

Vol. XI, No. 2]

[July, 1969

पुराणम्
PURĀṆA

[Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department]

*With the financial assistance from the Ministry of Education,
Government of India*

VYĀSA-PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annul Subs.—Inland Rs. 12

Foreign £ 1

सम्पादक-मण्डल

पद्मभूषण पण्डितराज श्री राजेश्वरशास्त्री द्रविड ;
अध्यक्ष, साङ्गवेद विद्यालय, रामघाट, वाराणसी ।

पद्मभूषण डा० वे० राघवन्, एम० ए०, पी-एच० डी० ;
अध्यक्ष, संस्कृत विभाग, मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय, मद्रास ।

डा० लुडविक स्टर्नबाख, एल-एल० डी०
अवैतनिक प्रोफेसर, धर्मशास्त्र तथा भारतीय संस्कृति,
संयुक्त राष्ट्र, अमेरिका ।

श्री आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त, एम० ए०, शास्त्री ; उपनिदेशक,
पुराण-विभाग, सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यास,
फोर्ट रामनगर, वाराणसी ।

EDITORIAL BOARD

Padma-Bhushan Paṇḍita-rāja Śrī Rājeśvara Śāstrī Draviḍa ;
Principal, Sāṅga-Veda-Vidyālaya, Varanasi.

Padma-Bhushan Dr. V. Raghavan, M. A., Ph. D. ;
Professor and Head of the Sanskrit Dept.,
Madras University, Madras.

Dr. Ludwik Sternbach, LL. D., Hon. Prof. of Dharmasāstra
and Ancient Indian Culture ; Senior Social Officer, U. N.
New York.

Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, M. A., Shastri ; Asstt. Director,
Purāṇa-Dept., All-India Kashiraj Trust. (*Editor-in-Charge*)

लेखकमहोदयैः प्रकटीकृता विचारास्तेषामेव स्वायत्ताः,
न पुनस्ते सम्पादकान् न्यासं च निबध्नन्ति

Authors are responsible for their views, which, do not
bind the Editors and the Trust.

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. XI., No. 2] व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः [29 July, 1969

लेखसूची—Contents

1. व्यास-वन्दना [Obeisance to Vyāsa]
(with Notes by *Sri Anand Swarup Gupta*) 203—206
2. वासुदेव स्तुतिः [Eulogy of Vāsudeva]
(with Notes by *Sri Anand Swarup Gupta*) 207—209
3. Principles of Mahābhārata Textual Criticism:
The need for Re-statement
[महाभारतस्य पाठसमीक्षासिद्धान्ताः-पुनर्वक्तव्यस्यावश्यकता] 210—228
By *Sri V. M. Bedekar*,
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
4. The Purāṇic Records on the Sun-worship
[सूर्यपूजाविषयकं पौराणिकविवरणम्] 229—272
By *Dr. V. C. Srivastava*;
Deptt of Ancient Indian History & Culture,
University of Allahabad.
5. The Symbolism of the Third Eye of Śiva in the
Purāṇas
[पुराणेषु शिवस्य तृतीयनयनस्य प्रतीकात्मकता] 273—284
By *Dr. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty*;
Lecturer in the Ancient History of South
Asia ; School of Oriental and African Studies,
University of London
6. A Purāṇic Iconographical Account of the Image
of Sarasvatī
[सरस्वत्याः मूर्तेः पौराणिकविवरणम्] 285—296
By *Sri Mohd. Israil Khan*;
Deptt. of Sanskrit, University of Aligarh,
Aligarh.

7. A Hitherto Unknown Manuscript of the Svargā-
khaṇḍa of the Bengal Recension—Its Character
and Importance
[वंगीयपद्मपुराणस्य स्वर्गखण्डस्य एको हस्तलेखः—अस्य स्वरूपं महत्त्वं च] 297—303
By *Dr. Ashoke Chatterji*; Head of Purāṇa-Itihāsa
Dept. ; Sanskrit University, Varanasi.
8. Purāṇic Theory of the Yugas and Kalpas—A Study
[पौराणिकयुगकल्पसिद्धान्तविषयको विमर्शः] 304—323
By *Sri Anand Swarup Gupta*;
All India Kashiraj Trust.
9. पौराणिकसूक्तयः 324
10. A Note on Kapālamocana 325
By *Dr. A. Ghosh*
Director General of Archaeology of India (Retd.)
11. Activities of the All India Kashiraj Trust
[काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्] 326—341
12. Notice about the International Congress of Orientalists 342

व्यास-वन्दना

विज्ञानरोचिःपरिपूरितान्तर्बाह्याण्डकोशं हरितोपलभम् ।
तर्काभयेतं विधिशर्वपूर्वगीर्वाणविज्ञानदमानतोऽस्मि ॥ १ ॥

नमामि नीलाम्बुदकान्तिकान्तं व्यासं निरस्ताखिलदोषदूरम् ।
ज्ञानादिदं ब्रह्मशिवादिकेभ्यः सत्तर्कमुद्राभययुक्तहस्तम् ॥ २ ॥

पूर्णबोधकरसेवितपादं सज्जनेष्टदमनन्तसदूगुणम् ।
वासवीहृदयनन्दनं हरिं बादरायणमहं भजेऽनिशम् ॥ ३ ॥

व्यासं सर्वगुणावासं वासवीनन्दनं प्रभुम् ।
गुर्वाराधितपादाब्जं वन्देहं मध्ववल्लभम् ॥ ४ ॥

वन्दे सत्यवतीसूनुं सच्चिदानन्दविग्रहम् ।
श्रीमध्वमुनिससेव्यपादपङ्कजमन्वहम् ॥ ५ ॥

आनन्दादिगुणोद्भक्तं स्वाश्रितानन्ददायकम् ।
आनन्दात्मरुसद्देहं भजेऽहं बादरायणम् ॥ ६ ॥

(आद्योपाह्वेन पं० मध्वाचार्येण संकलितम्)

१. आनन्दतीर्थीये तन्त्रसारे ।
२. आनन्दतीर्थीये भागवततात्पर्यनिर्णये ।
३. आनन्दतीर्थकृतस्योपाधिखण्डनस्य श्रीनिवासतीर्थकृतटिप्पण्याम् ।
४. श्रीनिवासतीर्थकृतप्रमाणलक्षणटिप्पण्याम् ।
५. श्रीनिवासतीर्थकृततत्त्वसंख्यानटिप्पण्याम् ।
६. श्रीनिवासतीर्थस्य तत्त्वविवेकटिप्पण्याम् ।

A NOTE ON THE VYĀSA-VANDANĀ

These verses of the *Vyāsa-vandanā* (adoration of Vyāsa) have been taken from some of the works of Madhva-Ācārya (also called Ānanda-tīrtha, b. 1119—d. 1199) who was the founder of the *dvaita* philosophy of Vaiṣṇavism, and also from the works of Śrī-nivās-ācārya (or Śrīnivāsātīrtha) of the Mādhva-sect. Śrī Madhva-Ācārya and the Ācāryas and followers of his sect were the great devotees and admirers of Veda-Vyāsa and regarded him not only as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, but Viṣṇu himself who incarnated into various *avatāras*, from Matsya to Kalki, as is clear from the *Karāvālabhāna-stotra* of Veda-Vyāsa composed by Yadupati or Yādavācārya (c. 1400 A.D.).

These verses describe the physical form and some of the prominent virtues of Vyāsa and pay homage to him as follows :

“I bow to him (i.e. to Vyāsa) who has filled the whole internal and the external universe with the light of knowledge, who is dark like an emerald, who keeps his hands in the position of the *tarka-mudrā* and the *abhaya-mudrā*, and who has imparted knowledge to Brahmā, Śiva and other gods.—(1)

“I bow to Vyāsa whose body is lustrous like the lustre of dark blue clouds, who has cast away (or driven away) all the evils, who imparts knowledge to Brahmā, Śiva and others, and whose hands are in the *sat-tarka-mudrā* and *abhaya-mudrā*.—(2)

“I incessantly adore Hari in the form of Bādarāyaṇa-Vyāsa who gladdens the heart of his mother Vāsavī (Satyavatī), who fulfills the desires of good persons, who has endless good virtues, and whose feet have been served by the hands of Ānanda-tīrtha endowed with full knowledge.—(3)

“I adore Vyāsa who is the abode of all the virtues, who is the son of Vāsavī (Satyavatī, the daughter of king Vasu Uparicara), whose lotus-like feet are worshipped by my teacher, and who is dear to Madhva —(4)

“I daily adore the son of Satyavatī, who has the form of *sat* (existence), *cit* (consciousness), and *ānanda* (happiness) and whose lotus-like feet are worthy to be served by Śrī Madhva Muni —(5).

“I adore Bādarāyaṇa (Vyāsa) who is prominent in the virtues like happiness, who gives happiness to his dependants, and whose body is made of happiness.”—(6).

Vyāsa is represented here as keeping his hands in the position of the *tarka* and the *abhaya-mudrā*-s. It has a great significance here. A *mudrā* is formed by keeping the fingers in a certain position according to the rules prescribed in the Tantra-s. The *tarka-mudrā* is also called the *jñāna-mudrā* and is formed by joining the index finger with the thumb and spreading out the other fingers jointly (see the footnote of the Hindi translation of VI. 6. 38 of the Bhāg.-P., Gītā Press edn.). This *mudrā* is formed when expounding the philosophical and religious truths. By the mention of this *mudrā* Vyāsa is represented here as a great expounder of *dharma* through his works—Mahābhārata, Purāṇas and the Brahma-sūtra. Vyāsa's *tarka-mudrā* symbolises *sat-tarka* (good and proper reasoning) and not *ku-tarka* (bad and fallacious reasoning). By his *abhaya-mudrā* Vyāsa assures security and freedom from fear through his exposition of *dharma* which protects one who protects or follows it (‘धर्मो रक्षति रक्षितः’).

The *tarka-(jñāna-) mudrā* is one of the nineteen *mudrā*-s sacred to Viṣṇu and the *abhaya-mudrā* is one of the ten *mudrā*-s sacred to Śiva (cf. Kālikā Purāṇa, Adh. 65, as quoted in the Śabda-Kalpa-druma). The mention of these two *mudrā*-s together, therefore, may also be taken to signify a synthesis of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism in Vyāsa and his works.

Vyāsa is considered as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu ; cf. śloka 3 above in the *Vyāsa-vandanā* and also the following :—

द्वापरे द्वापरे विष्णुर्न्यासरूपी महामुने ।
वेदमेकं सुबहुधा कुरुते जगतो हितम् ॥

(Viṣ.-P. III. 3. 5)

कृष्णद्वैपायनो व्यासो विष्णुर्नारायणः स्वयम् ।
अपान्तरतमाः पूर्वं स्वेच्छया ह्यभवद्वरिः ॥

(Kūr.-P. I. 51. 48)

In the Śiva-Purāṇa (Śata-rudrīya-Saṁhitā, 37. 22f.) Vyāsa is mentioned as a great devotee of Śiva :

एतस्मिन् समये व्यासो भस्मभूषितमस्तकः ।

रुद्राक्षाभरणश्चायात् जटाजूटविभूषितः ॥

पञ्चाक्षरं जपन् मन्त्रं शिवप्रेमसमाकुलः ।

तेजसां च स्वयं राशिः साक्षाद्धर्म इवापरः ॥

In the Kūrma-Purāṇa Vyāsa is said to have seen and praised three-eyed Śiva before arranging the Vedas :

पाराशर्यो महायोगी कृष्णद्वैपायनो हरिः ।

आराध्य देवमीशानं दृष्ट्वा स्तुत्वा त्रिलोचनम् ॥

तत्प्रसादादसौ व्यासं वेदानामकरोत् प्रभुः ।

(Kūrma-P. I. 52. 11f.).

His works, both Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, are permeated with a spirit of great tolerance and with the ideas of the unity of the two great gods—Viṣṇu and Śiva.

—ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

वासुदेव-स्तुतिः

(भागवतपुराणम् , ८. १६. २९-३७)

नमस्तुभ्यं भगवते पुरुषाय महीयसे ।
सर्वभूतनिवासाय वासुदेवाय साक्षिणे ॥ २९ ॥

नमोऽव्यक्ताय सूक्ष्माय प्रधानपुरुषाय च ।
चतुर्विंशद्गुणज्ञाय गुणसंख्यानहेतवे ॥ ३० ॥

नमो द्विशीर्ष्णे त्रिपदे चतुःशृङ्गाय तन्त्रवे ।
सप्तहस्ताय यज्ञाय त्रयीविद्यात्मने नमः ॥ ३१ ॥

नमः शिवाय रुद्राय नमः शक्तिधराय च ।
सर्वविद्याधिपतये भूतानां पतये नमः ॥ ३२ ॥

नमो हिरण्यगर्भाय प्राणाय जगदात्मने ।
योगैश्वर्यशरीराय नमस्ते योगहेतवे ॥ ३३ ॥

नमस्त आदिदेवाय साक्षिभूताय ते नमः ।
नारायणाय ऋषये नराय हरये नमः ॥ ३४ ॥

नमो मरकतश्यामवपुषेऽधिगतश्रिये ।
केशवाय नमस्तुभ्यं नमस्ते पीतवाससे ॥ ३५ ॥

त्वं सर्ववरदः पुंसां वरेण्य वरदर्षभ ।
अतस्ते श्रेयसे धीराः पादरेणुमुपासते ॥ ३६ ॥

अन्ववर्त्तन्त यं देवाः श्रीश्च तत्पादपद्मयोः ।
स्पृहयन्त इवामोदं भगवान् मे प्रसीदताम् ॥ ३७ ॥

A NOTE ON THE VĀSUDEVA-STUTI.

The above *Vāsudeva-stuti* is a part of the *payo-vrata* (a vow to live on milk only for twelve days in the bright half of the month of Fālguna) instructed by Sage Kaśyapa to his wife Aditi. By observation of this vow Viṣṇu is pleased and grants a boon to the worshipper. Aditi observed this *vrata* strictly according to the instructions of Kaśyapa, and thereby she was granted a boon by Viṣṇu that He would be born to her as a son in the form of Vāmana. This *payo-vrata* is called *sarva-yajña* (essence of all the sacrifices), *sarva-vrata* (essence of all the vows) and *tapah-sāra* (essence of all the austerities) and satisfies God Viṣṇu—

अयं वै सर्वयज्ञारूयः सर्वव्रतमिति स्मृतम् ।

तपःसारमिदं भद्रे दानं चेश्वरतर्पणम् ॥

(Bhāg. VIII. 16.60).

This *Vāsudeva-stuti*, being a part of this important *vrata*, has great importance from the religious point of view. The first two ślokas (29, 30) of this *stuti* are in general praise of Vāsudeva : He is the greatest of all the beings, he resides in all the beings, he is *Puruṣa* (the Supreme Being and the soul of the universe), *Vāsudeva* (the deity who resides in all and in whom reside all) and *sākṣin* (the witness) of all—(29). He is *avyakta* (unmanifest), *sūkṣma* (subtle) and *Pradhāna-puruṣa* (the Primaeval Matter or Prakṛti). He knows the twenty-four *guṇas* (i. e. 24 *tattvas* as enumerated in the Sāṅkhya Philosophy), He is the founder of the Sāṅkhya-philosophy (called here *guṇa-sāṅkhyāna*, as *guṇas* or *tattva-s* are enumerated and expounded here)—(30).

The third śloka (31) describes symbolically the form of *Yajña* (Sacrifice) who is considered as Viṣṇu himself (‘यज्ञो वै विष्णुः’) and also as an *Avatāra* of Viṣṇu (Cf. Bhāg.-P. II. 7.2). *Yajña* here is said as having two heads (*prāyanīya*, introductory libation, and *udayanīya*, finishing ceremony), three feet (i. e. the three *savana-s* act of pressing out the soma-juice performed at the three periods of the day), four horns (i. e. the four Vedas), seven hands (i. e. the seven Vedic metres). He (God *Yajña*) is *tantu* (producer and

increaser of the results of the actions) and his soul resides in the *Trayī-vidyā* (the science of the three Vedas). This śloka is infact a repetition of the following R̥gvedic *mantra*—

चत्वारि शृङ्गा त्रयो अस्य पादा द्वे शीर्षे सप्त हस्तासो अस्य ।
त्रिधा बद्धो वृषभो रौरवीति महोदेवो मर्त्या आविवेश ॥

(R̥gveda, IV. 58.3).

Sāyaṇa has interpreted this *mantra* as follows:—

अस्य यज्ञात्मकस्याग्नेः चत्वारि शृङ्गा चत्वारो वेदाः शृङ्गस्थानीयाः.....।
त्रयो अस्य पादाः सवनानि त्रीण्यस्य पादाः । प्रवृत्तिसाधनत्वात् पादा इत्युच्यन्ते । द्वे
शीर्षे ब्रह्मौदनं प्रवर्ग्यश्च । इष्टिसोमप्राधान्येनेदमुक्तम् । सप्त हस्तासः सप्त छन्दांसि ।
हस्ताः अनुष्ठानस्य मुख्यसाधनम् । छन्दांस्यपि देवताप्रीणनस्य मुख्यसाधनमिति हस्त-
व्यवहारः । त्रिधा बद्धः मन्त्रब्रह्मण्येदमुक्तम् । त्रिप्रकारं बद्धः । बन्धनमस्य तन्निष्पाद्यत्वम् ।
वृषभः फलानां वर्षिता (cf. 'तन्त्रे' in the above *stuti*).....

The next ślokas further describe Lord Vāsudeva as follows:

He is Śiva, Rudra, Śakti-dhara (upholder of *Śakti*); He is the Lord of all the *Vidyā*-s or branches of knowledge; He is the Lord of all the beings; He is the Hiraṇyagarbha (Brahmā or the Golden Egg.); He is *Prāṇa* (called also *sūtrātman* in the Vedānta); He is the soul of the universe; He has the body of the powers of *Yoga*; He is the founder of the *Yoga*; He is the Primaeval Deity; He is *Sākṣi-bhūta* (the witness of the universe); He is Sage Nārāyaṇa and Nara (these two are also considered as the *avatūras* of Viṣṇu); His body is dark like an emerald; He possesses *Śrī* (or Goddess of wealth); He is also called *Keśava* and *Pitavūsas* (having Yellow garments); He is the bestower of all the boons; He is the best of the *Puruṣas*; He is the best of those who bestow boons; the wise therefore worship the dust of his feet for their welfare. The gods and *Śrī* (Lakṣmi), therefore take shelter under his feet, desirous of obtaining fragrance from them. Salutation to Him. May He be propitiated.

—Anand Swarup Gupta

PRINCIPLES OF MAHĀBHĀRATA TEXTUAL CRITICISM :
THE NEED FOR RESTATEMENT'

BY

V. M. BEDEKAR

['पुराण' पत्रिकायाः १०. २ (जुलाई १९६८) अङ्के मैडेलेन विथारड्यू (Madeleine Biardeau) इत्याख्यया फ्रान्सदेशीय-विदुष्या पाठसमीक्षात्मकसरण्या प्रस्तुतानां महाभारतपुराणादीनां संस्करणानामनुपयोगित्वमप्रामाण्यं च विवेचितम् । लेखिकामहोदयया मतानुसारतः विभिन्नपाठसरणीनां पाठसाङ्कर्यं न करणीयम् अपि तु सर्वासाधेव तत्तद्देशेषु प्रचलितानां पाठपरम्पराणां रक्षणपुरस्सरं सर्वासां पाठसरणीनां समानान्तरं एकत्रैव पाठसमीक्षात्मकं संस्करणं विधेयम् । प्रस्तुतनिबन्धस्य लेखकः श्रीवेडेकर महोदयः उक्तलेखिकायाः मतानामालोचनं कृत्वा तेषां निस्सारत्वमप्रामाण्यं च दर्शयति । लेखकमहोदयस्य मतानुसारतः पाठसमीक्षासिद्धान्तानुसारतः प्राचीनग्रन्थानां सम्पादनं तु प्रायेण सर्वेषामेव विदुषां सम्मतमस्ति । सप्ततिवर्षाणां प्राक् विन्टरनित्रज-महोदयैः महाभारतस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंस्करणस्यावश्यकता प्रदर्शिता र्यूडर्समहोदयैश्च केषांचिन्महाभारतश्लोकानां समीक्षितसंस्करणं प्रकाशितम् । तदनन्तरं भाण्डारकरशोधसंस्थानतः बहुभिः प्रकाण्डपण्डितैः चत्वारिंशत् वर्षं यावत् सपरिश्रमं सम्पूर्णं महाभारतं प्रकाशितम् । प्रस्तुतनिबन्धे लेखकः प्रदर्शयति यत् लेखिकया उद्भाविता बहुव्यो विप्रतिपत्तयः पूर्वमेव कैश्चिद् विद्वद्भिर्ह्युद्भाविता आसन् यासां समाधानमपि सुकथानकरमहोदयैः कृतम् । यत् लेखिकामहोदयया सर्वासां पाठपरम्पराणां पृथक्-पृथक् सम्पादनं प्रस्तावितं तत् महाभारतादिवृहद्ग्रन्थानां पक्षे अव्यवहार्यं वर्तते । पुनश्च इदमपि पाठसमीक्षात्मकं संस्करणमेव भविष्यति । सर्वाः पाठपरम्पराः पृथक्-पृथक् दातव्या एव तर्हि तासामाधारभूतस्य कस्यचित् प्राचीनपाठस्य निर्धारणे को दोषो भवेत् । लेखिकामहोदयया विभिन्नपाठपरम्पराज्ञानवतां तत्तद्देशीयपण्डितानां महत्त्वप्रदर्शनमपि अतिरञ्जितम् । व्यक्तिविशेषाणां रचिररचिर्वा वैज्ञानिक-पद्धत्या विषयो न भवति । डाक्टरसुकथानकरमहोदयेन स्वभूमिकायां नीलकण्ठस्य ये दोषाः प्रदर्शितास्तेषां समाधानं न कृतं लेखिकया अपितु नीलकण्ठस्य तया अनपेक्षिता प्रशस्तिः कृता । पुनश्च नीलकण्ठेनापि विभिन्नकोशानामाधारेण संग्रहात्मकं संस्करणमेव प्रस्तुतम् । लेखिकया

यदुक्तं वैज्ञानिकी पाठसमीक्षापद्धतिः भारतीयपुराणेतिहासादिषु नोपयुज्यते तदपि असमीचीनमेव वैज्ञानिकपद्धत्याः सार्वभौमत्वात् सार्वजनीनत्वाच्च । लेखिकामहोदयया परम्परादृष्ट्याऽऽय संस्करणस्याप्रामाण्यकथनमप्यसमीचीनम् । यतः सुकथानकरमहोदयैर्नैदमुक्तं यदिदं संस्करणम् परम्परा-दृष्ट्याऽऽधिकं प्रामाणिकम् । अत्र लेखिकामहोदयः समस्तप्रश्नानामुत्तरं विधाय कथयति यत् लेखिकामहोदया इतिहासपुराणयोः कस्याप्यंशस्य स्वीयसिद्धान्तानुसारेण संपादनं प्रकाशनं च यदि कुर्यात् तदैव तस्य व्यावहारिकत्वमुपयोगित्वं च परीक्षितुं शक्येत ।]

The need for a critical edition of the Mahābhārata (*mb*) was first voiced about seventy years ago by M. Winternitz (1897). In furtherance of the project initiated by Winternitz's proposal, Prof. Lüders prepared a 'specimen' of a critical edition of the first 67 stanzas of the Ādiparvan of the *mb* in 1908. The first great World War gave a quietus to the ambitious project of the critical edition of the *mb* undertaken by Western Scholars. Subsequently, the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute enthusiastically undertook the work of the critical edition of the *mb*. Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, the first General Editor, brought out the critical edition of the Ādiparvan in 1933, with a Prolegomena appended to it in the beginning, in which he systematically formulated the principles of textual criticism underlying the critical edition of the *mb*. On the basis of these principles enunciated in the Prolegomena, the subsequent work of critically editing the rest of the *mb* was carried on, and the critical edition of the whole of the *mb* (without the Harivaṁśa) was completed in 1966. The principles formulated and applied to the critical edition of the *mb* have been acclaimed by almost all scholars and have generally served as a scientific norm in the preparation of the critical editions of old Indian texts. One would, indeed, think that, after the publication of the monumental critical edition of the *mb* on which so many eminent scholars worked, the principles of textual criticism underlying the edition had come to stay. It is, therefore, curious and intriguing, if not amusing, to read 'some more considerations about Textual Criticism' by Madeleine Biarreau (B) ('PURĀṆA' July 1968, pp. 115-123) in which the writer has called in question the very principles of Textual Criticism underlying the critical edition of the *mb*.

B, while attacking the principles of *mb* textual criticism has stated towards the end of her article that 'I purposely remained at the level of generalities to make my point clearer'. With all deference to the writer's candour in making this statement, it must be remarked that one's overall impression after reading the article is that of a cluster of vague generalizations which hardly 'make the writer's point clearer'. The writer has not given or pinpointed specific texts or passages in the critical edition of the *mb* or the Purāṇas to substantiate her contentions. A careful reader of Sukthankar's Prolegomena to the Ādiparvan will be agreeably surprised to find that many of the difficulties or the objections which B. claims to have raised in her article had been already forestalled and satisfactorily met by him. We shall give such instances in the sequel of this article.

Fortunately for the reader, B. has come down from the plane of generalities towards the end of the article and has vouchsafed what appear to be her constructive suggestions, for the consideration of the editors of the critical editions. B says (p. 123¹):— "The main concern of the editors should be to publish not only the different recensions as they are, but also when necessary, the different versions of each recension. The different texts should be published in parallel. Each version could be "critically edited" (B's own inverted commas) to a certain extent, though final certainty or completely satisfactory text is impossible. This detailed critical work should not be mechanically compiled just on the basis of known rules of critical editions. I would suggest that the *ms* evidence be checked and strengthened through consultations with the people who even now have a firsthand knowledge of the Epic and the Purāṇas".

The substance of the suggestion made by B. in the first sentence of the above quotation has been already dealt with by Sukthankar who says²: "One scholar (Lesny, Archiv Orientalni, Vol. 5 (1933), p. 159) has suggested that to expedite and facilitate the work, we should, as a first step, before any attempt is made to constitute the final text of the *mb*, critically edit all the different

-
1. The figures refer to the pages of B's article in the PURĀṆA already referred to.
 2. Prolegomena pp. 82 ff. Quotations from Sukthankar further on in the article refer to the pages from the Prolegomena.

versions. That, it must be said, a tall order, as any one will admit, who has any practical experience of editing the *mb*, in any shape or form, critical or otherwise. But perhaps funds and workers—not to speak of patience—can be found to edit a dozen or more lakhs of stanzas comprising the dozen or more versions of the Great Epic. There remains, however, yet another and more fundamental difficulty which appears to have wholly escaped the attention of the learned critic. The difficulty is that it is practically impossible to edit even a single version of the *mb*—or for that matter, of any other text—wholly satisfactorily, without considering the entire evidence that is, without, at the same time, consulting the readings of all other versions.¹.....In fact, there is no way of finding out whether any of the *mss* of a particular version. And, if for the editing of each of the individual versions, we have to scrutinize and weigh the entire evidence, we might as well get busy with the work of preparing the final text, assuming of course that a final text has to be prepared.....Even if we assume, for the sake of argument, that all the dozen or more versions lie before us in a critically edited shape, our task is not made easier on that account. One has to go through the same mental process in picking out or reconstructing the correct readings, whether, as at present, the *variae lectiones* are concentrated on a single page of the critical edition or have to be searched in a dozen or more different provincial editions, arranged round about in a semi-circle. Preparing all these different editions would not by itself give us the correct readings”.

We have given the above quotation in extenso in order to show that the suggestion of B. that the different recensions and their versions should be separately published is not a new one and that it has been given great thought and shown to be quite unfeasible by Sukthankar. The most important conclusion to which B's suggestion inexorably leads, in spite of her, is, as has been shown by Sukthankar, the very necessary task of preparing the critical edition to which B. unfortunately demurs throughout her article. That the suggestion made by B. has not been given

1. As this point, Sukthankar discusses a specific example of the difficulty of ascertaining the true character of the variants in Grantha *ms* without consulting other versions.

full thought or has not been thought out by her in all its implications or is even haphazard, vague and ill-conceived would appear from the rather intriguing statements made by her (following that suggestion made by her in the above quotation from her article). She says (p. 132): "The different texts of versions of recensions should be published in parallel. Each version could be 'critically edited' to a certain extent..... This critical work should not be just on the basis of known rules of critical editions The *ms* evidence be checked...through consultations with the people who have a first-hand knowledge of the Epics...." Now these vague statements raise a number of questions. On each of these statements, one would like to ask B. the following questions:

(i) If, in the proposed edition, the different texts are to be published in parallel, how would this procedure substantially differ from the present critical edition of the *mb*. in which the different varying texts are either given at the bottom of the page or in the Appendix ?

(ii) What does a version 'being critically edited' mean? Does it not mean, as Sukthankar says, the consideration and consultation of the readings of all other versions ? If that is what is meant, how does it differ from the present method of the textual criticism of the *mb* ?

(iii) What rules has B. in view, 'other than known rules of critical editions' ?

(iv) What particular people has she in view, who according to her 'have a firsthand knowledge of the texts' ? Are they some local Pandits or Purāṇikas who read or recite the Epics and the Purāṇas ?

What quality or standard has she in view, which the local Pandits should possess and by which their firsthand knowledge or accuracy of their particular transmission of the Epic or Purāṇic texts can be judged ? While consulting the Pandits, the Pandits of what particular locality or localities should be given preference in deciding upon a variant in a 'critically edited' text ?—These questions would logically confront the reader and befog him as to the exact and clear outlines of the new constructive method of textual criticism B. may have in view. Her statement that she has 'purposely remained at the level of generalities' would not

exonerate her from the charge of misleading the reader by making such vague general statements with a view to belittling, without adducing sufficient reasons, the canons of textual criticism on which the critical edition of the *mb* is based.

B. calls in question the textual criticism on which the critical edition of the *mb* is based, but nowhere does expressly state her own rules of textual criticism. If we try to gather, from the vague general statements which we have quoted above and subjected to a searching analysis, some canons of textual criticism which B. may have in view, we may say that one of her proposed canons of proper textual criticism would be to 'check the *ms* evidence through consultation with the people who have a first-hand knowledge of the epics' (p. 123). That She has this criterion of textual criticism in view gets corroborated by another statement which she has made in the article (p. 121). She says: "Any Epic or Purāṇic story is true if the local Brahmins recognize it as part of their beliefs". In support of this criterion of textual criticism which she has posited, she goes on to give a concrete illustration which she came across in her tour of Andhra. Her illustration throws an interesting light on what constitutes according to her own peculiar idea, a canon of textual criticism, namely, the recognition by local Brahmins. She says¹ (p. 121) "While talking with Shri Vaishnava Pandits of the Simhachalam Pathashālā in Andhra, I found that they admitted that the local Purāṇa which relates the story of Narasimha and Prahāda was quite different from the Skandapurāṇa version of the same story, though Skandapurāṇa version was the avowed source of it. In spite of this difference, the local Purāṇa was for them authoritative, since it expressed their beliefs, and was therefore considered superior to any local version....A non-Brahmin Hindu (who accompanied me) tried to propose another i.e. Śaivite version of the same story. The Shri Vaishṇava Brahmins rejected that version saying that it was a Purāṇa 'coming from the mouth', while their own local Sthala-Purāṇa was attributed to Vyāsa. The Shri Vaishṇava Brahmins found in themselves the real source of the authoritativeness of the story".

1. What follows is a summary of the anecdote of her meeting with the Brahmin Pandits.

The criterion, which B. has suggested for the checking of *ms* evidence,—namely the consultation with the local pandits—is, as has been suggested in the questions raised previously above, is, to say the least, uncertain and arbitrary. The anecdote which she narrates of her meeting and talk with the Vaishṇava Pandits of Simhachalam does not at all help to make the criterion clearer. The Pandits admit that the story of Naraśimha and Prahalāda occurring in the Skandapurāṇa is the source of, or older than, that in the local Purāṇa. The admission of the pandits that the Skandapurāṇa version of the story is older than the one in their own local Purāṇa, implies on their part the tacit acceptance—may be, unawares—of the principles of scientific textual criticism according to which attempt is made to distinguish or separate an older version from its later modified version. That the local pandits show their preference for the version in the local Purāṇa is another matter and being subjective cannot be a criterion of objective textual criticism. There might be other pandits of other localities who would show their preference for the version in the Skandapurāṇa. The non-Brahmin Hindu who accompanied B. had his preference for the Śaivite version of the story. How can such differing likes and dislikes—such subjective preferences for particular versions—serve as a criterion of scientific textual criticism? Scientific textual criticism, in application to this particular case, should and would take into account all available *ms* evidence and other testimonial bearing on all versions of the Naraśimha and Prahlāda story and try to arrive at and constitute the oldest shape or version of the story on the basis of that evidence. While recording the oldest form or version of the story thus arrived at and constituted, proper scientific textual criticism would not ignore the differences or variations found in the versions; on the other hand, it would also record such differences and variations in the critical apparatus below the constituted version or in the Appendices attached to it thus making available in one edition to all readers a panorama of different versions, still leaving them free choice to enjoy their preference for their own particular version which they may be considering as authoritative.

Basing his stand on the principles of objective textual criticism, Sukthankar has naturally been critical of the Vulgate i.e.

the Devanāgarī version of Nīlakaṇṭha which he takes as proof of the process of conflation through which the *mb* text has passed. B. disagreeing with Sukthankar's principles of textual criticism and his criticism of Nīlakaṇṭha, has the following to say in praise of the Vulgate and Nīlakaṇṭha (p. 120) : "N tried to collect all the available versions of the *mb* and on the basis of them all, to compose a more complete text....We have not much evidence of N's kind of work. No doubt he had also sometimes to eliminate and choose and he did not retain stories or details of stories which were meaningless to him. He was probably even more conscious of the religious requirement than the modern pandits. We can at least tentatively express the traditional idea in these terms: any epic or *purāṇic* story is true if the local Brahmins recognize it as part of their belief. These Brahmins are the *Śruta*, because they are well-versed in Śruti....."

Sukthankar has subjected to a fairly detailed critical analysis of the version of Nīlakaṇṭha (see, pp. 65-69, 80-81, 103 of the Prolegomena). If one read Sukthankar's analysis carefully, one would not agree with B's remark made above that 'we have not much evidence of N's kind of work'. Rather, as Sukthankar has said, Nīlakaṇṭha himself has vouchsafed some information as to how he has prepared his text (Prol. p. 81). That N's text is of an inclusive type is proved by a remark of N. where he naively admits that he had put together the stanzas which had been commented on by the ancient Bhāṣyakāras and others he had found in modern manuscripts with the idea of making 'a thesaurus of excellence' (गुणोपसंहारन्यायेन एकीकृत्य). He has borrowed, according to his fancy, passages short and long, from the southern recensions. Sukthankar has conclusively shown how N.'s conflated version contains a number of lines which are not found in any of the other versions (p. 78), how it contains mystifying, nonsensical repetitions (p. 78), how at one place N. has disfigured his text in his frantic attempt to squeeze into it a lengthy Southern passage containing some details which did not fit into his own text (p. 80), and how as a result of his additions, his text sometimes becomes wholly unintelligible and syntactically absurd.

B. while praising the Vulgate and Nīlakaṇṭha, does not care to answer Sukthankar's criticism. She further says (in the passage

quoted above) that 'No doubt he (i.e. Nīlakaṇṭha) had also to eliminate and choose etc.'. She does not explain why even Nīlakaṇṭha who, according to her, tried to collect all available versions and to compose a more complete text, was required to eliminate and choose certain texts. Perhaps even Nīlakaṇṭha had his own ideas of Textual Criticism, of which B. fights so shy. Therefore he was compelled by the logic of his own criterion to refer only to certain passages and eliminate them from his text. [e.g. he only refers (see his Ādiparvan 196 Bombay edition) to the two adhyāyas of Nālāyaṇī and Bhaumāśvī episodes which are typical Southern interpolations and which he has dropped from his text] (See Prol. 67). Sukthankar (Prol. 67) has pointed out how Nīlakaṇṭha has candidly confessed his inability to understand¹ the confused textual tradition (on B. 1.22.1) which shows that this learned pandit of the 17th century was groping, in his own way, to arrive at certain canons of textual criticism of which B. appears to be so chary. B. agrees with S. Levi in her high estimate of the Vulgate and Nīlakaṇṭha in spite of their obvious defect. The uncritical casual and ill-informed manner in which she has praised the Vulgate and Nīlakaṇṭha reminds us of the remarks which Sukthankar has made with regard to S. Levi. Sukthankar says (p. 84) "...his theoretical misgivings are based on a rather hasty study of both the Vulgate and the critical text; for the text of the Vulgate is so corrupt and obviously contaminated." These remarks of Sukthankar can apply to the whole article of B.

Then B. in the passage quoted above goes on to formulate what according to her formed Nīlakaṇṭha's criterion of composing his text, namely, the religious requirement of the modern pandits, adding her own pet maxim referred to above that "any epic or purāṇic story is true if the local Brahmins recognize it as part of their beliefs". This criterion, namely, consisting of religious requirements and the preference of the local Brahmin is a purely subjective matter, being vague and, in the ultimate analysis, indeterminate and falls outside the sphere of objective textual criticism.

B. has unjustly criticized Sukthankar and others in using the Western Scientific method of textual criticism which was not,

1. अत्र कौशुद्धि न प्रतीमः ।

according to her, meant for that kind of Indian Epic and Purāṇic literature. She says in effect (pp. 116-117) "The oral tradition in the West was authorless and collective and is in opposition to written literature which was by individual authors and maintained by *ms* tradition. The rules of textual criticism were evolved for written literature and their main purpose was to reconstruct, out of the variation of *mss*, the original work of the author". About the oral tradition in India she says (p. 118): "The Epic and Purāṇas are Smṛti texts. We have not here a single text with negligible variant readings but different recensions of the same work. In the Epics and the Purāṇas the oral tradition has been maintained through *ms* tradition in which vast variations occur not only between two recensions but also between two versions of the same recension".

If one reads these two quotations together, one fails to understand what essential difference B. has in view between Western and Indian traditionally written transmitted texts. Originally the Epics and the Purāṇas were orally transmitted. But when later on, they were committed to writing and transmitted through *mss*, they apparently stand on a par with Western written literature, as far as the essential rules of textual criticism are concerned. Only the proportion and the magnitude of the task of applying rules of textual criticism to *mb* differ in their vastness and arduousness from those of the Western written literature. Sukthankar was conscious of the difficulties and the limitations in applying the principles of textual criticism to the stupendous material of the *mb*. He also recognised the necessity of evolving for the critical edition of the *mb* canons of textual criticism different from those usually applied to Western texts. He says (p. 77) "Indeed our ideal is the same as that of the classical philologist : restoration of the text, as far as possible, to its original form. In the *mb*, we have a text with about a dozen, more or less, independent versions where extreme types differ, in extent, by about 13000 stanzas or 26000 lines ... The classical philologist has clearly no experience in dealing with a text of this description, an opus of such gigantic dimensions and complex character, with such a long and intricate history behind it". Undaunted by the stupendousness of the task, Sukthankar, therefore, tried to evolve, on the basis of Scientific Western textual criticism, canons of textual criticism in its application to the *mb*

problem which he called, to distinguish it from that of Western literary texts, a problem '*sui generis*' (p. 86). Sukthankar applying himself to the task of evolving and formulating the Mahābhārata textual criticism, was actuated, like other Western savants (like Lüders) before him, by the scientific spirit—the *raison d'être* of Western textual criticism—which aimed at the restoration of the oldest text on the basis of the available *mss* evidence. B.'s criticism that Western scientific method of textual criticism is not meant for the Indian Epics and Purāṇas is therefore not only unjustified but unsound as it finally militates against the very essential core of the whole question—namely the scientific approach which is inherent in the science of textual criticism. The textual criticism as a science is universal and it is crass obscurantism to say that it is not meant for the Indian Epics and the Purāṇas.

Some vague confusing statements in B.'s article would lead a discriminating reader to conclude that as far as Indian Epics and Purāṇas are concerned, B. does not believe in a scientific approach inherent in textual criticism and holds some beliefs as criteria which are extraneous and irrelevant to the science of textual criticism. We are giving, as example, the following statements in her article, with our critical remarks at the end of each statement.

(i) "Sukthankar has created a new recension of the *mb*. But it is not clear why it should be either better from a scientific viewpoint or more authoritative from a traditional angle. Since the traditional Indian Pandits presently seem to share in this opinion, it would seem that the target has been missed." (p. 119).

In this statement, it is not clear what B. exactly means by the words 'more authoritative from the traditional angle'. She does not clarify what is exactly meant by 'the traditional angle' or point of view. Perhaps by authoritative she means 'approved by the traditional Indian Pandits'. But this militates against the scientific spirit of the *mb* critical edition. For, the use of the word 'authoritative' is subjective and depends upon the likes of the persons who call it authoritative. The critical edition claims that its text is better from a scientific viewpoint, as it represents the oldest text arrived at on the basis of available *mss* evidences. It may not be authoritative from the traditional angle of the traditional pandits who regard subjectively as authoritative their own pet versions.

irrespective of the fact that those versions vary from other versions which latter may be considered authoritative by another set of Pandits. Sukthankar never claimed that the critical edition would be authoritative from the traditional point of view.

(ii) "If we want to study scientifically some piece of Indian oral tradition, we should not begin by focussing our attention on the changes that took place in the process of transmitting the texts but determine for any given time whether a particular piece of oral literature had some relation to the actual beliefs of the people and how it was understood by them" (pp. 119-120)

With regard to the above statement, one may ask : what after all does scientific study of texts mean, if it does not take into account the changes that appear from recension to recension or from version to version ? Again it goes without saying that every particular recension or version may have had some relation to the actual beliefs of the people. But how does this consideration help scientific textual criticism which, as has been already said, aims at the oldest text, irrespective of the beliefs of the people who may be having liking for a particular version. It is possible that the oldest text, thus arrived at on *mss* evidence, may have had some relation to the actual beliefs of the people. But this consideration is entirely extraneous to the canons of textual criticism which lead to the restoration of the oldest text.

(iii) Speaking in praise of Nīlakaṇṭha and his text, B. remarks : "His main concern was to bring out as complete a collection as possible of the epic stories that were prevalent at the time and known by every-body in one form or another. But certainly he was concerned with the authoritativeness of the stories, as any good Brahmin should be. He was probably more conscious of this religious requirement than the modern pandits". (p. 121)

B. has not clarified or specified the criterion or the test by which Nīlakaṇṭha, including the stories, was able to find the sense or consensus of 'everybody in one form or another'. It may have been probably his own subjective preference for particular stories from different recensions or versions which actuated him, to select his conflated text. If inclusion of as complete a collection as possible of stories prevalent during the growth of the epic were the main consideration in judging any edition of the *mb*, one would

recommend to B, the critical edition of the *mb* initiated by Sukthankar and completed by the successive Editors because the latter within its vast compass of (i) the constituted text (ii) starred passages and various readings given below the constituted text and (iii) the passages given in the Appendix to every *Parvan*, contains all the stories prevalent at various times and known by everybody in one form or another. Even the story of Nālāyaṇī which Nīlakaṇṭha has not included in his text is found included in the Appendix in the critical edition.

In the eloquent words of Sukthankar (p. 4), in the preparation of the critical edition of the *mb*, "all important versions of the great Epic have been taken into consideration and all important *mss* collated, estimated, and truned to account. Since all divergent readings of any importance will be given in the critical notes, printed at the foot of the page, this edition will, for the first time, render it possible for the reader to have before him the entire significant *ms* evidence for each individual passage.....Since not even the seemingly most irrelevant line or stanza actually found in the *mb ms* collated for the edition, is on any account, omitted this edition of the *mb* will be, in a sense more complete than any previous edition. It will be a veritable thesaurus of the *Mb* tradition".

Further, B. says that Nīlakaṇṭha as a good Brahmin was concerned with the authoritativeness of the stories, as he was more conscious of this religious requirement. Now the question is: on what grounds is the authoritativeness of a story to be judged? Is it on the grounds of 'religious requirements'? Again what does "religious requirements" imply? In that case, would not the authoritativeness of the story vary from sect to sect according to the beliefs of sectarian worshippers?

(iv) "The modern pandits are now in the name of science trying to decide what is old enough to possibly date back to Vyāsa and use this as the basis for determining the authoritative version. They have introduced the historical dimension into the realm of myth where it can not exist. For a long time, people have been aware of differences in local recensions or traditions but it has not occurred to them that these difference should be accounted for in terms of historical change. A criterion for decision could immediately be found in their own social group status."

In the above statement in the first two sentences B. appears to have misunderstood and misstated the work of modern scholars who have worked in the field of *mb* textual criticism. They do not claim to have restored texts dating back to Vyāsa; their only claim is that they have tried to restore the oldest possible text on the basis of available *mss* evidence. It is also a sweeping travesty of truth and a gross perversion to say that modern scholars have 'introduced historical dimensions into the realm of myth'. Even myths are studied scientifically by anthropologists. But here the matter is quite otherwise. Are *mss* of different recensions and versions myths? Rather, the *mss* provide a sort of a historical material into which modern scholars like Sukthankar have probed and which they have surveyed in its historical dimensions. Modern scholars have made the material historically meaningful and significant to give us the oldest possible text based on principles of textual criticism. B. further says in the statement above that people have been aware of differences in local recensions or traditions, which differences (as she appears to suggest in the last sentence if we interpret it rightly), are accounted for by them as stemming from their own social group status. What does B. exactly imply by 'social-group status'? Is it their particular sectarian creed or belief which made them introduce changes which are responsible for the differences in local recensions?—But such criteria are, again, subjective, as they are swayed by people's likes and dislikes of particular texts and must be pronounced as irrelevant and extraneous to the objective, scientific principles of textual criticism.

(v) "Any locally accepted version is authoritative in its own right. Any scientific study should, first of all, preserve these variations and determine the kind of socio-religious ideas they conveyed to the people". The two sentences in this statement, the second following the first, are mutually contradictory in spirit. A locally accepted version is authoritative i. e. regarded as the only true one by the local pandits or the people. Scientific study involves the comparison of recensions and versions and may reveal variations from one recension or version to another. If such variations are revealed, the science of textual criticism would try to account for these variations on objective principles based on the study of *ms* evidence, arrange them in their text-critical sequence

and place them as genuine or spurious, older or later, as the case may be. B. appears to insist in the second sentence that the variations in the particular version should be preserved that is, (if we interpret rightly), should be kept intact in their own original place, irrespective of what a scientific study may reveal or judge to the contrary ; in that case her reference to scientific study is meaningless, because scientific study presupposes that there is nothing authoritative in its own right unless and until it is proved to be so by the scientific method. The critical edition attempts to arrive at an authentic—not authoritative—text.

The *mb* grew through centuries into a national epic, a traditional book of inspiration which has been the cherished heritage of a whole people throughout India from Kashmir to Kanyakumari and has been preserved in numerous recensions written in different scripts. To say therefore, (as B. has said) that 'any locally accepted version (of the Epic) is authoritative' is to detract from the universal character of this national Epic, and make it a parochial text. The scientific study of the *mb*, on the other hand, based on the principles of textual criticism, takes into account this universal character of the Epic and sets about to discriminate, with as much precision and certainty as the *mss* material would allow, between the data of the rival recensions, and to evaluate correctly and confidently the amazingly large *mss* of variants. The critical edition worked on such scientific principles, besides giving the constituted text, would also preserve the variations (found in recensions collated for this edition), (which B. wants to be preserved) only in their proper perspective and place in the framework of the critical apparatus. Thus the critical edition, while being scientific in its constitution of the oldest text, would also fulfil the desideratum of B. by providing, if only in a differently arranged form, the locally accepted version to the local pandits who should then be satisfied with their socio-religious ideas which the variations convey.

B.'s suggestion in the statement that 'any scientific study should determine the kind of socio-religious ideas which the variations conveyed to the people' belongs properly to the sphere of Higher criticism and not to sphere of lower criticism, namely, the textual criticism which restricts itself only to constituting the oldest text on the basis of available *ms* evidence and does not

occupy itself with probing into the socio-religious ideas of the people. This latter task belongs in the sphere of Higher Criticism which will study the constituted text, the variants in the critical apparatus, the passages in the Appendices and try to determine the different strata or stages through which the contents of the text appear to have passed and the kind of socio-religious ideas which the variations may have conveyed to the people.

B. has picked out certain statements, from the Prolegomena of Sukthankar, which appear to her, to be contradictory. In one of her statements she says: (p. 116) "Sukthankar holds the idea of an old organic form which is the basis of all alterations; but he also says about this poem that, it, 'practically never existed'. This contradiction was brought to light by S. Levi". In another statement (p. 123) she says: "The editors up till now have concentrated on the reconstruction of a single text out of the several known recensions, but it is recognized by every body including the editors themselves, that such a text never existed".

The careful readers of the Prolegomena will be able to judge for themselves that B.'s above statements are based on quotations which are torn out of their context, and that they misrepresent the claims of the editors of the *mb*. We shall quote the relevant words of Sukthankar in their full context (p. 102-103):

"The essential fact in the *mb* textual criticism...that the *mb* is not and never was a fixed rigid text, but is fluctuating epic tradition...Our objective should consequently not be to arrive at an archtype (which practically never existed), but to represent, view and explain the epic tradition in all its variety, in all its ramifications. This is a problem in textual dynamics rather than in textual statics. To put in other words, the *mb* is the whole of the Epic tradition: the entire critical apparatus. Its separation into the constituted text and the critical notes is only a static representation of a constantly changing epic text"

The tenor of Sukthankar's words that 'an archtype...practically never existed' is to point out the fundamentally fluctuating, fluid nature of the epic text which, according to him, set limits, inherent in this peculiar task, on the critical edition's attempt to arrive at the archtype. Sukthankar is quite clear in his further statement regarding the objective of the critical edition: He says (p. 102-103):

“To prevent misconception in the mind of the casual reader, it is best to state at first what the constituted text is *not*. The editor is firmly convinced that the text presented in this edition is *not* anything like the autograph copy of the work of its mythical author, Vyāsa. It is *not*, in any sense, a reconstruction of the Ur-mahābhārata or of the ur-Bhārata, that indeed but impossible desideratum. It is also not an exact replica of the poem recited by Vaiśampāyana before Janamejaya. It is further wholly uncertain how close it approaches the text of the poem said to be recited by the Sūta before Śaunaka.....”

“It is but a modest attempt to present a version of the epic as old as the extant manuscript material will permit us to reach with some semblance of confidence. It only claims to be the *most ancient one* according to the direct line of transmission.....It may be regarded as the ancestor of all extant manuscripts, or to be precise, of the manuscripts examined and collated for this edition.....”

It will be clear from the above rather extensive quotation from the Prolegomena of Sukthankar what, according to him, was the objective of the critical edition of the *mb*. Sukthankar and other editors of the *mb* never claimed to have aimed at a restoration of the original archetype or the Ur-mahābhārata. It will be relevant here to refer our readers to the controversy between Sukthankar and S. Levi which has been alluded to by Sukthankar in a foot-note on the page (p. 103) from which the above quotation has been taken. Sukthankar has quoted S. Levi who in a review of the critical edition of the Ādiparvan said in effect : “I advise the editor to renounce the reconstruction of the Ur-mahābhārata, as he is pleased to call it.” Sukthankar has remarked on this statement that it is false, meaning thereby that the critical edition never claimed to have aimed at the reconstruction of the ur-Mahābhārata. It is certainly improper and unfair on the part of critics (e. g. S. Levi then and B. now) to foist on the editors of the critical edition a claim which they never made but which, on the other hand, they clearly disavowed, and to find fault with them for their not having been able to fulfil it.

We have selected some statements from B.'s article which is full of vague generalizations and have subjected them to critical

analysis in which we have quoted, to answer her vague contentions, passages from the Prolegomena of Sukthankar himself—pioneer of *mb* textual criticism. It will be clear to the readers that many of the objections of B. have already been dealt with in one form or another by Sukthankar. We regret to say that B. in her article appears to have made no contribution to the *mb* textual criticism. As we have pointed out in the beginning, B. has not given a single concrete illustration of a passage or passages from the critical edition of the *mb* in support of her vague contentions. When we consider that the critical edition of the *mb* after over forty years of labour which eminent scholars have put in in the field of textual criticism, stands before us as a *fait accompli*, vague statements made by B. in her article will no doubt appear on that background as not only full of antiquated or outdated ideas reminding one of Rip van Winkle but also of obscurantist ideas which militate against the very science of textual criticism.

B. has concluded her article by inviting the expressions of opinions on the points she has raised. We have expressed our opinion in the foregoing part of this article. Rather than being content with a more expression of our opinion, we would like to go a step further and, in the interest of the science of textual criticism, would like to make a request to her in the form of a concrete proposal. From her remarks on page 123 of her article, it appears that she is not against the critical edition of ancient texts as such. She says (p. 123): "Each version could be 'critically edited' to a certain extent". She wants that the ancient texts should be 'critically edited' to a certain extent. Now we would request her to come down from the level of generalities and try her hand at some such practical task of 'critically editing' a text to the extent which she may have in view. She should publish a sort of fascicule of a critically edited text, of some epic or Purāṇa passage, embodying her own suggestions (made on page 123 of her article) namely: "Publishing not only the different recensions but when necessary, different versions of each recension, publishing the different texts in parallel, checking the manuscript evidence and strengthening it through consultations with the people who have a firsthand knowledge of the epics and the purāṇas". The publication of such fascicule on her part would certainly be a practical demonstration of her thesis, thus rescuing her method

from the fog of generality and consequent ambiguity and would set the stage for fruitful discussion among serious students of textual criticism.

THE PURĀNIC RECORDS ON THE SUN-WORSHIP

By

V. C. SRIVASTAVA

[अत्र लेखकमहोदयेन सौरसम्प्रदायविषये पौराणिकोल्लेखानाधारी-
कृत्य भारते वर्षे प्रचलितस्य सूर्योपासनोपासकादेः शोधपरो विचार ऐतिहा-
सिकपद्धत्या कृतो वर्तते । वायु-विष्णु-ब्रह्माण्ड-मत्स्य-मार्कण्डेय-भविष्य-
ब्रह्म-स्कन्द-वराह-अग्नि-गरुड-विष्णुधर्मोत्तर-भविष्योत्तर-कालिका-साम्बपु-
रारोषूपलब्धसामग्र्या ईशवीयशताब्द्याः प्रारम्भकालतः प्रचलितायाः
सूर्योपासनायाः स्वरूपविकासयोः पर्याप्तं ज्ञानं प्राप्यते । प्राचीनतमेषु
पुरारोषु वैदिकपरम्परायाः सम्यक् निर्वाहोऽस्ति । जगत्पातुत्वेन सूर्यस्य
ख्यातिः सवित्रु-आदित्यप्रभृतिनामभिः प्रसिद्धतमैरस्य महत्त्वं 'जीवनः',
'ब्रह्मसत्कृतः' इत्यं प्रख्यापितमासीत् । सूर्यसम्बन्धे बहुविधो विचारः सूर्यव्रत-
सूर्यकथा-सूर्यरथ-सूर्यवंश-सूर्यप्रतीकादीनां निर्देशपुरःसरं प्रस्तूयते । अर्वा-
चीनेषु च पुरारोषु यथा साम्ब-भविष्यपुराणयोः सूर्योपासनापद्धतिः प्रतीकञ्च
'ईरान' देशीय सूर्योपासनायाः प्रभावबलात् साम्प्रदायिकतां गृह्णाति । शाक-
द्वीपीयमगानां वैदेशिक-पुरोहितानां सौरसम्प्रदायेन सम्बन्धस्य सम्भावनाऽति-
रञ्जितेति निबन्धकृता प्रतिपादितम् । नैकविधमूलाधारान् प्रमाणीकृत्य तेन
सौरसम्प्रदायस्य संकेत इतिहासग्रन्थेषु, विविधगृहक्रियाधर्मविधिषु च प्रचार
इत्यादि विस्तरेण विवेचितम् ।]

The vast literature of the Purāṇas ranging from the 3rd century A.D. to the 12th century A.D. and even beyond¹ supplies us with invaluable data for the study of religious history of the classical and the mediaeval Hindu periods of ancient India.²

1. Kane, P.V., H.D.S., vol. II, pt. I., pp. XI-XII; Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, pp. 1-189.
2. Pargiter, F.E., E.R.E., vol. X, p. 451 regards the Purāṇas as 'a popular encyclopaedia of ancient and mediaeval Hinduism'; Winternitz, M., A History of Indian Literature, vol. I, p. 521 emphasises this point, 'At all events they are of inestimable value from the point of view of the history of religion... They afford us far greater insight into all aspects and phases of Hinduism- its mythology, its idolworship, its theism and pantheism, its love of god, its philosophy and its superstitions, its festivals and ceremonies and its ethics, than any other works'.

There are many Purāṇas and Upa-purāṇas-early as well as late which throw flood of light on different aspects of the growth and nature of the sun-worship as was found prevalent from the 1st century A.D.³ to the 12th or 13th century A.D. in ancient India. The sun-worship in some form or the other is mentioned in Vāyu, Viṣṇu, Brahmāṇḍa, Matsya, Mārkaṇḍeya, Bhaviṣya, Brahma, Skanda, Varāha, Agni, Garuḍa, Viṣṇudharmottara, Bhaviṣyottara, Kālikā and Sāmba Purāṇas. No doubt, the question of the chronology of the Purāṇas and Purāṇic passages (because there have been changes, additions and interpolations many times in all Purāṇas) is a vexed problem,⁴ but efforts have been made by the scholars to settle the question with fair amount of probability⁵ and now the Purāṇic literature may be divided into early and late Purāṇic records. Of the various Purāṇas dealing with the sun and sun-worship, Viṣṇu,⁶ (the last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A.D.), Vāyu⁷ (3rd century A.D.) Mārkaṇḍeya⁸ (3rd or 4th century A.D.), Brahmāṇḍa⁹ (3rd-5th century A.D.) and Matsya¹⁰ (last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A.D. and later) may be assigned in the first group.

3. Though no extant Purāṇa can be dated earlier than the 3rd century A.D., yet it is probable that the picture of religion and society depicted in the earliest Purāṇic texts may be that of then contemporary India as well as of two three centuries before it.
4. Kane, P. V., op. cit. opines that the chronology of the Purāṇas like that of the epics, is a subject full of perplexing problems.
5. cf. Pusalker, A.D., Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas of India, pp. 205-230.
6. Hazra, R.C., op. cit., pp. 19-26. It has been dated differently such as by Pargiter, F.E., A.I.H.T., p. 80 (not earlier than the fifth century A.D.); Farquhar, J.N., An outline of the Religious literature of India, p. 143 (400 A.D.), Winternitz, M., op. cit., p. 545, f.n. 2., (5th century A.D.), Vaidya, C.V., History of Mediaeval Hindu India, vol. I, pp. 350 ff. and J.B.B.R.A.S., 1925, pp. 155 ff. (9th century A.D.), Dikshitar, V.R.R., P.I.H.C., XIII, pp. 46-50 and I.H.Q., VIII, pp. 370-71, (6th or 7th century B.C. and the major position of present Viṣṇu Purāṇa existed from the beginning of the Christian era).
7. Hazra, R.C., Purāṇic Records, pp. 13-17.
8. Ibid., pp. 8-17.
9. Ibid., pp. 17-19.
10. Ibid., pp. 26-52 cf. Karmarkar, A.P., Karmarkar Comm. vol. pp. 77-81 regards it as the earliest extant Purāṇa.

The second group of late Purāṇas and Upa-purāṇas consists of Bhaviṣya (500 A.D.—1200 A.D.),¹¹ Brahma¹² (900-1200 A.D.), Skanda¹³ (700 A.D. and later), Varāha¹⁴ (800 A.D.—1400 A.D.), Agni¹⁵ (9th century A.D. and later), Garuḍa¹⁶ (10th century A.D. and later), Viṣṇudharmottara (400-500 A.D.)¹⁷, Bhaviṣyottara,¹⁸ Kālikā (between the 10th and the 11th century A.D.)¹⁹ and Sāmba (500-1500 A.D.).²⁰

The earlier Purāṇic texts continue the older Vedic, Epic and Smṛti traditions of the sun-worship with minor changes and additions to suit the changed conditions. Āditya becomes a common name for Sūrya (the sun-god) with which he is identified.²¹ Thus in the Vāyu²² and the Brahmāṇḍa²³ Purāṇas this term has been enumerated with various other names of Sūrya. The Matsya Purāṇa²⁴ prescribes the worship of the sun under the name of Āditya in Avimukta-tīrtha ceremony. In the prayer of Yājñavalkya addressed to the sun-god, Āditya figures as one of the names of the deity in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa.²⁵ Regarding the origin of Ādityas

-
11. Ibid., pp. 167-173.
 12. Ibid., pp. 145-156.
 13. Ibid., pp. 151-165.
 14. Ibid., pp. 96-106.
 15. Ibid., pp. 134-140, Choudhury S.B., J.A.H.R.S. III, pp. 127-134 places it between the middle of the 8th and the middle of 9th century A.D.
 16. Ibid., pp. 141-144; Sastri, H.P. places it in third-fourth century A.D. but his view is disproved by Choudhury, S.B., I.H.Q., VI, pp. 553-560 who places it in the 10th or the 11th century A.D.
 17. Hazra, R.C., J.U.G., III, pp. 39-64.
 18. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. II, p. 345.
 19. Hazra, R.C., A.B.O.R.I., XXII, pp. 1-23; Gode, P.K., J.O.R., pp. 289-294, puts the date of this Purāṇa before 1000 A.D.; Raghavan, V., J.O.R., XII, pp. 331-360 gives 700 A.D. as the earlier limit; Sharma, T.N., I.H.Q. XXIII, pp. 323-326, places it to the end of the 11th and beginning of the 12th century A.D.
 20. Hazra, R.C. studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 93.
 21. Roy, S. N., Early Purāṇic Account of Sun and Solar Cult, University of Allahabad Studies, 1964 p. 1-44.
 22. Vāyu P., XXXI-37.
 23. Brahmāṇḍa P., II-13-125.
 24. Matsya P., CLXXXIV-31 'Ādityopāsanām kṛtvā'
 25. Viṣṇu P., III-5-24. 'Ādityādibhūtāya...namo namaḥ'.

who are twelve in number it has been narrated²⁶ that the gods called Tuṣitas of the Cākṣuṣamanvantara came to be known as Ādityas in the Vaivasvata manvantara. They were born out of the womb of Aditi which was the result of their pre-planned determination of enjoying the rank of gods in the next manvantara again. Ādityas along with other celestial beings occupy the orb of the sun and support his chariot in each month²⁷ and lend their fiery lustre to the sun.²⁸ It is said that in the beginning of creation the solar phenomenon came to be named Āditya not because he was son of Aditi but because he was first born.²⁹ This semantic etymological derivation is a departure from old practice and is a Purāṇic device.³⁰ These twelve Ādityas are Viṣṇu, Śakra, Aryaman, Dhṛti, Tvaṣṭṛ, Pūṣan, Vivasvat, Savitṛ, Mitra, Varuṇa, Aṁsa and Bhaga³¹ and have been assigned to different months.³² It is interesting to find that the solar nature of Viṣṇu, Pūṣan, Savitṛ, Aryaman, Vivasvat and Bhaga is not lost. Pūṣan has been compared with Āditya.³³ Savitṛ is one of the different names applied to the sun in the prayer offered by Yājñavalkya.³⁴ Savitṛ along with Aryaman has again been applied to the sun in the description of the northern part of the solar sphere.³⁵ According to Purāṇas³⁶ a householder offers water to the sun saluting the deity by the names of Vivasvān and Savitṛ, the former being radiant and glory of Viṣṇu, the latter being granter of the fruits of acts. This is in conformity with Sūtra tradition of "arghya" to the Sun-god. In some early Purāṇas Savitṛ has been described as one of the epithets of Sūrya who is also called Āditya and Bhānu.³⁷ It is stated that

26. Viṣṇu. P., I-15-126-131; Vāyu P., LXVI-66-67; Brahmāṇḍa P., III-2-67-69; Matsya-P., VI-3-5.

27. Viṣṇu-P., II-10-19.

28. Matsya-P., CXXXVI-25.

29. Mārkaṇḍeya, P., Ch. 102-14.

30. Agarwala, V. S., Matsya Purāṇa-A Study, p. 21.

31. Viṣṇu-P., I-XV-17.

32. Wilson, H. H., (Tr.) Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, p. 192.

33. Viṣṇu-P., I-9-63.

34. Ibid., III-5-24.

35. Ibid., II-8-92.

36. Ibid., III-11-39, 40.

37. Vāyu-P., XXXI-37, states 'Ādityaḥ Savitṛ Bhānuḥ Jīvanah-brahmasatkr̥taḥ. cf. Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-13-125.

in Cākṣuṣa manvantara Sūrya began to be called Vivasvān.³⁸ Satrājīta worshipped sun god as Vivasvān³⁹ and Brahmā also adored him as Vivasvān in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa.⁴⁰ Further it is enjoined⁴¹ in connection with Mandāra-Saptamī vrata that a devotee should salute the sun in the name of Aryamā and Pūṣan in the south-west and north-directions respectively and on the occasion of the Saṅkrānti-vrata it ordains that in south-west and north directions sun should be worshipped in the name of Savitṛ and Bhaga. No doubt, the Purāṇas were following the old Vedic tradition in this respect but there is one significant departure in the sense that Mārtaṇḍa—one of the Ādityas in Brāhmaṇas is conspicuous by his absence in this group though it always stands for the sun god in the Purāṇas.⁴² In connection with the Saṅkrānti-vrata it is prescribed that the sun should be worshipped in the name of Mārtaṇḍa in northern direction.⁴³ The sun is known as Mārtaṇḍa because of its flashing out of the Brahmāṇḍa.⁴⁴ Similar explanation is given in other early Purāṇas. The primeaval egg was divided into two parts by Tvaṣṭā. The sun sprang from it which was apparently dead (Mṛta) but was actually alive. Mārtaṇḍa is so known because it came out of the dead egg.⁴⁵

It is significant to point out that in the early Purāṇas the sun-god has been worshipped mainly in his benevolent role.⁴⁶ He is a great benefactor of humanity. This feature is essentially Ṛgvedic in origin. It is stated in typical Purāṇic fashion that the gods, men and demons depend upon the sun-god mainly because this god extracts waters for eight months of the year from various sources and pours them on the earth during remaining four months. It is due to rain that corn grows and the world subsists. It is further said that sometimes the sun pours down water with his

38. Vāyu-P., LXXXIV-29; Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-59-30.

39. Vāyu-P., IVC-22; Brahmāṇḍa-P., III-71-23.

40. 103-5 to 12.

41. Roy. S. N., Paurāṇic Dharma evam Samājya, p. 53.

42. Matsya-P., LXXIX-6, 7.

43. Matsya-P., XLVIII-6.

44. Ibid., II-36.; Mārkaṇḍeya-P., Ch. 105-19.

45. Vāyu-P., LXXXIV-26-29; Brahmāṇḍa-P., III-59-27 to 30.

46. Roy. S. N., Early Purāṇic account of Sun and solar cult, p. 48.

rays while he is still shining in the sky and there is no cloud.⁴⁷ It is due to his benevolent quality that the sun-god is also called as 'Jivana' and Brahma-satkṛta (honoured by Brahmā whose creation is nourished by him⁴⁸). In the present context the title 'Brahma-satkṛta' has no sectarian affiliation but may have given opportunity to later sectarian works to derive inspiration from such terms. All these beneficial qualities are described in connection with 'Saura-Vratas' described in Purāṇas⁴⁹ and legend of Rājyavardhana.⁵⁰ But from the above description inference should not be drawn that the malevolent aspect was not known at all. In Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa there are reference to the destructive role of the Sungod.⁵¹ The main reason for emphasis upon the benevolent aspect of the Sun-worship in the early Purāṇas lies in the fact that the Purāṇic theology centres round "theism".⁵²

The early Purāṇas give elaborate description of the sun's chariot, its different parts, horses and celestial beings. The sun's chariot is nine thousand yojanas in length. It consists of a pole which is twice of that longitude. Its axle is fifteen millions and seven hundred thousand yojanas long. On this axle a wheel is fixed which has three naves, five spokes and six peripheries. On the whole the wheel constitutes the circle or wheel of time. The seven horses which carry the chariot has been identified with the seven Vedic metres. The chariot is presided over by Ādityas, Ṛṣis, Gandharvas, Apsaras, Yakṣas, Sarpas and Rākṣasas. In every month these heavenly bodies occupy it in seven seats and perform their specific duties for enhancing the lustre and strength of the chariot.⁵³ Other early Purāṇas⁵⁴ give similar descriptions with the difference that the total length and breadth of the chariot in them is ten thousand yojanas and it is said to have been constructed by Brahmā. The association of the sun-god with a chariot drawn by horses

47. Viṣṇu-P., II-9-7., Mārkaṇḍeya P., 27-23.

48. Vāyu-P., XXXI-37; Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-13-125. Such titles are also given to sun in the epics and this legend of giving rain is also mentioned in the epics cf. MBH., III-3-146.

49. Matsya P. Chs. 74-78, 85-89.

50. B. Mārkaṇḍeya-P., Ch. 109-62-78; 110-1 to 5.

51. Ibid. Ch. 103-2 to 12; 105-39.

52. Macnicol, N., Indian theism, p. 7, 20.

53. Viṣṇu-P., II-2-2 to 7; II-10-1 ff.

54. Vāyu-P., I-89-90; Brahmāṇḍa-P., I.82-83; Matsya-P., CXXVI-9ff.

is Vedic in origin⁵⁵ and thus the early Purāṇas continue the tradition with elaborate descriptions. The Sungod has been identified with "Time" in the early Purāṇas.⁵⁶ This explains the number of 12 Ādityas and seven horses in chariot of sun.⁵⁷

The early Purāṇas are conscious of the existence of a family of the sun-god a tendency which is already prevalent in the epics⁵⁸. Samjñā the daughter of Visva-karman is mentioned as a wife of the sun and three children of the sun-Yama, Yamī and Manu are also referred to⁵⁹. Some early Purāṇas narrate the story of Chhāyā-shadow of his queen and refer to attendants also.⁶⁰ The story of the cutting of the rays of the sungod is referred to in the early Purāṇas.⁶¹

In the early Purāṇas, Agni—the fire god is placed as inferior to Sūrya in marked contrast to the high position given to Agni in the Vedic literature.⁶² In some Purāṇas Agni in the form of Kāla is regarded as nothing else than the essence of Sūrya.⁶³ At other place⁶⁴ it is more explicitly referred to that Kālāgni is Sūrya himself. The sun has been described as the cause of the regulation of day and night⁶⁵ a conception which is Ṛgvedic in origin.⁶⁶ It appears that the sun was regarded as remover of evil effects as it is said that if heretics are seen the wise men should look at the sun.⁶⁷ His connection with eye is not forgotten and he is

55. Macdonell, A. A., V. M., pp. 30-31.

56. Vāyu. P. XXXI-29; Viṣṇu. P., II-VIII-12., Mārkaṇḍeya P. Ch. 104-36.

57. Agarwala, V. S., Matsya P., A study, p. 210-12.

58. M. B. H.-I-203-34, cf. Karmarkar, A. P., Religion and Philosophy of the Epics., Cul. Her. of India, vol. II, p. 81.

59. Viṣṇu-P., III-2.

60. Matsya-P., XI-32-36 ; Viṣṇu-P., III-2 ; Mārkaṇḍeya-P. Ch. 78-32-34.

61. Viṣṇu-P., III-2. Mārkaṇḍeya P. II-6-108.

62. Keith, A. B., op. cit., p. 154 : cf. R. V., X-88-11 etc. Macdonell A. A., op. cit., pp. 30-31.

63. Vāyu-P., XXXI-29 'Ādityastvasau sūrah Kālāgnih'.

64. Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-13-117 'Ādityastu asau Sūryah Kālāgnih'

65. Viṣṇu-P., II-VIII-12.

66. Macdonell, A. A., op. cit. pp. 30-31.

67. Viṣṇu-P., III-XVIII-97.

regarded as presiding over eyes.⁶⁸ He becomes seven-fold at the end of the world.⁶⁹

There are many legends in the early Purāṇas which may be specially associated with the sun-worship—firstly, the legend of Yājñavalkya, secondly, that of Satrājita, thirdly, worship of the Sungod by Brahmā,⁷⁰ fourthly, worship of the Sungod by Aditi and fifthly, adoration of the Sungod by Rājyavardhana. According to Purāṇas Yājñavalkya invoked the sun to get the text of the Yajus. He worshipped him as the gate of liberation, the fountain of bright radiance, the triple source of splendour as the Ṛk, the Yajur and the Sāmavedas. He as fire and the moon is one with the cause of the universe—one with the notion of time and all its divisions of hours, minutes and seconds, He is to be meditated upon as the visible form of Viṣṇu, as the impersonation of the mystic 'OM', he nourishes troops of the gods, having filled the moon with his rays, who feeds Pitṛs with his nectar and ambrosia and who nourishes mankind with rain. Brahmā is nothing but the sun in the form of the three seasons, he alone is the dispeller of darkness of this earth of which he is the sovereign lord. He is clad in the raiment of purity. Man is incapable of devout acts until his rising. Touched by his rays the world is filled with religious rites. He is the centre and source of purification. He is the eye of the universe born in a golden car whose banners scatter ambrosia. The sun gave him Yajus in the form of a horse. In view of the fact that the story does not find mention in the Vedas, it has been suggested⁷¹ that it is a Purāṇic invention but this view is not acceptable as the legend is found in the epics⁷² and therefore it may be regarded as continuing the epic tradition. In the above descriptions certain well marked features of the sun-worship comes into prominent relief such as the identity of the sun with Time, Viṣṇu, Brahmā and OM etc., the description of the sun as nourisher and rain-giver, as the visible symbol of invisible reality, as symbol

68. Ibid., III-V-24.

69. Ibid., VI-3-3.

70. Viṣṇu-P., V-III-5; Vāyu-P., 69-209-210; Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-35-14-26. It occurs in some late Purāṇas also cf. Bhāgavata-P., 12-6; Skanda-P., Nāgarakhaṇḍa, 61-5.

71. Wilson, H.H. (Tr.) Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, p. 280.

72. MBH.-Śānti-Parvan-61-5.

of purity and source of all Vedas. All these features are Vedic in origin. In view of the fact that the sun god has been described as cause of the universe, the gate of liberation, the sovereign lord and identical with ultimate reality, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Vedas and Time etc., his supremacy has been clearly stated and therefore may be regarded as containing germs of the sectarian sun-worship, if not an example of sectarianism itself. This description of the sun-worship tallies with the epic description⁷³ of the sectarian solar worship and also with later Purāṇic passages⁷⁴ on the sun-sect.

The second story of Satrājita is also significant from the point of view of the sun-worship. Satrājita worshipped the sun and received from him Syamantaka gem as boon. He repaired to Dvārakā where people welcomed him. Here Āditya appeared in the human form with reddish eye, dwarfish stature burnished as copper.⁷⁵ The significance of the legend lies in the fact that it refers indirectly to the image of the sun when it is said that Āditya appeared in the human form. Secondly, the region of the story is Dvārakā which was associated with later sectarian sun-worship.⁷⁶ Moreover, many sun temples and inscriptions referring to the sun worship in sectarian form have also come to light from this very region during the same period.⁷⁷ All these definitely go to indicate that the early Purāṇas were conscious of the sectarian sun-worship as will be evident from their familiarity with the sun-worship in the human form—a fact indicative of image worship because the old Vedic tradition believed in the worship of the sun in the form of disc. or wheel or rayed orb⁷⁸ though no doubt anthropomorphic⁷⁹ descriptions of the sun-god are found in the Vedic literature. The story appears to be a faint echo of the story of Sāmba, found in the later Purāṇas.

73. Ibid., III-3-5.

74. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. II.

75. Viṣṇu-P., IV-13. In Vāyu-P., IVC-22 Satrājita is described as sun's friend 'Satrājitaḥ Sūryasakhā'. Brahmāṇḍa-P., III-71-23.

76. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa., Ch. III.

77. Sankalia, H.D., op. cit., pp. 212-214. Bhattacharya, H.D., The Age of of Imperial Kanauj, ed. Majumdar, R.C., p. 332.

78. R.V., I-175-4; IV-28-2, 30-4; V-29-10. S.B., VII-4-1-10.

79. Maedonell, A.A., op. cit., pp. 30-31.

The worship of the sun-god by Brahmā⁸⁰, Aditi⁸¹ and Rājya-varḍdana⁸² are found in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa which show familiarity of this Purāṇa with sectarian form of the sun-worship.⁸³

There is one significant reference to the sun-worship in the Vāyu-Purāṇa. In description of Vāyupur there appears to be an allusion to the setting up of an image of Vādāditya by the god Vāyu. It has been suggested⁸⁴ that this Vādāditya is none else but the sun-god or Sūrya. The suggestion appears to be probable in view of the following description found in the Vāyu Purāṇa. It is stated that the peoples of the place were called Vādavas whose customs were many and varied. Yājñavalkya and his pupils were inflicted with the sin of 'Brahmahatyā'. On the advice of Brahmā they worshipped the god Vālukeśvara of twelve beams (dvādaśārka i. e. the sun) in the city of Vāyupur and had their baths in the tanks at that place. One of the four was known as Sūrya-kuṇḍa. Then they adored Vādava, the lord of the north, and merged themselves into the world of Sūrya (Sūrya-maṇḍalam)⁸⁵. Of Yājñavalkya, it is stated, that he returned what he had learnt about the Vedas to his teacher and concentrated his mind on the sun-god. As a result of these efforts the god in the form of a horse gave a new saṁhitā to Yājñavalkya. The Rākṣasas named Yātudhānas—ten in number—were the followers of Sūrya and wandered with the deity.⁸⁶ Bhauvana who appears to be a demon offered a prayer to the sun-god with the Rathāntarasāman and was immediately turned into an elephant.⁸⁷ In the Kimśuka forest the Siddhas pay homage to Āditya.⁸⁸ Sūrya in the guise of a Brāhmaṇa begged of the king Arjuna the whole earth for alms. The above description from Vāyu Purāṇa may be regarded as containing many basic ideas of the sun-worship. Firstly, the familiarity of the Purāṇa with sun

80. Ch. 101-103.

81. Ch. 104-105.

82. Ch. 109-10.

83. See Agrawala, V. S., Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, Eka Sānskritika Adhyayana.

84. Patil, D.R., Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa, p. 67. cf. his appendix No. 1422.

85. Ibid., cf. App. No. 1423.

86. Vāyu-P., 69-128, 'Sūryasyānucarā hyete Saha tena Bhramanti'.

87. Ibid., 69-209-10.

88. Ibid., 38-31-2.

images is clearly indicated when it is stated that Rākṣasas roam along with the deity, that they worshipped god Vālukeśvara of twelve beams in the city of Vāyupur—most probably refers to the worship of a sun image in a temples⁸⁹ and that they set up Vādavāditya. Further the tradition of having Sūrya-kuṇḍa which become quite 'common in classical and mediaeval Hindu India'⁹⁰ appears to have been in vogue in early Purāṇic times as a Sūrya-kuṇḍa is mentioned here. Thirdly, both Āryan and non-Āryan or indigeneous peoples of India believed in the sun-worship as is apparent from the fact that besides Yājñavalkya and his pupils Rākṣasas and Yātudhānas—representative of the non-Āryan element in Indian society⁹¹ have also been associated with the sun-worship. Moreover, siddhas (Yogis) also paid homage to the sun-god in forests. It has been suggested that yogic practices such as meditation and concentration have prominent place in the ancient Indian sun-worship⁹² and this becomes more prominent after 7th or 8th century A. D after its association with Tāntrika practice specially in Pañcopāsānā.⁹³

It has been suggested⁹¹ that it is just possible that the Vādavas might have been foreigners like Magas of Sāmba and other Purāṇas. Though there is no positive evidence to this effect, yet there are internal evidences in the Purāṇa which may lend support to the suggestion. Firstly, it is specifically mentioned in case of Vādavas that their customs were varied and many while no such description is given of Rākṣasas and Yātudhānas who may have been indigeneous tribes of India while Vādavas may have

89. Patil, D.R., op. cit., p. 192.

90. Sankalia, H.D., op. cit., pp. 212-214.

91. Keith, A.B. and Macdonell, A.A., Vedic Index, vol. II. Ārṣeya Upaniṣad quoted by Belvalkar, S.K. and Ranade, R.R., History of Indian Philosophy, vol. II, p. 298 refers to a class of Puṇḍras, Suhmas, Udumbhas, Dardas and Barabaras who were sun-worshippers. In MBH., III-3-5 the sun god is adored by Siddhas and Gandharvas. Mandasor Stone Inscription of Kumargupta also refers to the worship of the sun-god by Siddhas, Kinnaras and Gandharvas etc. cf. Fleet, J.F., C.I.I., vol. III, pp. 79-88.

92. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 36.

93. Banerjea, J.N., Pañcopāsānā, ch. XIII.

94. Patil, D. R., op. cit., p. 192.

been foreigners and therefore the need was specially felt to emphasise the varied nature of their customs. Secondly, the god Vālukeśvara who was nothing else than the sun-god is specially mentioned as 'Dvādaśārka', of twelve beams. It is interesting to note that the Magas—the foreign priests also worshipped the sun god in his twelfth form⁹⁵. Thirdly, it is significant to note that Yājñavalkya returned the teachings of the Vedas and then worshipped the sun-god as if the worship of the sun god was something outside the sacred tradition of the Vedic worship. All these only hint that there may have been some foreign elements in the worship of the sun represented by the Vādavas, though it needs confirmation by other reliable sources.

The Vāyu Purāṇa⁹⁶ expressly states that in the Gayātīrtha there are installed four images of Sūrya which are expressions of four different yugas and if they are seen, touched and worshipped liberation of the ancestor is guaranteed. In sūtras also the sun worship is prescribed in śrāddha⁹⁷.

The Matsya Purāṇa gives detailed instructions regarding the construction of solar images thereby indicating that the practice of making image for the sun-god was already an established fact and therefore there was need for rules and regulations. According to this Purāṇa⁹⁸ the image of the sun should be made with beautiful eyes, seated in a chariot and holding a lotus. There should be seven horses and one cakra in the chariot of the sun and a coronet beaming red should be placed on his head. He should be decorated with ornaments and the two hands as holding blue lotuses and the latter should also be placed on his shoulders as if in a sport. His body should be shown as covered with a bodice of two pieces of cloth. The feet should not be made, it should be brilliant, otherwise he would suffer leprosy. Daṇḍa and Piṅgala should be placed as guards with swords in their hands. Aruṇa and snake etc. should also be there. The sun-god should be either seated on the chariot or on the lotus and holding a lotus.

95. Sāmba Upa-Purāṇa, 3.3 'Dvādaśa bhāṣeṇa mitreṇa'.

96. Vāyu. P., CVIII-36.

97. S. G. S., IV-1-8, A. G. S., IV-6-18, H. G. S., II-5-14. 3.

98. Matsya-P., CCLXI-1-7 ; XCIV-1.

It has been suggested⁹⁹ that these passages referring to the sun image are late and interpolations. It is significant to point out that in some earlier¹⁰⁰ Purāṇas the legend of not depicting feet is found as the sun because of his dazzling heat became unbearable and Viśvakarman diminished the dazzling parts of the sun in order that the latter might become bearable to Saṁjñā. It is probable that the passages may be late interpolations but there is no mention of the northerner's dress (Udīcyaveṣa) which was a characteristic of the sun image from the Kuṣāna period onwards and is also found repeatedly referred to in the technical literature¹⁰¹ and later Purāṇas.¹⁰² It may be the Indian method of depicting sun images as found in the earlier sun images.¹⁰³ Though the number of horses here is four generally while in this Purāṇa it is given as seven. Daṇḍa and Piṅgala are not seen in early sun-icons though they are mentioned in the Matsya Purāṇa.

The testimony of the Matsya Purāṇa is again revealing in the sense that it demonstrates the popularity of the sun god in various domestic vows.¹⁰⁴

The main ceremony of the Kalyānasaptamī vrata also called Vijaya saptamī to be celebrated on the sundays, 7th day of a bright fortnight, centres round the worship of the sun with flowers, sandals, white clothes, incense, eatables and raw sugar along with salt and fruits. Eight pictures of the sun-god should be drawn on eight petals of the lotus and following mantra should be recited :

'Tapanāya namaḥ, Mārtaṇḍāya namaḥ, Bhāskarāya namaḥ,

Vikartanāya namḥ, Ravaye namaḥ'

beginning with the pictures on eastern, south-eastern, southern, south-western, western, north-western, northern and north-eastern

99. Hazra, R. G., Purāṇic Records, p. 48 places these passages at a date not earlier than 650 A. D. (550-650 A. D.). Dr. S. N. Roy, thinks that it is not unjustified to regard these passages earlier than 550 A. D., Paurāṇic Dharma evam Samāja. p. 165.

100. Viṣṇu-P., III-2-2. The story is repeated with elaboration in later Purāṇas as Śāmba Upa-p., chs. 12-15.

101. Varāhmihira, Bṛihat-Samhitā, ch. 57.

102. Viṣṇudharmottara, III-67-2.

103. Banerjea, J.N., op. cit., pp., 432-33.

104. Roy, S.N., Early Purāṇic account of sun and solar cult, p. 55-57.

sides. He is also called supreme self. The reward of this Kalyāna-saptamī vrata is liberation from all sins, long life and prosperity.¹⁰⁵

In the Viśokāsaptamī vrata,¹⁰⁶ to be observed on the sixth and seventh days of the bright fortnight in Māgha month¹⁰⁷ the lotus is worshipped as the sun (Arkāya namaḥ) with red Kanera flowers and a piece of red cloth with invocation—‘O Āditya as this world becomes free from all grief at thy rising, in the same way let me also be free from sorrow in all my lives and may I have always faith in thee’. This results in freedom from sorrow for a period of ten Padmas and also from diseases and attainment of bliss and unification with Brahmā. One reference in it is worth mentioning. It is that the devotee prays for everlasting faith in the divinity a features of the Bhakti cult¹⁰⁸ which was responsible for the later sectarianism.¹⁰⁹

Phalasaptamī-vrata¹¹⁰ is also a solar vow to be performed on the seventh day of the bright fortnight of the month of mārḡaśīrṣa. Here the golden image is to be worshipped under various names such as Bhānu, Arka, Ravi, Sūrya and Vibhāvasu etc. for attainment of endless fruits, prosperity and liberation from diseases and the image is to be given to the Brāhmaṇas.

The Śarkarāsaptamī-vrata¹¹¹ is to be observed on the 7th day of a bright fortnight in Vaiśākha in honour of the sun by drawing lotus on an altar and reciting ‘savitrāy namaḥ’. This is done for prosperity for sons and grandsons and ultimate emancipation. One who reads or listens this obtains the region of the sun.

The Kamalāsaptamī¹¹² vrata is to be observed on the 7th day of a bright fortnight in spring in which golden lotus in a golden vessel as the sun should be worshipped under different names ‘Kamalahastāya namaḥ, Viśvadharmāya namaḥ, Divākarāya namaḥ,

105. Matsya-P., 74-5 to 9, 15-16 & 18.

106. Ibid., 75-4, 10, 12.

107. Bhattasala, N.K., Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum, p. 148. The vrata of Māgha maṇḍala is essentially a solar vrata.

108. Gītā, XVIII-62-66. also envisages for absolute faith in the divinity.

109. Maenicol, N., Indian Theism.

110. Matsya-P., ch. 76.

111. Matsya-P., ch. 77.

112. Ibid., Ch. 78, 85 to 89.

Prabhākarāya namaḥ'. One who observes this ordinance becomes possessed of inexhaustible wealth and goes to the kingdom of the sun.

The Mandārasaptamī¹¹³ vrata to be performed on the seventh day in the month of Māgha enjoins the worship of the golden image of the sun along with eight petalled lotus under the name of Bhāskara (god of East), Sūrya (god of South-East), Arka (god of South), Aryamā (god of South-West). Vedadharmiṇe (god of West), Caṇḍa-bhānu (god of North-West), Pūṣan (god of West) Ānand (god of North-East). This is meant for freedom from all sins.

In Śubhasaptamī vrata golden ox and golden cow is to be worshipped as born of sun under the mantra 'Aryamā priyatām'.¹¹⁴

The Sūrya-sankrānti vrata¹¹⁵ to be performed on the day of equinoxes or solstices enjoins the worship of the sun by drawing eight petalled lotus under different names : Āditya (East), Savitr (South-West), Tapana (West), Bhaga (North-West), Mārtaṇḍa (North), Viṣṇu (North-East), Sūrya in pericap of the lotus. The arghya consisting of water, sandals and flowers should be placed on the floor as an oblation to the sun. One who observes it is honoured by devas in the realm of Indra.

Besides the worship of the sun on these occasions, the general worship of the sun on sunday is prescribed¹¹⁶ by drawing 12 petalled lotus with red sandal. To the east of it he places after salutations Sūrya, to the south-east-Divākara, to the south Vivasvān, to the south-west Bhaga, to the west Varuṇa, to the north-east Mahendra, to the north Āditya and to the north-east Savitr. In the forepart of the lotus the horses of the sun should be inscribed, in the south Aryamān, in the west Mārtaṇḍa ; on the northern petal Ravi and Bhāskara on the pericap of the lotus. He has been described as the soul of the universe, the basis of Ṛk, Yajus and Sāmavedas. One who observes this ritual is freed from all sins and goes to the solar region. It is stated that Sūrya-vrata is one of the sixty ordinances explained by Śiva¹¹⁷ and thus it gives a

113. Ibid., ch. 79.

114. Ibid., ch. 80.

115. Ibid., ch. 98.

116. Ibid., 97-5-9.

117. Matsya-P., CI-63.

divine origin to this. A perusal of all these Sūrya-vratas will reveal to us that there was development of a cult of the sun-worship in the sense that a procedure was already evolved for this worship. This included in the main arghya of water, flower and sandal etc. depiction of the sun pictures in lotus, salutation to the sun and recitation of mantras to the sun under different names. The seventh day in a bright fortnight was specially sacred for the sun-worship and red colour was also sacred to the sun god. The sun is specially prayed for deliverance from the sin—a feature which is very old. Besides the worship of the sun by the depiction of eight petalled lotus, it was also to be done by means of a golden image of the sun. But there is no provision for the public worship of the sun god as there is no mention of the worship in a temple. This worship was in the form of domestic 'pūjā'. In view of the fact that the sun has been called as the soul of the universe, and bases of all Vedas, the solar sectarianism is hinted at as three constituents-supremacy of the god, fixed procedure of worship and exclusiveness are found in these solar vows. It has been suggested¹¹⁸ that passages referring to Saura-vratas are later which appears to be quite probable. But as the worship of the sun by means of arghya, salutation and recitation of mantras is mentioned in the sūtras¹¹⁹ it may be regarded as continuing the earlier tradition of the sun-worship, of course, with detailed additions to the procedure. The sun-worship has been prescribed as one of the daily obligations to be performed by every house-holder. It has been said that he should raise his mouth and offer water to the sun. On this occasion he should touch his forehead with his hands. Then he should recite verses

‘Namo vivasvate brahma bhāsavate
Viṣṇutejase jagatsavitre sucaye karmasākṣiṇe’¹²⁰

118. Hazra, R. C., Purāṇic Records, p. 43. Chapters 74 to 80 of the Matsya-Purāṇa may be dated between 550-650 A.D. as they mention week days and the earliest mention of week days is found in Eran Inscription of 484 A.D. cf. Fleet, J.F.C. II, vol. VII, p. 88-89 and there are other internal evidences to this effect.

119. Kane, P.V., op. cit., vol. II, pt. II, pp. 705-740.

120. Viṣṇu-P.

It is interesting to note that Sūrya and Śiva have been identified in some early Purāṇas.¹²¹ Further in Karmayoga the worship of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya is prescribed where they are to be considered as 'abhinna' (not different from one another).¹²² This tendency of religious syncreticism is a characteristic of the ancient Indian religious development¹²³ and is further amplified in the later sectarian literature of India¹²⁴ and is vouchsafed by the iconography¹²⁵ and epigraphy.¹²⁶ A parallel development may be traced in the religious life of Hinduised south-east Asia where Sūrya and Śiva are not differentiated particularly in Java¹²⁷

It has been suggested¹²⁸ that the sun occupies a subordinate position in relation to Viṣṇu in early Purāṇas. But it is difficult to agree with the view mainly because the suggestion has been made purely on the basis of Viṣṇu-Purāṇa which is a sectarian Purāṇa specially associated with Vaiṣṇava sect. It would be no surprise if the sun is subordinated to Viṣṇu in a Vaiṣṇavite Purāṇa as in a Saura Purāṇa like Sāmba, Viṣṇu and others are subordinated to Sūrya.¹²⁹ Moreover, in some early Purāṇas¹³⁰ Brahmā, Śiva, Viṣṇu and Sūrya all four are regarded as indistinguishable

-
121. Matsya-P., LV-3-5.
 122. Ibid., 52-23.
 123. Bhattacharya, H.D., Age of Imperial Kanauj. (Ed.) Majumdar, R. C., pp. 327-28. Banerjea, J. N., Pañcopāsanā, ch. XIII points out that Pañcopāsanā is the best expression of the religious syncreticism in ancient India. Monier Williams, W., Religious thought and life in India., pp. 411-12.
 124. Brahma-P., 33-11-14. Sūrya Upa-Purāṇa-2.; Kālikā-P., 74-113., Agni-P., 73, Mārkaṇḍeya-P., 109-5-79.
 125. Banerjea, J.N., op. cit.
 126. Fleet, J. F., C. I. I., vol. III, pp. 288-89, Nirmand Copper Plate Inscription also testifies to the combined worship of Śiva and Sūrya.
 127. Biswas, D. K., Sūrya and Śiva, I.H.Q., vol. 24, 1948, p. 142ff. Majumdar R.C., Suvarṇadvīpa, vol. I., points out that Sūrya-Sevana of Java is nothing but the worship of Śiva and Sūrya in a synthetic form. While worshipping Śiva the devotee uses the hymn-Sūryāya namaḥ Arkāya namaḥ. The kūtra mantra of Java also identifies them—Om, Hri Hri Sah Sivasūryaparantejassvarupāya-namaḥ. cf. Friederich, R., The Civilisation and Culture of Bali.
 128. Roy, S.N., Early Purāṇic Account of Sun and Solar cult, p. 41.
 129. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upapurāṇas, vol. I., p. 36.
 130. Matsya-P., 52-23.

thus indicating equality of all four gods. The place of pride that is given to the sun god in connection with the legend of Yājñavalkya¹³¹ and reference to "Sauradarśana¹³²" is a pointer in the direction that the sun was not occupying a subordinate position. Further in vows, Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava and Saura have been given equal opportunity¹³³ in early Purāṇas. In some early Purāṇas the sun-worship has been associated with the worship of nine Grahas.¹³⁴ This association of the sun worship with nine Grahas finds expression in ancient Indian arts also.¹³⁵

The later Purāṇas and Upa-purāṇas of the second category mentioned in the beginning of this article may be taken to reveal the religious condition of India from the 6th-7th century A. D. to the 12th or 13th century A. D. The Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa and Sāmba Upa-purāṇa are the most comprehensive and complete documents of the sun-worship in its sectarian form influenced by the advent of the Magas in ancient India. It has rightly been argued that most of the verses of the first group¹³⁶ of the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa are found to occur in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa which may have been the borrower.¹³⁷ The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, therefore, does not provide us with any additional information regarding the sun-worship as compared to the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa. Moreover, the verses showing the sectarian form of the sun-worship found in Skanda,

131. Viṣṇu-P., V-3-5; Vāyu-P., 59-209-10, Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-35, III-26.

132. Vāyu-P., 104-16. Jñānārṇavatāntra, 16-131-134 also refer to it Handiqui, K.K., Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture, p. 218.

133. Matsya-P., 92-101.

134. Ibid., Ch. 93.

135. Banerjea, J.N., op. cit., pp. 441-45.

136. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 57 divides the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa into two groups: Group I, Chapters 1-38, 44-46, 84, Group II, Chaps. 39-43, 43-83. Hazra, R.C., op. cit., p. 93 after careful examination has settled the date of different chapters as follows:

Group I, Chapters (except verses 17-25), 2-15, 16, 18-21, 24-32, 34-38, 46 & 84 composed between 500 A.D. and 800 A.D. (probably towards the beginning of this period). Chs. 17, 22-23 added later than 950 A.D., Ch. 33 added between 700 A.D., 950 A.D. Chs. 44-45 inserted into the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa between 950 A.D.-1050 A. D.

Group II, Chs. 39-43, 47-83 added between 1250-1500 A.D.

137. Ibid., op. cit., p. 59.

Brahma, Varāha, Agni and Garuḍa must have been borrowed from the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa.¹³⁸ Like other sects, the sun-sect also must have developed a vast Saura-literature as is evident by notices of such works in the literature of India but unfortunately the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa is the only extant Saura work. D. R. Bhandarkar¹³⁹ mentions a Sūrya Purāṇa as known to Śākadvīpī Brāhmaṇas known as Sevakas living round about Jodhpur but is quite ignorant of its contents and it is difficult to say whether it is the same as the Sāmba or not.¹⁴⁰ Bhaviṣya Purāṇa¹⁴¹ mentions an ancient work dealing with the saura-dharma as declared by Nārada. It has been quoted in many literary works of later times.¹⁴² It was an early work dealing with the duties of the Sauras. It has been included into the class of upa-purāṇas and dated earlier than 800 A. D. It is lost. Most of the verses of Saura-dharma quoted in later literature relates to fasting on the ekādaśī tithi in the month of Māgha, one to the eatables in the Kāmya vrata and lastly a Sūrya-vrata to be performed every month from Mārgasīrṣa by placing a golden image of the sun in a silver chariot.¹⁴³ It also enjoins that three leaves of a Tulasī plant are to be eaten up by the observers of Kāmya vrata and Sūrya vrata every month. There was another saura literature in Saura-dharmottara quoted by many works.¹⁴⁴ It may be regarded as an upa-purāṇa and may be dated not later than 900 A. D.¹⁴⁵ Its verses are generally related to Ekādaśī upavāsa. There is a reference to a Sūrya-Purāṇa.¹⁴⁶ Weber

138. Ibid., pp. 83-88.

139. E.I., vol. IX, p. 279.

140. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 100.

141. I-4-89. 'Saura dharmāś Ca Rājendra nāradokte mahīpate'.

142. Ānandabhaṭṭa, Vidhāna Pārijāta, II, p. 696. Gadādhara, Kālasāra, p. 129. Hemādri, Caturvarga Cintāmaṇi II-I, Gopala Bhaṭṭa, Haribhaktivilāsa, p. 773 etc.

143. Caṇḍeśvara-Tithi-niraṇaya, II-11, pp. 552-7 deals with Sūrya vrata of Sauradharmā.

144. Jīmūtavāhana, Kālaviveka, pp. 432-33, 443, 444, 447. Gopāla, Bhaṭṭa Haribhaktivilāsa, p. 776, 808. Raghunandana, Smṛti-tattva, II, p. 50. Caṇḍeśvara, Tithinirṇaya, fols. 12a, 13a, 13b. Hamādri, Caturvarga Cintāmaṇi, III-ii, p. 249.

145. Hazra, R.C., op. cit, p. 349.

146. Caṇḍeśvara in his tithinirṇaya, fol. 2a quotes the verse- 'Samkrāntyām ravivāre Ca tathā'.....which he assigns to Sūrya-Purāṇa.

describes a manuscript of the Kṛṣṇapañcamī-śrāddhavidhi which he claims to have belonged to the Sūrya Purāṇa.¹⁴⁷ In the Berlin manuscript¹⁴⁸ of the Bhaviṣyottara there is a chapter on putra-kāma-kṛṣṇa pañcamī-vrata which in its colophon names Sūrya Purāṇa as its source. As these topics are not found in the Sāmba upa-purāṇa, the Sūrya Purāṇa appears to be a distinct work, an early work but as no manuscript has come to light it cannot be dated in our present state of knowledge. Thus the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa is the only source of information regarding the sectarian sun-worship as prevalent between the 6th century A. D. and 1500 A. D. The Bhāskara Purāṇa mentioned in the Skanda Purāṇa¹⁴⁹ may be the same as the present Sāmba Upa-purāṇa.¹⁵⁰

The later Purāṇic records throw flood of light on the sun worship particularly on its sectarian side. All the features of a sectarian form of the sun-worship may be seen in the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, Varāha Purāṇa, Skanda Purāṇa and other late Purāṇas. Firstly, the unquestionable supremacy of the sun-god is well-established in these Purāṇic records. At the very beginning of the Sāmba Upa-Purāṇa the sun-god is described as the cause of creation, protection and destruction of the universe and is the soul of pitāmaha, Nārāyaṇa and Śaṅkara whose manifestations are the three Vedas and who pervades the universe in the form of Śakra, Vahni, Yama, Varuṇa, Samīraṇa (i. e. Vāyu), Dhanada and others who crowd the quarters. Here like other sects¹⁵¹ the sun god has been regarded as identical with the universe and the ultimate reality. The exclusiveness and supremacy of the sun god is further stressed in the praise of the sun by Vasiṣṭha. Here the sun-god is regarded as the only visible and eternal deity who is highest among gods and is the only source

147. Weber, A., Verzeichnise der Sanskrit and Prakrit Handschriften der Konighichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, 1853, No. 1127, p. 325 Colophon reads 'iti sūrya-purāṇa Kṛṣṇa-pancamī-śrādhavidhiḥ Samīptah'.

148. Ibid., No. 468, p. 135 (Colophon of Ch. 50).

149. Skanda-P., V-III.

150. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. I, verse 13 calls itself as 'Bhāskarāya Purāṇam' and contains in Chs. 10-11 the story of the birth of Aśvins mentioned by Bhāskara Purāṇa.

151. Bhandarkar, R.G., Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and minor religious systems, pp. 2-4.

of energy, who never moves from his fixed position, who manifests himself, at the time of destruction into whom the yogins and the sāmkyavid-s enter after forsaking their bodies...who is the only god deserving devotion and worship.¹⁵²

Again the sectarianism is stressed in the description of the Sūrya-loka by Nārada.¹⁵³ The sun is attended by the gods, Yakṣas, Gandharvas, Apsaras etc, by the three Vedas incarnate, by the sages reciting Vedic hymns of praise, by the three Saṁdhyās incarnate, Ādityas, Vasus, Maruts and Aśvins, by Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Rudra and by many others. This deity pervades the universe and is eulogised by Brahmā and other gods. It is to be noted that the sun-god is described as being attended by the three prominent gods-Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā of Purāṇic religion and is thus placed above all. The sectarian nature of the sun worship is again brought forth when the sun's creation and various other kinds of creatures in the form and capacity of Brahmā is described.¹⁵⁴ The supremacy of the sun-god is expressed in explicit words when the evolution of the universe according to the principles of the Sāṅkhya system and the appearance of the supreme being (īśvaraṁ Param) as a luminary (called Savitṛ) at the prayer of Brahmā, Viṣṇu,¹⁵⁵ Mahēśvara and others is mentioned. The making of Indra, Varuṇa, Rudra etc. as attendants of the sun¹⁵⁶ is a proof of the supremacy of the sun. Rudra is said to have taken recourse to the sun and eulogised him¹⁵⁷ which shows, the supremacy of the sun-god over Rudra. That the sun-worship was of a sectarian form is also confirmed by the mention of the Sūrya-bhaktas¹⁵⁸ and their characteristics, special sun-worshipping priests known as the Magas and the Yājakas¹⁵⁹, Sūrya-siddhānta (also called Āditya-siddhānta as distinguished from Traividya-Siddhānta¹⁶⁰), existence of a sectarian Saura literature as discussed before, the reference to the flags of

152. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, II.

153. Ibid., 6.

154. Ibid., 4.

155. Ibid., 14.

156. Ibid., 16. 25-35 & 17.

157. Ibid., 16-1-24. See reference 120.

158. Ibid., 38.

159. Ibid., 27.

160. Ibid., 28.

Ravi,¹⁶¹ the reference to fixed methods and procedures for worshipping this highest deity¹⁶², *sadācāra* for the sun-worshippers,¹⁶³ the elaborate descriptions for making sun-images and temples¹⁶⁴ and his identification with all gods such as Mahādeva, Ívara, Brahmā, Bhava, Prajāpati, Puruṣa, Svayambhū, Hiraṇyagarbha and Nārāyaṇa¹⁶⁵ and the praise of Sāmba upa-purāṇa by Sūta over the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. The sectarian mantra of the Sauras was “khakholkāya namaḥ”.

Thus there cannot be any doubt to the fact that the later Purāṇas witnessed the growth of a full-fledged sun-sect with all the paraphernalia needed for the growth of a sect. No doubt in the epics there are references to the Sauras—the sectarian sun-worshippers and the early Purāṇic records might have contained solar sectarianism in a veiled form. It was mainly during the period of later Purāṇas that a full-fledged sect round the sun-god developed on a unprecedented scale most probably due to the influence of a new form of the sun-worship from Iran.

One of the most interesting features of the sun-worship in ancient India as evidenced by late Purāṇas had been the association of the foreign priest-hood with the cult of the ‘Sauras’¹⁶⁶. These foreign priests were known as ‘Magas’ in ancient India. There are numerous references in many late Purāṇas which go to prove the advent of the ‘Magas’ in India from ‘Śākadvīpa’ to accept the priest-hood of the sun-temples which they constructed for the first time in the history of India. There is a legend concerning the advent of the Magas and their association with the sun-worship in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa.¹⁶⁷ Sāmba, the son of Kṛṣṇa by Jāmbavatī, constructed a temple of the sun on the banks of Candrabhāgā (modern Chenab in the Punjab) and no Brāhmaṇa would accept the office of a regular priest of the temple. He,

161. Ibid., 33.

162. Ibid., 47-83.

163. Ibid., 44.

164. Ibid., 30-31.

165. Ibid., 7 verses 16-21.

166. Bhandarkar, R.G., Collected Works of R.G. Bhandarkar, vol. IV, p. 218. Barth, A., Religions of India, p. 257. Majumdar, R.C. (ed.) Age of Imperial Unity, p. 465. Jairazbhoy, R.A., Foreign Influence in India, p. 153.

167. Bhaviṣya-P., Ch. 139.

therefore, asked Gauramukha, the priest of Ugrasena to help him. Gauramukha suggested him to get Magas who were special sun-worshippers from 'Śāka-dvīpa'. Regarding the origin of the Magas, he informed him that Nikṣubhā was the daughter of a Brāhmaṇa named Sujihva with whom the sun fell in love. The son of these two was called Zarasasta (Zarthrusta). From him sprang the Magas. They wore girdle round their waist known as 'Avyanga'. On this advice, Sāmba went on the back of Garuḍa—his father's vehicle—to Śākadvīpa and brought some Magas and installed them into the office of priesthood of the temple he had constructed. This legend is repeated in other Purāṇas such as Brahma¹⁶⁸ and Varāha¹⁶⁹ and Upa-purāṇas as Sāmba¹⁷⁰. Besides these references in late Purāṇic records, Magas find mention in MBH¹⁷¹, where four castes of Śāka-dvīpa are mentioned as Maga (or Manga), Masaka, Manasa and Mandoga. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa¹⁷² had them as Marga (but Maga in some manuscripts), Magadha, Manasa and Mandaga. Varāhamihira¹⁷³ clearly instructs that the installation and consecration of the images and the temples of the sun should be caused to be made by the Magas. Alberuni¹⁷⁴ the Arab traveller of the 11th century A. D. refers to the Magas in India. Thus the Magas have long been known in the literary history of India. There is an inscription at Govindpur in Gayā district dated Śāka year 1059 corresponding to 1137-38 A. D.¹⁷⁵ in the opening stanza of which the Magas who sprang from the sun, are represented to have been brought into the country by Sāmba. It appears that the Magas are mentioned for the first time in Indian epigraphy in 861 A. D. when the text of the inscription is said to have been drawn up by the Maga Mitraravi.¹⁷⁶ The legend

168. Brahma-P., 20. 71 also mentions the four castes of Śākadvīpa.

169. Varāha-P., Ch. 177.

170. Sāmba Upa-Purāṇa, Ch. 26 "Sāmbasya Ca Tadollāsam pratimā sthāpanam tathā

magānayanam atraiva maga-māhātmyameva ca"

Omitted in Ven. Press edition, found in J. Eggeling's India's Office Cat. VI, p. 1317.

171. MBH., VI-11-36-38.

172. Viṣṇu-P., II-4-69-70.

173. Bṛihat-Saṁhitā (S. Dwivedi's Ed.) 60-19.

174. Sachau (Tr.), Alberuni, I., p. 21.

175. Bhandarkar, R.G., Collected Works, p. 219.

176. Jairazbhoy, R.A., op. cit., p. 153.

finds confirmation in various coins of Scythians and Kusāṇas¹⁷⁷ and various seals.¹⁷⁸ Their presence on Indian soil is again indicated by many Iranian iconographical features mentioned in the *Bṛihat-Samhitā* and other texts,¹⁷⁹ as well as the depiction of these features in *Sūrya*-icons of Kusāṇa period¹⁸⁰ and onwards. These features were 'avyanga', udīcyaveṣa and upānatpinaddha¹⁸¹ Even today there are Brāhmaṇas of that name in Rajputana and some other states of Northern India.¹⁸²

All these evidences conclusively prove that a certain class of priests devoted exclusively to the sun and fire-worship were brought into India from 'Śāka-dvīpa'. There are many problems¹⁸³ connected with the advent of the Magas in ancient India. Firstly, the identity of 'Magas' and the location of 'Śāka-dvīpa' may be discussed. It has been held by most of the scholars that the Magas of the Purāṇas were no other than the sun-worshipping Magi priests of Persia or Iran¹⁸⁴ and the idea of locating them on a continent called Śākadvīpa must have arisen from the fact that they were foreigners like the Śakas with whom the Indians had been familiar since the second or third century B. C. There is no doubt that the Magi priests became closely and indistinguishably associated with Iran after Cyrus extended his empire to Medea and

-
177. Gardner, P., *Coins of Greek and Scythian Kings of Bactria and India in the British Museum*, pp. 131, 134, 141-43, 155; Smith, V.A., *Catalogue of the coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, p. 70.
178. Banerjea, J.N., *Development of Hindu Iconography*.
179. *Ibid.*, p. 437 ff.
180. Agarwala, V.S., *Catalogue of Brahmanical Images in Mathura Museum*, J.U.P.H.S., 1949, vol. XXII, p. 167.
181. Rao, Gopinath T.A., *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, pp. 299-305, I.H.Q., 1952, vol. XXVIII, p. 1ff.
182. Mitra, D., *Foreign Elements in Indian Population*, *Cul. Her. of India*, vol. II, pp. 613-15. cf. *Magavyakti* of Kriṣṇadāsa gives an account of them.
183. Bhandarkar, R.G., *op. cit.*, p. 219.
184. Bhandarkar, R.G., *Collected works*, p. 219. Jairazbhoy, R.A., *op. cit.*, p. 153, Barth, A., *op. cit.*, p. 257, Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 544, Majumdar, R.C. (ed.) *Age of Imperial Unity*, p. 465. Mitra, D., *Foreign Elements in Indian Population*, *Cul. Her. of India*, vol. II, pp. 613-15.

Lydia of which we find unimpeachable testimony in Persian texts¹⁸⁵ and Greek writers¹⁸⁶ but it may be pointed out that originally they were a priestly tribe—probably Non-Āryan in origin in Medea¹⁸⁷ a section of which worked their way in Zoroastrianism after founder's death probably in the fifth century B. C.¹⁸⁹ Though originally there were fundamental differences between their way of life and that of Persians,¹⁸⁹ there was ultimately a compromise and Mithraism was born not later than fourth century B. C.¹⁹⁰ Before the Persian impact this cult was already influenced by the religions of Babylonia and Chaldea.¹⁹¹ The chief features of the Magi-cult were their worship of the sun-god and fire-god under the name of Mithra with eastward position, the use of 'baroma' and belief in a dualist view of the world e. g. division of the world between good and evil powers represented by light and darkness—Ahurmazdah and Ahir-Man.¹⁹² They were famous for magic and occult power. From the above review the natural inference appears to be that the Magas who later came to India were originally the magic-expert indigenous non-Āryan fire and sun-worshipping Medean priests whose faith was very much mixed up with the Chaldean and the Babylonian elements and by the time they came to India it must have been Iranianised. Regarding the location of the 'Śāka-dvīpa', no definite opinion can be expressed since there is no detailed reference to its situation in any of the Purāṇas or other sources. The possibility appears to be that it must have been situated in

-
185. Avesta refers to them once. In Yasht there are signs of the presence of Magi. cf. Frank Cumont—The 'Mysteries of Mithra', p. 9.
186. Herodotus, II-67-79, Strabo, XV-I-68.
187. Moulton, The Treasure of Magi, p. 9. Moulton regards them neither Āryan nor Non-Āryan but low graded indigenous tribes of Medea.
188. Ibid., p. 9, 13. Xenophon, Cyropaedia, VIII-I-23.
189. Herodotus was aware of these differences specially in matters connected with the disposal of the dead. They exposed the dead body while Persians burnt it. cf. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, p. 57.
190. Burns, E.M., Western Civilizations, p. 70.
191. Frank Cumont, op. cit., p. 30 & 31 calls it 'a composite religion', Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, pp. 187, 191.
192. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, pp. 182-253.

Iran¹⁹³ most probably in Eastern Iran since the Śaka-occupation of the western portion of Northern India where the temple of the sun at Multan is supposed to have been built by the Magas, was principally the work of the Śakas of 'Eastern Iran'.¹⁹⁴

Another important aspect of the Maga-problem is the antiquity or date of the advent of the Magas in ancient India. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar gives the date of the third century A. D. for the introduction of this element from Persia. Mr. H. D. Bhattacharya gives the reign of Kaniška as the probable period for the introduction of the Magas from Persia. He, believing in Ist century A. D. theory of Kaniškas'¹⁹⁵ date regards Ist century A. D. as the time of their advent in India. Weber¹⁹⁶ also came to the conclusion that this Mithraic element came from Persia at the time of the Indo-Scythian Kings. The basis for this theory lies in the fact that Kaniška struck his coins with the image of Mithra and the name of Miiro (Mihir) added.¹⁹⁷ It may be pointed out that the presence of coins of Ist century A. D. having Mithra figure and name reveals that the cult might have been introduced some time before it. Let us examine the available materials chronologically.

- (1) The inscription at Govindpur (Gayā District) dated 1137-1138 A. D. refers to the Magas.
- (2) Alberuni (11th century A. D.) refers to the presence of Magi-priests in India.
- (3) An inscription dated in 861 A.D. knows about the Magas of India.
- (4) Varāha-Purāṇa (800-1000 A. D.¹⁹⁹) refers to them.
- (5) Varāhmihira (6th A. D.) refers to the Magas.

193. Barth, A., op. cit., p. 257-f. 9.

194. Sircar, D.C., Age of Imperial Unity, Ed. R.C. Majumdar, p. 121.

195. Bhandarkar, R.G., Collected Works, p. 220. He believed in 3rd century A.D., theory of Kaniška's date.

196. It is a matter of controversy but the most probable date accepted by many scholars is 78 A.D.—cf. Political History of Ancient India—Roychoudhury, H.C.

197. Barth, A., op. cit., p. 258, f. 9.

198. Stein, M.A., 'Zoroastrian deities on Indo-Scythic Coins' in Babylonian and Oriental Records, Aug., 1887, pp. 155-166.

199. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, p. 104.

- (6) Sāmba Upa-purāṇa (dated between 500-800 A. D.²⁰⁰) gives a full account of them.
- (7) Bhaviṣya Purāṇa (500 A. D. and after²⁰¹) was also familiar with them.
- (8) Several Gupta and Kuṣāṇa sun-icons are depicted in Iranian fashion thereby showing the influence of Magas of Iran.²⁰²
- (9) The seal No. 607 discovered by Spooner at Basarh²⁰³ contains a fire altar with probably a solar disc. The legend is in Gupta character 'Bhagavat Ādityasya'. It may be suggested that the association of fire and sun may be due to the Magi-influence.²⁰⁴ The seals from Bhīt, Sunet and Rājghat belonging to the Gupta period show Magi-influence.
- (10) The fire-altar occurs on much earlier coins—for instance on those of Wema Kadphises and others (1 century B.C.), on Panchāla-Bhānumitra²⁰⁵ coins (200 B. C.) the same device of fire on altar and sun on altar is found.
- (11) On the Indo-Greek and the Kuṣāṇa coins there is representation of Helios and Mithra. The Indo-Greek invasion began as early as 3rd century B. C.²⁰⁶
- (12) In the Mahābhārata²⁰⁷ (400 B. C.-400 A. D.) there is reference to Magas of Śākadvīpa and there are many mitra-ending names²⁰⁸ indicative of Magian-influence.
- (13) On an Avanti coin²⁰⁹ a human figure in association with a solar standard (3 B. C.-2 A. D.) is depicted which

200. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I., p. 91.

201. Ibid., Purāṇic Records, p. 171.

202. Agarwala, V.S., Catalogue of Brahmanical Images in Mathura Museum, J.U.P.H.S., 1949, vol. XXII, p. 167 ff.

203. A.S.I.A.R. 1913-14, pp. 118-120, 140 pl. XLIX.

204. Banerjea, J.N., op. cit., p. 199.

205. Smith, V.A., A Catalogue of the Coins of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, vol. I, p. 187, pl. XXII-4.

206. Tarn, W.W., The Greeks in Bactria and India.

207. MBA-VI-11:36-38.

208. Sorensan, Index, p. 1.

209. Smith, V.A., Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, vol. I, p. 153 Serial No. 12, pl. XX, No. 2.

shows the sectarian form of the sun-worship in view of the fact that the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa²¹⁰ describes about a flag staff of Ravi in connection with a Maginised sun worship and the region of Avanti may have been under the influence of a Magian form of the sun-worship as is hinted by Varāhmihira,²¹¹ the evidence of this coin may be taken for knowing the date for the advent of the Magas in India.

- (14) Ptolemy²¹² (2 century A.D.) vouches, for the existence of the 'Brahmanai Magoi' in the south.

In view of these continuous and overwhelming evidences ranging from 3rd century B.C. to 12th century A.D. and beyond no one can deny the influence of Magi-priests of East Iran upon India. There are two possibilities regarding the period of the advent of Magas. First possibility is that of 6th-5th century B.C. when Darius and his successors came to India and made its western part as a satrapy of Iran²¹³. It is well known that the Magi-cult of Iran was very much popular among the masses and specially among the military class²¹⁴, and it is no surprise if it could have poured into western part of India in the wake of Persian invasion. Spooner half a century ago suggested that this particular form of the fire-altar at Basarh in Indian archæology without attendant figure is not due to any modification of Sassanian coinage through Kusāṇa influence but rather due to the survival in India itself, of the older, more original Persian tradition in such matters which antedates the Sassanian themselves by many centuries²¹⁵. Further, it has been argued that in absence of any

210. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 33.

Srivastava, V.C., The religious study of a symbol on an Avanti coin. Proceedings of the seminar on local coin, Memoir No. 2., Deptt. of Indology, B.H.U. Varanasi, 1966.

211. Bṛhat-Jātaka, Ch. XXVIII-3. Varāhmihira himself was a Maga. cf. Mitra, Debala, Foreign Elements in Indian Population, Cul. Her. of India, vol. II, pp. 613-15.

212. Mcrindle, J. W. (Tr.), Ancient India as described by Ptolemy. p. 170.

213. Herodotus-III-94, Mookerjee, R.K., Age of Imperial Unity, ed. R.C. Majumdar, p. 71.

214. Frank Cumont-The Mysteries of Mithra, pp. 26 ff.

215. A.S.I.A.R., 1913-14, pp. 118-20, 140.

survival of old Persian tradition it is difficult to explain how Puṣyamitra (185 B.C.) could have been influenced by the Persian example in adopting the name of Mītra²¹⁶. It has been suggested that Puṣyamitra may have been an Iranian, a worshipper of the sun-Mithra²¹⁷. But as pointed out by a recent scholar²¹⁸ it is difficult to come to any absolute conclusion that Puṣyamitra was an Iranian or that he was under the influence of Magians or Iranians. There are a few names in the Mahābhārata even which end in Mitra but since the date of the Mahābhārata itself is controversial and there are much interpolations and later additions no reliance can be placed on this name-basis in matter of Magi-advent in India but there are other grounds for holding that the Magas might have come to India in 6th century B. C. There are references found in Pāli texts such as Bambhajāla-sutta²¹⁹ that at a time of Buddha the magic priests (probably Magas) were held in disrepute. Against the theory of the survival of old Persian tradition it has been argued that there is little to support this claim in Pre-Buddhistic Brāhmaṇa literature²²⁰ and Megasthenes is silent about Magi-priests in India.²²¹ In reply to these arguments it may be pointed out that this silence on the part of orthodox Brāhmaṇa literature²²² before the Purāṇas might have been due to their hostility and contempt to the peculiar ways and manners of the Magas. In Ārṣeya Upaniṣad²²³ there is reference to a class of peoples-Puṇḍras, Suhmas, Udumbhas, Dardas and Barbaras who believed in the worship of the sun and were outcaste in the orthodox society. They were held in contempt by the Brahmanic Ṛṣis such as Gautama. Are we not to suppose that this group was composed of

216. Jairazbhoy, R.A., op. cit., p. 148.

217. Smith, V.A., The Oxford History of India (Ed. 1920) p. 118. Vasu, N.N., Castes and Sects of Bengal, IV, pp. 56-57.

218. Jairazbhoy, R.A. op. cit.

219. Vasu, N.N., Archæological Survey of Mayurbhanj, p. 1.

220. Hopkins, Religions of India, p. 544.

221. See Majumdar, R.C., The Classical Accounts of India.

222. In Atharvaveda we find reference to Magadha. It is tempting to suggest that it was named after Magas but it is hypothetical with no positive data in its favour.

223. Ārṣeya-Upaniṣad, Quoted by Belvalkar, S.K. and Ranade, R.D., History of Indian Philosophy, vol. II, p. 298.

indigenous as well as foreign tribes as is clear from the word 'Barbaras'? If so, there is every reason to believe that the Magas—the foreign sun-worshippers might have been meant by the term 'Barbaras' who were against Vedas and Vedic culture.²²⁴ They are mentioned in the Brahmanic literature only when they because of their immense popularity and also because of their adoption of Hindunised ways are accepted as Śāka-dvīpī Brāhmaṇas in the Hindu fold. Now as the matter stands it may be suggested that there is possibility of the advent of Magi-priests and along with them Iranian form of the sun-worship in the wake of Iranian invasion of 6th century B. C.²²⁵ which was responsible for the occupation of the north-western part of India over two centuries upto 330 B. C. There might have been continuous pouring of Magi-priests from Iran into India under the presence of other foreign invasions in that region. This becomes very plausible in view of the close proximity of the two regions and of immense popularity of Mithra-cult of Magis among the military classes of Iran and neighbouring regions.²²⁶ But the positive evidence of the fire-sun worshipping Magi priests of Iran starts coming from the Indo-Greek period (3rd century B. C.) and it continued with renewed vitality in the Indo-Parthain-Sassanian Kuṣāṇa period when all over the ancient world Mithraism was spreading with phenomenal success.²²⁷ In its westward extension it became a formidable but unsuccessful rival to christianity in the Roman

224. Vasu, N.N., Archæological Survey of Mayurbhanj.

225. Sankalia, H.D. in Archæology of Gujarat, p. 212, supports this contention, 'An early form of the sun-cult of the type we find later in Kathiawar might have reached that region as early as the 5th century B.C. through the Magas when North-western India formed a part of the empire of Darius'. It may be pointed out that as early Asokan time there is evidence of a Yavana Tushapa as the governor of Saurashtra which reveals that even in 3rd century B.C. foreign influence had been predominant in this region and it is more than probable that there had been foreigners in the Indian population of this region.

Srivastava, V.C., Antiquity of Magas in Ancient India, Paper read at 30th Indian History Congress, Bhagalpur, 1968, Chattopadhyaya, S., Achaemenids in India, p. 22-23, 48.

226. Frank, Cumont, The Mysteries of Mithra, p. 30 ff.

227. Frank, Cumont, op. cit., pp. 11-19, 33-34.

world under Constantine,²²⁸ while in its eastward extension it crossed Asia Minor, Iran and come to India but only to be absorbed in the ever-expanding heart of liberal but vital India.

Another aspect of the Maga-problem is concerned with the question as to how far these magi-priests could influence the indigenous tradition of the sun-worship in Ancient India. Certain Hindu names containing Mihira i. e. Mithra, the Magas e. g. Magi priests, and recommendations of the sun-worship in the Purāṇas are the grounds on which Weber propounds a theory of the great influence of Magi-priests and cults upon indigenous sun-worship. He²²⁹ claims in fact, that the native sun-worship was quite replaced by this importation. It is difficult to agree with him in view of the fact that there are many Purāṇas²³⁰ which do not mention the role of Magian priests at all and continue the indigenous and national tradition of the sun-worship as found in the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Upaniṣads, the Sūtras, and the Epics. Some of the Purāṇas such as the Kūrma limit themselves to a description of the function of the sun as the heavenly body in regulating time and seasons, in maintaining the planets in their position and fostering the life of plants and animals and make only a passing reference to the solar family. This description is in conformity with the Vedic account of the sun-god. In the Viṣṇu, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Matsya Purāṇas there is the sun-worship of the Vedic tradition.²³¹ It has rightly been pointed out²³² that the orthodox tradition developed on the lines of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa's²³³ prescription of a golden disc to represent the solar orb and the Upaniṣadic²³⁴ doctrine of the golden Puruṣa in the Sun and the philosophically inclined concerned less of the 'all-red' deity and more of Brahmaṇa as the ultimate being with which the sun was identified. There is testimony of this tradition in the Kūrma Purāṇa and many other places²³⁵ in the Viṣṇu, the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa and the Matsya

228. Burns, E.M., *Western Civilizations*, p. 87.

229. Weber, A., *Indische Studien*, p. 104.

230. Bhattacharya, H.D., *Classical Age* (Ed.) R.C. Majumdar, p. 438.

231. Roy, S.N., *Early Purāṇic account of Sun and solar cult*, pp. 41-45.

232. Bhattacharya, H.D., *op. cit.*, p. 438.

233. S.B., VII-4.1.10.

234. B.A.U.-II-5-5.

235. See references 105, 111, 112 etc.

Purāṇas. Moreover, the name of the sect of which Magis became priests is named as 'Saura'—a Sanskritised form²³⁶ which is sufficient to indicate that the Magian cult was thoroughly Indianised and only then it could become palatable to the Indians. Further the whole of the theology²³⁷ of this system is so much Indian—a reflex of the teachings of Vedas, Upaniṣads and Epics that the question of displacement does not arise.

The influence of the Magi-cult upon indigenous solar cult has been generally overestimated. The fundamentals of the Magi-cult could not make slightest headway in India most probably due to exemplary assimilative and absorbing capacity of the Indian culture. Further it might not have been possible for Magi-priests to advance their cause because most of the features of the Magi-cult (especially its Iranianised form which reached India) were already present here. For instance, the worship of the sun under the name of Mithra had already been prevalent in the native tradition of India is revealed by the R̥gveda²³⁸, the Atharvaveda²³⁹, the Upaniṣads²⁴⁰ and the epics²⁴¹. The fire was also worshipped and was closely connected with the sun in India right from the R̥gvedic times. The dualist view of the world i.e. division of the world into good and evil powers and consequently the struggle between them and ultimate victory of the good was also found in ancient Indian history²⁴². The fight between Indra and Vṛtra which forms an important theme of the Vedic lore may be regarded as a fight between powers of light and darkness²⁴³. The whole epic story is taken by some scholars²⁴⁴ as symbolising this struggle. In view of these similarities there was

-
236. Farquhar, J.N., *An Outline of the religious Literature of India*, p. 153.
237. *Ibid.*, He compares it with Śaiva theology and considers it as a reflex of the Gītā.
238. R.V., III-59. cf. Macdonell, A.A., *Vedic Mythology*, p. 30.
239. A.V., XIII-3-13; IX-3-18; III-8-1; V-12-1.
240. Taittirīya-U., 1-1-1, 1-12-1.
241. Hopkins, E.W., *Epic Mythology*, pp. 202-204.
242. *Ibid.*, Maitreya is one of the names of Sūrya in the Mahābhārata, III-146 to 157.
243. Frazer, J.G., *Worship of Nature*, vol. I, p. 596.
244. Lakṣmī Dhara, *Woolner Comm.* vol. pp. 311-326., Ludwig, quoted by Pusalker, A.D., *Cul. Her., India*, vol. II, p. 65.

hardly anything new for Magi priests to propogate in India. There is one significant difference between Indian Mitra and Magi-Mitra. Magi-Mitra is credited with the slaying of the bull but we do not find any reference to this legend in the Purāṇas or other literature. No representation of this episode is found in the Indian art²⁴⁵ though it was frequently represented in the arts of Asia Minor and Rome.²⁴⁶ There are many rites of initiation etc. in the Magi cult of Mithraism but they are not to be traced in the Purāṇas.²⁴⁷ Thus it may be suggested that so far as the mythology, theology and philosophy of the sun-cult was concerned the Maga influence was negligible.

There are two connected spheres where they appear to have exerted powerful influence—iconography and temples. Though there might have been native tradition of image-making and temple-building for different sectarian²⁴⁸ gods yet it appears that the images and temples of the sun-god were either not known or popular in India before the advent of the Magas as evidenced by the Purāṇas.²⁴⁹ It might have been due to the fact that the solar deity itself was visible daily to every body and there was no need for its representation. Its orb was worshipped by the general masses.²⁵⁰ For the philosophically inclined its artificial representation was meaningless since they found in its visible form a symbol of ultimate reality.²⁵¹ Even if the tradition of image making in case of Sūrya might have existed it must have been on a very

245. Banerjea, J.N., *Development of Hindu Iconography*, pp. 428-505.

246. Frank, Cumont, *op. cit.*, Figs. 4-7, 25, 26, 35, 37.

247. Burns, E.M., *Western Civilizations*, p. 71.

248. Pāṇini and Patañjali inform us about the images of Hindu sectarian gods. cf. Puri, B.N., *India in the time of Patañjali*, p. 182-83, Agarwala, V.S., *India as known to Pāṇini*, p. 358 ff.

249. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 29-2-6. It is interesting to note that here the Maga priests are not described as responsible for image-making but Viśvakarman—the native architect was responsible. A few images of purely native tradition such as of Bodha-gayā, Bhaj, Lala-bhagat etc. have to come to light. cf. Banerjea, J.N., *op. cit.*, pp. 432-434.

250. R. V., I-175-4; V-29-10; S.B., VIII-4-1-10.; Banerjea, J.N., *op. cit.*, pp. 137-40, 198-199.

251. B.A.K., II-I, Chāndogya U., 3-1-11.

small scale because as it is mentioned in the Purāṇas²⁵² that the masses worshipped the solar deity not in its anthropomorphic but symbolic form by disc, wheel, lotus and svastika etc. On the other hand, there are many elements in the solar iconography of the Kusāṇa, the Gupta and the post-Gupta periods which are unmistakably Persian²⁵³. These must have been brought by the Agni-priests in India. These are Udīcyaveṣa, avyanga and high boots. They are found referred to in the literary texts²⁵⁴ of India as well as depicted in the solar images from the Kuṣāṇa period onwards found at Mathurā,²⁵⁵ Bengal²⁵⁶ and Western India.²⁵⁷ That these features were imported from Persia becomes too evident when they are not found in the solar iconography of south India²⁵⁸ which remained uninfluenced by the east Iranian tradition. The existence of a large number of the sun-temple in the western part of India²⁵⁹ where Magas first established the sun-temple at Mūlasthāna (Modern Multan²⁶⁰) is again a pointer in the direction that actually Maga priests were responsible for starting this new tradition in the solar religion. It is natural to presume that these two traditions established by them were materially instrumental in propagating and diffusing the sectarian form of the sun-worship. They gave concrete and lithic representation to the imaginary

-
252. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 29-2-6. Bhaviṣya Purāṇa (Brahma Parvan) refers to Maṇḍala form of the sun-worship. In commenting upon Āpastamba Dh. Sūtra, II-11-29-16 Haradatta says that the Draviḍas used to worship Āditya by drawing Maṇḍalas.
253. I. H. Q., vol. Myths explaining some alien traits of North India sun-icons, pp. 1ff., Banerjea, J. N., op. cit., p. 437.
254. Bṛihat-Saṁhitā, Ch. 57 (45-8); Viṣṇudharmotara, III, 67-1 to 5 also refers to these elements.
255. Agarwala, V. S., A Catalogue of the Brahmanical Images in Mathura Art, J. U. P. H. S., vol. XXII, 1949.
256. Saraswati, S. K., Early Sculpture of Bengal, p. 123. Bhattasali, N. K., Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Decca Museum, pp. 172ff.
257. Sankalia, H. D., Archaeology of Gujarat, pp. 84, 157, 158, 159 163.
258. Rao, Gopinath, T. A., op. cit., vol. I, part II, pp. 301-12. Sastri, H.K., South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses, Figs. 143, Dubreuil Iconography of Southern India, p. 109.
259. Sankalia, H.D., op. cit., pp. 59-60.
260. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 29-2-6. Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, Ch. 139 too narrates the incident.

depiction of solar anthropomorphism²⁶¹ as found in the Vedas, the epic and the Purāṇas.

There is another aspect of the Maga-problem e. g. absorption and acceptance of the Magas into the traditional Hindu fold.²⁶² The Indian culture has always been famous for its immense capacity of mutual adjustment and assimilation and ultimately absorption and annihilation into the ever-widening cultural patterns of India.²⁶³ Many tribes, races and cultures were absorbed into the Indian culture. The same fate awaited the Magas. They were ultimately accepted as 'Śākadvīpī-Brāhmaṇas' on account of their priestly functions by Indians. Already in 520 A. D. a manuscript found in Nepal²⁶⁴ gives an equal status to the Magas and Brāhmaṇas in the Kaliyuga. The very fact that they were mentioned in the Purāṇas in association with native myths and legends²⁶⁵ is indicative of their acceptance by the Brāhmaṇs

Another aspect of the problem is concerned with the factors responsible for the wide popularity which they commanded for two or three centuries and which were ultimately responsible for increased vitality of the solar-cult in the early centuries of the Christian era. The proselytising spirit of the Magas²⁶⁶, the state support that they enjoyed atleast under foreign rulers i. e. of Indo-Greeks, Scythians and Kuṣāṇas,²⁶⁷ the propogating of the benefits of the

261. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, p. 29.

262. Mitra, D., Foreign Elements in Indian Population, Cul. Her. of India, vol. II, p. 611.

263. Bhandarkar, D. R., Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population, Indian Antiquary, 1911 Jan., p. 18.

264. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, pp. 30-56.

265. Frank, Cumont, op. cit., pp. 30 ff.

266. Vasu, N.N., Castes and Sects of Bengal, IV, 56-57 suggests probable connection of the sun worship with Śuṅga, Kaṇva and Hūṇa dynasties.

267. Bloch, Z.D.M.G., 1910, p. 723 believes that the theory that sun god cures leprosy came from Persia. But as shown by the Ṛgveda and the Atharvaveda there was native tradition that the sun-god cures leprosy and other skin diseases. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 24, see Mayūra-śataka of Mayūra.

sun-worship, especially its creative properties.²⁶⁸, their contribution towards image-making and temple-building of Sūrya whose absence must have keenly felt—all these factors must have contributed towards their temporary success but ultimately they lost their individuality since there was nothing distinctive about them.

It has been suggested that the sun-worshipping Magas were divided in course of time into two groups of the Magas and the Bhojakas later on degraded as the Yājakas. Both are distinguished in the sense that the Magas used to meditate on the syllable 'A', while the Yājakas worshipped the sun by burning incense, offering garlands and various other articles and muttering mantras though the aim of both is the same—the attainment of final emancipation through Karmayoga to the sun who resides in the phenomenal sun and is both Sakala and niṣkala.²⁶⁹ It appears that the Bhojakas or the Yājakas or the Sevakas may have been indigenous priests of the sun-cult on the ground that they are described as chanting Vedic mantras etc.²⁷⁰ Later on they indulged into objectionable activities and practices and entered into matrimonial alliances with foreigners like the Magas. Then they came to be regarded as low or apānkta²⁷¹ or Devalaka-Brahmins²⁷² (temple priests). There is a reference to a tribe known as Bhojakas in the time of Aśoka²⁷³. It is difficult to suggest whether Bhojakas of Aśokan inscriptions and Bhojakas of the Purāṇas were identical. If they were identical, it is just probable that due to the extreme popularity of the Magas in northern India they might have migrated to south India but there is no evidence of migration of any such tribe. Whatever might be the truth they enjoyed respect upto the eighth century A. D.²⁷⁴

Though the sun-god had various names²⁷⁵ such as Āditya, Savitr, Bhāskara, Arka, Ravi, Sūrya, Mihira, Prabhākara, Mārtaṇḍa, Bhānu, Citrabhānu and Divākara etc., he was specially

268. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol, I, p. 97.

269. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 27

270. Ibid.

271. Bhaviṣya-P., I-140, 141, 146.

272. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-Purāṇas, vol. I, p. 40.

273. Mookerji, R.K., Aśoka, p. 21.

274. Fleet, J.F., C.I.I. vol. III, p. 217.

275. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 9.

worshipped in his twelfth form (Dvādaśārka)²⁷⁶ Mitra. The twelve Ādityas²⁷⁷ are Indra, Dhātṛ, Parjanya, Pūṣan, Tvaṣṭṛ, Aryamā, Bhaga, Vivasvat, Viṣṇu, Amśu, Varuṇa and Mitra.

The development of a family and attendants of a deity is a common feature of Hindu sects and cult. The later Purāṇas elaborately describe this feature of the sunworship. Rajanī and Nikṣubhā are his two wives. Piṅgala²⁷⁸ the recorder of good and bad deeds of creatures, Daṇḍanāyaka, Rajña and Stośa²⁷⁹, Kalmaśa (i. e. Yama) and Pakṣin (i. e. Garuḍa) attend on him and also Vyoman and naked Diṇḍi²⁸⁰. Rajanī's another name was Samjñā or Sureṇu²⁸¹ and the sun had two sons with her—Vaivasvata Manu and Yama Śrāddhadeva and a daughter named Yamī or Kālindī. The shadow of Samjñā was Chāyā (called to be the same as Nikṣubhā identified with Pṛthvī). From Chāyā the sun got Śrutaśravas and Śrutakarman and a daughter known as Tapatī. The other sons of the sun-god were two Aśvins named Nāsatya and Dasra (from Samjñā in Kuru country) and Revanta with the body of a horse having a bow and arrows. There is mention of eighteen attendants of the sun—Indra under the name

276. Sāmba Upa-p., I-8b-14. 3.3 'prītyā sāmasya,
tatrārko Jagato'nugrahāya ca /
Sthito dvādasā-bhāgena mitro maitreṇa cakṣuṣā //

In Sāmba Upa-purāṇa 4. 6 Mitra is mentioned as the last of the 12 Ādityas.

277. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 6.

278. Bhaviṣya-P. I-76-13 read 'piṅgalo lekhati' in place of 'pingalo devakaḥ' of Sāmba Upa-purāṇa but the text of the Bhaviṣya-P. appears to be the correct one. In Viṣṇudh. III-67. 5-7 Piṅgala is described as antipiṅgala, Uddīptaveṣa (Udīcyaveṣa ?) Lekhani patrakāra and carma Śūladhara".

279. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 6. 22a & 7. 3a., Bhaviṣya-P., I-76-13b & 18 (corresponding to above) to names are Rāja and Srośa but in Bhaviṣya P. I-124-13 and 22-24a they are Rajnā and Srauṣa Ch. I-143. 40a. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa 3.6.39 gives the names as Rājan and Tośa. In Āvesta Rashnu (justice) and Sraosha (obedience) are companions of Mithra.

280. Sāmba Upa purāṇa, 6. 23. 7, 4 & 16. 25 but in Bhaviṣya P., I-76. 14 and 19 and I-124-1 the words tathā, agrataḥ and magnaḥ are found in place of nagnaḥ and nagnakaḥ.

281. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 10-17b; Bhaviṣya-P., I-79b; Skanda-P., VII-1-11-65b,

of Daṇḍanāyaka on the left side of the sun and was engaged by latter to rule over the world with his daṇḍa and nīti, Agni known as Piṅgala on the right side of the sun was engaged in checking the good and bad deeds of all creatures, two Aśvins stood on two sides of the sun, Kārttikeya and Hara stood at the eastern gate under the name of Rajnā and Stoṣa respectively, Yama and Garuḍa assumed the names of Kalmaśa and Pakṣin who stood with two asses at the gate and on the south stood Citragupta and Kāla under the names of Jandākāra and Māthara, on the west stood Varuṇa and Sagara under the names of Prapnuyana and Kṣutapa respectively, on the north stood Kubera and Vināyaka and on the east stood Revanta and Rudra²⁸² under the name of Diṇḍi²⁸³ and also Śrī, Mahāśvetā and Mātr̥s. Besides these chief eighteen attendants, at one place²⁸⁴ Soma is included as an attendant deity of the sun and there were fourteen other attendants. In the list of attendants there are names which may be regarded as Iranian, importation²⁸⁵ such as Rajna and Stosa,²⁸⁶ Māthara and Jandākāra,²⁸⁷ though there is effort to Indianise them by giving them Indigenous origin as mentioned above.

The method of the sun worship is elaborately described in the late Purāṇas. Many influences may be seen in the evolution of the methodology of the sun worship in the late Purāṇas—such as the Vedic tradition of the sun-worship, the indigenous tradition of the sun-worship, the Iranian tradition of the sun-worship, the Tāntrik tradition of the worship and Śaiva tradition.

The first important feature in the worship of the sun was the introduction of image and temple of the sungod in contrast to the worship of sun in symbolic forms. This is expressly brought out

282. Ibid., 29-13b. Viṣṇudh-III-67-Daṇḍin (i. e. Daṇḍanāyaka)-Dharma in the form of lion and the banner (dhvaja) on the left of the sun, Piṅgala on the right, the sun's four sons (viz. Revanta, Yama and two Manus) as well as his four wives (viz. Rajanī, Nikṣubhā, Chāyā and Suvareasā) on both sides are mentioned.

283. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 16. 1. 24.

284. Ibid., 36-41b.

285. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 45.

286. Sāmba Upa-Purāṇa 16-8a; Bhaviṣya-P., I-124-21a.

287. Bhaviṣya-P., I-53-1 mentions Māthara but not Jandākāra.

in the later Purāṇas²⁸⁸. The rules for the construction of the sun temple and images are also given²⁸⁹. From the point of view of materials seven kinds of images and dresses etc. such as avyanga, pada-bandha etc. are mentioned²⁹⁰. It has rightly been suggested²⁹¹ that in the earlier chapters of the late Purāṇas the Vedic tradition has been given prominence though no doubt Iranian elements were already introduced in the sun-worship. There are references to six mediums of the sun-worship viz. fire, water, air, holy place, image and pedestal for the image of a deity²⁹². There is no reference to Tāntric symbols like Yantra or Maṇḍala in these earlier chapters. The hymns in praise of the sun are called Vedokta or Veda-Vedāṅga-sammīta²⁹³, the three Vedas are said to attend upon the sun²⁹⁴ and the agnihotra-grāha (the house for the oblations to the fire) is an integral part of the sun-temple²⁹⁵. The Vedic home forms an important part of the worship, the mantras to be used are either Vedic or Purāṇic or both²⁹⁶.

But the Tāntric cult was becoming quite popular particularly in eastern India from 7th-8th centuries onwards²⁹⁷ and the sun-worship could not remain aloof from this development. In the chapter of the second group of the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa there are many elements in the sun-worship which are essentially Tāntric.

288. Sāmba Upa-p., 29-2-6.

na purā pratimā hy āsīt pūjyate maṇḍale raviḥ/
yathaitan maṇḍalam vyomni sthīya te savitus tadā//
evam eva purā bhaktaiḥ pūjyate maṇḍalākṛtiḥ/
yataḥ prabhṛti cāpy eṣa nirmīto viśvakarmaṇā//
sarva-loka-hitārthāya sūryasya puruṣākṛtiḥ/
gṛheṣu pratimāyās tu na tāsām niyamaḥ kvacit//
devāyatana-vinyāse kāryam mūrtiparikṣaṇam//
Ibid., 1-17a 'Sāmbasya ca tadollāsam prtimāsthāpanam tathā'.

289. Ibid., Ch. 29.

290. Ibid., Ch. 30. 31.

291. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 63.

292. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 38. 45.

293. Ibid., 12. 8; 12. 13; 24. 7 etc.

294. Ibid., 6. 15.

295. Ibid., 29. 15.

296. Ibid., 30. 18, 32. 12 '.....purāṇoktena mantreṇa'.....

297. Chakravarti, C., The Tāntras, Studies on their Religion and Literature, pp. 80-89,

The method of initiation is full of Tāntric influence. It involves the selection and preparation of the ground, selection of spiritual preceptors and disciples, offer of argha to the sun with the mahā-mantra, drawing of a maṇḍala with the figure of a twelve-petalled lotus in it performance of home and of tattvanyāsa and mantranāyāsa, worship of the quarter guardians to whom fish, meat etc. are offered²⁹⁸. It is interesting to learn that the mantras with Tāntric symbolism are employed at every step. The drawing of maṇḍalas, the performance of various kinds of mudrās and nyāsas are in accordance with the Tāntric philosophy. The word 'Tantra' has been used to mean not only procedure but also Tāntric works²⁹⁹. The methods of performing abhicāra rites and bijas in mantras and practice of yoga have also been given and six acts viz. vaśīkaraṇa, ākarṣaṇa, māraṇa, uccāṭana, vidveśaṇa and stambhana etc.³⁰⁰. Thus the sun-worship in the later Purāṇas appears to have been influenced by Tāntric symbolism. The sun-worship was done at sun-rise, at mid-day and at sunset³⁰¹. The later Purāṇas also give an account of the method of performing the annual worship (samvatsarī pūjā) and the annual car-festival (rathayātrā) of the sun with the use of Vedic and Purāṇic mantras³⁰², and methods about the use of incense and other materials, methods and results of observing the seven different saptamī tithis as well as the twelve śukla-saptamīs³⁰³. The legends of Jāmadgni and Viśvakarman³⁰⁴ are given where an effort has been made to give a national version for covering the feet of the god sun. Other topics such as evolution of the universe according to the principles of Sāṅkhya system³⁰⁵ are described.

The later Purāṇas refer to three centres of the sun-worship³⁰⁶ of Magian type. *Firstly*, it mentions Mūlasthāna also referred to

298. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 39 & 41.

299. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 41-1, 51-195, 55. 19, and 191, 57,15, 61-50, 68-9, 74-10 = cf. Chakravarti, C., op. cit., pp. 19-20.

300. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. I, 47-83. cf. Chakravarti, C., op. cit., pp. 38-44, 80-82.

301. Ibid., Ch. 29.

302. Ibid., Ch. 34.

303. Ibid., Ch. 46.

304. Ibid., Ch. 45 and Ch. 12-15 respectively.

305. Ibid., Ch. 14.

306. Skanda-Purāṇa, VI-76 refers to Muṇḍira, Kālapriya and Mūlasthāna, VII-139, 11 & 12a mentions that the sun is seen at

as *Mitravana* on the³⁰⁷ Candrabhāgā river and identified with Multan in Punjab.³⁰⁸ Besides *Mitravana* and *Mūlasthāna* there are other names of this place—*Kaśyapa-pura*, *Hamsapur*, *Bhagapura*, *Sāmbapura* (referred to by *Abu-Rihan*), *Prahlādapur* and *Ādyasthana* all terms connected with the sun-worship.³⁰⁹ *Hiuen-Tsang* who visited the place in the seventh century A. D. testifies to the great popularity of this place as a centre of the sun-worship.³¹⁰ The other Muslim historians also give an account of this temple.³¹¹ *Cunningham* takes *Mūla* as an epithet of the sun

Muṇḍīrasvāmin at *Gangāsāgara sangama*, at midday at *Kālapriya* and in evening at *Mūlasthāna* near *candrabhāgā*. *Sāmba Upapurāṇa*, 26. 14 refers to *Kālapriya*, *sutīra* and *Mitravana* cf. 42. 43. 'Sthāpayitvā raviṃ bhaktyā trishāneṣu surottamaḥ' cf. *Sāmba-P.*, 43-36b., *Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa*, I-72-4-6 refers to *Muṇḍīra*, *Kālapriya* and *Mitravana*, I-129. 16b-17a, *Sutīra*, *Kālapriya* and *Mitravana*, I-189-23.26, *Puṇḍīrsvāmin*, *Kālapriya* and *Mūlasthana*, I-55-27, *Suṇḍīrsvāmin*, *Kālapriya* and *Mitravana*, *Varāha-Purāṇa*, 177-55-77 narrates that *Sāmba* established three images at *Udayācala*, *Kālapriya* on the south of *yamunā* and *Mūlasthāna* on the *Astamānācala*.

307. *Sāmba Upa-purāṇa*, 1-38.

308. *Cunningham*, A., *The Ancient Geography of India*, pp. 194-199. *De*, N.L., *Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India*, pp. 133-34 etc. *Sircar*, D. C., *Geography of Ancient & Mediaeval India*.

309. *Cunningham*, A., *op. cit.*, p. 196.

310. *Beal*, A., *Buddhist records of Western Countries*, vol. II, p. 274, 'There is a temple dedicated to the sun very magnificent and profusely decorated. The image of the Sun-deva is cast in yellow gold and ornamented with rare gems. Its devine insight is mysteriously manifested and its spiritual power made plain to all. Women play their music, light their torches, offer their flowers and perfumes to honour it. This custom has been continued from the very first. The kings and high families of the five Indies never fail to make their offerings of gems and precious stones (to this deval). They have founded a house of mercy (happiness) in which they provide food and drink and medicines for the poor and sick, affording succour and sustenance. Men from all countries come here to offer up their prayers. There are always some thousands doing so on the four sides of the temple. There are tanks with flowering groves which one can wander about without restraint'.

311. *Alberuni*, *Al. Edrisi*, *Abu Ishak al Ishtakhri* etc. Quoted by *Elliot*, H. M. and *Dowson*, J., *History of India as told by its own historians*, Vol.. & p. 18-73.

as the God of rays and therefore Mūlasthānapura as the 'City of the Temple of the Sun'.³¹² But the interpretation is far-fetched and more probable view appears to be that it means the 'original place of the sun worship'.³¹³ The internal evidence is in favour of this interpretation. In the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa as well as in the Sāmba Purāṇa the place is also referred to as Ādyasthāna³¹⁴ which directly means 'original place' and there is no reason to take it as a corruption of Āditya.³¹⁵ Secondly, the legend of Sāmba expressly states that for the first time a sun temple was established here.³¹⁶ That western India where Multan is situated was a strong hold of the sun-worship, is also attested by epigraphy.³¹⁷

The second place of the sun-worship is referred to as Kālapriya identified with modern Kālpī on the southern bank of Yamunā.³¹⁸ There is a controversy regarding the identification of Kālapriya temple of the sun at Kālpī with Kālapriyanātha at whose fairs all the three plays of Bhavabhūti were staged³¹⁹ but others identify Kālapriya with Mahākāla of Ujjayinī.³²⁰ It is reasonable to suspend judgment on this issue.

The third place is referred to as Sutīra, or Muṇḍīra or Udayācala also known as Sūrya-kānana, Ravikṣetra, Sūrya-kṣetra and Mitravana³²¹ while the Brahma Purāṇa expressly calls it Koṇāditya or Koṇāraka in Utkala (or odradeśa).³²² It is

312. Cunningham, A., op. cit. p. 197.

313. Hazra, R. C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas. vol. I, p. 39.

314. Ibid., p. 105.

315. Cunningham, A., op. cit., p. 198.

316. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 24-26.

317. Sankalia, H.D., Archæology of Gujarat, pp. 60, 80, 137, 212. Fleet, J.F., C.I.L., vol. III, pp. 70, 80, 162, 218.

318. Mirashi, V.V., Three Ancient Famous Temples of the Sun. Purāṇa, vol. VIII, No. 1, p. 42.

319. Mirashi, V.V., Identification of Kālapriya, Studies in Indology, vol. I, p. 33. Altekar, A.S., Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their times, p. 102, identifies Kālapriya with Kālpī.

320. Kane, P.V., (ed.) Uttararamacarita (4th ed.) (Intro), Tripurāri, A commentator of Bhavabhūti's Mālatīmādhava identifies both. Bhandarkar, D.R., E.I., vol. VII, p. 30.

321. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 42-2.

322. Brahma-Purāṇa, 28-32., Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 106. Though 'Koṇāraka' does not occur in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, I-153-50, the sun is called 'Koṇa-Vallabha. In Kapil-

generally and rightly identified with modern Konārak near Puri in Orissa.³²³ Dr. Kane objects to this identification and identifies Muṇḍīra with the sun temple at Modhera in north Gujarat but his objections are not forceful. It seems that the name Konarak came to be applied to this place because of its position in the north-east corner (Koṇa) with respect to Puri.³²⁴ It is clear from the above description of the places of the sun-worship that the whole of northern India was witnessing the development of the Magian type of the sun-cult.

Thus the Purāṇas—early and late—contain valuable data for the study of the sun and solar cult from the beginning of the Christian era, if not earlier, to the end of the Hindu period of India. The early Purāṇic records continue the national tradition of simple, non-sectarian sun-worship by means of symbols though there are passages and occasions when solar sectarianism in a veiled form is seen. The old Vedic tradition of worshipping the sun under different names continued though Sūrya, Savitṛ and Āditya became very prominent names. The sun was worshipped mainly in his benevolent form. The early Purāṇas describe about the family of the sun-god and his chariot with elaborateness not seen before. There are indirect references to sun-images and temples, but the early Purāṇas do not mention the Magas--the foreign sun-worshipping priests. There is mention of the characteristics of the sun-images which are Indian as compared to the Iranian elements of the late Purāṇas. In various domestic rites the sun-worship played predominant part and twelve petalled lotus was particularly associated with the sun-god. The worship of the sun in the early Purāṇas mainly consisted of recitation of mantras, Vedic and Purāṇic in praise of the sun god under the names of Bhāskara, Ravi, Sūrya, Savitṛ, Bhaga and Arka etc ; argha consisting of water, sandal flowers, specially red, and salutation to

samhitā A.S.B. Ms. No. 311, Ch. 6, Konāraka has been called Maitreya-Jana and the Ravikṣetra.

323. Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-Purāṇas, vol. I, p. 146. Mirashi, V.V., Three Ancient Famous Temples of the Sun, Purāṇa, vol. VIII, No. 1, p. 41.
324. Kane, P.V. (Ed.) Uttaraṛāmacarita of Bhavabhūti fourth ed., Intro. p. 13.
325. Ganguly, M.M., Orissa and her remains, p. 437.

the sun-god. There is no reference to the Tāntric mode of the sun-worship in the early Purāṇas.

The most interesting feature in the late Purāṇic records is mention of the advent of the Magas and the popularisation, if not introduction, of the sun images and temples at three places. The sun images were to be dressed according to the Iranian fashion though there is an effort in these Purāṇas to nationalise this foreign element. The advent of the Magas gave a philip to the cause of the sun-worshippers and it spread throughout northern India. Ultimately the national and Iranian traditions of the sun-worship were mixed up and the solar sectarians developed a philosophy which was similar to the Sāṅkhya system. In earlier chapters of the late Purāṇas the Vedas and the Purāṇas are given prominence in the worship while in the later chapters of the later Purāṇas Tāntric symbolism gains popularity.

THE SYMBOLISM OF THE THIRD EYE OF ŚIVA
IN THE PURĀNAS.

BY

WENDY DONIGER O'FLAHERTY

[अस्मिन्नबन्धे विदुष्या लेखिकया शिवस्य तृतीयनयनस्य प्रतीका-
त्मिका व्याख्या प्रस्तुता । शिवस्य तृतीयं नयनं कुत्रचित्तु अग्निमयं
योगशक्तिसमन्वितं वर्णितम् । कुत्रचित्तु शिवस्य पार्वत्या सह शृङ्गार-
लीलायां शृङ्गारचेष्टामयं च वर्णितमुपलभ्यते । अन्यत्र तिलकमयं च
वर्णितम् । अत्र शिवस्य तृतीयनयनसम्बन्धिनानाख्यानानामाधारेण
प्रमाणपुरस्सरं तस्य योगैश्वर्यमयं शृङ्गारात्मकं च द्विविधं रूपं
प्रदर्शितम् ।]

Symbolism is essential to all mythology, but particularly to the mythology of the Hindu god Śiva. For the corpus of myths, preserved in its most important form in the Sanskrit Purānas, embodies a basic paradox : that Śiva is the god of ascetics and the god of the *liṅga*.¹ The myths which explore this paradox do so by a combination of rational explanation and emotional perception ; but the symbols of Śiva express in a static form the resolution of the mythological paradoxes. Symbolism is uniquely capable of resolving such ambivalences, for the symbol may be two things at once, the actual object and the implicit quality. This facility is particularly applicable in the Purānas, since all of Sanskrit poetry is based upon the concept of *dhvani*—emotional overtones or echoes, secondary implications of words. Thus where the myth, which functions in terms of action, must describe first one and then another aspect of the god, resorting to cyclic activity, the symbol juxtaposes the aspects so closely as to superimpose them, forming the moment of complete resolution which the episodes of the myth approach but never reach.

1. This has been discussed at length by the present writer in two articles entitled, "Asceticism and Sexuality in the Mythology of Śiva," in *History of Religions* (University of Chicago : May, 1969, and August, 1969).

I. The antierotic connotation of the third eye.

Śiva is the god of yogis and the greatest of all yogis ; the third eye in the middle of his forehead is a symbol of his magic vision and an instrument of his ascetic power. With this eye he burns to ashes Kāma, the god of desire, when Kāma attempts to wound Śiva with one of his flower arrows. As R. C. Zaehner describes this episode, "With a glance of his third eye—the eye of contemplative wisdom situated above the bridge of the nose—he [Śiva] reduced the impudent godlet [Kāma] to ashes."² With this same divine eye, Śiva performed another antierotic act : at the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī, Brahmā, who was performing the ceremony in his capacity of Creator, became excited by the beauty of Pārvatī and shed his seed upon the ground. Brahmā created a screen of smoke to obscure his transgression, and Śiva's two eyes were blinded, but with his third eye he saw what had happened and punished Brahmā.³ Thus in terms of traditional symbolism, as well as by its application in Hindu mythology, the third eye is ascetic and antierotic, in keeping with Śiva's role of the divine yogī.

This connotation of the third eye appears throughout the myths of Śiva and his wife Pārvatī. In one story, Pārvatī beats Śiva by cheating in a game of dice :

When Pārvatī had won everything from Śiva, including his loincloth, Śiva looked at her in fury with his third eye, and the hosts were terrified and thought, "Now Śiva is angry with Pārvatī and will burn her as he burned Kāma. "But Pārvatī smiled and said to Śiva, "Why do you look at me with that eye ? I am not Death, nor Kāma, nor the sacrifice of Dakṣa, nor the Triple City, nor Andhaka [all enemies of Śiva who had been destroyed by the third eye]. What good will it do you to look at me with that thing ? You have become three-eyed in my presence in vain". Hearing this, Siva decided to go alone to a deserted forest.⁴

2. Robert Charles Zaehner, *Hinduism* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 111.

3. *Śiva Purāṇa* (Benares : Paṇḍita Pustakālaya, 1964) 2. 2. 19. 17-30 ; *Skanda Purāṇa* (Bombay: Venkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1867) 6. 77. 40.

4. *Skanda Purāṇa* 1. 1. 34. 130-139.

Even without these particular association, a third eye in the middle of the forehead produces a reaction of horror and aversion as a mere facial disfigurement, a physical monstrosity. This is brought out in the Purāṇa passages in which various people, trying to dissuade Pārvatī from her love of Śivā, contrast his three eyes with her lotus-petal eyes,⁵ his deformed eyes with her wide eyes,⁶ his monkey-eyes with her fawn-eyes⁷. A Bengali poem is based upon this contrast together with a related reversal : the idea that Kāma burns Śiva instead of being burnt by him :

Why do you burn my body, Madana [Kāma] ?

I am not Śaṅkara [Śiva], but a delicate girl.

A pearl tiara this and not the crescent moon [which Śiva bears] ;

Not an eye on my forehead but a vermilion spot.....⁸

The inappropriateness of the third eye in an erotic context is expressed in a verse describing Śiva as he wanders about begging, naked, enticing the wives of the sages living in a Pine Forest : "As the third eye saw the body of Śiva which, though the body of the enemy of Kāma, was arousing passion throughout the three worlds, the eye was ashamed of its former deed [the burning of Kāma], and it hid."⁹

II. The interaction of the Horrible and the Erotic.

Thus, on its explicit level, the third eye is horrible and therefore anti-erotic. Yet the two aspects are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although, in traditional Indian literary analysis, the loathesome, furious, heroic and frightening moods are opposed to the erotic,¹⁰ the *Mālatī Mādhava* is a notable exception to this rule, "a play that combines love and horror with a felicity

5. Śiva Purāṇa 2. 3. 27. 25.

6. Skanda Purāṇa 1. 1. 22. 66.

7. Skanda Purāṇa 1. 2. 25. 67.

8. Mathur, *Vaiṣṇava Pa'alaharī*, edited by Durgadās Lahiri (Calcutta : 1905), p. 85. Translation by Edward C. Dimock, Jr. (unpublished).

9. Kṣemendra, *Darṣadāna* (Bombay : Kāvya-mālā Series 6 [pp. 66-117], (1890) 7. 35.

10. cf. Viśvanātha Kavirāja, *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, ed. by J. Vidyāsagara (Calcutta : 1895).

never again equaled in Sanskrit.”¹¹ The presence of horror to enhance love may be seen in Indian miniature painting in the motif of the *abhisārikā*, the woman who steals out to meet her lover at night in spite of the dangers of darkness, lightning, snakes ghosts, and jungle plants that tear her *sārī* and pluck off her golden ornaments.

The worship of the Goddess in India is particularly characterized by the combination of these elements, and there is even explicit reference to this phenomenon in the Purāṇas : in describing the glory of the Goddess in full armor, the messenger of the demon Mahiṣa says, “All the *rasa-s* [moods]—erotic and terrible, heroic and marvellous and comic—are combined in her.”¹² Zaehner captures the logic of this juxtaposition when he writes, “[Kālī] is terrifying in her beauty, and her loveliness lies precisely in her frightfulness.”¹³

The interaction of these *rasa-s* is still more significant in the character of Śiva himself, though its presence in the Goddess makes all the more comprehensible her ultimate approval of it in him. “Rudra [Śiva] inspires terror and most paradoxically, a fascinated tenderness for the terrible,” writes Zaehner.¹⁴ This emotion often takes the form of something approaching necrophilia, as in the episode in which Śiva embraces the corpse of his dead wife, Sati,¹⁵ but throughout the mythology the “fascinated tenderness” turns upon the ambiguity of the symbols themselves rather than upon a seemingly perverse reversal of an unambiguous symbol (such as a corpse). The third eye, in spite of its superficial connotations, is in fact just such an ambiguous symbol.

III. The Erotic function of the third eye.

The third eye is capable of inspiring love as well as fear or revulsion in Pārvatī precisely because, in the context of the Hindu

-
11. Daniel H. H. Ingalls, *An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry* (Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard Oriental Series, 44, 1965), p. 75. cf. Bhavabhūti, *Mālatīmādhava*, ed. by Mangesh Rāmakrishna Telang, 6th edition (Bombay : 1936).
 12. *Devībhāgavata Purāṇa* (Benares : Paṇḍita Pustakālaya, 1960) 5.9. 54.
 13. Zaehner, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
 14. Zaehner, *op. cit.*, p. 43.
 15. *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*, ed. by Hariprasad Śāstri, 4 vols. (Poona : Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 102, 1935) 4. 46. 27-40.

attitude toward sexual love, the two emotions are entirely compatible and are in fact characteristic of Pārvatī's feelings toward Śiva from the very first. Pārvatī fears and loves Śiva simultaneously ; a Sanskrit poet notes that Śiva, who shares half of his body with Pārvatī in his androgynous form, is never left by her, "for though she draws away in fear, she is bound to the dexter part, which ever draws her back."¹⁶ The poet Kālidāsa writes that the combination of love and fear in Pārvatī on the wedding night aroused Śiva's desire,¹⁷ and in the *Śiva-Purāṇa* it is said that Śiva teased his wife by disappearing and then suddenly embracing her, frightening her.¹⁸

In many of these episodes of love and fear, the third eye plays an important dual function. This is clearly illustrated by a poem in which desire masquerades as fear (reference is made to the snakes which adorn Śiva and the river Ganges which flows through his hair, as well as to the third eye) :

"Whence comes this perspiration, love ?"

"From the fire of your eye."

"Then why this trembling, fair-faced one ?"

"I fear the serpent prince."

"But still, the thrill that rise on your flesh ?"

"Is from the Ganges' spray, my lord."

May Gaurī's [Pārvatī's] hiding thus her heart
for long be your protection.¹⁹

A similar juxtaposition is at the heart of a Tamil song in praise of Śiva ; in it, "the mother is apparently perturbed that the daughter has lost her heart to a weird character like Siva ; yet her catalogue of his qualities bring [sic] out his unique greatness"

What mad you fall in love with him [Śiva] ?...

Was it for ... the moon in his locks and the blazing eye
in his forehead ?

Or for killing Kāma (god of love), or for swallowing
poison ?

16. *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa*, ed. by D. D. Kosambi and V. V. Gokhale (Cambridge, Massachusetts : Harvard Oriental Series, 42, 1957), 56 ; translated by Ingalls, *op. cit.*

17. Kālidāsa, *Kumārasambhava* (Bombay : Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1955) 8. 1.

18. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2. 2. 21. 19.

19. *Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa* 75, translated by Ingalls, *op. cit.*

... Or the deeds he wrought or his lovesports ?
What made you fall in love ?²⁰

As the poem implies, Pārvatī loves Śiva not in spite of his ascetic accoutrements and the ascetic eye in his forehead, but because of these qualities ; she loves him because they make him unique among the gods, and because in his ascetic powers there is implicit great erotic power.

In Kālidāsa's description of the wedding night of Śiva and Pārvatī, the third eye is put to striking erotic uses, arousing in Pārvatī the very desire that it had formerly destroyed incarnate :

When her silken gowns were drawn away for love-making,
Pārvatī covered with her hands
the eyes of the trident-wielding god ;
but, to her dismay, her efforts were in vain,
for Śiva gazed at her
with the eye in his forehead ...
When Śiva's forehead eye was blinded
by the perfumed powder from her hair loosened by kisses,
he would place it in
the lotus-fragrant breezes from her mouth.²¹

IV. The Erotic Origin of the third eye.

The erotic uses of the third eye are supported by its various erotic origins as described in several myths. The Vedic god Indra, from whom Śiva derives many of his myths and symbols, sprouted a thousand eyes in order to see more of Tilottamā, the beautiful *apsaras*, or celestial nymph; and at the same time, Śiva became four-faced in order to see her,²² just as he becomes three-eyed to see Pārvatī on the wedding night. In addition to this explicit connection, Śiva's third eye is assimilated to the thousand eyes of

20. This song appears in the program of a performance by Bala-sarasvati at the New Empire Theatre in Calcutta, on February 5, 1964; the Tamil text is included in the program, and is probably from the 19th century, but I have not yet been able to trace it.

21. *Kumārasambhava* 8. 7 and 8. 19.

22. *Mahābhārata*, critically edited by Vishnu S. Sukthankar, *et. al.*, (Poona : Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933-), I. 203. 21-26 ; XIII. 128. 1-5.

Indra by the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* reference to Indra's third eye²³ and by the Brāhmaṇa verse which describes Rudra (Śiva) as having a thousand eyes.²⁴ One version of the Tilottamā story omits Indra but is still more closely related to the origin of Śiva's third eye:

Brahmā created Tilottamā, an *apsaras* so beautiful that she aroused even Brahmā himself. He sent her to Mount Kailāsa to bow to Śiva. Śiva saw her but did not dare to look carefully at her, for Pārvatī was there by his side and he was afraid of her. As Tilottamā walked around Śiva, in obeisance, Śiva made a head facing in each direction. Then the sage Nārada said to Pārvatī, "Look what a despicable thing your husband has done. You will be laughed at by all the wives of the gods when they know that Śiva is attracted to another woman." Then Pārvatī was angry and covered up Śiva's eyes. Darkness came over the world, and the mountains were shattered, and the oceans left their beds; it was like doomsday. Nārada was afraid, and he said, "Release Śiva's eyes now or everything will be destroyed." Yet Pārvatī did not uncover the eyes, and so, out of pity for the world and in order to protect it, Śiva made an eye in his forehead.²⁵

This myth combines two versions of the origin of the eye: one from the desire to see Tilottamā and one from the touch of Pārvatī's hands. That the latter is also a direct cause of the creation of the eye—and that it is an erotic cause—is made clear by yet another myth:

Formerly on Mount Madana, in playful jest, Pārvatī covered Śiva's (two) eyes with her lovely hands. When his (three) eyes were covered, great darkness arose [commentator: because Śiva's three eyes are the moon, sun, and fire], and from the touch of her hand Śiva's water of passion [*maḍām-*

23. Varāha Mihira, *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* [*Bṛihat Saṃhitā*], ed. by H. Kern (Calcutta : Bibliotheca Indica, New Series, 1865) 58. 42.

24. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa [*Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa*], ed. by Gulabrāya Vajasaṅkara Chaya (Poona : Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series 64, 1911), 6.1; *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* of the Black Yajur Veda, ed. by E. Roer and E. B. Cowell (Calcutta : Bibliotheca Indica, 1860). 4.5.5.5.

25. *Skanda Purāṇa* 6. 153. 2-27.

bhah; commentator: sweat] was shed. A drop of it fell into the fire [commentator: of Śiva's third eye] on the forehead, and it became heated. From it an embryo appeared, laughing and dancing. Śiva asked Pārvatī to release his (three) eyes; she released his (two) eyes and the light shone forth again. But the child was blind, because of the darkness in which he had been conceived, and so he was called Andhaka, the blind one.²⁶

The myth is imperfectly adapted from an earlier version in the *Mahābhārata*,²⁷ and it retains certain inconsistencies: Pārvatī covers only two eyes, as in the first version; but where the latter describes Śiva's creation of a third eye of fire to dispel the darkness, the *Purāṇa* omits to do so and yet refers to the third eye, by which it explains the birth of the child. This confusion is heightened by the natural tendency to refer to eyes in the dual, in spite of the fact that Śiva must be three-eyed by the end of the myth. The confusion extends to the blindness of Andhaka, who, in some versions, is said to be "blind" because of his own lust, rather than because of the lust associated with his birth.²⁸

V. The Wedding Transformation of the third eye.

Many of the myths of the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī ignore these secondary connotations of the third eye and begin from the superficial premise of its anti-eroticism. In these myths, Śiva wishes to change from his ascetic to his erotic aspect in order to marry, and so he changes his ornaments into the conventional ones with which they are usually compared. Thus all the serpents that adorn his body become gold bracelets; his matted locks become an elaborate coiffure; his tiger skin becomes an embroidered silk garment, and the funeral ashes on his body turn into perfumed sandal wood paste; by Śiva's wish, all his ascetic adornments become conventional ornaments (*yathāyogyam*).²⁹ And, in

26. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.5.42. 15-22; *Śiva Purāṇa*, ed. by Rājarāma Gaṇeṣa Boḍasa, with commentaries (Bomcay: Ganpat Krishnaji Press, 1884 [cited by Saṅhitā name]), Dharmasaṅhitā 4. 4-10.

27. *Mahābhārata* XIII. 127. 26-38.

28. *Skanda Purāṇa* 7.2.9.151-163.

29. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.2.18.23; *Śiva Purāṇa*, Jñānasāṅhitā, 16.4.

particular, he becomes two-eyed, or the third eye in his forehead becomes a fabulous gem or a *tilaka* (an auspicious mark painted in vermilion on the forehead).³⁰

This process is a transformation, not a replacement; when the Mothers laid out ornaments suitable for marriage Śiva rejected them, and his own apparel underwent a change, becoming suitable for a bridegroom:

The eye that blazed in the middle of his forehead,
its pupil red and yellow from the fire within,
performed the office of a *tilaka*
made of golden pigment.³¹

Śiva transforms himself in this way not for the sake of his bride, who would accept him anyway, but for the representative of the conventional world: his mother-in-law, Menā. First, in order to destroy her bride, he reveals himself in his three-eyed form: then, when she is suitably humbled, he reappears in glorious but conventional form, and Menā rejoices to see him.³² Brahmā states the reason for this transformation when he approaches Śiva before the wedding and says:

“Śiva, this is your highest form, beloved of yogins, your form that is streaked with ashes, four-armed. You should reabsorb this form and assume a lovelier, gentler one, so that your father and mother-in-law will rejoice to see how handsome you are, and so that no woman will be frightened of you.” Then Śiva assumed an anthropomorphic form, with two arms.³³

Similarly, the Mothers at the wedding urge him to behave like a handsome young lover in order to please Menā.³⁴

Often, Śiva appears with both traditional and ascetic garments in order to please the different levels of his worshipers. When he comes to visit Himālaya, the father of Pārvatī, he appears

30. *Kālikā Purāṇa* (Bombay: Venkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1891) 46, 44-48; *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.3.39.38.

31. *Kumārasambhava* 7.33; cf. *Śiva Purāṇa*, Jñānasamhitā, 16. 5.

32. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.3. 43-46; *Śiva Purāṇa*, Jñānasamhitā, 18. 17-31.

33. *Mahābhāgavata Purāṇa* (Bombay: Gujurati Printing Press, 1913), 27. 19-27.

34. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.3. 50,35.

with three eyes ; but when Menā enters, he appears to her with a pair of lotus eyes.³⁵ In another text, Brahmā again convinces Śiva to change his form for the sake of the Goddess, and he changes him into a second Kāma :

When Brahmā saw the beauty of the Goddess he thought :
 “A woman should not reign alone. Only Śiva can be her husband, but he has three eyes. She who is so auspicious must somehow choose him even though he is inauspicious.” Then Śiva appeared before Brahmā with a divine body and divine garments, with beauty great enough to enchant the universe. Brahmā thought him a suitable husband for the Goddess ; she saw Śiva and thought him to be Kāma incarnate, and she was overcome with desire for him.³⁶

Yet, from the more devout viewpoint, ornaments of Śiva are considered superior rather than inferior to the conventional ones. Although Śiva must actually transform his horrible adornments into their beautiful counterparts before the ordinary worshipper will accept him,³⁷ Pārvatī rejoices even at the first frightening description of him,³⁸ for she sees him in his true form from the beginning. The Hindu view of eroticism and the ascetic tradition which Pārvatī herself embraces—for she lays aside her own royal jewels and wears the bark garments of the female ascetic in order to win the love of Śiva—combine to depict the ascetic costume as more erotic than the conventional one. She accepts the third eye of Śiva not because it is like a *tilaka* or a fabulous gem in a diadem, but because a god who has an eye in his forehead is far more wonderful than one who wears ordinary jewels, and in her eyes the eventual transformation is no more than a revelation of what she had seen all along.

VI. The third eye—untransformed.

In this way, several of the Purāṇas describe the “transformation” from her point of view; the objects are not changed into

35. *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* 4.38.57 ; 4.39.12.

36. *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* (Bombay ; Venkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1857), 4.14. 15-29.

37. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.3.45. 3-7.

38. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.3.8.13.

their conventional counterparts, but are rather considered to substitute for them as they are:

The Seven Mothers came to adorn Śiva in the conventional way (*yathāyogya*m). But how can anything be done for one who is perfect? Śiva's own natural garb [*svābhāviko veśo*] became a kind of adornment. The third eye was a lovely *tilaka*. By Śiva's power, all his natural [*prākṛta*] qualities were transformed. It is difficult to describe the beauty of such a form.³⁹

The commentator on these verses (like the author of a second version⁴⁰) sees—wrongly, I think—an actual and therefore far less marvellous transformation: "The third eye became a *tilaka*." He reads "conventional" (*laukika*m) for "natural," and interprets the transformation as one from the common to the royal rather than from the royal to the magical, as the primary Purāṇa version itself describes it. Other texts substantiate the point of view that the ornaments remain unchanged: Śiva appears three-eyed, lovely in all his limbs;⁴¹ at the wedding, the sun, moon, and fire shine forth from his three eyes.⁴² Here, as in Kālidāsa's description, Śiva rejects the conventional ornaments offered to him and adorns himself only with his ascetic qualities.

For Pārvatī, who loves him as he is, this is entirely sufficient. Similarly, the manner in which true love or insight "transforms" the horrible ornaments even while they remain unchanged is illustrated by two verses which describe the baby Skanda playing with his father, Śiva. Here the strangeness and terror of Śiva lend a striking contrast to the air of tenderness, playfulness, and humor which, though bordering on the grotesque in Western eyes, do not jar the Indian sense of affection or devotion:

May Guha [Skanda] save you from misfortune,
who rolls at will upon his father's chest
until his limbs are whitened from the funeral ash;
who from the headdress then dives deep into the Ganges

39. Śiva Purāṇa Jñānasamh tā, 16. 3-8.

40. Śiva Purāṇa 2.3.39.36-42.

41. Śiva Purāṇa 2.2.17.4.

42. Padma Purāṇa (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 131, 1893) 5.40.435;
Matsya Purāṇa (Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 54, 1907) 154.441.

at the coldness of whose stream he cries aloud,
 till trembling and with chattering teeth
 he holds his hands before the blazing eye.⁴³
 ... Thinking the forehead eye a lotus flower,
 he tries to pry it open.
 May Skanda thus intent on play
 within his father's arms protect you.⁴⁴

The eye itself is ambiguous; the *Śiva Purāṇa* describes how, after burning Kāma to ashes with his fiery glance, Śiva then revived him by gazing upon him with his Soma glance, the glance made of the elixir of immortality.⁴⁵ These and many other overtones of the third eye all play a part in the mythology of Śiva. The interrelationship of these aspects is beautifully expressed by a verse in the *Skanda Purāṇa*:

May the three eyes of Śiva protect you
 when at the time of his meditation they are divided into
 three moods:
 one is closed in yogic meditation;
 the second, however, lusts greatly
 while looking at the hips and breasts of Pārvatī;
 and the third blazes with the fire of anger against Kāma,
 who has thrown his bow far away.⁴⁶

Summary

The third eye of Śiva is the emblem of his ascetic power; flames issue forth from it to destroy Kāma, the god of desire. Yet throughout the mythology of the purāṇas this eye appears in erotic contexts, serves erotic purposes, and has various erotic origins. At the wedding of Śiva and Parvatī it is described by certain texts as having been transformed into a *tilaka*; other versions of this myth state rather that, unchanged, it served as a *tilaka*. In this way, various connotations—some of them apparently contradictory—are seen to be symbolized by the third eye.

43. *Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa* 91, translated by Ingalls, *op. cit.*

44. *Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa* 92, translated by Ingalls, *op. cit.*

45. *Śiva Purāṇa* 2.3.51.14.

46. *Skanda Purāṇa* 5.3.150.18.

A PAURĀNIC ICONOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF
THE IMAGE OF SARASVATĪ

BY

MOHD. ISRAIL KHAN

[लेखेऽस्मिन् सरस्वत्या वैदिकदेवतायाः प्रतिमानिर्माणविधि-
सिद्धान्तप्रक्रियासम्बन्धे यत् पौराणिकं वर्णनमुपलभ्यते तस्य सयुक्तिकं
विवेचनं कृतं वर्तते । ऋक्संहितायां नदी, ब्राह्मणग्रन्थेषु वाक्, पुराणेषु
पूर्णव्यक्तित्वयुता देवी, इत्थं सरस्वतीपदमनेकार्थपरम् । पुराणेष्वेव
तत्प्रतिमायाः स्वरूपप्रकारादीनां च विशिष्टवर्णनमुपलभ्यते । यथा अग्नि-
पुराणे (अ. ४९-५५), मत्स्यपुराणे (अ. २५८-६४), विष्णुधर्मोत्तर-
पुराणे च (ख. ३ अ. ४४) देवानां प्रतिमायाः निरूपणं कृतमस्ति ।
मत्स्यपुराणे (२६०-४४) ब्रह्मणः प्रतिमायाः पार्श्वे सरस्वतीसावित्री-
प्रतिमयोरेवंविधो निर्माणप्रकारः प्रदर्शितः—‘आज्यस्थालीं न्यसेत्पार्श्वे
वेदांश्च चतुरः पुनः । वामपार्श्वेऽस्य सावित्रीं दक्षिणे च सरस्वतीम् ।’
इत्यादि । पुराणगतनियमानामंशतः पालनं शिल्पकलाशास्त्रे परिलक्ष्यते
इत्यादि सोदाहरणमत्र निर्दिष्टं वर्तते । प्रतिमानिर्मितिचिचारानां तेषां
प्रयोगश्चातिप्राचीन इति पुराणतः परिज्ञातं भवति । एतच्चाम्बुवीचिनुपेण
निर्मापितमृत्प्रतिमया प्रमाणितं भवति, वामनपुराणमपि (Cr. Edn.
स. मा. १९.४) प्रमाणभूतमत्र । एवं पुराणकाले देवी-देवानां प्रतिमा-
संबन्धे शिल्पशास्त्रीयाः विचाराः ‘दशताल’ प्रक्रिया प्रभृतयः सन्ति हि
श्रेष्ठतमा सारगभिताश्च । यथा (मानसार ५४.१०) ‘सरस्वतीं च
सावित्रीं च दशतालेन कारयेदि’ ति महत्त्वपूर्णां विचारः प्रयोगश्च प्रचर-
ति स्म । सरस्वत्याः स्वरूपतत्प्रतीकात्मकताऽपि लेखकेन प्रदर्शिताऽस्ति ।
अस्या आपोमयत्व-‘वीणापुस्तकधारिणी’-‘वाग्वैसरस्वती-पञ्च कृतिषु
गणना इत्यादीनां गूढविचारानां सोद्देश्यता सार्थकता वा यथावत्
व्यंजिता यत् प्राचीनपरम्पराऽनुगुणमेव । तत्तद्विषयाणां वर्णनवैविध्यम्,
जैन-बौद्धवर्णनैश्च तेषां सादृश्यं प्रदर्श्य लेखकेनात्र शास्त्रीयं मतमेव
प्रतिपादितम् ।]

In the *Rgveda*, there are many references which beyond doubt
of shadow, prove Sarasvatī to be a river¹. In the *Brāhmaṇas*,

1. Cf. *RV.* I. 3.12; II. 41.16; III. 23.4; V. 42.12, 43.11; VI. 52.6; VII.
36.6, 96. 1-2; VIII. 21. 17-18, 54.4; X. 17.7, 64.9, 75.5 etc.

we find her identified with speech completely 'vāg vai sarasvatī'¹ But a landmark in development has been paved towards the iconographical character of the goddess in her entering the Purāṇic era. It is the Purāṇas which at first have anthropomorphised her to the fullest extent and offer to us several iconographical references to her. In the following, it is observed in detail.

1. The prescription for the Image of Sarasvatī :

Among the Purāṇas the *Agni*, *Matsya* and *Viṣṇudhormottara* in particular deal with this prominently. The *Agni Purāṇa* spares its chapters 49-55 on laying down the prescriptions for the images of the various gods and goddesses. In its chapter 49 while describing the image of Brahmā, it lays down that the image of Sarasvatī and Sāvitrī should be respectively at the left and right sides of the Brahmā's image 'ājyasthālī Sarasvatī Sāvitrī vāmadakṣiṇe.'²

Like the *Agni-Purāṇa*, the *Matsya-Purāṇa* maintains the same formula ; and for it, it devotes chapters 258-64. Like the *Agni-Purāṇa*, it prescribes how the image of Sarasvatī and Sāvitrī should be made with Brahmā. It goes on saying that Brahmāṇī (Sarasvatī as either wife or daughter of Brahmā) should be made like Brahmā in all respects to his recognition of iconic features—'brahmāṇī brahmasadrśī.'³ As to the image of Brahmā, it says that it should be made of four heads and there should a water-vessel (kamaṇḍalu) in one of his hands. He should be made riding a swan or seated on a lotus.⁴ The image should have a site for oblations of ghee. It should have the four Vedas to its right. To

1. Cf. *Śat. Br.* II. 5.4.6; III. 1.4.9, 14, 9.1.7, 9; IV. 2.5.14, 6.33; V. 2.2.13, 14, 3.4.3, 5.4.16; VII. 5.1.31; IX. 3.4.17; XIII. 1.8.5; XIV. 2.1.12.

Taitt. Br. I. 3.4.5, 8.5.6; III. 8.11.2.

Ait. Br. II. 24; 3.1-2, 37; 6.7.

Tāṇḍa Br. XVI.5.16.

Gop. Br. II. 1.20.

Śūn. Br. V. 2; XII. 8; XIV. 4.

2. *AP.* 49.15.

3. *MP.* 261.24.

4. *MP.* 269.40.

its left there should be the image of Sāvitrī and to right that of Sarasvatī.¹

Like the *Agni* and *Matsya Purāṇas*, the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* spares its Third Khaṇḍa exclusively for iconic description. In Adhyāya 44 of this Purāṇa, Brahmā has been pictured as sitting in the lotus-posture (Padmāsana) and has Sāvitrī placed on his left lap.² The striking feature of this description is the absence of Sarasvatī who has been represented with Sāvitrī by the *Agni* as well as the *Matsya-Purāṇa*.

There remains not only a mere Purāṇic theory, but it has also taken econographical form. The dual image of Brahmā and Sarasvatī found in the Mathura Sculpture, shows partial acceptance of the formulas laid down by the Purāṇas³—partial, because sometimes the *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa* has been followed in depicting only Sāvitrī with Brahmā. But such distinction does not always prevail. An obvious attempt has been made at wiping out a distinction and the two goddesses are given their proper places by depicting both of them with Brahmā. This feature is available in some of the famous sculptures like “Mirpur Khas in Sindha”⁴ and “the early Chola and late Hoysala Schools”⁵.

Besides, the Purāṇas themselves let us believe that in the Purāṇic age, the theory of image-making had already been put into practice. This is evident from the following instances. Once the king Ambuvīci, after having known the great powers of Sarasvatī, had a great regard in his heart for her and consequently, taking the clay out of the Sarasvatī river, made an earthen image (Pratimā) of her.⁶ Similarly in the *Vāmana-Purāṇa*, Sarasvatī has been said to

1. *MP.* 260.44.

“आज्यस्थालीं न्यसेत्पाश्वे वेदांश्च चतुरः पुनः ।

वामपाश्वेऽस्य सावित्रीं दक्षिणे च सरस्वतीम् ॥

2. Cf. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa*, Third-Khaṇḍa, Vol. II (Baroda, 1961), p. 140.

3. Cf. Brindavan C. Bhattacharya, *Indian Image*, Part I, (Calcutta), p. 13.

4. Jitendra Nath Banerjea, *The Development of Hindu Iconography*, (Calcutta University, 1956), p. 518.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 518.

6. *SkP.* VI. 46. 16-17.

have been installed in the form of linga at the Sthāṇu-tīrtha by Śiva himself.¹ These instances will suffice to lead us to assume that in the Purāṇic age, we find not only allusions to the iconic features of various gods and goddesses, but we also witness that these were, by and by, translated into real iconography.

2. The Face

In iconography face attains very great importance. It is this alone through which the whole image is 'measured out. According to the *Mānasāra*, the image of Sarasvatī should be made in accordance with the daśatāla system —“sarasvatīm ca sāvitrīm daśatālen karyet”.² The daśatāla system is taken to be the supreme one among tālamānas—Navatāla, Aṣṭatāla, Saptatāla, etc., and according to all these measurement systems, the whole image (Pratimā) should be ten times the face. This daśatāla system is again divided into the three categories according to its height giving the measurement the various names such as Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama daśatālas. As per rule, the largest daśatāla system divides the whole length of the image into 124 proportionally equal parts, the Madhyama into 120 and Adhama into 116.³ The method of making the face is detailed in the same Śilpaśāstra.⁴ The three varieties of daśatāla system have fully been discussed by Śrī Kumāra in the *Śilparatna*.⁵ As regards the measurement of aṅgulas, a detailed description is given in the *Mānasāra-Śilpaśāstra* by Prasanna kumar Acharya.⁶

1. *Vān. P. S. M.* 19.4

“यत्रैष्ट्वा भगवान्स्थाणुः पूजयित्वा सरस्वतीम् ।
स्थापयामास देवेशो लिङ्गाकारां सरस्वतीम् ॥”

2. *Mān AS.* 54/19.

3. Prasanna Kumar Acharya, *Indian Architecture according to Mānasāra-Śilpaśāstra*, (New York, 1927), pp. 78, 123.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 84.

“The face is taken as the standard of the tāla measurement and is generally twelve aṅgulas or about nine inches in length. The face is stated to be of vocal shape (Kukkuṭaṅḍa-sāmākāra, lit., ‘shaped like the egg of a hen’).....”

5. *Śil R.* 5.1-114. $\frac{1}{2}$; 6.1-11. $\frac{1}{2}$; 7.1-42. $\frac{1}{2}$.

6. Prasanna Kumar Acharya, *A Summary of the Mānasāra* (A paper submitted to the Lieden University for Ph.D. Degree), p. 35. The paramāṇu or atom is the smallest unit of measurement.

8 Paramāṇu = 1 rathadhūli (lit. ear-dust).

8 Rathadhūlis = 1 bālāgra (lit. hair's end).

This is the detailed description of the face which has a impressive recognition in iconography. But so far as the Purāṇas are concerned, they actually do not go such a farther extent in connection with the face of a diety. While describing the face of Goddess Sarasvatī, they vary to a great extent. Like her father Brahmā, she is often mentioned as having upto five faces. According to the *Matsya-Purāṇa*¹, like Brahmā, Brahmāṇī should have four faces. Similarly in the *Vāyu-Purāṇa*, she is described as having four heads.² According to the *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa*, Sarasvatī has only one face.³

Śrī Sūtradhāra Maṇḍana in his *Rūpamaṇḍana*, has described forms of Sarasvatī, namely Mahāvidyā and Sarasvatī. There Mahavidyā is said to have one face (Ekavakra)⁴. Moreover, like Brahma, Sarasvatī has also been depicted to have five faces. In this form she has been named 'Śāradā'⁵.

Sarasvatī in Buddhism has some features similar and some dissimilar those of Brahmanic Sarasvatī while describing the farmer's iconic character, it is emphasised that she may have either one or three faces.⁶ Like her, Vajrasarasvatī has also three faces 'Vajrasarasvatīm Śrīmukhām.'⁷

8 Bālagras	=	1 likshā	(lit. a nit).
8 Likshās	=	1 Yūkā	(lit. a lause).
8 Yūkās	=	1 Yava	(lit. a barley corn)
8 Yavas	=	1 aṅgulas	(lit. finger's breadth).

Three kinds of aṅgulas are distinguished by the largest of which is made of 8 Yavas, the intermediate of 7 Yavas, and the smallest one of 6 Yavas."

1. *MP.* 261. 24.

2. *VP.* 23.50.

“सैषा भगवती देवी तत्प्रसूतिः स्वयम्भुवः ।

चतुर्मुखी जगद्योनिः प्रकृतिगौः प्रकीर्तिता ॥”

3. cf. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

4. Śrī Sūtradhāra Maṇḍana, *Rūpamaṇḍana*, (Vārāṇasī, Samvat 2021), p. 88.

5. cf. H. Krishna Shastri, *South Indian Image of Gods and Goddesses*, (Madras, 1916), p. 187.

6. Binaytosh Bhattacharya, *The Buddhist Iconography* (Calcutta, 1958), p. 349.

7. *Sādḥ M.* 163.

3. The Implication of the Faces.

Now the implication of one and four faces are to be seen. It is held that her face represents either Sāvitrī or Gāyatrī.¹ At one place in the *R̥gveda*, Sarasvatī is called 'Saptasvasā'² having the seven metres as her sisters where Gāyatrī is chief among them. All these metres separately or jointly symbolize not only the metres of the Veda, but actually they may be taken as symbolizing the Veda as a whole. This sense of one face of Sarasvatī tally with the fact that Vāk is said to have been issued from Brahmā's mouth.³ This Vāk may be said as symbolizing the Veda; and Sarasvatī, who is prominently described in the Purāṇas as Vāk or Vāgdevī or the presiding deity of speech, may be said as having embodied Veda herself. Similarly the four faces of hers may also be taken as symbolising the four Vedas in the same way as the four faces of Brahmā represent the four Vedas.⁴

In the Purāṇas, it is widely held that Brahmā has created the whole universe. For this creation, he had a pre-planning through his mind or intellect. This mind or intellect is nothing but the Veda itself which bears the cosmic feature endowed with four-fold nature.⁵ This sense goes to the four Vedas and mind can be replaced by the four-fold nature or creation. So the four faces of Brahmā imply the four Vedas. Similarly the four faces of Sarasvatī undoubtedly stand for the same fact, for she also is said as creating the universe.

So far as the three faces are concerned, they may be taken as implying the three principal Vedas—*R̥gveda*, *Yajurveda* and *Sāmaveda* exclusive *Atharvaveda* which is supposed to be a later compendium. That is why she is called 'Trayī Vidyā' representing these three Vedas. She in fact represents all the Vidyās—namely

1. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

2. *RV.* VI. 61.10.

“उत नः प्रिया प्रियासु सप्तस्वसा सुजुष्टा । सरस्वती स्तोम्या भूत् ॥”

3. *Bhā. P.* III. 12.26; also cf. *B.P.*, I. 3.54.57.

4. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

“The four faces of Brahman represent the four Vedas; the eastern *R̥gveda*, the southern *Yajurveda*, the the western *Sāmaveda* and the northern *Atharvaveda*”.

5. Vasudeva S. Agrawala, *Matsya Purāṇa—A study*, (Varanasi, 1963), pp. 15, 28,

Yajñavidyā, Mahāvidyā, Guhyavidyā, Ātmavidyā, Ānvikṣikī, Trayī, Vārtā and Daṇḍanīti¹

The conception of the five faces of Sarasvatī may be extended to the five Vedas in which *Nātyaśāstra* is included according to the new conception of the fifth Veda. Perhaps it has been reckoned so, because it embraces all the branches of arts and sciences². So this fifth Veda may be said to represent one of the faces of Sarasvatī obviously with the fact that she (Sarasvatī) is also said to represent the various arts and sciences³ and, therefore, appropriately is called 'sarvasangītasandhānatālakāraṇarūpiṇī'.⁴

4. The number of her hands and the objects held by them.

The number of hands of Sarasvatī differs from place to place in the Purāṇas. It is really very interesting to take them all into account. In the Purāṇas, Sarasvatī is mostly alluded to as having four hands. But by some of her Purāṇic epithets like 'Vīṇāpustakadhāriṇī'⁵, she seems to have two hands having a lute (Vīṇā) and a book (Pustaka). The *Matsya-Purāṇa*, while prescribing certain rules for making the images of the various gods and goddesses states that Sarasvatī like Brahmā, should be made as having four hands.⁶ Like the *Matsya*, the *Agni-Purāṇa* also prescribes that the image of goddess Sarasvatī should be made as having a book (Pustaka), a rosary (Akṣamālā), a lute (Vīṇā) and a water-vessel (Kumbhābja) in her respective hands.⁷

In the *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa*, as in the other Purāṇas, a number of references puts forth her iconic character. At one place, she is described as having four hands. In her two right hands, she holds a book and a rosary, while in her two left hands she bears a water-vessel and a lute.⁸ Elsewhere also she is pictured

1. *Viṣ.* P. I. 9.120-21, *Pd.* P.V. 27.118, also cf. Ramaprasad Chomda, *The Indo-Aryan Races, A study of The Origin of the Indo-Aryan people and Institutions*, (Rajshahi, 1916), pp. 228-330.
2. *Nūt Ś.* I. 15-6.
3. I. Dowson, *A classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology*, (London, 1961), p. 284.
4. *BVP.* II. 1.34.
5. *BVP.* II. 1. 35, 2. 55.
6. *MP.* 261.24.
7. *AP.* 50. 16.
8. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *op. cit.*, p. 225

as having four hands, but the order of the emblems held in the right and the left hands differs. In the latter case, Sarasvatī is depicted as having a rosary and a trident in her two right hands and a book and a water-vessel in her left hands.¹ Thus Trident has been given in the place of lute (Vīṇā). At another place, she is mentioned as usual to have a book and a rosary in her right hands and 'Vaiṇavī' and a water-vessel in her left hands.² The word 'Vaiṇavī' has been read by Dr. Kramrisch as 'Vaiṣṇavī'³ and by Dr. Priyabala Shah as the staff of Vīṇā made of bamboo.⁴

Besides, Sarasvatī has been reckoned one of the five Prakṛtis.⁵ The *Vāyu-Purāṇa* while describing her as the Prakṛti Gau, presents her as having four mouths, four horns, four teeth, four eyes and four hands.⁶ Since she herself is the prakṛti gau, all the animals are born under her impression as four-footed and four-breasted.⁷

In the *Skanda-Purāṇa*, an earthen image is said to have been made by the king Ambuvīci. That image is described to have four hands with a lotus, rosary, water-vessel and a book in the respective hands⁸. This shows the fulfilment of the rules laid down by the Purāṇas, according to which the image of goddess Sarasvatī would have been made.

In Jainism, most of the Vidyādevīs are four-handed; while in the Buddhism, the case differs. The Buddhistic Sarasvatī is said to have either two arms or six arms, and in case she is two armed,

1. *Ibid.*, p. 327.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 154.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 154. f.n. 1.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 154 c. "The word Vaiṇavī requires some classification. I have amended the reading Vaiṇavī into Vīṇaiva because Sarasvatī is traditionally known to carry Vīṇā and not a flute of bamboo which is the usual meaning of the word Vaiṇavī. On further, however, I find that it is not necessary to change the reading into Vīṇaiva because, the word Vaiṇavī does not mean Vīṇā. It indicates the staff of Vīṇā which must have been made of bamboo as in the case of the present 'Ekatāra'.

5. *BVP.* II. 1. 1 ff.

6. *VP.* 23. 44-45.

7. *VP.* 23. 88.

8. *SKP.* VI. 46. 16-19,

she has her four forms under different names.¹ She is also said to have eight² and even ten arms.³

5. The implication of the objects held in the hands

The four arms of Sarasvatī, like her four faces, represent the four Vedas⁴, and Kamaṇḍalu represents, the nectar of all Śāstras⁵. Since she symbolises the entire knowledge she symbolises all the Śāstras, too. She holds a book in one of her hands and this also conveys the same sense⁶. The *Skanda-Purāṇa* VI. 46. 19, while defining the book in the one of the hands of Sarasvatī says 'pustakaṃ ca tathā vāme sarvavidyāsamudbhavam.' Since other concepts of Sarasvatī have developed⁷ from her watery form, e.g. Sarasvatī as a river, it is also maintained that Sarasvatī has created all the tanmātrās⁸ which are but essential for the creation of the Universe and of which water is one. As prakṛti, she is advocated to have created the Universe⁹. The water is fundamentally necessary for this purpose. It is, perhaps, for this reason that she has water in her water-vessel and thus by it, she, perhaps, also denotes her earliest association with water. This water may not be thought of an ordinary type. It is divine (divya) and it is only in this capacity that it may be thought to have been kept in the water-vessel of Sarasvatī.¹⁰

Similarly the lute (Vīṇā) held by Sarasvatī is also not less important. It is held that the lute represents a kind of achievement or proficiency.¹¹ This close relation of the lute and the book cannot be ignored. Sarasvatī, no doubt, represents the principles of speech and for this very reason, she has been identified with speech (vāg vai sarasvatī) in the Brāhmaṇas. Now, this speech can

-
1. cf. Benoytosh Bhattacharya, *op. cit.*, pp. 349-51.
 2. *Vaik R.* 15.
 3. H. Krishna Śāstrī, *op. cit.*, p. 187.
 4. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *op. cit.*, p. 184.
 5. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
 6. *Ibid.*, p. 186.
 7. cf. James Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion And Ethics*, Vol. II, (New York, 1954), p. 196.
 8. cf. Vasudev S. Agrawal, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
 9. cf. *BVP*. II. 1. 1. ff.
 10. *SKP*. VI. 46. 19.
 11. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

reasonably be divided into sound (dhvani) and word (pada, vākya etc.,). The book in the hand of Sarasvatī may also be taken to represent besides what is said above, the second element while the lute in her hand represents the first element. Only the lute, and no other musical instrument has been described in the hand of the goddess. The lute is the most ancient musical instrument and finds mention in the *Aitāreya Āraṇyaka*. Melody helps mental concentration. The lute is the best instrument resorted to for this purpose, because it is highly useful for producing Soma song.¹ Moreover the goddess is said to have a rosary in one of her hands. This rosary in the hand of the goddess usually represents Time.²

Abbreviations

Ait. Br.	Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa
A P.	Agni-Purāṇa
Bv P.	Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa
Bhā. P.	Bhāgavata-Purāṇa
D. Bhā.	Devī Bhāgavata-Purāṇa
Gop. Br.	Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa
M P.	Matsya-Purāṇa
Mān. Ā S.	Mānasāra on Architecture and Sculpture
Nāt. Ś.	Nātya-Śāstra
Pd. P.	Padma-Purāṇa
R. V.	R̥gveda
Śat. Br.	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
Śāñ. Br.	Śāñkhāyana-Brāhmaṇa
Sādh. M.	Sādhana-Mālā
Śil. R.	Śilparatna
Sk P.	Skanda-Purāṇa
Taitt. Br.	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa
Tāṇḍ. Br.	Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa
V. P.	Vāyu-Purāṇa
Vām. P.	Vāmana-Purāṇa
Viak. R.	Vaikṛta-Rahasya
Viṣ. P.	Viṣṇu-Purāṇa

1. cf. *D. Bhā.* III. 30. 2.

2. Dr. Priyabala Shah, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

22. Bhattacharya B.C.,—Indian Image, Part. I, Thaker Sprink & Co. Calcutta.

The Jain Iconography, Motilal Banarasidass, 1939.

23. Bhattacharya, B.—Buddhist Iconography, Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1958.

24. Chand, R.—The Indo-Aryan Races, A Study of the Origin of the Indo-Aryan People & Insitutions Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, 1916.

25. Dikshitar, V.R.R.—The Purāṇa-Index, Vols. I, II & III, Madras University. 1951-52, 55.

26. Dowon, J.—A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology, Rousledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1961.

27. Hastings, J.—Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics, Vol. II, T. & T. Clark, New York, 1954.

28. Maṇḍana, S.—Rupamaṇḍana, Motilal Banarasidas, Vārānasī, Sam. 2021.

29. Muni, B.—Nāṭya-Śāstra, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1956.

30. Shah, P.—Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇā, Third-Khaṇḍa, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1961.

31. Śāstrī, H. K.—South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses, Madras. Government Press, 1916.

32. Śrī, K.—Śilparatna, Part. II, Government Press, Trivendram, 1929.

A HITHERTO UNKNOWN MANUSCRIPT OF THE SVARGA-
KHAṆḌA OF THE BENGAL RECENSION—ITS CHARAC-
TER AND IMPORTANCE

BY

ASHOKE CHATTERJEE

[निबन्धेऽस्मिन् विदुषा लेखकेन पद्मपुराणस्थस्वर्गखण्डस्य वङ्गीयपाठस्य
अद्यावधि अज्ञाता एका हस्तप्रतिः या श्यामाचरणकविरत्नमहोदयस्य
पुस्तकालयतः उपलब्धा परीक्षिता । सम्प्रति पद्मपुराणे पञ्चपञ्चाशत्
सहस्रश्लोकाः उपलभ्यन्ते । अस्य पुराणस्य विभागस्तु खण्डेषु कृतो
वर्तते । लेखकमहोदयेन प्रमाणपुरस्सरं स्थापितं यदादौ इदं पुराणं
द्वादशसहस्रश्लोकात्मकमासीदस्य विभागस्तु पर्वसु कृत आसीत् । स्वर्ग-
खण्डस्य अष्ट हस्तलेखा उपलब्धा वर्तन्ते । तेषु विवेच्यो हस्तलेखः
अधिकः प्रमाणिकः प्राचीनश्च इति नानाप्रमाणैः पुष्टीकृतम् ।]

Although the Padma-purāṇa in its entirety has been printed and published by five different scholars, yet the conclusion is irresistible that it has never been critically edited. It is a voluminous work consisting of extensive parts called Khaṇḍas which are five in number in the Bengal recension, i. e. Sṛṣṭi, Bhūmi, Svarga, Pātāla and Uttāra and six in Devanāgarī recension which replaces the Svarga by Ādi (called Svarga in the Veākateśvara Press edition) and Brahma. But although it has been published more than once, none represents the proper Bengal recension of it. There are reasons to believe that the Bengal recension of the Padma-purāṇa had perhaps a distinct text of its own which was in course of time not traceable on account of the overwhelming superiority of its Devanāgarī counterparts. At present there are some chapters of some Khaṇḍas which distinguish the two recensions of it. But the Svarga-Khaṇḍa in its entirety stands an exception to it. Remaining completely unrecognised in the Devanāgarī recension of it, this Khaṇḍa is a distinct text of varied interest. Its main importance lies in the fact that it may or may not possibly be regarded as the source of Kālidāsa's famous drama Abhijñānaśakuntalā. It is Prof. Winternitz who has first created interest in the minds of scholars with regard to the position and

importance of the Svarga-Khaṇḍa. He has remarked, "It will not be possible to decide the question of the source of Śakuntalā drama finally, as long as we do not possess a reliable text of the Padma-purāṇa and as long as it is not possible to make a thorough comparison of the two texts "

The Svarga-Khaṇḍa has never been published. and so far as our information goes eight complete manuscripts of it are traceable. Of these, two belong to the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, one to the National Library, Calcutta, one to the Sahitya Parisat Library, Calcutta, one to the Samskr̥ta Sikṣā Parisat, Calcutta, one to the Dacca University Library, East Pakistan one to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the last to the Staatsbibliothek, Marburg, West Germany.

We have had the opportunity to examine all these manuscripts in details. But quite recently we have been able to secure another manuscript of the Svarga-Khaṇḍa which we have reasons to believe, decidedly preserves the older text. This was found in the private collections of Pandit Shyamacharan Kaviratna, Howrah.¹ This is complete in 107 folios. But on account of the fault in numbering of some of the pages the last page is numbered 105 instead of 107. The error is first seen in page 22 where there is double numbering 22 and 20. Of these the latter was originally written but afterwards corrected as 22. Similar is the case with page 23 which bears an old but erroneous number 21. From this page no attempt has whatsoever been made to correct the numbering of the pages. This false numbering has been allowed to continue. It is all the more curious to note that the numbering of 38 is 36 as usual but there was another numbering of this page also which was 35 instead of 38. This numbering of 35 has been wiped out. From pages 93 to 107, there are always the double numbering one is from 91 to 105 the other is curiously one higher, i. e., from 92-106.

It is written on country made paper in Bengali character with nine lines (3+3+3) in each page. The page 105a, however, contains ten lines (3+4+3). Pages 47 and 76a also contain ten

1. We are grateful to Sri Bslai Chandra Banerjee, Govt. Pleader, Howrah, who has kindly lent it to me for examination from the private collection of his grandfather, pandit Kaviratna.

Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. The text is arranged in several paragraphs, but the characters are too light and blurry to transcribe accurately.

lines but that extra line denotes entirely later additions. Its size is 16 2×5·2. It is in good condition. It begins with Om śrī śrī hariḥ' and its post colophon is as follows.

Yatnena likhitaṃ granthaṃ yaś corayati mānavaḥ/
mātā ca śūkarī tasya pitā tasya ca gardabhaḥ//
śrīr-astu lekhake pāṭhake ca

Following are the grounds for considering it as preserving an earlier text.

In addition to the Khaṇḍas already mentioned above, there are innumerable treatises which though being originally independent claim to be parts of the Padma-purāṇa. It is due to the huge mass of it, the Vāyu-purāṇa, Matsya-purāṇa and some other Purāṇas state that the Padma-purāṇa consists of 55000 ślokas. But a careful examination of the present Padma-purāṇa shows that originally it consisted neither of such a huge bulk nor of distinct parts called Khaṇḍas. At one place in the Padma-purāṇa it is found that the whole of the Padma-purāṇa was spoken out by Marīci for Vyāsa's sake in five parts called parvans. Of these five parvans, the first dealt with the origin of Virāj, the second dealt with all the planets and the mountains, continents and seven oceans, the third contained the accounts of those Kings who paid large amount of money as priestly fees, and also treated of the creation by Rudra and the curse of Dakṣa, the fourth dealt with the origin of Kings and with the history of all the royal families and the fifth treated of the nature of final liberation and the way of attaining it.

That the Padma-purāṇa in its earlier form with the Parva division and with Brahmā and Marīci as interlocutors, was a much shorter work is shown not only by the above quoted rendering of the verses in which the Padma-purāṇa is said to have been spoken out briefly in five parvans but also by the Agni-purāṇa and the Bhūmi-Khaṇḍa of the present Padma-purāṇa. The Agni-purāṇa says (272.2).

Vaiśākhyāṃ paurṇamāsyāṃ ca svargārthī jaladhenumat/
padmam dvādaśa-sāhasraṃ jyaiṣṭhe dadyāc ca dhenumat//

It is clear that it knows a Padma-purāṇa consisting of 12000 verses. The Bhūmi-Khaṇḍa says that the Padma-purāṇa consisted of 12000 verses in the Kaliyuga, that the entire Purāṇa of 12000

verses would perish in the Kali age and that this work would again come into being for the first time in that age (Bhūmi-Khaṇḍa, 125. 43-45).

This fact that the Padma-purāṇa was probably not such voluminous as it appears to be is also corroborated by the evidence of the Bengal manuscripts of the Uttara-Khaṇḍa, the necessary passages of which are as follows:

dvādaśātha sahasrāṇi pāṣaṇḍāpahṛtāni vai/
kalau nāśaṃ prayāsyanti prathamam dvijasattamaḥ//
vinā dvādaśa sāhasra padmānyapi mahāphalam/
kalau yuge paṭhiṣyanti purāṇaṃ padmasaṃjñakam//

It is to be noted that though the writer of these verses made an attempt to give the present amplified text of the Padma-purāṇa a garb of greater antiquity, he has not denied the loss of the 12000 śloka belonging to this work.

So it is evident that the Padma-Purāṇa in its earlier form was much shorter and had its division known as the Parvans. We become all the more interested when we read and carefully examine this newly discovered manuscript. On two occasions its colophon distinctly mentions its Parva division, reads 'ityādi mahāpurāṇe pādme tṛtīye parvaṇi svargakhaṇḍe śakuntale prathamo' dhyāyaḥ, and 'iti śrīpadmapurāṇe tṛtīye parvaṇi svargakhaṇḍe anukrama-varṇanaṃ nāmāṣṭātriṃśattamo' dhyāyaḥ. Not any of the eight manuscripts of the Svarga-khaṇḍa mentioned above refers or seem to refer to the earlier division, i. e., Parva division of it. They all along in each of their colophons testify to the presence only of the Khaṇḍa division of it. This seems that this newly discovered manuscript is an older one.

Secondly, we have carefully calculated the total number of the verses of the Svargakhaṇḍa. Taking into consideration nineteen verses of the 20th chapter the bulk of which is written in prose, the total number of it is 2875. The variant of number of these śloka is not more than 20 in all the cases. But the number of the śloka in this manuscript is much more than its counterpart. There is no numbering of śloka in each chapter; it may be nearing 2600. The contents of two entire chapters are conspicuous by their absence in it. These are no. 28 and no. 38. Thus while all other have 40 chapters, it has 38 chapters only. Besides these quite a

number of verses from different chapters of it are missing in this manuscript. This tends to suggest that this belongs to the comparatively early recension of the Padma-purāṇa which, as we have noticed above, consists of lesser number of verses.

Thirdly a careful examination of the Svargakhaṇḍa shows that it has derived quite a large number of chapters and isolated verses from the Mahābhārata. The following short analysis will show the indebtedness of the writer of the Svargakhaṇḍa to the compiler of the Mahābhārata.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 67, Verses 1-22 = Svargakhaṇḍa,
Chapter I, verse
44-64.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 67, Verses 23-33 = Svargakhaṇḍa,
Chapter II, verses
1-14.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 68, Verses 18-80 = Svargakhaṇḍa,
Chapter III, verses
42-103.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 69, Verses 1-27 = Svargakhaṇḍa,
Chapter IV, verses
1-23.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 69, Verses 38-49 = Svargakhaṇḍa,
Chapter VI, verses
1-12.

Mahābhārata (Āraṇyaka) Chapter 192
Verses 6-29
-do- Chapter 193 Verses 1-27 } Svargakhaṇḍa, Chapter
-do- Chapter 194 Verses 2-25 } XVII, verses 2-96.
-do- Chapter 195 Verses 1-33 }

-do- Chapter 130 Verses 17-20 } Svargakhaṇḍa, Chapter
-do- Chapter 131 Verses 1-30 } XVIII, verses 2-43

Mahābhārata (Droṇa),
Chapter 173 verses 20-33 = Svargakhaṇḍa, Chapter XX, verses
2-15 (after 79 lines of prose begins
the verse)

Mahābhārata (Āśvamedhika),
Chapter 5 Verses 3-26 } = Svargakhaṇḍa, Chapter
do Chapter 6 Verses 2-33 } XIX, verses 2-53

Mahābhārata Chapters 7 and 8 correspond to Chapter XX (including its prose portion)

do Chapter 9 corresponds to Chapter XXI
do Chapter 10 corresponds to Chapter XXI

It may be mentioned, however, that our manuscript in question is comparatively free from the influence of the Mahābhārata. At least at some places it uses comparatively less terms and terminologies, words and phrases of the Mahābhārata as compared to its eight other counterparts. A difference of it with other eight manuscripts so far as the Śakuntalā episode is concerned may be shown. It is needless to mention that all other eight manuscripts show much more remarkable affinity with the Mahābhārata than this one. The following chart will classify it :

This manuscript

Mahābhārata and other manuscripts

Chapter I

46c sarvarājyam

sarvaṃ rājyam

54a dharma

dharmya

Chapter II

1b āgamat

āśrayat

5d anindite

śakuntale

Chapter III

44a gūhayante

gūhamānā

46c kalpanam

kalyāṇam

57d ātmāpakāriṇā

ātmāpahāriṇā

61a cāsya

tasya

65b saṃprati

saṃsadi

73d priyānvitāḥ

śriyānvitāḥ

76a saṃvasantam

saṃsarantam

76b viṣayeṣv

viṣameṣv

77a saṃhitā

saṃsthitā

80d prāpa sa

prāpy eva

81d gharmātmā

gharmārtāḥ

84b dharaṇī-reṇu-luṅṭhitāḥ

°reṇu-guṅṭhitāḥ

88d sutāḥ

putraḥ

93a ya

mām

Chapter IV

14b anyam

anyān

21b satyāc ca

satyaṃ ca

The twenty-eighth chapter which bears some ideas and passages similar to those of the Mahābhārata is conspicuous by its absence in it. This may lead to conclusion that in all probability it belongs to the earlier recension of the Padma-purāṇa which may not have copiously used the identical words, parts of sentence, and verses of the Mahābhārata. Its latter redactors in order to increase the bulk of it more for propagating their views have freely copied from the Mahābhārata—the ever-eternal fountain of Indian thoughts.

Fourthly, the colophons of all these eight manuscripts are all the same while those of this manuscript differs a bit from them. While all other manuscripts mention 'iti śrī-padma-purāṇe,' the colophons of this one runs as follows 'ityadi-mahāpurāṇe pādme' suggesting its inclusion in different type of recensions.

Fifthly it may be pointed out that while dealing with the Marutta-episode, this manuscript is bereft of nineteen verses where king Marutta glorifies Śiva in order to fetch gold by which he can perform his sacrifice. It is needless to mention that all other manuscripts contain it and the passages similar to it can also be found in the Mahābhārata VII. 173. This suggests its antiquity as we know the latter redactors of the Śaiva sects took up the whole of this Khaṇḍa, nay the whole of the Padma-purāṇa, tried to wipe out its Vaiṣṇava influence and administer from place to place certain passages glorifying Śiva.

Sixthly, it is interesting to note that the first six chapters (leaving aside the beginning portion of, chapter I i. e., verses 1-43) of the Svarga-Khaṇḍa deal with the Śakuntalā-episode. Here the colophon of this manuscript varies with that of others. While others run as 'iti śrī-padma-purāṇe śākuntale' (ity-ādi-mahāpurāṇe' of course runs over through out all the colophons). This shows a distinction of it—however minor may it be—with its counterparts.

Last but not the least, this is the only dated manuscript of the Svarga khaṇḍa while all other lack, and it shows that the scribe sends this work after completion to a King or Zamindar through the hands of one Laksmīnarayan Chatteraj. It bears the date Śaka 1763 (1861 A. D.) The scribe was aware that this one was not similar to its other counterparts.

THE PURĀNIC THEORY OF
THE YUGAS AND KALPAS—A STUDY

BY

ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे युग-मन्वन्तर-कल्पादीनां प्रमाण-संख्या-स्वरूपाणां मनुस्मृति-महाभारत-पुराण-ज्यौतिषदृष्ट्या विवेचनं कृतम् । अस्य सिद्धान्तस्य विषये आधुनिकदृष्ट्याऽपि कश्चिद् विचारोऽत्र कृतः । युगादीनां दैववर्षेषु मानं ज्यौतिषसिद्धान्तग्रन्थेषु पुराणेषु चैवोपलभ्यते अत्र विषये प्राचीनतरं मानं मानुषवर्षेष्वेवासीदित्यपि प्रदर्शितमत्र । सहस्रचतुर्युगाणामेकः कल्पः इत्येतावत्येव प्राचीना मानगणना आसीत् । युग-मन्वन्तर-कल्प इत्यनेन क्रमेण गणना तु प्रायः पौराणिकी, सा चापि ज्यौतिष-सिद्धान्तनिबन्धना । पुराणानुसारेण सूर्यसिद्धान्तानुसारेण च चतुर्युग-मन्वन्तर-कल्पमानस्य तुलनात्मको विचारोऽपि कृतः । ज्यौतिष पुराणादि-प्राचीनमतानुसारेण कल्पस्य मानं प्रदर्श्य तदनुसारेण पृथिव्या उत्पत्त्या वर्तमानं काल-मानम् दत्त्वा, आधुनिक भूगर्भ-विज्ञानदृष्ट्याऽपि पृथिव्युत्पत्त्या वर्तमानकालसूचिकैका तालिकाऽप्यत्र प्रदीयते ।]

The Purāṇas have given the long computations of the Yugas and the Kalpas, in which they have divided the duration of the Universe (Brahmāṇḍa) both in its manifest and semi-manifest forms. The Purāṇas have conceived the Time or *Kāla* as beginningless and endless, and so there is no break in the order of the creation, preservation and dissolution of the Universe, in other words, there is no break in the continuity of the universe in some form or the other; for, even in the *Pralaya* the universe is not totally destroyed, but merges into its unmanifest cause from which it emerged at the time of its creation, as says the *Gītā*—

अव्यक्तादीनि भूतानि व्यक्तमध्यानि भारत ।

अव्यक्तनिधनान्येव तत्र का परिदेवना ॥ (2. 28)

(Beings are unmanifest in their origin, manifest in the interval, and unmanifest in their end). The Viṣṇu Purāṇa puts this Purāṇic

truth of the continuity of the creation, preservation and dissolution of the universe in clear words :—

अनादिर्भगवान् कालो नान्तोऽस्य द्विज विद्यते ।
अव्युच्छिन्नास्ततस्स्वेते सर्गस्थित्यन्तसंयमाः ॥

(Viṣ.-P., I. 2.26)

Thus the creation, preservation and dissolution (*Sṛṣṭi*, *Sthiti* and *Pralaya*) go on taking place after each other in the fixed order and after fixed intervals like the day and night.

The Purāṇas call the duration of the Universe in its manifest form (i. e. the time of its creation and preservation, or its *Sṛṣṭi-kāla* and *Sthiti-kāla*) as a Kalpa which is regarded as the Day of Brahmā, the Creator, on the analogy of the day of man when he is active.

A Kalpa has been divided into 14 Manvantaras, and each Manvantara into 71 Catur-Yugas (a term generally used in the Purāṇas) or Daiva-Yugas (a term used in the Manu-Smṛiti) or Mahāyugas (a term generally found used in the astronomical works). Each Mahāyuga consists of four Yugas, viz. Kṛta-Yuga, (or Satya-Yuga), Tretā-Yuga, Dvāpara-Yuga and Kali-Yuga, of descending duration of the ratio of 4:3:2:1. Thus, the Kṛta-Yuga is of 4,000 divine years with a *Sandhi* of 400 divine years in the beginning and a *Sandhyāṃśa* of the similar length at the end, the Tretā-Yuga is of 3,000 divine years with a *Sandhi* and a *Sandhyāṃśa* of 300 divine years each, the Dvāpara-Yuga of 2,000 divine years with a *Sandhi* and *Sandhyāṃśa* of 200 divine years each and the Kaliyuga of 1000 divine years with a *Sandhi* and a *Sandhyāṃśa* of 100 divine years each. All these four Yugas (with their durations in the descending order, i. e. of 4000+400+400, 3000+300+300, 2000+200+200, 1000+100+100 divine years) make a Mahā-yuga of 12,000 divine years, each divine year being equal to 360 human years.

This computation of the length of the four Yugas has been considered by some modern scholars as 'purely hypothetical'¹, 'extravagant'² and 'gigantic'³. But considering the eternity and

-
1. A. D. Pusalker, *Studies in the Epic and the Purāṇas*, Introduction, p. lvi.
 2. A. Cunningham, *The Book of Indian Eras*, p. 4.
 3. K. D. Sethna, 'Megasthenes and Indian Chronology', *Purāṇa*, X. 2 (July 1968) p. 131.

infinity of the Time (*Kāla*), no division of time, whatever may be its length, can properly be called as extravagant and gigantic. And according to the Indian philosophical conception, *Time* is one and indivisible and so any division of time by its very nature must be purely hypothetical and imaginary. It must be conceded, however, that this long computation of the Yugas as given in the Purāṇas may also be taken as representing the later Purāṇic view only, for the earlier view seems to favour a much smaller computation of the four Yugas.

The Manu-Smṛti gives the length of the four Yugas as follows :—

चत्वार्यहुः सहस्राणि वर्षाणां तु कृतं युगम् ।
 तस्य तावच्छती संध्या संध्यांशश्च तथाविधः ॥
 इतरेषु ससंध्येषु ससंध्यांशेषु च त्रिषु ।
 एकापायेन वर्तन्ते सहस्राणि शतानि च ॥
 यदेतत् परिसंख्यातमादावेव चतुर्युगम् ।
 एतद् द्वादशसाहस्रं देवानां युगमुच्यते ॥ (1.69-71)

From these ślokas it appears that the Manu-smṛti gives the length of the four Yugas most probably in the human years and not in the divine years: for, firstly, it does not mention here these years as *daiva* (*divine*), and secondly, in the last śloka (71) quoted above, four human Yugas (‘मानुषं चतुर्युगम्’ कुल्लूकटीका) of the collective length of 12,000 years (एतद् द्वादशसाहस्रं) are said to make a *devānāṃ yugam* (Divine Yuga) and if these four Yugas are *mānuṣa* (human), then the length of their duration might also have been intended as *mānuṣa*. But following the Purāṇic view the commentator Kullūka remarks here that the number of the years of the duration of the four Yugas mentioned here is divine (वर्षसंख्या चैवं दिव्यमानेन तस्यैवानन्तरप्रकृतत्वात्)

The Mahābhārata (Vana-Parva, 188.22-26, Nīlakaṇṭha's text) gives also the length of the four Yugas which is similar to that given by the Manu-Smṛti, but it (the Mbh.) does nowhere mention the years as *divine*. It does not even say that the four Yugas collectively make one *divya* Yuga; it simply mentions that the 12,000 years of the four Yugas are collectively called the *yugākhyā*—

एषा द्वादशसाहस्री युगाख्या परिकीर्त्तिता । (27 cd)

But the Purāṇas clearly mention the years of the duration of the four Yugas as *divya* (divine); e. g.—

दिव्यैर्वर्षसहस्रैस्तु कृतत्रेतादिसंज्ञितम् ।
 चतुर्युगं द्वादशभिस्तद्विभागं निबोध मे ॥
 चत्वारि त्रीणि द्वे चैकं कृतादिषु यथाक्रमम् ।
 दिव्याद्भानां सहस्राणि युगेष्वाहुः पुराविदः ॥
 तत्प्रमाणैः शतैः संध्या पूर्वा तत्राभिधीयते ।
 संध्यांशश्चैव तत्तुर्यो युगस्यानन्तरो हि सः ॥

(Viṣṇu P., I. 3. 12-14)

कृतं त्रेता द्वापरं च कलिश्चेति चतुर्युगम् ।
 देवैर्वर्षसहस्रैस्तु तद् द्वादशभिरुच्यते ॥

(Brahma. P., 229. 5)

This Purāṇic computation of the length of the four Yugas in the divine years seems to be a later elaboration, the earlier computation as given in the Manu-smṛiti and the Mahābhārata being much smaller. But even the earlier Purāṇic view as represented by the Vāyu-Purāṇa (32.58 ff.) seems to favour the smaller computation in the human years. According to this Purāṇa the *Caturyuga* (four Yugas taken collectively) of the length of 12,000 years has four *Pādas* or quarters in the form of the four Yugas; thus—

1. Kṛta-yuga	4,800 years	Prakriyā-Pāda
2. Tretā-yuga	3,600 years	Anuṣaṅga-Pāda
3. Dvāpara-yuga	2,400 years	Upodghāta-Pāda
4. Kali-yuga	1,200 years	Saṁhāra-Pāda

The Purāṇa is said to be also of the 12,000 ślokas and to have the similar four *Pādas* :—

एतद् द्वादशसाहस्रं चतुर्युगमिति स्मृतम् ।
 एवं पादैः सहस्राणि श्लोकानां पञ्च पञ्च च ॥
 संध्यासंध्यांशकैरेव द्वे सहस्रे तथापरे ।
 एवं द्वादशसाहस्रं पुराणं कवयो विदुः ॥
 यथा वेदश्चतुष्पादश्चतुष्पादं तथा युगम् ।
 यथा युगं चतुष्पादं विधात्रा विहितं स्वयम् ।
 चतुष्पादं पुराणं तु ब्रह्मणा विहितं पुरा ॥

(Vāyu-P. 32. 65-67)

Here the 12,000 years of the *Catur-yuga* and its four *Pādas* are said to be corresponding with the 12,000 ślokas and the four *Pādas* of the Purāṇa, which indicates that the computation of the four Yugas according to the Vāyu Purāṇa here is in the human years and not in the divine years. The context preceding these ślokas also leads to the same conclusion.

But later on the Purāṇas elaborated the computation of the length of the four Yugas, perhaps under the influence of the *Siddhānta Jyotiṣa*, and so the computation of the four Yugas in the *human years* was replaced by that in the *divine years*, which made a lot of difference. According to the earlier computation in the human years the length of a *Catur-yuga* was 12,000 years, while according to the later Purāṇic computation in *divine years*, the length of the *Caturyuga* comes to 43,20,000 ($12,000 \times 360$) human years.

A Cunningham in his '*Book of the Indian Eras*' has suggested the source of this longer Purāṇic computation in divine years. According to him the present Purāṇic system of computation is the invention of the astronomers "which they based on their newly acquired knowledge of the precession". The precession of the equinoxes per year fixed by Parāśara was 46.5 seconds and that by Ārya-bhaṭa was 46.2 seconds. Shri K. D. Sethna in his article 'Megasthenes and Indian Chronology' (Pub. in '*Purāṇa*' X. 2) on the basis of these facts analyses this problem as follows:

Given the precession, what would be the period of one revolution through the whole circle of the ecliptic of 360 degrees? As 60 minutes make 1 degree and 60 seconds 1 minute, to cover the full circle of the ecliptic takes 1,296,000 ($360 \times 60 \times 60$) seconds divided by 46.5 or 46.2. Then we get $\frac{12,960,000}{465}$ or $\frac{12,660,000}{462}$ years, which by dividing them by three become $\frac{43,20,000}{155}$ and $\frac{43,20,000}{154}$ years. The numerator is exactly the number of years which goes into a Mahāyuga (or Caturyuga). And 43,20,000 years is the period in which the ecliptic would be circled 155 or 154 times.

According to both the earlier view and the later Purāṇic view 1,000 Caturyugas go to make the length of the duration of

a Kalpa, i.e. the duration of the existence of the universe, which is also called Brahmā's Day (ब्रह्माहः); cf.—

दैविकानां युगानां तु सहस्रं परिसंख्यया ।
ब्राह्ममेकमहर्ज्ञेयं तावती रात्रिरेव च ॥

(Manu-Smṛti. 1.72)

एषा द्वादशसाहस्री युगाख्या परिकीर्त्तिता ।
एतत् सहस्रपर्यन्तमहो ब्राह्ममुदाहृतम् ॥

(Mbh., Vana-P., 188 28)

कृतं त्रेता द्वापरश्च कलिश्चैव चतुर्युगम् ।
प्रोच्यते तत्सहस्रं च ब्रह्मणो दिवसं मुने ॥

(Viṣṇu-P., I. 3. 15)

In the Nirukta and the Bhagavad-Gītā the Caturyuga or the Mahāyuga is simply called as the *Yuga*—

‘तदेतदहर्युगसहस्रं’.....‘युगसहस्रं रात्रिस्तावेतावहोरात्रावजस्रं परिवर्त्तते’—

Nirukta, 14. 4.

सहस्रयुगपर्यन्तमहर्द्यद्ब्रह्मणो विदुः ।
रात्रिं युगसहस्रान्तां तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ॥

(Bhag.-Gītā, 8. 17; Nirukta 14. 4)

By the word ‘Yuga’ used by Yāska here Prof. Mankad in his work *Purānic Chronology*, remarks that “the designation (Caturyuga or Kalpa or Divya-yuga) employed by the Purāṇas for units of extreme length are replaced by one (i. e. *Yuga*) which Purāṇically means a lesser duration”. But I think Yāska's *yuga* is the same as the *Daiva Yuga* of the Manu-Smṛti or the *Caturyuga* of the Purāṇas, for the Manu-Smṛti uses the term ‘Yuga’ as a synonym for its ‘*Daivika yuga*’ also; cf.

दैविकानां युगानां तु सहस्रं परिसंख्यया ।

ब्राह्ममेकमहर्ज्ञेयं तावती रात्रिरेव च ॥ 72

तद्वै युगसहस्रान्तं ब्राह्मं पुण्यमहर्विदुः ।

रात्रिं च तावतीमेव तेऽहोरात्रविदो जनाः ॥ 73

(Manu.-Smṛti, Adh. 1)

Compare also the Vāyu-Purāṇa, 32, 67, quoted above, where the word *Yuga* is used for the Chatur-yuga.

YUGAS ASSOCIATED WITH DHARMA

The four Yugas are associated with *dharma* or moral virtues, and the *dharma* gradually decreases by one *pāda* (quarter) from *Kṛta* to *Kali*. Thus, the *dharma* in the *kṛta*-Yuga is of all the four *pādas* (i. e. in its entirety), in the *Tretā* it loses its one *pāda* and becomes of three *pādas* only, and so on up to *Kali*-Yuga when its one *pāda* only remains ; cf. the *Manu-Smṛti* 1. 81-82 :—

चतुष्पात् सकलो धर्मः सत्यञ्चैव कृते युगे ।
नाधर्मेणागमः कश्चिन्मनुष्यान् प्रतिवर्त्तते ॥
इतरेष्वगमाद् धर्मः पादशस्त्ववरोपितः ।
चौरिकानृतमायाभिर्धर्मश्चापैति पादशः ॥

Thus, there is the gradual deterioration from Yuga to Yuga. The period of human age is also subject to this gradual deterioration. In the *Kṛta* yuga man lives for 400 years, in the *Tretā* 300 years in the *Dvāpara* 200 years and in the *Kali*-Yuga 100 years only :

अरोगाः सर्वसिद्धार्थाश्चतुर्वर्षशतायुषः ।
कृते त्रेतादिषु ह्येषामायुर्हसति पादशः ॥

(*Ibid.*, Śl. 83)

This theory of the gradual deterioration in life from Yuga to Yuga is opposed to the modern theory of evolution.

The *dharma* of each Yuga differs from the other. In the *Kṛta* *tapas* (austerity) in the *Tretā jñāna* (knowledge of Self), in the *Dvāpara* *Yajña* (Sacrificial cult) and in the *Kali dāna* (charity) is the main *dharma* :

अन्ये कृतयुगे धर्मास्त्रेतायां द्वापरे परे ।
अन्ये कलियुगे नृणां युगहासानुरूपतः ॥
तपः परं कृतयुगे त्रेतायां ज्ञानमुच्यते ।
द्वापरे यज्ञमेवाहुर्दानमेकं कलौ युगे ॥

(*Ibid.*, Śl. 85-86)

Human actions bear fruits according to the influence of a Yuga :—

वेदोक्तमायुर्मर्त्यानामाशिषश्चैव कर्मणाम् ।
फलन्त्यनुयुगं लोके प्रभावश्च शरीरिणाम् ॥

(*Ibid.*, Śl. 84)

The same view of the gradual deterioration from Yuga to Yuga and different characteristics and *dharma* of the Yugas is held by the Purāṇas and the Epics also. According to the Vāyu-Purāṇa even the different gods are worshipped in the different Yugas.—Brahmā in the Kṛta, Yajña in the Tretā, Viṣṇu in the Dvāpara and Mahādeva in the Kali :—

ब्रह्मा कृतयुगे पूज्यस्त्रेतायां यज्ञ उच्यते ।
द्वारे पूज्यते विष्णुरहं पूज्यश्चतुर्वर्षि ॥

(Vāyu. P., 32. 21)

Even the mode of worship differs from Yuga to Yuga—in the Kṛta *dhyāna* (meditation) in the Tretā worshipping by means of *Yajñas*, in the Dvāpara *arcā* or *pūjā*, and in the Kali the chanting and repetition of God's name bear similar fruits :—

ध्यायन्कृते यजन्यज्ञैस्त्रेतायां द्वारेऽर्चयन् ।
यदाप्नोति तदाप्नोति कलौ संकीर्त्य केशवम् ॥

(Viṣṇu-P. VI. 2. 19.)

MANVANTARAS

Neither Yāska, nor the Gītā, nor the Mbh.-Vana-Parva and nor even the Manu-Smṛti in the ślokas quoted above have inserted the computation of the fourteen *Manvantaras* within the frame of the scheme of computation of the *Bṛāhma-ahaṅ* (the Day of Brahmā) or the Kalpa, although the Manu-smṛti mentions seven Manu-s and their *antara-s* or durations during which they created and protected the creatures :—

स्वायम्भुवस्यास्य मनोः षड्वंश्या मनवोऽपरे ।
सृष्टवन्तः प्रजाः स्वाः स्वा महात्मानो महौजसः ॥ 61
स्वारोचिषश्चौत्तमिश्च तामसो रैवतस्तथा ।
चाक्षुषश्च महातेजा विवस्वत्सुत एव च ॥ 62
स्वायम्भुवाद्याः सप्तैते मनवो भूरितेजसः ।
स्वे स्वेऽन्तरे सर्वमिदमुत्पाद्यापुश्वराचरम् ॥ 63

(Manu, Adh. 1)

But in the Purāṇas as well as in the works of the Siddhānta-Jyotiṣa we have also the computation of the Manvantaras (the

periods of Manu-s), fourteen of which go to make the total period of a Kalpa or the *Brāhma-ahaḥ* (the Day of Brahmā) inserted between Yuga (i. e. the Mahāyuga) and Kalpa; cf.

ब्रह्मणो दिवसे ब्रह्मन् मनवस्तु चतुर्दश ।
भवन्ति परिमाणं च तेषां कालकृतं शृणु ॥ 16
चतुर्युगानां संख्याता साधिका ह्येकसप्ततिः ।
मन्वन्तरं मनोः कालः सुरादीनां च सत्तम ॥ 18
चतुर्दशगुणो ह्येष कालो ब्राह्ममहः स्मृतम् ।
ब्राह्मो नैमित्तिको नाम तस्यान्ते प्रतिसञ्चरः ॥ 22

(Viṣṇu-P., I. 3)

चतुर्युगसहस्रं तु कथ्यते ब्रह्मणो दिनम् ।
स कल्पस्तत्र मनवश्चतुर्दश द्विजोत्तमाः ॥

(Brahma-P., 231.12)

So, according to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, a Manvantara (Manu's Period) consists of something more than 71 Catur-yugas (साधिका ह्येकसप्ततिः) The commentator Śrīdhara explains the word *sādhikā* as follows:—“चतुर्युगसहस्रप्रमाणस्य ब्रह्मदिनस्य चतुर्दशाधिविभागे प्रतिविभागमेकसप्ततिश्चतुर्युगानि भवन्ति : अवशिष्यते चतुर्युगषट्कान्तरस्य चतुर्दशांशो यथागणितः प्रतिमन्वन्तरमेकसप्ततरधिक इत्यर्थः”.

Thus, as the Day of Brahmā or Kalpa is equal to the 14 Manvantaras or 1000 Caturyugas, a Manvantara actually is equal to $71\frac{6}{14}$ Caturyugas (for, $1000 \div 14 = 71 + \frac{6}{14}$).

The Sūrya-Siddhānta (the earliest available work on the *Siddhānta-Jyotiṣa*) makes this point of ‘*sādhikā*’ more clear. In its computation of Yugas and Kalpas it says that after every Manvantara there is a *Sandhi* equal to the period of a Kṛta-Yuga (i. e. of 4800 years) and this *Sandhi* after each Manvantara is characterised by *jala-plava* (water-immersion or deluge), and there is also a *Sandhi* in the beginning of a Kalpa, which (*Sandhi*) is the fifteenth and is also of the length of the Kṛta-Yuga :—

युगानां सप्ततिः सैका मन्वन्तरमिहोच्यते ।
कृताब्दसंख्या तस्यान्ते संधिः प्रोक्तो जलप्लवः ॥
ससंधयस्ते मनवः कल्पे ज्ञेयाश्चतुर्दश ।
कृतप्रमाणः कल्पादौ संधिः पञ्चदशः स्मृतः ॥

(Sūrya-Siddhānta, I. 18-19)

Thus, the first Manvantara in a Kalpa has two *Sandhis*, one in the beginning and the other in the end, so there are 15 *Manvantara-sandhis* of 4800 years each in a Kalpa, besides the 14 Manvantaras of 71 Caturyugas each. These 15 *Sandhis* ($=4800 \times 15 = 72,000$ years or 6 Caturyugas) and the 14 *Manvantaras* ($=71 \times 14 = 994$ Caturyugas, together make the total of 1000 Caturyugas.

The conception of the 14 Manvantaras forming the duration of a Kalpa or the Day of Brahmā is mainly Purānic. According to the Purāṇas a Manvantara is a period of $\frac{1000}{14}$ or $71\frac{6}{14}$ Caturyugas and according to the *Sūrya-sindhānta*, as quoted above, it is a period of 71 *Mahāyugas* + 4800 divine years as its *Sandhi* except the first Manvantara which is of the period of 71 *Mahāyugas* + 9600 divine years (the two *Sandhis* one in the beginning and the other at the end). Both these computations come to the same thing. Thus, according to this computation a Manvantara is a period of 8,52,000 divine years and 30,67,20,000 ($12000 \times 360 \times 71 + 17,28000$) mortal years¹

A Manvantara is named after its presiding deity called *Manu* who is in charge of the preservation and protection of the universe during his period. According to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (III. 1f.) out of the 14 Manvantaras of the present Kalpa six Manvantaras have already passed, viz.—

1. Svāyambhuva (स्वायम्भुव), 2. Svārociṣa (स्वारोचिष), 3. Uttama (उत्तम), 4. Tāmasa (तामस), 5. Raivata (रैवत) and 6. Cākṣuṣa (चाक्षुस).

The seventh called the Vaivasvata (वैवस्वत) is the *present* Manvantara and the seven *future* Manvantaras are as follows :—

8. Sāvarṇi (सावर्णि),
9. Dakṣa-sāvarṇi (दक्ष-सावर्णि),
10. Brahma-sāvarṇi (ब्रह्म-सावर्णि),
or
Meru-sāvarṇi (मेरु-सावर्णि) (Devī Bhāg. X. 13. 26).
11. Dharma-sāvarṇi (धर्म-सावर्णि)
or
Sūrya-sāvarṇi (सूर्य-सावर्णि) (D. Bhāg.)

1. Viṣṇu-Purāṇa I. 3. 19-21.

12. Rudra-sāvarṇi (रुद्र-सावर्णि)
or
Candra-sāvarṇi (चन्द्र-सावर्णि) (D. Bhāg.)
13. Raucya (रौच्य) (= Ag. P., Adh. 150; Hariv. I. 7. 5)
or
Deva-sāvarṇi (देव-सावर्णि) (Bhāg.-P. VIII. 13. 27)
14. Bhautya (भौत्य) (= Ag.-P.; Hariv.)
or
Indra-sāvarṇi (इन्द्र-सावर्णि) (Bhāg.-P.)
or
Viṣṇu-sāvarṇi (विष्णु-सावर्णि) (D. Bhāg.)

Of these future Manus the 8th is the son of Vivasvān (Sun) from his wife Chāyā, and is therefore the step-brother of Vaivasvata-Manu and resembles him, whence he is called *Sāvarṇi* (of the same *varṇa* or form). The next four Manus (9-12) are the sons of Priyavrata and the grandsons of Svāyambhuva-Manu (the first Manu). According to the Harivamśa (I. 7. 6) these four Manus (9-12) are also called *Meru-sāvarṇis*, for they obtained the Manuhood by performing austerities on the Meru mountain (मेरुसावर्णां श्रुत्वारो ब्रह्मसावर्णिः, रुद्रसावर्णिः, मेरुसावर्णिः, दक्षसावर्णिश्च । एते मेरौ तपः कृत्वा सिद्धिं प्राप्ता इति सर्वेऽपि मेरुसावर्णा इत्युच्यन्ते—नीलकण्ठः). Raucya is the son of Prajāpati Ruci and Bhautya is the son of Bhūti.

Each Manvantara has its own *Saptarṣis* (Seven Sages), gods, Indra, Manu and his royal sons who are in charge of the protection of the world and are simultaneously created in the beginning and destroyed at the end of their Manvantara :—

सप्तर्षयः सुराः शक्रो मनुस्तत्सूनवो नृपाः ।

एककाले हि सृज्यन्ते संहियन्ते च पूर्ववत् ॥

In each Manvantara the *Sāttvikī Śakti* of Viṣṇu is also incarnated in the form of his partial incarnation to help in the work of the protection of the universe.

Below are given gods (in their *gaṇas*), Indra, part-incarnation of Viṣṇu and principal Purāṇic episodes of each Manvantara according to the Viṣṇu.-P. (III. 1-2) and the Bhāg.-P. (VIII. 1-24) :

<i>Manvantara or Manu</i>	<i>Gana-s of Gods</i>	<i>Indra</i>	<i>Viṣṇu's in- carnation</i>	<i>Episode relating to</i>
1. Svāyam- bhava	Yāma-s?	Yajña	Kapila
2. Svārociṣa	1. Pārā- vata-s 2. Tuṣita-s	Vipa- ścit	Vibhu	...
3. Uttama	1. Sudhā- man-s 2. Satya-s 3. Japa-s 4. Pratar- dana-s 5. Vaśa- vartīn-s	Suśānti	Satyasena	...
4. Tāmasa	1. Supāra-s 2. Hari-s 3. Satya-s 4. Sudhī-s	Śibi	Harime- dhasa	Gajendra- mokṣa
5. Raivata	1. Amitā- bha-s 2. Bhūta- raya-s 3. Vaiṅku- ṭha-s 4. Sume- dha-s	Vibhu	Vaikunṭha	...
6. Cākṣuṣa	1. Āpya-s 2. Prasūta-s 3. Bhavya-s 4. Pṛthu- ka-s 5. Lekha-s	Mano- java	Ajita	1. Samudra- manthana (churning of the ocean) and Kūrma- Avatāra

2. War between Gods and Asuras—Jambha Namuci etc. killed
7. Vaivasvata (Śrāddha-deva Manu) 1. Āditya-s 2. Vasu-s 3. Rudra-s 4. Viṣve-deva-s 5. Ṛbhū-s 6. Aśvin-s Purāṁ-dara Vāmana Bali-Vāmana
8. Sāvarṇi 1. Sutapa-s 2. Amitā-bha-s 3. Mukhya-s Bali Sārva-bhauma
9. Dakṣa-sāvarṇi 1. Pāra-s 2. Marīci-garbha-s 3. Sudharman-s Adbhu-ta Ṛṣabha
10. Brahma-sāvarṇi 1. Sudhāman-s 2. Viśud-dha-s Śānti (Viṣ-P) or Śambhu (Bhāg.) Viṣvaksena
11. Dharmasāvarṇi 1. Vihaṁ-gama-s 2. Kāma-gama-s 3. Nirvāṇa-rata-s Vṛṣa (Viṣ. P.) Dharmasetu Vaidhṛta (Bhāg.)
12. Rudra-sāvarṇi 1. Harita-s 2. Rohita-s 3. Suma-na-s Ṛta-dhāman Svadhāman

	4. Sukar-		
	man-s		
	5. Surāpa-s		
13. Raucya	1. Sutrā-	Divas-	Yogeśvara
	man-s	pati	
	2. Sukar-		
	man-s		
	3. Sudhar-		
	man-s		
14. Bhautya	1. Cākṣu-	Śuci	Bṛhad-
	ṣa-s		bhānu
	2. Pavitra-s		
	3. Kaniṣ-		
	ṭha-s		
	4. Bhrā-		
	jika-s		
	5. Vācāvṛ-		
	ddha-s		

KALPA

As 1,000 Mahāyugas, each of 12,000 divine years or of 43,20,000 human years, make a Kalpa or cosmic period, the length or duration of a Kalpa comes to 1,20,00,000 divine years or 4,32,00,00,000 human years. Since a Kalpa is the *Day of Brahmā* (Creator), 30 such Kalpas make a *Month of Brahmā*. And as there are 30 *tithis* (lunar days) of different designations in a lunar month, on the same analogy the different names of the 30 Kalpas of Brahmā's Month are given in the Matsya-Purāṇa (Adh. 290) as follows:

1. Śveta (श्वेत), 2. Nīla-lohita (नीललोहित), 3. Vāma-deva (वामदेव), 4. Rāthantara (राथन्तर), 5. Raurava (रौरव), 6. Deva (देव), 7. Bṛhat-kalpa (बृहत्कल्प), 8. Kandarpa (कन्दर्प), 9. Sadya (सद्य), 10. Īśāna (ईशान), 11. Tamaḥ (तमः), 12. Sāra-svata (सारस्वत), 13. Udāna (उदान), 14. Gāruḍa (गारुड), 15. Kaurma (कौर्म), 16. Nārasimha (नारसिंह), 17. Samāna (समान), 18. Āgneya (आग्नेय), 19. Soma (सोम), 20. Mānava (मानव), 21. Tat-pumān (तत्पुमान्), 22. Vaikuṅṭha (वैकुण्ठ), 23. Lakṣmī-kalpa (लक्ष्मी-कल्प), 24. Sāvitrī-kalpa (सावित्रीकल्प),

25. Aghora (अघोर), 26. Vārāha (वाराह), 27. Vairāja (वैराज),
28. Gauri-kalpa (गौरिकल्प), 29. Māheśvara (माहेश्वर), 30. Pitṛ-
kalpa (पितृकल्प).

Of these 30 Kalpas the 15th (*Kaurma*) is the Full-Moon Day (पौर्णमासी) and the 30th (*Pitṛ-kalpa*) the New-Moon Day (कुहू, अमावस्या) of Brahmā's Month.

Out of the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas the following Purāṇas deal with the accounts of some of these Kalpas, as follows (see Matsya-P., Adh. 53):—

<i>Purāṇa</i>		<i>Kalpa</i>
Padma-Purāṇa	deals with	Pādma-Kalpa (?)
Viṣṇu-Purāṇa	,,	Vārāha-Kalpa (26)
Vāyu-Purāṇa	,,	Śveta-Kalpa (1)
Bhāgavata-P.	,,	Sārasvata-Kalpa (12)
Nārādīya-P.	,,	Bṛhat-Kalpa (7)
Agni-P.	,,	Īśāna-Kalpa (10)
Bhaviṣya-P.	,,	Aghora-Kalpa (25)
Brahma-vaiv.-P.	,,	Rāthantara-Kalpa (4)
Līṅga-P.	,,	Āgneya-Kalpa (18)
Vārāha-P.	,,	Mānava-Kalpa (20)
Skanda-P.	,,	Tat-puruṣa-Kalpa (21)
Vāmana-P.	,,	Kūrma-Kalpa (15)
Kūrma-P.	,,	Lakṣmī-Kalpa (23)
Garuḍa-P.	,,	Gāruḍa-Kalpa (14)

The Vāyu-Purāṇa (Adh. 21) gives a different list of the 28 Kalpas (perhaps on the analogy of the 28 Nakṣatras or Constellations in a lunar month) as follows:—

1. भव, 2. भुवः, 3. तपः, 4. भव, 5. रम्भ, 6. ऋतुकल्प, 7. क्रतु,
8. वह्नि, 9. हव्यवाहन, 10. सावित्र, 11. भुवः, 12. उसिक, 13. कुशिक,
14. गन्धर्व, 15. ऋषभ, 16. षड्ज, 17. मार्जालीय, 18. मध्यम, 19. वैराजक,
20. निषाद, 21. पञ्चम, 22. मेघवाहन, 23. चिन्तक, 24. आकृति, 25. विज्ञाति,
26. मनः, 27. भाव, 28. बृहत् (or रथन्तर).

In addition to the twenty-eight Kalpas the Vāyu-P. (Adh. 22) gives 5 more Kalpas—1. श्वेतकल्प, 2. रक्त-, 3. पीतवासस्-,
4. कृष्ण-, 5. विश्वरूप—the names of which are derived from the forms which the Creator assumes in these Kalpas.

Each Kalpa (Cosmic Period) or the Day of Brahmā is followed by the *Pralaya* or the *Ekārṇava* state (Great Deluge) in which the whole of the universe up to the *Svar-Loka* is destroyed. This *Pralaya* is called *naimittika* as it is occasioned by the Night of Brahmā when he remains asleep (or inactive).¹ At the end of Brahmā's life of his 100 years (360×100 Kalpas) the entire universe including even Brahmā and all other Gods and all the fourteen *Loka-s* are destroyed and merge into their original cause or *Prakṛti*; hence this *Pralaya* is called the *Prākṛtika Pralaya*.² (cf. Viṣṇu-P. VI. 1f.)

Brahmā's full age of his 100 years is called *Para*, and half of this period is called *Parārdha*. One *Parārdha* of Brahmā's life has passed, the last Kalpa of this *Parārdha* is also called the *Pādma-Kalpa*, for the Earth (or the world) in that Kalpa is produced in the form of a Lotus from the navel of Viṣṇu; the present Kalpa, which is also the first Kalpa of the second *Parārdha* of Brahmā's life, is called the *Śveta Vārāha-Kalpa*. (Viṣ. P. I. 3. 26 f. ; Bhāg. III. 11. 33 ff. ; Mt.-P, 164. 5 ; 169. 2f).

As the scheme of the four Yugas is associated with the varying degrees of the *dharma* and *adharmā* (i.e. the gradual deterioration of *dharma*, and gradual increase of *adharmā* from the Kṛta-Yuga to the Kali-Yuga), this scheme is said to prevail in the Bhāratavarṣa only out of the nine *Varṣa-s* of the Jambu-dvīpa, and not in the remaining eight *Varṣa-s* where there is no *dharma* and *adharmā* and no gradation of high and low in their social order. (cf. Viṣṇu.-P. II. 3. 19—चत्वारिं भारते वर्षे युगान्यत्र महामुने । कृतं चेता द्वापरञ्च कलिश्चान्यत्र न वदन्ति ।³ In this respect these Yugas may be likened to the six *Ṛtus* (seasons)

1. Cf. also Viṣṇu-P. I. 3. 18 ff.

2. The *jala-plava* (Deluge) after each Manvantara may not be universal, but this *Naimittika Pralaya* is universal. A *jala-plava* is mentioned in the Matsya-Purāṇa, when the Matsya incarnation of Viṣṇu narrated the Matsya-Purāṇa to Vaivasvata Manu. So this *jala-plava* might have occurred after the sixth (Cākṣuṣa) Manvantara or in the beginning of the seventh Manvantara.

3. Cf. also Viṣṇu-P. II. 1. 25-26.

यानि किपुष्पादीनि वर्षाण्यष्टौ महामुने ।
तेषां स्वाभाविकी सिद्धिः सुखप्राया ह्ययत्नतः ॥
विपर्ययो न तेष्वस्ति जरामृत्युभयं न च ।
धर्माधर्मौ न तेष्वास्तां नोत्तमाधममध्यमाः ॥

also cf. *ibid*, II. 2 53-55.

of Bhārata-varṣa, which do not take place elsewhere in the same number, order and degree. But the *Kalpas* are not confined to a particular *Varṣa* or *Dvīpa*, They are universal.

A table of the computation of the Yugas, Manvantaras and their Kalpa is given below, which also indicates the age of the present universe according to the Purāṇas : our Earth might have come into existence a little later in this cosmological scheme. It may be seen that this Purāṇa or astronomical computation comes close to the modern calculation of the present age of the Earth according to the science of geology.

SRṢṬI KĀLA OR KALPA

(Manu-Smṛti 1.66 ff; Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, I. 3.8 ff)

360 human years	= 1 divine year
4000 divine years	= Kṛta (Satya) Yuga
400 divine years	= Kṛta-Sandhyā
400 divine years	= Kṛta-Sandhyāṁśa
3000 divine years	= Tretā Yuga
300 divine years	= Tretā-Sandhā
300 divine years	= Tretā-Sandhyāṁśa
2000 divine years	= Dvāpara Yuga
200 divine years	= Dvāpara-Sandhyā
200 divine years	= Dvāpara-Sandhyāṁśa
1000 divine years	= Kali-Yuga
100 divine years	= Kali-Sandhyā
100 divine years	= Kali-Sandhyāṁśa
4 Yugas combined	= 1 Mahāyuga, or 1 Divine Yuga
1 Mahayuga	= 12,000 divine years
	= 43,20,000 human years
$71 + \frac{6}{14}$ Mahāyugas	= 1 Manvantara
14 Manvantaras or 1000 Mahāyugas	
	= 1 Day of Brahma
	or
	The period of a Kalpa
	= 4,320,000,000 human years

THE PRESENT AGE OF THE EARTH

The present Kalpa is the *Vārāha-Kalpa*, of which the following period has already elapsed:—

6 Manvantaras =	1,85,14,28,574 human years
+ 27 Mahāyugas =	11,66,40,000 human years (of the present <i>Vaiṣvata</i> Manvantara).
+ 3 Yugas (Satya, Dvapara, Kali) =	38,88,000 human years
+ Past period of Kali (28th) =	5070 years (up to A. D. 1969).
Total Period elapsed =	1,97,19,61,544 years

This period may be taken, according to the Purāṇas, as the age of the present creation or *śṛṣṭi*. In the beginning the earth was only in the atomic form. It was in the womb of the cosmic water, and later on, it emerged from those waters as they gradually dried up by the Sun's rays, (that is what the episode of the *Prithivi-uddhāra* by God *Varāha* may indicate). So the real age of the present solid earth may be less than the above calculation of the present age of the *śṛṣṭi*, which surprisingly comes close to the geological time scale calculation as given below:

**ORIGIN OF
THE GEOLOGICAL**

Eras	Periods and Systems	Derivation of Names	
CAINOZOIC Kainos or Cenos = recent Zoe = life (Recent-life)	QUATERNARY		
	Recent or Holocene } Glacial or Pleistocene }	Holos = complete Pleiston = most	
	TERTIARY		
	Pliocene	Pleion = more	
	Miocene	Meion = less	
	Oligocene	Oligos = few	
	Eocene	Eos = dawn	
			} 'cene' from Kainos = recent
	MESOZOIC Mesos = middle (Mediaeval life)	CRETACEOUS	Creta = chalk
		JURASSIC	Jura mountains
TRIASSIC		Threefold division in Germany	
PALÆOZOIC Palaios = ancient (Ancient life)	PERMIAN	Permia, anc. kingdom E. of Volga	
	CARBONIFEROUS	Coal-bearing	
	DEVONIAN or OLD RED SANDSTONE	Devon (marine sediments) (Land sediments of same period)	
	SILURIAN	Silures anc. tribe of Welsh border	
	ORDOVICIAN	Ordovices, anc. tribe, N. Wales	
	CAMBRIAN	Cambria = Wales	
PRE-CAMBRIAN ERAS			
	PROTEROZOIC	Proteros = Earlier	
	ARCHÆOZOIC	Archæos = Primæval	
	EOZOIC	Eos = Dawn	

UNRECORDED INTERVAL**ORIGIN OF THE EARTH**

**THE EARTH
TIME SCALE***

Approximate dates in years	Distinctive Life
25,000	} Modern Man
1,000,000	
15,000,000	} Mammals and Flowering Plants
35,000,000	
50,000,000	
70,000,000	
120,000,000	} Reptiles
150,000,000	
190,000,000	
220,000,000	} Amphibians and Primitive Plant
280,000,000	
320,000,000	} Fishes
350,000,000	} Invertebrates First appearance of abundant fossils
400,000,000	
500,000,000	
	} Scanty remains of Sponges and Seaweeds
at least 1,750,000,000	No direct fossil evidence of Life
Unrecorded Interval	
at least 2,000,000,000	

*This Geological Time Scale showing the date of the origin of the Earth has been taken from Arthur Holmes ; *Principles of Physical Geology*, pp. 104-105. It has been kindly supplied by Dr. Arup Deb, Department of Geology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

कर्मयोगः

कार्यमित्येव यत्कर्म नियतं सङ्गवर्जितम् ।
क्रियते विदुषा कर्म तद् भवेदपि मोक्षदम् ॥
अथवा यदि कर्माणि कुर्यान्नित्यान्यपि द्विजः ।
अकृत्वा फलसंन्यासं बधयते तत्फलेन तु ॥
तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन त्यक्त्वा कर्माश्रितं फलम् ।
अविद्वानपि कुर्वीत कर्माप्नोति चिरात् पदम् ॥
कर्मणा क्षीयते पापमैहिकं पौर्विकं तथा ।
मनः प्रसादमन्वेति ब्रह्मविज्जायते नरः ॥
कर्मणा सहिताज्ज्ञानात् सम्यग्योगोऽभिजायते ।
ज्ञानं च कर्मसहितं जायते दोषवर्जितम् ॥
तस्मात् सर्वप्रयत्नेन यत्र तत्राश्रमे रतः ।
कर्माणीश्वरतुष्ट्यर्थं कुर्यान्नैष्कर्म्यमाप्नुयात् ॥
संप्राप्य परमं ज्ञानं नैष्कर्म्यं तत्प्रसादतः ।
एकाकी निर्ममः शान्तो जीवन्नेव विमुच्यते ॥
वीक्षते परमात्मानं परं ब्रह्म महेश्वरम् ।
नित्यानन्दी निराभासस्तस्मिन्नेव लयं व्रजेत् ॥
तस्मात्सेवेत सततं कर्मयोगं प्रसन्नधीः ।
तृप्तये परमेशस्य तत्पदं याति शाश्वतम् ॥

(कूर्मपुराण १. ३. १९-२७)

A NOTE ON KAPĀLAMOCANA

In the *Purāṇa*, X, 2 (July 1968), Devendra Handa has described a *tīrtha* called Kapālamocana in the Kurukṣetra region. In the same journal, XI, 1 (January 1969), V. Raghavan has referred to the existence of one or two *tīrthas* of this name in Kashmir.

It is certain that a homonymous *tīrtha* existed at Vārāṇasī as well. Thus one of the copper-plates of the Gāhaḍavāla ruler Govindacandra (c. A. D. 1114-55) found at Kamauli, District Vārāṇasī, says that the ruler bathed in Kapālamocana-*ghaṭṭa* on the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasī before making the grant of a village to a Brāhmaṇa in *saṃvat* 1178, i. e. A. D. 1122 (*Epigraphia Indica*, IV, pp. 109-11).

Prof. Anand Swarup Gupta, Editor-in-charge of this journal, has very kindly drawn my attention to a legend in the *Vāmana-Purāṇa* (ed. Anand Swarup Gupta, All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1967), *adhyāya* 3, verses 47-51, about a pond called Kapālamocana at Vārāṇasī. Other references to this Vārāṇasī *tīrtha* in the *Purāṇas* are not lacking, see Moti Chandra, *Kāśī kā Itihāsa* (Bombay, 1962), pp. 172, 176 and 185.

It appears therefore that there were many *tīrthas* of this name at different places.

—A. GHOSH

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(JANUARY-JUNE, 1969)

PURĀṆA-WORK

KURMA-PURĀṆA-WORK

The Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa with its English and Hindi translations having been published last year, the work of the Critical Edn. of the Kūrma Purāṇa is now in hand. The following preliminary work is being done for this purpose:—

(A) *Collation*—The following MSS. of the Kūrma-Purāṇa have been collated—

(a) *Devanāgarī Manuscripts*

1. No. 41 of 1881, from the B.O.R.I., Poona, dated Samvat 1615 (A. D. 1558).
2. No. 5589, from the V.V.I. Hoshiarpur, dated Samvat 1679 (A. D. 1622).
3. E. 3346, from the India Office Library, London.
4. PM. 2418. I. & II. (Two Volumes), from the Adyar Lib., Madras.

(b) *Bengali Manuscripts*

5. No. 2845 from the Dacca University; Microfilm.
6. No. 398 (G4492-5-F7), from the Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

(c) *Oriyā Manuscript*

7. No. 75139, from the Adyar Library, Madras; containing only the Uttarārdha-text.

(d) *Nandi-Nāgarī Manuscript*

8. A Palm-leaf MS. from the Śrīṅgerī Maṭha, Mysore.

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जनवरी—जून, १९६९)

पुराणकार्यम्

कूर्मपुराणस्य कार्यम्

विगतवर्षे वामनपुराणस्य आंग्ल-हिन्दी-अनुवादसंस्करणाभ्यां सहितस्य समीक्षितसंस्करणस्य प्रकाशने जाते सति वर्तमानसमये कूर्मपुराणस्य समीक्षित-संस्करणसम्बन्धे कार्यजातं प्रचरति । एतत्संबन्धे अधोलिखितानि पूर्वकार्याणि सम्पाद्यन्ते :—

(अ) अधोऽङ्कितकूर्मपुराणहस्तलेखाः सम्यक् संपादिताः :—

(क) देवनागरीहस्तलेखाः ; यथा—

१. संख्या ४१ आफ् १८८१, पूनास्थ भण्डारकर शोधसंस्थानतः, कालः संवत् १६१५ (१५५८ ई०) ।
२. सं० ५५८९, वी० वी० आइ० होशियारपुरतः, कालः संवत् १६७९ (१६२२ ई०) ।
३. ई० ३३४६, लन्दनस्थ इण्डिया आफिस लाइब्रेरीतः ।
४. पी० एम० २४१८, १ तथा २. (भागद्वयम्), मद्रासस्थ-अड्यारलाइब्रेरीतः ।

(ख) बंगला-हस्तलेखाः ; यथा—

५. संख्या २८४५ माइक्रोफिल्म ; ढाकाविश्वविद्यालयतः ।
६. संख्या ३९८ (G 4492-5-F7), कलिकातायाः एसियाटिक-सोसाइटीतः ।

(ग) उड़िया-हस्तलेखः :—

७. सं० ७५१३९, मद्रासस्थ-अड्यारपुस्तकालयतः (उत्तरार्द्धभागः केवलम्)

(घ) नन्दिनागरी-हस्तलेखः :—

८. एकः ताडपत्र-हस्तलेखः, मैसूरस्य शृंगेरीमठात् ।

(e) *Grantha Manuscript*

9. A Palm-leaf MS. purchased from Madras, containing only the Pūrvārdha-text.

The following Manuscripts are being collated:—

1. D. 10427 from the Sarasvati Mahal, Tanjore, Devanāgarī; microfilm copy procured; photo-copy prepared here by the Purāṇa Deptt.
2. No. C. 371 from the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore; Devanāgarī; microfilm copy procured; photo-copy prepared by the Purāṇa Deptt.
3. A Palm-leaf MS. No. 6036, from the V.V.I. Hoshiarpur, Grantha script; complete.

Efforts are also being made to procure a complete MS. of Oriya from the Raghunandan Library Puri, a Malayalam MS. from the Kerala University, Trivandrum, and a Kashmiri MS. from the Dharmārtha Trust, Jammu.

(B) *Other Work*

- (a) A subject-concordance of the parallel topics of the Kūrma Purāṇa with the Epics and the other Purāṇas is being prepared. The parallel topics from the Matsya, Vāmana, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa have been noted by this time.
- (b) Name-index of persons, places, rivers, mountains, tīrthas etc. from the Kūrma-Purāṇa is under preparation.
- (c) Kūrma Purāṇa quotations from the *Nibandhas* and the *Smṛti-śikṣās* are being collected.

'PURĀṆA' BULLETIN

The Vasanta-Pañcamī Number of the Purāṇa Bulletin (XI. 1) was published on the Vasanta-Pañcamī day, (January 22, 1969), consisting of pp. 202, and containing articles on Purāṇic topics, besides a Stuti with comment, Sūktis, notes and Book-Reviews.

We regret to inform that owing to some unavoidable circumstances the present July issue of the Purāṇa-Bulletin is not being published as the 'Vāmana-Purāṇa-Number' as had been proposed and stated in the last Vasanta-Pañcamī issue (XI. 1). It is hoped that the next January issue (XII. 1) will be published as the 'Vāmana Purāṇa Number'.

(ङ) ग्रन्थ-हस्तलेखा :—

९. एकः ताडपत्रीयहस्तलेखः पूर्वार्धभागमय एव मद्रासनगरात् क्रीतः ।
निम्नाङ्कितानां हस्तलेखानां संवादकार्यं प्रचलति :—
१. डी० १०४२७ सरस्वतीमहल-तञ्जोरतः, देवनागरीलिप्यां ; माइक्रोफिल्मः, फोटोप्रतिः पुराणविभागद्वारा निर्मिता ।
 २. संख्या सी. ३७१ ओरियन्टल रिसर्च इन्स्टीच्यूट माइसूरात् देवनागरी लिप्यां ; माइक्रोफिल्मः, फोटोप्रतिः पुराणविभागद्वारा निर्मिता ।
 ३. एकः सम्पूर्णः ताडपत्रहस्तलेखः सं० ६०३६, वी० वी० आइ० होशियारपुरात् ग्रन्थलिप्यां लिखितः प्राप्तः ।

अन्यच्च, प्रयत्नाः क्रियन्ते उडियालिप्यां एकस्य संपूर्णस्य हस्तलेखस्य संप्राप्तये पुरीस्थात् रघुनन्दनपुस्तकालयात् । अपरस्य मलयालमहस्तलेखस्य केरलविश्वविद्यालयात् त्रिवेन्द्रमस्थितस्य, तथाऽन्यस्य च काश्मीरीहस्तलेखस्य च धर्मार्थ ट्रस्ट जम्मू इत्यस्य स्थानात् प्राप्तये ।

(आ) इतरकार्याणि

(अ) कूर्मपुराणस्य इतरपुराणैः इतिहासग्रन्थाभ्यां च सह साम्यं भजतां कूर्मपुराणविषयाणां सूची निर्मायमाणा वर्तते । अद्यावधि मत्स्यवामनवायुब्रह्माण्ड-पुराणानां समानविषयाणां सूची प्रस्तुता वर्तते ।

(आ) कूर्मपुराणस्थानां व्यक्ति-स्थान नदी-पर्वत-तीर्थादीनां नामसूची अपि निर्मायमाणा वर्तते ।

(इ) निबन्धग्रन्थेभ्यः स्मृतिटीकाभ्यश्च कूर्मपुराणश्लोकानामुद्धरणानि संगृह्यमाणानि वर्तन्ते ।

‘पुराणम्’ पत्रिका

‘पुराण’ पत्रिकायाः वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्कः (११.१) वसन्तपञ्चमीदिने (२२ जनवरी १९६९ दिनाङ्के) प्रकाशितो जातः । तस्मिन्नङ्के २०२ पृष्ठानि सन्ति । तत्र सूक्तिटिप्पणीस्तुत्यादीनामतिरिक्तं पुराणवाङ्मयोपरि नानानिबन्धाश्चासन् । इदं सखेदं निवेदनीयं यद् अयमङ्कः वामनपुराणाङ्को भविष्यतीति वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्के सूचितं अपरिहार्यकारणैः तथा न जातम् । आशास्महे आगामी जनवरी-अङ्कः वामनपुराणाङ्को भविष्यतीति ।

PURĀṆA PĀṬHA AND PRAVACANA

1. From Māgha, Śukla 1 to 9 (January 19 to 26, 1969) the whole of the Devī-Bhāgavata was recited and discourses on it were given by Pt. Thakur Prasad Dvivedi of Ramnagar in the Sumeru Mandir.
2. From Fālguna, Kṛṣṇa 2 to 13 (February 5-16, 1969) the whole of the Vāmana Purāṇa was recited from its Critical Edition in the morning and discourses on it were given in the evening in the Śiva-temple by Pt. Thakur Prasad Dvivedi.

VEDA-PĀRĀYAṆA

From Māgha, Śukla 1 to 15 (January 19 to Feb. 2, 1969) the complete texts of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda, Taittirīya-Śākhā with its Brāhmaṇa, Āraṇyaka and Upaniṣad were recited from memory by Pt. Bhaskara Vaiśampayana of Bilaspur (M. P.) in the Veda Vyāsa temple inside the Ramnagar Fort. Pt. Sri Krishna Murti Ghana-pathi of Kashi was the Śrotā. The reciter was awarded a certificate of merit and a *ratna Kaṅkaṇa* by His Highness.

JYOTIṢA-SAMMELANA

The All-India Kashiraj Trust held a Jyotiṣa-Sammelana in the Shivala Palace, Varanasi, on 26 March, 1969 under the chairmanship of His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. The topic for the discussion was वाणवृद्धिरसन्नय (i. e. an increase upto five ghaṭikās and a decrease upto six ghaṭikās in the duration of a *tithi* or lunar day) versus सप्तवृद्धिदशन्नय (an increase upto seven ghaṭikās and a decrease upto ten ghaṭikās in a *tithi*). Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid maintained and explained the principle of वाणवृद्धिरसन्नय according to the Śākalya-Samhitā.

Jyotiṣa-scholars mainly belonging to the Banaras Hindu University and the Vārāṇaseya Sanskrit University and other local scholars took part in the discussion. The Vice-Chancellor of the Sanskrit University, Dr. Gauri Nath Shastri, was also present on this occasion. A Sub-Committee was formed for further consideration and discussion.

पुराणपाठः प्रवचनं च

१. माघशुक्लप्रतिपदामारभ्य नवमीं तिथिं यावत् (जनवरी १९-२६, १९६९) सम्पूर्णदेवीभागवतस्य पाठः सुमेरुमन्दिरे कृतः । तद्विषये रामनगर-वासिना श्रीठाकुरप्रसादद्विवेदिमहोदयेन प्रवचनं कृतम् ।

२. फाल्गुनकृष्णद्वितीयामारभ्य त्रयोदशीं यावत् (फरवरी ५-१६, १९६९) संपूर्णवामनपुराणस्य पाठः समीक्षितसंस्करणतः शिवमन्दिरे प्रातःकाले जातः । एतद्विषयकं प्रवचनं सायाह्नसमये पण्डितठाकुरप्रसादद्विवेदिना कृतम् ।

वेदपारायणम्

माघ शुक्ल १ तिथिम् आरम्भ १५ तिथिं यावत् (जनवरी १९-फरवरी २, १९६९) कृष्णयजुर्वेदस्य ब्राह्मणारण्यकोपनिषदैः सह सम्पूर्णायाः तैत्तिरीय-संहितायाः कण्ठस्थः पाठः विलासपुर (मध्यप्रदेश) निवासिना पण्डितभास्करवैशंपायनमहोदयेन रामनगरदुर्गस्थवेदव्यासमन्दिरे कृतः । काशीवास्तव्यः पण्डितकृष्णमूर्ति घनपाठी श्रोता आसीत् । तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः पाठकर्त्रे प्रशंसापत्रं रत्नकङ्कणं च प्रदत्तम् ।

ज्योतिषसम्मेलनम्

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य तत्त्वावधाने वाराणसीस्थशिवालाप्रासादे २६ मार्च १९६९ दिनाङ्के तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशमहाराज डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंह-महोदयानां साभापत्ये ज्योतिषसम्मेलनं संजातम् । विवेचनीयौ पक्षौ आस्ताम्—'बाणवृद्धिरसक्षयः' अर्थात् चान्द्रतिथौ पञ्चघटिका यावत् वृद्धिः षड्घटिका यावत् हासश्च, तथा 'सप्तवृद्धिदशक्षयः' अर्थात् सप्तघटिका यावत् वृद्धिः दशघटिका यावत् हासश्च । पण्डितराजेश्वरशास्त्रीद्रविडमहोदयः शाकल्यसंहिता-नुसारतः बाणवृद्धिरसक्षयसिद्धान्तस्य व्याख्यां कृतवान् । हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य वाराणसेयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य च विद्वांसः अन्ये विद्वांसश्च अस्मिन् विषये विवेचनं कृतवन्तः । वाराणसेयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्योषकुलपतिः डा० गौरीनाथशास्त्री अपि उपस्थितः आसीत् । अग्रिमविचारार्थं एका उपसमितिर्निर्मिता ।

KŪRMA-JAYANTĪ

As the Purāṇa Department is now doing the work on the Kūrma-Purāṇa, it celebrated the Kūrma-Jayantī on the Vaiśākha-Pūrṇimā, May 1, 1969. His Highness also graced the occasion. *Havana* and *Pūjā* were performed and *prasāda* was distributed.

SCHOLARS WHO CONTACTED THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT

The following scholars and research students contacted the Purāṇa Department either personally or by correspondence for obtaining them certain Purāṇic material and data :—

1. Mr. James Macdonald, International Hostel B. H. U., Varanasi required some data on the ghāṭas of Varanasi as recorded in the Kāśī-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda-Purāṇa or as known traditionally, and he personally visited the Purāṇa Department for this purpose.
2. Dr. Jagadish S. Sharma, Librarian of the Punjab University Library, was supplied the required information on the geographical names connected with the ancient Indian history.
3. A Professor of the Sanskrit and Philosophy Department, Gujarat Vidyapith has been supplied certain information on the Devī-Bhāgavata which he required for his Ph. D. students.
4. Miss Shashi Mathur, 6-E, Karol Bagh, New Delhi, Research Scholar, working on the cultural Study of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, wanted information about the available manuscripts of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, which was supplied to her.
5. Miss Santosh Bagai, 10-A/7, East Patel Nagar, Delhi-8, who is a lecturer in Sanskrit in a Women's College of the University of Delhi, and also doing research on the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, in her letter of 25. 4. 69 appreciates the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin and considers it as "indispensable for Research Scholars." She wanted to supply her a list of the articles on the Viṣṇu Purāṇa published in the various issues of the Purāṇa-Bulletin, which list has been supplied to her.

कूर्मजयन्ती

यतस्तु पुराणविभागे संप्रति कूर्मपुराणकार्यं प्रचरति अतः अस्मिन् विभागे वैशाखपूर्णिमा दिने (मई १, १९६९) कूर्मजयन्ती आयोजिता आसीत् । अस्मिन्नवसरे तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशमहोदया अपि उपस्थिता आसन् । हवन-पूजनानन्तरं प्रसादवितरणं जातम् ।

पुराणविभागेन सह संपर्कं स्थापयितारो विद्वांसः

अधोनिर्दिष्टा विद्वांसः अनुसंधित्सवश्च वैयक्तिकरूपेण पत्रेण वा पौराणिक-सामग्रीप्राप्तये पुराणविभागेन सह संपर्कं स्थापितवन्तः—

१. इण्टरनेशनल होस्टल, का० हि० वि०, वाराणसी, इत्यत्रत्यः श्रीजेम्स मैकडानल्लमहोदयः—अयं महानुभावः स्कन्दपुराणस्य काशीखण्डे वर्णितानामथवा परम्परायाम् वर्णितानां काशीघटानां विषये किञ्चिद्विवरणं प्राप्तुं पुराणविभागे आगतः ।

२. पञ्जाबविश्वविद्यालयस्य पुस्तकालयाध्यक्षः डा० जगदीशशरणशर्म-महोदयाय प्राचीनेतिहासेन संबद्धानि कानिचित् भौगोलिकविवरणानि प्रदत्तानि ।

३. गुजरात विद्यापीठस्य संस्कृतदर्शनविभागयोरेकस्मै प्राध्यापकमहोदयाय देवीभागवतपुराणविषयकं किञ्चिद्विवरणं प्रदत्तम् । अयम् महानुभावः स्वशोध-छात्रेभ्यः विवरणमिदं वाञ्छति स्म ।

४. ६—ई. करोलबाग नयी दिल्ली वास्तव्या कुमारी शशिमाथुरमहोदया, या विष्णुपुराणस्य सांस्कृतिकाध्ययनविषये शोधं करोति, विष्णुपुराणस्योपलब्ध-हस्तलेखानां विषये जिज्ञासितवती । एषा सूचना तस्मै प्रदत्ता ।

५. १०-ए/७ ईस्ट पटेलनगर दिल्ली-८ इत्यत्र वास्तव्या विश्वविद्यालयस्य एकस्मिन् महिलामहाविद्यालये प्राध्यापिका कुमारी सन्तोषबगौमहोदया, या विष्णुपुराणविषये अनुसंधानं करोति, २५।४।६९ दिनाङ्किते स्वपत्रे 'पुराण' पत्रिकां प्रशंसितवती । सा इमां पत्रिकां शोधछात्रेभ्य नितान्तं महत्त्वपूर्णा मन्यते । सा विष्णुपुराणविषयकानां लेखानां सूचीं वाञ्छति स्म । एषा सूची तस्यै प्रेषिता ।

SCHOLARS WHO VISITED THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT

1. Maharaja-Kumar Dr. Raghubir Singh, Sitamau, Our Trustee.—4. 1. 69.

2. Dr. W. Norman Brown, Professor Emeritus of Sanskrit, University of Pennsylvania.—16. 1. 69.

He has remarked in our Visitors' Book as follows—"The work of editing the texts of the Purāṇas, with English and Hindi translations, is one of the important project in the study of India's tradition. The volume of work involved in collecting, selecting and collating manuscripts is enormous, but is only a beginning. The judgment required to unraval the relationship of the manuscripts, the fine discrimination needed to determine the correct readings, and now, as in the case of the works being edited here, the mastery of other languages than the original essential to the making of the translations, all call for a rare combination of abilities. Indic scholarship in general is being put under a heavy—and pleasant—obligation by the scholars who have planned and are executing this important labour."

3. Dr. Ainslie T' Embree, Department of Middle East Languages and Cultures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.—16. 1. 69.

4. Dr. D. D. Karve, formerly Principal, Fergusson college, University of Poona —16. 1. 69.

5. Shri V. R. Nambiar, Executive Officer, American Academy of Benares, Varanasi.—16-1-69.

6. Shri Vinod Dvivedi, Nptional Museum, New Delhi :—1. 3. 69.

7. Dr. G. M. Bongard-Levin, Institute for Oriental Studies, Moscow, USSR.—14.3.69.

We are grateful to all these scholars for taking interst in our work.

पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

१. सीतामऊ (मालवा) वास्तव्यः न्याससदस्यश्च महाराजकुमार
डा० रघुबीरसिंहमहोदयः ४-१-६९ दिनाङ्के ।

२. पेनसिलवानिया विश्वविद्यालये संस्कृतस्य 'इमरिटसप्रोफेसर' पदभाक्
डा. डब्ल्यू० नारमन ब्राउनमहोदयः १६. १. ६९ दिनाङ्के ।

अयं महाशयः पुराणविभागस्य दर्शकपुस्तिकायां लिखति—भारतीयपरम्परायाः
अध्ययने हिन्दी-आंग्लभाषयोः अनुवादेन सह पुराणानां संपादनं महत्त्वपूर्णं कार्यमस्ति ।
हस्तलेखानां संग्रहस्य चयनस्य संवादस्य च कार्यं अति कठिनं व्यापकं च
वर्तते । इदं कार्यं प्रारब्धम् एव वर्तते । अस्मिन् कार्ये हस्तलेखानां संबन्धं
दर्शयितुं योग्यता, उचितपाठग्रहणस्य विवेकः तथा च यादृशं कार्यं प्रचरति
तस्मिन् अनुवादकार्यार्थं अन्यभाषाणामपि पाण्डित्यमपेक्षते । इदं कार्यं विशिष्ट-
योग्यतासापेक्षमस्ति । इदं कार्यं यैः विद्वद्भिः प्रस्तावितं यैश्च क्रियतेऽत्र तेषां
अतिकृतज्ञा वर्तते भारतीविद्या ।

३. डा. ऐनस्लाइ टी० इम्ब्री (Dr. Ainslie T. Embree)
न्यूयार्कस्थकोलम्बियाविश्वविद्यालये एशियामहाद्वीपस्य मध्यपूर्वदेशीयभाषानां संस्कृतेश्च
अध्यापकः १६-१-६९ दिनाङ्के ।

४. डा. डी० डी० कर्वे महोदयः, पुण्यपत्तनस्थफर्गुसनमहाविद्यालय-
स्यावकाशप्राप्त आचार्यः १६-१-६९ दिनाङ्के ।

५. अमेरिकन अकादमी, वाराणसी इत्यत्रत्यः श्री वी० आर० नाम्बि-
यार महोदयः १६-१-६९ दिनाङ्के ।

६. नेशनल म्युजियम, दिल्ली, इत्यत्रत्यः श्रीविनोदद्विवेदिमहोदयः
१-३-६९ दिनाङ्के ।

७. इन्स्टीच्यूट फार ओरियण्टल स्टडीज, मास्को, इत्यत्रत्यः डा.
जी० एम० बोनगार्ड लेविन महोदयः १४-३-६९ दिनाङ्के ।

वयं एतेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यः विद्वद्भ्यः तेषां अस्मिन्कार्ये रुचिप्रदर्शनार्थं
कृतज्ञाः स्मः ।

ACTIVITIES OF OUR SISTER-TRUSTS

1. MAHĀRĀJA BANĀRAS VIDYĀ MANDIR TRUST

(1) YAVĀGRĀYANEṢṬI (यवाग्रायणेष्टि)

The above *Iṣṭi* (Yajña or Sacrifice) is performed on the occasion when the barley (*yava*) harvest is reaped by cultivators. This *Iṣṭi* was performed in the Ramnagar Fort in the morning of the Pūrṇimā (full Moon day) of the month of Caitra, April 2, 1969, under the supervision of Panditaraja Shri Rajeshvara Shastri Dravid. The same persons who had acted as yajamāna and priests in the Paurṇamāsa and Darśa Yajñas mentioned in the last issue of the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin (XI. 1., p. 186) also acted as the Yajamāna and Priests in this *Iṣṭi*.

The members of the Sub-committee of the Executive Body of the Viśva Hindu Sammelana who returned from the Patna Session and halted at Varanasi to hold a meeting of the Committee under the chairmanship of His Highness, also attended the *Iṣṭi* and watched with interest its performance according to the Vedic sacrificial rules as prescribed in the Kalpa-sūtras. The dakṣiṇā was given to the priests in kind (i. e. in the form of bags of wheat).

(2) MAṄGALOTSAVA

Under the auspices of the Mahārājā Banaras Vidyā-Mandir-Trust, the *Mangalotsava* was celebrated in the form of the classical music and dance in the evening of 11 March, 1969, in which the teachers and students of the Music College of the Banaras Hindu University took part. A number of prominent persons of Ramnagar and Varanasi attended. The performance was very successful and was much appreciated.

(3) CHANTING OF THE SĀMAVEDA MANTRAS ON THE VĪṆĀ

A Vedic scholar from Madras chanted some Sāmaveda mantras on the Vīṇā in the Ramnagar fort in the evening of 20-5-69. Many learned scholars, such as Dr. Gaurinath Shastri, Vice-Chancellor of the Vārāṇaseya Sanskrit University, Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid, Prof. Lalmani Miśra, Head of the Department of Music, Banaras Hindu University, Shri Jyoti-bhushan Gupta, attended this attractive and novel performance. An interesting discussion on *svaras* and *śrutis* followed in which Dr. Gaurinath Shastri and Prof. Lalmani Misra were the main participants. Rupees hundred and one were given as *dakṣiṇā* by His Highness to the Vedic scholar who gave the performance:

सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

१. महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिर ट्रस्ट

(i) यवाग्रायणेष्टिः

एषा इष्टिः यवाग्रस्य लवनकाले भवति । एषा इष्टि रामनगरदुर्गे पंडित-
राजश्रीराजेश्वरशास्त्रिद्रविडमहोदयस्य निर्देशने चैत्रशुक्लपूर्णिमायाः प्रातःकाले
(अप्रैल २, १९६९) संपन्ना । ते एव जनाः अस्यामपि इष्ट्यां यजमानः
पुरोहिताश्च आसन् ये दर्शपौर्णमासयज्ञे यजमान् पुरोहिता आसन् येषां नामानि च
'पुराण'पत्रिकायाः गताङ्के (११-१, पृ० १८६) प्रकाशितानि । विश्वहिन्दू-
सम्मेलनस्य कार्यसमितेः उपसमित्याः सदस्याः, ये पटनासम्मेलनतः काश्यां तत्रभवतः
काशिनरेशस्याध्यक्षतायां समित्याः सम्मेलनं कर्तुमागता आसन्, महताऽऽदरेण
इष्टिं दृष्टवन्तः । एषा इष्टिः कल्पसूत्रेषु विहितवैदिकनियमानुसारेण संपन्ना ।
पुरोहितेभ्यः अन्नस्य दक्षिणा प्रदत्ता ।

(ii) मङ्गलोत्सवः

महाराज-बनारस-विद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य तत्त्वावधाने ११ मार्च १९६९
दिनाङ्कस्य सायंकाले शास्त्रीयसंगीतरूपेण नृत्यरूपेण च मङ्गलोत्सवः संपन्नो
जातः । अस्मिन् काशीहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयान्तर्गतसंगीतमहाविद्यालयस्य छात्रा
अध्यापकाश्च प्रदर्शका आसन् । रामनगरस्य काश्याश्च बहवः शिष्टा उपस्थिता
आसन् । प्रदर्शनं सफलं प्रशंसितं च जातम् ।

(iii) वीणायाः साहाय्येन सामवेदमन्त्राणां गानम्

२० मई १९६९ दिनाङ्कस्य सायंकाले रामनगरदुर्गे मद्रासनगरादागतः
एको विद्वान् वीणायां केषाञ्चित्सामवेदमन्त्राणां गानमकरोत् । बहवः विद्वांसो,
यथा वाराणसेयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्योपकुलपतिः डा० गौरीनाथशास्त्री, पंडितराज-
राजेश्वरशास्त्रिद्रविडः, हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य संगीतविभागाध्यक्षो डा० लालमणिमिश्रः
तथा श्रीज्योतिभूषणगुप्तमहोदयश्च, उपस्थिता आसन् । स्वरविषये श्रुतिविषये
च उपयोगी विमर्शो जातो यस्मिन् डाक्टर गौरीनाथशास्त्री तथा डाक्टर लालमणि
मिश्रः प्रमुखविवेचकौ आस्ताम् । तत्रभवता काशिनरेशमहोदयेन गानकर्त्रे
विदुषे एकशतमुद्रायाः दक्षिणा प्रदत्ता ।

2. MAHARAJA KASHI NARESH DHARMAKĀRY-NIDHI (TRUST)

(1) The Trustees of the Maharaja Kashi-naresh Dharmakarya-Nidhi under the presidentship of Maharaja Kashinaresh were pleased to approve a scheme of memorising the complete Sāmhītā of the Śukla-Yajurveda with its bulky Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and the related Upaniṣads and Āraṇyakas. It is estimated that it will take at least ten to twelve years to memorise the whole of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa.

Under this scheme the Vedic scholar, Ft. Sakha Ram Ji has been specially deputed to prepare students in this Śākhā. The teacher would be getting a dakṣiṇā of Rs. 300/- p. m. The three students have been memorising the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa under the guidance of the learned scholar. A scholarship of Rs. 601/- p. m. is given to each.

(2) As has been the practice, the above Trust gave a six monthly dakṣiṇā of Rs. 600/- to Pt. Krishna Murti Sroti Sāmavedin on the occasion of the annual function of the Sāngaveda-Vidyālaya, Varanasi. He has been memorising the complete Sāmhīta of the Sāmaveda and its Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads.

DISTINGUISHED GUESTS AT THE NADESAR HOUSE

The following distinguished persons were the guests of His Highness Maharaja Vibhuti Narayan Singh, at his Nadesar House during the period:—

1. Shri Y.B. Chavan, Home Minister, Govt. of India.
2. Shri Shyam Dhar Mishra, M. P.
3. Shri Jagajivan Ram, Food Minister, Govt. of India,
4. Maharajkumar Dr. Raghubir Singh, Sitamau, (Malawa).
5. Shri C.B. Gupta, Chief Minister, Govt. of U.P.
6. Shri Mangala Prasad, Minister, Govt. of U.P.
7. Shri B.B. Lal, Chief Secretary, Govt. of U.P.
8. General Ne Bin, Burma.
9. Justice Shashi Kant Varma, Allahabad High Court.
10. Justice K.B. Ashthana, Allahabad High Court.

(२) महाराजकाशिनरेश-धर्मकार्यनिधि: (न्यासः)

(१) तत्रभवतः काशिनरेशस्याध्यक्षतायां महाराजकाशिनरेशधर्म-कार्यनिधेः न्यासधारिणः शतपथब्राह्मणेन उपनिषदा आरण्यकेन च सह शुक्लयजु-र्वेदस्य संपूर्णां संहितां कण्ठस्थकरणाय योजनां स्वीकृतवन्तः । अनुमीयते समग्रं शतपथब्राह्मणं दशवर्षेषु द्वादशवर्षेषु वा कण्ठगतं भविष्यतीति । अस्यां योजनायां षण्डितसखाराममहोदयः अस्यां शाखायां बालकान् शिक्षितुं नियुक्तो जातः । प्राध्यापकमहोदयः शतत्रयमुद्राणां मासिकीं वृत्तिं प्राप्नोति । त्रयो बालका अस्य निर्देशने शतपथब्राह्मणं कण्ठस्थं कुर्वन्ति तेभ्योऽपि प्रत्येकं षष्टिः मुद्राः प्रतिमासं प्रदीयन्ते ।

(२) यथा पूर्वतः प्रचरति, वाराणसीस्थसाङ्गवेदविद्यालयस्य वार्षिकोत्सवा-वसरे अनेन न्यासेन मासिकवृत्तिरूपेण षण्डितकृष्णमूर्त्तिः श्रौतीत्यस्मै सामवेदविदुषे मासिकवृत्तिरूपेण षट् शतमुद्राः प्रदत्ताः । अयं महानुभावः स्वब्राह्मणोपनिषदा सह सामवेदस्य संपूर्णां संहितां कण्ठस्थं कर्तुं प्रयतमानो वर्तते ।

नन्देश्वरभवने विशिष्टा अतिथयः

अस्मिन् कार्यावधौ अधोनिर्दिष्टा महानुभावाः वाराणसीस्थे नन्देश्वरभवने तत्रभवतां काशिनरेश महाराज डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयानामतिथय आसन्—

१. श्री यशवन्तराव बलवन्तराव चवणमहोदयः; केन्द्रिय गृहमन्त्री ।
२. श्री श्यामधरमिश्रमहोदयः, संसत्सदस्यः ।
३. श्री जगजीवनराममहोदयः, केन्द्रिय-खाद्यमन्त्री ।
४. महाराजकुमार डा० रघुबीरसिंह महोदयः ।
५. श्री चन्द्रभानुगुप्तमहोदयः, उत्तरप्रदेशस्य मुख्यमन्त्री ।
६. श्री मङ्गलाप्रसादमहोदयः, उत्तरप्रदेशस्य मन्त्री ।
७. श्री बी० बी० लालमहोदयः, उत्तरप्रदेशस्य मुख्यसचिवः ।
८. जेनरल ने बिनमहोदयः, बर्माशासनस्याध्यक्षः ।
९. श्री शशिकान्तवर्माहोदयः, प्रयाग उच्चन्यायालयस्य न्यायाधीशः ।
१०. श्री के. बी. अस्थानामहोदयः, प्रयाग उच्चन्यायालयस्य न्यायाधीशः ।

11. Shri N.N Banerjee, Vishva Hindu Parisad.
12. Shri N.P. Sharma, Bar-at-Law; Guyana Swatantra Vidvat Parisad; Guyana Pandit's Council.
13. Prof. Ram Singh.
14. Shri Vishwanath Satyanarayan; Vizayavada.
15. Shri Subramanyam.
16. Shri A. T. Kande; Poona.
17. Pt. Brajeshji.
18. Prof. V. G. Deshpande; Patna.
19. Shri Ganga Saran Singh.
20. Sri P. Gokhle; Poona.

११. श्री एन. एन. बैनर्जीमहोदयः, विश्वहिन्दुपरिषदः ।
१२. श्री एन. पी. शर्मा महोदयः, गायनास्थस्वतन्त्र विद्वत्परिषदः अध्यक्षः ।
१३. प्रो० रामसिंहमहोदयः ।
१४. श्री विश्वनाथ सत्यनारायण महोदयः, विजयवाडावास्तव्यः ।
१५. श्री सुब्रह्मण्यममहोदयः ।
१६. श्री ए. टी. काण्डे महोदयः ।
१७. पं० ब्रजेशजी महोदयः ।
१८. प्रो० वी. जी. देशपाण्डेमहोदयः ।
१९. श्री गङ्गाशरणसिंह महोदयः ।
२०. श्री पी. गोखलेमहोदयः ; पूनावास्तव्यः ।

NOTICE

The 28 International Congress of Orientalists will be held at the Australian National University Canberra, A.C.T., from 6th to 12th January, 1971. All scholars of the languages, history, literature and culture of Asia are welcome.

Enquiries should be addressed to :

The Secretary-General,

28 International Congress of Orientalists,

Australian National University Post Office,

via CANBERRA CITY. A.C.T. 2601. AUSTRALIA.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT OF
THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST,
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI, U. P., INDIA

Purāṇa : Half yearly Purāṇa-Bulletin, started from 1959. Published in January and July each year. Contains articles in English and Sanskrit on Purāṇic studies and research. Annual Subscriptien Rs. 12 or £ 1. Supplements containing Indexes of articles and authors of every five Volumes also available separately.

Vāmana-Purāṇa: Critically edited for the first time by Prof. Anand Swarup Gupta on the basis of 21 manuscripts of different versions and scripts. The Introduction both in English and Sanskrit, besides giving the details of the Critical Apparatus, discusses the various textual problems of the Vāmana Purāṇa and the principles adopted for constituting the text. Besides the Introduction, Constituted Text and the Critical Apparatus the edition contains also a detailed concordance of its Adhyāyas and Ślokas with the other printed editions of the Purāṇa, detailed Adhyāya-Contents, Appendices containing (i) a Subject-concordance with the other Purāṇas and the two Epics, (ii) Vāmana Purāṇa quotations found in the Dharmaśāstra-Nibandhas, both identified and unidentified, and (iii) a concordance of the Vāmana Purāṇa Ślokas with the critical edition of the Mahābhārata. In the end an Index of the Vāmana-Purāṇa Ślokārdhas (Half Ślokas) is also given. Demy quarto size. pp. i-lxx+1-778+1-97
Price Rs. 125/-

Vāmana-Purāṇa with English Translation: English translation along with the constituted Sanskrit Text and with Introduction, Appendices, Adhyāya-concordance with the Veṅkaṭeśvara edn. and Verse-Index. The Appendices contain a subject-concordance and lists of the personal names, geographical names, tīrthas, stotras, vratas, flora and fauna mentioned in the Vāmana Purāṇa with references of Adhs. and Śls. Scientific Latin names of flora and fauna

and descriptive notes on the flora are also given. Demy quarto size, pp. i-1+1-543+1-70 (App.)+1-97 (Verse-Index). Price Rs. 80.

Vāmana-Purāṇa with Hindi Translation: Hindi translation along with the constituted Sanskrit text. Introduction (Hindi), Appendices, Adhyāya-Concordance and Ślokārḍha-Index same as in the English Translation Volume. Size also Same, pp. i-xl+1-465+1-55+1-97. Price Rs. 50.

Rāmacarita-mānasa: The great Hindi Poem of Gosvāmī Tulasīdāsa. Critically edited on the basis of a number of old manuscripts both in India and abroad written within the hundred years of the poet's death. By Prof. Vishvanath Prasad Misra. Price Rs. 6.50, Library Edn. Rs. 15.

Devī-Māhātmya: An annotated edition of the Durgā-Saptaśatī or the Devī-Māhātmya with an English translation. The text is primarily based on an old Nepali Ms. of about 10th century A.D., Symbolical and cultural significance of the text fully explained. By Dr. V. S. Agrawala, Price Rs. 10, Lib. Edn. Rs. 15.

Matsya-Purāṇa—A Study: By Dr. V. S. Agrawala. The Author's point of view is mainly directed to an interpretation of this important Purāṇa in the Vedic background on the one hand and in the light of the cultural, geographical and historical material incorporated in the Purāṇas on the other. Price Rs. 30.

Vyāsa-Praśasti: Compiled and edited by Dr. V. Raghavan from the Mahābhārata, Purāṇas, Māhātmyas, etc. Price Re. 1.

Nīti-Section of the Purāṇārtha-Saṃgraha: Edited with Introduction and Notes by Dr. V. Raghavan. Price Rs. 2.

Viṣṇu-Purāṇa-Viśayānukramaṇī (Subject-Index of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa in Sanskrit): By Pt. Madhvacharya Adya. Price Rs 5.

A New Abridged Version of the Bṛhaspati Saṃhitā of the Garuḍa-Purāṇa: Critically edited with Introduction, critical notes and Appendix by Dr. L. Sternbach. Price Rs. 10.

Hindi Translation of the Report of the Calendar Reform Committee : Government of India. (For Private use and not for sale).

General Secretary,

ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST,
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI (INDIA).

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

OF

THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

1. His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, M.A., D.Litt.
Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi.—(*Chairman*).

Trustee nominated by the Govt. of India :—

2. Shri Raghunath Singh, M.A., LL.B. ; Varanasi.

Trustees nominated by the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh :—

3. Pt. Kamalapati Tripathi ; Deputy Chief Minister, Government of Uttar Pradesh and President, U. P. Congress Committee.
4. Panditaraja Shri Rajeshvar Shastri Dravid, Principal Sangaveda Vidyalaya, Varanasi.

Trustees nominated by His Highness the Maharaja of Banaras :—

5. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, M.A., D. Litt. (London),
F. A. S. B., Professor Emeritus of Comparative Philology,
University of Calcutta ; National Professor in Humanities.
6. Maharajkumar Dr. Raghbir Singh, M A., D. Litt. ;
Raghbir Niwas, Sitamau (Malwa).
7. Pt. Giridhari Lal Mehta, Varanasi ; Managing Director :
Jardine Handerson Ltd. ; The Scindia Steam Navigation
Ltd. ; Trustee : Vallabhram-Saligram Trust, Calcutta.

The 'Purāṇa' Bulletin has been started by the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust with the aim of organising the manifold studies relating to the Purāṇas. It specially discusses the several aspects of text-reconstruction, of the interpretation of the vast cultural and historical material, and of the obscure esoteric symbolism of legends and myths of the Purāṇas. The editors invite contributions from all those scholars who are interested in the culture of the Purāṇa literature in which the religion and philosophy of the Vedas have found the fullest expression.

Statement of ownership and other particulars about

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Place of Publication | ... Fort, Ramnagar, Varanasi |
| 2. Periodicity of Publication | ... Half-yearly |
| 3. Printer's Name | ... Rama shanker |
| Nationality | ... Indian |
| Address | ... The Tara Printing Works,
Kamachha, Vāranasi |
| 4. Publisher's Name | ... Ramesh Chandra De, General
Secretary, All-India Kashiraj
Trust |
| Nationality | ... Indian |
| Address | ... All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi. |
| 5. Editors' Names
with Address | ... Rajeshwar Sastri Dravid (Sāṅga-
Veda Vidyālaya, Varanasi), V.
Raghavan (Madras University),
L. Sternbach, United Nations
(New York), A. S. Gupta
(<i>Editor-in-Charge</i>) (Purāṇa
Dept , Fort Ramnagar,
Varanasi). |
| Nationality | ... Indian, and American (L.
Sternbach) |
| 6. Name of the owner | ... All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar. Varanasi. |

I, Ramesh Chandra De, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Ramesh Chandra De
Publisher.