Vol. XVIII, No. 1] [January, 1976

पुराणम्

PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

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

VASANTA-PAÑCAMĪ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT, RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Subs.—Inland Rs. 30 Foreign £ 3·00

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.

Authors are requested to use standard system of transliteration and phonetic spellings when writing Sanskrit words in Roman letters. They are also requested to preferrably use Devanāgarī letters for Sanskrit ślokas and prose passages.

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. XVIII., No. 1] वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्कः [February 5, 1976

लेखसूची–Contents

वाराही-स्तोत्रम्

(From the MS. No. 3973/246 deposited in the Kashiraj Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍāra, Ramnagar).

॥ श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॥

ॐ अस्य श्रीवशीकरणवाराहीमन्त्रस्य भगवान् शिव ऋषिः अनुष्टुप्छंदः ॥ वशीकरणवाराही देवता ॥ ऐं बीजं, क्लीं शक्तिः, क्लौं कीलकं ॥ मम समस्तराजमंडलवश्यार्थे वाराहीप्रीत्यर्थे स्तोत्रपाठजपे विनियोगः ॥ अथ न्यासः ॥ ॐ शिवऋषये नमः शिरसि, अनुष्टुप्छंदसे नमः मुखे, ॐ वाराहीदेवतायै नमः हृदि, ऐं बीजाय नमः नाभौ, ॐ क्लीं शक्तये नमः गुह्ये, ॐ क्लौं कीलकाय नमः सर्वाङ्गे ॥

अथ ध्यानम्

रक्तामश्वाधिरूढां नवशशियुतां भालनेत्रां च दोष्णा
पाशाबद्धां मदनविवशां साध्यमाश्वासयन्तीम् ।
दक्षेणोद्यत्कनकरचितां वेत्रयष्टीं दधानाम्
बन्धूकाभां मनसि कलये पीनवक्षोजनम्राम् ॥

अथ स्तुतिः

अश्वारूढे रक्तवर्णे स्मितसौम्यमुखाम्बुजे ।
राजस्त्री सर्वजन्तूनां वशीकरणनायिके ॥१

वशीकरणकार्यार्थं पुरा देवेन निर्मिते ।
तस्मादवश्यं वाराही(हि ?) सर्वान्मे वशमानय ॥२

यथा राजा महान् ग्रामान् वस्त्रधान्यमहापशून् ।
मह्यं ददाति वाराही(हि ?) राजानं वशमानय ॥३

अन्तर्बहिश्च मनसि व्यापारेषु सभासु च ।
सत्वरं वनदुर्गेषु तथा वश्यं तमानय ॥
यथा मामेव स्मरति तथा देवि वशं कुरु ॥४

मन्मथस्मरणाद्रामा याति रन्तुं मया सह ।
स्त्रीरत्नेषु महत्प्रेम तथा जनय कामदे ॥५

मृगपश्वादयः सर्वे मां दृष्ट्वा प्रेमवीक्षिताः ।
अनुगच्छन्ति मामेव त्वत्प्रसादात् तथा कुरु ॥६

वशीकरणकार्यार्थं यत्र यत्र प्रयुज्यसे ।
संमोहनार्थं वर्द्धित्वा तत्कार्यं तत्र कर्षय ॥७

वशमस्तीति चात्रैव वश्यं कार्येषु दृश्यते ।
तथा मां कुरु वाराही (हि ?) वश्यं सर्वं प्रदर्शय ॥८

वशीकरणबाणास्त्रं भक्तानामनिवारितम् ।
तस्मादवश्यं वाराही (हि ?) जगत्सर्वं वशीकुरु ॥९

वश्यस्तोत्रमिदं देव्यास्त्रिसंध्यं यः पठेन्नरः ।
सोभीष्टं वशयेत्सर्वं रामां राज्यमथापि वा ॥१०

इति श्रीवशीकरणवाराहीस्तोत्रं संपूर्णम् ॥

Note

There are two manuscripts of the *Vārāhī Stotra* deposited in the Kashiraj Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍāra, Fort, Ramnagar, Varanasi—the one No. 3973/246 from wnich the above *stotra* has been taken and the other Ms. is No. 3974/26 which differs a little from the former. Both contain four folios each and their size is 13.5×10 cm., having 6 lines per page. The *stuti* in both the MSS. contain 10 ślokas each. The variants in the latter Ms. are as follows :—

In the beginning there is no mention of *Ṛṣi, Chandas* and *Devatā*, nor of the *Bīja, Śakti* and *Kīlaka*. It does not contain *Nyāsa* also nor any *Viniyoga*. The *Dhyāna* is the same in both the *stotra*. This MS. does not contain ślokas 3 and 4c-d of our *stuti*. It also does not contain śloka 8 of the *stuti* quoted above. It also contains the following additional śloka after Śl. 4 of our *stuti* :—

चामरान् दोलिकाछत्रं राजचिह्नानिमिच्छतु (?)
अभीष्टसंपदो राज्यं तथा देवि वशं कुरु ॥

The former MS. (No. 3973/246) names the *Devatā* of the *stuti* as *Vaśīkaraṇa-Vārāhī Devatā* or simply *Vārāhī Devatā*, but the MS. No. 3974/246 names the *Devatā* as *Vārāhī Devatā* only and gives the colophon as—श्रीवाराहीदेवतास्तोत्रं सम्पूर्णम् ॥ अश्वारूढार्पणमस्तु ॥ The epithets of the *Vārāhīdevatā* as *raktā* (red-coloured) and *aśvārūḍhā* (riding on a horse) are specially to be marked here. The MS. 3974 is rather corrupt in many of its readings.

Besides these two Mss. Aufrecht in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* notices two more Mss. of the *Vārāhī-stotra*, the one as a part or chapter of the *Rudra-yāmala-tantra*, named as *Vārāhī-stotra*, Oudh XVII, 104 and the other as *Vārāhī-stotra* Govt. Or. Libr. Madras 83. Besides, there is a *Vārāhī-sahasranāma-stotra* from the *uḍḍāmara-tantra*, Stein 228. Thus the *Vārāhī-stuti's* or *Vārāhī-stotra's* all belong to the *Tantra* literature.

In the *Brahma-vaivarta-purāṇa* Goddess Prithivī is also called Vārāhī and the female Energy of God Varāha (an incarnation of Viṣṇu) is also named as Vārāhī. Goddess Vārāhī as the female Energy of God Varāha is counted as one of the eight or nine *Mātṛkās* or Mother Goddesses as the female Energies (*Śaktis*) of the

principal Gods as mentioned in the *Devī-Māhātmya* of the *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* and also in the *Vāmana* and other Purāṇas. Here in the *stuti* given above Goddess Vārāhī as the female Energy of God Vārāha is eulogised mainly for the purpose of *vaśīkaraṇa* (overcoming or subjecting by charm and incantations). She is purely a *Tāntrika* Goddess here made to serve the lower purpose of life. The *stuti* is Tāntrika as it is preceded by the mention of *bīja*, *śakti* and *Kīlaka* and by *nyāsa* and *dhyāna*. The eulogiser wishes to bring into his subjugation the whole world from the king to the animal and the physical world by the grace of Vārāhī. In his opinion Goddess Vārāhī has been created by God for the sake of *vaśīkaraṇa* and he hopes that the Goddess eulogised with her *stuti* would bring the whole worl d under his subjugation:

वशीकरणकार्यार्थं पुरा देवेन निर्मिता ।
तस्मादवश्यं वाराही (हि ?) सर्वान् मे वशमानय ।।१

वशीकरणवाणास्त्रं भक्तानामनिवारितम् ।
तस्मादवश्यं वाराही (हि ?) जगत् सर्वं वशीकुरु ।।२

Vaśīkaraṇa, *sammohana*, *māraṇa*, *uccāṭana* etc. are the purposes for which the *Tāntrika* worship or *stuti* is mainly resorted to. The present *Vārāhī-stuti* is also no exception to the general *Tāntrika* rites. The eulogiser here has no concern with achieving the moral qualities elevating the soul or getting the heaven or the salvation. In this respect the *Vārāhī stuti* as given here may be regarded as not very inspiring from the moral, ethical or spiritual point of view. However, it gives a good idea of a *Tāntrika stuti* which may be put to a purely material and less refined use, although there are Tāntrika *stutis* which serve the purpose of bestowing on the worshippers *bhukti* and *mukti* both.

—**Anand Swarup Gupta**

A NOTE ON THE COMPOUND *PAÑCALAKṢAṆA* IN AMARASIṆHA'S *NĀMALIṄGĀNUŚĀSANA*

By

STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे विदुषा लेखकेन अमरसिंहकृते नामलिङ्गानुशासने नाम कोशे प्रोक्तस्य 'पञ्चलक्षणम्' इति पुराणपर्यायस्य सोपपत्तिकं पर्यालोचनं कृतम् । प्रायः सर्वैरेव विद्वद्भिः 'पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम्' इति वाक्ये प्रयुक्तस्य 'पञ्चलक्षणम्' पदस्य द्विगुगर्भितबहुव्रीहित्वमेव स्वीकृतम् । परन्तु पुराणस्य पञ्चलक्षणानि तु अमरसिंहेन स्वकोशे नोक्तानि, अष्टसु पुराणेष्वेव इमानि पञ्चलक्षणानि निर्दिष्टानि, तान्याधारीकृत्य च खीष्टैकादशशताब्द्याम् अमरकोशटीकाकारेण क्षीरस्वामिनाऽप्युक्तानि । परन्तु पुराणेषु पञ्चलक्षणातिरिक्ता अन्याऽपि पुरातनी सामग्री प्राप्यते । विदुषा लेखकेन समासे 'लक्षण' इत्युत्तरपदस्य कुत्र कुत्र कस्मिन् कस्मिश्चार्थे प्रयोगो वर्त्तते, समासे संख्यावाचकस्य समानाधिकरणपूर्वपदस्य चापि कुत्र कुत्र प्रयोगो वर्त्तते इत्यर्थं बहूनां संस्कृतपालिजैनप्राकृतग्रन्थानां निर्देशान् संगृह्य प्रदर्शितं यद् 'लक्षण' शब्दस्तु समासे characteristics (विषयाः) इत्यर्थे न कुत्रापि निर्दिष्टम् । लेखकस्य मते 'पञ्चलक्षण' इत्यस्य पञ्चलक्षणानि (विषयाः) यस्मिन् यस्य वा इति परम्पराप्राप्तोऽर्थस्तु न समीचीनः, परन्तु पञ्च विभिन्नानि वर्णनानि यस्मिन्नित्यर्थ एव युक्तः, पञ्च वर्णनीयविषयाश्च—इतिहासः, आन्वीक्षिकी, दण्डनीतिः, आख्यायिका, पुराणं चेति ।]

1.1. The compound *pañcalakṣaṇa* given in definition for *purāṇa* by Amarasiṃha in his *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* is generally taken to be a *bahuvrīhi* on a *dvigu* meaning 'that having five characteristics.'[1] See, for example, M. Winternitz, who wrote in his *History of Sanskrit Literature* that "every Purāṇa is *to have 'five characteristics'* (*pañcalakṣaṇa*) *i.e.* it is to treat five subjects [italics mine]."[2] Or see H.H. Wilson's preface to his translation of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* where he wrote that "the lexicon of Amara Siṃha gives as a synonym of Purāṇa, *Pañcha-lakṣaṇam*, 'that which has five characteristic topics."[3]

1.2. In giving this definition both scholars mainly were following H.T. Colebrooke. Colebrooke appears to have known the

term mainly from Amarsiṇha's lexicon, perhaps as explained by *paṇḍits*. In 1803 he wrote :

> Every *Purānā* [*sic*] *treats of five subjects* [italics mine] : the creation of the universe, its progress, and the renovation of worlds; the genealogy of gods and heroes; chronology, according to a fabulous system; and heroick history, containing the achievements of demi-gods and heroes. Since each *Purānā* contains a cosmology with mythological and heroick history, the works which bear that title may not unaptly be compared to the Grecian Theogonies.[4]

In his edition of the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* Colebrooke corrected this statement a bit—in all probability still without ever having seen a *purāṇa* text—and glossed the term *purāṇa* :

> Or theogony, comprising past and future events, under five heads : the creation; the destruction and renovation of worlds; genealogy of gods and heroes; the reigns of *Manus*; and the transactions of their descendants.[5]

Colebrooke never stated his authorities for these lists.

1.3. The five characteristics are never stated by Amarasiṇha, it is to be noted. They are listed for the first time in the *purāṇas* themselves—*Matsyapurāṇa* 54.65, *Śivamahāpurāṇa* 7[1]1.41 *Kūrmapurāṇa* 1.1.12, *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* 1[1].1.37-38, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 3.6.25 (in a variant form, without using the term *pañcalakṣaṇa*), etc.[6] Also to be noted is that only eight of the eighteen *mahāpurāṇas* list these characteristics.

1.4. The first datable occurrences of the listing are given by Amarasiṇha's earliest extant commentator, Kṣīrasvāmin, *circa* 11th century A. D., in his *Amarakośodghāṭana*, and by Hemacandra, *circa* 11th-12th century A. D., in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi*.

1.5. Al-Bīrūnī, *circa* 10th-11th century A. D., in his *Kitāb fītahqīq mā li'l-hind*, or *Ta' rīkh al-hind*, written early in the 11th century, does not note this list. Though he quotes extensively from *purāṇas* in various sections of his book, Al-Bīrūnī confines his discussion of *purāṇa* as a literary genre to giving two variant listings of the eighteen *purāṇas*, prefaced by the statement :

> As to the Purāṇas, we first mention that the word means *first, eternal.* There are eighteen Purāṇas, most of them called by the names of animals, human or angelic beings, because they contain stories about them, or because the contents of the book refer in some way to them, or because the book consists of answers which the creature whose name forms the title of the book has given to certain questions.[7]

This is, perhaps, of significance with regard to the prevalence of the definition of *purāṇa* as 'that having five characteristics' at the time of the earliest datable occurrences of it, as one would expect Al-Bīrūnī to have noted a systematization of such a sort. Or it may indicate that Al-Bīrūnī, or possibly the *paṇḍits* with whom Al-Bīrūnī had contact, did not credit this definition with having much validity and therefore did not report it.

1.6. It should also be noted that certain *purāṇas* appear to have felt uneasy with the definition 'that having five characteristics.' They introduce a new definition of *purāṇa, daśalakṣaṇa,* and relegate *pañcalakṣaṇa* to be a definition of *upapurāṇa.*[8]

1.7. Modern scholars, as well, have felt uneasy with the definition of a *purāṇa* as *pañcalakṣaṇa.* H. H. Wilson, for example, in his preface to his translation of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa,* wrote.

> Such, at any rate, were the constituent and characteristic portions of a Purāṇa in the days of Amara Siṃha, fifty-six years before the Christian era[9]; and if the Purāṇas had undergone no change since his time, such we would expect to find them still. Do they conform to this description ? Not exactly in any one instance; to some it is utterly inapplicable; to others it only partially applies. There is not one to which it belongs so entirely as to the Vishṇu Purāṇa, and it is one of the circumstances which gives to this work a more authentic character than most of its fellows can pretend to. Yet even in this instance we have a book upon the institutes of society and obsequial rites interposed between the Manvantaras and the genealogies of princes, and a life a Kṛshṇa separating the latter from account of the end of the world, besides the insertion of various legends of a manifestly popular and sectarial character. No doubt many of the Purāṇas, as they are

now, correspond with the view which Vans Kennedy takes of their purport. "I cannot discover in them," he remarks, "any other object than that of religious instruction." The description of the earth and of the planetary system, and the lists of royal races which occur in them, he asserts to be "evidently extraneous, and not essential circumstances, as they are entirely omitted in some Purāṇas, and very concisely illustrated in others; while on the contrary, in all the Purāṇas some or other of the leading principles, rites, and observances of the Hindu religion are fully dwelt upon, ... " (*Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology*, p. 153 and note). Now, however accurate this description may be of the Purāṇas as they are, it is clear that it does not apply to what they were when they were synonymously designated as Paṇcha—lakṣhaṇas, or 'treatises on five topics;' not one of which five is ever specified by text or comment to be "religious instruction."[10]

And M. Winternitz wrote :

> That our present Purāṇas are not the ancient works themselves which bore this title, can already be deduced from the fact that, in content, none of them agrees with the definition of the term Purāṇa given in themselves. According to this certainly very old definition, every Purāṇa is to have "five characteristics" (pañcalakṣaṇa) *i. e.* it is to treat five subjects : ... These five things only partly form the contents handed down to us; some contain much more than what is included in the "five characteristics," while others scarcely touch upon these subjects, but deal with quite different things. What is especially significant of almost all our Purāṇas, their *sectarian* character, *i. e.* their being dedicated to the cult of some god or other, of Viṣṇu or Śiva, is completely ignored by the old definition.[11]

1.8. A general tendency has been to assume that the *pañcalakṣaṇa* of the various *purāṇas* go back to a single original *purāṇa*[12] or that they go back to an old nucleus,[13] or that our modern *purāṇas* go back to a number of distinct and separate books—titled '*purāṇa*'—which dealt originally with *pañcalakṣaṇa* only and of which there may have been more or less than the traditional

eighteen.[14] Everything other than the original *pañcalakṣaṇa* material is supposed to be later accretion.

1.9. These positions are maintained despite the fact that there is found in our extant *purāṇas* material which does not fall within the limits of the definition *pañcalakṣaṇa* but which is nevertheless old.[15] It also is maintained despite the fact that the similarity between our extant *purāṇas* and Buddhist Mahāyāna literature, demonstrated so well by Winternitz, extends to topics included in the *pañcalakṣaṇa* scheme and therefore may be part of the same development rather than reflect an old nucleus.[16]

1.10. Modern scholars have felt themselves to be constrained by this definition, however. Winternitz wrote, "It [this certainly very old definition] is found in the more important Purāṇas, also in the ancient Indian lexicon, the Amarakośa, as well as in other lexicons."[17] And Wilson wrote, "...there is no disputing evidence to the like effect afforded by other and unquestionable authority. The description given by Colebrooke (*As. Res.* vol. VII, p. 202) of the contents of a Purāṇa is taken from Sanskrit writers. The Lexicon of Amara Siṃha gives as a synonym of Purāṇa, *Pañchalakṣaṇam*, 'that which has five characteristic topics:, and there is no difference of opinion amongst the scholiasts as to what these are. They are, as Colebrooke mentions,..."[18]

1.11. And yet the fact remains that the oldest demonstrable occurrence of the compound *pañcalakṣaṇa* is in the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* of Amarasiṃha, and that it is given there without definition. There are no earlier citations for the compound *pañcalakṣaṇa*. Its occurrence in a number of *purāṇas* must be omitted from our considerations due to the difficulty of dating the various passages in these texts. What M. Winternitz wrote of the difficulties involved in the dating of sections, or even verses, of the *Mahābhārata* is equally true, if not more so, with regard to the *purāṇas*.[19] In addition, there is the problem with regard to the *purāṇas* that a passage common to several texts might just as easily argue for a late date of composition and subsequent insertion as for an early date of composition with subsequent preservation in several independent sources.

1.12 In short, the strategy of modern scholars has been to hypothesize a species of text of which we have no example in order

to bring the data into accord with a detailed definition the date of which cannot be ascertained, and to hypothesize on the basis of flimsy evidence that this detailed definition has a greater antiquity than is perhaps justified. At the same time, this has forced scholars of *purāṇa* to turn their attention away from material in the extant texts which is demonstrably old, and exclude it from belonging originally to early *purāṇa* on the grounds that it does not fall within this detailed definition.

2.1. The answer to our thorny problem, therefore, would appear to be a philological investigation focused on determining how the word *lakṣaṇa* behaves when it is the second member of a compound, so as to attempt to determine how Amarasiṇha was using the term. At the same time, an investigation into the occurrence of a number as the first member of a compound in apposition to the second member is in order as we cannot rule out the possibility offhand that Amarasiṇha was writing an appositional *bahuvrīhi* once we leave behind our standard interpretation of *pañcalakṣaṇa*. As it has often been asserted that Amarasiṇha was influenced by Buddhism, or by Jainism, or was a Buddhist or a Jain, the investigation of these points must be extended from Sanskrit to Pāli, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and Prakrit as well. The nature of the existing Prakrit lexicographical sources, however, prevents me from carrying the investigation in this latter direction.[20] In order to carry out the initial portion of this investigation I have utilized M. Monier-Williams *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, new ed. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899); T. W. Rhys Davids and W. Stede, *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary* (London : Luzac and Company, 1966) and F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, v. 2 : *Dictionary* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1953). I have also consulted Vishva Bandhu, ed., *A Vedic Word-Concordance*, 5 vols., *The Shantakuti Vedic Series* (Lahore : V. V. R. Institute, 1942-65):[21] Derivatives ending in—*ā* and—*ī* were included in the compilation of data.

3.0. The following is an account of the results based on the Sanskrit data collected.

3.1.0. Number°+°*lakṣaṇa*. Omitting the compound in question in its usage in question, Monier-Williams notes six compounds containing a number as their prior member followed by

°*lakṣaṇa*. These demonstrate four different usages of the word °*lakṣaṇa*.

3.1.1.1. *dvilakṣaṇa* (*Mānavadharmaśāstra* 7.163), defined as 'twofold, or of two kinds.' G. Bühler translates the term as 'having two descriptions.'[22] The emphasis, from an examination of the context, is that there exist 'two different types' of a specific thing. The compound is a *bahuvrīhi* on a *dvigu*.

3.1.1.2. Related to this is the compound *daśalakṣaṇaka* (*Mānavadharmaśāstra* 6.91 and 94). The import and usage is the same as for *dvilakṣaṇa* above.

3.1.2. *pañcalakṣaṇa-vidhi*, m N. of a wk.; *pañcalakṣaṇī*, f. N. of sev. wks. (also *-kroḍa*, m., *-ṭīkā*, f., *-prakāśa*, m., *-viveka* n., °*ṇy-anugama*, m.). These are titles of commentaries on the first section of the chapter in Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi* which treats *anumāna*. The term is used simply to mean 'definition.' The compound is a *dvigu*. See 3 3.3 below. This meaning is also given by C. Kunhan Raja for *caturdaśalakṣaṇī*, i. e. 'fourteen definitions,' in his preface to M. Santanam Aiyar's edition to the *Caturdaśalakṣaṇī* of Gadādhara.[23] This, also, is a commentary on a section of the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. A variant of *caturdaśalakṣaṇī*, *caturdaśalakṣaṇa*, occurs as the title of one of the several texts which go by this name or by the name *caturdaśalakṣaṇī*° plus another term as the final member of the compound.[24]

3.1.3. *daśalakṣaṇī*, f. '10 chapters,' N. of Kaṇāda's Sūtras (*Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* 10.8); *dvādaśalakṣaṇī*, f.=°*śādhyāyī*=N. of Jaimini's *Mīmāṇsā* (consisting of 12 *adhyāyas*); *ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇa*, n. the Sūtra of Jaimini (consisting of 16 *adhyāyas*), (*Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*). The equation between °*lakṣaṇa*/-*ṇī* = *adhyāya* would appear to be fairly well set here. This may be real, being related to the usage of °*lakṣaṇa* as the final member of a compound in the titles of chapters, discussed below under 3.3.1.1-6. Or this may be in appearance only, being due to a usage of °*lakṣaṇa* discussed below in 3.3.3. when treating the term as the final member of compounds which are titles of philosophical treatises, and to the fact that each such *lakṣaṇa*, as defined below in 3.3.3, may comprise one chapter. From this latter vantage, the usage here may be closely related to that discussed immediately above under 3.1.2.

3.1.4. *saptalakṣaṇa*, n. N. of various wks.; *-bhāṣya*, n. N. of a wk. The term °*lakṣaṇa* here refers to treatise, the title referring collectively to seven *vaidika* phonetic treatises of modern origin, but derived from older sources.[25] See 3.3.2. below with regard to titles.

3.1.5. The *Vedic Word Concordance* lists *anekaśatalakṣaṇa* as occurring in *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 52.16.5. The compound here is found in a phrase referring to the totality of the *grahas*, the sons of the *grahas* and certain of the *pitṛs*: "...*eṣa kārtsnyena kīrtitaḥ/ anekaśatasāhasra anekaśatalakṣaṇaḥ*." Considering both the context and the parallelism between the word *sāhasra*, 'thousand-fold,' and the usage of °*lakṣaṇa* in *Mānavadharmaśāstra* 7.163 noted above under 3.1.1.1, it would appear that here °*lakṣaṇa* is used to mean '(different) ways;' that is, the subject was praised an innumerable hundred thousand number of times and an innumerable hundred (different) ways. As such, the compound would be a *bahuvrīhi* on a *dvigu*.

3.1.6. It is to be noted that with the exceptions of 3.1.1.1-2 and 3.1.5, all cited usages of the combinations are in titles of works.

3.2.0. Monier-Williams lists fifty-eight compounds which are not noted to be titles of works or sections of works, the second member of which is °*lakṣaṇa*/-*ṇā*. In calculating this total I have differentiated between compounds which are constructed from the same members but which members enter into composition differently in different citations. I have not differentiated between compounds which are constructed of the same members which remain in the same compositional relationship, though with different meanings in different contexts or according to different authorities. In noting below whether a compound appears with citation or without citation, I have counted a compound as appearing with citation if it so appears in even one of its occurrences. By 'without citation,' I mean terms with lexical citation only, terms coming from Wilson, Apte, or Monier-Williams without other citation, or terms with no citation given whatsoever in either Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* or in O. Böhtlingk and R. Roth, *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*, 7 vols. (1855-75; rpt. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966).[26] Interestingly, only one of the compounds given comes from the Vedic corpus. The *Vedic Word Concordance* lists one hundred and

thirty-six compounds having ^{0}*lakṣaṇa* as their last member and seventeen having ^{0}*lakṣaṇā* as their last member.[27] The vast majority of these compounds, however, are to be found in the *Vedāṅga* literature. This literature is defined very broadly in the *Vedic Word Concordance*, it must be noted, so as to include much literature which is not properly in Vedic Sanskrit. The *Brāhmaṇa* volumes, 2nd ed. (1973), the only volumes for which the frequency of ^{0}*lakṣaṇa* as the final member of a compound in the Vedic literature proper can be checked with facility does list eight compounds ending in ^{0}*lakṣaṇa*, however

3.2.1. *Dvandva.* Böhtlingk and Roth note of one term, *avyaktalakṣaṇa*, the possibility that it is a *dvandva.* The standard interpretation, and that accepted by Monier-Williams, is that the compound is a *bahuvrīhi* on a *karmadhāraya*, and as such, it is included in the count below under 3.2.3. The compound is with citation, occurring in the *Śivanāmasahasra.*

3.2.2. *Karmadhāraya.* Only one compound might be categorized as a *karmadhāraya*, with the note that the compound is cited as being the prior member of a larger compound only. This is *sarvalakṣaṇa*^{0}, glossed as meaning 'all suspicious marks.' Monier-Williams notes it as occurring in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa, khaṇḍa* 2. Böhtlingk and Roth do not note the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* reference, but note the compound as being followed by ^{0}*yuktatā* in *Rāmāyaṇa* 5.45.16, and as being followed by ^{0}*saṃpanna* in A. F. Weber, *Ueber die Kṛṣṇajanmāṣṭamī.*[28]

3.2.3. *Bahuvrīhi* on *Karmadhāraya.* Eleven compounds might be categorized as *Bahuvrīhis* on *karmadhārayas.* Of these, eight are with citation, three without. See 3.2.1 above.

3.2.4. Appositional *Bahuvrīhi.* Twenty compounds might be categorized as appositional *bahuvrīhis.* Of these, fifteen are with citation, five without. This compound is by far the one which is most frequently entered into by ^{0}*lakṣaṇa* if we consider only those occurrences with citation. See 3.2.5 and 3.2.7 below.

3.2.5. *Tatpuruṣa.* Sixteen compounds might be categorized as *tatpuruṣas.* Of these, three are with citation, thirteen without. Of those without citation, I can readily find citation for one in three sources. This would bring the count to four with citation, twelve without. The large number of compounds in this grouping

without citation prohibits us from considering this to be a very active method of placing *°lakṣaṇa* in composition in the literature *per se*, as cited in Monier-Williams' *Dictionary*. As is noted below in 3.3.1.1-3.3.3, its occurrence is very frequent with regard to the formation of titles of works and chapters, however. Also to be noted is that those compounds ending in *°lakṣaṇa* which are listed in the *Vedic Word Concordance*, and for which I have checked the context—most of these occurring in the *Vedāṅgas*, defined broadly, as mentioned above under 3.2.0—indicate a greater frequency of *tatpuruṣas* in the literature than the evidence from Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* would lead us to suspect. One should note, however, that appositional *bahuvrīhis* are also of great frequency, and that frequently, even in the same work, the same compound might be construed as a *tatpuruṣa* in some contexts and as a appositional *bahuvrīhi* in other contexts. See, for example, *Mīmāṇsāsūtras* 5.1.1 and 6.3.33 where *śrutilakṣaṇa* appears as a *tatpuruṣa* and 6.4.7 where the same compound appears as an appositional *bahuvrīhi*. When we add to this point the consideration that in the same work *vidhilakṣaṇa* (*Mīmāṇsāsūtras* 9.2.3) appears as an appositional *bahuvrīhi*, we are led to the conclusion that there may have been a greater freedom of composition in the *Vedāṅga* literature, broadly defined, and in Vedic literature that in the classical Sanskrit literature cited by Monier-Williams. See 3.2.6 below. This in not to state, though, that this literature was not following strictures which can be discerned through examination by some one for whom the sources are available.

3.2.6. *Bahuvrīhi* on *Tatpuruṣa*. One compound, *uttaralakṣaṇa*, defined as 'marked on the left side,' might be categorized as a *bahuvrīhi* on a *tatpuruṣa*. This is the one Vedic citation in our list. It comes from *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra* 16.7.13. Its uniqueness in the list supports the supposition advanced above under 3.2.5.

3.2.7. *Tatpuruṣa* or Appositional *Bahuvrīhi*. Occasionally it happens that a compound may be construed as either a *tatpuruṣa* or an appositional *bahuvrīhi*, depending on whether the prior member is seen to be a part of a larger whole, or is itself the whole which is the subject of the relationship. One example of such a situation, from the material in the *Vedic Word Concordance* was given above under 3.2.5. An example of such a situation from Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* exists with the compound *tallakṣaṇa*, n., an

appositional *bahuvrīhi* in *Lalitavistara* 12.165, for instance, meaning 'a particularly high number' and frequently a *tatpuruṣa*, as in Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* 21.2, meaning 'a sign of it.' (This compound, incidentally, is listed in the *Vedic Word Concordance.)* The only way in which to determine what the situation is in such cases, given ambiguous definitions, is to check the context. There are nine compounds, however, all without citation, on which I prefer not to make hasty judgement. These include such compounds as *vāyulakṣaṇa*, n. 'the character or property of air (viz. touch),' and other compounds which other Sanskritists might classify more readily as *tatpuruṣas*.

3.2.8. In the majority of these examples, the term °*lakṣaṇa* is used with its basic meaning of 'characteristic.' There are instances where this is not the case, however. For example, see A. F. R. Hoernle, *The Prākṛta-Lakshaṇam, or Chaṇḍa's Grammar of the Ancient (Ārsha) Prākṛt*, where Hoernle quotes Kedāra Bhaṭṭa as referring to '*prākṛtalakshaṇam*' which Hoernle translates—correctly, I think—as 'a Prākrit rule.'[29] The compound is a *tatpuruṣa*. While the definition here still falls within the sphere of the term *lakṣaṇa's* derivational meaning of 'that which characterizes something,' its usage would appear to require a more natural definition. Among the material collected from Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* I have come across only two examples of such a situation in which the natural definition appears to require a meaning other than simply 'characteristic' when the term is the second member of a compound, these being those reported above under 3.1.1.1-2. This excludes those instances in which the term functions as the second or final member of a title of a work or chapter.

3.3.0.1. Monier-Williams lists one hundred and seven titles of works ending in °*lakṣaṇa* or containing °*lakṣaṇa* before a word indicating that the work is a commentary. This count does not include those works listed above under 3.1.2-4 which contain numbers as the prior member of their compounds. To these one hundred and seven titles T. Aufrecht, in his *Catalogus Catalogorum*, lists at least twenty-six additional titles which must have been missed by Monier-Williams' assistants.[30] A number of the titles are used by more than one author for the titles of their texts. Of the total one hundred and thirty-three titles, by far the largest number, sixty-six, are *Nyāya* texts. For the remaining texts, utilizing the

categories used by Aufrecht (abbreviations Aufrecht's), we get; *Vedānta*, 7; *Dharma*, 6; *Tantr*, 4; *Śilpa*, 4; *Sv*, 4; *Vaid*, 3; *Taitt*, 3; *Med*, 3; *Archit*, 3; *Yv*, 2; *Gr*, 2; *Jy*, 2; *palmistry*, 2; *Yoga*, 1; *Nīti*, 1; *Alaṅk*, 1; *Music*, 1; *An*, 1; *on the forms of idols*, 1; *on precious stones*, 1; *on weapons*, 1; *on marks of royalty, etc.*, 1; "*rubbish*" or "*nonsense*", 2; with nine texts not categorized. Two of the texts listed by Monier-Williams are not listed by Aufrecht.

3.3.0.2. This calculation does not include in it the names of sections of larger texts. Monier-Williams lists only thirteen of these titles. They are much more numerous, however, as will be seen immediately below in 3.3.1.1-6.

3.3.0.3. While it might be argued that it is not particularly germane to see how the term °*lakṣaṇa* is used as the final member of a compound in titles, its usage in titles the first member of which is a number makes it germane. This is particularly the case when one considers the lexical implications of these usages, as can be seen above in 3.1.2-4.

3.3.1.0. First we will consider °*lakṣaṇa* as the final member of a compound in the name for a chapter of a work.

3.3.1.1. Three works use °*lakṣaṇa* as a chapter title so frequently, that it would appear to be in the same class of words as °*nirṇaya*, °*nirūpaṇa*, etc. These texts are the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* (eighteen out of eighty-seven titles), Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* (thirty-four out of ninety-five titles, with twelve chapters untitled) and the *Purāṇasarvasva* (thirty-two out of far more than two hundred titles). To a lesser extent, the term also appears frequently as the final member of a compound constituting a title in the *Kātyāyanapariśiṣṭa* (three out of eighteen titles). The force of the term appears to be 'description', 'the characteristic of,' in the latter case, with the term 'characteristic' being understood to represent several characteristics as a group or, more strictly speaking in derivational terms, 'that which characterizes..... . It does not appear to be of so generalized a force as to be freely substituted by a term such as *adhyāya*, though in the *Kātyāyanapariśiṣṭa* the juxtaposition of terms with which it is found as the final member of compounds in the names of other chapters of the work—*sūtra* (two times), *saṃkhyā* (two times), *kalpasūtra* (one time), *pariśiṣṭa* (one time), *vyūha* (one

time), *śāstra* (one time), with the remaining five sections not having final members or standard final members—would appear to indicate that the line of distinction between these terms was a fine one.

3.3.1.2. T. Aufrecht, in his Bodleian Library catalog, lists two other works which, though they do not use *°lakṣaṇa* frequently as the final member of title of chapters, juxtapose this term with others which are so standard that they appear to be utilizing this usage of the term.[31] These are the *Śārṅgadharasaṃhitā* (no. 748) and, perhaps more doubtfully, Kṛṣṇānanda's *Tantrasāra* (no. 149).

3.3.1.3. In some texts, the context of the title as used in the section of the text given, indicates either the force of a title of a chapter, or the usage of the term *°lakṣaṇa* in its sense as 'treatise' (see 3.1.4 above, and 3.3.2 below). Such an example occurs in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (no. 566, p. 235b). Such would also appear to be the case from the statement given from the *Agnipurāṇa* (no. 42, fol. 414b): *aśvādilakṣaṇaṃ vakṣye śālihotro yathāvadat.*

3.3.1.4. Other works which use *°lakṣaṇa* as the final member of a compound in the title of a chapter, as reported in the Index of Aufrecht's Bodleian Library catalog appear to be so few, and to use the word so sporadically, that it seems to be used in its sense of 'characteristic/description' without the force of being a term which marks off a specific unit of text. Some of these texts are the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* (no. 75), the *Prāyaścittaviveka* (no. 660), and perhaps the *Śāktānandataraṅgiṇī* (no. 159).

3.3.1.5. In several texts, the title, or colophon, places the word *lakṣaṇa* in the plural and/or separates it from its prior members by spelling out the case relationships. This would appear to indicate that, to the authors of the colophons of these texts, the topic of the chapter could not be described by usage of *°lakṣaṇa* in the singular. This might indicate a limit as to how much could be described under *°lakṣaṇa*. Or perhaps it might indicate that to the authors of the colophons, normal composition with *°lakṣaṇa* in the singular might have overtones which they were trying to avoid or might involve awkward composition. Examples of this occur in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (nos. 215, 216) and in the *Bhāvaprakāśa* (no. 743). In the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* we find amidst a list of titles which are compounds in the main, *paśūnām lakṣaṇāni cikitsā ca.* In the *Bhāvaprakāśa* we find *gṛhītagarbhāyā lakṣaṇam, putragarbhavatyā lakṣaṇam* and *vyādher lakṣaṇam*, but *garbhalakṣaṇam.*

3.3.1.6. In one instance, in the *Kathārṇava* (no. 328), the colophonic phrase '*atha kathakalakṣaṇam*, is used to mark off a section of text lauding the author and describing the exalted situation in which the author wrote the text. Here the term may be used to mean simply 'statement about...,' or may have the force of '(good) characteristic of...'

3.3.2.0. We will now consider °*lakṣaṇa* as the final member of a compound meaning 'description, exposition, treatise' in the name of a text.

3.3.2.1. Of those works in the list compiled from Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* and expanded on from the *Catalogus Catalogorum*, several titles stand out as indicating that perhaps the restricted meaning of 'characteristic' is inappropriate in signifying the nature of the work, and that perhaps the terms 'description,' 'treatise' or 'exposition' are more appropriate as the works are of a far-ranging, all-inclusive nature with regard to their topics.[32] Some of the titles which would appear to indicate this state of affairs are *Śastralakṣaṇa*, *Ratnalakṣaṇa* and *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa*. One of these, the *Prākṛtalakṣaṇa*, has been published by Hoernle, as cited above, and is a grammar of an entire Prakrit language. In a strict derivational sense, 'that which characterizes...' would be possible as a meaning. In a more natural sense, 'description,' 'treatise' or 'exposition' on Prakrit is called for as a translation. Hoernle gives no translation af the title in his text, though he does subtitle the edition '*Chaṇḍa's Grammar of the Ancient (Ārsha) Prākṛit*'. That it is the more natural sense which is called for is indicated by the title *Saptalakṣaṇa*, '7 treatises,' discussed above under 3.1.4. Also, this is indicated by the inclusion of *Vilaṅghyalakṣaṇa* one of these treatises, appearing in full title with °*lakṣaṇa* as its final member, in the *Catalogus Catalogorum*. It is indicated also by the existence of other texts on Vedic linguistic points, such as *Dhātulakṣaṇa* and *Sāmalakṣaṇa* which, by analogy, are in all probability using the term °*lakṣaṇa* in this same manner, as 'treatise.'

3.3.3.0. Lastly, we will consider °*lakṣaṇa* and °*lakṣaṇa*° as used in the titles of philosophical texts.

3.3.3.1. By far the largest number of texts using °*lakṣaṇa* in their titles are philosophical texts. Here, with only a few exceptions which are appositional *bahuvrīhis* functioning as technical

terms such as *jñānalakṣaṇa,* defined by B. Tarka-Vedāntatīrtha and J. C. Tarkatīrtha as "a special type of conjunction in which there is seeing an object and simultaneous remembrance of its qualities,"[33] the term is used, most usually in commentaries, in a technical sense to indicate an extended definition of the term which is the first member of the compound and includes a number of points above and beyond a simple definition, or simple statement of characteristics of the term in question. Rājendralāla Mitra often refers to such texts as expositions on the first member of the compound, or on a certain person's treatment of the first member of the compound.[34] As the definition of the term is technical, though clearly fulfilling the derivational meaning of the term, it is probably best left untranslated-though 'exposition' would fit well. This usage of the term °*lakṣaṇa,* however, is probably not directly related to that note above under 3.3.2. Its usage here probably has an independent origin grounded in the main aspect of a *lakṣaṇa,* which is a *lakṣaṇa* in its sense of simple definition. It is this simple sense of *lakṣaṇa* which is meant in *Pañcalakṣaṇī* and the attendant commentaries noted above in 3.1.2.

3.4.0. Next we will consider numbers in apposition to the second member of a compound. The possibility that the compound *pañcalakṣaṇa* may be an oppositional *bahuvrīhi,* plus the high frequency with which the term °*lakṣaṇa* enters into composition with prior members as an appositional *bahuvrīhi* in textual material, as opposed to titles, makes it incumbent on us to investigate the occurrence of this phenomenon. Monier-Williams cites this as occurring only eighty-four times out of a very much larger number of entries for numbers as the first members of compounds.

3.4.1. Of the total number of eighty-four occurrences, thirty-four are Vedic only; eleven are first cited as occurring in the *vedasaṃhitās* in the Vedic corpus, seven as first occurring in the *brāhmaṇas* and sixteen as first occurring in the *vedāṅgas.* To be noted is that there are no such occurrences cited for the *upaniṣads.*

3.4.2. Of the remainder of occurrences, fifty-five, eight are cited as occurring first in Vedic literature and later in classical Sanskrit as well. Twenty-five are first cited as occurring in classical Sanskrit, without Vedic precedents. Eighteen are given lexicographic citations only, and four are given no citations whatsoever either by Monier-Williams or by Böhtlingk and Roth.

3.4.3. Of the classical citations only, totalling thirty-three, fifteen—with five having Vedic citations—are from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Harivaṇśa,* and from the *Rāmāyaṇa.* This leaves open the possibility that these occurrences may reflect archaisms preserved in these texts. Five are from the *Mānavadharmaśāstra,* three with Vedic citations—one from the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* and two from the *Gautamadharmaśāstra.* This again indicates that perhaps these occurrences reflect archaisms. Three of the citations are from Pāṇini, all without Vedic precedents. Six are from the works of Kālidāsa, only one having a Vedic citation; and four are from Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṃhitā,* one with a Vedic citation.

4.0. The following is an account of the Pali data collected.

4.1.1. Rhys Davids and Stede list forty-one terms with *⁰lakkhaṇa* used as the final member of a compound.

4.1.2. Of these, sixteen are used to indicate types of fortume telling, mainly from *Dīghanikāya* 1.9, and are either appositional *bahuvrīhis* or *tatpuruṣas,* depending on whether one takes *lakkhaṇa* to mean 'physical signs or characteristics,' or whether one gives to it what appears to have been an extended meaning of 'fortune telling from physical signs or characteristics.'[35]

4.1.3. Of the remaining occurrences, two are *dvigus—tilakkhaṇa,* 'the three properties of existing things or of the phenominal world;' and *dvattiṇsalakkhaṇa,* 'the thirty-two bodily marks of a *mahāpurisa*;' five are *karmadhārayas*; one is a *bahuvrīhi* on a *karmadhāraya*; thirteen are appositional *bahuvrīhis*; and four are *tatpuruṣas,* with one of these being used in one context as a *bahuvrīhi* on a *tatpuruṣa.* In short, the high frequency with regard to *⁰lakkhaṇa* entering into composition as an appositional *bahuvrīhi* is in keeping with the Sanskrit data collected. The low frequency of occurrences of the word in composition as the final member of a *tatpuruṣa* in literature is also in accord with the Sanskrit data *with* citations. The *dvigus* are of a form for which there does not appear to be comparable data from Sanskrit in that they appear to enter into composition with primary meanings having no other overtones. With regard to this, however, note the observation under 4.3 below.

4.2. With regard to numbers as the first members of compounds in apposition to the second, only one occurrence is cited out of a fairly large number of compounds having numbers as their

first members—though not as large a listing as that given by Monier-Williams, it must be noted. This demonstrates a concord between Pali and classical Sanskrit, as opposed to Vedic Sanskrit.

4.3. In general, the semantic connotation of the term *lakkhaṇa* is far more physical and concrete than its usage in Sanskrit. It signifies physical signs, characteristics, marks. This is, it must be emphasized, a generalization only. But it holds true for most examples collected, including the two *dvigus* cited above under 4.1.3. It also appears to have taken on the meaning, as noted above under 4.1.2 of fortune telling from physical signs. It is noted together with *āthabbana, supina* and *nakkhatta* in the *Suttanipāta* commentary, *Paramatthajotikā* II, all these terms apparently having taken on such meanings of an extended nature.[36] Interestingly, this same text interprets the compound *lakkhaṇamanta*, found in the *Suttanipāta*, as '*lakkhaṇāni ca vedā ca.*' Rhys Davids and Stede, whose interpretation is scientifically founded, interpret the compound as a *tatpuruṣa*, 'the secret science of bodily marks.' The very standard usage in this text of *lakkhaṇa* in the sense of bodily marks or fortune telling from physical signs, in addition to the context of this phrase, makes it unlikely that the text is referring here to anything other than fortune telling, though the juxtaposition of *lakkhaṇa* to *veda* makes the theory that it is an ancillary literature which is meant here attractive, but unsupportable by parallel and contextual evidence.

5.1.1. The number of occurrences of °*lakṣaṇa* as the final or second member of a compound cited by Edgerton is minimal. The word is given in composition twelve times, four of these being in the names of Buddhas. Of the remaining eight textual occurrences, there is disagreement between authorities cited for two of these—in one case it is a decision between a *dvandva* and a *tatpuruṣa*, in the other between a *tatpuruṣa* and an appositional *bahuvrīhi*. Of the remaining six cases, one is a *bahuvrīhi* on a *karmadhāraya*, three are appositional *bahuvrīhis*, one is a *tatpuruṣa*, and two are *dvigus*. Of the latter, one of the compounds is *dvātriṇśallakṣaṇa*° (or *dvātriṇśalakṣaṇa*°), 'the thirty-two bodily marks of a *mahāpuruṣa*.' This is in keeping with the Pali data. The other is *aṣṭalakṣaṇa*, and is used in reference to eight different components of *vijñāna*.[37] This usage is in keeping with that in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* and the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* noted above under 3.1.1.1-2 and 3.1.5.

Of the four names, one is a *dvigu*, one is a *bahuvrīhi* on a *karmadhāraya*, one is a *tatpuruṣa*, and one might be an appositional *bahuvrīhi*. The *dvigu* is *varalakṣaṇaśrī*, or *varalakṣaṇaśiri*, in the *Gaṇḍavyūha*.

5.1.2. Little can be determined for our purposes from data which is so sparce, and which is open to a number of interpretations. The *dvigus*, however, do indicate both standard Pali usage noted aboved under 4.1.3 and 4.3 and what was apparently a very standard Sanskrit usage of °*lakṣaṇa* to indicate a number of different things, the occurrence of which was noted in the treatment of the Sanskrit data. Of note is that the general run of the definitions given by Edgerton for *lakṣaṇa* is in accord with the observation noted above under 4.3 for Pali.

5.2. With regard to numbers as the prior members of compounds in apposition to second members, so few examples of numbers in composition are given that, again, nothing can be determined.

6.0.1. Now that we have examined how °*lakṣaṇa* is used in the literature—as far as can be determined from dictionaries and manuscript catalogs, let us proceed to apply this information. Let us examine the several possibilities offered us by this information with regard to the specific usage of °*lakṣaṇa* in the compound *pañcalakṣaṇa* as in Amarasiṇha's *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*.

6.0.2. The printed editions which I have been able to examine all agree in the main as to the text for the section the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* in which this term appears.[38] The differences which do exist are with regard to a few points in *saṃdhi*, to an inclusion or omission of the word *ca* prior to *abhidhānaṃ* in vs. 8a, with regard to the numbering of the verses—Colebrooke and Deslongchamps standing together in considering vs. 2 to consist of two *pādas* only and thereby throwing off concord between their editions and everyone else's, and with regard to the numbering of the *Vāgvarga*, the *varga* in which the relevant section of text appears, as being 5 or 6. Which of these latter occurs as the case depends on whether the *Vyomavarga* and *Digvarga* are taken separately as *vargas* 2 and 3, as is done in most of the editions cited, or together as *varga* 2, as is done by Colebrooke and Deslongchamps. (Sardesai and Padhye make a compromise. They separate the *vargas*, but give them both the same number. Therefore the *Vāgvarga* comes out as *varga* 5.)

6.0.3. I will, therefore, accept the text as it stands for the present analysis, and utilize with regard to the correct readings for *saṃdhi* and the inclusion or exclusion of *ca* in vs. 8a the text as given by Ramanathan.

6.0.4. The section of text with which we are concerned, given in its wider framework, is as follows:

brāhmī tu bhāratī bhāṣā gīr vāg vāṇī sarasvatī |
vyāhāra uktir lapitaṃ bhāṣitaṃ vacanaṃ vacaḥ |1|

apabhraṇśo 'paśabdaḥ syāc chāstre śabdas tu vācakaḥ |
tiñsubantacayo vākyaṃ kriyā vā kārakānvitā |2|

śrutiḥ strī veda āmnāyas trayī dharmas tu tadvidhiḥ |
striyām ṛk sāmayajuṣī iti vedās trayas trayī |3|

śikṣetyādi śruter aṅgam oṃkāraprapaṇavau samau |
itihāsaḥ purāvṛttam udāttādyās trayaḥ svarāḥ |4|

ānvīksikī daṇḍanītis tarkavidyārthaśāstrayoḥ |
ākhyāyikopalabdhārthā purāṇaṃ pañcalaksaṇaṃ|5|

prabandhakalpanā kathā pravalhikā prahelikā|
smṛtis tu dharmasaṃhitā samāhṛtis tu saṃgrahaḥ|6|

samasyā tu samāsārthā kiṃvadantī janaśrutiḥ|
vārtā pravṛttir vṛttānta udantaḥ syād athāhvayaḥ|7|

ākhyāhve abhidhānaṃ ca nāmadheyaṃ ca nāma ca|

6.1. The first point which must be made with regard to our standard interpretation of the term pañcalakṣaṇa is that there are no parallel examples to it in Sanskrit. Semantically, °*lakṣaṇa* cannot be taken to mean 'characteristic' as it is presently understood in our definition of "the five *lakṣaṇas.*" See above, 3.1.1.1 to 3.1.6.

6.2. In order to find anything like a parallel example for such a usage we must turn to Pali. To interpret our term according to Pali usage at this time, however, without first examining the Sanskrit possibilities would be hasty and imprudent. It would defeat the purpose of our inquiry before it started in that it would have us accept a definition of *purāṇa* which, as pointed out at the beginning of this paper, is not and does not appear to have ever been applicable. Aside from these objections, there are difficulties with the interpretation that the compound is the result of Pali usage. These will be discussed in due course under 7.1 below.

6.3. The first of our viable Sanskrit alternatives is that the term is an appositional *bahuvrīhi*. Such an interpretation would be in keeping with the high frequency of occurrence of °*lakṣaṇa* as the final member of such compounds. This would give us a meaning, 'that which has five as its characteristic'. The most logical way in which this could be interpreted is that it is a statement asserting the place of *purāṇa* as the fifth *veda*. This is a claim made in the *purāṇas* themselves,[39] in earlier Sanskrit literature[40] and in the *Mahābhārata*, where it is made—though indirectly only—alongside the claim that *ākhyāna* is the fifth *veda*, that *itihāsa* is the fifth *veda* and that the *Mahābhārata* itself is the fifth *veda*.[41]

6.4.0. There are problems with this interpretation, however.

6.4.1. There intervenes between the listing of the three *vedas* and the noting of *purāṇa* a long list of terms: *aṅga*, *oṃkāra*, *itihāsa*, *svaras*, *daṇḍanīti*, *ānvīkṣikī* and *ākhyāyikā*. A supportable explanation must be advanced for the placement of this material here if we are to be able to interpret Amarasiṇha as stating, through use of the compound *pañcalakṣaṇa*, that *purāṇa* is the fifth *veda*. That the fourth *veda*, should we understand this to be the *Atharvaveda*, is not mentioned ought not bother us since, as was pointed out by Winternitz, mention of this text is often omitted.[42]

6.4.2. The place of the fourth *veda* may be represented here by *aṅga*. See, for example, *Dīghanikāya* 3.3 where various *aṅgas* are mentioned after reference to the three *vedas* and before reference to *itihāsa* as the fifth *veda*. T. W. Rhys Davids supplies here, in his translation, reference to these *aṅgas* taking the place of 'the fourth.'[43] Should such a situation be the case here, then *itihāsa* is the term which is in prime placement for our interpreting it to have been considered the fifth *veda* by Amarasiṇha. It has in Sanskrit literature as equal a claim to this designation as does the term *purāṇa*.[44] Further, Amarasiṇha almost appears to have marked off *itihāsa* as something special since he places before it the term *oṃkāra* and after it the term *svaras*. Neither of these are a type of text or literature, generally speaking, yet they appear in a section of a list which is basically of types of texts or literatures. Their placement here appears to be unexplainable unless we take them as marking off *itihāsa*, and perhaps separating it from what follows. With regard to *oṃkāra*, however, see 6.5.2. and 6.6.2 below.

6.4.3. We appear to have no evidence for the existence of a possible linguistic transformation of the sentence *purāṇaṃ pañcalakṣaṇam* to *purāṇaṃ pañcamavedaḥ*. Those compounds listed in the *Vedic Word Concordance* which might possibly have yielded some support for this transformation—*ṛgyajuḥsāmalakṣaṇa*, *aṅgalakṣaṇa*, *vidhilakṣaṇa*, and *śrutilakṣaṇa*—have not yielded, as for as the sources have been available to me for checking the citations given, any positive results.

6.4.4. There is no parallel in the Sanskrit material we have cited above for a number in apposition to *°lakṣaṇa*. Further, numbers generally were not in apposition to the second members of compounds in classical Sanskrit, with the few exceptions cited above which appear from their textual distribution to have been in most cases holdovers from Vedic Sanskrit. This means that in order to make an interpretation of *pañcalakṣaṇa* as an appositional bahuvrīhi plausable we must demonstrate that Amarasiṇha was drawing on a Vedic source for his material. The only way in which to do this is to find parallels to his entire listing in Vedic material, or in earlier classical material which was demonstrating such holdovers in the usage of numbers in apposition to the second member of a compound.

6.5.1. A compilation of such listings, together with a few others which will be useful for comparative purposes, is given in Table I. As can be seen, the lists form somewhat of a continuum. There is, however, an apparent break between those lists preceding the *Arthaśāstra* and that of the *Arthaśāstra* together with those following it, up to the Buddhist material. This break is marked by the insertion in the lists of *udāharaṇa/ānvīkṣikī* and *arthaśāstra/daṇḍanīti*. One continuity between the two major groupings of lists which is not evident from the listings themselves is that all except one in the second grouping, and several in the first grouping, are concerned with the responsibilities of a king. The disjunctive feature is that those in the first grouping are concerned with the king in his sacerdotal capacities, whereas in the second, with a partial exception in the case of that in Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, are concerned with what a king should know. The hearing of *itihāsas*, it is to be noted, is regarded as part of the daily task of a king according to *Arthaśāstra* 1.5. As can be seen, *purāṇa* is subsumed under *itihāsa* in the *Arthaśāstra* list.

6.5.2. It is in this second grouping that we find parallels for Amarasiṇha's listing. These items, as stated in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*, the *Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra* and the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* are normally cited as *vidyās* enjoined on a king. Monier-Williams notes that "according to some there are four Vidyās or sciences..., and Manu vii, 43 adds a fifth, viz. *ātma-vidyā*, knowledge of soul or spiritual truth."[45] Actually, the usage of the word "adds" by Monier-Williams in this place is misleading in that it gives the impression that this is a very old list. All citations for it that I have been able to find postdate the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*. It should also be evident from Table I that the inclusion of *ātmavidyā* has well-founded precedent, going back to an earlier alternation in the listings between *brahman/brāhmaṇas/vākovākya*. One very interesting point in the second grouping is that the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, which is supposed to have drawn on earlier sources, notes in the verse preceding mention of the four *vidyās* that the king should support citizens who create illusions *(māyā)*, who perform magic or sorcery *(indrajāla)*, who perform deception or trickery *(kuha)*, and who know song *(gāndharva)*, writing *(lekhya)*, the science of computation *(gaṇitā)*, and shooting or archery *(astra)*; and in the verse after that he should maintain envoys *(dūta)*, bards *(kavi)*, fools *(bāla)*, and eunuchs *(napuṇsaka)*. The first of these verses appears to show a continuity with the listings given from the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* and the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, and to a lesser extent the *Taittirīyāraṇyaka*; while the second, particularly through its mention of bards, displays a continuity with the end of the listings given from the *Atharvaveda* and the *Taittirīyāraṇyaka*.

6.5.3. From this we may conclude that there are Vedic and early post-Vedic sources which reflect the listing given by Amarasiṇha. To be noted is that both the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* and the *Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra* contain three of the terms used by Amarasiṇha in his listing. Also to be noted is that the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* is one of the classical sources which uses numbers in apposition to the second member of a compound. (See 3.4.)

6.6 0. We do find in these lists, however, another possibility for the signification of *pañcalakṣaṇa* which bases itself on the usage of a number plus °*lakṣaṇa* in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* and in the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* as twofold, tenfold and an inumerable hundredfold.

6.6.1. Perhaps in using the term *pañcalakṣaṇa*—which we would translate in this usage as 'fivefold,' or as 'of five different types'—Amarasiṇha was noting that he was listing the different constituent elements of *purāṇa* which had been given in part by the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* and the *Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra* as vidyās, and which had been given by the *Arthaśāstra*, in a variant listing, as a definition of *itihāsa*.

6.6.2. The difficulty here is that the list given by Amarasiṇha appears to contain only four items : *itihāsa*, marked off perhaps as the fifth *veda* —as noted above, *ānvīkṣikī*, *daṇḍanīti*, and *ākhāyikā*. What could be the fifth item ? It could be *aṅga*, but this would be unlikely. See 6.4.2 above with regard to the probability that *aṅga* is being used here in the place of the fourth *veda*. If it is taking the place of the fourth *veda*, then it cannot be a constituent part of *purāṇa*. It could be *vārtā* in its sense of profession, which would have to be omitted from Amarasiṇha's listing here as he is treating *vāc* in this *varga*, and *vārtā* in this sense is not *vāc*. However, Amarasiṇha does mention *vārtā* in vs. 7c, though in its meaning of 'news,' but perhaps punningly as well in its meaning of profession. (See 8.1.1 below). It could be *oṃkāra* or the *praṇava*. As is always the case, these are equated with one another by Amarasiṇha. This would refer back most directly to the *ātmavidyā* of the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* and the *rahasyavid* and *daivajña* of the *Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra*. This, too, would be unsatisfactory as there is a qualitative difference between a knowledge of *ātman* or *rahasya* or *daiva* and an element of that knowledge, or perhaps part of a means to that knowledge. It might be in keeping with the placement of *brahman* in these lists, however. Or it might even be *svaras*, which are also the name given to a group of *sāmans* beginning with the *udātta* accent. Were this the case, it would help us a great deal with an explanation as to why *svaras* should be placed here. There is, however, no parallel for this in any of the other listings. Also, the specific mentioning of exactly three *svaras* beginning with the *udātta* accent makes this unlikely.

6. 6. 3. The most likely possibility, however, is that it is *purāṇa* itself which is the fifth item, with *purāṇa* being used as both a specific item and general category. '*Purāṇa* consists of both itself and the preceding four items,' would be the general gist.

6.6.4. Support for this comes from the *Arthaśāstra* where one of the constituent elements of *itihāsa* is given as *itivṛtta*, which is Amarsiṇha's definition of *itihāsa*. By this interpretation we would have Amarasiṇha doing to *purāṇa* what Kauṭilya did to *itihāsa;* specifically, define it as one of its own constituent elements. With regard to this see also Winternitz, who remarked that "the Indians are not consistent in their use of the expressions *ākhyāna, itihāsa and purāṇa* for they sometimes use them as synonyms, but at other times to mean various kinds of narratives."[46]

6.6.5. Support for this also comes from *Mahābhārata* 1.1.14 where there is reference to the meritorious stories attached to *purāṇa* which are *dharmasaṃśrita*, or concerned with duty; and from *Mahābhārata* 1.1.15-18 where the *itihāsa Bhārata* is called *purāṇa*, and is said to be *sūkṣmārthanyāyayukta*, or filled with trifling matters and the universal rules (which they go back to), *granthārthasaṃyuta*, or consisting of 'form' and meaning, and *nānāśāstropabṛṃhita*, or increased by various *śāstras*.[47] (Interestingly, P. C. Roy interprets *granthārthasaṃyuta* to mean that "it includeth the subjects of other books."[48])

6.7. Another of the Sanskrit possibilities, which we ought not dismiss offhand, is that the term *pañcalakṣaṇa* refers to something having five chapters which are called *lakṣaṇas*. On the surface, this interpretation might fit well with the standard interpretation of *pañcalakṣaṇa*, provided it could be demonstrated that each *lakṣaṇa* restricted to a chapter. The difficulty with this is that we would again be looking not only for texts which contain just the five *lakṣaṇas* of our standard definition, but for texts which are just five chapters in length. Again, as has been done in the past, we would be creating for ourselves new, unattested tests. One way out of this difficulty is to apply the observation that by stating that a text contains five *lakṣaṇas* we need not be stating necessarily that a text contains only these five items. Rather, we would be stating that these are the five major items that the text contains.[49] The real fly in the ointment here, though, is that not all the standard *lakṣaṇas* are *lakṣaṇas* in the usage we are discussing. Genealogies would not be contained in *lakṣaṇas* in the demonstrated usage of the term. We may, therefore, rule out this possibility.

6.8. The last viable Sanskrit alternative is that *pañcalakṣaṇa* means 'five treatises.' Should we take treatise to mean a specific

text, as we are obliged to do, we place ourselves in the same situation as just described with regard to chapters. Here, however, we would probably have to arrive at the conclusion that the five treatises are Ur-texts—one on *daṇḍanīti*, one on *ānvīkṣikī* etc. The difficulty here is that we probably cannot maintain defensibly that we have an Ur-*ākhyāyikā*. If we maintain that our Ur-texts are one on each of the standardly defined "five characteristics," we not only place ourselves in the difficulty of taking the compound *pañcalakṣaṇa* in two different ways, as 'stated' in different sources, but as noted above, we are placing ourselves in the position of looking for texts which are unattested.

7.1. If we might turn to the Pali data briefly, we must note with regard to it the lexical implications of the term *lakkhaṇa* in Pali. That the form of composition, as noted above in 4.1, would be in concord with the manner in which °*lakṣaṇa* is placed in composition in our standard interpretation of *pañcalakṣaṇa* is true, but the lexical connotations of the term are not in accord with our standard "five characteristics." It would be unlikely that one aspect of the usage of the term °*lakkhaṇa* would be transferred to Amarasiṇha's Sanskrit and not the other as well.

8.1. With regard to the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit data, we might note that it is open generally to the same observations as just made about the Pali data. The *dvigus*, we might add, fall in line partly with our Pali data and partly, in the case of one compound, bolster one of our interpretations of the Sanskrit data that given above under 6.6.0—6.6.5.

9.1.1. Thus we return to the Sanskrit evidence, which provides us with two possible alternatives, each not without problems :

(a) Amarasiṇha is marking off *purāṇa* as the fifth *veda*.

(b) Amarasiṇha is listing five types of texts, or five items each different from the other, which are components of *purāṇa*.

9.1.2. We are also presented with a third possibility which depends on the extent to which Amarasiṇha was a Sanskrit stylist, and proof of which depends on a demonstration that he does similar elsewhere :

(c) Amarasiṇha is stating both (a) and (b).

9.1.3. The evidence for the second alternative (b) I see to be airly convincing as it involves parallelism of usage of the term *lakṣaṇa* with other material; as it involves parallelism between his isting and those in other texts; and as it would explain why *itihāsa* and *purāṇa*, which are usually placed together or one after the other in either order, are separated from one another here by so many other terms which offhand appear to be unrelated.[50] This would depend to some extent, however, on Amarasiṇha's having been a Sanskrit stylist. And if this is the case, then (c) is also a viable alternative : Amarasiṇha could be punning. While marking off *itihāsa* as the fifth *veda*, he could also be marking off *purāṇa*, which is so often alternated with it or which is included with it as the fifth *veda*, as also being the fifth *veda*, perhaps in its entirety. Support for this would come from *Arthaśāstra* 1.3, where it is stated that '*sāmargyajurvedās trayas trayī/atharvavedetihāsavedau ca vedāḥ*.' In our interpretation of *pañcalakṣaṇa* as (b) Amarasiṇha is, as is noted in 6.6.4 above, 'turning the table' on the *Arthaśāstra* and, instead of defining *itihāsa* as a group of things which includes itself, is probably defining *purāṇa* as a group of things which includes itself. From this we can conclude that anything the *Arthaśāstra* says about *itihāsa* would be equally applicable, in Amarasinha's terminology, to *purāṇa*.

10.1.0 We must look, therefore, to the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* to see if it displays any signs of stylism. From working with the passage cited above in 6.0.4 alone, we can judge that there is a very strong possibility of a ruling in the affirmative on this point.

10.1.1. One point indicating this is the derivational meanings of various of the terms given in definition for *āhvaya*, 'name', in vss. 7d-8ab. For example, notice the juxtaposition of *ākhyā*, 'a name'- but also 'something called out, 'to *āhvā* immediately following it- also 'a name,' but also, more strictly speaking, 'something invoked, or which summons.' The juxtaposition is between a word which indicates that a name is something you direct at someone and a word which indicates that a name is something which is used to direct someone to you.

10.1.2 Another point, along the same lines, is the dictionary meanings for the names of the goddesses equated with Sarasvatī in vs. lab. On the one hand, in the traditional interpretation

of the verse, this is a statement of polytheism. On the other hand it is, in the main, a listing of different types of speech in a rather ordered continuum. Of note here is that in Monier-Williams' *Dictionary* the citations for most of these terms as being the names of various goddesses equated with speech are lexicographic only. What we may very well have here is punning and/or else, not a listing of goddesses, but perhaps a listing which reflects some as yet undetermined aspect of speech in the feminine gender. This is, of course, a matter for a different research article.

10.1.3. A possible additional point is the definition of the term *vārtā* in vs. 7cd. As the term appears in the *vāgvarga*, it has always been translated as 'news.' In the two *dharmaśāstra* texts noted in Table I, however, the *Mānavadharmaśāstra* and the *Yājñavalkyadharmaśāstra*, *vārtā*, in its sense of 'profession, etc.,' is included in the list of *vidyās*. Were Amarasiṇha drawing on these lists, paralleling his text to these lists, it would be sensible for him to include *vārtā* in this sense in the listing he gives in some fashion, even though it is not *vāc*. The main difficulty with this interpretation, however, is that *vārtā* is mentioned by Amarasiṇha in its meaning of 'profession' in 2.9.1. But I find it to be extremely suggestive that the first and third terms given in definition for *vārtā* here, *pravṛtti* and *udanta*, are not only synonyms meaning 'news' but are also antonyms meaning 'exertion' and 'rest' respectively in usages older than their usage as 'news.' I also find it to be suggestive that the term placed between these two, *vṛttānta*, means not only 'news' but, again in a usage older than that as 'news,' a step intermediate between the first and third terms in their usage as antonyms—'event, end or result of a course of action.'

10.1.4. Possibly supporting this double interpretation of *vārtā*, and in part depending on it, is a possible further indication that Amarasiṇha was paralleling his listing to those on which he was drawing. This is his placement of *dharmaśāstra*, given in definition of *smṛti*, equidistant in one direction from the verse in which *purāṇa* is defined and in the other direction from the verse in which *vārtā* is defined. *Dharmaśāstra*, it is to be noted, is the one element in the *Arthaśāstra* listing which is not included in the listing of Amarasiṇha, in accord with the interpretation of (b) above.

10.1.5. Another point of stylism, less disputable, is that *kathā* in vs. 7a, *smṛti* in vs. 7c and *samasyā* in vs. 8a are all defined as

highly polished genres of literature, while *pravalhikā* in vs. 7b, *saṃgraha* in vs. 7d and *kiṃvadantī* in vs. 8b are less refined, and in cases of *pravalhikā* and *kiṃvadantī*, are for more popular consumption. Here we have a clear trace of deliberate stylistic organization.

10.2.1. Of the two types of Sanskrit dictionaries which the tradition defines—*ekārtha*, or *samānārtha* and *anekārtha*, or *nānārtha*—the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* is invariably placed with the *ekārtha*, or synonym dictionaries. As T. Zachariae points out, however, the distinction is rarely hard and fast. The *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, for example, is part *ekārtha* and part *nānārtha*. Also, to these two classes of dictionaries we must also add a third class of special dictionaries.[51] As the gist of my argument above indicates, I must argue that with regard to the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, at least, the distinction between *ekārtha* and *nānārtha* does not hold even for sections of the text which are generally recognized to be solely *ekārtha*. With regard to the definition *pañcalakṣaṇa* for *purāṇa* such as has been outlined above, for example, the text fits neither of the two standard categories.

11.1. In conclusion, if our standard interpretation of *pañcalakṣaṇa* is incorrect and is based, as I would argue, on a misunderstanding of the term in Amarasiṇha's lexicon or in the tradition which this lexicon represents, from where did the definition come? And from where did the list known as "the five characteristics" come ? These are questions to which attention must be turned in another study. As pointed out above in 1.2-3 and 1.9, there is no evidence that this definition was of such a wide currency in ancient India as the early Western discoverers of the term implied. Most important, however, is that it is most probable—as pointed out above in 6.6.0. to 6.6.5 and in 9.1.3, that the compound as used by Amarasiṇha in his *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana was* a *bahuvrīhi* on a *dvigu*, in its primary usage at least, but that it meant "that having five different descriptions," "fivefold" or "of five different types"—the five discrete items referred to being *itihāsa*, *ānvīkṣikī*, *daṇḍanīti*, *ākhyāyikā*, and *purāṇa* itself.

Footnotes

1. I would like to thank Dr. Ludo Rocher for his encouragement, stimulating discussions and advice, all of which aided in bringing this paper to fruition in its present form from a few basic ideas.

2. trans. Mrs. S. Ketkar (1927; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1971), v. 1, p. 522.

3. *The Vishṇu Purāṇa; a system of Hindu mythology and tradition* (1840; 3rd ed. Calcutta : Punthi Pustak, 1961), p. iv. It is to be noted that Wilson stated elsewhere (p. vi) that Amarasiṇha synonymously designated *purāṇa* "as Pañcha-lakshaṇas, or 'treatises on five topics.' " It is doubtful that in doing this he was being inconsistent in his interpretation of the compound in the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*, or that he was interpreting the term in accordance with the usage of *°lakṣaṇa* discussed below in 3.1.4 and 3.3.2. In all probability, he was paraphrasing the strict definition as Winternitz was to do later and as Colebrooke had done earlier. For Colebrooke's paraphrase see 1.2 immediately below.

4. "On the Sanscrit and Prācrit Languages," in Asiatick Researches 7 (1803), p. 202n.

5. *Kosha or Dictionary of the Sanskrit Language by Umara Singha, with an English interpretation and annotations*, 3rd ed. (Calcutta: H.D. Rakshit, 1883), p. 39, n.k.

6. For a fuller listing, see Yashpal Tandon, *Purāṇa-Viṣaya-Samanukramaṇikā* (*A concordance of Purāṇa-Contents*), *Vishveshvarānand Indological Series 3* (Hoshiarpur: V.V.R. Institute, 1952), p. 3.

7. Edward C. Sachau, trans., *Alberuni's India*, abridged ed. edited with introd. and notes by Ainslie T. Embree (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1971), p. 63.

8. See *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 2.9.43, 2.10.1-7 and 12.7.8-25, and *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa* 4.133.6-10.

9. Dr. Rosane Rocher, in a recent article on Amarasiṇha prepared for the *Biographical Dictionary of Linguists*, concluded that at present, on the basis of available evidence, Amarasiṇha's date cannot be determined with any degree of certainty.

10. pp. v-vi.

11. *History*, v. 1, p. 522.

12. See, for example, A. M. T. Jackson, *JBRAS* 21 (1905), Extra number, pp. 67-77; A. Blau, *ZDMG* 62 (1908), p. 337; F. E. Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition* (London: Oxford University Press, 1922), pp. 35-39, or, more carefully worded, W. Kirfel, *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (Bonn: Kurt Schroeder Verlag, 1927), pp. xlv-il.

13. See M. Winternitz, *History*, v. 1, p. 523.

14. See R. C. Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records of Hindu Rites and Customs, University of Dacca Bulletin No. 20* (Calcutta: Abinas Press, 1940), pp. 2, 4-5, 193.

15. See M. Winternitz, *History*, v. 1, pp. 226, 518 (esp. n. 1), 520-21, 530.

16. See *History*, v. 1, p. 525; v. 2, refs. under 'Purāṇas' in Index, p. 662, for similarity between extant *Purāṇas* and Buddhist Mahāyāna literature. See v. 2, pp. 43, 204, 244, 291, 306, for extension of this to topics included in the *pañcalakṣaṇa* scheme.

17. *History*, p. 522, n. 1.

18. *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, p. iv.

19. *History*, v. 1, p. 469.

20. The Prakrit lexicographical sources are dispersed widely in many different works, which prevents efficient utilization of them for the purposes desired. Furthermore, the three main comprehensive works on Prakrit lexicography, Hermann Jacobi, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī, zur Einführung in das Studium des Prākṛit : Grammatik Text, Wörterbuch* (Leipzig: Verlag Von S. Hirzel, 1886) Ratnachandraji, *An Illustrated Ardha-Magadhi Dictionary*, 5 vols. (Dhanmandi, Ajmer, etc. : Printed for the S. S. Jaina Conference, 1927-38), and Hargovind Das T. Sheth, *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo: A Comprehensive Prakrit-Hindi Dictionary* (Calcutta: Pandit Hargovind Das T. Sheth, 1928), contain few or very limited listings only of words in composition. This makes them, for purposes of the present investigation, not very useful tools.

21. Due to the unavailability to me of the majority of the texts cited in this latter work, however, use of this source was limited to only a few items of note which were in editions which could be consulted by me.

22. *The Laws of Manu, SBE,* v. 25 (Oxford : The Clarendon Press, 1886).

23. *Caturdaśalakṣaṇī of Gadādhara with three commentaries, v. 1: lakṣaṇas 1 and 2* (Adyar: Adyar Library, 1942).

24. *The New Catalogus Catalogorum,* v. 6 (Madras : University of Madras 1971), p. 310.

25. See A. C. Burnell, *Catalogue of A Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts,* Part I, Vedic Manuscripts (London: Trübner and Co., 1869), p. 12; A. B. Keith, *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the India Office,* v. 2, pt. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), pp. 75-77; M. Winternitz, comp., *A Catalogue of South Indian Manuscripts (especially those of the Whish Collection) Belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1902), p. 30.

26. I realize that Böhtlingk and Roth's dictionary is from 1855-75 and that Monier-Williams' compilation of dictionaries is from 1899. However, these are the only comprehensive sources which we have to go by at the present time.

27. v. 5.2, Index *Ab-Ultimo* (1965).

28. (Berlin : 1868), p. 273.

29. (Calcutta : The Asiatic Society, 1880), p.i.

30. 3 pts. (1891, 1896, 1903; rpt. Wiesbaden : Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1962).

31. *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, pars octava, Codices Sanscriticos Complectens* (Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1864).

32. As most of these texts are unpublished and as the catalogs in which they are originally listed are either inaccessible to me or are merely lists of titles and perhaps physical descriptions without sections of text being given, it is impossible for me to judge this in most cases.

33. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collection of the Sanskrit College*, v. 1.2, *Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. 36* (Calcutta : Sanskrit College, 1965), p. 188.

34. *Notices of the Sanskrit MSS*, vols. 1-3 (Calcutta : C.B. Lewis, at the Baptist Mission Press, 1871-76).

35. See Rhys Davids and Stede, *Pali-English Dictionary*, p. 578, especially p. 578b, top.

36. See Rhys Davids and Stede, *Pali-English Dictionary*, pp. 178-179 for citations from the *Paramatthajotikā II*, referred to there as SnA. I hesitate to use their exact reference numbers, or any others, as the numbers given by Rhys Davids and Stede appear to refer to page numbers at times, and to sections of text at other times. The introduction of consistency by me would only further confuse matters.

37. See Edgerton, *Dictionary*, under *vijñāna* 2, p. 486a, and the references cited there.

38. These editions are :

Borooah, Anundoram, ed. *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*. Rpt. Gauhati : Publication Board, Assam, 1971.

Colebrooke, William. *Kosha or Dictionary of the Sanskrit Language by Umara Singha, with an English interpretation and annotations*. 3rd ed. Calcutta : H.D. Rakshit, 1883.

Deslongchamps, A. Loiseleur. *Amarakocha ou vocabulaire d'Amarasinha, publié en Sanskrit avec une traduction francaise, des notes et un index*. 2 pts. Paris: L'imprimerie royale, 1839-45.

Dutta, Kali Kumar. *Padacandrikā, a commentary on the Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam of Amara (Amarakośa) by Rāyamukuṭa (Text and the Commentary)*, vols. 1 and 2. *Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series Nos. 48* and *86*. Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1966 and 1973.

Gaṇapati Sāstrī, T., ed. *The Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana of Amarasimha with the commentary Ṭīkāsaravaswa of Vandyaghatīya-Sarvānanda. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series Nos. 38, 43, 51, 52*. Trivandrum: The Travancore Government Press, 1914-17.

Jhalakikar, Vamanacharya. *Amarakośa with the commentary of Maheśvara, enlarged by Raghunath Shastri Talekar; revised, enlarged, and improved from Chintamani Shastri Thatte's edition of 1882.* Bombay: Government Central Book Depot, 1896.

Pandit, Ramaswarupa Bholanath. *Amarakosha of Amarasingh, with an iudex and a commentary.* Bombay: Shri-Venkateshwar Press, 1899.

Ramanathan, A. A., crit. ed. *Amarakośa [I], with the unpublished South Indian Commentaries, Amarapadavivṛti of Liṅgayasūrin and the Amarapadapārijāta of Mallinātha. The Adyar Library Series, vol. 101.* Adyar: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1971.

Sardesai, N. G. and D. G. Padhye. *Amara's Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam (Text), A Sanskrit Dictionary in three chapters critically edited with introduction and English equivalents for each word and English word-index. Poona Oriental Series No. 69.* 2nd ed. Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1969.

39. See, for example, *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 3.12.39.

40. See, for example, Chāndogyopaniṣad 7.1.2 and 4, 7.2.1 and 7.7.1.

41. See E. Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda und die Itihāsatradition* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1902), pp. 21-22.

42. *History*, v. 1, p. 126.

43. See T. W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, v. 1, *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, v. 2 (London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, 1899), pp. 109-10.

44. See E. Sieg, "Itihāsa," in J. Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, v. 7 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), p. 462 and E. Sieg, *Sagenstoffe*, pp. 21-22.

45. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 963.

46. *History*, v. 1, p. 311, n. 1.

47. Sukthankar, Vishnu S., ed. *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 1 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933), pp. 6-7.

48. *The Mahabharata of Krishna-Dwaipayana Vyasa*, rev. Hiralal Haldar, vol. 1 (Calcutta : Oriental Publishing Co., [n. d.]), p. 2.

49. See, for example, *Dīghanikāya* 4.13 (*Soṇadaṇḍasutta*), where mention is made of the *pañca sīlas* or *aṅgas*, abbreviated somewhat crudely in vs. 14 to good birth, technical training, *vaṇṇa*, virtue, and wisdom. In *Soṇadaṇḍasutta* 5, however, fully fourteen points are noted as possible *sīlas* or *aṅgas* of Soṇadaṇḍa. Not all fourteen, but definitely more than five, are *sīlas*.

50. See Sieg, "Itihāsa," in *Encyclopaedia*, v. 7, pp. 461b-462a.

51. See Theodor Zachariae, *Die Indischen Wörterbücher* (*Kośa*), in G. Bühler, ed., *Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* (Strassburg : Verlag Von Karl J. Trübner, 1897), pp. 1-2.

Lists of Texts and Literary Genres Cited in Relevant Passages[1]

TABLE I

ŚBr 13.4.3.1-5	*ĀśvŚr 10.7.1-9*	*TĀr 2.9*	*AV 15.6 3-4*	*ŚāṅkhGṛ 1.24*[2]	*Pat 1.1.1.5*	*AŚ 1.5*	*Mn 7.43*	*Yājñ 1.309-10*	*Yājñ 1.312*	*AK 1.6.3-7*	*VarBṛS 19.10-12*	*D 4.13*	*SnA 488*
ṛks	ṛks	ṛks	ṛks	ṛgveda	four vedas		trayī vidyā—			—three vedas		three vedas	vedas
yajurs	yajurveda	yajurs	sāmans	yajurveda									
		-sāmans	yajurs	sāmaveda									
atharvans	atharvaṇa veda	atharvāṅgirasa									(king should please those who create *māya*, who perform *indrajāla*, *kuha*, who know *gāndharva*, *lekhya*, etc.)		lakkhaṇas
aṅgirasa	aṅgirasa veda												
sarpavidyā	viṣavidyāveda												
devajanavidyā	piśācavidyāveda												
māyā	asuravidyāveda												
					aṅgas					aṅgas		aṅgas	
		brāhmaṇas	brahman	vākovākya	rahasya			—rahasyavid	daivajña				
					vākovākya—					oṃkāra			
								—dharmaka—					
itihāsa	purāṇavidyāveda	itihāsas	itihāsa	itihāsapurāṇa	itihāsa	itihāsa =				itihāsa	trayī	itihāsas	
purāṇa	itihāsa veda	purāṇas	purāṇa		purāṇa	purāṇa				[svara]	vārtā		
						itivṛtta				ānvīkṣikī	daṇḍanīti		
						ākhyāyikā				daṇḍanīti	ānvīkṣikī		
						udāharaṇa		ānvīkṣikī		ākhyāyikā			
						dharmaśāstra--	ānvīkṣikī		—uditodita—	purāṇa			
						arthaśāstra	daṇḍanīti	daṇḍanīti	daṇḍanīti				
		kalpas						—trayī—			(King should employ *kavis*, *dūtas*, etc.)		
		gāthā											
		nāraśaṇsī	gāthās										
			nāraśaṇsīs										
				all vedas					atharvāṅgirasa				
sāmans	sāmaveda———												
							—ātmavidyā—						
					vaidyaka		vārtā	vārtā		—smṛti [vārtā]			

1. The texts in which the various lists are found are ordered on organizational principles only, and are in no way intended to indicate or reflect chronology. The abbreviations used for these texts are those of M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, or T. W. Rhys Davids and W. Stede, *Pali-English Dictionary*, with the following exceptions: AŚ = *Arthaśāstra*, AK = *Amarakośa*.
2. The ordering followed is that given by M. Winternitz in his translation, *History*, v. 1, p. 126. The text itself appears to list the entries in the following order : *ṛgveda vākovākya, itihāsapurāṇa,* 'all *vedas,*' *yajurveda, sāmaveda.*
3. For the placement of *vākovākya* on the same line as *brāhmaṇas, brahman,* etc., see M. Monier-Williams, *Indian Wisdom; or Examples of the Religious, Philosophical, and Ethical Doctrines of the Hindus.* 4th ed. (London: Luzac and Co., 1893), p. 295, n. 1.

PURĀṆIC HERITAGE*

By

Anand Swarup Gupta

[आधुनिकभारतवर्षस्यापि स्वधर्म-दर्शन-संस्कृति-राजनीति-समाज-व्यवस्था-प्राचीनेतिहासादिषु विषये पुराणानां प्रभावः स्पष्टं प्रतिभातीति नात्र काऽपि विप्रतिपत्तिः। ग्रामेषु नगरेषु अपठितजनताया व्रतोपवासादिष्वपि पुराणानां प्रभावो दृश्यत एव। यद्यपि प्रचलितहिन्दुधर्मदर्शनादीनां मूलं भारतवर्षस्य प्राचीनतमे वैदिकवाङ्मये अन्वेष्टुं शक्यते, परन्तु वैदिकवाङ्मयः सर्वसुलभो न वर्त्तते, पुराणानि तु जनसामान्यस्य कृते श्रवणाय पठनाय च विहितानीत्यस्ति तेषां वैशिष्ट्यम्। अतएव पुराणानि "पञ्चमो वेद" इति कथ्यन्ते ब्राह्मणोपनिषदादिषु। अपरं च, बहूनां वैदिकवचनानां वैदिकाख्यानानां च व्याख्या उपबृंहणं च यत्र तत्र पुराणेषूपलभ्यते। पुराणेषु प्राचीनतमधार्मिकपरम्पराणां परिचयोऽपि क्वचित्-क्वचित् प्राप्यते याः परम्परा वेदेष्वपि निबद्धा न वर्त्तन्त, अतएव पुराणेष्वेवोक्तं—"पुराणं सर्वशास्त्राणां प्रथमं ब्रह्मणा स्मृतम्। अनन्तरं च वक्त्रेभ्यो वेदास्तस्य विनिःसृताः॥" इति। अतएव आधुनिककाले पुराणानां महत्त्वं प्रभावश्च वेदेभ्योऽप्यधिको मन्यते इति वक्तुं शक्यते। एतादृशं पुराणसाहित्यं निधिरूपेण अस्मभ्यं परम्परागतो हस्तगतमिति भारतीयानामस्माकं महत् सौभाग्यम्। पुनश्च पुराणानि देशकालानुसारं समये समये संस्कृतानि संक्षिप्तानि परिवर्धितानि चेत्यत्र विषयेऽस्ति तेषां भूषणं न तु दूषणं, येन तानि सदैव युगानुरूपाणि भूत्वा सर्वत्र जनताया धर्मविषये मार्गदर्शकानि संजातानि। पुराणवाङ्मयं तु सर्वविद्यानिधित्वेन स्वकं महत्त्वं प्रतिपादयति। उच्यते च स्कन्दपुराणेऽपि—"पुराणमखिलं सर्वशास्त्रमयं ध्रुवम्"। नास्ति काचिद् मानवोपयोगिनी पुरातनविद्या या पुराणेषु नोपलभ्यते। इतिहासः, भुवनकोशः, राजनीतिः, व्यवहारनीतिः, समाजनीतिः, वर्णाश्रमधर्माः, तन्त्रविषयाः, धर्मशास्त्रविषयाः, आयुर्वेदः, ज्यौतिषं, साहित्यशास्त्रोपयोगिनो अलंकाराश्छन्दांसि च, रत्नपरीक्षा, हस्त्यश्वादिपरीक्षा, सृष्टिविद्या, विज्ञानमित्यादि सर्वमेव पुराणेषु तत्र तत्रोपनिबद्धम्। सम्यगधीतानि सम्यगाचरितानि च पुराणानि भुक्तिमुक्तिप्रदानानि भवन्तीति विद्वत्सम्मतम्।

---

* Paper submitted to the World Sanskrit Conference, 1972. It is given here in a revised form.

पुराणानां बहूनाम् आख्यानानां समानानि आख्यानानि उपाख्यानानि च रोमनग्रीकादिसाहित्येष्वपि वर्त्तन्ते। एतां समतामाधारीकृत्यैव पाश्चात्य-देशेषु तुलनात्मकं पुराणविज्ञानं (Comparative Mythology इति नाम्ना) आरब्धं तथा संवर्धितमित्यस्ति पुराणानामन्तरराष्ट्रियोपयोगिताऽपि। अस्मिन् निबन्धे एतत्सर्वं विशदीकृतम्।]

Importance of the Purāṇa-s as our Precious Heritage

Ancient Sanskrit literature coming down to us surpasses all the extant ancient literatures of the world in its vastness and also in its being a rich and valuable heritage for humanity in the field of the philosophical, religious and ethical thoughts contributing most to the evolution of the well-cherished human values. *Śruti* and *Smṛti* are the two main branches of the religious Sanskrit literature, and Purāṇa-s are included in the *Smṛti*-literature. But the Purāṇa-s are considered even more important than the *Śruti* on account of their contribution to the all-round building of the Hindu society, not only in India but also in the other adjoining countries of Greater India; e.g. a *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* is "the sacred work of the Śiva-worshippers on the island of Bali."[1]

The *Purāṇa* as a branch of learning or *vidyā* has been mentioned as originated from Brahmā (°an) even before the Veda-s issued forth from his mouths.[2] And in fact, even the extant Purāṇas preserve in them certain ancient traditions that have their root in pre-Vedic times. Then again, Veda-s were not accessible to the general masses of the Hindu society on account of the unique sanctity attached to them. But such was not the case with the Purāṇa-s, which were meant not only for the learned scholars of the upper strata of the Hindu society, but also for the common man for whom they were specially composed and then redacted several times in order to make them up-to-date according to the changing times and the changed social and political condition of the society, so that they may serve as the permanent religious and cultural guides for the society in general.

On account of the divine origin ascribed to the Purāṇa-s as mentioned above[3] the Purāṇa-s came to acquire the status of the Veda-s. Even in the Brāhmaṇa-s this status of the Purāṇa-s was recognised. The *Śat. Br.* and the *Gopatha-Br.* both have used the epithet '*Veda*' for the '*Purāṇa*'.[4] The *Purāṇa* was regarded as the fifth *Veda*.[5] The study of the Purāṇa-s therefore, was held to be more important even than the study of the Veda-s, Vedāṅga-s

and the Upaniṣads.[6] The *Purāṇa*-s became the *Veda*-s of the laity, and they were enjoined to be read and listened to by all the four Varṇas of the Hindu society. Thus the Śūdras etc. who were forbidden to study the Veda-s were compensated by allowing them access to the *Purāṇa* and the *Itihāsa*[7], respectively called also as the *Purāṇa-Veda* and the *Itihāsa-Veda*.[8]

Purāṇas have been the main fountain-head of most of the Hindu traditions, social customs, religious rites, ethical codes, philosophical thoughts and mythological legends symbolizing the most abstruse truths of eternal value. Purāṇas have their own cosmological theories which though akin to the *Sāṁkhya* theories of creation are yet different from them to some extent, embedded as they are with Purāṇic mythological ideologies. Then the theories and descriptions of the four kinds of *pralaya*, fourteen Manvantara-s, genealogies of gods, sages and kings and the various *ākhyāna-s*, *upākhyāna-s* and *itihāsa-s* relating to them, the Purāṇic *Bhuvana-kośa*, comprising the account of the entire terrestrial expanse, description and glorification of the various sacred places with *ākhyāna-s* relating to them—all this makes the *Purāṇa* a distinct branch of learning which may be called the *Purāṇa-vidyā*. The *Purāṇa*, therefore, is regarded as one of the fourteen *Vidyā-s*.[9] A scholar versed in the Purāṇic lore was called a *Paurāṇika* whose status was in no way inferior to that of the scholars of other branches of learning (such as the Naiyāyika-s, Mīmāṁsaka-s etc).

The *Veda* has been regarded as the main source of *dharma*[10]; and as the Purāṇa-s and Itihāsa (which also belongs to the category of the Purāṇas) elaborate and clarify the statements of the Vedas,[11] the Purāṇa-s and the Itihāsa-s also constitute, next to Veda-s, the most important source of the *dharma*. Purāṇa-s have, therefore, been called as the *Dharma-śāstra-s*,[12] and most of the religious rites and ideas of the Hindus have their root in the *Purāṇa*-s. The medieval *Dharma-Nibandhas*, therefore, profusely draw upon the Purāṇa-s. The *Purāṇa*-s, along with the *Mahā-bhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, have also been included in the literature called as *Jaya*,[13] the study of which is said as conducive to *Jaya* or victory.[14]

Along with the Upaniṣad-s and the Darśana-s the Purāṇa-s have been mentioned as the highest authority (*parā prāmā*) for the

knowledge of Brahman.[15] The *Kūrma-Purāṇa* (II. 24.23) says that Vedic *Brahma-vidyā* is not acquired from any other sources. Although the Veda-s including the Vedānta-s (or the Upaniṣad-s) are the primary source both of *dharma* and *Brahma-vidyā*, yet as the Dharmaśāstra-s (comprising the Dharma-sūtra-s and the metrical Smṛti-s) and the Purāṇas both constitute what is called as the *upabṛṁhaṇa* of the Vedas[16], the Dharmaśāstra-s and the Purāṇa-s have, therefore, been respectively the main source of the *dharma* (religious theories and performances) and the *Brahma-vidyā* (knowledge of the Absolute Self).[17] The Purāṇas, being also regarded as the Dharma-śāstra-s, are thus the source both of the *dharma* and the *jñāna* (i. e. Brahmavidyā), and hence in the field of religion and metaphysics the Purāṇa-s (including the Itihāsa-s) have acquired more importance and higher authority than the Dharma-śāstra-s.

Out of the five special topics of the Purāṇa-s (सर्ग, प्रतिसर्ग, वंश, मन्वन्तर and वंशानुचरित), the royal genealogical lists (comprising वंश) have been the main literary source, besides the accounts written by the foreigners, for constructing the modern political history of ancient India. The royal dynastic lists from the earliest time up to the Āndhras and the Guptas, contained in the Purāṇa-s, have generally been corroborated and supported by epigraphic and numismatic evidences. The discrepancies occuring in the various genealogical tables given in the different Purāṇa-s are but natural considering the varying ancient traditions as their source, and the timely redactions of the Purāṇa-s by different hands. These discrepancies are explained, to some extent, by Pargiter in *Ancient Indian Historical Traditions.* Our knowledge of the ancient and medieval geography of India is mainly based on the *Bhuvana-Kośa* of the Purāṇa-s, while the knowledge of the ethnography of Indian sub-continent is also contributed by the lists of the Jana-pada-s given in the *Bhuvana-kośa* and the *Kūrma-vibhāga* chapters of the Purāṇa-s.

Purāṇa-s have also contributed to the emergence, in the West, of the modern science of comparative mythology; for, many of the Purāṇic mythological legends have their parallels in Greek and Roman mythologies, as indicated by several modern works written on Aryan mythologies.

Classification of the Purāṇa-s from the point of their Contributions to Knowledge

From the one original Purāṇa of the divine origin,[18] or from the one original *Purāṇa-Saṁhitā* composed (or compiled) by Vyāsa and handed over by him to his disciple Sūta Romaharṣaṇa,[19] the Purāṇa literature grew into the eighteen *Mahāpurāṇa*-s with an extent of four lacs of Ślokas and eighteen *Upapurāṇa*-s supplemented later on by the eighteen *Aupapurāṇa*-s, local Purāṇa-s and a large number of *Māhātmya*-s and *Vratakathā*-s all attributed to one or the other of the main Purāṇa-s. The evolution of this vast and extensive Purāṇic literature which has made valuable contributions to human knowledge took several centuries. According to Prof. Kane the compilation of the extant Purāṇa-s was completed by the 9th century A. D., and the Upapurāṇa-s began to be compiled from about the 7th or the 8th century A. D., and their number went on increasing till about the 13th century or even later.[20] But even after that, additions or interpolations continued to be made and thus the total extent of the Purāṇas has further swelled to more than four lacs of ślokas.[21]

From the point of their contribution to Hindu religion and its various sects the Purāṇa-s or rather the Mahāpurāṇa-s have been classified into the three classes : as (1) *Sāttvika,* (2) *Rājasa* and (3) *Tāmasa* or according to the *Matsya-Purāṇa* (53.68-69) into the four classes, adding the *Saṁkīrṇa* class to the above three classes. According to the Padma-P. (Ān. edn. VI. 263.81.85) the (1) *Sāttvika* Purāṇa-s are—Viṣṇu, Nāradīya, Bhāgavata, Garuḍa, Padma and Varāha, (2) the *Rājasa* Purāṇas are :—Brahmāṇḍa, Brahmavaivarta, Mārkaṇḍeya, Bhaviṣya, Vāmana and Brahma, (3) the *Tāmasa* Purāṇa-s are—Matsya, Kūrma, Liṅga, Śiva (or Vāyu), Skanda and Agni.

According to the *Matsya-Purāṇa* (53.68-69) the (1) *Sāttvika* Purāṇas are devoted more to the glorification of Hari or Viṣṇu (and therefore they are more Vaiśṇava in their character and have contributed a lot to Viṣṇuism). (2) the *Rājasa* Purāṇa-s are devoted more to the glorification of Brahmā and Brahmā worship (3) the *Tāmasa* Purāṇa-s glorify Śiva and Agni (which has also been regarded as one of the eight *tanu-s* or forms of Rudra-Śiva) and therefore they are more Śaivite in their character, and (4)

the *Saṁkīrṇa* Purāṇa-s (which have not been enumerated) glorify Goddess Sarasvatī and the Pitṛ-s (or the Manes), which glorification, perhaps, contributed to the rise of the Sārasvata-cult, some indication of which is to be traced in the *Skanda-Purāṇa*.[22]

The Skanda-Purāṇa (VII.1.2.89) merely mentions the number of the Purāṇa-s which sing the glory of the four deities. Thus according to it, Viṣṇu is praised in the four, Brahmā in two, Ravi or the Sun also in the two, and Śiva is praised in the remaining ten Purāṇas.

The above is the classification of the eighteen Purāṇa-s according to the Deities glorified in them, which may indicate their contribution to the evolution of the main religious sects, viz. Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Brahmaism, Śākta (and Sārasvata) cult, and the cult of Sun-worship. This sectarian classification of the Purāṇa-s is given in the Padma-Purāṇa as noted above and also in the *Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa* (II. III. 28.10-15). This division, however, is based on the sectarian spirit, which may be inferred from the fact that the *Padma-P.* which is predominently a Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa places the *Varāha-Purāṇa* in the *Sāttvika* division but the *Bhav. -P.* places this Purāṇa (Varāḥa) in the *Tāmasa* division; similarly the *Matsya* and *Kūrma* Purāṇa-s are both placed in the *Tāmasa* division by the *Padma-P.* while they are placed in the *Rājasa* division in the *Bhav.-P.* But this threefold (or fourfold according to the *Matsya*) classification of the Purāṇa-s which is mentioned in the Purāṇa-s themselves gives no indication of the Purāṇic contributions in the other important spheres of human knowledge and institutions. The modern classification of the Purāṇa-s, according to their main topics, however, as suggested by Haraprasada Sastri and P. V. Kane is quite useful in this respect.[23]

According to this modern classification which may throw a light on the various important contributions which the Purāṇa-s have made, the Purāṇa-s have been grouped as follows :

1. *Encyclopaedic* :—Agni, Garuḍa and Nāradīya. Purāṇa-s are said to be *sarva-śāstramaya* i. e. dealing with almost all the aspects and branches of human knowledge.[24] This all-comprehensive character of the Purāṇa-s is amply illustrated in these three Purāṇas. Besides dealing with the *Pañca-lakṣaṇa-s*

Bhuvana-kośa, tīrtha-s, vrata-s, upavāsa-s, mythological legends, etc. these three Purāṇa-s also deal with such secular subjects as medicine, astrology, omens, grammar, figures of speech, *ratna-parīkṣā*, politics, etc. which are of immense human interest. They also contain *tāntrika* elements, *tāntrika* mode of worship and *tāntrika* formulas.

2. *Sectarian*—As Brahma-vaivarta, Liṅga, Śaiva, Mārkaṇḍeya and Devī-Bhāgavata. Though majority of the Purāṇa-s are of non-sectarian type, displaying a reconciling spirit and a trend of synthesis, yet there are some Purāṇa-s which are tainted with a narrow sectarian bias. For example, *Brahma-vaivarta* is more inclined to Vaiṣṇavism or the cult of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa worship, *Śaiva* and *Liṅga* to Śaivism and the *Mārkaṇḍeya* and *Devī-Bhāgavata* to Śakti-cult. The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* elaborately deals with the cult of the Sun-worship and its origin. This Purāṇa (*Bhv.-P*) also contains a somewhat different version of the *Satyanārāyaṇa-vrata-kathā*, the Skanda-Purāṇa (Bengali MSS)-version of which is so prevalent among the Hindus all over India.

3. *Historical*—Brahmāṇḍa, Vāyu, Matsya, Viṣṇu etc. Preservation of the genealogical lists of the ancient royal dynasties of India was a task which was specially entrusted to the Paurāṇika Sūta.[24] The majority of the Mahāpurāṇa-s contain these genealogical lists and other valuable historical material. They begin these genealogical accounts from Vaivasvata Manu upto the Mahābhārata war in the past tense, but the accounts after the Mahābhārata war upto the Āndhra dynasty in the *Matsya Purāṇa* and upto the Gupta-dynasty in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, starting from the *sāmprate* king (the then-ruling monarch) the accounts are given in the future tense in the prophetic tone. The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* takes king Parikṣit, the grandson of Arjuna, ruling at Hastināpura, as the *sāmprata* king[25] and the Matsya-Purāṇa and the Vāyu-Purāṇa both have taken king Adhiso (or sī)-makṛṣaṇa, the great-grandson of king Parikṣit, as the *sāmprata* king.[26] Pargiter has utilised these lists in his two valuable works—*Ancient Indian Historical Traditions* and *Purāṇa-text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age.* The political history of ancient India has mainly been constructed on the basis of these Purāṇic genealogies as already mentioned.

4. *Mainly dealing with the tīrtha-s*—Such as Padma, Skanda etc. Tīrtha-s and tīrtha-yātrā-s (pilgrimages) occupy a very impor-

tant place in almost all the religions of the world. But it is in the Indian religion, specially in Hinduism, that tīrtha-s and yātrā-s have come to be regarded as having a most important place in the religious life of the different sects of Hinduism and other sister religions. The Purāṇa-s and Upa-Purāṇa-s contain accounts of tīrtha-s, their *māhātmya-s*, and the rules of and the merits accruing from going on the pilgrimages. The sacred rivers, sacred places situated on the banks of these rivers, forests and mountain-caves sanctified by the inhabitance and penances of the great ancient sages—all were regarded as the places of pilgrimage. Their importance as religious places has not dwindled even in this modern material age. The contribution of the Purāṇa-s in infusing the religious zeal and reverence for visiting places, and thus gaining a practical geographical knowledge of the country besides acquiring meritorious fruits, spiritual advancement and mental peace, is no mean thing. These tīrtha-s are scattered all over India, from the Himālayas in the North to the cape Kumari in the South and from the Western sea in Gujrat and Maharastra in the West upto the hills of Assam in the East. The Purāṇa-s contain the charming account of all these tīrtha-s of Bhārata-varṣa which though politically divided in these days was culturally united by the Purāṇa-s. The linguistic, regional and even ethnic differences could not break this remarkable cultural unity of this country; and it was all due to the love of the tīrtha-s engendered by the Purāṇa-s in the hearts of the people of India. Thousands of pilgrims still visit these sacred places where they lose all their superficial differences just as the rivers flowing from and over the different places of the country lose their separate identity by falling into the sea. These tīrtha-s are still the places of interest for the tourists on account of their archaeological or historical importance, but it is the Purāṇa-s which have impressed upon our mind their religious and spiritual importance, which from the Indian (or Purāṇic) point of view has a greater value for us for the upward march of life.

Contribution of the Purāṇas to the knowledge of the ancient geography of India

As has already been mentioned, the *Bhuvana-kośa* (or the *Bhuvana vinyāsa*) of the Purāṇa-s has been the main source of our

knowledge of the ancient Indian geography. The accounts of the *janapada-s*, mountains, rivers, etc. as given in the Purāṇa-s can be corroborated by their identification even now, thus these accounts are not speculative and fictitious. Bhārata-varṣa was considered to be a part of the Jambu-dvīpa i. e. one of the nine *varṣa-s* of the Jambu-dvīpa, situated on its southernmost side according to the *sapta-dvīpa* theory of the Purāṇa-s, which is contained in the *Agni, Bhāgavata, Brāhma, Garuḍa, Kūrma, Liṅga, Mārkaṇḍeya, Matsya, Vāyu* and *Viṣṇu*. But in the *catur dvīpa* theory which is met only in the Vāyu Purāṇa and also in the old Buddhist texts, Bhārata-varṣa has been identified with the Jambu-dvīpa. The term Bhārata-varṣa in the Purāṇa-s connotes what is known as the Greater India now. Bhārata-varṣa consisted of the nine dvīpa-s, viz. Indradyumna, Kaserumān, Tāmra-Parṇa (or-varṇa), Gabhastimān, Nāga-dvīpa, Saumya, Gandharva, Varuṇa and Kumāra dvīpa or the India proper. The expanse of Bhārata-varṣa (or Greater India) is said to be nine thousand Yojanas while that of the Kumāra-dvīpa (or India Proper) is said to be one thousand yojanas from north to south. It (India Proper) contains the seven *Kula-parvata-s* or mountain-ranges, viz. the Mahendra, the Malaya, the Sahya, the Śuktimān, the Ṛkṣa, the Vindhya and the Pāriyātra. Rivers are mentioned as flowing from the Himālayas and from these seven Kula-parvata-s; and Janapada-s are mentioned as the regions through which these rivers flow. Besides the seven Kula-Parvata-s a number of other mountains or hills are also mentioned. The Purāṇic list of the Janapada-s is very important from the ethnic point of view also. The lists of the Janapada-s according to their positions and directions are divided into seven divisions, viz. the Central division (*Madhya-deśa*), Northern (*Uttarāpatha*), Eastern (*Prācya*), Southern (*Dakṣiṇāpatha*), Western (*Aparānta*), Vindhya and the Himālaya. In the *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* (II. 3. 15-18); *Kūrma-Purāṇa* (Cr. Edn. I. 45. 39-42), and *Agni-Purāṇa* the lists are shorter consisting of the few names but indicating their directions; but in the *Mārkaṇḍeya* (57. 32-58), *Brahmāṇḍa* (I. 16. 40-69), *Matsya* (114.34.57), *Vāyu* (45.109-137), *Brāhma* (27.41-70), and *Vāmana Purāṇa* (cr. edn. 11, 31-46) there are longer lists, and they include all the geographical data of the shorter lists also.[27]

The accounts of the other eight Varṣa-s of the Jambu-dvīpa besides the Bhārata-varṣa and of the other six (Mahā) Dvīpas besides the Jambu-dvīpa which is regarded as the central (Mahā) Dvīpa in the *saptadvīpa* theory are generally speculative and so they need not detain us here.

Contribution of the Purāṇa-s to the reconcilation of the sectarian ideologies

The Purāṇa-s were the best media for the expansion and propagation of sectarian views of the various sects of Hinduism. We, therefore, find some narrow sectarian traces in some of the Purāṇa-s and Upapurāṇa-s. But even such so-called sectarian Purāṇa-s occasionally exhibit broader and healthy reconciling trends and thus rise above the narrow sectarian spirit of the age. Thus the extant Purāṇas are not mainly sectarian. In fact, the Purāṇa-s contain not much that can be labelled as purely sectarian. If we take a broader and complete view of the Purāṇa-s, we can easily discern in them the highest philosophical conception of the Trinity or the *Trimūrti* (Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra) and the other deities of Hinduism free from any sectarian bias. In fact, the Supreme Brahman, the ultimate and Highest Conscious Reality is termed sometimes as Brahmā, sometimes as Viṣṇu and sometimes as Śiva or Rudra, to whom the functions of creation, preservation and destruction of the universe are respectively assigned. The three Gods of the Purāṇic Trinity are sometimes treated separately as *saguṇa* forms of the Absolute Brahman, and sometimes each of them is identified with the Absolute Brahman in different Purāṇa-s, and sometimes, according to the context they are identified with each other also. For example, the Kūrma-Purāṇa (cr. edn. II. 11. 3-116) expressly advocates the unity and identity of Viṣṇu and Śiva. But sometimes according to the context and not with any sectarian bias, one deity is described as superior to the other two. In reality, according to the oft-expressed views of the Purāṇa-s there is no real difference between the Supreme Brahman and its *saguṇa* manifestations into the three or more deities, nor between one deity and the other. Kālidāsa, the great poet of India and the true exponent of the Indian thought and culture in the field of the classical poetry,

expresses this truth of the identity and oneness of the three deities in his *Kumāra-saṁbhava* (7.44):—

एकैव मूर्त्तिर्विभिदे त्रिधा सा सामान्यमेषां प्रथमावरत्वम् ।
विष्णोर्हरस्तस्य हरिः कदाचिद् वेधास्तयोस्तावपि धातुराद्यौ ॥

Thus the Purāṇa-s have played an important part in reconciling the mutually conflicting sectarian spirits of their respective ages, and thus upholding and enhancing the cause of the cultural and religious unity of Bhārata-varṣa.

Contribution of the Purāṇa-s to the exposition of the philosophical thoughts

Philosophical speculations and ideas constitute the main topics of the Upaniṣad-s and the Darśana-s, but it is in the Purāṇa-s that they are presented and elaborated in the form of the *ākhyāna-s* which can be understood even by the common man. As an example the *ākhyāna-s* of Jaḍa-Bharata and the dialogue between him and the king of the Sauvīra country (*Viṣṇu Purāṇa* II.13-14) bring out the real nature of the Self as distinguished from the body. Similarly the *ākhyāna* of Ṛbhu and Nidāgha (*Viṣ. P.* II.15) gives an interesting exposition of the *advaita* theory of *abheda* (non-difference) between Vāsudeva and the physical world. The *ākhyāna* of Keśi-dhvaja and Khāṇḍikya (*Viṣ. P.* VI. 6-7) presents the *Brahma-yoga* (means of the realising Brahman) in a very lucid form. Similarly the Īśvaragītā of the *Kūrma Purāṇa* (II.1-11) contains an account of the *Kāpālika yoga* which is a sort of combination of the *Pātañjala Yoga* and the *Haṭha-Yoga* tinged with the advaitic ideology of the Śaiva-philosophy. Such philosophical *ākhyāna-s* are contained in many of the Purāṇa-s for the benefit of the common man for whom the Purāṇa-s were specially composed.

Deification and Sublimation in the Purāṇa-s

Deification of the natural objects and living beings and sublimation of our instincts and passions are two of the main characteristics of the Hindu religious philosophy, as may be clear from the various statements and accounts contained in the Veda-s and the Purāṇa-s. The *prāṇa-vidyā* and the *pratīka-upāsanā* (worship

through symbols) mentioned in the Upaniṣad-s,[28] and conceiving all masculine objects and beings as Viṣṇu and Śiva, and all feminine objects and beings as Lakṣmī and Gaurī in the Purāṇa-s[29] are some of the examples of deification. Similarly, the *pañcāgni-vidyā* of the *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad* (5.3-9) and the *rāsa-utsava* of Śrī-Kṛṣṇa and *Gopī-s* in the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* (X.29-33) are some good examples of sublimation of the sexual function and amorous sports respectively.[30] By making a study of such and similar topics of the Veda-s and the Purāṇa-s with faith and reverence our mind can get rid of its frailties and lust and become fit for acquiring the knowledge of the Self and spiritual advancement, as the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa so clearly and emphatically puts it in the following words—

विक्रीडितं व्रजवधूभिरिदं च विष्णोः
श्रद्धान्वितोऽनुशृणुयादथ वर्णयेद् यः ।
भक्तिं परां भगवति प्रतिलभ्य कामं
हृद्रोगमाश्वपहिनोत्यचिरेण धीरः ।।

(X. 33.40)

("A wise person who listens to and narrates these amorous sports of Viṣṇu (Kṛṣṇa) with Gopī-s with faith becomes great devotee of God and soon gets rid of lust which is a kind of disease of the heart.")

Purāṇa-s contribution to the solution of some of the problemes of the modern world

Mal-distribution of wealth and population-explosion are the two baffling problems of our times. Communism and Socialism try to solve the problem of mal-distribution by compulsion or nationalization. But the Purāṇa-s try to infuse a social spirit into the society as a whole as a self-discipline. They enjoin on the rich giving charities and monitory help to the needy and the learned who are worthy of such charities, and who in their turn may also serve the society, and on the other hand they strictly forbid those who are not worthy of such charities to refrain from receiving these charities, and thus the Purāṇa-s try to keep an economic balance in the society by propounding such healthy principles in their chapters on the *dāna-dharma*. The *Kūrma-*

Purāṇa says that one should give away in charity what is left after the maintenance of his family to a learned man who is of good family, well-disciplined, self-restrained, of good character and poor.[30] The Bhāgavata goes even further. It says that a man has a right to acquire as much wealth only as may suffice for his and his family's maintenance, if he tries to possess more, he is a thief and deserves punishment.[31] Thus the Purāṇa-s try to educate the society and to create a social sense and responsibility among its members to care for others also. Such ideas of the Purāṇa-s are even more revolutionary and socialistic and also more human and ennobling than theories of the present day communism and socialism.

As regards the population-explosion in the modern age, the prescription suggested by the Purāṇa-s may also be regarded as quite useful and befitting our culture. The Purāṇa-s recommend self-restraint in sexual matters and allow sexual intercourse for begetting progeny only and not for self-indulgence and satisfaction of our carnal desires, and hence the sublimation of the sexual instinct in the Purāṇas. In this regard and also for the sake of establishing social and economic equilibrium we should remember the following śloka of the *Kūrma Purāṇa* :—

आत्मार्थं भोजनं यस्य रत्यर्थं यस्य मैथुनम् ।
वृत्त्यर्थं यस्य चाधीतं निष्फलं तस्य जीवितम् ॥

Kūrma-P. edn, cr., II. 19.18.

("One who cooks only for himself and fills his own belly, who indulges in sexual act only for the sexual pleasure, who acquires education only for earning money lives in vain.")

Kālidāsa also supports this view of the Purāṇa-s when he praises the kings of the Ikṣvāku-dynasty as follows :—

त्यागाय संभृतार्थानां सत्याय मितभाषिणाम् ।
यशसे विजिगीषूणां प्रजायै गृहमेधिनाम् ॥

(*Raghuvaṁśa* 1.7).

("Who accumulate wealth for the sake of giving it away, who speak measuredly for the sake of truth, who are desirous of victory or conquest for the sake of fame and glory and who adopt household life for the sake of begetting offspring").

Thus, in almost all matters of human interest the Purāṇa-s should be regarded as our most precious heritage.

Footnotes

1. Mentioned by R. Friedrich, *JRAS* 1876, p. 171. The Javanese *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa* is an abridged prose translation of the original Sanskrit work or a translation of an abridged form of the original Sanskrit work; Cf. J. Gonda: The Old Javanese Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa in *PURĀṆA*, Vol. II. (July, 1960) pp. 252-267.

2. *Cf.* पुराणं सर्वशास्त्राणां प्रथमं ब्रह्मणा स्मृतम् ।
नित्यं शब्दमयं पुण्यं शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ॥
अनन्तरं च वक्त्रेभ्यो वेदास्तस्य विनिःसृताः ।
—*Matsya* P. 4.3-4; *cf.* also *Vāyu* 1.54., *Bd.* I. 1.40, *Padma*, Sṛ-Kh. 1.45, *Mārk.* 45.20, *Brahma* 161.27; etc.

3. See fn. 2 above. Also cf. *Bṛ-Up.* II 4.10.
"अस्य महतो भूतस्य निःश्वसितमेतद् यद् ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदो ऽथर्वाङ्गिरसः इतिहासः पुराणं ।"

4. *Cf.* "अथ नवमेऽहन् तानुपदिशति पुराणं वेदः सोऽयमिति किंचित्पुराणमाचक्षीत ।"
(*Śat.Br.*, *XIII*.4.3.13), and "उदोच्या इतिहासवेदं ध्रुवायाश्चोध्वायाश्च पुराणवेदम् (*Gopatha Br.* 1.10).
Also cf. *Vāyu-P.* 1.17 : "पुराणवेदो ह्यखिलास्तस्मिन् सम्यक् प्रतिष्ठितः ।"

5. *Cf.* "...इतिहासपुराणं पञ्चमं वेदानां वेद..." *Chā-Up VII.* 1.2.

6. *Cf. Vāyu-P.* 1.180.
यो विद्याच्चतुरो वेदान् साङ्गोपनिषदो द्विजः ।
न चेत् पुराणं संविद्यान्नैव स स्याद् विचक्षणः ॥

7. *Cf.*, *Bhāg.*-P. I. 4.25.
स्त्रीशूद्रद्विजबन्धूनां त्रयी न श्रुतिगोचरा ।
कर्मश्रेयसि मूढानां श्रेय एवं भवेदिह ।
इति भारतमाख्यानं कृपया मुनिना कृतम् ॥

8. *Cf.* fn. 4. above.

9. *Cf. Viṣṇu. P.* III. 6.28 :
अङ्गानि वेदाश्चत्वारो मीमांसा न्यायविस्तरः ।
पुराणं धर्मशास्त्रं च विद्या ह्येताश्चतुर्दश ॥
Cf. also *Yājñavalkya Smṛ.* 1.3.

10. *Cf. Manu-Smṛ.* 2.6a : "वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलम्"
Also *Kūrma-P.* (cr. edn.) I. 11.267b : "वेदाद् धर्मो हि निर्बभौ"

11. *Cf.* इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत्
—(*Vāyu-P.*,) 1.281, Mor edn.
(V. l. वेदार्थानुपबृंहयेत्, *Kūrma-P.* 2.19.24)
Also cf. *Mbh.* I. 1.267.

12. *Cf. Bhaviṣya-P.* I. 1.65f. :—
एतानि कुरुशार्दूल धर्मशास्त्राणि पण्डितैः ।
साधारणानि प्रोक्तानि वर्णानां श्रेयसे सदा ॥
चतुर्णामिह राजेन्द्र श्रोतुमर्हसि सुव्रत ।
[एतानि, i. e. पुराणानि enumerated in 61-64 ślokas]
The *Mahābhārata* also calls itself as a 'धर्मशास्त्र'
(I. 2.383).

13. *Cf.* अष्टादश पुराणानि रामस्य चरितं तथा ।
कार्ष्णं वेदं पञ्चमं च यन्महाभारतं स्मृतम् ॥
तथैव विष्णुधर्माश्च शिवधर्माश्च शाश्वताः ।
जयेति नाम तेषां च प्रवदन्ति मनीषिणः ॥
(*Bhaviṣya-P.* I. 4. 86-88).

14. *Cf.* जयो नामेतिहासोऽयं श्रोतव्यो विजिगीषुणा ।
महीं विजयते सर्वां शत्रूंश्चापि पराजयेत् ॥
—(*Mbh.*, I. 62.20; Cr. edn., I. 56.19).

In his Comm. on the *Harivaṁśa* Nīlakaṇṭha explains the *Jaya* as जयत्यविद्यामनेनेति जयसंज्ञमविद्याध्वान्तनाशकं ग्रन्थम् ।

15. *Cf. Kūrma-P.* 2.24.22.

16-17. *Cf. Kūrma-P.* (cr. edn.) II. 24. 21-22 :—
पुराणं धर्मशास्त्रं च वेदानामुपबृंहणम् ।
एकस्माद् ब्रह्मविज्ञानं धर्मज्ञानं तथैकतः ॥
धर्मं जिज्ञासमानानां तत्प्रमाणतरं स्मृतम् ।
धर्मशास्त्रं, पुराणं तद् ब्रह्मज्ञाने परा प्रमा ॥

18. See fn. 3 and 4 above.

19. *Cf. Viṣ-P.* III. 6.15-16.

20. P. V. Kane : *History of Dharmaśāstra,* Vol. V, Part II., p. 855.

21. Cf. Bhaviṣya-*P.* I. 1. 104-105 :—

पुनर्वृद्धि गतानीह आख्यानैर्विविधैर्नृप ।
यथास्माकं तथा चेदं भविष्यं कुरुनन्दन ॥
स्कान्दं शतसहस्रं तु लोकानां ज्ञातमेव हि ।
भविष्यमेतदृषिणा लक्षार्धं संख्यया कृतम् ॥

This statement of the *Bhav.-P.* illustrates how the Purāṇas have grown in their bulk.

22. Cf. the story of Mṛgamukhī as given in the *Sk.-P.*, Prabhāsa—Kh., Vastrāpatha-māhātmya, Adhs. 6, 7.

23. Vide Haraprasada Śastri's article in *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society :* Patna, XIV, pp. 330-7 and P. V. Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 842.

24. *Cf.* ततः [आविर्भूतं] पुराणमखिलं सर्वशास्त्रमयं ध्रुवम् ।
नित्यशब्दमयं पुण्यं शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ॥
—*Sk.*, Prabhāsa-Kh., Pradhāsa-Kṣetra-māhātmya 2, 4)

24a. Cf. Vāyu p. 1.31?.

25. Viṣṇu-P. IV. 20. 52-53. :
".....परीक्षिज्जज्ञे ॥ सोऽयं साम्प्रतमेतद् भूमण्डलमखण्डायतिधर्मेण पालयतीति" ॥

26. *Matsya-P.* 50.66 :
अथाश्वमेधेन ततः शतानीकस्य वीर्यवान् ।
जज्ञेऽधिसोमकृष्णाख्यः साम्प्रतं यो महायशाः ।
Cf. *Vāyu-P.* 1.12 ff. also.

27. Cf. also C. A. Lewis : The Geographical Texts of the Purāṇa-s in *Purāṇa,* Vol. IV (1962) pp. 112-145, 145-276 and V. S. Agrawala 'Bhuvanakośa Janapada-s of Bhārata-varṣa' in *Purāṇa,* V. 1 (Jan., 1963) pp. 160 ff.

28. For *prāṇa-vidyā* see *Praśna-Upaniṣad* (2-3), and for the *pratīka-upāsanā* see *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad,* Brahmānanda-vallī Anuvāka-s 2-3, where the worship of the *anna* (food) and the *prāṇa* as *Brahman* is recommended.

29. *Cf. Viṣṇu-P.* I. 8.35 :

देवतिर्यङ्मनुष्यादौ पुन्नामा भगवान् हरिः ।
स्त्रीनाम्नी श्रीश्च विज्ञेया नानयोर्विद्यते परम् ॥

and *Liṅga P.* II. 11.18 ff.

शंकरः पुरुषाः सर्वे स्त्रियः सर्वा महेश्वरी ।
पुंलिङ्गशब्दवाच्या ये ते च रुद्राः प्रकीर्त्तिताः ।
स्त्रीलिङ्गशब्दवाच्या याः सर्वा गौर्या विभूतयः ॥

30. *Kūrma P.* (cr. edn.) II 26.10-11.

कुटुम्बभक्तवसनाद् देयं यदतिरिच्यते ।
अन्यथा दीयते यद्धि न तद् दानं फलप्रदम् ॥
श्रोत्रियाय कुलीनाय विनीताय तपस्विने ।
वृत्तस्थाय दरिद्राय प्रदेयं भक्तिपूर्वकम् ॥

31. *Bhāgavata P.* VII. 14.8.

यावद् भ्रियेत जठरं तावत् स्वत्वं हि देहिनाम् ।
अधिकं योऽभिमन्येत स स्तेनो दण्डमर्हति ॥

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE GEOGRAPHICAL TEXTS OF THE PURĀṆAS AND THOSE OF MAHĀBHĀRATA.

By

C. A. Lewis

[महाभारते पुराणेषु च भूगोलवर्णनं विद्यते । अत्रास्मिन् निबन्धे विदुषा लेखकेन महाभारते उपलब्धस्य पुराणेषु वर्णितेन विवरणेन सह साम्यं वैषम्यं च प्रदर्शितम् । वस्तुतस्तु महाभारते वर्णितं भूगोलवर्णनं दिङ्निर्देशविहीनं वर्तते । पुराणेषु तस्य वर्णनं सप्तवर्गेषु (दक्षिण-मध्य-उत्तर-पूर्व-पश्चिमादिदिङ्निर्देशनसहितं) वर्तते । यतो महाभारतविवरणं दिग्विहीनमतो सहसा तस्मिन् परिवर्तनं दृश्यते । पुराणानां वर्णनं तु दिगनुसारि अतो क्रमस्तेषां विवरणे वर्तते । महाभारते तु विवरणेषु पाठभ्रष्टता अज्ञातता च वर्तते । लेखकेन एषां विवरणानां मूलविषये संभावनात्रयस्योहनं कृतम् । प्रथमतो संभाव्यते यद् पुराणेषु इदं विवरणं महाभारताद् गृहीतम् । द्वितीयतो यत् पुराणेभ्य इदं विवरणं महाभारते आगतम् । तृतीयतो अन्यग्रन्थेभ्यः इदं विवरणमुभयत्र गृहीतम् । लेखक-महोदयेनेदं प्रतिपादितं यद् महाभारतोक्तं विकरणमेव प्राचीनम् । यद्यपि विवरणमिदमस्पष्टं तथापि परिवर्तिनि पौराणिकनिर्माणकाले तदाधारेणैव स्पष्टं देशविभाजनपूर्वकं च जनपदानां तत्रत्यानां जातीनां च विवरणं प्रस्तुतम् । अन्ततो महाभारतोक्तविवरणस्य पुराणविवरणेन सह साम्यं वैषम्यं च विस्तरेण वर्णितम् ।]

An examination of the geographical texts of the purāṇas and the Mahābhārata shows that in several places a close correspondence definitely exists. On several occasions, (for example at the very beginning of the Mahābhārata text) the lists complement one another to such an extent that it is impossible to regard such similarity as due to accident or mere chance. On other occasions the two lists completely diverge; that of the Mahābhārata goes on to mention names not found in the purāṇic texts, while the latter often adds some names of its own which are not found in the Mahābhārata section. The most important difference between the two texts however is that the text of the Mahābhārata makes practically no mention of direction, while that of the purāṇas groups its names into seven distinct categories (i. e. Central, North, East, South,

West, Vindhyas, Himālayas) in that order. It is this almost complete omission of any indication of direction in the Mahābhārata text that is primarily responsible for its obscurity. One can never be quite certain as to when the list will make a sudden change of direction especially when, as not infrequently happens, a whole line may consist of unknown or corrupted names.

There are three possible ways in which the lists of the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas may be connected with each other. They are :

1. The Mahābhārata list may have incorporated the materials found in the purāṇas along with materials derived from other sources.

2. The purāṇas may have "lifted" a few lines of the Mahābhārata text and "edited" them according to the direction required at the same time adding some names of its own.

3. Both the Mahābhārata and purāṇas have utilised some other third source, the former retaining most of the names and omitting virtually all the directions, while the latter included most of the directions, but excluded many of the names.

Of these three alternatives the first is improbable for chronological reasons. The composition of the Mahābhārata text must have taken place at a much earlier period than that of the purāṇas, which as will be shown may be dated to the third century A. D. as it includes the Ābhīras in the southern division (Mārk. p. 57, 47 followed by Kirfel and confirmed by Bṛhatsaṃhitā XIV. 12-koṅkanābhīras). The only way in which the Mahābhārata may have incorporated the materials found in the purāṇas is to assume the existence of a third source older than the Mahābhārata text and these materials have been reproduced by the purāṇas exactly, but which the Mahābhārata has utilised along with other sources. The mention of the Ābhīras in the South by the former, if it represents an original reading, however, is decisive against this theory.

Moreover even supposing that "Ābhīra" is a "corrected reading and the Mahābhārata had utilised the materials of some other earlier source, which has been reproduced exactly by the purāṇas, in the same way as the Bṛhatsaṁhitā has utilised those

of the Parāśara, one would have expected its list to be far closer to the purāṇas than it actually is. It is possible that for reasons of his own the compiler of the geographical section of the Mahābhārata decided to omit most of the directions deliberately; nevertheless he might reasonably be expected to have followed the general order of enumeration found in the purāṇas, but such is not the case. While the purāṇas begin with the Central region and then proceed north, east, south west, in a clockwise direction finally ending in the Vindhyas and Himālayas, the Mahābhārata list after starting in Madhyadeśa immediately proceeds to the Vindhyas, which is mentioned in the purāṇas penultimately. Similarly the list of northern peoples given by the purāṇas is broken into two by the Mahābhārata, one half coming about one quarter of the way through the latter's text and the other near its end. Hence the first method of liaison between the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas, namely that the materials of the latter were incorporated by the former in its own text may be rejected for two reasons. Firstly if the mention of the Ābhīras in the southern division represents an original reading then the text of the purāṇas cannot be earlier than the third century A. D. Hence chronological reasons preclude the possibility of the Mahābhārata utilising the purāṇic materials. Secondly if we consider Ābhīra to be an "edited" reading and suppose that the purāṇas have only utilised some earlier source in the same way as the Bṛhatsaṁhitā utilised the Parāśara, and Pliny Megasthenes, then it would be possible for the Mahābhārata to have drawn its materials from this hypothetical third source also. This however seems very unlikely because a comparison of the internal structure of the two texts shows a much greater possibility of the purāṇas extracting a few lines of the Mahābhārata, than the latter utilising the text of the former, for while the purāṇas list their materials in seven specific divisions, the Mahābhārata scatters them haphazardly throughout its list without any attempt to preserve their order.

Let us now pass on to consider the second alternative, i. e. that the purāṇas derived their materials from the Mahābhārata, and "edited" them by adding the directions. The close correspondence of several lines of these two texts renders it likely that the compiler of the purāṇic lists did extract some lines of the

Mahābhārata text. Chronological factors also make this possible as the purāṇas were composed at a much later date than the Mahābhārata and, this being the case, they could easily have utilised its materials for their own subject matter. Nevertheless as many of the names mentioned in the purāṇic lists do not occur in the geographical section of the Mahābhārata, even though they are known in other parts of the same text (e.g. Sūrpāraka MB. 2.28 43. Paṭaccāra MB. 2.28.4.), it would appear that the compilers of the purāṇic texts, while they obviously utilised the geographical section of the Mahābhārata, must have also drawn upon other sources as well. They may therefore be considered in some degree "editors" in the same way as Yadāvaprakāśa in the geographical portion of the Vaijayantī is found to have utilised the data supplied by the purāṇas as materials on which to base his lists of synonyms. Accordingly it is necessary to modify our second alternative to the extent of saying that while the purāṇas did derive many of their names from the geographical catalogue of the Mahābhārata, at the same time they included other names either on their own initiative or made use of other sources. Hence the close correspondences and wide divergences between the two lists can now be explained, the former being the result of the purāṇas "lifting" of lines from the text of the Mahābhārata while the latter is due to the utilisation of another source. In this respect the compilers of the purāṇas have adopted a more critical attitude than Yadāvaprakāśa, who only utilised one source, namely the Bhuvanakośa lists of the various purāṇas, to provide materials for his own compilation. This is conclusively proved by the fact that virtually every name found in the Vaijayantī can be traced back to one or other of these Bhuvanakośa lists.

Let us now proceed to examine the third alternative, namely that the geographical section of the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas both drew upon a third source. Such a theory is very attractive in that it neatly explains both the similarities and divergences of the two lists by referring them to some hypothetical third source, which would contain all the data found in both lists, i.e. it would possess all the names listed in the purāṇas together with all the directions of the latter. The possibility of the existence of such a text is very doubtful especially when, as we have already seen, the internal structure of the lists of the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas is quite

different, the former following no fixed direction, but changing from one to the other and back again without any apparent reason, while the latter is rigidly divided into seven distinct divisions. It would seem more probable that the Mahābhārata list itself may be an original compilation and as such would represent the earliest treatise extant on the ancient geography of India. It will be noticed that while the whole list lacks any systematic framework, the various parts within it nevertheless do have some specific arrangement and give the impression of being lists of regional groups of tribes all "strung" together haphazardly without any attempt to unite them in that distinct geographical framework which is the chief characteristic of the purāṇic lists. Such a theory would explain the abrupt changes of direction in the Mahābhārata list, and also the not infrequent repetitions as it is only to be expected that the better known tribes would be mentioned in more than one regional group relating to the same area. This being the case, the purāṇic lists would represent a definite advance in the geographical conception of Hindu India. From the old notion of merely "stringing" together lists of regional groups without any regard as to their relative position in the country as a whole, there has emerged in the purāṇas the concept of Bhāratavarṣa as a single unity capable of being divided into specific geographical divisions within which the various regional groups might be placed. Such a theory would explain why regional groups like the Bahlikas, Vāṭadhanas etc. and the Hūṇa, Pārada, etc. are widely separated from one another in the Mahābhārata text, but are placed by the purāṇas within the same division. The former regards them as groups without any apparent connection with each other, while the latter considers them to be units of one specific division of Bhāratavarṣa. To summarise; the Mahābhārata has no real conception of Bhāratavarṣa as a geographical entity, even though it is acquainted with all its parts while the purāṇas clearly regard it as a single whole.

It now remains to identify those parts of the Mahābhārata text which are connected with those of the purāṇic lists. The Mahābhārata text cited is that of the Poona critical edition.

6.10.37. tatreme kurupāñcālāḥ śālva-mādreya-jāṅgalāḥ

38. śūrasenāḥ kaliṅgāś ca bodhā maukās tathaiva ca

These tribes are located in Madhyadeśa by Brahmāṇda p. 1.16. 40b—41, Matsya p. 114. 34b-35, Vāyu p. 45.109b-110, Brāhma p. 27.4b, Mārkaṇḍeya p. 57.32b.

Kuru-Pāñcāla. Kurukṣetra is mod. Thaneswar. Pāñcāla refers probably to Northern Pāñcāla with its capital at Ahichattra (mod. Ramnagar).

Śālva. Modern Jaipur and Alwar districts.

Mādreya. Probably a branch of the Madras.

Jāṅgala. The forest district between the Ganges and North Pañcāla

Śūrasena. Capital Mathurā (mod. Maholi, 5 miles S-W of the modern city of that name).

Kaliṅga. (Variants. Da. D 5 Kulinda, K2 Kuliṅga, D4, 8. Dn. B. Pulinda). The reading here is quite difficult to determine. The purāṇic texts locate the Kaliṅgas in the Southern division, the Kulindas in the Northern, and the Pulindas in the Southern. It seems unlikely that any of these peoples can be included in Madhyadeśa. The K2 variant, Kuliṅga, is interesting in that it hints that the original reading may have been Bhuliṅga, a branch of the Śālvas according to the Kāśikā (Pāṇini IV. 1.173) and the Vaijayantī (ed. Oppert. p. 38 Sl. 39). Pliny (N.H. VI. 20.) refers to them as Bolingae and places them correctly west of the Aravalli hills. They are also known to Ptolemy (VII. 1.69) who has however misplaced them by locating them east of the Vindhyas.

Bodha. Probably the area around Indraprastha (mod. Indarpat, near Delhi.

Mauka. (Variant. Dl, 4,5,8, Da. Dn. B. Padma p. Māla). Mauka is not found elsewhere. The variant Māla is however to be found in several independent texts. It is mentioned in Kālidāsa's Meghadūta (I. 16), but it is difficult to identify being placed doubtfully by Upadhyāya (India in Kālidāsa p. 69) in a mountain range north of Ramtek. A town of Mālāprastha is referred to by Panini (IV. 2. 87), while a river of the same name is mentioned by Kauṭilya's Arthasastra (II.11) and located by Konnow (Studies in Kauṭilya. 1945, p. 19) between Indraprastha and Girivraja. Pāṇini's Mālāprastha may perhaps be a town on this river, especially when it is stated that places ending with prastha are confined to the Kuru country and the region of the Himālayas watered by the Ganges. The combined evidence of Kauṭilya and Pāṇini thus confirms the accuracy of the Padma purāṇa and those manuscripts of the Mahābhārata which place Māla in Madhyadeśa.

Matsya. Capital Vairāta (mod. Bairat, 100 miles S-W of Delhi).

Sukuṭya. (Variants. K4. Sukutta, D3. Sakutta, D2 Sunkanta. Da. D5. Kusanda, B2. Kusatta, B, 1, 4. Padmap. Kusatta, Dn. D4 Kusadya. Dn2. D6. Kusalya.

The corresponding section of the purāṇic texts have Kirāta (Matsyap), Aśvakūta (Mārkp.), Kuśālya (Brahmāṇḍap), Kisasna (Vāyup), Kusatta (Vaijayantī). Among these numerous variants the most probable form appears to be Kusatta. A country of Kusattha is mentioned in the Prakrit lists of Kirfel and placed significantly between Kuru and Pāñcāla, a position which indicates that it is to be located in Madhyadeśa. According to the Jain texts its capital was Saurika or Seripura. (Kirfel. Die Kosmographie der Inder, p. 227). With Kusattha may perhaps be connected the Asvattha of the Bṛhatsaṁhitā (XIV. 2.) which is also located in Madhyadeśa.

Saubalya. The purāṇic texts read Kulya at this point, but neither name can be identified.

Kuntala (Padmap. Kuntayah). The evidence for a tribe of Kuntalas in Madhyadeśa is very doubtful. Pargiter, following Cunningham, locates them at Kuntila near Chanour south of Benares (Markp. (trans) p. 308) but such an identification rests only on similarity of name. The Kuntis on the other hand are definitely located by passage of the Mahābhārata on the bank of the Aśvanādī river, a tributary of the Chambal and have accordingly been identified with Kontwar in Gwalior State. (Agrawala. India as known to Panini, p. 8). The Garuḍa-purāṇa (55, 12) also places them in Madhyadeśa while in the section of the geographical catalogue of the Mahābhārata, parallel to that of the Padmapurāṇa we find the same variation between Kuntala and Kunti in manuscripts. Accordingly the weight of the evidence is in favour of Kunti.

Kāśi-Kośala. Kośala is evidently Uttara-kośala whose capital was Śrāvastī (mod. Sahet-Mahat in Oudh). Kāśi (mod. Benares) according to Rājaśekhara (KM. p. 93) represented the eastern limit of Madhyadeśa.

6.10.39. Cedi—Vatsāḥ Karūṣāś ca Bhojāḥ Sindhu-pulindakāḥ
Uttamaujā Daśārnāś ca Mekalāś cotkalaiḥ saha

These tribes are located in the Vindhyas by Brahmāṇḍap. 1.16. 63b-64a, Matsyap. 114.52, Vāyup. 45.132, Brahmap. 27.59b-60a, Mārkaṇḍeyap. 57.53.

Cedi. The Vaijayantī also locates it in the Vindhyas and makes it synonymous with Traipura; the Kūrmavibhāga texts locates it in the South-East, but mentions it separately from Traipura. Its capital Śūktimatī on the river of the same name (mod. Ken. cf. MB. 1.57.32, 3.23.47) may be located near Benda. It roughly comprised the modern Bundelkhand region S-E of the Jumna from its junction with the Chambal. (For a detailed study see I. H. Q. 27 (1951) p. 250 ff.

Vatsa. Omitted by the purāṇic texts except the Vāyup. who makes it a variant of Matsya. Capital Kauśambī (mod. Kosam, west of Allahabad).

Karūṣa. The purāṇic texts also locate it in the Vindhyas. According to epigraphic evidence (A. S. R. III 67) it may be located in Shahabad district, Bihar.

Bhoja. The purāṇic texts similarly locate in the Vindhyas.

Sindhu—Pulindakas. i. e. Pulindas from the Indus, but such an interpretation seems very strained. The corresponding texts of the purāṇas read Kiskindhaka, which seems to be the correct reading. Sindhu is probably a corruption of Kiskindhaka due to the loss of the first syllable in transcription, i.e. (Ki) S (k) indhaka.

Uttamauja. The purāṇic texts read Uttamārṇa "the highest forts perhaps the Mahadeo Hills.

Daśārṇa. There are two branches of this tribe, the western Daśārṇas in Bhilsa district and the eastern Daśārṇas in the Chattirgarh area of C. P. The latter appear more likely to be referred to in the present context, as its association with the Mekalas and Utkalas indicates that we are now in the eastern ranges of the Vindhyas.

Mekala. Mod. Maikal range.

Utkala. They may be located in the Puri district of Orissa.

6.10.45b. Vāhīkā Vāṭadhānāś ca Ābhīrāḥ Kālatoyakāḥ
46a. Aparandhrāś ca Śūdrāś ca Pahlavāś Carmakhaṇḍikāḥ

These tribes are located in the northern division by Brahmāṇḍap. 1.16.46, Matsyap. 114.40, Vāyup. 45.115, Brahmap. 27. 44b-45a, Mārkaṇḍeyap. 57. 35b-36a.

Vāhīka (Variants. Dl,4,7,8, Dn, S, Bāhlīka. Da, D5, B, Bahlīka). Bāhlīka seems a preferable reading to Vahika as a similar form is found in the corresponding passages of the purāṇic texts. Originally the inhabitants of modern Balkh, they later migrated to the Punjab, occupying the area between the Satlej and Indus.

Vāṭadhāna. According to Pargiter (Mārkp. (trans) p. 312) they are to be located east of the Sutlej southwards from Ferozepur.

Ābhīra. According to the Mahābhārata (Roy's trans. v. VII p. 147) they are to be placed in west Rajputana, where the Sārasvatī disappears. Later they migrated through Gujarat into the mod. Konkan district.

Kālatoyaka. From its meaning of "black water" Pargiter (ibid.) has identified it with the swamps of the Indus delta.

Aparandhra. Most of the corresponding purāṇic read Āparanta "westerners" which is clearly out of place in a list of northern tribes. The original form is retained by the Vāyup. alone, i.e. Āparita which is identical with the Āprīta of Pāṇini IV. 2.53. (gana) and the Aparytai of Herodotus (3.91). Their name survives in the modern Afridi of N. W. F. P., which is actually pronounced Apridi.

Śūdra. They are frequently placed by the Mahābhārata in close association with the Ābhīras, and like them are located in west Rajputana where the Sārasvatī disappears into the desert.

Pahlava. Mod. Medes.

Carmakhaṇḍika. Their location is uncertain. Pargiter conjectures Samarkhand (Mārkp. (trans) p. 314), though there is no evidence in support of this beyond similarity of name. Pliny (N.H. VI. 23) speaks of a rex Charmarum.

6.10.48. Andhrāś ca bahavo rājann Antargiryās tathaiva ca

Bahirgiry Āṅga Maladā Māgadhā Mānavarjakāḥ

6.10.49a. Mahyuttarāḥ Prāvṛṣeyā Bhārgavāś ca janādhīpa

These tribes are located in the eastern division by Brahmāṇḍap. 1.16.53, 54a, Matsyap. 114.44, Vāyup. 45.122-123a, Brahmap. 27.51b. 52, Mārkaṇḍeyap. 57.42b-43.

Andhra. This well known southern people is clearly out of place in this context. The corresponding text of the Mārkaṇḍeyap. reads Andhrāraka or Abhraraka, which is unknown elsewhere, but the Matsyap. correctly reads at this point Āṅga-Vaṅga. The Aṅgas may be located in modern Bhagalpur and Monghyr districts with their capital at Campa. The Vaṅgas occupied the eastern portion of the Ganges Delta between the Meghna and Brahmapūtra and subsequently gave their name to the province of Bengal.

Antargiri. The purāṇic texts likewise locate in the east. They are to be identified with the modern Rajmahal Hills in Santal Parganas district, W. Bengal.

Bahirgiri. The purāṇic texts likewise locate in the east. According to Pargiter (Mārkp. (trans.). p. 325) they are to be identified with the mountains bordering on the territory of the Āṅgas.

Āṅga. The corresponding purāṇic texts indicate that Pravaṅga is likely to be the correct reading here. Probably the first part (Prav) aṅga became lost due to textual corruption. The Pravaṅgas are possibly the same as the Upavaṅgas of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts (BS. XIV. 18).

Malada. Mod. Maldah in West Bengal.

Māgadha. Mod. Patna and Gaya districts. Capitals Girivrāja (Rajgir) and later Pāṭalīputra (Patna).

Mānavarjaka. The corresponding text of the purāṇas has Mālavartika as the name of an eastern people, but so far they have not been identified. Rājaśekhara (KM. p. 93) also locates them in the east.

Mahyuttara. (Dl, Sahyottara, D2, 6,8, Da, K3, 5, B2 Sahyuttara. Dn. Samaṁtara). The parallel text of the purāṇas reads either Suhmottara or Brahmottara. The correct reading here is supplied by Rājaśekhara's Kāvya-mīmāṁsā (p. 93) Malada-Mallavartaka-Suhma-Brahmottara, which corresponds so exactly in form to the purāṇic texts that it may be reasona-

bly assumed that its author utilised them as his sources. Most scholars assume the question to be whether Suhmottara or Brahmottara is the correct reading. Those favouring the former defend their choice by stressing the importance of the Suhmas, while those adopting the latter reading refer to its mention in Rājaśekhara's text. In addition to this evidence the authenticity of the Brahmottaras may be further established by reference to the Nāṭyaśāstra (13, 33.) where it is included in a list of eastern tribes, and by its mention in the purāṇic text of rivers as one of the countries through which the Ganges flows (Matsyap. 121.48) and by Buddhist texts (Law in A.B.O.R.I. XV. p. 1 ff.). Accordingly this evidence is conclusive in establishing the existence of Brahmottara with the result that many scholars at once reject Suhmottara. This however is only partially correct for Rājaśekhara's text shows that the original text was almost certainly Suhma-Brahmottara. Brahma somehow became displaced, and so the false form Suhmottara arose. The existence of Suhma as a member of the original list is implied by the Vaijayantī (p. 37. śl. 30) which also locates its in the east and makes it synonymous with Rādha.

Suhma may be identified with modern Midnapur district. Brahmottara is mentioned in another purāṇic passage (Matsyap. 121.50) as being on the Ganges between Aṅga (mod. Bhagalpur dist.) and Vaṅga (mod. Murshidabad, Jessore, Rajshahi dists.). Hence it may be identified with modern Dumka dist., a location that would also place it north of the territory of the Suhmas.

Prāvṛṣeya. The parallel texts of the purāṇas read Pravijaya, which is identified by Dey (Geog. Dict. p. 160) without citation of evidence with Jyntea in Assam. Shafer (Ethnog. of Ancient India p. 69) conuects Prāvṛṣeya with prāvṛs "rainy season" and identifies it with the inhabitants of Bhutan or the Aka-Dafla-Miri country, the Garo-Khasi-Jainta Hills or the western Ghats. It is possible however that its existence as a proper name is due to corruption by copyists of the original text, for in the parallel passages of the Kāvyamīmāṁsā and Nāṭyaśāstra prabhṛtayaḥ is found in its place.

Bhārgava. Dey (Geog. Dict. p. 32) identifies them with the Bhars of Western Assam, but these seem far more likely to be the modern descendants of Bhāllāṭa (i.e. Bhararāṣṭra) which the Digvijaya of Bhīmasena has specifically located in the eastern part of the Himālayas (MB. 2.27.5.). Ptolemy (VII. 2.20) refers to them as Barrhai, a form which is a far closer transcription of Bhāllāṭa than of Bhargava.

6.10.57. Draviḍāh Keralāḥ Prācyā Bhūṣikā Vanivāsinaḥ
Unnatyakā Māhiṣakā Vikalpā Mūṣakās tathā

These tribes are located in the southern division by Brahmāṇḍap. 1.66.56, Matsyap. 114.46b-47a, Vāyup. 45.124b-125a, Brahmap. 27.54b-55a, Mārkaṇḍeyap. 57.45b-46a.

Draviḍa. The Limyrike of Ptolemy (VII. 1.8. Caldwell "Dravidian Grammar" p. 14 explains the L as an orthographical error for D.) and the Damirike of the Pentinger tables. The forerunners of the modern Tamils, they are to be located in that part of the Deccan which stretches southwards from Madras to Cape Comorin.

Kerala. It may be identified with the southernmost part of the Malabar Coast between Calicut and Cape Comorin. Its capital was Vanji, near Cochin.

Prācya. "Easterners". Though well attested by manuscript authority, this reading cannot be correct, as only two names previously we have been specifically informed that the nations of Dakṣiṇāpatha will now be enumerated. Prācya therefore makes no sense at this point. A far more likely reading is Pāṇḍya which is actually mentioned next to Kerala in the purāṇic list of southern peoples. Moreover it is important to note that this name is not mentioned anywhere else in this Mahābhārata text. A tribe of its importance would scarcely have been deliberately omitted in this context when it is so frequently mentioned elsewhere. Accordingly it is proposed to substitute Pāṇḍya for Prācya at this point of the text. They may be identified with the Pandiones of Ptolemy (VII. 1.89) and located in the modern districts of Tinnevally and Madura, the latter being their ancient capital.

Bhūṣika. (var. Mūṣika). The Mūṣikas may be identified with southernmost portion of the Mālabar Coast from Quilon to kape Comorin. Its location within this area is shown by its proximity in the purāṇic texts to the Setukas and the Kumāras.

Vanavāsina (var. Vanavāsika). The north Kanara area between the Ghats, Tungabhadra and Varada. A town called Banavasi stands on the left bank of the Varada river.

Unnatyaka. (D4, 7, 8, Da, Dn, K4, B. Karṇāṭa). Karnāṭa is clearly a superior reading to Unnatyaka, which does not occur elsewhere. The modern Kanarese speaking area.

Māhiṣaka. Modern Mandhata on an island in the Nerbuda.

Vikalpa. (Padmap. Vikandha, D8 Viṣaka). This name is very doubtful. Viṣaka, however, may be compared with Vīraka, a name which is listed along with the Kāraskāras, Māhiṣakas and Kaliṅgas as peoples of no religion, all of whom actually live in the south (MB 8.30.46). A form, Vīṭaka, which may be analogous to it occurs in the Bṛhatsaṁhitā, though not in a geographical context. (BS 16.2).

Mūṣaka (D 1-3,7, K 3-5, B2 Mūṣika). Pargiter (Mārkp, (trans) p. 366) identifies them with the inhabitants of the modern Musi river on which modern Hyderabad stands. The variant Mūṣika is due to confusion with the tribe of this name already mentioned as occupying the area near Cape Comorin, only a few names back.

6.10.58. Karṇikāḥ Kuntikāś caiva saudbhidā nalakālakāḥ. These tribes are located in the southern division by Brahmāṇḍa p. 1.16.59a, Vāyu p. 45.127b., Brahma p. 27.57b, Mārkaṇḍeya p. 57. 48b.

Karṇika (Jhillika Da, D4, 5, B 1-3; Jillika Dn; Nillika D8, Kuḍaya D1).

The corresponding section of the purāṇas gives the following variants Vāyup. Nairṇika, Mārkaṇḍeyap. Naisika, Brahmāṇḍap. Koṅkana, Brahmap. Kaulika. Attempts have been made to identify the Mārkaṇḍeyap. form with present Nasik, but such an identification is rendered impossible by Nāsikya actually being mentioned in the same texts (Matsyap

114.50; Vāyup. 45.130) as a place in Aparāntadeśa. The Brahmap. variant Kaulika (27. 57) suggests that the correct reading may be Śūlika a form which certainly is not too dissimilar with Epic Jhillika and is listed by the Kūrma-vibhāga texts (Bṛhatsaṁhitā XIV. 8) in the S-E division.

Kuntika (Kuntala D 1,3-8, Da, Dn, K4, B1, 3, 4)

According to Mirashi (Hyderabad Area Mem 14 p. 9n) the rivers Kuntalas are to be located between the Bhīmā and Vedavatī and comprised the Kanarese destricts of Bombay, Madras and Mysore states. Its capital was at Kalyāṇapura (mod. Kalyāṇa, 36 miles west of Bidar).

Saudbhida.

The accuracy of the Critical edition's reading is established by the corresponding text of the purāṇas which mentions the Udbhidas along with the Āndhras as peoples in the south. It is not possible to identify them however as apart from these texts the name does not seem to occur elsewhere.

Nalakālaka. In South according to the Kūrma Vibhāga texts. Dey (Geog. Dict. p. 139) connects it with the Nelcindya of the Periplus (sec. 54) and identifies it with Koṭṭayam in Travancore. Such an identification appears erroneous however as its position both here and in the Purāṇic lists is indicated to be much further North, probably somewhere in the Andhra region. Shafer (Ethn. Anc. India, p. 75) identifies it in the region along the Kistna and Nallamalai Mts., i.e. the territory of the modern Chenchus. Such a position is more in conformance with the evidence that the location proposed by Dey. The author of the Vaijayantī, Yādavaprakāśa (p. 37, śl.34) in his summarised list of Dakṣiṇāpatha peoples mentions a form Kulakālaka which must be an error for Nalakālaka.

6.10.60b. tathaiva vindhyapulakāḥ pulindāḥ kalkalaiḥ saha.

These tribes are located in the south according to Brahmāṇḍa p. 1 16.58a, Matsya p. 114.48b, Vāyu p. 45.126b, Brahma p. 27.56b, Mārkaṇḍeya p. 57.47. b.

Vindhyapulaka (Vindhya cūlika D4,8, Dn, B2,4, K4).

The corresponding texts of the purāṇas gives the form variously as Vindhyamauliya (Brahmāṇḍap), Vindhyapuṣika

(Matsyap.) Vindhyamauleya (Mārkaṇḍeyap.) Vindhyamūlika (Vāyup.). The best form would appear to be Vindhyamauleya; these living in the foothills of the Vindhyas. The variant 'Cūlika' listed by several manuscripts of the Mahābhārata is geographically possible as it is listed in the S-E by the Kūrmavibhāga texts (Bṛhat S. 14.8), but its association with the name of a mountain gives a rather strained type of Sanskrit. Moreover none of the purāṇic texts, it is significant to note, lists them in conjunction with Vindhya. Cūlika is probably therefore the result of a copist's efforts to correct the text.

Pulinda. The Kāśyapasaṁhitā (25.13) also locates them in the South and their antiquity is established by their inclusion along with the Āndhras in the text of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (VII, 18). According to Law (p. 184) their capital, Pulindanagara, was situated near Bhilsa in Jubblepore district.

Kalkala (D, B, S, K 2, 4 Valkala. Padma p. Valbala, var. Daṇḍaka). The correct reading here is early Daṇḍaka, a reading supported by the purāṇic texts. Daṇḍakāraṇya is well known in Sanskrit literature and may be indentified with the forest regions near the source of the Godāvarī.

6.10.62b.

Ādidāyāḥ sirālāś ca stūbakā stanapās tathā.

These tribes are located in the west by Brahmāṇḍa p. 1.16.60b, Matsya p. 114.49a, Vāyu p. 45.129a, Mārkaṇḍeya p. 57 50a. Hilgenburg (Die Kosmographische episode im Mahābhārata und Padmapurāṇa, p. 26) has failed to notice the connection between the epic and purāṇic texts at this juncture.

Ādidāya. The corresponding text of the purāṇas have the forms, Puleya (Vāyu p.), Puliya (Vāmana p.) Kulīya (Matsya p.), Pulinda (Mārkaṇḍeya p., Pauleya (Brahmāṇḍa p). It is not possible to identify the name with certainty, through the purāṇic forms seem to imply a form Puleya.

Sirāla. The corresponding section of the purāṇic lists have following forms : Sirala (Matsya p.), Asinila (Vāmana p.), Surala (Vāyu p.) Sumīna (Mārkaṇḍeya p.), Kirāta (Brahmāṇḍa p.). Of these Kirāta is impossible in this position and represents a

copyist's effort to "correct" the text. Shafer (E.A.I. p. 78) corrects Sirāla with modern Shirl, a town near Nirāj, Kolhapur district, Bombay.

Stubaka (Sunapa D, Sūnapa D 3, Sunaya D 4,5,8, Da, Dn, B1, 2).

The parallel text of the purāṇas reads Rūpasas of which the forms of Mahābhārata manuscripts D 13 represent metatheses. i.e. Sunāpa i.e. Surāpa>Rūpasa. This form is likely to be a corruption of Anūpa.

Stanapa. The corresponding passage of the purāṇas reads Tāpasa (Mārkaṇḍeya p. Svapada) which is undoubtedly correct as the Kūrmavibhāga texts refer to a Tāpasāśrama in Dakṣiṇāpatha (Bṛhats. XIV 15, Mārkaṇḍeya p. 58.27). It is mentioned by Ptolemy as Tabasol (VII.1.65) and may be identified with modern Pandharpur (Dey. p. 204).

6.10.64b.68

Sakṣaddruhaḥ kuntalāś ca Hūṇāḥ Pāratakaiḥ saha
tathaiva Maradhāś Cīnās tathaiva Daśamālikāḥ
kṣatriyopaniveśāś ca vaiśyaśūdrakulāni ca
Śūdrābhīratha Daradāḥ Kāśmīrāḥ paśubhiḥ saha
Khaśikāś ca Tukhārāś ca Pallavā Girigahvarāḥ
Ātreyāḥ Sabharadvājās tathaiva Stanayoṣikāḥ
Aupakāś ca Kaliṅgāś ca Kirātānāṁ ca jātayaḥ
Tāmarā Haṅsamārgāś ca tathaiva Karabhañjakāḥ.

These tribes are located in the Northern division by Brahmāṇḍa p. 1.16.47b-51; Matsya p. 114.41b-43; Vāyu p. 45.116b-120, Brahma p. 97.46-50a, Mārkaṇḍeya p. 57.37-41a.

Sahṣaddrupa. The purāṇic variant, Śatadruja "these born on the banks of the Sutlej appear the more probable reading.

Kuntala. The reading of the Critical edition is obviously out of place in a list of northern tribes. The corresponding passage in the purāṇas gives the following variants Kulinda (Vāyu p., Brahmāṇḍa p.), Pulinda (Matsya p.), Kalinda (Mārkaṇḍeya p., Brahma p.), Lalittha (Vāmana). Pulinda and Kaliṅga are obviously wrong in this context. Kulinda is well known as the name of a northern tribe, and may be located between the upper course of the Ganges and Sutlej, i.e. in modern Garhwal north of Shaharanpur (I.H.Q. XXVII (1951) p. 197).

Hūṇa. The corresponding text of the purāṇas indicates that the Hārahūṇās are the branch of Hūṇa referred to here. They are similarly located in the north by Rājaśekhara (KM p. 93) who distinguishes between the Hūṇas and the Hārahūṇas.

Pārataka. Ptolemy (VI.21.4) refers to them as Paradene and locates them in Gedrosia. They are also mentioned by the Mahāmāyūrī (Tome 92. Journ. Asiatique 1915 p. 103), Moti Chandra (J.U.P.H.S. Dec. 1943 p. 59) finds traces of their name in Pardān-domb in the centre of the Panjgur oasis near Chitkan.

Maradha (Ramatha K5, D3). The corresponding text of the purāṇas gives the following variants, Rāmatha (Matsya p.), Ramaṭa (Vāyu p.), Ravada (Brahmāṇḍa p.), Māṭhara (Brahma p., Mārkaṇḍeya p.). Ramatha is clearly the correct reading at this point, the form Māthara being due to confusion of the syllables. A passage in the Mahābhārata (3.48.21) (Journ. Asiatique 1915 p. 114) places it near Jāguḍa i.e. modern Ghazni and Helmand districts.

Cīna. Usually identified with tribes of Chinese origin inhabiting the northern slopes of the Himālayas.

Daśamālika. Pargiter (Mārk p. (trans) p. 318) identifies them as ten branches of the Mālikas (Mod. Mallis) though this seems very doubtful.

Śūdrābhīra. These two tribes are frequently associated in the Mahābhārata and are to be located in west Rajputana where the Sārasvatī disappears. (MB. (Roy's trans) vol. VII p. 147).

Darada. The Daradrai of Ptolemy (VII.1.42). They may be identified with modern Dardistar north of Kashmir on the upper bank of the Indus.

Kāśmīra. Mod Kashmir.

Paśu. This name would appear to be a truncated form of Paśupa or Paśupāla (MB 2.48.3). The former name is mentioned among the tribes who brought pots of gold raised from under the earth by unts, a statement that definetely locates them in the Himālayas near the Daradas in whose territory these arts are reputed to live (Strabo XV.1.44).

Khaśika. Mod. Khakhas of Nepal.

Tukhāra. Known to classical writers under the name of Tocharoi (Ptolemy VI.11.6) and may be located in the upper Oxus valley (Stein-Rājataraṅgiṇī I p. 136).

Pallava (Pahlava D 4,7,8, B, K 4). The Pallavas were an important dynasty in the south from the 2nd century A. D. onwords. They are out of place in this context and hence the variant Pahleva is to be prefered.

Girigahvara. The corresponding text of the purāṇas lists the following variants Bāhyotadara (Vāyu p., Vāmana p.), Vahyatodhara (Brahmāṇḍa p.) Bāhyato narāḥ (Mārkaṇḍeya p.

Ātreya. According to a passage of the Vanaparva (MB. 3.26.68.) they seem to be located near Dvaitavana, mod. Deoband 50 miles north of Mirat in Saharanpur District.

Bharadvāja. They are also mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. 2.145) and appear to be the descendants of a ṛṣi Bharadvāja frequently mentioned in the Mahābhārata as priest to the king of Kāśī.

Stanayoṣika. The corresponding text of the purāṇas gives the following forms, Stanapa (Vāyu p.), Talagāna (Matsya p.) Śūlakāra (Mārkaṇḍeya p.), Śunaśoko (Brahma p.), Tanaka (Vāmana p.) Tālaśāla (Brahmāṇḍa p). It also appears in the shorter Kūrmavibhāga texts as (S) Tananāga (Gar. p. 55.19) or Talanga (Vah p. 1.9.9) where it is likewise placed in the north. The last mentioned form supports that of the Matsya p. as being correct as nāga can easily be explained as a corruption of gāna.

Aupaka. The parallel text of the purāṇas give the following variants. Apaga (Vāyu p.), Alasa (Vāmana p.), Aupadha (Mārkaṇḍeya p.), Auṣadha (Brahmāṇḍa p.). It is difficult to determine the precise form of the name in view of the number of variants listed. It is perhaps identical with the Avagaṇas of the Bṛhatsaṁhitā (XI. 61, XVI, 37). Dey (Geog. Dict. p. 13) equates both with Kāmboja.

Kaliṅga. The corresponding section of the purāṇas lists the following forms. Alacandra (Brahma p.), Alimadra (vāyu p.) Arimadra (Mārkaṇḍeya p.) Alibhadra (Vāmana p.) Ālisandra (Brahmāṇḍa p.). Kaliṅga is completely out of place here and must be rejected. It is probably the result of a copyist's

effort to "correct" the text. The best reading is perhaps Alimadra which Dey (p. 4) identifies with the Hotimordern or Yusifzai country north-east of Peshawar.

Kirāta. Mod. Kirantis in the eastern part of Nepal.

Tāmara. They are refered to by Ptolemy (VII. 2.16) as Zamirai or Zamarai and are located beyond the Kirrhadai (Kirāta) near Mt Maiandros (Skt. Mandara). According to Mac Crindle (Ptolemy. p. 235) they may be placed in the Garo Hills district of Assam. Tamar (Shafer. Ethn. Anc. Ind., p. 134) is another name for Murmi, a Tibeto-Burmic language spoken in Nepal.

Haṁsamārga. Mod. Hunza district (J. U. P. H. S., July 1944, p. 48).

Karabhañjaka. (D 2, 6, K 3, 5 Karabhojaka). The digvijaya of Arjuna (MB. 2.24.24-6) clearly refers to two branches of Kāmbojas and only one has so for been mentioned in this catalogue. These of the present text would appear to be identical with the Paramakāmbojas of the digvijaya text and may be located in the Galcha speaking areas of the Yarkand Valley (Jayacandra. Bhāratbhūmi aur uske nivāsī. p. 313).

Such are the correspondences between the texts of the geographical lists of the Mahābhārata and purāṇas.

THE HARACARITACINTĀMAṆI—ITS ŚAIVA LEGENDS AS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF THE PURĀṆAS

BY

KANTA GUPTA

[जयद्रथकृतः हरचरितचिन्तामणिनामकः काव्यग्रन्थः शिवचरित्रस्य शैवदर्शनस्य माहात्म्यस्य च प्रख्यापकोऽस्ति । कविनाऽत्र शिवस्य सर्वदेवातिशायित्वं प्रतिपादितम् । पुराणेषु शिवचरित्रं विशदरूपेण वर्णितं वर्तते । अस्मिन् निबन्धे हरचरिते वर्णितानि शिवाख्यानानि पुराणेषु कुत्र उपलभ्यन्ते इति अन्वेषितम् । संक्षेपतः प्रतिपादितं यत् हरचरितचिन्तामणौ प्राप्तानि शिवमहत्त्वप्रतिपादकानि चरित्राणि अन्येषु पुराणेषु अपि वर्तन्ते । शैवदर्शनस्य धर्मस्य च प्रतिपादकदृष्ट्या हरिचरितचिन्तामणिः महत्त्वपूर्णो ग्रन्थो वर्तते ।]

The *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, a poem on the deeds and exploits of Hara, is conclusively attributed to poet *Jayadratha*[1], who bore the titles of Mahāmaheśvarācārya and Rājānaka. The deeds of the three-eyed Lord have been compiled here according to the texts[2] and the contents of the poem are in strict conformity with traditions and nothing is repugnant to them[3] as asserted by the poet.

Further the Kāvya proposes to deal with Śaiva philosophy and its tenets[4]. Jayadratha has emphasized the superiority of Śiva over all other divinities throughout the Kāvya.[5] In his zeal for Śaiva religion and philosophy, he does not hesitate to criticise and refute the tenets of other religions like Buddhism[6], Sāṁkya and Yoga. This is further shown by the fact that even small and simple acts of

1. (a) Bühler, G. *Kaśmira Report*, p. 61. *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Extra Number, 1877.
   (b) Aufrecht, Theodor, *Catalogus Catalogorum*; i, 7546, ii, 182b ; 236b.
2. चरित्रचित्राणि त्रिनेत्रस्य शास्त्रदृष्टानि गुम्फये
   Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, Intro 5.
3. *Ibid.*, XXX 126, 127.
4. *Ibid.*, XXX 2.
5. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, X 124, XIX 40.
6. *Ibid.*, XIII, 74-92 ; XVII 79-82.

worship like offering flower or Dhūpa to Śiva is said to yield far more beneficial results than the performance of several sacrifices.[1]

To stress Śiva's supremacy, the beginning of each chapter (Prakāśa) provides the philosophical basis for the incidents connected with Lord Śiva, while the concluding verses briefly touch upon the essence of story or the glory of Śiva, enjoining upon the readers utmost devotion to Mahādeva.

Jayadratha has thus dealt with Śaiva legends, myths and Śiva's various incarnations in great detail. The work apparently partakes the characteristics of Purāṇas. As a Purāṇa deals not only with the five topics of creation of universe, its destruction, genealogies of Gods, the ages of Manus and history of the kings[2], but also with various other subjects like description of earth (*Bhuvanakośa*), fasts, prayers, pilgrimages, avatāras of God and tenets and supremacy of a particular deity. The Haracaritacintāmaṇi, likewise, deals with ancient legendary lore, myths, incarnation of Śiva, fasts, festivals, prayers, pilgrimages and so on.

The *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* also refers to various wellknown Tīrthas and other sacred sites of Kashmir. Of the whole list of 51 Māhātmya texts collected by M.A. Stein,[3] apart from other sources like Purāṇas, the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* is given as the source of Kapaṭeśvara and Piṅgaleśvara avatāras. It has been righty observed, "The Haracaritacintāmaṇi of Jayadratha is not really a Mahākāvya but work of Māhātmya type, which retaisn in the śloka metre old and new Śaiva legends, some of which are distinctly connected with places of pilgrimage in Kashmir".[4]

Jayadratha's extensive description of the glorious acts of Śiva and his consort Pārvatī based on the accounts given in the extensive religious literature, bespeak his deep learning as both the commonly prevalent and uncommon Paurāṇic legends and lores. A close analysis will undoutedly prove that the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* is really a repository of various well known and less known legends and lores.

---

1. *Ibid.*, XVII, 83-88.
2. सर्गश्च प्रतिसर्गश्च वंशो मन्वन्तराणि च ।
   सर्वेष्वेतेषु कथ्यन्ते वंशानुचरितं च यत् ॥
   Viṣṇupurāṇa, III. 6,24.
3. Stein, M.A., *Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī*, Vol. II, pp. 491, 492.
4. Das Gupta, S. N. & De, S. K., *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 323, 324.

Śiva, being the supreme power, controls all the deities including even Brahmā and Viṣṇu. This supremacy is portrayed in various legends.

In Jvālāliṅgāvatāra—to settle the dispute between Brahmā and Viṣṇu for their supremacy—Lord Śiva appeared as Jvālāliṅga to test them and finally established his own supremacy over all.[1] This popular legend is mentioned often in the various Purāṇas, though with minor deviations.[2]

The incidents narrated in the Kāvya correspond closely to those in the *Liṅgapurāṇa*.[3]

The story of the enmity between Gods and Demons, the churning of the ocean to get ambrosia at Brahmā's bidding, appearance of *Kālakūṭa* which was a terror to all, and the drinking of the same by Lord Śiva[4] is quite popular in Purāṇas.[5] The *Matsyapurāṇa* seems to be the model for this legend in our Kāvya, as the story given here appears as a paraphrase of that in the *Matsyapurāṇa*.

The narrative of *Andhaka* is given.[6] His severe penance to get the boon of invincibility from Brahmā, his torturing the Gods, desiring to marry Durgā and being placed by Śiva on his trident, this story is given here as dealt with in *Śivamahāpurāṇa* and *Matsyapurāṇa*.[7]

---

1. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, i. 2-100.
2. (a) *Padmapurāṇa*, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa, XLI, 19.
   (b) *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa*, LXXXI, 50-78.
   (c) *Kūrmapurāṇa*–Pūrvārdha, XXVI, 64-110.
   (d) *Śivamahāpurāṇa*–Prathamā-vidyeśvarasaṃhitā, VI, VII.
   (e) *Śrimaddevībhāgavatam*, I, 9, 4-82.
   (f) *Matsyapurāṇa*–CLXX, 1-30.
   (g) *Liṅgapurāṇa*—Pūrvabhāga, XVII, 1-91.
3. *Liṅgapurāṇa*–Pūrvabhāga, XVII, 1-91.
4. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, III, 3-78.
5. (a) *Matsyapurāṇa*, CCL 5-61, (b) *Skandapurāṇa*, माहेश्वर खण्डस्य केदारखण्ड IX, 1-113 ; X, 1-87.
   (c) Ibid. वैष्णवखण्डस्य वासुदेवमाहात्म्यारम्भे XI, 130.
   (d) *Srīmadbhāgavata*, Vol. II, VIII, 7. 18-43.
   (e) *Śivamahāpūrāṇa*, तृतीयशतरुद्रीयसंहिता XVI, 1-7.
6. Jayadratha, *HCC* V, 3-107.
7. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa* द्वितीयरुद्रसंहिता चतुर्थयुद्धखण्ड XLIV, 1-71 ; XLV, 1-54, XLVI. 1-39.
   (b) *Matsyapurāṇa*, CLXXIX, 2-40.

The supremacy cf Śiva is further brought out by the story in which seeing the failure of the *Brahmadaṇḍa* of Brahmā to destroy Śarabha, Viṣṇu propitiated Śiva and got Sudarśana Cakra, with which he vanquished him and many other demons.[1] In *Śivamahāpurāṇa* and *Liṅgapurāṇa* Viṣṇu propitiated Śiva by offering one lotus for each of Śiva's thousand names and unable to find any more lotuses, offered his own eye. Śiva was highly pleased with this and granted him the Cakra.[2]

The story of demon Tāraka, his atrocities, the supplication of Gods to Lord Śiva for creation of a General to lead the force of Gods, Śiva's marriage with Pārvatī, the birth of Kumāra and the destruction of Tāraka by Kumāra[3]—is dealt with frequently and in detail in many Purāṇas.[4] Although this story is narrated in different Purāṇas, Jayadratha seems to have not only followed the same pattern of facts but also same mode of expression and phraseology as found in *Padmapurāṇa* and *Matsyapurāṇa*.

In *Svayambhunāthāvatāra*—the story of three invincible demons Vidyanmālin, Tāraka and Kamala who after propitiating Brahmā, got control over the wonderful Tripura, is given. They had steadfast devotion unto Śiva but were misguided by Bṛhaspati, who with the help of his intellect, wanted to spread Buddhism. They lost faith in Śiva, who consumed Tripura by the blazing fire[5]. This

1. Jayadratha, *HCC* VII, 4-64.
2. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa* चतुर्थीकोटिरुद्रसंहिता XXXIV, 1-35.
   (b) *Liṅgapurāṇa* –DCVIII. 1-187.
3. Jayadratha, *HCC* IX 3-261.
4. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa*, द्वितीया रुद्र संहिता, तृतीय पार्वती खण्ड. 1-11 ; IX 3-34 ; XII, 1-34 ; XIII-LVIII ; Ibid चतुर्थ कुमार खण्ड II 8-67 ; IV 29-40 ; V-X.
   (b) *Skandapurāṇa*, Vol. I XX 39-74 ; XXI-XXX. Ibid. द्वितीय कौमारिक खण्ड. XXX-XXXII.
   (c) *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, Vol. I चतुर्थ कृष्ण खण्ड Ibid, Vol. I तृतीय गणपति खण्ड XXXIX-XLI ; XLIV & XLV. XIV-XVI.
   (d) *Padmapurāṇa* सृष्टि खण्ड XLV 134-482 ; XLVI 121-216.
   (e) *Matsyapurāṇa* 154, 1-513 ; 158, 23-49 ; 159, 13-43 ; 160, 1-21.
   (f) *Varāhapurāṇa*, XXII, 1-48.
5. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XXII, 3-218.

story also is often described in the Purāṇas[1]. In *Śivamahāpurāṇa* and *Liṅgapurāṇa*, Viṣṇu was approached and he created a man from māyā and directed him to make a Śāstra against Śruti and Smṛti. In *Śrimaddevībhāgavatam*, the story is the same as in the *Haracaritacintāmaṇī*, but here Bṛhaspati preaches Jainism and not Buddhism.

In the legend of *Kapaṭeśvara-avatāra* the story of cutting Uṣas's head by Viṣṇu and its reunion effected by Bṛgu is given. Uṣas cursed Gods to become stones, wood and straw and Viṣṇu to become liable to birth and death. Śiva, to favour Viṣṇu and other Gods, incarnated as Kapaṭeśvara and bestowed on them unexpected results[2]. This incident is narrated differently in Purāṇas. In *Śrīmaddevībhāgavata* and *Matsyapurāṇa*, Viṣṇu cut Kāvyamātā's head, when demons took refuge under her and Śukra was away to get a sacred mantra from Śiva. Further, it was Bhṛgu, who cursed Viṣṇu to take frequent birth on earth and not Uṣas as is given in the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*.

The legend of the severe penance of Kṛṣṇa to get a son and his worshipping Śiva, who fulfilled his desire[3], is dealt with similarly in different Purāṇas.[4]

Jayadratha attributes the fast of *Śrāvaṇī-Dvādaśī* to Śiva in the month of Bhadra, and the fast of other Dvādaśī-days to Viṣṇu.[5] In Purāṇas, however, this is associated with Viṣṇu alone.[6]

---

1. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa* द्वितीया रुद्रसंहिता पंचमयुद्धखण्ड I-X,
   (b) *Liṅgapurāṇa* पूर्वार्द्ध LXXI, 9-161, LXXII, 1-34.
   (c) *Śrīmaddevībhāgavata* पूर्वार्द्ध: IV, 12, 46-53 ; 13, 1-62 ; 14, 1-43.
   (d) *Matsyapurāṇa*, LXVII, 175-215.
2. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacitāmaṇi*, XIV, 3-169.
   (a) *Śrīmaddevībhāgavata*, IV, 11, 44-55 ; 12, 1-15.
   (b) *Matsyapurāṇa*, XLVII, 81-107.
3. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XX, 27-29.
4. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa*, सप्तमवयावीय संहिता पूर्वखण्ड XXIV 31-58 ; XXV 22-39.
   (b) *Skandapurāṇa* माहेश्वर खण्डस्य कौमारिकखण्ड XXVII 58-84 ; XXVIII 1-14 ; XXIX 39-53.
   (c) *Padmapurāṇa* सृष्टिखण्ड XLVI, 1-95.
   (d) *Matsyapurāṇa*, CLVII, 1-19.
5. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XXVI 3-74.
6. (a) *Padmapurāṇa*, सृष्टिखण्डम् XXIV, 1-20.
   (b) *Bhaviṣyatapurāṇa* उत्तरपर्व LXXV, 1-17.
   (c) *Varāhapurāṇa*, XLVI, 1-15.

Śiva's great compassion, love, affection and kindness unto his devotees is reflected through various legends given is the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*. In order to protect the devotees in distress, Lord Śiva performs miraculous feats and grants fearlessness and then the desired objects to his worshippers and followers.

The legend of king Śveta, his penance, Kāla's (Death) arrival to fetch him, Śveta's futile entreaties to be spared from the clutches of Kāla and Lord's compassion, and his consequent release from the bondage of death,[1] has been elaborately dealt with in the Purāṇas.[2] In *Liṅgapurāṇa*, the story is the same. But in *Skandapurāṇa*, as in the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, Kāla did not come in the beginning, and Śiva of His own accord saved Śveta, his devotee. In *Kūrma Purāṇa*, when Kāla was burnt, Śiva required Kāla for keeping up the order of the world.

The story of Śilāda's son *Viśaka*, his coming to the world as Nandin and pleasing Śiva by his penance[3] is given in the Purāṇas.[4]

The legend of Upamanyu, his longing for milk, his severe penance, Indra's appearance but Upamanyu's refusal to ask anything from him and the revelation of Śiva[5], is similarly given in the Purāṇas.[6]

The story of the descent of Ganges through the severe penance of Bhagīratha, Śiva bearing her on his matted locks, her name Jāhnavī,[7] are all narrated frequently in the Purāṇas[8]. In *Śrīmad-*

1. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, II, 3-156.
2. (a) *Liṅgapurāṇa* पूर्वभाग XXX, 1-28.
   (b) *Skandapurāṇa* माहेश्वर खण्डस्य केदारखण्ड XXXII, 1-96.
   (c) *Kūrmapurāṇa*, उत्तरार्द्धे व्यासगीतारम्भ XXXVI, 12-37.
3. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, IV, 3-89.
4. *Liṅgapurāṇa*, XVII, 1-38.
   Śivamahāpurāṇa तृतीया शतरुद्रसंहिता VI, 5-62 ; VII, 1-20.
5. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XIX, 3-88.
6. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa* सप्तमवायवीयसंहिता XXIV, 10-59, XXXV, 1-65.
   (b) *Ibid.*, पंचमी उमासंहिता I, 1-71 ; III, 1-78.
   (c) *Liṅgapurāṇa*, पूर्वार्द्धे CVII, 1-64.
7. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XXVIII, 3-38.
8. (a) *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, LVI, 1-26.
   (b) Viṣṇupurāṇa, IV, 7, 2-6.

devībhāgavata and *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*, it is stated that king Bhagīratha propitiated Kṛṣṇa to bring Ganges on earth for the deliverance of his family. In *Śrīmadbhāgavata*, Gaṅgā herself was propitiated by Bhagīratha. At Gaṅgā's bidding, Bhagīratha worshipped Rudra, who accepted to bear the burden of Gaṅgā on his head.

The popular legends of Dakṣa, his sacrifice, the self-immolation of Dākṣāyaṇī, by Yoga, owing to the disrespect shown to Śiva, destruction of the sacrifice and finally enjoyment of all the fruits of sacrifice owing to Dakṣa's propitiation of Śiva[1] are often described in the Purāṇas.[2]

The story of the birth of the five-faced son to Mālinī, who drank the water from the whirl made by Pārvatī, his upbringing by Ganges but the claim by Pārvatī for him as her son, the conferment of special powers on him by Śiva and his being named Gaṇapati[3] is differently given in Purāṇas.[4] In *Liṅgapurāṇa*, at the request of Gods, Lord Śiva took the form of Lord of Gaṇas and endowed the child

(c) Śrīmaddevībhāgavata, IX, 11, 4-38 ; 12, 42-44.
(d) Śrīmadbhāgavata, IX, 9, 2-12.
(e) Brahmavaivartapurāṇa, Vol. I., प्रकृतिखण्ड X, 14-89.

1. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, VIII, 3-75. सतीखण्ड
2. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa* द्वितीया रुद्रीयसंहिता, XXVII, 1-28 ; XXVIII, 1-8 ; XXXI, 1-36 ; XXXII, 1-59, XXXVII, 45-48 ; XLI ; XLII, 7-42.
   (b) *Śivamahāpurāṇa*, सप्तमीवायवीयसंहिता' 'पूर्वखण्ड' XVIII, 1-62 ; XIX, XX, XXII.
   (c) *Skandapurāṇa* Vol. 1, माहेश्वरखण्ड II-V ; Vol. II वैष्णवखण्ड वैशाखमासमाहात्म्य III, 1-55 ; Vol. IV काशीखण्ड उत्तरार्द्ध LXXXVII, LXXXVIII.
   (d) *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, Vol. II , XXXVIII, 5-10, XLII, 85-94 ; XLIII, 1-106.
   (e) *Padmapurāṇa* सृष्टिखण्ड V, 1-95.
   (f) *Kūrmapurāṇa*, XV, 1-99.
   (g) *Liṅgapurāṇa*, पूर्वार्द्ध XCIX, 13-120 ; C. 1-51.
3. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XVIII, 2-39.
4. (a) *Liṅgapurāṇa*, CV, 1-30.
   (b) *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, Vol. I. II, 16-31 ; III-IX ; XI, 1-34 ; XII, 1-59.
   (c) *Varāhapurāṇa*–XXIII, 1-38.

with special powers. In *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* Pārvatī got the son by propitiating Viṣṇu. In *Varāhapurāṇa*, at God's request, Lord Śiva is said to have created one beautiful form with which Pārvatī was charmed and Śiva then cursed that person to have an elephant-trunk but later on conferred on him great powers.

Śiva and Śakti are inseparable like fire and its power of burning. She is the feminine aspect of nature and in union with Śiva is the cause of the entire creation. Śiva adopted Devī as his half of his own body, thus proving the unity and their inseparability like the word and its sense. The reason for this is given in the form of legend in which, enraged at the disrespect shown by Andhaka, one of Śiva's attendants, angry Pārvatī reported to Śiva who made her an inseparable part of his body.[1] This story of the Ardhanārīśvara form is given in the *Matsyapurāṇa*.[2] Thus Śakti like Śiva has unlimited powers. She is the giver of progeny, various Siddhis and is the benefactor of all in distress.

The story of humiliation of Pārvatī by Śiva, her transformation into Gaurī by her own Prowess and of the two lions Diṇḍi and Mahodara as her vehicles[3] is given in various Purāṇas. In *Śivamahāpurāṇa* being teased by Śiva who referred her as 'Kālī', Pārvatī propitiated Brahmā, who told her that through her own power, she could change her form to Gaurī. In *Skānda*, *Matsya* and *Pādma* Brahmā, knowing the reason for her penance, granted Pārvatī her desire.

Then is given story of the demons Śumbha, Niśumbha and Mahiṣa, who infatuated by the beauty of Durgā, wanted to marry her but were killed by the powers of mighty Durgā.[4] This legend is described in great detail, though with certain variations, in different Purāṇas. In *Skandapurāṇa*, at the request of Gods who were tormented by demon Mahiṣa, Gaurī with her Mohinī Śakti affected the mind of demon Mahiṣa, who wanted to marry her but was killed in the

1. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, VI, 3-43.
2. *Matsyapurāṇa*, CCLX, 1-70.
3. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XXII, 3-38.
4. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XXIII, 7-146.
5. (a) *Śivamahāpurāṇa* पंचमीउमासंहिता XLVI, 1-63 ; XLVII, 1-66; XLVIII 1-50.
   (b) *Skandapurāṇa* माहेश्वरखण्ड तृतीयारुणाचलमाहात्म्यस्य पूर्वार्द्धे X, 1-110; उत्तरार्द्धे XIX, 1-44.

encounter. In *Śrīmaddevībhāgavata*, at the request of Gods, Devī Ambikā created another beautiful form known as Kauśikī and both of them went to Śumbha's kingdom. At the news given by Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa, Mahiṣa wished to marry her but was defeated. In Varāhapurāṇa, it is Nārada, who reports to Mahiṣa about the pearless beauty of Vaiṣṇavī Śakti on Mandara mountain. Mahiṣa was, however, defeated in the battle.

The story of Jīmūtavāhana who was prepared to sacrifice his life in place of serpent Śaṅkhacūḍa to Garuḍa, who left him half-eaten, and who was later revived by Pārvatī[1] is given in *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. [2]

The sacrifice of Varavara an attendant in the palace of king Vikramāditya and his revival by Caṇḍī[3], is given in *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*.[4]

Thus the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* is a religio-philosophical poem dealing with the glorious feats of Śiva, his supremacy over all other Gods including Brahmā and Viṣṇu, his great compassion and love for his devotees and his unique inseparability from Pārvatī, who too is all powerful, kind hearted, donor of the desired fruits to her worshippers and followers. It thus clearly partakes the characteristics of the Purāṇas and Māhātmya-texts. M. Winternitz[5] and A.B. Keith hold the same view. The later says : 'Haracaritacintāmaṇi has some value for religion, at once a storehouse of Śaiva myth and evidence of Śaiva practices and beliefs."[6]

(c) *Markaṇḍeyapurāṇa*, LXXXII-XC.

(d) *Śrīmaddevībhāgavata*, V, 11-28 ; 30-31.

(e) *Varāhapurāṇa*. XCII, XCIII.

1. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XXV, 3-98.
2. *Bhaviṣyatapurāṇa*, तृतीय प्रतिसर्गपर्वद्वितीयखण्ड XV; 7-40.
3. Jayadratha, *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, XXVI, 3-63.
4. *Bhaviṣyatapurāṇa*, तृतीयप्रतिसर्गपर्व द्वितीयखण्ड III, 1-25.
5. Winternitz, M., *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 66.
6. Keith, A.B., *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 137.

A NOTE ON PĀÑCARĀTRA AND HERESY

BY

GANESH THITE.

[पाञ्चरात्रसम्प्रदायः प्रारम्भे वेदविषये असमाधानं प्रदर्शयति स्म । तस्य च मूलम् इत्थं नास्तिक्यादेवेति अनुमीयते । परं कालक्रमेण पाञ्चरात्रसम्प्रदायो वेदानुसारित्वं दर्शयति अथ च अन्ये पाञ्चरात्रविषये श्रद्धाम् आस्तिक्यबुद्धिं च धारयन्तु इति अपेक्षतो पञ्चरात्रसाहित्ये नास्तिकाः सदैव सर्वत्रवर्जनीया इति कथितम् । तेन स्वयं नास्तिक्यादुत्पन्नोऽपि पाञ्चरात्रः आस्तिक्यम् अपेक्ष्यते न नास्तिक्य-मिति प्रदर्शितमत्र लेखकेन ।]

In the Pāñcarātra-literature sometimes we notice that there is an antagonistic feeling to the Vedic literature. Thus in the Īśvarasaṁhitā it is said that once the seers like Śāṇḍilya went to Lord Viṣṇu and said, "we have learnt all the Vedas and Śāstras but could not get the real path leading towards the liberation; and therefore we have taken recourse to you." Then the Lord ordained them and taught the Ekāyanaveda (i.e. esoteric doctrine of Pāñcarātra) to them[1]. In the commentary of Śaṅkara on the Brahmasūtras, in order to prove that the Pāñcarātra-school is non-vedic and heretic one, Śaṅkara quotes a sentence according to which Śāṇḍilya obtained this system of Pāñcarātra after finding no real bliss in all the four Vedas[2]. In this way the Pāñcarātra-school appears to have been born out of dissatisfaction with the Vedic lore and thus like many other schools of philosophy, is originated out of heresy.

But later on it seems that some conciliation has taken place between the Pāñcarātra-school and the Veda. Thus many Vedic formulas are prescribed to be used in the rites of Pāñcarātra. Though the Pāñcarātra-school allows no scope for Śrauta-ritual, it does not expressly deny it. On the other hand it also tries to

---

1. Īśvarasaṁhitā (ed. P.B. Anantacarya, Kāñchipuram, 1923) 21.527 ff. (*adhītāḥ sakalāḥ vedāḥ śāstrāṇi vividhāni ca / mokṣopāyaṁ na jānīmas tatas tvām śaraṇaṁ gatāḥ* //525//).
2. Brahmasūtraśāṅkarabhāṣya, 2.2.45 : *caturṣu vedeṣu paraṁ śreyo'labdhvā śāṇḍilya idaṁ śāstram adhigatavān.*

show that the Pāñcarātra-ritual is as important as the Śrauta-ritual. Thereby it is implied that the Pāñcarātra-school does pay respect to the Śrauta-ritual and also wants to keep it aside and establish its own ritual. Thus it is said that one who fills the image of Viṣṇu with milk gets the merit of the Vājapeya-sacrifice, one who with honey, gets that of the Atirātra-sacrifice and so on[3]. From such sentences it appears that the Pāñcarātra-school has replaced Śrauta sacrificial ritual by the ritual of idol-worship. A work of Yāmunācārya named Āgamaprāmāṇya[4] tries to show that the Pāñcarātra-āgama is in accordance with the Veda and therefore is valid from the orthodox point of view. In this way, born out of heresy, the Pāñcarātra-school establishes itself in the orthodox way of thinking. Moreover, when it gets a firm foundation, it expects from others firm faith *āstikya* in it and reviles all heretic people and heretic views.

Thus many times in the texts of Pāñcarātra one is advised to avoid the heretic people (*nāstikas*). Thus at the time of establishment of an idol of Viṣṇu, one should keep the heretic people (*nāstikas*) away.[5] Moreover, no Pāñcarātra-rite should be performed for the heretic people, lest it should be a great sin.[6] Even an indirect contact with heretic people (*pāṣaṇḍa*) is worthy to be avoided. Therefore the ground where an idol of Sun is to be established, should not be situated near a temple of heretic people (Hayaśīrṣasaṁhitā (a manuscript in the library of Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Poona University, Poona 7), Paṭala 2).

---

3. Sanatkumārasaṁhitā (ed. V. Krishnamacharya, Madras, 1969), Indrarātra, I. 17 ff. (*pāyasā pūrayed yastu bhaktyā'tha pratimāṁ hareḥ | vājapeyaphalaṁ prāpya viṣṇuloke mahīyate* //17// *madhunā pūrayed yastu bhaktyā ca pratimāṁ hareḥ | atirātraphalaṁ prāpya viṣṇuloke mahīyate* //18//...).
4. J.A.B. Van Buitenen, (ed.) *Yāmunas's Āgama-prāmāṇya*, Madras, 1971.
5. Sanatkumārasaṁhitā, Brahmarātra, 6.27 f :...*nāstikān bhinnamaryādān devabrāhmaṇadūṣakān* //27// *pāṣaṇḍinaśca tadbhaktāḥ pāṣaṇḍājīvakānapi | dīkṣābahiṣkṛtāṁścāpi dūramutsārayet tataḥ* //28//.
6. Sanatkumārasaṁhitā, Indrarātra, 9.63 ff. : *nāstikāśca tathā mlecchāḥ pāṣaṇḍāśca tathaiva ca | dṛṣṭadoṣāstathā sarve cāturvarṇyabahiṣkṛtāḥ* //63// *eteṣāṃ yajanādeva yāgadoṣo bhaviṣyati |* ...//64// ...*tasmānnāstikayājyatvaṁ sarvadoṣasya kāraṇam*

According to Īśvarasaṁhitā, 22.15, no information about the Pāñcarātra-system should be given to people having no devotion, to fools and to heretics. Similarly according to another text, the repertoire of Mantras (sacred formulas) should not be impared to the people without devotion or to cunning or heretic people.[7]

Even if one comes into contact with heretic people inadvertently, one has to expiate it. Thus if one sits on the same seat with heretic persons (Sanatkumārasaṁhitā, Ṛṣirātra, 8.108) or touches them (*the same*, 8.110) one should undergo an expiation. Similarly, if at the time of idol-worshipping, one gets touched by an heretic person, one should bathe the idol again and then worship it again (Īśvarasaṁhitā 19.308). While taking food if one sees a dog, a person belonging to Cāṇḍāla-class, a woman in her menstruation period or an heretic etc., one should undergo an expiation in which one has to subsist on milk alone for one month.[8] Moreover, in that case, one has to leave aside the food which one is eating.[9]

Since Pāñcarātra is a religious sect, it gives a great emphasis on firm faith, and total acceptance of the authority (*āstikya*). Thus a performer of the Pāñcarātric ritual is expected to be an *āstika* and devoted to the performance of rites according to the prescriptions.[10] A Bhaṭṭāraka (a high priest of the Pāñcarātric order) is also expected to be an *āstika*.[11] A performer is sometimes expected to be an *āstika* and of good behaviour.[12]

---

7. *gopanīyo hyabhaktānāṁ śaṭhānāṁ ca viśeṣataḥ / nāstikānām asādhūnāṁ dhūrtānāṁ chadmacāriṇām* // Jayākhyasaṁhitā (ed. E. Krishnamacharya, Baroda, 1967), 7.116.
8. Sanatkumārasaṁhitā, Ṛṣirātra, 8.84-85 : *dṛṣṭvā ca kukkuṭaṁ śvānaṁ caṇḍālaṁ ca rajasvalāṁ* //84// *patitaṁ caiva pāṣaṇḍaṁ devanirmālyabhakṣakam / antyajaṁ vāpi bhuñjāno vratametat samācaret* //85//.
9. Sanatkumārasaṁhita, Brahmarātra, 5.52 f : *śvānaṁ rajasvalāṁ cāpi caṇḍālaṁ vā vyajñakam / kākaṁ pāṣaṇḍinaṁ vāpi devalaṁ vāpi kukkuṭaṁ* /52// *kārukān vā tadā paśyed annaṁ tat tu vivarjayet / snātvā jalāśaye paścāt pañcopaniṣado japet* //53//.
10. Śrīpraśnasaṁhitā (ed. Sitha Padmanabhan, Tirupati, 1969), 4.13 ; *āstikaḥ karmakāṇḍoktakriyānuṣṭhānatatparaḥ*.
11. Śrīpraśansaṃhitā 16. 11-13.
12. Īśvarasaṁhitā 15.6 : *āstikaḥ satyasandhaśca sadācārasamanvitaḥ/ācāryaṁ varayet pūrvaṁ bhagavacchāstrakovidaṁ//*.

Thus as regards the Pāñcarātra-school and heresy, following observations can be made :—(1) The Pāñcarātra-school seems to have been originated out of dissatisfaction with the Veda and thus it is of heretic origin. (2) Later on a reconciliation seems to have been taken place and the Pāñcarātra-school claims to be orthodox and a follower of Veda. (3) Further, the Pāñcarātra-school claims to be believed as an authority by others (*āstikya*) and reviles the heretics and heresy (*nāstikya*).

THE PURĀṆAS ON THE SUCCESSORS OF THE SĀTAVĀHANAS IN VIDARBHA

BY

V. V. MIRASHI

[पुराणेषु राजवंशवर्णनप्रसङ्गेन शासकानां समुल्लेखो वर्तते । पुराणानां पाठस्तु अद्यावधि समीचीनतया संशोधितो न वर्तते अतः बहूनां शासकानां वंशानां च नाम शुद्धरूपेण न प्राप्यते । अस्मिन् विषये पार्जिटरमहोदयेन पाठानां संशोधनं विधाय पौराणिकराजवंशानां परिचयः प्रदत्तः । अत्रास्मिन् निबन्धे विदुषा लेखकेन मत्स्यवायुब्रह्माण्ड-पुराणेषु वर्णितानां सातवाहनवंशीयशासकानन्तरवर्तिनां 'मौन' शासकानां विषये परिचयः प्रदत्तः । अमरावतीजनपदस्य अचलपुर-ग्रामे प्राप्तानां चतुर्णां ताम्रपत्राणामाधारेण अत्र लेखकमहोदयेन प्रतिपादितं यत् मत्स्यवायुब्रह्माण्डपुराणेषूपलब्धः 'मौन' पाठस्तु न यथार्थः । वस्तु-तस्तु अस्य स्थाने 'मौण्ड' पाठः समीचीनो वर्तते । एते मौण्डशासका ब्राह्मणवंशीया ज्ञाने माने च विशिष्टाः पुरुषा आसन् यैः शासकपदं सातवाहनवंशस्य पतने राष्ट्ररक्षार्थं स्वीकृतम् । एषां शासनकालस्तु ख्रिष्टीय २३०-२७५ वर्षेषु आसीत् । प्रतीयते यत् वाकाटकवंशीयैः मौण्डशासनं विनाशितम् । विदुषा लेखकेन सुयुक्तिभिः स्वमतस्य स्थापनं कृतम् ।]

The Purāṇas are our main source of the knowledge of the ancient history of a large part of India. They mention several dynasties which ruled over Central and Southern India after the downfall of the Sātavāhanas. Unfortunately, the texts of this portion of the Purāṇas have not been preserved carefully. There are various readings not only in the numbers of their rule and the periods of their reigns but even in their names. Pargiter collated several manuscripts of the Purāṇas and has given their constituted texts of the different portions. We shall take the following passage which occurs in the *Matsya*, *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* Purāṇa for discussion[1]—

अन्ध्राणां संस्थिते राज्ये तेषां भृत्यान्वया नृपाः ।
सप्तैवान्ध्रा भविष्यन्ति दशाभीरास्तथा नृपाः ॥
सप्त गर्दभिनश्चैव शकाश्चाष्टादशैव तु ।

1. Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age* (*DKA*), p. 45.

यवनाष्टौ भविष्यन्ति तुषारास्तु चतुर्दश ॥
त्रयोदश मुरुण्डास्तु मौना[2] ह्येकादशैव तु ।

This passage mentions the dynasties that rose to power after the downfall of the Sātavāhanas, whom the Purāṇas call the Andhras. When did the Sātavāhanas cease to rule? The Purāṇas are not unanimous on this point. But some important ones among them like the *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Bhāgavata* and *Viṣṇu* say that there were thirty kings and the whole duration of their reigns was either 460 (*Matsya*), or 456 (*Brahmāṇḍa*, *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata*).[3] We shall take 460 years as a round figure of the total period of their rule. Now, the Sātavāhanas probably rose to power in the chaotic condition which must have prevailed in *circa* 230 B.C., after the death of Aśoka. So their rule probably came to an end in *circa* 230 A.D. We have other evidence of the rule of some of the dynasties mentioned in the passage cited above. We know that the Ābhīras rose to power in the Deccan in *circa* A.D. 250 and started an era which later became known by the name of the Kalachuri era.[4] Judging by its spread in that period, the empire of the Ābhīras must have comprised North Koṅkaṇ, Western Mahārāṣṭra, Gujarāt and Central India. The Andhras mentioned in the above passage were evidently the Ikṣvākus that ruled in the lower Kṛiṣṇa valley. We do not know much about the Gardabhins. The Gardabhilla king mentioned in the Jaina tradition probably belonged to that dynasty. The story in the *Kālakācārya-kathānaka* about his overthrow by the Śakas awaits confirmation by other sources. The Śakas, who are mentioned next in the above-cited passage are not the Western Kshatrapas, because the latter did not come to power after the downfall of the Sātavāhanas. They were ruling in Gujarat and Kathiawad contemporaneously with them. The Śakas may be the ancestors of the Śaka king Śrīdharavarman known from his records found at Kānākherā near Sāñchī and at Eraṇ.[5] We have so far no evidence of the rule of the Yavanas and the Tushāras in the erstwhile empire of the Sātavāhanas. The Muruṇḍas may be identical with those mentioned in the Allahabad

2. *Hūṇā* is a *v. l.* for *Maunā*. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 37.
4. Mirashi, *Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era* [*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* (*CII*)], Vol. IV, Introd. pp. xxii f.
5. *CII*, IV, 13 f. and 605 f.

pillar inscription of Samudragupta.[6] The country under their rule has not been identified, but they may have been in power in some region of Central India. We next find the mention of the Maunas (with the *v. l.* of Hūṇas) as successors of the Sātavāhanas. Though Pargiter says that both the names are well supported by manuscript evidence,[7] the Hūṇas are not known to have ruled in any part of India as early as the third century A. D. Their invasions of North India commenced much later, in the latter half of the fifth century A. D. So Maunas must have been the intended reading. Have we any evidence of their rule in the period which witnessed the downfall of the Sātavāhanas? In this connection I would draw the attention of scholars to a copper-plate grant recently discovered in Vidarbha.

Nearly two years ago a single copper plate inscribed in box-headed characters was made over by Mr. D. Y. Watane, Secretary of the Achalpur Camp Marketing Panchayat Committee, to Mr. P.M. Mulay, Curator of the Central Museum, Nagpur. When the inscription on it was deciphered by Mr. V. P. Roday, Ex-Curator of the Museum, he found that it recorded the grant of a few villages to some Brāhmaṇas. In the absence of the other plates of the set, the date of the king Ādityarāja, who issued the plate, could not be determined. After strenuous efforts continued for nearly two years, the remaining four plates of the set have now been recovered at Malhārā, a village near Achalpur, a well-known town in the Amraoti District of Vidarbha.

The plates record the grant of some villages made by King Ādityarāja to some Brāhmaṇas. They were issued from Vānakheṭa, which may be Vānakhedpur in the adjoining district of Akolā. The grant is written in elegant Sanskrit such as is rarely noticed in early copperplates. The characters are of the boxheaded variety similar to those of the grants of the Vākāṭakas.

This grant has brought to light an ancient Brāhmaṇa royal family of Vidarbha. The first three ancestors of King Ādityarāja who made it, were learned and pious Brāhmaṇas always engaged in the study of the Vedas and the performance of Vedic sacrifices. Soma, the first of them, is described as having mastered the four Vedas. His son Vardhana was equally learned and was well known for his observance of religious vows, austere life, learning and hospitality

6. *CII.* III, 8.
7. *DKA*, 46, n. 24.

to guests. His son Muṇḍa never accepted any gifts. He was always consecrated for sacrifices. So Indra is said to have poured a shower of wealth during the performance of his sacrifices. This evidently suggests that the people spontaneously provided all materials for his sacrifices. He became so famous by his learning and piety that his descendants took pride in that they were borne in his family. Accordingly the grant states in the beginning that these persons belonged to the Muṇḍa family, though Muṇḍa was not the original propagator of it.

None of these three ancestors of king Ādityarāja ever cared for pelf or power. They were content to lead an austere life of learning and piety. We next find the mention of Muṇḍa's son Rāṣṭra-Mahārāja, who is said to have won a royal title by his sterling merit[8]. His son was Rājakula Mahārāja, who is said to have exterminated his enemies and won great fame in hard fought battles. It was evidently he who performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice with which the family is credited in the preamble of the grant. His son was King Ādityarāja, who made the present grant in the second regnal year. It is dated in the fifteenth day of the second fortnight of the season Grīṣma (summer). This season date is another indication of its early period.

This Muṇḍa royal family is coming to light for the first time by the present grant. The circumstances in which it had to exchange the sacrificial ladle for the sword are not explicitly stated in the present grant, but it is not difficult to conjecture them. The fourth member of this pious family seems to have been compelled to give up the traditional pious mode of living in the confusion and chaos which resulted after the death of the last Sātavāhana king. The *Manusmṛti* (VIII, 348) says that the Brāhmaṇas should take up arms when religious life is obstructed. (शस्त्रं द्विजातिभिर्ग्राह्यं धर्मो यत्रोपरुध्यते। द्विजातीनां च वर्णानां विप्लवे कालकारिते॥) The son of Muṇḍa came forward to protect the people in the state of anarchy which resulted after the downfall of the Sātavāhanas. He established peace and order in the country and then assumed the significant name of Rāṣṭra-Mahārāja. This could not have been his original name in view of his birth in a pious Brāhmaṇa family. His successors Rājakula Mahā-

8. See तस्य (i. e. मुण्डस्य) पुत्रस्तत्पादानुद्ध्यातः स्वगुणोपार्जितराजशब्दः श्रीराष्ट्रमहाराजः।

rāja and Ādityarāja bore names indicative of their royal status, unlike their earlier ancestors.

From several indications which I need not detail here, I place Rāṣṭra-Mahārāja, Rājakula-Mahārāja and Ādityarāja in the period from A.D. 230 to A.D. 275, that is, after the downfall of the Sātavāhanas and before the rise of the Vākāṭakas in Vidarbha. I have shown elsewhere[9] that the Vākāṭakas originally hailed from Andhra. They seem have raided Vidarbha and crushed this Muṇḍa family. So no other grants of this family have been discovered so far.

As the Purāṇas mention royal families ruling in India till the first quarter of the fourth century A. D. like the Guptas[10] and the Vākāṭakas,[11] one may expect the mention of this Muṇḍa family also in them. We find in stead the Maunas mentioned as the successors of the Sātavāhanas. No such family is, however, known from any other source. It is, therefore, not unlikely that *Maunāḥ* in the above-cited passage is a mistake for *Mauṇḍaḥ*. The Malhārā plates have now brought to notice the Muṇḍa family that flourished after the downfall of the Sātavāhanas.

It may be objected to this conjection that in that case the reading in the Purāṇic passage should rather be *Muṇḍaḥ* like *Śuṅgāḥ* or *Kāṇvāḥ*, and *Mauṇḍaḥ*. This objection is not difficult to answer. As Pargiter has shown,[12] the genealogies in the Purāṇas were originally composed in Prakrit and were later rendered into Sanskrit before being incorporated in the Purāṇas. Some features of the Prakrit original have continued in the Sanskrit rendering.

Like the Sātavāhana and Vākāṭaka families, this Muṇḍa family is one of famous ancient Brāhmaṇa families of India. The copper-plate grant will soon be published.

---

9. *CII*, IV, Introduction, xi f.
10. *DKA*, 53.
11. *Ibid.*, 50.
12. *DKA*, Introd., x f.

UMĀ HAIMAVATĪ MYTH IN THE DEVĪ BHĀGAVATA—A STUDY

By

JAYA CHEMBURKAR

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे केनोपनिषदि देवीभागवतपुराणे चोपलब्धस्य उमाहैमवत्या आख्यानस्य विवेचनं प्रस्तुतम् । प्रथममुभयत्र प्राप्तयोराख्यनयोः संक्षिप्तः परिचयः प्रदत्तस्तदनन्तरं च उभयोः स्वरूपं विवेचितम् । प्रतिपादितं यत् केनोपनिषदि प्राप्तमाख्यानं हैमवत्याः ब्रह्मत्वं प्रतिपादयति देवीभागवते प्राप्ते आख्याने तु शाक्तप्रभावः सर्वातिशायी । अत्र देवीभागवते गायत्र्युपासनाया विस्तृतं वर्णनमुपलभ्यते । तत्र न्यासकवचमुद्रादीनां विस्तृतोपन्यासः वर्तते येन तस्य शाक्तस्वरूपं स्फुटीभवति गायत्री सावित्री सूर्यशक्तिर्वा । सा च ब्रह्मशक्तिरपि मन्यते । सापि सम्यगुपासिता ज्ञानं ददातीति देवीभागवते प्रतिपादितम् ।]

1. The Purāṇas are generally classified in three groups viz. the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas, the Śaiva Purāṇas and the Śākta Purāṇas. Ancient myths and legends about gods, cosmology, philosophy etc. from the Vedic and the Epic literature have been incorporated into the Purāṇas and they have been given a sectarian garb so as to suit the philosophy, the ritual and the teachings of the sect concerned. The well known myth of Umā Haimavatī in the Kena Upaniṣad is incorporated in the Devī Bhāgavata.

2. The Devī Bhāgavata being a Śākta Purāṇa, this myth has been influenced by Śākta ideology.

3. This paper attempts to trace the Śākta influence in the myth.

Umā Haimavatī Myth in the Kena Upaniṣad

4. For our study it is necessary to know the myth in the original. It is as follows :—

5. The gods were proud of their victory over their enemies. Brahman appeared before them as '*Yakṣa*' (strange phenomenon). They first sent Agni to that '*Yakṣa*' to know what it was. Agni went with proud pretensions but returned baffled and bewildered. Then they sent Vāyu who also failed. Finally when Indra went to

it, (Yakṣa) disappeared and in its place appeared Umā Haimavatī who communicated to Indra the fact that Yakṣa was none else but Brahman, at whose victory they were rejoicing. From this Indra knew that it (Yakṣa) was Brahman.

6. Of that Brahman there is this teaching, "That in the lightning which flashes forth, which makes one blink and say 'Ah'-that 'Ah' refers to divinity.....etc... It should be worshipped.

7. Austerity, restraint and work are the foundation of it. The Vedas are Its limbs. Truth is its abode.

8. Let us now understand the myth in the Devī Bhāgavata.

Umā Haimavatī Myth in the Devī Bhāgavata[1]

9. On defeating the demons through the favour of Devī, the gods were overjoyed and indulged in self-praise. (*Sṛṣṭisthitikṣayakarā vayaṁ sarve yaśasvinaḥ*).[2] They were thus deluded. To do a favour to the gods Devī manifested before them in the form of '*Yakṣa*'. The gods who had not seen that lustrous thing before and being unable to know what it was, were astonished. So Indra sent Agni and Vāyu to find out what It was. Both of them went to that '*Yakṣa*', boasted of their powers but failed to recognise it and came back with great despair. Both realized that their pride was in vain. In the end Indra went to that '*Yakṣa*' but it disappeared from him. Indra felt ashamed of himself as he was denied even conversation with '*Yakṣa*'. Considering this as a great humiliation he made up his mind to put an end to his life and surrendered himself to God when he heard an incorporeal voice, "Perform 'japa' of 'māyābījamantra, Oh Sahasrākṣa, and be happy." (*tasminneva kṣaṇe jātā vyomavāṇī nabhastale māyābījaṁ sahasrākṣa japa tena sukhī bhava*).[3] Accordingly Indra performed a japa of '*māyābīja mantra*' for one lakh of years. One day the Goddess viz. Umā Haimavatī appeared before Indra who asked Her what that '*Yakṣa*' was. Umā Haimavatī explained the '*Yakṣa*' as follows.

---

1. For the Saṅskṛta Text of the Devī Bhāgavata I have used Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa edited by Acharya Shri Ram Sharma, and published by Saṅskriti Samsthan, Khvajakutub, Bareli.
2. Devī Bhāgavata, Part II, Chap. 66.17 (=XII. 8. 17a).
3. Ibid. 66.49 (=XII. 8.49)

10. "The '*Yakṣa*' was Her manifestation; It was Brahman the Cause of all the causes, Witness of all (*sarvasākṣī*). '*Om*' is Brahman in the form of one syllable. It is also called '*Hrim*' and '*Om*' and '*Hrim*' are Her two '*bījamantras*'. With these two ('Om' and 'hrim') as Her aspects She creates this universe. One of these two is denoted as '*saccidānanda* and the other as '*māyā*' (*tatraikabhāgaḥ saṁproktaḥ saccidānandanāmakaḥ*[4]/*māyāprakṛtisaṁjñastu dvitīyo bhāgaḥ īrita*[5]) and Umā i. e. the Goddess is 'Śaktimati' i. e. She possesses '*māyā*' and yet controls it. (*Sā ca māyā parā śaktiḥ śaktimatyahamīśvarī*)[6]. Māyā is inseparable from Her like the moonlight from the moon. Introvert '*māyā*' is '*yogamāyā*' and extrovert '*māyā*' is '*avidyā*' (nescience). The world is created by the extrovert '*māyā*'. By the predominance of '*rajas*', '*sattva*' and '*tamas*', Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra, respectively, are the form of cause of all.... She is the Inner Soul of all, identical with Brahman. Qualityful and Qualityless are Her two forms. Qualityless is void of '*māyā*' and the Qualityful is possessed of '*māyā*'. Having created the world She enters into it.[7] She impels the jīva (to activity). She inspires Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra to indulge in creation, sustenance and destruction. The wind blows through Her fear, the sun moves through Her fear. Similarly Indra, Agni, Mṛtyu also work because She is superior to all. The gods were victorious through Her favour; She makes them dance like puppets. Forgetting Her who is the soul of all, the gods, through pride, grew egoistic and were deluded. To favour the gods She manifested before them Her lustre in the form of '*Yakṣa*'. She asked the gods to give up all sense of pride and surrender themselves to Her." Thus enlightening the gods She disappeared.

11. The gods are then said to have propitiated the Goddess by performing '*gāyatrī-japa*' and offering sacrifices (*trisandhyaṁ sarvadā sarve gāyatrījapatatparāḥ yajñabhāgādibhiḥ sarve devīṃ nityaṁ siṣevire*).[9] In this context the author glorifies '*gāyatrī-upāsanā*' and

4. Ibid. 66.65b (=XII. 8.65b)
5. Ibid. 66.66a (=XII. 8.66a)
6. Ibid. 66.66b (=XII. 8.66b)
7. Cf. Idaṁ sarvamasṛjata yadidaṁ kiñca tat sṛṣṭvā tadevanuprāviśat. *Taittirīya* Up. 2.6.
8. Cf. Brhadāraṇyaka Up. 3.8.9.
9. Devī Bhā. Part II Chap. 66.86. (=XII. 8.86)

condemns '*Viṣṇu-Upāsanā*' and '*Śiva-upāsanā*' and remarks that *gāyatrī-upāsanā*, is eternal and has been enjoined by all Vedas; without it a Brāhmaṇa suffers from downfall. A twice-born attains liberation by being devoted to *gāyatrī*.... Therefore all are devoted to 'gāyatrī'.

Perusal of The Two Myths

12. Now a perusal of the above statements of the two myths shows that the myth in the Kena Upaniṣad is meant to enlighten the gods by impressing upon the mind of the gods the incomprehensible and unfathomable nature of Brahman. The failure of the gods in comprehending the nature of '*Yakṣa*' illustrates inscrutable nature of it.[10] Umā Haimavatī then enlightens them about the nature of '*Yakṣa*', i.e. Brahman. The purpose of Umā Haimavatī myth in the Devī Bhāgavata is to purge the gods of their ignorance and enlighten them. In both the works the gods are the initiate and Umā is their preceptor. But the knowledge imparted to the gods by the two Umās is not the same. The Umā of the Kena Up. is Upaniṣadic teacher and hence she describes the incomprehensible nature of Brahman in the manner of Upaniṣads e.g. 'That in the lightning which makes one blink and say "Ah"—that "Ah" refers to divinity'. That which comes as it were to the mind, by which one repeatedly remembers—that conception is it.[11] This is only an indefinite description of Qualityless Brahman, meant to enable an ignorant to understand Brahman as remarked by Śaṅkara (*evamādiśyamānaṁ hi brahma mandabuddhigamyaṁ bhavatīti brahmaṇa ādeśe upadeśaḥ nahi nirupādhikameva brahma mandabuddhibhirākalayituṁ śakyam*).[12] The means to comprehend Brahman preached by the Umā of Kena Up. are the usual Upaniṣadic means such as '*tapas*', '*dama*', '*karma*' which according to the Upaniṣads purify the mind which then becomes fit to comprehend Reality. On the other hand the Umā of the Devī Bhāgavata plays the role of a Śākta preceptor inasmuch as her teachings bear the stamp of the Śākta ideology. In the Devī Bhāgavata Indra is first advised by the incorporeal voice to perform a '*japa*' of '*māyābīja-mantra*'. Introduction of '*māyābīja-mantra*' in this context is obviously due to Tantric influence on the Devī Bhāgavata. The Purāṇas and the Tantras developed contemporaneously and hence mutual give and take attitude is noticed in

10. Mukhopadhyaya, Studies in the Upaniṣad; p. 12.
11. Kena Up. 4.4.5. Tr. by Hume.
12. Śaṅkara's commentary on Kena Up. 4.5.

them.[13] Mantras are used in Tantric rituals as a means of concentration.[14] They consist of a single syllable or syllables trung together. They are believed to purify the mind which is then divinely transformed and becomes fit for receiving sacred knowledge. Indra thus purifies his mind by the *'japa'* of *'māyābīja mantra'*[15]. Umā then manifests before Indra. Here Umā impresses on the mind of Indra that She is Śākti or the Supreme Deity of the Śaktas, identical with the Supreme Brahman. She states that 'Yakṣa' (which was a manifestation of Brahman according to Kena Up.) is her manifestation. The two mystic syllables *'Om'* and *'Hrim'* are her two aspects etc. It will be seen here that in imparting knowledge to Indra She has expounded the Śākta philosophy to Indra, emphasizing there by her being the Supreme Divinity. Lastly, in the Kena Up. Umā stands between the gods and 'Yakṣa', and explains Brahman to the gods. The Umā of the Kena Up. is not identical with Brahman. She is only a teacher of the gods. Here she may be only a mountain goddess (haimavatī) or a local deity and not Absolute Brahman. In the later Vedic literature Umā Haimavatī, the mountain goddess was affiliated to Rudra or Śiva who also was a mountain god, as his consort. Śāktism inculcates an exclusive adoration of Śiva's consort as the Highest Reality; and hence in the Devī Bhāgavata Umā Haimavatī is referred to as being identical with Brahman and thus elevated to the status of the Supreme Divinity. Thus it will be observed here how the original myth is given the Śākta garb and made to serve the purpose of the Śākta School.

Gāyatrī Upāsanā

13. It may be pointed out here that after the discourse of Umā is over, the author remarks that the gods propitiated the Goddess by performing *'gāyatrī-japa'* and then he glorifies *'gāyatrī-upāsanā'*. He states that *'gāyatrī-upāsanā'* is superior to *viṣṇūpāsanā'*

---

13. Lalye, P. G., Studies in Devī Bhāgavata, pp. 111. 121; also Cf. Sharma, Śākti Cult in Ancient India, p. 149.
14. Rawson, Phillip, Tantra, p. 22.
15. The Bīja Mantras are not mere words but are a concentrated thought of great power revealed to the Sādhaka in the hour of his profound illumination. Sharma, Śākti Cult in Ancient India, p. 173.

and '*śivopāsanā*' and as a sectarian condemns the latter two.[16] By mentioning '*gāyatrī-upāsanā*' at the end of Umā's discourse, the author links it up with the myth of Umā, probably, implying thereby that '*gāyatrī-upāsanā*' is a means of enlightenment. From ancient times '*gāyatrī-mantra*' is associated with initiation ceremony, because the highest knowledge is symbolised by '*gāyatrī-mantra*'. Hence the linking up of '*gāyatrī-upāsanā*' with the initiation of the gods appears to be significant indeed.

14. The Vedic (gāyatrī) mantra in '*gāyatrī*' metre is addressed to the vivifying sun-god. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa has completely identified '*gāyatrī*' with '*sāvitrī*' (Tasmādetāṁ gāyatrīmeva sāvitrīmanubrūyāt)[17] i.e. the power of the sun. The '*mantra*' is thus identified with the power of the sun. In ancient times '*gāyatrī-mantra*' was taught to the initiate by the teacher and with this '*mantra*' the initiate was to meditate upon the solar power.[18] This '*mantra*' was the most potent of all the '*mantras*'.

15. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up. glorifying '*gāyatrī*' remarks that the teacher repeats '*gāyatrī*' for the benefit of the young student and thereby saves his life from ignorance and the effects of sin[19]. To purge the gods of their ignorance '*gāyatrī-upāsanā*' was, therefore, essential.

Śākta Gāyatrī-Upāsanā

16. The Śāktas adoring Śakti or female energy of Śiva included all other '*Śaktis*' under that Śakti (i.e. Śiva's Śakti).[20] The identification of '*gāyatrī*' with '*sāvitrī*' i.e. the Sun's power (Śakti) had already taken place in the Brāhmaṇic period. The Śāktas honouring the authority of the Vedas treated *gāyatrī* as Śakti i.e. their Supreme Goddess (saccidānandarūpinīm[21], brahmarūpā devatoktā gāyatrī-paramā kalā).[22] The Śāktas thus indivi-

16. Devī Bhā. Part II. Chap. 66.88, 89, 91, 92. (=XII. 8 88,89, 91, 92).
17. Śat. Brā. XI 5.4.13 also Cf. Dange, S.A, Legends in the Mbh. p. 226.
18. Ibid. p. 226.
19. Br. Up. 5.14.4.
20. Williams, Monier, Brahmanism and Hinduism, p. 187.
21. Devī Bhā. Chap. 62.10. (=XII. 1.10).
22. Devī Bhā. Chap. 63.6; (=XII. 3.6b); also 27,31, also Chap. 64.2. (=XII. 5.2)

dualized the '*gāyatrī-mantra*' and deified it. In the Ṛv. the '*mantra*' was a means of meditation (i. e. upāsanā); in the hands of the Śāktas, it became an object of worship; '*gāyatrī*', according to them, is ādiśakti[23] the mother of the Vedas.[24]

17. The '*gāyatrī-upāsanā*' described in the Devī Bhāgavata comprises the muttering of '*gāyatrī-mantra*', '*upacāras*', '*mūdras*', '*kavaca*', '*nyāsa*', recitation of '*gāyatrī-sahasranāma*,' '*gāyatrī-praise*' etc. The ritual has been elaborately described. The form of the ritual is Tantric[25] as there is emphasis on '*mantras*', '*nyāsas*', '*mūdras*' '*kavaca*' etc.

18. Here '*gāyatrī-mantra*' is not the usual mantra of twenty-four syllables. The Devī Bhāgavata mentions '*gāyatrī-mantra*' of hundred syllables.[26]

19. '*Upacāras*' consist of the materials used or things done. These are generally sixteen; but in the Devī Bhāgavata a '*sādhaka*' is asked to perform with five '*upacāras*' mental worship as follows :—

(1) '*lam*', I offer sandal paste to Goddess identical with '*pṛthivī*' and bow down to her.

(2) '*ham*', I offer flower to Goddess identical with ether and bow down to her.

(3) '*yam*', I offer incense to Goddess identical with '*vāyu*' and bow down to her.

(4) '*ram*', I offer lamp to Goddess identical with fire.

(5) '*vam*', I offer food to the Goddess. In this way having uttered the syllables '*lam*', '*ham*', '*yam*', '*ram*', '*vam*' and having offered different offerings to the Goddess, the '*sādhaka*' in the end is asked to show '*mūdrās*'.

20. '*Mūdrās*', as commonly understood, are peculiar positions of fingers, which are believed to please the Goddess. The author has mentioned[27] twenty-four mūdrās such as '*sumukha*', '*sampuṭa*', '*vitata*' etc.

---

23. Ibid. (=XII. 5.2).
24. Ibid. 63.27. (=XII. 4.4a) *see* XI. 16.98.
25. Vide 12 above.
26. Devī Bhā. Chap. 56.20. (=XI. 16.102)
27. Ibid. 62.40-42. (=XII. 2.13-17)

21. *'Kavaca'* is a prayer addressed to *'gāyatrī'* wherein She is prayed to give protection to each and every part of the body of the *'sādhaka'* from evils proceeding from various directions. The prayer as though is a covering or an armour for the body.[28]

22. *'Nyāsa'* is another item in the ritual of *'gāyatrī'*. It means imaginary placing of different objects on different parts of the body with which they are believed to be identical e. g. the Devī Bhāgavata enjoins that one should imagine that the heaven is in the head; the two Aśvins in the teeth, sandhyā in the two lips, the fire in the mouth etc.[29]

23. The emphasis is on meditation and muttering of *'mantras'* and names of Gāyatrī. For this purpose the author has given *'gāyatrī sahasranāma'*. This, probably, is due to the belief that Devī is incarnate in sound and a *'mantra'* is identical with the deity and is the concentrated essence of all divine truth.[30] Owing to the influence of the Tantras, as remarked above,[31] the ritual represents a combination of *'kriyā'* (action) and *'bhāvanā*, (imagination or meditation).[32]

24. *'Gāyatrī-upāsanā'* is *'Devī-upāsanā'*. It is image-worship and is within the capacity of all the people. The various aspects of the worship mentioned above[33] are aids to concentrate the mind on the Goddess and to establish direct communion between the *sādhaka* and the Goddess by removing the veil of ignorance. The entire ritual is a sectarian (Śākta) vehicle for the attainment of their (Śākta) goal, viz. the realisation of the nature of Devī or Śakti and hence mention of *'gāyatrī-upāsanā'* in the myth, in the context of initiation of the gods, appears to have been made with propriety.

The myth is thus tinged with Śākta colours.

---

28. Ibid. 63.11-24. (=XII. 3.11-25)
29. Chakravarty, Chintaharan, The Tantras. Studies in their Religion and Literature p. 80. also Cf. Devī Bhā. Part II. Chap. 63. (=XII. 4.8ff.)
30. Cf. Farquhar, Outlines of the Religious Literature of India, p. 202; also Cf. Sharma, Śakti Cult in Ancient India p. 173.
31. Vide 12 above.
32. Sharma, Śakti Cult in Ancient India, p. 173.
33. Vide 17 above.

IDENTIFICATION OF BARHIṢMATĪ—NOTES AND CRITICISM

By

O. P. BHARADWAJ, I. A. S.

In his identification of Svāyambhuva Manu's capital Barhiṣmatī with the modern village Barhi in district Karnal, Haryana, Shri Devendra Handa[1] has built up a hypothesis that beats the proverbial house of cards.

All but one small paragraph of Shri Handa's five-page paper is devoted to the principles of identification of old sites, an elaborate reproduction of the Paurāṇic description of Barhiṣmatī and the country of its location and the final declaration of the doubtlessness of his identification on "archaeological, physiogeographical, traditional, circumstantial and philological grounds".

No serious attempt has been made to verify the existence of the so-called village Barhi adopted by Sh. Handa from a misprint in place of Bahri in Sh. Suraj Bhan's article.[2] He has, therefore, himself to blame if the edifice erected by him crumbles down at the slightest touch.

A glance at the Village Directory and the Karnal district Census Hand Book[3] would show that there is no village named

1. Purāṇa Vol. XVII. No. 2. July, 1975, pp. 163-167. The paper was originally presented by Sh. Handa in the Twenty-seventh Session of the All India Oriental Conference held at Kurukshetra in December, 1974. The weakness of the identification was briefly pointed out during discussion by the present writer as well as by the learned president of the section, Prof. Jagannatha Agrawal. But for Sh. Handa's persistence in publishing the same hypothesis without careful re-examination these few lines would not have been necessary.
2. "The Dawn of Civilisation in Haryana," in Haryana-Studies in History & Culture (ed. K. C. Yadav), Kurukshetra, 1968, pp. 1-5; Appendix II, p. 138. Barhi (sic) occurs in the list at serial No. 113.
3. Government of Haryana, Chandigarh, 1971.

Barhi in Karnal. On the contrary there is one called Bahri.[4] On philological grounds alone one could perhaps be tempted to drag in the process of metathesis of consonants to join Shri Handa in contemplating a possible equation of Barhiṣmatī > Barhi > Bahri > Bahri. But then it would be a folly to depend on philological considerations alone in attempting identifications of ancient sites. Handa himself mentions several other factors of equal importance.[5]

The most significant fact that emerges from the description of Barhiṣmatī in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is its location on the sacred Sarasvatī.[6] The village Bahri does not answer to such a location as erroneously stated by Handa. Nor is it anywhere near what he calls the "ancient pilgrimage of Varāha"[7]. It is no less than 35 miles away from Pehoa or Pṛthūdaka, the nearest point on the Sarasvatī, only about 8 miles from village Barah[8] which is to the south of this canal.[9] If the Western Jumna Canal flows in the old bed of the Dṛṣadvatī[10] the village Bahri can more fittingly be described as located on this river rather than on the Sarasvatī. And the discovery of the Early Historic Ware at this site[11] has precious little significance in relation to the hoary antiquity of Barhiṣmatī, the capital of the first ever patriarch-king of ante diluvium Brahmāvarta. In the circumstances an argument based on the love for song & music of the people[12] would be idle talk.

Handa's so called "Identification of Barhiṣmatī" has therefore literally no legs to stand upon. His passing identification of Bindusara with modern Binsar[13] is equally perfunctory to deserve serious notice.

---

4. I have further checked up & confirmed the position with the Deputy Commissioner, Karnal who in his letter dated 27th Sept. 1975 to me writes that "there is no village of the name of **Barhi** in this district. There is, however, a village of the name of **Bahri**".
5. See p. 1 supra.
6. Handa, op. cit. p. 164.
7. Ibid. p. 166.
8. Identified with Varāha tīrtha associated with the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu, Cunningham, Arch. Survey Report, Vol. XIV. p. 98.
9. For a clear geographical picture of the region, see ¼" sheets of the Survey of India 1954.
10. M. L. Bhargava, the Geography of Ṛgvedic India, Lucknow 1964, p. 55.
11. Suraj Bhan, op. cit. p. 113.
12. Handa, op. cit. p. 166.
13. ibid p. 164.

REVIEW

Caterina Conio : *Mito e filosofia nella tradizione indiana-Le cosmogonie nei Mahāpurāṇa* (Myth and Philosophy in Indian Tradition-Cosmogonies in the Mahāpurāṇas), Milano (Mursia), 1975, pp. 1-194 with & plates. Lire 5,500.

The book, in Italian, is number 10 in the Series 'Studi di filosofia' (Philosophical Studies) brought out by the publisher Mursia and has been sponsored and subsidized by the Italian 'Consiglio Nazionale delle ricerche' (National Council for Research).

The author is a reader in 'The Religions of India and the Far East' in the University of Pisa (Italy) and has taken one of her PhD. degrees at the Banaras Hindu University with a thesis on the Philosophy of the Maṇḍūkya Upaniṣad. The book, here reviewed, is an attempt at a synthesis of the cosmological philosophy as it is set out in the Mahāpurāṇas. Monographs on the philosophy of the individual Mahāpurāṇas are not yet available-except for the Bhāgavata Purāṇa-, therefore the author had to rely almost exclusively upon Kirfel's "*Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*" and some articles by P. Hacker. In fact, C. Conio is influenced by the German School of Indology although always alive to the suggestions made by the French and other schools. The quantity of works and authors quoted in the book is really impressive. But the personality of C.Conio is dominating throughout her work trying to build a synthesis and putting forward new problems.

The Purāṇic texts, says the author in the Introduction (p. 5), are of great interest not only for the Indian religious history but also for philosophy both in its evolution and in its present results. But the critical studies on their composition and evolution are not yet complete and no exhaustive synthesis has so for been published. Yet the author feels it necessary to 'attempt at least a beginning of a historical and theoretical synthesis' and 'enter into the field of "inter-discipline" (p. 6). She does not say however how an 'inter-disciplinary' work can begin when the individual 'disciplines' involved in it have no fixed bases as is the case with

the Purāṇas. She tries then to show the importance of an integration between Logos-representing philosophy-and Myth-represented by the Purāṇas. As the author is a philosopher and is writing for Western philosophers she enters into abstract speculations about the supremacy of Logos over Myth.

This completely Western perspective, which is quite frequent in the book, diminishes the flavour of the Purāṇic atmosphere and language, and introduces—and somehow overimposes—an extraneous element in the texts she is studying. The topics the author deals with are 'sarga and pratisarga', understood as 'creation and new creation' (p. 7) respectively. Her main topic being creation, one could expect more accuracy in specifying the real meaning of the two words, all the more when she gives, in this case, an interpretation different from Kirfel's (Introduction p. XLVII-VIII) whom she usually follows even in small details. The book is then divided into 8 chapters.

'Revelation and Tradition', the first chapter, deals with the Vedic background against which the cosmological philosophy of the Purāṇas has developed. The author sees in Chāndogya Upaniṣad (VI. 2.2) 'the salient moment of the speculation on the Being in the Śruti' (p. 15). As the echoes of these both rational and anthropomorphic speculations will be largely found in the purāṇic cosmogonies (p. 16), she dwells upon the function of Prajāpati Brahmā, tapas—understood as an ascetic activity, also in the Ṛgveda (!) (p. 17) and more particularly māyā. Later, the cyclical creation is examined in its philosophical significance. On the one hand stress is laid on the symbolism of the numbers 3 and 4 as often recurrent in the purāṇic cosmogonies. On the other, the necessity of an 'unalterable Being' (p. 24) is considered as perceived in the Purāṇas. The Supreme Being can be approached only through a divine intervention (p. 25), therefore the author examines the avatāras in their purport in the creational perspective. It is difficult, however, to understand why in this chapter only one theory about the kalpas has been used and why the author has not developed the concept of kāla as it appears in the Purāṇas. And more incomprehensible is why Bhakti too has not been considered as a link between God and man. And again why only seven avatāras are considered without giving any specific reason for such choice and instead the continuous epiphanies of the Lord are not

taken into consideration, while they have such a great importance for the relation between God and man in the Purāṇas. It is not true, moreover, as the author claims that all the avatāras—except Buddha—are 'legendary' (p. 27) and that in the Purāṇas gods' prerogative is a 'status' of tranquil beatitude' (p. 24).

The second chapter *"God and Nature"* faces directly the problem of creation as it is dealt with in the purāṇas. The author, following Kirfel's division in his *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*, talks about three separate groups of purāṇic texts, each of which is more or less influenced by the Sāṁkhya Philosophy. At the end of this description are considered the ways in which creation is said to have taken place, viz. creation as a play, creation through God's entering or approaching Pradhāna and Puruṣa, creation as a product of the Creator's yoga and kāla. Special attention is paid to the function of Avidyā and Karman in the creative process. The matter thoroughly examined is somehow narrowed by the fact of considering as starting point the creational portions of the Purāṇas only as given in the above mentioned Kirfel's book. Each Purāṇa instead has inserted the cosmological accounts in a broader context—the whole purāṇa itself—which should have been considered in order to obtain a sound result. In the case of Avidyā particularly (pp. 47-49), the speculations of the author are based on an inconsistent translation (p. 49). Here and there in fact (see p. 34 n. 13, p. 38 n. 22, p. 47 n. 40) the translation from sanskrit is not accurate.

"Names and aspects of the creating Deity" is the title of the third chapter where an interpretation is given of the most common names of God, viz. Īśvara, Brahmā, Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa, Rudra-Śiva. The study is limited here to a few aspects of the problem, chosen according to the personal sensibility of the author and of a western audience. Central importance is given to Viṣṇu and Brahmā who are studied at some length. The choice is appropriate as these two gods have particular significance in the creative and re-creating process. Brahmā is somehow rehabilitated in his importance as the first God of the Trimūrti, although it is hardly possible to agree with the author when she says, without any further explanation, that Brahmā is conceived in the purāṇas as the only God, having several aspects, close to man and object of cult (p. 61). Rudra-Śiva is dealt with briefly but impressively although it is not

clear why only three lines have been devoted to the "liṅga", while it is a rich theme fit for philosophical as well as more specifically cosmological speculations. This would have been also the right place to study the implications of the different verbs or nouns used in the Purāṇas to describe the creative process. Such a research would have prevented generalization such as "we know already that *'to be born'* with refference to gods, has to be interpreted metaphorically" (p. 62). The best chapter is the fourth *'The symbolism of Creation'* which has already appeared as a separate article in a 'Nota' published by the Istituto Lombardo—Accademia di Scienzee Lettere in "Rendiconti, Classe di Lettere" Vol. 107, 1973, pp. 33-72. It is more elaborate than all the others and ranges outside the purāṇic and Indological field too, in an attempt at comparative study. The author, after having stated the "pre-eminence" (p. 76) of symbol over myth, proceeds to examine in detail some of the most common cosmogonic symbols. The cosmic egg is considered is a sign of fertility, a symbol of the sun, the seat of the demiurge etc. and as one of the most wide spread "aniconic" symbols. Then are studied the fish in its salvific character, the tortoise in its cosmogonic meaning as well as its "maṇḍalic" aspect and as a yogic symbol, the serpent in its cosmic importance, and the lotus in its significance as the "place" where Gods are born, the Varāha in its broad and multivalent symbolism. These are only a few hints out of an interesting material which covers other non-Indian cultures too. The last part of the chapter is devoted to minor symbols, like disc, conch, colours, numbers, yantras and it is unfortunate that this part has not been more developed.

"*The Creatures*" is the title of the fifth chapter. All the created beings can be grouped following two different schemes, one similar to an ascending staircase i. e. from the beings where "tamas" is predominant up to the "Kaumāras" who are completely devoted to asceticism and one similar to a descending staircase. This latter vision reproduces a concept of life as decaying owing to Kāla and evil. Besides these schemes, particular attention is paid to the creation of the "Mānasas" and to eschatology. The chapter is linked to the purāṇic text of which an interpretation is attempted in an exegetical rather than philosophical way. In fact, the passages to be interpreted would need more reflection and deeper study by

philologists before a sound philosophical interpretation could be given.

About the last three chapters only a few words are needed. The sixth "*The creation in the Bhāgavata purāṇa*" is full of inaccuracies. I would suggest that this part should be somehow thoroughly rethought out. The last chapters "*Creation and Soteriology*" and "*Myth and Metaphysics*" are more speculations than considerations of the Purāṇas. At the end are given a selected *Bibliography*, a *Glossary* and an *Index of Names*.

The book is worth reading even if defective in some points. Praise is to be given to the courage of the author who ventured in attemping a synthesis of the purāṇic cosmogony while detailed studies on them are not yet satisfactory. The author repeats continuosly "clearly", "obviously", "evidently" and the like although her conclusions cannot be so "clearly" deduced from the texts she is examining. The too "philosophical" attitude of the author towards the purāṇic texts makes her introduce words like "improper", "legendary", "contradictory", "inexpert" and so on. This attitude sometimes disturbs a little and does not do justice to what she is studying.

Although the book has some shortcomings it is a real contribution to purāṇic studies and constitutes an incentive for others to continue on the same line.

GIORGIO BONAZZOLI

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(July-December, 1975)

Varāha Purāṇa Work.

In the last Review in *Purāṇa* Vol. XVII. No. 2, July 1975, pp. 192 ff. it has already been mentioned that we have completed the collation of the 19 manuscripts of the Varāha-Purāṇa and that in spite of our best efforts we could not procure the mss. in Kannada characters from Udipi (Mysore) nor any Nevari Manuscript from Nepal, and any Oriya manuscript from Orissa.

The collation work thus being almost completed the text of the Varāha Purāṇa is now being constituted on the basis of this collation. More than 100 Adhyāyas of the text have been constituted, and the critical apparatus is also being prepared and compared side by side. A part of the matter has already been sent to the press, and it is expected that the first fascicule of the critical edition containing about 5000 ślokas of the text will be published in a few months. Beside the constituted text and the critical apparatus, it will also contain a part of the Introduction including a detailed description of the critical apparatus and the mutual affiliation of the manuscripts collated. A few Appendices will also be added in the end, which will contain such material as the extra adhyāyas of the Varāha-Purāṇa text of the first fascicle which are contained in some of the manuscripts and the critical notes on the constituted text contained in the first fascicle.

Purāṇa Pāṭha and Pravacana

The Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa was recited in the Padmanābha temple of Ramnagar by Shri Ajay Narain Pandeya and the discourses on it were given in the evening by Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Dātār, from 12.11.75 to 18.11.75 (Kārtika Śukla 9 to Kārtika Śukla 15).

Veda-Pārāyaṇa

The complete text of the Ṛgveda-Saṁhitā with its *Vikṛti* Pāṭha was recited from memory by Pt. Sakharam Mahesvar Padhye Sharma in the Prabhunārāyaṇeśvara temple of the Sivala Palace,

सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जुलाई-दिसम्बर, १९७५ ई०)

वराहपुराणकार्यम्

'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः XVII 2 जुलाई १९७५ (पृ० १९२ इत्या०) अङ्के प्रकाशिते गतकार्यविवरणे सूचितं यदिदानीम् एकोनविंशति-हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवादकार्यं संपादितं तथा च अस्माकं बहुप्रयासान्तरमपि मैसूरराज्यस्य उडुपीनगरतः कन्नडलिपिहस्तलेखः, नेपालराज्यतः नेवारीलिपि हस्तलेखस्तथा च उत्कलप्रदेशतः उत्कललिपिहस्तलेखश्च न लब्धाः।

यतः पाठसंवादकार्यं प्रायेण संपन्नमतः संवादितानां हस्तलेखाना-माधारेण पाठनिर्धारणकार्यं प्रारब्धं वर्तते। अद्यावधि शताधिकाध्यायानां पाठनिर्धारणं संपन्नं तेषामध्यायानां पाठसमीक्षोपकरण (Critical Apparatus) निर्माणकार्यमपि च क्रियमाणं वर्तते। पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणस्य केचन अंशा मुद्रणालये प्रकाशनार्थं प्रदत्ताः सन्ति। आशास्महे पञ्चसहस्र-श्लोकात्मकः प्रथमो मुद्रितांशो कतिपयानां मासानामनन्तरं प्रकाशितो भविष्यति। अस्मिन्नंशे भूमिकाभागोऽपि भविष्यति यस्मिन् पाठविवरणस्य विस्तृतः परिचयः संवादितहस्तलेखानां पारस्परिकसाम्यविवरणं च भविष्यति। कानिचित्परिशिष्टानि अपि अस्मिन् भागे भविष्यन्ति येषु प्रथमभागे केषुचिदेव हस्तलेखेषु आगता अतिरिक्ता अध्यायास्तथा निर्धारित-पाठोपरि टिप्पण्यश्च दत्ता भविष्यन्ति।

पुराणपाठः प्रवचनं च

रामनगरस्थे पद्मनाभमन्दिरे विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणस्य पारायणं प्रातःकाले १२.११.७५ दिनाङ्कतः १८.११.७५ दिनाङ्कं यावत् (कार्तिक शुक्ल ९ तः १५ पर्यन्तं) श्री अजयनारायणपाण्डेयेन कृतम्। सायं समये एषु दिनाङ्केषु पण्डितविश्वनाथशास्त्रिदातारमहोदयेन प्रवचनं कृतम्।

वेदपारायणम्

ऋग्वेदसंहितायाः विकृतिपाठपारायणं शिवालाभवनस्य प्रभुनारायणे-श्वरमन्दिरे १ जून १९७५ दिनाङ्कतः २३ जुलाई १९७५ दिनाङ्कपर्यन्तं (ज्येष्ठमासस्य कृष्णपक्षस्य सप्तमीं तिथिमारभ्य आषाढशुक्ल पूर्णिमा-पर्यन्तम्) पण्डित श्रीसखाराममहेश्वरपाध्येमहोदयेन कृतम्। निर्दिष्टसमये

Varanasi from June 1 to July 23, 1975 (Jyeṣṭha Kṛṣṇa 7 to Āṣāḍha Pūrṇimā). After the scheduled pārāyaṇa was completed the dakṣiṇā was given to the reciter and to the Śrotā.

At the end of the Veda-pārāyaṇa His Highness declared a monthly scholarship of Rs. 100/- p.m. for life to Pt. Sakharam Padhye. The scholarship will continue for his three generations for Vedic studies. For this purpose a sum of Rs. 6000 has been set apart by the various Trusts created by His Highness the Kashinaresha Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. The fund will be known as Ṛgveda Vedic Tripūrushī Vṛittikosha. The balance of Rs. 6000 will be credited to this fund when Pt. Sakharam Padhye recites by memory the complete Ṛgveda-Śākhā (consisting of Saṁhitā, Brāhmaṇas, Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads) together with its sin Vedic aṅgas, viz., Sikṣā, Kalpa, Vyākaraṇa, Nirukta, Chandas and Jyotiṣa, thus completing the whole Vedic lore of the Ṛgveda, which will be a unique feature.

This Vedic scholar, Pt. Sakharam Padhye, is one of the few scholars who have memorised all the *Vikṛti* pāṭhas of the whole Ṛgveda-saṁhitā, and he, therefore, deserves our appreciation.

Purāṇa Goṣṭhī

On the 22nd July 1975, the usual Purāṇa Goṣṭhī was held from 8.30 A.M., after the Veda Pārāyaṇa which was presided by His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. It was attended by the Sanskrit Scholars of Varanasi and of its three Universities. Mention may be made of some of the scholars who attended the Goṣṭhī :—Panditraj Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid, Principal, Sanga Veda Vidyalaya, Varanasi, Dr. Lallan Ji Gopal, Dean of the faculty of Arts, B. H. U., Dr. Reva Prasad Dvivedi, Head of the Sahitya Deptt. Sanskrit College, B.H.U., Pt. Madhu Sudan Shastri, retired Professor B.H.U., Pt. Batuk Nath Shastri Khiste, Head of the Sanskrit University, Varanasi, Prof. Vagisa Shastri, Director, Research Deptt. S.U. Varanasi, Dr. Raghunath Giri, Kashi Vidyapeeth, Dr. Raghunath Singh, former member of the Lok-Sabha and a Trustee of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, Prof. Baldeva Upadhyaya, former Research Director of the Sanskrit University, Varanasi, and Prof. Siva Nandan Lal Dar, former Registrar of the B.H.U. Some of the Professors of the Maharaja Balawant Singh Degree college Gangapur also attended the Purāṇa Goṣṭhī.

पाठसमाप्तौ पाठकर्त्रे श्रोत्रिणे च दक्षिणाः प्रदत्ताः। पारायणसमाप्तौ तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयैः घोषितं यद् पं० सखारामपाध्येमहोदयाय १००) शतरूप्यकाणां मासिकी वृत्तिराजीवनंप्र दत्ता भविष्यति। एषा वृत्तिः वेदाध्ययनार्थं तस्य कुले त्रिपूरुषा भविष्यति। अस्यार्थं तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयैर्निर्मितैः विविधन्यासैः षट्सहस्राणां रूप्यकाणां राशिः पृथक्कृता वर्तते। एषा राशिः 'ऋग्वेद वैदिक त्रिपूरुषी वृत्तिकोशः' इति नाम्ना वर्तते। शेषा ६००० रूप्यकाणां राशिः अस्मिन् कोशे तदा निहिता भविष्यति यदा पण्डितसखारामपाध्येमहोदयः स्मृस्या संपूर्णस्य ऋग्वेदस्य-संहिताब्राह्मणारण्यकोपनिषद्युक्तस्य, षडङ्गैः—शिक्षाकल्पव्याकरणनिरुक्तछन्दस्ज्योतिष्—सह पाठं करिष्यति। इत्थं संपूर्णस्य ऋग्वेदस्य पाठः पूर्णो भविष्यति तथा च ऋग्वेदपारायणे एषा अपूर्वा स्थितिः भविष्यति। यैरल्पसंख्यकैः पण्डितैः ऋग्वेदसंहितायाः संपूर्णः विकृतिपाठः कण्ठीकृतः तेषु एकोऽस्ति एष विद्वान्। एष महाभागः अस्माकं धन्यवादमर्हति।

पुराणगोष्ठी

२२ जुलाई १९७५ दिनाङ्के वेदपारायणानन्तरं ८.३० प्रातःकाले तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशमहाराजानां डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयानामध्यक्षतायां पुराणगोष्ठी संपन्ना। काशीस्थानां त्रयाणां विश्वविद्यालयानां भारतीविद्यायाः अध्यापकाः अन्ये च काशीस्था विद्वांसो गोष्ठ्यामुपस्थिता आसन्। उपस्थितविदुषां प्रमुखा इमे आसन्—पण्डितराजराजेश्वरशास्त्रिद्रविडः, डा० लल्लनजीगोपालः, हिन्दुविश्वविद्यालये कलासंकायप्रमुखः, डा० रेवाप्रसाद द्विवेदी, हिन्दुविश्वविद्यालये साहित्यविद्याध्यक्षः, हिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य प्राप्तावकाशः साहित्याध्यापकः पं० मधुसूदनशास्त्रिमहोदयः, वाराणसेयसंस्कृत बिश्वविद्यालयस्य साहित्याध्यक्षः पं०बटुकनाथशास्त्रिखिस्ते, संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालये अनुसंधानसंचालकः श्रीवागीशशास्त्री, काशीविद्यापीठे दर्शनाध्यक्षः डा० रघुनाथगिरिः, पूर्वं संसत्सदस्यः काशिराजन्यासस्य न्यासधारकश्च डा० रघुनाथसिंहः, संस्कृत विश्वविद्यालयस्य प्राप्तावकाशः अनुसंधानसंचालकः पं० बलदेव उपाध्यायः, श्रीशिवनन्दनलाल दरमहोदयश्च। गङ्गापुरे स्थितस्य महाराज बलवन्तसिंह महाविद्यालयस्य केचन प्राध्यापका अपि उपस्थिता आसन्।

In the beginning the Vedic Vasant Pūjā was performed in which sixteen Ṛgvedic Scholars recited the *ghana, jaṭā*, and *Krama pāṭhas* of the Ṛgveda. Maharaja Kumar Sri Anant Narain Singh distributed the Dakṣiṇās to the reciters. These Vedic Scholars also listened to the Veda-Pārāyaṇa of the *Vikṛti-Pāṭhas* of the Ṛgvedic-Pārāyaṇa and were fully satisfied with the recitation of Pt. Sakharam Padhye and approved the proposed Dakṣiṇā to be given to him.

The maṅgalācaraṇa and Vyāsa-Vandanā were recited by Pt. Hiramani Misra of the Purāṇa Deptt. and the Varṣāśana (six monthly scholarship of Rs. 600) was given to Pt. Krishna Murti Srauti for committing to memory the complete texts of the Sāma-veda and its Brāhmaṇas. The Vyāsa-Pūrṇimā Number of the *Purāṇa* Bulletin was then presented to His Highness by Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid. The report of the Purāṇa work of the Purāṇa Deptt. was then read by Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai. A useful discussion followed, in which several scholars participated.

On this occasion, His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, as the President of the Vishwa Hindu Dharma Sammelan also honoured Pt. Batuknath Shastri Khiste and Pt. Rewa Pd. Dvivedi for composing verses of a Sanskrit *Praśasti*, which was presented to king Virendra Vikram Shah Dev of Nepal, as reported in *Purāṇa*, Vol. XVII.2 (July, 1975) pp. 198ff., on the occasion of his coronation in Feb., 1975. Both these scholars recited their own verses. The Dakṣiṇā and some Purāṇa Publications were presented to them by His Highness.

In the end His Highness thanked the audience and the Goṣṭhī was concluded with the distribution of the prasāda.

Scholars and Distinguished persons who visited the Purāṇa Deptt.

1. Hon'ble Dr. Jagannath Misra, Chief Minister of Bihar, paid a visit to Ramnagar Fort on 16.10.75. On this occasion His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh acquainted him with the Purāṇa-work and Purāṇa-publications of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, in which he showed keen interest. He has recommended that as the Kashiraj Trust is doing very useful work in the field of Sanskrit learning, all the States-Governments of India should help this Trust and buy its publications. His remarks in our Visiters Book are reproduced below :—

प्रारम्भे वैदिकवसन्तपूजा संपादिता यस्यां षोडशवैदिकब्राह्मणैः ऋग्वेदस्य केषांचिन्मन्त्राणां घनजटाक्रमपाठानां पारायणं कृतम्। महाराजकुमारेण श्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंहेन पाठकर्तृभ्यः दक्षिणाः प्रदत्ताः। इमे वैदिकविद्वांसः ऋग्वेदपारायणस्य विकृतिपाठपारायणमपि श्रुतवन्तः। इमे वैदिकविद्वांसः पं० सखारामपाध्येमहोदयस्य पाठेन संतुष्टा आसन् तथा पाध्येमहोदयाय प्रदानार्थं प्रस्तावितायाः दक्षिणाया अनुमोदनं कृतवन्तः।

पुराणविभागीयेन पण्डितहीरामणिमिश्रेण मङ्गलाचरणं व्यासवन्दना च कृता। पं० कृष्णमूर्ति श्रौतिमहोदयाय संपूर्णसामवेदस्य स्मरणार्थं वर्षाशनं (६०० रूप्यकाणा षाड्मासिकी वृत्तिः) प्रदत्तम्। तदनन्तरं तत्रभवद्भ्यः काशिनरेशेभ्यः 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः व्यासपूर्णिमाङ्कः पण्डितराजेश्वरशास्त्रि द्रविडमहोदयेन समर्पितः। तदनन्तरं पुराणविभागस्य कार्यविवरणं डा० गङ्गासागररायमहोदयेन उपस्थापितम्। तदनन्तरं-पुराणविषये उपयोगी विचारविमर्शो जातः यस्मिन् बहवो विद्वांसः सम्मिलिता आसन्।

अस्मिन् अवसरे विश्वहिन्दुधर्मसम्मेलनस्य अध्यक्षाः तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः पण्डितबटुकनाथशास्त्रिखिस्तेमहोदयं तथा डा० रेवाप्रसाद-द्विवेदिमहोदयं संभावितवन्तः। आभ्यां विद्वद्भ्यां नेपालनरेशाय तत्र भवते वीरेन्द्रविक्रमशाहदेवाय तदभिषेकावसरे फरवरी १९७५ समये समर्पिता प्रशस्तिः रचिता आसीत् (यथा पुराणम् XVII.2, जुलाई १९७५, पृ० १९८इ० सूचितम्)। उभाभ्यां विद्वद्भ्यां स्वरचिता प्रशस्तिः श्राविता तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः दक्षिणा पुराणग्रन्थाश्च तेभ्यः समर्पिताः।

अन्ते तत्र भवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः उपस्थितविदुषः प्रति कृतज्ञता ज्ञापिता। प्रसादवितरणेन सह गोष्ठी समाप्ता।

पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसो विशिष्टा अतिथयश्च

१. १६-१०-७५ दिनाङ्के बिहारप्रदेशस्य मुख्यमन्त्री माननीयो डा० जगन्नाथमिश्रमहोदयः रामनगरदुर्गे आगतः। अस्मिन् अवसरे तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयैः पुराणकार्यस्य पुराणप्रकाशनानां च तस्मै परिचयः प्रदत्तः। अस्मिन् कार्ये मुख्यमन्त्रिणा डा० जगन्नाथमिश्रेण स्वरुचिः प्रदर्शिता। तेन प्रस्तावितं यद् काशीराजन्यासेन संस्कृतविद्या-विषये अत्युपयोगि कार्यं क्रियमाणं वर्तते अतः सर्वैः प्रान्तीय-शासनैः अस्मै न्यासाय साहाय्यं दापनीयं प्रकाशनानि च क्रेतव्यानि। अस्माकमागन्तुकपुस्तिकायां तेन इत्थं लिखतम्—

"संस्कृत में अर्जित विद्या को अत्यन्त ही प्रभावशाली ढंग से संजोया जा रहा है, इस ट्रस्ट को सभी राज्य सरकारों की ओर से सहायता दी जानी चाहिये और प्रकाशन खरीद कर ज्ञान का प्रसार किया जाना आवश्यक है। मेरी शुभकामना इस संस्थान के लिये है।"

2. Dr. Paolo Emilio Taviani, Minister of Parliament of Italy. (on 13.11.75).

3. Prof. Dr. J. W. de Jong, Australian National University, Canberra. (on 18.12.75)

4. Prof. Dr. Amalendu Bose, Sir Gooroodas Banerjee Professor of English, Calcutta University (on 18.12.75).

Rāmalīlā

The famous Rāmalīlā at Ramnagar which has a great cultural and social importance is being celebrated for a month in September-October every year under the auspices of the All-India Kashiraj Trust with the financial help from the Government of India. This year (1975) the Rāmalīlā was celebrated from 19th September (Ananta Caturdaśī day) upto 18th September. Some members of the staff of the Purāṇa Department also helped the distribution of the free ration to the Sadhu-s who flock to the Rāmalīlā. The free ration is distributed for the whole month throughout the celebrations of the Rāmalīlā. Thousands of people witness the Rāmalīlā every day and draw healthy inspiration from the story of Śrī Rāma.

This year the Government of India realising the cultural and religious importance of the Ramnagar Rāmalīlā sent a team of photographers under the supervision and directions of Prof. Balwant Gargi of the Chandigarh University to prepare a documentary film of the Rāmalīlā The work of shooting and tape recording was done during the Rāmalīlā and also for a few days after the conclusion of the Rāmalīlā on the 18th October, when the desired scenes were re-enacted for this purpose only.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS.

Maharaja Udit Narain Singh Mānasa Prachāra Nidhi

Under the auspices of the Trust an inter-school Tulasī-Sāhitya competition was organised on 18-19 Aug. 1975 on the occasion of

"संस्कृत में अर्जित विद्या को अत्यन्त ही प्रभावशाली ढंग से संजोया जा रहा है। इस ट्रस्ट को सभी राज्य सरकारों की ओर से सहायता दी जानी चाहिये और प्रकाशन खरीदकर ज्ञान का प्रसार किया जाना आवश्यक है। मेरी शुभ कामना इसके लिये है।"

२. डा० पाओलो एमिलिओ टाविआनी, इटलीदेशस्य मन्त्री।
१३-११-७५ दिनांके

३. प्रो० डा० जे० डब्ल्यू० डी जान्ग, कैनबेरा नगरस्थस्य आस्ट्रेलियन नेशनल विश्वविद्यालयस्य प्राध्यापकः। १८-१२-७५ दिनांके

४. प्रो० डा० अमलेन्दु वसुः, कलकत्ता विश्वविद्यालये आङ्गभाषायाः सर गुरुदास बनर्जी प्राध्यापकः। १८-१२-७५ दिनांके

रामलीला

रामनगरस्य विश्रुता रामलीला सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य तत्त्वावधाने भारतशासनस्यार्थिकसाहाय्येन प्रतिवर्षम् आश्विनमासे (सितम्बर-अक्टूबर) मासपर्यन्तं आयोजिता भवति। रामलीलैषा सांस्कृतिकदृष्ट्या सामाजिकदृष्ट्या चातीव महत्त्वपूर्णा वर्तते। अस्मिन् वर्षे १९ सितम्बर दिनांके (अनन्तचतुर्दश्यां) रामलीला प्रारब्धा १८ अक्टूबर दिनाङ्के (आश्विनपूर्णिमायां) च समाप्ता। पुराणविभागीया केचन विद्वांसोऽपि रामलीलादर्शनार्थमागतेभ्यः साधुभ्यो भोजनप्रदाने साहाय्यं कृतवन्तः। यावत् रामलीला प्रचलति प्रतिदिनं मासपर्यन्तं साधुभ्यो निःशुल्कं भोजनसामग्री प्रदीयते। प्रतिदिनं सहस्रशो दर्शका रामलीलां पश्यन्ति रामकथायाश्च पावनीं प्रेरणां प्राप्नुवन्ति।

अस्मिन् वर्षे रामलीलायाः धार्मिकं सांस्कृतिकं च महत्त्वमनुभूय केन्द्रशासनं चण्डीगढ़विश्वविद्यालयीयस्य प्रो० बलवन्तगार्गिमहोदयस्य निर्देशने चित्रकाराणां (photographers) एकां समितिं रामलीलायाः वृत्तचित्र (documentary film) निर्माणार्थं प्रेषितवत्। चित्रग्रहणकार्यं (shooting) ध्वनिग्रहणकार्यं (recording) च रामलीलासमये तथाच १८ अक्टूबर दिनाङ्के रामलीलासमाप्त्यनन्तरं च केषुचिद् दिनेषु, यदा अस्य निमित्तमेव अभीष्टलीलानां प्रदर्शनं जातं, संपन्नम्।

सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

महाराज उदितनारायणसिंह मानसप्रचारनिधिः

अस्य न्यासस्य तत्त्वावधाने १८-१९ अगस्त दिनांकयोः अन्तर-विद्यालयतुलसीसाहित्यप्रतियोगिता आयोजिता आसीत्। रामनगरदुर्गे

the celebration of the Tulasī-Jayantī in the Ramnagar Fort. On 19.8.75 students from the B H.U. also participated in the competition. The winners were given prizes. Dr. Kamala Prasad Singh, Dr. Tribhuvan Singh and Dr. Ram Lochan Singh of B.H.U. spoke on the value and importance of the Tulasī-literature, and the usefulness of such competitions. Pt. Vishwanath Prasad Ji Misra also threw light on the importance of organising Rāmalīlās based on the Tulasī-Rāmcarita-mānasa. Verses from Tulasī-literature learnt by heart were recited by the students of the Vidyā Mandir Pathasala of the Ramnagar Fort and of the other local educational institutions. An antyākṣarī on the Tulasī literature, specially on the Rāmacarita-mānasa was also held. Some interesting scenes from the story of Rāma according to the Rāmacarita-mānasa were also enacted by the students.

The Mānasa Prachāra Nidhi organised two essay competitions on the Rāmacarita-mānasa, one for the Vyāsas (reciters and narrators of the Rāmacarita mānasa) and other for graduate and Post Graduate students. The subject of the essays is declared on Mārgaśirsa Sukla Pañcamī and awards are distributed on Vaisākha Kṛsṇa Saṣṭhī. No essay was received from Vyasas, but some good essays were received from the following students :—

1. Shri Devadatta Rai, Post Graduate Deptt. of Hindi, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya.
2. Kumari Abha Bisaria, B.A., Third year, Basant Kanya Maha Vidyalaya, Rajghat, Varanasi.
3. Shri Chedilal, Post Graduate Hindi Deptt., B.H.U.
4. Shri Ram Adhara Singh Chauhan, B.A., Second year, Swami Sahajanand Sarasvati Vidyapeeth, Ghazipur.
5. Shri Shalendra Kumar Shrivastava, Lucknow.

Shri Devadatta Rai of Magadh University got the first prize in this competition. The judges were Dr. Hazari Prasad Dvivedi, Shri Lakshmi Shankar Vyasa and Shri Vishwanath Shastri Datar.

Last year the Subject for Vyāsas was मानस पर हुये प्रमुख आक्षेपों का समाधान and for the students was मानस का प्रतिपाद्य प्रधान रस

१९ अगस्त दिनांके तुलसी जयन्ती आयोजिता आसीत् । अस्मिन्नुत्सवे हिन्दू-विश्वविद्यालयस्य छात्राऽपि प्रतियोगितायां सम्मिलिता बभूवुः । विजेतृछात्रेभ्यः पुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः । अस्मिन्नवसरे डा० कमला प्रसादसिंहः, डा० त्रिभुवन-सिंहः, डा० रामलोचनसिंहश्च व्याख्यानं दत्तवन्तः । आचार्य विश्वनाथ प्रसादमिश्रमहोदयोऽपि रामचरितमानसस्य आधारेण रामलीलाया आयोजनस्य महत्त्वविषये भाषणं कृतवान् । रामनगरदुर्गस्थाया विद्या-मन्दिरपाठशालाया अन्यासां पाठशालानामपि छात्रा कण्ठस्थस्य तुलसी-साहित्यस्य स्मृत्या पाठं कृतवन्तः । तुलसीसाहित्यस्य विशेषतो रामचरित-मानसस्य अन्त्याक्षरी प्रतियोगिताऽपि संपन्ना जाता । रामचदितमानसस्य आधारेण रामकथायाः केषाञ्चिदंशाना रोचकम् अभिनयप्रदर्शनमपि छात्रैः कृतम् ।

अयं निधिः रामचरितमानसविषयो द्वयोः निबन्धप्रतियोगितयो-रायोजनं कृतवान् एका निबन्धप्रतियोगिता रामचरितमानसस्य व्यासानां कृते अपरा च स्नातकछात्राणां कृते संयोजिता । विषयस्य सूचना विवाह-पञ्चम्यां (मार्गशीर्षशुक्लपञ्चम्यां) प्रदत्ता पुरस्कारश्च वैशाख तिथौ प्रदत्तः । गते वर्षे व्यासानां कृते विषय आसीत्—मानसोपरि आगताना-माक्षेपानां समाहारः । स्नातकछात्राणां कृते विषय आसीत्—मानसप्रतिपाद्यः प्रधानो रसः । व्यासानां कृते पुरस्कारस्य पञ्चशतरुप्यकाणां राशिर्वर्तते । छात्राणां कृते च शतरुप्यकाः वर्तन्ते केनापि व्यासेन निबन्धो न प्रेषितः किन्तु अधोनिर्दिष्टैः छात्रैः शोभना निबन्धाः प्रेषिताः ।

१. श्री देवदत्तरायः—बोधगयास्थिते मगधविश्वविद्यालये स्नातकोत्तर-हिन्दी छात्रः ।

२. कुमारी आभा विसारिया—काश्यां राजघाटस्थितस्य बसन्तमहा-विद्यालयस्य बी० ए० कक्षायाः ।

३. श्री छेदीलालः—हिन्दुविश्वविद्यालये स्नातकोत्तरहिन्दीविभा-गस्य छात्रः ।

४. श्री रामअधारसिंह चौहानः—गाजीपुरस्थितस्य स्वामीसहजा-नन्दमहाविद्यालयस्य स्नातककक्षायाः छात्रः ।

५. श्री शैलेन्द्रकुमार श्रीवास्तवः—लखनऊ नगरस्य छात्रः ।

अस्यां प्रतियोगितायां मगधविश्वविद्यालयीयो श्री देवदत्तरायः प्रथम-पुरस्कारं प्राप्तवान् । आचार्य हजारीप्रसाद द्विवेदी, श्रीलक्ष्मीशंकर व्यासः, श्री विश्वनाथ शास्त्रीदातारश्च परीक्षका आसन् ।

Maharaja Prabhu Narain Singh Physical Culture Trust

On the occasion of the birth day ceremony of Maharaja Kumar Shri Anant Narain Singh, sports of the boys of the local schools were organised in the Fort on 7th and 8th Dec., 1975. Almost all the local Junior and primary schools took part in the sports. The Students of the Vidyamandir Pathasala also participated in all the sports.

In September, 1975 Shri M. Kumara of Jaunpur gave an endurance cycling demonstration for a continuous period of 105 hours in the Ayodhya campus of the Ramnagar which was daily witnessed by thousands of persons. A reward of Rs. 501 was awarded to Shri Kumar by Maharajkumar Shri Anant Narain Singh on behalf of this Trust.

MAHARAJA BANARAS VIDYAMANDIR TRUST

Vedic Bālaka Vasanta Pūjā

On the same occasion of the birth day ceremony, the Vedic Bālaka Vasanta Pūjā was performed by sixteen Vedic students under 15 years of age from Varanasi. They orally recited the Vedic mantras in the Devī temple of the Ramnagar Fort in the morning with due ceremonial rites. Dakṣiṇā was given to them after the Pūjā.

Painting competition

A painting competition was organised on 9th Dec. 1975 for the children of the local schools and the Vidyamandir Pathasala. In this competition about 200 boys and girl-students took part. The paintings were examined for the prizes by Shri R. S. Dhir and Shri Hridaya Narain Singh, Lecturers in Fine Arts, B.H.U. The prizes were distributed by Shri Maharaja Kumara.

Bāla-śāstrārtha

Under the auspices of this Trust a Bāla-śāstrārtha on Nyāya was organised on the 10th December under the supervision of Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid in which the Students of the Vidya Mandir Pathasala and Udyanapathashala participated. Maharaja Kumara Shri Anant Narain Singh also participated in the Śāstrārtha. The prizes in cash and books were given to those who took part in the Śāstrārtha.

महाराज प्रभुनारायणसिंह फिजिकल कल्चरल न्यासः

चिरंजीविमहाराजकुमार श्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंहस्य जन्मोत्सवावसरे ७, ८ दिसम्बर १९७५ दिनाङ्कयोः रामनगरदुर्गे स्थानिकपाठशालीय-छात्राणां क्रीडायाः आयोजनं सम्पन्नम्। क्रीडायां प्रायशः स्थानिकाः सर्वे माध्यमिकाः प्राथमिकाश्च विद्यालयाः सम्मिलिता आसन्। विद्यामन्दिर-पाठशालायाः छात्रा अपि सर्वासु क्रीडासु सम्मिलिता बभूवुः।

सितम्बर १९७५ मासे रामनगरस्थे अयोध्याप्राङ्गणे जौनपुरवास्तव्यः श्रीएम० कुमारमहोदयः पञ्चाधिकशतघण्टानां सततसाइकिलचालनं प्रदर्शयामास। सहस्रशो दर्शकाः प्रतिदिनं प्रदर्शनं दृष्टवन्तः। श्रीएम० कुमार महोदयाय महाराजकुमारेण श्री अनन्तनारायण सिंहेन अस्य न्यासस्य प्रातिनिध्येन ५०१) रुप्यकाणि प्रदत्तानि।

महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासः

वैदिकबालक वसन्तपूजा

महाराजकुमारस्य जन्मोत्सववासरे वाराणस्या ऊनपञ्चदशवर्षीया षोडश वैदिकबालका वसन्तपूजां कृतवन्तः। ते प्रातःकाले दुर्गस्थे देवीमन्दिरे विधिपूर्वकं वैदिकमन्त्राणां पाठमकुर्वन्। पूजासमाप्तौ तेभ्यो दक्षिणा दापिताः।

चित्रकला प्रतियोगिता

स्थानिक पाठशालीयछात्राणां कृते विद्यामन्दिर पाठशालायाश्छात्राणां कृते च ९ दिसम्बर १९७५ दिनाङ्के चित्रकलाप्रतियोगिताया आयोजनमासीत्। अस्यां प्रतियोगितायां प्रायेण द्विशतसंख्याकाश्छात्राः सम्मिलिता आसन्। हिन्दुविश्वविलयस्य ललितकलायाः अध्यापकौ श्रीआर० ए० धीरमहोदयः श्रीहृदयनारायणसिंह महोदयश्च परीक्षकौ आस्ताम्। महाराजकुमार श्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंहमहोदयेन विजेतृछात्रेभ्यः पुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः।

बालशास्त्रार्थः

अस्य न्यासस्य तत्त्वावधाने पण्डितराजश्रीराजेश्वरशास्त्रियद्रविड-महोदयस्य निर्देशने च १० दिसम्वर १९७५ दिनाङ्के न्यायविषये बालशास्त्रार्थः संपन्नो जातः यस्मिन् विद्यामन्दिरपाठशालायाः उद्यानपाठशालायाश्च छात्राः सम्मिलिता बभूवुः। महाराजकुमारः श्री अनन्तनारायणसिंहोऽपि शास्त्रार्थमकरोत्। शास्त्रार्थे ये छात्राः सम्मिलितास्तेभ्यो पुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः।

KASHINARESH MAHARANI DHARMAKARYA NIDHI

Bāla Mela

On this occasion a Bāla mela including the baby show was arranged by this Trust on the 9th Dec. Sweets were distributed to the children of the local educational institutions and also to the other children of Ramnagar and neighbouring villages. Clothes were also distributed to the poor children of Ramnagar under three years of age on the same day in the afternoon.

MAHARAJA KASHIRAJ DHARMAKARYA NIDHI

The Trust gives donations to several religious and cultural institutions, such as the Vishwa Hindu Dharma-Sammelan, Girvana-Vagvardhini-sabha of Varanasi. The Trust gives medals and prizes in the Universities and Colleges.

The Trust is also running the following educational institutions:—

1. Maharani Ramratna Kunvari Samskrit Pathasala, Fort Ramnagar

This Pathasala was established in 1923 A. D. to impart Sanskrit education. The Pathasala is now teaching upto the Uttara Madhyama examination of the Sanskrit University, Varanasi. Last year four students appeared in their Sanskrit examination as follows :—

1 in Prathamā, 1 in Pūrva Madhyamā, Second Part and 2 in Uttara Madhyamā, Second Part. All the students passed in their respective examinations.

2. Maharaja Balwant Singh Degree College, Gangapur

This college was established in July, 1972 at Gangapur (Distt. Varanasi, the birth place of Late Maharaja Balwant Singh, founder of the Kashirajya at Ramnagar). The College imparts education in Arts upto the Degree examinations of the Gorakhpur University in Sanskrit, Hindi, Urdu, English, Economics, Political Science, History, Psychology, Sociology, Education, Geography and Indian culture.

3. Raja Manasā Ram Law College, Raja Talab

This college was established in November 1973 at Rajatalab, which place is at a distance of about 15 km. from Varanasi. It is

काशीनरेश महारानी धर्मकार्यनिधिः

९ दिसम्बर १९७५ दिनाङ्के न्यासेन बालमेलायाः बालप्रदर्शनस्य च आयोजनं कृतम्। स्थानिकविद्यालयानां छात्रेभ्यो रामनगरीयेभ्यस्तत्समीपवर्तिभ्योऽन्येभ्यो बालेभ्यश्च मिष्ठान्नानि प्रदत्तानि। तस्मिन्नेव दिने अपराह्णे ऊनत्रिवार्षिकेभ्यः रामनगरीयनिर्धनबालकेभ्यो वस्त्राण्यपि वितरितानि।

महाराज काशीराजधर्म कार्यनिधिः

अनेन न्यासेन अनेकेभ्यो धार्मिकसांस्कृतिकसंस्थाभ्यः यथा विश्वहिन्दुधर्मसम्मेलनम्, गीर्वाणवाग्वर्धिनीसभा, प्रभृतिभ्यः साहाय्य प्रदीयते। विश्वविद्यालयेषु विद्यालयेषु च पदकानि पुरष्काराश्च अनेन न्यासेन प्रदीयन्ते।

अनेन न्यासेन अधोनिर्दिष्टानां संस्थानां सञ्चालनमपि क्रियते।

१. महारानी रामरत्नकुँवरिसंस्कृतपाठशाला, रामनगर

संस्कृतशिक्षाप्रदानार्थमेषा पाठशाला ईसवीये १९२३ वर्षे स्थापिता आसीत्। संप्रति पाठशालैषा वाराणसेय संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य उत्तरमध्यमापरीक्षा पर्यन्तं शिक्षाप्रदानं करोति। गते वर्षे अधोनिर्दिष्टकक्षानुसारतः चत्वारश्छात्राः परीक्षायां प्रविष्टाः।

प्रथमाकक्षायाम् एकश्छात्रः, पूर्वमध्यमापरीक्षायामेकश्छात्रः प्रथमवर्षे, उत्तरमध्यमापरीक्षाया द्वितीयवर्षे द्वौ छात्रौ। सर्वे छात्राः उत्तीर्णा अभवन्।

२. महाराजबलवन्तसिंह महाविद्यालय, गङ्गापुर

एष महाविद्यालयः १९७२ ईसवीये वर्षे वाराणसी जनपदस्थिते गङ्गापुरनामके नगरे (काशिराज्यस्य संस्थापकस्य श्रीबलवन्तसिंहस्य जन्मस्थाने) स्थापितः। अस्मिन् महाविद्यालये गोरखपुरविश्वविद्यालयस्य स्नातककक्षानां हिन्दी, संस्कृत, उर्दू, आँग्लभाषा-अर्थशास्त्र-राजनीतिशास्त्र-इतिहास-मनोविज्ञान-समाजशास्त्र-शिक्षा-भूगोल-भारतीय संस्कृति विषयेषु अध्यापनं भवति।

३. मनसारामविधिविद्यालय, राजाताब

एष महाविद्यालयः वाराणसीनगरतः प्रायेण १५ कि०मी०, दूरस्थिते राजातालाबनामके स्थाने ईसवीये १९७३ वर्षे स्थापितः। गोरखपुर विश्व-

affiliated to the Gorakhpur University. This college works in the morning from 7 to 10 A.M. Last year (i. e. in 1975) 23 Law students appeared in the LL.B. Part I examination. This year the teaching work of LL.B. Part II has begun from 17.11.75.

'Hindutva' Magazine

The monthly Magazine 'Hindutva' is published in English under the auspices of the Vishwa Hindu Dharma Sammelan. The object of this publication is to disseminate Hindu culture. The Dharma Karya Nidhi gives an annual aid of Rs. 4000/- towards the publication of this magazine. This year a special issue on Nepal was published on the occasion of the coronation ceremony of His Majesty the king of Nepal, Shri Vir Vikram Shah Deva.

विद्यालयेन सम्बद्धे अस्मिन् महाविद्यालये प्रातःकाले ७ वादनतः १० वादन-कालं यावद् अध्यापनं भवति । गते वर्षे २३ छात्राः एल-एल० बी० परीक्षायाः प्रथमपर्षपरीक्षायां प्रविष्टाः । अस्मिन् वर्षे द्वितीयवर्षस्य अध्यापनं १७.११.७५ दिनाङ्कतः प्रारब्धम् ।

'हिन्दुत्व' पत्रिका

'हिन्दुत्व' नाम्नी मासिकी पत्रिका आङ्गलभाषायां विश्वहिन्दुधर्म सम्मेलनस्य संचालने प्रचलति । अस्याः पत्रिकायाः उद्देश्यं हिन्दुसंस्कृतेः प्रचारमस्ति । अस्याः पत्रिकायाः प्रकाशननिमित्तं काशिराजधर्मकार्यनिधिः ४०००) रुप्यकाणां वार्षिकी सहायता प्रददाति । अस्मिन् वर्षे तत्र भवतां नेपालनरेशाणां श्रीवीरेन्द्रविक्रमशाहदेवानां राज्याभिषेकावसरे अस्याः पत्रिकायाः विशेषाङ्करूपेण नेपाल-अङ्कः प्रकाशितः आसीत् ।

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ALL INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

Critical Edition and Translations

1. Vāmana Purāṇa—Edited by Sri A. S. Gupta. Rs. 125
2. Kūrma Purāṇa—Edited by Sri A. S. Gupta. Rs. 125
8. Rāmacaritamānasa—Edited by Acharya Vishva Nath Prasad Misra. Rs. 6.50
4. Vāmana Purāṇa—Constituted Text with English Translation and Appendices. Rs. 80
5. Vāmana Purāṇa—Constituted Text with Hindi Translation and Appendices. Rs. 50
6. Kūrma Purāṇa—Constituted Text with English Translation and Appendices. Rs. 80
7. Kūrma Purāṇa—Constituted Text with Hindi Translation and Appendices. Rs. 50
8. Devīmāhātmya—Text with English Translation and annotation. By Dr. V. S. Agrawala. Rs. 20
9. Svargakhaṇḍa of the Padma Purāṇa—edited by Dr. Asoke Chatterjee Rs. 40

Studies

1. Garuḍa Purāṇa—A Study. By Sri N. Gangadharan Rs. 40
2. Matsya Purāṇa—A Study. By Dr. V. S. Agrawala Rs. 40
3. Nārada Purāṇa—A Study By Dr. K. Damodaran Nambiar (In the Press)
4. Nīti-Section of Purāṇārthasaṁgraha—By Dr. V. Raghavan Rs. 2
5. Vyāsa-Praśasti [व्यासप्रशस्तिः]—Compiled and edited By Dr. V. Raghavan Re. 1
6. Greater Rāmāyaṇa—By Dr. V. Raghavan Rs. 30
7. Viṣṇupurāṇa Viṣayānukramaṇī [विष्णुपुराण-विषयानुक्रमणी]—By Pt. Madhvacharya Adya Rs. 5
8. Bṛhaspati-Saṁhitā of the Garuḍa Purāṇa—By Dr. L. Sternbach Rs. 10
9. Mānavadharmaśāstra I-III and Bhaviṣya Purāṇa—By Dr. L. Sternbach Rs. 20

Journal

Purāṇam—Half Yearly Research Journal dealing with the various aspects of the Purāṇas.
Annual Subscription Inland Rs. 30, Foreign £ 3.00

THE BO

OF

THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ T

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

Trustee nominated by the Govt. of India :—

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

Trustees nominated by the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh :—

3. Panditaraja Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid; Principal, Sangaveda Vidyalaya, Varanasi.

4. Hon.'ble Pt. Kamalapati Tripathi; Minister of Railways, Govt. of India.

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. Raghubir Sinh, M. A., D. Litt.; Raghubir Niwas, Sitamau (Malwa).

7. Pt. Giridhari Lal Mehta, Varanasi; Managing Director: Jardine Handerson Ltd.; Scindia Steam Navigation Ltd.; Trustee: Vallabhram-Saligram Trust, Calcutta.

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