

Vol. XXIII, No. 1]

[January, 1981

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**

## सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा० रामकरण शर्मा

उपशिक्षापरामर्शदाता, शिक्षामन्त्रालय तथा निर्देशक, केन्द्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान, नयी दिल्ली ।

डा० लुडविक स्टर्नबाख एल-एल. डी.;

प्रोफेसर, भारतीय विद्या,

पेरिस विश्वविद्यालय, पेरिस (सोरबोन) ।

श्री आनन्दस्वरूप गुप्त, एम. ए., शास्त्री; उपनिदेशक,

पुराण-विभाग, सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यास,

फोर्ट रामनगर, वाराणसी ।

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. R. K. Sharma

Deputy Educational Advisor (Skt.) Govt. of India and Director,  
Kendriya Sanskrit Sansthana, New Delhi.

Dr. Ludwik Sternbach, LL. D., Prof. of Indology,  
University of Paris, Paris (Sorbonne).

Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, M. A., Shastri; Asstt. Director,  
Purāṇa-Deptt., All-India Kashiraj Trust.

### EDITOR-IN-CHARGE

Shri Anand Swarup Gupta

### ASSTT. EDITORS

Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai, M. A., Ph. D.

Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli, M. A., M. D.

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 preferably use Devanāgarī letters for  
Sanskrit ślokas and prose passages.

## पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. XXIII., No. 1]

वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्कः

[February 9, 1981

लेखसूची—Contents

	Pages
1. सरस्वती-स्तवनम् [Eulogy of Sarasvatī] By Śrī A. S. Gupta.	1-2
2. King Bhagīratha and River Gaṅgā [राजा भगीरथः गङ्गानदी च] By P. L. Bhargava; S. B. 95, Bapu Nagar Jaipur-302004	3-8
3. The Circumstances of the Birth of the Rāmāyaṇa— A Study. [रामायणस्यः प्रादुर्भावस्य परिस्थितयः] By Dr. S. Sankaranarayanan; Director, Oriental Research Institute Sri Venkateswara University Tirupati	9-37
4. Thai Interpolations in the Story of Aniruddha [अनिरुद्धाख्याने थाइभाषायां प्रक्षेपकाः] By Śrī Maneepin Phromsuthirak; Thailand	38-47
5. Places of Purāṇic Recitation According to the Purāṇas [पुराणानुसारतः पुराणानां रचनायाः स्थानानि] By Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli; All-India Kashiraj Trust	48-61

6. Bhaviṣya Purāna and Br̥hatsamhitā on  
Temple Architecture : A Collative Study  
[मन्दिरवास्तुविषये भविष्यपुराणं बृहत्संहिता च]  
By *Dr. Tahsildar Singh* ;  
Research Assistant  
American Institute of  
Indian Studies Rāmnagar, Vārāṇasī 62-72
7. The Passage III, 3.2.21-33 in Bhaviṣya-Purāna  
[भविष्यपुराणस्य केचन श्लोकाः]  
By *Dr. Carl Gustav Diehl*;  
Danska Wagen 32  
22239 Lund, Sweden 73-77
- Notes and Comments*
8. Abbe J. A. Dubois on the Order of  
Hindu Avatāras  
By *Dr. Arvind Sharma* ;  
Deptt. of Religious Studies  
The University of Sydney  
Sydney N. S. W. 2006 78-80
9. *Reviews*
- a. Vettam Mani : *Puranic Encyclopaedia*,  
Vārāṇasī, 1975 81-82  
Reviewed By *Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli*
- b. Urmila Bhagowalia : *Vaisnavism and Society*  
*in Northern India 700-1200*, New Delhi, 1980. 83  
Reviewed by *Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli*
10. Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust  
[सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्त्यामस्य कार्यविवरणम्] 84-97

## सरस्वती-स्तवनम्

ब्रह्मस्वरूपा परमा ज्योतीरूपा सनातनी ।  
सर्वविद्याधिदेवी या तस्यै वाण्यै नमो नमः ॥१

यया विना जगत् सर्वं शश्वज्जीवन्मृतं सदा ।  
ज्ञानाधिदेवी या तस्यै सरस्वत्यै नमो नमः ॥२

यया विना जगत् सर्वं मूकमुन्मत्तवत् सदा ।  
वागधिष्ठातृदेवी या तस्यै वाण्यै नमो नमः ॥३

हिमचन्दनकुन्देन्दुकुमुदाम्भोजसन्निभा ।  
वर्णाधिदेवी या तस्यै चाक्षरायै नमो नमः ॥४

विसर्गबिन्दुमात्राणां यदधिष्ठानमेव च ।  
इत्थं त्वं गीयते सद्भिर्भारत्यै ते नमो नमः ॥५

यया विनाऽत्र संख्याकृत् संख्यां कर्तुं न शक्नुते ।  
कालसंख्यास्वरूपा या तस्यै देव्यै नमो नमः ॥६

व्याख्यास्वरूपा या देवी व्याख्याधिष्ठातृदेवता ।  
भ्रमसिद्धान्तरूपा या तस्यै देव्यै नमो नमः ॥७

स्मृतिशक्तिर्ज्ञानशक्तिर्बुद्धिशक्तिस्वरूपिणी ।  
प्रतिभाकल्पनाशक्तिर्या च तस्यै नमो नमः ॥८

त्वं संस्तुता पूजिता च मुनीन्द्रमनुमानवैः ।  
दैत्येन्द्रैश्च सुरैश्चापि ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवादिभिः ॥९

जडीभूतः सहस्रास्यः पञ्चवक्त्रश्चतुर्मुखः ।  
यां स्तोतुं किमहं स्तौमि तामेकास्येन मानवः ॥१०

—(ब्रह्मवै० पुराणम्, प्र० ख०, अ०५, श्लो० १०-१७, ३१-३२)

That who is a form of Brahmā, who is the immortal Light, who is the presiding Deity of all the sciences, obeisance to that Vāṇī.—(1)

Without whom the whole world is dead even if living, who is the presiding Deity of knowledge, obeisance to that Sarasvatī.—(2)

Without whom the whole world will remain always dumb and mad-like, who is the presiding Deity of speech, obeisance to that Sarasvatī in form of speech.—(3)

Whose form is white like snow, sandle, *kunda*-flower, moon, *kumuda* and lotus flowers, obeisance to that immortal Deity who is the presiding Deity of the letters.—(4)

Who is the substratum of *Visarga*, *Bindu* and *Mātrā*-s, the learned good people sing thy praise thus, obeisance to you, O Bhāratī.—(5)

Without whom a counter is not able to count, who is the form of time and numbers, obeisance to that Goddess.—(6)

The Goddess who is the form of comments and so who is the presiding Deity of all comments, who is the form of *bhrama* (delusion) and *siddhānta* (settled principles), obeisance to that Goddess.—(7)

Who is the power of all memory, of all knowledge, of all the mental powers of understanding, and who is the power of imagination and genius, obeisance to that Goddess.—(8)

Thou hast been praised and worshipped by great sages, Manu, men, *daitya*-s, gods and by Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and others.—(9)

The thousand-mouthed Śeṣa, five-mouthed Śiva and four-mouthed Brahmā become dumb and unable to praise, then how can I, with one mouth, praise you ?—(10)\*

—A. S. Gupta<sup>a</sup>

\* For Notes and Comments please see the *stuti* published in last year's Vasant-pañchamī issue of the *Purāṇa Bulletin*, XXII.1 (Jan., 1980).

# KING BHAGĪRATHA AND THE RIVER GAṄGĀ

By

P. L. BHARGAVA

[प्राचीनभारतीयवाङ्मये भागीरथ्या गङ्गाया उपाख्यानं विस्तरेण वर्णितं वर्तते । तत्र सगरयज्ञे कपिलकोपदग्धानां सगरसुतानां मुक्तये भागीरथस्य तपस्तत्प्रसङ्गे गङ्गाया अवतरणं सगरसुतानामुद्धारश्च विस्तरेण प्राप्यते । अत्र विदुषा लेखकेन प्रतिपादितं यद् इक्ष्वाकुवंशीयानां नृपानां राज्यं पश्चिमोत्तरप्रदेशे आसीत् । इक्ष्वाकुवंशीयेषु नृपेषु भागीरथः प्रथम आसीत् येन गङ्गानृपेषु राज्यविस्तारः कृतः तत्र स्थानामश्वानां सेनायाश्च प्रसारः कृतः । अतोऽर्थं गङ्गाया भागीरथीति नामकरणं जातम् ।

अस्मिन् प्रसङ्गे लेखकेन वेदतिहासपुराणानां परीक्षणं विधाय प्रतिपादितं यद् भागीरथात् पूर्वं इक्ष्वाकुवंशीयानां नृपानां शासनं पश्चिमोत्तरभारते आसीत् ।]

The Purāṇic authors have not only denigrated the character of ancient heroes by their myths but have also sometimes obscured their great achievements by mythologizing them. In this category falls the renowned Ikṣvāku king Bhagīratha after whom the river Gaṅgā is known as Bhāgīrathī.

The Ikṣvākus and the Paurava-Bhāratas were the two most illustrious royal dynasties of India in the Vedic period of her history. Many early kings of the Ikṣvāku dynasty are celebrated in both the Vedic literature and the *Purāṇas*. The most noted of these were Māndhātṛ, Purukutsa, Trasadasyu, Hariścandra and Bhagīratha. The last of these, whose achievements we propose to discuss, is not only mentioned as a famous king in the Ikṣvāku genealogy found in the *Purāṇas* but also in the *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*.

The fame of Bhagīratha rests on the fact that the river Gaṅgā is called Bhāgīrathī after him. According to popular belief, which is based on a myth found in *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*<sup>1</sup> the river received the name Bhāgīrathī because Bhagīratha brought it from heaven. The myth begins with an account of the deeds of

1. *Mahābhārata*, III, 107-9 ; *Bhāgavata*, IX, 8-9.

Bhagīratha's great-great-grandfather Sagara, whose horse suddenly disappeared when he was performing a horse-sacrifice. Sixty thousand of Sagara's soldiers, who are called his sons, went out in search of the horse and found it in the hermitage of a sage named Kapila, but were burnt to ashes when they accused the sage of stealing it. Sagara then sent his grandson Amśumat to pacify the sage who told him that the dead persons would obtain salvation only when the celestial river Gaṅgā flowed over their ashes. Amśumat therefore performed austerities to bring down the Gaṅgā from heaven but died without achieving success. So did his son Dilīpa. The austerities of Dilīpa's son Bhagīratha at long last pleased the Gaṅgā and she condescended to come down to the earth. She, however, advised Bhagīratha to pray to Śiva to hold her on his head before she descended on the earth, since her terrible velocity would be unbearable if she fell on the earth directly. Bhagīratha therefore prayed to Śiva who agreed to hold her on his head from where she flowed on the earth.

From myth to history is a far cry. Had this myth been common to all the *Purāṇas* we could not have helped declaring the connection between Bhagīratha and the river Gaṅgā as unhistorical. A study of the *Purāṇas*, however, makes it absolutely clear that the myth grew out of very simple facts. Let us examine the matter in some detail.

Besides the *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* ten other *Purāṇas* and the *Harivamśa* explain how the Gaṅgā came to be called Bhāgīrathī. The oldest *Purāṇa* viz., the *Vāyu* merely says that Bhagīratha brought the Gaṅgā (to light) by his efforts.<sup>2</sup> The *Brahmāṇḍa* follows it but, misunderstanding the word 'brought' and altering two of the corrupt words occurring in the *Vāyu*, suggests that the Gaṅgā was brought to the earth,<sup>3</sup> and the *Garuḍa* explicitly says so.<sup>4</sup> The *Harivamśa* and the *Brahma* and *Agni Purāṇas* go a step further and say that Bhagīratha caused the Gaṅgā to descend.<sup>5</sup> The *Matsya*, *Padma*, *Līṅga*, and *Kūrma Purāṇas* introduce another innovation by substituting the word *tapas*, austerities, for the earlier

2. *Vāyu*, 88, 137-9.

3. *Brahmāṇḍa*, III, 63, 167-9.

4. *Garuḍa*, I, 138.

5. *Harivamśa*, I, 11, 15-16; *Brahma*, 8, 75-77; *Agni*, 273, 30.



*karma*, effort.<sup>6</sup> The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* brings these changes to their logical conclusion by making Kapila say that the salvation of Sagara's sons depended on the Gaṅgā flowing over their ashes and by attributing to Bhagīratha the feat of bringing the Gaṅgā from the heaven to the earth.<sup>7</sup> This *Purāṇa* thus prepares the ground for the myth found in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*.

It is thus clear that a simple statement of fact by the *Vāyu Purāṇa* developed into a fanciful story in the course of some centuries. In order to fully comprehend the achievement of king Bhagīratha it is necessary to cite and explain the complete relevant text of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* which is as follows :—

Dilīpāt tu mahātejā vīro jāto Bhagīrathah  
Yena Gaṅgā saricchreṣṭhā vimānair upasobhitā.  
Ījānena samudrād vai duhitṛtvena kalpitā  
Atrāpy udāharantīmaṁ ślokaṁ paurāṇikā janāḥ.  
Bhagīrathas tu tāṁ Gaṅgāmānayaṁāsa karmabhiḥ  
Tasmād Bhāgīrathī Gāṅgā kathyate vaṁśavittamaḥ.

Unfortunately the two words 'ījānena samudrāt' in the beginning of the third line of this passage are corrupt and do not yield any coherent meaning. The *Brahmāṇḍa* has therefore not only substituted new words but has also without any justification changed the case of the first word. The ablative of the second word clearly suggests that the original words indicated the movement of Bhagīratha from some place. If so the first word must have been 'āyātena', having come, and not 'ījānena', having sacrificed. The second word 'samudrāt', from the sea, has been absurdly changed to 'Suresāt', from the king of gods, by the *Brahmāṇḍa*. There can be no doubt that the original word was not far removed in sound from the present corrupt word. The only word resembling the present word but yielding a better sense is 'sudūrāt' meaning 'from afar'. The first two words of the third line were thus in all probability originally 'āyātena sudūrāt' and were corrupted to 'ījānena samudrāt'. This emendation is, as we shall see later, supported by the evidence of the *R̥gveda* as well as the older *Purāṇas* and certain ancient passages of the *Mahābhārata*.

6. *Matsya*, 12, 44; *Padma*, V, 8, 149-50; *Līṅga*, 66, 19-20; *Kurma*, I, 21.

7. *Viṣṇu*, IV, 4, 35.

With this slight emendation the whole passage reads as follows in its English translation :—

“From Dilīpa was born the mighty hero Bhagīratha by whom, coming from afar, the excellent river Gaṅgā was adorned with chariots and made into a daughter (i. e. given a name derived from his own). On this subject the Purāṇists cite the following verse : ‘Bhagīratha brought the Gaṅgā (to light) by his efforts. Hence the Gaṅgā is called Bhagīrathī by the experts of dynastic history’ ”.

Any one can see how far removed the account of Bhagīratha’s achievement given in this passage of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* is from the later myth found in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. There is no mention here of the austerities of Bhagīratha for causing the Gaṅgā to descend from the heaven, of his prayers to Śiva for holding it on his head, of Śiva’s gracious complaisance, of the river’s descent on Śiva’s head, and finally of its flowing on the earth from there. Even if we ignore the two corrupt words which we have emended, the main drift of the passage still remains that Bhagīratha brought the Gaṅgā to light, adorned it with chariots and gave it his name. Does it not mean that the Gaṅgā had never before been seen by him, that he came on its bank with numerous chariots carrying his subjects and soldiers and that being the first king of his dynasty to set his foot on its bank he gave it his name? Further if he was the first king of his dynasty to set his foot on the bank of the Gaṅgā, does it not mean that his ancestors ruled in a region which lay far from the river? Let us see if this conclusion is supported by any independent evidence.

Three of the *Purāṇas*, viz. *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa* and *Brahma*, as well as the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Mahābhārata*<sup>8</sup> tell us that the Ikṣvāku king Māndhātṛ had a long war with a king of the Druhyu dynasty ruling in Gāndhāra and ultimately killed him and conquered his territory. If Māndhātṛ had been ruling in the Gangetic kingdom of Kosala he could not have proceeded to Gāndhāra without conquering the lands of the Gangetic valley that lay to the west of Kosala. There is, however, no mention either in the *Purāṇas* or the great epic of Māndhātṛ’s conflict with the rulers of these lands.

8. *Vāyu*, 88, 7-8; *Brahmāṇḍa*, III, 74, 7-8; *Brahma*, 13, 149-50; *Harivaṃśa*, I, 32, 124-25; *Mahābhārata*, III, 126.

The *Mahābhārata* does mention a number of kings who were conquered by Māndhātṛ, but all those who can be identified belonged to the Panjab.<sup>9</sup> The long period of fourteen months which the war between Māndhātṛ and the king of Gāndhāra is said to have taken, further indicates that the former ruled somewhere in the neighbourhood of Gāndhāra. What is implied in the *Purāṇas* and the *Mahābhārata* is expressly stated in the *Ṛgveda*. A hymn of it, attributed to Sobhari Kāṇva, praises the gifts which Trasadasyu, a near descendant of Māndhātṛ, conferred on the *ṛṣi* on the bank of the river Suvāstu, the modern Swat.<sup>10</sup> It is thus clear that the Ikṣvākus originally lived in a region to the west of the Indus. There is another interesting piece of evidence in support of this. It is very well known that the chief rivers of the later Ikṣvāku kingdom of Kosala were the Gomatī and the Sarayū. The *Ṛgveda* also mentions rivers bearing the names Gomatī and Sarayū but it is certain that they were different from the rivers of Kosala. Gomatī has been identified with a western tributary of the Indus named Gomal. An affluent of the river Gomal is known by the name of Siritoi. It is quite likely that this river is identical with the *Ṛgvedic* Sarayū. As new places are often given the old names of those very places with which the new comers had been associated, it is highly probable that the rivers Gomal and Siritoi flowed in the original home of the Ikṣvākus and the two rivers of Kosala were named after them. The ancient kingdom of the Ikṣvākus on the basis of this evidence must have stretched from the river Swat in the north to the rivers Gomal and Siritoi in the south, when at its zenith.

It is thus abundantly clear that Bhagīratha did come from afar to the bank of the river Gaṅgā and adorned it with chariots carrying his numerous followers. An ancient heroic laud of the *Mahābhārata*<sup>11</sup> further informs us that he celebrated his arrival on the bank of the holy river by a sacrifice in which he covered it with heaps of gold conferred as gifts on deserving persons. He was, however, not the first Aryan king to settle in the Gangetic region. That honour goes to Jahnu after whom the Gaṅgā was called Jāhnavī. Bhagīratha was, nevertheless, undoubtedly the first Ikṣvāku

9. See my book '*India in the Vedic Age*', 2nd Edn., p. 153.

10. *Ṛgveda*, VIII, 19, 16-17.

11. *Mahābhārata*, VII, 60, 1 & 8.

king to arrive on the bank of the Gaṅgā and therefore felt justified in giving the river his name. He must also have been the founder of the kingdom of Kosala, for according to the *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*<sup>12</sup> he was a neighbour of, and on friendly terms with, the Kuru-Pañcālas. Being the founder of a kingdom which was destined to be ruled by a galaxy of illustrious kings and above all by Rāma, Bhagīratha became unforgettable as the discoverer of the chief river of the region where he established the rule of his glorious dynasty.

---

12. IV, 6, 1. 2.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BIRTH OF THE  
RĀMĀYAṆA—A STUDY

By

S. SANKARANARAYANAN

[आदिकाव्यस्य रामायणस्य रचनायाः प्रादुर्भावस्य वर्णनं पुराणेषु संक्षेपेण वर्णितमस्ति । किन्तु वाल्मीकिरामायणस्य प्रारम्भे अस्य प्रादुर्भावस्य वर्णनं विस्तरेण प्राप्यते । नारद-वाल्मीकि-संवादः, क्रौञ्चवधानन्तरं वाल्मीकेः 'मा निषादे'त्यादिरूपेण शौकोद्गारः, ब्रह्मणा वाल्मीकेः सान्त्वनं रामायणरचनाया उपदेशश्च विस्तरेण तत्र प्राप्यते । अत्र विदुषा लेखकेन रामायणस्य रचना कथं जाता, अत्र के हेतवः, तेषां किमौचित्यम्, इत्यादि सविस्तरं विवेचितम् । अस्मिन् प्रसङ्गे लेखकेन नानाप्रश्नानामुत्थापनं कृत्वा तेषां समुचितसमाधान-मपि प्रदत्तम् ।]

The *Purāṇas* give very scanty description of the circumstances that led to the birth of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*. For example, the *Matsyapurāṇa*<sup>1</sup> simply says that the sage Vālmīki composed the *Rāmāyaṇa* as he heard from Nārada who got from Brahmā the same consisting of one hundred crores of verses. However these circumstances are detailed in the first two cantos of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The contents of these cantos may be summarised as follows :

The first earthly poet, the great sage Vālmīki put the following question to the heavenly sage Nārada : "Now in this earth is there any man living, who is an embodiment of all virtues, a man of valour, a man of righteousness etc.?" The sage enumerated the virtues he had in view.

Nārada, thus questioned, informed Vālmīki : "In this world there is no such person excepting Rāma who is a son of Daśaratha of the Solar race. He alone is endowed with all the qualities you have enumerated." Having stated this, Nārada briefly narrated Rāma's beautiful story to Vālmīki and went back to heaven.

1. Cf जगाम तमसातीरं जाह्नव्यास्त्वविदूरतः । and  
इदमेवावगाहिष्ये तमसातीर्थमुत्तमम् ॥

(*Bālakāṇḍa*, ii, 3 and 6 and commentaries thereon.)

After having heard the story, sage Vālmiki left his hermitage for a bath in the river. His pupil Bharadvāja accompanied him. The sage reached the banks of the nearby Tamasā river which was about to enter into the Jāhnavī-Gaṅgā in the neighbourhood. The water of the Tamasā was as crystal-clear as the mind of a righteous man. The heart of the sage was very much attracted by such a water. He started taking bath there itself. The verses in this context seem to indicate this : While he set out from the hermitage, the sage had planned to have bath in the Gaṅgā, near the confluence of the Tamasā; but on the way being much influenced by the beautiful water of the Tamasā, he decided to have bath in the latter river itself.

The sage put on his bathing dress and was getting ready for bath. At that juncture he witnessed the following distressing scene that occurred in the forest on the bank of the river : A pair of lovely male and female *krauñcas* (curlews) was on the branch of a tree. The two innocent creatures were making love and were singing in beautiful voice, soaked in love. When the sage was observing them, there came all on a sudden a hunter, took his arrow, put it on the bow, drew the string and shot down the male *krauñca*. The fatally wounded bird fell down on the ground and died. The female bird, the wife, saw her lover so fatally wounded and struggling for life. She started crying pathetically. Thus the scene of love turned to be a scene of pathos. By this scene the mind of the sage was very much tossed from one extreme to the other—love and pathos. And he was naturally very much perturbed. At that time from his mouth came this verse on its own accord :

मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वमगमः शाश्वतोः समाः ।

यत् क्रौञ्चमिथुनादेकमवधीः काममोहितम् ॥

Now the sage was wonderstruck by his own words. Why ? Indeed he had felt extremely pained because of his witnessing such a pathetic sight. But, what he had uttered was a full fledged verse, containing all its necessary qualities. Thus it was in proper metre; it had its syllables proportionately distributed; and above all it could be sung well in accompaniment of the stringed musical instruments. In the meanwhile Vālmiki's intelligent pupil Bharadvāja had learnt the verse by heart,

Then the sage took his bath, and came back to his abode pondering over the incident. He continued to feel very much pained. There came Lord Brahmā, the creator of the Universe, to the sage. The latter made his obeisance to Brahmā and narrated to Him what had happened to him on the banks of the Tamasā. On hearing the entire story, the Lord laughed and consoled him: "What you have uttered is a metrical composition on the Lord's glory indeed; on my own order, Goddess-of-Speech (*Vāgdevī*) herself came out of your mouth. By similar verses compose Rāma's story in detail following the outline given to you by Nārada. All actions, all thoughts, all secrets of all characters connected with Rāma's story shall be vividly known to you through my grace, Rāma's story you compose shall also shine supreme for ever in the world." Brahmā thus encouraged and graced Vālmīki and went to the heaven. Thanks to His grace, Vālmīki too composed the glorious epic, *Rāmāyaṇa* with verses having lovely meters, words, and sublime ideas.

This story is found in the now available *Rāmāyaṇa* as a sort of introduction to that epic and it is quite popular. It is not clear from the text why Vālmīki should feel very unhappy after he composed the verse *Mā niṣāda* etc.. But, by way of elucidating this point, the commentators tell us this: The said verse, composed for the first time by him had turned to be a curse to the hunter (*niṣāda*), the bird-killer. This thought arose in the sage's mind and made him unhappy. However, further thoughts revealed to him that his verse should be a song of glory of the Lord (Viṣṇu) Himself. Yet, the original idea of curse continued to haunt his mind like a goblin. Hence Brahmā had to console him by saying that his verse was a song on Lord's glory, and blessed him with the capability of composing the divine epic *Rāmāyaṇa*.

"The portion containing the above story of the birth of *Rāmāyaṇa* is probably a composition of one of the pupils of Vālmīki; however, because it has been added to the *Rāmāyaṇa* as a sort of introduction to that work this portion too came to be known as the work of Vālmīki himself". This is the verdict pronounced by Rāma, the author of the famous *Tilaka* commentary<sup>1</sup> on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Whether other commentators also take the same stand,

1. See under *Bālakāṇḍa*, ii, 16.

I do not know. But, while carefully studying this *Rāmāyaṇa*-prologue the following questions crop up in one's mind.

1. First question: What could have been the motive of Vālmīki in putting his question to Nārada : "Is there any individual living now in this world who is endowed with the great qualities enumerated?" Even a fool won't act without a purpose. Vālmīki, a sage of high order, would not have put such a question, without any purpose, much more so to the heavenly sage Nārada. Vālmīki's question sounds more or less like the anxious inquiry made nowadays to a marriage-broker by a father-of-a-daughter who wants to give his daughter in marriage to a suitable groom and who is unable to find out such a match easily. We know that such a question by such a father has its purpose. But what is the purpose of Vālmīki's question? The text does not appear to give clue to answer this question directly.

2. Second question : When Rāma, accompanied by Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa set out on exile, for the forest in the south, he first crossed the Gaṅgā, paid his obeisance to the sage Bharadvāja, received his blessings and then proceeded further south towards the Citrakūṭa mountain. Similarly, while, after killing Rāvaṇa in the war, Rāma started, after fourteen years, his northward journey back to Ayodhyā with his wife, brother, friends and their armies, he visited again the same Bharadvāja, had his blessings and then only he crossed the Gaṅgā and reached Ayodhyā. On his second visit to Bharadvāja's hermitage the sage told Rāma, we read, that on account of the supernatural power, acquired through penance, that sage had already known whatever happened to the hero with his wife and brother. We saw already that the hermitage of Vālmīki too was near the Gaṅgā. Further we read in the *Uttarakāṇḍa*<sup>1</sup> that Lakṣmaṇa took Sītā across Gaṅgā, and forsook her near the hermitage of Vālmīki as ordered by Rāma. Hence it is certain that Vālmīki's abode at that time was very near the Gaṅgā. So, instead of introducing this easily available nearby sage Bharadvāja, who knew Rāma's story well, why has the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*-prologue brought in Nārada of the far off heaven for giving Vālmīki the gist of Rāma's story? Is it wise to go to the far off mountain to fetch honey, when it is readily available in one's own courtyard?

अक्के चेन्मधु विन्देत किमर्थं पर्वतं व्रजेत् ।

1. Cantos, 45 ff.



3. Third question : As we have already pointed out, Vālmīki left his hermitage with a view to take bath—the commentators say it was the midday-bath in the Gaṅgā. Vālmīki was a sage, a *sthitaprajña*, a man of stable mind. So, why should he, like a fickle-minded fellow, change his plan on his way and start to take bath in the Tamasā itself ? No doubt, the author was in search of a suitable background for the *krauñca* episode. Could not the forest on the Gaṅgā serve the purpose ? Why should he prefer the Tamasā grove to the one on the Gaṅgā ?

4. Fourth question : In the *krauñca* episode, found in the prologue to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *rasas* (sentiments) viz., the love and pathos are depicted to occur in birds. But the birds and animals are unintelligent creatures and are totally oblivious of the *vibhāvas* (basic causes of emotions and sentiments). So, will not a student of Indian traditional literary criticism easily smell in this story a sort of bad scent of *rasābhāsa* or pseudo *rasa*? Of course, it is possible to argue : Only the actual occurrence of the *vibhāva* etc., and not their knowledge, is responsible for the birth of the *rasa*. That is why in the *Kāvya prakāśa* Mammaṭa cites Prāvarasena's verse मित्रे क्वापि गते सरोरुहवने etc., and illustrates the *vipralambha* (separation) aspect of love sentiment occurring in the bird *cakravāka*.<sup>1</sup> Hence there is no question of *rasābhāsa* in the *krauñca* episode. But, even accepting this argument, one can raise the question in a different manner.

It is well known to the students of Indian literature, that deers have been dearer to, and more popular in, the Indian hermitages. Why has the author chosen a pair of *krauñcas* instead of the more popular and more readily available pair of deers to show the occurrence of the sentiments of love and pathos ? Could he not compose the second half of the verse as यस्माद्धरिणयोरेकमवधोः काममोहितम् ?

Again one could argue : Study the episode more carefully. Here Vālmīki is depicted as getting ready for taking bath in crystal clear water of the Tamasā, and as witnessing the *krauñcas*. Now, how could the deers replace the *krauñcas* ? For, the mating deers had to be necessarily on the floor of the forest on the bank and the

1. See *Kāvya prakāśa* (The Poetic Light, Ed. R. C. Dwivedi, Delhi, 1970) Ch. VIII, under the verse No. 67 *Upakurvanti taṃ santam* etc.

sage was in the clear water—not flood water—the level of which must have been much lower than that of the bank with the forest and therefore he could not easily perceive the animals. Even accepting this argument as it is, one could easily ask : why not a pair of doves instead of a pair of *krauñcas* ? Could not the author compose यत् कापोतयुगादेकम् which is as charming as, if not more than, यत् क्रौञ्चमिथुनादेकम् ? In fact later in the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* we find, on the eve of accepting Vibhiṣaṇa as an ally, Rāma narrating the world famous dove-episode in which we hear that a hunter killed one among a pair of doves.<sup>1</sup>

5. Fifth question : Why should the author of the *krauñca* episode describe that the hunter killed only male bird and female bird cried pathetically ? If the female one was there still crying, would the heartless hunter have spared it ? He would have certainly finished that also. Indeed, that is the hunter's way. Further, why does not the episode run in the other way i. e., the wife was killed by the hunter while the husband was crying pathetically ? In the above mentioned dove-episode we find that the hunter killed the female dove only.

Moreover, Ānandavardhana, whom we had occasion earlier to speak of, refers to this *krauñca* episode in his famous book *Dhvanyāloka* under the verse :

काव्यस्यात्मा स एवार्थः तथा चादिकवेः पुरा ।  
क्रौञ्चद्वन्द्ववियोगोत्थः शोकः श्लोकत्वभागनः ॥<sup>2</sup>

Ānandavardhana writes an explanatory note (*vṛtti*) as :

.....तथा चादिकवेः निहतसहचरीकविरहक्रौञ्च्याक्रन्दनजनितः  
शोकः श्लोकतया परिणतः.....

In his gloss *Locana* on the above, Abhinavagupta adds the note :

निहतसहचरी इत्यनेन विभाव उक्तः ।

Abhinavagupta's commentator Uttuṅgodaya too writes :

सहचरीहननमत्र विभावः ।

1. See *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, Canto 18.

2. *Dhvanyāloka*, I, verse 5.

All this clearly shows that the Kashmir school of literary criticism, to which Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta etc. belong, found in the *krauñca* episode under question a text describing the hunter as a killer of the female bird only.

The same is the case with Rājasekhara too. For he writes in his famous *Kāvyaṁimāmsā* :

● निषादनिहतसहचरीकं क्रौञ्चयुवानं करुणक्रेङ्कारया गिरा क्रन्दन्त-  
मुद्रीद्य शोकवान् श्लोकमुज्जगाद 'मा निषाद' इत्यादि ।<sup>1</sup>

This makes it clear that the Central Indian school of literary criticism too fell in line with the Kashmirian school in viewing the female bird as being struck down by the hunter in the *krauñca* episode.

Of course, with a view to fall in line with what we read now in the *krauñca* episode in the Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, Mahāmahopādhyāya Kuppaswami Sastri had suggested corrections, in his commentary *Upalocana*<sup>2</sup>, to the said passages of the *Dhvanyāloka*, *Locana* and *Kāvyaṁimāmsā*. But he has done so with much difficulty and in an arbitrary manner too. But one should not ignore the fact that these authors viz., Ānandavardhana, Rājasekhara, Abhinavagupta etc. were famous authors, well known for their critical approach to their subject. Hence, had they had a *Rāmāyaṇa* text describing the killing of the male bird, they would not have ignored it. Hence it is certain that the *Rāmāyaṇa* text, they had with them, must have given a description of the killing the female bird only. The critical edition of the *Bālakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, published recently in Baroda, does note such readings. Now naturally a question arises : Among these two different readings viz., the one that speaks of the killing of the female bird—a reading accepted by Ānandavardhana and others—and the other that describes the killing of the male bird, which is more appropriate ? How to decide the issue and on what basis ?

6. Sixth question : In the forest there are not only hunters, but also powerful birds like vultures, kites etc. to kill the weak small birds such as *krauñcas*. So, why should the *krauñca*-story teller introduce a hunter in preference to one among those strong

1. *Kāvyaṁimāmsā* (GOS, 1937), p. 7.

2. Madras Ed. (1944), p. 163.

cruel birds? Could he not as well commence his verse either as :  
मा गृध्रक प्रतिष्ठां त्वम् or मा दाक्षाय्य प्रतिष्ठां त्वम् ?

7. Seventh question : The hunters of the forests live by mercilessly killing the animals and birds of the forest and by eating them. This is the custom and also the law of the forest since time immemorial. This age-old practice must have been well known also to the sage Vālmīki who was living in the forest all his life. So, what is wrong on the part of the hunter in killing the bird for his food in accordance with the well known prevalent jungle law? Then why should Vālmīki become angry with him and curse him? Is there any law that a bird or animal should not be killed when it is absorbed in making love with its mate? On the other hand, we find Rāma himself later, in the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* justifying his own act of killing Vālin by saying :

प्रमत्तानप्रमत्तान् वा नरा मांसार्थिनो भृशम् ।  
विध्यन्ति विमुखाश्चापि न च दोषोऽत्र विद्यते ॥<sup>1</sup>

Nor could it be stated that to kill *krauñcas* on the bank of a river was known to be free from all dangers. For, in the *Āraṇyakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* itself we find Kabandha attaining his original heavenly body after his curse came to an end, and advising Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa to kill and eat *krauñca*, *kurara* (osprey) and other birds that had known no killer on the banks of the Pampā lake.<sup>2</sup>

8. Eighth question : Even accepting that to kill the *krauñca* near a sage's hermitage was deemed to be wrong on one account or the other by the sage, why did he not cry : "Halt ! This *krauñca* is totally absorbed in making love; don't kill it" and prevent the hunter from the act of killing the bird? Do we not observe in the opening scene of the *Abhijñānaśākuntalā*, the pupils of Kaṇva crying "Don't kill; Don't kill;" and successfully dissuading the king from shooting down a deer?

9. Ninth question : Vālmīki was a great sage and had performed penance throughout his life-time. So had he any pity on the pathetically crying female bird why had he not pressed into service his divine power acquired through penance and brought back to life her husband killed by the hunter? Thus it is strange indeed

1. *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, xviii, 39.

2. *Āraṇyakāṇḍa*, lxxiii.

that though he was a great sage, Vālmīki neither took hunter's act of killing as a normal one, nor prevented him from killing the bird, nor restored the dead bird to life; instead he behaved like an ordinary ignorant person by getting himself drowned completely in the ocean of distress.

10. Tenth question : Why should his verse commence मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वम् ? Why did it not take the forms like प्रतिष्ठां मागमस्त्वं हे निषाद शाश्वतीः समाः । or something like that ? In other words : Is there any significance in the form of composition as we have at present ?

11. Eleventh question : Vālmīki seems to have had many pupils. Why should Bharadvāja alone among them accompany the sage when the latter went for a bath ? In other words : Is there any significance in naming the accompanying pupil as Bharadvāja ?

12. Twelfth question : During the years of his wandering in the forest, Rāma had occasion to meet many sages, and to receive their blessings. He had also done the same earlier as well as subsequently too. Among those sages why did Vālmīki alone have the inclination, opportunity and capacity to compose the *Rāmāyaṇa* ? In other words : Is there any significance in naming the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as Vālmīki ?

These are twelve questions that require to be answered and let us try to answer them as far as possible. Now one could offer a counter argument : Many things and many events take place as they are in the world and in everybody's life and no one raises questions as to why they happen and why they have not happened in a different way. For, such an investigation serves no purpose. For example no one raises a question like : Why are the sun and the moon circular ? Why is the sun hot and the moon is cool and not vice versa ? Similarly no body will be interested to find an answer to the hypothetical questions : "Why is the hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa* named Rāma and the heroine Sītā ? Why should they be described to have been born respectively in Ayodhyā and Mithilā and not vice versa ?" Because, these questions and their answers—even if there are proper answers—serve no useful purpose and they may not help us in appreciating the spirit of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. So the present investigation may be as useless as an investigation regarding the number of teeth in a crow's mouth ; काकस्य कति वा दन्ताः ?

Against this, the following may be contended. It is certain that all that happens, in this world, happens as the effect of its own respective cause. For, nothing could take place without a cause. By properly understanding the cause and effect relationship of these things one could no doubt appreciate the different forces of the Universe. The scientists could indeed tell us why the sun and the moon appear round and why they are hot and cold respectively. Similarly, if one tries it may not be impossible to find the cause why the hero and the heroine of the *Rāmāyaṇa* should be named respectively as Rāma and Sītā and why they are described to have been born respectively at Ayodhyā and Mithilā. An understanding of these causes will certainly enable one to appreciate *Rāmāyaṇa* better. Therefore our present investigation is not purposeless and it will certainly add to our knowledge and will help us in appreciating each and every part of the *krauñca* episode that is considered to be the immediate cause, or one of the immediate causes of the birth of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Now let us turn to our answers.

1. Answer to the first question : Vālmīki's question put to Nārada is no doubt unusual. His question betrays this : Vālmīki was already desirous of composing a poem and had some capacity to make such a composition even before he met Nārada, and he was very much preoccupied with his concern as to finding a most suitable living hero for his poem. That is why the moment he met Nārada, who knew all happening in the entire Universe, Vālmīki bombarded him with an army of questions about such a hero endowed with all high noble qualities, enumerated. In the *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* Rājaśekhara too tells that Vālmīki did have capacity to make a poetical composition, even before the *krauñca* incident took place. Therefore one may have to accept that even before his meeting with Nārada, Vālmīki had already a mind to create some poetical composition. Accordingly he put his question to Nārada. He got the answer he desired most. That is to say, he not only got a hero, but also a good plot for his composition.

2. Answer to the second question : No doubt, the sage Bhara-dvāja was not far removed from Vālmīki. However the author of the prologue perhaps intended to show that Rāma's glory had already reached all the corners of the heaven even before the *Rāmāyaṇa* was composed here in this earth.

Further, the author seems to have been bent upon to indicate that though Rāma belonged to this earth and though the course of his life was entirely connected with this world, the plot of his story should come to Vālmīki, not from any earthly being like Bharadvāja but only from some heavenly personality like Nārada. In the *Purāṇas*, Nārada is well known to have taught the *mantras* (magic formulas) of Viṣṇu to Prahlāda, Dhruva etc. Will it not be befitting if the same person teaches to Vālmīki the plot of the story of Rāma, an incarnation of Viṣṇu? Just like the capacity to compose the epic came from the heaven i.e., from the Goddess-of-Speech and Brahmā, the plot of the epic and the first inducement to compose the epic too should come from the heaven. Obviously the author of the prologue thought in this line. Hence he has introduced one Bharadvāja as a receiver of the first dose of Vālmīki's composition rather than introducing one Bharadvāja as a giver of the *Rāmāyaṇa* plot to Vālmīki. The significance of this we shall see later.

Moreover, as the sage Bharadvāja himself claimed, he did know the story of Rāma. But he knew only that much of Rāma's story that took place during the period of fourteen years in between the said two visits to his hermitage by Rāma, and that too rather superficially. Further, he did not know at all what happened earlier and later. That is why, when he first met Bharata, he mistook him to have had hand in Rāma's exile. Nor did the sage know what conspired in secret among the other different characters of Rāma's story and their different psychological upsets and mental aberration in order to compose successfully the *Rāmāyaṇa* in all its grandeur. That sort of extraordinary knowledge would be possible only through the grace of god Brahmā. The capacity and capability to compose such an extraordinary epic of *Rāmāyaṇa* entirely depended on the grace of Goddess-of-Speech (Sarasvatī). Thus the grace of Brahmā and his consort Sarasvatī was to be earned necessarily by Vālmīki for successfully composing the epic. The grace could be earned only through the blessing of Nārada who was the son of Brahmā and Sarasvatī, as the *Purāṇas* tell us. Probably thinking in these lines the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* prologue must have introduced Nārada instead of anybody else. Vālmīki got a hero and the plot for his epic from Nārada, the son; the capacity to compose the epic in such an inimitable style from the Goddess-of-Speech, the mother; and the capability to know ins and outs of each of the characters of the story from Brahmā, the father. Thus there appears to be an appropriate order of events in the prologue.

3. Answer to the third question: Indeed Vālmiki left his hermitage with a view to have bath in the Gaṅgā. However, the banks of the Tamasā seem to be better suited as a backdrop of the *krauñca* episode and as a place of birth of the verse *mā niṣāda* etc. Let us analyse this: The story of Rāma with all its dramatic effects and with different *rasas* was to be composed. All these qualities, according to the Indian literary tradition,<sup>1</sup> are the effects of a happy blend of the well known three *Guṇas* (Strands) viz., the *Sattva* (virtue), the *Rajas* (desire or passion) and the *Tamas* (ignorance). Therefore a situation had to be created in such a way so that all the three strands could play their own parts in proper manner. Now the sage was a man of *Sattva* i. e., perfection and virtue; his intense desire to create a literary composition, constituted the element of the *Rajas* in a suitable proportion. Now the third viz., the *Tamas* element is to be introduced to make the collection of the required means (*sāmagrī*) complete. According to the age-old tradition of Indian culture the river Gaṅgā is predominantly *Sattva* in nature. Hence the claim of the forest on the bank of the Gaṅgā river. For the latter's name i. e., Tamasā itself indicates that it essentially *Tamas* by nature. The mind of the sage, though *Sāttvika* by nature, was attracted by the water of the Tamasā as crystal clear as the mind of a man of *Sattva*. This seems to have been given by way of illustrating how even a man of *Sattva*, like Vālmiki, could be influenced by the pseudo appearance of the *Tamas*. The story also illustrates the fact that even such an influence of the *Tamas* on an integrated man of *Sattva*, like sage Vālmiki, will result not in anything bad, but only in something great viz., a great world classic, the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

8 & 9. Answers to the eighth and ninth questions : From what we have seen so far an answer to the eighth and ninth questions can also be deduced. Though he was a sage, Vālmiki was overpowered by the *Tamas* element at that time and was possessed by a deep sense of pity. Hence he did not know what to do at that juncture. There is nothing strange in it. For that is the greatness and power of the Goddess-of-*Tamas*. Elsewhere it has been well said :

1. Cf. त्रैगुण्योद्भवमत्र लोकचरितं नानारसं दृश्यते  
Kālidāsa, *Mālavirkāgnimitra*, I



ज्ञानिनामपि चेतांसि देवी भगवती हि सा ।  
बलादाकृष्य मोहाय महामाया प्रयच्छति ॥<sup>1</sup>

Even the gods like Viṣṇu, Śiva and Brahmā are said to have been under her influence and Brahmā himself confesses to Her :

विष्णुः शरीरग्रहणमहमीशान एव च ।  
कारितास्ते यतोऽतस्त्वां कः स्तोतुं शक्तिमान् भवेत् ॥<sup>2</sup>

The other points connected with the question we shall see later.

4, 5, 6, 7 & 10. Answers to the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and tenth questions : No doubt, the sentiment of pity of the sage could be aroused even by the sight of killing a deer. But between the animal and the bird the former has bigger and stronger body and if that is killed then more blood and fat etc., would be spilt and that would give rise to the *bībhatsa-rasa* (sentiment of abhorrence) too. That is not desirable in the context when there should be only those causes that would give birth to a composition in which the sentiment of pity alone (*karuṇa-rasa*) reigns supreme. Hence the deer could not be a proper substitute for the *krauñca*. Another point also must be taken into account. No doubt we have seen that the sight of killing the *krauñca* was responsible for kindling the sentiments of pity in the sage :

तथाविधं द्विजं दृष्ट्वा निषादेन निपातितम् ।  
ऋषेर्धर्मात्मनस्तस्य कारुण्यं समपद्यते ॥

But that sentiment just born was rather weak and could not lead to the expected result viz., the composition of the verse. Hence, the above sentiment was to be augmented for that purpose. We are also told that it was the pitiable agonising cry of the female bird that strengthened the sentiment in the sage and made it immediate cause for his composition :

निशम्य रुदतीं क्रौञ्चीमिदं वचमब्रवीत् ।  
मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वम् etc.

Therefore the cry of the female bird was a must. It may be seen now that if the male deer was struck and killed down by the hunter, then its female counterpart would have fled far away in

1. *Durgāsaptasatī stotra*, I, verse 55.

2. *Ibid*, verse 84

utter panic. It is not generally known whether the female deer would weep and make a pathetic cry on the death of her male partner, even if they are intensely in love with one another.

The last point may also answer the question : Why a pair of doves has not been introduced in the place of a *krauñca* pair ? For in the case of the dove-pairs also it is not well known whether one bird would weep and raise a pathetic note of cry when its partner is killed. For, in the *kapota* episode cited by Rāma which has been referred to earlier under the fourth question the bereaved bird did not make any cry; instead it behaved like a sage with all its feelings completely under control.

Of course, it is well known in Indian literary tradition that the female and male partners of the *cakravāka* (ruddy goose) pair are very much attached to one another and the female bird among them, if separated from the male partner, used to be overwhelmed by grief. That is why Kālidāsa's Yakṣa describes his lady love as

दूरीभूते मयि सहचरे चक्रवाकीमिवैकाम्<sup>1</sup>

Here in the *Rāmāyaṇa* itself i. e., in the *Sundarakāṇḍa*, Sitā, immersed in grief of her separation from Rāma, is described as :

सहचररहितेव चक्रवाकी जनकमुता कृपणां दशां प्रपन्ना ।<sup>2</sup>

The famous verse मित्रे ववापि गते सरोरुहवने etc. of Pravarasena, which we had already referred to, describes the pathetic weeping of the female *cakravāka* separated from her lover. However, it should not be forgotten that between the *cakravāka* and *krauñca* the latter is smaller and feebler too. Its very name *krauñca* itself derived from the root *kruñc* 'to become small, shrink', (*kruñca alpībhāve*), signifies its smallness. Therefore if the desired result could be effected by killing a feebler and smaller bird alone, why should one think of killing stronger and larger birds like dove or *cakravāka* ? Probably the author of the prologue thought in this line. Indeed no intelligent person would pay ten coppers for a commodity that could be bought for one copper.

पणलभ्यं न हि प्राज्ञः क्रीणाति दशभिः पणैः ।

This also supplies answer to the question why the killing of only one bird, and not two, is described in the story.

1. *Meghadūta*, 22.

2. *Sundarakāṇḍa* xvi, 30.

There is another secret also here. Vālmīki had got the plot of Rāma's story from Nārada; he was going to be blessed by Brahmā with an extraordinary power to know all past movements—both physical and mental—of all the characters connected with Rāma's story. In between these two events, Vālmīki was to win the grace of the Goddess-of-Speech, so that he may get the capacity to compose the epic in all its sublimity. Such a capacity is the first among the most important causes for composing the epic. So Vālmīki had to earn the grace of the Goddess. That could not be won except by gratifying Her. A gratification of the Goddess is impossible without a *yajña* i. e., sacrifice; and a *yajña* is nothing but an act of offering a prescribed commodity aiming at a Goddess in question, as the Vedic experts say.<sup>1</sup> If so, a question would naturally arise as to what commodity should be sacrificed for the Goddess-of-Speech. Now, because the question is concerned with *yajña*, one may have to turn to the *Veda* for necessary guidance and suggest that the *krauñca* bird must be offered to that Goddess, as enjoined in the *Veda*. Probably thinking in terms of the Vedic injunction only, the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*-prologue has introduced the killing of *krauñca* instead of anything else. For, while prescribing lists of different animals to different subordinate gods and goddesses connected with the Aśvamedha sacrifice, the *Veda* prescribes *krauñca* as a creature to be offered to the Goddess-of-Speech : वाचे क्रौञ्चः ।<sup>2</sup>

This Vedic injunction gives a definite clue to decide the question regarding the correctness or appropriateness of the above mentioned two different readings of the *Rāmāyaṇa* text viz., one reading that speaks of killing the male bird; and the other that describes the killing of the female one. For, in the said Vedic injunction वाचे क्रौञ्चः the word *krauñca* which speaks the object of the injunction, is in masculine gender and in singular number. The experts in the field of Mīmāṃsā and the sacrificial lore (*Śrauta sūtras*) know well that the gender and number which an object of injunction is found occurring must be necessarily taken into account.

विधेयगतलिङ्गसंख्ययोर्विवक्षितत्वंम् ।

Thus according to the Vedic tradition, one should offer one male *krauñca* alone to win the grace of the Goddess-of-Speech and it is incumbent on the story teller to say so in his *krauñca* episode.

1. देवतोद्देशेन द्रव्यत्यागो युगः ।

2. *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, V, v, 12,

Now again arises a question : If the killing of the *krauñca* is to be taken as a slaughter for offering to the Goddess-of-Speech, and if that killing is in accordance with a Vedic injunction, then how is it that the sage mistook this righteous act of killing for an unrighteous one, and thought of cursing the hunter for that act ? But, it should not be forgotten that the act of killing the *krauñca*, now under question, had been the basic cause for the birth of the *Rāmāyana*. Now, if that act was really an unrighteous one, how could it have been the cause of an epic entirely given to the cause of righteousness ? For bad act begets bad result only. Therefore it is to be deemed only as an act of righteousness. But, being under the spell of the emotion of pity due to the influence of the *Tamas* and the *Tamasā* the sage mistook it for *adharmā*. This has been stated in the story itself.

ततः करुणवेदित्वादधर्मोऽयमिति द्विजः ।

This indicates the spell of the emotion of pity alone was responsible for Vālmiki's conceiving the act of killing for an unrighteous one. Arjuna too on the eve of the Kurukṣetra war was possessed by the emotion of pity and mistook the righteous war for an unrighteous act. Thus the seventh as well as the eighth questions have been answered.

It may be observed that in the context of prescribing the different creatures to be offered to different gods and goddesses in the *Asvamedha* sacrifice, which we had occasion to refer to, a female white parrot, having male voice is enjoined to be offered to the Goddess *Sarasvatī*.

सरस्वत्यै शारिः श्येता पुरुषवाक् ।

Similarly in some other place a she-goat is prescribed to be offered for *Sarasvatī*.

सारस्वत्यै मेषीमालभेत<sup>1</sup>

Further, somewhere else the Goddess-of-Speech is identified with Goddess *Sarasvatī*.

वाग्वै सरस्वती<sup>2</sup>

1. *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, II, i, 2.

2. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, I, iii, 5.

The same identification is very well known in Purāṇic literature also. So a question will certainly crop up : Why not the killing of a female white parrot or a she-goat is described instead of a *krauñca* ? However one fact in this connection should not be lost sight of : The above Vedic passages are to be taken only to indicate that Goddess-of-Speech and Sarasvatī are but two aspects of one and the same goddess. Yet it is the aspect of Goddess-of-Speech and not the aspect of Sarasvatī that is to be worshipped and propitiated by a poet when he is seriously engaged in composing an epic or poetical work. Consequently at that particular context he has to offer only a *krauñca* to the Goddess-of-Speech and not a female white parrot or a she-goat to the Goddess Sarasvatī.

There is another more important secret in the *krauñca* episode. With his mind soaked in grief Vālmīki uttered the verse *Mā niṣāda* etc. Then after a pause he examined the verse and found it to be worthy of singing in accompaniment of stringed musical instruments and to have a particular time measure that may keep a pleasing union of song, dance and instrument music तन्त्रीलयसमन्वितम्. So, in Vālmīki's view the verse *Mā niṣāda* etc. is a composition mainly intended to be sung. Keeping this verse as a standard, the sage composed the entire epic. That is why he describes his own composition of the epic as "sweet to be recited and to be sung (पाठ्ये गेये च मधुरम्)", as 'having the three-fold measure of time (प्रमाणैस्त्रिभिरन्वितम्)<sup>1</sup>, as capable of being sung in seven *svaras* or modes (जातिभिः सप्तभिर्युक्तम्) and so on. That is why the epic was first taught to Kuśa and Lava who were expert singers knowing all the intricacies of the science of music.

Thus it is certain that the *Rāmāyaṇa* according to Vālmīki, is essentially a musical composition. Such a composition naturally requires an *ādhāra-śruti* (the base) and it must be intertwined with *Sapta Svaras* such as *Sa, Ri, Ga, Ma, Pa, Dha, Ni* and *Sa*. Now, what should be the required *ādhāra-śruti* and who is to provide it ? It seems that the preference was in favour of the *Madhyama-svara* viz., *Ma*. That the said *svara* had been preferred to any other ones is perhaps indicated by Vālmīki himself elsewhere. In the *Kiṣkindhā-kāṇḍa*, while appreciating the art of speech of Hanumān, the hero Rāma is shown to point out that the former's entire talk, whether that came from the throat or from the chest, was in the *Madhyama-svara*.

1. i. e., *Druta, madhya* and *vilambita*

उरःस्थं कण्ठगं वाक्यं वर्तते मध्यमे स्वरे ।<sup>1</sup>

No other *svara* seems to have been spoken with such preference in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Now, who is to supply that *Madhyama*? Naturally the vote goes to the *krauñca* bird. For, the musicologists of ancient India certify that bird's voice to be in pure *Madhyama-svara*.

क्रौञ्चः क्वणति मध्यमम्<sup>2</sup>

Thus the *krauñca*'s cry of *mā* (i. e., the *Madhyama-svara*) not only provided the *ādhāra-śruti* for Vālmīki's musical composition but also supplied the first letter for his composition viz., the verse मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठां त्वम् etc.<sup>3</sup> Thus no creature, other than *krauñca* could be thought of in this context by the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* prologue.

But again a question arises: Why should the *Madhyama* alone be favoured while there are actually seven *svaras* enumerated above? Before answering this question we have to understand certain facts: The *ma* is called *Madhyama* because it is exactly in the middle position in the scheme of the seven *svaras*, we saw above. We know that in the *Trimūrti* (Trinity) scheme of the Purāṇic pantheon of India viz., Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra, the god Viṣṇu occupies the middle (*madhyama*) place; that He is believed to have descended on this earth as Rāma, to sing whose glory the *Rāmāyaṇa* was composed; and that this earth too is placed again in the middle (*madhyama*) in the *Tri-loka* (triple-world) scheme of the *svarga*, *madhya* and *patāla* (the heaven, the earth and the nether world respectively) as described in the *Purāṇas*. Further this Rāma of the *Rāmāyaṇa* figures in the middle (*madhyama*) among the tripple Rāmas known in the *Purāṇas*, viz., Rāma, the son of Bhṛgu, Rāma, the son of Daśaratha, and Rāma, the son of Vasudeva. We know that in order to sing the glory of this middle Rāma, the sage Vālmīki was favoured by the Goddess-of-Speech in the *madhyama* (i. e. the middle part of the *śruti*) on the banks of the Tamasā, in

1. *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, ii, 31.

2. See the *Rāmāśramī* under the *Amarakośa*, I, vii, 1.

3. It is said Śekkilār, a Tamil poet of the middle age, in the presence of Lord Nāṭarāja of Chidambaram heard the expression *Ulagelām*, took it for the Lord's words, and composed his epic poem *Periyapurāṇam* that commences with the same expression,

the name of which also we notice *ma* occupying the middle portion and that Goddess too figures in the middle of the trinity viz. Nārada, the Goddess-of-Speech and Brahmā, who showered their grace on Vālmiki one by one. Thus we find the whole context, the entire atmosphere seems to have been surcharged with varieties of *madhyamas* 'middles'. Hence, it is but natural that the *madhyama svara* was preferred. A choice of any other *svara* would have perhaps marred the congeniality of the entire scene.

There is one more technical question on this point: The Vedic passage वाचे क्रौञ्चः has been quoted above in order to show that a male *krauñca* bird alone should be offered for the Goddess-of-Speech. Similarly the passage क्रौञ्चः क्वणति मध्यमम् of the ancient Indian musicologists has also been quoted to prove that the *krauñca* alone is capable of supplying the *Madhyama* as *ādhāra-śruti* for Vālmiki's musical composition. Now it must be observed that in the said passage of the musicologists the word क्रौञ्चः is found used, as in the said Vedic injunction, in masculine gender. Does it not show that the male *krauñca* alone is capable of supplying the *ādhāra-śruti* of the *madhyama*? But in the text of the *krauñca* episode we find that the male bird was struck down and died. In the story it is not stated to have made any crying. On the other hand it is the female bird that made a pathetic cry.

भार्या तु निहतं दृष्ट्वा रुराव करुणं गिरम् (I, ii, 11)

निशम्य रुदतीं क्रौञ्चीमिदं वचनमब्रवीत् (I, ii, 14)

So basing on क्रौञ्चः क्वणति मध्यमम् should we not conclude that the note given by the female *krauñca* was not *Madhyama-svara* at all? Or, in order to honour the said declaration of the musicologists should we fall in line with Ānandavardhana, Rājasekhara etc., and conclude that in the *krauñca* story it was only the female bird that had been killed by the hunter while the bereaved male bird made a pathetic note? In that case would it not go against the said Vedic injunction वाचे क्रौञ्चः? Thus we find ourselves placed in a dilemma, between Scylla and Charybdis.

However, it should be pointed out that the word क्रौञ्चः occurring in the Vedic injunction and the same found in the said musicologists' passage should not be treated alike though in both the instances the words are in masculine gender in singular number.

For, in the Vedic passage the stress is on the word क्राञ्चः that supplies the *vidheya* i. e., the main object of the predicate of injunction. Hence the gender and number of the word require to be taken into account—‘single male *krauñca*’. On the other hand, in क्राञ्चः व्रणति मध्यमम् the stress is on the word *madhyama* supplying the *vidheya*,<sup>1</sup> while क्राञ्चः is only *uddeśya* or the subject of the predicate of injunction. Hence the word क्राञ्चः cannot be given the same treatment that is given to the same word occurring in the Vedic passage. For, the Mīmāṃsakas would affirm that the gender and the number of the word denoting the *uddeśya* need not be taken into account.<sup>2</sup> That is why when two *krauñcas* are singing one is not expected to ask whether their chorus note is in *madhyama* or not. Similarly just as in the sentences “Man is mortal” (मनुष्यो मरणधर्मा), “Man’s life lies outside” (वहिः प्राणो वै मनुष्यः), the word ‘man’, though in masculine, does include woman also, so also क्राञ्चः व्रणति मध्यमम् the word *krauñca* denotes *krauñcī* or female *krauñca* also. The same principle may have to be applied also to other sentences like षड्जं मयूरो वदति; पिकः कूजति पञ्चमम्; शते मत्ता गायन्ति पञ्चमम् etc., of the musicologists. Thus it is certain that the author of the *krauñca* episode was a Vedist and hence he must have in the present context thought of the slaughter of the male *krauñca* and the cry of the female bird in *madhyama* as supplying a proper back ground for the verse *mā niṣāda* etc.

Following the same principle we have adopted to find out the significance of *mā* in the beginning of the verse, we may also establish the significance of the next word *niṣāda*. As we have already seen, the order of the *svaras* that are famous in the Indian musicology is *Sa, Ri, Ga, Ma, Pa, Dha, Ni, Sa*. Now the letters *mā ni sā* in the beginning seem to suggest a particular *rāga*, i. e., musical formula, consisting of the *Madhyama, Niṣāda, Ṣaḍja Svras*. Just as *mā* had been suggested to Vālmiki by the crying note of the bird *krauñca*, so also the two other *sva* were suggested to him by the hunter (*niṣāda*) by his presence. What is the name of this particular *rāga* we cannot now say. May be a research by an Indian musicologist could reveal the name of the *rāga*. Provisionally let us

1. Technically speaking in Sanskrit : लोकावगतक्रौञ्चव्रणनमनुवाद्य तदुद्देशेन मध्यमसंज्ञामात्रविधानम् ।
2. I. e., उद्देश्यगतविशेषणमविवक्षितम् ।



name it as *krauñcī-niṣādī* or *Vāgīśvarī* or *Vālmīkipriyā* or *Rāmāyaṇāvatāra*, or something else. This discussion certainly provides us with an answer to the sixth question 'Why the *niṣāda* ( hunter ) is introduced ?' For, the presence of the *niṣāda* had been very essential to suggest these *svaras*. Consequently, we get an answer to the tenth question also. Indeed the conglomeration of the causes had been such as to give an immediate rise to the expression मा निषाद only.

This question may be analysed from another angle also : The text of ancient Indian musicology describes *Ma* (*Madhyama svara* ) as being presided over by the Goddess-of-Speech Herself and as having the *krauñca* bird for its chariot :

मध्यमश्चैकवक्त्रः स्यात्.....भारती दैवतं  
..... क्रौञ्चो वाहनमस्य तु ।<sup>1</sup>

Thus it is but natural that the first syllable of Vālmīki's composition is *Mā* presided over by the Goddess, to whom the *krauñca* has been offered and thanks to whose grace Vālmīki is to compose the epic.

To complete the composition of such an epic requires not only the capacity on the part of the poet to compose it, but also a total absence of impediments (*vighnadhvaṃsa* ). For that purpose a worship of god Gaṇeśa is a must, according to the ancient Indian tradition. The Indian musicology again tells us that *Ni* (*Niṣāda svara* ) is presided over by god Gaṇeśa himself.

निषादो गजवक्त्रः स्यात्.....  
गणेशो दैवतं क्रौञ्चो द्वीपम्.....<sup>2</sup>.....

Therefore Ganeśa's syllable *Ni* is to be naturally uttered next. Now it may be observed that the *svara Ni* is described to reside in a territorial division called *Krauñca*, the very name of the bird in our episode. Here we have perhaps another clue why the *krauñca*, the bird, should be associated with *niṣāda*, the hunter in our story.

The next letter *ṣa* is also significant. For, we know that it is the *Ṣaḍja-svara*. And it is this *svara*, that is being presided over, according to the musicology, by Brahmā :

पङ्जो विप्रः पद्मपत्रप्रभः, ब्रह्मदैवतः.....<sup>3</sup>.....

1. See the *Bharatakośa* (SVOI, Tirupati, 1951) s. v. *Madhyama*.

2. *Ibid.* s. v. *Niṣāda*.

3. *Ibid.* s. v. *Ṣaḍja*.

This god Brahmā was about to bless Vālmiki as the story goes. Thus there is a logical sequence in the letters according to the Indian musicology also.

Now would arise the most fundamental technical objection : If what we have seen so far were correct, then would it not establish that it was the hunter who slaughtered the male *krauñca* and offered it to the Goddess-of-Speech ? By that act of the hunter how could Vālmiki win its result viz., the grace of the Goddess and the capacity to compose the epic ? Is it not against all the norms of cause-and-effect-relationship ? Should not the cause and effect be in one and the same substratum ? Is it not undesirable to conclude that X performed the sacrifice, and on account of that Y went to heaven ? No doubt a *rtwig* ( i. e., a priest like *adhvaryu* ) performs the sacrifice and on that account the *yajamāna* ( i. e., the institutor of the sacrifice who, to perform it, employs the priests ) wins the heaven. But, how could that sort of the *rtwig*-and-*yajamāna* relationship be brought in here between the hunter and the sage ? For, the text gives no indication to that effect. Further, how could a cruel hunter act as a priest for the sage Vālmiki, especially in those days ?

Indeed the question is a strong one and is quite pertinent too. However, a careful scrutiny of the text that is met with in the context in the episode may help us in finding a suitable answer to this question. Let us study the situation. Here we read this :

A. The sage, with his heart very much attracted by the clear water of the Tamasā river made up his mind to take bath in that water itself and took from the hands of his pupil, Bharadvāja nearby, the bathing dress. But then he did not commence bathing. Instead he, with all his sense-organs fully controlled, wandered in the vast forest on the bank witnessing its different parts :

स शिष्यहस्तात्तत्र श्लोकं विजितेन्द्रियः ।

विचचार ह यस्तु सर्वतो विपुलं वनम् ॥

(I,ii,18)

Instead of taking bath straight away, why should the sage wander in the forest? How to account for this drunkard-like unbecoming behaviour on the part of such a venerable sage ? Is it necessary in this context i. e. at the time of his fool-like wandering to describe him 'to have all his sense-organs well under his control' ?

B. Further, the sage witnessed this scene nearby : A pair of *krauñcas* were happily playing and making love with one another, a hunter killed the male bird. On observing the bird fallen, the sage was filled with grief; on hearing the pathetic crying of the female bird, he further concluded that what had happened was an *adharmā* or unrighteous act; and he did nothing else. But he uttered the verse *मा निषाद प्रतिष्ठाम्* etc.

C. While the sage was thus wandering in the Tamasā forest, his pupil Bharadvāja seems to have continued to be in the river-bed itself and not to have followed the master to the forest on the bank. But, he grasped the said verse when the sage uttered it. Should not the pupil ordinarily have accompanied the master wandering in the forest ? Besides, if the verse was uttered near the spot of the *krauñca* tragedy, how could the pupil in the river-bed grasp and learn it?

All this appears to be rather incoherent and incongruous. But, this incoherency and incongruity may disappear, provide we arrange things as follows :

Vālmīki put on his bathing cloth; remaining in the river-bed of the Tamasā itself he controlled all his sense-organs i. e., concentrated on his own self; by means of some magical power or by means of a supernatural power he had acquired through his long penance, he assumed another body, viz., the body of a hunter, wandered in the Tamasā forest and killed the *krauñca* with that body. And he was witnessing the entire thing with his own original body of the sage. After killing the *krauñca*, the hunter's body was abandoned. That is why the female bird was not killed; and that is why the male bird though struck down is not stated to have been snatched by the hunter. Had he been a commonplace hunter, he would have mercilessly struck down the female bird too and would have snatched away both. On seeing the *krauñca* mercilessly struck down, and on hearing the *krauñcī* pathetically crying, the sentiment of pity overpowered the sage. He then realised that what he had himself done by assuming the hunter's body was an act of *adharmā* and with his own original body the sage in the river-bed uttered the verse *Mā niṣāda* etc., which was heard and learnt by heart by the nearby pupil Bharadvāja.

Thus it is possible to find a common substratum for the cause (viz., the killing and offering the *krauñca* to the Goddess) and its

effect (viz., winning the grace of that Goddess). In some of the *Purāṇas* Vālmiki is stated to have been a hunter before he composed the *Rāmāyaṇa*.<sup>1</sup> Our above analysis of the situation may provide a sort of ground for those stories. Further, because the sage himself in the hunter's form killed the *krauñca*, he could not prevent the hunter from killing the bird. Because he thought that the male *krauñca* alone should be killed and offered for the Goddess-of-Speech, he did not kill the other bird too; nor did he restore to life the male bird he himself as a hunter had killed; nor did he snatch it off. Vālmiki continued to be very sad even after he won the grace of the Goddess, as he was haunted by a feeling of repentance for his own act of killing the bird. That is why he was consoled by Brahmā. Thus, answers are now easily available for many questions. Because Vālmiki acted in this context by mixing up both true and false bodies (*Satyānrte mithunīkr̥tya*) and because such a mixing up cannot be explained properly (*anirvācanīya*), this idea, though contained in the text, is not so clear but to be assumed (*kalpanīya*) by close scrutiny. Otherwise answers may not be available for many questions.

The deliberate action on the part of Vālmiki in assuming a second body i. e., a hunter's body and in killing and offering a male *krauñca* to the Goddess-of-Speech would indicate that, as we have already suggested on some other ground, the sage had already planned to compose a poem and hence he made the *krauñca* offering to the Goddess in order to successfully impliment that plan of his.

On the basis of what we have seen so far, we can say that the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*-prologue indicates that in the Tamasā river area, Vālmiki acted thus by means of his supernatural power and by mixing up both true and false bodies on account of his desire to compose the epic; and that on that account, his fame as a poet came to be widely well known. In describing the sage in this manner, the author had in his mind perhaps the following Vedic passage :

तम आसीत् तमसा गूढमग्रेऽप्रकेतम् ।  
सलिले सर्वमा इदम् ।

1. See *Purāṇic Encyclopaedia* (Delhi, 1975) s. v. *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Vālmiki*.

तुच्छेनाभ्वपिहितं यदासीत् ।  
 तमसस्तन्महिनाऽजायतैकम् ।  
 कामस्तदग्रे समवर्तताधि ।  
 मनसो रेतः प्रथमं यदासीत् ।  
 सतौ बन्धुमसति निरविन्दत् ।  
 • हृदि प्रतीष्या कवयो मनीषा ।  
 तिरश्चीनो विततो रश्मिरेषाम् ।  
 अधस्विदासीदुपरिस्विदासीत् ।

The idea of the passage may be summarised as follows : Due to the influence of the *Tamas* all remained undifferentiated. The whole thing was water (i. e., took place in the neighbourhood of the river water). The one that was at a distance (i. e., the body on the bank) was covered with, and born of, the magical power. The basic cause for its birth—just as sperm for the birth of the regular body—was the desire i. e., a desire to compose a poem. Then the poets assumed a connection of their real body with the magical ones by means of their thought coupled with a strong desire in their hearts. That is why their fame like sun-rays came to be well known everywhere, in nether world and in the heaven.

Now the above discussion shows that the *krauñca* episode was partly unreal and illusory. In that case, being born of illusion, will not the मा निषाद verse as well as the *Rāmāyaṇa* too be unauthoritative and be bereft of all their credibility ?

But, one thing must be borne in mind without any ambiguity. The authoritativeness of any particular means of knowledge and the credibility of things known through such means (*pramāṇa-prameya-vyavahāra*,—all these things, whether they are secular or religious (*vaidika* and *laukika*)—totally depend upon the indescribable illusory union of the false and true. Therefore the giants among the ancient Indian epistemologists who have investigated the matter have shown us convincingly that because of the above reason even the *Vedas* have only a relative authority for a man till he realises the self (*Ā ātmā-niścayāt*).<sup>1</sup> The *Rāmāyaṇa* too claims to be the very *Veda* born of Vālmiki :

1. See Śaṅkara's *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya*, I, i, 1 and 4,

वेदः प्राचेतसादासीत् साक्षाद्रामायणात्मना ।

Therefore the *Rāmāyaṇa* too can enjoy the same validity and invalidity as that of the *Vedas*.

In fact the idea that due to the power of illusion, Vālmīki himself entangled in another body and hence grieved helplessly, and that when he saw the other worshipful Brahmā he was relieved of that sorrow of his—this idea is perhaps due to the influence of the Upaniṣadic hymn :

समाने वृक्षे पुरुषो निमग्नोऽ  
नीशया शोचति मुह्यमानः ।  
जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीश—  
मस्य महिमानमिति वीतशोकः ॥<sup>1</sup>

“In a similar tree-like body<sup>2</sup> one gets immersed, and hence deluded, he grieves helplessly. When he sees the other worshipful Lord and His greatness, he becomes free from grief.”

So the verse मा निषाद etc., may have to be interpreted according to the Upaniṣadic idea, viz.,

“Oh, the one who has put an end to the Illusion!<sup>3</sup> (i. e., the one who has realised the Self !) May you attain the (ultimate) Resting place (i. e., Mokṣa) permanently ! For, you have annihilated the desire-deluded one among the pair of things that are small.”<sup>4</sup>

Hence it is not altogether improbable that the verse मा निषाद etc. had been composed by Vālmīki as an invocatory verse to his *Rāmāyaṇa* and it had been originally meant to be in praise of a man of Self-realisation in general; and that one of Vālmīki's disciples, as the *Tilaka* commentary says, or more probably some *Paurāṇika* of the post-Vālmīki era, composed the *krauñca* episode,

1. *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, II, i, 2.
2. See Śaṅkara under the hymn.
3. मायाः बन्धस्य अज्ञानस्य निषाद अवसादक ।
4. I. e., the *Jīva* (personal soul) among the two finite ones viz., the *Jīva* and *Īśvara* (personal god). For both of them are to be taken as small because of the existence of sense of duality. Cf. यत्रान्यत् पश्यति.....तदल्पम् *Chāndogya* VII, xxiv. 1.

and included it in his prologue to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, of course by taking clue from the two words of the verse viz., *niṣāda* and *krauñca* and by strictly adhering to the norms of the *Vedas* and the ritualistic literature.

Now, one could argue: If the verse were to be interpreted in the said manner, then could it be a verse of Vālmīki? Do we find an equality or homogeneity in this verse with other well known verses of this poet, in respect of its wording, its tenor, its style etc.? But it must be pointed out that none of the commentators on the *Rāmāyaṇa* is found satisfied with the apparent idea conveyed by the verse. The main reason for this attitude of the commentators is perhaps this: The apparent meaning of the verse is nothing but a curse to the hunter. How could it be then an invocatory first verse of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. These commentators may be correct. For, had it been a mere curse of the sage, it must have affected the hunter to whom the curse was given. But we do not find any such happening in the episode. Therefore the meaning of the verse as intended by Vālmīki must have been altogether different from its apparent meaning. Therefore each one of the commentators of the *Rāmāyaṇa* invariably tries hard to find out one or more hidden meanings in this verse. Now the above question could be easily raised with reference to each one of those hidden meanings suggested by the commentators. However all agree in concluding that it is the first verse to come out of the mouth of the sage Vālmīki and it has other meanings hidden in it. So there is nothing new and abnormal in our endeavour. Here the only new thing is this: Our endeavour here has been to show that the text of the *krauñca* episode could be probably better interpreted if we take Vālmīki himself assumed the body of a hunter; and taking this in our view we have suggested an interpretation to this मा निषाद verse in the light of the well known Upaniṣadic thought. This interpretation offered here may lighten and enhance the reputation and greatness of Vālmīki not only as a great poet, but also as a great seer.

In the context it may be noted that while commenting upon this mysterious multi-dimensional verse मा निषाद etc., the author of the *Tilaka* commentary found himself in a situation where he had to suggest that the hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, i. e., Rāma himself, came to the Tamasā forest assuming a hunter's form and, while Vālmīki was observing, killed the *krauñca* in order to kindle the sentiment

of pity in the sage so that the latter could compose the epic, basically of that sentiment.

11. Answer to the eleventh question: No doubt Vālmīki had more pupils other than this Bharadvāja. But we do not know whether any other pupil would have proved himself as happily suitable in the context as Bharadvāja did. For, in the Vedic literature *krauñca* and Bharadvāja seem to have been clubbed together and to have been described as being endowed with intelligence :

कुड्ङाङ्गिरसो धिया ।<sup>1</sup>

The word *kruñ* denotes *krauñca*<sup>2</sup> and Bharadvāja is well-known as Aṅgīrasa. Now it may be stated that to introduce Bharadvāja along with *krauñca* in the episode would be more Vedic than to introduce anybody else. Further intense desire on the part of a Bharadvāja to learn the Vedic lore had also been vouched for in the *Veda* itself.<sup>3</sup> So, why not introduce—the author perhaps has thought—one Bharadvāja in the prologue as a receiver of the first dose of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the essence of the *Vedas*? Besides, a Bharadvāja's quick grasp and mental agility have already been certified by the Vedic passage quoted above. These qualifications are very essential to learn by heart the verse of Vālmīki immediately even by hearing once. It is doubtful indeed whether any other pupil of Vālmīki had these requirements certified by the scripture itself.

12. Answer to the twelfth question: To answer the last question in detail requires a lot of discussion. For this question is very much interrelated with many other questions connected with a number of things in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. To say a few: Why should Vālmīki be described as *Ādikavi* 'First poet'? Why should the hero and the heroine of the epic be named Rāma and Sītā? And so on. Similarly there are questions concerning the R̥ṣyaśṅga episode, Viśvāmitra's introduction, the stories of the Gaṅgā's descent, of Ahalyā's purification, and so on. An answer to the twelfth question

1. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, II, vi, 2

2. Cf. कुड्, कौञ्चोऽय etc., *Amarakośa*, II, v, 22.

3. Cf. भरद्वाजो ह त्रिभिरायुभिर्ब्रह्मचर्यमुवास etc. *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, III, x, 11.



may have to touch these points. Hence reserving a detailed discussion on this point to a more appropriate future occasion, we may conclude our present investigation by saying this much a bit superficially.

The Sanskrit word *Valmīka* denotes the anthill created by white ants, and it is known to be made of the best fertile part of the earth. This fact is recognised even in the scriptures :

ऊर्ज्वा शतं रसं पृथिव्या उपदीका उद्दिहन्ति ।  
यद्वल्मीकम् ।<sup>1</sup>

This *Valmīka* or anthill is also described as the ear of the earth in the scripture :

श्रोत्रं ह्येतत् पृथिव्याः ।  
यद्वल्मीकः ।<sup>2</sup>

Therefore it seems to be in fitness of the things that the first poet who heard for the first time on the earth Rāma's story from the sage Nārada of the heaven should be considered as the very ear of the earth, i. e., *valmīka* or very closely connected with it viz. Vālmīki as he is better known.

1. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* V, 2.

2. Lexicons recognise *Valmīka* too as another name of Vālmīki, See Monier Williams, *Skt. Eng., Dictionary* s. v.

## THAI INTERPOLATIONS IN THE STORY OF ANIRUDDHA

by

MANEEPIN PHROMSUTHIRAK\*

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे विष्णुपुराणे हरिवंशे च उपलब्धस्य अनिरुद्धा-  
ख्यानस्य विवरणं दत्त्वा थाइ भाषाया द्वयोर्नाटकयोः प्राप्तस्य अनिरुद्धा-  
ख्यानस्य तुलना विहिता प्रतिपादितं यत् थाइभाषाया नाटकयोः  
शृङ्गारस्य प्राचुर्यं वर्तते तस्मात् कारणात् थाइनाटकयो रोचकता  
लोकप्रियता च तत्र वर्तते ।]

Aniruddha is the grandson of Kriṣṇa. His story, which is not lengthy, is in the Kriṣṇāvatāra (“Account of the incarnation of Viṣṇu as Kriṣṇa”). Aniruddha’s story is depicted in two Thai literary works: *Anirut Kham Chan* and *Bot Lakhon Rū’ang Unarut*. The first is supposed to have been written during the early Ayudhya period (?1529-1550). The second, which is a *lakhon* or dance drama text, was written in the early Ratanakosin period (1783). In the present article I shall discuss primarily the *Anirut Kham Chan* (AKC).

The prototype of AKC, according to Thai tradition, is the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*. Dhanit Yupho writes in his introduction to the play *Bot Lakhon Rū’ang Unarut* that “the story of Aniruddha has been widely known from the Ayudhya period. The most prominent version is the *Anirut Kham Chan* composed by Sī Prāt who lived in the reign of King Nārāī the Great. The story, names of the characters and of places in the *Anirut Kham Chan* correspond to those in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*”<sup>1</sup>.

But the internal evidence does not quite agree with this suggestion. I prefer to regard the *Harivaṃśa* as the prototype of AKC. *Harivaṃśa* is the celebrated poem, supplementary to the *Mahābhārata*, on the history and adventures of Kriṣṇa. The close similarities between the *Harivaṃśa* and AKC can be clearly seen in the fighting episodes in the later part of story. A comparison of similar incidents is illustrated in the table at the end of this article.

\* Doctoral candidate, School of Oriental & African Studies, London University. This article is reprinted from “Journal of the Siam Society, January 1979, Volume 67, Part I, with the kind permission of the Siam Society. (Ed.)

The first part of the story of Aniruddha in the *Harivaṃśa* is as follows. Uṣā, the daughter of the Demon King Bāṇa, is one of the attendant of goddess Umā. One day, seeing Umā enjoying the act of love together with her consort, Śiva, Uṣā wants very much to have the same experience. Umā discovers Uṣā's wish. She foretells that Uṣā is to enjoy sexual intercourse with a man in her dream on the twelfth night in the month of Vaiśākha. That man is to be her husband.

On the predicted night a young man does violate Uṣā's virginity in her dream. When Uṣā wakes up she finds that her dress is soaked with blood ("sā svapne rambhitā tena strībhāvaṃ cāpi lambhitā, śonitāktā prarudatī sahasaivotthitā niśi"). She is very upset over what has happened. Citralekhā, her close friend, helps her to find out who the man is. She paints the portraits of all the gods and heroes, including Aniruddha, for Uṣā. She also uses her magic power to bring him from his own city to be reunited with Uṣā<sup>2</sup>.

In the *Harivaṃśa* the couple do meet each other in reality, not just in a dream. This seems to be the same as in *AKC*. But the meeting in the *Harivaṃśa* is not treated as the most important part of the story. The battle episodes are more emphasized and depicted at great length. In *AKC*, however, the meeting of the couple is so emphasized, expanded and lengthened that it has become the main part of the work. Besides, an important character has been interpolated. He plays a very remarkable role in the story, the role of matchmaker.

In *AKC*, Anirut while on a tour in the forest, sleeps in his chariot under a great banyan tree. Before he goes to sleep he prays to the spirit of sacred tree for protection. Phra Sai, or the Banyan Tree spirit, is very pleased and wants to give Anirut something in return for his reverent behaviour. The spirit also feels pity for Anirut who is sleeping out in the lonely forest. He concludes that it is fit and proper to take him to sleep with Uṣā. He carries Anirut to Uṣā's palace. The meeting of the couple is depicted in erotic verse at length. At dawn Anirut is carried by the Tree Spirit back to his royal chariot<sup>3</sup>. After this episode the story is similar to that in the *Harivaṃśa*.

2. *Harivaṃśa*. Poona, 1936.

3. 2503.

Where can the prototype of this beneficial tree spirit be found? In Jātaka No. 493 (“mahā vaṇija jātaḥ”), a beneficial tree is mentioned. The spirit of a Serpent King in a banyan tree gives all kinds of desirable possessions including wealth and voluptuous girls to some merchants. But there is no episode of a hero being carried away to meet any one of the girls<sup>4</sup>.

There is a strikingly similar story in the *Daśakumāracarita*, a Sanskrit romantic tale written by a famous poet Daṇḍin (fifth or sixth century A.D.). In chapter X a man comes to sleep under a very tall tree on the side of a mountain in the Vindhya. He too prays to the spirit of the tree for protection before he goes to sleep. A moment later, he finds that he is sleeping by the side of a beautiful girl on the terrace of her palace. He falls in love with her at first sight. He just touches her gently and wakes her up. She also falls in love with him. But the couple do not make love to each other. They just lie together and sleep. When the man wakes up again he finds himself back on his bed of leaves under that sacred tree. Then the spirit appears to him and explains what has happened. It is his mother who has been cursed to forget all her past life and to stay in that sacred tree. At first, without recognizing her son, she had carried him to sleep in the palace of a princess in order to protect him from wild beasts when she had to leave the tree for a while. Here the spirit has reasonable motive to carry the man to the girl's palace. Later, the spirit and her son are able to recognize each other. She, however, is unable to help him further. When the man knows the truth he takes leave of his mother, the spirit, and wanders about searching for the girl. He comes to her city and is discovered by her maid. The girl has painted his portrait and let her maid see it and then go in search of him<sup>5</sup>. The recognition of a man by means of a painting is similar to the story of Aniruddha in the Puranas. But the role of treespirit is new. Whether the spirit in the *Daśakumāracarita* has any influence of that in *AKC* or not cannot be proved, but the similarity is still very striking.

This carrying of a man to the bedroom of a girl whose lover he is to become is widely referred to in Thai as Um Som, literally

4. *The Jataka* : vol IV, translated by W.H.D. Rouse Cambridge, 1901.

5. Daṇḍin. *Daśakumāracarita*, edited by M. R. Kale. Bombay, 1917.

“to carry in the arm and to match”. It can hardly be said, however, that it is Thai local conventio. There are about a dozen Thai plays extant. (These are traditional nonclassical plays called *lakhon nok*.) Most of which have more or less the same plot, and even identical episodes or incidents. But none of these plays has any beneficial tree spirit at all. In only one play called *Yo Phra Klin* a beneficial bamboo tree is mentioned. Indra leaves his daughter inside the bamboo tree. She remains there until the hero finds her<sup>6</sup>. But no spirit of this bamboo tree is ever mentioned.

In *AKC* the name of the tree spirit is not given. But in a Buddhist work called *Samuthakhot Kham Chan (SKC)* its name is *Sī Phromarak* (Sanskrit : *Srī Brahmarakṣa*).

The word *Sī Phromarak* appears in two literary works which are supposed to be earlier than *AKC*. They are *Lilit Ongkām Chaeng Nam*<sup>7</sup> and *Lilit Phra Lo*<sup>8</sup>. The former is a sacred text recited in the ceremony of “Drinking the Water of Allegiance”. The latter is the legend of the great love of a northern prince. In these two works *Sī Phromarak* seems to be a kind of a tree spirit because it is preceded by a word ‘*phanatbodi*’ (Sanskrit: *vanaspati*), meaning “Lord of the Woods”. In neither work does *Sī Phromarak* act as a matchmaker. But in *Lilit Phra Lo* this kind of spirit is in the entourage of a *rishi*-like sorcerer who, by means of his sorcery, brings the prince away from his family and his kingdom to the twin princesses who crave madly for him. The Tree Spirit, who does much the same thing for Anirut, might get his name from *Sī Phromarak* in *Lilit Phra Lo*. But it is more likely that *Sī Phromarak* in both works comes from the same source which has not been discovered yet.

An episode of matchmaking brought about by a tree spirit is also found in *SKC*. What is surprising is that this is the story of a *Bodhisattva*. The *Bodhisattva*’s story, in his birth as Prince *Samudaghosā*, is also told in a non-canonical Pali book of *Jātakas* called *Paññāsajātaka*. It has nothing at all to do with a tree spirit or ‘*Um Som*’. In the Pali *Jātaka* tale the prince hears of a beautiful princess. He desires very much to have her as his wife. He

6. Sowlak Anantasant, *The Ayudhya Lakhon Nok Manuscripts*, unpublished thesis. Chulalongkorn University. Bangkok, 1972.

7. 2517.

8. 2507.

goes to her city, displays his skill in music, and is allowed to marry the princess<sup>9</sup>.

*SKC*, however, is not a mere translation of the Pali *Jātaka*. The beginning part in the Thai *Samuddaghosa* story is very similar indeed to the *AKC*. Prince *Samuthakhot* also goes on tour in the forest. He also spends the night in his chariot under a sacred tree, but here it is a *bo* tree. Before he goes to sleep he also prays to the spirit of the tree for protection. The *Bo Tree Spirit* thinks along the same lines as *Phra Sai* in *AKC*. He wants to make the prince less lonely in the night and to match him with a suitable girl. He then does the same as the *Banyan Tree Spirit* does for *Anirut*. Moreover, the prince is also recognized by his portrait painted by the girl's nurse and is also brought back to the girl by her nurse by means of magic power, as is *Anirut* by *Phichitlekhā*, *Uṣā's* close attendant. The story from this point onwards is more or less similar to the Pali *Paññāsajātaka*, and quite dissimilar to the *Anirut* legend<sup>10</sup>.

It is at one point mentioned in *SKC* that, desiring to match *Samuthakhot* with *Winthumadī*, the *Bo Tree Spirit* carries him to her, "in the same manner as the *Banyan Tree Spirit* carried *Anirut* to *Uṣā*"<sup>11</sup>. This attests that the story of *Anirut* with the interpolated part was already well known at the time of the composition of this part of *SKC*. But it is not necessary that this story of *Anirut* is the selfsame story with the extant *AKC*.

As for the date of *AKC*, Thai tradition says that *Sī Prāt*, a poet of King *Nārāi's* court, composed *AKC* in order to compete with the *SKC* written by King *Nārāi* and *Phra Mahāratchakhrū*, the royal preceptor. Evidence from the Thai chronicles makes it clear that *Sī Prāt* did not live during King *Nārāi's* reign (1657-1688 A. D.) but some time after, either during the reign of King *Nārāi's* son or his grand-son. Evidence from the eulogy on King *Nārāi*<sup>12</sup> (date uncertain) makes no mention of *Sī Prāt* and *SKC*. Little or no weight, therefore, may be placed upon the Thai tradition.

9. 2467.

10. 8; 2419.

11. *Ibid.*

12. 2; 2515.

13. 2467.

Moreover the comparison of language and imagery in *AKC* with that of early Ayudhya works, such as, *Lilit Phra Lo*, *Mahā Chāt Kham Lūāng* and *Lilit Yūān Phāī* shows that *AKC* was composed at more or less the same time as these works. This might be during the sixteenth century<sup>14</sup>.

Why must there be an interpolation in these two stories, even when it sometimes causes awkwardness? In *SKC*, Samuthakhot stays with Winthumadi for only a few days, then he has to be taken back to his men waiting in the forest. All this happens before he comes back again to Winthumadi's city to take part in her *svayamvara* wedding ceremony. He there wins the competition and is married to Winthumadi as his reward<sup>15</sup>. In fact it seems that there are two incidents, one following the other, recounting the gaining of a girl by the hero in the selfsame story. In *AKC* Anirut and Uṣā are conscious when they meet each other and make love to each other. But neither of them asks who the other is. Uṣā tells Phichitlekhā, her maid and confidante, that, contrary to her expectations, Anirut has left without uttering a word to her. We can say that the Sanskrit version has better reason to explain why the identity of Anirut is a secret. No talk passes between them during their first meeting. In the Purāṇas, Uṣā is not quite sure whether it is in a dream or not when she meets Aniruddha.

Thus it is hard to justify the interpolation in *SKC* by claiming that it is an improvement in the original story. But the tree-spirit episode in *AKC* may have more justification. We can suggest that Phra Sai is interpolated into the story to make the character of Anirut more prominent. It is most unlikely that the reason for the interpolation is so that Phra Sai can please Kriṣṇa, Anirut's grandfather, by matching Anirut with Uṣā. After all, Phra Sai does not even know who Anirut is. It is only out of sympathy that Phra Sai carries Anirut to Uṣā's palace. Phra Sai thinks that Anirut, who might be either a most powerful god or a very handsome king, should not sleep alone without a girl to entertain him.

This heightens the importance of Anirut. It concords well with a later episode. When Anirut is fighting with the soldiers of

14. Sumalie Kieyakul, *The Ayudhya Portions of Samuthrakhot Khamchan: A Historical Analysis and Criticism*, unpublished thesis. Chulalongkorn University. Bangkok, 1976.

15. See footnote 10.

Bāṇa he is praised as if he is Kriṣṇa himself. His valiant fighting is described at great length and with even more colour than the battle between Kriṣṇa and Bāṇa.

The interpolated part makes clear that the work is supposed to be the story of the renowned Anirut, and not that of Kriṣṇa. It is true that the fight of Kriṣṇa against Bāṇa, the devotee of Śiva, is a necessarily related part of the whole story. But this episode is not depicted at great length. It occupies only one fourth of the whole story. Moreover, the narrative is not composed with great care and neatness as it is in the episodes on Anirut. Some passages are repeated to fill up the story. It is more like a note to show that the Thai story of Anirut has its origin in one of the well-known stories of Kriṣṇa related in the Sanskrit Purāṇas.

But here there is a question: why should a romantic—even erotic—interlude be interpolated in stories as religious in motivation as the Anirut and Samuthakhot stories purport to be? Formerly the stories of Aniruddha and Rāma were played by the Thai in order to eulogize the god Viṣṇu and to bring auspicious things to both the performers and the audience. That was why these two stories were regarded as sacred and religious so that only the king's troop of actors was allowed to play these two stories.

For the Thai audience and reader, a story which has romance as the main theme is always popular. *Lilit Phra Lo*, a great romance of a prince and his love for twin princesses, has always been highly praised until now. Early romantic and erotic poems, such as, *Khlong Thawā Thotsamāt* and *Khlong Kamsūān Sī Prāt*, through their popularity have been closely imitated by many famous later poets.

A story which does not have love as its main theme may actually be well-known on account of its romantic passages. For example, the passage called the 'Lament to His Concubines', spoken by the Burmese crown prince in *Lilit Taleng Phāī*, a history of the battle between the Thai and the Burmese, is remembered and recited more often than the fighting scene between the two crown princes. This suggests a possible reason for the erotic interpolation in *AKC*, which, without it, would be mainly preoccupied with the long series of fights in a symbolic battle between the forces of Śiva represented by Bāṇa and Uṣā and those of Viṣṇu represented by Kriṣṇa and his grandson Anirut.



Moreover, works written in the style of a sentimental poem called *nirāt* are famous and widely read when they are about love, and separation from the object of love, but not so much when they are mere descriptions of places visited. This suggests a possible reason for the interpolation at the commencement of *SKC*, for, subsequently, after the marriage, the story is taken up almost entirely with travels in the Himavanta (in which there is more emphasis on tourism, as it were, than on the delights of a honeymoon) and with a melodramatic conclusion in which the lovers find each other after a tragic separation and arduous wanderings.

Furthermore, episodes on love and love intrigues in Thai classical plays are put on the stage more often than war episodes. For example, it is the love stories of Hanumān not the battles between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, that have been performed and depicted on the stage most often. Many of these episodes are, in fact, also interpolations and are not found in the better-known Indian versions of the epic. For example, the 'Floating Maiden' episode contains an element of romance, for the journey back to Lanka made by Benaykāī, escorted by Hanumān, has a short scene of passion interpolated, when the monkey declares his love to her, and after persistent ardent wooing Benyakāī succumbs and the love match is consummated<sup>16</sup>. None of this find an equivalent in Vālmiki.

Turning to *AKC*, we can find something similar in the interpolation concerning 'Um Som' and the tree spirit. An element of fantasy, reminding us of Hanumān's fantastic adventures, enters into the story, and it is accompanied by a similar erotic sequel. It is not surprising that, for Thais as for many other peoples, a taste for mystery and romantic, may be behind the adaptation and interpolations in many traditional stories.

---

16. 2506, 4.

VIṢṆU PURĀṆA  
(VP)HARIVAMŚA  
(H)ANIRUT KHAM CHAN  
(AKC)

I.	Umā foretells Uṣā that she will see her future husband in a dream during the month of Vaiśākha.	The episode is similar to VP I.	Anirut hears of the forest and wants to go there.
II.	Uṣā sees Aniruddha in her dream.	Uṣā is violated by Aniruddha in her dream.	Phra Sai, the holy spirit of a banyan tree carries Anirut to Uṣā's chamber. In the morning he carries him back to his couch under the tree.
III.	Citralkhā, Uṣā's companion, paints the portraits of gods and all heroes including Aniruddha in order to help Uṣā identify her future husband.	This episode is similar to VP III.	The episode is similar to VP and H III.
IV.	Citralkhā, by her magic power, brings Aniruddha from Dvāravatī to Uṣā's chamber in Śoṇitapura.	The episode is similar to VP IV.	The episode is similar to VP and H IV.
V.	When Aniruddha is discovered in Uṣā's palace, King Bāṇa sends his soldiers to arrest him. Finding that Aniruddha is not easily seized Bāṇa arrests him by using his arrow of snakes.	This episode is similar to VP V.	The episode is similar to VP and H V.
VI.	Sage Nārada tells Kriṣṇa of Aniruddha's fate.	The episode is similar to VP VI	The episode is the same as VP and H VI.
VII.	Kriṣṇa, Baladeva and Pradyumna fight with Jvara or Fever, created by Śiva. Fever seizes Baladeva with burn-	Kriṣṇa fight with the five Fire Gods. He kills Aṅgira who is the leader. The other Fire Gods run away. The episod is	The episode is similar to VP VIII, but is almost identical with H VII and follows H's order of episodes. Angkhirot

VIṢṢU PURĀṆA  
(VP)HARIVAMŚA  
(H)ANIRUT KHAM CHAN  
(AKC)

	ing heat, but the latter is relieved by clinging to Kriṣṇa. Kriṣṇa expels Fever from his own body by a fever which he himself has created. Brahmā asks him to spare Fever's life.	similar to VP VIII.	(Aṅgira) is mentioned by name here too.
VIII.	Kriṣṇa fights with the five Fire Gods and kills them. No names of the gods are mentioned.	The episode is similar to VP VII. But here Fever is spared due to an injunction from heaven.	The episode is similar to H VIII. Even the injunction from above is mentioned.
IX.	Kriṣṇa fights with Śiva and Kartikeya. Śiva succumbs to a magic arrow which causes incessant yawning and is unable to fight. Kartikeya runs away.	Kriṣṇa fights with Śiva, Kartikeya and Nandī. Brahmā intervenes. He reminds Śiva that Śiva and Kriṣṇa are the same. Śiva then retires from the battle. Koṭavī, the eighth part of Parvati, asks Kriṣṇa to spare Kartikeya's life.	Kritsana fights with Isuan accompanied by Khanthakuman (Skandakumara) and Wikhanet (Vighnesa). Isuan asks Kritsana to spare Khanthakumān's life. Sages beg Isuan not to open his third eye. Whether Isuan retires from the battle or not is not mentioned.
X.	Kriṣṇa fights with Bāṇa on Nandī and cuts off all his arms even though the mystical goddess Koṭavī appears naked and asks him not to do so. Śiva asks him to spare Bāṇa's life.	Kriṣṇa fights with Bāṇa. Śiva sends Nandī to help Bāṇa. Umā appears naked and begs Kriṣṇa not to kill Bāṇa. Kriṣṇa therefore cuts off all his arms except two.	Kritsana fights with Phān (Bāṇa). He cuts off all Phān's arms except two.
XI.	The snakes that bind Aniruddha are destroyed by Garuḍa. Kriṣṇa, Baladeva, Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Uṣā go back to Dvāravatī.	The snakes flee away at the sight of Garuḍa. Kriṣṇa installs Kumbhaṇḍha, Bāṇa's minister, upon the throne of Śoṇitapura. Kriṣṇa marries Aniruddha to Uṣā in Śoṇitapura.	The episode is similar to VP XI.

## PLACES OF PURĀNIC RECITATION ACCORDING TO THE PURĀNA-S

By

GIORGIO BONAZZOLI

[कस्मिन् स्थाने कानि पुराणानि रचितानि अस्य निर्देशः  
पुराणेषु प्राप्यते । कानिचित् पुराणानि नैमिषारण्ये रचितानि  
कानिचित् कुरुक्षेत्रादिस्थानेषु । अत्र लेखकेन प्रतिपादितं यत्  
पुराणानां परस्परा स्थानानुसारतो भिन्नाऽऽसीत् । स्थानानां महत्त्वमपि  
पुराणानां रचनानुसारतो भिन्नमासीत् ।]

The present note studies the purānic statements about the places of purānic recitation and recitation means, throughout this note, the first narration of a *purāṇa* or part thereof. It does not aim, therefore, at finding out where the single *purāṇa*-s, or parts thereof, have been compiled or composed. Such a research on the purānic statements is useful because purānic tradition has its own value which is worth attentive consideration. What the *purāṇa*-s say about themselves, indeed, should be studied prior to any further investigation on them. In our case, moreover, it will become immediately apparent that the places of purānic recitation indicated by the *purāṇa*-s, are something more than a mere geographical or topographical problem. They tend, rather, along with many other points, to form the structure or inner logic of the *purāṇa*-s themselves. They deserve therefore a thoughtful and careful examination.

The following table shows the places where the *purāṇa*-s claim to have been narrated<sup>1</sup> :

1. The exact references are :  
Agni (ASS) 1.2 (*Naimiṣa*); 1.6 (*Badarikāśrama*)—Kūrma (Crit. Ed.) II, 44, 142 (*Gaṅgādvāra*)—Garuḍa (Jivānanda) 1.3 (*Naimiṣa*); 2.2 (*Badarikāśrama*); 2.10 (*Kailāśa*)—Devī Bhāgavata (Mor. Ed.) I. 2. 27 (*Naimiṣa*)—Nārada (Venk.) I. 1.3 cf. 25 (*Naimiṣa*); I. 1.15,24 (*Siddhāśrama*)—Padma (ASS) I. 1.6 and V. 1.10 (*Naimiṣa*); V. 2.44 (*Prayāga*); V. 1.47, 65 (*Gaṅgādvāra*); V. 16.5 (*Puṣkara*)—Brahma (Mor Ed.) 1.3 (*Naimiṣa*)—Brahmāṇḍa (Venk.) I. 1.17 (*Kurukṣetra*);

	Naimiṣa	Kurukṣetra	Himālaya	Puṣkara	Various
Agni	×		×1		
Kūrma			×4		
Garuḍa	×		×4		×6
Devī Bhāgavata	×				
Nārada	×		×2		
Padma	×		×4, × <sup>5</sup>	×	
Brahma	×				
Brahmāṇḍa		×			
Brahmavaivarta			×2, × <sup>3</sup>	×	×7
Bhāgavata	×				
Matsya	×				
Līṅga	×				
Vāyu		×			
Śiva			×5		
Skanda	×	×	×3		×6

×<sup>1</sup> = Badarīkāśrama; ×<sup>2</sup> = Siddhāśrama; ×<sup>3</sup> = Jāhnavītaṭe (Gaṅgā); ×<sup>4</sup> = Gaṅgādvāra; ×<sup>5</sup> = Prayāga; ×<sup>6</sup> = Kailāśa; ×<sup>7</sup> = Goloka.

Among the twenty *purāṇa*-s examined to prepare the table, including both *Śiva* and *Vāyu purāṇa*-s as well as the *Devī Bhāgavata* only fifteen mention the place of purāṇic recitation; out of which six, at least, name more than one place of narration. This fact, by itself, would already imply that the *purāṇa*-s do not aim at introducing one-place tradition but that they claim to have been narrated in different parts of the country by different persons to different listeners. Although Naimiṣāranya is introduced as place of recitation by not less than ten *purāṇa*-s, yet it is far from being the only one. There are *purāṇa*-s, indeed, which affirm to have been narrated in three or four places subsequently.

cf. I. 1.37 (*Naimiṣya*)—Brahmavaivarta (Jivānanda) I. 1.1 (*Naimiṣa*); I. 1. 60-63 (*Goloka, Puṣkara, Jāhnavītaṭe, Siddhakṣetra*)—Bhāgavata (Gītā Press) I. 1.4 (*Naimiṣa*)—Matsya (Venk.) 1.2 (*Naimiṣāranyavāsinaḥ*)—Līṅga (Venk.) I. 1.4-8 (*Naimiṣa*)—Vāyu (Venk.) I. 1.11 (*Kurukṣetra*); they are called *Naimiṣāranyagocara* in I. 1.12 and *Naimiṣya* in I. 1.41.—Śiva (Venk.) I. 1.1 (*Prayāgū*)—Skanda (Venk.) I. 1.12; II. 1.1 etc. (*Naimiṣa*); II. 1.1.7 (*Jāhnavītaṭe*); II. 8.1.8 (*Kurukṣetra*); VII. 1.27; VII. 3.4 (*Kailāśa*). The editions of the *purāṇa*-s mentioned in this list will be used also in the body of the article.

Even a cursory reading of the *adhya*-s dealing with the topic studied here reveals that the place of narration changes with the change of generation. The *Brahmavaivarta purāṇa* ( I. 1. 59ff ), for instance, explains that Kṛṣṇa gave the *purāṇa* to Brahmā in Goloka, Brahmā transmitted it to Dharma at Puṣkara and Dharma to his son Nārāyaṇa; this latter handed it over to Nārada, and Nārada on his turn gave it to Vyāsa on the river Gaṅgā. Vyāsa, having arranged it, forwarded it to Sauti at Siddhakṣetra. This statement implies, then, that the place of narration has its relevance in relation to different generations. It, moreover, suggests that each place constitutes a kind of purāṇic layer which has a bearing on purāṇic recitation. In other words, the above statement reveals that the very fact of being proclaimed at Puṣkara, for instance, or at Siddhakṣetra or at Naimiṣa means that a *purāṇa* has taken different shapes in those different places. *Nārada P.* II. 63.31 says ;

नैमिषे विष्णुसारूप्यं पुष्करे ब्रह्मणेऽन्तिकम् ।  
आखण्डलस्य लोको हि कुरुक्षेत्रे च माघतः ॥

‘By bathing during the month of Māgha at Naimiṣa is obtained identity of form with Viṣṇu, at Puṣkara closeness to Brahmā and at Kurukṣetra, indeed, Indra’s heaven’.

Just as a dip at the places mentioned in the *śloka* gives a particular merit to the bather, so analogically, each place of purāṇic recitation gives the *purāṇa*-s its own peculiar imprint and trend. *Nārada P.* II. 38. 20. gives a hint for understanding the above table.

कृते तु सर्वतीर्थानि त्रेतायां पुष्करं परम् ।  
द्वापरे तु कुरुक्षेत्रं कलौ गङ्गा विशिष्यते ॥

In Kṛta *yuga* all the *tīrtha*-s excell, in Tretā *yuga* Puṣkara, in Dvāpara *yuga* Kurukṣetra, in Kali *yuga* the Gaṅgā.’

This *śloka* suggests that *tīrtha*-s get different importance in different *yuga*-s. Much in the same way the tradition relating the *purāṇa*-s to different places puts them in relation also with different *yuga*-s. An example of this influence of *yuga*-s on the *purāṇa*-s can be seen in *Padma P.* II. 125. 33-43. The *Padma purāṇa*, it is said in this passage, had one hundred thousand *śloka*-s in Kṛta *yuga*, fifty-two thousand in Tretā, twenty-two thousand in Dvāpara, twelve thousand in Kali *yuga*. And even these last twelve thousand *śloka*-s will disappear at the

end of Kali *yuga* and the first number, one hundred thousand, will appear again. The influence of *yuga*-s is expressed in terms of length, but its repercussion also on content is not improbable, although the same *purāṇa* affirms that the meaning in the four forms the *purāṇa* assumes is only one.<sup>2</sup> The fact that Naimiṣa is the pre-eminent place of purāṇic narration, then, implies not only that the *purāṇa*-s have been told mainly in a particular place which gave its own peculiar imprint to them but also that they have been narrated in a particular *yuga*. This *yuga* is Kali, as it is often affirmed.<sup>3</sup> Just to face Kali *yuga*'s negative influences the ṛṣi-s in fact gather at Naimiṣa :

कलिमागतमाज्ञाय क्षेत्रेऽस्मिन् वैष्णवे वयम् ।  
आसीना दीर्घसत्रेण कथायां सक्षणा हरेः ॥

(*Bhāgavata P. I. 1.21*)

'Knowing that Kali *yuga* has come, we sit in this Vaiṣṇava place for a long sacrifice, having leisure for the story of Hari'.

This lets us suppose that in other *yuga*-s the *purāṇa*-s had other trends derived from the peculiar needs of that age and from the different place of their narration. *Purāṇa*-s indeed seem to have changed their purpose during their evolution.<sup>4</sup> It is enough to compare this *śloka* of the *Nārada purāṇa* (I. 92.22) :

पुराणमेकमेवासीत् सर्वकल्पेषु मानद ।  
चतुर्वर्गस्य बीजं च शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ॥

'O honour-giver, in all the ages Purāṇa was one, seed of the four aims of life, extending to one hundred crores of *śloka*-s'.

with the one from the *Skanda purāṇa* (Revā, I. 24cd-25ab) :

पुराणमेकमेवासीत् कल्पान्तरे मुने ॥ 24cd ॥  
त्रिवर्गसाधनं पुण्यं शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ॥ 25 ab ॥

2. एकोऽर्थश्चैकभावश्च चतुर्वर्गं प्रवर्तितः । संहितास्वपि विप्रेन्द्राः शेषाख्याना-  
प्रविस्तरः ॥ (śl 14)

3. See *Bhāgavata P. I. 1.21*; *Siva P. I. 1.12* etc. To be more accurate we could say that Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana is active during the *sandhyā*-s of *Dvāpara* and Kali *yuga*-s.

4. H. P. Shastri, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the Care of Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V, *Purāṇa Manuscripts*, Calcutta, 1928 (Preface) p. LXXXVII, writes : "(The *Purāṇa*-s) gradually assumed, from the form of historical to the form of religious works."

'O muni, at the end of this age, *purāṇa* was one, sacred means for the three aims of life, extending to one hundred crores of *śloka-s*.'<sup>5</sup>

This suggests, once again, that each age gave its imprint to the *purāṇa-s*. The importance acquired by Naimiṣāranya in Kali *yuga* overshadowed all the other places, which are mentioned only irregularly. This seems to match with what the *purāṇa-s* think of purāṇic evolution, namely that ancient pre-Kali *yuga* traditions were absorbed into the new stream which developed at Naimiṣa. Although absorbed, however, they left traces behind. So, for instance, according to *Skanda* P. II.8.1.8 Romaharṣaṇa tells the *kathā* to Śaunaka and the *ṛṣi-s* at Kurukṣetra, while according to the same *Skanda* P. II. 1.1.1, he would have told it at Naimiṣa.<sup>6</sup> The inconsistency is easily dissolved if we keep in mind what we have just mentioned, namely, that each place of narration is considered as having an impact on purāṇic evolution and that traces of such an impact are still visible in the actual purāṇic texts.

The *purāṇa-s* are rather concord in affirming that Sūta went to Naimiṣāranya where the *ṛṣi-s*, gathered for a twelve-year-long sacrifice, requested him to narrate *kathā-s*. Sūta had received the purāṇic tradition from Vyāsa (Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana) in another place, which is Badarīkāśrama for *Agni* (I.1) and *Garuḍa* (2.29), the bank of the Gaṅgā for *Brahmavaivarta* (I.1.62) and *Skanda* (II.1.7) etc. Sūta, then, and perhaps already Vyāsa, by narrating the *purāṇa-s* on that occasion would have transformed the purāṇic tradition, adapting it to the new *yuga* which had just begun. All this, moreover, matches also with the purāṇic theory of reduction to four hundred thousand *śloka-s* done by Vyāsa of the huge number of them hidden in, or narrated by, Brahmā and even now still available in *devaloka*<sup>7</sup>.

5. This *śloka* is available in other *purāṇa-s* too in this form; see *Matsya* P. 53.4; *Skanda* P. VII. 1.2.18 etc.
6. Note that II. 1.1.1 ff. although putting the recitation at the usual place of Naimiṣa, is indeed referring most probably only to the Venkātācala *māhātmya*. II. 8.1.1ff has, instead, a large bearing and reproduces, with modifications, *Padma* P. I. 1.2ff but while for the *Padma* the recitation took place at Naimiṣa, for the *Skanda* it was held at Kurukṣetra.
7. See *Nārada* P. I. 92.22ff.; *Matsya* P. 53.4,10, 27-58; *Skanda* P. VII. 1.2.18ff.



Such a theory seems to suggest that Naimiṣa, the place where Vyāsa's disciple Sūta narrates the *purāṇa-s*, signifies, in the purāṇic evolution, the place where all the precedent layers have been gathered, and systematized. Vyāsa would have begun the process, Sūta would have continued it by making Naimiṣāraṇya the seat of *purāṇa-s*, the converging point of all the previous traditions. This is expressed by *Padma purāṇa* (I. 1. 2ff), which describes *ṛṣi-s* and *muni-s* converging at Naimiṣa from different places for preparing a sacrifice and hearing purāṇic *kathā-s*.<sup>8</sup> The *purāṇa-s*, therefore, by naming the place where they had been narrated or re-narrated want to suggest mainly that the place they mention describes a moment of purāṇic evolution rather than a topographical spot. We can even easily realize that, once Naimiṣa had become important in the purāṇic arrangement as the place-layer of purāṇic recitation at the beginning of Kali *yuga*, it became a must for purāṇic compilers to put any recitation of *purāṇa-s* at Naimiṣa, even if the tradition of a particular *purāṇa* was linked to another place.<sup>9</sup> This purāṇic attitude towards the place of their recitation leaves room for further investigation about the actual geographical spot of their compilation. It is not difficult, indeed, to realize that what the *purāṇa-s* say about the place of narration and the geographical area in which we have to suppose they were actually written do not coincide. So, for instance, while Baladeva Upadhyaya,<sup>10</sup> by analysing the purāṇic data concludes that the *Matsya purāṇa* was written on the river Narmadā and the *Garuḍa purāṇa* in the Mithilā region, the *Matsya purāṇa* itself claims to have been narrated at Naimiṣa and *Garuḍa* at Badarikāśrama.<sup>11</sup> This discrepancy, which can be found also in several other cases is analogue to the other one regarding the purāṇic authors. I mention it here because I consider it useful for understanding what we are studying. Vyāsa, Sūta and other famous *ṛṣi-s* and *muni-s* are

- 
8. The same thing is repeated in *Skanda P.* II. 8.1.1ff, as we have seen, but there the *ṛṣi-s* and *muni-s* go to Kurukṣetra. Further it will appear that in fact Naimiṣa and Kurukṣetra represent two aspects of the same purāṇic layer.
  9. See the article 'Dynamic Canon of the Purāṇa-s' in *Purāṇa, Vārāṇasī*, XXI. 2 (July, 1979), pp. 126ff.
  10. *Purāṇa Vimarśa*, Vārāṇasī, 1965, pp. 564-70.
  11. See references above, fn. 1

repeatedly said in the *purāṇa-s* to be the narrators of purāṇic stories. But in fact, at the beginning of some *purāṇa* s<sup>12</sup>, we do not find immediately Vyāsa, Sūta or any of the *ṛṣi-s* or *muni-s* but other authors who introduce them and who cannot be identified with anyone of them. Such authors speak boldly in the first person. We may suppose that they are learned *brāhmaṇa-s* who take over the duty of Vyāsa or Sūta in their own country. There were surely many Vyāsa-s and Sūta-s in each important place<sup>13</sup>. They do not reveal their name or place of origin because *purāṇa-s* are not products of private invention basically but, according to the *purāṇa-s* themselves, they are the result of previous *yuga-s* reduced to their actual shape, mostly at Naimiṣa. These anonymous authors, however, while introducing Vyāsa's and Sūta's stories (i. e. Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana's and Romaharṣaṇa's *kathā-s*) inadvertently let details of their own place and time slip into their accounts. From these details that crept in we can deduce where the different *purāṇa-s* were compiled, while from the ancient stories narrated we can deduce the traditional place of recitation. What has been said for the narrators can apply to places of narration also. In fact, the place of actual compilation and the place of ancient recitation do not necessarily coincide. The above mentioned discrepancy is, therefore, only apparent. From what we have seen, then, we come to the same conclusion reached before, namely that the traditional places of purāṇic recitation mentioned in the *purāṇa-s* do not refer necessarily to the actual geographical spots where they were written. Whether in fact such traditional spots as indicated in the *purāṇa-s* were really meant to be the places where the *purāṇas* had been narrated in ancient times is what is going to attract our attention now.

We can put the question in this way: by mentioning the places of purāṇic recitation do the *purāṇa-s* intend that those were the spots where the *purāṇa-s* had really been recited? We have a means in the *purāṇa-s* themselves to check their statements. They affirm to have been recited at Naimiṣa, Puṣkara, Kurukṣetra, Badarīkāśrama, Siddhāśrama, Gaṅgādvāra, Prayāga and Puṣkara. Now, the *purāṇa-s* contain the *māhātmya-s* of all those places<sup>14</sup>.

12. See, for instance, *Kūrma P. I. 1. 1. ff.*

13. *Purāṇa-s* mention repeatedly Sūta-s, Magadha-s etc.

14. The *māhātmya-s* of the places we are studying here are the following :

But, unexpected as it might be, in none of them there is any mention of purānic recitation held in those places except in Naimiṣāraṇya. The authors of the purānic *māhātmya*-s seem to be blissfully unaware of an event which should have been of interest to them and of great relevance for the places they were celebrating in the *māhātmya*.

The *Naimiṣa māhātmya* of the *Kūrma purāna* is the only *māhātmya* giving a clear information about the recitation of a *purāna*.

अत्र पूर्वं स भगवानृषीणां सत्रमासताम् ।

प्रोवाच वायुर्ब्रह्माण्डं पुराणं ब्रह्मभाषितम् ॥

(*Kūrma P. II. 41. 13*)

'Here in ancient times the Lord Vāyu spoke out in front of the ṛṣi-s assisting in a sacrifice the *Brahmāṇḍa purāna* narrated by Brahmā'.

When we think that, according to *Skanda purāna* (VII. 1.2.8 ff) and *Nārada purāna* (I. 109. 30 f), the *Brahmāṇḍa* was the original *purāna*, we can deduce that the *Brahmāṇḍa purāna* mentioned here refers perhaps to the whole purānic corpus.

Vague instead are the references to purānic recitation in other *māhātmya*-s. *Puṣkara māhātmya* of the *Padma purāna* says:

Naimiṣa : *Kūrma* II. 41. 1-15; cf. also *Devī Bhāgavata* I. 2. 28; *Brahmāṇḍa* I. 1. 156; *Varāha* (Venk.) 11. 109; *Vāyu* I. 1. 166; *Siva* VII. 1. 4. 52

Kurukṣetra : *Nārada* II. 64-65; *Vāmana* (Crit. Ed.) 22.23-Sā. 28. 49; *Agni* 109; *Mahābhārata* III. 81. 1-178; IX. 37. 1-43, 49; *Brahmāṇḍa* II. 13.65-69; II. 47. 1-32; *Padma* (Mor Ed.) I. 26-27.

Badarī : *Skanda* II. 37; *Nārada* II. 67; see *Bhāgavata* VII. 11.6; *Padma* VI. 2; VI. 212; *Varāha* 141; *Mahābhārata* III. 88. 19-27

Gaṅgāsāgara : *Padma* I. 39. 4-5, I. 237. 6d; VI. 121. 10; 131. 54; 204. 33; *Brahma* 174 (it refers to Gautamī Gaṅgā)

Siddhāśrama : *Varāha* 145. 79 ff (cf. *Rāmāyaṇa* I. 29)

Gaṅgādvāra : *Nārada* II. 66; *Padma* VI. 213; VI. 21; 1. 28.27ff

Prayāga : *Matsya* 102-111; *Padma* I. 39-49; *Nārada* II. 62-63; *Kūrma* I. 34-37, *Agni* 111. For a more complete number of purānic references on Prayāga see *Purāna*, Vārāṇasī, XIX. 1 (Jan., 1977), p. 100, Table No 3.

Puṣkara : *Agni* 109; *Nārada* II. 71; *Padma* I. 11f; V. 15-31; VI. 214ff; *Skanda* VI 179; see *Brahmāṇḍa* II. 63. 192

पुरा कमलजातस्य स्वपतस्तस्य कोटरे ।  
 पुष्करे यत्र संभूता देवा ऋषिगणास्तथा ॥51॥  
 एष पौष्करको नाम प्रादुर्भावो महात्मनः ।  
 पुराणं कथ्यते यत्र वेदश्रुतिसमाहितम् ॥52॥

(Padma P, V. 16. 51-52)<sup>15</sup>

'In ancient times at Puṣkara, the cavity of that sleeping lotus-born (Brahmā), where gods and plenty of ṛṣi-s were born, (took place) this appearance of the great Spirit by name 'Pauṣkara'. And there the *purāṇa* which matches the Vedic tradition is recited.'

The statement is rather general and we do not know what '*purāṇa*' (singular) is meant by *śloka* 52 c. It might be the *Padma purāṇa* or the *Ṛṣi khayḍa* itself from which this *śloka* is taken. The same *purāṇa* (V. 18.50) mentions an attendance in a sacrifice at Puṣkara by '*itihāsapurāṇajñais*' 'and a presence of Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana and his disciples at the *Saptaṛṣis*' *āśrama* (V. 19.215 cd), but this does not imply that the *purāṇa*-s were recited at Puṣkara.

*Badarīkāśrama mātmya* of the *Skanda purāṇa* (II. 3. 2. 32) informs us that Nārāyaṇāśrama was situated here. The same *purāṇa* (3.21ff) assures us that Nārada as well as the commentators of the four *Veda*-s (ib. 6. 31ff) had their residence here. Nārada is one of the purāṇic narrators who enters very often in many *purāṇa*-s. Of Veda Vyāsa it is said (ib. 6. 38) :

वेदव्यासोऽपि भगवान् यत्प्रसादादुदारधीः ।  
 पुराणसंहितार्थज्ञोऽभवदत्र न संशयः ॥

'Also the sagacious Lord Veda Vyāsa, knower of the meaning of the *purāṇa saṁhitā*, was there by his grace; there is no doubt.'

What he did there is not specified.

*Gaṅgādvāra mātmya* of the *Nārada purāṇa* (II. 65. 53ab) affirms that if one listens to a *purāṇa* at Gaṅgādvāra with faith one will reach an undecaying state. But such a claim is common to

15. The *śloka* is repeated with some variants in *Brahma P*, 213. 30-31

many other places and adds nothing to our knowledge of purāṇic recitation held there.

The case of *Kurukṣetra mähātmya* is more striking. Not only it does not mention any purāṇic recitation held at Kurukṣetra but it affirms even that the place where Śaunaka, the foremost of the ṛṣi-s, enquires about river Sarasvatī from Lomaharṣaṇa (i. e. Sūta) is not Kurukṣetra but Naimiṣa.<sup>16</sup> From *Mahābhārata* III. 81-92 (cf. also *Brahma P.* 26. 6) we learn that Vyāsa went to Kurukṣetra where he died. We are also told that the Naimiṣeya-s moved to Kurukṣetra<sup>17</sup> in pilgrimage but never a hint at a purāṇic recitation held there. This seems to imply that even for the Kurukṣetra *mähātmya*-s the *purāṇa*-s, or some of them, were recited at Naimiṣa. The only strange thing is that such a statement is found in a *mähātmya* which should have to speak of purāṇic events at Kurukṣetra not at Naimiṣa.

To complicate the picture I have to point out another fact. The four purāṇic passages containing the *anukramaṇika*-s of all the *purāṇa*-s, namely, *Agni* 272, *Matsya* 53, *Nārada* 82-109 and *Skanda* VII. 1 2. 28ff. give details of purāṇic contents, the period of history described in each *purāṇa*, revealing deity etc., but they never mention any place of purāṇic recitation. Such places had no relevance for them, it seems.

This lack of clear statements in the *mähātmya*-s about purāṇic recitation in places other than Naimiṣāraṇya seems to imply that either the local traditions had already disappeared at the time of *mähātmya*-composition or that those places mentioned in the *purāṇa*-s were in fact ideal places. We can exemplify it in the following way : if Puṣkara is the *tīrtha* where Brahmā is specially venerated, a *purāṇa* or a part thereof, where Brahmā is prevalent must be put somehow in connection with Puṣkara. Puṣkara will become the traditional place of recitation of such a *purāṇa* or part thereof. Were this true, it would confirm what has already been affirmed above, namely that the places of purāṇic recitation mentioned in the *purāṇa*-s describe moments or layers of purāṇic evolution, they are not real geographical spots. Thus, in the above mentioned

16. See *Vāmana P.*, Sā., 16. 24ff.

17. See for instance, *Brahma P.* 26. 2-17; *Mahābhārata* III, 81. 92.

example, saying that a *purāṇa* was recited at Puṣkara would first of all mean that the *purāṇa* underwent a stage in which Brahmā and the sagas about him were the prevalent elements. This, of course, does not exclude that, in fact, such a *purāṇa* or part thereof, was really recited at Puṣkara, but it does not affirm it either. So, for instance, from *Padma P. V. 1. 55* we know that once *Padma's* first *parva* was called 'Pauṣkara'. So when *Padma P. V. 16.52* affirms that a *purāṇa* was recited at Puṣkara, it may mean in fact that a part or layer of the *Padma purāṇa*, the Pauṣkara layer, was recited at Puṣkara or was somehow related to the sagas of Puṣkara.

A last question remains : if these places represent layers of purāṇic evolution how many are they ? The above given table shows ten places. Should all of them be considered purāṇic layers ? The division given in the table already indicates the most important spots which probably correspond to distinct moments of development.

The first is *Naimiṣāraṇya* accepted by ten *purāṇa-s* at least and confirmed by the *Naimiṣa* and *Kuruṣetra māhātmya-s*, as we have seen. *Naimiṣāraṇya* most probably represents the last place or the last layer in the evolution of purāṇic tradition as it appears in the purāṇic arrangement<sup>18</sup>.

Directly connected with it is *Kuruṣetra*. I do not think that *Kuruṣetra* represents really a period different from *Naimiṣāraṇya's*. Both the spots in fact host a twelve-year-long sacrifice and both at the beginning of *Kali yuga*. In both the places we meet with *Loma-harṣaṇa*, the *Sūta* and the *ṛṣi-s* led by *Śaunaka*<sup>19</sup>. Moreover, the *ṛṣi-s* at *Kuruṣetra* according to *Vāyu I. 1. 11-12* are called 'Naimiṣeya-s'<sup>20</sup> which implies that they are exactly the same persons present at *Naimiṣāraṇya*. If everything is equal at *Kuruṣetra* and at *Naimiṣa* what is the need of two distinct places ? The reason can be the following. At the beginning of the *Kali yuga* an enthusiastic movement seems to have spread all over the

18. See also *Purāṇa*, *Vārāṇasi*, XXII. 1 (Jan., 1980) pp. 33-60

19. See *Skanda P. II. 1. 1. 1* and *II. 8. 1. 8*

20. The *ṛṣi-s* who attended the *purāṇa-s* are often called *Naimiṣiya-s*. See *Kūrma P. I. 1. 2*; *Garuḍa P. 1. 5*; *Brahmāṇḍa P. I. 1. 37* etc. •

Madhyadeśa. The *ṛṣi-s* were mainly responsible for it<sup>21</sup>. As the bards used to move about singing their sagas, so the *ṛṣi-s* also moved from place to place, performing sacrifices and narrating old stories and old events putting in them a new spirit. From this great effort to keep alive the ancient tradition which included, we have to suppose, also the answers to new necessities of the Kali *yuga*, two literary and religious streams took shape, namely, the *Mahābhārata* on the one hand, linked with the war of the Paṇḍava-s and the *purāṇa-s* on the other, in relation with Naimiṣāraṇya. This at least seems to be the picture we can deduce from tradition. Whether the details of this reconstruction are true or not should not bother us much now. Here one thing only should be stressed, namely that the message underlying the purāṇic statements considered above is simply that the same persons, in the same period, did the same things but in two different places, at Kurukṣetra, traditional place of the *Mahābhārata* and Naimiṣāraṇya, traditional place of the *purāṇa-s*. The inter-relation between the *Mahābhārata* and the *purāṇa-s* is no matter to be proved here as it is well-known. In fact, the two streams, *Mahābhārata* and *purāṇa-s*, seem to be different aspects of one and the same movement with strong reciprocal influence. The *purāṇa-s* express this fact by stating that Vedavyāsa composed both the *purāṇa-s* and the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>22</sup> Naimiṣa and Kurukṣetra, then, although two different places, do not represent in the texts we are examining two layers but only one. From what has been said it seems that this layer has to be put approximately in the period of the *Mahābhārata*, i. e. at the beginning of Kali *yuga*, according to the traditional view, and that the authors who mentioned Kurukṣetra as a place of purāṇic recitation most probably wanted to mean that the *purāṇa-s* and the *Mahābhārata* are somehow connected.<sup>23</sup>

Previous to the Naimiṣa-Kurukṣetra layer there was at least another place or, better, another area where the *purāṇa-s* had been recited: the *Himalayas*. In such a ~~area~~ we find Badarīkāśrama,

21. Cf. *Brahmaṇḍa* P. II, 35.15 ff; *Vāyu* I. 61.12ff. The *ṛṣi-s* surely supported the bards, cf. *Padma* V. 1. 36. We are not interested here to know whether such a period is historical or not. It is enough to point out the opinion of the purāṇic authors.

22. Cf. *Matsya* P. 53.70

23. A certain relation between Naimiṣa and Kurukṣetra can be seen also in *Mahābhārata* IX. 36. 39ff

Siddhāśrama, Gaṅgādvāra i. e. Haridvār and most probably Prayāga. Siddhāśrama is collocated in the Nepāla *kṣetra* by the *Varāha purāṇa* (145.79ff) which seems to be the only *purāṇa* mentioning this *āśrama* even if very shortly. *Nārada purāṇa* I. 1. 24ff implies that Nārāyaṇa was living in Siddhāśrama, while for *Brahmavaivarta purāṇa* I. 1. 63 Siddhakṣetra was the place where Sauti received the *purāṇa* from Vyāsa. For our purpose here it is enough to note that this place was on the Himalayas<sup>24</sup>. 'Jahṇavitāṭe', i. e. the Gaṅgā's river bank is also another place of purāṇic recitation mentioned in the *Brahmavaivarta* and *Skanda purāṇa-s*. It can refer to any *tīrtha* on the Gaṅgā, most probably Badarīkāśrama, where Nārada recited the *Brahmavaivarta purāṇa* to Vyāsa (I. 1. 62) and where there was Nara-Nārāyaṇa's *āśrama*, famous for purāṇic recitation (*Brahma P.* 210.33). As it cannot be further specified it is better to leave the problem open. I have to point out here that Haridvār is called '*tīrtharāja*' by *Padma P.*, Uttara Khanda, 231.41. Now, such a designation, although used for many places<sup>25</sup>, is commonly applied to Prayāga<sup>26</sup> (Allahabad), one of the places of the great sacrifice (*yāga*) of Brahmā. The denomination '*tīrtharāja*', therefore, is the link for passing from Haridvār, still a Himalayan spot, to Prayāga, another spot of purāṇic recitation, which at least in *Śiva purāṇa*, is the confluence of the Yamunā and the Gaṅgā, i. e. Allahabad. Prayāga, however, is the name of many spots, besides Allahabad, and is specially frequent on the Himalayas all along the river Gaṅgā. Even if the Prayāga mentioned by the *Śiva* and the *Padma purāṇa-s* is the one at the confluence of the Yamunā and the Gaṅgā at Allahabad, we can suppose that it has been introduced in the *purāṇa-s* as a place of purāṇic recitation because of its designation as '*tīrtharāja*', which it had in common with Haridvār. Prayāga, therefore, seems to have been originally no independent place of purāṇic recitation, but a designation of a '*tīrtharāja*' most probably on the Himālayas.

- 
24. Note that the Siddhāśrama, seat of Vāmana, near Baksar (Bihar), is not mentioned in the *purāṇa-s*. See Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa* I. 29 and N. L. Dey, *The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient India*, Delhi 1971
25. *Padma P.* VI. 132.6 (Kadālamocana *tīrtha*); *Brahma P.* 42.45; 44.46 (Utkala *kṣetra*) etc.
26. Cf. *Matsya P.* 109.15; *Skanda P.* IV. 7.45; *Padma P.* VI. 23.27ff. etc.



As for *Puṣkara*, we have first to note that it is found, as a place of purāṇic recitation, only in the *Padma* and *Brahmavaivarta purāṇa-s*. Both these *purāṇa-s* were linked, in a period of their evolution, with the cult of Brahmā as is still apparent in the actual *Padma purāṇa* and in the stress given to Brahmā (who is for all purposes identified with Kṛṣṇa) in the *Brahmavaivarta*. Puṣkara is the only other place, besides Naimiṣāraṇya, for which we have a mention of purāṇic recitation in the *māhātmya-s*, as we have seen above. According to *Nārada P. II. 71.16* at Puṣkara there was a forest where Brahmā and other gods spent the best of their time (śl. 155). As Brahmā is the main narrator of the *purāṇa-s*<sup>27</sup>, we can suppose that really, in the purāṇic views, the *purāṇa-s* were narrated here in ancient times.

The *purāṇa-s*, then, by specifying the places of purāṇic recitation seem to suggest that at least three layers of tradition are available in the purāṇic narration. One stemming from Puṣkara is attached to Brahmā and is prior to Kali *yuga*. Another contains a Himalayan tradition and is linked to the ṛṣi-s living in the mountains in different *āśrama-s* the most of which was Badarikāśrama, where the most renowned ṛṣi was Nārada. A third one, at last, is linked with Naimiṣāraṇya, it goes back to the beginning of the Kali *yuga* and is in direct connection with the performance of a sacrifice and is in relation to the current which gave birth also to the *Mahābhārata*.

While suggesting the interrelation between these three sources, however, the *purāṇa-s* seem to be attentive to stress their unity also. This fundamental unity is expressed by making Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana author of the *Mahābhārata*, of the *purāṇa-s* as well as systematizer of the *Veda-s*<sup>28</sup>. So the *purāṇa-s* seem to suggest that the many and different purāṇic traditions have been unified by Vyāsa without completely suppressing them, but rather integrating them organically at Naimiṣāraṇya.

27. *Purāṇa*, Vārāṇasī, XXII, 1 (Jan., 1980), pp. 40-42.

28. Cf. *ibid.* p. 34.

BHAVIṢYA PURĀṆA AND BRĀHATSAMHITĀ ON  
TEMPLE ARCHITECTURE : A COLLATIVE STUDY

By

TAHSILDAR SINGH

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे वृहत्संहितायां भविष्यपुराणे च उपलब्धस्य मन्दिरस्थापत्यस्य तुलनात्मकमध्ययनं प्रस्तुतम् । अत्र लेखकेन प्रदर्शितं यत् वृहत्संहितायां उपलब्धं वर्णनं भविष्यपुराणस्यापेक्षया प्राचीनमस्ति । लेखकेन अस्मिन् संदर्भे मन्दिररचनासंबन्धिनः प्रत्येकस्योपलब्धस्य विषयस्य क्रमानुसारतोऽध्ययनं प्रस्तुतम् । अन्ते मन्दिरस्थापत्यसंबन्धिशब्दानां सूची प्रदत्ताऽस्ति ।]

The eighteen *Mahāpurāṇas* are somewhat like a set of eighteen volumes of an encyclopaedia of ancient Hindu orthodoxy. They comprise a large number of subjects, mapping out the complete canvas of national life of their times, which attracted the charm and interest of average person of ancient India. Besides synthesizing the Vedic lore, historical traditions and religious beliefs the *Purāṇas* afford us far greater insight into all aspects and phases of Hinduism<sup>1</sup> including even so many technical disciplines requiring specialised training and study. In their encyclopaedic nature with Vedic metaphysics, mythology and cosmogony they also comprehend the culture, history, chronology, genealogy, polity, sociology, economy, topography, geography, medicine, astronomy, astrology, metallurgy, mathematics, art, architecture, sculpture and even painting.<sup>2</sup> However, in spite of their encyclopaedic character they pertain to variant religious sects prevalent in Hindu society with the different degree of the momentum they gain at different time, e. g. *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* mainly deals with solar cult.

As regards the temple architecture of ancient India the study of some major *Purāṇas*, namely *Viṣṇudharmottara*, *Agni*, *Matsya*,

1. Winternitz, M., *A History of Indian Literature*, translated by Subhadra Jha, Vol. I, Pt. II, p. 529, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1967.
2. Agrawala, V. S., *Matsya Purāṇa—A study*, Preface, pp. XI-XII, All India Kashiraj Trust, Ramnagar, Varanasi, 1963.

*Garuḍa* and *Bhaviṣya*, is desirable rather essential, as they provide a canonical base for this aesthetic plastic art. Here, we will scrutinise the facts and principles of temple architecture incorporated in *Brāhma parva* of *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* (hereinafter as *Bhaviṣya*) while describing a temple to sun-god.<sup>3</sup> In the dialogue of Śatānika and Sumantu the latter speaks what did Nārada tell to Sāmba about the consecration of a temple to the sun-god. Amazingly enough the description of the temples given by Nārada here is almost similar to that of Varāhamihira in *Brĥatsamhitā* (hereinafter as *Brĥat*).<sup>4</sup> The thirtyone ślokas of *Brĥat* exclusive of the last conclusive one are incorporated with two or three minor changes in *Bhaviṣya* which was apparently noted by the collation of the two works.

### **Bhaviṣya Purāṇa : Its extant form, subject matter and antiquity.**

*Āpastambadharmasūtra* quotes some ślokas from a *purāṇa* named *Bhaviṣyat Purāṇa*.<sup>5</sup> It helps us to assume that in 5th-4th cent. B. C. such a *Purāṇa* was in existence. *Matsya* (53.30-31), *Vāyu* (99.292), *Agni* (272.12) and *Nārādīya* (1.100) also provide some accounts of the contents of the *Bhaviṣya* not tallying with the extant matter of the contemporaneously known *Bhaviṣya* which is divided into four *Parvans* namely *Brāhma*, *Madhyama*, *Pratisarga* and *Uttara*. It is only the *Brāhma parva* that can claim an early date<sup>6</sup>, even the *Pratisargaparva* is a modern fabrication containing a galaxy of great men of medieval and modern India. The mention of Mughal kings and even British rulers indicate such a late date as the 19th century. Thus, the heterogeneous character of the subject matter found in it makes the riddle of the chronology a thorny one. Scholars do not agree on any certain date or even any distinct set of upper and lower limits for it. So, instead of determining a specific date it seems better to treat this voluminous text as an aftermath of editing, re-editing, extraction, incorporation and compilation by several skilled literary hands at different times in

3. *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* I (*Brāhma Parva*) ch. 130, pp. 192 ff, Sri Venkatesvar Press, Bombay 1955.
4. Varāhamihira, *Brĥatsamhitā*, edited by Pt. Achyutanand Jha Sharma, ch. 56, pp. 380 ff. Chaukhambha Vidya Bhavan, Varanasi, 1959.
5. "Punaḥ sarge bījārthā bhavanti Bhaviṣyatpurāṇe", *Āpastambadharmasūtra*, II, 9.24.6, Dhūrtaswamybhāṣya, Oriental Institute Baroda, 1955.
6. Kane, P.V. *History of Dharmasāstra*, vol. V, pt. II, pp. 896-97, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1962.

the span spread over more than 2,000 years, at least, with its ends on 5th-4th cent. B. C. and 19th cent. A. D.

*Varāha Purāṇa* presents an interesting evidence about the rewriting of *Bhaviṣya*.<sup>7</sup> It exhibits that Sāmba, the son of Kṛṣṇa, renovated (*krtoṽ punarnavam*) the *Purāṇa* called *Bhaviṣyat* and established images of sun-god in four places, namely (1) to the south of Yamunā, (2) between Yamunā and Multan, called Kālapriya (3) at Mūlasthāna (modern Multan), (4) in Mathurā.<sup>8</sup> It seems apparent that even *Brāhmaṇḍa*, the earliest portion of *Bhaviṣya*, has lost its ancient originality which is mentioned in *Āpastambadharmasūtra*. As the chapter 177 of *Varāha purāṇa* is regarded as an interpolation of 16th cent. A.D.,<sup>9</sup> this brings a later evidence. It, very precisely, shows that even the *Brāhmaṇḍa* was meddled at a later date like 15th or 16th cent. A. D. Moreover, the antiquity of sun-worship in India dates back from the time of Kuṣāṇa Emperor Kanīṣka,<sup>10</sup> it became quite common in North India in 6th-7th cent. A. D. with a desirable popularity already obtained in Gupta Age<sup>11</sup> and the *Sāmba Purāṇa* (many ślokas and even chapters from which are taken in *Bhaviṣya*) was most likely composed during the time span extending from 500 to 900 A. D. It seems that the revision of *Bhaviṣya* by Sāmba also dates to the same period. P. V. Kane proclaims that the extant *Bhaviṣya* cannot be placed earlier than about the 6th or 7th century A. D. (*History of Dharma Śāstra*, vol. V, pp. 897-98).

After a comparative study, it is traced that the chapter 130 entitled "*Saptamīkalpa Sāmbopākhyāne Prāsādalaṅkāraṇavarṇanam*" is a later interpolation with a bunch of thirty ślokas, pertaining to temple architecture, from *Bṛhat*, the famous work of Varāhamihira

7. *Varāha Purāṇa*, Sri Venkateśvar Press, Bombay.
8. See also *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* I. 72. 4-7 for three primary centres of Sun-worship, namely, Indravana, Muṇḍira and Kālapriya. Detailed discussion and identification of these three places with those modern ones see *Purāṇa*, vol. VIII, No. 1, pp.38-51 (an article by Dr. V.V. Mirashi), All India Kashiraj Trust, Ramnagar, Varanasi, January, 1966.
9. Hazra, R. C., *Studies in the Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, pp. 180-81, University of Dacca, April, 1940.
10. Mirashi, V. V., *Purāṇa*, vol. VIII, No. 1, p. 50.
11. Fleet, J. F., *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol. III, p. 88 ff.

a well-known courtier and one of the nine gems of the court of Chandragupta Vikramaditya II (c. 382-413 A. D.).

**Br̥hatsamhitā: Prāsādalakṣaṇādhyāya.**

Composed by Varāhamihira the royal astrologer of Chandragupta Vikramaditya II, the *Br̥hat*, though mainly deals with mundane astrology in all its various ramifications, contains a chapter on temple architecture broadening its field of study in accordance with its nomenclature (*Br̥hat* = great, *Samhitā* = treatise). Its date of composition falls in, or even before, second quarter of 5th cent. A. D., for 451 A. D. is accepted as the date of demise of this great scholar.<sup>12</sup> So the principles of temple architecture, naturally, seem to have been propounded in the Gupta period regarded as the epoch which ushered in the erection and consecration of lithic temples characterised by a more reasoned application of structural principles.<sup>13</sup> The chapter consists of thirty-one *ślokas*.

**Consecration of Temple: a deed of religious merit.**

The performance of meritorious deeds of piety and charity (*iṣṭāpūrta*) was the main aim behind the erection and consecration of a temple by which one can enhance his fame (*yaśa*), and merit (*dharma*) and easily enter the heaven.<sup>14</sup> Throughout the ages, the Hindu temple has been built with fervour of devotion, the *bhakti*, as a work of offering and pious liberality in order to secure for the builder a place in Heaven. The Hindu temple is a *tīrtha* made by art.<sup>15</sup>

**Selection of Temple Site: surroundings and ground.**

As far as the surroundings of a temple, the *devatāyatana*, are concerned, their details are well-provided in both texts in same words.<sup>16</sup> While describing the surroundings, the socio-religio-cultural significance of Hindu temple was kept in mind; that is why cleanliness, calmness and natural beauty was highly desirable

12. Bhattacharya, B., *The N... in the court of Vikramāditya*, Vikrama vol., p. III, Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain, 1948.

13. Krishna Deva, *Temples of North India*, p. 8, National Book Trust of India, New Delhi, 1969.

14. Compare the *ślokas* 8-9 of *Bhaviṣya* with those of *Br̥hat* 1-2.

15. Kramrisch, Stella, *The Hindu Temple*, vol. I, p. 4, Calcutta, 1946.

16. Compare the *ślokas* 3-8 of *Br̥hat* and 10-15 of *Bhaviṣya*.

elements in the environment. Lakes where groups of lotuses like umbrellas ward off sun's darting beams and the waters receive access of brightness by the rows of white water-lilies pushed aside by the shoulders of swans, (*hamsas*); where birds like *hamsas*, ducks, (*kāraṇḍavas*), curlews, (*krauñcas*) and paddybirds, (*cakravākās*) utter their resounding notes and fishes repose in the shade of *nicula* trees on the brinks; places where rivers flow, having *krauñcas* for their tinkling zones, singing *hamsas* for melodious voice, the water sheet for garments and carps for belt (*mekhalā*); regions where streams have blooming trees on the margin, comparable to ear ornaments (*karṇapūras*), confluences not unlike to buttocks, sandy banks like to high-swelling bosoms and merry laughter from the *hamsas*; tracts of land in the neighbourhood of woods, rivers, rocks and cataracts; towns with pleasure-gardens: these are such places the gods at all times take delight in. They use to haunt such spots accordingly beautified either by nature or artifice (*krteṣvakraṭakeṣu ca*).<sup>17</sup> For the ground and soil of temple *Brhat* says that the several sorts of soil already indicated when treating the house building<sup>18</sup> as suited to *Brāhmaṇas* etc. are likewise recommended to persons of different classes, when they wish to erect temples. The *śloka*, (*Brhat* 56.9) in its original form, is interpolated in *Bhaviṣya* (I. 130.16) but here is committed a fault of repetition, perhaps due to carelessness. Some more methods, to test the suitability of the soil, are provided afterwards.<sup>19</sup> (It is, again, a proof of the later interpolation of this chapter).

According to *Bhaviṣya* the land, where gravels (*śarkarā*), chaffs of grains (*tuṣa*), hair (*keṣa*), bone (*asthi*), acrid substances (*kṣāra*) and charcoal (*aṅgāra*) are found, is not fit for temple-building;<sup>20</sup> on the other hand the land where all types of seeds may grow and which produces the sound of a cloud or drum by striking, should be used for the same.<sup>21</sup> The colours of the

17. The translation is helped by the translation of Dr. H. Kern entitled '*Brhatsaṁhitā or Complete System of Natural Astrology of Varāhamihira*', The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, New Series, vol. VI, pp. 36 ff., London, 1873.

18. *Brhat*, Vāstuvidyādhyaīya 53. 91-97.

19. *Bhaviṣya*, I. 130.42-47

20. *Ibid.*, I. 130.43, "Śarkarātuṣakeśāthi Kṣārāṅgāra vivarjitā".

21. *Ibid.*, "meghadundubhinirghoṣā sarvabijaparrohiṇī.

ground for *Brāhmaṇas*, *Kṣatriyas*, *Vaiśyas* and *Śūdras* should be white, red, yellow and black respectively.<sup>22</sup> To test the quality of the ground a pit should be dug and filled with the earth excavated from it. If the pit is filled completely and some earth is left over, it (ground) is of good quality (*vṛddhikarī*); if the pit is filled only, it is of ordinary quality (*samaguṇā*) and if the pit remains unfilled, it is of inferior quality (*hīnaguṇā*).<sup>23</sup> *Bṛhat* also decides the effects of the aforesaid results as bad sign (*aśubha*), indifferently good (*sama*) and good luck (*śubha*) respectively.<sup>24</sup>

### Glossary of Architectural Terms

For precise representation it seems desirable to define the Sanskrit terminology applied for description of architectural members in texts and subsequently in this article. They are alphabetically enlisted below with their possible equivalent English meaning :<sup>25</sup>

aṇḍa	literally "egg"; used to mean spire (or <i>āmalaka</i> )
asra	edge
āsri	edge, see <i>asra</i>
aṣṭāsra (śri)	octagonal
bhitti	wall
bhūmi	storey
candraśālā	a decorative arched niche
caturasra	quadrangle
dvāra	doorway
gajapṛsthākṛti	resembling the shape of elephants back; wagon-vault roof.
garbha (gṛha)	sanctum, cella
gavākṣa	a window resembling the cow's eye; generally a latticed window.
ghaṭa	vase or pot motif
jāla	latticed web (decorative device)
jālagavākṣa	latticed window; see <i>gavākṣa</i>
kalaśa	pitcher, crowning member of a spire, a half round moulding

22. *Ibid.*, 1.130.44, compare with *Bṛhat*, 53.96.

23. *Bhaviṣya*, 1. 130. 45-47.

24. *Bṛhat*, 53. 92. See also Dr. H. Kern., *op. cit.*, p. 295.

25. See Monier William's 'Sanskrit English Dictionary' Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1963.

kaṭi	literally "hip" used to mean the decorated part of wall, also called <i>janḡhā</i>
kuhara	small window
maṅgalyavihaga	auspicious bird (generally couple), a decorative cum auspicious motif.
mithuna	couple
patravallī	foliage and creeper motif of decoration.
piṇḍikā	image of a deity or a <i>liṅga</i> with pedestal.
pramatha	goblin
pratihāra	doorkeepers
pratimā	image
ṣaḍāsra	hexagonal
śākhā	door jamb
sapiṇḍikā	an image with pedestal, see <i>piṇḍikā</i>
śikhara	spire, superstructure
soḍaśāsra	sixteen-sided
śrīvṛkṣa	the sacred fig-tree, used to mean a decorative vegetal motif on door jambs.
śṛṅga	miniature <i>śikhara</i> , turret
swastika	auspicious cum decorative mark.
udumbara	doorcill
valabhī	ridge of a roof, also the name of a specific type of temples.
vṛtta	circle.

### Construction of Temples : common characteristics.

*Bhaviṣya*, being devoted to the solar cult, furnishes a brief architectural description of a temple to be consecrated to sun-god, in this chapter. But the *ślokas* (17-37) provide some common features and twenty types of temples. This is due to their direct extraction from *Bṛhat*.<sup>26</sup> Special provisions for a sun-temple (*sūryasya prāsādam*) are added further, (*ślokas* 49-63) to be discussed in later passages. Here, only general features plan and layout of a temple are narrated.

The ground, for the temple, should be divided into sixty-four square parts (*padas*). The central doorway should be erected in one of the cardinal points. The height of a temple should be double of its area or width (*vistāra*). The decorated part of the

26. Compare with *Bṛhat* 56.10-30 where no special or sectarian temple is mentioned.



wall (*kaṭi*) should be one-third of the temples whole height. Half of the ground (whole extent) should be covered by the walls (*bhittis*) all around and the remaining half should be engaged by the extent of *garbhagrha*. The width of its doorway should be one fourth of the *garbhagrha's* length while its (doorway's) height should commensurate with double of its own width or two-fourths i. e. one-half of the *garbhagrha's* length. The width of the either doorjamb should be equal to one-fourth of the height of the doorframe with the *udumbara* accordingly commensurated and the thickness of the jamb should measure one-fourth of its own width. Both of the doorjamb should consist of three,<sup>27</sup> five, seven or nine vertical (decorative) bands and at the lower end as far as the fourth part of the altitude of the doorframe should be placed the *pratikhāras* while the remaining part should be embellished with *maṅgalyavihagas*,<sup>28</sup> *śrīvṛkṣas*, *svastikas*, *ghaṭas*, *mithunas*, *patravallīs*, and *pramathas*. The image (*pratimā*) enshrined in the *garbhagrha* along with its pedestal (*piṇḍikā*) ought to have a height equal to that of the doorway, diminished by one-eighth, of which two-thirds are appropriated to the image and one-third to the pedestal.

#### Types of Temples: Elevation and Embellishment.

Both the text present twenty types of temples which are also mentioned in several other texts,<sup>29</sup> with their measurements, shape of ground, rather ground-plan, elevational details and embellishment in nutshell. The twenty kinds of temples are Meru, Mandara, Kailasa, Vimānacchanda, Nandana, Samudga, Padma, Garuḍa, Nandivardhana, Kuñjara, Guharāja, Vṛṣa, Hamsa, Sarvatobhadra, Ghaṭa, Simha, Vṛtta, Catuṣkoṇa, Ṣoḍaśāsri and Aṣṭāśri. Their brief individual description is as follows :—

27. *Brhat* uses the phrase “*tripañca-saptanavabhiḥ*” while *Bhaviṣya* uses “*nr̥pañcasaptanavabhiḥ*”. Here ‘nr̥’ has no relevance only ‘tri’ is appropriate.
28. *Brhat* applies the phrase “*śamaṅgalavihagaiḥ*” while *Bhaviṣya* uses “*śailamaṅgalavihagaḥ*”, a phrase in Nominative case which apparently seems to be wrong because other phrases are in *tr̥tīyā* i. e. Instrumental Case.
29. *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, 53.1-34, edited by V. S. Agrawala, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1966. *Matsya Purāṇa*, 260. 28-56, Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar Bhaṭṭāchārya, Calcutta, 1879.

**1. Meru**

It is thirty-two cubits (*hastas*) wide. It is sexangular, have twelve storeys (*bhūmis*) variegated windows (*vicitrakuharas*)<sup>30</sup> and four doorframes or entrances. *haviṣya* adds the height as thirty-nine *hastas* and omits the six angles.<sup>31</sup>

**2. Mandara.**

It is thirty *hastas* in extent, has ten *bhūmis* and *śikhara*.

**3. Kailasa.**

It is twenty-eight *hastas* in extent. It, too, has *śikhara* and eight *bhūmis*.

**4. Vimāna.**

It is twenty-one *hastas* in extent and contains *jālagavākṣas*.

**5. Nandana.**

It is thirty-two *hastas* in extent. Has six *bhūmis* and sixteen *aṅḍas*, spires. It seems to present the conception of *aṅgaśikharas* clustering the main *śikhara* as nucleus.

**6. Samudga.**

Its shape is round (*vr̥tta*), it has one *bhūmi* and one *śṛṅga*.

**7. Padma.**

It is eight *hastas* in extent, lotus-shaped as its nomenclature suggests. It, also, has one *bhūmi* and one *śṛṅga*.

**8-9. Garuḍa and Nandi.**

They are of same shape namely that of Garuḍa, the mythical bird. Their extent is twenty-four *hastas*. They must be adorned with seven storeys and twenty *aṅḍas*.

**10-11. Kuñjara and Guharāja.**

These are sixteen *hastas* in extent on all four sides at the bottom. The shape is similar to the back of an elephant with three *candraśālās*.

**12. Vṛṣa.**

It is twelve *hastas* in extent and circular in shape with one *śṛṅga* and one *bhūmi*.

30. *Bṛhat* uses the phrase “*vicitrakuhara*” and *Bhaviṣya* prefers to “*vividhakuhara*”.

31. See *Bhaviṣya*, 1.130.27 a, “*navatrinśaducchritameruḥ*”

**13. Haṁsa.**

It is similar to the *haṁsa* in shape with the extent of twelve *hastas*, one *śṛṅga* and one *bhūmi*.

**14. Ghaṭa.**

It is circular in shape like a *kalāśa* with the extent of eight *hastas*. It, too, consists of one *śṛṅga* and one *bhūmi*.

**15. Sarvatobhadra.**

It is twenty-six *hastas* in extension, has four entrances, many *śikharas*, many attractive *candraśālās* and five storeys.

**16. Siṁha.**

*Brhat* says *Siṁha* is covered by lions while *Bhaviṣya* says it is lion-shaped.<sup>32</sup> Other details are similar in both texts namely, the twelve angles (or arms) and the extension measuring eight *hastas*.

**17-20. Vṛtta, Catuṣkoṇa, Ṣoḍaśāśri and Aṣṭāśri.**

*Bhaviṣya* is mum about these four.<sup>33</sup> *Brhat* tells that these four are shaped according to their names i. e. they are rotunda, quadrangle, sixteen-angle and octangle respectively and are dark in the interior with five *aṅḡas* above (the superstructure).

## OTHER DETAILS.

**Altitude of a storey.**

*Brhat* says that according to *Maya* the altitude of a *bhūmi* is 108 *aṅḡulas*<sup>34</sup> while *Viśvakarma* decides it three and a half *hastas* i. e. eighty-four *aṅḡulas*. However, the able architects opine that there is no discrepancy in these statements because by adding the height of *kapotapāli* i.e. twenty four *aṅḡulas* the smaller member becomes equal to the greater one.

**Subsidiary shrines.**

*Bhaviṣya* adds some more details pertaining to a sun-temple after the general description of the types of temples.<sup>35</sup> According

32. *Brhat* uses the word '*siṁhākṛant*' and *Bhaviṣya* uses *siṁhākāro*.

33. *Bhaviṣya* omits a line here and consequently contains a *śloka* of only one line numbered as 35.

34. An *aṅḡula* is a digit, a measure equal to eight barley-corns. See *Monier Williams* "*Sanskrit-English Dictionary*".

35. *Bhaviṣya*, I. 130.48-63.

to it the entrance of sun-temple should face the east. However, if that is not possible it should certainly be the west. The bath or *snānagrha* and place for sacrificial rituals or *agnihotra* should be constructed towards the south and north of the main shrine respectively. Similarly, the shrines for Nimba and Rājñī should be erected on its right and left sides. The shrine dedicated to Śrī and Mahāśvetā should stand in front of the main sun-temple flanked by the shrines of *piṅgala* on south (right) and that of Daṇḍanāyaka on north (left). Shrines dedicated to Aśvinīkumāras, Rājā, Sroṣa, Kalmāṣa, Jāndakāmacaras or Janukāmacaras, Kubera, Revanta and Vināyaka also should be established in different directions.

### Maṇḍalas

On the north and south sides two *maṇḍalas* should be constructed for offerings. The offerings of morning should be performed in the south *maṇḍala* and that of evening in the other one i. e. north *maṇḍala*. The third *maṇḍala* should consist of the idol of sun well-established in the midst of the different auspicious sounds of musical instruments like *tūrya*, *śaṅkha*, and decorated by four auspicious *kalāśas*, the pitchers.

### Vyoma and Pustakavacanasthāna

*Bhaviṣya* provides also a shrine for Vyoma i.e. sky before the idol of the tutelary deity and a shelter for the reciter of *pustaka* i. e. *purāṇa* nearby.

Thus the main architectural matter of *Bhaviṣya* is drawn from *Brhat* and presented in a re-arranged order specifying the construction and consecration of a full-fledged and well-equipped sun-temple.

### Acknowledgement.

I am highly indebted to Shri Krishna Devaji and Prof. M. A. Dhaky who engendered in myself the love for history of Indian Art and Architecture and endowed with many useful instructions for this article.

## THE PASSAGE III, 3.2.21-33 IN BHAVIṢYA-PURĀṆA

By

CARL GUSTAV DIEHL.

अत्र लेखकेन भविष्यपुराणस्य 'ईसामसीह' संबन्धिनोऽध्याय-  
स्याध्ययनं कृतम् । लेखकेनास्याध्यायस्य केषाञ्चित् शब्दानां विवेचनं  
कृत्वा प्रतिपादितं यद् यद्यपि वर्णनं तु ईसामसीहस्यास्ति तथापि  
अत्र भारतीयधर्मस्य पारसीकधर्मस्य प्रभावः प्रत्यक्षमस्ति । लेखकेन  
अस्याध्यायस्य रचनाकालस्य विवेचनं कृत्वा प्रतिपादितं यदयमध्यायः  
अर्वाचीनो वर्तते । वास्तविकरचनाकालस्य निर्णयः विदुषामन्वेषणस्य  
विषयो वर्तते ।]

The *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* has a passage which has been considered as referring to Jesus, III, 3.2.21-33. As such it has played a role in support of the assertion of the Ahmadiyya Movement that Jesus did not die on the cross but survived and after the crucifixion travelled as far as Afghanistan and Kashmir. For basic reference see Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad: "*Jesus in India*", Rabwah, Pakistan W., 1962, originally written in Urdu, 1899.

The question arises to what extent this passage can be taken in support of a theory diverging from other, totally different, historical traditions.

The story says that once the king of the ŚAKA went to the snowy mountain and in the centre of the Hūṇa land he met a man dressed in white who claimed to be MASĪHĀ, Messiah. To the king's question who he was he answered gladly: "Know me as IŚAPUTRA and KUMĀRĪGARBHASĀMBHAVA." The man is described as PURUṢA ŚUBHA, GAURĀṅGA, ŚVETAVASTRAKA and as such evidently considered remarkable in the Hūṇa country. Points for consideration are among others that GAURĀṅGA is known as a term used for Viṣṇu and that ŚVETAVASTRAKA is a reminder of *Śvetāmbara Jinas*. Terms familiar in Indian setting are also MLECCHADHARMASYA VAKTĀRAM, a teacher of the Barbarian Dharma, and SATYAVRATĀPARĀYANAM, which may lead the reader's thoughts to *Bhagavadgītā*, IV.

Of more special significance is his presentation of himself as *ĪŚAPUTRA* and *KUMĀRĪGARBHASAMBHAVA* and also as *MASĪ-HĀ* and as having reached *MASĪHATVAM*. The last two words are seemingly related to Hebrew *MASHIAH*. *ĪŚA* is naturally connected with Sanskrit. A word of more ambiguous meaning is *ĪSAMASĪ*, by some interpreted as a name of a goddess, by others left unexplained. As a marginal remark the ending *MASĪ* may be referred to a goddess black-painted, *UNMILITA*, with black pigment *AÑJANA* removing *AJÑĀNA*, ignorance, as per the opening lines of *Uttarakanda*. The interpretation is still more complicated through the words: "I obtained her." Did he take over her power or did he conquer her?

Some of the terms of identification of the man whom the king met can reasonably be taken to originate in a Christian background and some have evidently different connotations. The term *KUMĀRĪGARBHASAMBHAVA* could refer to the virgin birth of Jesus, but the interpretation is also qualified by genuine Indian references such as the concepts of *MALA* and *ŚUBHĀŚUBHA* which appear less likely to fit in with Hebrew thinking. The same may be said about *MANASAIKYA*, if taken to mean "the identity of the human soul with the Deity" (Apte, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, s. v. Aikyam). Words of similar character are *MĀNASAM NIRMALAM KṚTVĀ* and *NAIGAMAM* as related to the *Veda*.

Another aspect on the passage is brought in by reference to Sun-worship, which is considered to lead on to Iranian Sun-cult with Indian terms, however, such as *ĪŚA* and *PŪJĀ*. See further *Das Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, von Adam Hohenberger, Introduction by Helmut Hoffmann, p. X. Dr. V. Raghavan in his article on "Worship of the Sun" in "*Śaṅkara and Śaṅmota*", 1969 makes it clear that passages of the text like "The Sun is immovable" and "dragging all beings that by nature are moving" indicate Persian and Indian concepts and not Christian. Significant is his quotation of *Rg Veda* I, 115, 1 "The Sun is the soul of all, that moves and is stationary". Concepts that apply to Indian more than to Hebrew traditions may be found in verses 30 and 31, as just mentioned *TATTVĀNĀM CALABHŪ-TĀNĀM KARṢANĀḤ* and also *ĪSAMŪRTIRHRDI PRĀPTĀ* if compared with *Bhagavadgītā* 18,61 *ĪSVARAḤ SARVABHŪTĀNĀM HRDDEŚE' RJUNA TIṢṬHĀTI BHRĀMAYAN SARVABHŪTĀNI YANTRĀRŪDHĀNI MĀYAYĀ*, "The Lord dwells in the hearts

of all beings, O Arjuna, and by His *Māyā* causes all beings to revolve as through mounted on a machine." Quoted from "The *Bhagavadgītā*", by Swami Chidbhavananda, 1965. *NITYASUDDHĀ* and *ŚIVĀM-KARĪ* also have a definite Indian tinge.

Summing up the relevances drawn from the verbal formulations of the text some Christian background seems to be evident along with Indian concepts. As a general remark in the matter of historical investigation it can be said that the presentation of the incident is neither as a whole genuinely Biblical Christian nor altogether inherently Indian because of references to Sun worship in Persian form. The composition will have to be explained under several aspects. In as much as references to the Bible from the book of *Genesis* are also found in the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, the statement made by A. Hohenberger is justified: "The author of the *Bhaviṣya* knew how to connect Biblical and Indian concepts" (Op. cit. p. 5).

The historical question as to what incident is referred to leads on to a study of the composition and style of the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* and secondly to wider issues of contemporary historical records.

Regarding composition and style of the *Purāṇa* literature authorities agree that "they are no guides in an historical point of view" to quote K. M. Banerjea, *Markanda Purana*, Calcutta, 1851, or as it is said in *L'Inde Classique*, 1947, p. 416, "Aucun de nos Purana n'est absolument authentique". More specifically W. Kirfel states in *Das Purana Pancalaksana*, Bonn 1927 "dass unsere Puranas nur Rezensionen von älteren Werker derselben Gattung sind."

The time for the composition of the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* in its final shape is to be considered as late in view of references to historical events of 17th and 18th centuries. Fixing the date in regard to part III as late as the 18th or even 19th century does not, however, solve the question of historicity of the passage in question, but it can be a very late tradition in view of the availability of Bible translations being a comparatively late phenomenon but contact with Semitic languages may indicate a much earlier date. A sample of such contact may be the transcription of "Henoch" in *Genesis* 5,21 by "Hanuka", for which see Hohenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 12. The writings of Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers would support early Semitic, Biblical and Christian presence in the Indian borderlands such as the Afghans being of Hebrew origin. A support

to the existence of Christianity as such could be had through an interpretation of *MLECCHAPŪJAKAM*, "Barbarian worshipping" or "Religion for the Barbarians", which the king established "in the rough Barbarian country".

A passage a few lines further on introducing *MAHĀMADA* may again raise the question of what actually took place. No more than Jesus can Muhammed be considered for an actual appearance in person in the borderland of India, but the incident could reasonably be located in time before the Islamic conquest of India. The attribute *PAISĀCAKṚTITATPARAH*, "foremost in devil's work", could hardly be applied to him at the time of the Moghul empire. One more point for consideration is the use of *MASĪHĀ* for the founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in the 1890tieth. If this is behind the use of the word in our passage it could perhaps explain the accusation of "literary fake" made by Theodor Aufrecht. See Hohenberger, *op. cit.*, p. VI. This is considered superficial judgement and is refuted by other scholars. In order to complete the picture, however, the note made by Mohd. Yasin in his "*Mysteries of Kashmir*" may be taken notice of: "Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, firstly printed in 1910 under orders of Maharaj of Kashmir."

The final question is if the incident related in the passage can be located in other annals. The grandson of Vikramāditya could be Skanda Gupta whose reign ended about 467. Facts concerning the king Śālivāhana seem to dissolve according to the statement made in Majumdar, Raychadhuri and Datta "*An advanced History of India*", p. 115: "This legendary hero seems to have appropriated to himself the glorious deeds of several distinguished members of a long line of emperors of Deccan."

The mentioning of the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* in the *Āpastambīya Dharmasūtra* from the 4th century B.C. supports the fact that *Purāṇas* as a literary branch have an old tradition in spite of the, in many cases, very late composition of the existing texts. It might be possible to connect with the events of our passage facts about the Nestorian mission which in the 5th and following centuries extended into the Far East. The Huns are particularly mentioned as one people where the mission and church was established. (G. Rosencrantz in *RGG* IV, 1405). Five hundred years of Śālivāhana rule could cover the time from Jesus to Muhammed, who appears



a few lines further down in the text, but it is a long time for only ten kings and seems not to be corroborated in other sources of history.

There is no question here of evaluating historical data except to the extent that contact may have taken place with Christian concepts leaving a trace in our passage. The time for it to be integrated into our text may, however, be very late or be intermingled with component parts of an earlier date leaving no room for the suspect conclusions caused by the remark in "*Mysteries of Kashmir*" by Dr. Mohd. Yasin, already referred to: "Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, firstly printed in 1910 under orders of Maharaj of Kashmir". It leaves an open question for historical research and may fit in with these notes which are presented just as questions and not as final conclusions but meant to deserve to be considered as right questions.

ABBE J. A. DUBOIS ON THE ORDER OF  
HINDU AVATĀRAS

I

Abbe Dubois, who "died in 1848 at the patriarchal age of eighty-three"<sup>1</sup> was a French Christian missionary who has left an interesting account of his travels and stay in "the Dekhan and in the Madras Presidency".<sup>2</sup> In this account he makes several references to the Avatāras of Viṣṇu,<sup>3</sup> and at one place he offers a consolidated list of the ten major Avatāras of Viṣṇu. He introduces this list with the remark that Viṣṇu :

In his quality of preserver...has found himself obliged to take different forms which the Hindus designate under the name of *Avatāras* (incarnations). Of these they count the principal ones, the nomenclature of which is contained in the following verses :

adau matsyas tataḥ kurma varahascha param tataḥ  
narasimha maha saktir vamanascha param tataḥ  
ramasch balaramascha parasustadanantaram  
kalkirupascha baudhascha hyavatara dasa smitah.<sup>4</sup>

The purpose of this note is to draw attention to a peculiarity in the enumeration of the *avatāras* in this verse.

1. Henry K. Beauchamp, ed., tr., *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies by the Abbe J. A. Dubois* (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1928), p. xxviii.
2. *Ibid.*, p. vi.
3. See *ibid.*, pp. 74, 111, 144, etc.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 616. The verse may be restored in Sanskrit as follows :

ādau matsyas tataḥ kūrmo varāhaś ca param tataḥ  
narasiṃha mahāsaktir vāmanas ca param tataḥ  
rāmaś ca balarāmaś ca paraśus tad anantaram  
kalkirūpaś ca baudhaś ca hy avatārā daśa smṛtāḥ

The metre is *anustubh* of the *śloka* variety.

There are two remarkable features of this verse cited by Dubois. One is that it does not mention Kṛṣṇa,<sup>1</sup> the other is that Buddha is mentioned *after* the Kalki incarnation. With regard to the last point the following comment by Dubois is of some interest :

If I may believe certain learned Brahmins whom I have had an opportunity of consulting on this subject, it would appear that the incarnation of Buddha has also not yet taken place.

It ought to have occurred at the beginning of the *Kali-yuga* in the country called Kikoti. This Buddha will preach pure atheism to mankind ; he will lead even the gods themselves into sin and error,.....

In the opinion of most Brahmins, however, the *Avatar* in question has already taken place. They cannot exactly fix its date, but they maintain that it is this *Avatar* which put an end to the bloody sacrifices formerly in vogue.

It is probable the same epoch witnessed the establishment of Buddhism, which prevails throughout the greater part of Asia, but has been almost entirely destroyed by the Brahmins in India. Be it as it may, it is certain that under this *Avatar* the Brahmins render no homage to Buddha or to Vishnu.<sup>2</sup>

It is difficult to say whether the impression that the incarnation of Buddha had *not* occurred was the result of the currency of the verse quoted by Dubois in certain quarters or whether the verse itself was a product of this impression.<sup>3</sup>

1. Abbe Dubois adds, after enumerating the incarnations as per the verse : "There is yet another famous incarnation, which is that of Vishnu in the person of Krishna" (*ibid.*, p. 616).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 618.
3. In his own enumeration Dubois correctly mentions Buddha before Kalki but reverses the order of Kūrma and Varāha incarnations (*ibid.*, p. 616) which is mentioned correctly in the verse he quotes.

The verse quoted by Dubois has an additional feature of interest. The usual order in which the three Rāmas are mentioned is Paraśurāma, Rāmacandra and Balarāma.<sup>1</sup> But in this verse the following order is employed : Rāmacandra, Balarāma and Paraśurāma.

### III

To conclude : it would appear that in the early part of the nineteenth century one somewhat garbled account of the Avatāras was prevalent in certain quarters in South India to which abbe Dubois and the verse cited by him testify. In this verse the incarnation of Paraśurāma was seen to follow that of Balarāma rather than precede that of Rāmachandra;<sup>2</sup> that of Buddha to follow rather than precede that of Kalki; and that of Kṛṣṇa was conspicuous by its absence from the list.

—Arvind Sharma

- 
1. See T.M.P. Mahadevan, *Outlines of Hinduism* (Bombay : Chetana Ltd., 1960), p. 36.
  2. In his own list, however, Abbe Dubois mentions the correct sequence and does not repeat the error contained in the verse on this point.

## REVIEWS

VETTAM MANI : **Puranic Encyclopaedia**. A Comprehensive Dictionary with Special Reference to the Epic and Puranic Literature. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, Patna, Varanasi, 1975. Quarto, pp. viii, 922. Price Rs. 300/-

The work aims at helping the average school teacher to become acquainted with the vast purāṇic literature in order to be able to explain allusions to it in the writings of modern Indian languages. It took several years to prepare such a voluminous work which appeared first in Malayālam and was then translated into English. The original scope of the book and the regional influences are still very strong and disturbing in many instances. There are words, for instance, which are given only in Malayālam, like *Arayannan* (= the swan, Haṁsa), *ceṁb* (=copper), *pakal* (=day) etc. The names of numbers upto ten are also given only in Malayālam. So if one wants to find words like *kālatraya*, *guṇatraya*, *tripura*, *trimūrti*, *triloka* etc. (52 names in all) one should look at *mūnnu* (=three). All these topics are, therefore, inaccessible to non-Malayālam speakers. For easy reference here we give the numbers in Malayālam as they appear in this Encyclopaedia : *rantu* = two, *mūnnu* = three, *nālu* = four, *ār* = six, *ellu* = seven, *ompatu* = nine, *pattu* = ten. The other numbers do not appear in Malayālam in the Encyclopaedia.

The reader will also be surprised to find many columns on Malayāli kings like Payyannūr, Pāttu, Cennāsu, Nambūtiri, Nāṭoṭṭip-pāṭṭu etc. or lengthy information about Kerala and nothing, or almost nothing, on Tulsīdās, Kabīr, Vṛndāvana, Mathurā etc.

The weakest point of the whole Encyclopaedia are the sources. Not infrequently, indeed, the information about a subject is given without referring to anyone of the written texts or oral traditions. That is equivalent to claiming that some information is to be accepted merely on Mani's authority; see, e. g., *Pataṅga*, *Paudanya*, *Pavanāhrada*, *Śakuna*, *Śākuntalā* etc. Sometimes, on the other hand, the given sources are not the traditional ones, i. e. neither those normally accepted by common usage nor the most comprehensive. So, for instance, under *Prayāga*, Vana Parva (*Mahābhārata*) and *Agni Purāṇa* are quoted and not the more common *Matsya* or *Padma*

*Purāṇa-s.* Among all the quotations given for the description of Śiva and Rudra not a single one is taken from *Śiva* or *Linga Purāṇas*. Under Kāśī one reads plenty of details about this town and never does one come across a quotation from *Kāśī Khaṇḍa* (*Skanda Purāṇa*), well-known as the most important purāṇic source for any description of the sacred town.

Vettam Mani is very accurate as long as he has to deal with the *Mahābhārata*, with which he seems to be really very well acquainted, but he becomes inaccurate and vague as soon as he has to quote from the *Purāṇa-s*. Some purāṇic references seem even to be fake quotations and this fact reduces considerably the scholarly value of the book. For instance :

s. v. Narmadā I it is quoted *Padma Purāṇa* ch. 13 without any further specification, which deprives the quotation of any value. The same for Narmadā III where it is given *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, only; s. v. OM, *Vāyu Purāṇa*; s. v. Pippalāda, *Padma Purāṇa* chapters 60-62 etc. all without any value. Under Tapatī we find *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* chapter 47 and *Vāyu purāṇa* chapter 21 meaningless but *Ādi* 171.6, very accurate.

The way of quoting, moreover, is not the standard one and sometimes inconsistent, e. g. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* is sometimes divided into Parts (cf. s. v. *Ṛk*, *Ripu*), sometimes into *Amśa-s* (cf. s. v. *Ṛbhu*, *Revanta* etc.)

The very meaning of the word *Purāṇa* seems not clear, in Mani's work. So, for instance, s. v. *Makarī* it is said that it is 'A river of Puranic fame', but the only given quotation is *śl.* 33, ch. 9 of *Bhisma Parva* (cf. also s. v. *Māsavratopavāsa*, *Malaya IV*, *Pāṇḍya II* etc.). *Malayaprabha* (s. v.) is described as 'A king celebrated in Puranas', but the story narrated is taken from the *Kathāsarit-sāgara*, Śaśāṅkavati ~~Lambaka~~ 5th Taraṅga.

These are only a few points of the many drawbacks of this book. Only a very hasty reader can find in it some useful information. The work indeed seems to be devoid of any value for a scholar. To raise it to a decent standard it should be completely revised.

URMILA BHAGOWALIA, **Vaisnavism and Society in Northern India, 700-1200**, New Delhi, 1980, pp. 227. Rs 80/ Sole Distributors, Intellectual Book Corner, 23 Darya Ganj, New Delhi, 2.

Books on Vaiṣṇavism are not lacking, so it is not easy to write something new on the subject. Urmila Bhagowalia analyses five centuries of Vaiṣṇavism (from 700 to 1200 A. D.) basing her statements mainly on epigraphic evidence, and trying to see the impact Vaiṣṇavism had on a society which was undergoing evolution. This gives the book its particular feature and constitutes at the same time its limits. The range of topics presented is vast and the author has to summarize many statements from previous books, specially when she adventures into describing education, literature and art in chapters V to VII. The book contains seven chapters and two appendixes and is furnished with a bibliography and 14 illustrations. Urmila Bhagowalia has put all her care in analysing the many epigraphical statements referring to the centuries she is studying. She is one of the good historians, fortunately rather numerous in this period, who build their theories on the solid basis of factual findings. The book is her thesis approved by the University of Delhi in 1972 and shows that the author had already a good grasp of the material although some contradictions (see statements on *Lakṣmī* at p. 17 and p. 23 or on *Varṇāśrama* and *Bhakti* at p. 76, the numbers of *avatāras* in *Bhāgavata purāṇa* at p. 24) and some disproportionate treatment of the topics (like hasty affirmations on the *Purāṇas* which are supposed to belong to the period under study and long discussion on *Manu Smṛti* and *Yājñavalkya* much older, cf. pp. 113 ff) are evident.

To enhance the value of the book from a scholarly point of view we would suggest, for a second edition, that at least the places and dates of books quoted in the bibliography be given and that the printing mistakes (which run to more than 360!) be corrected.

—Giorgio Bonazzoli

## ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(July-December 1980)

### **Varāha Purāṇa Work**

The programme of editing and publishing the critical editions of all the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas sponsored by the Kashiraj Trust includes also the critical edition of the *Varāha Purāṇa*.

The *Varāha Purāṇa* is an important purāṇa and it even claims itself to be the essence of all the Purāṇas (146.19). In extent it is bigger than both the Purāṇas—the *Vāmana* and the *Kūrma*—the critical edition of which has already been published by the Kashiraj Trust. The vulgate text contains 217 Adhyayas and more than 10,000 ślokas. Uptil now (Dec. 1980) we have critically edited its 148 Adhyayas which have already been printed. The work of editing and printing is progressing satisfactorily, and it is expected the whole *Varāha purāṇa* will be edited and printed at an early date. As has already been announced before the *Varāha purāṇa* will be printed in two Volumes with Critical notes and appendices etc. The critical notes are being prepared and the several important appendices have also been prepared. The Verse-index is almost ready.

### **Viṣṇusahasranāma Work**

The All-India Kashiraj Trust has undertaken the collation of the *Viṣṇusahasranāma*. MSS have been requested from several libraries both in India and abroad. The MSS are bought, taken on loan or got through photostats or microfilms. Every Sunday a special committee under the direct supervision of the Chairman works on this project. We are thankful to the *Bhārat Kalā Bhavan* of the Banaras Hindu University for rendering all its help in the project, especially by offering the photocopies of required MSS.

### **Garuḍa Purāṇa Work**

The Trust is also gathering the MSS of the *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, as already announced, for which letters have been sent to all the important Libraries of MSS in India and in the world. The work is unexpectedly more laborious than foreseen. It is really a matter worth consideration the fact that most of the important libraries possess only MSS of the *Preta Kalpa*, i. e. the second part of the



# सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जुलाई-दिसम्बर १९८०)

## वराहपुराणकार्यम्

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन अष्टादशमहापुराणानां पाठसमीक्षात्मक-संस्करणस्य योजना प्रारब्धा । अस्यां योजनायां वराहपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षित-संस्करणस्य योजनाऽपि वर्तते । वराहपुराणं विशिष्टं महापुराणं वर्तते तथा स्वयमेव महापुराणानां साररूपेण स्वीकरोति (१४६/१९) । इदं पुराणं सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन पूर्वं प्रकाशितयोः भयोर्वाग्मिनकूर्मपुराणयोरपेक्षया वृहत्तरं वर्तते । प्रचलितसंस्करणे दशसहस्रापेक्षयाऽपि अधिकाः श्लोका वर्तन्ते । अद्यावधि (दिसम्बर १९८० यावत्) अष्टचत्वारिंशदधिकशताध्यायः सम्पादिताः मुद्रिताश्च वर्तन्ते । संपादनमुद्रणकार्यं संतोषार्हं वर्तते । आशास्महे शीघ्रमेव इदं कार्यं पूर्णं भविष्यति । यथा पूर्वमेव सूचितं पाठसमीक्षणपरिशिष्टादिभिः सहितं वराहपुराणं द्वयोः खण्डयोः प्रकाशितं भविष्यति । समीक्षात्मिकाः टिप्पणयः लिख्यमानाः वर्तन्ते । बहूनि उपयोगीनि परिशिष्टानि श्लोक-सूची च प्रस्तुतानि सन्ति ।

## विष्णुसहस्रनामस्तोत्रकार्यम्

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन विष्णुसहस्रनामस्तोत्रस्य पाठसंवादकार्यम् प्रारब्धम् । देशविदेशीया अनेकाः पुस्तकालयाः हस्तलेखार्थं प्रार्थिताः सन्ति । अनेके हस्तलेखाः क्रीताः, उपयोगार्थं वा गृहीताः तेषां “फोटो” माइक्रोफिल्म प्रतयो वा गृहीताः । प्रति रविवारं न्यासाध्यक्षाणां तत्रभवतां महाराजानां निर्देशने केचिद्विद्वांसः अस्योपरि कार्यं कुर्वन्ति । वयं काशिकहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य भारतकलाभवनं प्रति कृतज्ञाः । अस्मिन् विषये भारतकलाभवनं विशेषतो हस्तलेखानां फोटोप्रतीनां निर्माणे साहाय्यं करोति ।

## गरुडपुराणकार्यम्

यथापूर्वं सूचितं न्यासः गरुडपुराणस्य हस्तलेखानामपि संग्रहं करोति । एतद्विषये देशविदेशस्य प्रमुखहस्तलेखपुस्तकालयेभ्यः पत्राणि प्रेषितानि । एतत्कार्यं पूर्वानुमानापेक्षया कठिनं यतो बहुहस्तलेखपुस्तकालयेषु केवलं गरुड-पुराणस्योत्तरार्धस्य प्रेतकल्पस्यैव हस्तलेखाः सन्ति । यद्यपि तेषु गरुडपुराणस्य

Garuḍa purāṇa, and do not have any MSS of the first part, although many times the name of the manuscript is 'Garuḍa Purāṇa.' The search of MSS continues. Meanwhile the collation of the available MSS has been started. At present 100 adhyāyas have been collated.

### Purāṇa Goṣṭhī

The Purāṇa Goṣṭhī was held on the 26th of July, 1980 at the Shivala Palace of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. Before the Purāṇa Goṣṭhī scholars heard the Veda-recitation in the Śiva Temple and thereafter Vasanta Pūjā was performed in Vārādārī in which 16 Vedic Scholars recited the Vedas and Dakṣiṇā was given to them by Maharaja Kumar Anant Narain Singh. After the Vedic Vasanta Pūjā the Purāṇa Goṣṭhī started under the Chairmanship of Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. Pt. Hiramani Mishra of the Purāṇa Department recited the Maṅgalā Caraṇa, and Vyāsa Vandanā. The Vyāsa Pūrṇimā issue of the Bulletin was presented to the Chairman by the editor. Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai placed the work report of the Purana Deptt. Dr. Lalanji Gopal, Head of Deptt. of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, B.H.U. informed about the progress of the Purāṇa work in the Banaras Hindu University and Dr. Vagish Shastri, Director of Research in Sanskrit Viśvavidyālaya gave the details of Puranic Studies in Sanskrit University. Prof. Raghunath Giri of Kashi Vidyapith informed the Scholars about the Puranic Work in that University. Prof. Bādari Nath Shukla, Vice Chancellor of Sampurnanand Sanskrit Viśvavidyālaya expressed his views about the project. Prof. Baldev Upadhyaya emphasised the importance of the puranic work. H. H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh thanked the scholars for their co-cooperation and attendance. Prasāda was distributed and tea was served at the end.

### Tripurāṇa Pāṭha

The Tripura Rāhasya was recited in the Bālā Tripurasundarī Temple at Rāmnagar from Asāḍha Pratipad to Śukla 9 (July 13-22 1980). The reciter was Śrī Kāmadeva Jha.

The Viṣṇu Purāṇa was recited in the Padmanābha Temple of Rāmnagar from Kārtika Śukla 9 till Kārtika Pūrṇimā (November 16-22, 1980). The reciter was Śrī Rāmji Mishra.

नाम एव लिखितं वर्तते । किन्तु तत्र पूर्वभागस्य ग्रन्थो न वर्तते । हस्तलेखानामन्वेषणं क्रियमाणं वर्तते । हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवादकार्यं प्रारब्धं वर्तते । संप्रति रामनगरदुर्गस्य एकस्य हस्तलेखस्य १०० अध्यायानां पाठसंवादः कृतो वर्तते ।

### पुराणगोष्ठी

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य शिवालाभवने २६ जुलाई १९८० दिनाङ्के पुराणगोष्ठी सम्पन्ना । पूर्वं विद्वांसः शिवमन्दिरे वेदपारायणस्य श्रवणं कृतवन्तः । तदनन्तरं वारादरीप्राङ्गणे वसन्तपूजा संपन्ना । यस्यां षोडशवैदिकविद्वांसो वेदपारायणं कृतवन्तस्तेभ्यो महाराजकुमारेण अनन्तनारायणसिंहेन दक्षिणा प्रदत्ता । वैदिकवसन्तपूजानन्तरं तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशानां महाराजानां डॉ० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयानामध्यक्षतायां पुराणगोष्ठी प्रारब्धा । पुराणविभागस्य श्रीहीरामणिमिश्रः मङ्गलाचरणं व्यासवन्दनां च कृतवान् । तदनन्तरं सम्पादकेन 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः न्यासाध्यक्षेभ्यः काशिनरेशेभ्यः समर्पितम् । पुराणविभागस्य कार्यविवरणं विदुषां पुरतः डॉ० गंगासागररायमहोदयेन प्रस्तुतम् । काशिकहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालये क्रियमाणस्य पुराणसम्बन्धिकार्यस्य विवरणं प्रो० लल्लनजीगोपालमहोदयः प्रदत्तवान् । सम्पूर्णानन्दसं० विश्वविद्यालयस्य कार्यस्य विवरणं तत्रत्योऽनुसंधाननिदेशको डॉ० वागीशशास्त्री महोदयः अददात् । काशीविद्यापीठस्य कार्यस्य विवरणं डॉ० रघुनाथगिरिमहोदयः प्रदत्तवान् । संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य कुलपतिः पं० बदरीनाथशुक्लमहोदयः एतद्विषये स्वमन्तव्यान् कथयामास । पं० बलदेव उपाध्यायमहोदयः पौराणिकाध्ययनस्य महत्त्वस्य प्रतिपादनं चकार । काशिनरेशैः विदुषां सहयोगाय उपस्थित्यर्थं च धन्यवादा वितरिताः । अन्ते प्रसादवितरणं जातम् अल्पाहारश्च प्रदत्तः ।

### पुराणपाठः प्रवृत्तः च

रामनगरस्थे बालात्रिपुरसुन्दरीमन्दिरे, आषाढमासस्य शुक्लपक्षस्य प्रतिपत्तिथिमारभ्य नवमीं तिथिं यावत् (जुलाई १३-२१) त्रिपुरारहस्यस्य पाठो जातः । श्रीकामदेवज्ञानमहोदयेन पाठः कृतः ।

रामनगरस्थे पद्मनाभमन्दिरे कार्तिकमासस्य नवमीतिथिमारभ्य पूर्णिमातिथिं यावत् (नवम्बर १६-२२) विष्णुपुराणस्य पाठः श्रीरामजीमिश्रेण कृतः ।

### Veda Pārāyaṇa

The text of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda, Taittirīya Saṁhitā, with its parts i. e., *Pada, Krama* and *Jaṭā*, was recited from memory by Śrī Añjaneya Ghanpāṭī, while the Śrotā was Śrī Ganesa Bhatta. The recitation was held from 29 June, 1980 to 15 August, 1980 in the Prabhu Nārāyaṇeśvara Temple of the Śivālā Palace in Vārāṇasī. At the completion of the scheduled Pārāyaṇa the usual Dakṣiṇā was given to the Pārāyaṇa Kartā and the Śrotā.

### Scholars and Distinguished Persons who Visited the Purāṇa Department

1. S. Arjuna Rāja and K. T. Ramachandran, Director, Southern Asbesto Cement and Co., Madras, on 28-7-1980. They wrote in the visitors book : 'It is a unique work undertaken by All-India Kashiraj Trust which will go a long way in keeping up the ancient Indian Culture especially when the culture is fast fading out of the external influences. The architect of this divine work H. H. Shri Kashi Maharaja is responsible for implementing the great works started by His Ancestors. His absolute devotion, utmost sincerity and perseverance to this great cause is really commendable. It will indeed be useful to millions of people in India and abroad who really love the great motherland and its divine culture'.

2. Dr. Charles Malamoud—Professor in the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sorbonne, Paris—on 24.9.1980.

"Even a very short visit could persuade me that the Purāṇa Department is doing a most useful and very difficult work. A precious part of the Indian cultural treasury is being preserved and even enriched thanks to the generosity of the Maharaja and the endeavour of the scholars in Ramnagar. I will all the best to this institution."

3. Dr. H. V. Stietencron, Professor in the University of Tubingen (W. Germany)—on 3-10-1983.

'This is my second visit to the Purāṇa Department which continues to produce very good work in the important field of Purāṇic studies. To my great satisfaction I heard that the critical edition of Varāha Purāṇa will appear soon.'

4. Dr. B. Dagens, Director of the French Institute of Indology, Pondicherry—on 4-10-1983,

### वेदपारायणम्

कृष्णयजुर्वेदीयतैत्तिरीयसंहितायाः क्रमपदजटादिपाठैः सह पारायणं २९ जून १९८० दिनाङ्कमारभ्य १५ अगस्त १९८० दिनांकं यावत् शिवाला-भवनस्थिते प्रभुनारायणेश्वरमन्दिरे श्रीआञ्जनेयघनपाठिमहोदयेन कृतम् । श्रीगणेशभट्ट महोदयः श्रोता आसीत् । पारायणसमाप्तौ पाठकर्त्रे श्रोत्रे च नियमिता दक्षिणा प्रदत्ता ।

### पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

१. एस० ए० राजा तथा के० टी० रामचन्द्रन्—साउदर्न एसबेस्टो सीमेण्ट क० मद्रास, इत्यस्य निदेशकौ (८-७-१९८० दिनांके) ताभ्यां दर्शकपुस्तिकायां लिखितम्—सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन प्रारब्धम् एतद् महत्कार्यं बाह्य-प्रभावैः सत्वरं नश्यमानायाः भारतीयसंस्कृतेः संरक्षणार्थं अत्युपकारी भविष्यति । अस्य दिव्यकार्यस्य शिल्पी काशिराजमहाराजः स्वपूर्वजैः प्रारब्धानां महत्कार्याणां पूरणार्थं तत्परो वर्तते । अस्मिन् महति कार्ये तस्य पूर्णा श्रद्धा, अतोव जागरूकता सहिष्णुता च वस्तुतः प्रशंसनीया सन्ति । इदं सहस्राणां भारतीयानां वैदेशिकानां च कृते ये मातृभूमिं अस्या दैवीं संस्कृतिं च प्रेम्णा श्रद्धया च पश्यन्ति उपकारि भविष्यति ।

२. डॉ० चार्ल्समालमाउड-इकोलेडेस हाउट्स इट्रडेस, सोरबोने, पेरिस इत्यत्रत्यः प्राध्यापकः (२४-९-१९८० दिनांके)—

अतिसंक्षिप्ता यात्राऽपि मां अनुभवं प्रददाति यत् पुराणविभागः अत्यन्तो-पयोगि तथा अतिकठिनं कार्यं करोति । भारतीयसांस्कृतिकरत्नकोषस्य एको महत्त्वपूर्णभागो संरक्ष्यमाणोऽस्ति । काशिराजमहाराजाय औदार्यार्थं विद्वद्भ्यः प्रयत्नार्थं पुष्कलधन्यवादाः । अस्य संस्थानस्य मङ्गलार्थं कामये ।

३. डा० एस० वी० स्टेटेनक्रोन—टुविन्जेन (पश्चिमजर्मनी) विश्वविद्यालये प्राध्यापकः (३-१०-१९८० दिनांके)—

पुराणविभागे एषा मम द्वितीया यात्रा । पौस्तिकाध्ययनस्य महत्त्वपूर्णं विषये पुराणविभागोऽतिसुन्दरं कार्यं करोति । वराहपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षित-संस्करणं शीघ्रमेव प्रकाशितं भविष्यतीति श्रुत्वाऽतीव तृप्तोऽस्मि ।

४. डा० वी० डागेन्स—पाण्डिचेरीस्थितस्य फ्रेञ्चसंस्थानस्य निदेशकः (४-१०-१९८० दिनांके)—

‘This is my first visit to the Purāṇa Department and I have been very much impressed by the care taken to collect as much material as possible for the sake of the purāṇic studies.’

5. Srimati Bhagavati Gupta, teaching in Citrakalā Vibhāg of the Kanyā Gurukul Mahāvidyālaya, Dehradun on 29-11-1980.

### Rāsa Līlā

The Rāsa Līlā, which is performed under the auspices of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, in the Prasiddha Garden of Ramnagar, took place from 13 to 28 August 1980. As usual many devotees and enthusiastic people attended to the religious performance and admired the skill of the actors who come from Mathurā-Vrindāvan for the purpose. His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhūti Narain Singh also attended to the performance daily.

### Rāma Līlā

The Rāma Līlā, which is celebrated under the auspices of the All-India Kashiraj Trust with the financial help of the Government of India, took place from Anant Caturdaśī (23 Sept., 1980) to Āśvina Pūrṇimā (23 October, 1980). This performance, which was initiated by Tulsidas in the XVII cent. A.D., according to tradition, is both an occasion of manifesting publicly one's own faith and devotion and a chance of meeting persons and link with a human and social relationship. The hundred of sādhus who attend daily to the līlās increase the religious atmosphere of the inacting. They remain in Rāmnagar for a full month during which they get a free ration (Baṇḍāra) of food and constitute a continuous attraction for all the people. His Highness, Dr. Vibhūti Narain Singh and the Mahārāja Kumār Śri Anant Narain Singh attended every day to the performance from their elephants. Other high rank invitees also watched the inacting of the deeds of Rāma from their elephants provided to them by the All-India Kashiraj Trust for the occasion. The crowd, which is always very numerous, increases in number certain days when more meaningful līlās are performed. On the last day, owing to commotion produced in the huge number of people attending to the morning *ārati*, some persons were slightly injured. At the end of the month the *svaṛūḥas* (performers) were received, as it is customary, by H. H. the Mahārāja of Benares, who gave them due respect and food along with the Dakṣiṇā.

पुराणविभागे मम प्रथमा यात्रा । पौराणिकाध्ययनार्थं यथासंभवं साहित्यस्य संग्रहार्थं प्रयासेन अतीवप्रभावितोऽस्मि ।

५. श्रीमती भगवतीगुप्ता—देहरादूननगरस्थे कन्यागुरुकुलमहाविद्यालये चित्रकलाविभागे अध्यापिका (२९-११-८० दिनांके) ।

### रासलीला

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य संरक्षणे रामनगरस्थे प्रसिद्धोद्याने संपाद्यमाना रासलीला १३ अगस्तदिनाङ्कमारभ्य २८ अगस्त १९८० दिनाङ्कं यावत् संपन्ना । यथापूर्वं बहवः भक्ता दर्शकाश्च इदं धार्मिकप्रदर्शनं दृष्टवन्तः मथुरावृन्दावनतः आगतानां कलाकाराणां कौशलं च प्रशंसितवन्तः । तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशा महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयाः प्रतिदिनं रासलीलां दृष्टवन्तः ।

### रामलीला

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य संरक्षणे भारतीयशासनस्यार्थिकसाहाय्येन संपाद्यमाना रामलीला अनन्तचतुर्दशीदिनमारभ्य (२३ सितम्बर १९८० दिनाङ्कं) आश्विनपूर्णिमापर्यन्तं (२३ अक्टूबर १९८० दिनाङ्कं यावत्) संपन्ना । परम्परानुसारतो एषा रामलीलापरम्परा गोस्वामितुलसीदासेन ख्रिस्तीयसंवत्सरस्य सप्तदशशताब्द्यां प्रचारिता । एषा रामलीला भक्तिभावनाया व्यञ्जिका मनुष्याणां मेलनेन सामाजिकमानवीयसंबन्धस्य च संस्थापिका अस्ति । शतशः साधवो ये प्रतिदिनं रामलीलां पश्यन्ति लीलाया धार्मिकं रूपं विवर्धयन्ति । एते साधवो मासं यावत् रामनगरे तिष्ठन्ति तेभ्यः प्रतिदिनं भोजनसामग्री निःशुल्कं प्रदीयते । ते रामलीलादर्शकाणां कृते अतीवाकर्षकाः सन्ति । तत्र भवन्तो महाराजाः काशिनरेशा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवाः चिरञ्जीवी महाराजकुमारः अनन्तनारायणसिंहश्च प्रातःकाले गजयोः आरुह्य रामलीलां दृष्टवन्तः । अन्ये विशिष्टा जना अपि सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन एतदर्थं व्यवस्थापितेषु हस्तिषु आरुह्य रामलीलां दृष्टवन्तः । दर्शकाणां विपुला संख्या केषुचिद्विशिष्टलीलादिनेषु अतीव वृद्धिं याति । अन्तिमदिने प्रातःकालीने 'आरती'समये विपुलसंख्याकदर्शकाणां समूहेन केचिज्जना किञ्चिदाहता जाताः । अन्तिमदिने रामलीलायाः पात्राणि तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः भोजनदक्षिणादिभिः यथानियमं सत्कृताः ।

### Parties held at Rāmnagar Fort

1. On 21.11.1980 a group of delegates who had attended the Congress on Freedom of Religion held at the Banaras Hindu University came to see the Chairman H. H. the Mahārāja Kashinaresh who is also the protector and sustainer of Dharma. His Highness received the delegates led by the Vice-Chancellor of the B.H.U. Some of the delegates had a ride on the elephant and all were offered tea and snack. Prominent among the delegates were Justice Beg, ex-Chief Judge Supreme Court, and Justice Mookerji, ex-Judge of Calcutta High Court.

2. On 15. 12. 1980 the Museum Association Representatives, at the end of their Congress held in the Banaras Hindu University were invited by H. H. Dr. Vibhūti Narain Singh to visit the Museum in the Fort, where are kept old palanquins, garments and arms of the Kashiraj of the last 250 years. The delegates appreciated very much the objects displayed in the Museum. The members of the Purāṇa Department were also present at the party offered to the Delegates and showed all the publications of the Trust appeared in the past 22 years.

3. On 28. 12. 1980 the English Professors Conference was concluded at the Fort, where all the 400 delegates came to meet H. H. the Mahārāja of Banaras and to see the Museum. In that occasion the members of the Purāṇa Deptt. prepared a stall of the publications of the Trust. The delegates present at the tea party appreciated the work done by the Purāṇa Department.

### Government of India Grant to the Trust

The Trust is thankful to the Ministry of Education, Government of India, for giving a grant of 19,000 rupees towards the publication of the Purāṇas. The Trust expresses its gratitude to Dr. Kapila Vatsyayana, Dr. R. K. Sharma and Dr. C. R. Swaminathan for their continue cooperation and help.

### The Chairman becomes grand-father

All the members of the All-India Kashiraj Trust are happy to congratulate their Chairman Dr. Vibhūti Narain Singh on the happy occasion of the birth of His first grand-daughter. The event took place in the Fort of Rāmnagar on 19 Nov, 1980. We heartly wish long and happy years to the whole family of Kashinaresh.



**रामनगरदुर्ग संपन्नाः गोष्ठयः**

१—काशिकहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालये 'धार्मिकस्वतन्त्रता' विषये आयोजितायां सभायां सम्मिलिताः प्रतिनिधयः २१-११-८० दिनाङ्के तत्रभवतः काशिनरेशान् डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयान् ये धर्मस्य संरक्षका सन्ति, द्रष्टुं दुर्गे आगताः। काशिकहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य कुलपतेः अध्यक्षतायाम् आगताः सर्वे प्रतिनिधयः तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः सत्कृताः। केचित्प्रतिनिधयः हस्त्यारोहणं कृतवन्तः। तैभ्यः चायपानस्य अल्पहारस्य च व्यवस्था आसीत्। आगतेषु सर्वोच्चन्यायालयस्य अवकाशप्राप्तो प्रधानन्यायाधीशः वेगमहोदयः, कलकत्ता उच्चन्यायालयस्य लब्धावकाशः प्रधानन्यायाधीशः श्रीमुखर्जीमहोदयश्च प्रमुखौ आस्ताम्।

२—१५-१२-८० दिनाङ्के संग्रहालयसमितेः प्रतिनिधयः ये हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालये तेषां सम्मेलने आगता आसन् दुर्गस्य संग्रहालयं द्रष्टुं तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः आहूताः। दुर्गस्य संग्रहालये विगतानां २५० वर्षाणां काशिराज्यस्य शिल्पाः, शस्त्राणि वस्त्राणि च सुरक्षितानि सन्ति। संग्रहालये प्रदर्शितानां वस्तूनां प्रतिनिधयो भूरिशः प्रशंसनं कृतवन्तः। प्रतिनिधिभ्यः अल्पाहारस्यापि व्यवस्था आसीत् यस्यां पुराणविभागस्य विद्वांसोऽपि उपस्थिता आसन्। न्यासस्य विगतद्वाविंशवर्षाणां सर्वाणि प्रकाशनानि आगतविद्वद्भ्यः प्रदर्शितानि।

३—आङ्गलभाषाप्रध्यापकानां सम्मेलनस्य सर्वे ४०० प्रतिनिधयः २८-१२-८० दिनाङ्के तत्रभवतः काशिनरेशान् डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयान् संग्रहालयं च द्रष्टुं दुर्गे आगताः। अस्मिन् अवसरे पुराणविभागस्य विद्वांसः न्यासस्य प्रकाशनानां प्रदर्शनं कृतवन्तः। अल्पाहारे उपस्थिताः प्रतिनिधयः पुराणविभागस्य कार्यस्य प्रशंसनं कृतवन्तः।

**न्यासाय भारतशासनस्य अनुदानम्—**

न्यासः पुराणानां प्रकाशनार्थं १९००० रूप्यकाणां अनुदानार्थं भारतशासनस्य शिक्षामन्त्रालयं प्रति धन्यवादज्ञापनं करोति। न्यासः डा० कपिला वात्स्यायनमहोदयां प्रति, डा० रामकरणशर्ममहोदयं प्रति तथा डा० सी. आर. स्वामीनाथन्महोदयं प्रति तेषां सततसहयोगेन न्यासायार्थं च कृतज्ञतां ज्ञापयति।

**न्यासाध्यक्षः मातामहाः संजाताः**

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य सर्वे विद्वांसः तत्रभवद्भ्यो काशिनरेशेभ्यो महाराजेभ्यो डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवतेषां मध्यमदौहित्री प्राप्यवसरे धन्यवादान् वितरन्ति। महाराजानां दौहित्र्या जन्म दुर्गे विगते नवम्बरमास्य १९ दिनाङ्के अभूत्। वयं काशिनरेशानां समस्तपरिवारं प्रति सुखददीर्घजीवनस्य कामनां कुर्मः।

## ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

**Mahārāja Prabhu Narain Singh Physical Cultural Trust**

On the occasion of the birth day of the Mahārāja Kumār Anant Narain Singh, the usual sport competitions took place in the grounds adjacent to the Fort. The students of the Vidyāmandir Pāṭhaśālā which is sheltered in the Fort itself and other schools of Rāmnaḡar took part in the competitions. All the boys who belong to junior and primary schools, participated with great enthusiasm and competitive spirit. The Mahārāja Kumār Śrī Anant Narain Singh was also active in the competitions.

Judges of the sports were S. C. Datta, S. L. Dar, Ashok Kumar Singh. The prizes were distributed by the Mahārāja Kumārīs. The staff of Mahārāja Balyant Singh Degree College, Gaṅgāpur, with their principal were present on the occasion and helped in organizing the sports. This year a volley-ball tournament was introduced for the first time. The teams from Banaras Hindu University, the A.T. Senior Team, Mirzapur and P.N. College took part in the tournament. The team from Mirzapur got the first prize.

## MAHARAJA BANARAS VIDYAMANDIR TRUST

**Vedic Bālaka Vasant Pūjā**

On 12.12.1980 in the morning a Vedic Bālaka Vasant Pūjā was performed by sixteen Vedic Students under 15 years of age from Vārāṇasī. The Pūjā was performed in the Devi Mandir which is situated inside the Fort of Rāmnaḡar. The boys recited by heart the Vedic mantras which had to be recited during the ceremony. After the Pūjā a Dakṣiṇā was given to them and the usual meal was provided to them.

**Painting Competitions**

1. On 13-12-1980 a painting on spot competition was organized among the students of the local schools for art painting. Not less than three hundred children took part in the competition. They pacifically invaded the premises of the Vidyāmandir Pāṭhaśālā and applied themselves very attentively to their work. Prizes were distributed among them at the end of the competition.

2. The local potter artists depicted the wall paintings on the external walls of the Museum in the Fort, Rāmnaḡar on 13-12-1980. Seven of them took their inspiration from the Rāmāyaṇa, while two took it from the Mahābhārata and the Bhagavadgītā. One depicted Gaurī in the form of Māyā in the lap of Śiva.

## सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

### १. महाराज प्रभुनारायणसिंह फिजिकल कलचरल ट्रस्ट

चिरंजीविनो महाराजकुमारस्य श्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंहस्य जन्मदिवसा-  
वसरे पूर्ववत् दुर्गस्य समीपवर्तिप्राङ्गणे क्रीडाप्रतियोगिता संपन्ना । प्रतियोगितायां  
दुर्गस्थिताया विद्यामन्दिरपाठशालायाः रामनगरस्थानामन्यासां पाठशालानां  
च छात्राः सम्मिलिता आसन् । सर्वे प्रतियोगिनः छात्रा ये प्राथमिकलघुमाध्यमिक-  
पाठशालानामासन् अत्युत्साहेन प्रतियोगितायां सम्मिलिता आसन् । महाराज-  
कुमारः श्रीअन्तनारायणसिंहोऽपि प्रतियोगितायामत्युत्साहेन समाविष्ट आसीत् ।  
निर्णायकेषु श्री एस. सी. दत्तमहोदयः, श्री एस. एल. दरमहोदयः, श्रीअशोकः-  
कुमारसिंहकहोदयश्च आसन् । महाराजकुमार्यः पुरस्कारवितरणम् अकुर्वन् ।  
अस्मिन् वर्षे 'बालीबाल' क्रीडाप्रतियोगिताऽपि आयोजिता आसीत् । काशिक-  
हिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य, ए. टी. सीनियरटीम मिर्जापुर इत्यस्य, प्रभुनारायण-  
राजकीय इण्टरकालेज रामनगर इत्यस्य प्रतियोगिनः अस्यां प्रतियोगितायां  
सम्मिलिता आसन् ।

### महाराज बनारस विद्यामन्दिरन्यासः

#### १—वैदिकबालकवसन्तपूजा

१२-१२-८० दिनाङ्के वाराणसेयैः ऊनपञ्चदशवर्षीयैः षोडशवैदिकबालकैः  
वैदिकवसन्तपूजा सम्पादिता । एषा वैदिकबालकवसन्तपूजा दुर्गस्थे देवीमन्दिरे  
संपन्ना । बालकैः स्मृत्याधारेण वेदपाठः कृतः । वसन्तपूजानन्तरं तेभ्यो दक्षिणा  
भोजनं च प्रदत्तम् ।

#### चित्रकला प्रतियोगिता

१. १३-१२-८० दिनाङ्के स्थानिकपाठशालानां विद्यार्थिनां कृते तत्काल-  
चित्रकलायाः प्रतियोगिता संपन्ना । प्रतियोगितायां त्रिशतादधिकाः छात्राः  
समाविष्टा आसन् । सर्वे छात्रा अतीवोत्साहेन प्रतियोगितायां सम्मिलिता आसन् ।  
प्रतियोगितासमाप्तौ सफलछात्रेभ्यः पुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः ।

२. १३-१२-८० दिनाङ्के स्थानिककुम्भकाराः विद्यामन्दिरसंग्रहालयस्य  
बाह्यभित्तिषु चित्राङ्कनं चक्रुः । सप्त कुम्भकारा रामायणस्य आधारेण चित्र-  
निर्माणं चक्रुः । द्वौ च महाभारतस्याधारेण भृगवद्गीतायाश्चाधारेण चित्रनिर्माणं  
कृतवन्तौ । एकः कुम्भकारः शिवस्याङ्के गौरीं रचयामास । प्रथमपुरस्कारः

Rs. 101/- were given to the winner, Rs. 75/- to the second, Rs. 65/- to the third. Consolation prizes of Rs. 50/- were given to each one of the other artists.

3. On the same date a competition of wall-painting was organized also for the students of the Fine Art Department of the Banaras Hindu University. The paintings were mostly on the line of the modern trends of art and the subjects were taken both from the traditional stories and from modern daily life.

Rs. 51/- were given as first prize, Rs. 45/- as second and Rs. 20/- each to all the other artists.

The Head of Deptt. of Fine Arts, B. H. U., Vārāṇasī, judged the paintings.

### MAHĀRĀJA KASHINARESH DHARMAKĀRYA NIDHI

The Trust gives donations to several religious and cultural institutions such as the Viśva Hindu Sammelan, Gīrvāṇavāgvardhanīśabhā of Vārāṇasī. The Trust gives medals and prizes in the Banaras Hindu University, Sāmpūrṇānanda Sanskrit Viśvavidyālaya, Kashinaresh Degree College (Gyānpur) and various other Colleges. The Trust is also running the following educational institutions.

#### 1. Mahārāṇī Rāmratna Kumvari Saṅskṛta Pāṭhaśālā—Rāmnagar

It was in 1923 A. D. that the then Mahārāṇī started this Pāṭhaśālā which is in its 58th year now. The teachings at present go upto the high secondary (Uttara Madhyama) examination of Sāmpūrṇānanda Saṅskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, Vārāṇasī.

#### 2. Mahārāja Balvant Singh Degree College—Gaṅgāpur

The college is in its 9th year and is established in the place where the founder of the actual Kashirāj was born. The college has eleven class-rooms and a hall and imparts education in Arts upto the Degree examinations of the University of Gorakhpur. In the 1980-81 session 130 students are admitted in B. A. Part I and 75 in B. A. Part II.

#### 3. Rājā Mānasārām Law College, Rājātālāb

This College also is affiliated to the Gorakhpur University and has 9 classrooms and a hall. It has also a large library and play-grounds. In 1980-81 session 160 students are admitted in LL. B. Part I, 92 in Part II and 86 in Part III. The members of the staff are five,

१०१) रुप्यकाणां, द्वितीयपुरस्कारः ७५) रुप्यकाणां, तृतीयपुरस्कारश्च ६५) रुप्यकाणामासीत् । शेषेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यः ५०) रुप्यकाणां पुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः ।

३. तस्मिन्नेव दिने काशिकहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य ललितकलाविभागस्य छात्राणां कृते भित्तिचित्रप्रतियोगिता आयोजिता आसीत् । प्रायशः चित्राङ्कनम् आधुनिकचित्रपद्धत्याधारेण जातम् । केचन प्राचीनविषयमङ्गीचक्रुः केचन च वर्तमानजीवनस्याधारेण चित्राङ्कनं चक्रुः ।

५१) रुप्यकाणां प्रथमपुरस्कारः प्रदत्तः । ४५) रुप्यकाणां द्वितीयपुरस्कारो वितरितः । शेषेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यः कलाकारेभ्यः २०) रुप्यकाणां पुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः ।

काशिकहिन्दुविश्वविद्यालयस्य ललितचित्रकलाविभागस्य अध्यक्षो निर्णायक आसीत् ।

### महाराजकाशिराजधर्मकार्यनिधिः

एष न्यासः विश्वहिन्दुधर्मसम्मेलन-गीर्वाणवाग्बन्धिनीसभादिविधधार्मिक-सांस्कृतिकसंस्थानेभ्यः आर्थिकसाहाय्यं प्रददाति । एष न्यासः काशिकहिन्दु-विश्वविद्यालये, संपूर्णानन्दसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालये, काशिनरेशमहाविद्यालये (ज्ञानपुरस्थे) अन्येषु च विद्यालयेषु पदकानि प्रददाति । एष न्यास अधोनिर्दिष्टानां शिक्षासंस्थानानां संचालनमपि करोति ।

### महारानी रामरत्नकुंवरि संस्कृत पाठशाला, रामनगर

तत्कालीनया महाराज्ञ्या एषा पाठशाला १९२३ ईसवीये वर्षे स्थापिता आसीत् । एषा पाठशाला संप्रति अष्टपञ्चाशत्तमे वर्षे वर्तते । संप्रति संपूर्णानन्द-संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य उत्तरमध्येमाकक्षापर्यन्तमध्यापनं भवति ।

### २. महाराजा बलवन्तसिंह महाविद्यालय, गङ्गापुर

एष महाविद्यालयः स्वस्थापनाया नवमे वर्षे वर्तते । एष महाविद्यालयः वर्तमानकाशिराज्यस्य संस्थापकस्य महाराजस्य बलवन्तसिंहस्य जन्मभूमौ स्थापितो वर्तते । महाविद्यालये सप्त कक्षाः विस्तृतः प्रशालश्च वर्तते । एष महाविद्यालयः गोरखपुरविश्वविद्यालयस्य बी. ए. कक्षापर्यन्तं शिक्षाप्रदानं करोति । अस्मिन् वर्षे बी. ए. प्रथमवर्षे १३० छात्राः, बी. ए. द्वितीय वर्षे च ७५ छात्राः सन्ति ।

### ३. राजा मनसाराम विधिविद्यालय, राजातालाब

गोरखपुर विश्वविद्यालयेन संबद्धे अस्मिन् महाविद्यालये नवकक्षानि एकः प्रशालश्च वर्तते । १९८०-८१ वर्षे एल-एल. बी. प्रथमवर्षे १६० छात्राः, द्वितीयवर्षे ९२ छात्राः तृतीयवर्षे च ८६ छात्राः सन्ति । अध्यापकानां संख्या पुत्र वर्तते ।



## THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

OF

### THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

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

*Trustee nominated by the Govt. of India :—*

2. Dr. Raghunath Singh, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., LL. B.; Chairman  
Shipping Corporation of India; Varanasi.

*Trustees nominated by the Govt. of Uttar Pradesh :—*

3. Pt. Kamalapati Tripathi, Member of Parliament, Govt.  
of India, New Delhi.
4. Vacant.

*Trustees nominated by His Highness the Maharaja of Banaras :—*

5. Maharaj-Kumar Dr. Raghubir Sinh, M. A., D. Litt.;  
Raghubir Niwas, Sitamau (Malwa).
6. Pt. Giridhari Lal Mehta, Varanasi; Managing Director;  
Jardine Handerson Ltd.; Scindia Steam Navigation Ltd.;  
Trustee : Vallabhram-Saligram Trust, Calcutta.
7. Pt. Baldeva Upadhyaya, M.A., Sahityacharya, Vachaspati; Former  
Director, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University; Ravindrapuri  
Varanasi.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

### Critical Editions and Translations

1. Vāmana Purāṇa—Edited by Sri A. S. Gupta. Rs. 150
2. Kūrma Purāṇa—Edited by Sri A. S. Gupta. Rs. 150
3. Rāmacarita-Mānasa—Edited by Achārya Vishva Nath Prasad Misra. Rs. 10
4. Vāmana Purāṇa—Constituted Text with English Translation and Appendices. Rs. 100
5. Vāmana Purāṇa—Constituted Text with Hindi Translation and Appendices. Rs. 70
6. Kūrma Purāṇa—Constituted Text with English Translation and Appendices. Rs. 100
7. Kūrma Purāṇa—Constituted Text with Hindi Translation and Appendices. Rs. 70
8. Vārāha Purāṇa—(Cr. edn.) —In the Press
9. Vārāha Purāṇa (Eng. Tr.) --In the Press
10. Vārāha Purāṇa (Hindi Tr.) —In the Press
11. Devīmāhātmya—Text with English Translation and Annotations by Dr. V. S. Agrawala. Rs. 20
12. Svargakhaṇḍa of the Padma Purāṇa—edited by Dr. Asoke Chatterjee. Rs. 40

### Studies

1. Matsya Purāṇa—A Study. By Dr. V. S. Agrawala. Rs. 40
2. Garuḍa Purāṇa—A Study. By Dr. N. Gangadharan. Rs. 40
3. Nārada Purāṇa—A Study. By Dr. K. Damodaran Nambiar. Rs. 75
4. Nīti-Section of Purāṇārthasaṅgraha. By Dr. V. Raghavan. Rs. 2
5. Vyāsa-Prasasti [व्यासप्रशस्ति]: Compiled and edited by Dr. V. Raghavan. Rs. 1
6. Greater Rāmāyaṇa. By Dr. V. Raghavan. Rs. 30
7. Viṣṇupurāṇa Viṣayānukramaṇi [विष्णुपुराण-विषयानुक्रमणी]. By Pt. Machavacharya Adya. Rs. 5
8. Bṛhaspati Samhitā of the Garuḍa Purāṇa. By Dr. L. Sternbach. Rs. 10
9. Mānavadharmasāstra (I-III) and Bhaviṣya Purāṇa. By Dr. L. Sternbach. Rs. 20

### Journal

Purāṇa—Half Yearly Research Journal,  
dealing with the various aspects of Purāṇas.

Annual Subscription Inland Rs. 30, Foreign £ 3.