‡ Professor Wilson has rendered the explanation of the commentators.

§ कहावतंस: स तद्ध चाँसकुष्कका मृणित:।


¶ Corrected from “Nishatha”.

gef
CHAPTER XXVI.

Krishna carries off Rukmini: the princes who come to rescue her repulsed by Balarāma. Rukmi overthrown, but, spared by Krishna, founds Bhojakāla. Pradyumna born of Rukmini.

BHĪSHMAKA* was king of Vidarbha, † residing at Kuṇḍina.¹: He had a son named Rukmin, and a beautiful daughter termed Rukmini. Krishna fell in love with the latter, § and solicited her in marriage; but her brother, who hated Krishna, || would not assent to the espousals. At the suggestion of Jarāsandha, and with the concurrence of his son, the powerful (sovereign) Bhishmaka affianced Rukmini to Śiṣu-pāla.¶ In order to (celebrate) the nuptials, Jarāsandha and other princes, the friends of Śiṣu-pāla,** assembled

¹ Vidarbha is the country of Berar; and the name remains in the present city of Beder. The capital, however, Kuṇḍinapura, is, commonly, identified with a place called Kundapoor, about forty miles north-east of Amarāvatī (in Berar).

* The elongated form of Bhishma, as this king is called in the Mahābhārata.
† Literally, “in the country of the Vidarbhas”: विदर्भविष्ये।
‡ See Vol. II., p. 158, note 3.
§ And she, we are told, with him:

िकारणं चक्रमं खण्डं सा च तं चाष्ट्रासिनी।

Chāruhāsini is an epithet, not a second name, of Rukmini. For Chāruhāsini, another of Krishna’s numerous wives, see Vol. IV., p. 112; also, infra, p. 81, note §, and p. 83, note §.
|| Called Chakrin, in the Sanskrit.
¶ The beginning of this Chapter is translated in Original Sanskrit Texts, Part IV., p. 179; note 161.
** See Vol. IV., pp. 104 and 106.
in the capital of Vidarbha;* and Krishṇa, attended by Balabhadrī and many other Yādavas, also went to Kuṇḍina,† to witness the wedding. When there, Hari contrived, on the eve of the nuptials, to carry off the princess;‡ leaving Rāma and his kinsmen, to carry off the weight of his enemies. § Pauṇḍraka, § the illustrious Dantavakra, § Vidūratha, § Śisupāla, Jarāsandha, Śālwa,** and other kings, indignant (at the insult), exerted themselves to kill Krishṇa, but were repelled by Balarāma and the Yādavas. †† Rukmin, vowing that he would never enter Kuṇḍina again, until he had slain Keśava in fight, pursued and overtook him.‡‡ (In the combat that ensued), Krishṇa destroyed, with his discus, §§ as if in sport, the host (of Rukmin),—with all

* When she had gone forth from the city to worship Ambikā: Bhāgavata. Indrānī, the wife of Indra: Hari Vamśa.|||| Our text tells the circumstance more concisely than the others.

* भीषणकृष्ण पुरीं जग्ृः
† Corrected, throughout this Chapter, from "Kuṇḍina".
‡ विषयभारासाधव रामविष्णव वत्सुः
§ See Chapter XXXIV. of this Book.
|| See Vol. IV., p. 103.
¶ Vide ibid., p. 153.
** Exchanged for "Śalya", which I nowhere find, and which is, probably, corrupted from Śalya, a reading peculiar to Professor Wilson’s favourite MS. Śālwa was king of the Saubhas, according to the Hari-vamśa, Śī. 6143.
†† रामायणायदुपुष्पः
‡‡ हनुम ऋषामिन्दुः
 §§ The "discus", chakra, is not here mentioned; but Krishṇa is designated as Chakrin. The original of the passage where the discus was supposed to be spoken of is as follows:

निघितत: पाितश्रीत्यं लीलाय च चक्रितमा
I find no reading but this.
||| Śī. 6612.
its horse, and elephants, and foot, and chariots,—and
overthrew him, and hurled him on the ground, and
would have put him to death, but was withheld by the
entreaties of Rukmiṇī. * "He is my only brother;"
she exclaimed, "and must not be slain by thee. Re-
strain your wrath, O divine lord; and give me my
brother, in charity." Thus addressed by her, Kṛishṇa,
whom no acts affect,† spared Rukmin;¹ and he (in
pursuance of his vow,) founded the city Bhojakātā,²;
and (ever afterwards) dwelt therein. § After the de-
feat of Rukmin, Kṛishṇa|| married Rukmiṇī,¶ in due
form; having, first, made her his own by the Rākshasa
ritual.³** She bore him the gallant Pradyumna, a

---

¹ After depriving him of his eyebrows and hair. In the Bhā-
gavata, Balarāma also interferes in favour of Rukmin, and re-
proves Kṛishṇa for disfiguring him.

² Of course, this was somewhere in the neighbourhood of
Kuḍḍina, or Vidarbha, and is, usually, supposed to be situated
on the Narmadā.

³ That is, by violence. Thus Manu: "The seizure of a
maiden, by force, from her house, while she weeps, and calls for
portion of the deity of love.* The demon Šambara † carried him off; but he slew the demon.‡

assistance, after her kinsmen and friends have been slain in battle, or wounded, and their houses broken open, is the marriage styled Rākshasa." § III., 33.|| According to the Bhāgavata, Rukmiṇī sends to invite Krishṇa to carry her off, and instructs him how to proceed.

* "The deity of love" is to render Madana, a name of Kāma or Ananga.
† See Vol. II., p. 70.
‡ जहार शम्बरो यं वै यो जघान च शम्बरस्।
§ This is from the translation of Sir William Jones.
|| हला चित्त्वा च भित्त्वा च क्रीष्णसो बल्कीं गृहात।
प्रस्यं कम्याहरणं रावसो निधिभवते॥
CHAPTER XXVII.

Pradyumna stolen by Śambara; thrown into the sea, and swallowed by a fish; found by Māyādevi: he kills Śambara, marries Māyādevi, and returns, with her, to Dwārakā. Joy of Rukmiṇī and Kṛishṇa.

MAITREYA.—How, Muni, happened it that the hero Pradyumna was carried away by Śambara? And in what manner was the mighty Śambara killed by Pradyumna?

PāRĀŚARA.—When Pradyumna was but six days old, he was stolen, from the lying-in chamber, by Śambara, terrible as death;* for the demon foreknew that Pradyumna, if he lived, would be his destroyer.† Taking away the boy, Śambara cast him into the ocean, swarming with monsters;‡—into a whirlpool of roaring waves, the haunt of the huge creatures of the deep.§ A large fish swallowed the child; but he died not, and was born anew, from its belly:1 for that fish,

1 The Bhāgavata tells the story in the same manner; but the Hari Vaṁśa omits the part of the fish.

* Here, as below, the original has kālaśambara, i.e., according to Ratnagarbha, "black Śambara", or "Śambara, equal to death." Śridhara gives only the latter interpretation.

† वर्षकालिक जातमाध्यं तु प्रवृत्तं सूक्तिकाग्रहात्।
ममेव हि नेति सुने हृतवान्याकारश्चर्यः॥

‡ Grāhagura.

§ कषोष्णवनितावर्त चुंडोरि मकरालयः॥
पतितं तव चैविको मत्यो गत्याहि बालकम्॥
न ममार च तस्मापि जातरेः न जीयेवे॥
with others, was caught by the fishermen, and delivered, by them, to the great Asura Śambhara. His wife Māyādevī, the mistress of his household, superintended the operations of the cooks, and saw, when the fish was cut open, a beautiful child, looking like a new shoot of the blighted tree of love. Whilst wondering who this should be, and how he could have got into the belly of the fish, Nārada came, to satisfy her curiosity, and said to the graceful dame: "This is the son of him by whom the whole world is created and destroyed,"—the son of Vishṇu, who was stolen, by Śambhara, from the lying-in chamber, and tossed (by him,) into the sea, where he was swallowed by the fish. He is now in thy power. Do thou, beautiful woman, tenderly† rear this jewel of mankind." Thus counselled by Nārada, Māyādevī took charge of the boy, and carefully reared him, from childhood, being fascinated by the beauty of his person. Her affection became still more impassioned, when he was decorated with the bloom of adolescence. The gracefully-moving: Māyāvatī,§ then, fixing her heart and eyes upon the high-minded Pradyumna, gave him, whom she regarded as herself, all her magic (and illusive) powers.||

---

So reads Śrīdhara. Ratnagarbha ends the second verse with जठरा-लब्धिन्द्र; several MSS. unaccompanied by commentary, with जठरल-लब्धिन्द्र.

* समस्तजगत: मूर्तिसंस्थारकारिक: । + विस्मया ।

† Gajā-gāmī; literally, "having the gait of an elephant."

§ Another name of Māyādevī. Some MSS. yield, here and elsewhere, Māyārāti.

|| मायावती दृढी चाषी माया: सर्वा महाब्रजः ।
| प्रबुधायात्मलोताय तथ्यकहुःक्षया ||
Observing these marks of passionate affection, the son of Kríshña* said to the lotos-eyed (Máyádeví): "Why do you indulge in feelings so unbecoming the character of a mother?" To which she replied: "Thou art not a son of mine; thou art the son of Vishńu, whom Kála Śambara† carried away, and threw into the sea. Thou wast swallowed by a fish, but wast rescued, by me, from its belly. Thy fond mother, O beloved, is still weeping for thee." When the valiant§ Pradyumna heard this, he was filled with wrath, and defied Śambara to battle. In the conflict that ensued, the son of Mádhava|| slew the whole host of Śambara. Seven times he foiled the delusions of the enchanter, and, making himself master of the eighth, turned it against Śambara,¶ and killed him. By the same faculty he ascended into the air,** and proceeded to his father's house, where he alighted, along with Máyávatí, in the inner apartments. When the women beheld Pradyumna, they thought it was Kríshña himself. Rukmiṇí, her eyes dimmed with tears, spoke tenderly to him, and said: "Happy is she who has a son like this, in the bloom of youth. Such would be the age

---

This is the reading of Ratnagarbha. Śridhara begins the second verse with the words प्रजुक्ताः वातिरणस्याऽः।

* Káshá, in the original.
† See note * in p. 73, supra.
¶ बिष: सयुक्ति मात्स्यः समासो जटरानाभय।
§ Máká-bala.
|| Mádhavi, in the Sanskrit.
** In the original there is only the word उत्तम, to denote this procedure. Neither of the commentators remarks on the passage. See Vol. III., p. 311, note ||.
of my son Pradyumna, if he was alive. Who is the fortunate mother adorned by thee? And yet, from thy appearance, and from the affection I feel for thee, thou art, assuredly, the son of Hari."

At this moment, Kṛishnā, accompanied by Nárada, arrived; and the latter said to the delighted Rukmiṇī: * "This is thine own son, who has come hither, after killing Śambara, by whom, when an infant, he was stolen from the lying-in chamber. This is the virtuous Māyāvatī, his wife, and not the wife of Śambara. Hear the reason. When Manmatha (the deity of love,) had perished,1 the goddess of beauty, † desirous to secure his revival, assumed a delusive form, and, by her charms, fascinated the demon Śambara, and exhibited herself to him in various illusory enjoyments.: This

---

1 When he was reduced to ashes by a fiery glance from Śiva, in resentment of his inflaming him with passion for Umā. This legend is a favourite with the Śaiva Purāṇas, and is told in the Linga and Kālikā; also, in the Padma Purāṇa, and Kāti Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa. They do not say much about his resuscitation, however; Śiva, in pity of Rati’s grief, restoring him only to a bodiless existence, as Ananga, whose place is to be in the hearts of men. The Linga adds, that, when Vishṇu, in consequence of the curse of Bṛṛgū, shall be born as the son of Vasudeva, Kāma shall be born as one of his sons.

† This expression is to render rūpiṇī, “the beautiful one,”—an epithet, here, of Rati.

‡ Śridhara has विवाहाबुधमोगेशु Ratnagarbha, while mentioning this lection, prefers विवाहाबुधमोगेशु; and some MSS. of the mere text exhibit विवाहाबुधमोगेशु. The Translator seems to have taken the first
thy son is the descended Káma; and this is (the goddess) Rati, his wife.¹ There is no occasion for any uncertainty: this is thy daughter-in-law." Then Rukmini was glad, and Keśava, also. The whole city resounded with exclamations of joy;* and all the people of Dwárákā† were surprised at Rukmini’s recovering a son who had so long been lost.‡

¹ The daughter of Daksha, but not enumerated amongst those formerly specified (Vol. I., p. 109). She was born from his perspiration, according to the Káliká Puráña.

of these readings; in which, apparently, he thought he saw वायव्य, in the sense of something ‘airy’ or ‘unreal’. The whole expression signifies “sexual congress and other enjoyments”.

* गरी च समस्चा सा साधु साधिविषभाषत

† The original has Dwárávati.

‡ The rendering of this Chapter deviates rather more widely than usual from literality.
CHAPTER XXVIII.

Wives of Kríshña. Pradyumna has Aniruddha: nuptials of the latter. Balaráma, beat at dice, becomes incensed, and slays Rukmin and others.

RUKMIÑĪ bare to Kríshña these other sons: Chárudeśhíña, Sudeshnée, Chárudehá,* Susheéña, Chárugupta, Bhadracháru, Cháruvinda,† Sucháru, and the very mighty Cháru;‡ also, one daughter, Chárumati. Kríshña had seven other beautiful wives:§ Ká-

* Mahábala, in one MS., follows Chárudehá. It would be difficult to prove that it is not a proper name.
† Instead of Susheéña and Cháruvinda, the Bhágavata-puráña has Vi-cháru and Cháruchandra.
‡ A single copy has Chandra.
Several other sons of Rukmiñí, elsewhere recognized as such, are here unnoticed. See Vol. IV., p. 112, note **.
§ The original is as follows:

ऋष्यां कर्त्तां ऋष्यां बृहस्पतिः सप्त गोभनां।

It is signified, by this verse, that seven beautiful wives are about to be named; but it is not expressly said that the specification is restricted to seven wives, or to beautiful ones only. The commentators, however, endeavour to reduce the catalogue to a septenary. Śridhara’s identification, in order to this reduction, is spoken of, by the Translator, in his note in p. 81, infra, but is not accepted by him. Further particulars Śridhara does not enter into; and the Translator, who does not even allude to Ratnagarbha’s roll of the ladies, assumes that we are to find, here, precisely the same seven—and no more,—that are enumerated at the beginning of Chapter XXXII. of this Book. But, as will appear from my annotations that follow, it is more or less possible that several wives are designated over and above the heptad with which the commentators content themselves. My Ajmere MS. ends the verse quoted above with अभिृत्तियोभाः; thus premising ‘very beautiful’ wives, —not simply ‘beautiful’,—and omitting all definition of their number.

Ratnagarbha asserts that the seven are: Mitrávindá, Satyá, Jámbavatí, Rohíní, Súšíla, Satyabhámá, and Lakshmaná; and the words connected with these names are, he pronounces, epithets. Unlike Śridhara, he
lindí,* Mitravindá, † the virtuous: Nágnejití, § the queen || Jámavati; ¶ Rohinií,** of beautiful form; †† the

takes Jámavati to be a different person from Rohinií; and he considers Kálindí to be a synonym of Mitravindá.

In Vol. IV., p. 112, we read that Kṛishíá’s principal wives “were Rukminií, Satyabhámá, Jámavati, Cháruhásini, and four others.” If we knew who these four others were, it could be ascertained how far the principal wives tallied with the beautiful ones, and whether the group under discussion contains additions to those two categories.

* For her origin, see Vol. IV., p. 286, note *. Her offspring, as named in the Bhágavata-púráña, were Śrúta, Kávi, Vyása, Viśva, Su-báhu, Bhadra, Sánti, Darśa, Purúmássá, and Somaka.

† Corrected from “Mitravíndá”, which I find nowhere but in a carelessly executed copy of Śrádhara’s text and commentary, to which Professor Wilson was very partial, and which he too often used without controlling it.

Mitravindá’s children, the Bhágavata-púráña, alleges, were ten: Vyása, Harsha, Aníla, Grídhra, Várdhana, Annáda, Mahása, Pávana, Vahuní, and Kusudhi.

‡ The original is सखा गारनजिति तथा। According to Śrádhara, in his commentary on the Bhágavata-púráña, the lady here intended is Satyá, patronymically called Nágnejití. For the Translator’s “the virtuous Nágnejití”, we should, therefore, read ‘Satyá, daughter of Nágnejití.’ M. Langlois makes the same mistake, in his translation of the Hariváñha, Vol. I., p. 500. See further, note § in the preceding page, and note ‡‡ in p. 82, infra.

§ Mother, the Bhágavata-púráña alleges, of Víra, Chandra, Áswasena, Chitrágu, Vegavatí, Vyása, Ama, Śanku, Vasu, and Kuntí.

|| देवी जामवती चापि। It is barely possible that we should read ‘Devi,’ not “the queen”. Compare the Hariváñha, dl. 9179.

For Jámavati, see Vol. IV., p. 79.

¶ The Bhágavata-púráña represents her as mother of Sámba, Sumitra, Purújít, Śatájít, Sahárajíit, Víjaya, Chitráketu, Vasmata, Drávidá, and Kruá.

** An elder Rohinií was one of Kṛishíá’s numerous step-mothers. See Vol. IV., pp. 109 and 260.

Kṛishíá’s wife Rohinií had, on the authority of the Bhágavata-púráña, the following sons: Váma, Áyus, Satyaka, Diptimat, Támratapta, and others unnamed.

†† कामक्षिपिति। Possibly, this is a proper name, Kámarúpiní; but, probably, it is an epithet. See the Hariváñha, dl. 6701.
amiable and excellent daughter of the king of Madra,*

* Madrārāja. Leaving out of question the interpretation “king of Madra”, our choice lies, according to circumstances, between “king of the Madras” and “King Madra.” In the purest Sanskrit, only the former of these two significations is admissible. There are many cases, in later literature, similar to Madrārāja, thus considered; such as Kāśirāja, Vatsarāja, Bhojārāja, Bhojapati, &c. &c. Instances in which there is not the option spoken of above, but in which, at variance with classical canons, substantial members of a compound stand in apposition, are Varadārāja, Bhojadeva, Kāmadeva, Mādhavadeva, Nandīka, Venkatāsa, Bhāilēka, Kapilevara, Rāmevara, Gorakshanātha, Śeshanāga, Aghāsura, &c. &c.

Mādri’s father might, as has been said, be Madrārāja in the sense of “King Madra”; only no such ruler has been discovered among Krishnā’s contemporaries. Conclusively, Lakshmanā—as the lady who bears the patronym of Mādri is distinctively called,—is said, in the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, to have been daughter of Madrādhīpatai, which it would be very unsafe to translate otherwise than by “king of the Madras”.

In Sanskrit, names of countries and kingdoms are denoted, very frequently, by compounds ending with a word for country or kingdom,—deśa, viśaya, rājya, rāshtra. Examples of such names standing independently are rare, and seem to be confined to feminines. Most generally, a plural is employed; and this plural imports a people. Thus, where we should be disposed to say “he lives in Mālava”, an ancient Hindu would have said “he lives in the country of the Mālavas”, सत्ति मालवैदिक, or, in accordance with the somewhat more prevalent idiom, “he lives among the Mālavas”, सत्ति मालवंश.

The preponderant usage here referred to may, perhaps, be accounted for in this wise. The earliest Hindus were grouped in tribes, not in nations; and these tribes were distinguished by lineage, not by place of abode. The titles which they bore were eponymous; and it should seem that they were long in acquiring fixed habitations. Hence, it may be surmised,—and not for the reason that led Louis Philippe to style himself “king of the French”,—it is that we read of, for instance, “the king of the Panchalas”: somewhat as, from a sense of vagueness, the Yavanas, Hūnas, Chinas, Turushkas, and Śakas were never localized, further than by the indeterminate forms Yavana-deśa, “country of the Yavanas,” and the like. In later times, as history informs us, kingdoms of more or less definite bounds were established, and lasted for long periods. But the old idiom had become so firmly rooted as, in spite of the altered state of things, to hold its ground; and the option of mentioning a region or state (by its simple name), instead of its people, was seldom accepted. The sole exceptions seem to be afforded
(Madri);* Satyabhama, † the daughter of Satrjita; and Lakshmania, of lovely smiles. § Besides these,

by the names of cities which were, of themselves, kingdoms; and most Hindu cities bore appellations of the feminine gender. The Kurukshetra, Mathura, Sachiigna, and Avachatnaka of the Aitareya-brhmanas I take to be cities with masculine names,—like Kanyakubja, &c.,—not countries.

If this view be not fallacious, we can, therefore, only plead convenience, when we speak of Abhira, Anarta, Chedi, Keral, Kosala, Kuru, Madra, Magadha, Mauva, Srasena, &c. &c., after the manner of the latest and most corrupt Sanskrit, and of the living vernaculars of India. Similarly, we find, in Latin, only Sabiniorem ager or Sabinus ager, and in Sabinius versari, in Sabinus profiscici; but, in the present day, we have la Sabina. The Greeks, it is true, devised the name Ξαστίρη; and, in the same way, they invented the names Abiria, Cirhadia, Gandaritis, &c., though the ancient Hindus recognized no countries denominated Abhira, Kirata, Gandhara, &c.

* I have parenthesized this name, as being added by the Translator. The original has सुशिला शीलमण्डना। The latter word is, palpably, an epithet of the former, and suggested thereby. The Harivamsha, st. 6706, places this point beyond all doubt. We must read, therefore, "Sušila," and eliminate "amiable and excellent". Vide supra, p. 78, note §. Sušila appears, in p. 107, infra, under her patronym Madri.

To Madri the Bhagavata-purana assigns progeny bearing the names of Pragshasa, Gtrava, Simha, Bala, Prabala, Urdhwa, Mahaskati, Saha, Oja, and Parajita.

† According to the Bhagavata-purana, she had ten children: Bhana, Subhana, Svarbhanu, Prabhana, Bhanumati, Chandrabhanu, Bishbhanu, Atibhavana, Sribhavana, and Pratibhavana.

‡ Corrected from "Satrujit". The original has Sattrakiti, patronymic of Satrjita, for whom and his daughter Satyabhama, see Vol. IV., pp. 79, 80.

§ चालसार्वस्य | Here we have, possibly, another name of Lakshmania, rather than an epithet. For Chakrhasini, see Vol. IV., p. 112, note ।. Also see note § in p. 83, infra. My Ajmere MS. gives मिष्टिर्दर्शना; and Priyadarshana, too, is a lady's name, as in my Vasavadatta, p. 236.

|| Srihara is intended. Vide supra, p. 78, note §.

V.
he* had sixteen thousand other wives.†

this work and in the Bhágavata, she is distinct from Jámavatí. She seems, however, to be an addition to the more usually specified eight, of whose several marriages the Bhágavata gives the best account. In addition to the three first,—respecting whom particulars are found in all,—Kálindí, or the Yamaná, † is the daughter of the Sun, whom Kríshna meets on one of his visits to Indraprastha, § and who claims him as the reward of her penance. His next wife, Mitrvindá, is the daughter of his maternal aunt, Rájádhídeví (Vol. IV., pp. 101 and 103), and sister of Vinda and Anuvinda, kings of Avanti; ¶ she chooses him at her Swayánvara. The Hari Vaśiña ¨ calls her Sudattá, ** daughter of Śibi; and she is, subsequently, termed Śaibyá by our text. †† Nágñajiti, or Satyá, †‡ the next wife, was the daughter of Nágñajit, king of Kausálá, §§ and was the prize of Kríshna’s overcoming seven fierce bulls, whom no other hero had encountered with success. Bhadrá, †‖ princess of Kekaya, †¶—also Kríshna’s cousin, the daughter of Śrutakírtti (Vol. IV., pp. 101 and 103), —was his next; and his eighth wife was Mándri, *** the daughter of the

* Chakrin, in the original.
† In all, Kríshna’s wives amounted to sixteen thousand and one hundred, as we read in Vol. IV., p. 112. But vide infra, p. 106, note §§.
‡ See Vol. III., p. 20.
§ A city on the Jumna, near the present Delhi. It belonged to the Pánídas.
¶ See Vol. IV., supplementary note on p. 103.
† St. 9179 and 9187. In st. 6703 of the same work, this or another daughter of Śibi seems to be called Tanwí.
** Corrected from “Saudattá”. See note || in the page following.
†† In p. 107, infra.
†‡ Transformed, in the text, into “the virtuous”. See note † in p. 79, supra.
§§ The Bhágavata-puráña describes Nágñajit as Kausálya, which Śrídhara interprets by Ayodhyapáti, “King of Ayodhyá”; and this city was the capital of Kosala.
||| Her children, we read in the Bhágavata-puráña, were Sangrámañjít, Brñhatene, Śúra, Prábarañá, Arijit, Jaya, and Subhadrá.
†¶ See Vol. IV., p. 103, text and note §. The Bhágavata-puráña simply gives Bhadrá the epithet Káikéyí. *** See note • in the last page.
BOOK V., CHAP. XXVIII.

The heroic Pradyumna was chosen, for her lord, at her public choice of a husband, by the daughter of Rukmin;* and he had, by her, the powerful and gallant prince Aniruddha, who was fierce in fight,† an ocean of prowess, and the tamer of his foes. Keśava demanded, in marriage, for him, the granddaughter of

king of Madra,‡—named, according to the Bhágavata, Lakshmana,§ and, to the Hari Vamśa, Subhímá;∥ distinguishing, as does our text, clearly, Lakshmana from Mádri, and, like it, having no satisfactory equivalent for Bhadrá. The Hari Vamśa does not name Rohini, but specifies other names, as Bráhatí, ¶ &c. In the life of Kṛishṇa—taken from the Bhágavata, through a Persian translation,—published by Maurice, there is a curious instance of the barbarous distortion of Sanskrit names by the joint labours of the English and Persian translators. The wives of Kṛishṇa are written: Rokemenee (Rukmini), Setubhavani (Satyabhámá), Jamoomettee (Jambavati), Kalenderee (Kálindí), Lechmeena (Lakshmana), Soeta (Satyá), Bhedravatee (Bhadrá), Mithabenda (Mitravindá).

1 These, according to the Mahábhárata, Ádi Parvan, were Apsarasas, or nymphs. In the Dána Dharma, they become Kṛishṇa’s wives through a boon given him by Umá.

* Kakudmati was her name. See Vol. IV., p. 112, text and note ‡‡. The Bhágavata-puráṇa calls her Rukmavati, also. For Rukmin, vide supra, p. 67.

† रक्षण कुक्ष: ।
‡ Vide supra, p. 80, note •.
§ Corrected from “Lakshana”. Vide supra, p. 80, note •. In the Hariwaahša, sl. 6702 and 9179, Lakshmana takes the place of Mádri, and is followed, according to the Calcutta and Bombay editions, by जाल-हासिनी, for which see Vol. IV., p. 112, note ||. Is it a third synonym? Vide supra, p. 81, note §.
∥ Corrected from “Saubhímá”. See the Hariwaahša, sl. 9180.

Professor Wilson’s “Soudattá” and “Saubhimá” were taken, I suspect, from the “Soudattá” and “Soubhimá” of M. Langlois; his ou, a transliteration of उ, is being supposed to represent वृ, au.

Rukmin; and, although the latter was inimical to Kríshña,* he betrothed the maiden† (who was his son’s daughter,) to the son of his own daughter (her cousin Aniruddha). Upon the occasion of the nuptials, Ráma and other Yádavas attended Kríshña‡ to Bhojakāta, the city of Rukmin. After the wedding§ had been solemnized, several of the kings, headed by him of Kalinga,|| said to Rukmin: “This wielder of the ploughshare¶ is ignorant of the dice, which may be converted into his misfortune. Why may we not contend with him, and beat him, in play?”** The potent Rukmin replied to them, and said “So let it be.” And he engaged Balaráma†† at a game of dice, in the palace. Balaráma‡‡ soon lost to Rukmin a thousand Nishkas.¹ He then staked and lost another thousand,

¹ The Nishka is a weight of gold, but, according to different authorities, of very different amount. The commentator §§ here terms it a weight of four Suvarúnas, each about 175 grains Troy. ||

---

* Śauri, in the original.
† Subhadrá. See Vol. IV., p. 112.
‡ The Sanskrit has Hari.
§ Of Prádyumn.—according to the original,—that is to say, Aniruddha.
¶ वलिप्पराचप्रसुखः; “the king of Kalinga, and others.”
|| Halin, i. e., Balaráma. Vide supra, p. 63, note ||, and p. 65, note ‡‡.
** "अनगच्छे हली जूते तथास्थ असन महत्।
न जयामो बलं कशाहूतिने न महायुते।"

Ratnagarbha has अनभिष्क; instead of अनगच्छः.
†† Ráma, in the original.
‡‡ The Sanskrit has Bala.
§§ Śridhara. Ratnagarbha is silent.
|| In reckoning money by tale, the nishku, according to the first chapter of the Lilávati, is equivalent to sixteen drammas. See Colebrooke’s Algebra, &c., p. 1.
and then pledged ten thousand, which Rukmin, who was well skilled in gambling, also won. At this, the king of Kalinga laughed aloud;* and the weak and exulting Rukmin grinned, and said:† Baladeva is losing; for he knows nothing of the game; although, blinded by a vain passion for play, he thinks he understands the dice.”‡ Haláyudha, galled by the broad laughter of the Kalinga prince,§ and the contemptuous speech of Rukmin, was (exceedingly) angry, and, overcome with passion, increased his stake to ten millions of Nishkas. Rukmin accepted the challenge, and, therefore, threw the dice. Baladeva won, and cried aloud “The stake is mine.” But Rukmin called out, as loudly, that he was the winner. “Tell no lies, Bala,”‖ said he. “The stake is yours; that is true: but I did not agree to it. Although this be won by you, yet still I am the winner.”¶ A deep voice was then heard in the sky,—inflaming still more the anger of the high-spirited Baladeva,—saying: “Bala has rightly won the whole sum, and Rukmin speaks falsely. Although he did not accept the pledge in words, he did so by his acts,** (having cast the dice).” Bala-

* Swaranavat.
† द्वानविन्दश्यशृष्टि चकी चाह महिषतः ।
‡ मुदिवाश्चविपायी यस्तं मेंियिचकोविदम् ।
§ तृढ़ा कविकृराणाः प्रवाहिन्द्वागानम् ।
‖ एवं लया वेदिकितं मया न विजितं कथम् ।
¶ So read most MSS., and Sridhara. Ratnagarbha has:
\[ मुदिवाश्चविपायी योिवेनियिचकोविदान् । \]
** The expression in the original looks proverbial:
\[ अजुकायि वचः सिंहिखुलि भवति कर्मसा । \]
rama,* thus excited, his eyes red with rage, started up, and struck Rukmin with the board on which the game was played,† and killed him.¹ Taking hold of the trembling king of Kalinga, he knocked out the teeth which he had shown when he laughed.: Laying hold of a golden column, he dragged it from its place, and used it as a weapon to kill those princes who had taken part with his adversaries.§ Upon which, the whole circle, crying out with terror, took to flight, and escaped from the wrath of Baladeva.|| When Kṛishṇa‡ heard that Rukmin had been killed by his brother, he made no remark, being afraid of Rukmiṇī (on the one hand,) and of Bala (on the other); but, taking with him the (newly) wedded Aniruddha, and the Yādava tribe, he** returned to Dwārakā.

¹ The Bhāgavata and Hari Vamśa—which, both, tell this story,—agree in the death of Rukmin; but, in the Mahābhārata, he appears, in the war, on the side of the Pāṇḍavas. The occurrence is a not very favourable picture of courtly manners; but scenes of violence have never been infrequent at the courts of Rajpoot princes.

* The Sanskrit has Bala.
† Ashtāpada.
‡ See the original words quoted in note § in the preceding page.
§ ब्राह्मण च महासमं वातकोपमयं बधः।
जघान वेदां तत्सचा भूमृत: कुपितो बहात्।
|| ततो हाहाकारं सचं पञ्चायनपरं द्रिज।
तद्राजमखलं सचं चमुंत्र कुपिते वले।
¶ Madhusūdana, in the original.
** Keśava, according to the reading accepted by Śridhara. The other, Ratnagarbha’s lection, represents Bala as leading off Keśava and the rest.
CHAPTER XXIX.

Indra comes to Dwáráká, and reports to Kríshña the tyranny of Naraka. Kríshña goes to his city, and puts him to death. Earth gives the ear-rings of Aditi to Kríshña, and praises him. He liberates the princesses made captive by Naraka, sends them to Dwáráká, and goes to Swarga, with Satyabhámá.

ŚAKRA, * the lord of the three worlds, came mounted on his fierce † (elephant,) Airávata, to (visit) Śauri (Kríshña,) at Dwáráká. Having entered the city, and been welcomed by Hari, he related (to the hero) the deeds of the demon § Naraka. || "By thee, Madhusúdana, lord of the gods," said Indra, "in a mortal condition, all sufferings have been soothed. Arishta, Dhenuka, Cháhúra, Mushtika, ‡ Keśin, who sought to injure helpless man, ** have, all, been slain by thee. Kaúsa, Kuvalayápída, the child-destroying Pútaná, have been killed by thee; and so have other oppressors of the world. By thy valour and wisdom

* Or Indra. For him and his mother, see Vol. II., p. 27. Śakra and Hari were, both, sons of Aditi. See Vol. I., p. 151; and Vol. III., p. 18, text and notes 1 and †.
† Matta.
‡ Dwárvatí, in the original.
§ Daitya. See the next note.
|| The less famous Naraka was son of Viprachíttí, son of Káráyapa and Danu, and, hence, was a Dánava, according to our Puráña. See Vol. II., pp. 70—72. The Naraka of the text was not a Dánava; nor can he be called a Daitya, except by a very loose use of the term. As appears from note 1 in the next page, his father was Visháu; and our text expresses that his mother was Bhumí.
‡ Ratnagarbha's text does not mention the two pancratists Cháhúra and Mushtika.
** Tapaswi-jana,
the three worlds have been preserved;* and the gods, obtaining their share of the sacrifices offered by the devout, enjoy satisfaction. But now hear the occasion on which I have come to thee, and which thou art able to remedy.† The son of the earth,1‡ called Naraka, who rules over the city of Prágyotisha,2§ inflicts a great injury upon all creatures. Carrying off the maidens of gods, saints,|| demons, and kings, he shuts them up in his own palace.‖ He has taken away the umbrella of Varuña,** impermeable to water, the jewel-mountain crest of Mandara,†† and the celestial nectar-dropping ear-rings of my mother:: Aditi;§§ and

---

1 By Vishnú, as the Varáha Avatára;|| but found and adopted by Janaka. Káliká Puráña.

2 In the centre of the country of Kámarúpa,¶¶ inhabited by Kirátas; the site of the shrines of Deví, as Dikkavásini and Kámakhyá.*** Káliká Puráña.

---

*Bhau.  
† Sóh ha samáta mayáti yathámiṁ ca janárdeṇ.  
Tachúla tathā bova prastubhah bhūmaiṣs. ||

Siddha.

¶ Mandira.

** Called Prachetas, in the Sanskrit.

†† See Vol. II., p. 115.

‡‡ See note • in the preceding page.

§§ Corrected, here and everywhere below, from “Aditi”.

|| See Vol. I., p. 61, note 2, ad finem.

¶¶ Vide supra, p. 54, note 2.

*** In Assam, according to Professor Wilson, in his collected Works, Vol. III., p. 77. Also see Vol. I., Preface, p. XC. of the present work, where correct “Kámakhyá”.

---
he now demands my elephant, Airávata.* I have, thus, explained to you, Govinda, the tyranny of the Asura. You can best determine how it is to be prevented.”†

Having heard this account, the divine Hari‡ (gently) smiled, and, rising from his throne,§ took Indra¶ by the hand. Then, wishing for the eater of the serpents, Garuḍa immediately appeared; upon whom his master, having first seated Satyabhámá upon his back, ascended, and flew to Prágjyotisha. Indra¶ mounted his elephant, and, in the sight of the inhabitants of Dwáraká, went to the abode of the gods.

The environs of Prágjyotisha were defended by nooses, constructed by the demon Murú,** the edges of which were as sharp as razors;†† but Hari, throwing his discus Sudarśana‡‡ (amongst them), cut them to pieces. Then Murú started up; but Keśava slew him,
and burnt his* seven thousand sons, like moths,† with the flame of the edge of his discus. Having slain Muru, Hayagrīva,‡ and Panchajāna,§ the wise Hari rapidly reached|| the city of Prāgjyotisha. There a (fierce) conflict took place with the troops of Naraka, in which Govinda destroyed thousands of demons; and, when Naraka came into the field, showering upon the deity all sorts of weapons, the wielder of the discus and annihilator of the demon-tribe cut him in two with his celestial missile.¶ Naraka being slain, Earth,** bearing the two ear-rings of Aditi, approached the lord of the world,†† and said: “When, O lord, I was upheld by thee in the form of a boar, thy contact then en-gendered this my son. He whom thou gavest me has now been killed by thee. Take (therefore,) these two ear-rings, and cherish his progeny. Thou, lord, whose aspect is (ever) gracious,‡‡ hast come to this sphere, in a portion of thyself, to lighten my burthen. Thou art the eternal §§ creator, preserver,|| and destroyer

* मूरोख, or else मूरोख, in the original. The variant of some copies, मूरख, substitutes Mura for Muru. These persons—whose names are often confounded in MSS,—were, both, slain by Kṛṣṇa. The latter is said, by Śrīdharā, to have been a Rākṣasa.
† Śalabha.
‡ Vide supra, p. 2, note 7.
§ Vide supra, p. 48.
¶ Samupādṛavat, “assaulted.”
|| शस्त्रास्त्रवर्धे मुखलं मोमं तं गरकं बली।
 गिथ्या चक्रं हिघ्या चक्रे चक्रे दैत्यचक्रं॥
** Bhūmi.
†† Jagannātha.
‡‡ प्रसादसुपुष्कः।
§§ Auyayā. See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.
||| Vīkarṣṭi; ‘transformer,’ literally: “by means of rain and the like,” say the commentators.
of the universe; the origin of all worlds; and one with the universe.* What praise can be worthily offered to thee?† Thou art the pervader, and that which is pervaded; the act, the agent, and the effect; the universal spirit of all beings. What praise can be worthily offered to thee?: Thou art the abstract soul, the sentient and the living soul of all beings, the imperishable. But, since it is not possible to praise thee worthily, then why should the hopeless attempt proceed.§ Have compassion, O universal soul, and forgive the sins which Naraka has committed. Verily, it is for the sanctification of thy son, that he has been killed by thee.”|| The lord, who is the substance of all creatures,†† having replied to the Earth** “Even so,” proceeded to redeem the (various) gems from the dwelling of Naraka. In the apartments of the women †† he found sixteen thousand and one hundred damsels.†

1 These were captive princesses, according to the Bhāgavata;

* Of this passage there are several different readings, of little consequence.
† सूचनेः चू मह न तत।
‡ Here the translation is not literal.
§ परमांश्च लमांश्च च मुतांश्च चावयोभवाः।
 चदा तदा सुतिनास्मिन्निमया ते प्रस्तमत्॥
Ratnagarbha says: नाखिलमेवाह च विमघ्गा च विमाष्या।
For the expressions paramātman, ātman, and bhūtātman, here employed, vide supra, p. 14, note ††.
|| चद्रोपाय लतुष्ट: स नियतित:। So reads Śridhara; and his explanation has been followed by the Translator. Ratnagarbha speaks of this lection, but prefers to end the verse with तततूतत: परिपाख्यात:। in accepting which he connects चद्रोपाय with बच्चनाः, which precedes it.
¶ Bhūtā-bhāvana, “creator of beings.”
** Dharaṇi.
†† Kanyā-pura.
He also beheld (in the palace,) six thousand large* elephants, † each having four tusks; twenty-one lakhs; of horses of Kámbója§ and other excellent breeds. These¶ Govinda despatched to Dwáракá, in charge of the servants of Naraka. The umbrella of Varuña, the jewel-mountain, which he also recovered, he placed upon Garuda;** and, mounting him, himself, and taking Satyabhámá with him, he set off to the heaven of the gods, to restore the ear-rings of Aditi.¹

Apsarasas, or celestial nymphs, according to the Káliká Puráña; and these, upon their rescue by Kríshńa, became his wives.††

¹ The legend of Naraka is related, in more detail, in the Bhágavata and Hari Varásha, but is still more fully narrated in the Káliká Upapuráña. It may be considered as one of the various intimations that occur in the Puráñas, of hostilities between the worshippers of Vishńu and Śiva; Naraka being, in an especial degree, favoured by the latter.

* Ugra.
† According to the reading of some MSS., there were as many horses,—common ones, it is to be supposed, since a particular kind is specified just below.
‡ Niyut; a term variously defined by different authorities. See notes on the beginning of Chapter III. of Book VI.
§ काम्बोजायाम् | For the Kámbójas, see Vol. III., p. 291, note 1.
|| I find nothing, in the original, answering to the words “and other excellent breeds”.
¶ That is to say, agreeably to the original, the girls, the elephants, and the horses.

** दृश्यं वाच्यं कवः ततवेत मणिपर्वतम् | चारोपवामास ह्रिंगश्च पत्तनग्राहणे ||
I find no variants of this stanza, save as to its closing word, which Ratnagarbha reads पत्तिनेहरे।
†† According to the text of our Puráña, also, Kríshńa married them. Vide infra, p. 105.
CHAPTER XXX.

Krishna restores her ear-rings to Aditi, and is praised by her: he visits the gardens of Indra, and, at the desire of Satyabhama, carries off the Parijata-tree. Sachi excites Indra to its rescue. Conflict between the gods and Krishna, who defeats them. Satyabhama derides them. They praise Krishna.

GARUDA, laden with the umbrella of Varuna, and the jewel-mountain, and bearing Hirishikeśa* (on his back, to the court of Indra), went (lightly), as if in sport, along. When they arrived at the portals of Swarga, Hari blew his shell; on which the gods advanced to meet him, bearing respectful offerings.† Having received the homage of the divinities, Krishna went to the palace of the mother of the gods, whose turrets resembled white clouds; and, on beholding Aditi, paid his respects to her, along with Sakra; and, presenting to her her own ear-rings, informed her of the destruction of (the demon) Naraka. The mother of the world, well pleased, then fixed her whole thoughts upon Hari, the creator, and thus pronounced his praise: “Glory to thee, O god with the lotos-eyes, who removest all fear from those that worship thee. Thou art the eternal, universal, and living soul; the origin of all beings;§ the instigator of the mental fac-

* “And his wife:” सभाये च हुपीकेशम्। For Hirishikeśa, see Vol. I., p. 2, note 1.
† सार्थपाता:।
‡ Śikhara.
§ समानतान्तःस्वयंत्रबृहत्ताब्रूतभावः।
ulty and faculties of sense; one with the three qualities; beyond the three qualities; exempt from contraries; pure; existing in the hearts of all; void of colour, extension, and every transient modification; unaffected by (the vicissitudes of) birth, or death, sleep, or waking. Thou art evening; night, and day; earth, sky, air, water, and fire; mind, intellect, and individuality. Thou art the agent of creation, duration, and dissolution; the master over the agent; — in thy forms which are called Brahmá, Vishńu, and Śiva. Thou art gods, Yakshas, Daityas, Rákshasas, Siddhas, Pannagas, Kúshmándas, Piśáchas, Gandharvas, men, animals, deer, elephants, reptiles, trees, shrubs, creepers, climbers, and grasses; all things large, middling, small, immense, or minute: thou art all bodies whatsoever, composed of aggregated atoms. This thy illusion beguiles all who are ignorant of thy true nature,—the fools who imagine soul to be in that

* Práśita manasi váséiradhāyaśyaśya.
† Sitadídhini: pradhānaparivartita.
§ Bhūtātāt.
\* Sandhyā.
\$ Bhūtātāt.
\* Ratnagarha explains it by ahaṅkāra. For bhūtātāt, see Vol. I., p. 33, note *.
|| Corrected from “Punnagas.” Pannaga is the same as sarpa, for which see Vol. I., p. 83. The next term, “Kúshmándas,” is rendered “goblins” in Vol. IV., p. 277.
¶ Páśu; “sacrificial animals.” Vide supra, p. 59, note **.
** Mṛiga, “wild beasts.”
†† Sarisrípa. See Vol. I., p. 84, note §; and Vol. II., p. 92, text and note §.
\*\* Latā.
\*\*\* Valli.
\*\*\*\* For similar enumerations, see Vol. I., p. 84; and Vol. II., p. 92.
\*\*\*\* Deśhadeśa bhavastvaḥ eva kṣetrapālaḥ.
which is not spirit. * The notions that "I am—this is mine", which influence mankind, are but the delusions of the mother of the world, originating in thy active agency. † Those men who, attentive to their duties, diligently worship thee, traverse all this illusion, and obtain spiritual freedom. Brahmá and all the gods, men, and animals; are, alike, invested by the thick darkness of fascination, in the gulf of the illusions of Vishňu. That men who, having worshipped thee, should seek the gratification of their desires, and their own preservation,—this, O lord, is, also, thy delusion. It is the sport of thy fascinations that induces men to glorify thee, to obtain, thereby, the continuance of their race, or the annihilation of their enemies, instead of eternal liberation. § It is the fault of the impure acts of the unrighteous (to proffer such idle requests to one able to confer much more important benefits),—like asking for a rag to cover one's nakedness || from the tree that bestows whatever is solicited. ¶ Be propitious,

* माया तेषमभावातपमेधावितमोऽहिनि।
वा ज्ञातमात्रायमिन्नमोऽहिनि।

† चढ़े समेति भावसत्र चतुर्यासनानाधि जायि।
संसारमातृभानायासैवत्राय चैवितमवि।

‡ Pāṇu.

§ नारायण लामभः सैव लाभास्माभिजय।
यं देवाः मायाः सैवं भगवंद्र कान्ति।
मया लम पुत्रकामिन्या वै हिरण्यचन्द्राय।
नारायणाः न मौषाय मायाविभिन्तं श्री तत्तः।

|| Kaupina.
¶ Kalpadruma.
then, imperishable, author of all the error that deceives the world; and dispel, O lord of all creatures, the conceit of knowledge, which proceeds from ignorance.*

Glory to thee, grasper of the discus, wielder of the bow, brandisher of the mace, holder of the shell! For such do I behold thee, in thy perceptible form. Nor do I know that form of thine which is beyond perception. Have compassion on me, supreme god.”†

Vishṇu, thus hymned by Aditi, smiled, and said to the mother of the gods: † “Mother, goddess, do thou show favour unto me, and grant me thy blessing.”§ “So be it,” replied Aditi, “even as thou wilt; and, (whilst thou dwellest) amongst mortals, the first of men,† thou shalt be invincible by gods or demons.” Then Satyabhāmā, accompanied by the queen of Indra,** addressed Aditi respectfully, and solicited her benedic-
tions; and Aditi (in reply,) said to her: “Fair-browed dame, thou shalt never suffer decay, nor loss of beauty. Thou shalt be the asylum of all loveliness, dame of

---

* अश्रानं भानसत्वालः भूतेऽन्नासयः

Ratnagarbha says: भानसत्वालः भूतेऽन्नासयः। भानबानमोभिस्मिवभिमानानाम्।

† एतत्प्रभामि ते कृप्य खळचिङ्ग्मयेश्वरिः।

न जानामि परं यत्ते पृथीं परमेश्वर।

† Surāraśī. Similarly, Kunti is called Pāñchavārasī, in the Mahābhārata.

For arahī, see Vol. III., p. 330, note •.

§ वर्द्धा भव।

|| Corrected from “ever”, — a typographical error. The original is वच्चे च ते।

† Purusha-vyāghra, ‘tiger of a man,’ and in the vocative. See Vol. IV., p. 320, note •; also, supra, p. 22, note •.

** Śakrāṇī, in the original.
faultless shape."** With the assent of Aditi, Indra† then respectfully saluted Janárdana in all due form, and conducted him and Satyabhámá through Nandana and other pleasant gardens of the gods; where Keśava, the destroyer of Keśin,‡ saw the Párijáta-tree,§ the favourite of Śachi, which was produced when the ocean was churned for ambrosia: the bark was of gold; and it was embellished with young sprouting leaves of a copper colour, and fruit-stalks bearing numerous clusters of fragrant fruit.|| When Satyabhámá noticed this tree, she said to her beloved lord, Govinda: "Why should not this divine tree¶ be transported to Dwá-raká? If what you say is true, and I am really dear to you, then let this tree be taken away from hence, and planted in the garden** of my dwelling. You have often said to me: ‘Neither Jámbavatí nor Rukmiñí is so dear to me, Satyá, as you are.’ If you have spoken the truth, and not mere flattery,†† then let this Párijáta-tree be the ornament of my mansion. I long to shine amidst my fellow-queens, wearing the flowers of this tree in the braids of my hair."‡‡

† The Sanskrit has deva-rája.
‡ Kesáridana. I have corrected "Keśí". See Vol. IV., p. 340.
|| This description of the Párijáta-tree is rendered very freely. The original gives it one epithet not here translated,—sugandhádhiyá, ‘rich in fragrance’. The text followed is that of Śridhara, from which various MSS. offer many unimportant deviations.
¶ Professor Wilson read देवपादपः; but, no doubt, we should read देव पादपः. A variant is found: देव पादपः.
** Nishkúta. †† Upachára.
‡‡ Keśá-paksha.
Thus solicited by Satyabhámá, Hari smiled upon her, and, taking the Párijáta-plant, put it upon Garuda.* The keepers of the garden (remonstrated and) said: “This Párijáta-tree belongs to Šachi, the queen of the sovereign of the gods. It is not proper, Govinda, for you to remove it. At the time when the ocean was churned for the beverage of immortality, † this tree was produced, for the purpose of providing Šachi with flowery ornaments. You cannot be suffered to depart with it.‡ It is through ignorance that this is sought for by any one; as it is the especial property of her on whose countenance the king of the gods delights to look. And who shall go away with impunity, who attempts to carry it off?§ Assuredly, the king of the gods will punish this audacity; for his hand launches the thunderbolt, and the immortals attend upon his steps.|| Forbear, then, Kríshná; nor provoke the hostility of all the gods.¶ The wise will not commence actions that can be productive only of unpleasant consequences.”** Satyabhámá, on hearing these words, was exceedingly offended, and said: “What right has

* Called, in the original, Garutmat.
† अनुमततम्यः।
‡ न चेमी गृहीलिन्य गमिष्यसि।
§ त्वेवराजो सूक्ष्मं च यथास्य: परिग्रहम्।
|| मौदाराथपि चेमी गृहीलिन्य हि को विशेष।
Some MSS. read त्रेव, instead of चेमी।
|| वचोवयंकरं श्रुण्यमुयासि चामरा:।
¶ तद्वस्त सकलिद्वर्षिन्यथेण तवाच्छुत।
** विपायकल् यतं तत्र शुष्कति परिवर्तता:।

“The wise do not commend an act disagreeable in its consequences.”
Śachí, what has Indra,* to the Párijáta-tree? It was produced at the churning of the ocean, as the common property of all worlds. Wherefore, gods, should Indra† alone possess it? In the same manner, guardians of the grove, as nectar, as the moon, as (the goddess) Śrí (herself), so the Párijáta-tree is the common property of all the world; and, since Śachí, confiding in the strength of her husband’s arm, would keep it to herself, away with submission to her!‡ Satyá takes away the tree. Go quickly; and let Paulomí§ be told what I have said. Repeat to her this contemptuous message from Satyabhámá: ‘If you are the beloved wife of your lord, if your husband is obedient to your authority, let him prevent my husband from carrying off this tree. I know your husband, Śakra; I know the sovereign of the divinities; and I, who am a mortal,‖ take this Párijáta-tree away from you.’’’

Accordingly, the warders (of the garden) went and reported to Śachí the message (of Satyabhámá). Śachí appealed to her husband, and excited the king of the gods to resent this affront;¶ and Indra, accordingly, attended by the army of the celestials, marched to attack Hari, in defence of the Párijáta-tree. The gods were armed with clubs,** swords, †† maces, and darts;

* Śakra, in the Sanskrit.
† The original has Vásava.
‡ तत्कथयतामलं चाचया।
§ Patronymic of Puloman, father of Śachí. See Vol. II., p. 72, note 2.
¶ For a less famous Paulomí, see Vol. I., p. 162, note 1, ad finem.
‖ Manushi, ‘a woman.’ Śachí, no less than Satyabhámá, was “a mortal”.
¶¶ शची चोत्साह्यामास चिद्वधाधीति पतिष्म।
** Parigha.
†† Nistriśhā.

7*
and Indra* wielded the thunderbolt. As soon as Govinda saw the king of the gods† advancing against him, on his elephant, attended by the immortals,‡ he blew his shell, so that the sound filled all the regions, and he showered, smilingly, myriads of arrows upon his assailants.§ Beholding the air, in all directions, overspread with his darts, the celestials (in return,) hurled innumerable missiles; but every one of these the destroyer of Madhu,|| and lord of all worlds, cut, playfully, into a thousand pieces (with his shafts). The devourer of serpents (Garuḍa,) laid hold of the noose of the sovereign of the waters,¶ and tore it to fragments with his beak, as if it had been a little snake. The son of Devakí threw his mace at the club of Yama, and cast it, broken, upon the ground. He cut in bits ** the litter†† of the lord of wealth,‡‡ with his discus; a glance of his eye eclipsed the radiance of the sun; §§ he severed Agni into a hundred parts, with his arrows, and scattered the Vasus through the realms of space. With his discus he cut off the points of the tridents|| of the Rudras, and cast themselves upon the earth; and,

* Śakra, in the original.
† For “the king of the gods” the Sanskrit has Śakra.
‡ Literally, ‘the gods’—deva.

§ नमो भरतरात्रेऽस्त्रायुधुसौमितिः

Professor Wilson’s favourite MS. indefensibly ends this verse with स्त्रायुधुसौमिति; whence “smilingly”. Read: “And he discharged a volley of arrows, amounting to myriads of thousands.”

|| Madhusúdana.
¶ Namely, Varuńa.

** Tūkaśas. This word denotes that the pieces were no larger than sesamum-seeds.

†† Śibikā.
‡‡ Kubera, to wit.

§§ चक्षूर वीरिरवेणैं च इष्टिस्वयं हतीचस्म्

||| Śūla, ‘pikes.’
with the shafts shot from his bow, he dispersed the Sádhyas, Viśwas,* Maruts, and Gandharvas, like fleeces of cotton from the pods of the Simel† tree, through the sky. Garuḍa;‡ also, diligently plied his beak, and wings, and nails, and bit, and bruised, and scratched the deities who opposed his lord.§

Then the king of the gods and the foe of Madhu|| (encountered, and) overwhelmed each other with countless shafts, like rain-drops falling from two heavy clouds. Garuḍa, in the conflict, engaged with Airávata; and Janárdana was opposed to all the deities. When all the other weapons had been cut to pieces, Indra¶ stood armed with his thunderbolt, and Kríshṇa, with the discus Sudarśana.** Beholding them thus prepared for fight, all the people of the three spheres exclaimed

* Viśve. These deities are not mentioned severally, but always collectively. See Vol. III., p. 189, note beginning near the foot.
† शाद्यततुल्वत्। The original has, thus, Śādmati. See Vol. IV., p. 240, note ||.
‡ The Sanskrit has Garutmat.
§ गदवानिधि वेश्वप्रभायं निवर्जूद्रे॥
भवंतलावन्द्वचारंचं चचारे व॥

Herein is exemplified the figure of speech which is called, in Sanskrit, yathā-sankhyā. A similar, but more complete, instance of construction by the correspondent order of terms is afforded in the following couplet:

“Vir simplex, fortasse bonus, sed pastor ineptus,
Vult, tentat, peragit, plurima, paucis, nihil.”

Stanzas of like verbal collocation might be adduced, in any quantity, from medieval compositions. In the Third Book of Sir Philip Sidney’s Arcadia is a sonnet contrived, throughout, like its beginning:

“Vertue, beautie, and speech, did strike, wound, charmce,
My heart, eyes, eares, with wonder, love, delight.”
|| Madhusudana,
¶ Váśava, in the original.
** किल्लेर्वेिश्वराणि शाद्यततुल्वै च लर्जन ।
जयाय वासवो वच्चं व्याप्तं सुदर्शनं ॥
"Alas! alas!" Indra* launched his bolt; but in vain; for Hari caught and arrested it. He forbore, however, to hurl his discus, and only called out to Indra to stay.† Satyabhámá, seeing Indra disarmed, and his elephant disabled by Garuḍa, and the deity, himself, about to retreat, said to him: "King of the triple sphere, it ill becomes the husband of Śachí to run away. Ornamented with Párijáta-garlands, she will approach you. Of what use: is the sovereignty of heaven, embellished with the Párijáta-tree, no longer beholding Śachí meet you with affection, as of yore? Nay, Śakra: fly not! You must not suffer shame. Here, take the Párijáta-tree. Let the gods be no longer annoyed. Śachí, inflated with pride of her husband, has not welcomed me to her dwelling with respectful presents. As a woman, I am light of purpose, and am anxious for my husband’s fame. Therefore have I instigated, Śakra, this contest with you. But I do not want the Párijáta-tree; nor do I wish to take that which is another’s property. Śachí is proud of her beauty. What woman is not proud of her husband?" Thus spoken to (by Satyabhámá), the king of the gods turned back, and said to her: "Desist, wrathful dame, from afflicting your friend by further reproaches.§ I am not ashamed of being vanquished by him who is the author of the creation, preservation,

* Mahendra, in the Sanskrit.
† Hereabouts the translation is free.
‡ The insertion, here, of the words "to you", justified by the original, would make this sentence intelligible. The Sanskrit is as follows:

कीड़ेंश देवराज्ञि ते पारिजातक्षुण्यः ।
अपभ्रष्टो यथापूर्वे प्रशष्ठादागात्स्व शवीम् ॥

§ महाष्टी चैनामलं चिंद्र सखूः चेदात्तिविखः: ॥
and destruction of the world; who is the substance of all things;* in whom, without beginning or middle, the universe is comprised; and from whom, and by whom, identical with all things, it proceeds, and will cease to be.† What disgrace is it, O goddess, (to any one,) to be discomfited by him who is the cause of creation, continuance, and dissolution? His form is the parent of all worlds, though infinitely subtle, and known to those only by whom all that may be known is known. Who is able to overcome the unborn, unconstituted, eternal lord, who has willed to become a mortal, for the good of the world?”¹

¹ The Bhāgavata; merely says: “Incited by his wife, Krishṇa took away the Pārijāta-tree, having subdued the gods, and planted it in the garden of Satyabhāmā.” The Hari Vanaśa makes a long story of it, and tells it with some variations, especially in the commencement; Satyabhāmā’s desire for the Pārijāta-tree having been excited by Nārada’s presenting a flower from it to Krishṇa’s other spouse, Rukmini.

* Višva-rūpin.
† वर्षामयतःकलमेतद्नागदिमध्ये
   नारायणवच  भविष्यति सर्वमृतात्।
‡ X., Latter Section, IX., 39, 40:
   नोदितो भार्ययोत्स्थ याजियातो गभ्यति।
   श्रावणं सेंद्रान्वितुधाराधिर्भिक्षुपाणययतुर्म॥
   स्थापित सर्वभासमय गृहोवानोपश्रोभणः।
   ऋविगुर्वभरणः खंडःक्षेत्रश्चवचं पदनः॥
CHAPTER XXXI.

Krishna, with Indra's consent, takes the Párijáta-tree to Dwáraká; marries the princesses rescued from Naraka.

KEŚAVA, being thus eulogized by the king of the gods, smiled, and spake gravely to him (in reply). "Thou art Indra," said he, "the king of the celestials. We are (but) mortals, O lord of the world. Thou must pardon, therefore, the offence that I have committed. Let this Párijáta-tree be taken to its appropriate situation. I removed it in compliance with the words of Satyá. Receive back, also, this your thunderbolt, cast at me: for this is your proper weapon,* — the destroyer of your foes." Indra† answered, and said: "Thou beguilést us, O lord, in calling thyself a mortal. But we know thee to be the lord, although not endowed‡ with subtlety of discernment. Thou art that thou art, engaged in the (active) preservation§ of the earth; thou extractest the thorns implanted in her bosom, destroyer of the demon-race.|| Let this Párijáta-tree be transferred to Dwáraká;¶ and it shall remain upon earth as long as thou abidest in the world of mortals."** Hari, having assented to the proposal of Indra, †† returned to

---

* Praharaja.
† Šakra, in the original.
‡ That is to say, "although we are not endowed."
§ Trásha.
|| अगतः शक्निष्कष्यं करोधसूरसूदन ।
¶ The Sanskrit has Dwáravati.
** मद्वेड़ोऽः लया भूते नार्यं संख्यास्ते भूवि।
†† Devendra, in the Sanskrit.
earth, hymned by attendant sages,* saints,† and quire-
isters of heaven.

When Kṛishṇa arrived over Dwārakā, he blew his
shell, and delighted all the inhabitants with the sound.
Then, alighting from Garuḍa, he proceeded, with Satya-
bhāmā, to her garden; and there planted the great
Pārijāta-tree, the smell of which perfumed the earth
for three furlongs,§ and an approach to which enabled
every one to recollect (the events of) a prior existence;
so that, on beholding their faces in that tree, all the
Yādavas contemplated themselves in their (original)
celestial forms.|| Then Kṛishṇa took possession of the
wealth, elephants, horses, and women, which he had
recovered from Naraka, and which had been brought
(to Dwārakā) by the servants (of the demon); and, at
an auspicious season, he he espoused all the maidens
whom Naraka had carried off (from their friends):
at one and the same moment,** he received the
hands of all of them, according to the ritual, in separate
mansions.‡‡ Sixteen thousand and one hundred was
the number of the maidens. §§ And into so many dif-

* Siddha.
† Kishi.
‡ Nishkuta.
§ Yojana.

|| ततति यादवा: सवे देवबधानमालुपालः
ददेहुः पादधि तस्मिन्युवंतो मुखदर्शनम् ||

‡ The Sanskrit here has Janārdana.

** Kāla.

†† Govinda, in the original.

‡‡ Instead of पुषयित्वि, there is a variant, पुषयित्वि, importing “in
multiplied persons.”

§§ Our Purāña is at variance with itself as to the number of Kṛishṇa’s
wives. See Vol. IV., p. 112, with which compare pp. 81, 82, supra.
ferent forms did the foe of Madhu* multiply himself; so that every one of the damsels thought that he had wedded her, in his single person.† And the creator of the world, Hari, the assumer of universal shape, abode severally in the dwelling of each of these his wives.‡

* Madhusúdana.
† एकक्रियन ताः कथा सतिरे मधुसूदनसम्।
सत्यव पाणिग्रहणं सर्ववायस्तवानिन्ति॥
Śrīdhara, at least according to my single MS. of his commentary, begins this stanza with एकक्रियन, at the expense of metrical correctness.
‡ निग्रासु च जनकस्य तासां गेहं बैश्ववः।
. उवास विग्रं सर्वासां विक्रुपधरी हृदिः॥
CHAPTER XXXII.

Children of Kṛishṇa. Ěushā, the daughter of Bāṇa, sees Aniruddha in a dream, and becomes enamoured of him.

PARĀŚARA.—I have enumerated to you Pradhyumna and the other sons of Rukmiṇī. Satyabhāmā bore Bhānu* and Bhaimarika.† The sons of Rohiṇī were Dīptimat, Tāmrāpaksha,‡ and others. The powerful Sāmba§ and other sons were born of Jāmbavatī. Bhadravinda|| and other valiant youths were the sons of Nāgajaiti. Śaibyā (or Mitravindā¶) had several sons, of whom Sangrāmajit was the chief. Vṛika and others were begotten (by Hari) on Mādrī.** Lakshmanā had Gātravat and others; and Śruta and others were the sons†† of Kālindī;‡‡ Kṛishṇa §§ had sons, also, by his

---

* Two MSS. have Bhāru.
† Corrected from “Bhairika.” In giving this mangled form of the name, Professor Wilson was misled by an error in his favourite MS. The scansion of the line shows that a syllable is missing. Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth have helped to perpetuate “Bhairika”.
‡ Corrected from “Tāmrāpaksha”, in which reading Professor Wilson was again led astray by an error in the MS. referred to in the last note. Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth wrongly credit our Translator with “Tāmrāpakshin”. One of my MS. yields Tāmravarna; another, “Dīptimat and others”. Also vide supra, p. 79, note **.
§ Corrected from “Sāmba”. || My Ajmere MS. has Bhadramanda.
¶ Supplied by the Translator, on the authority of the commentator Śrīdhara. Ratnagarbha considers Śaibyā as one of Kṛishṇa’s eight wives of the first order; but he does not identify her, by name, with any one of those specified in note § to p. 78, supra.
** Vide supra, p. 81, note *.
†† There were three of them,—unnamed,—according to the reading of my Arrah MS. ‡‡ Vide supra, p. 78, note §, and p. 81, note 1. §§ Chakrin, in the original.
other wives,—in all, one hundred and eighty thousand. The eldest of the whole was Pradyumna, the son of Rukmiṇī: his son was Aniruddha, from whom Vajra* was born: his mother was Úshá,†,—the daughter of Bāña, and granddaughter of Bali,‡,—whom Aniruddha won in war.§ On that occasion, a fierce battle took place between Hari and Śankara, in which the thousand arms of Bāña were lopped away by the discus of the former.||

MAITREYA.—How happened it, (venerable) Bṛahman, that a contest on account of Úshá arose between Śiva and Kṛishṇa? And in what manner did Hari cut off the thousand arms of Bāña?** This, illustrious sir, thou art able to narrate.††

PARĀŚARA.—Úshá, the daughter of Bāña, having seen Pārvatī sporting with (her lord,) Śaśibhu, was inspired with a wish for similar dalliance. The beautiful Gaurī,‡‡ who knows the hearts of all, said to Úshá:

and gives the ten names of each set, with one or two exceptions. §§

---

* Corrected from "Vraja". See Vol. IV., pp. 112, 113.
† Corrected, here and everywhere below, from "Úshá", which, likewise, occurs, but not in our Purāṇa. ‡ See Vol. II., p. 69.
§ The original is अनिश्चितो रणो रुहः।
|| The Sanskrit has Chakrin. †† Hara, in the Sanskrit.
** कथं चयं च बाणस्क बाहनां जलवान्म्वरः।
†† The original adds:
महत्तौढळ जातं चयं ऋतुमिमां हरे:।
So reads Śrīdhara. Ratnagarbha has:
महत्तौढळं जातं कष्टयात्र कथामिनाम।
§§ Vide supra, p. 79, notes *, †, §, ‡, and **; p. 81, notes * and †; and p. 82, note ||||.


“Do not grieve. You shall have a husband.”* “But when will this be?” thought Úshá to herself. “Or who will be my lord?” On which, Párvatí continued: “He who shall appear to you, princess, in a dream, on the twelfth lunation† of the light half of Vaisákha, he will be your husband.”‡ Accordingly, as the goddess had foretold, on that lunar day a youth appeared (to Úshá,) in a dream, of whose person she became enamoured. When she woke, and no longer perceived him, she was overcome with sorrow, and, unrestrained by modesty, demanded of her companion whither he had gone. The companion and friend of the princess was Chitralekhá, the daughter of Kumbhánáda,§ the minister of Báña. “Of whom do you speak?” inquired she (of Úshá). But the princess, recollecting herself, was ashamed, and remained silent. || At length, however, Chitralekhá conciliated her confidence; and she related to her what had passed, and what the goddess had foretold; and she requested her friend to devise some means of uniting her with the person whom she had beheld in her dream. ¶

Chitralekhá then delineated the most eminent gods,** demons,†† spirits,‡‡ and mortals, and showed them (to

* चक्रकार्यार्थं भृषी लम्पि रंखसे।
† By this word Professor Wilson intends, at variance with scientific precedent, and otherwise entirely without justification, ‘lunar day’.
‡ In this sentence, and in the next, the Translator, with commendable taste, has not reproduced the grossness of the original.
§ Corrected from “Kubhánáda”.
|| यदा जम्बाकुला नाखे कथयामास सा सभी।
¶ देवा तीव्रव तमासी योः किस्मान् कुश्व तस।
** Sura.
†† Daitya.
‡‡ Gandharva.
Úshá). Putting aside the portraits of gods, spirits, snake-gods, * and demons, † the princess selected those of mortals, and, amongst them, the heroes of the races of Andhaka and Vṛishńi.‡ When she came to (the likenesses of) Kṛishńa and Ráma, she was confused with shame.§ From (the portrait of) Pradyumna she modestly averted her eyes; but, the moment she beheld the picture of his son, the object of her passion, her eyes wide expanded, and all her bashfulness was discarded.|| “This is he! This is he!” said she (to Chitrarekha). And her friend, who was endowed with magic power, ¶ bade her be of good cheer, and set off, through the air, to Dwāraká.**

* Uraga.
† Asura.
‡ मनुष्य ददी वृद्धि तत्वधन्यज्ञवृध्दि।
For Andhaka and Vṛishńi, see Vol. IV., pp. 71, et seq.
§ Lajjá-jāṇa.
|| वृद्धात्मधविकाशिनया सम्भा स्वापि निराकाता।
¶ Yoga-gāmin.
** Dwāravati, in the original.
CHAPTER XXXIII.

Báña solicits Śiva for war: finds Aniruddha in the palace, and makes him prisoner. Kríshná, Balaráma, and Pradyumna come to his rescue. Śiva and Skanda aid Báña: the former is disabled; the latter, put to flight. Báña encounters Kríshná, who cuts off all his arms, and is about to put him to death. Śiva intercedes; and Kríshná spares his life. Vishnú and Śiva are the same.

BEFORE this took place, Báña had been engaged in the adoration of the three-eyed* (god), and had thus prayed to him: “I am humiliated, † O lord, by (the possession of) a thousand arms in a state of peace. Let some hostilities ensue, in which I may derive some advantage from their possession. Without war, what is the use of these arms? They are but a burthen to me.” ; Śankara replied: “When thy peacock-banner shall be broken, thou shalt have war,—the delight of the evil spirits that feast on the flesh of man.” § Báña, pleased (by this promise), proffered his thanks|| to Śámbhu, and returned to his palace, where he found his standard broken; at which his joy was increased.

At that time, the nymph Chitralekhá returned (from Dwáraká), and, by the exercise of her magic power, brought Aniruddha (along with her). The guards of

† Nirvímna.

; कष्ठम्यया वाक्यां सापखङ्किको रशः ।
भविष्यति विना युवं भाराय सम किं सुधीः ॥
§ पिरिरतिक्षिजिहावं मान्यति लं तदा रशम् ॥
|| The Sanskrit has simply प्रकाशः ।
the inner apartments, discovering him there with Ushá,* reported it to the king, who immediately sent a body of his followers (to seize the prince). But the valiant youth, taking up an iron club, slew his assailants;† on which, Báña mounted his car, advanced against him, and endeavoured to put him to death. Finding, however, that Aniruddha was not to be subdued by prowess, he followed the counsel of his minister, and brought his magical faculties into the conflict, by which he succeeded in capturing the Yadu prince, and binding him in serpent-bonds.‡

When Aniruddha was missed from Dwáravatí, and the Yádavas were inquiring of one another whither he had gone, Nárada came to them, and told them that he was the prisoner of Báña; having been conveyed, by a female possessed of magic faculties, to Šońitapura.†§ When they heard this, they were satisfied;

† The synonyms of Šońitapura, in the Trikáńda Śesha,|| are Devíkośa, Báńapura, Kotívarsha, and Ushávana.¶ The first is, usually, considered to be the modern Devicotta, in the Carnatic, which is commonly believed to be the scene of Báña’s defeat. The name, however, occurs in other parts of India: in the Deccan, on the banks of the Godávari,—according to Wilford, the capital of Munja (Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX., p. 199); and in Assam,

* तं रमभाषं सहोयया।
† जगान परिचं कीहमादाय परन्तरं।
‡ तत्तं पतंगाख्यं वचनं यदुनवनम्।
§ The translation, hereabouts, is rather free.
|| II., I., 17.
¶ The better reading, it seems, is Umávana, as in the Haima-kośa, IV., 43, where, also, we find all the synonyms of Šońitapura which are specified above.
for they had imagined he had been taken away by the gods, (in reprisal for the Pārijāta-tree).* Kṛishṇa,† therefore, immediately summoned Garuḍa, who came with a wish;‡ and, mounting upon him, along with Bala and Pradyumna, he set off for the city of Báña. On their approach to the city, they were opposed by the spirits who attend on Rudra:§ but these were soon destroyed by Hari; and he and his companions reached the vicinity of the town.|| Here, mighty Fever—an emanation from Maheśwara,¶ having three feet and three heads¹,—fought desperately with Vishúu,** in defence of Báña. Baladeva, upon whom his ashes were

near Gwálpára, as the city of the Daityas. Asiatic Researches, Vol. XIV., p. 448. Hamilton†† notices the remains of a city, so called, in Dinajpoor. In the Kāliká Puráṇa, Báña is described as the friend and, apparently, neighbour of Naraka, king of Prág-jiyotisha,‡‡ or Assam

¹ Alluding to the three stages of febrile paroxysms, or to the recurrence of tertian ague. A contest with this enemy, in the course of military operations, is an allegory which the British armies in India too often illustrate.

* तं शोकिष्ठपुरी श्रुव्या नीति विषाचितं धर्मः
  योक्तिता प्रवर्य जगसुद्धारव्या गामिरेति ||
  † The Sanskrit has Hari.
‡ I. e., “at his wish”.
§ The Translator takes from Śridhara this explanation of pramatha.
|| पृथिवीरैः प्रमथेन्द्रामातीव्यहाराम् ||
  यथौ वाणपुराणाम् नीलशा नामसंध्ययं हरि: ||
¶ Maheśwara is the word translated by “an emanation from Maheśwara.”
** Śārnga-dhanava, “armed with the bow Śārnga,” is the term by which Kṛishṇa is here called, in the original.
†† History, &c. of Eastern India, Vol. II., p. 660.
‡‡ Vide supra, p. 54, note 1; p. 55, note ‡; and p. 88, note 1.
V.
scattered, was seized with burning heat, and his eyelids trembled; but he obtained relief by clinging to the body of Kṛishṇa.* Contending, thus, with the divine holder of the bow,† the Fever (emanating from Śiva) was quickly expelled from the person of Kṛishṇa by Fever; which he himself engendered..§ Brahmā,|| beholding the impersonated malady bewildered by the beating inflicted by the arms of the deity, entreated the latter to desist; and the foe of Madhu refrained, and absorbed into himself the Fever he had created.¶ The rival Fever then departed, saying to Kṛishṇa: “Those men who call to memory the combat between us shall be (ever) exempt from febrile disease.”**

Next, Vishṇu overcame and demolished the five fires;¹†† and, with perfect ease,‡ annihiliated the army

¹ The Áhāvaniya, Gārhapatyā, Dakshiṇa, Sabhya, and Ávasathya are the five fires; of which the three first have a religious, and the other two, a secular, character. The first is a fire pre-

* तत्राश्चायन्ततात्प: कष्टायकसंगमात्।
इवाप बलद्वैषयिष्य शममास्मीवित्य:॥

† To render Śārṅgin, as Kṛishṇa is denominated from his bow spoken of in note ** in the preceding page.

‡ Vaiśikhāvā is the epithet given it in the Sanskrit.

§ Kṛishṇa here figures as a practitioner of homoeopathy.

|| Pitāmaha, in the original.

¶ नागराष्ट्राभागाहातपरिपीडनविहृलम्।
तं वीच्य चम्यतामखेभासं देवं पितामहं॥
ततश्र भान्तिवेदैति मोक्ता तं वैष्णवं ज्ञरम्।
आत्रात्मवेत सर्व निन्दे भगवानंधुरुपद्यन:॥

** Viśvarā.

†† “The protectors of that city”;—namely, Bāñā’s, says Ratnagarbha.

‡‡ लीलया।
of the Dánavas. Then the son of Bali (Báña), with the whole of the Dáitya* host, assisted by Śankara and Kárttikeya, † fought with Śauri. A fierce combat took place between Hari and Śankara. All the regions shook, scorched by their flaming weapons; and the celestials felt assured that the end of the universe was at hand. Govinda, with the weapon of yawning, set Śankara a-gape; and then the demons‡ and the demigods attendant upon Śiva.§ were destroyed on every side; for Hara, overcome with incessant gaping, sat down in his car, and was unable longer to contend with Kríshña, whom no acts affect.|| The deity of war, Kárttikeya, * wounded in the arm by Garuḍa, ** struck by the weapons of Pradyumna, and disarmed by the shout of

pared for oblations at an occasional sacrifice; the second is the household fire, to be perpetually maintained; the third is a sacrificial fire, in the centre of the other two, and placed to the south; the Sabhya is a fire lighted to warm a party; and the Ávasathya, †† the common domestic or culinary fire. Manu, III., 100, 185; †† and Kullúka Bhatta's explanation. §§

* Dáitya, in the Sanskrit.
† See Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXXIX.; and Vol. II., p. 23.
‡ Dáitya.
§ In definition of pramatha.
|| Akliṣṭa-karman, "unweariable."
¶ For "the deity of war, Kárttikeya," the Sanskrit has, simply, Guba.
** Professor Wilson has followed the reading of Śrídhará, as it appears in the only copy of his commentary to which we, in common, have had access,—ग्रह- दचनतवाःIr Ratnagarbha adopts the ordinary lection, ग्रह- दचनतवाः.
†† Corrected from "Ávasatthya."
‡‡ Neither thence nor from Kullúka's comments is much to be gleaned touching the five fires.
§§ Also see Vol. III., p. 175, note §; and Vol. IV., p. 11, note 1.
Hari,* took to flight. Bāṇa, when he saw Śankara
disabled, the Daityas destroyed, Guha† fled, and Śiva’s
followers : slain, § advanced, on his vast car,—the
horses of which were harnessed || by Nandīśa,—⊥ to
encounter Kṛishṇa and his associates Bala and Pra-
dyumna.** The valiant Balabhadrā, attacking the host
of Bāṇa, wounded them, in many ways, with his ar-
rows, and put them to a shameful rout; †† and their
sovereign beheld them dragged about by Rāma, :: with
his ploughshare, or beaten, by him, with his club, or
pierced, by Kṛishṇa, §§ with his arrows. He, therefore,
attacked Kṛishṇa; and a fight took place between them.
They cast at each other fiery shafts, that pierced
through their armour: but Kṛishṇa intercepted, with
his arrows, those of Bāṇa, and cut them to pieces.
Bāṇa, nevertheless, wounded Keśava; and the wielder
of the discus wounded Bāṇa; and both, desirous of
victory, and seeking, enraged, the death of his antag-
onist, hurled (various) missiles at each other. When

* The original has Kṛishṇa.
† I. e., Kārttikeya.
‡ To render pramatha-sainya.
§ शाक्षिधन्वन, "by the bearer of the bow Śārnga", the original par-
ticularizes.
|| Read ‘driven’, —sangrihitā.
¶ Also called Nandi and Nandin. Generally he is represented as a
** The Sanskrit here calls him by his patronym, Kārshūi.
†† वलभद्रो महानीयोऽवासिन्यमनेनक्तः
विवाध बालः: प्रच्छ धर्मेन्त्यात्पलायत
Ratnagarbha ends the second verse with धर्मेन्त्यात्पलायत; and some
MSS. give, with this reading, संहक्त; instead of प्रच्छ।
::*: Bala, in the original.
§§ The Sanskrit has Chakrin.
an infinite number of arrows* had been cut to pieces, and the weapons began to be exhausted,† Krishña: resolved to put Bāńa to death. The destroyer§ of the demon-host, therefore, took up his discus, Sudarśana, blazing with the radiance of a hundred suns As he was in the act of casting it, the mystical goddess Koṭavī,¶ the magic lore of the demons, stood, naked, before him.†† Seeing her before him, Krishña,†† with unclosed eyes, cast Sudarśana, to cut off the arms:: of Bāńa. The discus, dreaded, in its flight, by the whole of the weapons of the demons, lopped off, successively,

---

* The Sanskrit yields "all the arrows".
† बले च सीद्धि माधुर्येऽः Ratnagarbha explains this as follows: माधुर्येऽशैलो सीद्धि चैवें सति।
‡ Hari, in the original.
§ Read "enemy",—ari.
¶ Here called, in the original, by his epithetical appellation, Madhuvardwīp, or Madhuvardvidh, according to various copies.
† Variant: Kodavī. And Ratnagarbha, in my best MSS., has Koṭavī.
†† नया देतेचयामूलकोटवी पुरातो है:।

Ratnagarbha says: कोटवी देतेचया माधवी देखकुलदेवता।

Also see note §§, below.
†† The Sanskrit has Hari.
*** बाजवत्व, according to Śrīdhara. बाजवत्व is Ratnagarbha's reading.
§§ This is from Śrīdhara, who says: कोटवी नाम देतेचयाणां विभाषनां माधविकुलदेवतां स्त्रालोक्यं क्रममांश:।

||| St. 10722.
the numerous arms of the Asura. Beholding Kṛishṇa with the discus again in his hand, and preparing to launch it once more, for the total demolition of Bāna, the foe of Tripura* (Siva,) respectfully addressed him.† The husband of Umā, seeing the blood streaming from

* In the Eighth Chapter of the Revā-māhātmya, it is said, that Tripurisvāna, where Śiva flung down Tripura, the Asura, lies to the north of the Narmadā. The Twenty-ninth Chapter of the same work somewhat discordantly relates as follows. The demon Bāna, in reward of his austerities as a votary of Śiva, received from him the gift of a city. Brahmā and Vishnū adding, each, another, he obtained the epithet of Tripura, or Tīrīṣṭalī. When slain by Śiva, as he was traversing the heavens, a part of his carcase fell near the well-known mountain Śrīśalā, in Siddha-kshetra; another fragment, not far from Amarakaśaka; and the remainder, in the vicinity of Gangāsāgara. The weapon, Aghorāstra, with which he was demolished, reached the earth at a point of the Narmadā hard by Jaleśwaratīrtha, and sank to Rasātala, the nethermost of the infernal stages.

Where this tale is briefly rehearsed in the Gaṇapīṭa Upaniṣad,— Prior Section, Chapter LXXI,—Bāna carries off Pradyumna, whose father, Kṛishṇa, attacks the giant, and, after propitiating Gaṇesā, overcomes the monster, and takes possession of his city, Šońitapura. Some ten chapters of the first half of the Gaṇapīṭa Upaniṣad, beginning with the thirty-eight, are taken up with Tripura or Bāna.

Tripuri, the capital of the Chedis,—a place connected with the preceding legends,—I discovered, while exploring the banks of the Narmadā, in the insignificant village of Tewar. See the Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. VI., p. 516.

† The Translator has strangely misunderstood the import of the following stanzas:

क्रमेण तत्तु बाजनम् वाष्कायुतनाद्वितम्।
क्रेणतु चक्करपाराकस्चकालयाध्यरहृदम्।
चित्रे बाजुसहस् तु कर्ष्क मधुन्दुरः।
सुतुत्वाणामार्य विश्वात्स्त्रिपुरहितः।

Ratnagarbha reads चाविन्दित, for -नाद्वित; -चच्यादि, for -चच्यादि; and बाजोले तस्मि, for बाजुसहस्तु. One other variant which I find is बाजलने तस्य; and my Ajmer MS. interpolates, after the first verse of the extract:

चिन्त्वकृ चक्रं बाजनां सहस्त्रपतिविनिग्यतं।

* Umāpati.
the dismembered arms of Bāṇa, approached Govinda, to solicit a suspension of hostilities,* and said to him: "Krīshṇa, Krīshṇa, lord of the world, I know thee, first of spirits,† the supreme lord, infinite felicity, without beginning or end, and beyond all things: This sport of universal being, in which thou takest the persons of god, animals, and men, is a subordinate attribute of thy energy.§ Be propitious, therefore, O lord, (unto me). I have given Bāṇa assurance of safety. Do not thou falsify that which I have spoken. He has grown old in devotion∥ to me. Let him not incur thy displeasure. The Daitya has received a boon from me; and, therefore, I deprecate thy wrath." When he had concluded, Govinda, dismissing his resentment against the Asura, looked graciously on the lord of Umā,¶ the wielder of the trident,** and said to him: "Since you, Śāṅkara, have given a boon unto Bāṇa, let him live. From respect to your promises, my discus is arrested.†† The assurance of safety granted by you is granted (also,) by me. You are fit to apprehend that you are not distinct from me.‡‡ That which I am thou art; and

---

* सामपूर्वसं।
† Purushottama.
‡ "Beyond all things" is to render para.
§ देवतिष्यक्षुष्यवश पूर्वग्रहणाधिकाः।
बौलियं सर्वभूतर्ग स्त्रृष्टीपल्लवण।∥

|| Saṅkraya.
¶ Umāpati.
** Śūla-pṛthi.
†† खद्ताकार्किरवाहदत्तश्च स्त्रृष्टिनिर्व्वतितम।
‡‡ मत्तोऽविभिसमावाम्ब द्रहुसहस्रसिंहं शंकर।

"You must perceive," &c.
that, also, is this world, with its gods, demons,* and mankind. Men contemplate distinctions, because they are stupified by ignorance,” So saying, Kṛishṇa went to the place where the son of Pradyumna† was confined. The snakes that bound him were destroyed, being blasted by the breath of Garuḍa; and Kṛishṇa, placing him,‡ along with his wife, upon the celestial bird,§ returned, with Pradyumna and Rāma, to Dwārakā.\

1 There can be little doubt that this legend describes a serious struggle between the Śaivas and Vaishnāvas, in which the latter, according to their own report, were victorious; and the Śaivas, although they attempt to make out a sort of compromise between Rudra and Kṛishṇa, are obliged to admit his having the worst of the conflict, and his inability to protect his votary. The Bhāgavata tells the story much as the text. The Hari Vaṁśa amplifies, even more than usual; the narrative occupying nearly seventy pages of the French translation. The legend is to be found, to the same purport, but in various degrees of detail, in the Agni Purāṇa, Kūrma Purāṇa, Padma Purāṇa (Uttara Khaṇḍa), Vāmana Purāṇa, and Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa, (Kṛishṇa Janma Khaṇḍa).

* Asura.
† In the original, Prādyumni. Aniruddha is intended.
‡ The Sanskrit has Aniruddha.
§ To represent Garutmat.

∥ ब्राजगुर्दीरकां रामकार्षिणद्वारे: पुरीम ।
“Rāma, Kārshūi, and Dāmodara went to the city of Dwārakā.”
CHAPTER XXXIV.

Pauṇḍraka, a Vāsudeva, assumes the insignia and style of Kṛishṇa, supported by the king of Kāśi. Kṛishṇa marches against and destroys them. The son of the king sends a magical being against Kṛishṇa; destroyed by his discus, which also sets Benares on fire, and consumes it and its inhabitants.

MAITREYA.—Of a truth, the divine Śauni, having assumed a mortal body, performed great achievements in his easy victories over Śakra, and Śiva,* and all their attendant divinities.† I am now desirous to hear from you, illustrious (sage), what other mighty exploit the humiliator of the prowess of the celestials performed.

PARĀŚARA.—Hear, excellent Brahman, ‡ with reverent attention, an account of the burning of Vāraṇasī§ by Kṛishṇa, in the course of his relieving the burthens of the earth.||

There was a Vāsudeva who was called Pauṇḍraka,¹

¹ From being, the commentator † says, king of Puṇāra.** The

* Śauna, in the original.
† चक्रे कर्म महृदीर्घिः शायको मानुषीं तनुम।
विगाय श्रान वर्षें च सर्वदिवांश लोकया।
‡ Viparasi; the same as Brahmarshi, for which term see Vol. III., p. 68, text and note 1.
§ Corrected, here and everywhere below, from “Varanasi” or “Varanasi.”
|| भारतवर्षे। Variant: नरायणरे।
¶ The two commentators have identically the same explanation of the name in question: पीछीदेशजः, “born in the country of the Pauṇḍras.” They do not call Pauṇḍraka a king.
** See Vol. II., p. 170, note 5.
and who, though not the Vásudeva, was flattered, by ignorant people, as the descended deity, until he fancied himself to be the Vásudeva who had come down upon earth.* Losing all recollection (of his real character), he assumed the emblems of Vishńu, and sent an ambassador to the magnanimous Kṛishńa, with this message: "Relinquish, thou foolish fellow, the discus. Lay aside all my insignia, my name, and the character of Vásudeva, and come and do me homage; and I will vouchsafe thee means of subsistence." † At which, Janárdana laughed, and replied: "Go, messenger, back to Pauńdraka, and say to him, from me: 'I will despatch to thee my emblem the discus, without fail. Thou wilt rightly apprehend my meaning, and consider what is to be done; for I shall come to

Bhágavata§ calls him chief of the Kárúshas; || the Padma, king of Káśi; but the Bhágavata, as well as our text, makes the king of Káśi his friend and ally.

† According to the Padma Puráňa, he propitiates Śiva, and obtains from him the insignia which constitute a Vásudeva. The different authorities for this legend all use the term Vásudeva in the sense of a title.

* पीण्डको वासुदेवस्वर वासुदेवोऽभिप्राप्ति ।
वाज्यरी भविष्यति। ||
के भविष्यति।

† वासुदेवामर्क भूष मुक्ता सर्वविषय ।
चारुस्वर धीरेतालोकम ततो न प्रायति त्रेष ||

शब्द, for sarva, is the reading of some MSS.

‡ समुस्तवे ||
§ X., Latter Section, Chapter XVI.
|| See Vol. III., p. 240, notes 1, etc.
¶ In all such cases, read "king of the Káśis."
thy city, bringing the discus with me, and shall, undoubtedly, consign it to thee. If thou wilt command me to come, I will immediately obey, and be with thee to-morrow. There shall be no delay.† And, having sought thy asylum, I will so provide, O king, that I shall never more have anything to dread from thee.'" So saying, he dismissed the ambassador, (to report these words to his sovereign), and, summoning,§ Garuḍa, mounted him, and set off for the city (of Pauṇḍraka').

1 The Hari Varṇa and Padma Purāṇa send Pauṇḍraka to Dwārakā. According to the latter, Nārada incites Pauṇḍraka to the aggression, telling him he cannot be a Vāsudeva till he has overcome Krīṣhṇa. He goes, and is killed. The former work, as usual, enters into particulars of its own invention. Krīṣhṇa is absent on a visit to Śiva at Kailāsa; and, during his absence, Pauṇḍraka, assisted by Ekalāvya, || king of the Nishādas, makes a night-attack upon Dwārakā. They are resisted by the Yādavas, under Sātyaki and Balarama; by the former of whom Pauṇḍraka is repeatedly overthrown, and all but slain. He requires so much killing, however, that he is likely to obtain the victory; when Krīṣhṇa comes to the aid of his kinsmen, and, after a protracted encounter, described in language employed a hundred times before, kills his competitor. The whole of the sections called the Kailāsa Yāträ—or Krīṣhṇa's Journey to Kailāsa,—must have been wanting in the copy used by M. Langlois, as they are not included in his translation. The chapters of the Hari Varṇa,
When the king of Kási* heard of the preparations of Keśava, he sent his army (to the aid of Pauńdraka), himself bringing up the rear; † and, with the force of the king of Kási, ‡ and his own troops, Pauńdraka, the (false) Vásudeva, marched to meet Krishña.§ Hari beheld him afar off, standing in his car, holding a discus, a club, a mace,∥ a scimitar, and a lotos, in his hands; ornamented with a garland of flowers; bearing a bow; and having his standard made of gold. He had, also, the Śrīvatsa॥ mark delineated on his breast; he was dressed in yellow garments, and decorated with ear-rings and a tiara.*** When the god whose standard is Garuda beheld him, he laughed with a deep laugh, and engaged in conflict with the hostile host of cavalry and elephants, fighting with swords, †† scimitars,‡‡

according to his enumeration of them, are 261: my copy has 316. §§

---

* Kási-pati. See note ‡, below.
† सन्वेश्यारिवार: पारिशिष्याह उपाययि.
‡ Ratnagarbha defines पारिशिष्याह: by सहायः; 'ally.' Compare Vol. IV, p. 2, text and note प.
‡‡ Kási-rája. See Vol. IV, p. 344, supplementary note on p. 87.
§ The original has Keśava.
∥ Probably the Translator forgot to strike out this word, after inserting 'club'. Krishña has only four insignia, named, in the original, as follows:

चञ्चलस्य गद्राखलवाङ्ग पारिशिष्यताक्षुज्ञः.

For Krishña's complete equipment of weapons, vide infra, p. 149.
*** Kirita. †† Nistriñ̄̄̄̄̄̄śa. ‡‡ Rishñi.
§§ The Calcutta edition has 326; the Bombay edition, 317, in three Sections of 55, 128, and 134, severally.
maces, tridents,* spears,† and bows. Showering upon
the enemy the shafts from his Śárnga: bow, and hurl-
ing at them his mace and discus, he § quickly destroyed
both the army of Pauṇḍraka and that of the king of
Kāśi. || He then said to the former, who was foolishly
wearing his emblems: “Pauṇḍraka, you desired me, by
your envoy, to resign to you all my insignia. I now
deliver them to you. Here is my discus. Here I give
up my mace. And here is Garuḍa: ¶ let him mount upon
thy standard.” Thus speaking, he let fly the discus
and the mace, by which Pauṇḍraka was cut to pieces,
and cast on the ground; whilst the Garuḍa (on his
banner) was demolished by the Garuḍa (of Vishnū).
The people, beholding this sight, exclaimed “Alas!
alas!” But the valiant king of Kāśi,** adhering to the
imposture of his friend, continued the conflict,†† till
Śauri: decapitated him with his arrows, shooting his
head into the city of Kāśi, §§ to the marvel of all the
inhabitants. Having, thus, slain Pauṇḍraka and the
king of Kāśi, |||| with all their followers, Śauri returned

---

* Śūla, 'pikes'.
† Śakti.
‡ Corrected from "Śárnga", a mistake found in Professor Wilson's Hindu-made version.
§ Janārdana, in the original.
|| Kāśi-rāja.
¶ Garuḍmat, in the Sanskrit; and so twice, just below.
** काशीनामधिप:, “king of the Kāsīs,” literally.
†† युधुधे वासुदेवः मित्रस्वायत्ते स्मः स्मः
The two commentators remark, in the same words: अपचित्ती।

चारुवृक्षिः सतयुधे।
•• This name does not appear in the original.
 §§ Kāśi-puri, "the city of the Kāsīs."
|| || Kāśi-rāja.
to Dwáraká,* where he lived in the enjoyment of heavenly delights.†

When the inhabitants of Káśi; saw the head of their king§ shot into their city, they were much astonished, and wondered how it could have happened, and by whom the deed could have been done.|| Having ascertained that the king had been killed by Kṛishná, the son of the monarch (of Káśi), together with the priest of the family, propitiated Śankara; and that deity, well pleased to be adored in the sacred place** Avimukta,†† desired the prince to demand a boon. On which he prayed, and said: “O lord, mighty god, through thy favour, let thy mystic spirit‡ arise to destroy Kṛishná, the murderer of my father.” “It shall be so,” answered Śankara. And from out of the southern fire§§ upsprang a vast and formidable female,² like flame out of

---

---

1 The Bhágavata||| names him Sudakshiňa; the Padma, Daúda-páni.

2 A personified Kṛityá, a magical creation. The Padma has

* The Sanskrit has Dwára-vatí.
† पुनःप्राच्यं प्राप्ते रेमि लघुगतो यथा।
‡ Not literal.
§ Káśi-pati.
|| तद्भवं पतितं तु तच्च वाशिपते: पुरे।
जनः किमेतद्विनां केलिन्दन्विनिश्चितः: ||
¶ Vásudeva, in the original.
** Mahá-kshetra.
†† This name of Benares is found in the Káśi-khaňda, as well. It occurs, also, in the Jábála Upanishad. See my Benares, &c., p. 4, note 2.
‡‡ “Thy mystic spirit” is to translate krítyá, for which see note 2 in the present page.
||| X., Latter Section, XVI., 27.
fire, blazing with ruddy light, and with fiery radiance streaming amidst her hair.* Angrily she called upon Kṛishṇa, and departed to Dwāракā; † where the people, beholding her, were struck with dismay, and fled, for protection, to Madhusúdana, the refuge of all worlds. The wielder of the discus,‡ knowing that the fiend § had been produced by the son of the king of Kāśi,|| through his adoration of the deity whose emblem is a bull, and being engaged in sportive amusements, and playing at dice, said to the discus: "Kill this fierce creature, ¶ whose tresses are of plaited flame." Accordingly, Sudarśana, the discus of Vishnu, immediately attacked the fiend,** fearfully enwreathed with fire, and wearing tresses of plaited flame. †† Terrified at the might of Sudarśana, the creation of Maheśvara;‡‡ awaited not his attack, but fled with speed, pursued by him with equal velocity, until she reached Várańasí, repelled by the superior might of the discus of Vishnu.

the same. The Bhāgavata makes the product of the sacrificial fire a male, and sends him to Dwāракā, accompanied by a host of Bhūtas, Śiva’s attendant goblins.

---

* My MSS. present a great variety of readings in the epithets applied to the being under description.
† Dwārvati, in the Sanskrit.
‡ Chakrīn.
§ Mahā-kṛityā.
|| Kāśi-rāja.
¶ Kṛityā.
** Kṛityā.
†† This is far from literal; and the same may be said of the remainder of the paragraph.
‡‡ छाया माहिष्यरी।
The army of Káši,* and the host of the demigods attendant upon Śiva,† armed with all kinds of weapons, then sallied out, to oppose the discus; but, skilled in the use of arms, he consumed (the whole of) the forces by his radiance, and then set fire‡ to the city, in which the magic power of Śiva§ had concealed herself. Thus was Váráṇaśi burnt, with all its princes and their followers, its inhabitants, horses, elephants, and men, treasures and granaries, houses, palaces,‖ and markets.¶ The whole of a city that was inaccessible to the gods** was, thus, wrapped in flames by the discus of Hari, and was totally destroyed. The discus, then, with unmitigated wrath, and blazing fiercely, and far from satisfied with the accomplishment of so easy a task, returned to the hand of Vishnú.‖‖

---

1 According to the Bhágavata, the magical being, himself, destroys Sudakshiña and his priest; but Sudarasana consumes the people and the city. The Padma ascribes the destruction of the king and all his city to the discus. The Hari Vaṁśa closes its narrative with the death of Pauṇḍraka, and makes no mention of the destruction of Benares. The circumstance ‡‡ is alluded to, in a preceding section (s. 159), by Nárada, when detailing the exploits of Kríshná.

2 In this legend, again, we have a contest between the followers

---

* Káši-bala; which may mean either "the army of the Kášis" or "the army of the king of the Kášis."
† This phrase is to represent pramatha.
‡ दृष्टा implies combustion.
§ "The magic power of Śiva" is to render kriyá.
‖ Prákára.
¶ Chatvaru.
** दुःर्चिरवच दृष्टा।
‖‖ The latter portion of this paragraph is translated very freely.
‡‡ Namely, of the burning of Benares.
of Vishnú and Śiva intimated; as, besides the assistance given, by the latter, to Paunídraka, Benares—Váráñasi or Avimukta,*—has been, from all time, as it is at present, the high place of the Śaiva worship.† There is, also, an indication of a Vaishñava schism, in the competition between Paunídra and Kṛishṇa for the title of Vásudeva and the insignia of his divinity.

* Corrected from "Atimukti". Vide supra, p. 126, text and note ††.
† See my Benares, &c., p. 18, note 2.
CHAPTER XXXV.

Sāmba carries off the daughter of Duryodhana, but is taken prisoner. Balaráma comes to Hastinápurá, and demands his liberation: it is refused: in his wrath, he drags the city towards him, to throw it into the river. The Kuru chiefs give up Sāmba and his wife.

MAITREYA.—I have a (great) desire to hear, (excellent) Brahman, some further account of the exploits of Balaráma.* You have related to me his dragging the Yamuná,† and other mighty deeds; but you can tell me, venerable sir;‡ some other of his§ acts.

PARÁŚARA.—Attend, Maitreya, to the achievements performed by Ráma, who is the eternal, illimitable Śesha, the upholder of the earth. At the choice of a husband by the daughter|| of Duryodhana, the princess was carried off by the hero Sāmba, the son of Jámbavaṭát.¶ Being pursued by Duryodhana,** Karña,†† Bhíshma,‡‡ Droṇa, and other celebrated chiefs, who were incensed at his audacity, he was defeated and taken prisoner.§§ When the Yádavas heard of the oc-

---

* Balabhadra, in the Sanskrit.
† Vide supra, pp. 65—68.
‡ Mahábhágä.
§ Bala’s, according to the original.
|| Her name was Lakshmana, according to the Bhágavata-puráña, X., Latter Section, XVIII., 1.
¶ Vide supra, p. 79, note ॥; and p. 107.
** See Vol. IV., p. 158.
†† Ibid., pp. 102 and 126.
‡‡ Ibid., p. 157.

§§ तत: कुञ्जा महावीर्या: कर्ष्णद्वेषोधनादयः।
भीष्मद्रोणाद्विष्णृ बचन्युग्धि निधितस्।

The translation of this stanza, as will be seen, is considerably interpolated.
currence, their wrath was kindled against Duryodhana and his associates; and they prepared to take up arms against them. * But Baladeva, † in accents interrupted by the effects of ebriety, : forbade them, and said: “I will go, alone, to the sons of Kuru. § They will liberate Sāmba, at my request.” Accordingly, he went to the elephant-styled city || (Hastinápurá), but took up his abode in a grove without the town, which he did not enter. When Duryodhana and the rest heard that he ¶ had arrived there, they sent him a cow, a present of fruits and flowers, and water. ** Bala received the offering in the customary form, and said to the Kauravas: “Ugrasena † † commands you to set Sāmba at liberty.” When Bhishma, Droṇa, Karṇa, Duryodhana, and the others heard this, they were (very) angry; and Bāhlíka: ‡ and other (friends of the) Kauravas, who looked upon the Yadu race as not entitled to regal dignity, said to the wielder of the club: §§ “What is this, Bálabhadrá, that thou hast uttered? What Yádava shall give orders to the chiefs of the family of Kuru? |||| If Ugrasena issues his mandates to the Kauravas, then

* Chālukya tāmbhirnàdva mahastraṃ ||
† The Sanskrit has Bala.
‡ Mādhavakavacharas ||
§ Kaurava.
|| I find two readings,— Nāgara nāgasaññavyaṃ and Nāgara gajasāññavyaṃ. For Hastinápurá or Hástinapura, see Vol. IV., p. 139.
¶ Bala, in the original.

** Gāmarthasudhā vichya rāmāya prabhavādyan ||
† † See Vol. IV., p. 98; also, supra, p. 45.
‡ ‡ See Vol. IV., p. 154, where correct “Bāhlíka”.
§§ Musalágyudha. Vide supra, p. 67, note **.
|||| See Vol. IV., pp. 148 and 152.
we must take away the white umbrella that he has usurped, and which is fit only for kings. Depart, therefore, Balaráma.† You are entitled to our respect: but Sámbla has been guilty of improper conduct; and we will not liberate him, either at Ugrasena’s commands, or yours. The homage that is due to us, their superiors, by the Kukura: and Andhaka§ tribes, may not be paid by them. But who ever heard of a command issued by a servant to his master? Elevation to an equal seat has rendered you arrogant. We have committed a great mistake, in neglecting, through our friendship for you, the policy (that teaches the danger of treating the abject with deference).¶ Our sending you (to-day,) a respectful present** was an intimation

* तदर्थः पाण्डुरिङ्कः गृहयो विनिवेदितः।
So reads Śridhara, from whom Ratnagarbha differs, in ending the verse with छलकर्ते।

† Bala, in the Sanskrit.
‡ Corrected from “Kukkura”. For Kukura, see Vol. IV., p. 97.
§ See Vol. IV., p. 96. Instead of the ordinary reading, कुकुरान्धके, my oldest and best MSS. of Ratnagarbha’s text have कुकुरान्धके, “titular Kurus.”

¶ मण्डितिः कताश्रिकमाद्याः कुकुरान्धके।
न नाम सा छटा केवलाः स्तानिन्यो भूखत।
This is Śridhara’s reading. Ratnagarbha substitutes मान्यान्त for ब्राह्मणान्त, and भूखत for भूखत। Also see note §, above. It is scarcely worth while to dwell on the Translator’s misapprehension of this unimportant passage.

In the couplet cited occurs the word ārya, in connexion with which the reader will, perhaps, pardon a digression. The reverse of ārya, anārya, ‘disreputable’, has, in Hindi, become corrupted into anāri, ‘inexpert’, ‘artless’, ‘stupid’. It being assumed, further, by popular etymology, that anāri is compounded of a and nāri, we have, by the prefixing of su, ‘good’, to the latter, sunāri, ‘expert’, ‘knowing’, ‘clever’.

** Argha.
of (personal) regard, which it was neither fit for our race to have proffered, nor for yours to have expected.”

Having thus spoken, the Kuru chiefs, unanimously refusing to set the son of Hari at large, immediately returned into the city. † Bala, ‡ rolling about with intoxication, and the wrath which their contemptuous language had excited, struck the ground furiously with his heel, so that it burst to pieces with a loud sound that reverberated through the regions of space. † His eyes reddened with rage, and his brow was curved with frowns, as he exclaimed: “What arrogance is this, in such vile and pithless creatures! The sovereignty of the Kauravas, as well as our own, is the work of fate, § whose decree it, also, is, that they now disrespect or disobey the commands of Ugrasena. Indra || may, of right, give his orders to the gods; and Ugrasena exercises equal authority with the lord of Śachi. Fie upon the pride that boasts a throne the leavings of a hundred mortals! ¶ Is not he the sovereign of the earth, the wives of whose servants adorn themselves with the blossoms of the Pārijāta-tree? Ugrasena shall be the undisputed king of kings; for I will not return to his capital, until I have rid the world wholly of the sons of Kuru.” ** I will destroy Karna,
Duryodhana, Droṇa, Bhīshma, Bāhlika, Duḥsāsana,* Bhūriśravas,† Somadatta,‡ Śala,§ Bhīma, Arjuna, Yudhishṭhira,|| the twins,¶ and all the other vile descendants of Kuru, with their horses, elephants, and chariots. I will rescue the hero Sāmba from captivity, and carry him, along with his wife, to Dwārakā, where I shall again behold Ugrasena and the rest of my kin. Or, authorized by the king of the gods to remove the burthens of the earth, I will take this capital of the Kauravas,** with all the sons of Kuru, and cast the city of the elephant†† into the Bhāgirathī.”‡‡

So saying, the wielder of the club, §§ (Baladeva), his eyes red with rage, plunged the blade of his ploughshare||| downwards, beneath the ramparts of the city,¶¶ and drew them towards him. When the Kauravas beheld Hastināpura tottering, they were much alarmed, and called loudly (on Rāma), saying: “Rāma, Rāma! Hold, hold! Suppress your wrath! Have mercy upon us! Here is Sāmba, and his wife, also, delivered up to

---

* See Vol. IV., p. 158.
† Ratnagarbha's text introduces both Bhūri and Bhūriśravas.
‡ For Somadatta and his sons, Bhūri, Bhūriśravas, and Śala, see Vol. IV., p. 157.
§ Corrected from “Ṣalya”, for which I find no authority. See note †, above; also, supra, p. 70, text and note **.
|| For these three personages, see Vol. IV., pp. 102 and 159.
¶ According to the commentators, Nakula and Sahadeva. See, for them, Vol. IV., pp. 103 and 159.
** Kauravādāhāni.
†† नगरं नागसाक्राक्षम्
§§ Musalāyudha. Vide supra, p. 67, note **.
||| “The blade of his ploughshare” is to render hala. Vide supra, p. 51, note ||.
¶¶ Prākāra-vapra.
thee. Forgive our sins, committed in ignorance of thy wondrous power."* Accordingly, issuing, hiedly, from the city, the Kauravas delivered Samba and his bride to the mighty Balaráma, who, bowing to Bhishma, Droña, and Kripa, † who addressed him in conciliatory language, said "I am satisfied," and so desisted. The city bears the marks of the shock it received, even to the present day,—such was the might of Ráma,—proving both his strength and prowess. The Kauravas, then, offering homage to Samba and to Bala, ‡ dismissed the former, with his wife and a bridal portion.†

---

† This adventure is related in the Bhágavata, and very briefly noticed in the Hari Varása; but I have not found any mention of it in the Mahábáráta. It may have been suggested, originally, by Hastinápura having sustained some injury, either from an earthquake, or from the encroachments of the river, which, as is recorded, compelled the removal of the capital to Kauśámbi (Vol. IV., p. 164).

‡ See Vol. IV., p. 147.

† Halin, in the Sanskrit. Vide supra, p. 84, note ‡. Halin means the same as Haláyudha, for which vide supra, p. 63, text and note ‡. 
CHAPTER XXXVI.

The Asura Dwivida, in the form of an ape, destroyed by Balaráma.

*HEAR, also, Maitreya, another exploit performed by the mighty Balaráma.* The great Asura,† the foe of the friends of the gods, Naraka,‡ had a friend, of exceeding prowess, in the monkey named Dwivida, who was animated by implacable hostility against the deities, and vowed to revenge on the whole of them the destruction of Naraka by Krishña, at the instigation of the king of the celestials, by preventing sacrifices, and effecting the annihilation of the mortal sphere. Blinded by ignorance, he, accordingly, interrupted all religious rites, subverted all righteous observances, and occasioned the death of living beings. He set fire to the forests, to villages, and to towns; sometimes he overwhelmed cities and hamlets with falling rocks; or, lifting up mountains in the waters,§ he cast them into the ocean: then, taking his place amidst the deep, he agitated the waves, until the foaming sea rose above its confines, and swept away the villages and cities situated upon its shores. Dwivida, also, who could assume what shape he would, enlarged his bulk to an immense size; and, rolling, and tumbling, and trampling amidst the cornfields, he crushed and spoiled

* Bala, in the original.
† Asurendra.
‡ Vide supra, pp. 87, et seq.
§ तोचियु् | Some MSS. have पोलियु्,—"in boats".—a reading noticed by Ratnagarbha.
the harvests.* The whole world, disordered by this iniquitous monkey, was deprived of sacred study† and religious rites,‡ and was greatly afflicted.

On one occasion, Haláyudha§ was drinking in the groves of Raivata, along with the illustrious Revati|| and other beautiful females; and the distinguished Yadu, in whose praises songs were sung, and who was preeminent amidst graceful and sportive women, resembled Kubera, the god of riches, in his palace.¶ Whilst thus engaged, the monkey (Dwivida) came there, and, stealing the ploughshare** and the club of Baladeva,† † grinned at and mocked him, ‡ ‡ and laughed at the women, and threw over and broke the cups filled with wine. §§ Balaráma, || becoming angry at this,

* कामक्षी महाकृष्ण क्षत्र स्वाथाभिषेकः |
बुधमित्रणसंस्कर्दीर्दे संघूर्ण्यति वानरः |
† Swádhyaäya.
‡ Vashatkära. See Vol. II., p. 29, note §; and Vol. III., p. 122, note †.
§ Vide supra, p. 63, note ||.
¶ उपगीयमानो विलसंस्क्रतानापूर्णिमयं |
रघु महाकृष्णः कुबेर वर मन्द्यरे ||

So reads Śrídara, according to the only copy of his commentary at my command. Both the scholiasts give the first line hypermetrical, as above; but Ratnagarha has, -कृष्ण, instead of -कृष्ण. In lieu of Śrídara's मन्द्यरे, at the end of the stanza, I find, everywhere else, मन्दरे, "on Mandara." On this mountain was Chaitraratha, the garden of Kubera. See Vol. II., p. 110, note *; and Vol. IV., p. 6. ** Hala.
† † The Sanskrit has Sirin. See Vol. IV., p. 82, note †; and Vol. III., p. 332, note ¶. Sirin is the same as Halin, &c. Vide supra, p. 135, note ‡.

‡‡ चालास्थ संसूर्य च विंदमनम् |
§§ पानपूषस्य कर्काश्चित्रिवापि वेपदा |

For चालास्थ, some MSS. have चालाख।

|| Bala, in the original.
threatened the monkey: but the latter disregarded his menaces, and made a chattering noise;* on which, Bala, starting up, seized his club, in wrath; and the monkey† laid hold of a large rock, which he hurled at the hero. Bala, casting his club at it, as it neared him, broke it into a thousand fragments, which, together with the club, fell upon the ground.‡ Beholding the club prostrate, the monkey sprang over it, and struck the Yādava violently on the breast with his paws. Bala replied with a blow of his fist upon the forehead§ of Dwivida, which felled him—vomiting blood, and lifeless,—to the earth. The crest of the mountain on which he fell was splintered into a hundred pieces by (the weight of) his body, as if the Thunderer|| had shivered it with his thunderbolt. The gods threw down a shower of flowers upon Rāma, and approached him, and praised him for the glorious feat he had performed. “Well has the world been freed,” said they, “by thy prowess, O hero, of this vile ape, who was the ally of the enemy of the gods!”¶ Then they and their attendant spirits** returned, well pleased,

* चकी किलिकिलाधिनिम् | Variants: किलिकिलाः and किलिकिलाः
† Plavogah.
‡ विषेष च स तां चिसां बुस्वन सहसुधा।।
बिकेक यादवस्म: सा पपात महीनति।।
आपत्तुस्वलं चासी समुहकास्य भवगमं।।
बोलेनामशो रोशिण तन्हिनारसर्वतावस्य।।
§ Mūrdhāh.
|| Vajrin, १. ०, Indra.
¶ Daitya-pakshopakārin.
** “Attendant spirits” is to render guhyaka. The Guhyakas attended on Kubera. See Vol. I., p. 122; Vol. III., p. 116, note †.
to heaven. Many such inimitable* deeds were wrought by the illustrious† Baladeva, (the impersonation of) Śesha, the supporter of the earth.¹

¹ This exploit of Balarama is, also, similarly, but more vulgarly, related in the Bhágavata. It is simply said, in the Hari Vaṁśa,‡—and erroneously,—that Mainda§ and Dwivida were conquered by Kṛishña.

* Aparimeya.
† Dhimat.
‡ Śl. 9802.
§ Corrected from "Menda".
CHAPTER XXXVII.

Destruction of the Yádavas. Sámba and others deceive and ridicule the Rishis. The former bears an iron pestle: it is broken, and thrown into the sea. The Yádavas go to Prabhása, by desire of Krishná: they quarrel and fight, and all perish. The great serpent Šesha issues from the mouth of Ráma. Krishná is shot by a hunter, and again becomes one with universal spirit.

IN this manner did Krishná, assisted by Baladeva, destroy-demons* and iniquitous monarchs, for the good of the earth; and, along with Phálguna,† also, did he: relieve earth of her load, by the death of innumerable hosts.§ Having, thus, lightened the burthens of the earth, and slain many (unrighteous princes), he exterminated, by the pretext of an imprecation denounced by Brahmans, his own (Yádava) race. Then, quitting Dwáraká, and relinquishing his mortal being,

1 A name of Arjuna, the great friend of Krishná, to whom the latter served as charioteer, in the war between the Páñdus and Kurus.

* Daitya.
† For the various names of Arjuna, and their origin, see the Mahábhárata, Vérdita-parvan, 61. 1375, et seq.
‡ The original here names Hari.
§ समस्कारोऽहितकोशाधारः | For akshauhiní, vide supra, p. 50, notes 2 and **.
|| My Arrah MS. here inserts as follows:

खल्का माणुषकेभ्यो भार्तर्तिस्य जताईगं ||
खल्का चावाणि कार्यायश्र्यिस्य देवानां हितकामययाः ||
दुर्योधनश्व विद्रहः युधिष्ठिरपुरोच्छति ||
पाण्डवेऽभेज्युक्तमुस्मुस्मुच्चति विन्दुवत्ता ||
the self-born reentered, with all his emanations, his own sphere of Vishńu.¹

MAITREYA.—Tell me how Janárdana effected the destruction of his own race, under the plea of Brahmanical imprecation; and in what manner he relinquished his mortal body.²

PARÁŚARA.—At the holy place† Píndáraka,³ Viśwámitra,§ Kańwa,|| and the great sage Nárada were

¹ With Balaráma, Pradyunna, Aniruddha, and the rest.
² The legend of the destruction of the Yádava race and the death of Kríshña appears, probably, in its earliest extant form, in the Mausala Parvan of the Mahábhárata. It forms the narrative portion of the Eleventh Book of the Bhágavata; having been previously briefly adverted to in the First and Third Books; and it is summarily told in the Uttara Khańḍa of the Padma Puráña.
³ The village of Píndáraka, still held in veneration, is situated in Gujerat, about twenty miles from the north-west extremity of the Peninsula. Hamilton, Vol. I., p. 664.

**Anvámodántat**: [Verse]

**Tathá hulá kुक्तसवम्याः परस्मारम्**

**Jagam víruṇtī tṛṇo jangtaḥ patirbhūḥ**

**Pracháparśaṁ hutaśruch bhadráśya bháṣāyaṇi**

A second of my copies gives the same verses, with the variation of only three words.

It is not palpable that this passage is an interpolation. The first line of it does not repeat the sense of what immediately precedes it,—Professor Wilson’s “relinquishing his mortal body”—the Sanskrit of which is ख़लका मानूष, i. e., according to both the commentators, मनुष्यांवेन, “personation of man.”

* Saṁśrů vijñamayā śrāvaḥ pravibhīṣaḥ pūrnānīṃgam*

† Mahá-tirtha.
‡ Connected, perhaps, with Píndáraka, son of Vasudeva and Robhíni. See Vol. IV., p. 109, text and note ††.
§ See Vol. III., p. 14, note 1, near the end.
|| Ibid., p. 57.
observed by some boys of the Yadu tribe. Giddy with youth, and influenced by predestined results,* they dressed and adorned Śamba, the son of Jāmbavatī, as a damsel; and, conducting her to the sages, they addressed them with the usual marks of reverence, and said: "What child will this female, the wife of Babhru, † who is anxious to have a son, give birth to?" The sages, who were possessed of divine wisdom, were very angry to find themselves thus tricked by the boys, and said: "She will bring forth a club, that shall crush the whole of the Yādava race." The boys, thus spoken to by the sages, went and related all that had occurred to Ugrasena; and (as foretold,) a club was produced from the belly of Śamba. Ugrasena had the club—which was of iron,—ground to dust, and thrown into the sea; but the particles of dust (there) became rushes.† There

---

1 The term is Erakā (एरका), which is explained, in some medical lexicons, "a kind of grass." The commentator ‡ also calls it a kind of grass; and, in the text of the Mahābhārata, the term subsequently used, and as synonymous with it, is Trīṅga (त्रीण), "grass." The Mahābhārata, when describing the affray which follows, mentions, that the grass, or rushes, on being plucked by Kṛishṇa and the Yādavas, turn to clubs. The text, and that of the Bhāgavata, here say, that the powdered particles, floating on the sea, became rushes. Or the latter may imply, that they fastened upon grass or weeds. The commentator, however, explains, that, the particles of iron being borne to land, they were so transformed. The Mahābhārata says nothing of the piece

---

* भाविकायचःप्रशोलिता: ।
† See Vol. IV, p. 72.
‡ एरका: । धाराचयोपितासृष्टिः । Śrīdhara. एरका: । विधार- । नारायणर्धिश: । Ratnagarbha.
was one part of the iron club which was like (the blade of) a lance,* and which the Andhakas could not break.† This, when thrown into the sea, was swallowed by a fish: the fish was caught, the iron spike was extracted from its belly, and was taken by a hunter named Jaras.: The all-wise§ and glorious Madhusúdana did not think fit to counteract what had been predetermined by fate.

Then there came to Keśava, when he was private and alone, a messenger from the gods, who addressed him with reverence, and said: “I am sent to you, O lord, by the deities. And do thou hear what Indra,|| together with the Viśwas,¶ Aświns,** Maruts, Ādityas, Rudras, and Sádhyas, respectfully represents. “More than a hundred years have elapsed since thou, in favour to the gods, † † hast descended upon earth, for

which could not be pounded; and this seems to be an embellishment, either of our text or the Bhágavata. The Mahábhárata, however, adds another precaution, which the two others have left unnoticed. Ugrasena causes a proclamation to be made, that none of the inhabitants of Dwáraká shall, thenceforth, drink wine, on pain of being impaled alive; and the people, for some time, observe the prohibition.

* Tomara.
† The original yields ‘triturate’: चूर्णं चित्तं शेषकर्म।
§ Corrected from “Jará”. Vide infra, p. 152, note †.
¶ विप्रातपरमार्गे।
|| Śakra, in the Sanskrit.
** I have inserted this word, inadvertently omitted by the Translator.
†† चिद्यः संग्रसादित्।
the purpose of relieving it of its load. The demons* have been slain, and the burthen of earth has been removed. Now let the immortals once again behold their monarch in heaven.† A period exceeding a century has passed. Now, if it be thy pleasure, return to Swarga. This is the solicitation of the celestials. But, should such not be thy will, then remain here as long as it may be desirable to thy dependants.”¹: To this, Krishnā replied:§ “All that thou hast said I am well aware of. The destruction of the Yádavas by me has commenced. The burthens of the earth are not removed, until the Yádavas are extirpated. I will effect this, also, in my descent, and quickly; for it shall come to pass in seven nights. When I have restored the land of Dwáráká to the ocean, and annihilated the race of Yadu, I will proceed to the mansions of the immortals. Apprise the gods, that, having abandoned my human body, and accompanied by Sankarashaṇa, I will then return to them.|| The tyrants that oppressed the earth,

¹ Nothing of this kind occurs in the Mahábhárata. Our text, therefore, offers an embellishment. The Bhágavata, again, improves upon the text; for, not content with a messenger, it makes Brahmá (with the Prajápatís), Śiva (with the Bhútás), Indra (with the other divinities), all come, in person; indicating, evidently, a

* Dáitya.

† लया सनातास्सिद्धा भवनु चिद्रिे पुषः।

‡ देवेविन्द्रायंते चेदस्मांसिवं रतिः।

†तस्फीयतं चवाकालमात्रियमयमुदीविभं।

§ श्रीभवाकाव्याच।

मानुषं देहसूचवं संकर्षणसहायवाच।

प्राप्त एवासिस्मि मन्तवो धीविष्णु तथा सुरः।
—Jarásandha and the rest,—have been killed; and a youth, even, of the race of Yadu, is, no less than they, an incumbrance. When, therefore, I have taken away this great weight upon earth, I will return to protect the sphere of the celestials.* Say this to them." The messenger of the gods, having received this reply, bowed, and took his heavenly course to the king of the gods.

The mighty (Kríshña) now beheld signs and portents,† both in earth and heaven, prognosticating, day and night, the ruin of Dwáraká. 1 Showing these to the

later date, as plainly as the addition of the text shows it to be subsequent to the date of the legend in the Mahábhárata.

1 The Mahábhárata, which delights in describing portents and signs, does not fail to detail them here. A dreadful figure, death personified, haunts every house, coming and going no one knows how, and being invulnerable to the weapons by which he is assailed. Strong hurricanes blow; large rats multiply, and infest the roads and houses, and attack persons in their sleep; Sárikás (or starlings,) utter inauspicious screams in their cages; storks imitate the hooting of owls; and goats, the howling of jackals; cows bring forth foals; and camels, mules; food, in the moment of being eaten, is filled with worms; fire burns with discoloured flames; and, at sunset and sunrise, the air is traversed by headless and hideous spirits. There is more to the same effect, which neither our text nor the Bhágavata has ventured to detail. The whole passage has been published in Maurice's Ancient History of Hindustan, Vol. II., p. 463; translated, apparently, by the late Sir Charles Wilkins. The names have been much disfigured either by the copyist or compositor.

* Amara-loka.
† "Signs and portents" is to render utpáta.
V. 10
Yádavas, he said: “See! Behold these fearful phenomena! Let us hasten to Prabhása, to avert these omens.”* When he had thus spoken to the eminent Yádava, † the illustrious Uddhava‡ saluted and said to him: “Tell me, O lord, what it is proper that I should do. For it seems to me, that thou wilt destroy all this race. The signs (that are manifest) declare (nothing less than) the annihilation of the tribe.” Then Kríshña§ replied to him: “Do you go by a celestial route, which my favour shall provide you, to the holy (place) Bada­rikáśrama,∥ in the Gandhamádana mountain, the shrine of Naranárayána;¶ and, on that spot, sanctified by them, thou, by meditating on me, shalt obtain perfection,** through my favour. When the race (of Yadu) shall have perished, I shall proceed to heaven; and the ocean shall inundate Dwáráká, when I have quitted it.” Accordingly, Uddhava, thus instructed †† by Keśava, saluted him with veneration, and departed to the shrine of Naranárayána.¹

¹ In the Mahábhárata, it is said, merely, that Uddhava, who was versed in Yoga, foreseeing the destruction of the Yádavas,

* श्रमाहिष्य प्रभास याम मा चिरस् ।
† एवंसु के तु कृषिण यादवप्रवर्तते ।

This verse is recognized by Sridhara, but not by Rñagarbha; and the sense is complete without it. My Ajmere MS. gives it; my Arrah MS. omits it.
‡ See Vol. IV., p. 113, notes 1 and ‡.
§ Bhagavat, in the original.
∥ Rñagarbha calls this hermitage by its shorter name, Bada­ri, instead of Bada­riká, the form preferred by Sridhara.
¶ We have already had mention of it. Vide supra, p. 52.
** Siddhi.
†† Anumodita.
Then the Yādavas ascended their rapid cars, and drove to Prabhāsa, along with Krishnā, Rāma, and the rest of their chiefs. They bathed there; and, excited by Vāsudeva, the Kukuras† and Andhakas indulged in liquor. As they drank, the destructive flame of dissension was kindled amongst them by mutual collision, and fed with the fuel of abuse. Infuriated by the divine influence, they fell upon one another with missile weapons; and, when those were expended, they had recourse to the rushes growing nigh. The rushes in their hands became like thunderbolts; and they struck one another, with them, fatal blows.

went away; that is, according to the commentator, he practised penance, and went to heaven: जगाम योगमालाय परस्मार्कम। The Bhāgavata, taking the hint, makes much more of it than our text, and expands it into a long course of instruction, given by Krishnā to Uddhava, occupying 150 leaves.

1 Vide supra, p. 47, note 2. By sending the Yādavas to Prabhāsa, (the commentator asserts,) Krishnā prevented, purposely, the Yādavas from obtaining Mukti, ‘final liberation’, which would have been the consequence of dying at Dwārakā. Death at Prabhāsa conferred only Indra’s heaven.

2 The Mahābhārata describes them as going forth with horses, elephants, and cars, and their women and abundance of good cheer, and varieties of wine and meat:

बहुनागाविध चक्रुमार्वं सांस्कृतिनाकः।

---

* Anumodita.
† Corrected, here and frequently elsewhere, from “Kukkuras”.
‡ Śastra, which almost always signifies an edged weapon, in contradistinction from astra, ‘a missile weapon’.
|| Sudāruṇa.
Pradyumna, Samba, Kritavaran, * Sathyaki, † Aniruddha, Prithu, Viprithu, ‖ Cháruvarman, § Cháruka, || Akrúra, and many others struck one another with the rushes, which had assumed the hardness of thunderbolts. Kesava interposed, to prevent them; but they thought that he was taking part with each, severally,

1 The Bhágavata, like the text, adverts only in this general manner to the conflict; but the Mahábhárata gives the particulars. Yuyudhána reproaches Kritavaran with having aided Aśvattháman** in his night-attack on the Pándu camp, and killing warriors in their sleep. Pradyumna joins in the abuse. Kritavaran retorts. Krishña looks at him angrily Sathyaki repeats the story of the Syamantaka gem, by which he accuses Kritavaran of being an accomplice in the murder of Satrájita†† (See Vol. IV., pp. 75, et seq.). Satyabhámá, ‡‡ the daughter of the latter, then mixes in the quarrel, and incites Krishña to avenge her; but Sathyaki anticipates him, and murders Kritavaran. Saineya §§ and the Bhojas attack Sathyaki; the Andhakas defend him; and the affray becomes general. Krishña attempts to part the combatants, until Pradyumna is killed; and, then, taking up a handful of rushes, which become an iron club, he kills, indiscriminately, all that come in his way. The conflict continues, until the greater part of the combatants have fallen, including all Krishña's sons; and he then, in wrath, sweeps off all the survivors, except Babhrú and Dárakú, with his discus.

---

† Ibid., p. 93.
‡ For these two brothers, see Vol. IV., p. 96.
§ I know nothing of him. In Vol. IV., p. 113, we have a Sucháru.

One of my MSS. has Chárudharmán.

|| The same as Cháru, for whom see p. 78, supra.
‖ The same as Sáthyaki. See Vol. IV., p. 93.
** See Vol. IV., p. 147.
†† Corrected from "Satrájít".
‡‡ See Vol. IV., p. 80.
§§ Was this Sátyaka, Sáthyaki's father? See Vol. IV., p. 92.
and continued the conflict. Kṛishṇa, then, enraged, took up a handful of rushes, to destroy them; and the rushes became a club of iron. And with this he slew many of the murderous Yādavas; whilst others, fighting fiercely, put an end to one another. The chariot of the holder of the discus, * named Jaitra, was quickly carried off by the (swift) steeds, and swept away by the sea, in the sight of Dāruka, (the charioteer). The discus, the club, the bow, the quiver, the shell, and the sword† (of Keśava), having circumambulated their lord,‡ flew along the path of the sun. In a short time there was not a single Yādava left alive, except the mighty Kṛishṇa and Dāruka.† Going towards Rāma, who was sitting at the root of a tree, they beheld a large serpent coming out of his mouth. Having issued from his mouth, the mighty $ snake proceeded towards

1 The Mahābhārata, as observed at the end of the last note, adds Babhru; but it presently gets rid of him. Kṛishṇa sends him to take care of the old people, the women, and children, in Dwārakā, whilst Dāruka goes to bring Arjuna to their aid. But, as he goes along,—overcome with grief for the loss of his kindred, and approaching separation from Kṛishṇa,—he is killed by a club that is cast from a snare, or trap, set by a hunter. Kṛishṇa then goes to Dwārakā, and desires Vasudeva to await the coming of Arjuna; after which, he returns to Rāma, and sees the phenomenon described in the text; the serpent being Śesha, of whom Balarāma was the incarnation. The Bhāgavata does not mention this incident; merely observing, that Rāma, by the power of Yoga, returned into himself,—that is, into Viṣhū

* Chakrin.
† Vide supra, p. 124; also, a passage towards the end of Chapter VII. of Book VI.
‡ Hari, in the Sanskrit.
§ Mahābhāgava.
the ocean, hymned by saints, and by other great serpents. Bringing an offering of respect, Ocean came to meet him; and, then, the majestic being, adored by attendant snakes, entered into the waters of the deep.† Beholding the departure of (the spirit of) Balabhadra, Keśava said to Dāruka: “All this is to be related, by you, to Vasudeva and Ugrasena. Go and inform them of the departure of Balabhadra, and the destruction of the Yādavas; also, that I shall engage in religious meditation, and quit this body. Apprise Áhuka,§ and all the inhabitants of Dwāarakā,¹ that the sea will inundate the town. Be ready, therefore, in expectation of the coming of Arjuna; and, when he quits Dwāarakā, no longer abide there, but go whithersoever that descendant of Kuru shall repair. Do you, also, go to the son of Kunti, ¶ and tell him, that it is my request that he will grant what protection he can to all my family.

¹ The women, the elders, and the children, amongst whom, as we shall presently see, was Vajra, the son of Aniruddha,** who was established as chief of the Yādavas at Indraprastha, and who, therefore, escaped the destruction which overwhemed their kinsmen, the Vīshnúis, Kukuras, and Andhakas, of Dwāarakā. This was a fortunate reservation for the tribes which, in various parts of Hindusthan,—both on the Ganges and in the Deccan,—profess to derive their origin from the Yādavas.††

* Siddha.

† वनिवेश च तत्तोर गूँजित: पत्तगोचरे: ।

‡ Bala, in the original.
§ Father of Ugrasena. See Vol. IV., p. 98.
¶ Here called Pàndava, in the Sanskrit.
¶¶ Kaunteya; namely, Arjuna. See Vol. IV., pp. 101, 109, and 159.
** Vide supra, p. 108, text and note •.
†† See Vol. IV., p. 58, notes 2 and §.
Then depart, with Arjuna and all the people of Dwāravati; and let Vajra be installed sovereign over the tribe of Yadu."

Dāruka, being thus instructed, prostrated himself, again and again, before Kṛṣhṇa, and walked round him repeatedly, and then departed, as he had been desired; and, having conducted Arjuna to Dwāravati, the intelligent (servant of Kṛṣhṇa) established Vajra as king. The divine Govinda, then, having concentrated in himself that supreme spirit which is one with Vāsudeva, was identified with all beings.\(^1\) Respecting the words of the Brahman,—the imprecation of Durvāsas,\(^2\) the process is explained by the commentator:\(\|\) "By the force of Dhyāna (or abstraction), Kṛṣhṇa satisfies himself that he is Brahma (वृह्वाइकिति धार्मिक), or universal spirit; and is, next, convinced, that he is, therefore, all things (सम्यक्षार-मूत्तायापहेन्ध्र); by which his individuality ceases."

\(^1\) The process is explained by the commentator:\(\|\) "By the force of Dhyāna (or abstraction), Kṛṣhṇa satisfies himself that he is Brahma (वृह्वाइकिति धार्मिक), or universal spirit; and is, next, convinced, that he is, therefore, all things (सम्यक्षार-मूत्तायापहेन्ध्र); by which his individuality ceases."

\(^2\) The story is told in the Mahābhārata. Durvāsas was, on one occasion, hospitably entertained by Kṛṣhṇa; but the latter omitted to wipe away the fragments of the meal which had fallen on the foot of the irascible sage, who, thereupon, foretold, that Kṛṣhṇa should be killed as in the text.
illustrious Krishṇa sat engaged in thought, resting his foot upon his knee. Then came there a hunter, named Jaras, whose arrow was tipped with a blade made of the piece of iron of the club, which had not been reduced to powder; and, beholding, from a distance, the foot of Krishṇa, he mistook it for part of a deer, and, shooting his arrow, lodged it in the sole.

Approaching (his mark), he saw the four-armed king, and, falling at his feet, repeatedly besought his forgiveness, exclaiming: "I have done this deed unwittingly, thinking I was aiming at a deer. Have pity upon me, who am consumed by my crime! For thou art able to consume me." Bhagavat replied: "Fear

---

1 This is an allegorical personage, however; for Jarā signifies ‘infirmity’, ‘old age’, ‘decay’.

2 The Bhāgavata explains how this part of the foot became exposed. Krishṇa had assumed one of the postures in which abstraction is practised. He had laid his left leg across his right thigh, by which the sole of the foot was turned outwards.

---

* This name and its epithet are supplied by the Translator.

† चोग्रुकः.

‡ Corrected from "Jarā", which the original cannot yield, as a huntress would be called labdhaki. The original is as follows:

चाययो च जरा चाम स तद्र तत्र चुबखः.

Compare note ‡ in p. 143, supra. Also see the Mahābhārata, Mau-sala-parvan, śl. 126, et seq.

§ मुसबावशिवश्चायकन्यकायतोमरः.

This compound is descriptive of चुबखः.

∥ A free translation.

¶ चन्द्रातासालपिण्ड द्राघं मां द्रघुधार्मिः.

Ratnagarbha begins this verse with the words चन्द्रातानाध्यर्पिण.

** To this speculation it is difficult to assent. See note ‡, above.
not, thou, in the least. * Go, hunter, through my favour, to heaven, the abode of the gods.” As soon as he had thus spoken, a celestial car appeared; and the hunter, ascending it, forthwith proceeded to heaven. Then the illustrious (Krishna), having united himself with his own pure, spiritual, † inexhaustible, inconceivable, unborn, undecaying, imperishable; ‡ and universal spirit, which is one with Vasudeva, abandoned his mortal body and the condition of the threefold qualities. §

1 He became Nirguna, ‘devoid of all qualities.’

* नतेंसि भयामपि।
† Brahma-bhuta.
‡ The epithet aprameya, ‘boundless’, is here omitted.
§ तथाज मानुषं देहसतीव चिन्तिष्ठाः गतिम्।
† Thus explain both Sridhara and Ratnagarbha.
CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Arjuna comes to Dwārakā, and burns the dead, and takes away the surviving inhabitants. Commencement of the Kali age. Shepherds and thieves attack Arjuna, and carry off the women and wealth. Arjuna regrets the loss of his prowess, to Vyāsa, who consoles him, and tells him the story of Ashávakra’s cursing the Apsarasas. Arjuna and his brothers place Pari-kshit on the throne, and go to the forests. End of the Fifth Book.

ARJUNA, having found the bodies of Kṛishṇa and of Ráma, performed, for them and the rest (of the slain), the obsequial rites. The eight queens of Kṛishṇa, who have been named,† with Rukmiṇī at their head,‡ embraced the body of Hari, and entered the (funeral) fire.¹ Revati, also, embracing the corpse of Ráma, entered the blazing pile, which was cool to her, happy in contact with her lord.§ Hearing these events, Ugrasena and Ánakadundubhi, with Devakí and Rohini, committed themselves to the flames.³ The

¹ The Mahābhārata takes the wives of Kṛishṇa, first, to Indraprastha; and there Rukmiṇī and four others burn. But Satya-bhámá and others become ascetics, going to perform Tapasya in the forest.

² It is merely said, in the Mahābhārata, that Vasudeva expired; on which, four of his wives burnt themselves.

* “Obsequial rites” is to render saṁskāra.
† Vide supra, pp. 78, et seq., and p. 107.
‡ सुकमणीप्रमुखा: “Rukmiṇī and the rest.”
§ विवेष ज्वलिते चतुष्टि तत्संगाहः दशीतथाम ।
last ceremonies* were performed, for all these, by Arjuna, who, then, made all the people leave the city, and took Vajra with him. The son of Kuntī† conducted the thousands of the wives of Kṛṣṇa, with Vajra and all the people, from Dwārakā,‡ with tenderness and care, and travelled slowly away. The Sudharman§ palace and the Pārijāta-tree, which had been brought to earth by Kṛṣṇa, both proceeded to heaven; and, on the same day that Hari departed from the earth, the powerful dark-bodied|| Kali (age) descended. The ocean (rose and) submerged the whole of Dwārakā, except alone the dwelling of the deity of the race of Yādu. The sea has not yet been able to wash that (temple) away; and there Keśava constantly abides, (even in the present day). Whoever visits that holy shrine—the place where Kṛṣṇa pursued his sports,—is liberated from all his sins.**

1 The Kali age commenced from the death of Kṛṣṇa, according to the usual notions; but it is commonly supposed to commence a little later, or with the reign of Pariksit. ††

2 The Bhāgavata agrees with the text, in excepting the temple of Dwārakā, and asserting that it still remains, in direct contradiction of the Mahābhārata, which declares, that the sea did not spare any part whatever. It is clear, therefore, that, when the latter was compiled, the temple was not standing, and that it was

* Prāta-kārya.
† Kaunteya. Vide supra, p. 150, note QT.
‡ Dwāravatī, in the Sanskrit.
§ Vide supra, p. 48, text and note •.
|| Kāla-kātya. There are three unimportant variants. Ratnagarbha notes and elucidates two of them.

The son of Pṛithā* (Arjuna,) halted the people (he had brought from Dwāarakā,) in the Panchanada country,¹ in a rich and fertile spot. But the desires of the robbers (of the neighbourhood) were excited, when they observed so many widowed females,—also, such great riches,—in the possession of Arjuna* alone.†

erected between the date of the compilation and that of the two Purāṇas. The present shrine, which is held in great repute, stands at the extremity of the peninsula of Gujerat. It is still an object of pilgrimage. It was so in the reign of Akbar (Ayeen Akbaree); and has been so, no doubt, from a remote period. The image formerly worshipped there was carried off 600 years ago; and this was, most probably, subsequent to the date of both the Purāṇas: for the idol was a form of Krīshṇa, called Rañachhor,—a popular divinity, unknown in the Paurāṇik pantheon. Another image was substituted in place of that which was taken away. Notwithstanding the testimony of our text, and that of the Bhāgavata, the originality of the temple is disputed; and a place thirty miles south from Poorbundur is said to be the spot where Dwārakā was swallowed up by the ocean. Hamilton (from Macmurdio, &c.), Vol. I., p. 662.

¹ "The country of the five rivers,"⁺ the Punjab:—rather an out-of-the-way route from Dwārakā to Dehli.


† ततो लोमः सम्भवेः सुन्दरा विहितेऽवरः।
 दृष्टा स्वियो नीयमाना: पार्थेनेवेन धन्विना।

Ratnagarbha reads as follows:

ततो लोमः सम्भवत्यथेनेवेन धन्विना।
 दृष्टा स्वियो नीयमाना द्वेखूर्व विहितेऽवरः।

And herewith agree my Ajmere and Arrah MSS.

In no MS. do I find, in lieu of धन्विना, धन्विना, which might suggest Professor Wilson's "such great riches."

⁺ The original is पश्चिमदेश. Most probably the tīrtha called Panchnada is intended; for which see the Mahābhārata, Vana-parvan, ll. 5025, 5086; and elsewhere.
Inflamed by their cupidity, they assembled the villainous Ábhiras,¹ and said to them: “Here is this Arjuna,—inmensely rich, † and having numerous women, whose husbands have been slain,—passing confidently amongst us; a disgrace to all brave men.‡ His pride is raised by the death of Bhishma, Droṇa, Jayadratha, Karna, and others (whom he has slain). He does not know the prowess of (simple) villagers. Up! up! Take your long thick staves.§ This stupid fellow despises us. Why should we not lift up our arms?” So saying, they rushed, armed with cudgels and clods of earth.¶

¹ Ábhiras mean ‘herds;’ † they are, afterwards, called, by Arjuna, Gopālas, ‘herdsmen.’ The pastoral tribes of the west of India, and, particularly, those of Afghanistan, almost always combine the character of freebooter with that of shepherd.

¶ I find, everywhere, धन्वी, ‘archer.’ See note ‡ in the preceding page.

§ वेतीमहायाम यूथ्रीत। Ratnagarbha has महायाम। || Nothing to yield “clods of earth” is read in the text as alone I find it:

¶ I know no authority for this meaning. For the Ábhiras, see Vol. II., p. 168, notes 4, etc.; p. 185, notes 2, etc.
upon the people, who were without their lord.* Ar-
juna† encountered: them, and said to them, in deri-
sion: "Retire, wretches, ignorant of what is right, unless
ye are desirous of dying." But they disregarded his
menaces, and seized his treasures, and his women,—
the wives of Viśwaksena. Thereupon, Arjuna began
to brace his heavenly bow, Gāṇḍīva, irresistible‡ in
battle. But it was in vain; for, in spite of all his efforts
to tighten it, it continued flaccid. Neither could he
call to recollection the incantations of the superhuman
weapons.‖ Losing all patience, he launched, as best
he might, his shafts upon the enemy; but those shot
from Gāṇḍīva merely scratched the skin. The arrows
given him, by Agni,¶ to carry certain destruction,**
now were, themselves, destroyed, and were fatal to
Arjuna, in his contest with herdsmen. He endeavoured
to recall the might of Krīṣṇa,—animated by which,
his numerous arrows had overthrown mighty kings;—
but he tried in vain: for, now, they were put aside by
the peasants;†† or they flew at random, wide of their
aim.‡‡ His arrows being expended, he §§ beat the ban-

* The widows above spoken of are intended.
† Kaunteya, in the Sanskrit. Vide supra, p. 150, note ¶.
‡ निलुकः implying that Arjuna desisted from encountering the Abhiras.
§ Ajara.
‖ न संसार तथास्लाषि चिन्तयतिपि पाषडवः ।
¶ In the original, Vahni.
** The epithet thus, rendered is akshaya, 'indestructible.'
†† Abhira.
‡‡ चचिन्तयत सोऽऽियः क्रष्णोऽऽिति हि तद्रजम ।
बहुर्या श्रसंघाःतः सकला भूभुवो जितः ।
सिपतः पाषडुपुंवख ततसः प्रमद्रोचमः ।
ब्राह्मीर्प्रत्यक्षसने कामाक्षाभः प्रचब्रुः ।
§§ Here Arjuna is called Dhananjaya, in the original.
detti with the horn of his bow: but they only laughed at his blows; and the barbarians,† in the sight of Ar-
juna,† carried off all the women of the Vrishňi and
Andhaka tribes, and went their way.¹

Then Jishńu‡ was sorely distressed, and lamented
bitterly, exclaiming: “Alas! alas! I am deserted by my
lord!” And he wept; and, in that instant, the bow and
(heavenly) arms, his car and steeds, perished entirely,
like a donation to an unlearned Brahman.§ “Resist-
less,” said he, “are the decrees of fate, by whom feeble-
ness has been inflicted upon me,—deprived of my illus-
trious friend,—and victory given to the base. These
two arms are mine; mine is this fist; this is my place;¶
I am Arjuna: but, without that righteous aid, all these
are pitiless. The valour of Arjuna,** the strength of
Bhíma,†† was, all, his work; and, without him, I am
overcome by peasants:‡‡ it cannot be from any other

¹ The principal wives of Kríshña, however, according to the
Mahábhárata, escaped. The occurrence is described, there, much
in the same way, but more briefly. It is not detailed in the Bhá-
gavata.

* Mechettha.
† Pártha, in the Sanskrit.
‡ Still another name of Arjuna. Vide supra, p. 156, note *.
§ द्रामस्त्रोतिचये यथा।
चक्रोः तिब्बलभव्यवं विना तेन महादश्या।
यद्वामस्यभवुहृते बिद्य नीचवशेष जयमदम्॥
¶ स्त्रां तत। His position as an archer, says Ratnagarbha: धाशु-
क्षणानावशिष्य:।
** To render Arjunatva.
†† भीमश्च भीमलम्।
‡‡ अभिरा.
cause.” So saying, Arjuna* went to the city of Mathurā,† and there installed the Yádava prince, Vajra, as its king. There he: beheld Vyásá, who was living in a wood; and he approached the sage,§ and saluted him respectfully. The Muni surveyed him for some time, as he lay prostrate at his feet, and said to him: “How is it that I see you thus shorn of your lustre?** Have you been guilty of illicit intercourse with women?*** Or of the death of a Brahman? Or have you suffered some grievous disappointment, that you are so dejected?+++ Have your prayers for progeny, or other good gifts, proved fruitless? Or have you indulged improper passions, that your lustre is so dim?+++ Or are you one that devours the meal he has given to the Brahmans? Say, Arjuna, have you seized upon the substance of the poor? Has the wind of a winnowing-basket lighted upon you? Or has an evil eye gazed upon you, Arjuna, that you look thus miserable?§§

* Jishú, in the original. This is one of the many names or epithetical designations of Arjuna.
† Śrídhará and Ratnagarbha notice a variant expressing that Arjuna went from Indraprastha to Hastinápura. My Ajmere and Arrah MSS. simply substitute Indraprastha for Mathurá.
‡ The Sanskrit has Phálguna.
§ Mahábhága.
|| Pártha is the wofd here used.

†† विच्छायः कथमयन्नमीडृशः:।
** This sentence is to render अवैरजोऽनुमगनस्। Both Śrídhará and Ratnagarbha dwell at length on the first of these words and its variant अवैरजः।

+++ अवैरजः:।

‡‡ सान्तानिकादयो वा ते याच्चमान निराकारः।
ब्रह्मविअस्वीरतिवा लो तेनासि विगतप्रभः॥

§§ विच्छायः:।
Have you been touched by the water of a finger-nail? Or has the water of a water-jar sprinkled you? Or, what is, most probably, the case, have you been beaten by your inferiors in battle?"*  

Arjuna,† having sighed deeply, related to Vyāsa all the circumstances of his discomfiture, and continued: "Hari, who was our strength, our might, our heroism, our prowess, our prosperity, our brightness, has left us, and departed. Deprived of him, our friend, illustrious, and ever kindly speaking, we have become as feeble as if made of straw.‡ Purushottama, who was the living§ vigour of my weapons, my arrows, and my bow,‖ is gone. As long as we looked upon him, fortune, fame, wealth, dignity || never abandoned us. But Govinda is gone from amongst us. That Kṛiṣṇa has quitted earth, through whose power Bhīṣma, Droṇa, the king of Anga, ** Duryodhana, and the rest were consumed. Not I alone, but Earth, has grown old, miserable, † † and lustreless, in the absence of the holder of the discus. † † Kṛiṣṇa, through devotion to whom Bhīṣma and other mighty men perished like

---

* The Translator has here somewhat departed from the order of the original.  
† Pārtha, in the original.  
‡ रत्नगर्भ बहुता स्वतपूवाभिभाषिता।  
हीना वर्ष दूनि तेन जाताख़ूणसया रूप।† †  
Ratnagarbhā begins this stanza with गीर्तिक, i.e., गीर्तिक, he says.  
§ Mūrtta.  
‖ Substituted, by the Translator, for Gāṇḍīva.  
¶ Unnati.  
** Anga-rāja. Karna is intended.  
† † अष्टक्षाराः।  
† † Chakrin.  
V. 11
moths in the flame of my valour, is gone; and I am, now, overcome by cowherds.* The bow Gándíva, that was famed throughout the three worlds, has been foiled, since he has departed, by the sticks of peasants.† The myriads of women over whom I was lord have been carried off from me by thieves, armed but with cudgels. The whole household: of Kríshña, O Kríshña,¹ has been (forcibly) carried away by peasants, who, with their staves, have put my strength to shame. That I am shorn of my lustre I do not marvel: it is wonderful that I live. Surely, grand-sire, I alone am so shameless as to survive the stain of indignity inflicted by the vile.”§

Vyásá replied to Arjuna, and said: “Think no more, my son, of your disgrace. It does not become you to grieve. Know that time subjects all beings to similar vicissitude.¶ Time effects the production and dissolution of all creatures. All that exists is founded on time. Know this, Arjuna, and retain your fortitude. Rivers, seas, mountains, the whole earth, gods, men, animals, trees, insects** are, all, created, and, all, will be de-

¹ A name of Vyásá. ††

* भक्षातुभावाजीवनारंभिन्नैथर्मिन्वौ शलभाचितमः।
विना तेनाथ रणणेन गोपालिरस्तिस्य निर्जितं॥
† अभित्र.
‡ Avarodhana. Ratnagarbha explains it to mean चन्द्रःपुरेऽखीर्गोऽ।
§ निषोक्तता ज मेघचित्तं वज्रीवविम् तदाक्षतम॥
 मीचापमान एकाकी निर्भिज्ञोऽस्मि पितामह॥
¶ The original has Pártha.

†† चेपेद्ध सर्वसृष्टिपुकारस्य गतिमोहकश्च।
** Sāriśita; ‘reptiles.’ Vide supra, p. 59, note ††. †† So the scholiasts allege.
stroyed, by time. Knowing that all that is is the effect of time, be tranquillized.* These mighty works† of Kṛishṇa, whatever they have been, have been performed to relieve earth of its burthen: for this he has come down. Earth, oppressed by her load, has had recourse to the assembly‡ of the immortals; and Ja-nárdana, who is one with time, has descended on that account. This object has been, now, accomplished. All the kings (of the earth) are slain; the race of Vṛishṇi and Andhaka is destroyed: no more remained for him to accomplish.§ Therefore has the lord departed whither he pleased, his ends being, all, fulfilled.|| At the period of creation, the god of gods creates; in that of duration, he preserves; and, at the end (of all), he is mighty to annihilate.¶ Now all is done. Therefore, Arjuna,** be not afflicted by thy defeat. The prowess of mortals is the gift of time.†† Bhīshma, Droṇa,‡‡ Karṇa, and other kings have been slain by thee alone. This was the work of time: and why, therefore, should not thy discomfiture, by those less than thou art,

* कालाबूकासिन्द स्वें बाला शममवमुहि ।
कालाबूकम् कालाधीवम् मयेन बममवमुहि ।

† "Mighty works" is to render māhātmya.
‡ Samiti.
§ Add "on earth": मूर्तितबें।
|| Kṛitokṛitiya, 'satisfied,' 'happy.'
¶ अचतास सचें।
** Pārtha, in the original.
†† भवनित भवकालिवु पुष्यवाणं पराक्रमम्।
‡‡ I have inserted this name, to conform the translation to Śrīdharā's text, which Professor Wilson, no doubt, heretofrays follows. Ratnagarbha's reading yields Bhīshma and Droṇa, omitting Karṇa; and therewith my Arrah MS. harmonizes.
occur?* In like manner as, through thy devotion to† Vishńu, these were overthrown by thee, so, at last, has thy defeat by miserable thieves been wrought by time.‡ That divinity, assuming various bodies, preserves the world; and, in the end, the lord of creatures destroys it. In the birth of thy fortunes,§ Janárdana was thy friend; in their decline,|| thy enemies have been favoured by Keśava. Who would have believed that thou shouldst slay all the descendants of Kuru, and kindred of Gangá?¶ Who would have believed that peasants** should triumph over thee? Be assured, son of Pṛithá,†† that it is (but) the sport of the universal;‡‡ Hari, that the Kauravas have been destroyed by thee, and that thou hast been defeated by herdsmen. §§ With respect to the women whom thou lamentest, and who have been carried off by the thieves, hear from me an ancient story, which will explain why this has happened.||

“In former times, a Brahman, named Ashtávakra,¹

¹ The story of Ashtávakra is related in the Mahábhárata.¶¶ He was the son of Kahóda,*** who, neglecting his wife, was rebuked

* तेपामर्जुन कालोत्यः किं वृद्धाभिमध्ये न सः।
† Read “through the might of”: चनुभावेन।
‡ ततस्तदेव भवतो दक्ष्मोक्षी तदुद्वयः।
§ मवोऽवेः।
¶ To render Gáŋgeya.
** अभिरा。
†† Pártha is the original word.
†‡ Sarva-bhūta. Vide supra, p. 34, text and note ††.
§§ अभिरा।

¶¶ तदुपयेः चचायुः कथयामि तवार्जुन।

पुष्प Ádi-parvan, 61, 10599, et seq.
*** Corrected from “Kahora”.
was pursuing his religious penances, standing in water, and meditating on the eternal spirit, for many years. * In consequence of the overthrow of the Asuras, there was a great festival on the summit of Meru; on their way to which, Rambhá, Tilottamá,† and hundreds and thousands of beautiful nymphs; saw the ascetic Ashtávakra; and they praised and hymned him (for his devotions). They bowed down (before him), and eulogized him, 'as he was immersed) up to his throat in water, his hair twisted in a braid. So they sang, in honour of him, whatever they thought would be most agreeable to that most eminent of Brahmans. Ashtávakra (at last,) said to them: 'I am well pleased with you, illustrious damsels. § Whatever you wish for, ask of me, and I will give it you, however difficult it may be of attainment.' Then all those nymphs,|| Rambhá, Tilottamá, and others, recorded in the Vedas,¶ replied: 'It is enough for us that thou art pleased. What need we aught else, venerable Brahman?'** But some

for it by his yet unborn son. The father angrily cursed him, that he should be born bent in every part; and he was, accordingly, brought forth crooked (vakra) in eight limbs (ashtán).†† He became, nevertheless, a celebrated sage. See, also, Hindu Theatre, Vol. I., p. 293, note.

* अष्टावक्रः पुरा चिमो जलवासरतोिभवति।
     वहन्तर्गतान्यार्थे गुणलक्ष्मे संगतमस।।
† See, for them, Vol. II., p. 75, note 3.
§ "Illustrious damsels" is to translate सहाभागा:।
|| Apsaras.
¶ For Apsarases mentioned in the Vedas, see Vol. II., pp. 80, 81.

** प्रस्त्रि लघुपयोगां जिमक्षाक्षितिः द्विज।
†† With the name Ashtávakra compare Naikavakrá and Trivakrá, for which vide supra, p. 21, note †.
(amongst them) said: 'If, exalted sir, you are (indeed) pleased with us, then grant us a husband, the best of men,* and sovereign of the Brahmans.'† 'So be it,' replied Ashtávakra, and, thereupon, came up from the waters. When the nymphs beheld him coming out of the water, and saw that he was (very) ugly, and crooked in eight places, they could not restrain their merriment, but laughed aloud. The Muni was (very) angry, and cursed them, and said: 'Since you have been so impertinent as to laugh at my deformity, I denounce upon you this imprecation: through the grace I have shown unto you, you shall obtain the first of males: for your husband; but, in consequence of my curse, you shall (afterwards) fall into the hands of thieves.' When the nymphs heard this uttered by the Muni, they endeavoured to appease him; and (they so far succeeded, that) he announced to them, they should finally return to the sphere of the gods. It is in consequence, then, of the curse of the Muni Ashtávakra, that these females, who were, at first, the wives of Keśava, have, now, fallen into the hands of the barbarians;§ and there is no occasion, Arjuna,|| for you to regret it in the least. All this destruction has been effected by the lord of all; and your end is, also, nigh at hand, since he has withdrawn from you strength, splendour, valour, and preeminence. ¶ Death is the doom of every

* Purushottama, i.e., Vishnu or Kṛishṇa.
† According to all my MSS., the term here rendered "sovereign of the Brahmans" is in the vocative, and applies to Ashtávakra.
‡ Purushottama, as above.
§ Dasyu.
|| Addressed, in the original, as Páśāva.
¶ Māhātmya.
one who is born; fall is the end of exaltation; union
terminates in separation; and growth tends but to
decay."* Knowing (all this), wise men are susceptible
of neither grief nor joy; and those who learn their
ways are even as they are,—(equally free from pleasure
or pain). Do you, therefore, most excellent prince,
understand this (truth), and, along with your brothers,
relinquish everything, and repair to the holy forest.
Go, now, and say, from me, to Yudhishthira,† that
he, to-morrow, with his brethren, tread the path of
heroes.";

Thus instructed by Vyása, Arjuna went and related
to the other sons of Prithá all that he had seen, had
experienced, and had heard.§ When he had commu-
nicated to them the message of Vyása, the sons of
Pándu placed Parikshhit on the throne, and went to
the forest.

I have thus narrated to you, Maitreya, in detail, the
actions of Vásudeva, when he was born in the race of
Yadu.

* जात्म् नियतं मृत्युः पतनं च तद्भिन्नः।
विश्रोगावसानं संयोगं: संचयः॥

Instead of संचयः, some MSS. give: संचयार्थः।
† Denominated, in the Sanskrit, by his epithet Dharmarāja. Yama,
also, is so called. See Vol. III., p. 118.

‡ परस्मो अनूभि: सारं गति कीर्त्यस्य कुष।
The more ordinary reading ends the verse with the words यथा यथाः
tथा कुष।

§ रथकोषभिः पार्थव्यां चमाभ्यां चाह चोकुः॥
दृशः विवाक्षुमेति च वाष्ठृतं तद्भिन्नः॥

By the two Parthas here spoken of, Yudhishthira and Bhima are in-
tended, in the opinion of Ratnagarbha.
The words च सहस्राण्य: end the first verse, according to some MSS.
VISHṆU PURĀṆA.

BOOK VI.

CHAPTER I.

Of the dissolution of the world: the four ages: the decline of all things, and deterioration of mankind, in the Kali age.

MAITREYA.—You have narrated to me, illustrious sage, the creation (of the world), the genealogies (of the patriarchs), the duration* of the Manwantaras, and the dynasties† (of princes), in detail. I am now desirous to hear from you (an account of) the dissolution of the world, the season of total destruction, and that which occurs at the expiration of a Kalpa.1

PARĀŚARA.—Hear from me, Maitreya, exactly (the circumstances of) the end of all things; and the disso-

1 Two kinds of great or universal dissolution are here intimated; one occurring at the end of a Kalpa, or day of Brahmá, to which the term Upasamuhriti is applied in the text, and Átyantika-laya by the commentator; and the other taking place at the end of the life of Brahmá, which is termed a great or elemental dissolution: Mahá-pralaya and Prákrit-pralaya.

* Sthiti.
† Vaiśeṣikanucharīta.
‡ Upasamuhriti.
§ Ratnagarbha.
lution that occurs either at the expiration of a Kalpa, or that which takes place at the close of the life of Brahmá.* A month (of mortals) is a day and night of the progenitors: a year (of mortals is a day and night) of the gods. Twice a thousand aggregates of the four ages is a day and night of Brahmá.† The four ages are the Kṛita, Tretá, Dwápara, and Kali; comprehending, together, twelve thousand years of the gods. There are infinite successions of these four ages, of a similar description, the first of which is (always) called the Kṛita, and the last, the Kali. In the first, the Kṛita, is that age§ which is created by Brahmá; in the last, which is the Kali age, a dissolution of the world occurs.||

MAITREYA.—Venerable sir, you are able to give me a description of (the nature of) the Kali age, in which four-footed virtue² suffers total extinction.

---

1 These measures of time are more fully detailed in the First Book. See Vol. I., pp. 46, et seq.

2 This is an allusion to a popular notion, originating, probably, with Manu: “In the Kṛita age, the Genius of truth and right * * * * stands firm on his four feet; * * * * but, in the

* “At the close of the life of Brahmá” is to translate प्राणते ।

† चतुर्थकलशक्सु ते ग्रहणो वै विश्रोत्तम ।

‡ Akśhata.

§ Read “creation”. Professor Wilson here went wrong from following his favourite MS., which, from the fault of the copyist, begins the verse with चाथे चतुर्थकलशक्सु ग्रहणा । See the next note. Besides, yuga, in the sense of ‘age’, is neuter.

|| चाथे चतुर्थकलशक्सु ग्रहणा जिगते यतः ।

जिगते चापसंहारस्थायानि च कली चुङ्गे ||
PARÁSARA.—Hear, Maitreya, an account (of the nature) of the Kali age, respecting which you have inquired, and which is now close at hand.

The observance of caste, order, and institutes will not prevail in the Kali age; * nor will that of the ceremonial enjoined by the Sáma-, Ṛig-, and Yajur-Vedas. Marriages, in this age, will not be conformable to the ritual; † nor will the rules that connect the spiritual preceptor and his disciple be in force. The laws that regulate the conduct of husband and wife will be disregarded; and oblations to the gods with fire no longer be offered. In whatever family he may be born, a powerful and rich man will be held entitled to espouse maidens of every tribe. A regenerate man will be initiated in any way whatever; and such acts of penance as may be performed will be unattended by any results. ‡ Every text will be scripture, that people

following ages, * * * * he is deprived, successively, of one foot,” &c. § I., 81, 82. ||

"Such an act is just what it is:" या शेव प्रायश्चित्तकिया कशो। Ṭ That is, it may be attended by inconvenience to the individual, but is utterly inefficacious for the expiation of sin.

† Dharmya.

‡ शेव शेव च रैवभय प्रायश्चित्तकिया कशो।

§ From Sir William Jones’s Translation.

चतुष्पातकशोधमः सत्य शेव हते चुने।

नाधमेशागमः बक्षिष्णुष्णान्तिविस्तते।

हर्षद्वागमादमः पाद्यगुल्लवरोपितः।

चौरिकानुगतमायाभिर्स्त्राचापित पादशः।

‡ This was suggested by the comment of Śrīdhara, who understands penance to be spoken of which is performed simply for popular applause,
choose to think so;* all gods will be gods to them that worship them;* and all orders of life will be common alike to all persons. In the Kali age, fasting, austerity,† liberality, practised according to the pleasure of those by whom they are observed, will constitute righteousness. Pride (of wealth) will be inspired by very insignificant possessions. Pride of beauty: will be prompted by (no other personal charm than fine) hair. Gold, jewels, diamonds,§ clothes, will, all, have perished; and then hair will be the only ornament with which women can decorate themselves.|| Wives will desert their husbands, when they lose their property; and they only who are wealthy will be considered, by women, as their lords. He who gives away much (money) will be the master of men; and family descent

* Whether it is conformable or contradictory to the Vedas and the law. The passage || may be rendered, also: “The doctrine or dogma of any one soever will be scripture.”

and not to wipe away sin. His words are देव दैविति | प्राय स्वतंत्रत्व विशेषः | शौचालयायं न तु पापचार्यसि। Ratnagarbha says: देव दैव | वधियान्तित्व:।

‡ देवताश कलो सर्वा।। This rather implies, that unaccredited gods will receive honour. Ratnagarbha says: देव तेन कहिता: सर्वा देवता:।

† Aśā. Ratnagarbha explains it by penance, or pilgrimage: श्रायास।। क्रान्ति:। तीर्थ्याचार्यसि।।

‡ In women. The verse runs:

§ Ratna.

|| कलो स्विरों भविष्यति तद्रा केशरसंज्ञाता।।

|| सर्वमेव कलो शास्त्रं यथा यद्वचं द्वित्व।।
will no longer be a title of supremacy.* Accumulated treasures will be expended on (ostentatious) dwellings. The minds of men will be wholly occupied in acquiring wealth; and wealth will be spent solely on selfish gratifications.† Women will follow their inclinations, and be ever fond of pleasure. Men will fix their desires upon riches, even though dishonestly acquired. No man will part with the smallest fraction of the smallest coin,¹ though entreated by a friend. Men of all degrees will conceal themselves to be equal with Brahmins. Cows will be held in esteem, only as they supply milk.² The people will be, almost always, in dread of dearth, and apprehensive of scarcity; ‡ and will, hence, ever be watching (the appearances of) the sky: they will, all, live, like anchorites, § upon leaves, and roots, and fruit; and put a period to their lives, through fear of famine and want. || In truth, there will never be abun-

1 He will not part with the half of the half of half a Paña,—that is, with ten Cowries: a Paña being equal to eighty Cowries (or small shells). ¶ Five Pañas are equal to one Anna, or the sixteenth of a Rupee; and, at two shillings the Rupee, ten Cowries are equal to about one-seventh of a farthing.

² They will be valued for their individual use only, not from any notion of their generic sanctity.

* स्वामिलहितः संवन्धी मावी नाभिखजनेन।
† गृहान्तः धृत्यसंघाता धृत्यान्तः च तथा मिति।
अशोकालोपमोगान्तः भविष्यति कलिक युगः ||

Much that follows this is, likewise, freely rendered.

‡ Ksudh, 'hunger,' 'famine.'
§ Tāpasa, 'ascetics.'

dance, in the Kali age; and men will never enjoy pleasure and happiness. They will take their food without previous ablation, and without worshipping fire, gods, or guests, or offering obsequial libations to their progenitors. The women will be fickle, short of stature, gluttonous. They will have many children, and little means. Scratching their heads with both hands, they will pay no attention to the commands of their husbands or parents. They will be selfish, abject, and slatternly; they will be scolds and liars; they will be indecent and immoral in their conduct, and will ever attach themselves to dissolute men. Youths, although disregarding the rules of studentship, will study the Vedas. Householders will neither sacrifice nor practise becoming liberality. Anchorets will subsist upon food accepted from rustics; and mendicants will be influenced by regard for friends and associates. Princes, instead of protecting, will plunder, their subjects, and, under the pretext of levying customs, will

1 The Bhágavata has: "Religious students will be regardless of vows and purification; householders will beg, not give alms; anchorets will dwell in villages; and mendicants will be desirous of riches."

* दुर्भिबृम्बेत सततं तदा कृष्णमयैश्वरयः ।
प्राप्त्याभिष्यं वसुदेवकोमोदा मानवं: कलः ॥
† Read "and they will not offer", &c.
‡ Loluta, 'covetous.'
§ Vanavásá, 'hermits.' Vánapraśasthas are meant; for whose duties, see Vol. III., pp. 94—97.
| XII., III., 33:

चतुर्वात् ब्रतानांशीष्या मिच्छन्या कुकुम्भिनः ।
तपस्विनो यामवासां व्यासिनो ब्रह्मोऽधूपः ॥
rob merchants of their property. In the Kali age, everyone who has cars, and elephants, and steeds will be a Raja; every one who is feeble will be a slave.* Vaisyas will abandon agriculture and commerce, and gain a livelihood by servitude,† or the exercise of mechanical arts.‡ Súdras, seeking a subsistence by begging, and assuming the outward marks of religious mendicants, will become the impure followers of impious and heretical doctrines.§

Oppressed by famine and taxation, men will desert their native lands, and go to those countries which are fit for coarser grains. The path of the Vedas being

1 That is, princes and warriors will be so no longer by virtue of their birth and caste.

2 Most of the mendicant orders admit members without distinction of caste; but, probably, Buddhists, especially, are here intended. The Bhágavata repeatedly alludes to the diffusion of heretical doctrines and practices, the substitution of outward signs and marks for devotion, and the abandonment of the worship of Vishńu. The Śaiva mendicant orders are, probably, those especially in view. The same, probably, are intended, by our text, in the subsequent allusion to unauthorized austerities and sectarian marks.

3 "Gavedhuka || (Coix barbata) and other bad sorts of grain:"

§ "Countries growing wheat, barley, and the like.

But to place wheat and barley amongst inferior grains, and to

---

*Bhṛitya, 'servant.'
† Súdra-varńi.
‡ Káru-kárman.
§ For gavedhukā, the same grain, see Vol. I., p. 35.
¶ This is Ratnagarbha's reading.
obliterated, and men having deviated into heresy, iniquity will flourish, and the duration of life will (therefore,) decrease. In consequence of horrible penances, not enjoined by scripture, and of the vices of the rulers, children will die in their infancy. Women will bear children at the age of five, six, or seven years; and men beget them, when they are eight, nine, or ten. A man will be grey, when he is twelve; and no one will exceed twenty years of life.¹ Men will possess little sense, vigour, or virtue, and will, therefore, perish in a very brief period. In proportion as heresy extends, so, Maitreya, shall the progress of the Kali age be estimated by the wise. In proportion as the number of the pious who adhere to the lessons of the Vedas diminishes, as the efforts of individuals who cultivate virtue relax, as the first of males becomes no longer the object of sacrifices,* as respect for the teachers of the Vedas declines, and as regard is acknowledged for the disseminators of heresy, so may wise men note the augmented influence of the Kali age.²†

rank them lower than rice, is a classification that could have occurred to a native of Bengal alone.

¹ The Váyu says three and twenty; the Bhágavata,‡ from twenty to thirty.

² The complaints of the prevalence of heterodox doctrines, and neglect of the practices of the Vedas, which recur in the

* यदा यदा न बन्धानामीरः पुष्पोत्तमः ।
ि ल्यन्ते पुष्पैर्यंब्यैर्सदाः चिरं कल्पवृक्षम ॥

† न प्रतितिस्वषवद्रा पापम्यं यदा च चिरः ।
ि कल्कृत्यंसदा प्राणिर्नुमिता ब्रह्मोत्तम ॥

‡ XII., II., 11.
In the Kali age, Maitreya, men, corrupted by unbelievers, will refrain from adoring Vishnu, the lord of sacrifice, the creator and lord of all, and will say: "Of what authority are the Vedas? What are gods, or Brahmans? What need is there of purification with water?" Then will the clouds yield scanty rain; then will the corn be light in ear; and the grain will be (poor and) of little sap. Garments will be, mostly, made of the fibres of the San; the principal of trees will be the Sami; the prevailing caste will be the Sudra. Millet will be the more common grain; the milk in use will be, chiefly, that of goats; unguents will be made of Ushira-grass. The mother- and father-in-law will be venerated in place of parents; and a man’s friends will be his brother-in-law, or one who has a

Bhagavata and our text, indicate a period of change in the condition of the Hindu religion, which it would be important to verify. If reference is made to Buddhism,—to which, in some respects, the allusions especially apply,—it would, probably, denote a period not long subsequent to the Christian era; but it is more likely to be of a later date, or in the eighth and ninth centuries, when Sankara is said to have reformed a variety of corrupt practices, and given rise to others. See Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 12. ¶

1 Crotalaria juncea.
2 The silk cotton, Bombax heptaphyllum. **

---

* Yajnapati. Variant: jagatpati.
† किं च मेठी: किं दिबिदिविः किं भौचिनाम्युज्जवलम्।
‡ Śāri. The word also means ‘mere rags’.
§ Andropogon muriceatum.
|| See Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.
** This is the sālmali. Read acacia suma.
wanton * wife. Men will say: “Who has a father? Who has a mother? Each one is born according to his deeds.”† And, therefore, they will look upon a wife’s or husband’s parents as their own.‡ Endowed with little sense, men, subject to all the infirmities of mind, speech, and body, will daily commit sins; and everything that is calculated to afflict beings, vicious, impure, and wretched, will be generated in the Kali age. Then shall some places follow a separate duty,§ devoid

1 The expression Kwachil lokah (क्वाचिल लोकः), ‘a certain place,’ is explained, by the commentator, || ‘Kīkāta, &c.’ (कीकाटादि); confirming the inference that Buddhism is especially aimed at in the previous passages; for Kīkāta, ¶ or South Behar, is the scene of Śākya’s earliest and most successful labours.

* Hāri, ‘handsome.’
† यद्य करङ्गवङ्गः पुषान्
‡ अधुरागुण्यता नरः। This is the whole that the English is intended to translate.

§ तद्य मभवस्तौ विवष्कज्जी निरवश्वचि।

|| So it is explained by both Śridhara and Ratnagarbha.

¶ The Kikafas are spoken of in the Rgveda, III., III., 14. In the third volume of his Translation, Introduction, p. XX., Professor Wilson speculates on their locality; and, again, in p. 86, note 4, commenting on the passage adverted to, as follows: “The Kikafas are said, by Sāyaṇa,—following Yāska, Nirukta, VI., 32,—to be countries inhabited by āndāyas, people who do not perform worship, who are infidels, nāstikas. Kikafa is usually identified with South Behar; showing, apparently, that Vaidik Hinduism had not reached the province, when this was said. Or, as Kikafa was the fountain-head of Buddhism, it might be asserted that the Buddhists were here alluded to, if it were not wholly incompatible with all received notions of the earlier date of the Vedas.”

Père Vivien de Saint-Martin, in his Étude sur la Géographie, &c., pp. 138—144, is very full, if not conclusive, on the country of the Kikafas. It is by no means improbable that this name was borne by two peoples, sundered by a very considerable interval of space, and belonging to different periods. In the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, I., III., 24, it is said that Buddha, son of Anjana, will be born among the Kikafas.
of holy study, oblations to fire,* and invocations of the gods.† Then, in the Kali age, shall a man acquire, by a trifling exertion, as much eminence in virtue as is the result of arduous penance in the Kṛita age (or age of purity).²

1 Several of the Purāṇas contain allusions to the degeneracy of the Kali age; but none afford more copious details. The description in the Bhāgavata is much shorter; that of the Vāyu is much the same, and employs many of the same verses and illustrations.

2 This might be suspected of being said ironically, referring to what had been just observed of places where a religion prevailed that required neither study nor sacrifice. The commentator, however, understands it literally, and asserts, that allusion is here made to the Vaishānava faith, in which devotion to Viṣṇu or Kṛishṇa, and the mere repetition of his name, are equally efficacious, in the Kali age, with the penances and sacrifices of the preceding ages. Therefore, he concludes, the Kali, by this one property, is the best of all the ages: चन्दनाकौण्ड मुखोऽद विनायकस्मर्तः सर्वनाशुष्ट रूख्यः।: This interpretation is confirmed by the following Chapter.

* Vāshaṭkāra. See Vol. II., p. 29, notes 3 and §.
† Swadā and svadā. See Vol. III., p. 122, note †; ad finem.
‡ Both the commentators give this explanation
CHAPTER II.

Redeeming properties of the Kali age. Devotion to Vishńu sufficient to salvation, in that age, for all castes and persons.

UPON this subject, Maitreya, you shall hear what the wise Vyása has related, as it is communicated truly by me.

It was, once, a matter of dispute, amongst the sages, at what season the least moral merit obtained the greatest reward, and by whom it was most easily displayed. In order to terminate the discussion, they went to Veda Vyása, to remove their doubts.* They found the illustrious Muni, my son, half immersed in the water of the Ganges;† and, awaiting the close of his ablutions, the sages remained on the banks of the sacred stream, under shelter of a grove of trees. As my son plunged down into the water, and again rose up from it, the Munis heard him exclaim: “Excellent, excellent is the Kali age!” Again he dived, and, again rising, said, in their hearing: “Well done, well done, Śúdra! Thou art happy.” Again he sank down; and, as he once more emerged, they heard him say: “Well done, well done, women! They are happy. Who are more fortunate than they?” After this, my son finished his bathing; and the sages met him, as he approached to welcome them. After he had given them seats, and

* सन्तुष्टिनिर्धारितवाय केदारास्म महामुनिम ।
बलको संवर्यं प्रढः मैति युनिपुञ्जवः ॥
† Jáhnávi, in the original.
‡ ‘Great’, according to the Sanskrit.
they had proffered their respects, the son of Satyavati* said to them: "On what account have you come to me?" They replied: "We came to you to consult you on a subject on which we entertain some doubt. But that may be, at present, suspended. Explain to us something else. We heard you say: 'Excellent is the Kali age. Well done, Śúdra! Well done, women!' Now we are desirous to know why this was said, why you called them, repeatedly, happy. Tell us the meaning of it, if it be not a mystery. We will then propose to you the question that occupies our thoughts."

Being thus addressed by the Munis, Vyásá smiled, and said to them: "Hear, excellent sages, why I uttered the words 'Well done! Well done!' The fruit of penance, of continence,† of silent prayer, and the like, practised, in the Kṛita age, for ten years, in the Tretá, for one year, in the Dwápara, for a month, is obtained, in the Kali age, in a day and night. Therefore did I exclaim: 'Excellent, excellent is the Kali age.' That reward which a man obtains, in the Kṛita, by abstract meditation, in the Tretá, by sacrifice, in the Dwápara, by adoration, he receives, in the Kali, by merely reciting the name of Keśava. In the Kali age, a man displays the most exalted virtue by (very) little exertion: therefore, (pious sages,) who know what virtue is, I was pleased with the Kali age. Formerly, the Vedas were to be acquired, by the twice-born, through the diligent observance of self-denial;‡ and it was their duty to celebrate sacrifices conformably to the ritual.

* See Vol. IV., p. 158.
† Brāhmacharya.
‡ Vratacharya.
Then idle prayers,* idle feasts, and fruitless ceremonies were practised but to mislead the twice-born; for, although observed, by them, devoutly, yet, in consequence of some irregularity in their celebration, sin was incurred in all their works; and what they ate or what they drank did not effect the fulfilment of their desires.† In all their objects the twice-born enjoyed no independence; and they attained their respective spheres only with exceeding pain. The Śūdra, (on the contrary,) more fortunate than they, reaches his assigned station by rendering them service, and performing merely the sacrifice of preparing food,‡ in which§ no rules determine what may or may not be eaten, what may or may not be drunk. Therefore, most excellent sages,|| is the Śūdra fortunate.

“Riches are accumulated, by men, in modes not incompatible with their peculiar duties; and they are then to be bestowed upon the worthy, and expended in constant sacrifice. There is great trouble in their acquisition; great care, in their preservation; great distress, from the want of them;¶ and great grief, for

---

* Kathā. “Praise of Kuśīnā,” the commentators say.
† A free rendering.
‡ पाकयाज्ञाधिकारवान। This implies “possessing the privilege of domestic sacrifices.” For the pākayajnas, which have nothing to do with ordinary cookery, see Vol. III., p. 114, notes ‡ and §.
§ This has not the connexion with what precedes that the Translator supposed. For “in which”, read “and for him”, or the like,—to render freely.
|| Muni-śārdhila.
¶ It is, rather, implied, that there is difficulty in the proper application of them:

तथा सद्विनियोगाय विषिष्टं गहनं नृषामः।
their loss.* Thus, eminent Brahmans, through these and other sources of anxiety, men attain their allotted spheres of Prájápati† and the rest, (only by exceeding labour and suffering). (This is not the case with women.) A woman has only to honour her husband, in act, thought, and speech, to reach the same region to which he is elevated; and she, thus, accomplishes her object without any great exertion. This was the purport of my exclamation ‘Well done!’ the third time. I have, thus, related to you (what you asked). Now demand the question you came to put to me, in any way you please; and I will make you a distinct reply.”

The Munis then said (to Vyása): “The question we intended to have asked you has been already answered, by you, in your reply to our subsequent inquiry.” On hearing which, Kṛishña Dwāpāyana laughed, and said to the holy persons‡ who had come to see him, whose eyes were wide open with astonishment: “I perceived, with the eye (of) divine (knowledge), the question you intended to ask; and, in allusion to it, I uttered the expressions ‘Well done! Well done!’ In truth, in the Kali age, duty is discharged with very little trouble§ by mortals whose faults are, all, washed away by the water of their individual merits; by Śúdras, through diligent attendance (only) upon the twice-born; and by women, through the slight effort of obedience to their husbands. Therefore, Brahmans, did I thrice ex-

---

* I find no Sanskrit for this clause.
† In the original, Prájápatya. For this heaven, see Vol. I., p. 98, notes 1 and •.
‡ Tápasa.
§ Some MSS. yield ‘time’.
press my admiration of their happiness; for, in the Kṛita and other ages, great were the toils of the regenerate to perform their duty. I waited not for your inquiry, but replied, at once, to the question you purposed to ask. Now, ye who know what virtue is, what else do you wish me to tell you?"

The Munis then saluted and praised Vyāsa, and, being freed, by him, from uncertainty, departed as they came. To you, also, excellent (Maitreya), have I imparted this secret,—this one great virtue of the (otherwise) vicious Kali age.* The dissolution † of the world, and the aggregation of the elements, ‡ I will now describe to you.¹

¹ The illustration of the efficacy of devotion to Vishńu, given in this Chapter, is peculiar to this Puráña; but the doctrine is common to it and the Bhágavata. It is repeatedly inculcated in that work. The parallel passage, in the Twelfth Book, § is the following: "Purushottama, abiding in the hearts of men, takes

---

* Śrīdhara seems to recognize the following verse, disregarded by the Translator:

कीर्तनादेव कृष्णस्य मुखवन्यः परं प्रवेति।

This verse is identical with one near the end of the passage cited, from the Bhágavata-purāṇa, in note §, below.

† Upaṇiṣhādītī.

‡ प्राणतामनराजाः। Śrīdhara: अन्तरालाम। अहाथी दिनि

दिने भवाम। Ratnagarbha: अन्तरालाम। इन्दिनीम्।

§ Chapter III., 45—52:

पुंसां कलिकान्त्रि वन्द्यासम्बवान।
सर्वान्तरिति चिन्तको भवान्त्रुष्योत्तमः।
श्रुत: संकीर्णिस्तो धाति: युजीश्वातितोष्णि वा।
नुषाण पुनोति भवान्त्रुष्यो ज्वायुनायुताभुमः।
यथा हृद्मिता स्थिती चाहि दुर्वच्छिण्य हृनि धातुतयम्।
एवमात्मातो विषुच्युतो यिन्तं गुष्माभाश्यम्।
away all the sins of the Kali age, produced by place or property. Bhagavat, abiding in the heart, and heard, repeated, read of, worshipped, or honoured, dissipates the ills of men for ten thousand births. As fire, entering into the substance of gold, purifies it from the alloy with which it is debased in the mine, so Vishnú, united with the devotee, is the refiner from all that is evil. By learning, penance, suppression of breath, friendship, pilgrimage, ablution, mortification, gifts, prayer, the soul attains not that exceeding parity which it derives from the presence of Vishnú. Therefore, with all your soul, O king, hold Keśava ever present in your heart. Let one about to die be most careful in this; for so he goes to supreme felicity. Let the name of the supreme god, Vishnú, be repeated, diligently, by all, in their last moments; for he who desires liberation shall attain it by the frequent repetition of the name of Kṛishṇa. Final felicity is derived, in the Kṛita age, from holy study; in the Tretá, from religious rites. In the Dwápara, it is attained by pious services; but, in the Kali age, it is secured by repeating the name of Hari.” Similar doctrines are taught in the Gîtá, and other Vaishnava works. See Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 116.*

CHAPTER III.

Three different kinds of dissolution. Duration of a Parárdha. The clepsydra, or vessel for measuring time. The dissolution that occurs at the end of a day of Brahmá.

THE dissolution* of existing beings is of three kinds,—incidental, elemental, and absolute.† The incidental is that which relates to Brahmá, and occurs at the end of a Kalpa; the elemental is that which takes

---

1 The first is called Naimittika, † ‘occasional’ or ‘incidental,’ or Bráhmya, as occasioned by the intervals of Brahmá’s days; the destruction of creatures, though not of the substance of the world, occurring during his night. The general resolution of the elements into their primitive source, or Prakrti, is the Prákritika destruction, and occurs at the end of Brahmá’s life. The third, the absolute or final, Átyantika, is individual annihilation; Moksha, exemption for ever from future existence.‡ The Bhágavata§ here notices the fourth kind, of which mention occurred in a preceding passage (Vol. I., p. 113),—Nitya, or constant dissolution;—explaining it to be the imperceptible change that all things suffer in the various stages of growth and decay, life and death. “The various conditions of beings subject to change are occasioned by that constant dissolution of life which is rapidly produced by the resistless stream of time, taking everything perpetually away:”

कालकोतोत्तिवेनायु हिष्माःश्च निक्षदः ।
परिशामिनामवस्याः जन्मग्रंथयतय: ॥

The Váyu describes but three kinds of Pralaya, omitting the Nitya.

---

* Pratisanchara. See Vol. I., p. 52, note *.
† Corrected from “Naimittaka”.
‡ Vide supra, p. 61, note §, ad finem.
§ XII., IV., 35.
place after two Parárdhas; the absolute is (final) liberation* (from existence).

Maitreya.—Tell me, excellent master, what is the enumeration of a Parárdha, the expiration of two of which is the period of elemental dissolution.¹

Paráśara.—A Parárdha, Maitreya, is that number which occurs in the eighteenth place of figures, enumerated according to the rule of decimal notation.² At

¹ Maitreya has a rather indifferent memory (see Vol. I., pp. 46, 47); but the periods specified in the two places do not agree. In the First Book, two Parárdhas, as equal to one hundred years of Brahmá, are 311.040.000.000.000 years of mortals.

² Counting according to this mode of enumeration, a Parárdha is represented by 100.000.000.000.000.000. The Váyu Puráña† has

* Moksha.
† Quoted by Śridhara and Ratnagarbha, as follows:

कौटिकोटिसहस्राणि परार्धमिति कीर्तिते।
परार्धं विग्रहं चापि परमाकर्मिनीषिणव॥
खानं दशगुणं विवाहितं दशं शतं ततः ॥
सहस्रसहस्रं तस्मादिद्रुतं प्रतिभुं तत: ॥
न्युंदे न्युंदे चैव दुस्ते चैव ततः परसः ॥
सन्ते चैव सन्ते च शाः पदार्थाषिव च।
समुद्रो मध्यमनाश परार्धं परस्वव च।
एवमद्वादशतानि पदानि गणनाविषिष्टः ॥

The English of this is, in brief, as below, and corrects Professor Wilson's representation, in several particulars:

Eka ................. 1
Daśa ............... 10
Śata .................. 100
Sahastra ........... 1,000
Ayuta ............... 10,000
Niyuta ............. 100,000
Prayuta ............ 1,000,000
Arbuda .......... 10,000,000
the end of twice that period, elemental dissolution occurs, when all the discrete products of nature are

a term for each of these decimal values: Daśa (दश), 10; Śata (शत), 100; Sahasra (सहस्र), 1000; Ayuta (आयुत), 10,000; Niyuta (नियुत), 100,000; Prayuta (प्रयुत), 1,000,000; Arbuda (अर्बुद), 10,000,000; Nyarbuda* (नयर्बुद), 100,000,000; Vṛinda (वृंद), 1,000,000,000; Para† (पर), 10,000,000,000; Kharva (खर्व), 100,000,000,000; Nikharva (निखर्व), 1,000,000,000,000; Śankha (षण्क), 10,000,000,000,000; Padma (पद्म), 100,000,000,000,000; Samudra (समुद्र), 1,000,000,000,000,000; Madhya ‡ (मध्यम), 10,000,000,000,000,000;§ Parārdha (परार्ध), 100,000,000,000,000,000. ||

Nyarbuda ............. 100,000,000
Vṛinda ................ 1,000,000,000
Kharva ............... 10,000,000,000
Nikharva ............. 100,000,000,000
Śankha ............... 1,000,000,000,000
Padma ................. 10,000,000,000,000
Samudra .............. 100,000,000,000,000
Madhya ................ 1,000,000,000,000,000
Anta ................... 10,000,000,000,000,000
Parārdha .......... 100,000,000,000,000,000

2 parārdhas, i.e., half-paras, = a para.

Our commentators' manuscripts of the Vāyu-purāṇa must have differed very noticeably, as to the foregoing passage, from those to which I have access.

A niyuta denotes, according to different authorities, a hundred thousand, a million, &c. More usually, however, it is a synonym of lakśha; as in the passage annotated supra, p. 92, note ‡. See Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth's Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, sub voce नियुत.

For a very learned article on Sanskrit numeration, from the pen of Dr. Albrecht Weber, see the Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. XV., pp. 132—140.

* Corrected from “Nyarvuda”, and the Sanskrit similarly.
† The original word is not, here, a technicality.
‡ Read “Madhya”. See note † in the preceding page.
§ Anta is here omitted.
|| In the Līlāvatī, Chapter II., Section I., the parārdha is arrived at differently, in this wise:
withdrawn into their indiscreet source. The shortest period of time is a Mátrá, which is equal to the twinkling of the human eye. Fifteen Mátrás make a Káshṭhá; thirty Káshṭhás, one Kalá; fifteen Kalás, one Nádiká. A Nádiká is ascertained by a measure of water, with a vessel made of twelve Palas and a half of copper, in the bottom of which there is to be a hole made with a tube of gold, of the weight of four Máshas, and four inches long.† According to the Mágadha measure,

In the First Book, the Parárdha, as the half of Brahmá's life, is but 155,590,000,000,000,—fifteen, instead of eighteen, places of figures.

† The description of the Clepsydra is very brief, and wanting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eka</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daśa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śata</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahasra</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayuta</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakṣha</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayuta</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koṭi</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbuda</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abja</td>
<td>1,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharva</td>
<td>10,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Níkharva</td>
<td>100,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahápadma</td>
<td>1,000,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śanku</td>
<td>10,000,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaladhi</td>
<td>100,000,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antya</td>
<td>1,000,000,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madhya</td>
<td>10,000,000,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parárdha</td>
<td>100,000,000,000,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As words, abja is a synonym of padma; and jaladhi, of samudra.

* सिमेकू सान्यो यों स्थानमाण: प्रमाणत: ।
† उक्षपिरिनांस: सा तु पल्लवन्धित्योपाद्यः ।
हृदमथ: शततिरिक्तयूपुरुपर्णः ॥

The expression अर्धचयोद्य is explained, by the commentators, to mean "twelve and a half". The Bhágavata-púrása has dwáddásárdha.
the vessel should hold a Prastha (or sixteen Palas) of water. Two of these Nādikās make one Muhūrta,—thirty of which are one day and night. Thirty such periods form a month; twelve months make a year, or a day and night of the gods; and three hundred and sixty such days constitute a year of the celestials. An aggregate of four ages contains twelve thousand divine years; and a thousand periods of four ages complete a day of Brahmā. That period is, also, termed a Kalpa, during which fourteen Manus preside; and, at the end of it, occurs the incidental or Brahmā dissolution. The nature of this dissolution is very fearful. Hear me describe it, as well as that which takes place at the elemental dissolution, which I will, also, relate to you.

At the end of a thousand periods of four ages, the earth is, for the most part, exhausted. A total dearth then ensues, which lasts a hundred years; and, in conse-

in precision. One of the commentaries* is more explicit: “A vessel made of twelve Palas and a half of copper, and holding a Prastha, (Māgadha measure) of water, broad at top, and having, at bottom, a tube of gold, of four Māshas weight, four fingers long, is placed in water; and the time in which the vessel is filled by the hole in the bottom is called a Nādikā:” साधत्निश्चलताद्र मध्य मागध छुं त्त्तो जुतीं मूर्त्तुर भुजस्वलस्तावक्या शस्त्राधिकृत्र जने खापित तेन चित्रत्र यावता कालः पूर्णे ताव- त्वालो नाडिकैति। The term Šalākā generally means a needle or stake; but it must, here, denote a pipe. The common measure of the Nādi is a thin shallow brass cup, with a small hole in the bottom. It is placed on the surface of water, in a large vessel, where nothing can disturb it, and where the water gradually fills the cup, and sinks it. Asiatic Researches, Vol. V., p. 87.

* Śrīdhara’s. Ratnagarbha enters into further particulars.
quence of the failure of food, all beings become languid and examine, and, at last, entirely perish.* The eternal† Vishńu then assumes the character of Rudra, the destroyer, and descends to reunite all (his) creatures with himself. He enters into the seven rays of the sun,¶ drinks up all the waters (of the globe), and causes all moisture whatever, in living bodies or in the soil, to evaporate; thus drying up the whole earth. The seas, the rivers, the mountain torrents, and springs are, all, exhaled; and so are all the waters of Pátála,§ (the regions below the earth). Thus fed, through his intervention,|| with abundant moisture, the seven solar rays dilate to seven suns,² whose radiance glows above,

---

¹ See Vol. II., p. 297, note 1.
² These, also, have their several appellations. The commentator¶ quotes the Vedas,** as the authority: Árága,†† Bhrája, Páñala, Patanga, Swarnabháj, †† Jyotishmat, and Savibhása. §§

† Ayajaya. See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.
‡ See the Taittiriya-áranyaka, I., VII., I. The seven suns are there called Ároga, Bhrája, Páñala, Patanga, Swarnára, Jyotishmat, and Vibhása.
§ “The Pátálas”, according to the Sanskrit. For these domains, see Vol. II., pp. 209, et seq.
|| Anubháva.
¶ Both the commentators give the names following.
** Hereon the commentators cite a stanza: Ratnagarbha gives it as anonymous; but Śrídara refers it to the Kírma-puráña. The seven rays are there said to be Sushumña, Harikeśa, Viśvakarman, Viśwavyar-čchas (?), Varchas, Vasu, Saṁpadvasu (?).

Compare the particulars in notes 1 and † to p. 297 of Vol. II.
†† So reads Ratnagarbha. Śrídara has Ároga.
‡‡ Corrected from “Swamábhák”. Śrídara’s reading, in my one MS., seems to be Swarnároman.
§§ Vibhávasu, according to Śrídara.
below, and on every side,* and sets the three worlds and Pātāla† on fire. The three worlds, consumed by these suns, become rugged and deformed;‡ throughout the whole extent of their mountains, rivers, and seas; and the earth, bare of verdure, and destitute of moisture, alone remains, resembling, in appearance, the back of a tortoise. The destroyer of all things, Hari, in the form of Rudra, who is the flame of time,§ becomes the scorching breath of the serpent Śesha, and thereby reduces Pātāla || to ashes. The great fire, when it has burnt all the divisions of Pātāla, proceeds to the earth, and consumes it, also.†† A vast whirlpool of eddying flame then spreads to the region of the atmosphere,** and the sphere of the gods,††† and wraps them in ruin. The three spheres show like a frying-pan, amidst the surrounding flames that prey upon all moveable or stationary things. The inhabitants of the two (upper) spheres, having discharged their functions,‡‡ and being annoyed by the heat, remove to (the sphere above, or) Mahar-loka. When that becomes heated, its tenants, who, after the full period of their stay, are desirous of

* There is no Sanskrit for “on every side”.
† The plural is better.
‡ For “rugged and deformed” the original has nā斯nēha, “deprived of moisture.”
§ Kālāgni. See Vol. I., p. 128, text and note ‡.
|| The original has the plural.
†† पातालानि समस्तानि स द्रग्धा ज्वजनी महान।
भूमिस्मेवक्ष वक्षि वघुधातलम्।

†† Swar-loka.
‡‡ Kṛitādhikāra. Variant: kṛitādhikāra, “deprived of office.”
ascending to higher regions, depart for the Jana-loka.\footnote{1}

Janárdana, in the person of Rudra, having consumed the whole world, breathes forth heavy clouds; and those called Samvartaka,\footnote{†} resembling vast elephants, in bulk, overspread the sky,—roaring, and darting lightnings. Some are as black as the blue lotos; some are (white) as the water-lily; some are dusky, like smoke; and some are yellow; some are (of a dun colour,) like (that of) an ass; some, like ashes sprinkled on the forehead; some are (deep blue,) as the lapis lazuli; some

---

\footnote{1} The passage\footnote{§} may, also, be understood: "Those go to Jana-loka, who are desirous of obtaining Brahma, or final liberation, through the ten stages of perfection,—devotion, penance, truth, &c." In the Váyu Puráña, more details are specified. Those sainted mortals who have diligently worshipped Vishńu, and are distinguished for piety, abide, at the time of dissolution, in Mahar-loka, with the Pítris, the Manus, the seven Rishis, the various orders of celestial spirits, and the gods. These, when the heat of the flames that destroy the world reaches to Mahar-loka, repair to Jana-loka, in their subtile forms, destined to become reembodied, in similar capacities as their former, when the world is renewed, at the beginning of the succeeding Kalpa. This continues throughout the life of Brahmá. At the expiration of his life, all are destroyed; but those who have then attained a residence in the Brahma-loka, by having identified themselves, in spirit, with the Supreme, are, finally, resolved into the sole-existing Brahma.||
(azure), like the sapphire; some are (white) as the conch or the jasmine; and some are (black) as collyrium; some are (of bright red), like the lady-bird; some are of the fierceness of red arsenic; and some are like the wing of the (painted) jay. (Such are these massy clouds, in hue.) In form, some resemble towns; some, mountains: some are like houses and hovels; and some are like columns. Mighty in size, and loud in thunder, they fill all space. Showering down torrents of water, these clouds quench the dreadful fires which involve the three worlds; and then they rain, uninterruptedly, for a hundred years, and deluge the whole world. Pouring down, in drops as large as dice, these rains overspread the earth, and fill the middle region, and inundate heaven. The world is now enveloped in darkness; and, all things, animate or inanimate, having perished, the clouds continue to pour down their waters for more than a hundred years.

* Indragopa. See Vol. IV., p. 284, note ..
† मन्मेघनिभासण |
‡ "Houses and hovels" is to render kūlīgāra, which denotes a superstructure on the roof of a house.
§ Śrīdhara reads sthūla, 'a heap', 'a tent'; Ratnagarbha, śrīrā, 'wool'. Other lections which I find are sthala 'a mound', 'a tent'; and sthaṇa, of unascertained signification.
|| Nabhas-tala.
¶ Bhūvo-loka.
CHAPTER IV.

Continuation of the account of the first kind of dissolution. Of the second kind, or elemental dissolution; of all being resolved into primary spirit.

WHEN the waters have reached the region of the seven Rishis,* and the whole of the three worlds is one ocean, they stop. The breath of Vishnú becomes a (strong) wind, which blows for more than a hundred years, until all the clouds are dispersed. The wind is then reabsorbed; and he of whom all things are made, the lord by whom all things exist,† he who is inconceivable, without beginning, beginning of the universe,‡ reposes, sleeping upon Śesha, in the midst of the deep. The creator,§ Hari, sleeps (upon the ocean), in the form of Brahmá,—glorified by Sanaka|| and the saints ¶ who had gone to the Jana-loka, and contemplated by the holy inhabitants of Brahma-loka, anxious for final liberation,—involved in mystic slumber, the celestial personification of his own illusions, and meditating on his own ineffable spirit, which is called Vásudeva.**

---

* See Vol. II., p. 226, and p. 230, note †.
† भूतमायांः।
‡ Corrected from the printer's error “without beginning of the universe.” The original is चनादिराद्विक्रियाः।
§ Adhibhūt.
¶ Siddha.

** ब्राह्मायामहिमं द्रव्यं योगिनिद्रां समाख्यितं।
ब्राह्मान्वासुदेववशं चिन्तयन्यर्मेखः॥

For Yoganidrā, which the Translator here renders by “mystic slumber”, see Vol. IV., p. 260, note 1.

18*
This, Maitreya, is the dissolution* termed incidental; because Hari, in the form of Brahmá, sleeps there, as its incidental cause.†

When the universal spirit wakes, the world revives; when he closes his eyes, all things fall upon the bed of mystic slumber.‡ In like manner as a thousand great ages constitute a day of Brahmá,§ so his night consists of the same period,—during which the world is submerged by a vast ocean. Awaking at the end of his night, the unborn, Vishńu, in the character of Brahmá, creates the universe anew, in the manner formerly related to you.¹

I have, thus, described to you the intermediate dissolution|| of the world, occurring at the end¶ of every Kalpa. I will now, Maitreya, describe to you elemental dissolution. When, by dearth and fire, all the worlds and Pátálas are withered up, and the modifications of Mahat and other products of nature are, by the will of Kríshńa, destroyed, the progress of elemental dissolution is begun. Then, first, the waters swallow up the property of earth, (which is the rudiment of smell);

¹ The Naimittika Pralaya is described in the Váyu, Bhágavata, Kúrma, and other Puráńas, to the same effect, and, very commonly, in precisely the same words.

* Pratisanchara.
† "Incidental cause" is for nimitta. See Vol. I., p. 65, note †, ad finem.
‡ निमीलबित्तदिबितं योगश्वपाश्चे सुते।
§ The original has Padmayoni, the same as Abjayoni, for which see Vol. I., p. 17, note †.
|| Pralaya.
¶ Saindhara.
and earth, deprived of its property, proceeds to destruction. Devoid of the rudiment of odour, the earth becomes one with water. * The waters, then, being much augmented, roaring, and rushing along, fill up all space, whether agitated or still. † When the universe is, thus, pervaded by the waves of the watery element, its rudimental flavour is licked up by the element of fire; and, in consequence of the destruction of their rudiments, the waters themselves are destroyed. ‡ Deprived of (the essential rudiment of) flavour, they become one with fire; and the universe is, therefore, entirely filled with flame, § which drinks up the water on every side, and gradually spreads the whole of the world. While space is enveloped in flame, above, below, and all around, the element of wind seizes upon the rudimental property, or form, which is the cause of light; and, that being withdrawn, ¶ all becomes of the nature of air. The rudiment of form being destroyed, and fire ** deprived of its rudiment, air extinguishes fire, and spreads, resistlessly, over space, which is deprived of light, when fire merges into air. Air, then, accompanied by sound, which is the source of ether, extends

---

* Śridhara, like several independent MSS., here interposes the following verse:

रस्ताज्जल समस्युत तांत्रावशात्त रसालाकम।
† तिएश्च विचारचत च।
‡ चापामिद गुणो वसु क्षितिष्ठ तीव्रते तु सः। नक्षिक्षापपत्तताः सरसंतानांसंबंधयात्॥
§ चानाबलिः तु मपिते मत्सा तर्पते हुते।
¶ ज्योतिषोपन्ति परं दृप वाच्यरतिः प्रभास्रम।

अः Praśna.
** Viśhāvasu.
everywhere throughout the ten regions of space,* until ether seizes upon contact,† its rudimental property, by
the loss of which, air is destroyed, and ether‡ remains unmodified: devoid of form, flavour, touch,§ and smell,
it exists unembodied|| and vast, and pervades the whole of space. Ether,¶ whose characteristic property
and rudiment is sound, exists alone, occupying all the vacuity of space.** But then the radical element††
(egotism,) devours sound; and all the elements and faculties are, at once, merged into their original.‡‡ This
primary element is consciousness, §§ combined with the property of darkness,||| and is, itself, swallowed up by
Mahat, whose characteristic property is intelligence; ¶¶ and earth and Mahat are the inner and outer bound-
daries of the universe. In this manner,—as (in the creation,) were the seven forms of nature (Prakṛiti),
reckoned from Mahat to earth,†***—so, at the (time of

---

1 See Vol. I., p. 29.

* तत्सः मूलमासाय वायुः संभवमात्रनः।
   जघन्यते चाष्ट्यत तिमिन्द्रो द्रोधविन्द दिशो दश ||

† Sparia.
‡ Kha.
§ Sparia.
|| I find no reading but mūr̥t̥im̥at, which means 'embodied'.
¶ Akāśa. See Vol. I., p. 34, note •.
** परिमण्डलं तत्सुपिरस्माकालम्।
†† Bhūtādi. See Vol. I., p. 33, note •.
‡‡ मूर्तिः चित्रम सुधदुमात्री संखियतिः च।
 §§ चामिमामाभक। See Vol. I., p. 33, note ‡.
||| This phrase is to render tāmasa, for which see Vol. I., p. 34, note 1,
and p. 35, note •.
¶¶ Buddhi.

*** एवं सत महाजरे; क्रमात्मकतपतसः च।
elemental) dissolution,* these seven successively re-enter into each other. The egg of Brahmá† is dissolved in the waters that surround it, with its seven zones,‡ seven oceans, seven regions, and their mountains. The investure of water is drunk up by fire; the (stratum of) fire is absorbed by (that of) air; air blends itself with ether; the primary element§ (of egotism) devours the ether, and is (itself,) taken up by intellect,|| which, along with all these, is seized upon by nature (Prakṛiti). Equilibrium of the (three) properties, without excess or deficiency, is called nature (Prakṛiti), origin (Hetu), the chief principle (Pradhaṇa),† cause (Kāraṇa), supreme (Para). This Prakṛiti is, essentially, the same, whether discrete or indiscrete; only that which is discrete is, finally, lost or absorbed in the indiscrete.** Spirit,†† also, which is one, pure, imperishable, eternal, all-pervading, is a portion of that supreme spirit which is all things. That spirit:‡ which is other than (embodied) spirit, in which there are no attributes of name,

The seven prakṛitis, or productive productions, are, in the pure Sāṅkhya philosophy, mahat, ahaṅkāra, and the five tanmātras. See the Sāṅkhya-kārikā, III., and the commentaries.

With the statements in the text, which counts the seven prakṛitis from mahā-buddhi—the same as mahat,—compare Vol. I., p. 40.

* Pratyāhāra.
† Sarva-maṇḍala.
‡ Dwipa.
§ Bhūtādi.
|| Mahat.
†† See Vol. I., p. 20, note ••.

** रूपिशा प्रकृति: सर्वा वल्लभक्ष्यायि रूपिशा प्रकृति: सर्वा लक्ष्मणवियिः सर्वीयिः प्रकृति ||

†† Pūrṇa.
‡‡ Sarvēda.
species,* or the like,—which is one with (all) wisdom, and is to be understood as (sole) existence,†—that is Brahma, infinite glory;‡ supreme spirit, supreme power,§ Vishńu, all that is; from whence the (perfect) sage|| returns no more. Nature (Prakṛiti)—which I have described to you as being, essentially, both discrete and indiscrete,—and spirit¶ (which is united with body), both resolve into supreme spirit. Supreme spirit is the upholder of all things, and the ruler of all things,** and is glorified, in the Vedas and in the Vedānta, by the name of Vishńu.

Works, as enjoined by the Vedas, are of two kinds, active (Pravṛttita) and quiescent (Nivṛttita), by both of which the universal person†† is worshipped by mankind. He, the lord of sacrifice,‡‡ the male of sacrifice, §§ the most excellent male, ||| is worshipped, by men, in the active mode, by rites enjoined in the Rig-, Yajur-, and Sáma-Vedas. The soul of wisdom, the person of wisdom, ¶¶ Vishńu, the giver of emancipation, is worshipped, by sages, *** in the quiescent form, through medi-

---

* Nāman and jāti. Vide supra, p. 15, note *.
† Sattā.
‡ परं धाम |
§ “Supreme power” is to render iśwara.
|| Yāti.
¶ Purusha.
** This expression is to translate parameswara.
†† Sarva-mūrtti.
‡‡ Yajñeshvara.
§§ Yajña-puñña.
||| Purushottama.
¶¶ Jñāna-mūrtti.
*** Yogin.
tative devotion.* The exhaustless † Vishnú is whatever thing that is designated by long, short, or prolated syllables, or that which is without a name. He is that which is discrete, and that which is indiscr**

te; he is exhaustless spirit, supreme spirit, universal spirit, Hari, the wearer of universal forms. Nature, whether discrete or indiscr**
te, is absorbed into him; and (detached) spirit, also, merges into the all-diffusive and unobstructed spirit.‖ The period of two Parárdhas, as I have described it to you, Maitreya, is called a day of that potent Vishnú; and, whilst the products of nature are merged into their source, nature into spirit, and that into the Supreme, that period is termed his night, and is of equal duration with his day.‖ But, in fact, to that eternal supreme spirit there is neither day nor night; and these distinctions are only figuratively applied to the Almighty. †† I have, thus, explained to you the nature of elemental dissolution, and will now ex-

pound to you which is final. 1

1 The Bhágavata notices the Prákáľta pralaya much more briefly; and it is omitted in the Váyu.

* Jñána-yoga.
† Ayóga. See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.
‡ Vindatman.
§ Purusha.
|| Vyópin.
¶ Atnan.

‖ वत्से च प्रक्तति ब्रह्म कैनि प्रक्तत्यां पुष्के तथा।
तव फळ्यते निश्चा चान्या तत्समाया महासुमेन॥
†† उपचारस्यायनं तश्चेत्य द्विजोचारे॥
CHAPTER V.

The third kind of dissolution, or final liberation from existence. Evils of worldly life. Sufferings in infancy, manhood, old age. Pains of hell. Imperfect felicity of heaven. Exemption from birth desirable by the wise. The nature of spirit or god. Meaning of the terms Bhagavat and Vásudeva.

THE wise man, having investigated the three kinds of worldly pain,*—or mental and bodily affliction, and the like,†—and having acquired (true) wisdom, and detachment (from human objects), obtains final dissolution. The first of the three pains, or Ādhyātmika, is of two kinds, bodily and mental. Bodily pain is of many kinds, as you shall hear. Affections of the head, catarrh, fever, cholic, fistula, spleen, hemorrhoids,‡ intumescence, sickness, ophthalmia, dysentery, leprosy, and many other diseases constitute bodily affliction. Mental sufferings are love, anger, fear, hate, covetousness, stupefaction,§ despair, § sorrow, malice,|| disdain, jealousy, envy, and many other passions which are engendered in the mind. These and various other

---

1 The three kinds of affliction, ‡ inseparable, incidental, and superhuman, are fully described, in the commentary on the first verse of the Sánkhyā Kārikā, p. 8, in a similar strain as that which is adopted in the text.

---

* Tápa-traya.
† Here the original inserts ástwa, ‘asthma’ (?).
‡ Moha.
§ Visháda.
|| Asúyá.
‡ Vide supra, p. 60, note •.
(afflictions, mental or corporeal,) are comprised under the class of (worldly) sufferings, which is called Ādhyātmika (natural and inseparable). That pain to which, excellent Brahman, the term Ādhibhautika (natural, but incidental,) is applied, is every kind of evil which is inflicted* (from without,) upon men by beasts,† birds, men, goblins,‡ snakes, fiends,§ or reptiles;|| and the pain that is termed Ādhisthaivika (or superhuman,) is the work of cold, heat, wind, rain,¶ lightning, and other (atmospherical phenomena). Affliction, Maitreya, is multiplied in thousands of shapes, in (the progress of) conception,** birth, decay, disease, death, and hell. The tender (and subtile) animal exists in the embryo,†† surrounded by abundant filth, floating in water,‡‡ and distorted in its back, neck, and bones; enduring severe pain, even in the course of its development, §§ as disordered by the acid, acrid,¶¶ bitter,¶¶¶ pungent,*** and saline articles of its mother’s food; incapable of extending or contracting its limbs, reposing amidst the slime of ordure and urine, every way in-commoded, unable to breathe, endowed with conscious-

* There is free interpolation here.
† Mārga.
‡ Pūjā.
§ Rākṣasa.
|| Sarisāpa.
¶ Insert ‘water’, ambu.
** Garbha.
†† Garbha, again.
‡‡ I find no Sanskrit for these words.
§§ वध्यमाताचित्वेद्यन्।
||| Kātū.
¶¶ Tikṣha.
*** Uṣhka.
ness,* and calling to memory many hundred (previous) births. Thus exists the embryo, in profound affliction, bound (to the world) by its (former) works.

When the child is about to be born, its face is besmeared by excrement, urine, blood, mucus,† and semen; its attachment to the uterus is ruptured: by the Prájápatya§ wind; it is turned head downwards, and violently expelled from the womb by the powerful and painful winds of parturition; and the infant, losing, for a time, all sensation, when brought in contact with the external air, is immediately deprived of its intellectual knowledge.|| Thus born, the child is tortured in every limb, as if pierced with thorns, or cut to pieces with a saw, and falls from its fetid lodgement, as from a sore, like a crawling thing, upon the earth.● Unable to feel** itself, unable to turn itself, it is dependent upon the will of others for being bathed†† and nourished. Laid upon a dirty bed,‡‡ it is bitten by insects and musquitoes,§§ and has not power to drive them away. Many are the pangs attending birth; and (many are those) which succeed to birth; and many are the

---

* Sachaitanya.
† There is no word for “mucus”, in the original.
‡ पीड़ामानासिख्वत्यन्:।
§ Corrected from “Prájápati”.
|| “Intellectual knowledge” is to render vijnána.

● कष्टवैरिव तुमाकः कष्टवैरिव दारितः।
पृूतितव्यावहिततीन धर्मान्त कीठिको यथा ॥

** The original, कष्टवैरिव चाप्यशंकः, denotes scratching.
†† A variant yields ‘drinking milk’.
‡‡ Srastara, with prastara as a variant. See Vol. III., p. 131, note *, and p. 150, note *.
§§ Dakhá, ‘gadflies.’
sufferings which are inflicted by elemental and super-
human agency, in the state of childhood.* Enveloped
by the gloom of ignorance, and internally bewildered,
man knows not whence he is, who he is, whither he
goeth, nor what is his nature; by what bonds he is
bound; what is cause, and what is not cause; what is
to be done, and what is to be left undone; † what is to
be said, and what is to be kept silent; what is right-
eousness, what is iniquity; in what it consists, or how;
what is right, what is wrong; ‡ what is virtue, what is
vice. Thus, man, like a brute beast, addicted only to
animal gratifications, suffers the pain that ignorance
occasions.§ Ignorance, darkness, inactivity influence
those devoid of knowledge, so that pious works are
neglected; ‖ but hell is the consequence of neglect of
(religious) acts, according to the great sages; and the
ignorant, therefore, suffer affliction both in this world
and in the next.

When old age arrives, the body is infirm; the limbs
are relaxed; the face is emaciate and shrivelled; ¶ the
skin is wrinkled, and scantily covers the veins and

* वशाब्धवि यद्वास्मातः भाधिभीतादिकान्ति च।
† विषे कार्यं विनमर्यादो च। I should prefer “what is effect, and what
is not effect”, considering what we meet with just below. See the next note.
‡ विषे कर्मव्यवहारं श्रम। “What is to be done, and what is not
to be done.”
§ एवं पशुधरि सर्वभागः महत्।
प्राप्तं न रितं श्रीनादरपरायणः॥
‖ अभासं नागसो भास: कार्यार्थं प्रयत्नं।
प्राप्तिः प्रवर्तति कर्मलोपाततो विन्यु॥
¶ Rather, “the teeth decay and fall out.” विगदचर्चिष्ट्येद्रश्च। This
is the only good reading that I find.
sinews;* the eye discerns not afar off, and the pupil gazes on vacuity; the nostrils are stuffed with hair; the trunk trembles (as it moves); the bones appear (beneath the surface); the back is bowed, and the joints are bent; the digestive fire is extinct, and there is little appetite and little vigour;† walking, rising, sleeping, sitting are (all,) painful efforts; the ear is dull; the eye is dim; the mouth is disgusting with dribbling saliva;‡ the senses no longer are obedient to the will; and, as death approaches, the things that are perceived even are immediately forgotten.§ The utterance of a single sentence is fatiguing; and wakefulness is perpetuated by (difficult) breathing, coughing, and (painful) exhaustion. The old man is lifted up by somebody else; he is clothed by somebody else; he is an object of contempt to his servants, his children, and his wife. Incapable of cleanliness, of amusement, or food, or desire, he is laughed at by his dependants, and disregarded by his kin; and, dwelling on the exploits of his youth, as on the actions of a past life,‖ he sighs deeply, and is sorely distressed. Such are some of the pains which old age is condemned to suffer. I will now describe to you the agonies of death.

The neck droops; the feet and hands are relaxed; the body trembles; the man is, repeatedly, exhausted,

* विश्वास्यायांश्चराभुतः ।
† Cheshita, 'activity.'
‡ सत्वकालविवधः ।
§ अनायति: समस्तेऽथ अभिनिर्मणेऽशृङ्खलः ।
तत्रध्वनिः प्रायूप्तामायमस्मन्तःविनिर्मितवश्चुनाम ॥
‖ "Past life," in the sense of previous state of existence. The original expression is अन्यायः॥
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subdued, and visited with interrupted knowledge.* The principle of selfishness afflicts him, and he thinks: “What will become of my wealth, my lands,† my children, my wife, my servants, my house?” The joints of his limbs are tortured with severe pains, as if cut by a saw, or as if they were pierced by the sharp arrows of the destroyer;‡ he rolls his eyes, and tosses about his hands and feet; his lips and palate are parched and dry; and his throat, obstructed by foul humours and deranged vital airs,§ emits a rattling sound; he is afflicted with burning heat, and with thirst, and with hunger; and he, at last, passes away, tortured by the servants of the judge of the dead,|| to undergo a renewal of his sufferings in another body. These are the agonies which men have to endure, when they die. I will now describe to you the tortures which they suffer in hell.

Men are bound, when they die, by the servants of the king of Tartarus,¶ with cords, and beaten with sticks, and have, then, to encounter the fierce aspect of Yama, and the horrors of their terrible route. In the different hells there are various intolerable tortures with burning sand,** fire, machines, and weapons: some

* सच्चमानयान्तः हर्षे वेप्युषः नरः। सुपौलकृति पर्यशो सोऽस्मिनवान्ति।||
† Dхान्य, ‘grain.’
‡ The Sanskrit has Antaka, the same as Yama. Vide supra, p. 15, note §§.
§ This is a free rendering.
|| याम्यकिषुरपीविति।
¶ याम्यकिषुर°।
** कर्मयावकुः। Compare the Laws of the Mdnavas, XII., 76.
are severed with saws; some, roasted in forges;* some are chopped with axes; some, buried in the ground; some are mounted on stakes; some, cast to wild beasts,† (to be devoured); some are gnawed by vultures; some, torn by tigers;‡ some are boiled in oil; some, rolled in caustic slime;§ some are precipitated from great heights; some, tossed (upwards) by engines. The number of punishments inflicted in hell, which are the consequences of sin, is infinite.¹

But not in hell alone do the souls of the deceased undergo pain: there is no cessation, even in heaven; for its temporary inhabitant is ever tormented with the prospect of descending again to earth. || Again is he liable to conception and to birth; he is merged again into the embryo, and repairs to it, when about to be born; then he dies, as soon as born, or in infancy, or in youth, or in old age. Death, sooner or later, is inevitable.¶ As long as he lives, he is immersed in manifold afflictions, like the seed of the cotton amidst the down** that is to be spun into thread. In acquiring,

---

¹ Some further particulars of the different hells, and the punishments inflicted in them, have been given before. See Vol. II., pp. 214, et seq.

* Maśā, 'crucibles.'
† बाघवक्ल, ।
‡ Dwipin, 'ounces', or 'panthers'.
§ चारज्जमे ।

|| न केवलं दिवाग्रमेछ नरकं दुःखप्रदर्मैः ।
ेकणैं पि पातभीतं बच्चोन्मारसि निर्पृहि: ॥

¶ This sentence is to render ध्वषां मृति: ।

** Pakshman, 'filaments.'
losing, and preserving wealth, there are many griefs; and so there are in the misfortunes of our friends.* Whatever (is produced that) is (most) acceptable to man, that, Maitreya, becomes a seed whence springs the tree of sorrow. Wife, children, servants, house, lands, riches contribute much more to the misery, than to the happiness, of mankind. Where could man, scorched by the fires of the sun of this world,† look for felicity, were it not for the shade afforded by the tree of emancipation? Attainment of the divine being is considered, by the wise, as the remedy of the three-fold class of ills that beset the different stages of life, —conception, birth, and decay,—as characterized by that only happiness which effaces all other kinds of felicity, however abundant, and as being absolute and final.1:

It should, therefore, be the assiduous endeavour of wise men to attain unto God.2 The means of such at-

---

1 All this is conformable to the Sánkhya doctrines, in particular, although the same spirit pervades all Hindu metaphysics.
2 Tasmá Tat práptaye yatnali kartavyali paúditair narali:
   
   The expression Tat-práptaye, “for the obtaining of that,” refers to the phrase immediately preceding,—Bhagavat-práptili, “obtaining of,” or “attaining to, Bhagavat,” the Lord.

† Sáirnára.

: तद्रथ चिविकृष्टाय पु:खः शातस्क प्रिष्ठी:।
   गंभर्वजन्यार्बेधु स्नासिद्धान्त:।
   निर्ब्रतातिशयांहाद्वभिविकलयाः।
   भैरववं भगवत्वादििर्वास्वातान्तत्तिकी सता।
   
V. 14
tainment are said, great Muni, to be knowledge and works. Knowledge is of two kinds,—that which is derived from scripture, and that which is derived from reflection.\footnote{Brahma that is the word is composed of scripture; Brahma that is supreme is produced of reflection.} Ignorance is utter darkness, in which knowledge obtained through any sense (as that of hearing,) shines like a lamp; but the knowledge that is derived from reflection breaks upon the obscurity like the sun.\footnote{What has been said by Manu, when appealing to the meaning of the Vedas, with respect to this subject, I will repeat to you.} There are two (forms of) spirit (or God),—the spirit which is the word, and the spirit which is supreme. He who is thoroughly imbued with the word of God obtains supreme spirit.\footnote{The Atharva Veda, also, states that there are two kinds of know-}
knowledge. By (the one which is) the supreme, God* is attained; the other is that which consists of the Rich and other Vedas.† That which is imperceptible, undecaying, inconceivable, unborn, inexhaustible, ‡ indescribable; which has neither form, nor hands, nor feet; which is almighty, § omnipresent, eternal; the cause of all things, and without cause; permeating all, itself unpenetrated, and from which all things proceed,—that is the object which the wise behold, that is Brahma, that is the supreme state, that is the subject of contemplation to those who desire liberation, that is the thing spoken of by the Vedas, the infinitely subtle, supreme condition of Vishnu.|| That essence of the Supreme || is de-

1 The commentator quotes other passages from the Vedas, of a similar tendency; intimating, however, the necessity of performing acts prior to attaining knowledge; as: कषायिः कर्मभि: पक्षि ततो चानं तु परमा गति: || "The decoction (preparatory process) being digested by rites, thereafter knowledge is the supreme resource."

चितविवाया मृतृं तीर्था विवषायामृतमाम्यते ||
"Having crossed the gulf of death by ignorance (ceremonial acts), man obtains immortality by (holy) knowledge."

* Akshara.
† Auyaya. See Vol. I., p. 17, note .
‡ Compare Vol. IV., p. 253.
§ Vibhu.

|| चुतियवायोनिमृत्युं तत्वं तद्भिषोऽः परमं पदम् ||
¶ Paramadaman.

** This seems to be a selection from the following stanza, cited by the commentator Ratnagarbha:

कषायपद्धः कर्माणि चानं तु परमा गति: ||
कषायिः कर्मभि: पक्षि ततो चानं प्रवर्तिते ||
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fined by the term Bhagavat.¹ The word Bhagavat is the denomination of that primeval and eternal god;* and he who fully understands the meaning of that expression is possessed of holy wisdom,—the sum and substance of the three Vedas.† The word Bhagavat is a convenient form to be used in the adoration of that supreme being; to whom no term is applicable; and, therefore, Bhagavat expresses that Supreme Spirit, which is individual, almighty, and the cause of causes of all things.§ The letter Bha implies the cherisher and supporter (of the universe). By ga is understood the leader, impeller, or creator. The dissyllable Bhaga indicates the six properties,—dominion, might, glory, splendour, wisdom and dispassion.|| The purport of

¹ According to the comment, allusion is here made to the twelve-syllable Mantra (or mystic formula) addressed to Vishńu: “Om Bhagavate Vásudeváya namáḥ;” Om! Salutation to Bhagavat Vásudeva; the repetition of which, by those devoted (bhakta) to Vishńu, is the easy mode of securing their liberation.” The mysticism is, however, no doubt, older than the worship of Vishńu; and the term Bhagavat is defined, in the text, according to the interpretation of the Vedas.

* Atman.
† एवं निगद्वितार्थेष्व सतसं तथ्स स्थलं: ||
  स्वायते पैन तत्स्वार्थान परमं यद्यिमयम् ||

* Brahma.
§ गुरुः महाभिमूखायोऽपि प्रहवच्य वत्ते ||
  मैत्रिय भगवक्ष्णः सर्वसार्यायायाः ||
  एवर्यस्म च समवेष्ठ धर्मप्रय ययस: त्रितः: ||
  ब्राह्मविरागेऽत्यः च प्रयस्तं भग रतीक्ष्णः ||

* See Vol. I., p. 99, note *. 
the letter \textit{va} is that elemental spirit in which all beings exist, and which exists in all beings.\textsuperscript{1} And, thus, this great word Bhagavat is the name of Vásudeva,—who is one with the supreme Brahma,—and of no one else. This word, therefore, which is the general denomination of an adorable object, is not used, in reference to the Supreme, in a general, but a special, signification. When applied to any other (thing or person), it is used in its customary or general import.\textsuperscript{†} In the latter case, it may purport one who knows the origin, and end, and revolutions of beings, and what is wisdom,\textsuperscript{‡} what ignorance. In the former, it denotes wisdom,\textsuperscript{§} energy, power, dominion, might, glory, without end, and without defect.\textsuperscript{||}

The term Vásudeva means, that all beings abide in that Supreme Being, and that he abides in all beings;\textsuperscript{2} as was formerly explained by Keśidhwaja to Khánḍi-

\textsuperscript{1} The commentator says, these interpretations are from the \textit{Nirukta},—the glossary of the Vedas. The more etymological derivation of the term is: Bhaga, ‘power,’ ‘authority,’ and vat, possessive suffix.

\textsuperscript{2} From the root \textit{Vas (वस)}, ‘abiding,’ ‘dwelling.’ See Vol. I., pp. 1 and 17.
CHAPTER VI.

Means of attaining liberation. - Anecdotes of Khāndikya and Kesidhwaja. The former instructs the latter how to atone for permitting the death of a cow. Kesidhwaja offers him a requital; and he desires to be instructed in spiritual knowledge.

HE, Purushottama, is, also, known by holy study* and devout meditation; † and either, as the cause of attaining him, is entitled Brahma. From study let a man proceed to meditation, ‡ and from meditation to study: ¹ by perfection in both, supreme spirit becomes manifest. Study is one eye, wherewith to behold it; and meditation is the other. He who is one with Brahma sees not with the eye of flesh. §

MAITREYA.—Reverend teacher, I am desirous of being informed what is meant by the term meditation (Yoga), by understanding which I may behold the Supreme Being, the upholder of the universe.

¹ Both study of the Vedas (Swādhyāya) and abstraction (Yoga) are to be practiced. When a man is weary of one, he may apply to the other. The Yoga,|| however, limits the practical part to silent prayer.

चपाच्छातः पुनर्धैर्यच्छातः पुनर्जपित।
“Wearied of meditation, let him pray inaudibly: weary of prayer, let him repeat meditation.”

जपधारानाभयोगेन पञ्चद्राजानास्थापन।
“By the union of prayer and meditation let him behold soul in himself.”

* Swādhyāya. Vide infra, p. 239, note §. † Sākyama. ‡ Yoga.

§ न मांसचर्चा दुःश्रेयम ज्ञानमूर्ति स शक्यते।
|| The verses quoted by the Translator are given by both the commentators, and as from the Yoga-śāstra.
PARÁŚARA.—I will repeat to you (Maitreya,) the explanation formerly given by Keśidhwaja to the magnanimous Khánḍikya, also called Janaka.*

MAITREYA.—Tell me, first, Brahman, who Khánḍikya was, and who was Keśidhwaja; and how it happened, that a conversation relating to (the practice of) Yoga occurred between them.

PARÁŚARA.—There was Janaka, (named) Dharmadhwaja, who had two sons, Mitadhwaja and Krita
dhwaja; and the latter was a king ever intent upon existent supreme spirit:† his son was the celebrated Keśidhwaja. The son of Mitadhwaja was Janaka, called Khánḍikya.¹: Khánḍikya was diligent in the way of works, and was renowned, on earth, for religious rites. Keśidhwaja, on the other hand, was endowed with spiritual knowledge. These two were engaged in hostilities; and Khánḍikya was driven from his principality by Keśidhwaja. Expelled from his dominions, he wandered, with a few followers, his priest, and his counsellors, amidst woods and mount-

¹ No such names occur amongst the Maithila kings of the Vishúu Puráña (see Vol. III., pp. 330, et seq.) ; but, as there noticed (p. 338, note 2§), the Bhágavata inserts them. Janaka is used as a title. Kritadhwaja, in some of the copies, is read Rítadhwaja.

* That is to say, Janaka, son of Khánḍika. In the Bhágavata-puráña, IX., XIII., 20, he is called son of Mitadhwaja; and, the original of the Vishúu-puráña being ambiguous, I have corrected accordingly Professor Wilson’s “Amitadhwaja”, just below. Mitadhwaja was patronymically called Khánḍika; and his father must have been called Khánḍika, with other names.

† सद्याधाबररतिर्गुप: ।

‡ Here, as in p. 214, supra, the original does not yield “Janaka, called Khánḍikya”, but Khánḍikyajanaka. Also see note *, above.

§ But also see note ***, in the page referred to.
ains, where, destitute of true wisdom, he performed many sacrifices, expecting, thereby, to obtain divine truth, and to escape from death by ignorance.  

Once, whilst the best of those who are skilled in devotion† (Keśidhwaja,) was engaged in devout exercises,‡ a fierce tiger slew his milch-cow,§ in the lonely forest. When the Raja heard that the cow had been killed, he asked the ministering priests what form of penance would expiate the crime. They replied, that they did not know, and referred him to Kaśeru. Kaśeru,§ when the Raja consulted him, told him that he knew not, but that Śunaka would be able to tell him. Accordingly, the Raja went to Śunaka; but he replied: “I am as unable, great king, to answer your question as Kaśeru has been; and there is no one now, upon earth, who can give you the information, except your enemy Khāṇḍikya, whom you have conquered.”

Upon receiving this answer, Keśidhwaja said: “I will go, then, and pay a visit to my foe. If he kill me, no

---

1 The performance of rites, as a means of salvation, is called ignorance, in the Vedas (vide supra, p. 211, note 1). Works are recommended as introductory to the acquirement of knowledge: it is ignorance to consider them as finite.

2 Tasya dhenum (तस्य देनुम्). One copy has Homa-dhenum, ‘cow of sacrifice,’ another, Dharma-dhenum, || ‘cow of righteousness.’ The commentator explains the terms as importing the same thing,—a cow yielding milk for holy purposes, or for the butter which is poured, in oblations, upon the sacrificial fire.

† All my MSS. have the vocative चौधविद्वां वर I. † Yoga.
§ The original calls him a Bhārgava, or descendant of Bhīṣma.
|| Dharma-dogdhrim is the only variant noticed by Śridhara or Ratnakarabha; and the former explains it by homa-dhenum.
matter; for, then, I shall obtain the reward that attends being killed in a holy cause.* If (on the contrary,) he tell me what penance to perform, then my sacrifice will be unimpaired in efficacy.” Accordingly, he ascended his car, having clothed himself in the deer-skin (of the religious student), and went to the forest where the wise Khándezikya resided. When Khándezikya beheld him approach, his eyes reddened with rage, and he took up his bow, and said to him: “You have armed yourself with the deer-skin, to accomplish my destruction; imagining, that, in such an attire, you will be safe from me. But, fool, the deer upon whose backs this skin is seen are slain, by you and me, with sharp arrows. So will I slay you: you shall not go free, whilst I am living. You are an unprincipled felon, who have robbed me of my kingdom, and are deserving of death.”† To this, Kesídhwaja answered: “I have come hither, Khándezikya, to ask you to solve my doubts, and not with any hostile intention. Lay aside, therefore, both your arrow and your anger.” Thus spoken to, Khándezikya retired, awhile, with his counsellors and his priest, and consulted with them what course to pursue. They strongly urged him to slay Kesídhwaja, who was now in his power, and by whose death he would again become the monarch of the whole earth. Khándezikya replied to them: “It is, no doubt, true, that, by such an act, I should become the monarch of the whole earth. He, however, would, thereby, conquer

* स चाहैं तं प्रसाधिष्ट प्रत्युत्थातनिपितं सुने।
प्रान्ते एव मया यथो यद्य संस्मृतिः॥

† The translation is free hereabouts, as throughout the rest of the Chapter.
the world to come; whilst the earth would be mine. Now, if I do not kill him, I shall subdue the next world, and leave him this earth. It seems to me, that this world is not of more value than the next: for the subjugation of the next world endures for ever; the conquest over this is but for a brief season. I will, therefore, not kill him, but tell him what he wishes to know.”

Returning, then, to Keśidhwaja, Khāṇḍikya* desired him to propose his question, which he promised to answer; and Keśidhwaja related to him what had happened,—the death of the cow,†—and demanded to know what penance he should perform. Khāṇḍikya, in reply, explained to him, fully, the expiation that was suited to the occasion; and Keśidhwaja then, with his permission, returned to the place of sacrifice, and regularly fulfilled every necessary act. Having completed the ceremony, with its supplementary rites, Keśidhwaja accomplished all his objects. But he then reflected thus: “The priests whom I invited to attend have, all, been duly honoured; all those who had any request to make have been gratified by compliance with their desires; all that is proper for this world has been effected by me. Why, then, should my mind feel as if my duty had been unfulfilled?” So meditating, he remembered that he had not presented to Khāṇḍikya the gift that it is becoming to offer to a spiritual preceptor; and, mounting his chariot, he immediately set off to the thick forest where that sage abode. Khāṇḍikya, upon his reappearance, assumed his weapons, to kill him. But Keśidhwaja exclaimed: “Forbear,

* The original has Khāṇḍikyajanaka.  
† Dharma-dhenu.
venerable sage. I am not here to injure you, Kháṇḍikya. Dismiss your wrath; and know that I have come hither to offer you that remuneration which is due to you, as my instructor. Through your lessons I have fully completed my sacrifice; and I am, therefore, desirous to give you a gift. Demand what it shall be.”

Kháṇḍikya, having once more communed with his counsellors, told them the purpose of his rival’s visit, and asked them what he should demand. His friends recommended him to require his whole kingdom back again; as kingdoms are obtained, by prudent men, without conflicting hosts. The reflecting king Kháṇḍikya laughed, and replied to them; “Why should a person such as I be desirous of a temporary earthly kingdom? Of a truth, you are able counsellors in the concerns of this life; but of those of the life to come you are, assuredly, ignorant.” So speaking, he went back to Keśidhwaja, and said to him: “Is it true that you wish to make me a gift, as to your preceptor?” “Indeed, I do,” answered Keśidhwaja. “Then,” rejoined Kháṇḍikya, “as it is known that you are learned in the spiritual learning that teaches the doctrine of the soul, if you will communicate that knowledge to me, you will have discharged your debt to your instructor. Declare to me what acts are efficacious for the alleviation of human affliction.”*
CHAPTER VII.

Keśidhwaja describes the nature of ignorance, and the benefits of the Yoga or contemplative devotion. Of the novice and the adept in the performance of the Yoga. How it is performed. The first stage, proficiency in acts of restraint and moral duty: the second, particular mode of sitting: the third, Prāṇāyāma, modes of breathing: the fourth, Pratyāhāra, restraint of thought: the fifth, apprehension of spirit:* the sixth, retention of the idea. Meditation on the individual and universal forms of Vishnu. Acquisition of knowledge. Final liberation.

"BUT," said Keśidhwaja, "why have you not asked of me my kingdom, now free from all annoyance? What else except dominion is acceptable to the warrior race?"

"I will tell you," replied Khāndikya, "why I did not make such a demand, nor require that territory which is an object of ignorant ambition. It is the duty of the warrior to protect his subjects (in peace), and to kill, in fight, the enemies of his sway. It is no fault, that you should have taken my kingdom from one who was unable to defend it, to whom it was a bondage, and who was, thus, freed from the incumbrance of ignorance. My desire of dominion originated in my being born to possess it. The ambition of others, which proceeds from (human) frailties, is not compatible with virtue. To solicit gifts is not the duty of a prince and warrior; and, for these reasons, I have not asked for your kingdom, nor made a demand which ignorance

* By referring to note † in p. 240, infra, it will be seen that yama and niyama are the first and second stages, while "apprehension of spirit", bhāvanā, should not be counted as a stage.
alone would have suggested.* Those only who are destitute of knowledge, whose minds are engrossed by selfishness,† who are intoxicated with the inebriating beverage of self-sufficiency,‡ desire kingdoms,—not such as I am."

When King Kesidhwaja heard these words, he was much pleased, and exclaimed: "It is well-spoken." § Then, addressing Kháṇḍikya|| affectionately, he said: "Listen to my words. Through desire of escaping death by the ignorance of works, I exercise the regal power, celebrate various sacrifices, and enjoy pleasures subversive of purity. Fortunate is it for you, that your mind has attached itself to the dominion of discrimination. Pride of your race! now listen to the real nature of ignorance. The (erroneous) notion that self consists in what is not self, and the opinion that property consists in what is not one's own,¶ constitute the double seed of the tree of ignorance. The ill-judging embodied being, bewildered by the darkness of fascination, situated in a body composed of the five elements, loudly asserts 'This is I.' But who would ascribe spiritual individuality to a body in which soul is distinct from the ether, air, fire, water, and earth, (of

---

* न याद्याच चचबन्धुमां धर्मोऽश्रुतस्ततां मतम।
धतोऽन याचितं राज्यमविवासणेत् तथ।

The translation of the a large part of the present Chapter is not at all close.
† Mamatwa.
‡ Aham-mána.
§ 'Enough!' साध्विति माह। A sacred license of grammar is here taken, as is remarked by the commentators.
|| The original has Kháṇḍikyajanaka.
¶ ऋषि खमिति या मति।
which that body is composed)\(^1\) What man of understanding assigns to disembodied* spirit corporeal fruition, or houses, lands, and the like, that it should say 'These are mine'? What wise man entertains the idea of property in sons or grandsons, begotten of the body, after the spirit has abandoned it?† Man performs all acts, for the purpose of bodily fruition; and the consequence of such acts is another body; so that their result is nothing but confinement to bodily existence. In the same manner as a mansion of clay is plastered with clay and water, so the body, which is of earth, is perpetuated by earth and water, (or by eating and drinking). The body, consisting of the five elements, is nourished by substances equally composed of those elements. But, since this is the case, what is there in this life that man should be proud of?§ Travelling the path of the world|| for many thousands of births, man attains only the weariness of bewilderment, and is smothered by the dust of imagination.¶ When that dust is

---

\(^1\) The text is somewhat obscure; but it is, in some degree, cleared up by the next illustration. No one would think of applying the property of self—the idea of possession, or personality, to soul separated from body. But the objection is equally applicable to soul in the body; for, whilst there, it is as distinct, in its nature, from the materials of body, as if it was disembodied, and quite as incapable of individual personal fruition.

* Adeha.
† This clause is to render चर्चात्मि कलिवरि।
§ I find no Sanskrit answering to this sentence. ?
|| Sākhāra.
¶ Vāsand.
washed away by the bland* water of (real) knowledge, then the weariness of bewilderment sustained by the wayfarer through repeated births is removed. When that weariness is relieved, the internal man is at peace, and he obtains that supreme felicity which is unequalled and undisturbed.† This soul is (of its own nature,) pure, and composed of happiness‡ and wisdom. The properties of pain, ignorance, and impurity are those of nature (Prakṛiti), not of soul. There is no affinity between fire and water; but, when the latter is placed over the former, in a caldron, it bubbles, and boils, and exhibits the properties of fire.§ In like manner, when soul is associated with Prakṛiti, it is vitiated by egotism|| and the rest, and assumes the qualities of grosser nature, although essentially distinct from them, and incorruptible.¶ Such is the seed of ignorance, as I have explained it to you. There is but one cure of worldly sorrows,—the practice of devotion: no other is known.”**

“Then,” said Khāṇḍikya, “do you, who are the chief of those versed in contemplative devotion, explain to me what that is: for, in the race of the descendants of Nimi,†† you are best acquainted with the sacred writ-

---

1 That is, in the race of princes of Mithilā.

* Uṣhṇa.
† अज्ञातिश्वासां दल्हे निर्वायामुक्तति।
‡ Nīrūṭa-maya.
§ जलभ नापिसंसंगे खासीसंगात्त्वापि हि।
शाल्न्त्र्यकाविक्षांध्य्वधोकालीत्व यथा चुनि।
|| Ahast-māna.
¶ Auyaya. See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.
** श्रेष्ठां च चयकरं योगाद्वयत्र विवत।
†† See Vol. III., pp. 259 and 327.
ings in which it is taught.” “Hear,” replied Kesidhwaja, “the account of the nature of contemplative devotion,¹ which I impart to you, and by perfection in which the sage attains resolution into Brahma, and never suffers birth again. The mind of man is the cause both of his bondage and his liberation: its addiction to the objects of sense is the means of his bondage; its separation from objects of sense† is the means of his freedom. The sage who is capable of discriminative knowledge must, therefore, restrain his mind from all the objects of sense, and therewith meditate upon the Su-

¹ The term Yoga (योग), which is that used in the text, in its literal acceptation signifies ‘union,’ ‘junction,’ from यूज ‘to join’: in a spiritual sense, it denotes “union of separated with universal soul;” and, with some latitude of expression, it comes to signify the means by which such union is effected. In the Bhagavad Gitā, it is variously applied, but, ordinarily, denotes the performance of religious ceremonies as a duty, and not for interested purposes. Thus, Krishnā says to Arjuna:

योगेष्वः कुष्ठ कस्मात्सि संग बाह्य धनंजय।
सिद्धांसिद्धांः समो मूला समतं योग उच्चति ॥

“Engaging in Yoga, perform rites, Dhananjaya, being indifferent to success or failure. Such indifference is called Yoga.” II., verse 48. It is elsewhere defined “exemption from the contact of pain:”

ङ्गसंयोगविचोगं योगसन्धितम् ॥ VI., verse 23. The word has been, accordingly, rendered ‘devotion’, by Wilkins, and ‘devotio’, by Schlegel, in their translations of the Gitā. In this place, however, it is used in a less general sense, and signifies, as is subsequently explained, reunion with spirit, through the exercises necessary to perfect abstraction, as they are taught and practised by the followers of Patanjali.

† Nirvishaya.
preme Being,—who is one with spirit,—in order to attain liberation.* For that Supreme Spirit† attracts (to itself) him who meditates upon it, and who is of the same nature; as the loadstone attracts the iron by the virtue which is common to itself and to its products.\(^1\): Contemplative devotion is the union with Brahma, effected by that condition of mind which has attained perfection through those exercises which complete the control of self;\(^2\) and he whose contemplative devotion

---

\(^1\) This illustration is, however, only to a limited extent explanatory of the nature of Yoga; for, though the loadstone and iron unite, by virtue of a community of kind, yet the union that takes place is only that of contiguity, Saamyoga (संयोग), not that of identification or unity, Tad-aikya (तद्विक्य). Some further explanation, therefore, is required.

\(^2\) The first stage is the Ātma-prayatna, the practice of moral and religious restraint,—Yama, Niyama, § &c. When the novice is perfect in these, then he is fit to attain the perfectibility of an adept, through the especial practices which treatises on the Yoga prescribe. When the mind has attained the state which can alone be attained through them, then the union with Brahma, which is the consequence, is called Yoga:

श्राभ्यम्यक्कतीर्थ्य स्थिराय याय सम्मोगति:।
तत्त्वा श्रवण्विष योगा रुत्विशिप्त्यित।

The Ātma-prayatna is defined\(^7\) to be that which has Yama, &c.

---

\(^*\) विषयः समाध्य विष्णुनामा मनो मुनि:।
विज्ञायस्यृतयं तेन श्रवण्विष परेभ।

† "Supreme Spirit" is for Brahma.

\(^?\) विकार्यमधाम: श्रवण्व लोकान्तर्वर्याया।

§ Vide infra, p. 230, notes * and †.

|| This is the original of the passage to which the Translator's note is attached.

\(^?\) By the commentator Śridhara, whom Ratnagarbha here closely follows.
is characterized by the property of such absolute perfection is, in truth, a sage, expectant of final liberation from the world.*

"The sage (or Yogan), when first applying himself to contemplative devotion, is called the (novice or) practitioner (Yoga-yuj); when he has attained spiritual union, † he is termed (the adept, or) he whose meditations are accomplished. ¹ Should the thoughts of the

for its object, चमनियमादिविषयः। The next phrase, तत्सनेषाः, is explained तद्धीशा ‘depending upon, or relating to, such control.’
मनोगति: is the same as मनोवृत्ति:, condition or state of mind which is विशिष्ठा, ‘perfected:) of that state of mind union with Brahma is Yoga. Union with Brahma is the abstraction that proposes the identity of the living with the supreme spirit,—of the Jīvātmā with Brahma: जीवात्माकारिकविषयकलम्। And Yoga is understanding of the identity of the contemplator and the object contemplated: ध्यातुधीधिकधी:। A text of Yājñavalkya§ is quoted to this effect: ||

चाने योगाल्के विशिष्ठ योगविषयकारिकसंघुतः।
संयोजने योग इत्युत्तो जीवात्मप्रसादानि:॥

"Know holy wisdom to be the same with Yoga, (the practice of) which has eight divisions. That which is termed Yoga is union of the living with the supreme soul."

¹ Vinishpanna-samādhi ‡ is the expression of the text, which can scarcely be regarded as an appellative. The commentator terms the adept Brahma-jñānī, “he who knows Brahma.”

* स वे योगी सुवतुमभीधिष्यति।
† परत्रश्चोपवियमान्।
‡ See Vol. IV., p. 253, note *.
§ Corrected from "Yajnyawalkya". With reference to Yājñavalkya, vide infra, p. 230, note ||.
|| By Ratnagarbha.
‡ Samādhi is rendered "abstraction", in Vol. II., p. 315.
former be unvitiated by any obstructing imperfection, he will obtain freedom,* after practising devotion through several lives.† The latter speedily obtains liberation in that existence (in which he reaches perfection), all his acts being consumed by the fire of contemplative devotion. The sage who would bring his mind into a fit state for (the performance of) devout contemplation must be devoid of desire,‡ and observe (invariably,) continence, compassion, truth, honesty, and disinterestedness: he must fix his mind intently on the supreme Brahma, practising holy study,§ purification, contentment, penance, and self-control.|| These

---

1 After three lives, according to the Vāyu Samhitā, as quoted in the comment.¶

---

* Muktī.
† Nishkāma.
‡ Compare Vol. III., p. 77, note 1; also, Vol. IV., p. 294, notes 1 and ‡. Ahiśā, asteya, and aparigraha I should render ‘not killing’, ‘not thieving’, and ‘not coveting’, rather than “compassion”, “honesty”, and “disinterestedness”.
§ Svaddhyāya, “the murmuring of sacred texts.” In the Rāja-mārtanda we find the following definition, in explanation of the Yoga-sāstra, II., 1: स्वाद्ध्याय: प्रशास्तीनां मन्त्रायां जप:। द्वारा सुतार्थचान्द्रिकाः हास:। स्वाद्ध्याय: श्रीतापूर्ववक्षमलासाः जप:।।

|| स्वाद्ध्यायशैवसंस्तोषपांशी नियताश्रवण:। कुर्भोत् प्रशाश्च तथा परस्मिन्नास्य मन:।।

The Translator should not have rendered नियताश्रवण as if it denoted “self-control”. The fifth observance is ग्रंथेष्य मन; —the Translator’s “mind intently”, — which is equivalent, the scholiasts say, to pratītkhāna, ‘persevering devotion.’ See the Yoga-sāstra, II., 32.

¶ By Ratnagarbha, as follows:

अत्यायास्तोपिः प्रको भक्तिः संरक्षित जयचतव्यः।
न योजितलोपोद्रं पुनर्रति न संशयः।।
(virtues), respectively termed the five acts of restraint* (Yama), and five of obligation† (Niyama), bestow excellent rewards, when practised for the sake of reward, and eternal liberation, when they are not prompted by desire (of transient benefits). ∥ Endowed with these merits, the sage,§ self-restrained, should sit in one of the modes termed Bhadrásana, &c., and engage in contemplation. ¹ Bringing his vital airs, called Prāṇa, under subjection, by frequent repetition, is, thence, called Prāṇāyāma, which is, as it were, a seed with a seed. ² In this, the breath of expiration

¹ There are various postures in which the Yogan is directed to sit, when he engages in meditation. In the Bhadrásana, ∥ he is directed to cross his legs underneath him, and to lay hold of his feet, on each side, with his hands.

² सवीचो नीच एव च। It is, itself, figuratively, the seed of the fruit, which is meditation; but it is to be accompanied with what is also technically called Bija (or seed),—inaudible repe-

* 'Forbearance' is more exact. † 'Religious observance' is preferable.

§ Yati.

∥ The commentators cite, in description of this posture, a stanza from Yájnavalkya. Perhaps it is taken from the Yájnavalkya-gítá, for which see my Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems, p. 14.

Besides the bhadrásana, the Yoga philosophy prescribes postures denominated padmásana, svastikásana, vajrásana, and virásana. These seem to be the principal out of an aggregate said to consist of eighty-four, among which are the siddhásana, kamalásana, davi’dásana, &c.

¶ Correctly, सवीचो नीच एव च, "with a seed, and also without a seed." The term 'seed' is here, of course, a technicality.

Samddhi, as sabija and as nirbija, is spoken of in the Yoga-śāstra, I., 46 and 50. The abstract meditation referred to is, in other words, divided into that in which there is distinct recognition of an object, and that in which there is not such recognition.

See, further, note † in the following page.
and that of inspiration* are alternately obstructed, constituting the act twofold; and the suppression† of both (modes of breathing) produces a third.\footnote{1} The exercise of the Yogan, whilst endeavouring to bring before his thoughts the gross form of the eternal, is denominated Ālambana.\footnote{2} He is then to perform the
tition of certain prayers, and meditation on the visible form of the deity,—termed, likewise, Ālambana, and presently mentioned.§

\footnote{1} Prānāyāma is performed by three modifications of breathing. The first act is expiration, which is performed through the right nostril, whilst the left is closed with the fingers of the right hand: this is called Rechaka. The thumb is then placed upon the right nostril, and the fingers raised from the left, through which breath is inhaled: this is called Prākana. In the third act, both nostrils are closed, and breathing suspended: this is Kumbhaka. And a succession of these operations is the practice of Prānāyāma. ||

\footnote{2} Ālambana is the silent repetition of prayer. ¶

* Prāna and apāna. † Sanāyama.
‡ तद्ध चालम्बनत: खूलं कुर्यं द्विग्नीतमः।
आलम्बनसमन्तः योगिनोंभसतः स्वतः ||

"And, as regards the Yogan practising meditation with a rest for his thoughts, as he feels after the Supreme, the gross aspect of the Infinite—\footnote{i.e., Hiranyagarbha, etc., }—is prescribed as the rest, O best of Brāhmans."

See the beginning of annotation ¶ in the preceding page. On the words there quoted Ratnagarbha says: सवीजः | सालम्बः | मन्त्रज्ञप्रधासहितः। And Śrīdhara writes to the same effect. It is now evident how the Translator came to misunderstand the sense of bija and ālambana. The commentators begin their gloss on the stanza cited above with the words: तच्च सवीजः चालम्बनमाहो॥

§ This view of the meaning of bija and ālambana is quite a misapprehension. See the preceding note.

|| Both Śrīdhara and Ratnagarbha have the substance of this note.

The Translator has previously rendered prāṇīdāyāma by "suppression of breath," "austerity," and "ascetic practices". See Vol. II., pp. 89 and 272; Vol. III., p. 55. Its exact meaning is 'regulation of the breath'.

The third division of the prāṇīdāyāma, the kumbhaka, has its name from kumbha, 'a jar'; inasmuch as, on its taking place, the vital airs are stationary, like water in a jar. ¶ See note ‡, above.
Pratyáhára, which consists in restraining his organs of sense* from susceptibility to outward impressions, and directing them entirely to mental perceptions. By these means the entire subjugation of the unsteady senses is effected; and, if they are not controlled, the sage will not accomplish his devotions. When, by the Práňáyáma, the vital airs are restrained, and the senses are subjugated by the Pratyáhára, then the sage will be able to keep his mind steady in its perfect asylum.”†

Khándikya then said (to Keśidhwaja): “Illustrious sage, inform me what is that perfect asylum of the mind,† resting on which, it destroys all the products of (human) infirmity.” To this, Keśidhwaja replied: “The asylum of mind is spirit (Brahma), which, of its own nature, is twofold, as being with, or without, form; and each of these is supreme and secondary.¹

¹ शास्त्रयोजनयो यद्र द्विधा तद् स्थायपतः॥
भूप मूर्त्तम्यूर्त् च यरं चापरमेव च ॥
The Brahma that is without form (Amúratta) may be Para or Apara. Supreme formless spirit is without attributes of any kind. Secondary formless spirit is invested with the attributes of power, glory, truth, perfection. Spirit embodied, or with form in his highest state, is, according to our text, Vishnú and his manifestations. Spirit, in an inferior or secondary series of bodily forms, is Brahmá and all other living beings.¶

* Akáha.
† तत्त: कुष्ठात्सिरं चेत: गुभास्थवः।
‡ Chetas, as above; and so below.
§ The ordinary reading is स्थायपतः।
|| Variant: भूपमूर्त्तम्यूर्त्तम।
¶ This note is gleaned, with additions and variations, from the commentaries.
Apprehension of spirit,\(^1\) again, is threefold. I will explain the different kinds to you. They are: that which is called Brahma, that which is named from works, and that which comprehends both. That (mental apprehension) which consists of Brahma is one; that which is formed of works is another; and that which comprehends both is the third: so that mental apprehension\(^*\) (of the object or asylum of the thoughts) is threefold. Sanandana and other (perfect sages) were endowed with apprehension of the nature\(\dagger\) of Brahma. The gods and others, whether animate or inanimate, are possessed of that which regards acts.\(\ddagger\) The apprehension that comprehends both works and spirit exists in Hiraṇyagarbha\(§\) and others, who are possessed of contemplative knowledge, of their own nature, and who, also, exercise certain active functions, as creation and the rest.\(\parallel\) Until all acts, which are

\(^1\) The term is Bhāvanā, defined to be "function to be engendered by knowledge," चानवनयः संखारः\(\ddagger\), the mental impression or apprehension following upon knowledge. Here it implies, in particular, the formation of a fixed idea, by the Yogin, of the object of his contemplations. It is also termed Bhāva-bhāvanā, "apprehension of the being, the existence, or substantiality, of the object; the thing contemplated;" भावभावना। भावी वसु तद्भवा भावना।**

\(\dagger\) Here, "apprehension," &c. is to render भावभावना।

\(\ddagger\) कर्मभावना।

\(\parallel\) दिकः भावभावना। च व्रजयमानीमाक्षिका दिक्षा।

\(\ddagger\) A name of Brahmā.

\(\parallel\) Hārambhārṣī, भ्राम्यमानिका विस्म।

\(\ddagger\) Ratnagarbha.

** Sridhara.
the causes of notions of individuality, are discontinued, spirit is one thing, and the universe is another, to those who contemplate objects as distinct and various.* But that is called true knowledge, or knowledge of Brahma, which recognizes no distinctions, which contemplates only simple existence, which is undefinable by words, and is to be discovered solely in one’s own spirit.† That is the supreme, unborn, imperishable form of Vishnu, who is without (sensible) form, and is characterized as a condition of the supreme soul, which is variously modified from the condition of universal form.: But this (condition) cannot be contemplated by sages in their (early) devotions;§ and they must, therefore, direct their minds to the gross form of Hari, which is of universal perceptibility. || They must meditate upon him as Hiraṇyagarbha, as the glorious Vāsava, as Prajāpati, as the winds,** the Vasus, the Rudras, the suns, stars, planets, Gandharvas, Yakshas, Daityas, all the gods and their progenitors,†† men, animals,‡‡ mountains, oceans, rivers, trees, all beings, and all sources of beings, all modifications whatever.

* अचौत्तूम समसित स्विश्वविधानकर्मस | विश्वमित्यर्य चान्यशेषद्विषत्वेशार्य वूप ||
† प्रभुर्मित्यवृद्ध यत्तत्त्वाणाचाचमोचरम् | वचसामानससयविव तत्त्वाण अभासित्वम ||
‡ विश्वकृष्णविश्वलक्षणं परमाभेन: ||
§ This expansion is to represent yoga-yuj, for which see p. 228, supra.
|| Viśva-gochara.
¶ Bhagavat.
** Marut.
†† सकलाद्वयोगोऽच: ||
‡‡ Paśu.
of nature and its products,\* whether sentient or unconscious, one-footed, two-footed, or many-footed.† All these are the sensible;\* form of Hari, to be apprehended by the three kinds of apprehension. All this universal world, this (world) of moving and stationary beings, is pervaded by the energy of Vishṇu, who is of the nature of the supreme Brahma. This energy is either supreme, or, when it is that of conscious embodied spirit,§ it is secondary. Ignorance, or that which is denominated from works, is a third energy,\¹ by which the omnipresent energy of embodied spirit is ever excited, and whence it suffers all the pains of repeated worldly existence. Obscured by that (energy of ignorance or illusion), the energy that is denominated from embodied spirit is characterized by different degrees of perfection, in all created beings. In things without life,∥ it exists in a very small degree;

---

\¹ The term used, throughout, is Śakti (शक्ति), 'power,' 'ability,' 'energy.' By the first kind, or Parā, is understood knowledge able to appreciate abstract truth, or the nature of universal soul; by the second, ability to understand the nature of embodied soul; and, by the third, inability to discern one's own nature, and reliance on moral or ceremonial merit. These different kinds are called energies, because they are the energies or faculties of the Supreme Spirit, or, according to the Vaishṇavas, of Vishṇu, accompanying soul in all its various conditions of existence.

\* प्रधानादिविशिष्यालम्।
\† Add "or footless": अपादपरम्।
\‡ Mūrtta.
\§ चेतनायां।
∥ As stones and the like, Ratnagarbha says.
it is more, in things that (have life, but) are without motion;* in insects,† it is still more abundant; and still more, in birds; it is more in wild animals;‡ and, in domestic animals,§ the faculty is still greater. Men have more of this (spiritual) faculty than animals; and thence arises their authority over them:|| the faculty exists, in an ascending degree, in Nāgas, Gandharvas, Yakshas, gods, Śakra, Prajāpati, and Hiraṇyagarbha, and is, above all, predominant in that male (Vishṇu) of whom all these various creatures are but the diversified forms, penetrated universally by his energy,—as all-pervading as the ether.¶

"The second¹ state of him who is called Vishṇu, and which is to be meditated upon by the (advanced) sage, is that (imperceptible,) shapeless** form of Brahma, which is called, by the wise 'That which is,'² and in which all the before-described energies reside. Thence proceeds the form of the universal form, the other great form of Hari, which is the origin of

1 The first, which has been intended to be described in the foregoing passages, was the universal, visible form of Vishṇu; the second is his formless or imperceptible condition.

2 Sat (सत्), "what is being."

* Sthāvara. Ratnagarbha explains that trees, &c. are intended.
† Sarisripta, which the Translator generally renders "reptiles". Vide supra, p. 58, note ††: and p. 94, note ††.
‡ Mṛiga.
§ Paśu.

|| पशुभो मनुजाश्चाति शत्रुधं पुंसः प्रभाविता: ।

1 परान्यश्रेष्ठवर्षापी तस्म क्षणिः पार्वित ।

वर्षाश्चक्षुकात्योगेन चुकानि नभसा यथा ॥

** Amirtta.
those manifested forms (or incarnations) that are endowed with every kind of energy, and which, whether the forms of gods, animals, or men, are assumed by him (Hari,) in his sport. This active interposition of the undefinable god, all-comprehending and irresistible, is for the purpose of benefiting the world, and is not the necessary consequence of works.* This form of the universal form is to be meditated upon by the sage,† for the object of purification; as it destroys all sin. In the same manner as fire, (blazing) in the wind, burns dry grass;‡ so Vishńu, seated in the heart, consumes the sins of the sage: and, therefore, let him (resolutely) effect the fixation of his mind upon that receptacle of all the (three) energies, (Vishńu); for that is (the operation of the mind which is called) perfect Dháraná:§ and, thus, the perfect asylum ¶ of individual, as well as universal, spirit, that which is beyond the three modes of apprehension,‖ is attained, for the (eternal) emancipation of the sage. The minds of other beings, which are not fixed upon that asylum, are altogether impure, and are all the gods and the rest, who spring from acts.¶ The retention or apprehen-

---

* Retention, or holding of the image or idea formed in the mind by contemplation: from Dhři (ध्री), 'to hold,' literally or figuratively.

† Read 'the novice'; the original being yoja-yuj. Vide supra, p. 228.
‡ Kaksha, 'dry wood.'
§ गुभाभरणः ‖ मायाभावना ‖
¶ चन्द्रे तु पुष्यवाच्रे चेतसे चे वापाभरणः ‖
चशुभासे समतासु देवायाः कर्मयोनयः ‖
sion, by the mind, of that visible form of Vishńu, without regard to subsidiary forms, is, thence, called Dhárañá;* and I will describe to you the perceptible† form of Hari, which no mental retention will manifest, except in a mind that is fit to become the receptacle of the idea.‡ The meditating sage must think (he beholds internally the figure) of Vishńu, as having a pleased and lovely countenance, with eyes like the leaf of the lotos, smooth cheeks,§ and a broad and brilliant forehead; ears of equal size, the lobes of which are decorated with splendid pendants; a painted neck;|| and a broad breast, on which shines the Šrívatsa||| mark; a belly falling in graceful folds, with a deep-seated navel;** eight long arms, or else four; and firm and well-knit thighs and legs, with well-formed feet and toes. Let him, with well-governed thoughts, con-


1 The explanation of Dhárañá given in the text is rendered unnecessarily perplexed by the double doctrine here taught, and the attempt to combine the abstractions of Yoga theism with the sectarian worship of Vishńu.

* मूर्ति भगवती कुम सब्बीपास्थर्यनिसुहम | प्रेषा वै धारणा हृष्या यवनित्व तत्र धार्येत् ||

In dhárañá, or ‘fixed attention’, no mediate rest is required, such as is spoken of in note ‡ to p. 231, supra.

† Mārtta.

‡ तत्र मूर्ति हरे कुम यादृक्कित्वं नराधिप | तक्कृत्यतमानाधारि धारणा नौप्रयति ||

§ Su-kapola.

|| ? The original has कमुग्रीवम् | Śridhara and Ratnagarbha say: रेखाच्यायाहाहितकश्च ||

¶ See p. 5, and p. 124, note ¶, supra.

** वल्लीचन्द्रप्रक्षिणा ममचािमिना चोद्रेयं वे |
template, as long as he can persevere in unremitting attention, Hari, as clad in a yellow robe, wearing a (rich) diadem (on his head), and brilliant armlets and bracelets (on his arms), and bearing (in his hands) the bow, the shell, the mace, the sword, the discus, the rosary, the lotos, and the arrow. When this image never departs from his mind, whether he be going, or standing, or be engaged in any other voluntary act, then he may believe his retention to be perfect. The sage may then meditate upon the form of Vishnu without (his arms, as) the shell, mace, discus, and bow, and as placid, and bearing (only) his rosary. When the idea of this image is firmly retained, then he may meditate on Vishnu without his diadem, bracelets, or other ornaments. He may, next, contemplate him as having but one single limb, and may then fix his whole thoughts upon the body to which the limbs belong. This process of forming a lively image in the mind, exclusive of all other objects, constitutes

---

1 The two last implements are from the comment: the text specifies only six.

* चिन्तयेततर्थम् पत्रिगी समाधायात्मानसम्।
नाथमाणस्य तृतीय गृह धारणम्॥

† Keyura and kataka.
‡ Aksha-valaya.
§ Vide supra, pp. 124 and 149.
|| Budha.
¶ Bhagavat, in the original.
** Aksha-sutraka.

†† सा यद्दा धारणा तद्वन्दनाष्टानवति ततः।

‡‡ Keyura.

§§ प्राप्तिकान्यपरं भवेत्॥
Dhyāna (or meditation), which is perfected by six stages;¹ and, when an accurate knowledge of self, free from all distinction, is attained by this mental meditation, that is termed Samádhi.²

¹ They are: † 1. Yama, &c., acts of restraint and obligation; 2. Āsana, sitting in particular postures; § 3. Prānāyāma, modes of breathing; ¶ 4. Pratyāhāra, exclusion of all external ideas; ¶² 5. Bhávanā, apprehension of internal ideas; ** 6. Dhárañā, fixation or retention of those ideas. ††

² The result of the Dhyāna or Samádhi: †† is the absence of all idea of individuality, when the meditator, the meditation, and the thing or object meditated upon are, all, considered to be but one. According to the text of Patanjali: "Restraint of the body, retention of the mind, and meditation, which, thence, is exclusively confined to one object, is Dhyāna. The idea of identification with the object of such meditation, so as if devoid of individual nature, is Samádhi:"

†† देहावस्थान्तरिताभासं करितानं तत्र विद्ययन्ती । तद्रेकार्थकार्यविभागं तस्य प्रभृविद्यमिति समाधिः।

† I do not know whence this classification is taken; and I doubt its correctness exceedingly. According to the Yoga-tāstra, II., 29, the six stages preceding dhyāna are yama, niyama, āsana, prānāyāma, pratyāhāra, and dhárañā. Yama and niyama can scarcely, from their very nature, be taken as parts of a whole; and bhávanā is not at all a stage subservient to the attainment of yoga.

†† Vide supra, p. 230, notes * and †.

§ Ibid., note ||.
 || Ibid., p. 231, note ||.
 ¶ Ibid., p. 232.
 ** Ibid., p. 233, note 1.
 †† Ibid., p. 238, note *.

¶ These, 'contemplation' and 'meditation', are never to be considered as synonyms. See note †, above.

§§ Here we have an extract from the Yoga-tāstra,—III., 1—3. These
"(When the Yogan has accomplished this stage, he acquires) discriminative knowledge, which is the means of enabling living soul, when all the three kinds of apprehension are destroyed, to attain the attainable supreme Brahma. 1 Embodied spirit is the user of the instrument, which instrument is true knowledge; and, by it, that (identification) of the former (with Brahma) is attained. 2 Liberation, which is the object to be effected, being accomplished, discriminative knowledge ceases. When endowed with the apprehension of the nature of the object of inquiry, † then

1 The expressions of the text are somewhat obscure; nor does the commentator ‡ make them much more intelligible, until he cuts the matter short, by stating the meaning to be, that "discriminative knowledge enables the living spirit to attain Brahma:"

विद्वान् कीवामाय ब्रह्म प्राप्यतीविच:।

2 The text is very elliptical and obscure. Having stated that embodied spirit (Kshetrajna) is the Karanin, the possessor or user of the Karanin, which is knowledge, it adds तेन तत्तत्तत, literally, "by that, of that, that;" i.e., Tat, "that which is;" and Brahma, or supreme spirit, is the attainment of that spirit which abides in body by that instrument, or discriminative knowledge, of which it has become possessed through perfect meditation:

विद्वान् करण्य भान करण्य तेन तत्तत ।

निवायु सृष्टिकारये वै ज्ञात्तिष्ठात्तिष्ठते॥

विद्वान् निवायु ॥

aphorisms are read as follows: देशवन्ध्यवित्तकः धारणा। तत् प्रक्षे-वतानता धानम। तद्वस्तिर्भीमस्य स्वस्यग्युन्मसिव समाधि।
Thus we have definitions of dhāraṇā, dhyāna, and samādhi.

* विद्वान्य प्राप्तेऽप्राप्ते पररद्वायै पार्थिवनः।

प्राप्तायर्भिभवामा प्रक्षेप्रश्वायमानः॥

† तत्तः प्रथमाचन।
‡ Ratnagarbha.
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there is no difference between it (individual,) and supreme spirit:* difference is the consequence of the absence of (true) knowledge. When that ignorance which is the cause of the difference between individual and universal spirit† is destroyed, finally and for ever, who shall (ever) make that distinction (between them) which does not exist? Thus have I, Kathādikya, in reply to your question, explained to you what is meant by contemplative devotion, both fully and summarily. What else do you wish to hear?"

Kathādikya replied (to Keśidhwaja, and said): "The explanation which you have given me of the real nature of contemplative devotion has fulfilled all my wishes, and removed all impurity from my mind. The expression 'mine,' which I have been accustomed to use, is untruth,: and cannot be otherwise declared by those who know what is to be known. The words 'I' and 'mine' constitute ignorance; but practice is influenced by ignorance. Supreme truth§ cannot be defined; for it is not to be explained by words. Depart, therefore, Keśidhwaja. You have done all that is necessary for my (real) happiness,|| in teaching me contemplative devotion,—the inexhaustible bestower of liberation from existence."¶

Accordingly, King Keśidhwaja, after receiving suitable homage from Kathādikya, returned to his city.

---

* Five kinds of emancipation are enumerated in the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, III., XXIX., 13: sālokya, sārśti, sāmīpya, sārūpya, and ekātwa.
† The original words are ātman and Brahms.
‡ Āsat.
§ Paramārtha.
|| Śreyas.
¶ Vimuktī. Vide supra, p. 61, note §.
Kháṇḍikya, having nominated his son Raja,
retired to the woods, to accomplish his devotions; his whole
mind being intent upon Govinda. There, his entire
thoughts being engrossed upon one only object, and
being purified by practices of restraint, self-control,
and the rest,* he obtained absorption into the pure
and perfect spirit† which is termed Vishńu. Keśidhwa-
ja, also, in order to (attain) liberation, became averse
from his own perishable works, and lived amidst ob-
jects of sense (without regarding them), and instituted
religious rites without expecting therefrom any ad-
vantages to himself: Thus, by pure and auspicious
fruition, being cleansed from (all) sin, he, also, ob-
tained that perfection which assuages all affliction for
ever.

The commentator, in order to explain how Kháṇḍikya
should have given what he did not possess, states that it is to be
understood that Keśidhwaja relinquished to him the kingdom.
Or the term Raja may denote merely “master of, or acquainted
with, mystic prayers, or Mantras:” चह्रा राजायं मन्त्रादिवञ्जामिनं
क्लाः।

* चमादिगुणाशोचितः।
† This is to render Brahma.

मेशिध्वजोपि सुक्ष्मं स्वकमेवस्यपायुभुकः।
बुमुः विष्यास्मभे चक्रि चाणबिसदिष्टम्॥

16*
CHAPTER VIII.


I HAVE now explained to you, Maitreya, the third kind of worldly dissolution, or that which is absolute and final, which is liberation and resolution into eternal spirit.¹ I have related to you primary and secondary creation, the families (of the patriarchs), the (periods of the) Manwantaras, and the genealogical histories* (of the kings). I have repeated to you, (in short,) who were desirous of hearing it, the imperishable Vaishnava Purāṇa, which is destructive of all sins, the most excellent of all holy writings, and the means of attaining the great end of man. If there is anything else you wish to hear, propose your question, and I will answer it.

MAITREYA.—Holy teacher,† you have, indeed, related to me all that I wished to know; and I have listened to it with pious attention.‡ I have nothing further to inquire. The doubts inseparable from the

¹ The term is Layo Brahmaṇi (लयो ब्रह्माणिः), which means ‘a melting away,’ ‘a dissolution’, or ‘fusion,’ from the root Li (ल), ‘to liquefy,’ ‘to melt,’ ‘to dissolve.’

* Vaśānucharita.
† Bhagavat.
‡ Bhakti.
mind of man have, all, been resolved by you;* and, through your instructions, I am acquainted with the origin, duration, and end † of all things; with Vishńu, in his collective fourfold form;¹ his three energies;² and with the three modes of apprehending the object of contemplation.³: Of all this have I acquired a knowledge, through your favour; and nothing else is worthy to be known, when it is once understood that Vishńu and this world are not (mutually) distinct. Great Muni, I have obtained, through your kindness, all I desired,—the dissipation of my doubts;§ since you have instructed me in the duties of the several tribes, and in other obligations; the nature of active life, and discontinuance of action; and the derivation of all that exists from works. ¶ There is nothing else, venerable Brahman, that I have to inquire of you. And forgive me, if your answers to my questions have imposed upon you any fatigue. Pardon me the trouble

¹ Or with Vishńu in the four modifications described in the First Book,¶—spirit, matter, form, and time. See Vol. I., pp. 18, 19.
² Or Śakti, noticed in the last Chapter;—p. 235, supra.
³ Or Bhávanás, also described in the preceding Chapter;¶—p. 233, supra.

* विचिन्त्रा: सर्वसंदिः चेमक्ष मगस: झतम ।
† Sadyama. See Vol. I., p. 26, note *.
: बाणशुल्कः राशि: शक्तिः बिचिधा गुरो।
विचित्रता चापि कार्य्येन बिचिधा भावभावना ॥
§ Aparasandeha.
॥ वर्णधारण्यो धर्मा विचित्ता यदशष्टः।
प्रवृत्तं च निपृत्तं च चातं कर्म सचापक्षम, ॥
¶ Substituted for “section”. 
that I have given you, through that amiable quality of the virtuous which makes no distinction between a disciple and a child.∗

PARĀŚARA.—I have related to you this Purāṇa, which is equal to the Vedas (in sanctity), and by hearing which, all faults and sins whatever are expiated. In this have been described to you the primary and secondary creation, the families (of the patriarchs), the Manwantaras, the regal dynasties;† the gods, Daityas, Gandharvas, serpents;‡ Rākṣasas, Yakshas, Vidyādharas, Siddhas, and heavenly nymphs;§ Munis endowed with spiritual wisdom, and practisers of devotion;|| the (distinctions of the) four castes, and the actions of the most eminent amongst men;¶ holy places on the earth, holy rivers and oceans, sacred mountains, and legends ** of the (truly) wise; the duties of the different tribes, and the observances enjoined by the Vedas.†† By hearing this, all sins are, at once, obliterated. In this, also, the glorious :: Hari has been revealed,—the cause of the creation, preservation, and destruction of the world; the soul of all things, and, himself, all things; §§ by the repetition of whose name man

∗ यद्यक्रमनायापूज्येऽधिनित्रुप्त स मया गुरोऽ
तत्तत्त्वस्य विश्वेषोऽधिस्ति न सतां युगविम्भयोऽः ||
† Vaisākhanucharita.
‡ Uraga.
§ Apsaras.
|| सुनयो भावितात्मानः कथने तपसान्विता: ||
¶ पुंसां विश्वेषाणि नरः ||
** Charita.
†† वर्षाधिमाह्यो धर्मा वेदधिमाष्ट्र हर्षम्: ||
‡‡ Bhagavat.
§§ Sarva-bhūta.
is, undoubtedly, liberated from all sins, which fly like wolves that are frightened by a lion. The repetition of his name with devout faith is the best remover of all sins; destroying them, as fire purifies the metal (from the dross). The stain of the Kali age, which ensures to men sharp punishments in hell, is, at once, effaced by a single invocation of Hari.† He who is all that is—the whole egg of Brahmá, with Hirañyagarbha, Indra; Rudra, the Ádityas, the Aświns, the winds, the Kimnaras, the Vasus, the Sádhyas, Viśwadevas, the (celestial) gods,§ the Yakshas, serpents,|| Rakshasas,¶ the Siddhas, Daityas, Gandharvas, Dánavas, nymphs,** the stars, asterisms, planets, the seven Rishis,†† the regents and superintendents of the quarters,‡‡ men, Brahmans, and the rest, animals tame and wild,§§ insects,||| birds, ghosts and goblins,¶¶ trees, woods, mountains, rivers, oceans, the subterranean regions,***

* Bhakti.

† कलिकालयममहनं गर्वकारितमदं नृणाम।
प्रयाति विशिष्य प्रभ: सहस्यचाचुन्तः॥

‡ Devendra, in the original.

§ Sura.

|| I do not find them named in the Sanskrit.

¶ The original yields Rakshases.

** Apsaras.


‡‡ "The quarters and superintendents of the quarters: धिश्यायधिपति:। The term Dhishâyadhípati is synonymous with Dikpála; for which, see Vol. III, 170, note §.

Śrídhará—if I may judge from the single MS. of his commentary which is accessible to me,—has धिश्य:, with reference to the like of which, see Vol. IV, p. 164, note §.

§§ Pašu and mríga.

|| Sarisvápa. Vide supra, p. 236, note †; also, Vol. I., p. 84, note §.

These two terms are to render प्रेताभिः।

*** Corrected from "legions".
the divisions of the earth, and all perceptible objects,—he who is all things, who knoweth all things, who is the form of all things, being without form himself, and of whom whatever is, from (Mount) Meru to an atom, all consists,—he, the glorious Vishnu, the destroyer of (all) sin,—is described in this Purana. By hearing this (Purana) an equal recompense is obtained to that which is derived from the performance of an Aswamedha sacrifice, or from fasting at (the holy places) Prayaga,* Pushkara,† Kurukshtera,‡ or Arbuda.§ Hearing this (Purana) but once is as efficacious as the offering of oblations in a perpetual fire for a year. The man who, with well-governed passions, bathes at Mathurá, on the twelfth day of (the month) Jyeshtá,¹ and beholds (the image of) Hari, obtains a great recompense; so does he who, with mind fixed upon Kesava, attentively recites this Pu-

¹ This month is also called Jyeshtamula,** which the commentator†† explains to mean the month of which the root or cause (Mula) of being so called is the moon’s being full in the constellation Jyeshtá. But it may be so termed, perhaps, from the lunar asterism Mula,—which is next to Jyeshtá,—falling, also, within the moon’s passage through the same month.

---

* See Vol. III., p. 246, note 2; and Vol. IV., p. 218, note 2.
† See Vol. I., Preface, p. XXX.; and Vol. II., p. 96.
‡ See Vol. II., p. 133, note 1; and p. 142, note 4.
§ For this mountain, vide ibid., p. 131, note 1, and p. 141, note 2; also, Vol. IV., p. 222, note 2.
¶ Insert “of the light fortnight”.

¹ प्रामोदी परमन गतिम। This means, that he obtains emancipation.

** See note † in the next page.
†† Both the commentators give the ensuing explanation. See, further, Nilakañtha on the Mahabharata, Anukasana-parvan, sl. 4609.
ráña. The man who bathes in the waters of the Yamuná, on the twelfth lunation* of the light fortnight of the month in which the moon is in the mansion Jyeshtá,† and who fasts and worships Achyuta in (the city of) Mathurá, receives the reward of an uninterrupted Aśwamedha. Beholding the (degree of) prosperity (enjoyed by others) of eminence, through (the merits of) their descendants, a man’s paternal ancestors, his parents, and their parents exclaim:: “Whosoever of our descendants, having bathed in the Yamuná,§ and fasted, will worship Govinda in Mathurá, in the light fortnight of Jyeshtá,|| will secure for us eminent exaltation; ¶ for we shall be elevated by the merits of our posterity.” A man of good extraction will present obsequial cakes to his fortunate (ancestors) in the Yamuná, having worshipped Janárdana in the light fortnight of Jyeshtá.** But the same degree of merit that a man reaps from adoring Janárdana†† at that season, with a devoted heart, and from bathing in the Yamuná, and effecting the liberation of his progenitors by offering to them (on such an occasion,) obsequial cakes, he derives, also, from hearing, with equal devotion, a section of this Puráña.:: This Pu-

* Vide supra, p. 109, note †.
† “The month”, &c. is to translate Jyeshtá-múla.
‡ The extract is said, by Śrīdhara, to be from the Pitri-gítā. See Vol. III., p. 66, note §; and p. 170, text and note ||.
§ Kálini, in the original. See Vol. IV., p. 286, note *.
|| The original is Jyeshtá-múla.
¶ Kriplā.
** Jyeshtá-múla, in the Sanskrit.
†† The original has Kṛishñā.
:: चुलाधार्थ तद्विधीति पुराणव्याख्या भलिमान।
rāṇa is the best of all preservatives for those who are afraid of worldly existence,* a certain alleviation of the sufferings of men, † and remover of all imperfections.

This (Purāṇa), originally composed by the Rishi (Nārāyaṇa), was communicated, by Brahmā,‡ to Ribu;§ he related it to Priyavrata,|| by whom it was imparted to Bhāguri.¶ Bhāguri recited it to Tamasītra;†** and he, to Dadhīcha, †† who gave it to Śāraswata.‡‡ From the last Bhṛigu §§ received it, who imparted it to Purukutsa;¶¶ and he taught it to Nar

madā. The goddess ††† delivered it to Dhrītarāśtra,***

---

1 This name is also read Tambamitra. ††† One copy has Tava
mitrāya,···“to thy friend,” as if it was an epithet of Dadhīcha: but the
construction of the verse requires a proper name. “Bhāguri
gave it to Tambamitra; and he, to Dadhīcha.” §§§

भागुरिस्माबिनिधाय द्वीपाय स चोखवान ।

---

* Sāhasrāṇa.
† Literally, “a cure for men’s bad dreams”: बुङ:स्मानवर्ण नूषाम ।
‡ Called, in the original, by his epithet Kamalodbhava,—the same as
Abjayoni. See Vol. I., p. 17, note †.
|| Ibid., pp. 107, et seq.
¶ For a Bhāguri, see Vol. II., p. 113, note 1.
** This reading I find nowhere. See, further, note †††, below.
†† Correct from “Dadīcha”. See Vol. I., p. 124; also, Professor Wil
son’s Translation of the Rgveda, Vol. I., p. 216, note a, and p. 310,
note a.
§§ Ibid., p. 100.
||| Ibid., p. 17; Vol. III., p. 268, text and note ‡, and p. 283.
¶¶ Literally, Narmadā.
*** See Vol. I., p. 183, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 74.
+++ So reads, like, my Ajmere MS., my oldest MS. of all. Ratnagarbha
has Tambhamitra; and my Arrah MS. yields Stambamitra.
++++ This is Śridhara’s lection.
§§§ Corrected from “Dadhīcha”.
the Nāga king, * and to Āpūraṇa, † of the same race; by whom it was repeated to their monarch, § Vásuki. ‡ Vásuki communicated it to Vatsa; † and he, to Āsватara, from whom it successively proceeded to Kambala and Elāpatra. ** When the Muni Vedāširas descended to Pátāla, †† he there received the whole (Puráṇa) from these Nágas; ‡ and communicated it to Pramati. §§ Pramati consigned it to the wise Játukarṇa; ‡‖ and he taught it to many other holy persons. Through the blessing of Vasíshtha, ‡‖‖ it came to my knowledge; and I have, now, Maitreya, faithfully imparted it to you. You will teach it, at the end of the Kali age, to Śamīka. *** Whoever hears this great mystery, which

---

* The original has only Nāga.
† Corrected from “Puraṇa”. See Vol. II., p. 286. From note * to ibid., p. 280, it seems that other Puráṇas read Varaṇa and Aruṇa (?).
‡ The original is घूटराण्याच नागापापुरुषाय च | Āpūraṇa is not, then, said to be “of the same race”. In the passages referred to in the preceding note, he figures as a Grámanī or Yaksha.
§ Literally, “to the king of the Nágas”, नागराजाय।
‖ See Vol. II., p. 74, and p. 86, note 1.
¶ For the Naga called Vatsa, see Vol. II., p. 287, note *.
** For Āsватara, Kambala, and Elāpatra, see Vol. II., p. 74.
†† The original seems to denote that Vedāširas became master of Pátāla:

पातालं समुपांस्तन्त वेदशिरासुनि।

‡‡ By the word तैन, immediately following the mention of Elāpatra, it is implied that from him alone the Puráṇa passed to Vedāširas.

§§ Variant: Pramita.
‖‖ Some of my best MSS. give Játukarṇya. For both names, see Vol. III., p. 36, text and note *.
¶¶ Puyā Pulastya, according to my Ajmere MS.
*** Variant: Śanika, Śanika, and Śīnīka. For Śamīka, see Vol. I., Preface, p. LV.
+++ On which Ratnagarbha remarks: अन्त सांग्रहाकारार्थमेवः कक्ष्यमेवः

व्यवस्थितः।
removes the contamination of the Kali, shall be freed from all his sins. He who hears this every day, acquits himself of his daily obligations to ancestors, gods, and men.* The (great and) rarely attainable merit that a man acquires by the gift of a brown cow,† he derives from hearing ten chapters of this (Purâṇa). He who hears the entire (Purâṇa), contemplating, in his mind, Achyuta,—who is all things, and of whom all things are made; who is the stay of the whole world, the receptacle of spirit; who is knowledge, and that which is to be known; who is without beginning or end, and the benefactor of the gods,‡—obtains, assuredly, the reward that attends the uninterrupted celebration of the Aśwamedha rite.§ He who reads, and retains with faith this (Purâṇa), in the beginning, middle, and end of which is described the glorious Achyuta, the lord of the universe in every stage,|| the master of all that is stationary or moveable, composed of spiritual knowledge,¶ acquires such purity as exists not in any world,—the eternal state of perfection,** (which is) Hari. The man who fixes his

---

* पिनूङ्गसमुवेश्य: समसामसरस्त्रुति: ||
† तत्त्व तेन भावदेवच्यो: गृहोति दिने दिने ||
‡ Kapilâ. According to Colebrooke, “when applied to a cow, this term signifies one of the colour of lac dye, with black tail and white hoofs.”
§ Vâjimedha, in the original.
|| अखिलांकल्लघातस्तर्गमधुः: ||
¶ अवालोकितमयः ||
** एकानासिद्धि: ||
†† Śrīdhara ignores it; otherwise it seems to be recognized.
mind on Vishnú goes not to hell. He who meditates upon him regards heavenly enjoyment only as an impediment; and he whose mind and soul are penetrated by him thinks little of the world of Brahmá: for, when present in the minds of those whose intellects are free from soil, he confers upon them eternal freedom. What marvel, therefore, is it, that the sins of one who repeats the name of Achyuta should be wiped away? Should not that Hari be heard of whom those devoted to acts worship with sacrifices, continually, as the god of sacrifice;* whom those devoted to meditation† contemplate as primary and secondary, composed of spirit;‡ by obtaining whom, man is not born, nor nourished,§ nor subjected to death; who is all that is, and that is not, (or both cause and effect); who, as the progenitors, receives the libations|| made to them; who, as the gods, accepts the offerings¶ addressed to them; the glorious being who is without beginning or end; whose name is both Swáhá,** and Swadhá;†† who is the abode of all spiritual power; in whom the limits of finite things cannot be measured; and who, when he enters the ear, destroys all sin?‡‡

---

1 The words or prayers employed in presenting oblations with fire.
2 The text has:

याः सम्बन्धाः स्वर्गशिल्पिकाः मानांकं जो मानिकाः

मन्ना प्रभवितं हृद्म कशुर्यं शौचं स वाति हरिः

Mána commonly means 'pride;' but here it seems most appro-

* Yajneswara.
† Yogin.
‡ Brahma-maya.
§ The original has नो चर्घते हीयते नैव.
|| Kavya.
¶ Havya.
** See Vol. III., p. 122, note ‡; ad finem.
I adore him, that first of gods, Purushottama,* who is without end and without beginning, without growth, without decay,† without death;‡ who is substance that knows not change. I adore that ever inexhaustible spirit,§ who assumed sensible qualities;¶ who, though one, became many; who, though pure, became as if impure, by appearing in many and various shapes; who is endowed with (divine) wisdom, and is the author of the preservation of all creatures.¶¶ I adore him, who is the one conjoined essence and object of both meditative wisdom and active virtue; who is watchful in providing for human enjoyments; who is one with the three qualities; who, without undergoing change, is the cause of the evolution of the world; who exists of his own essence, ever exempt from decay.** I constantly adore him, who is entitled heaven,†† air, fire, water, earth, and ether;‡‡ who is the

priately rendered by its radical import, 'measure.' The measures which are for the determination of measurable things are not applicable to Vishńu.

---

* नतोऽधि पुष्योत्तमंमायमिश्रम् । + Pariñjana. † Apakshaya.
§ तस्य नतोऽधि पुष्यात् सदाभ्याय ।
For asyaya, see Vol. I., p. 17, note *.
¶ अभुगुणस्वरूपः । ‡ सक्षमश्रविभूतिकर्ता ।
** ज्ञानप्रदत्तिनिर्माणमित्रयायणम् पुस्: ।
भोगमद्रानपप्रस्वरूपत्वं विगुणश्रविभूतिकर्ता ॥
अन्वाध्रेत भवभावभवनकारखाय ।
वने स्वदेशयमभवसदांस्वर ॥
†† Vyanam, the same as dkiśa, which is generally rendered 'ether'.
See Vol. I., p. 34, note *.
‡‡ The only reading which I find is
वीमान्यत्वोपतिन्यभूचमयायां ।
We have had "ether" just above, in the Translator's "heaven"; and
bestower of all the objects which give gratification to the senses; who benefits mankind with the instruments of fruition; who is perceptible, who is subtile, who is imperceptible. May that unborn, eternal Hari, whose form is manifold, and whose essence is composed of both nature and spirit,* bestow upon all mankind that blessed state which knows neither birth nor decay!

there is no sixth element.

In the MS. which Professor Wilson used in preference to any or all others, the letters रच- in this passage look very like ख, for which he probably took them, not noticing the two letters following, making up रचना-; and kha is one of the words for "ether". Vide supra, p. 198, text, with notes  and ख.

* खच द्वय प्रकटतिपराधमध्यम ।
APPENDIX.

[No one among the contemporaries of Professor Wilson is known to have qualified himself more adequately than Colonel Vans Kennedy for discussing the subject of the Purāṇas; and it has, therefore, been considered that the following correspondence must, with all its defects, possess, to the readers of these volumes, sufficient interest to justify its republication in this place. The seven letters of which it consists—namely, five entitled On Professor Wilson's Theory respecting the Purāṇas, the Professor's Reply, and the Colonel's Rejoinder,—originally appeared in the London Asiatic Journal for 1840 and 1841, addressed to its editor. F. H.]

Sir: In the learned and ingenious remarks contained in the Preface to his Translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Professor Wilson remarks that the Purāṇas "may be acquitted of subservience to any but sectarian imposture. They were pious* frauds for temporary purposes;"† and that they "are, also, works of evidently different ages, and have been compiled under different circumstances, the precise nature of which we can but imperfectly conjecture from internal evidence, and from what we know of the history of religious opinion in India. It is highly probable that, of the present popular forms of the Hindu religion, none assumed their actual state earlier than the time of Śankara Āchārya, the great Śaiva reformer, who flourished, in all likelihood, in the eighth or ninth century. Of the Vaishnava teachers, Rā-

* Colonel Kennedy omitted this word. † Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.
mánuja dates in the twelfth century; Madhuváchaurya, in the thirteenth; and Vallabha, in the sixteenth; and the Puráñas seem to have accompanied, or followed, their innovations; being obviously intended to advocate the doctrines they taught.”* He further observes that “a very great portion of the contents of many [of the Puráñas], some portion of the contents of all, is genuine and old. The sectarial interpolation, or embellishment, is always sufficiently palpable to be set aside without injury to the more authentic and primitive material; and the Puráñas, although they belong especially † to that stage of the Hindu religion in which faith in some one divinity was the prevailing principle, are, also, a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Ve
das.”‡ And yet Professor Wilson, at the same time, maintains that religious instruction is not one of the five topics which are treated of in a genuine Puráña, and that its occurrence in the Puráñas now extant is a decisive proof that these are not the same works, in all respects, that were current, under the denomination of Puráñas, in the century prior to Christianity.

These, however, and similar remarks contained in that Preface, seem to be inconsistent and inconclusive; for, if the Puráñas, in their present form, are of so modern a date, and if the ancient Puráñas are no longer extant, by what means can it be ascertained that any portion of the contents of the works now bearing the name of Puráñas is genuine and old?

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.
† Colonel Kennedy—a very heedless quoter,—had “essentially”.
‡ Vol. I., Preface, pp. XI., XII.
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Professor Wilson rejects, as not belonging to the Puráñas, in the time of Amara Simha (B.C. 56), all those parts of the present Puráñas which relate to the rites and observances and to the theology of the Hindus; but it is those parts only which admit of being compared with other Hindu works, and with all that is known of the Hindu religion. It is, also, unquestionable that certain works denominated Puráñas have been immemorially considered, by the Hindus, as sacred books;* and it must be evident that, unless the doctrines of the Hindu religion were inculcated in those works, they could contain nothing which could communicate to them a sacred character. The opinion, therefore, of Professor Wilson, that the genuine Puráñas treated of profane subjects only, is, obviously, incompatible with that profound reverence with which the Puráñas are regarded by all Hindus, even at the present day. The only argument, also, which he has adduced in support of this opinion depends entirely upon the use and meaning of the term *pancha-lakshaña*, as applied to a Puráña. But the passage in Sanskrit, quoted in the note in page VII., does not admit of the restricted sense which Professor Wilson has given to it; because the first of the five topics† there mentioned, or *sarga*, is inadequately expressed† by "primary creation, or cosmogony." This will be at once evident by a reference

---

1 The five topics, as explained by Professor Wilson, are: "1. Primary creation, or cosmogony; 2. Secondary creation, or the destruction and renovation of worlds, including chronology; 3. Genealogy of gods and patriarchs; 4. Reigns of the Manus, or periods called Manwantaras; and, 5. History."

* But see what the Colonel says in p. 299, note 2, *infra.*
to the contents of the Translation of the *Vishńu Puráña*,
where, under *sarga*, are enumerated: *Vishńu*, the or-
gin, existence, and end of all things; his existence be-
fore creation; his first manifestations; description of
Pradhána, of Prakṛiti, of the active cause; development
of effects, of the mundane egg. For the description of
all that precedes the appearance of the mundane egg,
which occurs in the *Vishńu* and other Puráñas, is the
most abstruse and sacred part of Hindu theology; as it
explains the real nature of the Supreme Being, and of
those manifestations of his divine essence which lead
men to believe in the actual existence of a material
world. The first, therefore, of the five topics treated
of in a genuine Puráña, according to Professor Wil-
son, necessarily includes religious instruction; because the
antecedents to creation could not have been described
without, at the same time, explaining the distinction
between the one sole-existing spirit and those illusive
appearances which seem to be composed of matter.
The second, also, of those topics is, equally, of a reli-
gious nature; for an account of the destruction and
renovation of worlds must, necessarily, include a de-
scription of the means and agents employed, by the
Supreme Being, for those purposes. Under the first
two topics, consequently, is comprised a great part of
what is contained in the Puráñas, as at present extant:
namely, a description of the real essence of the Su-
preme Being, and of the illusive nature of the uni-
verse; of the production of Brahmá, Vishńu, Śiva, and
their female energies; of the origin of angelic beings
and holy sages; and of all the circumstances relating

* This is not a fair representation.
to the repeated creation, destruction, and renovation of the world; and it may, therefore, be justly concluded, that these subjects were also treated of in the eighteen Puráñas, as originally committed to writing, and that the term *pancha-lakshaṇa* affords no grounds for the conclusion which Professor Wilson has deduced from its use and meaning.

But those parts of the present Puráñas which relate to festivals, rites, and observances, and to the worship of particular deities, may appear to support this remark of Professor Wilson: "They [the Puráñas] are no longer authorities for Hindu belief, as a whole: they are special guides for separate and, sometimes, conflicting branches of it; compiled for the evident purpose of promoting the preferential, or, in some cases, the sole, worship of Vishńu, or of Śiva."* It is not clear what is here meant by the "Hindu belief, as a whole;" for there are, I believe, no traces, now extant, of the Hindu religion having ever existed as one uniform system of belief in one and the same deity. But the antiquity of the Upanishads is not disputed; and, in one or other of them, the attributes of the Supreme Being are distinctly ascribed to Brahmá, Vishńu, Śiva, Deví, Súrya, and Gańeśa; and, consequently, when the Upanishads were composed, there must have been some Hindus who paid a preferential worship to one or other of those deities. These, however, are precisely the same deities to whom the attributes of the Supreme Being are ascribed in one or other of the Puráñas; and, therefore, if the antiquity

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.
of the Upanishads be admitted, the variety of deities proposed for worship in the Purāṇas now extant can be no proof that these works were recently compiled, for sectarian purposes. The Vedas, indeed, have not yet been so examined as to admit of its being determined whether the same distinction is to be found in them; but Mr. Colebrooke has stated that the whole of the Indian theology is founded on the Upanishads, and that several of them, which he has described, were extracts from the Vedas. The six deities, therefore, just mentioned, were, most probably, objects of worship, when the religious system of the Vedas flourished; and it must, in consequence, be altogether improper to consider the worshippers of one of those deities, in preference to the others, as sectarians, if, by this term, is intended such sectarians as have existed in India in later times. For, according to the principles of the Hindu religion, there is unity in diversity; and, hence, it is held that these apparently different deities are merely variant forms of one and the same Supreme Being, and that, consequently, the worship of any one of them is equally holy and effective,—as it is, in fact, the adoration of the Supreme Being in that particular form. Sectarianism, at the same time, consists in the exclusive, and not merely preferential, worship of a particular deity; but in not one of the Purāṇas is there a single intimation, or injunction, which, virtually, or expressly, sanctions the rejection of the worship of Vishṇu, or Śiva, or of any of the other six deities. The orthodox Hindus, therefore, are, even at the present day, votaries, but not sectaries, of either Vishṇu or Śiva; and such they appear to have been from the
remotest time,—as the particular worship of Brahmá has long ceased, and, though particular worshippers of Súrya and Gáneśa have existed, and, perhaps, still exist, in India, they have never been numerous, and the worship of Deví has degenerated into rites and ceremonies which, though practised by many Hindus, are, generally, considered to be contrary to the tenets and ritual of the Hindu religion.¹

Professor Wilson also has not explained the sectarian purposes to promote which he thinks the works at present bearing the names of Puráñas were compiled in a period so comparatively modern as that between the eighth and seventeenth centuries. But he cannot mean to contend that Vishnú and Śiva were not objects of worship in the earliest times of the Hindu religion, or that they were worshipped with the same rites and ceremonies; and, if not, the mere ascribing, in those works, preeminence to either Vishnú or Śiva, and a superior excellence to the worship of either of those gods,—which is all that occurs of them,—can be no proof that the Puráñas, as now extant, are mere modern works, compiled for sectarian purposes; because in not one of the eighteen Puráñas is it, in any manner, intimated that Vishnú or Śiva ought not to be worshipped; and, on the contrary, numerous passages occur in them, in which precisely the same rewards are promised to the worshipper of either god. So far, indeed, is any one of the Puráñas from inculcating the exclusive worship of either Vishnú or

¹ I here merely allude to the worship of Deví by the sacrifice of animals, and not to the abominable worship described in the Tantras.
Śiva, that Vishňu is introduced, in some of them, teaching the worship of Śiva, and, in others, Śiva, teaching the worship of Vishňu. The only distinction which appears to exist between these gods is, that, in particular Puráňas, each is represented as the Supreme Being, when the other becomes, in a certain sense, inferior, without, however, detracting from his divine excellence. It is, also, remarkable that it is not in separate Puráňas only that preeminence is ascribed to either Vishňu or Śiva, or even to Brahmá; but this ascription occurs in the very same Puráňa. For, as far as I have observed, there are only five Puráňas in which the supremacy is uniformly ascribed to the same god: namely, the Linga and Skanda, in which Śiva is identified with the Supreme Being; the Vishňu and Bhágavata, in which this honour is attributed to Vishňu; and the Brahma Vaivarta, in which Kríshña is represented as the Supreme Being, and his favourite mistress, Rádhá, as his śakti or energy. When, therefore, in the Puráňas as now extant, equal reverence is given not only to Vishňu and Śiva, but to four other deities, and when nothing occurs, in them, which in the least sanctions the rejection of the worship of those deities, or in any manner condemns or disparages it, it seems evident that such works could not have been composed for the sectarian purpose of promoting the exclusive worship of either Vishňu or Śiva, or of any other god.¹

¹ I should except the Brahma Vaivarta Puráňa (for I have not met with any Upanishad in which Kríshña is represented as the Supreme Being); but this Puráňa appears to me to be of
It is, as the same time, impossible to understand why Professor Wilson should have been so anxious to establish, in that Preface, that the Puráñas now extant are mere modern compilations, and that a genuine Puráña treats of profane subjects only, when, in p. XCVII., he makes these remarks: "That Brahmins unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Puráñas, cannot reasonably be contested, after dispassionately weighing the strong internal evidence, which all of them afford, of the intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients. But the same internal testimony furnishes proof, equally decisive, of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Puráñas, in the face of abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era." For the natural conclusion from such premisses must, necessarily, be, that the Puráñas now extant are the very same works which were known, under that denomination, three centuries before the Christian era, but that they, at the same time, afford strong internal testimony of an intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients. But, to invert this conclusion, and to suppose that, because some parts

a much more ancient date than that ascribed to it by Professor Wilson.
of the present Puráñas are, perhaps, modern, therefore these works must be modern compilations, is, obviously, contrary to every principle of just reasoning; because, as it is admitted that ancient materials existed anterior to the supposed compilation of the present Puráñas, and as no cause can be assigned for their disappearance—if such existed,—in the tenth or eleventh century, it is most reasonable to conclude that the Puráñas now extant do, actually, consist of those very materials, and that they are, in fact, the very same works which were current, under that denomination, in the time of Amara Siúňha. Professor Wilson, however, seems to have given more weight to the internal testimony arising from those passages of the Puráñas which he thinks have a modern appearance, than to that which results from those parts which the Puráñas must have contained from their first composition, in order to entitle them to a sacred character and to that reverence with which these works have been always regarded by the Hindus. But the fixing the precise date when the Puráñas received their present form is a question of little or no consequence, when it is admitted that there is "abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era."

The Puráñas, therefore, cannot be—as also remarked by Professor Wilson, in p. XI,—pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarial imposture. But these are the principal grounds on
which he rests his opinion, that the Puráñas now extant did not receive their present form until a thousand years after the birth of Christ. Professor Wilson, however, does not explain in what this imposture consisted, or for what sectarian purpose it was intended. That there are, at this day, and may have been, for many centuries, exclusive worshippers of Vishńu, or Śiva, is undoubted; but, as I have before observed, this exclusive worship is not sanctioned by anything that is contained in the Puráñas now extant; nor do they, in any manner, countenance those more obscure sects which have existed in India in later times. The opinion, also, of Professor Wilson, that "the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole [of the Rájasa division of the Puráñas], although it is to some of the series; for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Puráña,"* is, unquestionably, erroneous; because, in not one of the eighteen Puráñas is there the slightest indication of the Tántrika worship, or the slightest allusion to it; for the worship of Deví, in the form of Durgá or Káli, by blood, flesh, and spirituous liquors, is essentially different from that of Deví as Śakti: in the one, it is her image which is worshipped, and, in the latter, it is a naked virgin.¹ Had, however, imposture for sectarian purposes been the object for which the Puráñas were written, it must have been evident in every part of them; but, on the

¹ Strictly speaking, not the virgin, but the κεφαλή of the virgin.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XXI., XXII.
contrary, I have no doubt that, were they carefully and dispassionately examined, it would satisfactorily appear that they contain nothing which is incompatible with those principles of the Hindu religion which are universally acknowledged by all Hindus. The argument, consequently, deduced from the assumption that the Purāṇas, as now extant, are pious frauds, and, therefore, modern compilations, is refuted by the whole scope and tendency of those works; nor, were it even proved that interpolations and additions have taken place in them, would this circumstance detract from the authenticity of such portions of them as afford strong internal evidence of their antiquity. But what more conclusive evidence of their antiquity can be required than—as is admitted by Professor Wilson himself—their containing a correct description of the doctrines, the legends, and the institutions of the Hindu religion which were prevalent in India three centuries before the Christian era? For it is, obviously, much more probable that the present Purāṇas are works which were then extant, than that eighteen different persons should, each, have conceived, thirteen hundred years afterwards, the design of writing a Purāṇa, and should have been able to compile or compose, so accurately, eighteen different works which correspond so exactly in numerous essential and minute particulars.

The eighteen Purāṇas, also, as Professor Wilson states, consist of 400,000 ślokas, or 1,600,000 lines; and it must, therefore, be evident that nothing but the most attentive examination of the whole of such extensive works, and a thorough knowledge of the
exact state of India, and of all the changes which may have taken place, in the country and amongst the people, during the last two thousand years, could enable any person to fix, with any degree of certainty, from the internal evidence of the Puráñas, the date when each of them was composed. A name, a circumstance, or even a legend may have a modern appearance; but its recentness, or antiquity, can only be determined by there being some known facts with which it can be compared; and it is the want of such facts, in the present state of our knowledge of Hindu history, that renders all reasoning, with respect to the dates of the events mentioned in the Puráñas, so completely inconclusive. Most of the legends, also, are of a miraculous nature; and no date, therefore, can be inferred from them. Professor Wilson, however, undeterred by such considerations, has not hesitated to fix the time when each Puráña was composed, and to place the compilation of the Puráñas, as now extant, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries. But his reasons for assigning so modern a period to the compilation of those works appear to rest, principally, if not entirely, on the contents of the different Puráñas not corresponding with his preconceived opinion of what a Puráña ought to be. For Professor Wilson thus observes, with respect to the Brahma Vaivarta Puráña: "The character of the work is, in truth, so* decidedly-sectarial, and the sect to which it belongs, so distinctly marked,—that of the worshippers of the juvenile Kŗishṇa and Rádhá, a form of belief of known modern origin,—that it can scarcely have found a notice in a

* Colonel Kennedy omitted the words “in truth, so”.
work to which, like the Matsya, a much more remote date seems to belong. Although, therefore, the Matsya may be received in proof of there having been a Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa at the date of its compilation, dedicated especially to the honour of Kṛishṇa, yet we cannot credit the possibility of its being the same we now possess.”¹ Thus, Professor Wilson decides, not only that “the Brahma Vaivarta has not the slightest title to be regarded as a Purāṇa,”‡ but, also, that the Purāṇa which bore that name is no longer extant; and yet he adduces neither argument nor proof in support of this decision, and of his gratuitous assumption that this Purāṇa owes its origin to the modern sect of the worshippers of the juvenile Kṛishṇa. He admits, also, that the first three Books (or nearly two-thirds,) of this Purāṇa are occupied in the description of the acts of Brahmā, Devī, and Gaṇeśa; but he does not explain why the supposed sectarian writer, instead of composing a work solely in honour of Kṛishṇa, and in support of his sect, has dedicated so great a part of the Purāṇa to the celebration of other deities. In the same manner, Professor Wilson remarks, with respect to the Vāmana Purāṇa: “It is of a more tolerant

¹ The object of this Purāṇa is to represent Kṛishṇa as the Supreme Being, and Rādhā, as his energy; and it is, therefore, altogether improbable that it should have been compiled for the purpose of promoting the modern worship of the juvenile Kṛishṇa, or that a modern work should have been written, and substituted in the place of the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa mentioned in the Matsya.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI. † Ibid., p. LXVII.
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character than the Puráñas, and divides its homage between Śiva and Vishńú with tolerable impartiality. It is not connected, therefore, with any sectarian principles, and may have preceded their introduction. It has not, however, the air of any antiquity; and its compilation may have amused the leisure of some Brahman of Benares three or four centuries ago." ¹ But this, surely, is not the manner in which the question whether the Puráñas, as now extant, are ancient and original compositions, or mere modern compilations, ought to be discussed,—far less, decided. On the contrary, the particular passages of the Puráñas which are supposed to be modern ought to be adduced, or referred to; and it should, then, be shown that the circumstances and events, or the doctrines and legends, mentioned in them could not be of an ancient date, because they had occurred, or had been introduced, in modern times, or that they were posterior to modern events of known dates; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has not followed this method, but trusted to conjecture and inferences deduced from erroneous premisses, it seems evident that his speculations respecting the modern period in which the present Puráñas were composed must be considered to be either groundless or not yet supported by the requisite proof.

¹ As, however, Professor Wilson places the introduction of sectarian principles in the eighth or ninth century, † the date of the Vámana Puráña, if compiled previous to their introduction, must be the eighth century, at least, and not the fourteenth or fifteenth.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXVI.
† Vide supra, p. 257.
The preceding observations will have, perhaps, evinced that the remarks contained in Professor Wilson's Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Purana have been written under the impression of two conflicting opinions: for he is obliged to admit that the Puranas now extant were compiled from ancient materials, and that they are "a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas"; and yet he contends that those works are pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarian imposture. But both these opinions cannot be correct; and it must, therefore, be most accordant with probability to conclude that, although interpolations and additions may, possibly, have taken place in the Puranas, as now extant, they are, still, in all essential respects, the very same works which have been, from remote times, held sacred by the Hindus. That, however, alterations have been made in the present Puranas is a mere supposition, which has never yet been supported by any clear and satisfactory proof; and the inconsistent and inconclusive reasoning, employed by a person so well acquainted with the Puranas as Professor Wilson, to prove that they are mere modern compilations, must, alone, evince that the internal evidence of the Puranas, even in their present form, affords such incontrovertible proof of their antiquity, that even those who wish to contest this are obliged to admit it, and to explain it by having recourse to the conjecture, that ancient materials existed, from which those parts of the extant Puranas which are, most probably, ancient, were compiled. But, as this conjecture is altogether gra-
tuitous, and unsupported by proof, it may be much more reasonably concluded that the Purāṇas now extant are the very same works which have been always known, under that denomination, from the remote time when they were originally composed;* and Professor Wilson himself remarks that “they never emanated from any impossible combination of the Brahmans to fabricate for the antiquity of the entire Hindu system any claims which it cannot fully support;”† and that “the origin and development of the doctrines, traditions, and institutions [described in the Purāṇas now extant,] were not the work of a day; and the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity,—to an antiquity that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions, or beliefs of the ancient world.”‡

VANS KENNEDY.

Bombay, 28th August, 1840.

Sr: In the letter which I addressed to you on the 28th ult., I confined myself to such observations as seemed to evince that the remarks contained in Professor Wilson's Preface to his Translation of the Vishnū Purāṇa were written under the impression of two conflicting opinions, which could not, both, be correct. As my attention has, thus, been again directed to the question whether the eighteen Purāṇas, as now extant,

---

* Of this untenable position Colonel Kennedy nowhere offers any proof
† Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.
‡ Ibid., p. XCIX.
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are ancient compositions, or modern compilations, I am induced to enter into a further discussion of this subject. For it is evident that, if the works now known under that denomination were written between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries, for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarial imposture, they cannot be a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas. Nor can they, indeed, afford any authentic information with respect to the state of the Hindu religion previous to the twelfth century; because, even admitting that those works may have been partly compiled from ancient materials, there are no means now available by which what is genuine and old that may be contained in them can be distinguished from what is supposed to be spurious and modern.

The limits of a preface may have prevented Professor Wilson from fully discussing this question; but, as that Preface extends to seventy-five quarto pages, it is most probable that he has, at least, stated, in it, the principal reasons which induce him to consider the Puráñas to be modern compositions. To me, however, it appears that those reasons, instead of supporting Professor Wilson’s opinion, should lead to a directly contrary conclusion. The arguing, in particular, that, because not one of the present Puráñas corresponds with the term pancha-lakshaña, or “treatises on five topics”,—which is given as a synonym to a Puráña, in the vocabulary of Amara Siúha,—therefore it is decidedly proved “that we have not, at present, the same works, in all respects, that were current, under the denomination of Puráñas, in the century
prior to Christianity,"* is, certainly, altogether inconclusive. For a mere descriptive term cannot be received as proof, when the argument itself admits that the works which it was intended to describe are no longer extant, and that, consequently, there are no means of determining whether the term did, or did not, apply strictly to those works. On the supposition, also, that the Puráñas now extant are modern compositions, written in imitation of the ancient Puráñas, it must be evident that those works could not have been restricted to the treating only of the five topics mentioned by Professor Wilson; for he himself observes that the description of a Puráña, included in the term pancha-lakshana, is utterly inapplicable to some of the present Puráñas, and that to others it only partially applies. But, though it may be supposed that the Brahmins might possibly recompose their sacred books, it is altogether improbable that they would so alter them, as to leave no resemblance between the original and its substitute; and, consequently, had the prescribed form for the composition of a Puráña required the treating of five topics only, in that precise form would the present Puráñas (if modern compilations,) have, no doubt, been written. As, therefore, they do not exhibit that form, and as they could not have succeeded to the reverence in which the ancient Puráñas were held, unless they resembled those works, (at least in form,) it is most reasonable to conclude that a Puráña, as originally composed, was not "a treatise on five topics." The miscellaneous nature, consequently, of the contents of the present Puráñas cannot

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.
be admitted as a valid objection to their antiquity, on a mere supposition, which is not only improbable in itself, but which is, also, disproved by the sacred character that has been immemorially ascribed to the Puráñas, which, it is obvious, they could not have received, had they treated only of the profane topics mentioned by Professor Wilson.

The argument also supposes that the original eighteen Puráñas were current prior to the Christian era; and, before, therefore, the conclusion can be granted, the time and manner in which those works have become extinct should be proved: for, as numerous Sanskrit works which were, unquestionably, extant at the commencement of the Christian era, have been preserved until the present day, nothing but satisfactory proof can establish that the Puráñas alone, although held to be sacred books, have completely disappeared. It requires to be particularly considered that the Puráñas consist of eighteen distinct works, comprising an aggregate of 1,600,000 lines,* and that India, more than one million of square miles in extent, has been, during the last two thousand years, divided into at least ten distinct regions,† differing in language and in local customs and prejudices. Were it, therefore, even conceded that the Brahmans, since the Christian era, had succeeded in suppressing the whole of the eighteen Puráñas, and in substituting other works in their place, in some one or other region of India, still copies of the original Puráñas would have

* See Vol. I., Preface, p. XXIV.
† For the particulars of this unscientific classification, see Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II., p. 179.
been preserved in the other regions. Nothing but the entire extirpation of the Brahmanical religion, throughout the whole of so extensive a country, could have effected the complete destruction of such voluminous works,—the more especially, as their sacred character would have rendered their preservation an object of constant solicitude. But, until a complete suppression of the ancient Puráñas had been effected, other works could not have been substituted in their place; and, thus, the objection to the supposition that the Puráñas, as now extant, were not written until between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries becomes insuperable. For, admitting the dates assigned to each of the Puráñas by Professor Wilson, it may be asked: Was the ancient Puráña, bearing the same name, extant until it was superseded by the modern one, or was it not? In the first case, in what manner was its supersession accomplished? Professor Wilson extends the period during which he supposes the Puráñas to have received their present form, to eight centuries; and he, thus, admits that the replacing of the ancient Puráñas by new works did not proceed from a combination of the Brahmans to remodel the Hindu religion on new but premeditated principles. It becomes, therefore, impossible to understand how any individual could, without the consent and assistance of the Brahmans, effect the suppression of an ancient Puráña, and the substitution, in its place, of a work of his own composition or compilation, throughout the whole of India. If, for instance, the Bhágavata was written by Bopadeva, at Doulutabad, in the twelfth century, was the original Bhágavata then in existence, or not? If it
was, what reason, consistent with probability, can be assigned for supposing that the Brahmans of all India would have suppressed one of their sacred books, to which they ascribed a divine origin, and received, as entitled to the same reverence, the acknowledged composition of an obscure grammarian? The supposition is, evidently, absurd. It is strange, also, that Mr. Colebrooke should have remarked that "Bopadeva, the real author of the Śrī Bhāgavata, has endeavoured to reconcile all the sects of Hindus, by reviving the doctrines of Vyāsa. He recognizes all the deities, but as subordinate to the Supreme Being, or, rather, as attributes or manifestations of God:"¹ for, with the omission of the word "attributes", this is precisely the same doctrine which is invariably taught in each and all of the eighteen Purāṇas. The Bhāgavata, therefore, as now extant, could not have been written for the purpose of inculcating a new doctrine; for, in that respect, it entirely corresponds with the other Purāṇas: nor is the representation, in it, of Vishnū as the Supreme Being inconsistent with the principles of the Hindu religion as explained in the other Purāṇas. It, in consequence, does not afford the slightest internal evidence of its having been written for the purpose of sectarial imposture; nor have I observed, in it, any passage which indicates that this Purāṇa could not have been written prior to the twelfth century. If, however, the original Bhāgavata was not then in

¹ Asiatic Researches, Vol. VII., p. 280.*

existence, the objection still remains insuperable; for nothing can render it in the least probable that the Brahmans of all India would receive the composition of an obscure individual as a sacred book entitled to their reverence. It must, also, be evident that, if the Puráñas which were current in the century prior to the Christian era have not been suppressed, there can be no reason for supposing that they have not been preserved until the present day. But it seems unquestionable that the Puráñas then current could not have been subsequently suppressed, and other works substituted in their place, unless the Brahmans of all India had combined together in order to effect that object; and Professor Wilson, himself, remarks that the Puráñas, in their present form, "never emanated from any impossible combination of the Brahmans to fabricate for the antiquity of the entire Hindu system any claims which it cannot fully support."* A combination, therefore, of the Brahmans being considered to be impossible, it must appear most probable that the eighteen Puráñas have been preserved, during the last eighteen hundred years, in the same manner as other Sanskrit works of the same period have been preserved, and that the present Puráñas are, in fact, in all essential respects, the same works which were current, under that name, in India in the century prior to the Christian era.†

Another argument adduced by Professor Wilson, in

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.
† Throughout this critique, Colonel Kennedy seems to ignore the predictive sections of the Puráñas,—a very essential feature in almost all of them.
support of his opinion, is the sectarian tendency of the Puráñas. But he does not clearly explain what he means by that term; and, in his “Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus,” he has observed: “This is not the case, however, with the first two on the list, the Saurapátas and Gáñapátas: these are usually, indeed, ranked with the preceding divisions, and make, with the Vaishnávas, Saivas, and Sáktas, the five orthodox divisions of the Hindus.”¹ In this passage, however, some inadvertency must have occurred: for, according to Professor Wilson’s own account, the Sáktas cannot be included among the orthodox divisions of the Hindus; and I suppose, therefore, that the worshippers of Deví were here intended. But Vishnú, Siva, Deví, Súrya, and Gañapati are the very deities, and the only ones, whose worship is described or mentioned in the Puráñas; and, as this is admitted to be orthodox, it must follow that the Puráñas could not have been written for sectarian purposes. What are the sects, therefore, to which Professor Wilson alludes, in that Preface, is not apparent. But his notion of a sect would seem to originate in this singular opinion, which he has expressed with respect to the Pauránik account of the Hindu religion: “The different works known by the name of Puráñas are, evidently, derived from the same religious system as the Rámayana and Mahábhárata, or from the mytho-heroic stage of Hindu belief.”* For, in both those poems, the passages which

¹ Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVII., p. 230.†

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.
† Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 265, 266.
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relate to the legends and tenets of the Hindu religion are merely incidental, and do not form a principal part of those works; while, on the contrary, the legends and tenets of the Hindu religion are not only the principal, but the sole, subject of the Puráñas. It is much more probable, therefore, that such incidental notices of those topics as occur in the two poems were derived from the Puráñas, than that such extensive works as the Puráñas—which embrace all the details of Hindu mythology, and all the abstruse doctrine of Hindu theology,—were derived from poems which are, principally, of an historical character. To conclude, consequently, that, because those topics are treated of at much greater length in the Puráñas than in the Ráma
máyaña and Mahábhárata, therefore the Puráñas were written at a later period than those poems, is, evidently, erroneous. At the same time, on what grounds does Professor Wilson suppose that there ever was a “mytho-heroic stage of Hindu belief”? He merely says that Ráma and Kríshña “appear to have been, originally, real and historical characters,” who have been “elevated to the dignity of divinities,”* and that the Puráñas belong, essentially, to that stage of Hindu belief “which grafted hero-worship upon the simpler ritual”† of the Vedas. But Professor Wilson adduces neither argument nor quotation in support of this opinion; and it is, therefore, sufficient to observe that, in the Puráñas, the Ráma, and Mahábhárata, Ráma and Kríshña are invariably described, not as mere men, but as in-

* Vol. I., Preface, p. IV.
† Ibid., p. XII.
carnate forms of Vishńu, and that not a single passage can be produced, from those works, which inculcates hero-worship.

Professor Wilson, however, not only remarks that "Śiva and Vishńu, under one or other form, are almost the sole objects that claim the homage of the Hindus, in the Puráṇas,"* but also rests much of his reasoning, with respect to the date when each Puráṇa, as at present extant, was composed, and to its having been written for sectarian purposes, on the character of Kṛishṇa as a hero-god. For, in describing the Brahma Puráṇa, he observes: "Then come a number of chapters relating to the holiness of Orissa, with its temples and sacred groves dedicated to the Sun, to Śiva, and Jagannátha,¹—the latter, especially. These chapters are characteristic of this Puráṇa, and show its main object to be the promotion of the worship of Kṛishṇa as Jagannátha."²† With regard, also, to the Vishńu Puráṇa, he remarks: "The fifth book of the Vishńu Puráṇa is exclusively occupied with the life of Kṛishṇa. This is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Puráṇa, and is one argument against its antiquity."‡ And this objection he explains, in speaking of the Brahma Vaivarta Puráṇa, where he observes that the decidedly sectarian

¹ A name of Kṛishṇa.
² Professor Wilson states, at the same time, that the legend of Jagannátha occupies one-third only of this Puráṇa; from which it would be more just to conclude that its main object could not be the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.
† Ibid., p. XXVIII.
‡ Ibid., p. CIX.
character of that Puráña shows that it belongs to the sect, of known modern origin, which worship the juvenile Kríshña and Rádhá.* But Professor Wilson does not specify the forms of Śiva, the worship of which is mentioned in the Puráñas, as he states; and, on the contrary, it is unquestionable that, in those works, it is strictly enjoined that Śiva should be worshipped under no other figure or type than that of the Linga; and, as Śiva was never incarnate, there could be no form under which he could be worshipped. With regard, also, to Vishúu, Professor Wilson confines his remarks to the eighth incarnation only, that of Kríshña. But the Puráñas contain long details relating to the incarnation of Vishúu in the human forms of Rámachandra and Paraśuráma; and why, therefore, should Kríshña alone be considered as a real historical character who has been elevated to the dignity of divinity? The answer is obvious. There is a sect, of known modern origin, who worship the juvenile Kríshña and Rádhá; and it may, in consequence, be concluded that the Puráñas in which Kríshña is mentioned were written for the purpose of promoting the extension of that sect. But, as no sect has selected Rámachandra or Paraśuráma as the peculiar object of their worship, no argument could be founded on the mention of their names in the Puráñas; and, therefore, it was unnecessary to notice them. But they were, both, greater heroes than Kríshña, and lived several centuries before him;† and, had, consequently, hero-

* Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI.
† The Colonel is precise, here, beyond all reasonable warrant.
worship ever prevailed in India, it must seem most probable that it would have originated with Rāmachandra,—whose expedition to Lankā is the subject of a celebrated and revered poem,—had the Hindus ever considered him to be merely a mortal prince. It is, however, needless to continue these observations; for Professor Wilson has, himself, refuted his own opinion; as he has also remarked that Kṛishṇa is not represented in the character of Bāla Gopāla (the object of worship of the modern sect,) in the Vishnū and Bhāgavata Purāṇas, * and that the life of Kṛishṇa in the Brahma Purāṇa “is, word for word, the same as that of the Vishnū Purāṇa;” † to which I add, that Kṛishṇa is not represented in that character in the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa: for it is in those Purāṇas only that the life of Kṛishṇa is described at length; and, in them, Kṛishṇa invariably appears and acts as a human being, except on occasions when he exerts his divine power; but he is, at the same time, frequently acknowledged and adored as Vishnū in the incarnate form of Kṛishṇa.¹

¹ I do not exactly understand what Professor Wilson means by this remark: “Rāma, although an incarnation of Vishnū, commonly appears [in the Rāmdyaṇa,] in his human character alone.” ‡ I suppose he means, that Rāma is seldom described, in that poem, as exerting his divine power; for he always appears, in it, as a man, even when he acts as a god. Nor can I understand what the notion is which Professor Wilson has formed of a divine incarnation; for he observes that the character of Kṛishṇa is very contradictorily described in the Mahābhārata,—usually,

† Ibid., p. XXIX.
‡ Ibid., p. XV.
All suppositions, therefore, that hero-worship ever prevailed in India, or that it is inculcated in the Puráñas, or that Vishńu and Śiva have ever been worshipped under any other figure or type than such as exist at the present day, are entirely groundless.

It will hence appear that this remark of Professor Wilson must be erroneous: "The proper appropriation of the third [Rájas,¹] class of the Puráñas, according to the Padma Puráña² appears to be the worship of Kṛishṇa ... as the infant Kṛishṇa, Govinda, Bāla Gopāla, the sojourner in Vrindāvana, the companion of the cowherds and milkmaids, the lover of Rádhā, or as the juvenile master of the universe, Jagannátha."* But, in the same manner as Professor Wilson thus appropriates, on no grounds whatever, one class of the Puráñas to the worship of Kṛishṇa, he also appropriates another class, the Támasa, to the Tántrika worship. For he remarks: "This last argument is of weight in regard to the particular instance specified; and the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole class, although it is to some of the series: for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Puráña."† That is, that there is no incompati-

as a mere mortal, though frequently as a divine person. But is not that precisely the character of an incarnation,—a man, occasionally displaying the powers of a god?

¹ The Puráñas are divided into three classes,—named Sáttwika, Támasa, and Rájasa,—consisting, each, of six Puráñas.

² No passage in the Padma Puráña authorizes this remark.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII.
† Ibid., pp. XXI., XXII.
bility in the Puráñas—which have immemorially been held to be sacred books,—inculcating a worship not only directly contrary to the Vedas, but which even requires, for its due performance, flesh, fish, wine, women, and which is attended "with the most scandalous orgies amongst the votaries." The mere mention, however, of such an opinion is, alone, sufficient to show its improbability; and Professor Wilson correctly observes: "The occurrence of these impurities is, certainly, countenanced by the texts which the sects regard as authorities, and by a very general belief of their occurrence. The members of the sect are enjoined secrecy,—which, indeed, it might be supposed they would observe on their own account,—and, consequently, will not acknowledge their participation in such scenes."¹ It is, therefore, surprising that, notwithstanding his own previous account of the Śáktas, he should remark, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnú Puráña: "The date of the Kúrma Puráña cannot be very remote; for it is, avowedly, posterior to the establishment of the Tántrika, the Śákta, and the Jaina sects. In the twelfth chapter it is said: 'The Bhairava, Váma, Árha, and Yámala Śástras are intended for delusion.'"* The passage here referred to is, at length, as follows: "Certain acts have been prescribed to Brahmans and others; and for those who do

¹ These three quotations will be found in Professor Wilson's "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVII., pp. 223, 224, 225.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.
† Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 266—260.
not perform these acts are prepared the lowest hells. But there is no other Śāstra than the Vedas which deserves the name of virtuous; and Brahmans, therefore, ought not to delight in reciting the Yoni Śāstras, which are of various kinds in this world; because they belong to the quality of darkness, and are contrary to the Śrutī and Smṛtī: of these are the Kapāla, the Bhairava, the Yāmala, the Vāma, and the Ārhata. Thus, for the purpose of deception, are there many such Śāstras; and by these false Śāstras are many men deceived.” This passage, it is evident, condemns these sects, and could not, therefore, have been written by a person who belonged to some one of them. But I have quoted it in order to show the manner in which allusions to philosophical and religious sects occur, in a few instances, in some of the Purāṇas; for, in all such passages, the name only is mentioned, and the doctrine of the sect is never in the least explained. Before, therefore, it is concluded that the name applies to a sect of modern origin, it should, surely, be first proved that no sect existed in India, under that name, until the establishment of the modern sect. In the above quotation, the worship of Śiva in his terrific character, and of Devī as Śaktī, is, no doubt, clearly intimated; but it affords no indication of the date when such worship commenced, or of the period during which it may have been prevalent. But it is stated, in more than one Purāṇa, that the Kapāla sect was coeval with the institution of the worship of the Linga; and its antiquity is, further, rendered probable by its having long become extinct in India; and it is evident that, as the Ārhata is here distinctly called a Yoni
(that is, a Śākta,) Śāstra, this term can have no reference whatever to the Jaina sect. Were, also, the Tántrika doctrines really inculcated in the Puráñas, the passages relating to them would be so numerous and explicit as to attract attention; and yet, in my examination of those works, I have never met with a single Tántrika passage; and Professor Wilson ad-duce only the above-quoted text of the Kúrma Pu-ráña, which can prove nothing, until the sects alluded to, in it, are satisfactorily ascertained. To found, consequently, any argument with respect to the date when the Puráñas, as now extant, were written, or their sectarian tendency, on a few obscure passages which occur in them, the precise meaning of which it is now impossible to determine, is, surely, a mode of reasoning which may be justly pronounced to be altogether futile and fallacious.

Professor Wilson also states, in too decided and un-qualified a manner, that, "In a word, the religion of the Vedas was not idolatry:"* for he, at the same time, correctly remarks that "It is yet, however, scarcely safe to advance an opinion of the precise† belief or philosophy which they inculcate."‡ But it unquestionably appears, from several of the Upa-nishads,—which are admitted§ to be portions of the Vedas,—that the principal deities have always been represented by images; and it may, therefore, be justly inferred that image-worship has always formed part of the Hindu religion. In its purest form, however, it

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. III. † The word 'precise' was here omitted.
‡ Vol. I., Preface, p. II.
§ Not with any scientific accuracy.
is probable that the worship of images was practised particularly by the inferior castes, and not, generally, by the Brahmans and Kshatriyas; but that, when the strict observance of the system of religious worship prescribed by the Vedas began to decline, then idolatry gradually assumed that form under which it appears in India at the present day. That such a change has taken place in the Hindu religion is clearly shown in the Puráñas; for, in those works, though the worship of particular deities by various rites and observances is principally inculcated, they still contain numerous passages in which it is explicitly declared that such worship is not the adoration which is most acceptable to the Supreme Being, or the most effectual for obtaining final beatitude.

But the following remarks may appear to fix a modern character on the eighteen Puráñas, as now extant: "It is a distinguishing feature of the Vishńu Puráña, and it is characteristic of its being the work of an earlier period than most of the Puráñas, that it enjoins no sectarian or other acts of supererogation; no Vratas, occasional self-imposed observances; no holydays, no birthdays of Kríshńa, no nights dedicated to Lakshmi; no sacrifices or modes of worship other than those conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. It contains no Maháátmyas or golden legends, even of the temples in which Vishńu is adored."* In these remarks, however, it is assumed that sacrifices and modes of worship which are not conformable to the ritual of the Vedas are prescribed in the Puráñas: but

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XClX., C.
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this is precisely the question which requires to be proved. It is probable that the worship of images is not authorized by the Vedas; and so far, therefore, the Puráñas inculcate a mode of worship which is not conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. But idolatry has, unquestionably, existed, in India, from the remotest times; and, consequently, its being inculcated in the Puráñas cannot be admitted as any proof of their being modern compositions. The invocations, also, and prayers to the different deities, contained in the Puráñas appear to be in strict accordance with such as are contained in the Vedas; for they are composed of the Gáyatri and, apparently, of other texts of the Vedas; and, although the rites and offerings with which the deities are directed to be worshipped may, probably, differ from the ritual of the Vedas, they still have been, evidently, intended to conform to it, as far as the difference of image-worship would admit of.¹ Sacrifices are not prescribed in the Puráñas; and the description of such as are mentioned in them is, no doubt, conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. It is not, therefore, the modes of worship which the Puráñas prescribe, upon which any argument to prove the remodelling of the Hindu religion in modern times can be validly founded; for their simplicity, and their

¹ It is unnecessary to except, expressly, the worship of Devi by the sacrifice of animals; for Professor Wilson has remarked (Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVII, p. 219):* "This practice, however, is not considered as orthodox, and approaches rather to the ritual of the Vánácharins; the more pure Bali [sacrifice] consisting of edible grain, with milk and sugar."

accordance, in all essential respects, with the ritual of the Vedas must render it most probable that such modes of worship were practised long prior to the Christian era. Nor will the other acts specified by Professor Wilson afford support to his opinion. I do not, indeed, understand what is here intended by "sectarial or other acts of supererogation:" but the fourth order, or that of the ascetic, is mentioned in the Institutes of Manu; and the Yogi is frequently mentioned in the Upanishads; and, surely, the sufferings and deprivations to which the ascetic and Yogi subject themselves, for the purpose of obtaining beatitude, are, decidedly, acts of supererogation. The inculcating, therefore, in the Purânas, the advantage to be derived from such acts can be no proof that those works were written in modern times, for sectarian purposes. There then remain to be considered only self-imposed observances, holydays, birthdays of Kṛishṇa, and nights dedicated of Lakshmī. But Professor Wilson has invalidated his argument by the mention of Lakshmī; for, most certainly, that goddess has not been an object of peculiar worship in modern times; and her festival, therefore, must have been derived from the ancient calendar. It is singular, also, that the description of holydays and festivals should be adduced as an argument against the antiquity of a religious work; for these have been coeval with the institution of every religion; and such self-imposed observances as fasts and vows are too common, in all religions, to admit of their mention in a religious work being considered as a valid argument against its antiquity. Such description and mention, therefore, are, in themselves, no proof of the
period when the Puráñas were composed; and Professor Wilson has not proved (nor can he, I am convinced, prove,) that the deity to whose honour a festival is ascribed in the Puráñas, or in whose propitiation a fast or vow is directed to be performed, was not worshipped prior to the eighth or ninth century, or that the preceding mode of worship has been since altered. But, until either of these assumptions is proved, it must be evident that the mention of the festival, the fast, or the vow, in any of the Puráñas, in no manner proves, or even renders it probable, that that Puráña did not exist prior to the Christian era, in precisely the same state as that in which it is now extant.

I admit, however, that doubts may be reasonably entertained with respect to the antiquity of some of the legends relating to temples and places of pilgrimage, which are contained in the Puráñas; for the miscellaneous nature, the want of arrangement, and the humility of style of the Puráñas would easily admit of an account of a particular temple or place of pilgrimage being interpolated, without the interpolation being liable to detection from the context.* It is, therefore, possible that, when those works are further examined, such interpolations may be discovered in them; but, were it, for instance, even proved that the legend of Jagannátha in the Brahma Puráña was an interpolation, this would be no proof that that Puráña was written for the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha: for it would be much more reasonable to suppose that the Brahmans of that temple had availed

---

* Contrast what is said in p. 311, note 1, infra.
themselves of the original Puráña, to introduce into it, and to circulate under the sacredness of its name, the legend which they had composed in honour of their god. When, therefore, a passage occurs in any Puráña, which has a modern appearance, it should not, at once, be concluded that the Puráña is a modern composition; but it should first be ascertained whether the passage is really modern, and, if so, whether it may not be an interpolation which does not necessarily affect the antiquity of the Puráña itself. Nothing, however, is so difficult as to decide satisfactorily on the existence of a supposed interpolation in any work; and, with respect to the Puráñas, this difficulty, from the reasons just mentioned, and from our almost entire ignorance of the history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era, becomes so insuperable as clearly to evince how completely er-

---

1 In forming, however, an opinion of the genuineness and entireness of the Puráñas, as now extant, it should be recollected that these works are written in Sanskrit, and that the Brahmans have always been, alone, acquainted with that language. The Puráñas, therefore, circulated amongst the Brahmans only; and it, consequently, seems in the highest degree improbable that the Brahmans of all India would admit into their copies of these sacred books interpolations which were merely intended to serve some local purpose. It is, at least, certain that the manuscripts of the Puráñas which are, at this day, spread over India, from Cashmere to the extremity of the southern peninsula, and from Jagannátha to Dwáraká, contain precisely the same works; and it is, therefore, most probable that the Puráñas have always been preserved in precisely the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing.

---

* Never, in all probability, has this been the case.
raneous it must be to conclude, from their internal evidence, that "the Puráñas are works of evidently different ages, and have been compiled under different circumstances."

But it is impossible to ascertain, from this Preface, Professor Wilson's precise opinion with respect to what a work ought to be, in order to entitle it to the character of a Puráña; for, in speaking of the Linga, he remarks: "Data for conjecturing the era of this work are defective. But it is more of a ritual than a Puráña; and the Pauráńik chapters which it has inserted, in order to keep up something of its character, have been, evidently, borrowed for the purpose."† In considering, however, the age and the scope and tendency of the Puráñas, Professor Wilson has entirely overlooked the sacred character which has inmemorially been ascribed to those works; and yet he could not intend to deny so indisputable a fact; in which case it must be evident that the more a Puráña is occupied in "narrating legends, and enjoining rites, and reciting prayers,"† the more it maintains its proper character. Professor Wilson, on the contrary, is of opinion that the religious instruction which is contained in the present Puráñas is a decisive proof that they have undergone some material alteration, and that they are not the same works which were current in the century prior to Christianity. He admits, at the same time, the accuracy of this description of the Puráñas, as they are:¹ The principal object of the Puráñas is the moral and

¹ In my work on Ancient and Hindu Mythology, p. 150.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI. † Ibid., p. LXIX.
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religious instruction which is inculcated in them, and to which all the legends that they contain are rendered subservient. In fact, the description of the earth and of the planetary system, and the lists of royal races, that occur in them are, evidently, extraneous, and not essential, circumstances; as they are omitted in some Puráñas, and very concisely discussed in others; while, on the contrary, in all the Puráñas, some or other of the leading principles, rites, and observances of the Hindu religion are fully dwelt upon, and illustrated, either by suitable legends, or by prescribing the ceremonies to be practised, and the prayers and invocations to be employed, in the worship of different deities. It will, I think, be admitted that these are precisely the topics which ought to occupy a sacred book intended for the religious instruction of the Hindus; and that, consequently, so far from its being supposed that the present Puráñas have undergone some material alteration in consequence of these topics being their principal subject, this very circumstance should be considered as a conclusive argument in support of their genuineness and antiquity. As, also, the religious instruction contained in the Puráñas is perfectly uniform, and entirely consistent with the principles of the Hindu religion, and as it, consequently, betrays not the slightest indication of novelty or sectarianism, it must be most consistent with probability to conclude that the eighteen Puráñas, as now extant, are ancient compositions, and not, as Professor Wilson supposes, an "intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients" with "ancient materials." *

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
I have, thus, examined the arguments adduced, by Professor Wilson, to prove that the books now extant under the name of Puráñas are not the original eighteen Puráñas which have been immemorially held to form part of the sacred literature of the Hindus, but works which have been compiled, within the last eight hundred years, from ancient and modern materials, and written in subservience to sectarial imposture. The remarks, however, contained in this and my former letter will, perhaps, evince that those arguments are much too inconsistent and inconclusive to render the antiquity and genuineness of the present Puráñas in the least questionable. The admission, indeed, that the original Puráñas were extant in the century prior to the Christian era, is, alone, sufficient to invalidate all suppositions of their being, now, no longer in existence; and, unless, therefore, the time and manner of their becoming extinct are proved, it must be evident that inferences resting merely on their internal evidence cannot be received as any proof that the original Puráñas have not been preserved until the present day. For all reasoning founded on the internal evidence which the Puráñas may afford on any point can be of no avail; as there are, I believe, scarcely any persons competent to decide upon its correctness; and the different conclusions which Professor Wilson and myself have drawn from this internal evidence must show that the impression received from it depends entirely on the disposition of mind and the spirit of research with which the Puráñas are perused. I read them with a mind perfectly free from all preconceived opinion, and with the sole object of making myself
acquainted with the mythology and religion of the Hindus; and I did not observe, in them, the slightest indication of their having been written in modern times, for sectarian purposes; but, on the contrary, their perusal irresistibly led me to conclude that they must have been written at some remote period. Even Professor Wilson has not been able to resist this impression of their antiquity; for he declares that it is "as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of* the Puráñas."† Why, therefore, he should have endeavoured—particularly, in his account of each of the Puráñas,—to demonstrate that those works are modern compilations, and that, in consequence, "they are no longer authorities for Hindu belief, as a whole," but "special guides for separate and, sometimes, conflicting branches of it,"‡ I pretend not to conjecture.

But it is very evident that Professor Wilson examined the Puráñas with a preconceived opinion of their being modern compilations, and of their containing an account of the sects which have originated in India in modern times;¹ for it is only from the influence of such a preconceived opinion that can have proceeded

---

¹ I cannot avoid observing, with reference to Professor Wilson's account of the manner in which his analyses of the Puráñas are made, contained in No. IX. of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, p. 61,§ that it appears to me that no series of indices, abstracts, and translations of particular parts of the Puráñas will ever enable any person either to form, himself, or to

---

* The words "the contents of" were omitted by the Colonel.
† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
‡ Ibid., p. V.
the contradictory and fallacious reasoning, with respect to the age and the scope and tendency of the Puráñas, which is contained in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnú Puráña. Because that reasoning rests entirely on two assumptions, neither of which is proved nor can be proved: the one, that a genuine Puráña should treat of profane subjects only; and the other, that the works now extant under the name of Puráñas were written in modern times, for sectarian purposes. Thus, in the account of each of the Puráñas, it is pronounced that the main object of the Brahma is the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha (Krishná), and that there is little, in it, which corresponds with the definition of a Puráña; that the different portions of the Padma "are, in all probability, as many different works, neither of which approaches to the original definition of a Puráña;" that the Linga "is more a ritual than a Puráña;" that the Brahma Vaivarta "has not the slightest title to be regarded as a Puráña;" that the date of the Kúrma "cannot be very remote, for it is, avowedly, communicate to others, "a correct notion of the substance and character of those works." The Puráña must not only be read from beginning to end, but examined over again more than once, before any person can be qualified to pronounce a decided judgment upon its age, scope, or tendency. The most ample index of its contents will never suggest or supply those reflections which necessarily arise during its perusal, and which, alone, can produce a correct opinion with respect to the connexion which the different parts of the Puráña bear to each other, and with respect to the principal or accessory objects of its composition. A more attentive consideration of the context, for instance, would, perhaps, have prevented Professor Wilson from quoting the line of the Kúrma Puráña, on which I have remarked in this letter.
posterior to the establishment of the Tántrika, the Šákta, and the Jaina sects;** and so with respect to the other Puráṇas. It will not, however, be denied that nothing but the most attentive and repeated actual perusal of the whole of each and all of the Puráṇas would warrant such positive and unqualified assertions, and that nothing but satisfactory proof of such perusal would entitle them to the least credit; and yet Professor Wilson has stated that the Puráṇas comprehend a quantity of lines which any European scholar could scarcely expect to peruse with care and attention, unless his whole time were devoted, exclusively, for very many years, to the task.† Professor Wilson, therefore, is not, according to his own admission, qualified to decide ex cathedrā on the age, or the scope and tendency, of the Puráṇas. His reasoning, also, in support of the opinions which he had expressed on these points is singularly illogical; for he, first, assumes that a genuine Puráṇa ought to treat of such and such topics only, and then—as not one of the present Puráṇas conforms to the definition² assumed,—he at once concludes that those works are modern compilations. But, as the definition fails in eighteen instances, it must appear most

---

* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, No. IX., p. 61.†

² Professor Wilson, also, has not translated this definition literally from the Sanskrit; and he, thus, argues, not on it, but on the meaning which he has, himself, thought proper to give to the definition. Literally translated, it can mean nothing more than "creation," repeated creation, races or families, manvantaras,§ and

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XXVIII., XXXIII., LXIX., LXVII., and LXXIX.
† Vide supra, p. 297, note §.
‡ See the Colonel’s remark on sarga, in p. 259, supra.
§ This is transliteration, not translation.
probable that it was never intended to be understood in the very restricted sense which Professor Wilson applies to it; and, in my former letter, I have shown that two of the topics, at least, comprise much more than what he has included under them. The non-conformity, however, of the contents of the present Puráñas to this assumed definition—the precise extent and meaning of which are not ascertained,—is, in fact, the only argument which is adduced, by Professor Wilson, to prove that the works now bearing the name of Puráñas are not the original Puráñas, and the only ground on which he pronounces that this or that one of those works does not correspond with the definition of a genuine Puráña. But the mere statement of such an argument is, surely, quite sufficient to expose its total invalidity. The other assumption is not only equally groundless, but it is even disproved by Professor Wilson himself; for he has rested his argument, in support of it, entirely on Krishña being, as the juvenile Krishña, the peculiar object of worship of a sect of known modern origin; and yet he is obliged to admit that

what accompanies races.” To found, therefore, an argument against the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráñas, as now extant, on such a definition, is, surely, a most singular and futile mode of reasoning.*

* This is hypercriticism. For the original terms referred to, see Vol. I., Preface, p. VII., note 1; also, Vol. III., p. 67, and p. 71, note; and supra, pp. 169 and 244. Professor Wilson’s expansions, to be found in Vol. I., Preface, p. VII., are fully authorized. Colebrooke, in his edition of the Amara-kösa, p. 33, following the authority of scholiasts, defines a Puráña to be “theogony, comprising past and future events, under five heads: the creation; the destruction and renovation of worlds; genealogy of gods and heroes; the reigns of Manus; and the transactions of their descendants.”
APPENDIX. 301

Krishna is not represented in that character in three of the Puranas in which his life is related at length. The only proof, also, of the Tantrika doctrines being inculcated in the Puranas, which is adduced, is a single obscure line of the Kurma Purana.* But, were that the case, there could have been no difficulty in quoting numerous Tantrika passage from some one or other of the Puranas; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has not supported his opinion by producing such passages, it may be justly concluded that not one of the Puranas in any manner advocates "a Tantrika modification of the Hindu religion."†

The more, therefore, that I consider the remarks contained in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Purana, the more am I at a loss to understand how Professor Wilson could express such contradictory opinions. For he maintains, for instance, "that Brahmans unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Puranas, cannot reasonably be contested;"‡ but he equally contends that the internal evidence of the Puranas furnishes decisive proof "of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Puranas."§ On the contrary, it would, surely, be irrational to admit either, after Professor Wilson has proved—as he supposes,—that the works now bearing the name of Puranas are "an intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively

* See Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.
† Ibid., pp. XXI., XXII. ‡ Ibid., pp. XCIII., XCIX.
§ Ibid., p. XCI.
modern ingredients,"* and that not one of those works conforms to the definition of a genuine Purāṇa. It becomes, therefore, requisite either to deny the antiquity and authenticity of the present Purāṇas, or to contest the assumption that the Brahmans have remodelled their sacred books,—a supposition so totally improbable, that nothing but the most clear and incontrovertible proof could render it at all credible. Until, consequently, Professor Wilson produces such proof, it must appear most rational and reasonable to conclude that the Brahmans have never remodelled their sacred books (as no motive for their doing so can be conceived), and that the Purāṇas now extant, having been preserved in the same manner as other Sanskrit manuscripts of the same period, are, in all essential respects, precisely the same works which were current in India in the century prior to the Christian era.

Bombay, 29th Sept., 1840.

VANS KENNEDY.

SIR: Notwithstanding my two former letters, there are still one or two points on which I would wish to offer a few remarks, in order to complete my observations on Professor Wilson's objections to the genuineness and antiquity of the Purāṇas, as now extant. For it will, I think, be admitted that this question is discussed in a very unsatisfactory manner in the Pre-

* See Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX. Only Professor Wilson makes no such assertion. His words are quoted correctly in p. 295, ad calcem, supra.
face to his Translation of the *Vishnú Puráña*; as that Preface contains merely the conclusions which Professor Wilson has drawn from certain circumstances that are represented solely according to the view which he has taken of them; and, thus, the reader is not afforded the means of judging whether this view is correct, or otherwise. But an inquirer into the real character of the mythology and religion of the Hindus would, no doubt, wish to know the grounds on which Professor Wilson states: "It is not possible to conjecture when this more simple and primitive form of adoration [of the Vedas,] was succeeded by the worship of images and types, representing Brahmá, Vishnú, Śiva, and other imaginary beings, constituting a mythological pantheon of most ample extent; or when Ráma and Krishná, who appear to have been, originally, real and historical characters, were elevated to the dignity of divinities."* In that Preface, however,—and in all, I believe, that Professor Wilson has yet published respecting the *Puráñas*,—the most questionable assertions are made in the most positive manner; but they remain unsupported by either argument or authority; and, consequently, not even the deference which is justly due to Professor Wilson, as an accomplished Sanskrit scholar, should preclude an examination of his opinions, or the rejection of such as are inconsistent in themselves, or contrary to probability and evidence.

It is particularly remarkable that, in that Preface, Professor Wilson has passed over a material fact,—the sacred character of the *Puráñas*,—without a due consideration of which it is impossible to form a correct

* Vol. I., Preface, p. IV.
judgment with respect to their age, and their scope and tendency. But it is undeniable that certain works named Puráṇas have immemorially been held, by the Hindus, to be sacred books of divine origin, and, therefore, entitled to the greatest veneration. Even at the present day, those works are regarded with the same reverence, and are, in consequence, considered to be incommunicable to Śúdras, women, and barbarians:* and, on this account, a Brahman in my employment declined to read the Puráṇas with me; while another Brahman, though he conversed with me on the subjects treated of in those works, and even gave me hints where to find particular passages, would not open the Puráṇa in which they were contained, in my presence, and show me the passages.† In judging, therefore, whether the Puráṇas now extant have been preserved, to the present day, in precisely the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing, the sacred character of those books should, most assuredly, be taken into consideration, and not passed over as of no consequence; for this circumstance, alone, renders it, in the highest degree, improbable that the Brahmans would allow the Puráṇas to be lost, and utterly incredible that they would suppress any one of those sacred books, and substitute, in its place, another work of the same name. On this incredible supposition, however, Professor Wilson's opinion, that the present Puráṇas are modern compilations, entirely rests. But he has not attempted to explain the manner in which the replacing of the original Pu-

* A grosser error than this was never committed to paper.
† Colonel Kennedy's Bráhmans must have been very peculiar.
ráñas by new works was effected; and, consequently, his positive and unqualified statement, that the date of the earliest of the present Puráñas is not prior to the ninth century, is a mere gratuitous assertion, which is not only contrary to probability, but which is even left unsupported by any proof whatever. But every principle of reasoning requires that, before the conclusion is drawn, the premises of the argument should be, first, established; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has neither proved nor rendered probable the premises from which he draws the startling and questionable conclusion, that the present Puráñas have no title to be regarded as genuine Puráñas, it must be evident that his opinion on this point must be considered to be totally groundless.

Another point essential to the proper discussion of this question is, the ascertaining what it is that should be held to constitute a genuine Puráña; although it might be supposed that no difference of opinion could exist respecting it: for, the Puráñas being sacred books, their contents should, of course, relate, principally, to the rites, ceremonies, offerings, prayers, and invocations with which the deities mentioned in them are to be worshipped, and to the legends and doctrines of the Hindu religion. Professor Wilson, on the contrary, has stated that "The earliest inquiries into the religion, chronology, and history of the Hindus ascertained that there existed a body of writings especially devoted to those subjects.... These were the Puráñas of Sanskrit literature."\(^1\)

\(^1\) In the Analysis of the Brahna Puráña, contained in No. IX.

But this statement is altogether erroneous; for not a single Puráña contains chronology and history, in the meaning usually given to these terms; and, in the description of a Puráña, given in that Analysis, are omitted that essential part of all the Puráñas which treats of the mythology and religion of the Hindus, and that part which has induced Professor Wilson to pronounce that the Línga is more of a ritual than a Puráña. In his examination, therefore, of the Puráñas, he has, avowedly, overlooked topics the due consideration of which is indispensable for the forming a correct opinion of their age, object, and tendency. But this will be best rendered evident by a few remarks on his Analysis of the Brahma Puráña, contained in No. IX. of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

In my last letter I was unavoidably led to observe that Professor Wilson had, evidently, examined the Puráñas under the influence of preconceived opinion; and this Analysis completely confirms that remark: for, at its very commencement, he states that "the first verses of the Brahma Puráña" .... "sufficiently declare its sectarian bias, and indicate it to be a Vaishnava work."* But, in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus",†

of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. In this;‡ it is also said that a genuine Puráña "should treat of the creation and renovation§ of the universe, the division of time, the institutes of law and religion, the genealogies of the patriarchal families, and the dynasties of kings." But no other topics than these are mentioned.

§ General Kennedy omitted the words "and renovation".
Professor Wilson admits that the preferential worship of Vishńu is perfectly orthodox; and, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishńu Purāṇa, he states that one-third only of the Brahma Purāṇa is dedicated to Vishńu’s incarnation as Jagannátha.* Consequently, it is evident that this Purāṇa is neither sectarian nor exclusively dedicated to the legend of Jagannátha. But this erroneous impression has, evidently, led him to affirm, as erroneously, (unless my copy of this Purāṇa differs from his), that “the first chapter of the Purāṇa describes the creation, which it attributes to Nárayaṇa or Vishńu, as one with Brahmá or Íswara.” For the only verse to which he can refer will bear no other meaning than this: “Comprehend, O reverend Munis, Brahmá, of boundless splendour, the creator of all beings, Nárayaṇa, the all-pervading.”¹ But this error is of material importance; because, in this Purāṇa, Brahmá is represented as the Supreme Being; and, had it, therefore, been composed after the general worship of Brahmá had entirely ceased,—as it did in remote times,—and the preeminence (as at this day,) of either Vishńu or Śiva had been established, it seems altogether improbable that such a distinction would have been ascribed to Brahmá by any writer. The representing, consequently, Brahmá as the Supreme Being, in four of the Purāṇas,—the Brahma,

¹ तं बुधद्धं सूरिणिषेषद्र भ्रामणममितीव्रसम्।
क्षतारं सर्वभूतां नारायणं परायणम्॥

It is quite clear that Nárayaṇam is here placed in apposition with Brahmáṇam, and that it is, therefore, an epithet of Brahmá, and not of Vishńu.

Váyu, Kúrma, and Brahmadáda,—was a circumstance which, certainly, deserved particular attention; because it corresponds with the character in which Brahmá is represented in several of the Upanishads and in the Institutes of Manu. When, therefore, a circumstance so indicatory of the antiquity of the Puráñas is passed over by Professor Wilson, it must be evident that his conjectures respecting the dates when those works, as now extant, were compiled, are not entitled to the slightest consideration.

Professor Wilson also attaches no importance to the long account of the Sun and his worship, which is contained in the Brahma Puráña; although this, undoubtedly, indicates that it cannot be a modern composition. And a similar description of the worship of the Sun, contained in the Linga Puráña, is not even noticed by him, notwithstanding that it contains the Gáyatrí and, apparently, other verses of the Vedas. But it seems unquestionable that, if the Sun was ever an object of popular worship in remote antiquity, this worship had assumed a mysterious character at the time that the Vedas received their present form, and had become restricted to the Brahmans; for Mr. Ward has correctly observed that “the Brahmans consider Súrya as one of the greatest of the gods; because, in glory, he resembles the one Brahma, who is called te-jomaya, or ‘the glorious’. In the Vedas, also, this god is much noticed. The celebrated invocation called the Gáyatrí, and many of the forms of meditation, prayer, and praise, used in the daily ceremonies of the Brahmans, are addressed to him.”

fore, of a worship so ancient and so celebrated in the Vedas, contained in at least two of the Puráñas,¹ should not, surely, have been overlooked by Professor Wilson, when deciding upon the period when the present Puráñas were compiled; for these descriptions clearly prove that those works must be ancient, and not modern, compositions.

In the same manner, Professor Wilson takes no notice of the identification, in the Brahma Puráña, of Brahmá, Vishúu, Śiva, and Súrya with the Supreme Being; but, on the contrary, he contends that its main object is the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha. This conclusion, however, is directly contradicted by the contents of that Puráña; because it appears, from them, that the legend of Jagannátha occupies one-third only of the work, and that, in it, preeminence is not attributed exclusively to Vishúu. It is, hence, evident that the view taken by Professor Wilson of the object and tendency of the Puráñas cannot possibly be correct; since he, thus, discovers a sectarian bias in a Puráña which so clearly illustrates that predominant principle of the Hindu religion which inculcates that the preferential worship of particular deities is equally meritorious; for it is, in fact, the worship of the Supreme Being under those forms. But Professor Wilson is not content with pronouncing that the Brahma Puráña is a Vaishnava work; for he, at the same time, states that it “is referred to the Sákta class, in

¹ This worship is also mentioned in the Garuda Puráña; but I do not immediately recollect whether it is mentioned in any other of the Puráñas.
which the worship of Śakti, the personified female principle, is more particularly inculcated."* It is not for me to explain how any composition can be both a Vaishnava and a Tántrika work; but the assumption that there is a class of Puráñas denominated Sákta is totally unfounded. The division of the Puráñas into three classes is mentioned in the Padma Puráña alone; and all that is said, in it, is, that such and such Puráñas—naming them,—are included in the Sáttvika, Rájasa, or Tánmasa class.† Nothing, therefore, contained in the Padma Puráña in the least authorizes the remark just quoted; and in not one of the Puráñas is Devi ever represented under the same character as the Śakti of the Tántrika sect. It, hence, unquestionably appears that Professor Wilson has completely mistaken the object and tendency of the very Puráña which he professes to have carefully analysed; and it must, therefore, follow that indices and abstracts of the Puráñas will never enable any person to form, himself, or to communicate to others, "a correct notion of the substance and character of these works."‡

Professor Wilson, however, hesitates not to pronounce that "It is, nevertheless, obvious that such a Brahma Puráña as has been here described cannot have any pretension to be considered as an ancient work, as the earliest of the Puráñas, or even as a Puráña at

---

* This division, also, is entirely fanciful; for there is nothing contained in any one of the Puráñas which at all justifies it; as the subjects treated of in those works are of precisely a similar nature, and, in all of them, the same tenets and doctrines are inculcated.

† Ibid., p. 6.
all."* He, thus, first gives a completely erroneous account of the real nature of the contents of this Puráña, and then concludes that it is not even a Puráña at all! The question, also, recurs: What is a Puráña? Professor Wilson contends that it is a work which "should treat" only "of the creation and renovation of the universe, the division of time, the institutes of law and religion, the genealogies of the patriarchal families, and the dynasties of kings:" but the Sanskrit authority to which he refers, and which occurs at the commencement of several of the Puráñas, says, merely, "creation, repeated creation, families, manvantaras, and what accompanies families."† From such a definition as this it is obvious that no opinion can be formed with respect to the subjects which should, alone, be treated of in a Puráña; and yet Professor Wilson’s objections to the genuineness of the Puráñas, as now extant, rests principally on their non-conformity to this unintelligible definition. For this appears to be the only reason that has led him to pronounce that the Brahman is not even a Puráña at all; because "the greater portion of the work belongs to the class of Máhátmyas,"—

1 There is no class of Máhátmyas; but passages, bearing that name, the authenticity of which cannot be contested,—as, for instance, the Deví Máhátmya; in the Márkaṇḍéya Puráña,—have been extracted from the Puráñas, and circulated as distinct works; and there seems to be no doubt that, in later times, works have been written in imitation of the authentic Máhátmyas; but their

* Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. III., pp. 16, 17.
† Vide supra, p. 299, note 2, and p. 300, note 6.
‡ It would be curious to know why the Colonel excepted it.
legendary and local descriptions of the greatness or holiness of particular temples, or individual divinities."* But, as usual, he does not explain why the description of a particular temple, or an individual divinity, should be considered as incompatible with the ancient and original composition of the Purāṇa in which it is contained. He merely assumes that the temple of Kanārka, mentioned in this Purāṇa, is the same as the Black Pagoda, built A.D. 1241, and that the temple of Jagannātha of the Purāṇa is the same as that which was built in A.D. 1198; and hence concludes that the Brahma Purāṇa was written in the course of the thirteenth or fourteenth century.† But he adduces neither argument nor proof in support of this assumption; although, in order to warrant it, it was indispensable to prove that no temple of Kanārka or Jagannātha ever existed in the same situations until the present temples were erected. For it may be equally assumed that the temples mentioned in this Purāṇa were built, and had attained celebrity, several centuries prior to the Christian era: and in what manner is this assumption to be disproved? The history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era is almost unknown; and consequently, there are, now, no means available for determining the dates when the temples were erected, when the places of pilgrimage acquired holiness, when

spuriousness can always be detected by their not being to be found in the Purāṇas‡ to which they are ascribed.

* Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 17. † Ibid., p. 18. ‡ And the Māhātmyas therein found are, in all likelihood, later than their contexts.
the kings and distinguished personages lived,* or when the events occurred which are mentioned in the Puráñas. To all these works this remark of Professor Wilson applies: "The Vishnú Puráña has kept very clear of particulars from which an approximation to its date may be conjectured."† For, as far as I have observed, not one of the Puráñas contains a single circumstance from which it would be possible to determine even the period when it may have been composed. The mere supposition, therefore, that the temples mentioned in the Brahma Puráña are the same as those built in A.D. 1198 and 1241 cannot be admitted as a sufficient ground for deciding that that Puráña is of modern date; for there is nothing improbable in concluding that other temples of the same names, and in the same situations, may have existed long before those erected in modern times were in existence.

The only reason, also, that can have led Professor Wilson to suppose that descriptions of temples and places of pilgrimage should not be contained in the Puráñas, is the above-mentioned definition; as it, certainly, does not include such a topic. But it is highly probable that pilgrimages to sacred places, and the visiting of temples, was practised, in remote times, by the Hindus, as they are practised by them at the present day; and no subject, therefore, could be more adapted to such a sacred book as a Puráña, than de-

* Inscriptions have brought us acquainted with not a few facts tending to fix the age of later Pauránik celebrities. And, inscriptions apart, could Colonel Kennedy doubt our knowing the age of Chandragupta?
† Vol. I., Preface, p. CXI.
criptions of those celebrated places and temples a pilgrimage to which was deemed to be a pious and meritorious act.* The legends, also, relating to temples and places of pilgrimage, which occur in the Puráñas, are of precisely the same kind as those which have found a place in all religions, and cannot, consequently, be considered, in themselves, to be any proof against the antiquity of the Puráña in which they are contained. Many of those places of pilgrimage are not frequented at the present day, and some of them cannot, now, be even ascertained; which circumstances must render it highly probable that they are of a remote period, and that they would not have been mentioned in a particular Puráña, had they not been held in reverence at the time when it was composed. I admit that this is an unsatisfactory mode of arguing; but, in this instance, to supposition supposition can alone be opposed; for, as I have just observed, the internal evidence of the Puráñas affords no means of determining the date of any circumstance mentioned in them.

In his Analysis, therefore, of the Brahma Puráña, Professor Wilson has, evidently, not only omitted circumstances which are essential to the forming a correct judgment of its object and tendency, but he has, also, under the obvious influence of preconceived opinion, found, in it, that which it does not contain, and attached an undue importance to an unintelligible definition, and to one-third only of the work, without taking the other two-thirds into his consideration.

* Temples and pilgrimages were not Hindu institutions "in remote times."
But nothing can more clearly evince the disposition of mind, and the attention with which Professor Wilson has examined the Purāṇas, than this elaborate passage, contained in p. LIX. of the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnū Purāṇa: "A considerable portion [of the Agni Purāṇa] is then appropriated to instructions for the performance of religious ceremonies, many of which belong to the Tāntrika ritual, and are, apparently, transcribed from the principal authorities of that system. Some belong to mystical forms of Śaiva worship, little known in Hindusthān, though, perhaps, still practised in the south. One of these is the Dīkṣā, or initiation of a novice; by which, with numerous ceremonies and invocations, in which the mysterious monosyllables of the Tantras are constantly repeated, the disciple is transformed into a living personation of Śiva, and receives, in that capacity, the homage of his Guru."

For, throughout this passage, some one or other of the names of Vishnū continually occurs; and it is evident, therefore, that the passage relates to Vishnū, and not to Śiva. In regard, also to the dīkṣā, these verses, contained in the 27th Chapter, will be sufficient to prove that this initiation is in the name of Vishnū, and not of Śiva: "Having propitiated Fire, sacrifice to Vishnū; and, then, having called the novices, initiate them standing near." This dīkṣā is

---

1 Nothing contained in the passage of the Agni Purāṇa here referred to in any manner authorizes the words which I have placed in italics. Mysterious monosyllables, also, are perfectly orthodox; for they occur in the Upanishads.

2 मद्यस्तिष्ठच यज्ञेत्रिप्यायं तत् संतर्ये पावनम्।
ब्राह्मण दृष्टिप्रक्षयते च यूपन्यासनात्मिनाः।
also mentioned in the Garuḍa Purāṇa, in which it is equally said that the initiation is in the name of Hari or Vishṇu; and not one of the prayers and invocations contained in those two passages is taken from the Tāntrika ritual. It is, indeed, surprising that, after having written the accurate account 1 of the Śākta sect, contained in his “Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus,” Professor Wilson should state that the Garuḍa Purāṇa contains prayers from the Tāntrika ritual, addressed to the Sun, Śiva, and Vishṇu; for he must be well aware that the Tāntrika sect do not worship either Vishṇu or the Sun. As, however, Professor Wilson has, in that Sketch, confined himself principally to the description of its distinguishing characteristics,—the kumārī-pūjā, or worship of the virgin,—I add these remarks of Mr. Ward, in order to evince how totally impossible it must be to find such doctrines in the Purāṇas: “The Tantras either set aside all these ceremonies [of the Vedas], or prescribe them in other

1 I, of course, except this passage: “The adoration of Pra-kriti or Śakti is, to a certain extent, authorized by the Purāṇas, particularly the Brahma Vaivarta, the Skanda, and the Kālikā:* the erroneousness of which I have, perhaps, demonstrated in these letters. I am, indeed, strongly inclined to suspect that Professor Wilson’s employment of indices and abstracts for the examination of the Purāṇas has often led him to conclude that the term Śakti, which occurs so frequently in those works, denoted Devī in her character of Śakti, as worshipped by the Śāktas. But, in the Purāṇas, this term means power and energy in general; and, when it does not, it invariably denotes the energy of the Supreme Being, or Māyā, or the impersonified energies of the three principal gods.

forms." The Tántrika prayers, even for the same ceremony, differ from those of the Veda; and, in certain cases, they dispense with all ceremonies; assuring men that it is sufficient for a person to receive the initiatory incantation from his religious guide, to repeat the name of his guardian deity, and to serve his teacher. They actually forbid the person called púrāñabhishikta to follow the rules of the Veda."

In that Preface, * also, Professor Wilson observes: "Colonel Vans Kennedy, however, objects to the application of the term Šákta to this last division of the Puráñas [the Rájasa]; the worship of Šakti being the especial object of a different class of works, the Tantras; and no such form of worship being particularly inculcated in the Brahma Puráña. This last argument is of weight in regard to the particular instance specified; and the designation of Šakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole class, although it is to some of the series: for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Puráña." Professor Wilson is, thus, obliged to admit that he had completely mistaken the tendency of a Puráña which he had analysed; and yet he not only adheres to his opinion, that some of the Puráñas belong to his imaginary Šákta class, but he has even advanced, in that Preface, † these extraordinary assertions: "The term Rájasa, implying the animation of passion, and enjoyment of sensual delights, is appli-

---


* Pp. XXI., XXII.
† P. XXII.
cable not only to the character of the youthful divinity [Krishna], but to those with whom his adoration in these forms seems to have originated,—the Gosains of Gokul and Bengal, the followers and descendants of Vallabha and Chaitanya, the priests and proprietors of Jagannath and Srinitydwār, who lead a life of affluence and indulgence, and vindicate, both by precept and practice, the reasonableness of the Rājasa property, and the congruity of temporal enjoyment with the duties of religion.” All this, however, is not only totally erroneous, but it rests entirely on certain fanciful inferences which Professor Wilson has drawn from the meaning of the term Rājasa; which is, certainly, a most singular mode of reasoning. He is, here, also in direct contradiction with himself; for, in one part of the paragraph from which this quotation is taken, he says that the Rājasa Purāṇas “lean to the Šákta division of the Hindus, the worshippers of Šakti, or the female principle;” and, in conclusion, he speaks of persons vindicating “the reasonableness of the Rājasa property, and the congruity of temporal enjoyment with the duties of religion.” But Professor Wilson attempts not to explain how it can be possible that the same class of Purāṇas should inculcate the peculiar worship of both Krishnā and Šakti; nor what the leading a life of affluence and indulgence has to do with worshipping the yoni of a naked virgin; nor what resemblance there can be between the scandalous and abominable orgies of the Šaktas, and the calm though sensual enjoyment of life by the votaries of Krishnā, as above described. Nothing, indeed, can be more dissimilar than the worship of the juvenile Krishnā and that of Šakti; and,
when, therefore, Professor Wilson is of opinion that, in some of the Puráñas, both of these dissimilar worships are peculiarly enjoined, it must be evident that he has as much mistaken the object and tendency of the Brahmánáda, the Brahma Vaivarta, the Márkañ-ñeya, the Bhavishya, and Vámana Puráñas, as he admits he was mistaken in placing the Brahma Puráña in the Śákta class. I have also remarked, above, that this division of the Puráñas into three classes is mentioned in the Padma Puráña alone; and that this Puráña does not explain the reason why a particular Puráña is assigned to a particular class. But, admitting this classification, it appears clearly, from it, that the Puráñas relating to Śiva are placed in the Támasa class; and, consequently, as Tántrika works are dedicated to Śiva and Deví, if the Rájasa class of Puráñas inculcate Tántrika doctrines,—as Professor Wilson supposes,—they ought, according to the principle of classification in the Padma Puráña, to have been included in the Támasa, and not in the Rájasa, class. The writer, however, of that Puráña has not so classed them; and, thus, all the reasoning which Professor Wilson has founded on the meaning of the term Rájasa is refuted by the very authority that he has adduced in support of it.

It is, at the same time, obvious that all the arguments adduced by Professor Wilson against the genuineness of the Puráñas, as now extant, presuppose that descriptions of rites and ceremonies, injunctions for the preferential worship of particular deities, legends, tenets and doctrines, and moral and religious instruction should not find a place in a genuine Puráña; for
he takes no notice of those parts of the present Puráñas which relate to these subjects, and, thus, rejects at least two-thirds of the whole of the eighteen Puráñas now extant, as being spurious and modern. But it is evident that it is only from a due consideration of these subjects, and a careful comparison of what is said, respecting them, in one Puráña, with what is said in the other Puráñas, that a correct opinion can possibly be formed with respect to whether those works exhibit one uniform religious system, or whether they indicate that heterodox doctrines have been introduced into them; for, if an undeniable uniformity exists—as I have no doubt it does,—in an aggregate of 1,600,000 lines, in the general description of rites, ceremonies, legends, and doctrines, no stronger internal evidence is, surely, requisite, to prove that the present Puráñas cannot be, as Professor Wilson supposes, an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients.† Professor Wilson also avows that he has not read the Puráñas, and that the notices which he has given of their contents must have been taken from indices and abstracts, the accuracy of which I have never questioned.¹ But I am convinced that

¹ In his Analysis of the Brahma Puráñia, Professor Wilson has observed* that the manner in which he effected his examination of the Puráñas has been misconceived; and he may, possibly, refer to a letter which I addressed to you, and which appeared in the number of your Journal of March, 1887. In that letter I remarked, in a note: "Was any precaution adopted in order to ascertain that all the chapters of each Puráña, or even all the subjects treated of, in it, were actually included in it?

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
such a manner of examining the Purāṇas will never enable any person to form any but an erroneous judgment of the real nature and genuineness of their contents. Had, for instance, Professor Wilson actually read even that division of the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa which is dedicated particularly, but not exclusively, to the life of Kṛishṇa, he would have found, in it, several conversations between Kṛishṇa and Rādhā, in which Kṛishṇa relates, in the most orthodox manner, several legends and particulars of Hindu mythology, and instructs Rādhā in the abstruse doctrines of Hindu theology; and, even in one of those conversations, is contained a long orthodox account of Śiva, Sātī, and Pārvatī. The ritual, also, prescribed, in it, for the celebration of Kṛishṇa's annual festival, is perfectly orthodox; for it directs that, in performing it, texts of the Śāma Veda should be recited; besides which, three divisions of this Purāṇa are dedicated to Brahmā, Devī, and Gaṇeṣa; so that, in fact, there is not, perhaps, more than one-sixth of the whole work that is occupied with descriptions of Kṛishṇa. Yet this is the work the character of which Professor Wilson pronounces to be, "in truth, so decidedly secta-

For any omission of them would, obviously, prevent an accurate opinion being formed of its contents." The indices and abstracts may be quite correct, as far as they go; but the question is, Are they full and complete? And, as it cannot be supposed that Professor Wilson has omitted, in his notices of the Purāṇas, those particulars, contained in them, which were contrary to his view of the subject, these letters will sufficiently show that no precaution was adopted to render those indices and abstracts full and complete, and that omissions of essential importance have, in consequence, taken place in them.
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rial," as to give it "not the slightest title to be regarded as a Puráña."*

I shall pursue the subject in a succeeding letter.

Bombay, 30th October, 1840.

Vans Kennedy.

Sir: I proceed—with reluctance, however,—to consider another of Professor Wilson’s arguments, in which he infers that the present Puráñas must be modern compilations, because the Jainas are mentioned in them. But, in my last letter, † I have shown that, had Professor Wilson read the chapter of the Kúrma Puráña from which he has made a mutilated quotation, he would have observed, from the context, that the term Árhuṭa, contained in it, could not possibly apply to Jina; and, in the passage which he quotes from the Bhágavata, ‡ there is neither proof nor probability that Árhuṭa means either Jina or the Jaina sect.§ It is, also, expressly said, in the Vishńu Puráña, Vol. III., p. 209, the Buddhists "were called Árhuṭas, from the phrase he (Buddha,) ‖ had employed, of ‘Ye are worthy (Arhatha) of this great doctrine.’" It is singular, there-

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXVI. and LXVII.
† The Colonel should have written "my last letter but one". Vide supra, pp. 286, 287.
‡ Vol. II., p. 104, note 1. Arhat, a proper name, occurs there.
§ Árhuṭa, according to circumstances, may denote either a follower of Buddha or a follower of Jina.
‖ Vide infra, p. 348, text and note 1, for a lame apology for this interpolation.
fore, that Professor Wilson should assume, in direct opposition to the authority of the Puráña which he has, himself, translated, that the term Árhat, when it occurs, as a proper name, in the Puráñas, should be considered to apply to Jina, and not to Buddha. But it has been sufficiently proved that Buddha lived in the sixth century B. C.; and no argument, therefore, could be founded upon the mention of his name in the Puráñas, to prove that not one of the works now extant under the name of Puráñas was written prior to the year 900 A. D.; and, on that account, Professor Wilson has—too evidently, for the support of his opinion,—transferred the term Árhat from Buddha (to whom, alone, it is applied, in the Puráñas,) to Jina. Professor Wilson, therefore, has not yet proved that the Jainas are mentioned in the Puráñas. But the Buddhists are frequently mentioned in those works; and it is, therefore, a strange mode of reasoning, to infer that anything contained in the Puráñas relates to Jina, when it may apply, with so much more probability, to Vishńu’s incarnation, Buddha, from whom the Buddhists, according to the Puráñas, originated.

The preceding remarks, and those contained in my former letters, will evince that Professor Wilson’s examination of the Puráñas has been much too incomplete, and that the conclusions which he has drawn from it are much too erroneous to authorize him to state so positively: “That Brahmans unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Puráñas, cannot reasonably be con-

* Vide infra, p. 362, text and note §.
† This is quite a mistake. See Vol. IV., p. 43, note 1.
tested,"* and that "It is possible† that there may have been an earlier class of Puráñas, of which those we now have are but the partial and adulterated representatives."‡ This opinion has been maintained by Lieut. Col. Wilford and Mr. Bentley, and, in some measure, countenanced by Mr. Colebrooke; but it still remains unsupported by any proof whatever. Professor Wilson argues thus: In the vocabulary of Amara Siúňa, written 56 B.C., it is said that a Puráña is "a treatise on five topics," and, in several of the Puráñas, it is, further, explained what these five topics are: but not one of the Puráñas now extant conforms to that definition: therefore, the present Puráñas cannot be the works which were current, under that name, in the time of Amara Siúňa. This conclusion is, further, supported by his affirming only, but not proving, that the present Puráñas inculcate the doctrines of sects of known modern origin, and that "circumstances are sometimes mentioned, or alluded to, [in the Puráñas], or references to authorities are made, or legends are narrated, or places are particularized, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable."‡

Such is the state of the question. On the first two of these points I have, perhaps, already said more than sufficient; and the only point, therefore, which re-

---

* This "it is possible" is singular; for much of Professor Wilson's reasoning depends on the fact, that the original Puráñas were current in the time of Amara Siúňa.

† Ibid., p VI.
‡ Ibid., p. XI.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XCVIII., XCIX.
mains to be considered is, whether there is any internal evidence, contained in the Puráñas now extant, which proves that each and all of those works are modern compilations. I cannot place so much reliance on my own examination of the Puráñas, as to affirm that there is not; but no passages containing such internal evidence have been yet produced; and, were even passages bearing a modern appearance produced, the dates of the circumstances mentioned in them could not be determined. For the Puráñas contain no dates; and there exists not any biographical, topographical, chronological, or historical work which would afford the means of fixing the date when, in India, a place of pilgrimage first acquired sacredness, when a temple was first erected, when a distinguished character lived, when a king reigned,* or when an ancient sect, philosophical or religious, was founded, or when it became extinct. All the circumstances and events mentioned in the Puráñas, from which an inference with respect to their date might be drawn, are of precisely the same kind as the temples in Orissa, from the mention of which, in the Brahma Puráña, Professor Wilson infers the modern date of that work; for it is not only necessary to prove that those temples were built in modern times, but it must be, further, proved that, previous to their erection, no temples ever existed, in India, of the same names, and in the same situations. In the quotation, also, from the Kúrma Puráña, contained in my second letter;† is mentioned a Váma Sástra; and there is, at this day, a sect

* Vide supra, p. 313, note *.  
† Vide supra, pp. 286, 287.
named Váma Yamáchárin; but, as the Puráña gives no description of the Váma Sástra, on what grounds can it be reasonably supposed that this is, actually, the same as the Tantras of the left-handed sect of the Sáktas? In all such cases, it is evident that coincidence merely in name is no proof that the name must necessarily apply to the modern temple or sect; and, consequently, its applicability must be proved, before a mere name can be admitted as any proof that the Puráñas are modern compilations. It is equally evident that, as the Puráñas contain no dates, and as there are no books to refer to for an illustration of their contents, so far is the recent date of any particular circumstance mentioned in them from being indisputable, that, on the contrary, every adaptation of an occurrence or event, mentioned in the Puráñas, to a date must depend solely and entirely on conjecture. No circumstances, therefore, are mentioned in the Puráñas, the precise or even approximate date of which can be indisputably fixed, or even fixed at all; and it must, hence, follow that those works do not contain any internal evidence which proves their recent composition.*

Professor Wilson's supposition, however, that the Puráñas have been remodelled by the Brahmans, rests entirely on the further supposition, that circumstances are mentioned, in those works, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable. But I have examined in vain the remarks contained in the Preface to the Translation of the Vishúnu Puráña, in order to ascertain

* That the Puráñas are not ancient is evident from their very Sanskrit. How, too, as regards their prophetic parts?
what the precise opinion is which Professor Wilson means to express with respect to the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráñas, as now extant. He maintains that the whole of the Bhágavata was written by Bopadeva; that the compilation of the Vámana “may have amused the leisure of some Brahman of Benares”; that the Agni and Brahma Vaivarta have no claims to be regarded as Puráñas; and that the Linga “is more a ritual than a Puráña”;* and he, thus, gives approximate dates to nine of the Puráñas, the dates of the other nine being nearer to, or remoter from, the earliest date mentioned:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Márkañdéya} & \quad \text{9th or 10th century.} \\
\text{Linga} & \quad \text{9th or 10th} \\
\text{Víshnu} & \quad \text{11th or 12th} \\
\text{Padma}^1 & \quad \text{12th — 16th} \\
\text{Váraha} & \quad \text{12th} \\
\text{Bhágavata} & \quad \text{12th} \\
\text{Brahma} & \quad \text{13th or 14th} \\
\text{Vámana} & \quad \text{14th or 15th} \\
\text{Náradiya} & \quad \text{16th or 17th}^{\dagger}
\end{align*}
\]

But, although Professor Wilson thus expressly ascribes the original composition of two of the Puráñas to two individuals, and seems to intimate that several of the other Puráñas were composed in the same manner, he

---

1 Professor Wilson remarks that the different portions of this Puráña “are, in all probability, as many different works”; and the above dates, therefore, apply to different portions of the whole work.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. L., LXXVI., LX., LXVII., LXIX.
† Ibid., pp. LVIII., LXX., CXL., XXXIV., LXXI., LI., XXIX., LXXXVI., LIII.
yet seems to suppose that the groundwork of the present Puráñas was the eighteen ancient Puráñas; for he speaks of "the strong internal evidence, which all of them afford, of the intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients."* He even remarks that "the identity of the legends in many of them [the Puráñas], and, still more, the identity of the words,—for, in several of them, long passages are, literally, the same,†—is a sufficient proof that...... they must be copied either from some other similar work, or from a common and prior original."‡ To argue against such inconsistencies and contradictions is quite out of the question; but it is evident that, if the composition and compilation of the present Puráñas by eighteen different persons occupied eight centuries, those works could not also have been remodelled by the Brahmans, for sectarian purposes; and that, if their groundwork was the ancient Puráñas, not one of them could be the original composition of a modern writer; and that, if such was not their groundwork, it is utterly incredible that eighteen different persons, living at long intervals of time from each other, and while the Muhammadans were extending their dominions over the greatest part of India, should produce eighteen works in which the legends are identical, and long passages are, literally, the same. The supposition, also, that an aggregate of 1,600,000 lines, spread over an extent of a million of square miles, should have been remodelled, whether by the Brahmans or any

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
† This is, I believe, greatly an overstatement. It is a rare thing, at least in my experience, to find even a single couplet precisely the same in any two Puráñas. See Vol. I., p. 57, note •. ‡ Vol. I., Preface, p. VI.
other persons, on one uniform plan, seems to be an absolute impossibility; and the motive assigned for such remodelling,—sectarial imposture,—is at once disproved by the simple facts, that not one of the Puráñas inculcates sectarian doctrines, and that the exclusive worshippers of Vishńu, or of Śiva, or of any other deity, have always formed, in India, but a small portion of the whole population.

There is, however, a difficulty which embarrasses the decision of this question; for, not only in several of the Puráñas are the names of all the eighteen specified, but, in most of them, the narrator is requested to repeat the Puráña about to be related, expressly by name. Professor Wilson, therefore, correctly remarks that "the identity of the legends in many of them [the Puráñas], and, still more, the identity of the words,—for, in several of them, long passages are, literally, the same,—is a sufficient proof that, in all such cases, they must be copied either from some other similar work, or from a common and prior original." The internal evidence, however, of the Puráñas fully proves that they have not been copied from each other; and this identity, therefore, must have been derived from one common original. But there is nothing improbable in supposing that, previous to the Puráñas being committed to writing in their present state, *four or five centuries prior to the Christian era*, numerous legends and traditions relating to the modes of worship and the doctrines of the Hindu religion had, in remote times, been formed, preserved, and transmitted by oral communication only.¹ When, therefore, eighteen different per-

¹ Such is the manner in which instruction is communicated
sons, in different parts of India, collected together those legends and traditions, and committed them to writing, the greatest similarity would, necessarily, exist in the eighteen works, and the same legend and tradition would often be selected for insertion, and, consequently, often expressed in the same, or nearly the same, words. The existence, therefore, of "a common and prior original", so far from being an argument against the genuineness and antiquity of the present Puráñas, should, on the contrary, be considered as a decisive proof that those works are, essentially, in the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing. Because, in their present state, each of the Puráñas is a collection of legends, traditions, and rituals, and not a work systematically written; and it must, hence, be evident that such collections could have been made only at a time when such traditionary lore was fresh in the memory of the Brahmans. The present state, therefore, of the Puráñas now extant, in which the most important legends, and even the origin of the deities, are related in a discordant manner,—though not in such a manner as in the least affects the perfect homogeneity of the Hindu religion,—is, alone, a strong proof that those works have undergone no amongst the Brahmans, even at this day; and it is an immemorial tradition, that the Puráñas were thus transmitted. In the Vishnú Puráña, for instance, Parásara thus replies to Maitreya: "Now truly all that was told me formerly by Vasishtha, and by the wise Pulastya"... "I will relate to you the whole, even all you have asked.”

* Vol. I., p. 11.
alteration since they were first committed to writing; for, as those discordancies have been allowed to remain, it is most probable that religious scruples have prevented the Brahmans from subsequently giving uniformity to their religious system.

But, to the supposition, that the present Purâñas are modern compilations, written between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, the existence of "a common and prior original" becomes an insuperable objection; for it is highly improbable that such legends and traditions as are contained in the Purâñas were then current; and, even admitting that they were, it is quite incredible that, in the disturbed state of India, and decay of Sanskrit learning, during that period, eighteen different persons should produce eighteen works in which not only the legends are identical, but long passages literally the same. It may, however, be said that the eighteen ancient Purâñas were then extant, or, at least, that fragments of them were still preserved. I shall not here repeat what I have already said respecting the incredibility of the suppositions that the Brahmans have suppressed the ancient Purâñas, and substituted, in their place, the works now bearing that name, or that the Brahmans of all India have received, in the place of the ancient Purâñas, the acknowledged works of eighteen obscure individuals. On this point, also, it is impossible to ascertain what the opinion of Professor Wilson is: for, in one part of that Preface, he appears to admit, distinctly, that each of the ancient Purâñas was extant until it was superseded by the present Purâña; but, in other parts, he has argued at length, to prove that the present Purâ-
ñas cannot be the same works which were current in the time of Amara Siáhá. Since, therefore, Professor Wilson has, thus, adopted 'two contradictory suppositions, in order to account for what he supposes to be the spuriousness of the present Puráñas, it must be evident that he has completely failed in proving that the present Puráñas are not genuine. But the levity and irrefection with which Professor Wilson has decided against the genuineness and antiquity of those works will be best judged of from these remarks: "No weight can be attached to the specification of the eighteen names; for they are, always, complete: each Puráña enumerates all. Which is the last? Which had the opportunity of naming its seventeen predecessors, and adding itself? The argument proves too much. There can be little doubt that the list has been inserted, upon the authority of tradition, either by some improving transcriber, or by the compiler of a work more recent than the eighteen genuine Puráñas."¹ Professor Wilson extends the compilation of the present

---

¹ Professor Wilson observes that the objection to the modern composition of the Śrī Bhágavata is rebutted by there being another Puráña to which the name applies,—the Devi Bhágavata. But all his remarks on this point are entirely misplaced and unnecessary; because the mere perusal of the Devi Bhágavata † will at once show that it is, decidedly and avowedly, a Tántrika work: for, in the 26th chapter of the 3rd skandha, is contained a description of the Kumári-pújá, or worship of the virgin. I possess a copy of this work, in twelve skandhas, which appears to be complete.

What, also, does Professor Wilson here mean by genuine Puráñas? He denies that the Puráñas current in the time of Amara

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XLV. † Ibid., p. LXXXVIII., note †.
Puracyas over eight centuries; and, therefore, in order to get rid of the objection to this supposition, which results from each Purânya containing the names of all the eighteen, he thinks it quite sufficient to observe that this specification has been inserted by some improving transcriber,—he must mean, of course, after the last of the present Purâñas was written, that is, after the seventeenth century. Thus, supposition is supported by supposition; and, thus, all Professor Wilson's reasoning, to prove that the present Purânas are modern compilations, depends entirely on gratuitous assumptions and groundless assertions.

Whether, however, complete works, bearing the same names, existed previous to the present Purânas being committed to writing, is a question which admits not of decision. That the names of all the eighteen Purâñas were previously known seems unquestionable;* and it would, therefore, appear most probable that these names had belonged to works which had preceded the present Purâñas. But the internal evidence of the present Purâñas proves that they are, rather, collections of legends, traditions, and rituals, than works systematically written; for they are entirely deficient in arrangement, and the subjects treated of in them have

Símba are now extant; but he has not attempted to explain how long it was that they continued current after that time, nor the time and manner in which they subsequently became extinct; and yet, in discussing a point relating to the present Purâñas, he seems to speak of them as if they were the genuine Purâñas. To elicit, therefore, either meaning or consistency out of such remarks is, evidently, quite impossible.

* What proof is there of this assertion?
no further connexion with each other than that they all contribute to inculcate and illustrate some of the tenets and doctrines of the Hindu religion. It is possible, however, that more ancient Puráñas may have existed, which, from various circumstances during their transmission by oral communication only, were no longer in a complete state, when the present Puráñas were committed to writing; and that such fragments of them as were at that time preserved have been incorporated in the present Puráñas, to which, also, the names of the ancient works have been given. But the decision of this question is of no importance; because it is proved that works bearing the names of the Puráñas were current in India in the century prior to the Christian era;* and there is not the slightest reason for supposing that those works have not been preserved until the present day, in the same manner as other Sanskrit manuscripts of the same period have been preserved. From the notices, also, which occur in Greek writers, it appears highly probable that the very same system of religion which is described in the Puráñas prevailed in India at the time of Alexander's invasion; and it may, therefore, be justly concluded that the Puráñas had received their present form† four or five centuries prior to the Christian era. Even Professor Wilson remarks: "But the same internal testimony furnishes proof, equally decisive, of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Puráñas, in the face of abundant posi-

* This has never been proved.  
† As to their predictions and all?
tive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of
the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the
legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the
institutions which they describe, at least three cen-
turies before the Christian era."* But it must be evi-
dent that these remarks are totally irreconcileable with
what Professor Wilson elsewhere observes: "At the
same time, they [the Puráñas,] may be acquitted of
subservience to any but sectarian imposture. They
were pious frauds for temporary purposes."†

It, hence, clearly appears that, in contending for the
modern compilation of the present Puráñas, Professor
Wilson was influenced by a preconceived opinion, the
erroneousness of which he would not admit; but that,
in thus forcibly maintaining the antiquity of the greater
portion of the contents of those works, he was irre-
sistibly compelled to yield to the convincing proof,
which their internal evidence presents, of the genuine-
ness and antiquity of the Puráñas, as now extant.
I have, also, sufficiently shown, in these letters, that
the present Puráñas do neither inculcate sectarian doc-
trines nor indicate, in any manner, that they are an
intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients; but
that, on the contrary, they exhibit, throughout an ag-
gregate of 1,600,000 lines, the utmost uniformity in
the general description of legends, traditions, modes
of worship, and doctrines.‡ It must, consequently, be
most reasonable to conclude that the Puráñas now
extant received their present form four or five cen-
turies prior to the Christian era, and that, since then,

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XClX. † Ibid., p. XI.
‡ One is at a loss to see where all this has been shown.
they have undergone no alteration whatever; rather than that they are works which, for the purpose of sectarian imposture, either have been remodelled by the Brahmans since the Christian era, or which have been written by eighteen obscure individuals, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries.

Bombay, 30th October, 1840.

Vans Kennedy.

Sir: As the eighteen Puráñas are, undoubtedly, the only source from which a knowledge of the mythology and popular religion of the Hindus can be derived, it becomes of importance to determine whether those works are ancient compositions, or mere modern compilations; and I trust, in consequence, that you will have no objection to my offering a few further remarks on this subject, previous to closing its discussion. In my last letter, however, I observed that the Puráñas contain no dates, and that there is no biographical, topographical, geographical, or historical work which would afford the means of fixing the date when, in India, a place of pilgrimage first acquired sacredness, when a temple was first erected, when a king or distinguished personage lived,* or when a philosophical or religious sect was founded, or when it became extinct. It would, hence, seem that, as the date of the circumstances mentioned in the Puráñas cannot be determined, the question whether they are ancient or

* Vide supra, p. 313, note *.
modern cannot be decided; as all opinions respecting the period when they may have been written must depend, principally, if not entirely, on conjecture. But the internal evidence of those works affords the strongest proof that they cannot be modern compilations; for the legends, and descriptions of scenery, and of men and manners, contained in them, bear such an unquestionable impression of antiquity, and such a dissimilarity to all that is known of India since the era of Vikramáditya (B.C. 56),* that they irresistibly lead to the conclusion that the Puráñas must have been written at some remote period. When, therefore, the Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford published his opinion, that the works now bearing that name were compiled between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, it might have been expected that he would have supported so startling a statement by the clearest and most conclusive arguments and authorities. But he has, on the contrary,—as I have, perhaps sufficiently shown,—formed that opinion from an imperfect examination of the Puráñas, and maintained it solely by having recourse to gratuitous assumptions and groundless assertions.

The whole, indeed, of the remarks contained in the Preface to the Translation of the Vishvú Puráña appear to have been written for the purpose of demonstrating that, "of the present popular forms of the Hindu religion, none assumed their actual state earlier than the time of Śankara Áchárya, the great Śaiva

* In p. 312, supra, Colonel Kennedy pronounces that "The history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era is almost unknown." Also see p. 293, supra.
reformer, who, flourished, in all likelihood, in the eighth or ninth century. Of the Vaishnava teachers, Ramanuja dates in the twelfth century; Madhwhacharya, in the thirteenth; and Vallabha, in the sixteenth; and the Puranas seem to have accompanied, or followed, their innovations; being obviously intended to advocate the doctrines they taught."* A still more erroneous opinion was published by Professor Wilson, twelve years before, in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," in which he has observed: "To the internal incongruities of the system, which did not affect its integral existence, others were, in time, superadded, that threatened to dissolve or destroy the whole. Of this nature was the exclusive adoration of the old deities, or of new forms of them; and even, it may be presumed, the introduction of new divinities. In all these respects, the Puranas and Tantras were especially instrumental; and they not only taught their followers to assert the unapproachable superiority of the gods they worshipped, but inspired them with feelings of animosity towards those who presumed to dispute that supremacy. In this conflict, the worship of Brahma has disappeared, as well as, indeed, that of the whole pantheon, except Vishnu, Siva, and Sakti, or their modifications. With respect to the two former, in fact, the representatives have borne away the palm from the prototypes; and Krishna, Rama, or the Linga, are almost the only forms under which Vishnu and Siva are now adored in most parts of† India.";

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.
† Colonel Kennedy here omitted the very important words "most parts of".
‡ Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 3—5.
this Sketch, however, Professor Wilson at the same
time observes that "the worshippers of Vishńu, Śiva,
and Śakti, who are the objects of the following de-
scription, are not to be confounded with the orthodox
adorers of those divinities."* And yet he also states
that the present state of the Hindu faith is of, com-
paratively, very recent origin.†

It would, hence, appear that Professor Wilson has
formed his opinion of the Hindu religion from the excep-
tion, and not from the rule, and that he has given
an importance to the sects that have originated amongst
upwards of a hundred and thirty millions of people,
to which they are not entitled. For it would, no doubt,
be considered as a strange mode of judging of the
established religion of England, were an opinion to be
formed of it from the sects which prevail there: but
such seems to have been the manner in which Pro-
fessor Wilson has contemplated the Hindu religion;
and it is too evident that it is in support of this erro-
neous view of the subject that he has ascribed to the
Puráńas a modern origin, and contents which they do
not contain. But I am certain that not a single Puráńa
ipecula the exclusive worship of a particular deity,
and that not a passage which is genuine can be found,
in any Puráńa,‡ which would inspire the followers of

---

* This Sketch is contained in Vols. XVI. and XVII. of the
Asiatic Researches. I refer, throughout this letter, to the part
contained in Vol. XVI.

‡ In p. 347, infra, Colonel Kennedy asserts, however, that "there are
no means of distinguishing those parts of them [the Puráńas,] which
one deity with feelings of animosity towards those who presumed to dispute its supremacy.\(^1\) So far, indeed, is this from being the case, that every sect—as Professor Wilson himself admits,—has found it necessary to compose works for the purpose of teaching and supporting its peculiar tenets; which circumstance, alone, is sufficient to prove that the Puráñas were not adapted for the promotion of such an object, and, consequently, that those works could not have been written in subservience to sectarian imposture, as Professor Wilson supposes.

It is also undeniable that the great mass of the Hindus are Śmārtas, though all who are so do not adopt this name;\(^2\) that is, they consider both Vishńu

\(^1\) In the Sketch referred to, Professor Wilson has quoted several Sanskrit authorities, which, if genuine, would disprove this statement: but he has specified neither the book nor the chapter of the Puráñas from which they are said to be taken; and it would appear that he had not, himself, verified them. Not being able, therefore, to ascertain this point, I must consider these quotations to be spurious; for they are at complete variance with numerous passages that occur in the Puráñas, which expressly inculcate that Vishńu and Śiva ought, both, to be worshipped.

\(^2\) The Brahmans of the Deccan, for instance, and of Gujerat, call themselves Śaivas; but they are, in reality, Śmārtas, as they do not reject the worship of Vishńu, though they consider it of less importance than that of Śiva. The same is the case with many of the Brahmans in other parts of India, who call themselves Vaishāivas, but consider Śiva as entitled to adoration. This, however, is in strict conformity to the Puráñas, in which are thought to be ancient and genuine from those which are thought to be modern and spurious."

* Most venturesomely.
APPENDIX.

and Śiva to be entitled to adoration, but some of them identify either Vishṇu or Śiva with the Supreme Being,—an opinion which is clearly inculcated in several of the Purāṇas. But, though, in some of those works, Vishṇu is represented to be, in some degree, inferior to Śiva, still the latter is frequently introduced, in the Śaiva Purāṇas, as enjoining the necessity of worshipping Vishṇu, and explaining the mysterious nature of his incarnations; and, in the same manner, though, in the Vaishṇava Purāṇas, the supremacy is ascribed to Vishṇu, still the fullest justice is done to the divinity of Śiva. The exclusive votary of Vishṇu, on the contrary, refuses all adoration to Śiva; and, in the same manner, the exclusive votary of Śiva denies Vishṇu to be a proper object of worship; and such votaries, therefore, of these deities are, with reference to the population, by no means numerous in India. It is equally unquestionable that the substitution of the Linga for the image of Śiva occasioned no alteration in the worship of that god; for, in the ritual prescribed for the worship of the Linga, as contained in the Linga Purāṇa, it is said: "Having bathed in the prescribed manner, enter the place of worship; and, having performed three suppressions of the breath, meditate on that god (Śiva,) who has three eyes, five heads, ten arms, and is of the colour of pure crystal, arrayed in costly garments, and adorned with all kinds of ornaments. Thus, having fixed in thy mind the real form of Maheśwara, proceed to worship him with the proper hymns and prayers." The Linga, therefore, is

the terms Vaishṇava and Śaiva denote the preferential, but not the exclusive, worshipper of either Vishṇu or Śiva.
worshipped by all Śaivas and Smārtas; for it is, in fact, the only type under which Śiva has been adored from remote times. The worship, also, of Rāma is scarcely known in India;* and Professor Wilson is, certainly, incorrect in stating that the worship of Bāla Gopāla, the infant Kṛishṇa, is very widely diffused amongst all ranks of Indian society; for the votaries of Kṛishṇa are by no means numerous, and are to be found only in Bengal,¹ and in some parts of Hindostan proper.

Much of the reasoning, however, adduced in the Preface to the Translation of the Viṣhṇu Purāṇa, to prove the modern compilation of the Purāṇas, is founded on the supposition that the date of the Purāṇas in which Kṛishṇa is mentioned—particularly the Brahma Vaivarta,—must be subsequent to the establishment of the sect of “the worshippers of the juvenile Kṛishṇa and Rādhā, a form of belief of known modern origin.”† But, in that Preface, Professor Wilson gives it, as his opinion, that the Mahābhārata “is, evidently, the great fountain from which most, if not all, of the Purāṇas have drawn;”: and, in the Sketch above referred to,§ he remarks: “The worship of Kṛishṇa, as one with Viṣhṇu and the universe, dates,

¹ Mr. Ward remarks: “Six parts out of ten of the whole Hindu population of Bengal are supposed to be disciples of this god. The far greater part of these, however, are of the lower orders; and but few of them Brahmans.” Vol. I., p. 200.

* If Colonel Kennedy’s information had been coextensive with anything approaching the whole of India, he would never have hazarded this remark.
† Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI. ‡ Ibid., p. XCII.
§ Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. I., p. 121.
evidently, from the Mahābhārata.” According to this statement, therefore, it is evident that, as the worship of Kṛishṇa dates from that poem, and as its composition preceded that of the Purāṇas, the date of none of those works can in the least depend on the time when the sects of Vallabha and Chaitanya originated,—unless, indeed, Professor Wilson supposes that the Mahābhārata was not written until after the year 1520, A.D. In that Sketch, also, Professor Wilson has observed: “The worship of Kṛishṇa, as one with Vishūu and the universe, dates, evidently, from the Mahābhārata; and his more juvenile forms [actions?] are brought pre-eminently to notice in the account of his infancy contained in the Bhāgavata: but neither of these works discriminates him from Vishūu; nor do they recommend his infantine and adolescent state to particular veneration.” And, further: “In this description of creation, however, the deity [Kṛishṇa,] is still spoken of as a young man; and the Purāṇa [the Brahma Vaivarta], therefore, affords only indirect authority, in the marvels it narrates of his infancy, for the worship of the child.”* These remarks are quite correct, as far as relates to the veneration of Kṛishṇa; for I have shown, in my former letters, that in not one of the Purāṇas is the worship of Kṛishṇa, either as a child or a young man, inculcated, or even indicated. It is, hence, evident that, although the accounts of Kṛishṇa’s boyhood, which are contained in several of the Purāṇas, may have suggested to Vallabha and Chaitanya the design of establishing the worship of Kṛishṇa, still those Purāṇas could not have been written

for the purpose of promoting a form of belief which is
not even mentioned in them.

Professor Wilson, at the same time, extends the pre-
valence of this worship, by identifying the infant
Krishna with “the juvenile master of the universe, Ja-
gannatha”;* and yet he fixes the date when the temple
of Jagannatha was erected, in A. D. 1198,† and that
when Vallabha lived, in about A. D. 1520.‡ The wor-
ship, therefore, of Jagannatha cannot be the same as
that of Krishna established by Vallabha; and, in fact,
there is not the slightest resemblance between them:
because Jagannatha is worshipped as an incarnate
form, or, rather, as a type, of Vishnu, by all Hindus;
and, on the contrary, the worship of Krishna is not
generally practised, and prevails only in particular
parts of India. The legend, also, relating to Jagannatha
has no further reference to Krishna than the name;
for it is said, in it, that the temple of Purushottama
was erected by a king named Indradyumna, a fervent
votary of Vishnu, who being much distressed for the
want of a proper image to place in it, Vishnu appeared
to him, in a dream, and informed him that, the next
morning, he would find, in the sea, a sacred tree from
which the image was to be made. In the Brahma Pur-
ana, it is, further, said that, when the king had, ac-
cordingly, found the tree, and brought it on shore,
Vishnu and Vishvakarman (the artificer of the gods) ap-
peared to him, and that Vishnu directed the latter to
form from the tree the images of Krishna, his brother
Balabhadra, and sister Subadhra, which command

---

‡ Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. III., p. 120.
Viśwakarman immediately executed. Although, therefore, the images worshipped at Jagannātha bear these names, the adoration is, in reality, addressed to Viṣṇu, as the lord of the universe; and, consequently, in the ritual prescribed for it, there is no mention whatever of "the infant Kṛishṇa, Govinda, Bāla Gopāla, the sojourner in Vrindāvana, the companion of the cowherds and milkmaids, the lover of Rādhā."

Professor Wilson also seems not to have taken into consideration that the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu are an essential part of the Hindu religion; as it appears to be sufficiently ascertained that they are alluded to in the Vedas,† and it is certain that the son of Devaki, or Kṛishṇa, is mentioned in at least two of the Upanishads—the Chhāndogya and Nārāyaṇa. The veneration, therefore, of Kṛishṇa, as an incarnate form of Viṣṇu, which is all that is prescribed in the Purāṇas, must be of as remote a date as the most ancient known state of the Hindu religion;‡ and the mention, consequently, of Kṛishṇa, in any of the Purāṇas, as an avatāra of Viṣṇu, but not as a peculiar object of worship,—in which character he is never described in those works,§—can afford no grounds for supposing that the present Purāṇas are modern and sectarian compilations. Before, therefore, Professor Wilson identified that veneration with the worship of Kṛishṇa established by Vallabha and Chaitanya, and hence inferred the

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII.
† The knowledge of this allusion seems to be the peculiar property of Colonel Kennedy.
‡ That is to say, as old as the mantras of the Rīgveda!
§ For disproof of this assertion, see Book V of this Work, passim.
comparatively recent date of the Puráñas, as now extant, he should have produced, from those works, some passages which either expressly or virtually inculcate that worship; but he himself acknowledges, as I have before observed, that no such passages exist, and thus admits that this objection to the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráñas rests, solely and entirely, on inferences drawn from suppositions imagined by himself, but which are supported by neither probability nor by any authority whatever.

It is, hence, evident that, in presenting the sects which exist in India as a correct representation of the actual condition of the Hindu religion, and in maintaining that the present state of the Hindu faith “is of, comparatively, very recent origin,”* Professor Wilson has taken a most erroneous view of the subject. For the great mass of the Hindus adhere to that religious system which has prevailed in India from the remotest times, and which, alone, is inculcated in the eighteen Puráñas. Even Professor Wilson himself has observed that “the origin and development of their doctrines, traditions, and institutions [of which that system is composed,] were not the work of a day; and the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity, to an antiquity that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions, or beliefs of the ancient world.”† As, however, it is only from the Puráñas that a complete knowledge of those traditions and doctrines can be

---

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIIX.
derived, it is obvious that there are either no grounds for ascribing to them a remote antiquity, or that it must be admitted that the Puráñas are ancient compositions, and not modern compilations written by eighteen obscure individuals between the eighth and seventeenth centuries: because there are no other works with which the legends, and descriptions of scenery, men, and manners, and of rites, ceremonies, and modes of worship, contained in the Puráñas, might be compared, in order to ascertain whether they are of ancient or of modern date. And the supposing, consequently, with Professor Wilson, that the Puráñas are an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients, can be of no avail; for there are no means of distinguishing those parts of them which are thought to be ancient and genuine from those which are thought to be modern and spurious. But the internal evidence of the Puráñas proves that those works did not accompany, or follow, the innovations introduced into the Hindu religion by Śankara Áchárya, Rámánuja, Madhwáchárya, and Vallabha; and that they are not intended to advocate the doctrines taught by those sectaries. For not one of their sects is mentioned, or alluded to, in the Puráñas, in which works the only deities who are represented to be objects of worship are Vishńu, Śiva, Devi, Gañesa, and Súrya; and the worshippers of these deities are, indisputably, held to be the five orthodox divisions of the Hindus. Professor Wilson’s supposition, therefore, that the Puráñas were written in subservience to sectarian imposture, being, thus, disproved, it follows that the whole of his reasoning, to prove their modern date, founded on their
“exhibiting a sectarian fervour and exclusiveness,”* is totally futile and fallacious.

The Puráñas, consequently, do not contain—as Professor Wilson states,—the doctrines of sects of known modern origin; as, besides the sects just referred to, he only particularizes, in the Preface to the Translation of the Vishnu Puráña, the Sáktas and Jainas as being mentioned in the Puráñas. But, in my former letters, I have sufficiently shown that the tenets and practices of the Sáktas are so completely at variance with every principle of the Hindu religion, that it is impossible that they could be noticed in books which the Hindus hold to be sacred. I also pointed out, in my last letter;† that the term Arhata did not—as Professor Wilson assumed,—indicate either Jina or the Jainas; but I stated, erroneously, that it implied, in the passage which I quoted, to Buddha.‡ On subsequently comparing, however, the eighteenth chapter of Book III. of the Translation of the Vishnu Puráña with the original, I found that the one did not agree with the other; for the terms “Bauddhas” and “Jainas”, which are introduced into the Translation and the notes to it, do not occur in the origi-

---

* This mistake was occasioned by my trusting to the Translation, in which it is said: “These Daityas were induced, by the arch-deceiver, to deviate from their religious duties (and become Bauddhas).”

† Vide supra, pp. 322, 323.

‡ The whole truth is, that the Colonel not only criticized Professor Wilson’s rendering without reference to the original, but that he interpolated it without acknowledgement, in foisting in the word “Buddha”, so distinguished, typographically, that it seems to be quoted. The excuse offered in note 1, above, is very feeble.
nal. It is, therefore, singular that Professor Wilson should have made such a translation as this: "The delusions of the false teacher paused not with the conversion of the Daityas to the Jaina and Baudhā heresies;"* and that he should have remarked, in a note: "We have, therefore, the Baudhās noticed as a distinct sect:" because the original is, simply: "O Maitreya, after Māyāmoha, the great deceiver, had deluded the Daityas by various heretical doctrines, they relinquished the excellent faith inculcated by the Veda and Śruti."† It even appears, from the whole of this legend, that it does not apply to Vishnū's appearance as Buddha, but to some other occurrence, which is not mentioned in any other Purāṇa than the Vishnū;‡ for it thus commences, according to the translation: "There was, formerly, a battle between the gods and demons, for the period of a divine year, in which the gods were defeated by the demons under the command of Hrāda." But the only dissemination of heretical doctrines, through the instrumentality of Vishnū, which is mentioned in any other Purāṇa, is that in the city of the Tripura Asuras and that in Kūśi; to neither of which this legend applies; as it is said, in it, that Māyāmoha, the name of the illusory being emitted from Vishnū's body, "having proceeded (to earth), beheld the Daityas,

* Vol. III., p. 211. Colonel Kennedy quotes only a portion of the sentence corresponding to his own translation given just below.
† For refutation of this, vide infra, p. 378, note ‡.
‡ Vol. III., p. 201.
engaged in ascetic penances, upon the banks of the Narmadá river.”* Professor Wilson, therefore, has given to this chapter an interpretation not authorized by the original, in which nothing occurs which indicates that the composer of this Puráña intended to describe either Buddha or Jina, under this illusory form, or to adopt, or allude to, their doctrines, in the words spoken by it.†

I have adverted to this remarkable deviation from the faithful manner in which translations should always be made,‡ because the purport of this legend clearly shows that the terms “Jainas” and “Bauddhas” cannot be contained in any manuscript of the Vishńu Puráña. But Professor Wilson may have supposed that the term Arhata denoted the Jainas, and may have understood, from the words budhyadhwam and budhyate,§ that they applied to the Buddhists; and to this there could be no objection, had he expressed his opinion in a note, and not introduced into the text, the title of the chapter, and the index, the term “Jainas” and “Bauddhas”. As, also, the illusory form addressed

---

* Vol. III., p. 207.
† On the contrary, it is beyond doubt that both Jina and Buddha, by implication, are represented as forms of Māyāmoha. First, in the Vishńu-puráña, we have mention of the establishment of the Ārhatas by this “Deluder by illusion”, who then metamorphoses himself, and establishes a sect by which the Bauddha is, unmistakeably, intended. The Ārhatas must be either Jainas or Bauddhas; and the Chapter referred to shows that they were, unquestionably, the former. But I have anticipated Professor Wilson’s Reply.
‡ The Colonel, practically, was scarcely so austerely punctilious as his principles. Vide supra, p. 348, note †.
§ On the gross error here accepted, vide infra, p. 362, note †, and p. 377, note †.
only the same Daityas,* it is evident that he could not have induced them to adopt the doctrines of both Jina and Buddha; and Professor Wilson, therefore, should have selected either the one or the other as being the false teacher here intended. But it is undeniable that Jina or the Jainas are not mentioned, in the Puráñas, under these names;† and there is no reason, as I have before shown, for supposing that they are denoted by the term Árhata;‡ as no conclusion can be justly drawn from an isolated word which occurs in the Puráñas, unaccompanied by any explanation of its intent and meaning. It will, hence, appear that this legend cannot apply to the Jainas: nor can it apply to Buddha; for he, according to the Vaishnava Puráñas, was not an illusory form emitted from the body of Vishńu, but an actual incarnation of Vishńu,§ born in Kíkaña.|| When, therefore, Professor Wilson has so misunderstood and misinterpreted a passage in a Puráña which he has himself translated, it must be evident that no reliance can be placed on the correctness of the opinions which he expresses with respect to the age, and the scope and tendency, of the eighteen Puráñas. He has, however, intimated that he intends laying before the Royal Asiatic Society analyses of all the Puráñas, similar to the one of the Brahma Puráña, published in No. IX. of the Journal of that Society. But it is obvious that

† For Paurá nék mention of the Jina-dharma, or "religion of Jina", see Vol. IV., p. 43, note 1.
‡ Who are the Árhatas, then?
§ But why assume that the Puráñas may not contradict each other?
|| Vide supra, p. 178, notes 1 and 7.
such mere details of the contents of each Puráña can afford no information respecting the variety of subjects treated of in those works; and it is certain that, if these details are accompanied with such comments as have been already published by Professor Wilson, the analyses will convey the most erroneous notions of what is actually contained in the Puráñas. For Professor Wilson supposes that the Puráñas exhibit "a sectarian fervour and exclusiveness"; that they contain the doctrines, or allusions to the doctrines, of philosophical and religious sects of known modern origin; and that, in them, circumstances are mentioned, or alluded to, or legends are narrated, or places are particularized, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable. But no one of these suppositions—as I have evinced, in the course of these letters,—rests on any grounds whatever; and nothing contained in the Puráñas in any manner justifies Professor Wilson's opinion, that those works are pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, and in subservience to sectarian imposture. As, however, he not only entertains such an opinion, but even supposes that the Puráñas were compiled by eighteen obscure individuals, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, it will be evident that no analyses which Professor Wilson may give of those works will convey a correct, complete, and impartial account of the traditions, doctrines, and modes of worship which are described in the eighteen Puráñas.

In the remarks, therefore, contained in these letters, my object has been to evince that Professor Wilson has taken a most erroneous view of the remote and
actual state of the Hindu religion, and that his preconceived opinions on this subject have led him to assign a modern origin to the Puráṇas, and to support this statement by ascribing to them sectarian doctrines which they, certainly, do not contain; and that all his reasoning to prove the modern compilation of those works is futile, contradictory, unfounded, or improbable. In this I have, perhaps, succeeded; for, as Professor Wilson has not quoted any passages from the Puráṇas, in which sectarian fervour and exclusiveness are exhibited,* and in which circumstances of comparatively recent date are mentioned,† it may be concluded that he knew of no such passages; as their production would, at once, have proved the point which he wished to establish. This negative argument acquires the greater force from Professor Wilson having stated that he has collected a voluminous series of indices, abstracts, and translations of all the Puráṇas; and, consequently, if any passages occur, in them, which inculcate the exclusive worship of Vishńu or Śiva, or the worship of Ráma, Kríshńa, or Śakti, or which mention the Jainas,‡ or any modern sect, or any comparatively recent event, he could have had no difficulty in producing such passages, in support of his statements; and their non-production, therefore, must be considered as strong proof of their non-existence. The supposition, however, that the Puráṇas were written in subservience to sectarian imposture, was judiciously selected, by Professor Wilson, as his principal argument in proof of

* Vide supra, p. 340, notes 1 and 2.
† Professor Wilson does refer to the prophetic parts of the Puráṇas. See Vol. I., Preface, pp. XVI. and XVII.
‡ Vide supra, p. 323, note †.
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their modern compilation; for the internal evidence of the genuineness and antiquity of those works depends entirely on their exhibiting a faithful representation of the Hindu religion as it existed in remote times. But Professor Wilson has not yet proved that the Purāṇas contain sectarian doctrines; and I am convinced that, when the Purāṇas are more fully examined, and the Vedas more completely known, it will be ascertained that the rites, ceremonies, and doctrines of the Hindu religion, described in the Purāṇas, are, essentially, the same as those described in the Vedas, and that no essential difference exists between the ritual of the Vedas and the modes of worship prescribed in the Purāṇas, except the adoration of images; and I can affirm, from actual perusal, that the theological parts of the Purāṇas conform, in every respect, to the doctrines which are contained in the principal Upanishads; and these, it is admitted, are portions of the Vedas.*

With regard, however, to the legends which occur in the Purāṇas, I may be allowed to avail myself of the following remarks which I have made in another work: "I observe, however (Mr. Colebrooke remarks), in many places [of the Vedas], the groundwork of legends which are familiar in mythological poems: such, for example, as the demon Vṛitra, slain by Indra, who is, thence, named Vṛitrahan; but I do not remark anything that corresponds with the favourite legends of those sects which worship either the Linga or Śakti, * The multiplied errors of this passage it must be unnecessary, at this day, to point out. The writers of the Purāṇas paid little intelligent heed to the Vedas, of which, for the rest, the Upanishads cannot, with any propriety, be considered as portions.
or else Rāma or Kṛiśhnā. I except some detached portions the genuineness of which appears doubtful; as will be shown towards the close of this Essay." But, instead of considering the allusions to popular mythology which occur in the Vedas as being the groundwork of subsequent legends, would it not be more consonant with reason and probability to conclude that these allusions actually referred to well-known legends? For, otherwise, it will be evident that they must have been altogether unintelligible,—expressed, as they were, with so much brevity, and, in fact, merely mentioned in that cursory manner which is usual in adverting to circumstances perfectly notorious. In which case, it would also appear most likely that the legends had been previously collected, and rendered accessible to every one by being recorded in those very works which are still extant under the name of Purāṇas; for it is quite impossible to discover, in the Purāṇas, a single circumstance which has the remotest semblance to the deification of heroes, a notion totally unknown to the Hindus."¹‡

It, hence, appears that there is an intimate correspondence between the legends, rites, ceremonies, and doctrines described in the Vedas and Purāṇas; and even Professor Wilson admits that there is "abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence

¹ Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology, p. 188.

‡ Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 28, note •. Colebrooke does not italicize this passage.

‡ Here, again, Colonel Kennedy has come to a conclusion widely different from that ordinarily entertained.
of the doctrines which they [the Puráñas,] teach, the
currency of the legends which they narrate, and the
integrity of the institutions which they describe, at
least three centuries before the Christian era;”* and
that “the testimony that establishes their existence
three centuries before Christianity carries it back to
a much more remote antiquity.”† But it is evident
that such a correspondence with the Vedas, and with
the ancient state of the Hindu religion, could not exist
in the Puráñas, unless they were written at a period
when the traditions, the ritual, and the doctrines of the
Vedas still constituted the prevailing form of the Hindu
religion; and it is, therefore, utterly improbable that
(as Professor Wilson supposes,) the Puráñas, as now
extant, could have been compiled between the eighth
and seventeenth centuries, when the Muhammadans
were extending their dominion over the greatest part of
India, and when the Hindu religion had lost much of
its original purity. His reasoning, consequently, is
altogether ineffectual to prove that the Puráñas are
modern compilations; for it is not supported by either
probability or proof, or by the internal evidence of
those works; and it, thus, entirely fails in demonstrat-
ing that the Puráñas were written or remodelled for
the purpose of promoting the innovations introduced
into the Hindu religion by Śankara Áchárya, Rámá-
nuja, Madhwáchárya, and Vallabha, and of advocating
the doctrines which they taught. All the remarks,
therefore, on this subject, which Professor Wilson has
yet published, are completely erroneous; and it may,

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
† Ibid.
in consequence, be concluded that there are no valid
grounds for disputing the genuineness and antiquity
of the eighteen Puráñas.

Bombay, 29th December, 1840.

Vans Kennedy.

PROFESSOR WILSON’S REPLY.

Sir: Col. Vans Kennedy has lately favoured you
with a series of letters upon the subject of my views
of the modern date and sectarian spirit of the works
termed, by the Hindus, Puráñas. I entertain great re-
spect for the Colonel’s talents and industry, but none
whatever for his love of disputation, or his pertinacity
of opinion, and attach little weight to deductions that
are founded upon imperfect investigation, and pre-
judices much more inveterate than any which he ac-
cuses me of cherishing. I have, therefore, no inten-
tion of entering upon any refutation of his notions, or
vindication of my own. Having put forth conclusions
drawn from a deliberate and careful scrutiny of the
premises which warrant them, I am contented to leave
them to their fate: if they are sound, they need not be
defended; if they are erroneous, they do not deserve
to be defended. I have implicit faith in the ultimate
prevalence of truth; and, as I am satisfied that my
conclusions are, in the present instance, true, they have
nothing to apprehend from Colonel Vans Kennedy.

Neither is it necessary, now, to expend time upon
any discussion as to what the Puráñas are. The con-
futation of Colonel Vans Kennedy's doctrines of their high antiquity and pure theological character is to be found in the works themselves. Translations of two of them have been published,—that of the Vish nú Pu-
ráña by myself, and that of the Sri Bhágavata by M. Burnouf; and an appeal to these, which are now ac-
cessible to all who may be interested in the inquiry, will show how utterly untenable is Colonel Vans Ken-
nedy's theory. If he objects to the particular examples here named, let him choose his own. He will pardon me for suggesting that he would be more usefully and creditably employed in translating and publishing some other Puráña or Puráñas than in depreciating the better directed labours of other Sanskrit scholars. The result of such translations will, I have no doubt, con-
firm the conclusions which I have not found it pos-
sible to avoid, and with respect to which the opinions of M. Burnouf coincide with mine. The Puráñas, in their present form, are not of high antiquity, although they are made up, in part, of ancient materials; and, in the legends which they relate, and the practices which they enjoin, they depart as widely from what appears to be the more primitive form of Brahmanism as they do from the subjects which authorities of un-
questionable weight, as well as their own texts, declare should form the essential constituents of a Puráña.

Whilst, however, I think it a work of supererogation to refute errors which the Puráñas themselves are at hand to correct, I must beg leave to set Colonel Vans Kennedy right on a matter not of opinion, but of fact. Conscious, no doubt, that his arguments will not bear the test of comparison with the original works, he has
attempted, at the close of his last letter, to insinuate a suspicion that the translation is not to be trusted, and charges me with having misunderstood and mistranslated a passage that is of some importance as a criterion of the date of the Puráña. He does not say that I have done so purposely, in order to fabricate a false foundation for my opinions; but the tendency of his animadversions leads to such an inference. To this inference I cannot stoop to reply; but I shall have no difficulty in showing that the charge of misapprehension applies not to me, but to Colonel Vans Kennedy.

Now, I will not venture to affirm that, in a work of some extent and, occasionally, of some difficulty, I have never mistaken my original; that I have always been sufficiently careful in expressing its purport; that I may not have, sometimes, in the course of a translation not professing to be literal,* diverged more than was prudent from the letter of my text. The latter may have been the case, in the passage in question; and Col. Vans Kennedy is literally correct in stating that the very words "Jainas and Bauddhas" are not in the Sanskrit, where they are found in the English. At the same time, had he fully comprehended the sense of the preceding passages, had he been aware that all which had gone before related to Jainas and Bauddhas, he must have admitted that their specification, which was recommended by the consideration of perspicuity, and by the construction of the English

* Whatever Professor Wilson may have meant, his words are: "In rendering the text into English, I have adhered to it as literally as was compatible with some regard to the usages of English composition." Vol. I., Preface, p. CXVI.
version, was warranted by the context, and was, therefore, unobjectionable.*

I will not think so meanly of Col. Vans Kennedy’s criticism, as to suppose it possible that it would cavil at words, or that it would attach any importance to the insertion of the terms “Jainas and Baudhhas” in the place where they occur, if it could be substantiated that, in all the preceding parts of the chapter, the text has had them in contemplation. This he denies, and I maintain. We shall see which is right.

The eighteenth Chapter of the third Book of the Vishnū Purāṇa describes, in the first part, the apostacy of certain persons from the Brahmanical faith,—from the Vedas and Smṛitis—in consequence of the doctrines of a false teacher, who is Vishnū in disguise. The heresies into which they fell were two. Col. Vans Kennedy’s interpretation is “one”; and here is the source of his misapprehension. That he labours under an erroneous view of the sense of the passage, a brief examination of it will irrefutably demonstrate.

In the first place, then, speaking of those who first became followers of the false prophet, the text says, expressly: “They were called Arhatas, from the phrase which the deceiver made use of, in addressing them, ‘arhatha’ (Ye are worthy) of this great doctrine.”† So far there can be no question that the Arhatas are named, by the Vishnū Purāṇa, as one set of schismatics.

---

* The words in question—Vol. III., p. 211,—are “Jaina and Bauddda”; and, since Professor Wilson tacitly professed to translate on a uniform plan, he should have included them in parentheses, just as, in the preceding paragraph, he has parenthesized the words “and became Baudhhas”.

† Compare the rendering in Vol. III., p. 209.
It is very true that we have not the name of the other apostate sect enunciated; but it is indicated in a manner not to be mistaken. "Know ye," says the teacher,—budhyaswa.* "It is known," reply the disciples,—budhyate.† If these inflexions of the verb budh, 'to know,' do not clearly intimate the followers of a faith who, from the same root, are named Baudhhas, I should like to know to what other class of Indian religionists it can apply.‡

It is not, however, from inferences, even thus palpable, that I am justified in limiting the designation of Baudhhas to the sect here described. Col. Vans Kennedy is told, in my Preface, that I have, invariably, consulted an able commentary on the text of the Vishn̄u Purāṇa; and to this commentary he either has, or has not, referred: if he has not, he has come to his task of criticism very ill-prepared; if he has, he should, in candour, have admitted that what he is pleased to term my misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the text was shared by learned Hindus, who, most assuredly, could not be suspected of any disposition to derogate from the sanctity and antiquity of such sacred books as the Purāṇas. If the word Baudhha is inaccurately specified, the error is as much the commentator's as mine. Col. Vans Kennedy may, possibly, set a higher value upon his own erudition than that of any native Pandit: he must not expect others to agree with him in an estimate; and, at any rate, he is bound, in fairness, to admit the existence of such an authority, supposing him to be aware of it,

---

* Correct to budhyadhwam. Moreover, budhyaswa means "know thou".
† See note † in the next page. ‡ Vide infra, p. 368, note †.
when he condemns an interpretation which it fully justifies. Ratnagarbha, the commentator on the Vishnu Purana, explicitly states that, "in the repeated use of the words budhyaswa* and budhyate, † it is the intention of the text to explain the meaning of the denomination Baudhha (Evaṁ budhyatety-atra punaruktir Baudhha-pada-niruktyarthā.)" I have been fully authorized, therefore, in inserting the term Baudhhas.

Having, thus, vindicated, unanswerably, the propriety of employing the word Baudhha, we come to that of Jaina. It has been shown that the Ārhatas are named; and by these, I affirm, Jainas are intended. Col. Vans Kennedy asserts that the term is applied, in this very place, to Baudhhas, and adds: "It is singular . . . that Professor Wilson should assume, in direct opposition to the authority of the Purāṇa which he has, himself, translated, that the term Ārhaṇa, when it occurs . . . in the Purāṇas, should be considered to apply to Jina, and not to Buddha."‡ I am not aware that I have said any such thing:§ but that is of no matter. In the passage in dispute, I do understand Ārhatas to mean Jainas; and I am not so singular, in this understanding, as Col. Vans Kennedy fancies. I again appeal to

---

* See note * in the preceding page.
† The commentator, having to do with a verb, would not have used the term punaruktii, 'iteration', unless he had been referring to a repetition of the same mood. The text—see Vol. III., p. 211, note §,—exhibits budhyate, budhyadhwam, and budhyata again. Professor Wilson omitted to translate the first, hastily misrepresented the second, and mistook the third. If evam in the text, and iti in the commentary, had been preceded by budhyate, the result would have been budhyata evam and budhyata iti.
‡ Vide supra, p. 323.
§ As much may, however, fairly be taken as implied in Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.
the commentator, in support of my translation. The Colonel, not perceiving that two different sects are described, asserts, as just seen, that Ārhatas, in this place, means Buddhists. Had he taken pains to be better informed, he would have found that there was sufficient authority for distinguishing them in this passage, and he would not have made an assertion so utterly at variance with the general purport of the whole of the description. Ārha ta does not mean Buddhist; for the commentator expressly observes, of the object of the text, when describing the operations of the false teacher: "Having expounded the doctrine of the Ārhatas, he proceeded to explain the doctrine of the Baudhaṇas (Ārha ta-matam uktvā Baudha-matam āha.)" Ratnagarbha, therefore, unequivocally asserts that two sects (not one) are here described, and that Ārhatas are a different class of sectarian from Buddhists or Baudhhas. Col. Vans Kennedy is, therefore, wholly mistaken in understanding the passage to relate to one sect of schismatics only, and is wholly wrong in confounding Ārhatas and Buddhists.

That Ārhatas are not, in this place, Buddhists, is undeniable, upon authority which few will fail to prefer to Colonel Vans Kennedy's; and it only remains to determine what they are. To any one at all acquainted with the practices and tenets of the Jainas, as they have been explained by Mr. Colebrooke, they are sufficiently well indicated by allusions in the text of the Vishṇu Purāṇa, in the passage in question, to leave no doubt that they are intended. If Jainas are not meant, what are the schismatics here described by their doctrines, and designated by the term Ārhatas?
They are not Baudhbas; that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Arhatas with Baudhbas, there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas. That the term does, very commonly, denote Jainas, is familiar to all who ever heard of either. Perhaps Colonel Vans Kennedy will admit this; perhaps he will, also, admit that the celebrated Jaina teacher and lexicographer Hemachandra is some authority for the accurate designation of the sect of which he was so distinguished an ornament, and that he gives the word Arhat as a synonym of Jina, Tirthankara, and the like.* This is a mere waste of words. When Arhata does not mean a Baudhha, it means a Jaina. It cannot mean a Baudhha, in the passages of the Vishnu Purana which are now under discussion; because the Baudhhas are also specified and distinguished by both text and commentary: it, therefore, does mean Jaina; and, consequently, I am fully authorized in inserting the words Jainas and Baudhhas in the Translation.† The misapprehension is not mine; it is my critic’s: with which restitution of what appertains to him, and not to me, I take my leave of him, and of all further controversy with him.

H. H. Wilson.

---

COLONEL KENNEDY’S REJOINDER.

Sir: The letter of Professor Wilson, inserted in the number of your Journal for May last (received here

* Haima-kota, L, 24.
† This conclusion is not easy to accept. Vide supra, p. 360, note •.
on the 7th instant), has much surprised me; as I do not understand why he accuses me of “love of disputation” and “pertinacity of opinion”: for the opinions expressed in the letters which I, some time ago, transmitted to you are contained in my work on Ancient and Hindu Mythology, published in 1831; and, to prepare materials for that work, I actually read, and carefully examined, all the eighteen Purāṇas, except the Bhavishya. When, therefore, Professor Wilson, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Purāṇa, took so very different a view of the genuineness and antiquity of the Purāṇas, as now extant, nothing could be more unobjectionable than my examining critically the remarks contained in that Preface, and making public the result of that examination. Nor could it be reasonably expected that I should admit the correctness of that view, when it appeared to me to have been formed on insufficient and erroneous grounds.

In his letter, Professor Wilson very politely observes: “Conscious, no doubt, that his arguments will not bear the test of comparison with the original works,¹ he has attempted, at the close of his last letter, to insinuate a suspicion that the translation is not to be trusted.” I have, however, neither insinuated nor stated any objections to the accuracy of that Translation, except in one instance, in p. 340, * in which Professor Wilson has thus translated a passage of the Vishnu Purāṇa: “The delusions of the false teacher paused

¹ On the contrary, I have, in my former letters, transcribed the original Sanskrit, in the few instances in which I have specifically contradicted the statements of Professor Wilson.

not with the conversion of the Daityas to the Jaina and Baudhda heresies.” Of this passage I transcribed the original Sanskrit, in my last letter, in order to show that the terms Jaina and Baudhda were not contained in it. But I further observed: “Professor Wilson may have supposed that the term Ārhatā denoted the Jainas, and may have understood, from the words budhyadhram and budhyate, that they applied to the Buddhists; and to this there could be no objection, had he expressed his opinion in a note, and not introduced into the text, the title of the chapter, and the index, the terms Jainas and Baudhhas.” I, thus, anticipated all that Professor Wilson has said on this point, in his letter; and, as he admits, in it, that these terms are not to be found in the original, the question is, simply: Is a translator at liberty to insert, in the original text of the work which he translates, a name which is not contained in it, and then to argue that the work must be of modern date, because that particular name occurs in it? Such is the case, in the present instance; for Professor Wilson affirms that the Jainas are mentioned in the Vishnú Purāña, and adopts this circumstance as a criterion for fixing the dates when the Purāñas were composed: but this name is not to be found in that Purāña; and I, therefore, justly objected to its being introduced into the Translation.

Professor Wilson, however, in his letter, remarks: “I will not think so meanly of Colonel Vans Kennedy's criticism, as to suppose it possible that it would cavil at words, or that it would attach any importance to the insertion of the terms ‘Jainas and Baudhhas’ in
the place where they occur, if it could be substantiated that, in all the preceding parts of the chapter, the text has had them in contemplation." But it is precisely to this that I object; for I contend that, in judging of the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráñas, their text should be allowed to speak for itself, and not as it may be interpreted by translators and commentators. For, with respect to the passage in dispute, I observed, in my last letter: "Professor Wilson, therefore, has given to this chapter an interpretation not authorized by the original, in which nothing occurs which indicates that the composer of this Puráña intended to describe either Buddha or Jina, under this illusory form, or to adopt, or allude to, their doctrines, in the words spoken by it." To this he replies, in his letter: "In the first place, then, speaking of those who first became followers of the false prophet, the text says, expressly: 'They were called Arhatas, from the phrase which the deceiver made use of, in addressing them, 'arhattha' (Ye are worthy) of this great doctrine.' So far there can be no question that the Arhatas are named, by the Vishnú Puráña, as one sect of schismatics." Admitted. He proceeds: "It is very true that we have not the name of the other apostate sect enunciated; but it is indicated¹ in a manner not to be mistaken. 'Know ye,' says the teacher,—budhyadhwam.* 'It is known,' reply the disciples,—budhyate. If these inflexions of the verb budh, 'to know', do not clearly

¹ The italics, in these two instances, are mine.

* Here Colonel Kennedy silently corrects an inadvertence of Professor Wilson. Vide supra, p. 361, note *.
intimate the followers of a faith who, from the same root, are named Baudhhas, I should like to know to what other class of Indian religionists it can apply." But there is nothing whatever, in the original, which shows that the second address of this false teacher was intended to inculcate doctrines different from those taught in his first address.* On the contrary, the former appears to be, clearly, a continuation of the latter; and, as it is not said, in the original, that a sect was denominated from the word budhyadhwan,† in the same manner that it is said that a sect was denominated from the word argha, it is most probable that, in this passage, the Ārhatas sect is, alone, intended. But Professor Wilson observes: "If Jainas are not meant, what are the schismatics here described by their doctrines, and designated by the term Ārhatas? They are not Baudhhas; that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Ārhatas with Baudhhas,¹ there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas."

¹ Professor Wilson seems to forget, here, his note in p. 339 ‡

* The Sanskrit text distinctly enough points to two forms of heterodoxy. The first is intimated as the Jaina, by mention not only of one of the names of its professors, but, also, of one of the differentiae of their doctrines; and the stanza to which reference is made, just above, intends, undeniably, the Baudha. The writer of the Vishnu-purāṇa seems to regard the Jainas and the Baudhhas as, in some sort, cognate. That he represents the Jainas as preceding the Baudhhas manifests that his information as to the history of these two classes of religionists was far from exact,—a striking argument of his modernity.

† If Colonel Vans Kennedy had recognized that the original has budhyāta, budhyadhwan, and budhyāta,—and all in one line,—could he have resisted the conclusion that these words indicate Buddha? See, further, note ‡ in p. 377, infra.

It is in this singular manner that Professor Wilson attempts to prove that the Puráñas, as now extant, are modern compilations; for he entirely disregards the original text, and substitutes, for it, his own inferences and assumptions. In this instance, he admits, in his letter, that it is the term Árhatā, and not Jaina, that is contained in the original; and he, further, admits that, in it, the name Baudhā is not enunciated, but merely indicated; and yet he maintains that he was "fully authorized in inserting the words Jainas and Baudhās in the Translation." He remarks, also, that, though "Colonel Vans Kennedy may, possibly, set a higher value upon his own erudition than that of any native Pandit, he must not expect others to agree with him in an estimate." But I may be permitted to observe that long experience has convinced me that, although commentaries on Sanskrit works are, no doubt, of much use, yet they are by no means safe guides for ascertaining the plain and unsophisticated meaning of the text. In objecting, therefore, to the translation of the passage in dispute, I did not think it necessary to notice whether or not it agreed with the commentary; and Professor Wilson has, now, most unfortunately for his argument, referred to it: for the commentator never uses the word Jaina, but always Árhatā;* as in the passage quoted from the commentary in p. 43 of the Asiatic Journal for May last.† Conse-

* Vide infra, p. 378, note †. † Vide supra, p. 368.
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quently, Professor Wilson has no right to quote the commentary of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, as an authority in support of his assumption, that the Ārhatā of the Purāṇas means the Jaina sect. * It is, however, on this assumption that Professor Wilson, when speaking of the date of that Purāṇa, hesitates not to state: “Both Baudhās and Jainas are adverted to [in it]. It was, therefore, written before the former had disappeared.† But they existed, in some parts of India, as late as the twelfth century, at least; and it is probable that the Purāṇa was compiled before that period.” Thus, from a few verses of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, in which no sect is mentioned except the Ārhatā, Professor Wilson assumes that the Baudhās and Jainas are adverted to, in it, and, hence, fixes the compilation of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa* at some time before the twelfth century. On the total invalidity of such a mode of reasoning I need not remark; but it seems extraordinary that he should have called attention to it by his ill-judged letter; as he has, by the arguments contained in it, fully confirmed all that I have said relative to his assertions and statements being at complete variance with what is actually contained in the Purāṇas, and to his being,

---

* Preface to the Translation of the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, p. LXXII.

† This is mere paltering. Ārhatā, when it does not mean Baudhā, means Jaina; and Professor Wilson, in p. 363, *supra*, quotes the commentator Ratnagarbha as saying: “Having expounded the doctrine of the Ārhatas, he proceeded to explain the doctrine of the Baudhās.”

†† Is this logic conclusive? Save in a spirit of prophecy, the Baudhās could not be spoken of before they appeared. But why might not a Hindu writer make mention of them after their disappearance, just as well as during their presence?

†† See Vol. I, Preface, p. CXL.
in consequence, unqualified to express a correct opinion respecting their age, and their scope and tendency.

I do not, therefore, understand what Professor Wilson means by observing, in his letter, that he has "implicit faith in the ultimate prevalence of truth." I objected to his introducing into his Translation of the Vishnu Purana the names of two sects which are not contained in the original, and to his adopting these names as a criterion for fixing the dates of the Puranas; and he admits these facts. The truth, consequently, in this instance, belongs to my objections. Although, also, he considers it quite superfluous to enter into any controversy with me, yet it has been hitherto supposed that discussion was the best means of ascertaining the truth: and it is, surely, not sufficient that the Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford should be satisfied that his conclusions are true; for it might be expected that he would be prepared to support those conclusions, whenever controverted, by argument and authority. Professor Wilson may think that my deductions are founded on imperfect investigation and inveterate prejudice, and that the refutation of my doctrines of the high antiquity and pure theological character of the Puranas is to be found in the works themselves.* But this is not enough; for, if my theory on these points is utterly untenable, it

---

1 I have never described the Puranas as being purely theological; as I have merely stated that their principal object is moral and religious instruction; and I have, invariably, used the words "mythology" and "theology" in order to show that these subjects are of a distinct nature, although both are treated of in the Puranas.

---

* Vide supra, pp. 357, 358.
would, most assuredly, be much more conducive to
the prevalence of truth to expose its erroneousness
than to refer, for its refutation, to such voluminous
works as the Puráñas, which scarcely any person will
take the trouble to examine. The weight, however,
which should be attached to my opinions respecting
the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráñas, as now
extant, is not the point in question; for I observed, in
my last letter, that Professor Wilson had taken a most
erroneous view of the remote and actual state of the
Hindu religion, which had, alone, led him to ascribe a
modern origin to the Puráñas; but, that, "as he has not
quoted any passages from the Puráñas, in which sec-
tarial fervour and exclusiveness are exhibited, and in
which circumstances of comparatively recent date are
mentioned, it may be concluded that he knew of no
such passages; as their production would, at once, have
proved the point which he wished to establish.* This
negative argument acquires the greater force from
Professor Wilson having stated that he has collected
a voluminous series of indices, abstracts, and transla-
tions of particular parts of all the Puráñas; and, conse-
quently, if any passages occur, in them, which incul-
cate the exclusive worship of Vishńu or Śiva, or the
worship of Ráma, Kríshña, or Śakti, or which mention
the Jainas, or any modern sect, or any comparatively
recent event,† he could have had no difficulty in pro-
ducing such passages, in support of his statements;
and their non-production, therefore, must be considered

---

* Vide supra, p. 340, notes 1 and ; also, p. 353, note †.
† For Pauránik mention of the introduction of the Parsees into In-
dia, vide infra, pp. 381—385.
as strong proof of their non-existence.” It is not, consequently, the opinions which Professor Wilson or myself entertains on this subject that should be considered, but that which is actually contained in the Puráñas. I affirm that the Puráñas do not contain what Professor Wilson has stated is contained in them; and, as I cannot be required to prove a negative, it remains with him to produce such passages, from those works, as will demonstrate that my affirmation is unfounded. Until, however, such passages are produced, I may be allowed to repeat my former conclusions, that Professor Wilson’s opinion, that the Puráñas, as now extant, are compilations made between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, rests solely on gratuitous assumptions and unfounded assertions, and that his reasoning, in support of it, is either futile, fallacious, contradictory, or improbable.

It is not, I may trust, necessary that I should disclaim all intention of depreciating, by what I have written at any time, the labours of any Sanskrit scholar. In the present instance, in particular, as I had given some time and some attention to the examination of the Puráñas, and to acquiring information concerning the remote and actual state of the Hindu religion, I saw no reason for refraining from making public my objections to the view which Professor Wilson had taken of the age, the scope, and the tendency of the Puráñas, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Puráña. It must, also, be evident that, if the opinions expressed respecting any part of Sanskrit literature were not controverted, when erroneous, it would be impossible that the real nature of that literature could
ever be ascertained. Had, therefore, Professor Wilson been solicitous for the prevalence of truth, he should not have been indignant at the remarks on his theory, which you obliged me by publishing in the *Asiatic Journal*; but, on the contrary, he should have taken the trouble of examining my objections, and of exposing their erroneousness, if unfounded; but, if founded, candour and the love of truth should have induced him to acknowledge that he had called in question, on insufficient grounds, the genuineness and antiquity of the eighteen Puráñas.

*Bombay, 17th July, 1841.*

VANS KENNEDY.

**Note.**

Professor Wilson seems to have misunderstood the reason which led me to point out, in my last letter, that he had misunderstood and misinterpreted a passage in a Puráña which he had, himself, translated: for, in his reply, he merely defends the introduction, into the translation, of the words "Jainas" and "Baudhhas";

1 It is singular that Professor Wilson has, in one part of his letter, adopted my view of the subject; as he actually speaks, in it,* of "learned Hindus, who, most assuredly, could not be suspected of any disposition to derogate from the sanctity and antiquity of such sacred books as the Puráñas." It would seem, therefore, that, however satisfied Professor Wilson may be with the truth of the conclusions which he has published, he, nevertheless, fluctuates in his opinion respecting the sanctity and antiquity of the Puráñas, as now extant, or their being modern compilations, made for the purpose of sectarian imposture.

* Vide supra, p. 361.
but he says nothing with respect to his having adopted the names of these sects as a criterion for fixing the modern dates at which he thinks the Purāṇas were written. It was, however, to this that I particularly objected, in my former letters; for, in p. L. of the Preface to the Translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, * Professor Wilson states that “the date of the Kūrma Purāṇa is, avowedly, posterior to the establishment of the Jaina sect: and that there is no reason to believe that the doctrines of Arhat or Jina were known in the early centuries of our era.”† And, in his notes to the Translation, pp. 339, 340, 341, ‡ he remarks: “Here is further confirmation of the Jainas being intended by our text.”—“We, have, therefore, the Bauddhas noticed as a distinct sect. If the author wrote from a personal knowledge of Buddhists in India, he could not have written much later than the tenth or eleventh century.”Ⅰ—“We may have, in this

Ⅰ But why not much earlier? As it is sufficiently proved that Buddha flourished in the sixth century before our era.

* See Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXIX. If Colonel Vans Kennedy had quoted more ingenuously, the reader would have seen that, in the passage which Professor Wilson translates from the Kūrma-purāṇa, the Bhairava, Vāma, and Yāmala scriptures are named with the Arhata; and, the former being modern, there is a strong presumption that the term Árhat is meant to denote a faith more recent than the Bauddha,—namely, the Jaina. Still more cogent, as against the Colonel, is his own fuller rendering—in pp. 286, 287, supra,—of the passage in question. For, there, besides the scriptures just enumerated, those of the Kapālas are specified; and the Kapālas are not known as a sect of much antiquity.

† Suspicion of mistake or forgery not being entertained, already in the fifth century of our era the Jainas must have been a sect of some considerable age. For a Jaina inscription, said to be dated in the Śaka year 411, corresponding to A. D. 459, see the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. V., pp. 346, 344. ‡ See Vol. III., pp. 209, 211, 214.
conflict of the orthodox divinities and heretical Daityas, some covert allusion to political troubles, growing out of religious differences, and the final predominance of Brahmanism. Such occurrences seem to have preceded the invasion of India by the Mohammedans, and prepared the way for their victories."

But, after thus making use of the names "Jainas" and "Bauddhas", to prove the modern compilation of the Puráñas, Professor Wilson now admits that these names are not to be found in the original; but he maintains that he was fully authorized in inserting them in it, by the context and commentary. Yet, in his letter, he quotes no part of the context,* in order to evince that it relates to the Jainas and Buddhists, and rests his argument, in support of its being these sects that are intended in the passage in dispute, solely on the words Árhata, and budhyadhwam, and budhyate. But the commentator does not say that Árhata means Jaina;† and Professor Wilson assigns no other reason

* The English translation, even apart from Professor Wilson's supplements, is quite sufficient to show that the Jainas and Bauddhas are meant to be described.

† I think I am not wrong in saying that Hindu writers, as a rule,—so far as I have examined them,—affect the terms Arhat and Árhata, rather than Jina and Jaina. Possibly the former may have become, comparatively, more dyslogistic, as they easily might, by suggestion; for, though Jina was the name of a Buddha,—but one not much heard of, apparently, in later times,—Arhat denoted another Buddha, whose name was of more frequent mention, perhaps from its adoption by the Jainas. These religionists, while professing no reverence for Buddha, did profess reverence for Arhat, an equivocal designation, and which reminded of the Baudhás; and this fact, it may be, influenced the Hindus, with their hatred of Buddhism and everything therewith cognate, to call the Jainas, by preference, Árhatas. It should seem that the Jainas, among themselves, were more generally denominated Jainas.
for supposing that these two sects are one and the same than that, as the *Arhatas* cannot be Bauddhás, they must be Jainás. I am, however, obliged to observe that the original does not in any manner admit of this translation in p. 339: *"In this manner, exclaiming to them, 'Know' (budhyadhwam), and they replying, 'It is known' (budhyate), these Daityás were induced, by the arch-deceiver, to deviate from their religious duties (and become Baudhás)."* For, in the original,—at least, according to my copy of it,—it is not said that the words *budhyadhwam* and *budhyate* were spoken by this emanation of Vishnú and the Daityás; but they are distinctly ascribed to Parására, the narrator of the Puráña, who, after relating what was said by this false teacher, proceeds to narrate that it was thus by saying "know ye", and, they replying "it is known", that Máyámoha caused the Daityás to forsake their religion.\footnote{1} The word *budhyadhwam*, how-

---

\* परासार उचायि।
\* एवं बुधाध्वम बुधतैवभिमितिर्यथण।
\* मायामोहः स दैत्यान्धमेज्यामावर्तितम।
\* Vishnú Puráña, Part III., Chap. XVIII.

On the waning of the Baudhás, while religious rivalry was still active, and controversial debate still ran high, no doubt the Hindus transferred to the Jainás a liberal share of the animosity of which their heretical congenerás had been the object.

See, further, \*infra, p. 379, note \†.


† See my translation of the passage, in Vol. III., p. 210, note §. Professor Wilson, in his rendering of the passage, omits, as he frequently omits, the introductory words "Parására said". But the omission, in this instance, is of no help to Colonel Vans Kennedy's argumentation,—if such it may be called.

‡ For the correct reading of the first verse, see Vol. III., p. 210,
ever, is used in this address of the false teacher, but evidently in its usual sense; for Professor Wilson thus translates the sentence in which it occurs: “Understand my words; for they have been uttered by the wise.”

There are, consequently, no grounds whatever for supposing that the words *budhyadhwam* and *budhyate* were, in this passage, intended to indicate the “Bauddhas”; and, as this emanation of Vishnu was not Buddha,† it must be evident that the doctrines which he is here represented as teaching could not be the same as those which were first taught by Buddha. The original, therefore, did not justify this gloss of Professor Wilson, “and become Bauddhas”: for it is not said, in it, that, after the false teacher had addressed

---

note §. Provided there is not a typographical oversight, was it because he could make nothing of the word *vāgyat* which he leaves out, that the Colonel abridged the text?

In thinking, like Professor Wilson, that the word coalescing with *एवं* is *vāgyat*, he evinced forgetfulness of a most elementary rule of Sanskrit grammar.

Though Professor Wilson misapprehended the sense of the stanza in question, his very confident critic did not take a single step towards setting him right.

* See Vol. III., p. 210. The original is:

\[\text{vāgyat} \text{ सम्यगः सदर्शिवमुदीरतिम्} \]

† According to the *Padma-purāṇa*, the god Śiva declares:

\[\text{रैवानं नाश्वर्तार्थं विष्णुं सुदुर्विष्ठं} \]
\[\text{वौकशास्त्रसमस्तों सप्रभृतिपटाटिकं} \]

“In order to the destruction of the Daityas, the false Bauddha system—with its naked *images*, blue vestments, and the rest,—was enunciated by Vishnu in the form of Buddha.”

Here there is a distinct reference, in direct contradiction of Colonel Kennedy’s positive assertion.

I have no copy of the *Padma-purāṇa* at hand, by which to verify this extract. It will be found quoted in p. 6 of my edition of the *Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāṣya*, in the *Bibliotheca Indica*. 
the Daityas* a second time, a second sect was originated; and it appears evident that, throughout this passage, the text relates to no other sect than the Arhata, which is, alone, mentioned in it.

It is, hence, undeniable that Professor Wilson has not “vindicated, unanswerably, the propriety of employing the word Baudhha”; and, consequently, the singular futility of his argument, with respect to the Jainas, becomes the more conspicuous. The Árhatas “are not Baudhhas (he says); that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Árhatas with Baudhhas, there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas.” But, as Professor Wilson has not produced, and I am certain that he cannot produce, any Sanskrit authority which proves that the Árhatas of the Puráñas is the same as the Jaina sect,† and, as

* But not those who had already been proselytised. Vide supra, p. 351, note *.

† There is no question that the Puráñas were written after the rise of the Jainas, and that the authors of the Puráñas, equally with their successors, designated them, preferably, as Árhatas. Vide supra, p. 376, note †.

I do not mean, however, that the Jainas were called Árhatas only. Vide supra, p. 351, note †.

In Nágeśa Bhatta’s gloss on Govardhana’s Saptakāti, entitled Guru-vyākhyā, the subjoined verses, which follow a denunciation of Śaṅkārya as heretical, are quoted from the Linga-purāṇa:

पाष्काराचः मागवतं बौद्धं दैगम्बरं तथा ।
लोकायतं च काराच्छिन्नमान शासुपतं तथा ॥
जाकुलं(?) भेरवं वामं शास्तं शास्त्रव्यायांले ।
एवविधानी शास्त्राणि विष्णवानि महामुनि ॥
खत: प्रमाणभूतेन वेदेन सुनिश्चितम ।
बैद्धकल्लि शास्त्राणि मन्त्रापि न संक्रित ॥

Doctrines here specified, and stigmatized as repugnant to the Veda, are the Páñcharátra, the Bhágavata, the Baudhha, the Daigambara, the
he here admits that it is not the same as the Buddhist sect, it must, consequently, follow that the “Jainas” and “Bauddhas” are neither mentioned nor indicated* in the passage in dispute; and that he, therefore, attempts in vain to show that he was fully authorized in inserting the names of these sects in his translation.

V. K.

Lokâyata, the Kâpâla, the Sauna, the Pâsûpata, the Lâkula(?), the Bhairava, the Vâma, the Śâkta, the Sâmbhava, and the Yâmala.

It would be very risky to deny that the term Daigambara here points to one of the two grand divisions of the Jainas. The preceding passage I have been obliged, from want of access to manuscripts, to take on trust.

* As to palpable indication of the Bauddhas there, vide supra, p. 368, note †.
CORRIGENDA, &c.

VOL. I.

PREFACE.

P. VII., note †. That Colonel Wilford was acquainted with the Jyotirvi-
dābharaṇa appears from the Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX., pp. 82, 131.

P. XLV., note * . Read editor's note in p. LV. infra.

P. LVI., l. 11. The Translator had, erroneously, "Kroshfuki," where I
have put Kraushfuki.

P. LXX., ll. 10—14. The work there described is properly entitled
Vahni-purāṇa, and differs from the Agni-purāṇa.

P. LXXXIV., l. 15. The following observations touching the Magas were
communicated by Professor Wilson to Père Reinaud, and will be found
in his Mémoire Géographique, Historique et Scientifique sur l'Inde, etc.,
pp. 391—397:

"In the brief notice of the Bhavishya Purāṇa which I have given
in the Preface of the Vīshnū Purāṇa, it is stated that the greatest part
of the work relates to the worship of the Sun, and that, in the last
chapters, there is some curious matter relating to the Magas, wor-
shipers of the Sun; as if the compiler had adopted the Persian term
Mugh, and connected the fire-worshippers of Iran with those of India.
But the subject, it is added, requires further investigation.

"The last twelve or fourteen chapters of the Bhavishya Purāṇa are,
in fact, dedicated to the tradition, of which a summary and not
altogether accurate account has been given by Colonel Wilford, in the
Eleventh Volume of the Asiatic Researches, and which records the in-
roduction of the worship of the Sun into the north-west of Hindustan,
by Sāmba, the son of Krīshnā. This prince, having become a leper,
through the imprecation of the irascible sage Durvāsas, whom
he had offended, and despairing of a cure from human skill, resolved
to retire into the forest, and apply himself to the adoration of Śūrya,
of whose graciousness and power he had learned many marvellous
instances from the sage Nārada. Having obtained the assent of
Krīshnā, Sāmba departed from Dwārakā; and, proceeding from the
northern bank of the Sindhu (Indus), he crossed the great river the
Chandrabbhāgā (the Chinab), to the celebrated grove of Mitra (Mitra-
vana), where, by fasting, penance, and prayer, he acquired the favour
of Śūrya, and was cleansed of his leprosy. By Śūrya's injunctions,
and as a mark of his gratitude, Sāmba engaged to construct a temple
of the Sun, and to found, in connexion with it, a city on the banks
of the Chandrabbhāgā. As he was in some uncertainty what form of
the Sun he should set up, a miraculous image of great splendour
appeared to him, when bathing, which floated on the current, and, on
being wafted to the shore, was accepted by Sāmba, as sent to him
by the original, and was, accordingly, placed, with due honour, in the
temple dedicated to the Sun.

"After narrating these events, several chapters of the Purāṇa are
occupied with the instructions communicated to Sāmba by Nārada,
regarding the ceremonies to be observed in the construction of the
temple and the daily worship of the image. Sámba is desirous of retaining learned and pious Brahmans for the purpose of performing the appointed rites, and receiving the donations he may make to the Sun; but Nárada, in the spirit of the prohibition found in Manu, against the performance of idol-worship, as a source of emolument, by Brahmans, apprises Sámba that no Brahman can undertake the office of ministering priest without incurring degradation in this life, and punishment in the next. He, therefore, refers Sámba to Gauramukha (White-face), the Purohita (or family-priest) of Ugrasena, king of Mathurā, as the only person who could tell him whom he might most suitably employ as the officiating priests of the Sun; and Gauramukha directs him, in consequence, to invite the Magas to discharge the duty, as they are, in an especial degree, the worshippers of Súrya.

"The Magas, according to the legend narrated, not very distinctly, by the compiler of the Puráṇa, were at once the progeny of Agni and Aditya (Fire and the Sun,) by Nishkumbhá, the daughter of a holy sage named Ríju or Rívāháva (Ríju, upright, and dhruv, appellation), of the race named Míbira. She was dedicated to Agni by her father; but the Sun, fascinated by her beauty, assumed the form of Agni, and beget a son, named Jalagambu, from whom sprang the Magas. Ríju, displeased with his daughter, condemned her offspring to degradation; but the Sun, at Nishkumbhá's entreaty, although he could not raise the Magas to a level with the Brahmans, conferred upon them the almost equal distinction of being his chosen ministers.

"Although Gauramukha could inform Sámba what priests the prince ought to employ, he is represented as ignorant of the place where they dwelt, and, referring Sámba again to the Sun, Súrya desires him to repair to Sáka-dwipa, beyond the sea of salt water, in which region the Magas corresponded with the caste of Brahmans in Jambu-dwipa or India; the other three castes being the Magasasas, Mánasasas, and Mandagas, equivalent to Kshattriyas, Vaśyas, and Śúdras: there were no mixed castes in Sáka-dwipa. It may be here observed that a similar enumeration of the tribes of Sáka-dwipa occurs in other Puráṇas, as in the Vishnú Puráṇa, where, instead of Magas, the Translation has Míigas: but this may be only a various and, perhaps, an inaccurate reading of the original manuscript.

"In obedience to the commands of Súrya, and with the help of Krisbhá, who lent him the use of Garúda for the journey, Sámba went to Sáka-dwipa, and induced eighteen families of Magas to return with him to India, to fulfil the function of ministering priests in the temple of the Sun, which he now completed, building, at the same time, around the temple, a spacious city, which was called, after him, Sámbapura. The legend also relates that the Yádava prince prevailed upon his kinsmen, the Bhojas of Dwáraká, a branch of the race of Yadu, to give their daughters, in marriage, to his Magas; and their descendants were, thence, called Bhojakas. But, in a subsequent passage, with an inconsistency not unfrequent in some of the Puráṇas, it is said that ten only of the eighteen families received damsels of the tribe of Bhoja, whilst the other eight, who were of the rank only of Śúdras, although equally worshippers of the Sun, were married to Sáka maidens: their descendants were named Mandagas."
So far there is little, in the legend, beyond the name Maga, and the worship of the Sun, to suggest any connexion between it and the history of the fire-worshippers of Persia. But there are other particulars mentioned, which are of a more explicit tenour. They cannot, however, always be satisfactorily made out, in consequence of the obvious inaccuracy of the texts, arising, in a great measure, from the usual carelessness of the copyists, but partly from the occurrence of terms, probably ill understood and imperfectly represented by the original writer. There are three copies of the Bhavisya Purâna in the Library of the East India House, and two in the Bodleian. One of each collection omits the legend: of the remaining copies, the Oxford manuscript is the most correct; but it abounds in mistakes. Dr. Maximilian Müller has kindly furnished me with a transcript of the passages I required, and has enabled me to collate them with the East India House copies, from which, although some particulars remain doubtful, yet enough may be extracted to establish the identity of the Magas of the Purânas with the followers of Zoroaster.

"In answer to various questions relating to the practices of the Magas, put by Sàmba, the Sage Vyàsa professes to give him some account of them, beginning with the explanation of their name, which is not very intelligible. Apparently, it may be rendered: 'The Magas are so called because they do not proceed by a contrary Veda' (viparyastena vedena Magâ nã*yantyato maghâ; as if from mä, 'not', and gâ, 'who goes'); the writer considering the precepts of the Zend authorities as not opposed to those of the Vedas. The Sun, Vyàsa continues, in the form of fire, bears or wears (dhârayate) what he calls a kûrçha; and, therefore, the Magas are wearers of it (kûrça-dhûraññat): the word ordinarily implies a bunch of peacock-feathers; but it may have, in this place, some other sense. The Magas eat in silence, whence they are called Mauniññah (silenuiaries). They are also termed Vachûrcha, from Vacha, said to be a name of the Sun, and archá, 'worship'. They have four Vedas, termed Vada, Vîswa-vada, Vidut (?), and Angirâsa(?). Gopa or Gësha (perhaps for Šësha), the great serpent, having cast off his skin in the Sun's car, it became the origin of what is here called the Amâhaka, which is given by the Magas, on solemn occasions, and with appropriate mantras or prayers. This is somewhat differently told a few lines afterwards. All creatures, it is there said,—Gods, Êishis, Êakshhasus, Nâgas,—assemble, at stated periods, in the chariot of the Sun; and, on one of these occasions, Vâsuki, the king of the serpents, dropped his old skin: it was picked up by Aruna, and given, by him, to the Sun, who put it on round his waist, in honour of Vâsuki, as if unseparated from the body of the Nâga, whence it was called Avyanga (from a, 'not,' vi 'apart from,' and anga, 'the body'). From its being thus worn by the Sun, it became sacred, in the estimation of his worshippers; and they, therefore, constantly wear it. Whoever goes without it is impious and impure, and falls into hell. Like the Mûnja of the Brahmins, it is said, it should be put on in the eighth year from conception. It is to be made of cotton, or wool, of one colour: the best kind is 132 inches (or fingers) long; the next, 120; and it should never be less than 108 inches in length. Other names appear to be applied to it, as Amâhaka, Sâra-pratihâna, Bhâva-âdra, and Sâra-mara; but this is uncertain, as the passage is corrupt, and some other article may be intended, invested with which, and the Avyanga, the worshipper is said to be Pa-
Sūkraṇa. Again, in place of the Darbha, or sacred grass of the Brah-
manas, the Pāvitra, or purificatory instrument of sacrifice of the Magas,
is said, by Vyāsa, to be called Varsma, or (in another place,) Varsama.

“A variety of other particulars are briefly mentioned, some of which
are intelligible, others uncertain. A Maga must not touch a dead
body, nor a woman at certain seasons; he should (not?) cast a dead
dog on the earth, and should not die without worshipping the Sun.
He should let his beard grow, travel on foot, cover his face in wor-
shipping, and hold what is called the Pūrṇaka in the right hand, and
the Śankha (conch-shell?) in the left; and he should worship the Sun
at the three Sandhyās, and at the five festivals. Other details are too
questionably particularized to be specified; but more than enough has
been cited to establish the fact that the Bhavishya Purāṇa intends,
by Magas, the Mughls of the Persians, the Magi of the Greeks, and
the Parsees of India. Thus, the rule of eating in silence, the covering
of the mouth at worship, the prohibition of touching a corpse, or,
at least, the impurity thereby contracted, are characteristic of the
Parsee faith. A still more decisive indication is furnished by what is
related of the Āryaṇa, which is, clearly, the sacred garde of the
Parsees, called, most commonly, Kusti or Kosti, but also Aiwyungkinā,
according to Anquetil du Perron, as quoted by Dr. John Wilson, in
his notices of the Parsee religion. The latter also observes, almost in
the words attributed to Vyāsa: ‘The Kusti bears some analogy to the
Munjia of the Brahmans.’ According to him, the Kusti should be put
on when the child has attained the age of seven years, seven months,
and ten days, (which agrees well enough with our text); and the
wickedness of not wearing it, and the consequences of such impiety,
are similarly described in Zend and Pehlevi works. Unluckily, I have
not, at present, the means of consulting Anquetil du Perron; or some
other analogies might be traced. But there can be no doubt that
another term which occurs in the Sanskrit text is identifiable in the
Zend, and that the Varsma or Varsama of the Bhavishya Purāṇa is
the Barsam or Barsom of the Vendidad,—a bundle of twigs of the
pomegranate, in place of the bundle of sacred grass used by the
Brahmans, and equally an essential part of the apparatus employed
in the worship of Fire, or oblations offered to that element, in both
religions.

“It is evident, therefore, that the Bhavishya Purāṇa, in the legend
of sāmba, has in view the introduction of the fire-worship of Iran;
and it is curious to find so prompt an adoption by the Brahmans,
such a cordial tolerance of a foreign system of religious practices
and belief. The only question that suggests itself concerns the period
at which this took place, the time at which the Brahman acknowledged
the high-priests of the Sun as little inferior, in sanctity, to their own
order;—whether it followed the flight of the Parsees to Gujerat, in the
beginning of the eighth century, or whether it occurred some few cen-
turies earlier, when, we have reason to infer from numismatic evidence,
Persian princes or satraps exercised authority on the north-west frontier
of India. Either period would not be incompatible with the probable
date of the Bhavishya Purāṇa, which, in its actual form, cannot pretend
to very remote antiquity. That the legend is of the more recent era
is most likely; and this is confirmed by the circumstance of sāmba’s
being fabled to have gone from Dwārakā, in Gujerat, to bring the
Magas from their native country to India. That the Parsees ever made
their way into the Punjab is very questionable; and no traces are recorded of their presence on the banks of the Chandrabhágá; nor have we any notice of the remains of a temple of the Sun in that quarter, although, according to Colonel Wilford, there was a city of Sámba in the same direction."

Instead of “Nishkumbhá”, the preferable reading of MSS. seems to be Nikshubbá. Nor is Rjwáhwa called by a second name, “Rjitu”. For the castes in Sáka-dwípa, see Vol. II, pp. 199, 200. It will there be learned, from one of my annotations, that, in lieu of “Mríga”,—the only reading known to Professor Wilson,—I found, in most of my copies, the undoubtedly correct ‘Maga’.

P. LXXV., 1. 3. Read Yudhisthirá.


P. XC., 1. 12. For Kámkékhyá read Kámkákhyá. And see Vol. V., p. 88, notes 2 and ***.

P. XCIX., 1. 22. Read beliefs.

P. CXV., 1. 1. I have corrected Professor Wilson’s “Ratnagarbha Bhaffa”. Bhattáchárya is a title which has been used, I believe, only in Lower Bengal; whereas the title of Bhattá, there unknown, seems to have been current in almost every other part of India.

P. CXV., 1. 3 ab infra. Instead of ‘Chitsukha Yogin’, Professor Wilson had, erroneously, “Chit-sukha-yoni.”

For Chitsukha Muni, perhaps the same as Chitsukha Yogin, see my Sanskrit Catalogue, pp. 155 and 206.

P. 2, 1. 2. One of my MSS. here interpolates the following stanzas:

विक्षेपरं विब्युंजं वरेखा
विब्यं विब्युं वर्दं वरेखम्।

सन्नाक्षिरस्वात्मलक्ष्यं
विषुं विषुं विप्रहिं नातोभिः॥

उत्तमिक्षितिस्वाहार्मोहचायां चैकारायम्
वाराज्ञमण्यायां प्रणातोभिः जगन्नुम्रम्॥

P. 6, 1. 7. Instead of the five stanzas which, according to the text followed by the Translator, begin the work, three of my best MSS. give only the last of them, preceded by the following:

श्रीश्लोकान्तं गुप्तरक्षानं
पराशरं यथ्सुभाषावृद्धिभो स्वे।

हयेहं द्वीर्विशुंपुराण्वकेशभो
व्यक्ताभ्यासविवृद्धि विवस्तुवः॥

P 6, 1. 16. “All the Hindu systems consider vegetable bodies as endowed with life.” So, and correctly, remarks Professor Wilson, in his collected Works, Vol. III., p. 381. Chárdárcha, or the synonymous sthívára and jangama, is, therefore, inaccurately rendered, in pp. 6, 47, 64, 149, 183, and elsewhere, “animate and inanimate”, “sentient beings” and “unconscious”, “conscious and unconscious beings”, &c. &c. ‘Loco-
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motive and fixed’ would be better, since trees are considered to possess souls.

P. 8, note †. See Vol. III., p. 35, note ‡‡.
P. 32, notes, l. 14 ab infra. Read Swayāmbhū.
P. 46, ll. 1, 2. The original is:

उपचारतः भेदः विद्विदित्व एवोपचारतः।

The term उपचारतः here implies ‘metaphorically’.
P. 55, notes, l. 5. Read Swayāmbhū.
P. 60, notes, l. 2 ab infra. Read śīlānamaya.
P. 65, note * *. Also see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I., pp. 50, 51 (2nd ed.).
P. 66, notes, ll. 3—5 ab infra. Dr. Muir translates, more correctly:
“Every substance (vastu) is brought into the state of substance (vastutā) by its own inherent power.” Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I., p. 51 (2nd ed.).
P. 70, notes, l. 7 ab infra. For the term mukhyā, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I., p. 57, text and note 104 (2nd ed.).
P. 80, note, l. 7 ab infra. For the term ambhāsai, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I., p. 24, note 38 (2nd ed.).
P. 84, ll. 13 et seq. For a similar passage, translated from the Taṅttiriya-samhitā, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I., p. 16 (2nd ed.).
P. 85, notes, l. 11. Instead of ‘Shodaśin’, the Translator had ‘Sorasi’. Many errors of this stamp have been corrected silently.
P. 95, l. 7. Professor Wilson had “Gavedukā”, instead of ‘Gavedhukā’; for which see Vol. V., p. 175, notes 3 and ।।.
P. 95, notes, l. 10. The udāra is a wild grain, according to the commentators.
P. 95, notes, l. 11. For the Professor’s “Kodrava”, I have put ‘Kordaṅḍa’. On this word the commentator Śrīdhara makes a remark which plainly evinces that he was not an inhabitant of Eastern India.
P. 96, l. 10. Where I have printed ‘drop’, the first edition had “dross”. The error was typographical, the original word being bindu.
P. 98, notes, l. 4. “The city of the Gandharvas is, properly, Alakā,—on Mount Meru,—the capital of Kubera.” Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnson’s Selections from the Mahābhārata, p. 11.
P. 108, l. 1. For the origin of the name Uttanapāda, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I., p. 72 (2nd ed.).
P. 109, l. 4. Daksha’s daughters by Prasūti furnish several of the Mātris, according to diverse enumerations of the members of this group.
P. 111, notes, l. 11. It is observable that we here have Dañdanaya, but Dañḍa and Naya in p. 110.
P. 112, text and note * *. Raurava is one hell, and Naraka is another. See Vol. II., p. 214; p. 215, note ॥; and p. 216.
P. 114, l. 13. The words “whose essence is the elements” scarcely render aright the original expression, bhūta-bhāvana.
P. 116, ll. 4, 5. In Áśvaláyana’s Gṛihya-sūtra, IV., VIII., 19, we find the following names: Hara, Mṛḍa, Sarva, Sīva, Bhava, Mahádeva, Ugra, Bhima, Paśupati, Rudra, Śankara, Īśāna.
P. 117, l. 2. For Ushá read Ushas. The latter is classical; the former, Vaidik. Compare apará and apsaras.

P. 117, l. 7 and note 4. According to the Mahábhárata, Ádi-parvan, sl. 2589, Anila had two sons, Manojava and Avijnátagati. Which of the two is the same as Hanumat is undecided. Can Anila be synonymous with Išána? If not, there are two Manojavas with mothers of the same name, Śivá.

P. 119, l. 10. Instead of Gauri, some MSS. yield Bhútigauri.

P. 119, ll. 23, 24. Dháneswara is the term there rendered “the god of riches”; and Kubera is not named in the original.

P. 120, l. 9. Instead of my ‘Sumeru’, the former edition had “Meru”, which I find in no MS.

P. 139, l. 21. उपचारण:—a word often misapprehended by the Translator,—here means ‘metaphorically’, not “who is not in need of assistance”. Further, परसंधि:, rendered “the supreme god”, is explained as meaning ‘lord of the great Má’, i.e., Lakshmi. The original of the sentence is as follows:

प्रोऽचते परसंधि हि या: युक्तोऽस्यूपचारण: ||

प्रसीद्धु स नी विषुरालाम या: सब्दंदिप्रिताम ||

“May he who, though pure of connexion with all things, is, by a figure of speech, called lord of the great Má”; &c.

P. 144, note 5. My list of corrigenda, entirely overlooked by Professor Müller, points out several gross typographical errors; and these he has reproduced.

P. 147, note, last line. Ordinarily, at least, Ráhu is described as a Dánavas, or son of Danu.

P. 148, notes, l. 7. Ráhu is generally considered to be the ascending node; Kétu, the descending.

P. 152, l. 4. Besides this Lakshmi, the text of the Vishnú-purána mentions another, of less note, daughter of Daksha, and wife of Dharma. See the Index.

P. 152, l. 7. The first edition had, for Niyati, Niryati,—an error of the press.

P. 154, notes, l. 14 ab infra. “Agastya is a celebrated person in Hindu legend. He is famed to have prostrated the Vindhyas mountain, as well as to have drunk the ocean dry. The traditions of the South of India ascribe to him a principal share in the formation of the Tamil language and literature; and the general tenour of the legends relating to him denotes his having been instrumental in the introduction of the Hindu religion and civilization into the Peninsula.” Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnson’s Selections from the Mahábhárata, p. 51, note 2.

P. 155, l. 7. Read Abhimánin.

P. 155, notes, l. 7. Read Šankhapád. See Vol. II., p. 262, note †, ad finem.

P. 156, notes, l. 5. Pávaka, I think, is called parent of Kavyaváhana.


P. 159, note, l. 3. Instead of ‘Ayushmat’, the former edition had “Ayushmánta”, which is impossible.
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P. 165, l. 5. The word “Madhuvana” is not in the original.
P. 177, l. 2. Variants of Slishi are Śrishi and Śīshī.
P. 177, l. 8. Arānya seems to be as common a reading as Anarānya.
P. 177, l. 9. For the patriarch Vairāja, see Vol. II., p. 86.
P. 178, l. 1. The original here not only names Pīthu, but calls him by his patronym, Vainya.
P. 178, notes, l. 12. The unwarrantable “Suvithi” stood, in the former edition, for my ‘Swarvithi’.
P. 182, notes, l. 10 Read Bharamaras.
Pp. 187—191. For a passage on the milking of the Earth, see the Atharavā-veda, VIII., X., 22-29,—especially, 24. I have to thank Dr. Muir for this reference.
P. 194, l. 2. It would have been an improvement, for clearness, to put Samudra, instead of “ocean”. Sāgara, a well-known proper name, also means “ocean”.
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P. 5, last line. The original word for “region” is āyatana.
P. 7, ll. 3 and 19. Read Keśava.
P. 9, notes, l. 8 ab infra. Read by.
P. 21, notes, l. 2. Professor Wilson had “Kakud” where I have substituted ‘Kakubb’.
P. 22, l. 3. For definitions of the Vasus and Rudras, see the Bṛhad-ārañjayaka Upanishad, III., IX., 3, 4.
P. 29, l. 3. On the number of the gods, see the Bṛhad-ārañjayaka Upanishad, III., IX., 1, 2.
P. 29, notes, l. 5. Read Śastradevatās.
P. 71, l. 6. Siṁhikā was half-sister of Viraḍchitti.
P. 85, ll. 4, 5. Soma, here called monarch of Brāhmans, was, himself, a Kshātrā, according to the Bṛhad-ārañjayaka Upanishad, I., IV., 11.
P. 86, l. 5. For Vairāja, see Vol. III., p. 168, note ॥.
P. 100, l. 3. The Translator had “Medha” where I have put ‘Medhas’.
P. 105, notes, ll. 5, 6. Arhat is synonymous with Jina; Arbata, with Jain. See Vol. V., p. 376, note ॥.
P. 112, note, l. 14. Instead of Kubera, we have Soma, in p. 240.
P. 117, l. 8. The Gandhamādana mentioned in p. 122 is a different mountain.
P. 120, l. 3. Burnouf considers the Śitā to be the same as the Sihoun. Introduction à l’Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien, Vol. I., p. 540.
P. 120, note ॥. The Sanskrit name of the Oxus seems, through the Chinese, to be Vakshu. And this form I have found, more than once, in MSS.
P. 121, notes, l. 10 ab infra. Read Śarayu.
P. 128, notes, l. 7. Read Narmadā.
P. 137, notes, l. 10. Read मनुष्य.
P. 143, notes, l. 12 ab infra. Professor Wilson had “Sthānośwara” where I have put ‘Sthāńwiśwara’. This, the correct form, I learned from
the *Harsha-charita*. The first word in the compound is Sthánu, a name of Śiva.

P. 149, l. 1. According to Mr. Molesworth's Marathi Dictionary, a river Pravará falls into the Godávari at Toúkén.

P. 152, l. 1. *Read* Púrnáśa.  
P. 155, notes, l. 13 *ab infra. Read* 131.  
P. 159, notes, l. 10. *Read* Kuúňiña.  
P. 163, notes, last line. *For Káši read* of the Káśis.  
P. 166, note *. *For* third *read* fourth.

P. 166, note  ††. The Mákshikí river is named in the Bengal recension of the *Rámayána*, *Kishkindhá-kañála*, XLI., 10.

P. 166. Erase note §§.

P. 172, notes, l. 6. *Read* occur.

P. 172, note  ††. *For* Kuúšasthali and Kuúšavati, see Vol. III., p. 320, note ‖.

P. 174, note 1. "The Sauvíras, although applied here to a particular family, denote, as is subsequently shown, a tribe or people either identical, or closely connected, with the Sindhus; for Jyádratha is indifferently termed Raja of the Sindhus or Saindhavas and Raja of the Sauvíras. They are sometimes named in concert, as Sindhu-sauvíras, and, whether the same as the dwellers on the Indus, or a kindred tribe, must have occupied much the same territory,—the western and southern portion of the Punjab." Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnsson's *Selections from the Mahábhárata*, p. 65, note 3.

P. 177, note 1. For the supposed modern representatives of the Dahae, see Sir H. M. Elliot's *Supplemental Glossary*, pp. 414, 415.

P. 178, l. 2. *Read* Kárñáí̄ákás.

P. 211, notes, l. 5. *Read* Pulóman.

P. 221, text and note 1. According to Sir David Lyndesay's less pagan notions,—which he shared with S. Thomas Aquinas and Peter Lombard,—a humbler class than the gods, the elect, will be indulged with the felicity of contemplating the discomforts of the damned:

> "Thay sail rejoyis to see the gret dolour  
> Off dampnit folk in hell, and thare torment;  
> Because of God it is the inste iugement."

P. 236, ll. 10, 11. Compare the *Bhágavad-gítá*, IX, 10.

P. 255, notes, l. 7. *For* 1809 *read* 2010, in correction of Professor Wilson.

P. 287, note *. *For* Rambah, see Vol V., p. 12, text and note ‖.

P. 288, note †. *For* Ápúráña, see Vol. V., p. 251, note †.

P. 293, notes, l. 12 *ab infra. Read* Śakra.

P. 316, note 1. It does not appear that the *Bhágavata-puráña* mentions Jambúmárga. Probably it is named by the scholiast Śrídhara: for Professor Wilson not seldom confounds commentary and text.

P. 318, l. 4. A Sauvíra is an inhabitant of Suvíra. *Read*, therefore, "king of the Sauvíras".

P. 340, l. 32. *Read* l. 11 *ab infra.

P. 341, l. 25. Maháráshtra, it seems, was a designation known to Híouén Thsang.

P. 343, ll. 21—23. Erase the note.
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P. 2, notes, l. 4. Read Yāmas.

P. 6, notes, l. 18. Read Vaṁśavartins.

P. 7, notes, l. 2. The inverted commas should come at the end of the sentence in the line preceding.

P. 16, l. 1. Read Ákúti.

P. 18, notes, l. 3. Read Vaikuńśha.

P. 44, notes, l. 5. Read Sánti.

P. 55, note †. For the meaning of prańayáma, see Vol. V., p. 231, note ||.

P. 60, l. 6. Káta seems to be the right name. See Vol. IV., p. 143, text and note †.


P. 80, notes, l. 2 ab infra. For father read grandfather.

P. 87, note †. For p. 110, note §, read p. 113, note †, and p. 114, notes † and §.

P. 131, notes, l. 8 ab infra. The real designation of the work there named is, I find, Prańakritiśhñayasadābdhī.

P. 131, notes, l. 14. Táráchandra Chakravartin prepared the revised English translation; and the Bengalee translation was the work of Víśvanátha Tarkabhúṣása. See the London Asiatic Journal, 1832, Part I., p. 335.

P. 164, note †. See p. 221, note ||, in the same volume.

P. 167, notes, l. 13. Read Váruńa.

P. 179, notes, l. 10 ab infra. Read I., LXXXIX., 3.

P. 183, note †. For Vol. II. read Vol. I.

P. 187, notes, l. 8 ab infra. Read Brahmacāda-puráña.

P. 197, l. 4. The Manu intended is Vaivaswata; for whom see p. 13 of the same volume.

P. 198, notes, l. 9. Read vague sense.

P. 209, l. 1. Read Árhatas.

P. 209, note 2. Professor Wilson should have written 'Árhatā'. See Vol. V., p. 376, note †.

P. 217, note *. Read Kíshi.

P. 218, l. 9. Instead of "Raja of Kási" the correct rendering is 'Raja of the Kási'.

P. 220, l. 3 ab infra. The translation is not literal here, and yields neither 'king of Kási' nor 'king of the Kási'.

P. 230, note ||. See p. 20, note 1, in the same volume.

P. 245, l. 5. Read Tríśabindu.

P. 249, notes, l. 3. It is meant that Ánarta and the rest were brothers.

P. 249, note ｢. Read IX.

P. 266, notes, l. 4. Read Rantinára. Also see Vol. IV., p. 129.

P. 266, notes, l. 8. Read Matinára. Also see Vol. IV., p. 129, notes 2 and ||.

P. 267, l. 21. The learned reader may be amused by the whimsical etymologies, of a like character to this, given in the annexed stanza.
from Appayya Dikshita's Śivatattvaviveka:

हृस्वधाते: सिद्धश्रृव्वर वश काने निष्क्रिय स्त्रूतं।
वर्गवल्लभ: शब्दः पश्च: कृष्णोऽपि यथा॥

P. 280, note *. Yauvanāśwa is, of course, the patronym of Ambarisha.
P. 283, notes, l. 2. 'Dañisaha' is a more ordinary form than "Dussaha".
P. 321, notes, l. 5. Read Tārāpīḍa.
P. 325, notes, l. 2. For a Yājnavalkya, in connexion with the Yoga philosophy, see Vol. V., p. 230, note ||.
P. 325, note 4. Viśwāśhwāna is, probably, one with the Viśwassha of p. 323.
P. 330, notes, l. 2. See Vol. IV., p. 344; supplementary annotation on p. 84.
P. 334, l. 1. Read Ḫītuja.
P. 336, note §. For 353 read pp. 244, 245.
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P. 17, note 1. For Ḫīchika, see Vol. III., p. 80, note †.
P. 30, l. 6. Compare p. 136, note 1, in the same volume.
P. 40, note †. Compare what is said of Tālajangha in p. 57.
P. 57, l. 3. Read Tālajanghas.
P. 63, notes, l. 13. Read Rachaka.
P. 67, notes, l. 6. Read Romapāda.
P. 95, l. 3. Read Ávāha.
P. 97, note ‡. Read Dhīshā.
P. 100, notes, l. 18. Read Śūra.
P. 111, notes, l. 3 ab infrā. Read Haṁsa, Suvarṇa.
P. 112, note ||. For Chaṁbhasīnī, see Vol. V., p. 69, note §; p. 81, note §; and p. 83, note §.
P. 114, notes, l. 10 ab infrā. Read p. 98.
P. 123, notes, l. 10. Insert a comma after "Bṛihaspati".
P. 132, notes, l. 12 ab infrā. It is observable that, in p. 102, we have had a Bhima son of Anila.
P. 141, notes, l. 4. Read Dhīdhāśwa.
P. 142, note ‡‡. For Dhītarāṣṭra read Dhītarāṣṭra's charioteer, according to the more usual legend.
P. 144, note 3. Read Ṛiksha.
P. 148, notes, l. 6. Read Arimejaya.
P. 157. Erase note §.
P. 178, l. 5 and note ||. For "Chandapadhyota" and his son Pālaka, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. IX., p. 147.
P. 182, note **. Read is Udayin. For Udāyin, said to have been son of Kūnika, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. IX., pp. 147, 154.
P. 184, note 2. A mahāpadma is only a thousand millions, according to the Līlāvatī. Elsewhere a simple padma is said to be ten thousand millions. See Vol. V., p. 187, note 1, and p. 188, note 2.

P. 202, l. 1. For Gardabhila, said to have been king of Ujjayini, and father of Vikramāditya, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. IX., pp. 139, 143, 148, 154.


P. 216, l. 1, and p. 217, notes, l. 1. For Viśvasphafiku, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. IX., p. 146.

P. 217, note 1. For Kantipuri read Kantipuri.

P. 223, notes, l. 11 ab infra. Read Chandrabhāgā.
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P. 2, note 4. For Hayagrīva, as slain by Viśhū, see p. 90.

P. 2, notes, l. 7 ab infra. Read ब्रुतुष्नवती.

P. 26, notes, l. 12 ab infra. Read निधनय.

P. 53, notes, l. 9. Read Harivaiśka.

P. 74, notes, l. 5. Read Gaja-gāmini.

P. 140, notes, l. 6. Read Viḍita-parvan.

P. 169, notes, l. 3 ab infra. Read Vaisñavānucharita.

P. 176, l. 6. For sage read age.

P. 190, notes, l. 4. By the original expression, here rendered “four fingers”, ‘four finger-breadths’ is intended.

P. 209, notes, l. 3. Read Tat-prāptaye.

P. 250, l. 4. Read Bīshi.

P. 250, l. 5. Read Ribhu.

P. 290, notes, l. 5. Read Vāmāchārins.

P. 319, l. 5. Read Brahmacāda.

P. 326, l. 1. “Vāma Yāmāchārin”, it may be surmised, is a typographical error for ‘Vāmāchārin’.

P. 356, l. 4 ab infra. Read Madhūvāchārya.

P. 358, l. 5. Read Śrī Bhāgavata.
POSTSCRIPT.

The MSS. of the Vishnu-purana and of its commentaries used by the Editor belong, chiefly, to himself, and are the best, or copies of the best, which he was able to discover during a long and extensive search in India. He has also carefully examined all the oldest and most valuable MSS. which he knows to exist in England, and an especially excellent one obligingly lent to him by the accomplished Principal of the Benares College, Mr. Griffith. The Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta impressions he has, further, constantly had by his side; and he has frequently consulted them, but to little useful purpose. With few exceptions, the Sanskrit works brought out under the supervision of Hindus are inferior even to indifferent manuscripts; and this must continue to be their character, so long as they betray a systematic disregard of the most elementary principles of editorial probity.

As regards the original and the translation of a book, until the text of the first is duly ascertained, the other can be worth very little; and the MSS. of the Vishnu-purana—which is still inedited,—present a choice of lections in almost every line. Professor Wilson sometimes employed one MS., sometimes another; and there are but rare indications that he compared together even two, out of all that were accessible to him. The consequence of impatience of collation is inevitable; and it not seldom happens that he unfortunately had before him, and followed, the very worst reading from among a variety of good and bad.

Had the Editor clearly foreseen, in time, what awaited him, rather than do that which he has done, he would have hazarded a critical edition of the Vishnu-purana in the original, and an entirely new translation. The one has long been all but ready for the press; but its appearance has been defeated by one manoeuvre after another, and now can never be realized. An independent version of his own would, certainly, have cost him
much less trouble than the invidious labour which he has expended on these volumes. Of notes he would have been sparing; inasmuch as, in the whole compass of Sanskrit literature, he could not consider the text of even a dozen works to be sufficiently settled to warrant an appeal to them, except in a most general way, for purposes of comparison or illustration.

Though many of Professor Wilson's notes have no very intimate connexion with his translation, others have such a connexion; and some of them are necessary to its very intelligibility. To make a selection, from among these categories, as subject-matter for remark, would have been difficult, and, the question of difficulty apart, would have been liable to objection. Emendations, to be rendered at all convincing, every here and there demanded the production of new matter; and, sometimes, when such matter has lain at the Editor's elbow, it has been offered to the reader, notwithstanding its being only indirectly germane to the occasion. As for his annotations, however, he does not lay the least claim to their being exhaustive. He has given mere specimens,—at best, suggestive of the peril which, in the dawn of the exploration of Sanskrit literature, attends on peremptory statement or positiveness of conclusion,—and equally so where he has amended the Professor's renderings, and, in short, in the discharge of his revisory functions generally. Still, in one important respect he has been solicitous of thoroughness. By citations from, and references to, the other publications of Professor Wilson, he has studied—not unsuccessfully, he trusts,—to make him, as far as possible, his own commentator, corrector, and supplementer.

A copious disquisition on the Puráñas as a class, and on the Vishnú-puráña in particular, is reserved against the emergence of some other opportunity for publishing it.

The sixth volume will be occupied with a full index to the entire work.

LONDON,
July, 1869.