

Vol XII, No. 2]

[July, 1970

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

Annual 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 ;

भू० पृ० 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 Rajeśvara Śāstrī Draviḍa ;
Principal, Sāṅga-Veda-Vidyālaya, Varanasi.

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

Dr. Ludwik Sternbach, LL. D., Hon. Prof. of Dharmaśāstra
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. XII., No. 2]

व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः

[July 18, 1970

लेखसूची—Contents

| | Page |
|---|---------|
| 1. व्यासमहिमा [The Glorification of Vyāsa] | 203 |
| 2. इन्द्रद्युम्नकृता विष्णुस्तुतिः [Eulogy of Viṣṇu by Indradyumna] | 204 |
| 3. Worship of the Sun [सूर्यस्थोपासना] By <i>Dr. V. Raghavan</i> ; Madras. | 205—230 |
| 4. Śakti (The Power) in the Philosophy of the Purāṇas [पौराणिकदर्शने शक्तेः स्वरूपम्] By <i>Dr. Raghunath Giri</i> ; Deptt. of Philosophy, Kashi Vidyapith, Varanasi. | 231—251 |
| 5. The Concept of the Earth in Purāṇas [पुराणेषु भूमेर्वर्णनम्] By <i>Sri Ramji Pandey</i> ; Purāṇa Section ; Deptt. of Ancient Indian History and Culture, B.H.U., Varanasi. | 252—266 |
| 6. Some Notes and Observations on the Purāṇic Account of the Imperial Guptas [गुप्तवंशविषयकपौराणिकविवरणस्य विमर्शः] By <i>Dr. S. N. Roy</i> ; Deptt. of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Allahabad University. | 267—285 |

7. The Story of Arjuna Kārtavīrya without Reconstruction
[पाठनिर्धारणं विना कार्तवीर्यार्जुनाख्यानविवेचनम्] 286-303
By *Dr. Madeleine Biardeau* ;
Directeur D'études Ecole Pratique des Hautes
Etudes. Sorbonne, Paris.
8. A Problem of Purāṇic Text-Reconstruction
[पुराणपाठनिर्धारणविषयिका एका समस्या] 304-321
By *Anand Swarup Gupta* ;
Purāṇa Deptt., Fort Ramnagar.
9. Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust
[सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्] 322-331
10. पुराणरत्नानि 332

व्यासमहिमा

(Kūrma-Purāṇa, Bib. Ind. Edn.)

कृष्णद्वैपायनो व्यासो विष्णुनारायणः स्वयम् ।
अवातरत् स सम्पूर्णं स्वेच्छया भगवान् हरिः ॥
अनाद्यन्तं परं ब्रह्म न देवा ऋषयो विदुः ।
एकोऽयं वेद भगवान् व्यासो नारायणः प्रभुः ॥ I. Adh. 51
षड्विंशो तथा^१ प्राप्ते यस्मिन् वै द्वापरे द्विजाः ।
पराशरसुतो व्यासः कृष्णद्वैपायनोऽभवत् ॥
स एव सर्ववेदानां पुराणानां प्रदर्शकः ।
पाराशर्यो महायोगी कृष्णद्वैपायनो हरिः ॥ I. Adh. 52
इत्येदक्षरं वेदमोङ्कारं वेदमव्ययम् ।
अवेदं च विजानाति पाराशर्यो महामुनिः ॥ I. Adh. 52
तस्मै व्यासाय मुनये सर्वज्ञाय महर्षये ।
पाराशर्याय शान्ताय नमो नारायणात्मने ॥ II. Adh. 45

१. इतः परं

शक्तिः षड्विंशो तु पराशरः । सप्तविंशो तथा व्यासो जातुकर्णो महामुनिः ॥

अष्टाविंशो पुनः

इत्यधिकं केषुचित् पुस्तकेषु दृश्यते ।

इन्द्रद्युम्नकृता विष्णुस्तुतिः

(Kūrma-Purāṇa, Bib. Ind. Edn.)

इन्द्रद्युम्न उवाच

यज्ञेशाच्युत गोविन्द माधवानन्त केशव ।
कृष्ण विष्णो हृषीकेश तुभ्यं विश्वात्मने नमः ॥
नमोऽस्तु ते पुराणाय हरये विश्वमूर्त्तये ।
सर्गस्थितिविनाशानां हेतवेऽनन्तशक्तये ॥
निर्गुणाय नमस्तुभ्यं निष्कलाय नमो नमः ।
पुरुषाय नमस्तेऽस्तु विश्वरूपाय ते नमः ॥
नमस्ते वासुदेवाय विष्णवे विश्वयोनये ।
आदिमध्यान्तहीनाय ज्ञानगम्याय ते नमः ॥
नमस्ते निर्विकाराय निष्प्रपञ्चाय ते नमः ।
भेदाभेदविहीनाय नमोऽस्त्वानन्दरूपिणे ॥
नमस्ताराय शान्ताय नमोऽप्रतिहृतात्मने ।
अनन्तमूर्त्तये तुभ्यममूर्त्तय नमो नमः ॥
नमस्ते परमार्थाय मायातीताय ते नमः ।
नमस्ते परमेशाय ब्रह्मणे परमात्मने ॥
नमोऽस्तु ते सुसूक्ष्माय महादेवाय ते नमः ।
नमः शिवाय शुद्धाय नमस्ते परमेष्ठिने ॥
त्वयैतत् सृष्टमखिलं त्वमेव परमा गतिः ।
त्वं पिता सर्वभूतानां त्वं माता पुरुषोत्तम ॥
त्वमक्षरं परं धाम चिन्मात्रं व्योम निष्कलम् ।
सर्वस्याधारमव्यक्तमनन्तं तमसः परम् ॥
प्रपश्यन्ति परात्मानं ज्ञानदीपेन केवलम् ।
प्रपद्ये भवतो रूपं तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥ I. Adh. 1

WORSHIP OF THE SUN

By

V. RAGHAVAN

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे विदुषा लेखकेन सूर्यपूजायाः प्राचीनत्वं सार्वभौमत्वं तस्या विविधदेशेषु स्वरूप-प्रकारं तथा सूर्यमन्दिराणां स्वरूपं स्थानं च सम्यक् प्रमाणपुरस्सरं प्रदर्शितम् । निबन्धं दशभागेषु विभज्य विभिन्नशीर्षकेषु विविधविषयाणां विवेचनं कृतम्, यथा—(i) सूर्योपासना ख्रिष्टीयवर्षस्य प्राक् १४०० वर्षेऽपि प्रचलिता आसीत् पाश्चात्य-मध्यपूर्वदेशेषु । 'हिट्टाइट' इति प्रथितजनानां सूर्यो 'मित्र' इति नाम्ना उपास्यदेव आसीत् तेषु वर्षेषु—इति सिद्धमेव 'हिट्टाइट-मितानि' जनानां सन्निपत्रस्योपलब्ध्या । तेषु जनेषु सूर्यः कर्मसाक्षी जगच्चक्षुश्च प्रसिद्ध आसीत् । तदनन्तरं 'अवेस्ता' इत्यस्य 'मित्र' इति नाम्ना प्रथितः सूर्यदेवः यूरोपीयदेशेषु विस्तृतिमवाप । अत्र विविधदेशेषु विविधप्रमाणैः सूर्योपासनायाः प्रचारः, पूजाप्रकारः, मूर्तिप्रकारश्च प्रदर्शितः—वैदिक-सूर्योपासनया सह साम्यमपि निर्दिशितम् ।—(ii) तदनन्तरं वेदेष्वारण्यकेषूपनिषत्सु च सूर्योपासनाप्रकारः, सूर्यसंबन्धिवर्णनम् च प्रदर्शितम् । —(iii) रामायणे महाभारते चोपलब्धस्य सूर्यसंबन्धिवर्णनस्य निर्देशो विहितोऽत्र ।—(iv) भारतीय शासकैरपि सूर्योपासनायाः प्राथम्यं स्थापितम् । हर्षवर्धनः सूर्योपासकशासकेषु प्रमुख आसीत् । गुप्तवंशीयैः शासकैरपि 'आदित्य' इत्युपाधिः स्वैभ्यः स्वीकृतः ।—(v) पुराणेष्वपि सूर्यपूजा सूर्योपासना च वर्णिताऽस्ति । केषुचिच्च पुराणेषु सूर्यवर्णनस्य प्राधान्यं वर्तते—एते विषयाः सप्रमाणं प्रदर्शिताः ।—(vi) सूर्यपूजासंबन्धिग्रन्थानां हस्तलेखानां च परिचयो दत्तः ।—(vii) सूर्य-सूक्तानां स्तुति-ग्रन्थानां च निर्देशः प्रस्तुतः ।—(viii) सूर्यमन्दिराणां परिचयः प्रस्तुतः ।—(ix) आदिम-जन-जातिषु अपि सूर्यपूजायाः प्रचारः प्राप्यते ।—(x) अन्ते च सूर्योपासनायाः वैष्णव-शैव-शाक्तेषु उपासनापद्धतिं विनिर्दिश्य सूर्योपासनाया महत्त्वमुपयोगित्वञ्च प्रदर्शितम् । एषु शीर्षकेषु तत्तद्विषयाणां प्रमाणपुरस्सरं प्रामाणिकं च विवेचनं कृतं निबन्धेऽत्र ।]

“सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुषश्च”

“The Sun is the Soul of all that moves and is stationary”

(Rg. Veda, I. 115. 1.)

When we speak of the worship of the Sun, we are really dealing with an international religion, a religion which in the 3rd Century A. D. was poised against Christianity in a bid to take over as the world religion. But the worship of the Sun, *Mitra* as He is known in His sway in the Middle East and the West, was as old as 1400 B. C. when in Anatolia, at the place called Bagozkoi, in a treaty between two ruling dynasties, the Hittites and the Mittanis, in a language almost Sanskrit, *Mitra*, along with the Vedic gods, Indra, Varuṇa and Nāsatyau or Aśvins, was invoked. The worship of the Sun was part of the State religion of the Hittites and the Sun was regarded as the King of Gods, the God of right and justice and the impartial surveyor from above of the deeds of men (*Karmasākṣin* and *Jagaccakṣus* as we would say). As the God of peace-contract, He always figured in the treaties that Kings concluded. Here is the prayer to Him by the Hittite King Muwatallis : “Sun-God of Heaven ! My Lord ! shepherd of mankind !daily thou sittest in judgment upon man, dog, etc.” And in another prayer : “The inspired lord of justice art thou, and in the place of justice, thou art untiring.” Another interesting fact is that like the language of the tablets, and the names of the Vedic deities, the conception of the eastern origin of the Sun, points to the Indian origin of the Sun-worship of Asia Minor of the middle of the second millennium B. C.

The latter spread of Mithraism in Europe was from the Mithra of the Avesta, where Mithra was next only to Ahura Mazda. Avestan Mithra was the lord of the wide pastures, truthful, vigilant with a thousand eyes and ears ; ‘Mithram’ meant ‘compact’, contract, plighted word and ‘Mithradruj’ was a promise-breaker ; His companions were Saraosa, Śrosa or Susrusa =obedience and Rashnu =justice. The following prayer is from the Avestan hymn to Mithra, the Mihir Yasht (X) :

“I will worship Mithra, who is good, strong, supernatural foremost, merciful, incomparable, high-dwelling, a mighty strong warrior. Valient, he is equipped with a well-fashion-
ed weapon, he who watches in darkness, the undeceivable. He is what (is) strongest among the very strong ; he has by far the greatest insight among the gods. Fortune attends him, the valiant, who with his thousand ears and ten

thousand eyes is the strong, all-knowing, undeceivable master of ten thousand spies." (X. 170-1).¹

Mithra did not disappear from the later or even modern Zoroastrianism. The Mihragān, a five-day festival of Mithra is still observed and Mithra-temples still exist in Iran. Mithra is still called 'Judge of Iran', 'Mihr-i-Iran-dāvar'.²

With the growth of the Persian Empire, the Maga or Magi priests also became powerful all over Asia Minor and they, in a great measure, became responsible for the development and spread of the Mithra cult all over this area, paving the way for its further spread into the Hellenic world and the Roman Empire through warriors drawn from Asia, and merchants and other seafarers from the East. But before we come to this phase, let us see the Sun-God and His worship in other countries and ancient civilizations.

In Egypt, the Sun-God was called *Re* or *Ra-Atun* and from the fifth dynasty onwards, all Kings considered themselves, like their Sūrya-vaṁśī counterparts of India, sons of *Re* and added *Re* to their own names. An Egyptian hymn of *circa* 1412 B. C. describes *Re* the Sun-God as Lord of truth, Lord of sweetness, great in love and waking when all men sleep. In the 14th Century B.C. Akhenaton established a religion round the Sun-God Aton. The Pyramids, which were astronomically oriented, were Sun-monuments. At On, called Heliopolis by the Greeks, the Sun-God was believed to have revealed Himself in the form of a pyramid-shaped stone within the temple. The Sun, as the traverser of the sky, was described as a winged bird, a falcon, a description which can be compared with the Vedic description of the Sun as Tārksya, Suparṇa, Garutman and Haṁsa ; also the Egyptians had a curious conception of the crawling Sun as a Beetle, which has its echo in one of our names for the Sun, the *Patanga*, figuring in some Vedic hymns E.g. Rv. X. 177. 1, 2 ; 189.3. The Pyramid was not only the magnification of the Solar-symbol stone mentioned above, but

-
1. See also p. 18, Prof. A. J. Carnoy, *The Religion of Ancient Persia*, London.
 2. See A. V. Williams Jackson, *Persia Past & Present*, New York, 1909. For the latest examination of this subject, see Mary Boyce, 'On Mithra's Part in Zoroastrianism', *Bulletin of the School of Ori. and African Studies, University of London*, XXXII, i. 1969, pp. 10-34.

it is also by soaring with its height into the skies; the symbol of the entombed King ascending to and joining the Sun-God.

The Calendar stone and the Sun-disc among the monuments of the Aztecs of Mexico show a conception of Universe with the Sun as the centre of all life. The Aztecs conceived of Time as of four ages, (*cf.* the four *yugas*), and called each age a Sun, as He was the presiding deity. The Incas of Peru called themselves sons of the Sun. Sacrifices and a number of rites including a Sun-dance were offered by American Indians to their Sun-God.

The Sun, Shamash, was the tutelary deity of the local dynasty of the town of Sippara in Mesopotamia and a representation of this Sun-God in human form with rays issuing from his shoulders is seen in a Sumerian Seal of 2800 B. C. He was the upholder of truth and justice and the promulgator of the laws. He is represented in Assyria as a flying *disc*. (*cf.* our *Cakra*).

The Japanese belief in their Kings being direct descendants from the Sun-God is well-known. The close association of the Sun and Royalty was a prominent feature in most ancient civilizations. The Parthian monarchs considered themselves as brothers of the Sun.

The Chinese believed in ten Suns and had several Sun-myths

Mithraism mixed with local beliefs and took over additional related ideas. Thus in Chaldea, Mithraism was influenced by astrology and the planets and the Zodiac and their influences on human affairs. It mingled in parts of Asia Minor with the Mother Goddess, Anahita, and in Greece with Hermes. Greece had its own Sun-God in Helios. Royalty took up Mithra as their talisman and symbol of glory. The concept of the 'Invincible Sun' '*Sol Invictus*', as the protector of the Empire and the Emperors, was particularly developed in Syria and Chaldean-Syrian Solar pantheism later exerted strong influence on the whole of the Roman world. Nero, perhaps the first Roman Emperor to be initiated into the Mithraic mysteries, had an enormous statue of himself set up for being worshipped as the Sun-God. And as in the Hittite-Mittani treaty of thousand six hundred years before, in the treaties of the Roman Empire also, Mithra was invoked and altars dedicated to him by contending Kings. Of Mithra monuments in Europe, which have survived destructions by Muslims, there are about 500

sculptures and 400 inscriptions, extending from the Scottish borders to the borders of Hungary, as also in parts of Africa. They are particularly numerous along the German and Danubian borders. There are still some Mithra temples and frescoes that have escaped Christian iconoclasm of the 4th century A. D., in Rome. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries A. D., in Rome alone there were more than a hundred temples to Mithra in different parts of the city, both inside and outside the city walls. From the remains of the structures and the frescoes and from the inscriptions that survive, as also from the writing of some Christian Fathers, we can reconstruct the details of this Mithraism which had, according to a writer¹, spread like wild fire throughout the Empire in the first four centuries A. D.

Mithra was worshipped in a natural mountain cave by the side of some running water and accordingly Mithra shrines were raised on such a natural background. The rising of the Sun and the bursting forth of light from amidst the rocks was symbolised in the cave, the image of the celestial vault. References to the rock, Parvata, and the waters, Samudra or Salila, are common in the Vedic descriptions of Mitra and Savitā. E.g. Rv. X. 159. 3 :

चक्षुर्नो देवः सविता, चक्षुर्न उत पर्वतः ।

His mysteries were celebrated within the dark of caves, where there was the sculpture of Mithra slaying the Bull, altars and other reliefs and drawings on the surrounding walls, including the scene of the sacred Meal.

The iconography of Mithra shows his chief exploit as the slaying of the Bull, evidently the symbol of seasons and weather. Other details of His iconography comprise the presence of a *crow* as a heavenly messenger. In Chinese Sun-myths, a raven was believed to reside in the Sun. As in the case of the cave, *Guha*, the symbol of the heart, we have in the Veda also the symbolism of *Vāyasa*, crow, and other birds, for the fleeting Sun. There is also a scorpion and a lion; also a representation of Mithra as an archer. All these, together with the idea that Zervan, the God of Time, re-appeared as Mithra and that Mithra held the 'globe as Kosmokrater (ruler of cosmos) and supported the Zodiac, show an

1. G. S. R. Mead, *Mysteries of Mithra*, TPH.

amalgamation of the old ethical Mithra with the warrior Mithra of the Kings and the Sun as the astronomical and astrological hub; the Bull, the Lion, the Scorpion, and the Archer point to the signs of the Zodiac, Vṛṣabha, Simha, Vṛścikā and Dhanus and the seasons they stand for. Mithra is also described as being carried in a chariot, driven by a solar deity, other than Mithra, namely Helios-Sol, the light-giving charioteer, who may be the counterpart of our *Aruṇa*. A dog that is depicted as a 'faithful companion of Mithra' may be compared to our *Saramā*, *Deva-śunī*. When mingling with the Orphic doctrines, Mithra was identified with the god of the Rays, Phanes, born of an Egg. In a Hadrian Wall stone relief, Mithra's birth from an Egg is shown, in the midst of the signs of the Zodiac, which reminds us of our Sun-name pointing to His Egg-birth, *Hiraṇyagarbha* and *Mārtāṇḍa*. The number 'seven' played a part in Mithraic mysteries, in which seven states of spiritual progress were formulated. Here also we may compare our conception of seven Suns and the seven horses for the Sun; as also the seven *Bhūmis* of Yoga. Thus Mithra had developed into a 'universal and all-embracing divinity.'

Answering the question 'Why the Oriental Religions spread?' Franz Cumont says:¹ These religions represented a more advanced type in the evolution of religious forms. They gave greater satisfaction to the senses, to the intelligence and lastly to the conscience. They taught man how to reach a blissful state in which the soul was freed from bodily tyranny and suffering, through contemplation and the artistic aids of music and dance; compared to the infantile nature of the prevailing religion, they were sacerdotal, prescribed rituals, penances, and purifications, asceticism; compared to the prevalent vague and un-enthusing notions, they offered a definite view of after-life, survival of the soul and the attainment of happiness. They thus offered "greater beauty of ritual, greater truth of doctrine and a far superior morality". And "Of all the Oriental cults none was so severe as Mithraism, none attained an equal moral elevation, none could have had so strong a hold on mind and heart." According to Frazer (*The Golden Bough*, I Vol. edn. p. 358) "There can be no doubt that the Mithraic religion proved a formidable rival to Christianity, com-

1. In his *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, Dover Publications, New York,

binning as it did a solemn ritual with aspirations after moral purity and a hope of immortality." So much so that Renan observed that "If Christianity had been stopped in its growth by some deadly disease, the world would have become Mithraic."¹ Julian was the last Emperor who was a declared Mithraist; he gave a 'Hymn to the Sun' and glorified Mithra as the One God of whose power, all other gods were but different aspects. But the victory of Constantine and his vision of Christ proved the turning point and with the banning of Mithra worship and the massacre of Mithra priests and followers and the destruction of Mithra monuments by Christian fanatics, who had now gained an upper hand, Mithraism began to fade out by about 400 A.D. But Mithraism did not recede without leaving its lasting marks on Christianity, which, to make itself popular with the people, adopted Mithraic architecture, rites and festivals. The 25th December was the popular festival of Mithra's birth, and it was taken over; the Meal of the Mithra cult², the idea of 'eating of My body and drinking of My blood' were also taken over as the Eucharist. The bull that was destroyed by Mithra was identical with Mithra who thus sacrificed Himself. Baptism, Communion, Resurrection, all these cardinal ideas, Christianity had to absorb, before it could supplant Mithraism.³

II

We shall now swing back to another 1500 years before Bagazkoi where we first met Mitra and see him in his own Vedic world in India. Mitra appears in the R̥gveda in a number of names and forms and if there had not been in the Vedas, such extensive references to the Sun and Solar and other celestial luminaries including the constellations, our knowledge of the age and antiquity of the Vedas would have been poor indeed. The Solar deities dominate verily the Vedic horizon. Yāska gives the threefold classification of the Vedic deities into the terrestrial, the

1. In his book on Marcus Aurelius.
2. Michael Angelo's 'The Last Supper' is said to be a copy of a fresco in a Mithra temple. See Poure-Davond, J. the Bihar and Orissa Res. Soc., Vol. 19 (1933), Mitra Cult, pp. 255-280.
3. See H. Stuart Jones on Mithraism in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, VIII, pp. 752-9; M. J. Vermaseren, *Mithras, The Secret God*. Chatto & Windus, London 1963.

atmospheric and the celestial. In this way, we have three primary deities Agni, Vāyu and Sūrya.

तिस्र एव देवता इति नैरुक्ताः । अग्निः पृथिवीस्थानः, वायुर्वा इन्द्रो वा
अन्तरिक्षस्थानः, सूर्यो द्युस्थानः । Nirukta VII.

Under Sūrya is comprehended a world of deities; hence his prominence in the Vedic worship, including what we are enjoined to do every day at dawn, midday and evening. The Vedic sacrifice which was co-ordinated to the year and the seasons and the movements of the Sun proclaims again the dominance of the Sun as the Lord of the year, Saṃvatsara Says Śaṅkara in his Chāndogya-bhāṣya:

सर्वयज्ञानां च कार्यनिर्वृत्तिरूपः सविता महत्या श्रिया दीप्यते ।

There are about 133 separate hymns in the Ṛgveda alone to the different Solar deities, apart from hymns in which some of them figure jointly; there are about 2000 and odd references to them, the references to Sūrya and Āditya being too numerous to count. The Solar deities thus praised are Mitra, Sūrya, Savitā, Pūṣan, Viṣṇu, Vivasvān, Ādityas, Aryaman, Bhaga, Amśa, Dakṣa, Uṣas and Aśvins. The two twilights and the Dawn or Dawns, including their long Arctic forms, claim the largest number of individual hymns.

Mitra of whose form and sway outside India we have been speaking, has one full hymn for himself in the Ṛgveda but with Varuṇa, his close associate in the Avesta, he occurs far oftener in the Ṛgveda. Mitrā-Varuṇa are the most powerful of Vedic conceptions and to them jointly we owe two of our greatest Vedic Ṛṣis, the two Maitrāvaruṇis, Vasiṣṭha and Agastya. Mitrā-Varuṇa form two aspects of the same deity, he who uncovers or spreads in the morning and he who covers and envelops in the evening. In the Atharvaveda, too, the two are praised together as the vigilant supervisors and moral mentors of mankind. "The wonderful divine array, the Eye of Mitra¹ and Varuṇa, the Sun is indeed the soul of all that moves and stands still."

1. According to Zoroastrian priests Mihir (Mithra) and Khorsed are the two eyes with which Ohrmazd surveys the world.

चित्रं देवानामुदगादनीकं चक्षुर्मित्रस्य वरुणस्याग्नेः ।
आ प्रा द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरिक्षं सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुषश्च ॥

I. 115.1.

Here rises the beautiful, the one common Lord of all mankind, witness to everything, the eye of Mitra and Varuṇa¹, rolling up all darkness as if a sheet of leather.”

उद्वेति सुभगो विश्वचक्षाः साधारणः सूर्यो मानुषाणाम् ।
चक्षुर्मित्रस्य वरुणस्य देवः चर्मव यः समविष्यक् तमांसि ॥

VII. 63.1.

We saw how Mitra became the patron-god of royalty in his Western form. In the Ṛks, he is lauded as Rājā and Sukṣatra.

अयं मित्रो नमस्यः सुशेवो राजा सुक्षत्रः अजनिष्ट वेधाः ॥ III. 59.4.

The first two Mantras of the hymn on Mitra may be quoted to bring out the several aspects of the deity: Mitra speaks to men and stirs them. He supports earth and heaven; he watches people with un-winking eye; to this Mitra we make our oblation.

मित्रो जनान् यातयति ब्रुवाणः मित्रो दाधार पृथिवीमुत द्याम् ।
मित्रः कृष्टीः अनिमिषाभि चष्टे मित्राय हव्यं घृतवज्जुहोत ॥

III. 59. 1.

Let the men who offer you oblations O Mitra! be pre-eminent, as also those, O Āditya! who, according to your ordinances, pay obeisance to you; he who is aided by you is not slain nor vanquished; neither from near nor from afar does any trouble, come to him.

प्र स मित्र मर्तो अस्तु प्रयस्वान् यस्त आदित्य शिक्षति व्रतेन ।
न हन्यते न जीयते त्वोतो नैनमंहो अश्नोत्यन्तितो न दूरात् ॥

III, 59.2.

The moral aspect of the Solar deity, Mitra, Savitā, etc., which we saw in Avestan and other Western Mithraism, is very prominently and often mentioned in the Vedas, when he is praised singly or with his double Varuṇa. He is the Spy of the Universe.

1. For a discussion on 'Yātayaj-jana' as an epithet of Mitra and Varuṇa, in Ṛgveda, see *APOC. Proceed.* X. Tirupati (1940) p. 27.

Spāśam viśvasya (Rv. IV. 13. 3) ; he is often called Nṛ-caḅṣa and Viśva-caḅṣa, the supervisor of people. He is born of Ṛta and is the upholder of Ṛta, the moral order.

X. 85. 1. ऋतेन आदित्यास्तिष्ठन्ति ।

VII. 66. 12-13 यदोहते वरुणो मित्रो अर्यमा यूयमृतस्य रथ्यः ॥

ऋतावान् ऋतजाता ऋतावृधो घोरासो अनृतद्विषः ।

It may be noted that the Ādityas are here called also the formidable enemies of untruth. The Ādityas see the good and bad inside the people,

अन्तः पश्यन्ति वृजिनोत साधु ॥ II. 27. 3.

He is not only the brilliant and vigilant Eye above but also the divine benevolent Eye that bestows on us long life and health and well-being.

तच्चक्षुर्देवहितं शुक्रमुच्चरत् । पश्येम शरदः शतम् । जीवेम शरदः शतम् ॥

VII. 66.16.

The Ādityas are so considerate that like birds they spread their protective wings over their supplicants and give them happiness.

पक्षा वयो यथोपरि व्यस्मे शर्म यच्छत । VIII. 47.2.

He destroys all evils अपविश्वा दुरिता बाधमानः (Rv. I. 35. 3). With a golden arm and omniscient, Savitā moves between Heaven and pervades the entire firmament with his glory.

हिरण्यपाणिः सविता विचर्षणिरुभे द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरीयते ।

अपामीवां बाधते वेति सूर्यमभिकृष्णेन रजसा द्यामृणोति ॥

Rv. I. 35. 9.

With a golden arm, the life-giving Lord who leads us best and gladdens us, who is endowed with riches comes before us and being lauded, protects us against evil spirits in the nights.

हिरण्यहस्तो असुरः सुनीथः सुमृळीकः स्ववाँ यात्वर्वाङ् ।

अपसेधन् रक्षसो यातुधानाः न स्थाद् देवः प्रतिदोषं गृणानः ॥

Rv. I.35.10.

Adoring the Sun who is beyond darkness and sin, who is the supreme among the Gods, may we also attain to the supreme light.

उद् वयं तमसस्परि ज्योतिष्पश्यन्त उत्तरम् ।

देवं देवत्रा सूर्यमगन्म ज्योतिरुत्तमम् ॥

R.v. I.50.10.

O Sun ! possessing a light which is beneficent to the whole world ! Rising and ascending the high Heaven, please destroy my inner afflictions, as also those of my external body.

उद्यन्नद्य मित्रमह आरोहन्नुत्तरां दिवम् ।

हृद्रोगं मम सूर्य हरिमाणं च नाशय ॥

R.v. I.50.11.

O Savitar ! destroy all the evil and bestow on us all good.

विश्वानि देव सवितर्दुरितानि परासुव । यद् भद्रं तन्म आसुव ॥

R.v. V. 82. 5.

Invoking jointly the several Solar deities Savitā, Bhaga, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman, the devotee prays for welfare:

तत् सु नः सविता भगो वरुणो मित्रो अर्यमा ।

शर्म यच्छन्तु सप्रथो यदीमहे ॥

R.v. VIII. 18.3.

Another joint prayer to the several Solar deities—As they rise today, may Sūrya, the flawless Mitra, Aryaman, Savitā and Bhaga extend to me their riches.

यद्य सूर उदितेऽनागा मित्रो अर्यमा । सुवाति सविता भगः ॥

R.g. VII. 66.4.

For a third joint prayer to several Solar deities for manifold welfare and several good things of life, the whole hymn R.v. II.27 may be cited.

Like an engineer Savitā has centered the beam and the pillar of the vault of Heaven, and has set the world in happiness. He has made the Heaven yield waters and has shaken, as it were, the horse of the cloud tied above.

सविता यन्त्रैः पृथिवीमरुणादस्कम्भने सविता धामदंहत् ।
अधमिवाधुक्षदूधुनिमन्तरिक्षमूर्ते बद्धं सविता समुद्रम् ॥

Rv. X.149.1.

Savitā who bears the Heavens is universally desirable.

धर्ता दिवः सविता विश्ववारः ।

Rv. X. 149 4.

By reason of all this, the Vedic poet calls the Sun the Gem of the sky. (Rv. VI.51.1 : VII.63.4.)

One of the common prayers to the Sun is for his blessings for long life and for being able to look at the Sun all the time. (Rv. X. 36.14)

सविता पश्चातात् सविता पुरस्तात् सवितोत्तरात् सविताधरात् ।

सविता नः सुवतु सर्वतांति सविता नो रासतां दीर्घमायुः ॥

उद्यन्तं त्वा मित्रमहो दिवे दिवे । ज्योग्जीवाः प्रति पश्येम सूर्य ॥

Rv. X. 37. 7.

Indeed as the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (I.14.1) says : Āditya is effulgence, brilliance, strength, fame, all the faculties of seeing, hearing, etc., self, mind, indignation, thought, death, truth, friendliness, the various elements wind, ether, etc., life-breath, the protector of the world, the creator, anything and everything, happiness, food, life, immortality, the universe, the creator, the year Such is the great Spirit, the Sun, the Lord of the Beings.

आदित्यो वै तेज ओजो बलं यशश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रमात्मा मनो मन्युर्मृत्युः सत्यो
मित्रो वायुराकाशः प्राणो लोकपालः कः किं कं ; तत्सत्यमन्नमायुरमृतो
जीवो विश्वः कतमः स्वयंभूः प्रजापतिरिति । संवत्सरोऽसावादित्यो य एष
पुरुष एष भूतानामधिपतिः ।

It is with the same rays with which he produces heat that he produces rains, from rains vegetation, from vegetation food, from food life and strength; and austerity, faith, intellect, thoughts, mind, peace, ideas, memory, knowledge; from knowledge one attains bliss which is the Brahman and the source of everything.

याभिरादित्यस्तपति रश्मिभिस्ताभिः पर्जन्यो वर्धति पर्जन्येनौषधिवनस्पतयः
 प्रजायन्त ओषधिवनस्पतिभिरन्नं भवत्यन्नेन प्राणाः प्राणैर्बलं बलेन तपस्तपसा श्रद्धा
 श्रद्धया मेधा मेधया मनीषा मनीषया मनो मनसा शान्तिः शान्त्या चित्तं चित्तेन
 स्मृतिं स्मृत्या स्मरंस्मारेण विज्ञानं विज्ञानेनाऽऽत्मानं वेदयति तस्मादन्नं ददन्स-
 र्वाण्येतानि ददात्यन्नात्प्राणा भवन्ति भूतानां प्राणैर्मनो मनसश्च विज्ञानं विज्ञानादा-
 नन्दो ब्रह्म योनिः ।

Already in the R̥gveda the Sun is prayed to for immortality—
 Amṛtatva,.

तत् सविता वोऽमृतत्वमासुत् । R̥v. I. 110.3.

Of the Sun and immortality we shall see more as we come to the Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads. There are some characteristic descriptions of the Sun in terms of different kinds of birds traversing space, Tār̥kṣya, Suparṇa, Vāyasa, etc. (R̥v. X. 177. 1,2 ; V. 47.3 ; I. 191.9 ; VII. 63.5 ; V. 47.3). (R̥v. X. 37.7). The *Bull* which we saw in Western Mithraism is seen in the R̥v. as an image of the Sun. (R̥v. V. 47.3 and I. 189.1). He is described as the wheel, *Cakra* in I. 175.4 ; IV. 28.2 ; V. 29.10.

Each of the names of the Solar deities referred to above emphasises an aspect of the Sun. Mitra whom we saw in Avesta and Western Mithraism as the Lord of Peace and compact in war, friendliness, and guardian of promise and promoter of victory appears with the same ideas in the Taittiriya Saṃhitā, II.1.8.4:

संग्रामे संयत्ते समयकामो मित्रमेव स्वेन भागधेयेनोपधावति स एवैनं मित्रेण
 संनयति विशालो भवति व्यवसाययत्यैवेनम् ।

Aryaman is the same as Mitra or friend. Bhaga is a giver of bounty and fortune ; according to Yāska he is the Sun of the forenoon. Aryaman is apportioner, an aspect of Bhaga. In several hymns Mitra, Varuṇa, Savitā, etc. are referred to as Pūta-Dakṣa, endowed with purified strength, but separately Dakṣa meaning 'the dexterous' is also mentioned as a form of the Sun. Savitā is the inspirer and stimulator and he is the deity of the great Gāyatrī which we all adore. Pūṣan is the Lord and protector of the pathways and cattle, and vivifier, one of his epithets being Puṣṭimbhara. Vivasvat is the Lord who shines forth. Of all the Solar deities

Viṣṇu deserves special notice and several of the incarnations with which Viṣṇu is associated in mythology could be traced in the descriptions of Solar deity Viṣṇu in the R̥g Veda. The Kaustubha on his chest is the Sun himself. Viṣṇupada is the sky itself. Varāha is also a solar phenomenon, as also Trivikrama of three strides. The association of the Sun with Indra, led to the Upendra form of Viṣṇu later.

It is in the well known Mantras of Sūrya Namaskāra in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka that we have the full picture of the Sun as the Lord of the year and seasons. Here we have also descriptions of the phenomena relating to the Sun and light. The Mantras here refer also to the number of Suns which gradually developed into the concept of twelve Suns. (Dvādaśa Ādityas.). In one Mantra we have the following seven Suns—Aroga, Bhrāja, Paṭara, Pataṅga, Svarnara, Jyotiṣīmān, Vibhāsa. Kaśyapa is mentioned as the eighth form. In another we have the mention of Mitra, Varuṇa, Dhātā, Aryaman, Amśa, Bhaga, Indra and Vivasvān.

A passing reference should be made to Sūryā, the daughter of Sūrya the Sun, whose marriage with the Aśvins forms the subject-matter of R̥v. X. 85. For it is the Mantras uttered at her marriage that we use to this day for consecrating all marriages.

We shall now come to the deeper esoteric worship of the Sun as it evolved from some of the Mantras of the R̥v. Saṃhitā already referred to and in the Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads which specialised in esoteric worship. The Taitt. Āran. (II. ii. 2) says that a Brahmin attains all welfare by contemplating upon the rising and the setting Sun as the Supreme Brahman itself. By such meditation, he becomes Brahman itself:

उद्यन्तमस्तं यन्तमादित्यमभिध्यायन्कुर्वन्ब्राह्मणो विद्वान्सकलं भद्रमश्नुतेऽ-
सावादित्यो ब्रह्मेति । ब्रह्मैव सन्ब्रह्माप्येति य एवं वेद ॥

The Sun and Solar light and energy have a close relation to Vāk or Sonant energy. The Mantra par excellence of the Vedas, Gāyatrī or Sāvitrī, has had a great role in the whole field of esoteric worship, including the Upāsanā of the Supreme Being. Sonant energy and Solar energy are considered as two forms of the same Jyotis and the Sun is Himself the R̥k, Yajus, and Sāma Vedas : it is the three-fold Vedic knowledge that shines forth as the Sun.

The eight-letter Mantra of Āditya, Saura Aṣṭākṣara, 'Gṛṇih Sūrya Āditya Om' is to be meditated upon and one realises Āditya as the Light, Bliss, Immortality, the Brahman and all the three world.

आदित्यो वा एष एतन्मण्डलं तपति तत्र ता ऋचस्तदृचां मण्डलं स ऋचां
लोकोऽथ य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डलेऽर्चिर्दीप्यते तानि सामानि स साम्नां लोकोऽथ
य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डलेऽर्चिषि पुरुषस्तानि यजूषि स यजुषां मण्डलं स यजुषां लोकः
सैषा त्रय्येव विद्या तपति य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुष इति ॥

There are two kinds of Upāsanās which we come across in the Upaniṣads, the Pratīka Upāsanā and the Ahamgraha Upāsanā. In the former an object is itself meditated upon as a symbol and in the latter the indwelling spirit in the thing as identical with one's self is meditated upon. In both these forms the Sun occurs in Upāsanās in the Upaniṣads particularly in the two big ones, the Chāndogya and the Bṛhadāraṇyaka. The best known is the Madhu vidyā in Chānd. 3.

ओम् । असौ वा आदित्यो देवमधु तस्य द्यौरेव तिरश्चीनवंशोऽन्तरिक्षमपूपो
मरीचयः पुत्राः । तस्य ये प्राञ्चो रश्मयस्ता एवास्य प्राच्यो मधुनाड्यः । etc.

where the Sun is described as embodying in its rays in all the four directions, the four Vedas and in its upward rays, the Madhunāḍis. There is a further form in which the Sun does not move, rise or set but remains hanging in the middle, motionless as it were. The Gāyatrī is related to this Upāsanā of the Sun, as also the five centres in the heart in which the Sun is said to be present.

In Bṛhadāraṇyaka I.5.23, it is said, that it is in the life breath, Prāṇa, that the Sun rises and sets:

अथैष श्लोको भवति यतश्चोदेति सूर्योऽस्तं यत्र च गच्छति इति, प्राणाद्वा
एष उदेति प्राणेऽस्तमेति । etc.

In Bṛhadāraṇyaka II.4.5, the Sun is described as the honey or the most enjoyable thing of all beings and he who is present in the Sun and the effulgent immortal being within the eye of men—these two are identified as the Self, the Immortal, the Brahman which is everything:

अयमादित्यः सर्वेषां भूतानां मध्वस्यादित्यस्य सर्वाणि भूतानि मधु । *etc.*

The same idea is taken up again in Brhadārṇyaka V.4.2:

तद्यत्तत्सत्यमसौ स आदित्यो य एष एतस्मिन्मण्डले पुरुषो यश्चायं
दक्षिणेऽक्षन् पुरुषः । *etc.*

Already in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka we noted the Mantra referring to the golden Puruṣa in the Āditya:

य एष अन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषः । I. 10. 13.

य एष आदित्ये पुरुषः स परमेष्ठी ब्रह्माऽऽत्मा I. 10.63.

The Chāndogya reverts to this golden Puruṣa who is of golden hair and is all gold up to his very finger tips:

अथ य एषोऽन्तरादित्ये हिरण्मयः पुरुषो दृश्यते हिरण्यश्मश्रुहिरण्यकेश
आप्रणखात्सर्व एव सुवर्णः ॥

These are referred to as the Āditya, the Antarāditya and the Akṣi Vidyās.

Concluding the Āditya Upāsana the Chāndogya says at the end of Chapter III that even as when the Sun rises, beings and their actions and desires rise up, and the Sun is greeted all round with shouts of joy, even so he who adores the Sun as the Brahman and thereby attains the Brahman, is attended on all sides by people who raise shouts of joy in his honour:

अथ यत्तदजायत सोऽसावादित्यस्तं जायमानं घोषा उल्लवोऽनूदतिष्ठन्स-
र्वाणि च भूतानि च सर्वे च कामास्तस्मात्स्योदयं प्रति प्रत्यायनं प्रति घोषा
उल्लवोऽनूत्तिष्ठन्ति सर्वाणि च भूतानि सर्वे चैव कामाः । स य एतमेवं
विद्वानादित्यं ब्रह्मेत्युपास्तेऽभ्याशो ह यदेन साधवो घोषा आ च गच्छेयुरुष च
निम्नेऽरेरिन्निम्नेऽरेरन् ॥

Among the lesser Upaniṣads the Maṇḍala Brāhmanopaniṣad sets forth the teaching on Sūryopāsana which Yājñavalkya, who got his Veda (the Śukla yajus or Vājasaneyya) from the Sun Himself, is taught by Āditya. The Sūryopaniṣad contains several Sun Mantras the practice of which secures a number of material and spiritual gains. The Akṣi Upaniṣad expatiates on the Upāsana of Sūrya through the Cākṣuṣmatī Vidyā for the obtaining of

unimpaired eye-sight ; the *Sāvitrī Upaniṣad* is also important as it deals with the *Upāsanā* of *Gāyatrī* and, as many do not know, this is the only text which speaks about the *Bala* and *Atibala* Mantras which we know *Viśvāmitra*, the Seer of the *Gāyatrī*, taught *Rāma* and *Lakṣmaṇa* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. There is also a *Sūryatāpinī Upaniṣad* published by the *Adyar Library* in their Volume 'Unpublished Upaniṣads in which the Sun as the Supreme Deity and his *Upāsanā* are described. The twelve *Sūryas*, *Mitra*, *Ravi*, *Sūrya*, *Bhaga*, *Khaga*, *Pūṣan*, *Hiraṇyagarbha*, *Marīci*, *Āditya*, *Savitā*, *Arka*, and *Bhāskara*¹ are mentioned. Several *Sūrya* Mantras including the *Saura Aṣṭākṣara* are described, as also the method of contemplation of *Sūrya*, his *Pūjā* and his *Yantra*.

In philosophy we know of the two paths of *Devayāna* and *Pitṛyāna*, the former referring to the path of light leading to liberation through the Sun. These two paths are also derived from the course of the Sun and the Sun as a medium of spiritual progress.

III

In the heroic annals of ancient India, in which the two epics were born, the Sun figures along with the Moon, as in other ancient civilizations of the world, as the progenitor of the line of kings—the *Sūryavamśa*. He is the prime ancestor of the Kings of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Naturally his worship occurs in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Particularly when *Rāma* feels somewhat fatigued on the battle field of *Laṅkā*, Sage *Agastya*, son of *Mitrā-Varuṇa*, teaches *Rāma* the hymn of *Āditya-hṛdaya* which *Rāma* recites thrice and feels reinforced ; the Sun looks at *Rāma* in great joy and asks *Rāma* to hurry up and kill *Rāvaṇa* :

एतत् त्रिगुणितं जप्त्वा युद्धेषु विजयिष्यसि ।
आदित्यं प्रेक्ष्य जप्त्वा तु परं हर्षमवाप्तवान् ।

1. The list of twelve *Ādityas* differs from text to text. Another list is *Dhātṛ*, *Mitra*, *Aryaman*, *Rudra*, *Varuṇa*, *Sūrya*, *Bhaga*, *Vivasvān*, *Pūṣan*, *Savitṛ*, *Tvaṣṭṛ* and *Viṣṇu*. The anonymous commentary on *Sāmbapañcāśikā* (JSS. 104., on verse 4) quotes a verse which gives the twelve *Ādityas* with a slight difference, adding *Indra* and *Parjanya* and dropping *Sūrya* and *Savitā* from the above list. The commentary adds that the twelve *Ādityas* preside over the twelve months and that, according to the *Mahābhārata*, *Mārtāṇḍa* is the composite form of all these twelve.

अथ रविरवदन्निरीक्ष्य रामं
मुदितमनाः परमं प्रहृष्यमाणः ।
निशिचरपतिसंक्षयं विदित्वा
सुरगणमध्यगतो वचस्त्वरेति ॥

Yuddha. 107. 26, 29, 31.

It is not so well known to many that earlier, in the context when Sitā swoons on seeing the magic head of Rāma brought before her by Vidyujjihva, her friend Trijaṭā gives Sitā the same advice that she might turn to the Sun and seek solace and strength from Him.

गिरिवरमभितोऽनुवर्तमानो
हय इव मण्डलमाशु यः करोति ।
तमिह शरणमभ्युपैहि देवं
दिवसकरं प्रभवो ह्ययं प्रजानाम् ॥

Yuddha. 33. 36.

This relation of the Sun to battle and victory would remind us of the Sun as a God of war and victory in western Mithraism, dealt with earlier.

In the Mahābhārata, the best known episode is the exiled Yudhiṣṭhira worshipping the Sun in the beginning of the Vanaparvan and obtaining from the Sun the vessel of inexhaustible food, Akṣayapātra. In this connection we have a hymn of 108 names (Aṣṭottaraśatanāma-stotra) of the Sun by Yudhiṣṭhira.¹ Earlier, in Ādi parvan, in the story of the marriage of Sūrya's daughter Tapatī, there is a stotra on Sūrya, by Sage Vasiṣṭha, another Maitrāvaruṇi.

We cannot take leave of the Mahābhārata without referring to the story of Yavakṛita told in connection with the hermitage of Sage Lomaśa in the Tirthayātrā-parvan of the Vanaparvan. In this connection we have the related story of the brothers Parāvasu and Arvāvasu, the former having killed his father mistaking him for a sylvan animal, and the brother expiating for this sin. Arvāvasu is here described (Chs. 138-140 according to different editions) as performing penance to propitiate the Sun God who appears before him. Arvāvasu is mentioned as having

1. For a detailed study of this hymn, see V. M. Bedekar, B. K. Barua Com. Vol., Gauhati, 1966, pp. 57-67.

composed or seen the *Rahasya Veda* of *Sūrya* for propitiating the Sun, (Verse 17 or 18) and the establishment of *Saura Veda*, with the blessings of Sun (Verse 22)

रहस्यवेदं कृतवान् सूर्यस्य द्विजसत्तमः ॥

and

प्रतिष्ठां चापि वेदस्य सौरस्य द्विजसत्तमाः ॥

This is an intriguing reference and cannot obviously be to the Śukla Yajurveda because none of the names mentioned here are known in connection with Śukla Yajus in any of its Śākhās. Neither have we any text of this name that has come down to us. Although the critical edition relegates the lines referring to the Saura Veda, to the footnotes, from our acquaintance with works, manuscripts and the process of their authentication and incorporation in the main tradition, we can say that such a reference would never get into a work like the Mahābhārata, unless there was a text answering to this name current among those in whose midst it was in vogue.

IV

We shall now take a quick survey of the state of Sun-worship as seen from historical evidences. Sun-worship had a somewhat interesting development in historical times. As we have seen, it was the oldest Vedic worship of the country, and its continuity is borne out by archaeological evidence also. As shown by Jitendra-nath Banerjee¹ there are some very ancient coins with wheel and lotus representations and these are not Buddhistic but symbols of the Sun. But into this ancient and native Sun-worship flowed the one which successive waves of immigrants from Persia, the Magas of Śakadvīpa, brought with them; their Mitra or Mihira cult, gave a fresh impetus to it. They probably started coming in during the first two or three centuries of the Christian era, when after a boom, the Mitra cult began to decline in the West and Middle Est. The Śakadvīpi Maga priests who came in the earlier waves of immigration got absorbed into the Brahmin community, with the course a special appellation, Maga, Bhojaka or Śakadvīpi. The story of the chiselling of the Sun by Tvaṣṭā which the Purāṇas say was done in the Śakadvīpa is known to poet Kālidāsa (Raghu. VI. 32). Many Gupta kings and chiefs

1. The Representation of the Sun in Brahmanical Art, *Indian Antiquary*, August 1925, pp. 161-3.

bore Sun names. More than one monument and epigraph bears witness to the new vogue that Sun-worship gained during the Gupta age; we have thus the Mandasor Sun temple and inscription (A.D. 473-4), the Indore Copper Plate grant of Skandagupta I (A.D. 465-6) and in the reign of Jīvitagupta II of the later Guptas of Magadha, the Deo Baranark inscription mentioning Sun-worship and the Sun-priest Bhojaka Sūryamitra. It is highly probable that ancient Brahmin-names with Mitra-endings denote a Maga connection. In the sixth century, Varāhamihira who was in all likelihood of Maga descent, describes the iconography of the Sun in Persian style (Bṛhatsaṃhitā 57.46-48)¹ and refers to Magas as the priests proper for Sun-worship (ib. 60.19). Hieun-Tsang describes a glorious Sun-temple attracting a thousand pilgrims a day at Multan² around which a large community of Magas had settled, and another splendid Sun-temple at Kanauj³. The great Sun-temple Mārtaṇḍa in Kashmir belongs to 8th Century A.D. Inscriptions refers to the father and grandfather of King Harṣavardhana of Kanauj, Prabhākaravardhana and Ādityavardhana, both of these bearing Sunnames, as Paramādityabhaktas. The second day of Emperor Harṣa's periodical congregations was dedicated to the Sun. Poet Mayūra of the Court wrote the famous hymn Sūryaśataka and is believed to have been cured of leprosy by the grace of the Sun God. Bāṇa, in his Harṣacarita confirms this vogue of Sun-worship by describing Prabhākaravardhana's daily adoration of the Sun and the recital three times a day of the Mantra called Ādityahṛdaya. This Ādityahṛdaya may be the text now found in the Yuddhakāṇḍa of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa (Agasty-Rāma-Saṃvāda) or the other longer text (Kṛṣṇa-Arjuna-Saṃvāda) assigned in many manuscripts to the Bhaviṣyottara Purāṇa. Of this last-mentioned Purāṇa, whose original text may go to the Gupta times, the opening book called the Brahmaparvan is, in most part, on the worship of the Sun and on the history of the Magas or Bhojaka Brāhmaṇas from the Śakadvīpa. Inscriptions continue to mention these Maga Brāhmaṇas as such⁴; and for his part Medhātithi, on Manu (II. 6)

1. The Viṣṇudharmottara also prescribes this 'Udīcya-veṣa' with coat, boots, the Persian Avyaṅga etc. for the Sun-image.

2. Watters, II. 294.

3. Ib. I. p. 352.

4. D.R. Bhandarkar, *Ep. Ind.*, IX. p. 279, inscription dated 861 A.D.

would keep Magas and their worship of the Sun distinct from that of the Sun according to the Veda and the Pañcāyatana-worship and classify the Bhojaka as being outside the Vedic pale. Besides the portions in the major Purāṇas devoted to Sun-worship, the Saura-literature of this period comprises the Sāmba-Upapurāṇa, known to Alberuni, and the *Saurasāhita*, a text in 700 verses, a manuscript of which, dated 941 A. D. is known¹. At the close of the chapter on the consecration of images in his *Bṛhatsamhitā* (Ch. 59.22), Varāhamihira says that one should look up the *Sāvitra* for more details regarding Sun-worship, and Utpala explains that the reference is to a *Saura Śāstra* of that name ; under 59.19, Utpala speaks of the procedure set forth in the *Sauraśāstra*.

V

Some references have already been made to Purāṇas containing Saura material. Several of the well-known Purāṇas have incidental descriptions of the worship of the Sun, Brahma, Skanda, Varāha, Matsya, Agni, Garuḍa, Nāradya and Mārkaṇḍeya which has eleven chaps. on the Sun (102-110) and the stories of his birth etc.: the section includes three hymns to the Sun. In the *Līṅga* (Uttara-bhāga, ch 22), a Saura-snāna or Sun-bath is enjoined before the Bhasma-snāna (smearing the body with holy ash) as a preliminary to the worship of Śiva; a Bhāskara Navākṣara Mantra is given; in *Aṅga-nyāsa*, the Sun is described as being of the form of the Trimūrtis, Brahmā being the Hṛdaya, Viṣṇu Śiras and Rudra Śikhā ; and the Dhyāna prescribed is 'सूर्योऽहम्'-'I am Sūrya'. Special note however should be taken of the *Bhaviṣya* and *Sāmba* which are regular Saura Purāṇas. The Sun and his worship described in these two are of the type of Sun-image and forms of worship as practised by Maga Brāhmaṇas who had come from Śakadvīpa. *Sāmba Purāṇa* in 84 Chaps. available in the Venkatesvara Edition, deals with Sāmba, Kṛṣṇa's son, being cursed with leprosy, his worship of the Sun for becoming cured, his bringing of the Maga Brāhmaṇas to Mitra Vana or the forest of the Sun near Multān, the story of the Sun being chiselled by Viśvakarman in Śakadvīpa, characteristics of Sun's image, his temple, methods of his worship, Sun as the supreme deity of wor-

1. Haraprasad Shastri, Report of Search for Sanskrit Mss., 1895-1900, p. 5.

ship for attaining all objects including Mukti, the consorts of the Sun-God Samjñā, Rājñī, Chāyā, etc.,¹ the twelve names of the Sun and the twelve Ādityas, the evolution of the Universe as born of the Sun, Sun's attendants², performance of Sun's festivals, Sun-mantras, several Sun-hymns, centres of Sun-worship in India like Sūtra which seems to be same as Koṅārk, Kālapriya and Mitra-vaṇa (Mūlasthāna). Kālapriya is near Kanauj and its Sun-temple is the one referred to by Hieun-Tsang. Here was the temple of the Sun called Kālapriyanātha before which, as V.V. Mirashi has shown, Bhavabhūti's three plays were staged : it is significant in this connection that Bhavabhūti prays to the Sun in the prologue to his Malatīmādhava. There is a lot of common matter between the Sāmba and the Bhaviṣya Purāṇas. The latter part of Sāmba Purāṇa seems to represent a Tantric text on Sun-worship called jñānottara.

The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa in its earlier part gives all the above-mentioned episodes relating to Sāmba and the Maga Brāhmaṇas and the worship of the Sun as the supreme God. Besides these there was a regular Āditya Purāṇa but with this title there are at least three Purāṇas glorifying Śiva, Viṣṇu and Sun.³ Of the last, with which alone we are now concerned, only one extracts dealing with some aspects of Sun worship are available. No full manuscript of this Purāṇa has come to light. This may be identical with old Saura Purāṇa dealing with Sun, of which again we have no mss. yet, and which is different from the Saura Purāṇa printed in the Ānandāśrama and dealing with Śiva.

VI

Among other texts on Sūrya worship, which are known from mss. or citations, the following may be mentioned : *Sūryarahasya* tantra, by Vrajarāja ; *Sūryāgama* or *Saurāgama* quoted by the Dharma śāstra writers Raghunandana and Kamalākara : *Sūryādi-pañcāyat. na-pratiṣṭhāpaddhati* by the well-known Dharma śāstra writer of Banaras, Divākara ; *Sūryāvālokana-prayoga* on how to gaze at the Sun ; *Sauradharmā* and *Saura-dharmottara* quoted by Hemādri, Raghunandana, Kamalākara and several other Nibandha writers ;

1. Other wives are Svarnā, Suvarcasā, and Nikṣubhā.
2. Such as Māthara, Piṅgala, Daṇḍa.
3. See New Catalogus Catalogorum, Vol. II. pp. 72-74.

and *Sauratantra* quoted by Kṣīrasvāmin on Amarakośa. There are also several amorphous texts called Saura etc. setting forth details of Sūryopāsanā, texts giving Sūryapūjā, Sūrya-mantras etc. The *Prapañcasārasamgraha* of Gīrvāṇendra Sarasvatī deals at some length in its fourteenth and fifteenth paṭalas with Saura Mantras, Yantras etc., following the treatment of the same in Śaṅkara's Prapañcasāra, paṭala fourteen. Texts called Tṛca, Tṛcakalpa and so on deal with Sūryopāsanā and the great Śākta authority Bhāskararāya wrote a *Tṛcabhāskara*.

VII

Reference was already made to Sūrya-hymns. The most popular one with us is the Ādityahṛdaya of the Rāmāyaṇa. There are other texts, shorter and longer of this name assigned to other sources, like the Bhaviṣyottara.¹ There are several nāmastotras, Dvādaśa, Aṣṭottaraśata, and Sahasranāma the last mentioned being assigned to the Bhaviṣyottara. There are hymns of the Sun from Purāṇas and Tantras. Of hymns in the line of the *Sūryaśataka* of Mayūra, there are a few worthy of mention: The *Sāmba-pañcāśikā*, fifty verses ascribed to Sāmba, Kṛṣṇa's son, published in Kāvya-mālā (No. 13) and in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (No. 104). This hymn itself is mentioned in the Varāhapurāṇa and it has in its K. M. edition the learned commentary of the Kashmirian Saivite writer Kṣemarāja and in the Trivandrum edition, another equally learned anonymous commentary. This is easily the most important of Sūryastotras of the classical times ; it integrates Yoga and the philosophy of Vāk (speech) with the worship of the Sun who is conceived here on advaitic lines as the Supreme Being. Next in importance is the *Āditya-stotra-ratna* by Śrī Appayya Dīkṣita, with his own commentary ; this deals with the adoration of Āditya by himself, as Brahman and as being presided over by Śiva. On the model of Mayūra's hymn, the well-known Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha wrote the Sun-hymn called Sudhālaharī. Gopāla Śarman, Śrīśvara and Kodaṇḍarāma are three other poets who produced each a Sūryaśataka probably on the same Mayūra-model.

VIII

Some of the renowned and ancient Sun-temples of the North have been referred to. But the greatest gift of Sun-worship to the

1. See *ibid.* pp. 76-79.

art of Temple architecture and sculpture is the Sun-temple of Koṅārka in Orissa, built by King Narasimhadeva of Orissa, 1230-64 A.D. One of the leading dollar-earning temples of India, Koṅārka, fashioned like the the chariot of the Sun, is one of the most magnificently carved temples of the country.

In South India, in Hanumakoṅḍa in Warangal, the Kākatiya capital, there is a temple with three shrines dedicated to Śiva, Viṣṇu and Sūrya. Andhra has another Sun temple at Arasavalli near Śrī Kūrmam and on the day of the Shan-mata conference, dedicated to Sun, our Ācārya has arranged for special worship to the Sun at this temple. There is hardly a shrine in Tamilnad without Sūrya in the Navagraha group ; some have additionally a separate standing figure of the Sun. The most important of such a separate representation of Sūrya is the exquisite carving of Sūrya's chariot with his horses in Gaṅgikoṅḍacolapuram, which, at the bidding of our Ācārya, is now receiving special attention and pūjā. I am told that a similar Sūryaratha is to be seen in Dārāśuram. There are many shrines where according to the Kṣetra māhātmya Sūrya was worshipped or Sūrya worshipped Śiva.

The lower rock-cut cave in Tiruchi has a series of shrines to the Pañcāyatana deities including the Sun. The Nāgeśvarasvāmin temple in Kumbhakoṅḍam of the early Cola age has a separate shrine for Sūrya. In the Kacchapeśvara temple in Kanchipuram, there is a shrine to the Sun, and verses from Mayūra's Sūrya-śataka were inscribed here on the pillars, but only a bit of one of these pillars is now preserved in the Madras Museum. An exclusive Sūrya Kṣetra in Tamilnad is Sūryanārkoli of Kulottuṅga Cola's time. At Tiruvarur, the writer's birthplace and an old and famous kṣetra, there was a Sūrya temple with a Sūrya tank, but the latter alone is now seen.

T. Gopinatha Rao has noticed in his book on Hindu Iconography Sun-images, standing as well as seated in the chariot, from Chittorgarh in Marwar, Ajmere, Ellora : from Haveri, Nuggehalli and Belur in Karnataka ; from Guḍimallam ; from Melacheri near Kāverippākkam. He has also reproduced an interesting Sūrya-toraṇa from the Sun temple of Junagarh in which eleven Ādityas are sculptured on the toraṇa with the twelfth in the inner shrine.

South Indian Sun-sculpture does not show any trace of the 'Udīcya-veṣa' brought by the Magas.

IX

An intense region-wise survey yield abundant data on the historical, archaeological and religious side: for an example of such a regional study, we may refer to the paper by P. N. Bhatt 'The Sun-cult in Gujarat and Saurāṣṭra' (AIOC. XVIIth, Ahmedabad, pp. 429-436). The festivals and other celebrations and customs still prevalent show the vogue of Sun-worship even among the common folk. It is not as if Sun-worship is prevalent only among the higher classes. Sun-worship is prevalent in different forms among the trival folk as well. For example, Tarak Chandra Das has described Sun-worships among the aboriginal tribes of Eastern India, in the J. of the Dept. of Letters University of Calcutta, Vol. XI. 1924, pp. 87-94.

X

In the Upaniṣads we saw the Upāsanā of Sūryaas presided over by the Supreme Being Puruṣa. This Puruṣa in the Āditya-maṇḍala has also been taken in Saḡuṇa form as Sūrya-Nārāyaṇa or as Sāmba (Śiva). According to the internal preferences of the Pañcāyatana worshipper, those who prefer Nārāyaṇa as the indwelling Being contemplate so :

ध्येयस्सदा सवितृमण्डलमध्यवर्ती नारायणः सरसिजासनसन्निविष्टः ।

केयूरवान् मकरकुण्डलवान् किरीटी हारी हिरण्यवपुर्धृतशङ्खचक्रः ॥

and those who prefer Śiva contemplate accordingly.

सौरमण्डलमध्यस्थं साम्बं संसारभेषजम् ।

नीलग्रीवं विरूपाक्षं नमामि शिवमव्ययम् ॥

Of Viṣṇu or Śiva, the Sun, along with the Moon, has also been taken as the Eye. Cf. the *Puruṣa Sūkta* :

चक्षोस्सूर्योऽजायत ।

The Sun was born of the eye of the Puruṣa. There are some composite sculptures of Sun, which may be taken as representing the Trimūrtis, Sun, Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā with three or four faces. The Mārtāṇḍa-Bhairava image is to represent the Trimūrtis accord-

ing to the *Śaradā Tilaka* ब्रह्म-विष्णु-शिवात्मकाय सौराय योगपीठाय नमः । For a probable sculpture of this Mārtāṇḍa-Bhairava, see VIth All India Oriental Conference Proceedings, Patna, pp. 243-7. According to the *Subhagodaya* quoted by Lolla Lakṣmidhara in his commentary on the *Saundaryalaharī*, verse 41, Devī also is to be contemplated in the Solar orb :

सूर्यमण्डलमध्यस्थां देवीं त्रिपुरसुन्दरीम् ।

पाशाङ्कुशधनुर्बाणहस्तां ध्यायेत्सुसाधकः ॥

Of Devī, the Sun, along with the Moon, is the brilliant ear-ring, Tāṭaṅka.

ताटङ्कयुगलीभूततपनोडुषमण्डला ।

Apart from these is the worship of the Sun Himself as the main object of adoration, such as the Hindus do in their daily Sandhyā. Among Sūrya stotras, the Ādityahṛdaya, is to be recited thrice daily or as often as possible; among forms of worshipping the Sun with Vedic Mantras, the Sūrya-namaskāra is to be performed on Sundays or at least on the birth-days and whenever there is illness in the house. Gāyatrī or Sāvitrī (Rg. III. 62.10) is the famous Vedic mantra of God Savitr which is recited daily by Orthodox Hindus in their Sandhyā. It is by the prolonged Japa of Gāyatrī in three Sandhyās that, Manu says, the Ṛṣis became what they were:

ऋषयो दीर्घसन्ध्यत्वाद्दीर्घमायुरवाप्नुयुः ।

प्रज्ञां यशश्च कीर्तिं च ब्रह्मवर्चसमेव च ॥ IV. 94.

May Gāyatrī, the Mother of the Vedas, as Her name promises, save Her reciters !

ŚAKTI (THE POWER) IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE PURĀNAS

BY

RAGHUNATH GIRI

[पुराणानां समन्वयात्मकदर्शने शैव-शाक्त-अद्वैत-विशिष्टाद्वैतप्रभु-
तिसम्प्रदायानां सिद्धान्तभूतानि तत्त्वानि संनिविष्टानि । शक्तितत्त्वं हि
पुराणेषु चतुर्षु रूपभेदेषूपवर्णितमिति लेखेऽत्र निबन्धकृता प्रतिपादितम् ।
प्रथमं रूपं तावत् शक्तेः स्वाभाविकं परमार्थभूतं ब्रह्माभिन्नं निर्गुणं
निरवयवं कूटस्थनित्यं सच्चिदानन्दं जगत्कारणं ब्रह्म-विष्णु-शिवात्मकम् ।
द्वितीयं तु परमसत्तायाः शिवस्यापृथग्भूता शक्ति-शिवौ शब्दार्थाविव
संयुक्तौ, शक्ति-शक्तिमतोरभेदत्वात् शक्तिरहितः शिवः शिव एवेति
व्याहृतत्वाच्च । शक्तेरेतस्याः तृतीयं रूपं शिवलीलासाधनमनुल्लङ्घ्या-
ज्ञाभिधानं बन्धमोक्षकारणं विद्याविद्यात्मकमावरण-विक्षेपशक्तिद्वयात्मकं
नामरूपात्मकं जन्मस्थितिलयात्मकमुपादानकारणं, मूलप्रकृतिः सांख्योक्ता,
गीतोक्ताऽपरा प्रकृतिरष्टधा, ब्रह्मराणी, लक्ष्मीः, रुद्राणीत्यादिनामभेदैः प्रसिद्ध-
तरम् । विद्वान् लेखकोऽत्र सोदाहरणं सयुक्तिकञ्च साधयति यत् शाक्तमत-
प्रभावितेषु शिव-देवीभागवत-वायवीयपुराणेषु शक्तितत्त्वस्य ब्रह्मणाऽनन्यत्वं
प्रतिपादितम् । अद्वयं शक्तितत्त्वमेव वस्तुभूतं सत्यं ब्रह्मात्मान्तयामि
सदसत्परं चिन्मयं परमं ज्योतिर्विज्ञानघनं सूक्ष्मातिसूक्ष्मं परात्परं सर्वज्ञं
विभु कूटस्थं ब्रह्म-विष्णु-शिव-वाणी-कमला-कालिकेत्यादिनामरूपभेदेना-
विरोधितया निष्कलं निरञ्जनं निर्गुणमपि सकलं सगुणं समायं वा प्रतीयते ।
तथा हि शक्तितत्त्वं स्वीयेषु प्रतीयमानेषु रूपान्तरेष्वपि भेदाभेदं सहते
भेदस्यास्मिन्नध्यस्यमानत्वात् । सृष्टिदृष्ट्याऽपि सच्चिदानन्दरूपत्रयेषु 'सत्'
स्वरूपं परमा शक्तिश्शुद्धसत्तैव तिष्ठति 'चिदानन्द' रूपे तु सत्त्वस्य
परमार्थभूतस्य द्वे रूपे जायेते, रूपत्रयं च मिलित्वा उपनिषत्प्रतिपाद्यं परं
ब्रह्मैव भवति । इत्येवं शैव (प्रत्यभिज्ञा) शाक्तप्रभृतिसम्प्रदायानां
बहुविधः प्रभावः पुराणीयदर्शनसिद्धान्तेषु परिलक्ष्यते इत्यपि निबन्धेऽस्मिन्
तत्त्वव्याख्यानप्रसङ्गे निर्दिष्टं वर्तते] ।

Śiva (the supreme Reality) truth, knowledge infinite, being, intelligence, bliss, pure, attributeless, indeterminate, unknowable indivisible, imperishable and eternal is the cause of the world which is non-intelligent, finite, transitory, mutable, perishable, a

manifold of changing phenomena, fleeting events and finite things. This supreme Reality Śiva is bliss, but the world is full of misery and sufferings 'a vale of tears'. It is called appearance and not the thing in itself by Kant. Parmenides asserts the world of empirical reality to be a mere show, and Plato calls it a shadow of the true reality. Acārya Śaṅkara calls it *Vyavahāra* as opposed to *Paramārtha*. It is *Samvṛti* and not *paramārtha* according to Nāgārjuna, while it is *parikalpita* and not *pariniṣpanna* according to Vijñānavādin. But the problem here is to explain the original relation of the world with the reality. How does the impure and transitory world come into existence from the reality which is pure and eternal? If there is no difference between the world and the Reality as in the table and the wood then either blemishes of the world would be imposed on reality or the purity, eternity and infinity of reality should be applied to the world. Both of the alternatives introduce self-contradiction. If we only say that the absolute appears in the transitory form of the world, it will not satisfy the seeker after truth. If we accept a separate entity independent of Śiva, to explain the nature of the world, we fall into some kind of dualism like that of *Sāṅkhya* and Descartes, but they fail to justify the relation between *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*, matter and mind. And without accepting an extraneous principle, it is impossible to account for the appearance of the world. "There must be admitted some principle or Power or force which superimposes the manifold of sense on the super-sensuous and supreme Brahman". The Advaitin calls this principle, *Prakṛit* (Primal Nature), *Māyā* or *Avidyā*, and in the Purāṇas it is called Śakti or Prakṛti.

The Philosophy of the *Purāṇa* is an integration of Śaivism, Śāktism, Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita etc. so here, Śakti is not merely a principle of manifestation and limitation, but it is also the supreme reality, inseparable power of Śiva, or Viṣṇu, the order (*Ājñā*, Anucari) of Śiva and the origin of matter

Four different phases¹ of this Śakti are described in the *Purāṇas*. In the first phase or in its real nature Śakti is identified with supreme

1. VSPK, 23.28-35 : VSUK, 4. 12-16.

तयैव प्रेरिता शैवी मूलप्रकृततिरव्यया ।

महामाया च माया च प्रकृतिस्त्रिगुणेति च ॥

Reality. It is non-different from Brahman. It is qualitiless, indeterminate unchanging, imperishable, beyond speech and mind. It is being, intelligence and bliss. It is like Śiva, both-indeterminate and determinate. It is the origin, source and instrument of the creation, sustenance and dissolution. It is not only the origin of the world, but also the mother of the Gods, *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu* and *Rudra*, as well as the reservoir of their power, energy, Knowledge and activity. In the second phase it is the inseparable power of supreme reality (Śiva). It is power, hence Śiva is powerful. Without it He cannot be capable of doing anything. Without power or potency Śiva is Śava—a dead body. A thing which does not do anything, cannot be regarded as existing, because existence implies some activity, some power, some potency. But Śakti also being the power of Śiva, cannot remain separate from Him. Śiva cannot live without Śakti and vice versa Śakti cannot exist without Śiva. In the third phase it is the unwarranted command (Anullanghyā *Ājñā*) of Śiva. He makes it the instrument of His sport. In this phase, it is called *Māyā* and He, the possessor of it, is called *Māyāvin*. It is the cause of bondage and liberation. It is both *Vidyā* and *Avidyā*. It is the concealing power of Śiva. It constrains Śiva to make one appear into many, being into non-being, conscious into unconscious, eternal into transitory. It takes different names and form for the sake of creation, sustenance and dissolution. When it helps *Brahmā* (The creator of the universe), it is called *Brahmāṇī*; and in sustenance it helps *Viṣṇu* as His power *Lakṣmī*; for dissolution as *Rudrāṇī* it helps *Rudra*. In its fourth phase it is the primal nature (*Prakṛti*), the material cause of all unconscious being. It becomes the eight fold bondage (earth, water, fire, air, sky, mind, *Ahankāra* (ego) intellect,¹ which is called *Aparā Prakṛti* in the *Gītā*² and *mūla Prakṛti* in *Sāṅkhya*.)

1. V.S., 18.2.4

प्रकृत्यग्रे ततो बुद्धिरहंकारो गुणात्मकः ।
पञ्चतन्मात्रमित्येतत्प्रकृत्याद्याष्टकं विदुः ॥

2. *Gītā*, 7.4, 5a

भूमिरापोऽनलो वायुः खं मनो बुद्धिरेव च ।
अहंकार इतीयं मे भिन्ना प्रकृतिरष्टधा ॥

THE FIRST PHASE

Śakti is regarded as the highest deity and Supreme Reality in *Śakta* cult. *Śaktāgamas* or *Śakta* tantras describe her as Pure Being, consciousness, Bliss, potency of all and radiant illuminate in all beings.¹ The synthetic philosophy of the *Purāṇas* especially of the *Śiva Purāṇa* is also influenced by this cult. We can see the direct influence of *Śakta* cult in the description of the First Phase of *Śakti*. But it does not introduce contradiction or inconsistency in the integrative approach of the *Purāṇa* ; as *Śakti*, *Śiva* or *Brahman* are not separate entity or Reality ; these are the different names of the same Reality who is beyond the approach of mind and speech.

The *Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa* states that there is complete identity between Brahman and *Śakti*. *Śakti* and Brahman or supreme Reality are not two or separate entities, but two names of the same Reality. Really speaking the supreme Reality is non-dual *Śakti*, that can be called Brahman also. But this does not bring duality, because the difference is mere illusion and identity is only real². The question of gender does not arise for the supreme Reality, because the sign and distinction of gender come later in creation. Hence Supreme Reality is neither male nor female nor neuter.³ *Devī Bhāgavata P.* tries to prove logically that *Śakti* is all pervasive and Supreme Reality. It says that the Supreme Reality is *Śakti*, because it pervades everything and is immanent in everything. The existence of everything depends upon the immanence of *Śakti*. without Power (*Śakti*) nothing can exist

1. *Śakti & Śāk ta*, P. 27.

2. DBP, 3.6.2.

सदैकत्वं न भेदोऽस्ति सर्वदैव ममास्य च ।

योऽसौ साहमहं योऽसौ भेदोऽस्ति मतिविभ्रमात् ।

3. DBP, 3.6.7.

नाहं स्त्री न पुमांश्चाहं न क्लीबं सर्गसंक्षये ।

सर्गे सति विभेदः स्यात्कल्पितोऽयं धिया पुनः ॥

Mahā kāla Saṁhitā :

“Thou art neither girl nor maid nor old. Indeed thou art neither female nor male, nor neuter. Thou art inconceivable, immeasurable, power, the being of all which exists, void of all quality, the supreme Brahman, attainable in Illumination alone.”

Śakti & Śāk ta, pp, 28.29.

nor be able to perform any activity. We can suppose a world without Śakti. A person, who is unable to bear his responsibilities or who is not able to protect himself against his enemy, is never said to be non-Brahmā, or non-Rudra (Abhramā, Aviṣṇu, Arudra) but he is called Aśakta (Powerless). This shows that nothing can be done without Śakti. All activities are governed and motivated by this Śakti.¹ Stating the nature of Śakti, Devī Bhāgavata P. says that Śakti is only real. She alone is in the beginning of creation and at the end of dissolution. She is called by different names, such as Ātmā (soul), cit (consciousness or intelligence), Samvit (knowledge) and Para Brahman (Supreme Reality). She is inconceivable, incomparable and unaffected by the afflictions of the world.² There is nothing in the world, whose existence can be conceived without the relation to this Śakti (Power).³

The Vāyavīya Samhitā States that Supreme Śakti is beyond the approach of senses, mind and speech. They make attempt to grasp her, but return unsuccessfully.⁴ She pervades the whole universe with her own glory. She is without birth, death, old age and decay.⁵ Though she is beyond being (Sat) and non-being (Asat) yet she is all pervasive (Sarvagā), all knowing (Sarvajñā) and the subtlest of all (Paramā Sūkṣmā).⁶ The whole world is a manifestation of her supreme nature.⁷

1. DBP, 3.6. 19-20

रुद्रहीनं विष्णुहीनं न वदन्ति जनाः किल ।
शक्तिहीनं यथा सर्वे प्रवदन्ति नराधमम् ।

2. DBP, 7.32. 2-3

अहमेवास पूर्वं तु नान्यत्किञ्चिन्नगाधिप ।
तदात्मरूपं चित् संवित्परं ब्रह्मैकनामकम् ।
अप्रतर्क्यमनिर्देश्यमनौपम्यमनामयम् ।

3. DBP, 3.6.11

किं नाहं पश्य संसारे मद्वियुक्तं किमस्ति हि ।

4. VSPK, 16.9 a

यस्या वाचो निवर्तन्ते मनसा चेन्द्रियैः सह ।

5. VSPK, 16.7, 8

यामाहुर्ब्रह्म विद्वांसो देवीदिव्यगुणान्विताम् ।

6. VSPK, 16. 13 b

सर्वज्ञां सर्वगां सूक्ष्मां सदसद्व्यक्तिवर्जिताम् ।

7. VSPK, 16. 14. a

परमां निखिलं भासा भासयन्तीमिदं जगत् ।

Umāsaṃhitā says that supreme *Śakti* (*Umā*) is Parama Brahman (Supreme Reality) and supreme light (Parama jyoti). All the Gods even *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu* and *Rudra*, are inferior to Her. She is everything as well as beyond everything. Nothing exists without her and apart from her. She is both determinate and indeterminate, formless and with form. As immanent, she is the essence of all elements, all categories and all realities, but as transcendent her potency and attributes are beyond conception. She is eternal and supreme source of cause and effect. She assumes different forms. All Gods like *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu*, *Rudra* etc. and Goddesses like *Vāṇī*, *Kamalā Kālikā*, etc. are her different assumed forms and agents to perform the different functions viz. creation, sustenance, and dissolution¹.

As a magician exercises his magic and makes the dolls dance, so she makes the whole world dance. The air blows under her command ; the fire burns everything under her control and all the guards of direction perform their specific duties under her supervision.² The same fact is stated in the story of *Umā Haimavatī* of *Kenopaniṣad* ; where it is mentioned that in the presence of a *Yakṣa* all the Gods, Fire, Wind, Indra etc., became unable to burn or to move even a small grass. At last, they realized that they have no power at all whatever was done for the victory over demons was not their own power but the glory of Brahman who had made them to do so and had appeared before them in the form of *Yakṣa*³. *Kāthopaniṣad* also states that being afraid of Him the sun shines, the fire burns, the wind blows, Indra and God of death perform their own duties⁴.

According to *Vāyavīya Saṃhitā*, whatever is in the world, *Māyā* (illusion), *Prakṛti* (Primal Nature), *Jīva* (Soul, evolutes

1. US, 49, 27-32

परं ब्रह्म परं ज्योतिः प्रणवद्वन्द्वरूपिणी ।
अहमेवास्मि सकलं मदन्यो नास्ति कश्चन ॥

2. US, 49, 34-35

यथा दारुमयीं योषां नर्तयत्यैन्द्रजालिकः ।
तथैव सर्वभूतानि नर्तयाम्यहमीश्वरी ॥

3. Ken. U, III

4. KU, 2.6.3.

भयादस्याग्निस्तपति भयात्तपति सूर्यः ।
भयादिन्द्रश्च वायुश्च मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चमः ।

(*Vikāras*), *asat* (non-being), and *sat* (being) each of them is pervaded by the potency of *Śakti*. She is the cause of bondage and liberation. She deludes the world by her *māyā* and liberates it by her sport *Līlā*¹. The Rudra Saṁhitā adds that she is *Śāntā* (calm or serene), *Mahadāvyaktā* (The great and unmanifested) *Śuddhā* (Pure), gross and subtle (*Sthūlā* and *Sūkṣmā*). She is faith, patience, sleep, hunger, desire, beauty, nourishment and satisfaction of all beings. She is the motivator of all beings. She is the unmoved mover of the world wheel.² The Rudra Saṁhitā states that she is called by different names, viz. *Śivā*, *Śāntā*, *Mahā Māyā* and *Yoganidrā*, etc. She is non-different from the world. Appointed by her *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu* and *Rudra* proceed to perform their specific duties of creation, sustenance and dissolution. She assumes the form of three attributes for the sake of different activities.³

The above description of *Śakti* gives some contradictory characteristics such as immanent and transcendent, formless, and with form, attributeless and with attributes, static and dynamic, knowledge and ignorance, determinate and indeterminate, etc. But the minute observation clarifies that there is neither inconsistency nor contradiction nor possibility of dualism in this description. It is stated that these two are not separate entities but are two different aspects of the same *Śakti*, or the two view points to describe the same reality. When she manifests her potency *Māyā* and is related to it she assumes forms and becomes determinate but her real nature, beyond the relation of *Māyā*, is indeterminate.⁴

THE SECOND PHASE

In the first phase of *Śakti*, we have explained her as the supreme Reality, who is beyond the approach of mind and speech

1. VSUK, 7. 3-9

सा देवी मायया सर्वं ब्रह्माण्डं सचराचरम् ।
मोहयत्यप्रयत्नेन मोचयत्यपि लीलया ॥

2. RS. Par, 3. 27-38

3. RSST. 14. 29, 30a, 31a, 32, 33 RS. Par 4. 3-5.

शिवा शान्ता महामाया योगनिद्रा जगन्मयी !

.....

4. US, 49. 38

सगुणं निर्गुणं चेति मद्रूपं द्विविधं मतम् ।
मायासंबलितं चैकं द्वितीयन्तदनाश्रितम् ॥

as well as the sources of creation and motivator and sustainer of the world. In this second phase, she is inseparable power of supreme *Śiva* (Supreme Reality). *Śata-Rudra Samhitā* states that she is not accidental, conditional and transitory but eternal, inseparable, inherent power of *Śiva*, who is self-proved, self-shining and supreme Lord.¹ The *Rudra Samhitā* adds that she is consort of *Śiva*. She has an effulgence of millions of suns. Every part of her is the source of beauty. There is no change, diminution and decay in her. Like *Śiva* she is both determinate and indeterminate.³ She is equal to *Śiva* in attributes, form and actions.³ The *Kailāsa Samhitā* declares that the supreme Reality is neither only *Śiva* nor only *Śakti*, but a harmony of both *Śiva* and *Śakti*. The two are one, the difference between them is imaginary and their identity, non-difference is real. This harmony of *Śiva* and *Śakti* is called Brahman in the *Upaniṣads*. The word, Brahman, is derived from the root 'Brihi' which means 'to pervade' and it becomes etymologically significant as Supreme Reality (*Śiva* with *Śakti*) pervades all and is the greatest of all.⁴

The supreme reality (*Paramātmā*) consists of two aspects, *Śiva* and *Śakti*. That is why both of them separately or simultaneously are called supreme Reality.

These two aspects of supreme Reality viz. *Śiva* and *Śakti* cannot be divided or separated, they can be merely distinguished. Both the aspects have a parallel evolution. The *Śakti* aspect of Reality evolves successively into *cit Śakti* (conscious power) *Ānanda Śakti* (bliss power) *icchā Śakti* (The will Power), *Jñāna Śakti* (The

1. SRS, 8. 35

असौ हि परमेशानस्स्वयंज्योतिस्सनातनः ।
आनन्दरूपा तस्यैषा शक्तिर्नागन्तुकी शिवा ॥

2. RS, Par, 4. 2-5

अनूपमा महामाया सदाशिवविलासिनी ।
त्रिगुणा निर्गुणा नित्या शिवलोकनिवासिनी ॥

3. VSUK, 4. 136-18

समानधर्मिणीमेव शिवस्य परमात्मनः ।

4. KS. 16. 35-36.

एवं शिवत्वं शक्तित्वं परमात्मनि दर्शितम् ।
सवात्मत्वं तयोरेवं ब्रह्मात्युपनिषत्सु च ॥

knowing Power), and *Kriyā Śakti* (the power of activity)¹. And the *Śiva* aspect of Reality creates successively the five Brahmins, *Īśāna*, *Tatpuruṣa*, *Aghora*, *Vāmadeva*, and *Sadyojāta*. These five *Śaktis* and five Brahmins, are arranged in the five pairs, such as, *Īśāna* and *cit*, *Puruṣa* & *Ānanda*, *Aghora* and *icchā*, *Vāma* & *jñāna* and *Sadyojāta* and *Kriyā*. These five pairs perform the five functions respectively viz. *anugraha* (grace) *Tirodhāna* (obscuration), *Samhāra* (dissolution) *Sthiti* (sustenance) and *Sṛṣṭi* (creation).² The five powers create respectively the five component parts of the sacred syllable om viz. *Vindu*, *Nādu*, *Makāra*. *Ukāra* and *Akāra*³ and the five Brahmins produce the five *Kalās* viz. *Śāntyatīta*, *Sānti*, *Vidyā*, *Pratiṣṭhā* and *Nivṛtti*⁴. The former five, products of *Śaktis* are words (*Vācaka*) and the latter five product of Brahmins are denotations (*Vācya*). Each component of one group in its respective order makes a couple with the corresponding component of the other group to create the five elements.⁵

The above description of the evolution makes it clear that the three aspect *Sat*, *cit* and *Ānanda* are in a heirarchical order here. *Sat*, pure being is pure power or supreme *Śakti*, while *cit* and *Ānanda* are the two aspects or two phases of the same reality. These three harmonized together are identified with the supreme Brahman of the *Upaniṣads*. The last three, *Ichhā*, *Jñāna* and *Kriyā* are the governing powers (*aiśvarya*) *Śakti*. God controls the world by these three powers. *Nyāya Darśana* also accepts eternal desire, knowledge and effort (*Nitya Ichhā*, *Jñāna* and *Pryatna*) as the eternal properties of God by which He becomes capable of performing His functions viz. creation, sustenance and dissolution. These three powers are explained as follows : *Ichhā Śakti* is the

1. KS, 16. 54-58

शिवशक्तिसमायोगः परमात्मेति निश्चितम् ।
पराशक्तस्तु संजाता चिच्छक्तिस्तु तदुद्भवा ।

2. KS, 16. 58-61

शिवादीशान उत्पन्नस्ततस्तत्पुरुषोद्भवः ।
ततोऽघोरः ततो वामस्सद्योजातोद्भवस्ततः ॥

3. KS, 16. 56-57

4. KS, 16. 59-60

5. KS, 16. 61

वाच्यवाचकसम्बन्धान्मिथुनत्वमुपेयुषि ।
कलावर्गस्वरूपेऽस्मिन्पञ्चके भूतपञ्चकम् ॥

regulative eternal power of the Lord. It is an internal order that this effect should be produced like this and should not be produced like that. The second *jñāna Śakti* is the determining Power of the Lord. It determines the nature of cause, effect, and instrument. The third *Kriyā Śakti* is the accomplishing Power. It moulds the matter into effect. The first power is the initiative, the second is preparation and the third is completion.¹

The view of the evolution of the five *Śaktis* is quite similar to that of *Pratyabhiñā* school of *Śaivism*. According to it *cit Śakti* is pure light by which Śiva shines Himself even in the absence of objects. The second *Ānanda Śakti* makes Himself satisfied and gives constant pleasure. The third *Ichhā Śakti* makes Him aware of His freedom and uninterrupted power to fulfil His desire. The fourth *Jñāna Śakti* is called *Amarśa*. It is the knowledge of all knowable things. And the last *Kriyā Śakti* is the ability to assume any form according to His sweet will.²

RELATION OF ŚIVA AND ŚAKTI

Now the question of relation of *Śiva* and *Śakti* arises here. How these two are related together? They should not be accepted as two separate entities; in that case, this system will fall in dualism. But if they are not two separate entities what is the use of describing them separately? If *Śakti* is the Power of *Śiva*; their relation should be made clear. According to *Prabhākara*, *Śakti* is also a separate category because it cannot be included in other categories of substance, attribute etc. It can be explained easily with an illustration of fire and its burning Power. According to him both cannot be identified together. In the case of identity one cannot disappear in the presence of other. But when fire is placed near the moon-stone (*candrakāntamaṇi*) its burning power disappears. It can appear again only when either the moon stone is rubbed or the sun stone (*Sūrya Kāntamaṇi*) is also

1. VSUK, 4. 31-34

ज्ञानक्रियाचकीर्षाभिरित्सुभिस्स्वात्मशक्तिभिः ।

शक्तिमानीश्वरः शश्वद्विश्वं व्याप्याधितिष्ठति ॥

2. Tantrāloka. IX. 50 :

स्वतन्त्रभासितभिदा पञ्चधा प्रविभज्यते ।

चिदानन्दैषणाज्ञानक्रियाणां सुस्फुरत्वतः ।

brought there. This appearance and disappearance of burning power proves the difference of fire and its power. According to *Nyāya*, Śakti is not a separate category as it can be included either in quality or dharma. In the case of quality, this can remain with inherent relation to its substance. In the case of Dharma, if it is universal, it can be related to inherent relations, if it is not universal but *akhandopādhi*, it can be related to svarūpa relation. In both the cases the relation is not identity but difference. Both these schools agree together to say that Śakti sometimes can remain in its substratum and at other times it may not remain in it. *Śiva Purāna* does not attempt to discuss this matter logically. It simply indicates that the power (Śakti) and the possessor of the Power (Śaktimān) are indivisible and inseparable, therefore, it is not proper to consider that relation which implies separation. In such a case the relation between them would be non-difference or identity.¹ They are not only inseparable but mutually dependent also. The *Vāyaviya Samhitā* cites certain examples to show their mutual dependence. As the moon cannot shine without moon-light, so Śiva cannot manifest without Śakti, and as the existence of moon-light cannot be conceived without moon, so the existence of Śakti is not possible without Śiva. As the sun and its rays are inseparably related so Śiva and Śakti are inseparably related. None can exist or can be conceived without the other.² In general expression the possessor is regarded as support or substratum and the object possessed becomes supported. The first can exist or can be conceived without the latter but the latter cannot exist or cannot be conceived without the former. This shows some superiority of the possessor. So Śiva, being Śaktimān, may be regarded independent, superior to Śakti. The *Vāyaviya Samhitā* rejects this view and states that both are mutually support and supported and interdependent. Śiva is support of Śakti and Śakti is the support of Śiva. None can remain without other and none

1. VSUK, 7. 21

नहि शक्तिमतश्शक्त्या विप्रयोगोस्ति जातुचित् ।

तस्माच्छक्तेः शक्तिमतस्तादात्म्यान्निर्वृत्तिद्वयोः ॥

2. VSUK, 4. 9-12

एवं परस्परापेक्षा शक्तिशक्तिमतोः स्थिता ।

can be conceived without other.¹ It takes vedic example of Agni and Soma to show their mutual dependence and mutual support. Agni depends upon Soma and Soma depends upon Agni. Both have a opposite tendency. Agni has a tendency to go up on the support of Soma, and Soma has a tendency to go down on the support of Agni.² The other example cited to show their mutual dependence is of word and its meaning. *Śiva* and *Śakti* are related like word and meaning. Each word has some meaning and every meaning has some word. These may be an imaginary separation but real separation is not possible.³

All these illustrations in minute explanation, may be called fallacious as they have one or other defects. But it shows the view of the *Purāṇas* that they do not like to go into logical discussion. They simply show that these two are the different aspects of the same reality.

THE THIRD PHASE.

MĀYĀ

In the second phase *Śakti* is described as eternal, inherent and inseparable power of *Śiva*. The same *Śakti* is called *Māyā* when she helps *Śiva* to assume different forms. *Māyā* is limiting principle.⁴ It limits *Śiva* who is unlimited. It is the concealing power of *Śiva*. It conceals His unlimited consciousness, knowledge and activity.⁵ And it helps Him in His self sport. It is the desire of *Śiva*. It is the principle of multiplying one into many.

1. VSPK, 23. 12

शिवश्चोद्ध्वमधश्क्तिरूद्ध्वं शक्तिरधः शिवः ।

2. VSPK, 28. 1, 9-11.

अग्निरूद्ध्वं ज्वलत्येष यावत्सौम्यं परावृतम् ।

यावदग्न्यास्पदं सौम्यममृतं च स्रवत्यधः ॥

3. RSSSt, 24.5; R 1.1: Somananda Śivadṛṣṭi—3. 2. 3.

वागर्थीविव सम्पृक्तौ शक्तीशौ सर्वदा चितौ ।

कथं घटेत च तयोर्वियोगस्तत्त्वतो मुने ॥

4. SBP, 3.5, 25 ; 3. 7. 2, 3, 5, 6 ; 3.7. 9, 11 ; II. 3.3-16

सा वा एतस्य संद्रष्टुः शक्तिस्सदसदात्मिका ।

माया नाम महाभाग मयेदं निर्ममे विष्णुः ।

5. VSPK, 5. 20 a

मायां माहेश्वरी शक्तिश्चिद्रूपो माययावृतः ।

Without this limiting, concealing and multiplying principle *Śiva* cannot assume different forms and in the absence of different forms His self sport would not be possible. Hence *Śiva* desires to be many. This desire is the original form of *Māyā*. In the process of evolution it is the destiny of the world and all the beings,¹ It is the order, command of *Śiva* (*Ājñā Anucari*). The *Vidyeshvara Samhitā* states that the word *Māyā* is compound of two words 'Mā' and 'Yā'. The word 'Mā' means action (karma) and knowledge (jñāna), and the meaning of the word 'Yā' is "to make obtain." Hence the etymological meaning of the compound word *Māyā* is 'that which enables one to obtain the result of action and knowledge.' Thus above this *māyā* one can obtain the eternal enjoyment and below this *Māyā* there are only transitory and perishable enjoyments.² *Pauṣkarāgama* analyses this word in two ways and shows its significance. In first analysis the word *Māyā* becomes significant because everything returns to it in dissolution (*Māti asyām Pralaye*), and in second analysis it means that the world comes from it (*Mayati asmāt jagat sarvam ten Māyā Samīritā*).³ It is called by many names in different schools of Philosophy viz. *Avidyā* (ignorance), *Vimarśa*, *Asatī* (non being), *Tamas* (darkness), *Tapas* (penance), *Māyā* (illusion), *Ajā* (unborn power), *Pradhāna* (chief principle of creation), *Prakṛti* (Primal Nature) and *Jadā* (unconscious) etc.⁴ It is the magic power of the Lord (*Ātma Māyā*) for creation and *yoga Nidrā* (the principle of passivity) in dissolution.⁵ It is *Mahā supti* (the great sleep) in which all the beings sleep in

1. RŚ Par, 2. 15, 16

मोहिनी सर्वलोकानां शिवमाया गरीयसी ।
तदधीनं जगत्सर्वं शिवेच्छा सा प्रकीर्त्यते ।
प्रारब्धं प्रोच्यते सैव तन्नामानि ह्यनेकशः ।
शिवेच्छया भवत्येव नात्र कार्या विचारणा ।

2. VS, 17. 69-70

मा लक्ष्मीः कर्मभोगो वै याति मायेति कथ्येत ।
मा लक्ष्मीः ज्ञानभोगो वै याति मायेति कथ्येत ॥

3. SRTS, 27th Kārikā

4. DBP, 7.32. 9-11

केचिन्तां तप इत्याहुः तमः केचिज्जडं परे

5. VP, 6.4.6 ; AP. 367. 12, 13, 14

आत्ममायामयीं दिव्यां योगनिद्रासमास्थितः ।

dissolution.¹ It is the deluding principle. It deludes the triple Gods *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu* and *Rudra* and makes them to embody. Its process is so secret that even triple Gods are unable to know it.² During to this great deluding power it is called *Mahā Māyā* and *Mahā Avidyā*.³ As *Avidyā*, it is a process of wrong knowledge. It creates the knowledge of 'self' in those that have no self, and of 'ownself' in those who do not have it.⁴ It has two fold functions ; first it makes a thing appear at the place where the thing is really not present and secondly, it conceals the thing where it is really present. The first can be illustrated by the moon's reflection in the water and the second can be compared with the shadow of *Rahu* on the moon at the time of lunar eclipse.⁵ As *Vidyā* it is the instrument to cut the bondage of Yogins⁶. It's nature and function is so strange that it cannot be known by reasoning.⁷ It is 'Sat' as it appears and creates the whole world. It is *Asatī* as it disappears after awakening of the true knowledge. It is unconscious because it is perceived and it conceals the consciousness. It is the Power of Śiva and yet it limits Śiva. It is the cause of bondage to those who do not understand it, but it becomes the instrument of liberation to those who know it. As inherent power of Śiva it is eternal, all pervasive source of creation, sustenance and dissolution, and very strong to delude Gods, demons and men and very difficult to be crossed

1. Mar P. 81. 59.

कालरात्रिर्महारात्रि मूर्हरात्रिश्च दारुणा
सा मोहयन्नि सर्वेषां त्रिगुणा परमेश्वरी

2. US, 45, 47-49 ; RS S., 2. 28

3. VP, 5. 1. 70 b

योगनिद्रा महामाया अविद्यया जगत्सर्वं

4. VP, 6.7. 10-11

अनात्मन्यात्मबुद्धिर्या चास्वे स्वमिति या मतिः ।
संसारतरुसम्भृतिर्बीजमेतद् द्विधा स्थितम् ।

5. SBP, 2. 9. 33

ऋतेऽर्थं यत्प्रतीयेत न प्रतीयेत चात्मनि ।
तद्विद्यादात्मनो मायां यथाभासो यथा तमः ।

6. RS Par, 5. 24 a

सा त्वं बन्धच्छेदहेतुर्यतीनाम् ।

7. SBP, 3.7.9.a

सेयं भगवतो माया यन्नयेन विरुध्यते ।

over.¹ But it is unreal, transitory for those who have realized the nature of supreme reality.²

The nature of *Māyā* as stated above according to the *Purāṇas* can be compared on the one hand with the *Āgamic* concept of *Māyā* and on the other hand with the Advaitic concept of *Māyā*. According to the *Āgamas* *Māyā* is the seed of the world. It is indestructible, eternal, inauspicious (*Aśivātmaka*), all pervasive (Vibhu), one, partless (Akala), subtle (*Sūkṣma*), beginningless (*Anādi*), imperishable (*Avyaya*), unconscious (*Jaḍa*) and controlling power, the Lord (*Aiśvaryaśakta*).³ According to the *Advaita-vedānta* *Māyā* is unconscious (*Jaḍa*), the inherent power (*Śakti*) of *Brahman*, beginningless, something positive (*Bhāvasvarūpa*), indescribable and undefinable and removable by right knowledge (*Vijñāna nirasya*).⁴ The difference between these two concepts is very clear. In the *Āgamas* it is eternal and real and in Advaita it is beginningless but not eternal, as it is removable by right knowledge, it is the cause of the world, but it is neither real nor unreal; it is undefinable and indescribable.

Śiva Purāṇa makes an attempt to synthesise both these views together. According to this *Māyā* is both sat and Asat, *Vidyā* and *Avidyā*, eternal and removable. These contradictory characteristics of *Māyā* does not introduce any inconsistency in the Philosophy of Purāṇas as it assumes the different point of views to describe *Māyā*. The great vedantist *Vidyāranya* also assumes three stand-points to explain the nature of *Māyā*. He says that *Māyā* is unreal (Tuccha) for *Śrauta* (those who believe in scriptures), real (*Vāstavik*)

1. US, 45. 47-49 ; US, 4. 15

तन्माया परमा दिव्या सर्वत्र व्यापिनी मुने ।

तदधीनं जगत्सर्वं सदेवासुरमानुषम् ॥

2. DBP, 7.32. 9-11

ज्ञाननाशात्ततोऽसती ।

3. SRtS, 27th. Karika

तदेकमशिवं बीजं जगत्त्रिंशक्तिमतम् ।

सहकार्यधिकारान्तसंरोधि व्याप्यनश्वरम् ॥

4. BSSB, 1.4.3 ; Naiskarmasiddhi 2.66 ; Vibhkaudamaṇi 11, 111.

अव्यक्तनाम्नी परमेशशक्तिरनाद्यविद्या त्रिगुणात्मिका या ।

कार्यानुमेया मुधियैव माया यया जगत्सर्वमिदं प्रसूयते ॥

for Laukika (those who have common sense view) and indescribable (anirvacanīya) real and unreal both for Yauktika (the logicians or metaphysicians).¹

FOURTH PHASE

Prakṛti

We have discussed above the third Phase of Śakti (*Māyā*), which is the principle of multiplying concealment, limitation and differentiation. It causes both bondage and liberation. Śakti in her fourth phase is *Prakṛti* the origin and source of materialization and solidification. When *Māyā* solidifies itself it becomes *Prakṛti*. Since *Prakṛti* is the direct evolute of *Māyā* it is called *Māyā*² or a principle of concealment³. It seems necessary here to explain the denotation of the work *Prakṛti* as it is used in wider sense also. Sometimes the word *Prakṛti* is used for the first, second or the third Phase of Śakti. Therefore, it is better to distinguish here between the *Mūla Prakṛti* or *Prakṛti* of *Sāṅkhya* Philosophy and *Mūla Prakṛti* or *Prakṛti* of this *Purāna*. According to *Sāṅkhya*, *Mūla Prakṛti* (Primal nature) is the state equilibrium of three attributes (Sattva, Rajas and Tamas), as it is not an evolute (*Avikṛti*) but only evolvent. And the Mahat and Ahankāra with five subtle elements can also be called *Prakṛti* (evolvent), as they are both evolute (*Vikṛti*) and evolvent (*Prakṛti*).⁴ But according to the *Śiva Purāna*, *Mūla Prakṛti* means Śakti in her first or second Phase (generally second Phase). She is called *Umā*, *Girijā*, *Mahādevī*, *Mahā Māyā*. She is the origin of the later two or three phases. As the terminology of the *Purāna* is not very rigid, the word, which denotes one Phase, is used for other Phases also. Hence the words *Prakṛti*, *Māyā*, *Parā*, *Guṇavatī*, *Vikṛtivarjitā* (without

1. PD. 6. 130

तुच्छाऽनिर्वचनीया च वास्तवी चेत्यसौ त्रिधा ।

ज्ञेया माया त्रिभिर्बोधैः श्रौतयौक्तिकलौकिकैः ॥

2. VSUK, 4. 23-25

मायातः पुनरेवाभूदव्यक्तं त्रिगुणात्मकम् ।

3. VSPK, 5. 139

माया प्रकृतिरुद्दिष्टा पुरुषो माययावृतः ।

4. SK, 3

मूलप्रकृतिरविकृतिः प्रकृतिविकृतयः सप्त ।

evolutes), *Buddhitattva janani* (the mother of intellect), *Sakalesvarī* (governess), *Ambikā* (mother of three Gods) and *Mūla Kāraṇa* (the primal cause) etc. are used to denote one or other Phases of Śakti without any hard and fast rule. But really speaking, the second Phase of Śakti is *Mūla Prakṛti* or *Mahā Māyā* or *Parā*, third Phase is *Māyā*, *Vidyā*, or *Avidyā* and the fourth Phase is *Prakṛti* in the same sense as *Sāṅkhya* uses this term. But the third and fourth Phases are identified with the second Phase also as they are the different modes of the second phase of Śakti.¹ Thus when we discuss the fourth phase of Śakti we mean here the determinate form of Śakti which consists of three attributes Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, in its two states equilibrium and disturbed, subtle and gross, caused state and state of effect, unmanifest states.² In brief we can say that the Śakti in her fourth Phase is identical with *Sāṅkhya Prakṛti*. But *Sāṅkhya Prakṛti* is not evolute, it is the final cause of the world. While *Prakṛti* (Śakti in fourth phase) in this *Purāṇa* is the evolute or product of *Māyā* or *Brahman* (Śiva). According to the *Rudra Samhitā* this *Prakṛti* originates with *Puruṣa* from determinate Śiva.³ But *Vāyaviya Samhitā* states that this *Prakṛti* comes from the unity of *Māyā* and Ananta.⁴ The *Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa* gives different etymological meaning of the word 'Prakṛti'. First, the word 'Pra' denotes chief principle and the word, 'kṛti' denotes creation, hence 'Prakṛti' denotes the chief Principle of creation, as it has potenciality of creation.⁵ Secondly 'Pra' means Upper or Sattva, 'Kṛ' means middle or Rajas and 'Ti' means down or Tamas. Thus the word *Prakṛti* denotes one which consists of three attributes,

1. RSSt 6. 19-21

शक्तिस्तदैकलेनापि मूलकारणमित्युत ।

2. RS Par, 29.24 ; RSSt, 11.3.4.5a ; VSUK, 4.136,18
VSPK, 5. 39-40

त्वं हि प्रकृतिस्सूक्ष्मा रजस्सत्त्वतमोमयी ।
..... सगुणा निर्गुणाऽपि च ।

3. KRS, 42.2.3

तस्मात्प्रकृतिरुत्पन्ना पुरुषेण समन्विता ।

4. VSUK, 4.23

मायातः पुनरेवाभूदव्यक्तं त्रिगुणात्मकम् ।

5. DBP, 9.1.5

प्रकृष्टवाचकः प्रश्न कृतिश्च सृष्टिवाचकः ।

सृष्टौ प्रकृष्टा या देवी प्रकृतिः सा प्रकीर्तिता ॥

Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, which leads upwards, middle-wards and down wards respectively.¹ Thirdly 'Pra' means Pre-existence and 'Kṛti' means creation. Thus 'Prakṛti' means 'one which exists before the creation.'² It is called Bhaga or Bharga also. The *Vidyēśvara Samhitā* defines it as the basis and embryo of manifest nature (*Suuyaktāntarādhiṣṭhāna garbha*).³ It always grows and proceeds for creation, therefore it is called Bhaga or Bharga. The same sense comes from the etimological explanation of the word Bhaga. The word 'Bha' means growth development or evolution and the word 'ga' means obtainment. Thus the word Bhaga expresses that which obtains growth, development or evolution (Vṛddhimagacchati). In other sense Bhaga means the object of enjoyment or the source of enjoyment.

All the objects of enjoyment viz. colour, touch, taste, sound, smell etc. and all the instruments of enjoyments, eye, skin, tongue, ear, nose etc. and their functions such as seeing, touching, eating, hearing and smelling as well as the locus of the enjoyments, the subtle and gross body, are the products of Prakṛti, hence Prakṛti is called the chief Bhaga.⁴ Both the *Bhāgavata* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* agree with the *Sāṅkhya* in calling *Prakṛti* the equilibrium state of the three attributes.⁵ According to *Linga Purāṇa* it is called *Linga* (the sign or symbol) of *Śiva*, because it manifests the unmanifested reality (*Śiva*). In *Gītā* it is called the *Mahat* Brahma or *Yoni* of the Lord or eight fold lower nature of the Lord.⁶ The *Bhāgavata* defines it as consisting of three attributes, unmanifested (*Avyakta*), eternal in the form of being and non-being (*Sadasadātmaka*), without

1. DBP, 9.1.6,7

..... प्रधाना सृष्टिकरणे प्रकृतिस्तेन कथ्यते ।

2. DBP, 9.1.8

सृष्टेरादौ च या देवी प्रकृतिः सा.....

3. VS, 16.956, 966

भर्गः प्रकृतिरुच्यते । सुव्यक्तान्तरधिष्ठानं गर्भः प्रकृतिरुच्यते ।

4. VS, 16,101, 102 ; RS Par, 13.11b, 12, 13, 14a :

भं वृद्धिं गच्छतीत्यर्थाद् भगः प्रकृतिरुच्यते । ..मुख्यो भगस्तु प्रकृतिः...

5. VP. 1. 2. 33a : SBP, 11.22. 12,

प्रकृतिगुणसाम्यं ..स्थित्युत्पत्त्यन्तहेतवः ।

6. Gita, 7.45 | 14- 3 :

मम योनिमहद्ब्रह्म तस्मिन् गर्भं दधाम्यहम् ।

characteristic (*Aviśeṣa*) but the support and basis of all characteristics and particularities (*Viśeṣāśraya*).¹

We have mentioned above the two states of *Prakṛti*. In both the states it consists of three attributes. In the unmanifest state there is only homogeneous changes in the attributes and in the manifest state there is heterogeneous changes in the attributes. Hence the second state is the corporeal form of *Prakṛti* while the first remains beyond this corporeal form.²

NATURE OF THE ATTRIBUTES

These three attributes are the component parts of *Prakṛti*. They exist in it as oil exists in oil seed³ These three attributes are the basis of creation, sustenance and dissolution of the world.⁴ Due to them *Prakṛti* is said to be pleasant, painful and indifferent as well as the object of enjoyments.⁵ The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* identifies *sattva* with knowledge, *rajas* with action, and *tamas* with ignorance.⁶ The *Vāyavīya Samhitā* defines *Sattva* as pleasure and the cause of pleasure, *Rajas* as pain and cause of pain and *Tamas* as indifference or delusion and the source of indifference, delusion and restraint. The attainment of *Sattva* is up path, of *rajas* is middle path and of *Tamas* is down path.⁷ According to *Sāṅkhya Karikā* these three

1. SBP. 2.26.10 ; VP, 1.2.19

यत्तत्रिगुणमव्यक्तं नित्यं सदसदात्मकम् ।

प्रधानं प्रकृतिं प्रादुरविशेषं विशेषवत् ।

2. VSPK, 5.39-40

तत्कारणदशापन्नमव्यक्तमिति कथ्यते ।.....

व्यक्तमव्यक्तान्नातिभिद्यते ।

3. VSPK 5.34

सत्त्वं रजस्तम इति गुणाः प्रकृतिसंभवाः ।

प्रकृतौ सूक्ष्मरूपेण तिले तैलमिव स्थिताः ॥

4. RSY. 26.21

यदुद्भवास्सत्त्वरजस्तमोगुणाः सर्गस्थितिध्वंसविधानकारकाः.....

5. VSPK 5.33b

मुखदुःखविमोहात्मा भुज्यते गुणवास्त्रिधा ।

6. SBP, 11.22, 13a

सत्त्वं ज्ञानं रजः कर्म तमोऽज्ञानमिहोच्यते ।

7. VSPK, 5.34-36

सात्त्विक्युर्ध्वगतिः प्रोक्ता तामसी स्यादधोगतिः ।

मध्यमा तु गतिर्या सा राजसी परिपठ्यते ॥

attributes are of the nature of pleasure, pain and indifference and they serve to illumine, to actuate and to restrain. Among them Sattva is considered to be light and illuminating, Rajas to be stimulating and mobile and Tamas is heavy and enveloping¹ *Gītā* states their nature in some detail. According to it these three attributes come from *Prakṛti* and tie the soul with body. Among them Sattva is stainless, illuminating and flawless ; binds through self identification with happiness and wisdom ; Rajas is of the nature of passion. It originates from cupidity and attachment. It binds the soul through attachment to actions and their results ; and Tamas is the product of ignorance. It deludes all beings and binds the soul through error, sloth and sleep. According to their nature, they function to motivate the beings. Sattva motivates one to happiness, Rajas to action, and Tamas enveloping to wisdom, urges one to error. In their motivating process Sattva produces knowledge, Rajas creates greed and Tamas causes error, stupor and ignorance.² The *Devī Bhāgavata* further adds that Sattva creates simplicity, truth, purity, faith, forgiveness, patience, benevolence, bashfulness, peace, contentment and genuine belief. Rajas engenders in beings hatred, malice, jealousy, longing, sleeplessness, lofty ambitions, pride, lustful passions and arrogance. And Tamas generates in beings lazyness, ignorance, sleep, poverty, fear, dispute, wretchedness, roughness, infidelity, and fault finding and back biting.³ Their mutual relations are stated as suppression, co-operation, transformation, cohabitation intimate-intercourse etc.⁴ For the solution of the problem of co-habitation and co-function of the three attributes which are of opposite nature, *Sāṅkhya* and *Devī Bhāgavata* cite the analogy of a lamp, where the wick oil and flame of opposite nature co-operate, co-exist habit, and co-function in giving light.⁵ The above mentioned effects or

1. SK, 12, 13

प्रोत्यप्रोतिविषादात्मकाः प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिनियमार्थाः ।

2. *Gītā*, 14. 6-9, 17, 18

3. DBP. 3.8.6-11

4. BrP, 1.4. 6-18 ; MarP. 46. 20-21 ; Sk 12b; DBP 3.8. 13-15

अन्योन्याभिभवाश्रयजननमिथुनवृत्तयश्च गुणाः ।

5. Sk 13b, D.B.P 3.9. 29-30

प्रदीपवच्चार्थतो वृत्तिः ।

functions of each attribute are not exclusively caused by only one. They are caused by one with the assistance of other two. Thus it hardly needs to be proved that Sattva cannot be cause of excitement or Tamas of enlightenment. The co-existence of these three attributes is observed even in everyday experience, as seen from an example well known in the exposition of the *Sāṅkhya*. A's wife is beautiful, young and well endowed with all the qualities of head and heart that are requisite in the ideal wife, These constitute the Sattva elements in her : because of that she causes A, her husband, to rejoice. She is, however, the cause of jealousy in her co-wives B and C and despair to a neighbour D who has not had the good chance to be married to her. Jealousy is rajas and despair is tamas ; they are due to the elements of Rajas and Tamas in A's wife; these become active only in respect of the co-wives and the neighbour, as the case may be.

संकेत विवरणम् :

- B S B S—ब्रह्मसूत्रशांकरभाष्य
 Br P—ब्रह्मपुराण
 D B P—श्रीमद् देवीभागवतपुराण
 Gita—श्रीमद् भगवद् गीता
 K U—कठोपनिषद्
 Ken—केनोपनिषद्
 K S—कैलाससंहिता (शिवपुराण)
 Mar. P—मार्कण्डेय पुराण
 P D—पंचदशी
 R S Par.—रुद्रसंहिता-पार्वतीखण्ड (शिवपुराण)
 R S St— „ सतीखण्ड „
 R S Y— „ युद्धखण्ड „
 S R S—शतरुद्रसंहिता „
 S Rt S—शतरत्नसंग्रह
 S B P— श्रीमद् भागवतपुराण
 S K—सांख्य कारिका
 U S—उमासंहिता (शिव पुराण)
 V S P K—वायवीयसंहिता, पूर्वखण्ड „
 V S U K— „ „ उत्तरखण्ड „
 V S—विद्येश्वर संहिता „
 V P—विष्णुपुराण

THE CONCEPT OF THE EARTH IN THE PURĀNAS

BY

RAMJI PANDEY

[अस्मिन् लेखे पुराणेषूपलब्धस्य पृथिवीसंबन्धिवर्णनस्य वेद-ज्योतिष-साम्प्रतिक-मतस्य चाधारेण प्रामाणिकं विवेचनं कृतम् । पृथिव्या उत्पत्ति-अवस्थिति-विस्तार-विभागादिविषयाणामुल्लेखो वर्णनं वा पुराणेषु इतरग्रन्थेषु च वर्तते । अत्र एषां सर्वेषां विषयाणां साङ्गोपाङ्गं विवेचनं कृतम् । पृथिवी तु आधारभूता आसीत् सर्वेषां सर्वदैव अतः इतरग्रहापेक्षया पृथिव्या ज्ञानमपि अधिकमासीत् । पुराणेषु भुवनकोशवर्णनप्रसङ्गे पृथिव्या विभागस्य व्यापकं वर्णनमुपलभ्यते । इदं सर्वं पृथिवीसंबन्धिवर्णनं ज्योतिषग्रन्थेषूपलब्धेन विवरणेन सह अन्यत्रप्राप्त-विवरणेन सह च क्वचित्साम्यं क्वचिद्वैभिन्यं च भजते । अधोवर्तिसप्त-लोकानामुपरिवर्तिसप्तलोकानामपि निर्देशोऽत्र विहितः । एषां सर्वेषां विषयाणां सप्रमाणं सयुक्तिकं च विवेचनमत्र लेखकमहोदयेन कृतम् ।]

The earth, being one of the most important factors of our existence, is better known to us than any other natural phenomenon from time immemorial. The ancient Indian seers were cautious enough to note its general characteristics and changes on its surface which are recorded in the Indian literature. Here an attempt is made to present the ancient Indian outlook, mainly from the Purāṇas about its origin, shape, situation, extent, different geographical divisions, its seven upper and lower regions, motion and gravitations, etc. As the Purāṇas, having wide informations about our culture, are interlinked with the Vedas, it is necessary to produce their views of the Earth in comparison with the Vedic and later astronomical statements.

Various synonyms :—In the Vedic literature we find as many as twentyone synonyms of the earth (Pṛthivī) recorded in the Nighaṇṭu¹ which, with a few exceptions, were also current in

1. गौः ; रमा ; जमा ; क्षमा ; क्षा, क्षमा ; क्षोणिः ; क्षितिः ; अरुनिः ;
उर्वी ; पृथ्वी ; मही ; रिपः ; अदितिः ; इला ; निर्ऋतिः ; भूः ;
भूमिः ; पूषा ; गातुः ; गोत्रा इत्येकविंशतिः पृथिवीनामधेयानि ।

Nighaṇṭu, I. 1.

the classical period.¹ Yāska comments the word *go* as 'The word *go* is a synonym of earth (so called) because it goes very far or because all the beings go over it (Nirukta, II-5.). Purāṇas accepted the Vedic as well as classical synonyms with some modifications. The Brahma-Vaivartta gives etymological explanations of some of these words as follows.²

'This earth is called *bhūmi* as all the beings exist on it, *Vasudhā* as it possesses *vasus* or gems, *urvī* due to its origin from the thighs of Lord Hari, *dharanī*, *dharitrī* and *dharā* as upholds everything, *ijyā* as it fulfils the requirements of the sacrifices, *kshiti*, as it is destroyed in the great dissolution, *kāśyapī* being connected with Kāśyapa, *achalā* due to its immovable nature, *viśvambharā* as it sustains all, *anantā* due to its endless nature, *pṛthvī* being the daughter of Pṛthu and *mahī* due to its extensive nature'³.

Origin of the Earth :

While dealing with the science of creation the Purāṇas clearly mention the order in which the creation came into being. That process reveals some facts regarding the origin of the earth. The Purāṇic principle of creation is mainly based on Vedic cosmogony which was later on followed by the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*.

The Ṛgveda⁴ records various theories regarding creation which are *sadasadvāda*, *rajovāda*, *vyomavāda*, *aparavāda*, *āvaranavāda*, *ambhovāda*, *amṛta-mṛtyuvāda*, *daivavāda*,⁵ etc. Here the doctrine of *ambhovāda* is much valuable for us as it is closer to our Purāṇic doctrine of *ekārṇava* and *hiraṇyagarbha vidyā*. According to the

1. भूर्भूमिरचलानन्ता रसा विश्वंभरा स्थिरा ।
धरा धरित्री धरणी क्षोणी ज्या काश्यपी क्षितिः ॥
सर्वसहा वसुमती वसुधोर्वी वसुंधरा ।
गोत्रा कुः पृथिवी पृथ्वी क्ष्मावनिर्मिदिनी महौ ॥

Amarakośa, II. 2-3.

2. Prakṛtikhaṇḍa IX. 29-33.
3. For a correct etymological exposition of these words see the Commentary of Kshīrasvāmin on *Amarakośa* and that of Devarājaya-jvan on the *Nighaṇṭu*.
4. Nāsadiyasūkta, X. 129.
5. For their detailed exposition, see Agrawala's 'Sparks from the Vedic Fire' pp. 61-77.

ambhovāda Waters were conceived as primeval source of all creation and this whole universe proceeded from that infinite ocean designated as *salilam* (Rv. X, 129.3) of unfathomed depth. From Waters was born Agni which symbolises the principle of Motion and Light. All creation is spoken of as the result of the union of *Agni* and *Soma* (*agnīṣomātmakam jagat*). This union gave birth to *Hiranyagarbha*, the supreme principle of creation which supports *dyāvāprithivī* (*Sa dādāhāra prithivīm dyāmutemām* Rv. X. 121.1). This Vedic principle of creation was later on accepted by Manu, who also supports the original theory that the Waters were first created from the unmanifest *tamas* and a Golden Egg floated over the surface for a thousand years, divided itself into two halves representing the heaven and earth.¹ The Purāṇic writers took the theme from Vedic and Manu's *Hiranyagarbha* doctrine and put it in the form of an interesting legend which runs as follows :

'At the time of dissolution when this whole universe had become one ocean the creator Lord Nārāyaṇa = Brahmā rested for a *Kalpa* and on its expiry awaking from his slumber saw this universe and became engaged in the creation. Inferring that the earth was sinking under Waters he took the form of a Divine Boar and entered the primeval waters for its search. Thus the supreme soul, the holder of earth, at once lifted her up and set it on the floods just like a boat which never sinks due to the flatness of its frame. He for the good of this world created the mountains which were previously burnt by *sainvaritakāgni* at the time of dissolution. After this he properly divided the land containing islands, mountains and rivers, etc. Then he created the four *lokas bhūh*, etc.' Similar accounts are found in almost all the Purāṇas which describe the

1. अथ एव ससर्जादी तामु बीजमवासृजत् ।

तदण्डमभवद् हैमं सहस्रांशुसमप्रभम् ॥

×

×

×

तस्मिन्नण्डे स भगवानुषित्वा परिवत्सरम् ।

स्वयमेवात्मना ध्यानात्तदण्डमकरोद् द्विधा ।

ताभ्यां स शकलाभ्यां च दिवं भूमिं च निर्ममे ॥

creation in detail.¹ Prof. Wilson has taken this account to be purely mythological and has stated as follows :

“The elevation of the earth from beneath the ocean in this form, was therefore, probably, at first an allegorical representation of the extrication of the world from a deluge of inquiry by the rites of religion. Geologists may perhaps suspect in the original and unmystified tradition, an allusion to a geological fact or the existence of lacustrine mammalia in the early periods of the earth”.² There may be some truth in the above words but being mythological they symbolise some natural incident which has much bearing on the formation of earth. These are symbolical expressions which are frequent in the Vedic literature where the Waters are described as the primeval source of creation and the creator as a Boar.³ Similar ideas regarding the origin of this universe are found in other civilisations of the world.⁴

Apart from the above account we find another description which is much more geographical in nature contained in the Bhuvanakośa chapters of the Purāṇas. There it has been said that ‘from the

1. Kūrma I. 6.23-25, etc.
Brahmāṇḍa I. 1.4.27-30 ; 1.5. 1-28.
Matsya ch. 247.
Mārkaṇḍeya 47. 5-14.
Viṣṇu I.4. 6-10 ; 45-49.
Vāyu I. 6. 25-34.
Līṅga I.4. 59-63
2. Wilson Viṣṇu Purāṇa translation p. 23, New edition (1961) from Punthi Pustaka Calcutta 4.
3. Tait Br̥h. I. 1.3.
Tait. Samhitā VII. 1.5, apart from this Ṛigveda X, 190. 1.3 ; 72. 1-5 also contain some references to earth's creation.
4. Prof. Ali in his Geography of the Purāṇas, p 137, summarising the Vedic and Purāṇic view comments thus :—

The central idea of various cosmogonic theories of the Vedic and post-vedic period appears to be the existence of Waters in the beginning of the creation of cosmic nucleus-Prajāpati (Rv. X. 121.7) the maker of this universe. This nucleus is often named as Hiranyagarbha (Golden Egg) which is considered as the source of the existence of all mundane and heavenly entities because it contained fire within itself...Not only the Purāṇas but also the basic concepts of cosmology in different parts of the old world confirmed the general pattern laid down by the Vedic writers.”

Great God Mahādeva, unmanifest in nature, a *sanātana-lokapadma* originated, from that the four-faced god Brahmā and from his naval-lotus this earth came into being in 'the form of a lotus. Mountain Meru was the pericarp of this lotus-shaped earth, It had four petals which were the four continents round the mountain Meru, viz. Bhadrāśva, Bhārat, Ketumāla, and Uttarakuru.¹ Though there is some difference between the cosmological and geographical statements, the original source seems to be the same, the unmanifest, i. e. the primeval Waters (*salilam*). This became *Hiranyagarbha* and from this proceeded the whole universe.

Age of the Earth :—

We may have an idea about the age of the earth from the account contained in the *pratisarga* (dissolution) chapters of the Purāṇas. We find three types of dissolution (i) incidental (ii) elemental and (iii) absolute. The first takes place at the end of each *Kalpa* which comes about after 4320 million years ; the second after two *parārdhas* and the last occurs on the expiry of the age of Brahmā. Thus the sequence of events during the period of incidental dissolution are desiccation, destruction and deluge, after which the process of creation is repeated and marks the beginning of the next *Kalpa*. Brahmā's awakening represents creation and his sleep the dissolution. Modern geology on the basis of uranium lead ratios fixes the age of the earth about 2000 million years. Prof. Ali has shown a fair degree of similarity in the statements of the Purāṇas and modern geological conceptions. He has arrived at the conclusion "If we identify a *Kalpa* or Brahmā's day with the inter-revolutionary period and the revolution with the incidental dissolution of the Purāṇas and the transgression of the earth in an envelop of water as conceived by the Purāṇics the two accounts tally accurately except in point of time. The Brahmā's day or *Kalpa* is given as 4,320,000,000 years while the later inter-revolutionary periods do not extend beyond 100-150 million years and are not of equal duration²."

Shape of the earth :—

No clear reference to its shape is mentioned in the Vedas. A passage in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa clearly evinces the circular

1. Vāyu II. 34.36-37 ; 42-46 ; 56-60. cf. Varāha 75.41-50.

2. 'Geography of the Purāṇas' p. 196.

shape of the earth.¹ From the import of certain *mantras* in the R̥gveda it follows that its shape is circular². The Purāṇas describe it in the form of a lotus³. The words like *bhūvalaya* (Bhā. V. 21.1, 19), *kuvalaya* (Bhā. V. 16.5,7), *bhūgolaka* (Bhā. V. 16.4), *Mahigola* (Pañchāsiddhāntikā, Trailokya-Saṁsthāna 1.1.) indicate the roundness of its shape. Later on in the Jyotishasiddhānta age it was accepted as circular like a ball.⁴

From the statement of Śrīpati, a tenth century astronomical writer it is clear that three types of opinions were current regarding the shape of the earth in his time. Some held it to be plain like a mirror (*mukurodara-saṁnibhā*), others like the back of a tortoise (*kūmapriśkṭhasadṛśī*), and lotus-shaped (*sarojākṛti*) according to the Purāṇas.⁵ Lalla and Bhāskara both rejected the flatness of the earth on the ground :

“had the earth been flat, the palm-like tall trees even standing afar would have been visible.

“if the goddess earth were plain like a mirror why then the Sun revolving on high be not visible to men as it is to immortals”.⁶

1. “The (Sun) never really sets or rises. In that they think of him ‘He is setting’, verily having reached the end of the day, he inverts himself ; thus he makes evening below, day above. Again in that they ‘think of him ‘He is rising in the morning’, verily having reached the end of night he inverts himself ; thus he makes day below, night above. He never sets, indeed he never sets, union with him and identity of form and world he attains who knows thus”.

R̥gveda Brāhmaṇas Translated, Keith, Ait. III. 4.44, page 193. cf *Gopatha* IX.10.

2. Rv, I. 33.8 ; 1V. 53.3.
3. *Padmākārā samutpannā*, Vāyu II. 34.44, Viṣṇu II. 12.37, Brahma 13.25, Varāha 81.8. Bhāgavata V. 16.5.
4. *Kandukarūpā dhātṛi* Mahāryabhaṭṭīyam, *Golaṭpāda*. 5.
5. आदशोदरसंनिभा भगवती विश्वंभरा कीर्तिता ।
कैश्चित् कैश्चन कूर्मपृष्ठसदृशी कैश्चित् सरोजाकृतिः ॥

Śrīpati, quoted in Siddhāntaśiromaṇi, Bhuvanakośa.

6. समता यदि विद्यते भुवस्तरवस्तालनिभा बहूच्छ्रयाः ।
कथमेव न दृष्टिगोचरं नुरहो यान्ति सुदूरसंस्थिताः ॥

Lalla, quoted in Siddhāntaśiromaṇi

यदि समामुकुरोदरसंनिभा भगवती धरणी तरणिः क्षितेः ।
उपरि दूरगतोऽपि परिभ्रमन् किमु नरैरमरैरिव नेक्ष्यते ॥

Śiromaṇi, Bhuvanakośa 11.12.

Situation :—

The earth is supported by a mythical serpent (*śeṣha*) is the general view of the Purāṇas.¹ Some believe that it is on the back of a tortoise², an incarnation of Vishṇu. Bhāg. V. 20.39 mentions that the earth is held by the four divine elephants. These statements of the Purāṇic writers seem to be groundless and have been rejected by later astronomical authorities. They propounded the view that this sphere stands by itself through gravitation in the wide space.³ Lalla criticised the Purāṇic notion⁴ that this earth is placed like a boat on the waters, on the ground that:—

‘the situation of the earth on waters is not possible as in that case it would have been dissolved in them and if it were taken to be placed on some base that also be nothing more than the earth itself or if the earth is considered to have been placed on water which also in turn remains baseless like the sky. If such a huge terrestrial globe may stand on waters why should it not be taken as standing in the sky by itself?’⁵ Bhāskara II (about A.D. 1150) exposed the absurdity of the views that the earth is placed on the head of a serpent (*śeṣha*) or a tortoise. If we accept that it is supported by any material base which in turn, will require another base to hold it on and thus there would be no end to this. Then

1. तेनेयं नागवर्येण शिरसा विधुता मही ।

बिभर्ति मालां लोकानां सदेवासुरमानुषम् ॥

Vishṇu II. 5.27; Bhāgavata V. 25.2, 12. VI.16.48.

2. क्षितिरतिविपुलतरे तव तिष्ठति पृष्ठे,

Gītagovindam I. 2.

3. अनिलाधारा केचित् केचिल्लोका वसुन्धराधारा ।

वसुधा नान्याधारा तिष्ठति गगने स्वशक्त्यैव ॥

Mahāryabhaṭṭiyam 16.4.

4. अप्सु पारिप्लवां पृथ्वीम्

Brahma I. 43.

तस्योपरि जलौघस्य महती नौरिवास्थिता ।

Vāyu I. 6.27.

5. सलिले विलयो मृदो भवेदिति गोरप्सु न युज्यते स्थितिः ।

अथ पात्रगतेति तत्कथं न भवेद्यावदिलैव पार्थिवम् ॥

यदि वाम्भसि संस्थिता मही सलिलं तद्द्युवदप्रतिष्ठितम् ।

गुरुगोम्भसि चेत् स्थितिर्भवेत् क्षितिगोलस्य न किं विहायसि ॥

Lalla, quoted in the footnote of Śiromaṇi, Bhuvanakośa.

why do we not accept the fact that this earth is supported by itself ?¹ From observing the host of constellations constantly moving without any base in the sky the baselessness of the earth is likewise proved.² He also rejected the belief of the Bauddhas that this earth is constantly falling downwards. Illustrating this point he further argues that an arrow shot upwards must not fall on the earth as the latter is far heavier than the former. As such the earth must fall more vehemently and both of them can never come together. But the arrow does actually fall on the earth. This fact proves the gravitation of the earth.³

Extent :—In the Vedas the extent of the earth is nowhere mentioned with any accuracy except the vague statement that it is extensive. The Purāṇas give a rough statement that it is extended over five hundred million *yojanas*⁴ Wilson comments on it thus :—

“This comprises the planetary sphere, for the diameter of the seven zones and oceans each ocean being of the same diameter as the continent it encloses, and each successive continent being twice the diameter of that which precedes it amounts to but two crores and fiftysix lacs, and Lokāloka is but ten thousand *yojanas*. So the whole is five crores ten lacs and ten thousand (5, 10, 10,000)”.⁵

1. सूर्तो धर्ता चेद्धरित्र्यास्ततोऽन्यस्तस्याप्यन्योऽस्यैव मानानवस्था ।
अन्ये कल्प्या चेत् स्वशक्तिः किमाद्ये किं नो भूमेः साष्टमूर्तेश्च मूर्तिः ॥
Śiromaṇi, Bhuvanakośa. 4.
2. भपञ्जरस्य भ्रमणावलोकादाधारशून्या कुरिति प्रतीतिः ।
Śiromaṇi, Bhuvanakośa 7.
3. आकृष्टिशक्तिश्च मही तथा यत् खस्थं गुरुस्वाभिमुखं स्वशक्त्या ।
आकृष्यते तत्पततीव भाति समे समन्तात् क्व पतत्विर्यं रवे ॥
Śiromaṇi, Bhuvanakośa 6.
4. Kūrma I. 45.4. Liṅga I. 49.2,
Garuḍa I. 54.3. Viṣṇu II. 4.97.
Bhāgavata V. 2036. Mārkaṇḍeya 54.4 (Pargiter, in his
footnote, has written that taking
the *yojana* as 40,000 feet, this dia-
meter of the earth equals 3, 737,
878, 781 miles).
- Vāmana XI. 31
- Vāyu II. 50.68.
- Śiva I. 12.2.
5. Viṣṇu Purāṇa Translation p. 167.

It was generally understood that the terrestrial sphere extends as far as it is illuminated by the rays of the Sun and the Moon,¹ It was extended upto Lokāloka mountain. Later on the astronomical authorities mention the diameter of the earth about 1581 *yojanas*. This measurement of the earth was differently accepted by various authorities. The diameter of the earth largely differs on account of various measurements of a *yojana*. Generally 32000 hands or ten English miles make a *yojana* and hence the diameter according to *Pañchasiddhāntikā* comes about 10186 miles. It is about 7925 miles according to the modern calculations.

According to the *Vāchaspati* and *Śabdārṇavakośa* a *yojana* is equal to 16000 hands or 5 miles. If this be accepted as the minimum extent of a *yojana* as is also supported by Huien T-sang's statement in the middle of the 7th A.D. the diameter estimated by Brahma Gupta will be identical with modern calculation i.e., about 7920 miles.

Different Geographical divisions :—

In the Vedic period we find three divisions of the universe viz. *Prithivī*, *Antariksha* (the intermediate region) and *Dyuloka* (Heaven)² but no specific divisions of the earth like Jambū and other continents are mentioned.³ It seems possible that this division took place somewhere between the Epic and Purāṇic age. The Mahābhārata expanded the theory and the Purāṇas further elaborated it with its full particulars gradually. As many as three times the Purāṇas indicate incidents of its divisions, firstly, by the Divine Boar at the time of its establishment on the primeval waters, secondly, by Mahārāja *Pr̥thu* and lastly by *Priyavrata*, the son of

1. Matsya 124.1-2; 18. Brahma 23.13. Śiva V.19.1. Vāyu II.49, 186; 50.75. Vishṇu II.VII. 3. Liṅga I. 53.33
 2. RV. I. 34.6. Atharva XX. 34.2.
 3. "Dr. Jensen has also discussed the seven-fold division of the earth's continents by the Babylonians and pointed out its resemblance with the Purāṇic account of the seven continents (kosmologie der-Babylonier 163-184). But I think that the parallel can be carried much further for I have shown elsewhere that this seven-fold division is to be found not only in the Purāṇas but also in the Vedas (Arctic Home 340. "Vedic chronology p. 143 by Prof. Tilaka.)"
- For seven divisions of the earth cf. Ṛgvedic Geography p. 39 by M.L. Bhargava.

Svāyambhū Manu.¹ Geographically we have seen that lotus-shaped earth with Meru as pericarp and its four petals, viz., Bhadrāśva, Bhārata, Ketumāla and Uttarakuru was originated, from the unmanifest (*avyukta*). This was the ancient conception of the earth consisting of four dvīpas (*chaturdvīpī*)², the same was developed into that of seven continents (*saptadvīpī*) later on.

Priyavrata, a descendant of Manu divided this whole earth among his seven sons after their names. Those seven sons further divided their respective continents into seven sub-divisions each designated after their seven sons. Hence the Purāṇic writers describe the geography of seven continents with their seven Varsha-mountains, seven great rivers, etc. Pushkara is divided into two divisions while Jambu into nine, otherwise the order is the same. According to seven continental theory of the earth Jambu dvīpa is in the centre of all continents with mountain Meru as its neval. It is encircled by an ocean of salt of equal extent. Similarly *Plaksha*, *Śālmali*, *Kuśa*, *Krauñcha* *Śāka* and *Pushkara* each having double area of its preceding one. All of them are surrounded by an ocean of sugarcane juice, wine, ghee, curd, and sweetwater. The Purāṇic writers describe the geography of Jambudvīpa in detail and here, too, that of Bhārata-varsha still more elaborately. These accounts of World Geography are well-preserved in the bhuvanakośa chapters of the Purāṇas.³ Later on a second division is mentioned as *Kūrmavibhāga* by Varāhamihira, a sixth century astronomical authority, in his *Saṁhitā* (ch. XIV), this division is also found in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Ch. CVIII). Later Astronomers took these views from the Purāṇas and describe them in their own ways in their bhuvanakośavarṇana.

Concept of Brahmāṇḍa.—The Purāṇas often deal with the *chaturdaśa-bhuvanātmaka brahmāṇḍa* constituting seven upper and seven lower divisions. The seven upper divisions including the

-
1. Bhāg. IV. 18. 29-32. V. 1. 39-40.
 2. Vāyu II. 34. 36-37, 56-60. Matsya 113. 43-44.
 3. Vāyu (chs. 34-50) Matsya (chs. 123-128) Brahma (chs. 18-28) Brahmāṇḍa (II. 16.19) Viṣṇu (II. 2.7) Varāha (chs. 74-89) Vāmano (chs. 11-13) Mārkaṇḍeya (chs. 54-60) Agni (chs. 108-9, 119.20) Kūrma (I. chs. 43-50) Śiva (V. 17-18) Liṅga (I. 46-53) Garuḍa (I. 54-56) Bhāgavata (V. 16-20) Padma, Svarga chs. 3-9 Viṣṇudharma. I. 6-11.

earth are *bhūh*, *bhuvah*, *svah*, *mahah*, *janah*, *tapah* and *satyam* and the seven lower regions are *atala*, *vitāla*, *sutāla*, *talātāla*, *rasātāla*, *mahātāla* and *pātāla*. The height of the earth from nether regions is mentioned as seventy thousand *yojanas*; each lower region covering a distance of ten thousand *yojanas*. About the seven lower regions the general idea of scholars is that these are layers of this very earth and nothing else.¹ They abound in luxuries even more than heaven, inhabited by superhuman beings, viz. *Nāgas*, *Asuras*, and *Siddhās*, etc. Among upper divisions the solar region is situated on a hundred thousand *yojanas* from the earth. On one *Koṭi yojana* from *Dhruva* is *Jana* from *Jana* at the distance of 8 *Koṭi yojanas* is *tapoloka* and 48 *koṭi yojana* above is *satyaloka*². Bhāskara II has identified *bhūrloka* to the south of equator, *bhuvah* to the north, and *sva* in the Polar region.³ The Purāṇic writers also describe the seven spheres of the wind above the earth,⁴ viz. *āvaha*, *pravaha*, *saṁvaha*, *vivaha*, *parāvaha* and *parivaha* supported by astronomers⁵ too. Bhāskara has located the region of *bhūvāyu*, sixty miles above the earth. Both Āryabhaṭṭa and Lalla and others also have accepted the same while the distance according to modern calculations is about 45 to 100 miles.

Planetary distances:—

According to the Purāṇa the earth is the lowest sphere among the seven upper *lokas*. Above it at a distance of one lac *yojanas* is the solar sphere, one lac *yojana* above the Sun is the lunar sphere then are those of Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn situated at the distance of two lac *yojanas* from each other. There is some difference between the Purāṇic and astronomical sequence of planets, which begins with the earth and then occur moon, mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn and so on. It is clear from the above statement that Purāṇic writers did not know the exact orbits of the planets. The distance also stated by them is not correct. According to the *Sūryasiddhānt*, the distance between the earth and moon is equal to earth's radius i.e. 800 *yojanas* × 64.46. The distance of the Sun = earth's radius × 862 = 689450

1. Purāṇa-vimarśa pp. 345-350.

2. For the upper divisions see Viṣṇu II. 7, and Vāyu II. 50.

3. Śiromaṇi Bhuvanakoṣa 43.

4. Kūrma I. 41-6-7.

5. Liṅga I. 53.36-38. Vāyu 67. 110-129, Sk, Māheśvara 38.53-60.

yojanas which is 233000 times greater than earth's radius according to modern calculation. It seems that the Purāṇic writers had tried to measure the distance between earth and planets, it matters little, how far their conclusions tally with the modern calculations.

Motion :—Nowhere either in the Vedic or Purāṇic theory we find any reference to the earth's motion. In the Purāṇas only the planets are described as moving round the earth. Later astronomical writers have accepted the earth as stable, except Āryabhaṭa I who has mentioned that this earth moves one *kalā* in a *prāṇa*. The stability of the earth is proved by the planets revolving round it. We see the luminary bodies going daily in the sky from east to west. Of them some are stationary (*Nakṣatras*) and some change their positions from west to east, these are called planets. Hence observing these two movements Āryabhaṭa I had said that "As a man in a boat sees the banks and other things going against his direction so he sees the constellations moving westwards in the equatorial region."¹ This proves that Āryabhaṭa had accepted the daily movement of the earth. Later on, Brahma Gupta raised the objection saying "if the earth moves a *Kalā* in a *prāṇa* then whence and what route does it proceed? If it revolves why do not lofty objects fall?² Lalla and others have also commented and criticised the theory saying 'if we accept movement in the earth how the birds will reach their nests, the arrows shot upwards in the sky will fall westward. The clouds will float west-wards and if it is said that it moves slowly, how is it possible to complete its round in a single day'³.

सूर्यादि ग्रहाणां गतिः Bhāg. V.22.2; 23.3.

1. अनुलोमगतिर्नैस्थः पश्यत्यचलं विलोमं यद्वत् ।
अचलानि भानि तद्वत् समपश्चिमगानि लंकायाम् ॥
Āryabhaṭīyaṃ Golapāda, 9.
2. प्राणेनैति कलां भूर्यदि तर्हि कुतो व्रजेत् कमण्डलम् ।
श्रावर्तनमुर्व्याश्चेन्न पतन्ति समुच्छ्रयाः कस्मात् ॥
Brahmasiddhānta. XI
3. यदि चलति क्षमा तदा स्वकुलायं कथमाप्नुयुः खगाः ।
इषवोऽभिनभः समुज्झिता निपतन्तः स्युरपांपतेर्दिशि ॥
पूर्वाभिमुखे भ्रमे भ्रवो वरुणाशाभिमुखो व्रजेद्धनः ।
अथ मन्दमगात्तदा भवेत् कथमेकेन दिवा परिभ्रमः ॥
Lalla.

Though these objections are removed by modern scholar's on new scientific lines still their historical importance is in no way less as they represent the gradual development of Hindu astronomical speculations and discoveries in which such theories were propounded in remote past. This is in short an account, of the earth, contained in the various ancient works. Apart from this the Purāṇic writers accepted it not only a mere terrestrial sphere but side by side they tried to see it in the form of a living unit as *Viśvambharā*¹, the mother sustaining the world.

1 जननी सर्वभूतानां सर्वभूतधराधरा ।
 नानाजनपदाकीर्णा नानाधिष्ठानपत्तना ॥
 नानानदनदीशैला नैकजातिसमाकुला ।
 अनन्ता गीयते देवी पृथिवी बहुविस्तरा ॥

Vāyu II. 51. 1-2.

सेयं धात्री विधात्री च सर्वभूतगुणाधिका ।
 आधारभूता सर्वेषां मैत्रेय जगतामिति ॥

Viṣṇu II. 4. 98. Kūrma I. 45.5.

SOME NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS ON THE PURĀNIC
ACCOUNT OF THE IMPERIAL GUPTAS

By

S. N. ROY

[युक्तिसहितेन विवेचनेनात्र लेखे निर्धार्यते यत् गुप्तराजवंशवर्णने पुराणानां प्रामाणिकत्वाङ्गीकरणे नास्ति काचित् विप्रतिपत्तिः । एतत्सम्बन्धे वायुब्रह्माण्डयोरेकस्य श्लोकस्य पार्जितरमहोदयेन संशोधितः पाठोः लेखकमहोदयेनोपन्यस्तः तस्य अन्येभ्यः पुराणेभ्यः पाठभेदांश्च प्रदर्श्य तेषां सम्बन्धे पुराणप्रामाण्यमालोचितम् । स च श्लोकस्तद्यथा— 'अनुगङ्गा प्रयागञ्च साकेतं मगधांस्तथा । एतान् जदपदान् सर्वान् भोक्ष्यन्ते गुप्तवंशजाः ॥' प्रसङ्गेऽस्मिन् मज्जमदार-गङ्गुली-पार्जितर-वित्सन-एलन-दशरथशर्मप्रभृतिविदुषां मतान्यप्यत्र विधिवत्समालोचितानि । तदनन्तरं डा० दक्षरथशर्मणो विचारमनुसृत्य 'अनुगङ्गमाप्रयागं गुप्ता भोक्ष्यन्ति मेदिनीम्' इति पाठ एव शुद्ध इति विदुषा लेखकेन निर्धारितम् । एवं प्रकारेण एकैकपुराणस्य वर्तमानपाठस्य शुद्धिमौलिकता वा तस्य विविधहस्तलेखेषु समुपलब्धपाठान्तराणां संवादेन, पुराणात्तरेषु सुरक्षितपाठसामञ्जस्येन च निर्धारयितुं सुशक्येतिमितं लेखकमहोदयस्य । मन्यते चासौ यद्यपि पुराणगतैतिहासिकप्रसङ्गानां वर्णनं परवर्तिकाले पाठसंशोधनवशाद् ऐतिहासिकमहत्त्वाधायकं, श्रद्धोपपादकमसंदिग्धं वा प्रायेण नैव तिष्ठति, तथापि तादृशपाठानां यथावत् मौलिकत्वोपपादनार्थं पाठनिर्धारणक्रमे तेषामैतिहासिकमहत्त्वं लक्ष्योक्त्य कृतं पुनर्निर्माणं (संशोधनं) सर्वथा समीचीनं सम्भवं बहूपकारकं वा भवितुमर्हति । इत्येतत्सर्वं सारगर्भितं विवेचनमत्र प्रस्तुतम् ।]

Eversince Mr. Pargiter presented his monumental finds regarding the dynasties of the Kali Age culled out from the passages of the early Purāṇas, fashion has been in vogue among the scholars to examine the state of historical affairs as can be gleaned from them. Among such passages as have been subjected to much frequent comments mention can specially be made of the one concerning the account of the territories ruled over by the Gupta Kings. The wording and formation displayed by it, as would be subsequently shown, seem to be so very peculiar in their own way and it is so much inconsonantly preserved in

different Purāṇic versions that the conclusion worthy of proper history can hardly be arrived at on the basis of too apparent an analysis without testing its merit in a proper perspective. The revisionary role of the Paurāṇikas, on the other hand, led to the distortion of the early passages to such an extent that the meaning intended originally in the passage under question as well as many others of its kind, is difficult to gather unless the persistent trend operative in their formation is not taken into full account. In view of these considerations it is proposed here to find out as to how far the original form of the passage has survived in the concerned texts and see as to what extent it can prove to be competent for the reconstruction of the Gupta history, if its available form is emendated, restored and interpreted in consonance with the corroborative evidences.

Before examining in detail the points at issue, it seems worthwhile to reproduce the varied readings of the passage as found in the different texts and manuscripts. The reading of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas has been emendated by Mr. Pargiter¹ as follows :

‘Anugaṅgā Prayāgam ca Sāketam Magadāṁstathā /
Etāñjanapadān sarvān Bhokṣyante Guptavānśajāḥ’ //

Some of the significant variants noticed by the same scholar in the manuscripts available to him are Anugaṅgam for Anugaṅgā (MSS. C and J), and Madhyagā (MS. B) and Makhagā (MS. E) for Māgadhā. We shall have an occasion to discuss below that these variant forms cannot be ignored, while drawing conclusion out of the aforementioned verse. The copies of Viṣṇu Purāṇa have preserved in them the condensed form of the passage. After piecing together the readings of the various versions of this text Mr. Pargiter² has restored the passage in Viṣṇu Purāṇa as under :

‘Anugaṅgā Prayāgam Māgadhāḥ Guptāśca Bhokṣyanti’.

The essential variants of the passage which have been brought out by Pargiter in respect of Viṣṇu Purāṇa’s manuscripts are the following ones ; use of Māgadhān (MSS. H and L) and Magadhā Suhmā (MS. J) for Māgadhā ; addition of Māgadhān (MS. B) and omission of Guptāśca (MS. A). It is noteworthy that

1. D.K.A. (second edition), p. 53.

2. Ibid, p. 54, Fn. 10.

these variants, too, are as significant as those found in the copies of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas. The corresponding text of the Bhāgavata reads this passage as 'Anugaṅgamā Prayāgam Guptām Bhokṣyati Medinīm'. The only variant reading which seems to be significant in case of this Purāṇa is Guptā in place of Guptām³.

While testing the merit of the present passage scholars have been, in some cases, skeptic about its authenticity for the history of the Gupta rulers. In this connection Dr. R. C. Majumdar draws our attention to the 'discrepancies' of the Purāṇa texts, which render it a difficult task to reconstruct from the Purāṇa passage the extent of territory ruled over by the Guptas. He also observes the vagueness contained in the word Anugaṅgā and finally concludes that 'it is hardly justified to assign too great importance to the Purāṇic passage, and far less to rely upon it in deducting the extent of territory ruled over by Chandragupta I'⁴. Almost a similar remark has been made by Dr. D. C. Ganguly who, however, has examined the problem in his article more elaborately than Dr. Majumdar. The article is concluded with the following words : 'It will thus follow that even if the above statements of Purāṇas are taken to have contained genuine historical facts, they cannot in any way be assumed to have referred to the political condition of the country on the eve of the rise of Samudragupta. As a matter of fact no importance should be attached to them until they are corroborated by authentic evidence'⁵. The point whether the Purāṇic account is genuine or not had already been considered by Wilson. While translating this passage as it occurs in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, he did not feel any hesitation in suggesting that 'the account is the most explicit and probably most accurate of all'⁶. The view-points of Allan⁷, Pargiter⁸ and Dr. Dashrath Sharma⁹ are, in their essential aspects, akin to that of Wilson. It has been

3. Variant cited by Dr. Dasharath Sharma, I.H.Q., Vol. 30, 1954; p. 375.

4. Vākāṭaka-Gupta Age (1967), p. 135.

5. D.C. Ganguly, I.H.Q. Vol. 21, June, 1945.

6. Viṣṇu Purāṇa's translation, (1961), p. 385, Fn. 70.

7. Allan, Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta dynasty, p. XIX.

8. D.K.A. (second edition); p. XII.

9. In Journal of Ganga Nath Jha Research Institute, Vol. 7, 1949 and in Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. 30, 1954.

pointed out that the Purāṇic passage appears as a good evidence for the political condition of India in C. 330 A.D. Of these scholars Dr. Sharma has analysed the passage in historical set-up twice. He is inclined to believe that 'the discrepancy in the Purāṇic statements is more apparent than real'. Another noteworthy remark which he has made in his illuminating analysis of the said passage is that 'we have to take the texts as they stand and give them their liberal meaning, laying aside, no doubt all preconceived notions and partiality for interpretations that have so far held the field'.

The point which deserves prime consideration in this context is to find out how far and in which particular respects the relevance of the passage especially in regard to the preservation of the original matter can be justified in its extant form. It would be seen that the passage as such is a little dislocated from grammatical regularity and *syntactical* consistency. This is mainly due to the employment of the term *Anugaṅgā* the accuracy of which, in respect of meaning can hardly be ascertained unless it is supposed to be a clerical error for *Anugaṅgam*. But the possibilities of *Anugaṅgam* having been the original form and *Anugaṅgā* its latent substitute is held in doubt for two apparent reasons. In the first place the term *Anugaṅgā* occurs almost in all Purāṇa-texts and their manuscripts containing the passage, whereas *Anugaṅgam* is found only in one manuscript. Secondly, the term *Anugaṅgam* naturally serves as an epithet of *Prayāgam*. This will seriously affect the consonance of the passage with general mode of the Purāṇic description of *Prayāga* as of the confluence of *Gaṅgā* and *Yamunā*, wherever the location of *Prayāga* is intended. Scholars, who have so far examined this passage generally take the term *Anugaṅgā* in the sense of 'along the Ganges'. Moreover, how the term should be related to (*Etān*) *janapadān*, has not been explained in clear terms. Their treatment, however, tends to indicate that in the passage the term *Anugaṅgā* stands conspicuously separated from the rest of the territories enumerated subsequent to it. The term as far its precise connotation is concerned, is enigmatic to say the least.

The natural question which arises here is whether the passage should be analysed in accordance with the literal meanings of the words contained in it or with a view to bringing out the total sense as a whole. It would be seen that the verse-form of the

passage has in it the second line as under: 'Etāñ Janapadān Sarvān Bhokṣyante Guptavamśajāḥ'. Now if we proceed to analyse the verse in its literal sense, the present line would appear meaningless because in the preceding one only one Janapada viz. Magadhā/Māgadha is enumerated. Other place-names detailed in the list are Prayāga and Sāketa, which enjoyed the rank of capital and premier cities of the Janapadas. Independently these are never enumerated as separate Janapadas in the available lists of the texts dealing with this topic^{9a}. It is, therefore, quite evident that instead of taking into account each word in the literal sense emphasis is to be laid on the proper interpretation of the passage as a whole in case we are to gather historical information from it. Problem of right interpretation of the passage obviously leads to the necessity of its emendation and restoration in relation to the possible original form and its commodious adjustment to other evidences shedding light on the history of the Gupta rulers. But the fact of matters is that even the emendated and restored form of the passage, as has been done by Pargiter, does not help us very much in removing the riddle with which it is apparently wrapt in the text. The external evidences, on the other hand, can be utilized in such contexts only when the genuineness of the passages is not disproved and its originality remains unchallenged.

One significant fact to which adequate attention has not been paid by the scholars so far is that the style which has been employed by the Purāṇa-compiler in the present passage does not accord so much with the dynastic portion as with the Janapada list occurring in the Bhuvanakośa section of these texts. Except for the employment of the term 'Bhokṣyante' which ensures the accommodable consistency of the passage in the setting of the dynastic portion, the style followed by the compiler in its essential aspects is more akin to the one enumerating place-names in the section of Bhuvanakośa. Within a reasonable limit Pargiter rightly pointed out that the original dynastic list of the Purāṇas concerns itself only upto the period of the Āndhras.¹⁰ His analyses, however, do

9a. See Sircar, D.C., *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*, p. 17 ff, and Ali, S.M., *Geography of the Purāṇas*, p. 175.

10. Pargiter, *ibid*, p. XII; His supposition, however, that these matters were borrowed from the original Bhaviṣya Purāṇa at two stages is not accepted; see, Hazra, *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, p. 27.

not sufficiently make it clear as to whether uniformity of style in the early and subsequent descriptions is maintained or not. It is quite likely that after the completion of the original account of the dynastic list running upto the period of the Āndhras an attempt was made at its enlargement at that stage when the Bhuvanakośa-portion was already complete and to an appreciable degree it had also left its popular appeal among the Purāṇa-readers. The testimony to this possibility presents itself, when it is observed that the line 'Etāñjanapadān Sarvān Bhokṣyante Guptavamśajāḥ' describing the places under the royal possession is quite similar in its expressive grab to the line 'Etāñjanapadān Āryān Gaṅgā Bhāvayate Śubhā' which is aimed at giving the description of the places in the Gangetic basin.¹¹ The fact, which is of special note here is that the words 'Etāñjanapadān Sarvān' are repeated in all the passages subsequent to the above one in the dynastic list upto the end of the section. In as much as the wording in a similar set-up is not found in the dynastic section prior to these passages, similarity of which is otherwise suitably established with those found in the Bhuvanakośa-portion the unity of authorship with regard to the former can evidently be held in doubt. Answer to the question as to when and in which particular circumstances these passages were compiled in the Purāṇa-texts necessitates re-assessment of one of the basic problems of the Purāṇic studies. That problem is which of the two portions Vamśānucarita and Bhuvanakośa has the stamp of earliness on it. It would be seen that in the well-known Purāṇic definition, by way of alternative occurrence these are both enumerated as the fifth characteristic of a Purāṇa. But while Vamśānucarita is mentioned in a great majority of the Purāṇa-texts laying down the said definition, Bhuvanakośa occurs in the single passage of only one Purāṇa-text.¹² Outside the Purāṇas we find that Vamśānucarita figures prominently in the Purāṇic definition given by the lexicon Amarasimha, while Bhuvanakośa as a part of Purāṇa-subjects occurs in the Kādambarī of

11. Vāyu P., XLVII. 49 ; Matsya P., CXXI.51. Brahmāṇḍa P., II.18.52, however replaces 'Āryān' by 'Mānyān'. For the rendering of the Matsya passage see, Agrawala, V.S. Matsya Purāṇa -A Study (All India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi, 1963), p. 206.

12. Matsya P., II.22, see Pusalker, Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas, p. XLV (Intro.)

Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa.¹³ This shows that among the Purāṇa characteristics Bhuvanakośa was not only less popular than Vamśānucarita, but it seems to have been coined also as a substitute of the latter comparatively at a later stage of Purāṇa-Compilation. In a general way it can be said that the replacement of Vamśānucarita by Bhuvanakośa was effected after the age of Amarasimha, who is known to have flourished in the Gupta period. There is, however, one serious objection that can apparently be raised against the present supposition. The datable limit of the dynastic account can not be extended beyond the early Gupta period, whereas our analysis tends to place the passages under purview in the post-Gupta period. The weight of this objection is to a great extent reduced by the fact that these passages do not seem to be from the pen of the same compiler who recorded the major bulk of the dynastic account. The style which is followed in them is in conformity with that of the Bhuvanakośa-portion; and if the latter is to be dated in the post-Gupta period, the former can also be placed within the same date-limit.

One noteworthy aspect of these passages is that while repeating the words 'Etāñjanapadān Sarvān' in a set style, they also refer to such terms in them, whose exact significance has rarely been emphasized by the scholars so far. These terms are as under: Mañdhānya/Mañdhara, Devarakṣita, Mahendra and Guha. These appear to be the names of royal personages ruling over the Janapadas specified in each of the Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇas; which, however, have also variant readings in some cases. Commenting on these Dr. Dashratha Sharma is of the opinion that herein we have the 'correct Gupta line of succession'. He is further of the opinion that we also get in these texts 'a good idea of Gupta imperial expansion'. As regards the particular territories mentioned in these texts, the point has been cautiously examined by him¹⁴. In as much as the present discussion is intended at the exposition of a different issue, it seems needless to reproduce Dr. Sharma's analysis regarding the applicability of these territories in the context of the Gupta history. Nevertheless the other aspect of his conclusion that Devarakṣita,

13. Purāṇamiva Yathāvibhāgasthāpitasakalabhuvanakośam, Kādambarī, Pūrvabhāga.

14. J.O.G.J.R.I.; Vol. 7, 1949, p. 61 ff.

Mahendra and Guha can stand respectively for Chandragupta II, Kumāragupta and Skandagupta seems eminently instructive especially in regard to the ascertainment of the approximate period of the Purāṇa-passage. The only possible conclusion which can emerge from these analyses is that these passages were incorporated in the Purāṇa-texts much later than the commencement of the reign of the Gupta dynasty, in all probability after the imperial line had ceased to rule, 'when', as it would be clear from the subsequent Purāṇa-passages, 'India temporarily lay prostrate before the barbaric invaders'.

The above analysis can very well lead us to assume that the whole of the dynastic portion was not compiled in one plan and at one stage, and that the addition of the passages relating to Gupta history coincided with the compilation of the Bhuvanakośa section. For the simple reason that in both these sections place-names had to be specified and emphasis had to be laid on the demarcation of areas, common expressions pointing to the identity of style were characteristically used in them. If the present problem is to be visualized from this consideration, we find that the Bhuvanakośa portion supplies pertinent parallel not only of the expressions 'Etāñjanapadān Sarvān' but also of the term Anugaṅgā meaning of which as shown above, is said to be vague. The source of the term Anugaṅgā seems to be Anugā used in a passage of Bhuvanakośa, whose originality can hardly be doubted, as it occurs in all the three Purāṇas Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Matsya. The interesting part of the said passage is that while in the scheme of the seven great rivers of the Himāhva country the river is called 'Anugā', the names applied to it elsewhere are Bhāgīrathī and Gaṅgā. In this connection the Purāṇas also explain¹⁵ the etymological significance of Anugā by narrating that the river is so known because it began to flow in the footsteps of king Bhagīratha to whose ascetic observances its descent on the earth was due. Scrutiny of the two terms from the above angle and the consideration that their construction is based on the same prefix (Anu) and the same root (Gam) would probably establish an indubitable unity in them as far as their meaning is concerned. The replace-

15. Vāyu P., XLVII.39, Matsya P., CXI. 41, Brahmāṇḍa P., II. 18.41, Brahmāṇḍa P. has, however, changed Anugā into Anvagāt. This seems to be a later arrangement.

ment of Anugā in the dynastic section points to the readjustment of the term in agreement with the more popular name of the river and also to its provision associated with the metrical consistency in the verse form of the passage. The last expression viz. 'Sapta Vai' of the previous verse, which in fact precedes Anugaṅgā if the two verses are to be combined and read together, tends to the possibility of a similar conclusion. In two Purāṇa-manuscripts 'Sapta Vai' is transferred into 'Sapta Vi' and 'Saptatamī'¹⁶ with the result that Sapta Vi/Saptatamī Gaṅgā of the dynastic passage assumes the appearance of close similarity with Saptamī Anugā of the Bhuvanakośa passage. This is a good evidence of the fact that the source of the dynastic passage, as far as its extant reading is concerned, should be traced in the Bhuvanakośa passage and that the meaning originally intended in it cannot be sought out without its evaluation in a relative set-up.

The natural query that may conveniently be put here is how and motivated by which particular factor the compiler selected the term Anugaṅgā, while bringing into relief the territories under the Gupta rulers. As a matter of fact the places mentioned in the verse could well have been specified even without any reference to the river Gaṅgā, because these are too well known to be expressed by their association with the river. It might be, therefore, interesting to find out whether this is a case of deliberate use without which the intended idea could not have been fully expressed in the verse. Attention may here be drawn to the conspicuous description of the territories of Gangetic basin, under the name of Ārya Janapada in the geographical section of the Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Matsya Purāṇas.¹⁷ Reference to Ārya Janapada reminds us of the territories of Āryāvarta, the conquest of which was accomplished by the imperial Guptas under Samudragupta before he extended his arms beyond this geographical division as recorded on the well known pillar at Allahabad. The generic expression Ārya Janapada applied to the territories of Gangetic basin is, however, not repeated in the dynastic section. But considering the identity of style found in both these sections and the fact that the word Janapada in the dynastic section is qualified (though not in strict grammatical

16. These variants are listed by Pargiter, *Ibid*, p. 53, fn. 4.

17. Vāyu P., XLVII. 49, Brahmāṇḍa P., II. 18.52, Matsya P. CXXI. 51, The text of Brahmāṇḍa reads mānyān for āryān.

sense) by Anugaṅga, the possibility can not be altogether ruled out. Reference to 'Anugaṅgā.....Janapadān', whose equation with 'Āryān Janapadān' is not beyond the limit of logical consideration, shows that in the Purāṇic verse there is perhaps an echo of the Āryāvarta-conquest by the Gupta sovereign. The two place-names Prayāga and Magadha intervening between Anugaṅgā and Janapadān may point to the assertion that only a considerable part and not the whole of Āryāvarta is intended in the Verse. Reference to Sāketa is not made in the prose form of the passage occurring in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa and Bhāgavata. It was probably incorporated in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas out of metrical exigencies. Samudragupta is known to have subdued the rulers of the entire Āryāvarta, the conclusion of the scholars that the Purāṇic description in the present context points to the reign of Chandragupta I is too reasonable to leave any room for doubt. Such assumption can hold good only in respect of the verse Anugaṅgā Prayāgam etc., which, however, does not mark the end of the dynastic description in the Purāṇas. As remarked earlier, to the present verse are appended such verses as reveal the distinct stamp of lateness in their form and meaning. We have noted above the remark of Dr. Dasharatha Sharma relating to the equation of Devarakṣita, Mahendra and Guha of the subsequent verses with Chandragupta II, Kumāragupta and Skandagupta of the Gupta dynasty. Unfortunately the suggestive element contained in the conclusion of Dr. Sharma has not been recognized so far, and the general trend of the scholars has been to assess the authenticity and applicability of the Purāṇa-text regarding the Gupta history as far as it has been reconstructed by Pargiter. Thus a note of objection has been put forth against the view point of Dr. Sharma in a recent work on the history of the imperial Guptas. But the ground cited in this context is miserably inadequate and misleading for the disproof of the proposed identification. It is essentially and entirely based upon the single and solitary argument that the 'Purāṇic statements regarding these rulers are too confused to warrant any such conclusion'.¹⁸ The fact, however, remains that a patient and careful analysis with a correct methodical approach may yield data of genuine historical value from what appears as muddled Purāṇic accounts. The valuable information

18. S. R. Goyal, A History of the Imperial Guptas, pp. 50-51.

which can be gathered from these accounts is apt to be missed in case we are inclined to test their validity with the yardstick of accuracy and precision setting aside other criteria to ensure their genuineness for the study of history. As a matter of fact, the Purānic materials could have hardly been enlisted among the sources of Political history of ancient India in the absence of Pargiter's Purāṇa-text of the Dynasties of Kali Age, the essential structure of which is prepared by way of collation, restoration and emendation of the materials scattered in various Purāṇas and their manuscripts. Despite the profundity of scholarship displayed in his unique and monumental work, it can never be denied that he could not grasp the real historical import of the passages in question. It is true that in presenting these passages Pargiter has shown the same degree of caution and care as in case of other passages in the section. But the notes of Pargiter on their restored forms as also the meaning which he is inclined to attach these seems too bypothetical to be regarded as sound. In the method which he has employed with reference to the interpretation of these passages the terms Maṇidhānya/Maṇidhāra, Devarakṣita, Mahendra and Guha appear to be the names of ruling families along with the family of the imperial Guptas.¹⁹ In view of the fact that such ruling families are not known from any other source, the approach of Pargiter to these passages can hardly be treated as a case of right interpretation. Dr. Dasharatha Sharma's analysis²⁰ makes it convincingly clear that the Purānic verses of these contexts allude to the Gupta rulers by such names. This is specially true of Devarakṣita and Mahendra, the former being the same as Devagupta of the epigraphic records while the latter can essily be treated as the simplified form of Aśvamedha-Mahendra legend alluded to in the commemorative coins of Kumārgupta. Employment of the term Guha in place of Skanda should not surprise us in view of the fact that the compiler of Purānic verse could not separate himself from the convention of the age in which the use of synonyms even for expressing proper names was not inadmissible, if the same was required for metrical adjustments.

The attempt at the identification of the Purānic terms brought out in these lines would perhaps remain incomplete in

19. Pargiter, *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

20. *J.O.G.J.R.I.*, Vol. 7, 1949, p. 61 ff.

case the mystery centering round Maṇidhānya/Maṇidhāra is not removed and the term is not explained even to the degree of a satisfactory reservation. The point as to whether its equation can be sought forth with any one of the known Gupta rulers has not been, however, touched upon by Dr. Dasharatha Sharma, the task can, nevertheless, be attempted in consonance with the methodology which has been followed by him with regard to the other terms of the group. Three vital factors have to be considered before the historical interpretation of this term is made. In the first place the name occurs in the verse previous to the one that contains the name of Devarakṣita. Secondly, the style followed by the compiler of these passages points to the fact that the kings are referred to in these verses either by such names as were less commonly known or by the synonyms of their well-known names. Thirdly, of the two terms; Maṇidhānya and Maṇidhāra; only one seems to have been referred to in the original Purāṇa-account the variant being a distinct case of scriptorial oversight. The only Gupta ruler who responds to these three factors is Samudragupta, the immediate predecessor of Chandragupta II, called Devarakṣita in the Purāṇic account. The question now left to be answered is the consideration as to what extent and in which particular respect the name of Samudragupta could be expressed by the term Maṇidhānya/Maṇidhāra in accordance with the Purāṇic description. Its equation can by no means be established with the known epithets of Samudragupta, which are so very distinct and so widely circulated in the Gupta records. So, in case the term is at all intended to refer to Samudragupta it can only be considered as a synonym of the latter.

Before carrying on the present point of discussion to its possible end, it may be remarked that so far as the synonymic consideration is concerned the word Maṇidhānya/Maṇidhāra can not stand related to Samudragupta as directly as can be found in case of Guha to the name of the Gupta monarch analysed in the above lines. The fact, however, remains that before making a reference to Devarakṣita in the succeeding verse, the compiler must have been inclined to select such word which could evidently express the name of the immediate predecessor of Chandragupta II. Instead of concerning himself with the general and more popular meaning of the word Samudra, he probably took it in view of the

literal signification. His emphasis seems to have been on the root term *Mudrā*, and consequently he interpreted the word *Samudra* in the sense of *Mudrayā Sahitaḥ* i.e. one who bears a *Mudrā*. In a more convenient sense it may be stated that the compiler was in the know of the fact that the *Rājamudrā* of *Samudragupta* was honourably applied in the subjugated territories,²¹ and thus the word *Samudra* was taken by him in the sense of *Mudrādhāra* which was capable of imparting the above idea in a more commodious form. Elsewhere the Purāṇic passage alludes to God Śiva as 'Mudrāmaṇidharāya Ca'²² i.e. one who is bearer of *Mudrā* and *Maṇi*. The dification of the kings being a well-established fact by the emergence of the Gupta period, the selecting of the word *Maṇidhāra* in the Purāṇa appears to be an attempt for bringing out divine prestige in the royal personage.²³

The present problem can also be tackled from another angle. It is quite probable that while choosing the term *Maṇidhāra* for the name of *Samudragupta*, the compiler had in his mind the name of *Kāca*, who not only falls in the line of the monarchs of the Gupta dynasty but has also behind him such historical traces worthy of reliance, as can prove that he was a contemporary and rival of *Samudragupta*²⁴. Doubt is, sometimes, entertained regarding the separate existence of a monarch bearing the name *Kāca*, and it is pointed out that *Samudragupta* himself was probably called by that name at the early stage of his political career.²⁵ Although the bearing of the Purāṇic reference on the present point is by no means certain, yet the high probability of the following two broad facts can well be taken into account. The word *Maṇi* carries the meaning exactly opposite to that of *Kāca*, and consequently the two terms are found juxtaposed even in one and the same verse²⁶ for the sake of imparting adversative impression. In

21. See line 23 of Allahabad Pillar Inscription, C.I.I., III, pp 8 and 14.

22. *Namaḥ Priyāya Varadāya Mudrāmaṇidharāya Ca*, *Vāyu P.* XXIV. 246.

23. It has been suggested that the tendency of attaching divinity to kings can be traced even earlier; S. C. Bhattacharya, *Jl.*, A.U.S. 1963-64, p. 68 ff.

24. *Heras*, A.B.O.R.I., IX, p. 83 ff.

25. *Allan*, *Op. Cit.*, p. XXXII.

26. E.g. *kācam maṇim kāñcanamekasūtre grathnāsi bāle kimidaṁ vicitram/vicāravān Pāṇinirekasūtre śvānaṁ uvānaṁ Maghavāna-māhiti.*

case the compiler of the Purāṇa-passage was guided by this convention, it would evidently follow that the term Maṇidhāra/Maṇidhānya was employed by him in view of Kāca being an adversary and contemporary of Samudragupta. But the possibility of the other alternative seems to be more justified and suitably relevant in the present context, and as such the use of Maṇidhāra/Maṇidhānya would be a case of Purāṇic attempt aimed at giving the stamp of an augustus form to the monarch's name originally being uncouth and awkward in case the term applied to it, was Kāca. Out of the two readings Maṇidhāra and Maṇidhānya preference seems to be deserved by the former one in view of its proximity to Samudra and in view of the fact that the words in the Purāṇic passages are, more than often, dislodged from their original and intended form due to the ignorance of the later copyists.

Another noteworthy aspect with which the historical interpretation of the Purāṇa-passage has to be aimed at, is to find out the intended syntactical relationship of the two words Gupta and Māgadha in these texts especially in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, reading of which is so often cited by the scholars on the present issue. It would be observed that these two words constitute the relevant part of the sentence in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa-text, which may be reproduced as under : Māgadhā Guptāśca Bhokṣyanti. Despite the sentence being as explicitly simple as can be expected, its syntactical significance has been differently approached by the scholars and consequently two varied meanings have emerged out of it. Wilson²⁷ in his pioneer work on the Viṣṇu Purāṇa interpreted the word Māgadha as an adjective in relation to Gupta. The analysis of the passage, as has been done by Dr. Dasharath Sharma does not deviate from the translation of Wilson²⁸. The ground which he has put forth in respect of his approach is essentially based on the grammatical order in which the two words Māgadha and Gupta are related to each other in the sentence. Dr. Majumdar²⁹ has taken them in the sense of two independent

The verse is quoted by Tīkākāra Śrīdharānanda Śāstry in *Laghusi-ddhānta Kaumudī*, on Pāṇini VI, 4, 133 ; see also K. C. Chatterji, *Patañ-jalis Mahābhāṣya* (Calcutta, 1953) p. 126.

27. Wilson, *Ibid*, p. 385.

28. *I.H.Q.*, vol. 30, 1954, pp. 374 ff.

29. *Vākātaka-Gupta Age*, p. 134.

words each being used in the sense of noun. Majumdar's approach has received agreeable response from those who are inclined to find in the Purāṇa-sentence an echo of what is treated, in view of numismatic indication, as the joint-rule of the two powers; the Licchavis and the Guptas³⁰.

The exact meaning of the Purāṇa-sentence can, however, be ascertained if the analysis is based on the following considerations. In the first place, the two words are variedly used in the versions of the other Purāṇas, and moreover the sentence constituted by them assumes a different form, if it is emended in view of textual variation even of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa itself. In other Purāṇa-texts the word Māgadha serves the purpose of an object, whereas Gupta (Vamśajāḥ) is subject in its relation. The historical interpretation of the passage would hardly be justified without taking into account their bearing on the point being considered in this context. As regards the textual variation of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, as noted earlier, one of its manuscripts, has the word Māgadhān in addition; and thus the sentence would be restorable as under : Māgadhā Guptāśca Magadhān Bhokṣyanti. One should not feel any hesitation in agreeing with the view of Dr. Dasharath Sharma³¹ that 'on account of the extreme closeness of the words Māgadhā and Magadhān in the sentence the later word was inadvertently dropped by some one' in all probability for avoiding Punaruktidoṣa of the Sanskrit poetic convention. It would be seen that the above sentence of Viṣṇu Purāṇa does not convey any such meaning as can be different from the other Purāṇa-texts. Secondly, we can not completely ignore the applicability of grammatical rule in the Purāṇa-sentence, to which its meaning is largely due. Thus the particle Ca which is found in 'Māgadhā Guptāśca Bhokṣyanti' necessarily implies that the relative position of the words Magadha and Gupta can be respectively established only in the sense of qualifier and qualified words in the sentence. Had it not been so, as remarked by Dr. Dasharath Sharma, 'the particle Ca must probably have been repeated twice, this being the general rule in prose though not in poetry'. It is thus evident that the word Māgadha can be interpreted only in the sense of an adjective; while the omission of the word Māgadhān simply shows

30. S. R. Goyal, Ibid, pp. 51-52.

31. I.H.Q., Vol., 30, 1954, p. 376.

that the region of Magadha was original seat of the Gupta power. As a matter of fact what is noted as Māgadhā Guptāśca in the text of Viṣṇu Purāṇa accords, to a satisfactory extent, with the Purāṇic style often making distinct reference to the original locale of the dynasties and kings by adjectival terms. By way of its example we may quote here references like Māgadhānām Bārhadrathānām, Nrpān Vaideśikān, Āmdhrāḥ Śrīparvatīyāśca³² in all of which words pointing to the original place of the dynasties and kings have their adjectival forms. This possibility is further brought out in clear terms if we take into account the variants of Māgadhān found in the MSS of Vāyu Purāṇa. Thus MSS 'b' and 'c' cited by Pargiter³³ omit Māgadhān and read out respectively Madhyagā and Makhagā in its place. Although these two words appear too insignificant to ascertain any distinct status attributable to the Gupta rules, yet their importance in the context of the present discussion can not be totally ignored. As far the grammatical status, these words in the Vāyu Purāṇa's passage seem to be substitute for what is referred to as Māgadhā in the text of Viṣṇu Purāṇa. In as much as these are essentially used in the sense of adjective in their relation to Gupta (Vamśajāḥ), similar status is evidently assignable to their counterpart Māgadhā in the text of Viṣṇu Purāṇa.

The fact, which is still more important and whose significance has been much rarely realized by the scholars so far, is that the account of Viṣṇu Purāṇa at least in its extant form can not be preferred to that of Vāyu Purāṇa for the purpose of historical investigations. The degree of originality and the element of genuineness contained in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa's account seem to be doubtful in view of its far condensed prose form as compared to the elaborate and versified account preserved in the text of Vāyu Purāṇa. The relative chronology of these two texts specially with regard to the dynastic account had already been analysed by Mr. Pargiter, who in close agreement with the view point of Prof. R.G. Bhandarkar pointed out the comparative lateness of Viṣṇu Purāṇa³⁴. It is not improbable that the short account of Viṣṇu Purāṇa has

32. References enlisted by Pargiter, D.K.A. pp. 14, 46 and 49.

33. Ibid, p. 53, Fn. 7.

34. Pargiter, Ibid, Intro. p. XIV, R.G. Bhandarkar, Early History of Deccan (1895), p. 162

been designed on its own material much of which has been sliced off the original and early form. The point which has not been taken into a proper account by the scholars, who have deduced two different conclusions from the texts of Viṣṇu and Vāyu, is that the oft-quoted line of the former does not present its position as clearly as can be necessary for comparative analysis of the problem. As shown above, if the Viṣṇu Purāṇa's text is interpreted in view of the variant reading, which is found in one of its versions, the possibility of meaning deduced out of it as different from the Vāyu Purāṇa's text is totally ruled out.

The high probability of the reference in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa's line to one people only is brought out in clear terms, when it is further observed that the expression *Guptāśca* has been dropped out in one,³⁵ of its copies, whose reading, nevertheless resembles that of the other versions in respect of the rest of the words. The sentence, which is substituted in it is as under: *Māgadhā Bhokṣyanti* for *Māgadhā Guptaśca Bhokṣyanti* of the other versions can only denote in this context that the word *Māgadhā* with or without *Guptāśca* was intended to carry on the same meaning in both the forms. The compiler of the Purāṇa-copy could not have probably left out the expression *Guptāśca* in case the region of Magadha was not considered to be the original seat of Gupta-power and in case the word *Māgadha* denoted the people as distinct from the Guptas.

Despite the fact that uniformity in the account of the Viṣṇu and Vāyu Purāṇas is maintainable in view of the aforementioned consideration, attempt has been made to establish their textual discrepancy in another context. As noted previously a version of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa refers also to the region called *Suhma* in the list of the territories under the Gupta-rule.

Dr. D. C. Ganguly makes a distinct note of this variant reading and considers its significance too seriously in touching upon one fundamental problem of the Gupta history. Dr. Ganguly lays stress on the genuineness of Viṣṇu Purāṇa's account in regard to the present reading, which according to him is corroborated by the evidence proving the region of Bengal as the original homeland of the Gupta rulers. The same scholar makes note of the fact that reference to *Suhma* in the copy of Viṣṇu Purāṇa should not be

35. MS. 'a' of Pargiter's list, D.K.A. p. 54, Fn. 8.

regarded as a later interpolation, though the term is not referred to in other copies of the text.³⁶ The ground on whose basis this remark has been made is however too very inadequate and unless otherwise the authenticity of the evidence cited in its favour is established beyond the range of all doubts it can not prove itself to be worthy of authenticating other evidences on the point. As a matter of fact unless it is admitted that the term Suhma was inserted in one copy of Viṣṇu Purāṇa at a later stage, it remains inexplicable why does the term find no mention in other copies of Viṣṇu Purāṇa on one hand and in the texts of the Purāṇas of similar value on the other. It is often forgotten that rare reading found in a particular Purāṇa-text can speak well of the fancy of the subsequent compilers aiming at the adherence to the technique of the Purāṇa-compilation which required amendments in the Purāṇa-recording to the changes of the later times. In view of this persistent trend of the Purāṇa-compilation the only possible inference deductible out of this additional reading is that insertion of Suhma was effected in the original text for the sake of fashioning it uptodate after the extension of the original Gupta kingdom as far as Bengal in the east. Previously we have stated that the phraseology of the Purāṇa line is far close to the one found in the Bhuvana-kośa-portion particularly to the passage enumerating the names of the places in the basin of river Gaṅgā. The word Suhma finds prominent mention among the places specified in the said section³⁷; and it is quite likely that with a view to making a reference to it, the Purāṇa-sentence in the dynastic portion was retouched sometime during the late Gupta period when the Purāṇa-texts were being considerably modified consequent upon the incorporation of the geographical passages into them. The actuality of the circumstance contributing to the insertion of the term Suhma in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa-copy may also be visualized from the consideration that while Sāketa of the other Purāṇa-texts was deleted without the placement of any substitute of it in the various copies of Viṣṇu Purāṇa, it was substituted by the word Suhma for the sake of bringing about conformity between two sections of the Purāṇa-text. In this attempt the copyist seems to have kept himself concerned

36. I.H.Q. Vol. XXI, 1945, p. 142; History of Bengal, p. 69.

37. Suhmottarāṁśca Vaṅgāṁśca Tāmrāliptāṁstathaiva Ca, Brahmāṇḍā P. II. 18. 51, The texts of Vāyu and Matsya read Brahmottarāṁśca for Suhmottarāṁśca. The former seems to be the original reading.

not so much with the historical accuracy of the original description as with maintaining the consonance of the places, as far as possible. spotted out with reference to the Anugā of the Geographical section with those relating to Anugaṅgā to be specified in the dynastic section.

Very little justice has been done by certain scholars to the passage of Bhāgavata, while taking into account its general bearing on the history of the imperial Guptas. Thus relying on one of the Bhāgavata-copies and on the commentary of Śrīdharasvāmin relating to it, Dr. Ganguly³⁸ has entertained grave doubts regarding the uniformity of the Purāṇa-passage and their authenticity for the history of the Gupta-rulers. The copy of Bhāgavata, which he has consulted reads Anugaṅgamā Prayāgam Guptām Bhokṣyati Medinīm and the commentary of Śrīdharasvāmin on it runs as under: Gaṅgādvāramārabhya Prayāgaparyantām Guptām Pālītām Medinīm Bhokṣyati. In case the present reading is not properly checked; the import of this text would certainly go much against the other texts, which do not have any reference either directly or indirectly to Haridvāra as the westernmost boundary of the Gupta kingdom. For want of a properly reconstructed and restored text, the version of Bhāgavata has been misjudged by some³⁹ as a 'decidedly late work'. It is surprising to find out that while making such remark on the text of Bhāgavata, no attention has been paid to the significant variant readings of the different copies of Bhāgavata, which can otherwise be well utilized for the restoration of its passage in the intended original form. Instead of attaching much importance either to the restored passage of this text quoted in the work of Pargiter or to its construction and interpretation figuring in the commentary of Śrīdharasvāmin, the variant readings should have been collated in view of their competence for making out the order and form of the passage correspondingly similar to that of the other Purāṇa-texts. In this connection Dr. Dasharath Sharma⁴⁰ rightly invites our attention to the passage being misconstrued and misinterpreted by Śrīdharasvāmin, use of which has been made in the paper of Dr. Ganguly without considering its authentic or the otherwise nature

38. I.H.Q., Vol. XXI, 1945, p. 142.

39. S.R. Goyal, Ibid, p. 51, fn. 1.

40. I.H.Q., Vol. XXX, 1954, p. 375.

from a proper angle. The fact that the said passage is open to serious doubts becomes evident not only from the consideration that commentator Śrīdharasvāmin belongs to a fairly late period and as such he was less competent to interpret it in the right channel of history but also from its being thoroughly irrelevant in the context of the general report of the Purāṇic evidence on the point. In view of the various readings available in the Bhāgavatā-copies as listed by Pargiter, Dr. Sharma suggests the possible reconstructed form of the passage in the following order 'Anugaṅgamā Prayāgam Guptā Bhokṣyanti Medinīm' and this appears to be the passage composed in the original copy of the Bhāgavatā. The genuineness of the passage of an individual Purāṇa can be established in a correct and coherent form only when its readings scattered in various manuscripts are picked up after taking into due consideration of the extent of their correlation and identity to the readings which are preserved in the versions of other Purāṇa-texts. There is little doubt about the fact that the information supplied by the Bhāgavatā-passage reconstructed in the above form can be different from the texts of the other Purāṇas. Non-inclusion of the word Māgadhā in the Bhāgavatā passage can not be taken for the discrepancy of this text in relation to the passage of the other Purāṇa-texts. It is simply an indication of the fact that at the time of the composition of the passage in the Purāṇa-text association of Magadha with the Guptas, as the original seat of their power was too well-known to affect the intended meaning when as a result of the omission of name of the region the passage was made condensed in this text.

The notes and observations made by us in this humble attempt may probably lead to the following general conclusion : The account of the Purāṇas can, to the extent of original data contained in their passages, be treated as a reliable source of historical information. By their very nature the passages of these texts could not survive, in most cases, in their original and unadulterated forms consequent upon the revisionary fancies and recompilatory trends of the later compilers. The fact, however, remains that without rearranging and readjusting their readings distributed in the various copies any statement worthy of proper historical reconstruction can never be made. Their convergence to one general historical conclusion is sometimes held in doubt because of the

contradictory readings available in them, but the same can be easily brought out if these readings are properly checked up in consequence of the restoration of the passages of such Purāṇa-texts as have not been analysed with this end in view. After giving due regard to all these factors it is made evident that the Purāṇic evidence regarding the Gupta-history is neither discrepant in itself nor in any way uncomfortable in the context of the other evidences on the topic.

THE STORY OF ARJUNA KĀRTAVĪRYA WITHOUT RECONSTRUCTION

BY

MADELEIN BIARDEAU

[निबन्धेऽस्मिन् महाभारतग्रन्थस्य वनपर्वणि शान्तिपर्वणि च प्रोक्तस्य कार्तवीर्यार्जुनोपाख्यानद्वयस्य विषये व्याख्यानात्मिकां समन्वयात्मिकां च प्रक्रियां प्रदर्श्य चित्रशालाप्रेसमुद्रितस्य परम्परागतपाठयुक्तस्य महाभारतप्रचलितसंस्करणस्य भाण्डारकरप्राच्यशोधसंस्थानप्रकाशितस्य संशोधितपाठवतो महाभारतसंस्करणस्य च एतदाख्यानसम्बन्धिनामंशानां तुलनां कृत्वा निबन्धकर्त्र्या महोदयया प्रतिपादितं यत् चित्रशालाप्रेससंस्करणस्य महाभारतस्य वनपर्वणि ११५ अध्याये प्रोक्तस्य कार्तवीर्यार्जुनोपाख्यानस्य ११-१७ श्लोकानां भाण्डारकरसंशोधितसंस्करणोऽग्रहाणात् अस्य आख्यानस्य वनपर्वणि शान्तिपर्वणि च प्रोक्तयोश्चभयोः पाठसरण्योस्तत्र संशोधितसंस्करणे संगतिः प्रलुप्ता, अर्थदुरूहता च संजाता । परन्तु चित्रशालाप्रेससंस्करणे उभयत्र अस्योपाख्यानस्य यः पाठो वर्तते तेनास्योभयोरंशयोः संगतिः सुकरा प्रतीयते । कस्यचिदपि पौराणिकाख्यानस्य सर्वासां पाठपरम्पराणां समन्वयो भवितुं शक्यते । कालक्रमेण देशक्रमेण च महाभारतादिग्रन्थानां पाठेषु यो भेदो व्यतिक्रमो वा निसर्गतः संजायते तेन एतादृशानां प्रायेण मौखिकपद्धत्या लोके प्रचारितानां पुरातनग्रन्थानां विभिन्नाः पाठपरम्परा अवश्यम्भाविन्यः । परन्तु पाठदृष्ट्या भिन्ना अपि ता अर्थदृष्ट्या परस्परं पूरिकाः संगताश्च भवन्ति, अतः तासां मध्ये काचिद् पाठपरम्परैव प्रामाणिका संशोधितपाठे ग्राह्या च, अपराश्च अप्रामाणिका अग्राह्याश्चेति वक्तुं न पार्यते—इति निबन्धकर्त्र्या मतम् ।]

In the last issue of *Purāṇa* (Jan. 1970) I have announced a more developed reply to V. M. Bedekar's article that was itself a reply to a previous article of mine¹. My aim here is to give an example, not of what a critical edition should be, but of the

1. See my "Some more considerations about textual criticism", *Purāṇa* X-2, July 1968, and V.M. Bedekar's "Principles of Mahābhārata textual criticism : the need for a restatement", *id.* XI-2, July 1969.

kind of interpretational work that could most fruitfully be applied to epic and purāṇic texts. I must admit that I started from the wrong end when I criticized the principles governing the so-called critical editions of those texts without mentioning the use that can be made of the different versions of the same story.

However, I have to say one more word about textual criticism, in order to justify my choice of Arjuna Kārtavīrya's story included in the legend of Paraśurāma for my present purpose. One of the main difficulties of a critical edition is that it cannot easily succeed in eliminating all discrepancies between different versions of the same story, because, sometimes, we find utterly irreconcilable versions inside the same recension of the text and possibly in the very same manuscript. The temptation could be very great to try to harmonise the texts by choosing the one variant reading which will make them at least comparable if not identical. If one believes that only one text should be accepted as correct at anyone time, it becomes even more impossible to accept a contradiction between two accounts of what appears to be fundamentally the same story. Kārtavīrya's story seems to offer just such a conflict and it is interesting to know whether one version should simply be discarded as absurd or whether some coherent meaning could be arrived at by facing the contradiction. Since the contradiction appears most clearly in the Citraśālā Press edition of the *Mahābhārata*, we shall use that text and come later on to the emended text of the critical edition².

In the MhBh, the story of Rāma Jāmadagnya is narrated twice: one version is found in *Vanaparvan* ch. 115-117, whereas the second one is given in *Śānti-parvan* ch. 49. Broadly speaking, the two versions are in agreement, even though the order of the different parts of the story is not the same. But on one point there seems to be a clear contradiction, and that is in the description of the king Arjuna Kārtavīrya. The relevant passages are given here below in parallels:

2. As a matter of fact, judging from the soaring prices for it in the booksellers' catalogues, the Citraśālā Press edition seems to be still very much in demand and has not been superseded even among scholars by the critical edition, though it will be very soon as costly, if not more, as the latter.

Vanaparvan 115 11-14, 16b-17

Śāntiparvan 4935-47

रामेण चार्जुनो नाम हैहयाधिपतिर्हतः ।
तस्य बाहुशतान्यासंस्त्रीणि सप्त च पाण्डव ॥
दत्तात्रेयप्रसादेन विमानं काञ्चनं तथा ।
ऐश्वर्यं सर्वभूतेषु पृथिव्यां पृथिवीपते ॥
अव्याहतगतिश्चैव रथस्तस्य महात्मनः ।
रथेन तेन तु सदा वरदानेन वीर्यवान् ॥
ममर्द देवान् यक्षांश्च ऋषींश्चैव समन्ततः ।
भूतांश्चैव स सर्वास्तु पीडयामास सर्वतः ॥
विमानेन च दिव्येन हैहयाधिपतिः प्रभुः ।
शचीसहायं क्रीडन्तं धर्षयामास वासवम् ॥
ततस्तु भगवान् देवः शक्रेण सहितस्तदा ।
कार्तवीर्यविनाशार्थं मन्त्रयामास भारत ॥

116. 19-21

कदाचित्तु तथैवास्य विनिष्क्रान्ताः सुताः प्रभो ।
अथानूपपतिर्वीरः कार्तवीर्योऽभ्यवर्तत ॥
तमाश्रमपदं प्राप्तं ऋषेर्भार्या समार्चयत् ।
स युद्धमदसम्भक्तो नाभ्यनन्दत्तथार्चनम् ॥
प्रमथ्य चाश्रमात्तस्माद्धूमधेनोस्तथा बलात् ।
जहार वत्सं क्रोशन्त्या बभञ्ज च महाद्भुमान् ॥

एतस्मिन्नेव काले तु कृतवीर्यात्मजो बली ।
अर्जुनो नाम तेजस्वी क्षत्रियो हैहयाधिपः ॥
दत्तात्रेयप्रसादेन राजा बाहुसहस्रवान् ।
चक्रवर्ती महातेजा विप्राणामाश्रमेधिके ॥
ददौ स पृथिवीं सर्वां सप्तद्वीपां सपर्वताम् ।
स्वबाहुस्रबलेनाजौ जित्वा परमधर्मवित् ॥
तृषितेन च कौन्तेय भिक्षितश्चित्रभानुना ।
सहस्रबाहुर्विक्रान्तः प्रादाद् भिक्षामथाग्नये ॥
ग्रामान् पुराणि राष्ट्राणि घोषांश्चैव तु वीर्यवान् ।
जज्वाल तस्य बाणाग्राच्चित्रभानुर्दिधक्षया ॥
स तस्य पुरुषेन्द्रस्य प्रभावेन महौजसः ।
ददाह कार्तवीर्यस्य शैलानथ वनस्पतीन् ॥
स शून्यमाश्रमं रम्यमापवस्य महात्मनः ।
ददाह पवनेनेद्धश्चित्रभानुः सहैहयः ॥
आपवस्तं ततो रोषाच्छशापार्जुनमच्युत ।
दग्धे श्रमे महाबाहो कार्तवीर्येण वीर्यवान् ॥
त्वया न वर्जितं यस्मान्ममेदं हि महद्भनम् ।
दग्धं तस्माद्रणे रामो बाहूस्ते छेत्स्यतेऽर्जुन ॥
अर्जुनस्तु महातेजा बली नित्यं शमात्मकः ।
ब्रह्मण्यश्च शरण्यश्च दाता शूरश्च भारत ॥
नाचिन्तयत्तदा शापं तेन दत्तं महात्मना ।
तस्य पुत्रास्तु बलिनः शापेनासन् पितुर्वधे ॥
निमित्तादवलिप्ता वै नृशंसाश्चैव सर्वदा ।
जमदग्निघेन्वास्ते वत्समानिन्युर्भरतर्षभ ॥
अज्ञातं कार्तवीर्येण हैहयेन्द्रेण धीमता ।
तन्निमित्तमभूद् युद्धं जमदग्नेर्महात्मनः ॥

In the *Vanaparvan* version, the meaning is obvious at once: Arjuna Kārtavīrya is one of those innumerable princes of the epic legends who, after acquiring too much might, misuse it against all the rules of *dharma*: he harasses the *devas* and the *ṛṣis* with his wonderful chariot and finally dares to disturb Indra, the king of the gods, when he is sporting with his wife. This brings about Viṣṇu's decision to incarnate himself on earth to relieve the gods and all creatures of the permanent threat³. This is only in the way of a preamble, the celestial part of the drama, which gives its meaning to Arjuna's behaviour later on in Jamadagni's *āśrama*: whether he harasses the gods or steals the brahman's Homadhenu, his character is the same. In short, Arjuna is a bad king, a great sinner; similarly, the *Reṇukāmāhātmya* considers him as the *asura* Madhu incarnate.

It is not only Arjuna's wicked nature which is thus symbolically described: the result of his misbehaviour towards the gods as well as Jamadagni is also to be understood symbolically. In heaven, the climax is reached when the intimacy between Indra and his wife is disturbed. Indra being the king of the gods, his wife, Śacī, symbolises both the Earth and the prosperity of our world that the dharmic relationship between gods and men only can bring about⁴. When Indra stays with his wife in a loving mood, things must be in order in our human world. To come and disturb this happy occasion is a dreadful act in itself, as well as having dire consequences. Our text does not even mention Indra's anger, and that would certainly not be a sufficient symbol of the meaning of Arjuna's boldness and arrogance: in fact, it means that heaven and earth are so deeply affected by Arjuna's doings that their normal and peaceful relationship has been destroyed and life is no more possible. That is why Viṣṇu himself has to step in at this point and decide Arjuna's death. The scene has been set ready for an *avatāra* to be born on this earth.

As a matter of fact, the story goes on to tell us of Jamadagni's birth from the brahman Ṛcika's marriage with the princess Satya-

3. Actually our text only says that Viṣṇu deliberates with Indra in order to kill Arjuna.

4. Cf. in MhBh, Kṛṣṇā Draupadī, the wife of the five Pāṇḍavas, is said to be an incarnation of Śrī or Lakṣmī (I 197 30, 35), but also an incarnation of Śacī as well (I 67 157), in which latter case Rukmiṇī, the wife of Kṛṣṇa, is an incarnation of Śrī (*ibid.* 156).

vatī and of the exchange of the ritual *caru* between Satyavati and her mother, which will be an instrument secretly used by Viṣṇu to fulfil his purpose : Jamadagni's son by his wife Reṇukā-another prince-will be a brahman endowed with the virtues of a perfect kṣatriya. Paraśurāma, whom the purāṇic literature explicitly gives as Viṣṇu's *avatāra* is thus prepared to meet the danger coming to brahmans from greedy kṣatriyas⁵. At this point, Arjuna Kārtavīrya comes to the fore : he arrives at Jamadagni's hermitage in the forest when the ṛṣi's sons are away. Though Reṇukā receives him suitably, he is not pleased with her welcome, being *yuddhamadasammattaḥ*. He takes away the calf of Homadhenu, Jamadagni's cow. Here our text is very brief. But some purāṇic accounts of the same story (for example the *Reṇukāmāhātmya* of the *Skandapurāṇa*) make Arjuna envious of the brahmanic power as incarnated in Kāmadhenu, another name for Jamadagni's cow. He steals the cow or its calf in a bid to conquer the *brahman*, which he finds superior to his *kṣatra*. That he ultimately kills Jamadagni does not add anything more to the meaning but is the direct consequence of first act : when he tries to rob the brahman of the source of his power—the cow from which he gets milk for sacrifices and food for his guests-, he destroys the normal order of things, the *dharma*, in which the *brahman* and the *kṣatra* should be kept separate. A brahman without his cow can no longer perform his ritual duties, which is as much as to say that he is no more a brahman or that he is dead. But this means at the same time the destruction of the source of all prosperity on earth and peace in heaven. The gods are no longer fed on sacrificial offerings and they cease to take care of this earth by sending rains, etc. In other words, what Arjuna is now doing in Jamadagni's *āśrama* is the symbolic repetition of what he had done in heaven when he had disturbed Indra and his wife. The *king's* wickedness consists in his misbehaving towards the gods and the brahmans and thus transgressing the dharmic order of the world. When Paraśurāma kills him, that can be seen only as a just punishment for his sins⁶.

5. We shall omit here the episode of the Reṇukā beheading by Paraśurāma (*Vana*^o 116 5-14), which is not relevant to the story of Arjuna Kārtavīrya.

6. Though it must be remembered that this is not the end of the story: when all the kṣatriyas have been killed by Rāma, the Earth cannot

This interpretation tallies also with the epic account of a discussion that takes place between Vāyu and Arjuna Kārtavīrya (MhBh XIII. 152 sq.), in which the latter stresses the lordship of the princes, whereas Vāyu gives him a lengthy demonstration of the spiritual superiority of the brahmins. In all these occurrences, Arjuna is a mighty kṣatriya who does not accept the spiritual supremacy of the brahmins over himself : either he claims to be superior to them or he tries to snatch their spiritual power to add it to his own worldly power. In both cases, the result is of the worst kind : if the king fails to fulfil his duties and goes against the dharmic order of things instead of protecting it, the world cannot live long and is destined to an early disaster. That is precisely what the story of Rām Jāmadagnya has to tell us.

In contrast to this bad king, one may look at Viśvāmitra, the counterpart of Paraśurāma, who, though he was born a kṣatriya, discarded his *kṣatra* in order to possess the *brahman* after admitting that the latter was superior. His choice, which goes also against the set order of the world and is not without danger for the world, at least does not result into an utter confusion -*saṅkara*-, since he first gives up the *kṣatra* and then take to *tapas* in order to reach brahmanhood. His ready acceptance of the superiority of the brahmins can be understood in a way as submissiveness to the dharmic order of the world. Though he becomes a brahman of a special type, not identical to the purest type as represented by Vasiṣṭha, his behaviour does not go against the set order that requires a strict separation of the *brahman* and at *kṣatra*.

It is even more interesting to compare Arjuna to Paraśurāma in this very context of *Vanaparvan* 115-117. Though Paraśurāma is a typical example of the dreaded *varṇasaṅkara* and is thus in himself the foreboding of a terrible event for this world, the story shows that he does not take advantage of his nature to snatch both powers, *brahman* and *kṣatra*, for his own benefit, but uses his kṣatriya might for the sake of the brahmins and, after fulfilling his purpose by destroying all kṣatriyas on earth, gives away the earth to brahmins as a *dakṣiṇā* (III. 117. 11). The result for the earth will be disastrous but Paraśurāma's birth had been decided

live because she is deprived of a ruler. The *dharma* will be restored only when virtuous kṣatriyas are born and rule the Earth according to *dharma*. Cf. here below.

by Viṣṇu in order to provoke that disaster, and he has acted in conformity with his own *dharma* for the ultimate benefit of all creatures.

Let us now consider the second version of the story of Kārtavīrya as it is given in *Śāntiparvan* 49 (Citraśālā Press ed.). At first sight, the description of Arjuna's character contrasts strikingly with that in the version already examined. Arjuna is the same powerful prince, whose thousand arms have been given him as a boon by Dattātreyā. But, far from being intoxicated with pride, he is now called *paramadharmavid* (v. 37) and later on, in spite of Vasiṣṭha's curse, he is still said to be *śamātmaka, brahmaṇya, śaraṇya, dātṛ* (v. 44). In fact, he is so virtuous that he is not very much disturbed by Vasiṣṭha's curse (v. 45) : in his own eyes he does not see anything to be cursed for. As a matter of fact he seems to be a very pious king, respectful of brahmans and full of compassion for those who come and ask for his protection. What more could be required for a king to be dharmic ? But, at the same time, we are at a loss to explain how his present character is going to lead him into the same trouble as his wickedness in the *Vanaparvan* story. Therefore, we have to interpret his present behaviour in the light of these two facts, namely that he is a dharmic and nonetheless initiates a major disaster for himself, for all the kṣatriyas and ultimately for the whole earth.

Our edition of the text describes two separate acts of his, without clearly stating the link between them : on the one hand, being a *cakravartin*, that is, the lord of the whole earth, he offers an *aśvamedha* sacrifice, at the end of which he gives the totality of his kingdom to brahmans, presumably to the officiating priests in the way of *dakṣiṇā*. On the other hand, Agni (also called Citrabhānu) comes and begs from him some alms to quench his thirst : probably the word *trṣita* here means "greedy" or "hungry" in general rather than "thirsty". A pious king cannot refuse a *bhikṣā* to anybody, least of all to Agni, the sacrificial Fire. But his way of giving satisfaction to Agni's request is in itself strange : he leads Citrabhānu everywhere on the earth for him to burn and consume everything, as if cities, villages, forests, in fact the whole world, had become a sacrificial offering. And the Fire seems to burn these "alms" with the help of Arjuna's arrows : "The mighty Citrabhānu, desirous of burning (everything), turned

to flames villages, cities, kingdoms, cattle-pens from the tip of his (Arjuna's) arrows (v. 39)". But we know that arrows and flames can symbolise each other quite easily. Here it means only—and that in itself is mysterious—that Agni requires the king's help. In the universal fire Vasīṣṭha's hermitage is burnt down. Vasīṣṭha manages to escape. His anger and his curse are the beginning of Arjuna's troubles⁷.

The way in which these two acts of the king are juxtaposed suggests that we should look for some connection between them, and possibly for a cause and effect relationship : Arjuna's piety—or should we rather say : excess of piety ?—may be the cause of Agni's greediness and ultimately of the universal fire. As our text sheds very little light on this point, we may look for some similar stories where the symbolic meaning would be made more explicit. What appears to many people as an unmanageable overgrowth of myths in epics and *purāṇas* is actually an invaluable source of information for a better understanding of each of them.

The gift of the whole earth as *dakṣiṇā* to officiating priests is a theme already known to the *Brāhmaṇas*, since we find it in the *Aitareya Br.* (VIII 21) and the *Śatapatha Br.* (XIII 7.1.15). We quote here the *Aitareya* version and Muir's translation⁸ :

“एतेन ह वा ऐन्द्रेण महाभिषेकेण कश्यपो विश्वकर्माणं भौवनमभिषिषेच ।

तस्माद् उ विश्वकर्मा भौवनः समन्तं सर्वतः पृथिवीं जयन् परीयायाश्चेन च
मेध्येनेजे । भूमिर्ह जगावित्युदाहरन्ति “न मा मर्त्यः कश्चन दातुमर्हति विश्वकर्मन्
भौवन मां दिदासिथ । निमङ्क्ष्येऽहं सलिलस्य मध्ये मोघस्त एष कश्यपायास
सङ्गर इत्य्”

With this great inauguration like that of Indra did Kaśyapa consecrate Viśvakarman Bhauvana, who in consequence went round the Earth in all directions, conquering it ; and offered an *aśvamedha* sacrifice. They relate that the Earth then recited this verse :

7. We shall not here ponder over the name that is given to Vasīṣṭha : Āpava, though it has also a special significance in this context. We may only venture to say that, by remaining alive, he marks the limits of Agni's fire just as the deluge puts an end to the cosmic fire during *pralaya*.

8. Cf. J. Muir, *Original Sanskrit Texts* I p. 456.

“Me may no mortal give away ; but thou, oh king, dost so essay ; deep will I plunge beneath the main ; thy pledge to Kaśyapa is vain”.

Here the context is exactly the same as in our myth: King Viśvakarman Bhauvana, after conquering the Earth, offers an *aśvamedha* and the Earth's threat to disappear in the ocean suggests that he, just like Kārtavīrya, wanted to give the whole Earth as *dakṣiṇā* to the officiating priest. In the *Śatapathabr.* the same intention of the same king-the priest still being Kaśyapa-and the same reaction of the Earth occur in the context of the *sarvamedha*: giving the whole Earth to the officiating priest in such a total sacrifice is understandable, the more so as it puts an end to one's life as a householder. But it does not seem to be more acceptable to the Earth: if the Earth is given to brahmans, it means that she has no more kṣatriya ruler to protect her and *dharma*. This would result in a state of chaos, which ultimately would bring a *pralaya* of some sort. This meaning of the Earth's threat is clearly expressed in the Paraśurāma story, in the very same context of the *Śāntiparvan* that gives our present version of Arjuna's myth (XII 49 64,68-73a):

त्रिःसप्तकृत्वः पृथिवीं कृत्वा निःक्षत्रियां प्रभुः ।
दक्षिणामश्वमेधान्ते कश्यपायाददात् ततः ॥
कश्यपस्तां महाराज प्रतिगृह्य वसुंधराम् ।
कृत्वा ब्राह्मणसंस्थां वै प्रविष्टः सुमहद्वनम् ॥
ततः शूद्राश्च वैश्याश्च यथा स्वैरप्रचारिणः ।
अवर्तन्त द्विजाग्र्याणां दारेषु भरतर्षभ ॥
अराजके जीवलोके दुर्बला बलवत्तरैः ।
पीड्यन्ते न हि विप्रेषु प्रभुत्वं कस्यचित् तदा ॥
ततः कालेन पृथिवी पीड्यमाना दुरात्मभिः ।
विपर्ययेण तेनाशु प्रविवेश रसातलम् ॥
अरक्ष्यमाणा विधिवत्क्षत्रियैर्धर्मरक्षिभिः ।
तां दृष्ट्वा द्रवतीं तत्र संत्रासात्स महामनाः ॥
ऊरुणा धारयामास कश्यपः पृथिवीं ततः ॥

Kaśyapa, being a Prajāpati, stands for all the brahmins. When he is given the Earth as a *dakṣiṇā*, he bestows her on the brahmins, Paraśurāma having destroyed all kṣatriyas. Then Kaśyapa retires into a forest, which means the beginning of the end. Soon after, the Earth, deprived of a king, sinks into the ocean; there she meets the same Kaśyapa who arrests her flight. She will ask him for a king (v. 74b).

We can now be sure of the meaning of Arjuna Kārtavīrya's gift of the Earth to the priests at the end of his *aśvamedha*: it is the foreboding of a disaster. But what is the reason for this awful gift? We are not told that Kārtavīrya wants to retire from the world and take to ascetic life in the forest. But we know that he is very pious, *brahmanya*, *śaranya* and *paramadharmavid*. The only reason then that can be invoked for this act of his is precisely an excess of piety: he is so generous to the brahmins on the occasion of sacrifices, that he gives away all his possessions. Generosity to brahmins is the very definition of a good king whose piety brings prosperity to his kingdom. But obviously, there must be some limit to a king's generosity. If he gives away everything, he cannot perform any more sacrifices, since he has no more wealth to spend. Thus he can no longer be a dharmonic king and he has destroyed his kingdom's prosperity. What is even worse, the wealth, which should primarily belong to the king, has become the property of the brahmins, though these are not fit to rule over the Earth: we have reached a situation that is not without similarity with that in the previous version of the myth, a state of utter confusion where *brahman* and *kṣatriya* have not been kept separate and which announces the end of the present world.

That is why Agni has become "thirsty" and, with the help of the king, burns everything around. It is quite normal to see the destruction of the world beginning with fire and ending in water, as we have just seen with the meeting of the Earth and Kaśyapa at the bottom of the ocean. The events in between (Arjuna's sons killing Jamadagni, Paraśurāma killing the kṣatriyas) establish the disappearance of the *kṣatra* as a direct consequence of Arjuna's behaviour and Vasiṣṭha's curse.

To support this interpretation we have also an incident taken from MbBh *Ādiparvan*: the burning of the Khāṇḍava forest by

Agni⁹. Everybody knows the story and it is too long to be quoted here (ch. 222-227). But we may recall particularly meaningful details, which will shed some more light on Kārtavīrya's story. Agni comes to Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa¹⁰ under the guise of a brahman ascetic and begs for their help to consume the Khāṇḍava forest. He is very weak and hungry and wants to eat up the forest with all its inhabitants. But the forest, being the abode of Indra's friend, the snake Takṣaka is protected by the king of the gods who pours rains over the forest and extinguishes Agni's fire. Whatever may be the meaning of the whole myth in its own context, it is here interesting to know the reason why Agni is so hungry, as it is given by Vaiśampāyana (I. 223).

King Śvetaki was a very dharmic king of old: *yajvā dānapatir dhīmān yathā nānyo'sti kaścana | rje ca sa mahāyajñaiḥ kratubhiścōpta-dakṣiṇaiḥ ||* (223. 18). Everyday he was busy offering sacrifices with generous *dakṣiṇā*, so much so that the priests had become exhausted and their eyesight had been blurred by the smoke of the sacrificial fire. They finally refused to perform any more sacrifice. Obviously at this point the king had gone beyond the limits of his duty, since the brahmans, because of him, had been made unable to fulfil their own duty. He nonetheless did not understand the meaning of this omen, and being as eager as ever to act as *yajamāna*, he followed the advice of the wearied and angry brahmans and performed *tapas* to obtain Rudra's help, asking him to perform a sacrifice for him. But Rudra asked him first to live for twelve years as a *brahmacārin*, and during that period to pour oblations of clarified butter continuously into the fire, that is, to act as a *ṛtvij* and not as a *yajamāna*. Here again the royal and the priestly functions have not been kept separate. The

-
9. Let us note here that, mysteriously the brahmans who divide the Earth between themselves after Paraśurāma's gift to them in the *Vanaparvan* version of the myth are called Khāṇḍavāyana (III. 117 13). Immediately after this, Paraśurāma is said to retire into the forest, the Earth being deprived of her rulers.
 10. We shall notice only by the way that in both fires, an Arjuna is Agni's helper. In the *Khāṇḍavadāha*, the Pāṇḍava Arjuna is accompanied by the *avaiāra* Kṛṣṇa and they act together, whereas in our myth, Arjuna Kārtavīrya's feat determines Paraśurāma's interference.

brahmans refuse to act as priests and the king performs oblations like a priest.

After twelve years, Rudra informed Śvetaki that he himself, not being a brahman, could not perform a sacrifice for the king, but he sent him to his earthly incarnation, the brahman Durvāsas. Durvāsas performed a sacrifice in due form, which seemed to be nothing but the conclusion of the twelve years oblation. At the end, Agni has been so much overfed that he cannot drink clarified butter any longer and feels weaker and weaker. Brahmā advises him to go and burn the Khāṇḍava forest in order to regain his vitality. Obviously this wild food, which is not *medhya*, will help him to recover from the excess of sacrificial food.

So we have here the same logical connection between the king's overpious behaviour, the confusion of functions and the fire. The narrative details are different but the meaning of the sequence is obviously the same. The interference of Rudra and Durvāsas cannot but add a note of bad omen: the sacrifice that Śvetaki performs with Durvāsas as his priest gives off a whiff of *pralaya*. Rudra is Kālāgni, he is the Destroyer at the end of a cosmic period¹¹.

Now, to come back to our *Śāntiparvan* myth of Kārtavīrya, the meaning and the result of the pious behaviour of the king are ultimately so similar to the *Vanaparvan* version that Arjuna's sons, if not he himself, have to be made arrogant and cruel. The father's character in the previous version has now become that of the sons. This allows the rest of the story to follow the same pattern in both versions. Once it has become clear that the king has trespassed the limits of *dharma* just because he was too dharmic, nothing seems illogical in the story; no detail is out of place. What is more, in the perspective of our present enquiry into the merits of critical editions, we have no reason to believe that one version is more

11. We shall not insist here on Arjuna's and Kṛṣṇa's role nor on the absence of Takṣaka from his dwelling-place when the forest is burning. Arjuna is the antithesis of Arjuna Kārtavīrya. His close association with the *avatāra* Kṛṣṇa warns us that the destruction of the forest aims at a re-creation of a world of *dharma* where brahmans and kings will each play their proper part. Takṣaka is the symbol of the creator who will "give shape" to everything again. That is why he will escape from the fire.

genuine or more original than other; nor that, inside one version, one detail is more authentic than another. The only question to be decided is whether the two accounts of the Kārtavīrya story, which are obviously the same story, can be equated with each other as wholes and element by element. Any other question seems to be irrelevant. As the following table will show, the two versions do correspond in the essential significance of their component parts,

| <i>Vanaparvan</i> | <i>Śāntiparvan</i> |
|--|---|
| I-A Arjuna, intoxicated with pride, harasses brahmins and gods | I-A Arjuna, after conquering the Earth, bestows her as <i>dakṣiṇā</i> to brahmins |
| I-B Ultimately he disturbs Indra and his wife | I-B With the help of Arjuna, Agni burns everything on the Earth, including Vasiṣṭha's <i>āśrama</i> |
| II Viṣṇu decides to have Arjuna killed | II Arjuna is cursed by Vasiṣṭha |
| III Arjuna steals the calf of Jamadagni's cow and breaks trees in J.'s <i>āśrama</i> | III Arjuna's sons, who are arrogant and cruel, take away the calf of Jamadagni's cow |

etc.

The correspondence between the two versions is perfect, at least for this part of the story, which is only an episode in the myth of Paraśurāma. With the help of the chart, we can even complete our analysis by noticing that the burning of Vasiṣṭha's *āśrama* expresses the same climax in the king's misbehaviour as the assault on Indra and his wife in the other version; also that in one version Viṣṇu himself decides Arjuna's death, whereas in the other, Vasiṣṭha's curse is sufficient. Viṣṇu the pure God, Viṣṇu who is Sacrifice in person, can be aptly represented on earth by the pure brahman Vasiṣṭha. This does not mean that the correspondence is or should be always perfect when we have different versions of a myth. One part in one version may for instance correspond to

two sub-parts in another. Any kind of variation is possible, provided the intended significance of the whole remains clear¹².

If we now turn to the critical edition of our texts, we find, for the *Vanaparvan* version, that only III. 116. 19-21 has been printed in the main text (BORI III 116. 19-21, the reference being the same in both editions) and is substantially identical with our edition, whereas III. 115. 11-17 has been rejected into an Appendix (which incidentally is found in the second volume of the *Āraṇyakaparvan*, whereas our text is in the first one). The episode of Arjuna Kārtavīrya begins at III. 119, with no mention of his thousand arms, his character and his misbehaviour towards the gods, nor of Viṣṇu's interference. In terms of the above chart, only § III has been retained by the editor as authentic. It is indeed a fact that the passage corresponding to the heavenly part of the drama (Citraśālā ed. III. 115. 9-19) does not occur in all mss. But is this passage really less 'authentic' than the rest and on what grounds? The description of the king's boldness may seem exaggerated to a modern mind, but we have seen that its significance is clear and not out of place. Why not rather consider that this was an "authentic" part of some versions, or, say, of a particular line of tradition? This idea is not incongruous, provided we stop looking for some historical value in the MhBh and take it as primarily didactic in purpose¹³.

As to the *ŚāntiParvan* version of the BORI edition, it is at first sight closer to our Vulgate. The text differs substantially only in one passage at the beginning, which runs thus :

एतस्मिन्नेव काले तु कृतवीर्यात्मजो बली ।
अर्जुनो नाम तेजस्वी क्षत्रियो हैहयान्वयः ॥

-
12. This does not mean that this significance has remained clear throughout centuries to all Hindus upto the present days. The contrary seems to come nearer to truth. That is why nowadays a truly scientific investigation is necessary to restore the lost meaning of so many epic and purāṇic stories. The obvious superiority of the Hindus in this kind of scientific work is that they still know a great many stories from their childhood and have not to discover them painstakingly one by one as we have to do it as Westerners.
13. This in itself is open to question, but we shall not touch upon this problem here, because any Indian mind is ready to accept that the MhBh wants to express certain abstract ideas through stories. That is also what I believe basically.

ददाह पृथिवीं सर्वां सप्तद्वीपां सप्ततनाम् ।
 स्वबाहुस्त्रबलेनाजौ धर्मेण परमेण च ॥
 तृषितेन स कौरव्य भिक्षितश्चित्रभानुना ।
 सहस्रबाहुर्विकांतः प्रादाद् भिक्षामथाग्नये ॥

(BORI ed. XII. 49. 30-32).

This passage corresponds to XII. 49. 35, 37-38 of the Vulgate ; v. 36, which mentions the *aśvamedha* and the brahmans as recipients of the Earth (as well as the boon of a thousand arms given by Dattātreya) has been dropped and quoted in a foot-note as belonging more particularly to the so-called "composite Devanāgarī version". V. 37 has been altered accordingly : *dadau*, which would then stand without anybody to receive the gift, has been replaced by *dadāha*. This verb, to make things worse, is underlined as doubtful. The result of this procedure is that no reason whatsoever appears for the king to burn the whole earth. The only explanation that could be suggested by the context would be along the lines of a continuation of the war up to the total destruction of the world, but that does not tally with the dharmic character of the king. Moreover, the king burns the earth and gives it as alms to the begging Agni. But this also has become quite unintelligible. No reason is given for Agni's thirst.

If we now try to draw up a chart of the two critically edited versions of the story, as we did above with the Vulgate, we come to this result :

| <i>Vanaparvan</i> | <i>Śantiparvan</i> |
|---|---|
| I | I Arjuna "burns" (?) the whole world in a dharmic war and gives it as alms to Agni |
| II | II Arjuna is cursed by Vasiṣṭha |
| III Arjuna, intoxicated with pride, steals the calf of Jamadagni's cow and breaks trees in J.'s <i>āśrama</i> | III Arjuna's sons, who are arrogant and cruel, take away the calf of Jamadagni's cow. |

The comparison between the two versions of the story leads us nowhere. Nothing can be understood from it and the two stories appear just as two different stories, which may be juxtaposed but have no comparable significance. I fail to see what has been gained by critically editing these texts. They have lost their intrinsic intelligibility and the mutual relationship that was so clear in the Vulgate has disappeared.

Consequently the whole story of Paraśurāma, in which this passage is inserted in both versions, has lost much of its meaning on both sides. One may argue that Paraśurāma is not explicitly mentioned here as Viṣṇu's *avatāra* and that we should not look in the MhBh for a fully developed legend as in the *purāṇas*. To my mind, this should not deter us from looking for the significance of the Paraśurāma story, and its pattern points to an interpretation of the hero as an *avatāra* who has come to rescue the brahmins from the kṣatriya oppressors. As all *avatāras*, his duty is to destroy in order to prepare the ground for a new and dharmic creation, a golden age as is described in MhBh *Ādi-parvan* 64. That is why it is important that the Arjuna Kārtavīrya episode should have its clear significance as a part of the Paraśurāma story. Seen in this light, the text retained in the critical edition seems to me, not only a shorter one, but an altered one; it has suffered a loss of meaning, which is equal to a loss of authenticity.

If now we consider the plot of the MhBh and its overall pattern, we can easily conceive of different recensions and different versions inside those recensions, which have all the same thing to say though they may say it somewhat differently, owing to the variation of local traditions. Even if we want to infer a common source to all recensions, this common source will forever remain and we may be sure that, as soon as it was recited all over Bhārata-varṣa, it was bound to undergo some changes here and there. So much so that, at any time after this, there was never a single recension and no reason to take any particular one as more authentic. The regional variants are all authentic as long as the overall significance of the epic remains. There may be mistakes, nonsensical verses or obviously corrupt readings, owing to some defects in the transmission, but the major variations in the text are likely each to have its own significance fitting into the whole.

That is why it would be more fruitful to search out the meaning of each and every part of all versions rather than to try to reconstruct one text out of the existing many. Although the rules of textual criticism elaborated by Sukthankar and applied in the BORI edition are in themselves excellent, and a vast amount of work has been devoted to the preparation of the critical edition, I think that these efforts have missed their aim. Meaningful interpretation of the MhBh requires, as I have tried to show, a quite different approach.¹⁴

ADDITIONAL NOTE

I am very grateful to Shri A. S. Gupta to have taken so much trouble as to clearly express what seems to him a major doubt regarding the interpretational approach that I have explained in the above paper. I shall here quote part of his letter and it will give me one more opportunity to clarify my points:

“The text III. 115. 9-19 of the Mahābhārata (Citraśālā Press ed.) does not occur in a number of MSS. of different versions (Śāradā, Telugu, Malayalam etc.) and in several MSS. of the Kashmirian and Devanāgarī versions. If this omission is also genuine and authentic in those MSS. (and there is no sound reason to regard otherwise), then in the light of this omission how will you explain your chart given on p. 10 of the typed copy of your article; for these MSS., which also represent a certain textual tradition of their own, retain only Sec. III of your chart like the critical edition of the Mahābhārata?”

14. Actually, if we refer to V. S. Sukthankar's position, it is not quite so simple. It may even be that the learned author of the *Introduction* to the critical edition of the MhBh had changed his mind in course of time: in his lectures on the MhBh (published long after his death but delivered on the very year of his death in 1942), his belief in the historical value of the epics had grown dim. No doubt the story was still something of the hoary past, but of an idealized past, so much so that the events were not so important as their “inner” meaning. The problem would then be whether he still believed that the MhBh text had to be edited along the same lines. There is an interesting fact about this, which has been noted down by the editor of his lectures (*On the meaning of the Mahābhārata*, The Asiatic Society of Bombay, 1957) in his introductory note: in these lectures, Dr. Sukthankar relied on the Bombay edition of the MhBh and not on the critical edition....

There can be no doubt that the textual tradition represented by the Śāradā, Telugu, Malayalam and some MSS. of the Kashmirian and Devanāgarī versions is as genuine as the Vulgate version. Actually any version must be considered as genuine even if we some times feel that one is more explicit and meaningful than others and if we suspect that the bard has not always been fully aware of the meaning of the text. But quite often, if we compare the existing versions, there are elements that remain quite unintelligible until we come across one version; which happily gives us one new detail or one more element, thus suddenly shedding light on the obscure points of the other versions. The new detail or element may not have been so essential to the understanding of the story by the former listeners, but it has become essential for us. Who have lost the capacity of immediately understanding the meaning of the epic and purāṇic stories. Naturally we may expect to find the extra element that will help us in more developed versions.

But it does not mean that one and the same version of the whole epic is more helpful than the others for any particular story. The superiority of the Vulgate that I have tried to show on one example does not mean that the Vulgate should be taken as the standard version as a whole, but only that it cannot be so easily discarded. I should probably have to say the same thing for regional version, and its superiority could be shown by taking other stories as examples. That is the very reason why the diversity of versions has to be maintained carefully if we are to reach a better understanding of the epic, and rather than reconstruct a single authentic text we had better published all regional versions.

One more remark: on the one hand, it may be assumed that a story that has taken in more elements than others will be more explicit. On the other hand, in the present state of epic tradition, it would certainly be wrong to think that a longer version is necessarily a more recent one. As long as the text was orally transmitted, it would be either lengthened or shortened (possibly according to the fees to be expected). Thus there is no reason to prefer a shorter version just because it is shorter.

I hope I have answered Shri Gupta's question and I thank him for the opportunity he has given me to publish this and the above paper in *Purāṇa*.

A PROBLEM OF PURĀNIC TEXT-RECONSTRUCTION

By

ANANDA SWARUPA GUPTA

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे निबन्धकर्त्रा पुराणपाठनिर्धारणविषयकाः कतिचित् प्रश्ना विचारिताः । निर्धारितपुराणपाठे केषुचित् हस्तलेखेषु आधिक्येन प्राप्तानामंशानां किं स्थानं भवितव्यमिति च विवेचितम् । अत्र विषये केचिद् विद्वांसः पुराणानां हस्तलेखेषु आधिक्येन वर्तमानानामंशानां संशोधितपुराणसंस्करणोऽसमावेशमिच्छन्ति, अन्ये च पुनर्विद्वांसः सर्वेषामेव आधिक्येन वर्तमानानामंशानां निर्धारिते पुराणपाठे सम्यग्रहणं समर्थयन्ति । अत्र निबन्धे हस्तलेखेषु प्राप्तानाम् अधिकानामंशानां प्रथमं चतुर्षु वर्गेषु विभाजनं विधाय तत्समाविष्टानामधिकांशानां उपबृंहणत्वं प्रतिपादितम् निर्धारितपाठे च तेषां ग्रहणमुचितमिति मतमुपस्थापितम् । ततश्च पञ्चमे विभागे पुराणपुस्तकेषु प्राप्तानां लेखकपाठकादिभिः प्रक्षिप्तानाम् अंशानां विमर्शं कृत्वा निर्धारितपाठे तेषामग्रहणमेव समर्थितम् । प्रथमवर्गचतुष्टयान्तर्गतानाम् अधिकांशानां पुराणग्रन्थस्य संशोधितसंस्करणे ग्रहणाय का पद्धतिरनुसरणीयेत्यप्यत्र कूर्मपुराणोदाहरणमुखेन विचारितम्, तदन्ते च विद्वांसोऽस्मिन् विषये स्वमतप्रदानाय प्रार्थिताः ।]

There has been a controversy as to the need and value of a critical edition of the Epic or Purāṇa. Dr. V. S. Sukthankar was the first scholar who undertook to reconstitute the text of the Mahābhārata on the modern principles of textual criticism ; the critical edition of the Hari-vamṣa has also been prepared by Dr. P. L. Vaidya and recently published by the B. O. R. I., Poona. The Rāmāyaṇa has been edited on the same principles and pattern as adopted for the Mahābhārata-edition. The first critical edition of a Purāṇa text, i. e. of the Vāmana-Purāṇa, has been published by the All-India Kashiraj Trust on almost the same principles though modified to some extent, and now the critical edition of the Kūrma Purāṇa is under preparation.

In the West, however, the purpose of textual criticism was to restore a particular text to its original form given to it by its known author whose historicity could not be questioned, a text which had

its original autograph either preserved or inferred. The Western textual criticism has been mostly applied in the West to the editions of the classical and medieval texts composed and transmitted in written form only. And for discussing the textual problems of these fixed (not fluid) texts works like *The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare* (1951), *On Editing Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Dramatists* (1955) etc. appeared there.¹

Textual Problems of the Purāṇas

The textual problems of the Purāṇas are altogether different from those of the Western classical and medieval texts, which may be briefly enunciated as follows:—

1. Both the Epics and the Purāṇas, as we have them now, are not the works of single individual authors, for they have been compiled, redacted and revised several times and by several hands; and in the course of such redaction and revision their texts have rather been amplified than reduced, and have therefore undergone a vast change both in their forms and volumes. Not being the works of any single individual authors and of any particular time and region the question of restoring these texts to their original form does not arise; for, it is quite doubtful that in view of their fluid nature they ever existed in their purely original form. Though Vyāsa has been generally regarded as the author of the Mahābhārata and the eighteen Purāṇas², yet the historicity of Vyāsa has been questioned by a number of modern scholars, specially of the West, who regard him as a mythical person³. We Indians however, are not used to regard all our ancient sages and heroes as mythical figures. But supposing that Vyāsa was a historical person and the real author of the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, can we assert with any degree of certainty that we shall be ever able to restore the present texts of the Epic and the Purāṇas to their original form in which they had been composed by Vyāsa? It then should be considered as one of main problems of the Purāṇic text-reconstruction.

1. Vide *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 22 (1961 edn.), p. 19.

2. Cf. ऋषटादश पुराणानि कृत्वा सत्यवतीसुतः ।

भारताख्यानमखिलं चक्रे तदुपबृंहितम् ॥ (Mt.-P., 53.69)

3. See 'Some more considerations about Textual Criticism' by M. Biarreau, *Purāṇa*, X. 2 (July, 1963) pp. 115 ff.

2. Purāṇas had first been transmitted orally by the Sūta- and other reciters before they were committed to writing. In course of this oral transmission the Purāṇic texts underwent several radical changes such as variations, interpolations (which may better be called additions or amplifications), omissions and transpositions. And when these texts were committed to writing in the form of manuscripts this fluid or changing nature of these texts was arrested to some extent; but similar changes still continued to take place in the transmitted written texts also due to the scribal slips and emendations and also to the readers' attempts to supplement or change the texts according to their own views; regional cultures and ideas also effected several changes in the Purāṇa-texts. Consequently various versions and even recensions arose in different regions and times, which versions must have been far distant from the original Purāṇic text, if ever there existed such a text. Can we, or should we, then reduce these various versions to any single universal version by our text-reconstruction ?

3. Manuscripts of the Purāṇas generally date earliest from the 14th or even the 15th century A.D. onward, and the oldest Nibandhas (e.g. Vallālasena's *Dānasāgara* and Laxmidhara's *Kṛtya-Kālpataru*) which quote the Purāṇas were not composed earlier than the 11th or the 12th century A.D. But many of the extant Purāṇic texts took their shape between the 3rd century B. C. and the 3rd or the 4th century A D., when they were probably committed to writing. Before that period Purāṇas might have had a long-standing oral tradition of transmission from the time of the composition of the original Purāṇa-Saṁhitā which according to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (III. 6. 15) was composed by Vyāsa and taught by him to his disciple Sūta Romaharṣaṇa.

Now, on the basis of such late manuscript-and Nibandha-material is it possible to arrive at the reasonably oldest authoritative Purāṇic texts which may be nearer to the inferred original or to the lost archetype ?

4. There have undoubtedly been later additions in a Purāṇic text from time to time and from region to region. Are all these later additions the results of the tampering attempts of the interpolators beyond any justification, or are these additions the results of the desire on the part of the redactors to revise the texts

of the Purāṇas from time to time and keep them in line with the current religious and social ideas of their times in order to preserve the encyclopaedic nature of the Purāṇas and keep them upto-date. Should a text-critic or a critical editor spurn all such later additions as spurious matter from his critical text, giving them an inferior position in his critical footnotes, or relegating them to an appendix, or altogether rejecting them and thus driving them to oblivion ?

These are some of the main problems which confront a critical editor in reconstructing his text of a Purāṇa. There is yet another point : It is said that a Purāṇic text has different textual traditions preserved in the different regional versions which are available in their respective regional manuscripts written in their regional scripts, and that if a single critical text is prepared on the basis of the manuscripts of the various versions, a new recension or version might arise and the various valuable Purāṇic traditions may be lost to us. It is for this reason that some scholars, such as Prof. Sylvain Levi and his pupils, are totally against any critical edition of the Epic or a Purāṇa.⁴

Each of the problems mentioned above requires some detailed consideration and discussion. I shall here confine myself to the last mentioned problem (No. 4); i. e. the problem of the later-on added material in a Purāṇic text; for, the main structure of a constituted Purāṇic text would depend on the proper solution of this important problem.

But before considering this problem in detail a few words may here be said about the need and importance of the critical edition of the Purāṇas (including the Epic):

Need of Critical Editions of the Purāṇas

The texts of the Purāṇas are preserved in manuscripts which are scattered all over the country. We find manuscripts of the Purāṇas from Kashmir and Nepal in the extreme north to Temilnad and Kerala in the extreme south, and from Asam in the east to Maharastra in the west. This wide area of the availability of the Purāṇa-manuscripts has naturally given rise to the different versions of a Purāṇa-text in different regions and scripts. But this does not mean that a Purāṇa-text has different text-traditions

4. *Ibid.*

in the same way as a Vedic Saṁhitā has different established text-traditions in the form of its Śākhās, in which case particular Vedic Śākhās are followed, studied and adhered to by particular Brāhmaṇa-families, so much so that the daily worship and the religious rites of these Brāhmaṇa-families are performed according to their own particular Śākhā. The texts of these Vedic Śākhās have been preserved intact and without the least change by these Brāhmaṇa-families with utmost care and sanctity. It is for this reason that no single Vedic text can be reconstructed out of these various Śākhās. The study of these Vedic Śākhās had remained confined to the priestly class (Brāhmaṇas) only and had never been allowed to be carried on by the laity. The case of the Purāṇas is, however quite different. The Purāṇas have always been the popular religious works, they were made accessible to every cast and fold of the Hindus. They are publicly recited and no such sanctity, therefore, was attached to their recitation as to that of the Veda. The whole Vedic texts had been memorised and are even today recited by memory in the particular Brāhmaṇa-families, but not so the Purāṇas. Moreover, no particular text-tradition of a Purāṇa is adhered to in particular regions or in particular religious sects; for, the vulgate text of a Purāṇa printed in Devanāgarī (which has been a universal script for writing Sanskrit texts) is generally used all over the country by the reciters, readers and also by Indian and foreign scholars.

It is, therefore, not improper to reconstruct a single critical text of a Purāṇa on the basis of the available manuscripts of all its versions. Such single critical text must be a conflated text by its very nature, but this defect is more than compensated by giving the readings and variants of all the available versions in the critical apparatus (in the form of the critical footnotes) of a critical edition.

Again, no single manuscript of a Purāṇa is found absolutely correct and the text found in most of the manuscripts, specially in the Devanāgarī manuscripts, is conflated. The printed editions of the vulgate text of the Purāṇas, based as they are on more than one manuscripts, are also conflated to some extent, some portions agreeing sometimes with particular manuscripts and sometimes with others. To avoid conflation the text of a single unconfliated manuscript need be printed, but even then the conflation cannot be wholly avoided, for we have to take the help of other manuscripts

also in order to corroborate and correct the readings of our manuscript and to fill up the lacuna which is sometimes found even in the best of the manuscripts. And even then we cannot have the complete or the correct picture of the text of the Purāṇa; for, a reading common to several versions is often (though not always) superior to a reading available in one single version or manuscript only. So the printing of the text of even a best single manuscript would not serve the end of textual criticism.⁵

Then again, sometimes a text in the majority of the manuscripts even of different versions gives a wrong reading or have some lacuna causing a wrong or incomplete sense; and then to our pleasant surprise the reading (which does not seem to be an emended one) found in some single or a few manuscripts gives us the clue to the correct and complete sense. In the Introduction of the critical edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa (pp. xxxiii-iv) I have given some instances to show how the Kashmirian manuscripts only provide us the text of a śloka which has been lost in all other versions, and without which the sense of some ślokas would have remained incomplete or unintelligible. Instances are also found in the manuscripts of the Kūrma-Purāṇa where majority of the versions and the manuscripts are wrong and the correct reading is found only in a few manuscripts. In one place (corresponding to I. 46.20 of the Venk. edn.) a single manuscript of the Kūrma-Purāṇa (viz. the Grantha MS. purchased from Madras) has supplied us an additional śloka which seems to have been omitted by mistake in other manuscripts, for this additional śloka of the Grantha MS. completes the sense.

5. Cf. also the following remarks under 'Textual Criticism' by its author in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. 22 (1961) :--

"The school of textual critics stemming from Karl Lachmann favoured the acceptance of one 'best' manuscript and the rigid adherence to its readings in all possible circumstances as the only 'scientific' attitude for the editor. This school tacitly considered that textual criticism ended with the establishment of the family tree and the consequent decision in favour of some one preserved manuscript as the 'best'.....The illogic of the Lachmann position, in its abrogation of the critical second stage in preparing a definitive text, was exploded by A.E. Housmann (Preface. *The Astronomicon of Manilius*, Cambridge University Press)".

The edition of the text of a single manuscript or of a single version of a Purāṇa may, therefore not provide us a correct and authoritative text throughout. Hence there is the need of a critical edition of a Purāṇa based on its available manuscripts of different versions and scripts.

Evolution and Growth of a Purāṇa-text

According to the Indian tradition relating to the origin and evolution of the Purāṇas as recorded in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (III. 6. 15ff), Vāyu-Purāṇa (60. 2; 61. 55ff.; 104. 2ff.) etc. Vyāsa first composed a Purāṇa-Saṁhitā containing the *ākhyāna*-s (tales and legends), *upākhyāna*-s (episodes), *gāthā*-s (ślokas handed down from the ancient times) and *Kalpajokti*-s (lore coming down from the ages). Vyāsa taught his Purāṇa-Saṁhitā to his disciple Sūta Romaharṣaṇa, who also composed a Purāṇa-Saṁhitā, which was the basis of the other three Purāṇa-Saṁhitās composed by three disciples of Romaharṣaṇa, viz. Kāśyapa (or Akṛtavṛṇa), Sāvārṇi and Śāmsapāyana. These four Purāṇa-Saṁhitā-s were the *pūva* (Vāyu.-P.) or the *mūla* (Bhāg.) Purāṇa-Saṁhitā-s, each consisting of 4000 ślokas excepting the Śāmsapāyana-Saṁhitā which consisted of 8600 ślokas. Later on eighteen Purāṇas were evolved out of these four original Purāṇa-Saṁhitā-s, which all were ascribed to the authorship of Vyāsa.

The Vāyu-Purāṇa says that originally a Purāṇa consisted of four pāda-s, and contained 12,000 ślokas only (32.62-63). The Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa (I. 1. 103) also corroborates the Vāyu-Purāṇa when it says that all the Purāṇas are said by the wise each to have been of 12,000 ślokas (“सर्वाण्येव पुराणानि सञ्ज्ञेयानि नरर्षभ । द्वादशैव सहस्राणि प्रोक्तानीह मनीषिभिः ॥”) But the Bhav.-P. further remarks that later on they increased in their extent by incorporating in them *ākhyāna*-s of various kinds (“पुनर्वृद्धिं गतानीह आख्यानैर्विविधैर्नृप ॥”). Still later on, the extent of the Purāṇa-literature swelled up to four lacs of ślokas (“एवं पुराणसंस्थानं चतुर्लक्षमुदाहृतम् ॥” Bhav.-P.)

Thus the Purāṇa-literature from the few thousand ślokas gradually grew up to an enormous extent of four lacs of ślokas, and the authorship of all these four lacs of ślokas was attributed to Vyāsa (“चतुर्लक्षमिदं प्रोक्तं व्यासेनाद्भुतकर्मणा” Matsya-P., 53.57). Thus, all this growth in the extent of the Purāṇas is admitted by the Purāṇas

themselves; not only this, but all this addition or growth is also held to be valid and authentic by ascribing it to Vyāsa

The Purāṇas have always been a living literature, and have acquired a unique popularity and sanctity in India. This living literature of the Purāṇas may be likened to a living human organism. The spontaneous growth in the form of additions and amplifications (*upabṛīṃhaṇa*) in the body of the Purāṇa-puruṣa is like the natural growth of a human organism. The grown-up form of a Purāṇa-text, therefore, is as important and valuable as its original or the pristine form, just as a grown-up human body is not less important than its early and undeveloped baby-form. But sometimes spurious matter also makes its appearance in the Purāṇas, like some unnatural redundant growth of a limb in the human body. In that case the spurious matter is to be carefully distinguished and separated from the naturally grown-up (*upabṛīṃhita*) body of a Purāṇa-text.

Nature of Additions in the Purāṇas

Additions in the Purāṇas may be classified as follows:—

1. The natural growth or *upabṛīṃh ṇa* of a Purāṇa-text, i. e. the growth or *upabṛīṃhaṇa* effected by the redactors or the Sūta s. Such growth or addition is accepted and assimilated by the Purāṇa in its body of the text and is found in nearly all of its versions and manuscripts. The following instance from the Kūrma-Purāṇa (K.P.) will make this point clear:—

The K.P., I. 51.14 (Venkt. edn.) reads as follows:—

शिविरिन्द्रस्तथैवासीच्छ्रुतयज्ञोपलक्षणः ।
बभूव शंकरे भक्तो महादेवार्चने रतः ॥

The first line of this śloka has its verbatim parallel in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (III 1.17ab), but the second line (बभूव शंकरे भक्तो महादेवार्चने रतः ॥) is not contained in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa. Now, if we regard the entire Purāṇa-literature as one single whole, of which the various Purāṇas form different parts or chapters, then it can be safely said that the K.P., being predominantly a Śaiva Purāṇa, had added this line in the body of its text and so this line is found in all the versions and manuscripts of the K.P.; it has, therefore, to be given a place in its constituted text.

Compare also the following śloka of the KP.—

स्वारोचिषश्चोत्तमश्च तामसो रैवतस्तथा ॥

प्रियव्रतान्वया ह्येते चत्वारो मनवः स्मृताः । (I. 51. 19-20)

This śloka of the KP. is the same as Viṣ.-P. III. 1. 24, but the Viṣ.-P., being a Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa, adds the following śloka immediately after this śloka :—

विष्णुमाराध्य तपसा स राजर्षिः प्रियव्रतः ।

मन्वन्तराधिपानेतोऽर्हन्स्ववानात्मवंशजात् ॥ (Viṣ.-P. III. 1.25)

The KP. does not contain this śloka, so it should be considered as an addition in the Viṣṇu-P. rather than an omission in the KP. ; it has become an inseparable part of the text of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa.

2. There are found certain passages or ślokas in a Purāṇa which are available in some of its versions and manuscripts only, while in others they are missing or omitted. Now if this omission is genuine in these versions and manuscripts and not due to haplography or other scribal slips, then the presence of these passages or ślokas in the other versions and manuscripts should also be regarded as genuine additions there, additions which have been accepted and assimilated by the text-tradition of at least the versions and manuscripts containing them. Sometimes such addition is found in one version only and sometimes in more than one. But this additional matter should also be considered as valuable and fit to be preserved, although it is not uniformly available in all the versions and manuscripts of the Purāṇa.

Now, if we exclude such additional matter from our constituted text and give it in the critical apparatus or relegate it to an appendix, then there is every chance of its being lost for ever from our text, if the constituted text only is to be separately printed without the critical apparatus and appendices for the purpose of translations or for the purpose of general reading, recitation or study.

It may be noted here that in the case of the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata the editors' efforts have been to restore the text, as far as possible, to its *pristine* form, and so they have tried to exclude from their constituted text all the additions which they considered might have been introduced later on, and have given

all such additional passages in the critical footnotes, and the longer passages in the Appendix. This is one view of dealing with the inferred additional passages in the Epic and the Purāṇas. But strictly speaking this kind of application of the canons of textual criticism can be justified in the case of the edition of a Western classical (Greek or Latin) text only, for which purpose these canons were evolved in the West. Another extreme view is that of Sylvain Levi and his followers which would not allow any exclusion from the extant texts of the Epic and the Purāṇas as preserved in the various versions and manuscripts. In the case of the Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa (All India Kashiraj Trust, 1967), however, we resorted to a middle path. The *Saro-māhātmya* text of the Vāmana-Purāṇa consisting of 27 Adhyāyas, is not available in the Kashmirian (only first 10 Adhyāyas available), Bengali and South Indian manuscripts of the Vāmana Purāṇa, but we retained this text within the constituted text of the Vāmana Purāṇa; we, however, numbered its chapters separately from the main text of the Vāmana Purāṇa to show that according to the editor's view this *Saro-māhātmya* text might not have been the original part of the Vāmana Purāṇa text.

But if we think that a critical editor must exclude all the additional (called as spurious and interpolated) matter from his constituted text in order to arrive at the oldest possible text of his Purāṇa, even then it is not possible; for no critical editor has got the entire and the complete manuscript-material at his disposal for scrutiny. In the Introduction (p. XVII) of his critical Edition of the Harivaṃśa Dr. P. L. Vaidya says that "the Critical Text in this edition represents a phase which is positively older than A.D. 1050, the age of Kṣemendra.....But this does not mean that there are no interpolations in my text." And he further says (pp. XXXIV-V)—"Even my Critical Text might be an expended version of the original text of Harivaṃśa, but I cannot further reduce it because of my MSS. material and its abridgement preserved in the *Mañjarī*." So if the complete manuscript-material, without any break, from the time of the first archetype upto the time of the latest manuscript, had been available to us, we would then have been able to show that such and such additions were made at such and such time to the original or the oldest text of the Purāṇa, and would then have been justified to exclude all the

later-on-added (or spurious) matter from our constituted text, which we might perhaps, to some degree of certainty, claim to call as the oldest text.

It is not, however, possible now, for the manuscripts written earlier than the oldest manuscripts now available to us are perhaps, irretrievably lost. In such a state of affairs why then should we exclude from our constituted text only those additions which may be known to us as such on the basis of the meagre and insufficient manuscript-evidence, and allow all the passages which might also have been earlier additions introduced at some unknown stage of the growth of the Purāṇa an honourable place in our constituted text ? These remarks may be labelled as uncritical, but they may perhaps conform more to our Purāṇa-tradition.

In my humble opinion all such additions should also be included in the constituted text. We should, however, use some device to indicate that as they are not uniformly available in all the versions they might be treated as belonging to the textual tradition of those versions and manuscripts only in which they are available ; but care should be taken to ascertain that they had not been inserted in some common exemplar of those manuscripts from a different source by the scribe or reader of that exemplar.

3. Sometimes there are found two parallel versions of some portion or portions of the text of a Purāṇa in its manuscripts ; the one version being shorter which is available in some of its manuscripts, while the other version is longer which is also available in the other set of manuscripts of the same Purāṇa. In the case of the Kūrma-Purāṇa this kind of double version is found in its manuscripts in several places of the text. On account of the different wordings and construction of these two versions they can not be amalgamated with each other. Both these versions—shorter and the longer—should be accepted as authentic, i. e. as acknowledged and assimilated by the two different manuscript-traditions of the Purāṇa, although the longer version may be a later one (which, however, is not always the case).

4. Sometimes a text in almost all the manuscripts is wrong or incomplete and does not, in some cases, also tally with the preceding and the following text. I have already referred in these pages to such texts in the Vāmana and the Kūrma Purāṇas. In such cases the additional line or śloka available in some single version or

even in a single manuscript, which completes or corrects the sense of the text of the remaining manuscripts, should be included in the critical text, assuming that this additional text might have been rightly preserved in that particular version or manuscript only, and some-how-or-other lost in others.

5. Besides these authentic or justifiable additions, we also find in some manuscripts of a Purāṇa such additional matter as is really spurious, introduced by a scribe, reader or reciter according to his particular leanings or predilections either from some other source or composed by himself. Such spurious additions or interpolations are made with a desire on the part of the interpolator to amplify some description, *deva-stuti*, *māhātmya*, *phala-śruti*; etc.⁶

Some additions are tinged with sectarian zeal and motive; e. g. a Nandi-nāgarī MS. of the Kūrma-Purāṇa, procured from the Śringerī-Maṭha, Mysore, adds a śloka of Śaivite nature after KP. I. 2. 16cd-17ab (Venkt. edn.),⁷ and this Śloka of the Nandi-nāgarī MS. is not found in the other collated MSS. of the Kūrma-Purāṇa. The Śaivite spirit of this MS. is borne out when it alone substitutes the reading “सर्वं शिवमयं जगत्” for the reading “सर्वं ब्रह्ममयं जगत्” contained in all the other MSS. in I. 4.65d.

Such spurious additions or interpolations are found sometimes in one manuscript only and sometimes in more than one MSS.,

6. Dr. P. L. Vaidya, in the Introduction (p. XXXV) of his Critical Edition of the Harivaṃśa has given the following śloka which mentions the five groups of interpolations introduced in the Epic and Purāṇa :—

संग्रामश्च विवाहश्च स्तुतिर्देवीवरादिकम् ।
प्रक्षेपकारणाभ्याहुः पञ्चमं च फलश्रुतिः ॥

7. KP., I. 2. 16cd-18ab (Venkt-edn.), reads as follows :—

ये यजन्ति जर्पहीमिर्देवदेवं महेश्वरम् ।
स्वाध्यायेनेज्यया दूरात्तान् प्रयत्नेन वर्जयेत् ॥
भक्तियोगसमायुक्तानीश्वरार्पितमानसान् ।
प्राणायामादिषु रतान् दूरात् परिहरामलान् ॥

Between these two Ślokas the Nandi-nāgarī MS. inserts the following Śloka :—

नमस्कारादिसंयुक्तं शिव इत्यक्षरद्वयम् ।
जिह्वाग्रे वर्तते येषां तान् प्रयत्नेन वर्जयेत् ॥

But no other MS. of the KP. contains this Śloka.

generally in those which might be the direct or indirect copies from the same exemplar containing that spurious reading. These interpolations are to be excluded from the constituted text and should be given a place in the critical footnotes or appendix.

ADDITIONS AND TEXT-RECONSTRUCTION

Out of these five categories of additions found in the manuscripts of a Purāṇa, there should be no controversy about the first category (i.e. the additions accepted by and assimilated in the text of all the versions) to be included in the constituted text, and also about the fifth or the last category (Additions which are clearly spurious and interpolated) to be excluded from the constituted text. But the second, third and the fourth categories of additions, as detailed above, should, in my opinion, also be included in the constituted text; in such cases of inclusion, however, we should use some device to indicate that these additions are not uniformly available in the text-tradition of all the versions as I have already mentioned above; for example, we may mark these portions in our constituted text by a vertical line and (or) number these passages separately.

I shall now illustrate my point by giving a few illustrations from the MSS. of the Kūrma-Purāṇa. The following symbols have been used by us for the 21 collated MSS. of the Kūrma-Purāṇa :—

Kashmirian Version

का 1 = MS. No. 3563, Raghunāth Sanskrit Library, Jammu.

Bengali and Uriya Version

ब 1 = MS, No. 2885, Dacca Unieersity Library, Dacca, Pakistan.

ब 2 = MS, No. 3390, Dacca University Library.

ब 3 = MS, No. 398, Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

उ 1 = Uriya MS., No., 75139, Adyar Library, Madras. (Containing only the Uttarārdha of the text).

Devanāgarī MSS. (North and West)

द 1 = MS., E. 3346, India Office Library, London.

द 2 = Ms. Tod 39, Royal Asiatic Society, London ; A.D. 1598.

द 3 = MS., No 5589, V.V.I., Hoshiarpur, Punjab.

द 4 = MS., No 999, Banaras Hindu University Library.

द 5 = MS., M.C. 371, Oriental Research Institute, Mysore.

- दे 6 = MS., No. 1039, Harvard University (U.S.A.)
 दे 7 = MS. E. 3345, India Office Library, London (collated
 Bhuvan-kośa only).
 दे 8 = MS., 41 of 1881-82, B.O.R.I., Poona ; A. D. 1558 (the
 oldest MS. collated).
 दे 9 = MS., 16 of 1873-73, B.O.R.I., Poona ; A. D. 1565 (the
 next oldest MS).
 दे 10 = MS., PM. 2418, Adyar Library, Madras.

South Indian MSS.

- न 1 = Nandī-nāgarī MS., Srīngerī Maṭha, Mysore, Palm-leaf.
 ते 1 = Telugu MS., D 2107, Govt. Oriental MSS. Library
 Madras.
 द 1 = Devanāgarī MS., No. 1588, Sarasvati Mahal, Tanjore.
 प्र 1 = Grantha MS., Purchased from Madras, Palm-leaf.
 प्र 2 = Grantha MS., No. 5036, V.V.I., Hoshiarpur, Palm-leaf.
 म 1 = Malayalam MS., No. 110/19129, Kerala University
 Trivandrum, Palm-leaf.

Now, about the place of additions of the three categories (2-4) in the constituted text we shall first take the case of the text which is found in some of the MSS. only but omitted in others. (References from Venkt. ed.).

After K.P., I. 53.9 we have the following three lines which are found with some variants in का 1 ब 1-3 दे 1-3.5.6. ते 1 प्र 1, 2 म. 1, but are *omitted* in दे 4. 8-10 न 1 and द 1. So we can mark these lines with a vertical line and number them separately in Lines :—

महायामो मुनिः शूली ढिण्डिमुण्डीधरः स्वयम् ।
 सहिष्णुः सोमशर्मा च नकुलीधर एव च ॥ ९
 वैवरवतेऽन्तरे शम्भोरवतारास्त्रिशूलिनः । 1
 अष्टाविंशतिराख्याता ह्यन्ते कलियुगे प्रभोः । 2
 तीर्थे कायावतारे स्याद् देवेशो नकुलीधरः । 3
 तत्र देवाधिदेवस्य चत्वारः सुतपोधनाः ।
 शिष्या बभूवुश्चान्येषां प्रत्येकं मुनिपुङ्गवाः ॥ १०

The critical apparatus of these three additional lines may be given Line-wise after the critical apparatus of śl. 9.

These three lines are omitted in the oldest MSS. दे 8.9 also; but in certain cases a text is found contained in both these oldest MSS. and also in दे 10 (which three form a separate Group) but omitted in all other MSS., e.g. KP. I. 26.32. In this case also these two lines (Sl. 32) may be included in the constituted text but marked with a vertical line.

(2) In the Kūrma-Purāṇa MSS. there are some cases of two parallel versions, one shorter and the other longer. These should be considered as the two independent text-traditions, as the readings and the construction of these two versions indicate: they run parallel to some extent, the longer version then gives some additional text which is absent in the shorter version, and then the two versions culminate in a similar text which has variants separately conforming to the two texts of the two versions. Both of these should be adopted in the constituted text. But the question is how to adjust these two parallel versions in the same place. If the constituted text is printed in single column, then these two texts can be given side by side in two columns in *pāda*-s where they differ from each other in variants in their culminating portions. For example, compare the following text :—

Kp. I. 24. 11 has the following two versions :—

क्रथस्याभवत् कुन्तिवृष्णिस्तस्याभवत् सुतः । ११ A

वृष्णेर्निवृत्तिरूपन्नो दशार्हस्तस्य तु द्विजाः । 1

दशार्हपुत्रोऽप्यारोहो जामतस्तस्युतोऽभवत् । 2

जैमूतिरभवद् वीरो विकृतिः परवीरहाः । 3

तस्मान्नवरथो नाम

बभूव सुमहाबलः ॥ ११ B

तस्य मीमरथः पुत्रस्

तस्मान्नवरथोऽभवत् । 4

दानधर्मरनो नित्यं

सत्यशीलपरायणः । 5

Here the two versions of the genealogy of Kings after Kratha, the son of Videha and the grandson of Jyāmagha, are recorded. The shorter version is given in दे 1.8 9 10 न 1, and the longer is given

According to this latter method the above text may be given as follows :

क्रथस्याभवत् कुन्तिवृष्णितस्याभवत् सुतः ।

वृष्णेर्निवृत्तिरुत्पन्नो दशार्हस्तस्य तु द्विजाः ॥ ११

दशार्हपुत्रोऽप्यारोहो जीमूतस्तत्सुतोऽभवत् ।

जैमूतिरभवद् वीरो विकृतिः परवीरहा ॥ १२

तस्य भीमरथः पुत्रस्] तस्मान्नवरथोऽभवत् ।

दानधर्मरतो नित्यं सत्यशीलपरायणः ॥ १३

[The vertical straight line indicates that the text marked by it is available in some of the versions only, and the horizontal wavy line denotes that the text marked by it has its alternative or variant in some versions or manuscripts.]

(3) If a version or a manuscript contains some additional line or lines which complete the sense of the text given in the other manuscripts and thus fills up their lacuna, then this additional text ought to be included in the constituted text, but marked with a vertical line to indicate that this additional text is available in some MS or MSS. only and not in all the MSS. of the critical apparatus.

For example, K.P. I. 46.20 (Vañkt. edn.) reads as follows :—

तत्रापस्रोगणैः सिद्धैः सेव्यमानोऽमराधिपैः ।

आस्ते स वरुणो राजा तत्र गच्छन्ति येऽम्बुदाः ॥

Here in 20d 'येऽम्बुदाः' is the reading in the Veñkt. edn. and in दे 1.8.9. only, दे 10 reads 'ये बुधाः', but the majority of the remaining MSS. read here 'ये मुदा' or 'ये नराः' (South Indian MSS. ; ते 1-'ये सदा'). All these readings ('ये मुदा' 'ये नराः' 'ये सदा' etc.) require a clause to complete the sense, this clause or line is available in प्र 1 as follows :—

तीर्थयात्रापरा नित्यं ये च लोकेऽघमर्षिणः ।

This additional line in प्र 1 completes the sense and also fits well with the Vedic and Purāṇic conception of Varuṇa and his devotees. The whole text of I. 46.19-20 may be given in the constituted text of the Purāṇa as follows :—

पश्चिमे पर्वतवरे वरुणस्य महापुरी ।

नाम्ना शुद्धवती पुण्या सर्वकामद्धिसंयुता ॥ १९

तत्राप्सरोगणैः सिद्धैः सेव्यमानोऽमराधिपैः ।

आस्ते स वरुणो राजा तत्र गच्छन्ति ये मुदा (or नराः) ।

| तीर्थयात्रापरा नित्यं ये च लोकेऽघमर्षिणः ॥ २०

We should thus adopt the text as it has been accepted by the manuscript-tradition of the various versions of our Purāṇa. The task of the critical editor and the text-critic should be to indicate in his adopted text the various stages of development or growth of the text, for which he has to use some suitable device as suggested above.

I have thus tried here to place before the scholars a few suggestions for dealing with the additional texts of the manuscripts in the constituted text of a Purāṇa. Comments and suggestions from scholars interested in the problem are welcome.

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST.

(JANUARY-JUNE 1970)

WORK ON THE KŪRMA PURĀṆA.

As has already been noticed, after the publication of the critical edition of the Vāmana-Purāṇa we took up the work of preparing the critical edition of the Kūrma Purāṇa. The following work has been done in this connection :

1. COLLATION OF MANUSCRIPTS.

For the purpose of constituting the text 21 Manuscripts of the Kūrma Purāṇa have been collated as shown below :—

| <i>Script</i> | <i>No. of MSS. Collated</i> |
|-------------------|---|
| Devanāgarī | 11 (Including the 3 South Indian Dev. MSS.) |
| Kashmirian (Dev.) | 1 |
| Bengali | 3 |
| Uriya 1 | 1 (Uttara-bhāga of the text only) |
| Telugu | 1 |
| Grantha | 2 (1. Grantha MS., Pūrva-bhāga of the text). |
| Malayalam | 1 |
| Nandī-Nāgarī | 1 |

With all over efforts we have not been able to procure any Śāradā, Mithila and Nevarī' MS. of the Kūrma Purāṇa.

A List of these Manuscripts with their brief details has been given in the last review in *Purāṇa* XII. 1., Jan, 1970. Besides these Manuscripts, the three printed editions, viz. Venkaṭeśvara, Bibliotheca Indica and Baṅga bāsi Press edn., have also been collated.

We are extremely grateful to the Librarian of the India Office Library, London, for promptly supplying us at our request the details of the printed editions of the Kūrma-Purāṇa and of its various parts from the India Office Library Catalogue and from other Catalogues. He has very kindly supplied us the Xerox copy of the pages in the Library's printed Catalogue listing editions of the Kūrma Purāṇa, and also copies of the title page and final colophon of each book.

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जनवरी-जून १९७०)

कूर्मपुराणसम्बन्धि कार्यम्

यथा पूर्वं सूचितं, वामनपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंस्करणस्य प्रकाशनानन्तरं कूर्मपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंस्करणस्य कार्यं प्रारब्धम् । एतत्सम्बन्धे अधोनिर्दिष्टं कार्यं संपन्नम् ।

१. हस्तलेखानां संवादकार्यम्

कूर्मपुराणस्य पाठनिर्धारणार्थमद्यावधि अधोनिर्दिष्टानां २१ हस्तलेखानां संवादकार्यं संपन्नम् ।

| लिपिः | संवादितानां हस्तलेखानां संख्या |
|-----------------------|---|
| देवनागरी | ११ (३ दक्षिणभारतीयदेवनागरीहस्तलेखाः) |
| काश्मीरी (देवनागरी) | १ |
| बंगीया | ३ |
| उडिया | १ (केवलं उत्तरभागात्मकः) |
| तेलगु | १ |
| ग्रन्थ | २ (एको ग्रन्थहस्तलेखः पूर्वभागात्मकः) |
| मलयालम | १ |
| नन्दिनागरी | १ |

प्रयत्नानन्तरमपि मैथिललिप्यां नेवारीलिप्यां शारदालिप्यां वा लिखितः एकोऽपि हस्तलेखो न प्राप्तः ।

एषां हस्तलेखानां सूची संक्षिप्तविवरणेन सहिता 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकाया गते XII. 1 (जनवरी १९७०) अङ्के प्रदत्ताऽऽसीत् । एषां हस्तलेखानाम-तिरिक्तानि त्रीणि मुद्रितानि संस्करणानि-वेङ्कटेश्वर-बिब्लियेनिका इण्डिका-बंगवासी—अपि संवादितानि ।

इण्डिया आफिस लाइब्रेरी, लण्डन पुस्तकालयाध्यक्षं प्रति वयं अतीव कृतज्ञाः स्म येन अस्मत्प्रार्थनानुसारं इण्डिया आफिस लाइब्रेरी कैटलाग (सूची) तथा अन्य सूचीग्रन्थेभ्यः कूर्मपुराणस्य तथा अस्य पुराणस्य विविधभागानां मुद्रितसंस्करणानां सूची अस्मभ्यं प्रदत्ता । तेन महाशयेन सूच्याः कूर्मपुराणस्य मुद्रितसंस्करणानां सूचकपृष्ठस्य फोटो प्रति (xeroxcopy) तथा प्रत्येकस्य कूर्मपुराणग्रन्थस्य आदिपृष्ठस्य चान्तपृष्ठस्यस्यापि च फोटो प्रतिः प्रेषिता ।

2. COLLECTION OF THE KŪRMA-PURĀṆA QUOTATIONS

The quotations from the Kūrma Purāṇa found in the various Dhārma-śāstra Nibandhas are being collected and arranged. About 30 Nibandhas have already been utilised for this purpose.

3. SUBJECT-CONCORDANCE

A Subject-Concordance of the Kūrma-Purāṇa with the other Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata is also being prepared. Up to this time the subject-concordance with the Mahābhārata, Padma, Brahmāṇḍa, Matsya, Vāmana, Vāyu, Varāha, Śiva and Skanda Purāṇas has been tentatively prepared.

4. CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT

The text of the Pūrva-Vibhāga of the Kūrma-Purāṇa has been constituted on the basis of the collated Manuscripts. The Uttara-Vibhāga has now been taken up for text-reconstruction, of which the text of the Īśvara-gītā comprising the first eleven Adhyāyas of the Uttara-Vibhāga has also been constituted.

5. PREPARATION OF THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

The Critical Apparatus giving the variants of the readings of the text is being prepared. The Critical Apparatus of the first 40 Adhs. of the Kūrma Purāṇa has already been prepared by this time. The work is ready for the Press.

OTHER WORK CONCERNING THE PURĀṆAS

Purāṇa-pāṭha and Pravacana.

According to the scheme of the pāṭha and pravacana of the Purāṇas as given in *Purāṇa*, III. 2 (July, 1961), the complete texts of the following Purāṇas were recited and discoursed:—

| <i>Purāṇa</i> | <i>Place</i> | <i>Time</i> |
|---|----------------------------|--|
| <i>Devī-Bhāgavata</i> (Recited by Pt. Hira- mani Misra and dis- courses given by Pt. T. P. Dvivedi) | Sumeru Temple, Ramnagar | Māgha, Śukla 1-9 (Feb. 7-15) |
| <i>Vāmana Purāṇa</i> (Recited by Pt. Sukha- nandan Misra and discourses given by Pt. Vishvanath Shastri Datara. | Śiva-Temple, Ramnagar | Fālguna, Krishṇa 2-13 (Feb. 23-March 5) |

२. कूर्मपुराणस्योद्धरणानां सङ्ग्रहः

विभिन्नधर्मशास्त्रनिबन्धेषूपलब्धानां कूर्मपुराणस्योद्धरणानां सङ्ग्रहस्तत्संपादनकार्यं च क्रियमाणं वर्तते । एतन्निमित्तं त्रिंशन्निबन्धग्रन्थानामुपयोगोऽद्यावधि कृतः ।

३. समानविषयाणां सूची

कूर्मपुराणस्येतरपुराणैः महाभारतेन च सह साम्यं भजतां विषयाणां सूची निर्मायमाणा वर्तते । अद्यावधि महाभारतेन, ब्रह्म ब्रह्माण्ड-मत्स्य-वामन-वायु-वाराह-शिव-स्कन्दपुराणैश्च सह साम्यमारोहतां विषयाणां सूची निर्मिता वर्तते ।

४. पाठस्य निर्धारणम्

कूर्मपुराणस्य पूर्वभागस्य पाठनिर्धारणं सम्पन्नम् । संप्रत्युत्तरभागस्य पाठनिर्धारणं क्रियमाणं वर्तते । तत्रापि ईश्वरगीतात्मकस्यैकादशाध्यायग्रन्थस्य पाठनिर्धारणकार्यं संपन्नम् ।

५. पाठसमीक्षोपकरणस्य निर्माणकार्यम्

पाठवैविध्यसूचकस्य पाठसमीक्षोपकरणस्य निर्माणकार्यं प्रारब्धम् । कूर्मपुराणस्य ४० अध्यायानां पाठवैविध्यसूचकं पाठसमीक्षोपकरणं निर्माय मुद्रणार्थं प्रस्तुतम् वर्तते ।

पुराणसम्बन्धीनीतरकार्याणि

पुराणपाठः प्रवचनं च

पुराणपत्रिकायाः III. २ (जुलाई १९६१) अङ्के सूचितायाः पुराणपाठप्रवचनपद्धत्या अनुसारमघोनिर्दिष्टानां पुराणानां पाठः तेषां प्रवचनं च कृतम् ।

| पुराणम् | स्थानम् | कालः |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| देवीभागवतम् (पाठकर्ता पं० हीरामणिमिश्रः प्रवचनकर्ता-पं० ठाकुरप्रसाद द्विवेदी) | सुमेरुमन्दिरं, रामनगरे | माघशुक्ले १-९ (फरवरी ७-१५) |
| वामनपुराणम् (पाठकर्ता-पण्डितसुखनन्दन मिश्रः प्रवचनकर्ता-पण्डितविश्वनाथ शास्त्री दातारः) | शिवमन्दिरं, रामनगरे | फाल्गुनकृष्णपक्षे २-१३ (फरवरी २३-मार्च ५) |

Veda-Pārāyaṇa

The Veda-pārāyaṇa (i.e. the recitation of the complete text of a Veda) by memory was arranged as usual during the bright fortnight of the month of Māgha, from February 7 to 21, in the Vyāsa temple of Ramnagar fort. In this pārāyaṇa the complete text of the Āśvalāyana-Śākhā of the R̥gveda with its Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyaka, texts was recited by memory by Pt. Dattatreya Guruji Kinjavadekar of Poona; the Śrotā was Pt. Ananta Rama Patavardhana. On the successful completion of the Pārāyāṇa the usual dakṣiṇā of Rs. 501 with *Ratna-Kaṅkaṇa* was given to the reciter.

SCHOLARS WHO VISITED THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT

The following scholars visited the Purāṇa Department and acquainted themselves with its work:—

1. Prof. Dr. Juan Roger Riviere, University of Madrid, Spain.—(23.1.70).
2. Sri Brijanarayana Brajesh, President, Hindu Mahasabha.—(27.1.70).
3. Prof. M. C. Dillon, Sydney, Australia.—(13.3.70).
4. Swami Ksishananand, Port Louis, Mauritius.—(3.4.70).
5. Dr. Alex Wayman, Prof. of Sanskrit, Columbia University.—(April 23, 1970).
6. Prof. Ramji Upadhyaya, Head of the Sanskrit Department, Sagar University.—(11.6.70).

All these scholars recorded their appreciation of the Purāṇa work in our 'Visitors' Book'. The copy of the latest issue of the Purāṇa was presented to them. Dr. Alex Wayman purchased the English translation of the Vāmana Purāṇa and some other publications of the Trust. He has much appreciated the work; he writes in the 'Visitors' Book—"I am most impressed by your exacting labour to critically recover India's traditions as preserved in the Purāṇas."

वेदपारायणम्

वेदपारायणम् (वेदस्यैकशाखाविशेषस्य सम्पूर्णपाठस्य कण्ठाग्रोच्चारणम्) पूर्ववदेव रामनगरदुर्गस्थे व्यासमन्दिरे माघमासस्य शुक्लपक्षे (फरवरी ७-२१) आयोजितमासीत् । एतस्मिन् पारायणे पुण्यपत्तनवास्तव्येन पं० दत्तात्रेयगुरुजी किंजवडेकरवैदिकमहोदयेन ऋग्वेदस्य आश्वलायनशाखायाः संहिताब्राह्मणोपनिषदा-रण्यकग्रन्थानां सम्पूर्णः पाठः कण्ठाग्रतया कृतः, श्रोता च पण्डितप्रवरः अनन्तराम पटवर्धन आसीत् । पारायणस्य साफल्येन पूर्णतां गते सति पारायणकर्त्रे ५०१ रूप्यकाणां नियतदक्षिणा रत्नकङ्कणयुता प्रदत्ता आसीत् ।

पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

पुराणविभागेऽधोलिखिता विद्वांसः समुपस्थिता अभवन्, अत्र सम्पाद्यमानं कार्यजातञ्च ज्ञातवन्तः—

१. प्रो. डा. ज्वॉन रोजररिविरीमहोदयः स्पेनस्य मद्रिदविश्वविद्यालयस्य । (२७.१.७० तिथ्याम्) ।
२. श्रीवृजनारायण ब्रजेशः हिन्दुमहासभायाः अध्यक्षः । (२७.१.७० तिथ्याम्) ।
३. प्रो. एम. सी. डिलोनमहाशयः आस्ट्रेलियायाः सिडनीप्रान्तस्य । (१३.३.७० तिथ्याम्) ।
४. स्वामिकृष्णानन्दमहाशयः, पोर्ट लुइस मारिशसदेशस्य । (३.४.७० तिथ्याम्) ।
५. डा. एलेक्स वेमैनमहोदयः कोलम्बियाविश्वविद्यालयस्य संस्कृत-विभागाध्यक्षः । (अप्रैलमासस्य २३ तिथौ)
६. प्रोफेसर रामजीउपाध्यायः सागरविश्वविद्यालयस्य संस्कृतविभागा-ध्यक्षः । (११.६.७० तिथ्याम्) ।

सर्वेऽमी विद्वांसः अत्रस्थसम्मतिपुस्तिकायां पुराणकार्यविषये स्वीयां संस्तुतिमलिखन् । तेभ्यः पुराणपत्रिकायाः अन्तिमोऽङ्कः समर्पितः । एलेक्स वेमैनमहानुभावस्तु वामनपुराणस्य आङ्गलभाषानुवादभागमपि अत्र प्रकाशितैरितरग्रन्थैः सह क्रीतवान् । असौ हि पुराणविभागस्य सम्पादनकार्यं बहु प्रशंसितवान्, लिखति च सम्मतिपुस्तिकायाम्—“पुराणसाहित्ये संरक्षितायाः भारतीयसंस्कृतेः समुद्धारार्थं कृतेन समुचितेन भवत्प्रयत्नेन बहुतरं प्रभावितोऽहम् ।”

ACTIVITIES OF MAHARAJA BANARAS VIDYĀ MANDIR TRUST

1. *Maṅgala-Utsava*

To keep alive the tradition of the old Ganges Fair of Ramnagar called the Buḍhavā-maṅgala, a Maṅgala-Utsava is celebrated in the Ramnagar Fort every year for two days sometime after the Holi festival under the auspices of the Maharaja Banaras Vidyā-Mandir Trust in the form of the śāstrīya (classical) music and dance. This year the Maṅgala-Utsava was celebrated on the 31st March and 1st April at night from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. The teachers and students of the Music College of the Banaras Hindu University gave a performance of classical music on the first day and on the second day Prof. Krishna Murti of the Music College (B. H. U.) gave a performance of the Bharata-dance along with his wife and young daughter of about eight years old. A number of prominent persons of Ramnagar and Varanasi attended. The performance was much appreciated as it also served the purpose of a healthy cultural entertainment.

2. *Yavāgrayāṇa-iṣṭi*

This *iṣṭi* or yajña is performed when the *yava* or barley harvest is reaped by cultivators. This year this *iṣṭi* was performed in the Ramanagar Fort under the auspices of the Maharaja Banaras Vidyā Mandir Trust on the *Pūrṇimā* of the month of Chaitra (April 21, 1970). The same yajamāna and the priests as mentioned in *Purāṇa* (XI. 1, p., 186) performed this *iṣṭi*. His Highness Maharaja Kashinaresh and the Brahmachārins of the Vidyā Mandir Pāṭhaśālā attended the *iṣṭi*. The staff of the Purāṇa Department and other local scholars also attended the function. The dakṣiṇā was given in kind.

DISTINGUISHED GUESTS AT THE NADESAR HOUSE

| | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 1. | Smt. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India | 13.1.70 |
| 2. | Dr. Juan Roger Rivierc, Modrid, Spain | 25.1.70 |
| 3. | Sri H. B. Bhide, Nagpur | 27.1.70 |
| 4. | Sri Braj Narain Brajesh | 27.1.70 |

महाराजवनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य कार्याणि

मङ्गलोत्सवः

परम्परागतगङ्गामहोत्सवस्य 'बुढवामङ्गल' इति ख्यातस्य परम्परोज्जीवनाय एको महोत्सवः शास्त्रीयसङ्गीत-नृत्यादिमयः महाराजवनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य संरक्षकतायां रामनगरदुर्गे प्रत्येकवर्षे होलिकानन्तरं दिनद्वयं प्रचलति । अस्मिन् वर्षेऽयं मङ्गलोत्सवो मार्चमासस्य ३१ तिथ्याः प्रारभ्य अप्रैलमासस्य १ तिथौ यावत् रात्रौ सप्तवादनान्नव वादनं यावत् सम्पन्नोऽभूत् । प्रथमे दिवसे काशीहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयीयसंगीतमहाविद्यालयस्य शिक्षकशिक्षार्थिजनैः शास्त्रीयसंगीतस्य कार्यक्रम आयोजितः । द्वितीये दिवसे तु काशीहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य संगीतमहाविद्यालयीय प्राध्यापकेनापि श्रीकृष्णमूर्तिमहोदयेन नृत्यं सम्पादितम् यस्मिन् तस्य महोदयस्य पत्नी अष्टवर्षीया बालिका च सम्मिलिते आस्ताम् । रामनगरस्य वाराणस्याश्च निवासिनः प्रमुखा जनाः तत्रोपस्थिता अभवन् । उत्सवोऽयमत्यन्तमेव प्रशंसनीयोऽभूत्, यतोऽयं महत्त्वपूर्णः सांस्कृतिको महोत्सवः प्रसिद्धः ।

यवाग्रयणेष्टिः

इष्टिरेषा कृषकाणां यवादेः लवनावसरे इज्यते । एतस्मिन् वर्षे यज्ञोऽयं महाराजवनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य संरक्षकतायां रामनगरदुर्गे चैत्रपूर्णिमायां सम्पन्नः ।

अस्मिन् यज्ञेऽपि यजमानपुरोहिताः पुराणपत्रिकायां (X.1.1.P.186) निर्दिष्टा जना एवाभवन् । महाराजाः काशिनरेशमहाभागाः विद्यामन्दिरपाठशालायाः ब्रह्मचारिणश्चात्रोपस्थिता आसन् । पुराणविभागस्य विद्वांसः स्थानीयाश्चापरे विद्वांसः तत्रोपस्थिता आसन् । दक्षिणापि धान्यरूपेण यज्ञकर्तृभ्यो दत्ताऽसीत् ।

नन्देश्वरभवने विशिष्टा अतिथयः

१. श्रीमती इन्दिरागान्धी, प्रधानमन्त्री—१३.१.७०
२. डा० जुआन रोजर रिविरिः, माद्रिद वि०वि०, स्पेनदेशः—२५.१.७०
३. श्री. ह. भा. भिडे, नागपुरवास्तव्यः—२७.१.७०
४. श्री ब्रजनारायण ब्रजेशः—२७.१.७०

| | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 5. | Their Majesties the King and Queen of Belgiam | 1.2.70 |
| 6. | H.H. Maharaja Dr. Karan Singh, Minister for Tourism of Govt. of India | 1.2,70 |
| 7. | Justice K. B. Asthana, Allahabad | 7.2.70 |
| 8. | Sri Morarji Desai | 8 2.70 |
| 9. | Justice Sudhir Mullick | |
| 10. | Justice S.K. Varma, Allahabad | 6.3 70 |
| 11. | Sri Satya Narain Sinha, Minister, Govt. of India | 10 3.70 |
| 12. | Sri P. A. Devitre, Chief Agent, Central Bank of India | 19.3.70 |
| 13. | Sri Jagdish K. Munshi, Bombay | 4.4.70 |
| 14. | Air Marshal O.P. Mehra, Deputy Chief of Airstaff | 8.4.70 |
| 15. | Shri Jagjivan Ram, Defence Minister, Govt. of India | |

५. बेल्जियमदेशस्य महाराजः महारानी च-१.२.७०
६. महाराज डा० कर्णसिंहः केन्द्रियसरकारस्य पर्यटनमन्त्री-१.२.७०
७. न्यायाधीशः के. बी. अस्थाना, प्रयाग-७.२.७०
८. श्री मोरारजी देसाई-८.२.७०
९. न्यायाधीशः सुधीर मल्लिकः, प्रयाग
१०. न्यायाधीशः एस. के. वर्मा, प्रयाग-६.३.७०
११. श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह, केन्द्रियमन्त्री-१०.३.७०
१२. श्री पी. ए. देवित्रे, सेन्ट्रलबैंक आफ इण्डिया, इत्यस्य चीफ एजेण्ट,
पदभोक्-१९.३.७०
१३. श्री जगदीश के. मुन्शी, बम्बई-४.४.७०
१४. एयरमार्शल ओ. पी. मेहरा, डेपुटी चीफ, एयरस्टाफ-८.४.७०
१५. श्री जगजीवनरामः, केन्द्रिय रक्षा मन्त्री

पुराणरत्नानि

यथा प्रकाशतमसोः सम्बन्धो नोपपद्यते ।
तद्ब्रह्मैक्यं न सम्बन्धः प्रपञ्च-परमात्मनोः ॥
छायातपौ यथा लोके परस्परविलक्षणौ ।
तद्वत् प्रपञ्च-पुरुषौ विभिन्नौ परमार्थतः ॥
यद्यात्मा मलिनोऽस्वच्छो विकारी स्यात् स्वरूपतः ।
न हि तस्य भवेन्मुक्तिर्जन्मान्तरशतैरपि ॥
पश्यन्ति मुनयो मुक्ताः स्वात्मानं परमार्थतः ।
विकारहीनं निर्द्वन्द्वमानन्दात्मानमव्ययम् ॥
अहं कर्ता सुखी दुःखी कृशः स्थूलेति या मतिः ।
सा चाहङ्कारःकर्तृत्वादात्मन्यारोपिता जनैः ॥
वदन्ति वेदविद्वांसः साक्षिणं प्रकृतेः परम् ।
भोक्तारमक्षरं बुद्धं सर्वत्र समवस्थितम् ॥
तस्मादज्ञानमूलो हि संसारः सर्वदेहिनाम् ।
अज्ञानादन्यथा ज्ञानात् तत्त्वं प्रकृतिसङ्गतम् ॥
नित्योदितं स्वयंज्योतिः सर्वगः पुरुषः परः ।
अहङ्काराविवेकेन कर्ताहमिति मन्यते ॥
पश्यन्ति ऋषयोऽव्यक्तं नित्यं सदसदात्मकम् ।
प्रधानं प्रकृतिं बुद्धेः कारणं ब्रह्मवादिनः ॥
तेनायं सङ्गतः स्वात्मा कूटस्थोऽपि निरञ्जनः ।
स्वात्मानमक्षरं ब्रह्म तावबुध्येत तत्त्वतः ॥
अनात्मन्यात्मविज्ञानं तस्माद् दुःखं तथेरितम् ।
रागद्वेषादयो दोषा सर्वे भ्रान्तिनिबन्धनाः ॥

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 :—

1. Dr. Raghunath Singh, M.A., Ph.D., LL.B.; Varanasi.

Trustees nominated by the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh :—

3. Panditaraja Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid; Principal Sāṅgaveda
Vidyālaya, Varanasi.
4. Pt. Kamalapati Tripathi; President, Uttar Pradesh Congress
Committee.

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. Maharaj-kumar 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 'Purāna' Bulletin has been started by the Purāna Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust with the aim of organising the manifold studies relating to the Purānas. 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 Purānas. The editors invite contributions from all those scholars who are interested in the culture of the Purāna 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, Varanasi |
| 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), L. Sternbach, United Nations (New York), A. S. Gupta (Editor-in-Charge) (Purāna Deptt, 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.