

Vol. XXIII, No. 2]

[July, 1981

पुराणम्
PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

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

VYĀSA-PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

SPECIAL ISSUE ON THE OCCASION OF THE
Vth WORLD SANSKRIT CONFERENCE
VARANASI, 1981



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT, RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा० रामकरण शर्मा

उपशिक्षापरामर्शदाता, शिक्षामन्त्रालय तथा निदेशक, केन्द्रीय संस्कृत संस्थान, नयी दिल्ली

डा० रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर

भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे

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 Samsthana, New Delhi.

Dr. R. N. Dandekar

Bhandakar Oriental Research Institute, Pune

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. 2]

व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः

[July 17, 1981

लेखसूची—Contents

	Pages
....व्यास वन्दना [Eulogy of Vyāsa]	99
1. नन्दीकृता शिवस्तुतिः [Eulogy of Śiva by Nandi]	100
2. The Historical Backgrounds of the Maruts' (or Rudras') association with Indra and Rudra; and of the Purāṇic Story of their origin. [मरुतामिन्द्रेण रुद्रेण च सह संपर्कस्य पौराणिकजन्मनश्च ऐतिहासिका पृष्ठभूमिः] By Dr. R. C. Hazra; P. 555/B, Panditiya Road Extension, Calcutta-700029	101-148
3. Notes on Prajāpati [प्रजापतिः] By Prof. Dr. J. Gonda; Van Hogendorpstraat, 13 Utrecht—Holland	149-160
4. Certain Geographical Concepts in the Purāṇas [पुराणेषु काश्चिद्भौगोलिकधारणाः] By Dr. N. Gangadharan; Lecturer in Sanskrit University of Madras Madras—600 005	161-164
5. Bhoja and Vastrāpathamāhātmya; A Re-appraisal [भोजो वस्त्रापथमाहात्म्यं च : पुनर्विवेचनम्] By Prof. R. N. Mehta; Prof. and Head, Deptt. of Ancient History and Archaeology, M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda and Prof. S. G. Kantawala; Prof. and Head Deptt. of Sanskrit M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda.	165-174

6. भविष्यपुराणे राजनैतिकतत्त्वविवेचनम् 175-181
[An Analysis of Political Thoughts in the
Bhaviṣya Purāṇa]
By रामजी त्रिपाठी
99, Sant Kabir Chatravasa
Gorakhpur University, Gorakhpur
7. The Varāha Purāṇa and the Varāha-Viṣṇu
Theme in Sanskrit Poetry—(वराहपुराणम्, संस्कृत-
काव्ये वराहविष्णुविषयकं वर्णनम् च) 182-187
By Dr. S. V. Singh;
Ex-Vice Chancellor, Sanskrit Univ., Varanasi
8. An Appraisal of the Data Regarding Temple
Architecture Gleaned from Agni Purāṇa
(अग्निपुराणे मन्दिरवास्तुकलाया विवेचनम्) 188-200
By Sri Tahsildar Singh;
Research Assistant AIIS, Ramnagar,
Varanasi 221008.
10. In Memoriam : Prof. Dr. Ludwik Sternbach 201-203
By Dr. K. V. Sharma;
VVRI—Hoshiarpur
11. Activities of the All—India Kashiraj Trust
[काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्] 204-213

व्यास वन्दना

पाराशर्यं परमपुरुषं विश्वदेवैकयोनिं
विद्यावन्तं विपुलमतिदं वेदवेदाङ्गवेद्यम् ।
शश्वच्छान्तं शमितविषयं शुद्धतेजोविशालं
वेदव्यासं विगतशमलं सर्वदाऽहं नमामि ॥

नरसिंहपुराणम् १।२६

नन्दीकृता शिवस्तुतिः

(अ. २११.४३-४८)

नमो धात्रे विधात्रे च शम्भवे वरदाय च ।
जगद्भोक्त्रे त्रिनेत्राय शंकराय शिवाय च ॥
भवाय भवगोप्त्रे च मुनये कृत्तिदाससे ।
नीलकण्ठाय भीमाय भूतभव्यभवाय च ।
लम्बस्तुवे करालाय हरिनेत्राय मीढुषे ।
कपर्दिने विशालाय मुञ्जकेशाय धीमते ।
शूलिने पशुपतये विभवे स्थाणवे तथा ।
गणानां पतये स्रष्ट्रे संक्षेप्त्रे भीषणाय च ।
सौम्याय सौम्यरूपाय भीमाय त्र्यम्बकाय च ।
प्रेतवासनिवासाय रुद्राय वरदाय च ।
कपालमालिने तस्मै हरिश्मश्रुधराय च ।
भक्तप्रियाय सततं नमोऽस्तु परमात्मने ।

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE MARUTS'
(OR RUDRAS') ASSOCIATION WITH INDRA AND
RUDRA, AND OF THE PURĀNIC STORY OF
THEIR ORIGIN¹

By

R. C. HAZRA

[अत्र विदुषा लेखकेन ऐतिहासिकपद्धत्या वेदेतिहासपुराणा-
नामाधारेण महताम् रुद्रेण सह संबन्धस्य इन्द्रेण सह च मूलतो
विरोधस्य कालान्तरे मैत्रीकरणस्य च विवेचनं कृतम् । यद्यपि महतो
रुद्रेस्यानुचराः पुत्रा वा ऋग्वेदे वर्णितास्तथापि तेषामिन्द्रस्य
सहायकरूपेणोल्लेखो वेदेऽस्मिन् प्राचुर्येण प्राप्यते । रुद्रस्य इन्द्रेण सह
कोऽपि संबन्धो न दृश्यते । स्वभावतो रुद्रो महतश्च क्रोधनशीला एव
सन्ति । लेखकेन प्रतिपादितं यद् मूलतो महतः इन्द्रस्य वैदिकयज्ञस्य
जनानां च विरोधिन आसन् । किन्तु कालान्तरे ते यज्ञभागभोक्तारः
कृताः । इत्थं ते इन्द्रसहायका जाताः । इतिहासपुराणेषु दितिगर्भे
इन्द्रशत्रुरूपेण तेषामुद्भवस्य तत्रैव एकस्यैव गर्भस्य सप्त भागेषु पुनश्च
सप्त भागेषु इन्द्रेण छेदनस्य वर्णनं प्राचुर्येण प्राप्यते । कथमिन्द्रविनाशाय
जातो गर्भः इन्द्रस्य सहायकरूपेण जातः इति वर्णनं इतिहासपुराणेषु
प्राप्तं वर्णनं मूलतो वैदिकवर्णनस्यैव सूचकम् । अत्र अस्य समग्रस्य
विषयस्य लेखकेन साङ्गोपाङ्गं विवरणं प्रस्तुतम् ।]

A critical study of the *Rg-Veda* and the other Vedic and non-Vedic works (including the Epics and the Purāṇas) makes it evident that Rudra was basically an extremely unsocial and non-co-operating god having a character quite different from that of the other Vedic deities². He was so touchy and self-conceited that he did not allow any other Vedic god to share honour with him in a Vedic hymn or a Vedic sacrificial rite. Still, we find the Maruts to be

1. This article forms a part of a Chapter of a work of mine entitled "*Rudra in the Rg-Veda*" which is nearing completion.
2. For this character of Rudra see our article published in *Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda*, Vol. XXV, 1976, pp. 213-222.

very friendly and intimate with him but originally inimical to Indra, who, as we shall see below from the Epics and the Purāṇas, cut, with a sinister motive, a single mortal enemy of his into a number of parts all found living as equally powerful beings and, out of fear, made them sacrificial deities under the common name 'Marut', even though Rudra is never brought into the slightest conflict with the greatest Vedic god Indra. This position and character of the Maruts are peculiar and have to be explained relevantly on historical backgrounds from the earliest times possible.

It is a fact that in *RV* 6.50.12 Rudra has been implored to be accordant with Sarasvatī, Viṣṇu, Vāyu, Ṛbhukṣan, Vidhātṛ, Parjanya and Vāta in granting to his worshippers and eulogists an increased supply of food; but this is merely a prayer to Rudra not to make his votaries suffer from want of food by falling out with other deities capable of doing their good in this respect, and it contains in it nothing which may show that Rudra was in any way friendly with any of these deities. So, besides Soma, the only Vedic deities with whom Rudra is given out to be friendly and intimate in the *Ṛg-Veda*, are the Maruts, of whom Rudra is repeatedly said to be the father and leader, and who, in their turn, are called Rudra's youths, sons and followers. Although, as is evident from the *Ṛg-Veda*, the Maruts have much closer active association with Indra than with Rudra³, they constitute the army of the latter as well and take part in his exploits, good or bad⁴, as is known from a few *Ṛg-Vedic* verses, particularly *RV* 2.33.11 cd—

“मृळ्वा जरित्रे रुद्रं स्तवा नोऽन्यं ते अस्मिन्न वपन्तु सेनाः”

[“Being extolled, O Rudra, be gracious to (me, thy) praiser, (and) let (thy) hosts kill one other than us”].

We also see how in *RV* 1.122.1⁵ Rudra and his associates, the Maruts, have been presented as extremely dangerous enemies des-

3. The Maruts' relation with Indra will be dealt with elaborately below.
4. Macdonell does not appear to be right in stating that ‘.....Rudra is never associated, as Indra is, with the warlike exploits of the Maruts,.....’ Macdonell, *Ved. Myth.*, p. 74.
5. This verse runs as follows :

“प्र वः पान्तं रघुमन्यवोऽन्धो यज्ञं ह द्वाय मीळ्हुषे भरध्वम् ।
दिवो अस्तोष्यसु रस्य वीरैरिषुध्वेव मरुतो रोदस्यो ॥

troying the Vedic people's sacrificial rites and also their food materials collected by them at the place of sacrifice or produced in villages or stored in houses for consumption, and in 7.46.4 these deities have been entreated not to slay the Vedic sacrificers or bind them up (evidently for carrying them away as captives). There are a few other verses in which Rudra has been given the epithet 'kṣayad-vīra', which, in some places, mean 'lord or commander of the (divine) heroes (viz., the Maruts)'. Thus, in *RV* 1.114.1 Rudra, called 'kṣayad-vīra', is sought to be propitiated by the Vedic people with eulogies, so that in their village the bipeds and the quadrupeds may enjoy relief and all may be thriving (in food and wealth) and remain unaffected; in 1.114.2 Rudra, characterised with the same epithet, is desired to be pleased with complete submission (cf.

As Sāyaṇa, Venkaṭamādhava and others' construction and interpretation of this verse, and Muir, Wilson, Griffith, Ludwig, Grassmann and others' translation of it are open to serious objections (which will be found in Appendix I.ii in our forthcoming work entitled "*Rudra in the Rg-Veda*"), we should like to construe, explain and translate it thus :

“[हे ऋत्विजः, यूयं] रघुमन्यवः (लघुक्रोधाः) [सन्तः] वः (युष्माकम्) अन्धः (अन्नं यज्ञसाधनम् आज्यसोमादिलक्षणम् तद्व्यतिरिक्तम् अन्यच्च देहपोषणं) पान्तं (रक्षन्तं) यज्ञम् [अभिमतफललाभार्थं] मीळ्हुषे (अभिमतफलानां वर्षित्रे) रुद्राय प्र भरध्वम् (प्रकर्षेण संपादयत) ।

[अहं च] इषुध्या इव (इषुधुपलक्षितैस्तन्निहितैः शरसमूहैरिव) दिवः असुरस्य (अन्तरिक्षस्थितस्य शक्तिमतो देवस्य अर्थात् रुद्रस्य) वीरैः (वीर्यैः, वीरैः कर्मभिर्वा) [युक्तान्, तथा] रोदस्योः (द्यावापृथिव्योः) [अवस्थितान्] महतः अस्तोषि (स्तौमि)” ।

“[Being] of little rage (or, with mitigated rage, i. e., discarding rage to the greatest possible extent), [O priests] excellently (or, properly) offer to bounteous (or, wish-fulfilling) Rudra sacrifice [that will be] protecting your food [sacrificial and otherwise].

[And I, on my part,] eulogise the Maruts [who are furnished], as if with [a number of arrows contained in] a quiver, with the [multitude of] heroic powers (or, heroic deeds) of the powerful [god] of heaven (viz., Rudra) [and remain] in heaven and earth.”

'*namasā*') and to be gracious to the submissive and grant happiness to them; and in 10.92.9 Rudra, who is accompanied by his horse-riding kins, the Maruts, and called '*kṣayad-vīra*', is desired to be eulogised with humble submission (cf. '*namasā*'). Again, in 1.114.11 and 2.33.6 Rudra is said to be 'accompanied by the Maruts' (*marutvān*) and invoked to give protection to his votaries and to cheer them up with most invigorating food; and in 1.114.6, 1.114.9, and 2.33.1 this god, addressed as or called 'the father of the Maruts' (cf. '*pitar marutām*', '*pitre marutām*'), is asked to give his eulogist food which mortals eat and to be gracious and grant happiness to him and his sons and descendants, and not to bring about their death. As, in most of the above verses, Rudra has been presented as a mischievous and destructive god, and as, in their harmful activities against the Vedic people and their cattle and other properties, the Maruts, as followers of Rudra, are very much like their father and leader, it is evident that the Vedic people characterise Rudra as such, so that this god may keep under his control his Marut host, and he and his followers, the Maruts, may desist from doing any harm to them and see to their welfare.

Although the *Rg-Veda* repeatedly gives out the relation of Rudra and the Maruts to be that of a father and his sons or of an army-leader and his hosts, and presents the latter much more frequently as being very intimate with Indra as his constant followers and associates, it is very peculiar as well as significant that nowhere in this work Rudra is brought, directly or indirectly, into connection with Indra either as a friend or as a foe⁶. So, the

6. The only verse which may be mentioned here, is *RV* 5.41. 2, which runs thus :

“ते नो मित्रो वरुणो अयं मायुरिन्द्रं ऋभुक्षा मस्तो जुषन्त ।

नमोभिर्वा ये दधते सुवृक्तिस्तोमं रुद्राय मीळ्हृषे सजोषाः ॥”

“May they—Mitra, Varuṇa, Aryaman, Ayu, Indra, Ṛbhukṣan, [and] the Maruts—be pleased with us,—[they] who, with equal pleasure, accept (or, hold up) the eulogy [which has been made by us] to bounteous Rudra with prostrations (i.e., with repeated prostration) [and] from which thorough elimination [of the names of other gods] has been made”.

But in this verse neither Indra nor any other god is presented as a friend of Rudra. It only says that this eu-

questions naturally arise as to whether Rudra and the Maruts entered the Vedic pantheon jointly at the same time or separately at different times, and whence, when, how and why the Maruts came and got associated with Rudra. But before we take up for critical examination these highly interesting questions, which are expected to throw a flood of light on the dark history of Rudra's origin and character, we should see whether, besides the Maruts, Rudra had any other associates or followers.

[The Ṛg-vedic 'Rudras'—originally the same as the Maruts]

In view of the mention of 'Rudras' as Rudra's followers and also as a class of beings in some verses⁷ of the *Ṛg-Veda* and of the statements made about Rudra and the Rudras in the post-*Ṛg Veda* works (including the Epics and the Purāṇas), some scholars⁸ are of opinion that the Rudras and Maruts were originally two different classes of beings, of whom the former were demoniac in nature, that it was the Rudras who were the genuine followers of

logy made exclusively to Rudra does not displease Mitra, Varuṇa and the other gods including Indra and the Maruts (who are, thus, expected to admit Rudra as a Vedic deity).

7. These verses, as referred to by R. N. Dandekar in his article (p. 102) entitled 'Rudra in the Veda' in *JUP*, 1953, Humanities Section, No. 1, pp. 94-148, are the following : 2.31.1 and 3; 8.13.28, and 54 3; 10.66.4.

There are also a few other verses which should be mentioned here; viz., 1.45.1, and 58.3; 3.8.8, and 20.5; 7.5.9, 10.4, and 35.6 and 14; 8.35.1 and 10.66.3, 125.1, and 128.9.

The value of the testimony of these verses will be examined below in their proper places. It may be mentioned here that, as we shall see below, *RV* 8.13.28, though included by Dandekar in his list, does not distinguish between the Rudras and the Maruts but shows that the latter, as followers of Indra, were also called Rudras, and that *RV* 8.54 is a Khila-Sūkta and consequently of minor importance.

8. See particularly Dandekar's article in the *JUP* referred to above (in which Dandekar often follows Arbman's views in his *Rudra*).

Rudra and were originally associated with this god, that, for conceding to Rudra a place in the official Vedic pantheon, the poet-priests of the *R̥g-Veda* substantially changed 'the original and essential character of that god' by suppressing more or less 'the original relationship between Rudra and the Rudras and making the Maruts take the place of the latter and thus representing the relationship between Rudra and the Rudras in a purely formal and conventional manner' by associating Rudra with the Maruts and transferring to the latter the name of the original Rudras but not their essential character, that, consequently, Rudra's association with the Maruts was posterior in date to that with the Rudras, that, later, as 'the mythology relating to Rudra and the Maruts took a different turn altogether', 'Rudra tended to regain his pristine character and, consequently, the Maruts transferred their allegiance from Rudra to Indra' and 'the Rudra-Marut combination' 'tended to become rarer in course of time', that, thus, Indra was associated with the Maruts much later than Rudra, that 'in this process the original character of the Maruts was almost unrecognizably transformed and the relationship between Rudra and the Rudras regained its old vitality in the later Vedic literature', and that, besides the Rudras and the Maruts, there are the Rudra-gaṇas, who, with the said two classes of beings, correspond with the three distinct stages in the evolution of Rudra's character and personality⁹.

It is hardly necessary to say that these views, which are undoubtedly ingenuous and provocative of a more critical study of the *R̥g-Veda* go definitely against the courses of history and are principally based on the ideas that the 'Rudras', mentioned as a class of beings in some of the *R̥g-Vedic* verses referred to above, were quite different from the Maruts, and that Rudra's original character as a god was much worse than what he is given in the said work. But we are constrained to say that these ideas, for which there is no pre-*R̥g-Vedic* record, have practically got no basis in the *R̥g-Veda* and that assessment of the original character of Rudra and the Maruts on the basis of statements made in the post-*R̥g-Veda* works, is practically going

9. See Dandekar's article (pp. 98 and 102-4) referred to above.

against the hands of a clock. As regards the Rudras, we cannot overlook the facts that, as we shall see on a different occasion, the word 'rudra' is originally not a name but simply an epithet derived from \sqrt{rud} or \sqrt{ru} (meaning 'to roar', 'to howl', 'to shout'), and that it is used in the *R̥g-Veda* not only as Rudra's epithet used as his name but also on many occasions to characterise a number of Vedic gods, such as Agni, Indra, Aśvins, Mitra and Varuṇa, and the Maruts, for their roaring, howling or shouting. As a matter of fact, the Maruts have been addressed as, or called, 'rudrāsah' or 'rudrāḥ' (meaning, as a noun, 'roarers', 'howlers' or 'shouters' or, as an adjective, 'roaring', 'howling' or 'shouting') in a good number of verses occurring in the Marut-Sūktas in Maṇḍalas 1, 2, 5 and 8¹⁰; in a few places these deities are given the epithet 'rudra'¹¹; and once the word 'sūnu' (meaning 'son') has 'rudra' as

10. Maruts—addressed as 'rudrāsah' or 'rudrāḥ' in *RV* 1.39.4 and 7, 2.34.9, and 5.54.4, 57.1, and 60.6, and called so in *RV* 1.64.3, 85.2, and 166.2, 2.34.13, 5.87.7, and 8.7.12, and 20.2.
11. *RV*. 5.60.2—rudrā marutaḥ (roaring or shouting Maruts); 10.64.11—rudrāṇaṃ marutām upastutiḥ (laudation of the roaring or shouting Maruts); 10.92.6—rudrā marutaḥ.

[According to Sāyaṇa, 'rudrāḥ' and 'rudrāṇaṃ' in these verses mean 'rudra-putrāḥ' and 'rudra-putrāṇaṃ' respectively].

See also *RV*. 1.100.5 and 8.103.14, which run respectively as follows :

“स स॒नुभिर्न॑रु॒द्रेभिर्ऋ॑त्वा॒ नृ॒शाह्ये॑ सास॒त्त्वाँ अ॒मित्रा॑न् ।
सनी॒ळेभिः॑ श्रव॒स्यानि॑ तूर्व॑न्म॒हत्वा॑न्नो भव॒त्विन्द्र॑ ऊ॒ती ॥”

and

“आग्ने॑ याहि म॒हत्स॑खा रु॒द्रेभिः॑ सोम॑पीतये ।

... .. ॥”

In the former of these two verses we should take 'rudrebhiḥ' as an adjective qualifying both 'sūnubhiḥ' and 'marudbhiḥ' (which is understood) and translate it thus :

“Like (one accompanied) by (his own) shouting sons, that leader (Indra, accompanied) by the roaring (Maruts), overpowered the enemies in the manly battle.

its adjective¹². Even, as followers of Indra, the Maruts are called 'Rudras' in a number of verses occurring in the Indra-Sūktas in Maṇḍalas 1, 3, 8 and 10¹³. It is true that in Maṇḍalas 4 and 6, as Hillebrandt points out in his *Vedische Mythologie* III, p.303, the Maruts are not called Rudras; but that is absolutely immaterial

Doing deeds of glory with close comrades, may Indra, girt by the Maruts, be for our protection."

[From the *Ṛg-Veda* we learn that the Vedic people often prayed to their deities for the birth of troops of heroic sons to them, and that these sons accompanied their fathers to the battle-field when occasions arose. It is very natural that, going out with their fathers to fight the enemies, these sons did not and could not keep silent but shouted very loudly out of rage for terrifying the latter].

Likewise, taking 'rudrebhiḥ' to mean 'with the roaring (ones)', the latter verse (i.e., 8.103.14) is to be translated thus :

"Come, O Agni, the friend of the Maruts, with the roaring (ones) for drinking Soma (juice).

... .."

The *Ṛg-Veda* tells us on many occasions (such as in 3.32.2-3, 8.13.28, 8.103.14, etc.) that Soma drink pleased the Maruts so much that they shouted out of joy even at its prospect.

According to Sāyaṇa, the word 'rudrebhiḥ' in the two verses (viz., *ṚV*. 1.100.5 and 8.103.14) means 'rudraputrain marudbhiḥ' and 'marudbhiḥ' respectively.

12. *ṚV* 1.100.5 quoted and translated above in the immediately preceding foot-note.
13. See *ṚV* 1.100.5 (quoted and translated above), and 101.7; 3.82.2 and 3; 8.3.7, 13.28, and 63.12 (rudrāḥ.....indrajyeṣṭhāḥ); 10.32.5, and 99.5. (For interpretation and interest of 8.13.28 see below).

Although, in explaining *ṚV* 3.32.2 referred to above, Sāyaṇa connects 'mārutena gaṇena' and 'rudraiḥ' with a 'ca' supplied by him and thus takes the 'Māruta gaṇa' and the 'Rudras' to be different, *we should like to construe and explain this verses thus :*

and not at all 'significant' as Dandekar says, and we must not attach any importance to it whatsoever. As a matter of fact, Maṇḍala 4 contains no hymn on the Maruts, and these deities have been mentioned in it only ten times, and in Maṇḍala 6 there is only one Marut-Sūkta (viz., 6. 65) of eleven verses, and the Maruts have been mentioned in the other Sūktas of this Maṇḍala only nineteen times. There is also no mention of 'Rudras' as a distinct class of beings in any of these two Maṇḍalas. Still, the loud roar of the Maruts has been mentioned in RV 4. 6.10 and 6.48.15, of which the former says that the flames of Agni roar loudly like the Marut host (...अर्चयः...तुविष्वणसो मारुतं न शर्धः) and in the latter the host of Maruts is said to be mighty in their roar (शर्धो...मारुतं तुविष्वणि). Similarly, in Maṇḍala 3 there are only three verses (3.26.4-6) on the Maruts, and in one of them (viz., 3.26.5) these deities have been called 'the noisy sons of Rudra who roar like lions' (...मरुतः...स्वानिनो रुद्रियाः...सिहा न हेषकृतवः.....). It may be mentioned in this connection that, in two of the five Sūktas in which Rudra has been extolled individually or jointly, there is mention of the Maruts in a few verses, but the word 'rudra' does not occur in them or in any other verse of the said Sūktas either as their epithet or as the name of a group of deities, whoever they may be. On the other hand, Maṇḍala 2 contains only one Marut-Sūkta (2.34), and, as has already been said, the Maruts have been addressed as and called 'Rudras' in two of its verses, viz., 2.34.9

“[हे इन्द्रं त्वं] ब्रह्मकृता (तव स्तुति कुर्वता) मारुतेन गणेन सजोषाः (समानप्रीतियुक्तः सन् अर्थात् स्तुतिकरणाद् यथा मरुतां प्रीतिर्भवति, स्तुतिश्रवणात् त्वमपि तथैव प्रीतः सन्) रुद्रः (आनन्दातिशयाद् रोरूयमाणैर्मरुद्भिः सह) तृपत् (सोमपानेन तृप्यन्) आ वृषस्व (सम्यक् मेघवारि सिञ्च) ।”

For the fact that Soma drink or its prospect exhilarates the Maruts and makes them roar, see also RV 3.32.3, 8.13.28, and 8.103.14 (all referred to above).

In 3.32.3 the expression 'rudrebhiḥ saganah' deserves special notice, because, in all other places (viz., 1.101.9, 3.47.2 and 4, 3.52.7, and 10.157.3, and also 1.23.7, 1.64.12, 3.35.9, etc.) Indra is said to have the Maruts as his 'gaṇa' (troop).—See the expressions 'sa-gaṇo marudbhiḥ', etc. used for Indra in these verses,

and 13 respectively. That the loud roar of the Maruts was traditionally a fact known to the R̥g-Vedic Aryans is also evident from many other R̥g-Vedic verses such as the following:

1.23.11—जयतामिव तन्यतुर्महताम्—the thundering voice of the Maruts like that of the conquerors;

1.64.8—सिंहा इव नानदति—(the host of the Maruts) roars frequently and violently like lions;

1.127.6—शर्षो न माहृतं तुविष्वणिः—(Agni) roaring very loudly like the Marut host;

1.143.5—न यो वराय महतामिव स्वनः—(Agni) who cannot be controlled like the Maruts' roar;

1.166.11—(महृतः) स्वधितारः—(Maruts) shouting;

5.54.3—...महृतः...स्तनयदमाः—...Maruts...roaring in onset;

5.54.8—...महृतः.../...यदिनासो अस्वरन् व्युन्दन्ति पृथिवीं...//...Maruts ...when impetuous, they roar, they inundate the earth...;

8.7.3—...वाश्रासः पृश्निमातरः/धुक्षन्त पिप्युषीम् इषम् //...loudly roaring... (the Maruts), whose mother is Pṛṣṇi,....have poured out the streaming food;

8.7.7—वाश्राः (महृतः)—loud-roaring (Maruts);

8.7.17—उदु स्वानेभिरोरते पृश्निमातरः—with...tumultuous roar... (the Maruts), whose mother is Pṛṣṇi, hurry forth; and so on.

That some of the Vedic Seers looked upon the 'Rudras', mentioned together with the 'Ādityas' and the 'Vasus' in some R̥g-Vedic verses referred to above, as identical with the Maruts, is shown by the facts that at least in two R̥g-Vedic verses, one of which occurs in Maṇḍala 6 and the other in Maṇḍala 10, the 'Rudriyas' (and not 'Rudras') have been mentioned with the 'Ādityas' and the 'Vasus' as one of the three prominent groups of deities¹⁴, and that in at least one verse the 'Rudras' have been said to have been born of a cow (go)¹⁵. It is hardly necessary to

14. These two verses are *RV.* 6.62.8—तदादित्या वसवो रुद्रियासः....., and 10.48.11—आदित्यानां वसुनां रुद्रियाणां.....

15. *RV.* 8.101.15—माता रुद्राणां.....। मा गाम् अनागाम्बदिति वधिष्ट ॥

Also cf. 9.73.7, in which 'vācam' is explained by Śaṅkara as 'mādhyaṃmikāṃ vācam', 'mādhyaṃmikā vāk', in his opinion, being the same as the Cow Pṛṣṇi, the mother of the Maruts.

say that it is the Maruts who have been called 'Rudriyas' ('sons of, or belonging to, Rudra') in a large number of Ṛg-Vedic verses¹⁶ and said in a good number of others to have been born of Pṛṣni¹⁷, who is called a cow more than once¹⁸. So, there is hardly any scope for doubt that at least some Vedic Seers knew that the 'Rudras', mentioned together with the 'Ādityas' and the 'Vasus' as a class of divine beings, were really the same as the Maruts. It is a fact that there are a few verses, occurring in Maṇḍalas 8 and 10, in which the 'Maruts' (and not the 'Rudras') have been mentioned together with the 'Ādityas' and the 'Vasus' or only with the 'Ādityas'¹⁹. But these verses do not point definitely to the identity of the 'Rudras' with the Maruts. We shall see below that the Seers of the Sūktas in which some of these verses occur, regarded the 'Rudras' as distinct from the Maruts.

We have already seen that in a good number of Ṛg-Vedic verses of different Maṇḍalas, the so-called 'Rudras' (who are really the same as the Maruts) have been associated with Indra as his followers. We have also referred to the fact that in the Rudra-Sūktas there is no mention of the 'Rudras', although the Maruts have been mentioned in them several times as the sons or followers of Rudra. So it is not possible for us to say with any amount of certainty whatsoever that the Rudras and the Maruts were originally two different classes of beings and that it was the Rudras who were the genuine followers of Rudra and were originally associated with this god. On the other hand, as we have seen above, the *Ṛg-Veda* amply testifies to the facts that it was the Maruts who, in course of time, were given the epithet 'Rudra' for their loud roar, and that in comparatively late days, this epithet came to be used occasionally as their name, as in the case of their father and leader Rudra. It is clearly for this reason that the *Ṛg-Veda* is completely silent about any 'gana' of these so-called 'Rudras', although this

-
16. ṚV 1.38.7; 2.34.10; 3.26.5; 5.41.11, 57.7 and 58.7; 6.62.8; 7.56.22; 8.20.3; 10.48.11; and so on.
 17. ṚV 1.168.9; 2.34.2 and 10; 5.52.16, 58.5, and 60.5; 6.66.3; and so on.
 18. ṚV 1.160.3, 4.5.10, 5.52.16, etc. Also cf. 2.34.2 and 10, 4.3.10, 5.60.5, 6.66.1, 7.35.14, etc. The Maruts have been called 'go-mātaraḥ' in ṚV 1.85.3.
 19. ṚV 8.35.13 and 15; 10.65.1, 98.1, and 157.3.

work mentions the 'gana' of the Maruts on many occasions²⁰. So, it is evident that originally there was no distinct class of beings, divine or otherwise, called 'Rudras'.

That the 'Rudras' as a class of gods distinct from the Maruts were conceived quite early, even before the composition of many of the hymns of the *Rg-Veda*, cannot be denied. We have given above (in fn. 7) a list of verses which mention the 'Rudras' together with the 'Ādityas' and the 'Vasus' or with either of these two groups of deities. Although, for the reasons stated above, we should not take the 'Rudras' mentioned in all of these verses to constitute a class of divine beings quite different from the Maruts, there are some among these verses which show definitely that according to some Vedic Seers there was a class of deities called 'Rudras' who were not taken to be identical with the Maruts. Thus, the 'Rudras' have been distinguished from the Maruts in *RV* 2.31 (verses 1 and 3) ascribed to Gr̥tsamada Śaunaka, in 7.35 (verses 6,9 and 14) ascribed to Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvareṇi, in 8.35 (verses 1 and 3) ascribed to Śyāvāśva Ātreya, in 8.54, a Khila-Sūkta (verse 3), ascribed to Mātariśvan Kāṇva, and in 10.66 (verses 3 and 4) ascribed to Vasukarṇa Vāsuka. It is remarkable that sometimes the same Vedic Seer is found to address the Maruts as 'Rudras' or to call them as such, to use the word 'rudra' as an epithet of these deities, and also to name, together with the 'Ādityas' and the 'Vasus', a class of deities called 'Rudras' as distinct from the Maruts²¹. For instance, Śyāvāśva Ātreya addresses the Maruts as 'Rudras' in *RV* 5.54.4, 57.1, and 60.6, and gives them the epithet 'rudra' in 5.60.2 but distinguishes between the Rudras and the Maruts in 8.35.1 and 3; Viśvāmitra Gāthina, in 3.32.2 and 3, calls the Maruts 'Rudras', even though they are the followers of Indra, but names the 'Ādityas', 'Rudras' and 'Vasus' as distinct classes of gods in 3.8.8; and Gr̥tsamada Śaunaka addresses the Maruts as 'Rudras' in 2.34.9, calls

20 Viz., in 1.14.3, 38.15, 64.9 and 12, 87.4; 3.26.6, 32.2; 5.52.13 and 14, 53.10 and 11.56.1, 58.1 and 2, 60.8; 6.16.24; 7.56.7, 58.1; 8.94.12; etc.

21. As the contradictory statements of these types are not found to occur in the same hymn, it is very probable that hymns of different seers belonging to a particular family of priests were put under the same name through mistake or confusion.

them as such in 2.34.13, but differentiates the 'Rudras' from the Maruts in 2.31.1 and 3. This is very peculiar as well as significant and shows that the 'Rudras', though originally the same as the Maruts, had come to be looked upon (for reasons stated below) as distinct class of gods quite early, even before many of the extant R̥g-Vedic hymns were composed.

Although we do not know exactly how the epithet 'rudra', used for the Maruts for their loud roar, gave rise to a distinct class of deities called 'Rudras', there is a verse in the R̥g-Veda which appears to throw a flood of light on this problem. This verse is RV 8.13.28, which says:

“अभि स्व॑रन्तु ये तव॑ रुद्रासः सक्षत॑ श्रियंस् । उ॒तो म॑रुत्व॑ती॒र्विश॑ अभि प्रयः ॥”

[“(O Indra,) may (they) who are thy roarers (i. e., thy roaring Marut host) approach (and) partake of the glory²² (of the sacrifice);

and also may (thy divine) folk, accompanied by the Maruts, approach (for partaking of the sacrificial) food”]

In this verse the pronoun 'tava' for Indra in the expression 'tava rudrāsaḥ' shows that the word 'rudrāsaḥ' means Indra's roaring followers, the Maruts, who, being extremely fond of Soma drink, roar, out of joy, at the prospect of drinking Soma in a sacrifice. As, in the second half of this verse, the Maruts, associated with the common run of celestial people (*viśaḥ*), have been mentioned, it is evident that this verse divides the Maruts into two groups or classes, viz., the roaring and turbulent ones, and the beneficent and friendly ones. As a matter of fact, the R̥g-Veda brings out in many of its verses these two prominent aspects of the character of the Maruts which are connected with their natural basis. It has already been said that the Maruts are basically the winds, stormy or otherwise, which are born of and move forward, as their fore-runners, with the rain-clouds and bring rain and thunder in their train. So, they are rightly called Rudra's sons begotten by him

22. Being the cause of glory (*śrī*) Soma is practically the glory of a Sacrifice. RV 9.94.4 says of Soma: “For glory born he hath come forth to glory: he giveth life and glory to the singers. They, clothed in glory, have become immortal. He measured in his course, makes frayas successful”.

on Pṛṣṇi, the cow in the form of the rain-cloud, and forming his host.

We have already seen that the Maruts in general and the roaring or howling ones called 'Rudras' came to be differentiated very early as forming two distinct classes of deities. The Vedic Seers Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi and Vasukarṇa Vāsuka, who, as is known from the extant Sūktas of the *Ṛg-Veda* and has already been indicated above, looked upon the 'Rudras' as quite different from the Maruts and never used the word '*rudra*' as an epithet of the latter or addressed these deities as 'Rudras' or called them as such, no matter whether they were the followers of Indra, Rudra or any other god, are found in these Sūktas to name the three prominent groups of deities, viz., Vasus²³, Rudras and Ādityas, and to attach them respectively to Indra, Rudra, and Aditi or Varuṇa, in *ṚV* 7.10.4 and 7.35.6 (both ascribed to Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi) and 10.66.4 (ascribed to Vasukarṇa Vāsuka²⁴). So, there is little scope for doubt that the 'Rudras' as a distinct class of deities had come to be attached to Rudra very early, undoubtedly before many of the extant Sūktas of the *Ṛg-Veda* were composed.

Thus, the different traditions, viz., those of the Maruts as Rudras, i. e., roaring or howling gods, and of the 'Rudras' as a distinct class of deities, were already current in the Vedic society when many of the extant hymns or verses on the Maruts were composed. As there were different families of Vedic priests not all living at the same time or at the same place, and as religious faith and nature of allegiance to particular Vedic deities coming from particular sources Vedic or non-Vedic, or Aryan or non-Aryan, naturally differed more or less in different families or individuals, the said traditions were utilised in their respective hymns by the different Seers in different ways according to their own knowledge of or faith in their deities or traditions.

-
23. As the Maruts have been given the epithet '*vasu*' in many verses of the *Ṛg-Veda*, they must be the same as the 'Vasus' attached to Indra.
24. Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi and Vasukarṇa Vāsuka attach the Ādityas to Aditi in *ṚV* 7.10.4 and 10.66.3 respectively, but the former attaches this group of deities to Varuṇa in 7.35.6.

We have already seen why, in the *Rg-Veda*, the Maruts came to be called 'Rudras'. We shall now discuss the questions as to how and when the Maruts came to be associated with Indra and Rudra and a distinct class of divine beings called 'Rudras' grew out of the Maruts.

[The Maruts' association with Indra]

A critical study of the *Rg-Veda* shows that after the Indra-worshipping Aryan tribes, particularly the Bharatas, had been compelled by their more powerful Indra-hating Aryan enemies to migrate, in the hoary pre-*Rg-Vedic* past, from their ancient (but certainly not their original) common home-land situated very probably in a place lying immediately to the south of Lake Balkash in Russian Turkestan in Central Asia and bearing the Russian name "Semiretchenski-krai" (literally meaning "the land of the seven streams")²⁵, they came to Iran, but, having a cold, or rather extremely unfavourable, reception from the Indra-hating Aryans who had already settled there, they pushed forward and came to India, where they gradually occupied an extensive territory in, or very near about, the land of the five rivers by prolonged and severe warfare with the Dāsa-Dasyus, who had built up a highly developed urban civilization there.²⁶ From the *Rg-Veda* we learn that this war took place in the hoary past, long before the composition of at least the great majority of the hymns of this work. As a matter of fact, we are told in the *Rg-Veda* that Indra's first or ancient heroic deeds (*vīryāṇi* *prathamāni*, or *pūrvyāṇi karaṇāni*) were his fight with and slaughter of Vṛtra, also called Ahi (Serpent), and his war with the Dāsa-Dasyus in connection with it.²⁷ The verses which deserve special mention for the said statements, are the following :

25. For more information about this place, which still bears 'traces of an ancient Aryan colonisation', see N. G. Sardesai's article entitled "The Land of Seven Rivers" in *Commemorative Essays presented to Sir R. C. Bhandarkar*, 1917, pp. 93-96.
26. Detailed treatment of this topic with relevant quotations from the *Rg-Veda* has been made in Chap : I of our work entitled "*Ancient Traditions of Origin of the Śūdra. (A Critical Study)*", which is nearing completion.
27. We shall explain below how the Dāsa-Dasyus came to be associated with the more ancient story of Vṛta.

इन्द्रस्य नु वीर्याणि प्र वोचं यानि चकार प्रथमानि वृञ्जी ।
अहन्नहिम् अन्वपस्ततर्द् प्र वृक्षणा अभिनत् पर्वतानाम् ॥

(RV. 1.32.1).

[Of Indra, the thunder-wielder, I declare the first heroic deeds which he accomplished :

he slew Ahi (the Serpent, in the form of the dam), then disclosed the waters, (and) cleft the water-channels of the mountains] and

दासपत्नीरहिगोपा अतिष्ठन्निरुद्धा आपः पणितेव गावः ।
अपां विलम् अपिहितं यदासीद् वृत्रं जघन्वा अप तद् ववार²⁸ ॥

(RV. 1.32.11)

[Guarded by Dāsas (engaged for the purpose, and) protected by Ahi (the Serpent in the form of the surrounding dam), the waters, (being) pent up by the Paṇi²⁹, stood (at rest) like kine (which, being) confined by a Paṇi, (are) guarded by Dāsas (employed for the purpose, and) concealed by Ahi (the Serpent in the form of the surrounding wall);

the (huge) ditch of waters, which was closed, (Indra) exposed by striking down Vṛtra (the surrounding dam)].

प्र ते पूर्वाणि करणानि वोचं प्र नूतना मघवन् या च्चकर्थ ।
शक्तीवो यद् विभरा रोदसी उभे जयन्नपो मनवे दानुचित्राः ॥

(RV. 5.31.6)

[Thy ancient exploits I declare (and also) the new (ones), O Maghavan, which (thou) didst accomplish,

28. This verse should be construed as follows : पणिना निरुद्धाः दासपत्नीः अहिगोपाः गावः इव, अतिष्ठन् । यत् अपां विलम् अपिहितम् आसीत्, वृत्रं जघन्वान् [इन्द्रः] तत् अप ववार ।

29. As 'ahi' is the subject of √gup in 'ahi-gopāh', 'niruddhāh', in the Passive Voice, has 'paṇinā' as its Undeclared Subject (*anukta kartā*), because it was the Paṇi who made the said arrangements for confining and safely preserving a huge mass of water, possibly for agricultural and other purposes.

From the Words 'dāsa-patniḥ' and 'ahi-gopāh', in which 'dāsa' is the subject of √pā (in '—patniḥ') and 'ahi' that of √gup (in '—gopāh'). So, 'dāsa' cannot be taken to mean Vṛtra, who is also called *Ahi*.

when, O mighty (one, thou) forest asunder both the (two) world-halves (viz., earth and heaven), winning the moistly-gleaming (?) waters for Manu (i. e., men)]; and

तद् इन्नु ते करणं दस्म विप्राहिं यद् घ्नन्नोजो अत्रामिमीथाः ।
शुष्णस्य चित् परि माया अगृभ्णाः प्रपित्वं यन्नपु दस्यूरसेधः ॥
(RV. 5.31.7)

[That was indeed thy exploit, O wonderful (and) wise (Indra), that, slaying Ahi, (thou) showedst here (thy) strength, controlledst thoroughly the wiles of Śuṣṇa, (and), waging war (or, drawing near), didst chase away the Dasyus].

त्वं ह त्यद् वृषभ चर्षणीनां घ्नो वृत्राणां त्विषो बभूथ ।
त्व सिन्धूरसृजस्तस्तभानान् त्वम् अपो अजयो दासपत्नीः ॥
(RV. 8.96.18)

[Then wast thou, O chieftain of all living mortals, the very mighty slayer of the Vṛtras.

Thou didst set the obstructed rivers flowing (and) conquer the waters guarded by the Dāsas].³⁰

× × ×
अतश्चिद् इन्द्राद् अभयन्त देवा विश्वा अपो अजयद् दासपत्नीः ॥
(RV. 5.30.5).

[... .. Since then even the gods were afraid of Indra; he conquered all the waters guarded by the Dāsas³¹].

It is to be noted that in the second of these verses there is mention of 'Paṇi'. From the *R̥g-Veda* we learn that the Paṇis as a class of traders were very ancient, so much so that they had come, like the Dāsa-Dasyus, to be looked upon by the Vedic people as mythical beings even in the early *R̥g-Vedic* age, and the word 'paṇi' (meaning 'trader', 'merchant'), derived from their class-name

30, Sāyaṇa interprets 'दासपत्नीः' in this verse as दासा उपक्षयितारः शत्रवः । ते पतयः स्वामिनो यासां ताः । असुरस्वामिकाः ... ।

31. Although Sāyaṇa and Venkaṭamādhava, and, following them Wilson, Griffith and many others, take 'dāsa' (in 'dāsa-patniḥ') to mean Vṛtra, we should take this word to mean the people of the dāsa tribe as in RV. 1.32.11 and 8.96.18 quoted above.

'paṇi',³² had already been in use in that hoary past, as the occurrence of this word in two Ṛg-Vedic verses³³ shows. As in the said verse (1.32.11) a Paṇi who must have been very rich and influential is said to have constructed a big dam for preservation of water and to have employed Dāsas as guards for its proper maintenance and also for its protection from enemies, he must have been thoroughly acquainted and very friendly with the latter and must have looked upon them as sufficiently trustworthy and dependable. So, a Paṇi must have been a non-Aryan and a Dāsa by origin³⁴. Be a Paṇi, a Dāsa or not, the fact remains that Indra had to fight the Dāsa employees of the Paṇi for shattering Vṛtra Ahi (i. e., the serpentlike dam surrounding the pent up waters), and this fight was one of the first or earliest heroic exploits of Indra and occurred in the hoary past, long before the Ṛg-Vedic period.

But, although the Maruts appear in the *Ṛg-Veda* very often as Indra's host accompanying and following this god in war and peace, they are not found to take any prominent part in the latter's fight with or slaughter of the Dāsa-Dasyus. As a matter of fact, in none of the numerous Marut-Sūktas in the *Ṛg-Veda* the Maruts are brought into connection with the Dāsa-Dasyus either as their friends or as their foes. In the Indra-Sūktas also, in which Indra's encounter with or slaughter of the Dāsa-Dasyus has been described or referred to in a very large number of verses or groups of verses scattered more or less over all the Books of the *Ṛg-Veda*, the mention of the Maruts' co-operation with Indra in these activities of his is remarkably rare. In *RV* 1. 101. 1-2 and 5 Indra's driving the dusky brood away, his smiting down of Vyamśa, Śambara, and the unrighteous (*avrata*) Pipru, his extirpating of the insatiate Śuśṇa, and his

32. Cf. Uṇādi-Sūtra 2.70—"पणेरिज्यादेश्च वः" ["To √paṇ (meaning 'to barter') is added the affix *iji* (>ij), and the initial 'pa' is replaced by 'va'"].

33. One of these two verses is *RV* 1.112.11—...ओशिजाय वणिजे दीर्घश्रवसे (... for the merchant Dīrghaśravas son of Uśij ...), and the other is 5.45.6.

34. Other evidences in favour of the Dāsa origin of a Paṇi will be found in Chap. I of our work entitled "*Ancient Traditions of Origin of the Śūdra (A Critical Study)*" which is nearing completion.

casting down of the Dasyus beneath his feet, have been mentioned as his exploits of the past, and the eulogists invoke 'Indra girt by the Maruts' to be their friend, but there is no express mention of the Maruts' taking any active part in the said exploits of Indra as his allies. Even in those few verses in which the Maruts have been associated with Indra in his war with the Dāsa-Dasyus, their function is very minor, not practically anything very different from that of the onlookers or cheerers. Thus, in RV 1.33.4 it is said that Indra though moving with his retinue the Maruts, *alone* (ekah) slew the wealthy Dasyu with his bolt; in 3.47.4 the Maruts are said to have strengthened Indra against Śambara in winning cattle (gaviṣṭau); 3.49.2 says that Indra shortened the Dasyu's life 'with his warriors bold of spirit'; in 5.29.6 it is said that the Maruts glorified Indra, when the latter, with his thunderbolt, demolished ninety-nine castles of Śambara; and in 6.18.3 Indra is said to have subdued the Dasyus *alone* and *singly* (ekah).

Very similar is the part played by the Maruts in Indra's fight with or slaughter of Ahi or Vṛtra. Although this exploit of Indra has been described or referred to very frequently throughout the *R̥g-Veda*, the Maruts have been associated with it only on a very limited number of occasions, and that also often in a very superficial way. Thus, in RV 5.29.2-3 it is said that when the Maruts sang their song to Indra joyous with Soma-drink, the latter grasped his thunderbolt to slay Ahi; 5.30.6 says that to Indra, who *subdued* (*pra sakṣat*)³⁵ Ahi with wondrous powers, the Maruts *sing* their psalm of praise (*arcanty arkam*) and *pour* libations of Soma (*sunvanty andhaḥ*) to him; 3.47.4 says that the Maruts strengthened Indra at the time of his slaughter of Ahi; 1.52.4-5 and 15 say that the Maruts stood beside Indra and praised him during the latter's fight with and slaughter of Vṛtra; 1.80.11 says that when Indra, begirt by the Maruts, slew Vṛtra, both the worlds trembled in fear at his wrath; 3.32.4 says that the Maruts excited with song the meath-created strength of Indra, and the latter, being thus impelled to act, reached the vitals of Vṛtra; 3.34.3 says that Indra led his band (of the Maruts) add encompassed Vṛtra; 3.47.3 says that the Maruts, sharing in the Soma-drink, gave victory to Indra, and the latter *slaw* Vṛtra; 8.76.2 says that with his Marut friends Indra

35. Note that Indra's subduing of Ahi was a matter of the past.

broke Vṛtra's head into pieces by means of his thunderbolt; 8.96.7-9 say that the Maruts stood by Indra in his fight with Vṛtra when all other gods left him; and so on. As a matter of fact, Indra's fight with and slaughter of Ahi or Vṛtra was absolutely a personal exploit of his and also a matter of the remote past, and the Maruts, evidently being comparatively late intruders into the Vedic pantheon, had, in their origin, no connection with it. It must be for this reason that in *ṚV* 4.19.1 there is the statement that all the gods and both the worlds elected Indra, *alone* to slaughter Vṛtra; that in *ṚV* 1.165.6 and 8 Indra tells the Maruts that he slew Ahi Vṛtra with his own strength; and that in 5.30.6 it is said that the Maruts *praise* Indra and *offer* libations of him, because he *subdued* Ahi with his wondrous powers. As, from the statements about the Maruts occurring more or less in all parts of the *Ṛg-Veda*, it is evident that these deities had entered the *Ṛg-Vedic* pantheon much earlier than the *Ṛg-Vedic* hymns and verses on them were composed, and as, being people of comparatively very late ages, the Seers of the present *Ṛg-Vedic* hymns not rarely overlooked the high antiquity of the story of Indra's Vṛtra-vadha and also the chronology of the origin of this story and the Maruts' entrance into the *Ṛg-Vedic* pantheon, thus making a *confusion* between the word '*vṛtra*' meaning 'foe'³⁶ and the name 'Vṛtra' of the demon of drought of the ancient tale, the comparatively late Dāsa-Dasyu enemies of the Aryans as well as the Maruts came to be associated with Vṛtra of the ancient tale (who is also called Ahi). In order to show the Dāsa-Dasyus' association with 'Vṛtra' we have already referred to some verses of the *Ṛg-Veda*.

36. A peep into the *Ṛg-Veda* brings to light the fact that like '*amitra*', '*śatru*' and '*dasyu*' the word '*vṛtra*' has been used in a very large number of places in this work as a synonym for 'enemy'. According to Sāyaṇa, '*amitra*', '*dasyu*' and '*vṛtra*' respectively mean '*asniḡdha*' (unfriendly), '*upakṣapaṇakārī śatru*' (destructive foe), and '*āvaraka śatru*' (obstructive foe). (See, for instance, Sāyaṇa on *ṚV*. 10.83.3).

The said meaning of the word '*vṛtra*' points to the high antiquity of the story of Vṛtra (the demon of drought), so much so that even the early *Ṛg-Vedic* Aryans came to use the word '*vṛtra*' in a general sense to mean 'an enemy', what Vṛtra really was to the *Ṛg-Vedic* people,

On the Maruts' association with the latter there are also a few verses. For instance, in *RV* 1.23.9 'the bounteous gods' (viz., the Maruts) are asked to strike down *Vṛtra* with Indra for their ally, and in 8.89.3, prayer is made to the Maruts to sing to Indra their song of praise, and to Indra, called 'Vṛtra-slayer', to slay the '*vṛtra*' i. e., 'foe' (cf. *vṛtram hanati vṛtrahā*)³⁷.

That the Maruts, in their origin, were independent deities and had no connection with Indra, is further shown by the facts that in the very great majority of the Indra-Sūktas there is no mention of the Maruts and that most of the Marut-Sūktas are completely silent about Indra. The *Ṛg-Veda* also says clearly on several occasions that the association of the Maruts with Indra as their leader and master was a later development caused by particular circumstances.

From *RV* 1.170 and 171 we learn that originally the relation between Indra and the Maruts was very much strained and not at all friendly³⁸ and that the former was definitely against the worship of the latter by the Vedic people. Thus, in *RV* 1.170.2 sage Agastya, the Seer of the hymn (1.170) and the supporter of the Maruts' claim to divinity, is found to say: "Why, O Indra, dost thou intend to slay us? The Maruts are the *brothers*³⁹, share with

37. The word '*vṛtraha*' is derived thus वृत्रं हतवान् इति वृत्र + √हन् + क्विप्; and it means (one) who killed *Vṛtra* (in the near or remote past). As, thus, in the said expression, *Vṛtra* (the demon of drought) is said to have already been killed by Indra, the latter cannot be invoked to kill '*vṛtra*' if this word means that demon of drought.

38. *TBr.* 2.7.11.1 also refers to the conflict between Indra and the Maruts, saying that the bulls, consecrated by Agastya for the Maruts, were taken away by Indra, and that, as the Maruts approached Indra, by raising their bolt (*vajra*), Indra and Agastya managed to pacify them by means of the *Kayaśubhīya Sāman*.

39.इन्द्रभ्रातरो मरुतस्तव ।

The Maruts have never been called Indra's sons in the *Ṛg-veda* or elsewhere, although Keith says so in his *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, p. 151. *RV* 1.100.5 says that in his battle against his foes Indra is 'strong with the Rudras (i. e. Maruts) as with (his

them [the sacrificial offering] in a friendly way; destroy us not *in war* (मा नः समरणे वधोः)”. Again, in 1.170.5cd he says : “Indra, speak thou [in a friendly way] with the Maruts [and] then partake of the oblations [offered] in the proper season”; in 1.171.4 he narrates why he was compelled to allow Indra to enjoy the offerings prepared for the Maruts and apologises to them, saying : “I fled in terror from this mighty Indra, [my body] trembling in fear, O Maruts. Oblations meant for you had been made ready; these have we set aside; [for this] forgive us”; and in 1.171.6ab he conciliates Indra, saying : “Do thou, O Indra, guard the conquering heroes and rid thee of thy wrath against the Maruts”. Agastya’s pleadings on behalf of the Maruts and his attempts for bringing about a compromise between Indra and the Maruts became fruitful when, as the *Ṛg-Veda* says more than once, the Maruts gave up fighting and submitted to Indra and joined him as his allies in war (śami)⁴⁰, and, as a reward, the latter accepted them as Vedic deities

son) sons’ (स सूनुभिर्न हृद्रेभिर्ऋग्वा) thus implying that like loving sons, who never forsake their father at critical moments, the Maruts stand by Indra in his war with his enemies.

40. The *Ṛg-Veda* does not say expressly who the enemy or enemies of Indra was or were; but Griffith, in his note on his translation of *RV.* 1.87.5, says : “The Maruts obtained divine honours only as a reward for assisting Indra in his battle with the demon *Vṛtra*”.

Except in *RV.* 1.165.6, in which the Maruts are said to have placed Indra alone in charge of slaying Ahi (i. e. *Vṛtra*), there is no express statement anywhere else that the Maruts forsook Indra during his fight with *Vṛtra*.

From a study of the relevant *Ṛg-Vedic* passages (viz., 1.165.6, 170.2 and 5, 171.4 and 6, and so on) we learn that, as Macdonell, Keith, and several others say, Indra’s hostile attitude to the Maruts was due to these deities’ forsaking Indra during his fight with *Vṛtra*. But we must not forget that this is merely a mythical reason given by the poet-priests for the conflict between Indra and the Maruts, who are mythical figures. So, we are in need of a historical explanation of this matter, and this is given in the following pages.

deserving offer of sacrifice. Thus, *RV* 1.6.4 says : “Then, aiming at *svadhā* (स्वधाम् अनु, i. e. for the holy food offered at sacrifices), [the Maruts] obtained again the state of a foetus (पुनर्गर्भत्वम् एरिरे, i. e., had a new birth), assuming the sacrificial name (Marut) (दधाना नाम यज्ञियम्)”; and 1.87.5 says : “.....When, praising [Indra, the Maruts] joined him in war (*sami*), then only they obtained [their] sacrificial names (आदिन्नामानि यज्ञियानि दधिरे)”. In 8.12.29 also there is mention of the Maruts’ humble submission to Indra.

From the above statements about the Maruts’ assuming sacrificial names, only after submitting to and joining Indra as his allies against his enemy or enemies, it is evident that the Maruts were originally non-Vedic, or rather anti-Vedic and more particularly anti-Indra, deities, whose divinity and worship as Vedic deities were recognised by the Indra-worshippers, only after a long period of enmity.

It is highly interesting that this originally non-Vedic, or rather anti-Vedic or anti-Indra, character of the Maruts finds strong support in an ancient tradition which is now found to occur, with some variations here and there, in *Harivaṃśa* (Vaṅga. ed.) 1.3.123ff., *Viṣṇu-p.* (Vaṅga. ed.) 1.21.226-240, *Brahma-p.* (AnSS. ed.) 3.109ff., *Vāyu-p.* (AnSS. ed.) 67.86-135, *Brahmāṇḍa-p.* (Venk. ed.) 2.5.45-106, *Matsya-p.* (Vaṅga. ed.), chap. 7, *Padma-p.* (AnSS. ed., *Sṛṣṭi-kh.*) 7.1-67, *Devī-bhāgavata* (Vaṅga. ed.) 4.3.21-55, etc. and is referred to by Śaṅkara in commenting on *RV* 1.114.6, 1.166.2, etc. This story is as follows.

After Diti, a wife of Kaśyapa and the mother of the Daityas, had her sons and grandsons killed in a war between the gods⁴¹ and the Asuras, she asked her husband for ‘an immeasurably powerful son capable of killing Indra.’⁴² Kaśyapa agreed to grant her desired boon and said : “Your son will be the killer of Indra,

41. Ādityas (including Indra), according to the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa-p.*

42. पुत्रमिन्द्रवधायै समर्थममितीजसम्—*Hv.* 1.3.125 ab, *Viṣ.* 1.21.31 ab, *Br.* 3.111ed, *Mat.* 7.31 bc (v.l. ‘शक्र’—for इन्द्र), *Pd.* (*Sṛṣṭi-Kh.*) 7.32 ab (v. l. ‘समृद्धम्’ for ‘समर्थम्’), etc. See also *Vā.* 67. 89 ab, *Bḍ.* 2.5.49 ab—शक्रहन्तारं पुत्रं *Bḍ.* 2.5.50 a—पुत्रमिन्द्रवधे युक्तम्

if you bear the foetus (in your womb) for a hundred years⁴³ by following on austere life [and] scrupulously observing (the rules of) purity”.⁴⁴ [Here the *Matsya* and the *Padma-p* lack the said statement of Kaśyapa but have a few verses⁴⁵, in which it is said that at Diti’s prayer for a very powerful son who would be ‘the killer of all immortals (सर्वामरनिषूदनगर्भ)’⁴⁶, after Āpastamba had

43. For a thousand years (वर्षसहस्रम्) according to the *Bḍ.* (2.5.52).

44. इन्द्रं पुत्रो निहन्ता ते गर्भं वै शरदां शतम् ।
यदि धारयसे शौचतत्परा व्रतमास्थिता ॥

Br. 3.113

See also *Hv.* 1.3 127 (v. 1. ‘सुतो’— for ‘पुत्रो’— and ‘शौच’ for ‘शौच-’ *Vis.* 1.21.32-33 (vl. ‘शक्र’ for ‘इन्द्र’, ‘यदि गर्भं शरच्छतम्’ for the second pāda, and समाहितातिप्रयता शुचिनी धारयिष्यसि for the second.

45. These verses, immediately following the line ‘पुत्रमिन्द्रवधार्थाय etc.’ (quoted in fn. 42 above), run as follows :

वरयामि महात्मानं सर्वामरनिषूदनम् ।
उवाच कश्यपो वाक्यम् इन्द्रहन्तारमूर्जितम् ॥
प्रादास्याम्यहमेवेह किंत्वेतत्क्रियतां शुभे ।
आपस्तम्बः करोत्विति पुत्रीयामद्य सुव्रते ॥
विधास्यामि ततो गर्भमिन्द्रशत्रुनिषूदनम् ।
आपस्तम्बस्ततश्चक्रे पुत्रेष्टि द्रविणाधिकाम् ॥
इन्द्रशत्रुर्भवस्वेति जुहाव च सविस्तरम् ।
देवा मुमुदिरे दैत्या विमुखा स्युश्च दानवाः ।
दित्यां गर्भमथाघत्त कश्यपः.....

Mat. 7.32-36ab. See also *Pd.* (*Sṛṣṭi-Kh.*) 7.32cd-36 ef. (V.P. एतेन for एवेह in line 3; सुस्तनि for सुव्रते in line 4; स्पृष्ट्वाहं ते ततः शुभम् for इन्द्रशत्रुनिषूदनम् in line 5; भविष्यत्येव ते गर्भो दिवि इन्द्रनिषूदनः after line 5; इन्द्रशत्रो भवस्वेति जुहाव बहुविस्तरम् for line 7; and विमुखाश्चैव दानवाः for the second half of line 8).

46. This word may be analysed as इन्द्र एव शत्रुः (अर्थात् शातयिता) तस्य निषूदनम् [meaning ‘the exterminator of the foe (or chastiser) in the form of Indra], इन्द्रस्य शत्रुः (शातयिता),

performed, at his wish, an extremely expensive 'Putriya Iṣṭi' (Sacrifice meant for the birth of a son), in which the latter offered oblations into the fire with the Mantra इन्द्रशत्रुर्भवस्व⁴⁷, to the great delight of the gods and after disappointment of the Daityas and the Dānavas]. As Diti was ready to undergo all kinds of hardship for a son of her choice, Kaśyapa laid seed in her. But, unfortunately, Diti (who, according to the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa-p.* practised austerities at Kuśaplavana⁴⁸ made some lapses towards the end of the period, and Indra, who, being afraid of the enemy in his mother's womb, engaged himself to her service for an opportunity for killing the child, lulled her to sleep⁴⁹, entered her abdomen, and, with his thunderbolt, cut the foetus into seven parts. But these parts were all alive and began to cry bitterly. So, Indra asked them not to cry, repeatedly saying "Don't cry", "Don't cry"

तस्य निषूदनम् ('the extirminator of Indra's enemy or chastiser) or इन्द्रः शत्रुः (शातयिता) यस्य तस्य निषूदनम् ('the extirminator of him whose for or chastiser is Indra'). There is hardly any doubt that for misleading Diti Āpastamba used this word in the second sense with the requisite intonation.

47. The word 'इन्द्रशत्रुः', being taken as a Bahuvrihi Compound, gives prominence to Indra over his foes as their chastiser. So, it is said to be the cause of delight of the gods.
The reading 'इन्द्रशत्रो', given by the *Padma-p.* is defective even though it can be taken to give the same sense as that or 'इन्द्रशत्रुः' (a Bahuvrihi Compound).
48. *Bḍ.* 2.5.55-56. The reading 'कुशलं वनम्' of the *Vāyu-p.* (67.94) is a mistake for 'कुशलवन' found in some of the manuscripts of the *Vāyu*. For 'कुशलवनम्' (a holy place) see also *Mbh* (Vaṅga. ed.) 3.85.36 (which has been given as spurious in the Poona cr. ed.).
49. निद्रां च कारयामास *Hv.* 1.3.132; निद्रां चाहारयामास *Viṣ.* 1.21.37, *Br.* 3.118. But the readings 'निद्रयापहृता' of *Vā.* 67.100 and *Bḍ.* 2.5.65. and 'निद्राभरसमाक्रान्ता' of *Mat.* 7.54 and *Pd.* (*Sṛṣṭi-kh.*) 7.56 show that Diti's untimely slip was natural and due to fatigue.

(मा रोदीः).⁵⁰ As they did not stop crying, Indra got enraged and again cut each of these parts into seven. Finding all of them still alive (and evidently understanding that they were invincible and, consequently, taking a conciliatory policy), Indra made them (Vedic) 'gods' (*deva*)⁵¹ entitled to have shares of Vedic sacrificial offerings⁵², had them as his allies (*sahāya*)⁵³; gave them the name 'Marut'⁵⁴, and made them denizens of heaven⁵⁵. But Diti was not angry with Indra; she approved his attitude to the Maruts on the ground that, as the *Vāyu*- and the *Brahmāṇḍa-p.* say, 'there is nothing wrong in the slaughter of an enemy'⁵⁶. [The *Matsya*- and the *Padma-p.* say that Indra pacified Diti by apologising to her, saying: "This misdeed has been done by me by taking (my) stand on Arthasāstra"⁵⁷ and that he gave the Maruts a position equal to that of the (Vedic) gods]⁵⁸.

The above Purāṇic story supplies us with the following interesting pieces of information about Indra and the Maruts;

(1) that, as Diti desired and Kaśyapa assured her, originally there was *only one child (warrior son)* in Diti's womb;

(2) that it was Indra who cut this warrior child into seven groups of seven deities each, and gave them the common name Marut;

-
50. *Bḍ.* 2.5.70—मा रोद मा रोद; *Mat.* 7.58, *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-Kh) 7.60—मा रद्वम् Also *Mat.* 7.62—मा रुदत, *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-Kh) 7.68—मा रुद
51. *Viṣ.* 1.21.40, *Hv.* 1.3.135-6, *Br.* 3.121, *Mat.* 7.61. *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-Kh) 7.63; *Vā* 67.132.
52. मखभागिनः—*Mat.* 7.62; यज्ञभागभुजः—*Mat.* 7.65, *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-7.67; यज्ञभाजः—*Vā.* 67.132, *Bḍ.* 2.5.103.
54. *Viṣ.* 1.21.40, *Hv.* 1.3.136, *Br.* 3.121-2; *Mat.* 7.62, *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-Kh) 7.64, *Vā.* 67.110 and 121, *Bḍ.* 2.5.90.55. *Mat.* 7.64, *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-Kh.) 7.66; *Bḍ.* 2.5.105.
56. शत्रोर्वधे न दोषोऽस्ति.... —*Vā.* 67.109, *Bḍ.* 2.5.77.
57. अर्थशास्त्रं समास्थाय मयैतद् दुष्कृतं कृतम् *Mat.* 7.63, *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-Kh). 7.65.
58. कृत्वा मरुद्गणं देवैः समानम् भमराधिपः । ॥
Mat. 7.64., *Pd.* (Sṛṣṭi-Kh.) 7.66. Also cf. *Vā* 67.134 *Bḍ.* 2.5.103-5.

(3) that, being born from the same father but of different mothers, the Maruts and the Ādityas (including Indra) were stepbrothers and thus *cognate deities* and had, in their origin, the same status but a distant and strained relation, like that of unfriendly stepbrothers;

(4) that from their very birth the Maruts were bitter enemies of Indra and aimed at his life and position (and were consequently non-Vedic or anti-Vedic deities);

(5) that they were found invincible by Indra but were finally defeated in war and subjugated by the latter;

(6) that, as a *political move*, Indra accepted them as his subjects (*viś*) and allies, gave them recognition as Vedic deities, evidently of a lower position, under the common name Marut, and allowed them to have shares of the sacrificial offerings; and

(7) that, as Vedic deities, the Maruts were much younger than Indra and the other Ādityas.

It is highly relieving to find that all these pieces of information agree very remarkably with the R̥g-Vedic statements mentioned above. As the Maruts could be accepted by Indra (i. e., by the Indra worshippers) as Vedic deities and allowed to have shares of sacrificial offerings, and as the Purāṇic tradition makes them stepbrothers of, and thus cognate with, Indra and the other Ādityas, they must have been Aryan deities belonging originally to the non-Vedic (or anti-vedic) and anti-Indra Aryans.

In R̥V 5.53. 8-9 the Maruts have been addressed thus:

“आ यांत महतो दिव अन्तरिक्षाद् अमाद् उत । मावँ स्थात परावतः ॥
 “मावो रसानि तभा कुभा क्रुमुर्मा वः सिन्धुनि रीरमत् ।
 मा वः परिष्ठात् सरयुः पुरीषिण्यस्मे इत् सुम्नस् अस्तु वः ॥”

“Hither, O Maruts, come from heaven, from mid-air, or from near at hand. Tarry not far away from us.

“Let not the Rasā, Anitabhā, Kubhā [and] Krumu [and] let not the Sindhu hold you back. Let not the watery Sarayu stand in your way. With us be all the bliss you give.”

In the second of these two verses the river Rasā has been named together with the Anitabhā, Kubhā, Krumu, Sindhu and Sarayu; and in R̥V 10.75.6 the Rasā, Kubhā, Krumu, and a few

other rivers (except Anitabhā and Sarayu) have been mentioned as tributaries of the Sindhu. So, the Rasā mentioned in the said two verses as well as in *RV* 1.112.12, was a real river, and not a mythical one like the Rasā mentioned in a few other *Rg*-Vedic verses⁵⁹; and as it must have originally been the same as the Ranhā mentioned in the *Vendidad* or derived its name from that of the latter, as its name has been made to precede those of the Kubhā and the Krumu in *RV* 5.53.9 (quoted) and 10.75.6 (referred to) above, and as in the latter of these two verses the Sindhu is said to have met its tributary *Tr̥ṣṭāmā* first of all (*prathamam*) and then the Susaryu, Rasā, Śvetyā, Kubhā, Gomatī, Krumu and Mehantu in its downward course to the sea, there can hardly be any doubt that the Rasā was an affluent of the Sindhu (Indus) in the extreme north-west of the territory occupied by the Vedic Aryans in the Panjab. The Kubhā and the Krumu, which are reasonably identified with the Kophēn (or Kabul) and the Krumu respectively, were the western tributaries of the Sindhu after the Rasā : and so also must have been the Anitabhā as well as the Sarayu which was certainly different from the Sarayū of Oudh⁶⁰. Thus, the Rasā, Anitabhā, Kubhā, Krumu and Sarayu were all real rivers flowing into the Sindhu on its north-western and western sides. As, in the two verses (5.53.8 and 9) quoted above, the Maruts have not been invited as friends and benefactors to come to the land of the Vedic Aryans by crossing the rivers Rasā, Krumu, Anitabhā, Kubhā, Sindhu and Sarayu, but these rivers have been expected not to hold the Maruts back by obstructing their passage into the land of the Vedic people, these deities have been looked upon as well-wishing invaders coming from the north-west or west for their benefit. Although the north-western or western wind entering India in the winter is very cold and generally poor in moisture (and is thus like an unkind enemy), it is not absolutely undesirable, because, carrying some amount of moisture mainly from the Mediterranean Sea, it not rarely does good to the Vedic people by causing showers, often light, which are highly conducive to the growth of winter crops in the Panjab and the neighbouring localities. So, in the said verses

59. Viz., *RV*. 5.41.15, 9.41.6, and 10.121.4. We shall see below that the river Rasā, mentioned in *RV*. 10.108.1 and 2, is very probably, the name of a real stream.

60. The name of the river is seldom (if at all) spelt as 'Sarayu'.

the Maruts have been presented as enemies of the Vedic people but not as absolutely undesirable and unwelcomed deities to them. Consequently, there is an indication that these gods were originally Aryan but belonged to the anti-Vedic Aryan people and came for the good of the Vedic people from the north-west or west of the tracts of land occupied by them. Now, from the Babylonian records referring to the Kassites, who invaded Babylon from the Iranian plateau in the east and reigned there approximately between 1700 and 1100 B. C. and whose language, as known to us at present, had no connection with Aryan or Indo-European, we learn that, during the rule of the Kassites in Babylonia and Iran in the second millennium B. C., there was a hybrid pantheon consisting of Asianic and Babylonian deities and also of some of those of the Indo-Europeans. These deities, as named in a list with their Babylonian equivalents, include 'Shuriash' (Babylonian 'Shamash', the Sun-god), who must be the same as the Vedic 'Sūrya', and 'Maruttash' (Babylonian 'En-urta', *alias* 'Ninurta' and 'Inurta')⁶¹ who, as we shall see presently, later became the Indian 'Maruts'. So, there is hardly any doubt that in Babylonia and Iran 'Maruttash' had become widely popular with a section of the Aryans much earlier than the beginning of the second millennium B. C.; otherwise, he would not be recognised by the Kassite rulers as one of their most prominent deities.

From the name of the Indo-European deity Maruttash and that of his Babylonian equivalent En-urta (*alias* Ninurta and Inurta) it is evident that, like Shuriash (the Vedic Sun-god Sūrya) and Buriash (who, also mentioned in the said list, was undoubtedly the same as Boreas, the Greek god of the north wind), Maruttash was an individual deity⁶², who must have

61. Ghershman, *Iran*, pp. 64-65; Burrow, *Sanskrit Language*, p. 28; *Cambridge Ancient History*, I, p. 553.

62. In the *Cambridge History of India*, I, Chap. III (p. 67) the said name 'Maruttash' has been given as 'Marytas' which like the name 'Shurias', also given there, is undoubtedly that of an individual god and not that of a group of gods.

P. Giles, the editor of the said Chapter, is not sure that 'Marytas' means the 'Wind-gods' Maruts.

For a similar doubt caused by the singular number of 'Maruttash' and the plural of 'Maruts' see Burrow,

Sanskrit Language, p. 28, and Keith in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, I, pp. 15 ff.

The fact that 'Maruttash' in the Babylonian records is the name of an individual god, whereas the word 'Marut' has always been used in the Vedic and post-Vedic works in the plural number to mean a group of gods, need not present any difficulty in the way of identifying Maruttash with the Indian Maruts. We have already indicated and shall explain below elaborately why and how a single god of battles and of wind and rain was made into a group of gods in the Vedic religion.

The name 'Marutta' is very old. According to the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas, there was, in ancient times, an extremely powerful king named Marutta (son of Avikṣit), who, as *Mārka*, (Vaṅga. ed.) Chaps. 127-131 say, was born of a Gandharva princess and had his name from that of the Maruts who were invoked by Tumbura to favour him with their protection and blessings (*Mārka*. 127. 33-35). In *ŚBr.* 13.5 4.6 and *Mbh* 7.53.41 and 12.29.22 [= Poona cr. ed. Vol. 9, Appendix I, No. 8, lines 347.8 (p. 1089) and 12.29.19 respectively] the Maruts are said to have worked in King Marutta's palace as servers of food (parivestāh).

[In his English translation of the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* Eggeling renders 'parivestārah' as 'guards-men'. But this rendering is not satisfactory.—Cf. *Atharva-Veda* 9.6.51—यत् परिवेष्टारः पात्रहस्ताः When the servers (of food), with drinking-vessels in their hands (Whitney), and 9.6.53—यद् वा अतिथिपतिरतिथीन् परिविष्य — Verily when the lord of guests, after serving the quests,].

In Dravidian there is a word 'marutta' which means 'medicine man' (*ZDMG*, 23, p. 518); and the *R̥g-Veda* characterises the Maruts as possessors and givers of medicines (bheṣaja) and curers of diseases in more places than one (viz., 2.33.13, 5.53.14, 8.20.23-26).

For want of sufficient records it is not possible for us to say whether the Epic and Purāṇic King Marutta or

been like his Babylonian equivalent En-urta (*alias* Ninurta and Inurta)⁶³, a warrior god armed with various weapons and

the Dravidian word, 'marutta' had any basic connection with Maruttash (or Marytas).

From the facts that the *Mārkaṇḍeya-p.* gives out King Marutta to be the son of a Gandharva princess, that the Maruts came to India from the north-west or west, and that among the present-day Pathans (the descendants of the ancient Pakthas, who have been mentioned in the *Ṛg-Veda*) there is a tribe called the Marwats (i. e. Maruts) now living in the Marwat Tahsil of Bannu district (*Imperial Gazetteer*, VI, p. 394), it appears that Marutta was the name of an ancient deified ruler or chief of a (non-Vedic or anti-Indra) Aryan tribe, which came to be known as Marutta or Marut after their ruler or chief and in course of time became pro-Vedic and pro-Indra like the Pakthas mentioned in the *Ṛg-Veda*.

63. En-urta was the most important and powerful of the deities, besides those of the two triads (viz., Anu-Enlil-Ea, and Sin-Shamash-Istar), which formed the Babylonian pantheon. Being, in his origin, a nature divinity controlling wind and rain, he governed, in the earliest Sumerian period, the annual floods and growth of animal life and vegetation and had the plough as his symbol. He was also a mighty war-god 'wise in combat, whose crushing force the countries of the earth cannot support'. In the Assyrian period he became the god of battles and had his plough replaced by different kinds of weapons of war including a bundle of maces and weapons with convex blades which he held in his right hand. At Kalah he carried a bow. As a hero he led the attacks; and he destroyed the wicked and the hostile, and fulfilled the heart's desire. The month of Duzu was the month consecrated to him. His great prominence as a powerful god led to his identification with or assimilation to the 'bel'-s (lords) of a few cities of Babylonia and to the assignment to him of a wife who had different names at different times and places, was the goddess of medicines, and dressed wounds and cured diseases.

being originally a nature divinity associated with peasantry and with wind, rain, and growth of herbs, plants and food grains. We shall see below that in the *R̥g-Veda* the Maruts are said to have possessed all these characteristic features. So, there can hardly be any doubt about the fact that Maruttash was the same as the Indian Maruts; and the identity of these deities is evident not only from the striking similarity of their names and character but also from the facts that, as has been said above, the Maruts came to India from the north-west or west (in which direction Iran is from India), that, according to the ancient Purāṇic tradition referred to above, there was originally only one god, being meant for deadly war against Indra and the other Vedic gods and thus being by birth an anti-Indra (i.e., anti-Vedic) warrior god, was severed by Indra into a number of parts, all of which survived as individual deities of the same age, appearance and physical capacity and had the common name Marut, and that, ancient Iran being primarily an agricultural and stock breeding country, Maruttash enjoyed the respect and worship primarily of the agricultural and cattle-rearing people, or rather the anti-Vedic Aryan *Viś*, of Iran, just like the Indian Maruts, who had the Vedic Aryan *Viś* as their devotees. As Iran is mountainous and also has an extensive desert and many tracts of land where water is very difficult to procure, the original connection of the Maruts with Iran seems to find support in the frequent mention, in the *R̥g-Vedic* verses⁶⁴, of hills and mountains connected with these deities or affected by their great fury and terrible strength and in the mention, on two occasions, of desert place (*dhanvan*) where these deities caused showers (*vṛṣṭayaḥ-R̥V* 5.53.6) or poured down 'windless rain' (*miham... avātām-R̥V* 1.38.7). So, there is hardly any doubt that it was Maruttash of Iran who later became the Maruts of India.

It has already been said that Maruttash of Iran was an individual deity. So, the question arises as to why the Vedic Aryans of India made this single god into a group of deities describing Vedic sacrifice and why they gave this group the common name Marut.

From the *R̥g-Vedic* statements referred to above and from the said Purāṇic story of the origin of the Maruts it is evident

64. *R̥V*. 1.37.7, 12; 39.5; 166.5; 168.6; 5.54.1, 5,9; 55.7; 56.4; 60.2,3; 61.19; 8.7.1, 2,4,5,14; and so on.

that Maruttash originally belonged to those non-Vedic or anti-Vedic (or rather anti-Indra) Aryans who settled, temporarily or permanently, in Iran after migrating from their ancient common home, that the Vedic-Aryan worshippers of Indra had often bloody warfare with those non-Vedic or anti-Vedic Aryans of Iran and the neighbouring places who were sincere devotees of the warrior god Maruttash, and that for a long time the former found the latter very powerful and invincible, but at last, getting the upper hand, forced them to submission as their allies of a lower status.

That originally the Maruts were extra-Vedic, and their inclusion in the Vedic pantheon was the result of the Vedic Aryans' prolonged warfare with their anti-Vedic enemies, is further evident from the fact that in the *R̥g-Veda* and also in the post-*R̥g-Veda* works the Maruts have been called 'viśaḥ' (folk or subjects) or Vaiśyas, or associated with the (human) Vaiśyas as their presiding deities. Thus, {RV 8.12.29 speaks of 'the (divine) viśaḥ (consisting) of the Maruts' (mārutīr viśaḥ); in 1.39.5 the 'viś' of the Maruts is mentioned; in 3.34.2 Indra is called "the leader of the gods' viśaḥ (viz. the Maruts)" (viśam̐ daiṁvīnām...pūrvā-yāvā); in 5.56.1 the invoking priest says: "The (divine) viśaḥ (consisting) of the Maruts I call down to-day from heaven" (viśo adya marutām avahvaye divaḥ); in 7.56.5 the famous (divine) viś (i. e., the subject class) is expected to be one 'furnished with good heroes by the Maruts' (cf. सा विद् सुवीरा मरुद्भिरस्तु), and in 9.58.7 Soma is asked to flow onward unreveiled like the divine viś (consisting of the Maruts) (cf. पवस्वानभिश्स्ता दिव्या यथा विद्). The *Yajur-Veda-Saṁhitās* and the Brāhmaṇas often call the Maruts 'viśaḥ' or 'viśaḥ of the gods'⁶⁵ and occasionally correct the 'Vaiśya' with the Maruts as his presiding deities⁶⁶; in the Puruṣamedha Sacrifice, as described in the *Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā*, *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* and *Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa*, a 'Vaiśya' is dedicated to the Maruts, who are his presiding deities⁶⁷; the *Mahābhārata*

65. See, for instance, *KS* 10.11 (17-19), and 37.3-5 (4-8), *KKŚ* 46.3 (p. 277, line 12)—विष्मरुतः; *TS* 2.2.5.7, *KKŚ* 6.9 (p. 68, lines 15-16), *ABr.* 2.3 (p. 42), 2.4 (p. 44)—मरुतो वै देवानां विशाः; *KKŚ* 28.6. p. 126, line 8)—दैवीविशो मरुतः; *SBr.* 2.5.1 12—विशो वै मरुतो देवविशः...., 2.5.2.6, 24, 27, 35, etc. —विशो मरुतः or विशो वै मरुतः; and so on.

66. See, for instance, *KS* 37.3 (4)—मारुतो वै वैश्यः

67. *VS* 30.5, *SBr.* 13.6.2.10, and *TBr.* 3.4.1—मरुद्भ्यो वैश्यम्

says that, among the gods, the Ādityas are 'Kṣatriyas', the Maruts are 'viśah' (i. e., Vaiśyas), the Aśvins are 'Śūdras', and the divine Aṅgirasas are 'Brāhmaṇas'⁶⁸ and according to the Purāṇas the region of the Maruts is meant for those Vaiśyas who have lived by faithfully performing their own prescribed duties⁶⁹. From a highly interesting and significant story contained in the *Taittirīya-Saṃhitā* (2.3.7) we understand that the class of *viś* or Vaiśya consisted very considerably of such people of different ranks and tribes, both Aryan and non-Aryan, as being defeated in war or captured as war prisoners, were divested of their power and strength, brought down to the same social level, and reduced to the status of *viś* (i. e., Vaiśyas). This story begins thus :

देवासुरा संयत्ता आसन् । तान् देवान् असुरा अजयन् । ते देवाः परा-
जिग्याना असुराणां वैश्यम् उपायन् । तेभ्य इन्द्रियं वीर्यम् उपाक्रामन् ।...

[“The gods and the Asuras were in conflict. The Asuras conquered the gods. The gods, being defeated, passed into the status of the Asuras' *viś* (folk or subjects, i. e. Vaiśyas). From them power and strength departed.....”]

It is evident that, for speedy and sure solution of problems particularly relating to food and finance, the Vedic Aryans compelled their subjugated Aryan and non-Aryan enemies of different status and vocations to mix up with their *viś* and follow the duties of this class and the Vedic sacrificial religion; and as the number of the non-Aryans thus absorbed into the class of *viś* was evidently much greater than that of the defeated Aryans⁷¹, their inclusion

68. *Mbh* 12.208.23 cd.-24 (= Poona cr. ed. 12.201.22)—विशश्च महत्तस्तथा.

69. वैश्यानां माहृतं स्थानं स्वस्वकर्मोपजीविनाम्—*Bḍ.* 1.7.166 cd.
For this line see also *Vā* 8.174 cd (v.1. स्वधर्मम् उपजीविनाम्, *Mār.* 49.78 ab (v. 1. स्वधर्मम् अनुवर्तताम्), *Viś.* 1.6.35 ab (v. 1. —स्वधर्मम् अनुवर्तिनाम्), *Kūr.* (ed. All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi) 1.2.67 ab (v.1. as in *Mār.*), *Pd* (Sṛṣṭi-kh). 3.148 ab (v. 1. as in *Viś.*) and so on.

70. *TS* 2.3.7.1. For this story see also *KS* 10.10. (14-16), but in it there is no mention of the gods' being reduced to the status of the Asuras' *viś*.

71. Being Aryan by birth these defeated persons might, on occasions, have the opportunity, establishing their position in the Vedic society as Brāhmaṇas or Kṣatriyas in accordance with their respective duties and professions.

in the Vedic fold led to a great pre-dominance of non-Aryan blood among the Vaiśyas. It was most probably for this mixed composition of the Vaiśya class, with a much greater number of non-Aryans in it, that, in his *Nāṭya-śāstra* 23.107 cd-108 ab, Bharata prescribes, undoubtedly following a respectable ancient tradition, that under all circumstances the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas are to be made reddish--or yellowish-white⁷² (*gaura*), and the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras are to be made dark (or deep blue,—*śyāma*) in complexion⁷³.

The above state of things regarding the class of *Viś* (or Vaiśya) among the Aryans finds strong support in some post-*Rg-Veda* Vedic works⁷⁴ which, in narrating the story of Prajāpati's creation of the four classes of men with the relevant stories, metres, gods and beasts, say that from Prajāpati's belly (*udara*), which is the receptacle of food (*annadhāna*) and is the procreative middle (*prajanana madhya*) of his body, the All-Gods (*viśve devāḥ*) were created and, after them, the Vaiśyas, whose deities the All-Gods are, that, being created from the procreative middle of Prajāpati's body, the All-Gods were the most numerous of the (Vedic) deities, and the Vaiśyas, whose mixed origin is indicated by their association with the All-Gods, who, being created after the most numerous of the gods, were more numerous than others, and who were to follow the duties of agriculture, cattle-rearing, trade and banking, and also to pay taxes (*bali-kṛt*) to their rulers, became the main and inexhaustible sources of supply of food and finance, and that consequently, the Vaiśyas were 'to be eaten' (*ādya*, i. e., to be lived upon) by the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas. Thus, not only a king was free to seize upon the property of a Vaiśya according to the necessity of his state but also, with his permission, a Brāhmaṇa

72. In *RV*=1.100.18 the Aryans have been described as '*śvitnya*' as against the *Kṛṣṇa* (dark-complexioned) Dāsa-Dasyus.

73. The relevant lines of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* are as follows :

ब्राह्मणाः क्षत्रियाश्चैव गौराः कार्याः सदैव हि ।

वैश्याः शूद्रास्तथा चैव श्यामाः कार्यास्तु वर्णतः ॥

74. *TS* 7.1.1.5, *JBr* 1.69 (p. 31), *TMBr* 6.1.10, etc. See also *ABr* 35.3 (7.29) for the position of, and the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas' treatment to, the Vaiśyas.

and a Kṣatriya could utilise a Vaiśya's assets respectively for the performance of a costly sacrifice and meeting the needs of war, famine, and similar other crises.

Similarly, as the *Ṛg-Veda* and the *Tāṇḍya-Mahābrāhmaṇa* say respectively, the Maruts have a common home and are brothers among whom there is no distinction between the senior and the junior⁷⁵, and Indra forcibly took a thousand (cows) from them, 'his own subjects' (svām viśam), after announcing this to king Soma⁷⁶. Thus, the position of the human *viśaḥ* (or Vaiśyas) and the Maruts being identical to a great extent, the former deserved equation and connection with the latter, who, as we have already seen, are called, often and aptly, the divine *viśaḥ*, or Vaiśyas.

Although, from what has been said above, it is evident that the non-Vedic or anti-Vedic Aryans' defeat in war was a potent cause for recognition of the Maruts as Vedic gods following Indra and deserving share of Vedic sacrificial offerings, there seem to have been other serious reasons, stated below, for which the Maruts had to be accepted by the Vedic Aryans as their sacrificial deities and these deities came to attain wide popularity with the Vedic people.

It has already been said that the Maruts, as presented in the *Ṛg-Veda*, are basically the winds, stormy or otherwise, which are born of and move, as their forerunners, with the rain-clouds and bring rain and thunder in their train. Repeated statements have been

75. *RV* 5.87.4—स चक्रमे... निरुक्रमः समानस्मात् सदसः... (स = मरुद्गणः) 5.60.5—अज्येष्ठासो अकनिष्ठास एते... भ्रातरः 5.59.6—ते अज्येष्ठा अकनिष्ठासः... अमध्यमासः (Sāyaṇa—सर्वप्रकारैः समाः)

76. *TMbr.* 21.1.1—इन्द्रो मरुतः सहस्रम् अजिनात् स्वां विशं सोमाय राज्ञे प्रोच्य, तस्माद् राज्ञे प्रोच्य विशं जिनन्ति...

[Indra took per force a thousand (cows) from the Maruts, his own subjects, having announced this to King Soma. Therefore, they oppress the subjects after having announced it to the King...]. See also Kautilya's *Arthasāstra* 5.2.

made in this Veda⁷⁷ about the rainfall, light or heavy, caused by the Maruts in different places such as pastures, deserts, etc., and for this these deities have been invoked in a good number of hymns with great earnestness and sincere love and devotion. The showers sent down by them are said to be productive of imperishable seed of food grain⁷⁸ and also medicine (i. e. medicinal plant—*bhaṣaja*—5. 53.14), and thus to sustain life of the Vedic people as well as that of their domestic animals. So, rain-water has at times been called milk (*payas*)⁷⁹ and the rain-clouds the milch-Kine (*dhenavaḥ*)⁸⁰, and as with rain the Maruts make the earth productive of corns and medicines, a poet-priest, in praising these gods, once says : “Even Earth has spread herself wide at their coming, and they as husbands have impregnated her with power.....”(RV 5.58.7). The Maruts’ function as givers of food is very prominent in the *R̥g-Veda*, so much so that, as has been said above, the Maruts are said in the *Satapatha-Brahmaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* to have worked as servers of food (*pariveṣṭārah*) in King Marutta’s palace. So the Maruts are evidently deities primarily of the agricultural and cattle-rearing people. As a matter of fact, in Iran, from where the Maruts were first derived by the Vedic Aryans of India, Maruttash, who was the source of origin of the Maruts and must have been a very important and

77. RV 1.37.10 (mentioning heavy showers in pastures, so that the cows may walk knee-deep), 38.7 (on windless rain even in desert places); 5.53.6 (mentioning rain floods flowing over desert places); 1.36. 8-9, 64.2, 85.4 and 5 (said to moisten the earth, like a skin, with floods of water), 87.2; 2.34.2; 3.26. 4-5 and 13; 5.53. 2, 5, 10 and 14, 54.3 and 8, 55.5, 57.4 (said to be wrapped in robes of rain) and 5 (said to be rich in drops), 58.3, 59.5 (making, with floods of rain, the Sun’s eye fade away) and 7; 7.58.1; and so on.

78. In this verse, due to the separate mention of ‘*āpah*’ (‘waters’) and ‘*bhaṣajam*’, which are objects of the ground (‘*vr̥ṣṭvī*’ (meaning ‘showering’), the latter should be taken to mean ‘herb’, as Wilson has done in his translation of the *R̥g-Veda*. Cf. RV 6.52.6, in which Parjanya (Rain Cloud) is said to bring health with herbs (ओषधीभिः)

79. RV 1.64.5,6; 1.166.3; 5.60.5; etc,

80. RV 2.34.5; 5.55.5; etc.

popular deity, as his inclusion in the hybrid pantheon in Babylonia and Iran during the rule of Kassites shows, was worshipped by a heroic people primarily following agriculture and cattle-breeding for their livelihood. In the *Ṛg-Veda* the Maruts have been presented as extremely heroic, powerful and invincible deities capable of giving all-round protection to their votaries both in war and peace and also great prosperity and offspring. So, there must have already been traditions about the great liberality of Maruttash in giving rain, food, wealth and progeny, and also about his dependable heroism; and, consequently, coming with the vanquished Aryans of Iran, this god in his new form of the Maruts easily attained wide popularity with all grades of the Vedic people and made a position among them as being extremely powerful but highly benevolent and friendly.

We have seen above that both Maruttash of Iran and the Maruts of India were primarily the deities of the agricultural and cattle-rearing people. But, as Maruttash was the god of the vanquished non-Vedic or anti-Vedic (or rather, anti-Indra) Aryans of Iran, the victorious Vedic (or pro-Indra) Aryans of India lowered his position as well as that of his votaries to the position of the *Viś* (folk or subject, i. e., Vaiśya) among the Vedic gods and the Vedic people respectively. Now, as we have already seen, the class of *Viś* among the Vedic Aryans consisted not only of the Vedic-Aryan *viśaḥ* but also of such people of different tribes, positions and vocations as, being defeated or captured in war, were reduced to the same social status and compelled to follow mainly agriculture and cattle-rearing for their livelihood. So, in consideration of the facts that the class of *Viś* had a great numerical strength, that the members of this class were all of equal status but had different religious faiths, and that it was the *viśaḥ* who formed their King's army men and fought for him in the field of battle (cf. *ṚV* 6.26.1), Maruttash was made into a group of deities (very much like the All-Gods—*viśve devāḥ*, who, according to the *Taittirīya-Samhitā*, *Jaiminīya-Brahmaṇa*, *Tāṇḍya-Mahābrāhmaṇa*, etc.⁸¹ are the gods of the *Viśaḥ* or Vaiśyas), lowered to the position of *Viś* (or Vaiśya), and given a similar but new name 'Marut', which, in its plural form 'Marutaḥ' (i. e., 'Marutas'), which is clearly formed in imitation of and based on 'Maruttash', might be used for all these new

81. See *TS* 7.1.1.5, *JBr* 1.69 (p.31), *TMbr* 6.1.10, etc.

gods and by which all of them might be offered sacrifice by the Vedic people. So, this new name has been called a sacrificial one (*yajñiya nāma*) in two *Ṛg-Vedic* verses referred to above.

Being most needed and desirable gods and thus having attained wide popularity among the Vedic people the Maruts, in spite of their non-Vedic origin and their original position as *Viśam* among the Vedic gods, came to be classed with the great gods of the *Ṛg-Veda*, to be associated, like Indra, with the tribe of the Bharatas⁸², and to be offered sacrifice with Soma juice more than once a day with the use of the word '*svāhā*' (7.59 6)⁸³ as in the case of the other great Vedic deities. *Sāma* songs also were sung in praise of them⁸⁴. So, there is hardly any doubt that in the *Ṛg-Vedic* period the Maruts came to attain a position of very high respect as genuine Vedic gods among the Vedic people. As, thus, these deities, though classed as *Viśam* of the Vedic gods, could improve their position very much by dint of their own merits, and as their non-recognition as Vedic deities was sure to affect the Vedic society very seriously, a story was fabricated and introduced into the *Śatapatha-Brahmaṇa* (2.5.1.12-16), stating how they compelled Prajāpati (who is the same as the Vedic sacrifice) to offer to them a cake on seven potsherds for the safety of the creatures created by him.

In spite of the unquestionable friendliness and great benevolence of the Maruts, these deities were not unmixed blessings to the Vedic Aryans. As storm-gods and gods of rain they were not rarely objects of terror to these people. Being fierce and vigorous⁸⁵, terrible like wild beasts in their strength⁸⁶, impe-

82. See *RV* 2.36.2, in which the Maruts are called 'Bharata's sons' (भरतस्य सुतवः), and 5.54.14, in which the Maruts are said to have said to have given Bharata (भरताय) a horse as his strength.
83. We shall explain later why, in the post-*Ṛg-Vedic* ages, the use of the word '*svāhā*' ('hail') was denied in the case of the offerings made to the Maruts. - See *ŚBr* 4.5.2.17.
84. See *Sāma Veda* 2.2.2.7 (= *RV* 1.6.7, 4 and 5), 2.7.3.12 (= *RV* 1.86.8), 2.9.1.8 (= *RV* 8.94.4-6), etc.
85. *RV* 1.37 4, 38.7, 64.12, etc.
86. *RV* 2.34.1, 5.56.3, etc.

tuous like a wild bear (ṛkṣa, 5.56.3), and extremely wrathful like serpents⁸⁷ the Maruts, the giants of the sky (1.86.1), often rushed forward like wild boars with tusks of *ayas* (bronze or copper,—1.88.5) or like creatures drunk with wine (1.39.5), spreading darkness at day-time by means of the water-laden rain-clouds (1.38.9), roaring mightily like lions (1.64.8, 3.26.5), making the earth tremble in terror like the hem of a garment⁸⁸ or 'like an age-weakened lord of men'⁸⁹, shaking and bringing down mountains⁹⁰, throwing stones⁹¹, stirring and shattering woods⁹², uprooting and consuming trees like wild elephants (1.64.7), blowing away shrubs in high speed (1.166.5), terrifying every creature (1.39.6, 85.8) and making them tremble (1.69.3), scattering clouds about the sky (1.19.7), inundating the earth with floods⁹³, casting men down (1.37.12), and taking their life as well as that of their cattle with their bolt or lightning shaft 'armed with its gory teeth like a well-aimed dart'⁹⁴. So, prayers were repeatedly made to them by their worshippers to avert their blazing shaft from them and to see that their ill-will (*durmati*) did not reach them (7.56.9) and their bolt or blazing dart which kills men and cattle was far away from them (7.56.4, 17). These violent and destructive activities of the Maruts formed a prominent aspect of their character which is in full conformity with their natural basis and has been set forth in many of the Ṛg-Vedic verses, mostly for presenting these deities as extremely powerful and thoroughly capable of meting out reward and punishment to all and, thus, wholly dependable under all circumstances. As in setting their whole dread power in motion they profusely soaked the earth and made people happy (1.169.3-6), this aspect of their character did not tower their position in public eye and make them unpopular but enhanced their glory all the more.

87. ṚV 1.64.8-9; also 7.56.8, 58.2; etc.

88. ṚV 1.37.6; also 1.39.1, etc.

89. ṚV 1.37.8, 87.3, etc.

90. ṚV 1.37.12; also 1.37.7, 39.5, etc.

91. ṚV 5.54.3; also 1.172.2, etc.

92. ṚV 1.88.3, 5.57.3, 58.6, 60.2, etc.

93. ṚV 1.38.9, 85.9; 5.54.8; etc.

94. Cf. ṚV 7.56.4, 1; 1.166.6.

[Rudra's Association with the Maruts]

The position of high regard and respect, which the Maruts came to attain among the Vedic people through their association with Indra, was very different from that of Rudra as a Vedic god. It has already been said that the Maruts were offered sacrifice with Soma juice more than once a day, and Sāmans were sung in praise of them; but, as has already been said and will be shown below, Rudra in the *Ṛg-Veda* was not a Soma-drinking god, nor was any Sāman sung in his honour, even though he is repeatedly said to be the father and, on two occasions, the progenitor of the Maruts. There is not even a single *Ṛg-Vedic* verse in which Rudra, though often said to be the father of the Maruts, has been brought into connection with Indra either as a friend or as a foe of his; and there is no indication anywhere in this work that the host of the Maruts, when associated with Indra as his retinue, included Rudra among them⁹⁵. There is also no statement in the *Ṛg-Veda* as to why the Maruts, *alias* Rudras, if they had been associated with Rudra as his sons and followers earlier than with Indra, excluded Rudra from their group when they became Indra's followers, and Rudra, being the father of the Maruts, was not brought into touch with Indra. While the Maruts are implored by their worshippers, in *ṚV* 1.86.9, to strike the demon (rakṣas) with their brilliant lightning shaft (vidyutā), and, in *ṚV* 1.86.10, to drive far from

95. It is true that in *ṚV* 10.64.8, which is evidently a comparatively late verse, Rudra has been mentioned as 'rudriya (i. e. *rudra-Karm-ārha*—fit for doing terrible acts) among the Rudras, i. e., Maruts' (रुद्रं रुद्रेषु रुद्रियम्), but we cannot overlook the fact that there is no mention of Indra in the first eleven verses of this Sūkta (10.64). So, in the said verse the Rudras (i. e., Maruts) have not been presented as the followers of Indra.

[For the meaning of 'रुद्रिय' (derived from 'रुद्र' with the Taddhita suffix 'य') cf. *TS* 1.2.11.2 या ते रुद्र रुद्रिया तनूः....

(in which Sāyaṇa takes 'रुद्रिया' to mean 'कूरा' and Keith renders it as 'dread'), But we cannot take 'रुद्रा' to be synonymous with 'रुद्रिया']

them each devouring fiend (atrinam)⁹⁶, Ṛg-Vedic Rudra is nowhere found to chastise or kill any demon, be he a Rakṣas, an Atrin, a Yaludhāna, a Kimīdin, or anything else, although this god is presented in the Ṛg-Veda as extremely violent and malevolent and relentlessly murderous of the Vedic people and their cattle and destructive of their Vedic sacrifices together with the patrons and institutors of these rites. We have already seen that in spite of their occasionally violent and destructive activities, the Maruts were looked upon by the Vedic people as their friends and benefactors. As a matter of fact, in ṚV 1.52.9 these deities are said to be faithful to mankind and to be “Indra’s helpers for the good of men”. They are friends of men (3.26.5) and have friendly relationship and a feeling of brotherhood with their worshippers (10.64.13), who are said to invoke them by their ‘dear names’ till they are satisfied (7.56.10).

Besides the above differences in nature and activities between Rudra and the Maruts there are also a few others, which may be mentioned here. We have already seen that to the Vedic people the Maruts are the generous givers of food grains, whereas Rudra is the cruel looter and destroyer of these; the natural basis of the Maruts is much more prominent than that of Rudra, who appears in the Ṛg-Veda mostly as an ordinary human being of flesh and blood, or rather a demon of great ill-will, and whose natural basis has been blurred seriously but not completely; being the leader of the Marud-gaṇa, Indra is called Gaṇa-pati (ṚV 10.112.9), but not Rudra (who, thus, must have had no previous connection with the Maruts); and so on. That originally the Maruts were not associated with Rudra, is also evident from a few verses of the Ṛg-Veda, such as ṚV 1.43. 1-3, in which Agni is asked to bring and worship the gods Indra, Vāyu, Brahmanaspati, Mitra, Agni, Pūṣan, Bhaga, Ādityas, and the Māruta Gaṇa, but not Rudra (who is not mentioned in these verses), and ṚV 5.41.2, in which the Maruts are classed with Mitra, Varuṇa and others but not with Rudra. Here we should not overlook the fact that although the Ṛg-Veda contains a good number of hymns (such as 1.6, 1.167, 1.171, etc.) in which the Maruts have been praised conjointly with Indra, there is not even one which extols these deities with Rudra.

96. Sāyaṇa interprets ‘अत्रिणम्’, as ‘अत्तारं राक्षसादिकम्’ or पुरुषार्थ-
स्यात्तारं कामक्रोधादिकं सर्वम्’.

From what has been said above about the nature and activities of Rudra and the Maruts it is evident that in his origin the former was an independent deity and had no connection with the latter, and that he came to be associated with these deities much later than their association with Indra⁹⁷ (otherwise it is not possible for us to explain satisfactorily how, being said to be the father and progenitor of the friendly and benevolent Maruts, he could be stamped out as an extremely cruel and malevolent god and why, unlike the Maruts, he was deprived of the privileges of Soma drinks and Sāma songs from the very beginning). So we are to account for Rudra's association with the Maruts as their father and leader and not with any other Vedic god.

We shall [see on a different occasion⁹⁸ that Rudra was originally an outstanding non-Aryan deity, whom some pre-Ṛg-Vedic Aryan people (who were undoubtedly pro-Vedic) were compelled to accept for worship in order to earn his favour and, thus, to get rid of the terrible atrocities perpetrated by him (i.e., by his, undoubtedly non-Aryan, worshippers on these people. That, even after his acceptance by the Vedic Aryans, Rudra was not a much respected god in the Ṛg-Vedic pantheon and that his position as a Vedic deity was sufficiently low, are evident from the facts that he was never allowed the privilege of drinking Soma in any Vedic sacrifice and no Sāman was sung in his praise, although even the Ṛbhus, whom the *Ṛg-Veda* itself gives out to be originally human beings raised to divinity by their extra-ordinary skill in chariot-making and other works of art⁹⁹, and the Aśvins, whom the *Mahābhārata* calls Śūdras, were offered sacrifices with Soma juice without the least hesitation or objection, and the latter were also honoured with Sāma songs. This attitude of the Ṛg-Vedic people to Rudra shows that originally he was a highly dreaded god, whom

97. It must be due to this reason that, as has already been said above, the *Ṛg-Veda* contains a few hymns praising the Maruts together with Indra but not even one in which these deities have been extolled together with Rudra.

98. In our article entitled "The Source or Origin of Ṛg-Vedic Rudra" to be published in the *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda.

99. See, for instance, *ṚV* 1.110.3-4; 3.60.1-7; 4.33.3-4, and so on.

the early Ṛg-Vedic people took up for worship much more out of a feeling of fear than that of love and respect. We have already given accounts¹⁰⁰ of the maleficent activities of Rudra on the basis of the statements made about him in the *Ṛg-Veda*, in which he appears for the first time as a Vedic deity. Although the Ṛg-Vedic statements forming the basis of these accounts must have been made much later than Rudra's first entrance into the Vedic Pantheon, there is hardly any doubt that before his acceptance by the Vedic people as a deity of theirs, he was a no-less cruel and mischievous god, whom the Vedic people must have looked upon with great dislike, fear and hatred. So, Rudra's attainment of a place among the Vedic gods was not an easy matter. From the very few (only five) Ṛg-Vedic hymns in which Rudra has been extolled individually or jointly and from the small number of verses contained in these hymns it is evident that originally the Aryan supporters of Rudra's godhood were very limited in numbers. The foreign and non-Aryan origin of Rudra and his hated activities must have stood so adversely in the way of his attaining popularity among the Vedic people that even after his recognition as a Vedic god his position was not all enviable, very few of the privileges enjoyed by the Vedic deities being allowed to him and the number of his sincere votaries, who appear to have respected him mainly out of fear, being highly limited. We have already seen that Rudra was not only a relentless killer of the Vedic people and their cattle and an avowed destroyer of their sacrificial rites as of the patrons and institutors of these but also an extremely unsocial god who was highly intolerant of the Vedic deities. So, the first Aryan supporters of his godhood must have faced insurmountable difficulties in making room for him in the Vedic pantheon. It appears that, for giving him a Vedic stamp and, thus, making his entrance into the Vedic fold easier, they thought it advisable to associate him with the Maruts as their father and progenitor, and for this association there were a number of reasons, which may be stated as follows :

(1) Both Rudra and the Maruts were, in their origin, outlandish, and consequently hated, deities, although the latter belonged to non-Vedic (or rather, anti-Vedic or anti-Indra) Aryans.

100. In our articles published in *Journal of Ancient Indian History* (Calcutta), V. 1971-72, pp. 123-148, and *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, XXV, 1976, pp. 213-222.

(2) Being originally connected with storm, thunder and rain both Rudra and the Maruts had a number of features, mostly destructive, common to them.

(3) As Rudra was capable of accomplishing terrible acts much more than the Maruts (cf. रुद्रं रुद्रेषु रुद्रियम् RV 10.64.8)¹⁰¹ he rightly deserved to be their father and leader.

(4) Although the position of the Maruts as Vedic deities improved very much in course of time, it was certainly not so at the time of, and even for a considerable period after, their entrance into the Vedic fold, when they were looked upon as divine Viśaḥ or Vaiśyas and assigned a considerably low position; consequently, the Maruts were most suited for association with Rudra, and there would be little possibility of any objection being raised against this association.

(5) As the Maruts were already recognised as Indra's faithful and beloved allies and followers, Rudra's association with them as their father and leader would place Rudra in a friendly relation with, and thus make him immune from any antagonism from or conflict with, Indra, the most popular and powerful god of the Vedic pantheon.

From the mention of Rudra's said relation with the Maruts throughout the *R̥g Veda* it is evident that this relation had its beginning much earlier than most of the extant R̥g-Vedic hymns were composed and that the Vedic people accepted it without any open objection. We shall see on a different occasion that this acceptance was a matter of compulsion and not mere option, and there were serious political reasons behind it.

It has already been said that in one of the five Sūktas in which Rudra has been praised individually or jointly there is any mention of the word 'rudra' either as an epithet of the Maruts or as the name of a group of deities, whoever they may be, although the name 'Marut' for Rudra's sons and associates occurs in a few verses. So, the Maruts must have been given the epithet 'rudra' after Rudra's association with them, most probably because, as stormy winds bearing the rain-clouds, the Maruts also were roarsers, and the epithet 'rudra' for these deities would bind them closer to Rudra. It is to be noted that, although the Marut's howling, shouting or roaring has been mentioned in a good

101. For our interpretation of 'रुद्रियम्', see fn. 95 above.

number of Ṛg-Vedic verses with the use of the roots 'tan' 'nad' 'stan', 'svan' etc., there is not a single instance in which the root 'ru' or 'rud' has been used for the purpose. So, the Maruts must have derived their epithel 'rudra' from Rudra and not *vice versa*, because in that case there would be every possibility of Rudra's enjoying at least some of the privileges allowed to the Maruts and the Ṛg-Veda would mention his original and principal name, of which his present one would be an epithet. From the mention of 'rudra' as an epithet of the Maruts throughout the Ṛg-Veda it is evident that these deities had attained this epithet long before the extant hymns of the Ṛg-Veda were composed.

It is a fact that by his association with the Maruts, Rudra was able to earn the Vedic people's recognition as a Vedic god; but the position of the Maruts was affected considerably by it. As Rudra was a god mostly of demoniac activities so far as the Vedic people and their sacrificial rites and properties were concerned, the Maruts following him could not be expected to be better. As a matter of fact, in ṚV 1.122.1 (construed and translated above by us) the Maruts have been presented as Rudra's accomplices in looking or destroying the food materials of the Vedic people; and in 7.46.4 there is an indication¹⁰² that these deities took part in Rudra's killing the said people or binding them up (evidently for carrying them off as captives). The Ṛg-Veda contains a few more verses in which the Maruts have been desired to keep off from their worshippers the monstrous foe (*abhya*) sent by them (1.39.8) and also their 'blazing shaft' (*didyu, didyut*, i. e., lightning), their 'ill-will' (*durmati*) and their 'cow-killing (and) man-killing weapon' (*gohā nrhā vadhah*)¹⁰³. Although, besides cows, the Vedic people had also horses, goats, rams, ewes, etc. as their domestic animals, the mention of only cows as targets of the Maruts' deadly weapon indicates that these deities did not do this mischief merely in their capacity as natural phenomena, because, in that case, only cows could not be made the victims of their weapon, but they (i.e., their worshippers) were sworn enemies

102. Note the pronoun 'यूयम्', which has evidently been used for Rudra together with the Maruts. (See Sāyaṇa's commentary "हे रुद्रप्रमुखा देवाः, यूयम्.....")

103. ṚV 7.57.4, 7.56.9, and 7.56.17.

of the Vedic people like their father and leader Rudra. We shall see on a different occasion¹⁰⁴ that Rudra's character as a highly despotic war-lord, which had its beginning from a comparatively late Ṛg-Vedic period with his connection with the north and with the Mūjavat mountain, became much more prominent in the post-Ṛg-Vedic days, with the result that he became a much more dread as well as disliked and hated god. But as the Maruts had already attained great popularity among the Vedic people as very friendly and benevolent deities, their votaries must have disliked the idea that their 'dear'¹⁰⁵ deities should go down in public opinion with Rudra. So, as we have already seen, the howling and turbulent Maruts, called 'Rudras', were distinguished from the friendly ones and attached to Rudra as his worthy followers; and thus, in course of time, a distinct class of secondary deities called Rudras came into being and gradually fell in public opinion with their leader Rudra due to their increasingly terrible acts (cf. रुद्रं रुद्रेषु रुद्रियम्—RV 10.64.8).

It is a fact that in the post-Ṛg-Vedic days the Maruts were lowered very much from their respectable position as Vedic deities; and for this their association with Rudra was certainly responsible to a great extent. But there was a more serious reason, which is stated below.

From a study of the *Ṛg-Veda* we learn that competition between *brahma* and *kṣatra*, i.e., between the mystic (or holy) power of the Brāhmaṇas and the ruling (or lordly) power of the Kṣatriyas, for supremacy in all spheres of life social, religious and political, began in the Ṛg Vedic age with the growing importance of the Purohita, who, representing *brahma* was a Brāhmaṇa; and in course of time the Brāhmaṇas totally ignored the human rulers' control over them and declared themselves to be the subjects of King Soma. Thus in announcing the new king to his people in the Rājasūya ceremony, the Adhvaryu priest says: "This, O Bharatas, is your king; Soma is the king of us Brāhmaṇas".¹⁰⁶ According to the

104. In our work entitle "*Rudra in the Post Ṛg-Veda Vedic Works*", which is nearing completion.

105. Cf. RV 7.56.10 प्रिया वो नाम हुवे तुराणाम्....

106. TS 1.8.10.2. and 1.8.12.2 एष वो भरता राजा सोमोऽस्माकं ब्राह्मणानां राजा. See also KS 15.7(14)—v.l.—ते जनते (for 'वो भरता:'); MS 2.6.9 (25)—v.l. as in KS; VS 9.40—v.l. वोऽमी (for 'वो भरता:'). Also ŚBr 5.4.2.2—v.l. as in VS.

*Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*¹⁰⁷ it was only the Brāhmaṇas who were 'eaters of (remnants of sacrificial) oblation' (*hutādaḥ*) and were entitled to drink Soma, and not the Kṣatriyas and the Vaiśyas. As Indra and Varuṇa, being called Kings in the *R̥g-Veda* and thus representing 'Kṣatra', were Kṣatriyas, and the Maruts, being members of the Viś, were Vaiśyas, the Brāhmaṇas became reluctant to attach too much importance to them as gods, and thus they dwindled in course of time.

Abbreviations, used above, are the following :

ABr = *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* (ed. AnSS, 1930-31).

Bḍ. = *Brahmaṇḍa-purāṇa*.

Br. = *Brahma-purāṇa*

Ed. = Edition, or edited by

Fn. = Foot-note.

Hv. = *Harivaṃśa*.

JBr = *Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa* (Nagpur ed.).

JUP = *Journal of the University of Poona*.

-*Kh.* (as in 'Sṛṣṭi-Kh.) = -*Khaṇḍa*.

KKS = *Kaṣiṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā* (ed. Raghu Vira, 1932)

KS = *Kaṭha-Saṃhitā* (ed. Svādhyāya-Manḍala, 1943)

Kūr = *Kūrma-purāṇa* (ed. All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi)

Mārka = *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa*.

Mat. = *Matya-purāṇa*.

Mbh. = *Mahābhārata*.

MS = *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā*.

-*p.* (as in 'Brahma-p') = -*purāṇa*.

Pd. = *Padma-purāṇa*.

Poona cr. ed. = Poona critical edition (published by the BORI, Poona).

RV = *R̥g-Veda*.

ŚB. = *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (ed. Acyuta-grantha-mālā, Varanasi)

TBr = *Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa* (ed. AnSS, 1934-8).

TMbr = *Tāṇḍya-Mahābrāhmaṇa* (ed. Chowkhamba, 1935-36)

TS = *Taittirīya-Saṃhitā*

Vā. = *Vāyu-purāṇa*.

Vaṅga = Vaṅgavāsī Press (Calcutta)

Veṅk = Veṅkaṭeśvara Press (Bombay)

Viṣ. = *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*.

VS = *Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā* (Nirṇaya Sāgara Press ed., 1929).

107. *ABr* 34.1 (7.19) at pp. 860-1, and 35.2.3 (7.28-29) at pp. 879-82.

NOTES ON PRAJĀPATI

By

J. GONDA

[वेदेषु निर्दिष्टानामाख्यानानां देवादीनाञ्चोल्लेखः पुराणेषु परवर्तिष्वितरग्रन्थेषु प्राप्यते । तत्र केषाञ्चिदाख्यानानां विस्तारः क्वचित्संक्षेपः क्वचित्पूरणं च वर्तते । इत्थं वैदिकपरम्परायाः विस्तारः इतिहासपुराणादिषु प्राप्यते । अत्र विदुषा लेखकेन प्रजापतेः कीदृशोल्लेखः पुराणादिषु प्राप्यते अस्य सप्रमाणं विवरणं प्रस्तुतम् ।]

The problems¹ connected with the survival, assimilation, and transformation of Vedic belief and doctrines, Vedic customs and religious practices, mythical themes and divine figures belong to the most interesting subjects for research and discussion in the field of Sanskrit literature and the history of Indian religion. Notwithstanding the fact that many relations between the Vedic and the purāṇic and āgamic religions are fairly well known, a thorough investigation of all relevant and available texts, Vedic, epic, purāṇic

1. Abbreviations: AP. = Agni-Purāṇa; AVŚ. = Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā Śaunakiya recension; IG. = Īśvaragītā (belonging to the Kūrma-Purāṇa); ṚV. = Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā; AiB. = Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa; KaU. = Kaṭha-Upaniṣad; KūP. = Kūrma-Purāṇa; Kauś. = Kauśikā-Sūtra; KP. = Kālikā-Purāṇa; KB. = Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa; GB. = Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa; JB. = Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa; TB. = Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa; TS. = Taittirīya-Saṃhitā; PG. = Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtra; PB. = Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa; BĀU. = Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad; BŚ. = Baudhāyana-Śrautasūtra; BḍP. = Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa; BrP. = Brahma-Purāṇa; MuU. = Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad; MaiU. = Maitrāyaṇīya-Upaniṣad; Mbh. = Mahābhārata, crit. ed.; MŚ. = Mānava-Śrautasūtra; MS. = Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā; LP. = Liṅga-Purāṇa; VāP. = Vāyu-Purāṇa; VS. = Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā; ViSm. = Viṣṇu-Smṛti; ŚP. = Śiva-Purāṇa; ŚB. = Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa; SP. = Saura-Purāṇa; Har. = Harivaṃśa.

etc., may still be expected to throw more light, or a new or a more vivid light, on some traditional theme, some doctrine, some divine personage. The following small and random collection of notes on Prajāpati's presence in the purāṇas is mainly intended to substantiate the above statement, although it may perhaps also serve to correct and supplement some superficial and infelicitous passages in a recent book.²

That the mythical narratives about Prajāpati's creative activities have in course of time changed or have been replaced by other stories and explanations is only to be expected. Yet it is interesting to see that some particulars (motifs) have remained as they were in the Veda, and others were modified, gave rise to enlargements or came to be combined with other elements. To mention only this : whereas many Vedic texts inform us that before creating Prajāpati had to practise asceticism (*tapo'tapyata*, AiB. 4, 23, 1; TB. 1, 1, 10, 1 etc., also Mbh. 14, 50, 14, but ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 7 speaks of "singing praises and exerting himself")³, purāṇas make in this connexion mention of meditation or mental concentration (MkP. 48 (45), 5 *yuktātman*; 49 (46), 3 *satyābhidhyāyin* "concentrating on reality", the subject is Brahmā-Prajāpati). According to ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 7 f. he created the gods (by the breath of) his mouth (cf., e. g., also ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 1) and then the asuras by means of his downward breathing, and Har. 1, 1, 39 f.; MkP. 48 (45), 5 ff. etc. say that the asuras came into existence out of his buttocks, the gods out of his mouth, but whereas the Vedic text goes on to mention the creation of the year and the sacrifices of full and new moon, the purāṇas add the creation of the Fathers and of men. After each creative act the purāṇic Prajāpati assumes, in this narrative, another body, a motif not foreign to the Veda : cf. TB. 1, 6, 4, 1 where he transforms himself successively into Savitar and Varuṇa. The epic and purāṇic doctrine of the 'spiritual' creation, by Brahmā Svayambhū (who is generally identified with Prajāpati etc.), of "mind-born" (*mānasa*) sons (see e. g. Mbh. 1, 59, 10; BrP. 1, 43 f.; Har. 1, 1, 41

2. S. Bhattacharji, *The Indian theogony*, Cambridge 1970, p. 322 etc.

3. On creative *tapas* as a motif in the purāṇas see W. Doniger O'Flaherty, *Asceticism and eroticism in the mythology of Śiva*, London 1973, p. 375.

(33)⁴ cannot be dissociated from the Vedic passages such as VS. 18, 43; TS. 3, 4, 7, 1 etc. "Prajāpati who accomplishes (creates) everything, is (as) *manas*, the gandharva; the *rcas* and the *sāmans* are the *apsarasas*"; ŚB 6, 1, 2, 6 "Prajāpati entered into sexual union with Vāc by his *manas* (i. e. mentally)" (cf. also TB. 2, 2, 9 quoted below etc.). The first of these mind-born sons is Marīci; Atri, one of the others is no doubt mentioned in ŚB. 1, 4, 5, 13.

A good instance of utilization of ancient material and of elaboration of Vedic themes is found in the purāṇic account of Creation handed down in AP. 17,8 ff., BrP. 1, 39 ff.; Har. 1, 1, 29 (or 37) ff. etc. : Brahmā Svayambhū alias Hiraṇyagarbha produces heaven, earth etc. and thereupon Prajāpati (of course, the same god) creates time (*kāla*), mind (*manas*), speech (*vāc*), desire (*kāma*), anger (*krodha*) and delight or the pleasure of love (*rati*). As to the identification of Prajāpati with Hiraṇyagarbha see e. g. ŚB. 6, 2, 2, 5 and remember the so-called hymn to the unnamed god ṚV. 10, 121⁵. The ultimate origin of this doctrine or the god's continued creative activity is no doubt to be sought in passages such as PB. 20, 14, 3 ff. stating that Prajāpati emitted (produced, *vyasṛjata*) Vāc which was his only (possession); ŚB. 7, 3, 1, 20 where he has produced the earth; 10, 4, 2, 1 where he is said to have created all existing things. According to the account of Creation in TB. 2, 2, 9 *manas* was produced from the undifferentiated initial chaos (*asat*); in its turn it produced Prajāpati; in ŚB. 4, 1, 1, 22 *manas* and Prajāpati are identical (cf. TS. 2, 5, 11, 4; 3, 1, 2, 2; VS. 18, 43; JB. 1, 68; KB. 10, 2, 10 f.; 26, 3), but in MuU. 2, 1, 3 mind is, like space, water, earth etc., said to have been produced from the Puruṣa.

When Brahmā had seen Pārvatī his semen came to be ejaculated; at Śiva's request Prajāpati threw (sacrificed) it into the fire; out of it arose the 88000 *munis* who, living in chastity, are called Vālakhilyas (cf. 67, 14)—with this mythical narrative told in SP. 59, 55 ff. one may compare AiB. 3, 33 f., where Agni Vaiśvānara, aided by the Maruts, heats Prajāpati's seed (cf., e.

4. Cf. V. S. Agrawala, *Matsya Purāṇa. A study*, Varanasi 1963, p. 35 f.; on Atri, p. 118 ff.

5. Elsewhere, e.g. KūP. 4, 59; LP. 70, 101 Prajāpati is one of the aspects of the Supreme Being because he *pāti prajāḥ sarvāḥ*.

g., also PB, 8, 2, 10) and out of it sprang successively Āditya, Bhṛgu and the Ādityas. Except for Prajāpati the persons occurring in both narratives and the contexts in which the narratives are told—the *āgnimāruta śāstra* etc. in the AiB. and Śiva's marriage in the SP.—are different but the main motif is the same.

The reference found in KP. 58, 72 to Prajāpati creating “the syllable *Oṃ* by extracting the syllable *a*, the syllable *u* and the syllable *ma* from the three Vedas” occurs also in Manu 2, 76 and ViSm. 55, 10 (. . . *vedatrayān niraduhat* . . .) where the three *vyāhrtis bhūr bhuvahḥ svaḥ* are added to the former syllable. This deed of the creator god is already circumstantially told in AiB. 5, 32, 1 f. : Prajāpati, wishing to be propagated and multiplied, performed *tapas* (Keith⁶ translated “practised fervour”) and created the three provinces of the universe. Making these the object of his *tapas* he created three ‘luminaries’ (*jyotṛṃsi*), viz. Agni, Vāyu and Āditya; making these the object of *tapas*, the three Vedas; from these *bhūr bhuvahḥ svaḥ* came, likewise through *tapas*, into existence; from these likewise the sounds *a, u, m*. These brought together so as to form one single whole; that made *Oṃ*.

That purāṇic authors were not averse to pursuing Vedic subjects or to elaborating, or making use of, themes or motifs which had their origin in the Veda may appear, for instance, also from KP. 59, 32 : while explaining the composition of the Nārasimha-mantra (*kṣraum*) the author makes mention of the “syllable of the one brought forth by Prajāpati” : as already observed by the editor of the Venkaṭeśvara edition, the one brought forth by Prajāpati is Agni, and his *bija* is *ram*; so the syllable meant is *ra*. For Prajāpati as Agni's creator or father see, e. g., ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 1; 6, 1, 2, 27.

When reading SP. 15, 38, where a mantra accompanying the gift of food invokes Prajāpati after the food itself as the first of a number of gods who are implored⁷ to take away the giver's evil or

6. A. B. Keith, *Rigveda Brāhmaṇas*, Cambridge Mass. 1920, p. 256.

7. It would be worth the trouble to collect the Vedic and post-Vedic sacrificial formulae consisting of parallel invocations etc. of a number of gods and to study the order and combinations in which the names of the gods occur. Vedic combinations such as Bṛhaspati and Prajāpati (e.g. PB. 1, 2, 4; 6, 5, 3) or *viśvebhyo devebhyah sarvebhyo devebhyah* (MG. 1, 22, 5; Kauś. 56, 13) are also found in much later texts.

sin, we cannot help being reminded of ŚB. 5, 1, 3, 7 and 7, 1, 2, 4, where the god is said to be food; of 5, 1, 1, 2, where the sacrifice being identical with him (cf. 3, 2, 2, 4 etc.) is the food of the gods because Prajāpati has given himself to them (cf. also 4, 6, 4, 2; 5, 2, 2, 3; 8, 1, 1, 3; 8, 5, 3, 1); of TB. 3, 3, 4, 1, where he is stated to be ghee and honey; of TS. 3, 4, 8, 6, where he is instrumental in depriving somebody of the possibility of eating food. And see Mbh. 3, 200, 35 ff.; 68 stating that Prajāpati being food, the year and the sacrifice is pleased with food and that by giving food to brahmins one secures access to the god's world. Compare also the parallel mantra used in giving water which begins with the names of the aquatic gods par excellence, Parjanya and Varuṇa.

Sometimes a purāṇic author succeeds in dealing in a brief and concise, yet complete or almost complete form with a subject which in the brāhmaṇa literature is incompletely dealt with or referred to in different places. According to ŚB. 10, 1, 1, 3 the days and nights are Prajāpati's joints (*parvāṇi*); to 10, 4, 2, 18 the year consists of 24 half-months (*caturviṃśatyardhamāsah*) and the god beheld also the 15 parts of the day, viz. the *muhūrtāḥ* as forms for his body (the great fireplace which is in course of construction), as well as the 15 parts of the night (cf. 10, 4, 2, 27; 30); and to 11, 1, 6, 5 there are five seasons (*ṛtavah*) because Prajāpati fashioned them from the five syllables which he had spoken. See also AiB. 4, 25, 5: "Prajāpati, the year, was firmly founded on the seasons and the months" and the enumeration of the divisions of time in ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 14: days and nights, half-months (*ardhamāsāḥ*), months, seasons (cf. also TB. 3, 10, 10, 2 ff.). Now compare IG. 6, 40 *kalākāṣṭhā nimeśās ca muhūrtā divasāḥ kṣapāḥ|ṛtavah pakṣamāsās ca sthitāḥ śāstre prajāpateḥ*.

That, notwithstanding Śiva's and Viṣṇu's rise to the highest power and position, redactors of purāṇas were aware of the fact that there were others who recognized not only Brahmā but also Prajāpati as the cause of creation and Supreme Being appears from BḍP. 2,3,91 and VāP. 66, 112 *brahmāṇaṃ kāraṇaṃ kecid kecid āhuḥ prajāpatiḥ|kecid bhavaṃ (śivaṃ) paratvena prāhur viṣṇuṃ tathāpare*. However, in places such as BḍP. 2,3,63; VāP. 66, 62 where his name is associated with those of Viṣṇu and Bhava it is no doubt interchangeable with that of Brahmā (cf. VāP. 66,83 and 86).

In a section that deals with creation and evolution the authors of LP. 70, 90 f.; BḍP. 1, 4, 17 ff.; VāP. 5, 28 ff. say that Svayambhū

or Prajāpati manifests himself in three states or conditions, viz. as Brahmā, as Kāla, and as Puruṣa, observing that in his first aspect Prajāpati emits the worlds etc. : *brahmatve sṛjate lokān kālatve saṃkṣīpaty api|puruṣatve hy udāsīnas tisro 'vasthāḥ prajāpateḥ*. The same thought is expressed in the Calcutta edition of the Mahābhārata (3, 15824⁸) *sṛjate brahmanūrtis tu rakṣate pauruṣī tanuḥ|raudrībhāvena śamayet tisro 'vasthāḥ prajāpateḥ*. It is as far as I know not before this late epic passage that we read that the Lord of Creatures emanates in his form as Brahmā, preserves as Puruṣa and extinguishes or suppresses in his Rudra nature. The doctrine of the union of the three gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva—the *trimūrti*—can indeed hardly be said to form part of the religious system recognized by the authors of the Mahābhārata⁹. Nor does this idea seem to be clearly stated in the ancient parts of the Rāmāyaṇa¹⁰. In the purāṇas, however, it occurs as an invariable doctrine in innumerable places¹¹, a clear and authoritative definition being given for instance in VāP. 5, 17. The *trimūrti* idea—which should be distinguished from triads of gods and threefold joint manifestation of divine power, often found in the Veda¹²—seems to have developed from ancient cosmological and ritualistic speculations about the triple character of an individual god, in the first place of Agni¹³, including among other things the awareness of the difference between the oneness of a deity and the plurality of his functions (see e. g. Yāska, Nir. 7, 5; Śāṅkara, on BĀU. 3, 9, 9), the conviction that essential elements of a triad of gods are complementary and so on. It may also be noticed that the Vedic Prajāpati is as the 34th believed to exceed, surpass, include and encompass the totality constituted by 33 gods (TB. 1, 87,

-
8. See in V. S. Sukthankar's critical edition, The Āraṇyaka-parvan. II, Poona 1942, Appendix I, p. 1085, line 35 and 36.
 9. Otherwise P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, II, Poona 1941, p. 724.
 10. See also A. Guruge, *The society of the Rāmāyaṇa*, Mahāragama (Ceylon) 1960, p. 256; 258.
 11. For some places see J. Gonda, *The Hindu Trinity*, in *Anthropos* 63 (1968), p. 220, fn. 63 (= *Selected Studies*, IV, Leiden 1975, p. 35).
 12. Gonda, *Trinity*, p. 215 (30) ff.; *Triads in the Veda*, Amsterdam Academy 1976.
 13. For particulars see Gonda, *Trinity*, p. 218 (33) f.

1; PB. 10, 1, 16; ŚB. 5, 1, 2, 13; 5, 3, 4, 23 etc.). The purāṇic *trimūrti* doctrine likewise implies that the Lord, Viṣṇu or Śiva, includes and encompasses their three manifestations but at the same time also exceeds and surpasses them¹⁴. Is there, by the way, not something to be said in favour of the thesis that this old view of Prajāpati survives in places such as MkP. 29 (26), 15 enjoining to present libations of water (*tarpaṇam*) to the gods, *ṛsis*, Fathers and Prajāpati ?

As to the two above quotations, it is worth noticing that on the one hand they both use the verb *srjate* which in the Veda is usual in connexion with Prajāpati's creative activity; that Viṣṇu's identification with Puruṣa is foreshadowed in VS. 31, 22, where Śrī and Lakṣmī, elsewhere Viṣṇu's spouse(s), are said to be the wives of Puruṣa-Prajāpati—for their identification see JB. 2, 56; ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 5—in the form of the Sun, and that at KaU. 3, 9 and 11 dealing with the progression to the final goal (the end of the journey, the Supreme) this is described as the highest place or abode of Viṣṇu and as the Puruṣa. On the other hand, neither text mentions the name Śiva. The Mahābhārata alludes to the god's Vedic name Rudra : by using the term *raudrībhāva* the author takes also the opportunity of characterizing this manifestation of the god as dreadful. The term Kāla used in the purāṇas may be regarded as a substitute for *saṃvatsara* "the year" with which, in the Veda, Prajāpati is often identified (cf. e. g. ŚB. 1, 5, 1, 16; 1, 6, 3, 35; 2, 2, 2, 3ff.; JB. 8, 167; 2, 56), although it may be recalled that in as early a text as AVŚ. 19, 53, being part of two successive hymns in which Kāla (Time) is eulogized as the highest principle, the first of the gods and the creator of heaven and earth, Time is said to be the father of Prajāpati (st. 8 and 10). In Mbh. 12, 217, 52 eulogizing Brahman as Kāla, the latter is also called Prajāpati. The year, a cosmological entity—in which are contained the past and the future (PB. 18, 9, 7)—is the full time cycle, and "the year, indeed, is Prajāpati as time" (*saṃvatsaro vai prajāpatiḥ kālah*, MaiU. 6, 15). As to the term *brahmatve*, which occurs in the above quotation, Prajāpati is at ŚB. 7, 3, 1, 42 explicitly stated to be the whole *brahman*, at SVB. 1, 1, 1 ff. said to have had his origin in the mind (*manas*) of Brahmā who owed his exis-

14. Cf. also W. Kirfel, *Die dreiköpfige Gottheit*, Bonn 1948, p. 43.

tence to the semen of *brahman*; and as is well known, in the Mahābhārata he is mostly identified or identifiable with Brahmā (cf. e. g. also MaiU. 5, 1 "Thou art Brahmā.....thou art Prajāpati"). Remember also that the combination of the names Kāla and Rudra, viz. Kālarudra, is (e. g. ŚP. V a, 11, 41) used to denote Śiva-Maheśvara as the power which makes an end to all phenomenal existence.

Not infrequently we find in the purāṇas combinations of the name Prajāpati and a proper name, e. g. MkP. 5, 3 "the *prajāpati* Tvaṣṭar" (Pargiter's¹⁵ translation); 17, 12 the *prajāpati* Soma; 50, 12 the *prajāpati* Ruci; 52, 23 the *prajāpati* Pulaha; 53, 14 the *prajāpati* Kardama; 33 the *prajāpati* Priyavrata; SP. 28, 2 the *prajāpati* Virāṇa and so on (see below). In these expressions the word *prajāpati* functions as a name or title of a class or group of mythical figures. It is worth while to consider some of them more closely.

The first, Tvaṣṭar, is of course the well-known Vedic divine fashioner or shaper of forms (TB. 1, 8, 1, 2), who is also often described as bestowing offspring and presiding over fashioning (RV. 3, 4, 9; 3, 55, 19; 7, 34, 20 etc.), as fascioning or transforming the cast semen (ŚB 4, 4, 2, 16, and ruling the living forms (5, 4, 5, 8). In GB. 2, 2, 1 we read the story of Prajāpati creating offspring by means of a horse that belonged to Tvaṣṭar. In the oft-quoted stanza RV. 10, 184, 1 Viṣṇu is implored to prepare the womb, Tvaṣṭar to shape the forms, Prajāpati to pour in (the semen) and in ŚB. 1, 9, 2, 10; 3, 7, 2, 8; 4, 4, 2, 16 Tvaṣṭar transforms (*vikaroti*) the semen that has been emitted (cf. also TB. 2, 6, 18, 4; 2, 8, 7, 4). In AVŚ. 7, 17, 4; TS. 1, 4, 44, a Dhātār, Savitar, Prajāpati, Tvaṣṭar and a few other gods are implored for wealth with offspring. Tvaṣṭar is at ŚB. 3, 7, 3, 11 the lord of the domestic animals which are often said to be Prajāpati's concern; in MŚ. 1, 6, 1, 39 he is invoked as their protector. The comparatively frequent occurrence of the two gods in the same passage foreshadows the assimilation of the Fashioner to the Creator of Life. Just as the latter is not infrequently described as being desirous of propagating himself (TS. 5, 5, 2, 5; 7; 1, 1, 4; TB. 2, 1, 2, 8; AiB. 4, 23, 1 etc.) and realizes his ambition by means of a sacrificial rite (e. g. TS. 7, 2, 5, 1; AiB. 4, 23, 1 f.) the former (Tvaṣṭar, in

15. F. Eden Pargiter, *The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, Calcutta 1904, p. 22.

TB. 2, 5, 7, 4 called the Lord of Forms, *rūpapatih*) offers at TB. 3, 1, 4, 12 a sacrificial cake in order to obtain offspring, thereby so to say fulfilling Prajāpati's function. It is not surprising that this led to fusion and identification of the two gods, but in JB. 1, 259, where this process appears to have made progress, names and functions are still distinguished: the patron of the sacrifice is the sacrifice, soma is the sacrifice; when the soma is pressed, the patron (*yajamāna*) becomes semen; "the chanter (*udgātar*) is Prajāpati; this one is Tvaṣṭar; he is the shedder (*sektā*; in ṚV. 10, 184, 1 the verb *sic*-is used) of semen; he is the transformer (*vikartā*, see above) of forms. When....the *udgātar* chants the *retasyā* stanza he sheds the *yajamāna* who has become semen (*retas*)". The next stage seems to have been reached in Mbh. 5, 9, 3 and 40 (cr. ed.). In this "ancient story", the epic version of the history of Tvaṣṭar's son Trisīras who was killed by Indra¹⁶ the god is, not as in ŚB. 12, 7, 1, 1; 12, 8, 3, 1 and GB. 2, 5, 6 simply called by his traditional single name, but Tvaṣṭar Prajāpati (without interruption). This combination creates the impression of being comparable to double names such as Puruṣa Prajāpati (ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 8: cf. 5 "that same Puruṣa became Prajāpati"); Puruṣa Nārāyaṇa (12, 3, 4, 1); Hari Nārāyaṇa (Mbh. 12, 270, 28);—compare also Brahmā Prajāpati (MkP. 81 (78), 51); Padmayoni Prajāpati (82 (79), 3); Dakṣa Prajāpati (SP. 28, 1) denoting two divine figures that had become one. The above English spelling of the double name Tvaṣṭar Prajāpati, with two capitals, which is also found in the most recent translation¹⁷, seems therefore to be right. Notice that in MkP. 5, 3 the combination is interrupted: *tvaṣṭā kruddhaḥ prajāpatih*.

On Viśvakarman—e. g. MkP. 106 (103), 1; 107 (104), 1—a few words may suffice. In ṚV. 10, 81 and 82 he is, among other things, "our father and progenitor, the one who places or establishes (*dhātā*), the one who disposes (*vidhātā*) and the one who gives the (other) gods their names". Among the qualities which in various religions are attributed to a high god or a Supreme Being is also 'visual omniscience'¹⁸: according to ṚV. 10, 81, 2 he is "all-

16. See e. g. E.W. Hopkins, *Epic mythology*, Strassburg 1915, p. 130.

17. J.A.B. van Buitenen, *The Mahābhārata*. Books IV and V, Chicago 1978, p. 202; 204.

18. Cf. R. Pettazoni, *The All-knowing god*, London 1956, p. 3 ff. etc.

seeing" (*viśvacakṣāḥ*) In the brāhmaṇas this All-maker, or Creator of all things—I have my doubts about the correctness of the view that this figure was an abstract deity originating in a compound epithet¹⁹—is not infrequently (cf. ŚB. 7, 4, 2, 5, 8, 2, 1, 10; 8, 2, 3, 13, see also 7, 1, 1, 43) explicitly said to be Prajāpati; see also 9, 4, 1, 12, explaining VS. 18, 43, where both names are placed side by side; likewise TB. 3, 7, 9, 7, where a translation "Prajāpati, is the creator of all things"²⁰ is possible; so is "Prajāpati, the maker of all" in VS. 12, 61; at MS. 1, 3, 35 : 42, 4 where the two names are followed by two epithets this translation is most probable. Elsewhere, however, they are clearly distinct deities (ŚB. 6, 2, 3, 10; cf. also 6, 2, 1, 5). Epic places describing Viśvakarman as the carpenter of the gods²¹ no doubt attest to a role played by this deity in popular belief that in all probability existed already in an earlier period.

The story of Prajāpati becoming a tortoise (*kūrma*, ŚB. 7: 5, 1, 5) in order to create, in that from, living beings is well known, and (the text adds) since *kūrma* and *kaśyapa* are synonyms, all creatures are said to be descended from Kaśyapa. This story is no doubt based on ancient and widespread belief in the cosmogonic functions of that animal which therefore could be regarded as a manifestation of the creator god²². In PG. 2,9, 2 however both Prajāpati and Kaśyapa are recipients of offerings. Interestingly, the names of the five gods to whom in this *grhyasūtra* offerings are made, uiz. *brahmaṇe prajāpataye, grhyābhyāḥ, kaśyapāya, anumataye* recur in the same order in MkP. 44 (31),

19. A.A. Macdonell, *Vedic mythology*, Strassburg 1897, p. 118.

20. Thus P. E. Dumont, in *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 107 (1963), p. 453.

21. Hopkins, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

22. I refer to my book *Aspects of early Viṣṇuism*, Utrecht 1954, ²Delhi 1969, ch. XVIII. It is not surprising that there should have been mythical or historical persons bearing the name Kaśyapa "Tortoise" who had nothing to do with this identification. The remarks made by A. B. Keith, *The religion and philosophy of the Veda*, Cambridge Mass. 1925, p. 196 are not wholly convincing.

95 f. (only *guhyaebhyaḥ* instead of the deities of the house). Here Pargiter's translation "to the *prajāpati*" is wrong. In the Mahābhārata Kaśyapa is a *ṛṣi* and a son of Marīci; at 1, 27, 16 the words, *kaśyapo'tha prajāpatiḥ* were recently translated "Kaśyapa, Lord of Creation"; according to 1, 60, 33 gods as well as asuras were born from him, but in st. 11 f. he is not identical with Prajāpati who gave him thirteen wives, daughters of Dakṣa, a passage too well known to be discussed here (see e. g. BrP. 2, 48; 32, 4). It is not always easy to decide how to translate passages such as MkP. 97 (94), 8 *prajāpateḥ* (*sic*) *kaśyapāya somāya varuṇāya ca* | ... *namasyāmi kṛtāñjaliḥ* : probably "Prajāpati Kaśyapa", but elsewhere "the *prajāpati* Kaśyapa" may be preferred (e. g. 80 (77), 9).

As to the *prajāpati* Soma, in Mk. 17, 12 (16, 103)—notice that in the preceding stanza Brahmā is related to have become Soma—the proper name opens the stanza and the 'title' is placed at its end: "Soma, ever causing creepers, (medicinal) plants and men to grow with his cool rays . . . , the *prajāpati*". Remarkably enough, Soma Pavamāna is already at ṚV. 9, 5, 9 said to be Prajāpati "the Lord of Creatures". Is Prajāpati here only just an epithet²³? or is Soma—in ṚV. 10, 97, 18 the king of plants—here 'identified' with Prajāpati, the creator of life? Otherwise Vedic texts attesting to special relations between the two gods appear to be few in number: at KB. 18, 1, 7 f. Sūryā, given in marriage to Soma, is said to be Prajāpati's or Savitar's daughter; ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 14 Soma is one of the four gods who are created out of Prajāpati; 12, 6, 1, 1 Prajāpati is, as the sacrifice, identified with King Soma; see also 10, 4, 2, 1.

In connexion with Manu Vaivasvata, the *prajāpati* (MkP. 106 (103), 4), it may be observed that Manu is already ŚB. 6, 6, 1, 19 on etymological grounds (Prajāpati's relation with the root *man*—; for this god and *manas* see e. g. VS. 18, 43; JB. 1, 68) identified with this god; at 14, 1, 3, 25 the earth is related to have carried "Manu, her lord (*patiḥ*), Prajāpati". The patronymic Vaivasvata is added to the name Manu (king of men) in ŚB. 13, 4, 3, 3 (cf. ṚV. 8, 52, 1 *manau vivasvati*)²⁴.

23. Cf. L. Renou, *Etudes vediques et pāṇineennes*, VIII, Paris 1961, p. 53.

24. For other particulars see Macdonell, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

In view of the fact that in the Vedic period several personages were identified with Prajāpati or were regarded as manifestations of this deity the number of these figures could in course of time easily increase²⁵. Thus the *prajāpati* Kardama (MkP. 52 (49), 24; 53 (50), 13) makes his appearance in Mbh. 12, 59, 97 (*prajāpateḥ kardamasya*) but as far as I am able to see, he does not belong to the Veda. That this Kardama, just as Priyavrata (MkP. 53 (50), 33) and others, was also a progenitor rich in offspring is as easy to understand as the tendency to regard a Manu as a Prajāpati (e.g. Mk. 73 (70), 1 *manvantare... auttamasya prajāpateḥ*, 67 (64), 1 *svārociṣaṃ nāmnā... prajāpatim/manuṃ cakāra bhagavān*) which is already found in the Veda (VS. 11, 66; BŚ. 8, 12: 250, 5 etc.).

25. A plural *prajāpatibhiḥ* occurs already at AVPaipp. 5, 35, 11 : *prajāpataye samanaman tasmai prajāpatibhiḥ samanaman.*

CERTAIN GEOGRAPHICAL CONCEPTS IN THE PURĀNAS

By

N. GANGADHARAN

[पुराणेषु सामान्यतो प्रख्यातभौगोलिकविषयातिरिक्तं संक्षिप्त-
रूपेण वर्णितानां भूगोलविषयाणां विवरणं प्राप्यते । अत्र पुराणेषु लिखितानां
कूप-भूमिविभाग-वायुस्कन्ध-नगरसंज्ञिवेश-भूमिभागादिनां विषयाणां
संक्षिप्तरूपेण विवरणं प्रदत्तमस्ति ।]

Almost all the *Purāṇas* have sections describing the origin of the world, origin of the earth, the divisions of the earth into 7 continents, the names of the different oceans in these continents and their characteristics and the names of the mountains forming the boundaries of the different regions. It is quite interesting to find some more geographical concepts explained in the *Purāṇas*. The purpose of this paper is to shed light on such concepts which are not normally known.

Artesian wells

There is a clear reference¹ to the bubbling up of water from the ground in the *Kimpuruṣavarṣa*.

Classification of the soils

The soils in the subterranean regions are classified² into seven categories such as (1) black, (2) white or yellowish, (3) blue or red, (4) yellow, (5) gravelly, (6) lilly and (7) golden coloured.

Five types of rocks are recognised in the *Padmapurāṇa*³—quartz, blue rocks, *Indranīla*, yellow and white. *Varāhapurāṇa*⁴ names a kind of rock as *Bhaumasīlā*.

1. *Mārka*. 56.21-22.
2. *Brahmāṇḍa* (Pūrva) XX. 13-14; *Brahma* XXI. 3; *Skanda* (Maheśvara) (Kaum.) 39.2, *Viṣṇu* II. 5.3.
3. *Uttara*. 221.7-10.
4. 75. 15-17.

The different kinds of winds and the formation of clouds

Different *Purāṇas*⁵ refer to seven layers of winds (*vātaskandha*) in the atmosphere such as *pravaha*, *āvaha*, *udvaha*, *samvaha*, *vivaha*, *parāvaha* and *parivaha*. A detailed discussion on the phenomenon of evaporation, cloud formation, classification of clouds and their relationship with winds or regions of atmosphere indicates that the *Purāṇas* have realized their importance. According to the *Vāyupurāṇa*⁶ there is moisture content in all the movable and immovable objects of the world and evaporation takes place on account of sun's rays and this produces clouds.

According to the *Vāyu*⁷ and *Brahmāṇḍa*⁸ those clouds which give water are called 'megha' and those which do not bring any rainfall are known as 'abhra'. The clouds are classified into three groups—*āgneya*, *brahmaja* and *pakṣaja*. They are further described as connected with cyclonic, convectional (occurring in the northern region) and orographic (occurring from Mountains flanks) types of rainfall. Among these the *āgneya* occurs in the winter, and are devoid of lightning and thunders. The 'brahmaja' clouds have lightning and deep rumbling. The *pakṣaju* or *puṣkarāvarta* clouds produce deep rumbling sound and bring excessive rain fall.

The *Matsyapurāṇa*⁹ states that the clouds (*jṃṃta*) beget life. They remain suspended on the wind *āvaha*. According to the *Skandapurāṇa*¹⁰, it is the *pravaha* wind which makes the clouds, produced by smoke, full of water, so that the clouds taking blue colour give copious rainfall. The *Matsyapurāṇa* says that 'the waters from the (vapours of the) clouds when brought into contact with the wind fall in the shape of rain'.

The oceans and tides

All the *Purāṇas* name the seven oceans as *lavaṇa*, *ikṣu*, *surā*, *ghṛta*, *dadhi*, *dugdha* and fresh water. The names do not have any specific indication about any attribute.

5. *Brahmāṇḍa* (Pūrva) 19.171; *Vāyu* 49.163; *Nārada* 60.13, 17-35; *Kūrma* 41 (p. 368); *Matsya* 163.32-33; *Padma* (Sṛṣṭi) 42.123-24.
6. 51.22-25.
7. 51.26-40.
8. 22.30-43.
9. 124.9b.
10. *Maheśvara* (Kumāra) 38.53-54.

Many of the *Purānas*¹¹ are unanimous in describing about the tides, "When the moon rises in the east, the sea begins to swell. The sea goes down when the moon wanes. When it swells, it does so with its own waters and when it subsides, it does not actually lose any water. The sea rises and falls according to the phases of the moon. Nearly 32 feet is the measure of its rise and fall on the 2 *parva* days."

Miscellaneous matter

The *Śivapurāṇa*¹² refers to milk of trees in connection with the establishment of a *liṅga*. The *Garuḍapurāṇa*¹³ has a section devoted to the lapidary science. The *Liṅgapurāṇa*¹⁴ has a chapter "*bhuvanavyāsoddeśasthānavarṇana*". It gives the number and population of towns and cities of different communities. It has attempted to give several types of statistics. The *Skandapurāṇa*¹⁵ gives the number of *grāmas* in various countries. It seems that the word *grāma* here means something other than a village. From the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*¹⁶ we understand that the ancient Indians knew how to keep their population constant.

The *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*¹⁷ recognises ten types of roads—

1. *Diśāmārga* (international trunk roads of 80 cubits); 2. *Grāma-mārga* (leading to another village, 80 cubits); 3. *Sīmāmārga* (border roads, 40 cubits); 4. *Rājapatha* (city roads, 40 cubits); 5. *Sākhārathyā* (branch roads, 16 cubits); 6. *Rathoparathyā* (vehicular branch roads, 12 cubits); 7. *Uparathyā* (smaller ones, 8 cubits); 8. *Jaṅghāpatha* (4 *padas* or feet); 9. *Gṛhāntarapatha* (internal streets, 3 *padas*) and 10. *Dhṛtimārga* (above 6 *padas*). The *Vāyu*¹⁸ mentions 11 types,

11. *Viṣṇu* Amśa II. iv. 89-91; *Matsya* 122. 30-34; *Agni* 119. 25-26; *Brahmāṇḍa* XIX. 131-36; *Brahma* XX. 91-94; *Vāyu* 49. 127-131.

12. प्रतिलिङ्गं तु संस्थाप्य क्षीरं वृक्षसमुद्भवम् ।
स्थित बुद्ध्वा उत्सृज्य लिङ्गं ब्रह्मशिलोपरि ॥
Śiva, *Uttara Vāyaviya Samhitā* 7, *Khaṇḍa* 2. 36.35.

13. I 68-80.

14. I. 50.

15. *Maheśvara kh.* 39. 125-165.

16. अपसर्पिणी न तेषां वै न चोपसर्पिणी द्विज । II. 4-13.

17. Ch. 7. Also *Agni* 106; *Matsya* 129.3; *Vāyu* 8.

18. 8. 118-21.

the first 7 being the same as in *Brahmāṇḍa* and the rest as follows :
 8. *Ghaṇṭāpātha* (4 *padas* or feet); 9. *Gṛhāntarapātha* (3 *padas* or feet);
 10. *Vṛttimārga* (1/2 *pada* ?) and 11. *Prāgvaniśa* (one *pada*-foot)

The *Viṣṇupurāṇa*¹⁹ speaks of Kamboja horses and the *Matsyapurāṇa*²⁰ of Nepal blankets.

The *Purāṇas*²¹ also speak about the physical features of the the different races inhabiting different countries.

We find detailed description of surveying for laying out roads etc. The *Agnipurāṇa*²² mentions towns of different shapes—*candrārdhābha* (semi-circular), *vajrasūci* (octagonal) and *cāpābha* (bow-shaped).

From the *Liṅgapurāṇa*²³ we know about the preparation of a world map on a gold sheet having the shape of a quadrilateral and measuring one cubit on one of its sides, wherein the seven continents, seven seas etc. are indicated for being given as a gift.

Thus we get a glimpse of some of the geographical concepts known to the *Purāṇas*.

19. V. 29.32.

20. 22.86.

21. *Mārkaṇḍeya* 57; *Garuḍa* 55; *Bhāgavata* IX. 20.30.

22. 106. 4-5.

23. II. 32. 1-6.

BHOJA AND VASTRĀPATHAMĀHĀTMYA : A REAPPRAISAL*

By

R. N. MEHTA

and

S. G. KANTAWALA

[स्कन्दपुराणान्तर्गतस्य प्रभासखण्डस्य द्वितीयो भागो वस्त्रापथ-
माहात्म्यनाम्ना प्रथितोऽस्ति । अस्मिन् एकोनविंशोऽध्यायः सन्ति ।
अस्मिन् गुर्जरप्रान्तीयजूनागढस्थतीर्थानां विवरणमस्ति । प्रथमाध्याय-
मारभ्य एकादशाध्यायपर्यन्तं भोजराजस्य विवरणमस्ति । अत्र लेखक-
द्वयेन अत्रोल्लिखितस्य भोजविवरणस्य अन्यप्रमाणैः तुलना विहिता]

Introduction

The Vastrāpathamāhātmya (= VM) forms the second part of the Prabhāsakhaṇḍa¹ which forms the seventh *khaṇḍa* of the voluminous Skanda-Purāṇa.² The VM is a small *khaṇḍa* of 19 *adhyaṅgas* and eulogises the holy spots at Junagadh and Vanthali in Junagadh district (Gujarat state). It opens with a salutation to Gaṇeśa and Sarasvatī. The holy spots at Junagadh are Bhavanātha temple, the Mrgīkuṇḍa which is to the west of the Bhavanātha temple, the Suvarṇarekhā-river (modern Sonrekha) emerging from the Girnar, Ambājī temple and others that lie on the way to the Girnar mountain and on it. In this paper it is proposed to evaluate

* The authors are grateful to the U.G.C. for assistance to the project on the Prabhāsakhaṇḍa and the present paper is an outcome of the said project.

1. Cf. *atha Śrīskanda-mahapurāṇe saptame Prabhāsakhaṇḍe-dvitiyaṃ Śrīvastrāpatha-māhātmyam ārabhyate* [VM 1.1.

The Raivatakakṣetra is also called the Vastrāpathakṣetra (VM 1.2.). For the explanation of the term *Vastrāpatha* vide 9.202-220; 11.13.

2. The other six *khaṇḍas* of the Skandapurāṇa are :—

(1) Māheśvarakhaṇḍa, (2) Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa, (3) Brahmakhaṇḍa, (4) Kāsīkhaṇḍa, (5) Āvanyakhaṇḍa and (6) Nāgarakhaṇḍa. *Vide* Mehta, R. N. and Kantawala, S. G., Two legends from the Skanda-Purāṇa, *Purāṇa* Vol. XV, No. 1. January, 1973, p. 125.

this Purāṇic version of King Bhoja in the light of comparative evidence. The story of King Bhoja is told in chapters 1 to 11 and it is summarised here below for ready reference.

Synopsis of the Bhoja-Episode

The VM begins with a recommendation of the performance of *śrāddha* at Mṛḡikuṇḍa near Dāmodarakuṇḍa. Here a king named Gaya has a discourse on sacred spots, *śrāddha* etc. The *śrāddha* performed in the month of Caitra at Prabhāsa is eulogised along with the Dāmodarakuṇḍa and Vastrāpatha is said to be of one *gavyuti* in dimension (VM 1. 106). The chapter refers also to the Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava and possibly some Jain *tīrthas* of the area.

The second chapter dealing with the Bhavamāhātmya describes Vastrāpatha as the navel of Prabhāsa, indicating thereby that it is in the centre of Prabhāsa. This central place of Girnar in the Prabhāsa area is well-recognised because of its political importance as a centre of the area and this position is maintained by it even now as a district head-quarter of Junagadh. In the succeeding chapter numerous holy spots and Mṛḡikuṇḍa are mentioned. The latter is, however, described as the annihilator of all sins.

This Mṛḡikuṇḍa is the source of the legend of King Bhoja and one *mṛḡānanā*³ (the doe-eyed woman) in chapter VI. Herein Bhoja is mentioned as a king of Kānyakubja (6.20). Once a forest-officer (*Vanapāla*) reported to him about a doe-eyed woman roaming amidst a herd of deer. On hearing Bhoja's curiosity was aroused and he successfully made an effort to capture her by surrounding the said forest with cavalry, foot-soldiers and trappers and then she was taken to Kānyakubja, where she was received very warmly. The king asked her, once, in privacy what her name was and why she was reduced to such a therio-anthropomorphic form, but she remained mute. Then he called for his ministers, astrologers and the best of the Brahmins and asked them how she could articulate human speech with a human face. The Brahmins, thereupon, told him that in Kurukṣetra dwelt Sārasvata, the best of the Brahmins, who practised penance on the bank of the river Sarasvatī and they further, informed him that she would utter out everything at his (*i. e.* Sārasvata's) instance. Accordingly

3. Note that she is called a *nārī* in 6. 23 and a *bālā* in 6.24.

he was respectfully summoned to Kānyakubja and on his arrival she bowed down to him and swooned. With the performance of due rituals she was brought to consciousness and he conferred upon her human speech with his powers. She, then, narrated the history of her seven births which are as follows :—

(i) King Bhoja is said to be the son of the King of Kalinga country in his former seventh birth and this *mṛgānanā* was the daughter of the king of Vaṅga. Both were married and she became his crown-queen⁴.

(ii) Then both were born as Brahmins in Malwa and she became his housewife. Unfortunately her husband died prematurely and she enjoyed her husband's wealth.

(iii) He was born as *śvetasarpa* and she was born as a Brahmin's daughter and was married at the age of eight. The *śvetasarpa* was, then, killed and her head was shaved as she had become a widow.

(iv) He was born as a crocodile in the river Godāvārī at Bhīmeśvara. When she visited the holy spot, she was killed by the said crocodile, who was killed in turn with a spear by men. She was consigned to fire and her remains were immersed in the holy waters of the river.

(v) Later on, he was born as a hunter and she was born as *krauñcī*. During her dalliance the impassioned *krauñca*, her mate, was killed by that hunter and he was, therefore, cursed by a sage⁵.

(vi) With the passage of time the hunter was born as a lion on the Raivataka mountain and she was born as a doe who was chased by the very lion and she fell into the waters near the Bhavanātha temple and her decayed and tattered body was carried away in the waters of the Svarṇarekhā river.

(vii) Later on he was born as King Bhoja and she was born as *mṛgānanā*, the doe-faced woman.

4. On the problem of their marriage *vide* Mehta, R. N. & Kantawala, S. G., *Op. cit.*, p. 131.

5. The idea of the *krauñcavadha* is traceable to the Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa. Cf. *māniṣāda pratiṣṭhām tvam agamaḥ śāsvatīḥ samāh|yat krauñcamithunād ekam avadhīḥ kāmamohitam* (Bāla-kāṇḍa 2.14 Cr. Ed.)

Chapter VII continues the legend and relates that once a doe chanced to drink up the sage Uddālaka's semen and this led her to such a birth as prognosticated by the sage Uddālaka. She, further, told Bhoja that her head was dangling in a bamboo-grove and if someone could immerse it in the waters of the river Svarṇarekhā, she would regain her human form. Accordingly, Bhoja despatched his *pratihāras* and got her dangling head immersed into the holy waters of the river with the help of Kuśāla, a disciple of Sārasvata.

She observed the Cāndrāyaṇavrata at the end of which she was transformed into a beautiful damsel. After this transformation she lost the memory of her previous births. Bhoja married her and she became his crown-queen and was renowned as 'Mṛgamukhī'.

In chapter XI it is said that Bhoja was highly impressed with and pleased by the *tīrthamāhātmya* and desired to visit it after abandoning everything, including his beloved sons, foot-soldiers, elephants *etc.* and establishing his sons (*putrān*) in the administration of the kingdom (*rājye*). But his preceptor, Sārasvata, discouraged him from doing so and imparted detailed instructions on the *tīrthayātrā*, which he might undertake. At the end of the VM it is related that King Bhoja with all the members of his family visited the *tīrtha* and the VM is wound up by noting that ultimately he with the members of his family went to heaven.

Analysis

The following salient points emerge from the above-going summary :—

1. Bhoja was a ruler of Kānyakubja.
2. His *vanapāla* was in the Girnar region.
3. He reported the existence of a therio-anthropomorphic being *i.e.* a human female with a doe's face.
4. Bhoja surrounded the forest and trapped her.
5. She was, then, taken to Kānyakubja.
6. By his magic powers, Sārasvata conferred upon her human speech.
7. This enabled her to narrate the story of her seven births.
8. Bhoja despatched his *pratihāras* to the Girnar mountain to immerse her doe's head in the waters of the Svarṇarekhā.
9. With the above act performed the *mṛgānanā* was transformed into an exquisite beauty whom Bhoja married.

10. Bhoja, then, desired to visit the *tīrtha* by abdicating the throne and handing over the regal duties to his sons.
11. He was dissuaded to do so by his preceptor who narrated to him the *tīrthayātrāvidhāna*.
12. Bhoja with his family did the *tīrthayātrā* and went to heaven.

Discussion

This VM version has led H.C. Raychaudhury⁶ to equate this Bhoja with the seventh ruler of the Pratihāra dynasty, *vi.z.* Bhoja known also as Mihira Bhoja, ruling between 836 A. D. and 882 A. D. at Kānyakubja and he has shown that the king Bhoja who ruled at Kanauja was the supreme ruler of Saurashtra and had abdicated in favour of his son.⁷ B. N. Puri⁸ accepted a part of H. C. Raychaudhury's thesis, but did not agree with the theory of Bhoja's abdication. A. B. L. Awasthi has also studied this problem.⁹ But this vexed problem of Bhoja requires a fresh assessment of this Purāṇic version and hence it is proposed to re-valuate it in this paper.

The foregoing synopsis and analysis would show that from the political point of view the forested region of Girnar was under the control of Bhoja, a ruler of Kānyakubja¹⁰. From the Girnar

-
6. Raychaudhury, H. C., A Note on the Vastrāpathamāhātmya of the Skandapurāṇa, *IHQ*, vol. v, (1929), pp. 129-132.
 7. Pusalker, A. D., *Purāṇic Studies, Review of Indological Research in the last 75 years*, Ed. by P. J. Chinmulgund and V.V. Mirashi, p. 527.
 8. Puri, B. N., *The History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras*, (1957), pp. 65-66.
 9. Awasthi, A. B. L., *History from the Purāṇas*, Ch. VI, pp. 84 ff. He discusses also the qualities of a king that are mentioned in the VM. These could be better interpreted as traditional virtues of a king and essential prerequisites for a good administrator and he quotes parallel passages from Mahābhārata. It may be noted that these parallel passages cited bring out the indebtedness of the VM-tract to the Mahābhārata.
 10. *Vide* Mehta, R. N. & Kantawala, S. G., *op. cit.*, p. 132.

region in Saurashtra his forest officers (*Vanapāla*) used to come to him and his *pratihāras* also could move freely from Kānyakubja to the Girnar-area; hence it is an obvious logical corollary that he could also move safely in this region for a *tīrthayātrā*.

It is significant to note that the VM mentions neither the genealogy nor the chronology of the ruler. Under such a nebulous circumstance an attempt is made to apply historical chronology to this story in the VM. As noted above H. C. Raychaudhury¹¹ tried to identify the Bhoja of the VM-version with the one recorded in the inscriptions at Barah Daulatpura, Deogadh, Gwalior, Peheva and Ahara.

These inscriptions mention the Gurjara Pratihāra ruler Bhoja, who ruled in the ninth century A.D. His grandson was also known by the same name. In this attempt at identification it is assumed that the ruler who has more records probably was Bhoja of the VM. As noted earlier, this assumption of H. C. Raychaudhury seems to be accepted by B. N. Puri¹² partly, A. B. L. Awasthi and other scholars, inspite of the fact that the VM is quite silent on such an identification.

In view of the Purāṇic methods of narration which are adopted in the VM, it is interesting to note that Bhoja's reference in the VM indicates that a memory of some ruler of Kānyakubja, Bhoja by name, was surviving, then, around Junagadh in Saurashtra. The discovery of the Una plates of the time of Mahendrapāla (*circa* 890 A.D.) seems to point to the possibility of Bhoja ruling over this area. These historical documents support the view that the Purāṇas contain some good reliable information of historical nature, proving thereby their historical relevance and importance. But it may be observed that the identification with Mihira Bhoja is not justified from the source and the claim of another ruler cannot be completely ruled out for identification and hence it requires consideration.

The political control over Saurashtra by the rulers of Kanauj will naturally make the VM refer to the forest officer (*vanapāla*) going to Kanauj and the transference of the *mṛgānanā*, a therio-anthromorphic female to Kanauj. The movement of the Pratihāras

11. Raychaudhury, H. C., *op cit.*, p. 129.

12. Puri, B. N., *The Gurjara Pratihāras*, pp. 58 ff.

of Bhoja to Junagadh to immerse the head of the doe in waters *etc.* is a natural conclusion of the stage set in the *tīrthamāhātmya* as noted above. Bhoja was very much impressed by the narration of his preceptor Sārasvata and expressed his desire to undertake a *tīrthayātrā* even by abdicating the throne.

*Cf. tyaktvā rājyaṃ priyān putrān pattyaśvarathakuñjarān
putrān rāje pratiṣṭhāpya gantavyaṃ niścitaṃ mayā|| VM 10.15.*

The stanza in question states merely the pious idea that struck his (i.e. Bhoja's) mind and not what he actually did. Thus the stanza notes his psychological process. It is equally significant to note also the vocable *putrān* which is a plural form.

This stanza is the main plank in the abdication-theory and H. C. Raychaudhury interprets it to indicate that Bhoja abdicated the throne in favour of his son. To bolster up his theory he advances suitable arguments. It should be noted that the text has a plural form *putrān* and not a singular form *putram* as the abdication-theory would demand. Moreover, a careful perusal of the VM itself clearly indicates two different lines of thought. The line of thought in the VM indicates that Bhoja's preceptor did not approve of his enthusiasm and directed him in clear terms to mind the affairs of the state. This attitude and advice helped to bring down Bhoja's enthusiasm for giving up his kingdom and this led him to put forward a query about the *tīrthayātrāvidhāna* and the same was answered. At the end of this important dialogue, when the relevant information was obtained, Bhoja with his family undertook the *tīrthayātrā*.

Thus it appears from the fact that in this *tīrthamāhātmya* an effort is made to put the holy spots of Bhavanātha and Mṛgikunḍa on a sound footing. While doing so, the VM eulogised a number of surrounding holy spots. It is probable that this legend was invented to explain the name "Mṛgikunḍa." Incidentally, it may also be mentioned that the *tīrthayātrā*-motif is common in the Purāṇas and this would suggest a free social intercourse between the two different parts of India.

The historical notion that could be drawn is the existence of the sway of Kānyakubja over a large part of territories where a ruler and his officers could move without any obstruction. The situation indicated the age of imperial Kanauj and this is recalled by the author of the VM.

But the perusal of the whole VM indicates that over and above preserving the memory of history, it gives a good amount of cultural and religious information about Girnar, the Svarṇarekhā, Bhavanātha, Mṛṅgikuṇḍa, Ambājī-temple and the other holy spots around Junagadh. This leads us to the problem of the genesis of the VM.

It is difficult indeed to answer the problem of the authorship of the VM. In this connection it may be mentioned that the perusal of the Nāgarakhaṇḍa, a part of the Skandapurāṇa, indicates that it was possibly a work of the Nāgara Brahmins. The Mallapurāṇa¹³ which is a caste-Purāṇa, is a work of an Audīcya Brahmin. This may indicate also that the said caste Audīcya, is closely connected with the Purāṇic tradition and it is necessary to note that it is maintained even to day by it. On this line of thinking one would be tempted to offer a suggestion on the problem of the authorship of the VM. The language of the VM indicates that there are instances of Sanskritisation of Gujarati vocables and phrases, e.g. *hallati mallati* (VM 1. 102); cf. Gujarati: *hale che male che*. And hence it may be surmised that author of the VM knew and/or was influenced by Gujarati in his Sanskrit phraseology etc.

Another feature of this work indicates that it is by someone who claims to be a Sārasvata (with *double entendre* on the vocable *sārasvata* referred to earlier as a proper name). It is quite well-known that one of the Brahmin-groups occupied the bank of the river Sarasvatī in north Gujarat. It is an intelligent group of Brahmins with a good tradition of Sanskrit learning and following a *smārta* religion with an emphasis on Śiva worship. This group of Brahmins worked also as temple-priests as well as caste-priests and moved extensively from Siddhapur (in North Gujarat), the place of their residence, to different parts of India. Under these circumstances it may be surmised that the Audīcya Brahmins migrating from the banks of the river Sarasvatī and having a Sārasvata tradition of learning and *tantrasāadhanā* may be responsible for the origin of this work i.e. VM. In this connection it is to be noted that the Sārasvata mentioned in the VM hails from Kurukṣetra and

13. The Mallapurāṇa was composed before 1674 A. D. but not before the 15th century A. D. (Mallapurāṇa edited by B. J. Sandesara and R. N. Mehta, GOS No. 144, Introduction, p. 7.).

thus here is a case of transplantation of the local habitat of the Sārasvata. In the VM a reference to the garrulous and mellifluous tongue (cf. *prabhāṣaka*, 6.38) of Nāgaras who are also known for political activities, is of significant interest in this problem of identification and as the above remark i. e. '*prabhāṣaka*' in the VM is not laudatory, it tends to suggest the Nāgaras are not responsible for this work under consideration, even though the Junagadh-area is known as one of the centres of the Nāgara community. It is, therefore, highly probable that the author of the VM is an Audīcya Sahasra Brahmin who was a votary of Śiva following a Smārta method of worship and was also possibly a *tantrika*.¹⁴ Thus it is locally produced by an Audīcya Brahmin connected with the worship of Bhavanātha.

These points require further study; but it may be suggested for the present that the VM had relied on the memory of some ruler Bhoja of Kānyakubja, as described above, because the end of the VM also is legendary in the sense that King Bhoja with his family departed to heaven after his visit to Bhavanātha, as would happen in a narration of any legend or a tale. Moreover, as the Bhoja-episode does not form part of the dynastic account, it tends to reduce a little its historicity.

Moreover, we do not know from any other source that he, i. e. Bhoja, visited Saurashtra for *yātrā* or otherwise. One is reminded here of what V. V. Mirashi remarked in a different context, *viz.* "We had indeed some legendary stories about great kings like Parmara Bhoja."¹⁵

From a philosophical point of view the legend of Bhoja may also be looked upon as a legend illustrating the doctrine of transmigration, one of the important doctrines of Indian Philosophy. Moreover, the legend gives also a glimpse into a belief that a limb belonging to someone left in a miserable condition may help to emancipate the individual from an unhappy condition.

14. Cf. *Audīcya ṛṣayo na tu Moḍha Nāgaras' ca*. For this maxim the authors are grateful to Prof. Dr. A. Jani, Director, Oriental Institute, Baroda.

15. Mirashi, V. V.. Epigraphical Research, *Review of Indological Research in the last 75 years*, edited by R. J. Chinmugund and V. V. Mirashi, p. 527.

Incidentally, it may be pointed out that the Purāṇic tradition seems to deal with the history of *tīrthas*, rulers, caste-groups on one side and to preserve the tradition of culture and religion on another side. These are late Purāṇas as compared to the Vāyu-purāṇa, Matsya-purāṇa, Bhāgavata-purāṇa and others; but the tradition of preserving Indian culture for the common man is common to them and thus they maintain the long line of Indian socio-cultural continuum at different sites under favourable as well adverse conditions and circumstances. Their careful study provides very useful data of local and pan-Indic studies. They give cultural directions and a sense of history even to the mass of Indian population but also they are capable of providing insight into micro-historical situations.

भविष्यपुराणे राजनैतिकतत्त्वविवेचनम्

—राम जी त्रिपाठी

[In some of the Purāṇas some chapters are devoted to the description of Polity. Among such Purāṇas Garuḍa, Agni and Bhaviṣya are the main ones. Here the author has dealt with the Polity chapters of the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa and compared with the relevant chapters of other Purāṇas and text dealing with Polity].

पुरातनराजनीतिविषयमधिकृत्य अथर्ववेदे पर्याप्तरूपेण सम्यक् सामग्री समुपलभ्यते । तत्र राज्यसभायाः लोकसभायाश्च सुचारुरूपेण उल्लेखं कृतमस्ति । तत्र सभासमिती प्रजापतेः तनये चित्रिते । कौटलीयार्थशास्त्रमपि तदाधृत्येव विश्लेषितं ग्रन्थं समवलोक्यते । चरणव्यूहेऽपि अर्थशास्त्रं अथर्ववेदस्य उपवेद-तया वर्णितम् । अथर्वपरिशिष्टे, अथर्ववेदीयकौशिकसूत्रे च राजनीतेः वार्त्ता चर्चिता । मॉरिशब्लूमफील्डमहोदयेन अतीव परिश्रमेण एषां समेषां ग्रन्थानां शोधपूर्णं वैज्ञानिकं संस्करणं प्रकाशितम् । महत्त्वपूर्णा च भूमिका तत्रोद्दृक्ता । प्रथमं बृहस्पति^१ कृतमपि आसीत् कश्चिद् विशालः अर्थशास्त्रीयो ग्रन्थः । यः कालक्रमेण नष्टः । वायुपुराणस्य^२ उपोद्घातपादे च इदं राजनीतितत्त्वं सम्यक् चर्चितं दृश्यते । दण्डिनः^३ दशकुमारचरितस्य दशमोच्छ्वासेऽपि बृहस्पतिना साकं शुकः विशालाक्षश्च राजनीतिज्ञानां सरण्यां गणितौ । सर्वेषामेतेषां मतानां चर्चा कौटल्येन स्वीयार्थशास्त्रग्रन्थे सततं कृता । राज्ञा भोजेन^४ स्वरचितयुक्ति-कल्पतरुग्रन्थे बृहस्पतिमेव सर्वश्रेष्ठं राजनीतिज्ञमन्यत् ।

महाभारतस्य^५ वनपर्वणि द्रौपद्यापि अयमेव सर्वोपरिराजनीतिज्ञतया-चित्रितः । शान्तिपर्वणः ५९, ६८-१०३, अध्यायेषु अनुशासनपर्वण अध्यायेषु ६२, ७६, १११-एवमेवान्येषु अपि अध्यायेषु एषां मतानां भीष्मद्वारा उल्लेखः-समभवत् । तत्पश्चात् एफ० डब्लू० टामसमहोदयेन 'लीम्यूजियम्' पत्रिकायां

१. बृहस्पतेः अर्थाधिकारिकम् ॥ कामसूत्रे-१।१।७॥

२. बार्हस्पत्ये तथा शास्त्रे पारं यश्च द्विजो गतः ।

सर्वे ते पावना विप्राः पङ्क्तीनां समुदाहृताः ॥ वायुपु० ७९।५९

३. तन्त्रकाराशुक्राङ्गिरस विशालाक्षबाहुदन्तिपुत्रपराशरप्रभृतयः ॥

—दशकुमारचरिते-१० ।

४. नीतिबृहस्पतिप्रोक्ता तथैवोशन्नशी परा, इत्यादि—युक्तिकल्पतरुग्रन्थे—पृ० २ ।

५. नीति बृहस्पतिप्रोक्तां भ्रातुर्मै ग्राहयत्पुरा ॥ महाभारतस्य वनपर्वणि ॥

मार्चमासस्य १९१६ ख्रिष्टाब्दे रोमनाक्षरेषु एका 'बार्हस्पत्य' नामिका पत्रिका प्रकाशिता । इदं कैम्ब्रिजविश्वविद्यालयस्य प्रमुखं शोधात्मकं गम्भीरविषयग्राहकं च पत्रं वर्तते । पुनरियमेव 'वैदिकमैगजीन' नामकपत्रिकायां प्रकाशिता । अनन्तरञ्च १९२१ ख्रिष्टाब्दे पंजाबसंस्कृतसिरीजप्रकाशकेन पुस्तकरूपे प्रकाशित-मभवत् । तत्पश्चात् लालाकन्नोमलमहोदयेन अस्य हिन्दीभाषायामपि अनुवादं प्रकाशितं लाहौरस्थप्रकाशकेन । एतावतापि कौटलीयमर्थशास्त्रम् अस्यापेक्षया राजनीतेरुत्तमो ग्रन्थः प्रतीयते । राजनीतेरन्यः नीतिसाराभिधेयो ग्रन्थः संकलितरूपेण गरुडपुराणस्य १०८-११५ अध्यायेषु प्राप्यते । किंतु एतदतिरिक्तं कौटलीयार्थशास्त्रे प्रकाशितं निखिलविषयमधिकृत्य अत्रत्यानां ग्रन्थानां समुद्धरणं च कुर्वन् श्रीमत् लुडविकस्टर्नबाख्रमहोदयेन विश्वेश्वरानन्दशोधसंस्थानप्रकाशनात् प्रकाशितायां शोधपत्रिकायां रजतजयन्तिविशेषाङ्के एकस्मिन् दीर्घात्मके निबन्धे सर्वं संग्रहीतम् ।

प्रायेण पुराणेषु राजनीतिप्रकरणं मत्स्याग्निमार्कण्डेयविष्णुधर्मोत्तरब्रह्मवैवर्तगरुडपुराणेषु एवमेव क्वचित्-क्वचित् किञ्चिन्मात्रमन्यत्रापि समुपलभ्यते । महाभारतेऽपि शान्तिअनुशासनपर्वणी सम्यक् राजनीतिचर्चा चर्चिते-स्तः । चण्डेश्वरेण एतानधिकृत्य राजनीतिरत्नाकरनामधेयं वीरमिश्रेण च राजनीतिप्रकाशाभिधो ग्रन्थो लिखितः । ईदृशमेवास्ति नीलकण्ठस्य भगवन्तभास्करस्य नीतिमयूखग्रन्थरत्नम् । पुनश्च सर्वान् ग्रन्थान् अधीत्य महता प्रयत्नेन काशीप्रसादजायसवालमहोदयेन 'हिन्दू पार्लिटी' नामधेयं पुस्तकं लिखितम् । सारांशरूपेण लिखितस्यास्य ग्रन्थस्य प्रशंसा बुधवरैः राजनीतिविशारदैरपि क्रियते एव । एवमेव सोमेश्वरदेवस्य 'मानसोल्लासः'—सोमदेवस्य 'नीतिवाक्यामृतम्' कामन्दकस्य 'नीतिसारम्' भोजराजस्य 'युक्तिकल्पतरुः' वैशम्पायनस्य च 'नीतिप्रकाशिका' एतत्सदृशा अन्येऽपि ग्रन्थाः प्रसिद्धाः सन्त्येव राजनीतेः क्षेत्रं च प्रकाशयन्ति । एतेषामुपरि लिखितानां ग्रन्थानां टीकासु व्याख्यासु वा प्राचीनतमाः सहस्रसोप्यधिकाः ग्रन्थाः राजनीतिविषये प्रकाशिताः आसन् इति चर्चिता अपि कालक्रमेण विनष्टा नैव समुपलभ्यन्ते इदानीम् ।

भविष्यपुराणोपरि डॉ० राजकुमारअरोरामहोदयेन शोधकार्यं कृतम् । किंतु अत्रत्यराजनीतिमधिकृत्य नैव किञ्चित् समुल्लिखितम् तेन । दृश्यते च भविष्यपुराणे प्रतिसर्गपर्वणि सर्वत्रैव राज्ञां वृत्तम् । अस्याध्ययनेन आचारेण च राजनीतेः सूक्ष्मेक्षिका शिक्षा च प्राप्यते । वेतालपञ्चविंशत्या अंशेऽपि राजनीतेः वर्णनं प्रत्येकस्मिन्नध्यायेऽस्ति । मयापि तस्मिन् प्रकरणे द्वयैकयोः कथयोः अन्ते एतस्य वर्णनं कृतम् । अन्येष्वपि पर्वेषु एवमेव राजधर्मः समुपवर्णितोऽस्ति । उत्तरपर्वणि १३८ तमे अध्याये राज्ञा विन्ध्यवासिन्याः विधिविहितं पूजाकार्यं

स्वपरिकरस्य परिषदः, उपकरणस्य, अस्त्रशस्त्रस्य पूजाया विधानञ्च उल्लिखितम् । एतस्मिन्नध्याये १-३३ श्लोकेषु देव्याः पूजायाः पश्चात् हवनं विहितम् । ४१-४२-श्लोकयोः छत्रपूजाविधानम्, ४३ तः ४८ यावद् अश्वपूजनमन्त्रम्, ४९ तः ५१ यावत् रथस्य तस्य ध्वजायाश्च पूजनमन्त्रम्, ५२ तः ५३ श्लोकयोः गजानां कुमुदस्य, ऐरावतस्य, पद्मस्य, पुष्पदन्तस्य, वामनादिदेवयो-निगजानां भेदः, भद्रस्य, मंद्रस्य मृगादिशुद्धानां भद्रादिसंकीर्णानां वनहस्तिनां भेदा निर्दिष्टाः सन्ति । ततः परं ५४ तः ५६ श्लोकेषु राज्ञः इन्द्रमरुद्गणरुद्रादित्याशिवनीकुमारैः गन्धर्वैः नागादिभिः सुरक्षिते प्रतिपालने च । पुनश्च वायोः गतित्वं, सूर्यात् तेजस्विता, विष्णोः बलवत्ता, चन्द्रमसः लक्ष्मी, सुमेरोः स्थैर्यम्, इन्द्राद् यशः संग्रहणीयम् प्रापणीयञ्च इत्यपि कथितं वर्तते । पुनश्च ५७ तः ६४ श्लोकेषु पताकायाः, ६५ तः ६७ श्लोकेषु खड्गपूजायाः, ६८ तमे श्लोके कवचपूजायाः, ६९ तः ७१ तमेषु श्लोकेषु दुन्दुभिपूजा, ७२ तमे श्लोके धनुषःपूजा, ७३ तमे श्लोके शङ्खपूजा, ७४ तमे श्लोके चामरस्य पूजा सिंहासन-पूजाविधानं मन्त्राणां च कथनं प्राप्यते । अत्रत्याः कियत्याः वार्त्ताः रमणीयाः प्रतिभान्ति । खड्गपूजायाः मन्त्रेषु अस्य श्रीगर्भम्, विजयम्, दुरासदम् इत्यादयः नामानि कथितानि । उत्पत्तिश्च कृत्तिकानक्षत्रात् समुपवर्णिता । एते विधयः किञ्चिदन्तरेण हेमाद्रेः व्रतखण्डे, बृहत्संहितायाम्, नीतिप्रकाशिकायाम् शैवरत्नाकरे च निर्दिष्टाः । अथर्वपरिशिष्टे इदं विस्तरेण चर्चितम् । पुनश्च ८६ तः ११५ तमेषु श्लोकेषु विधिपूर्वकं दुर्गायाः कृते विविधानि बिल्वपत्राणि, कुंकुमम् चन्दनम् पूजोपकरणम् विहितम्, विजयोत्सवसमारोहम्, वरुणमरुद्गणरुद्रासुरपिशाचशाकिनीयोगिनीपूतनादिवपाललोकपालानां कृते बलिप्रदानम्, प्रार्थना च विहिताऽस्ति । दुर्गायाः शोभायात्रानिःसारणप्रथा तत्र आदिष्टा । अनेन राज्ये शान्तिः सुभिक्षं च भवति । एतत्सदृशविधानमेव अथर्वपरिशिष्टे अग्निपुराणे च वर्णितं विभाति । वेदेषु रात्रिदेव्याः पूजया नीराजनेन च राज्यस्य जनपदराष्ट्राणाञ्च शान्तिः भवतीति कथितम् ।

विद्यापतिठक्कुरेण मिथिलेश्वरवीरसिंहेश्वरसभासदेन एतेषु निखिलसंग्रहेषु वासंतीविवेकम्, शारदोयपूजापद्धतिः, दुर्गोत्सवविवेकादीनां कतिपुस्तकानां संरचना कृता । राज्ञा एतदतिरिक्तं शमीपूजनं चाषण (नीलकण्ठदर्शनम्) विजययात्रा च क्रियतेऽस्य इत्यपि सूच्यते ।

अस्योपरान्तं १३९ तमे अध्याये इन्द्रध्वजस्य वर्णनमस्ति । इन्द्रध्वजमाधृत्य बड़ौदाप्रकाशनात्, पूनाप्रकाशनात् होशियारपुरतश्च शोधपत्रिकासु विस्तरेण निबन्धानि प्रकाशम् आगतानि सन्ति । विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणस्य द्वितीय-खण्डस्य १५४ तः ५७ तमेषु अध्यायेषु अस्योपरि विस्तृतं चर्चा समुपलभ्यते । एतेषु ग्रन्थेषु उल्लिखितं यद् देवासुरसंग्रामे ब्रह्मादयो देवा विद्याधारादयश्च

इन्द्रविजयार्थं सुमेरुपर्वते ध्वजप्रतिष्ठापनं कृतवन्तः ।^१ इदं ध्वजयष्टिरपि प्रत्यक्षदेवतारूपेण मन्यते । इयमपि तस्माद्धेतोः पुष्पचन्दनछत्रार्किकिणीभिरलंकृता भवेत् ।^२ देवासुरसंग्रामे इमां दृष्ट्वैव दैत्या युद्धस्थलात् पलायिताः । तदा प्रभृत्येव अस्य पूजनं भवति ।

अस्याः कालः प्रायेण वर्षतीर्ण एव निर्दिष्टः । अस्याः स्थाने एव कृष्णेन गोवर्धनस्य अर्चना कृता । श्रवणनक्षत्रे अस्याः स्थापनं कृत्वा पूजा कर्तव्या । अस्य दीर्घता विशतिहस्तपरिमता भवेत् । इयं सुवस्त्रेण परिवेष्टनीया । त्रयोदशाभूषणानामोल्लेखः वर्तते । प्रथमोऽलंकारः पिटकाकारः (चौकोरः) भवति । अयं लोकपालपिटकनाम्ना आख्यायते । द्वितीयोऽलंकारः रक्तवर्णः वृत्ताकारः भवति । तृतीयः श्वेतः अष्टकोणात्मको भवति । एवमेव सर्वेऽपि त्रयोदशपिटकाः विभिन्नाकारः विभिन्ननामधारकाश्च भवन्ति । षोडशदिनात्मकं यावदस्य पूजा भवति । राजा च तत्र प्रतिदिनं अधिकं समयं यापयति नृत्यगीतादिकं मल्लयुद्धादिकं दानमानपुरःसरं नीराजनादिकार्यं कुर्वन् तत्र भूयमानमुत्सवं निवर्त्तयति सर्वान् च कार्यकर्तृन् सम्मानयति । तस्मिन् समये तत्र काकोलूककपोतानामागमनमशुभं मन्यते ।^३ तस्मिन्काले ध्वजभङ्गे च याते राजा एतस्य शान्त्यै उपायं करोति । यस्मात् भागात्, इन्द्रध्वजयष्टिः ऋट्यति तस्य फलं पृथक् भवति । भङ्गे चेन्द्रध्वजे तस्य शान्त्यर्थं स्वर्णनिर्मितेन इन्द्रध्वजेन पूजा करणीया^४ । एवं प्रकारेण विधिविधाने इन्द्रध्वजपूजनेन राज्ये शान्तिः भवति, समृद्धिश्च जायते, सुभिक्षं भवति प्रजानाम् । ईतयो न भवन्ति, महाव्याधिप्रकोपश्च न संजायते । राजा शत्रूणां विजयं कृत्वा पृथ्वीं सम्यक्प्रकारेण पालयति । प्रतिवर्षं सम्यक्तया इन्द्रध्वजस्योत्सवकारको राजा दीर्घं कालं यावत् पृथिव्याः शासनं करोति अन्ते च इन्द्रलोकं प्रयाति ।^५

राज्ञां लक्षणम् :—एवमेव ब्राह्मपर्वणः सप्तविंशत्यध्याये (२७) राजलक्षणमुपवर्णितम् । एकोनत्रिंश (३९) श्लोकेषु प्रस्तुतमिदं वर्णनम् । सर्वे चैते श्लोकाः वाल्मीकिरामायणस्य सुन्दरकाण्डस्य पञ्चत्रिंशदध्यायस्य १७ तः २०

१. मेरोरुपरि संस्थाप्य सिद्धविद्याधरोरगैः ।
सा देवी ह्यर्चिता नित्यं भूषणैर्भूषिता स्वकैः ॥ भविष्यपुराणे ४।१३९।२
२. तां दृष्ट्वा दानवा नष्टा भयादेव रणे हताः ॥ तत्रैव—४।१३९।३
३. काकोलूककपोतानां येन पातो न विद्यते ॥ भविष्यपुराणे—४।१३९।४-२७ उत्तरार्धे
४. सौवर्णं रौप्यकं कृत्वा पूर्णमुत्थापयेद्ध्वजम् ॥ तत्रैव—४।१३९।२६-२८ पूर्वार्धे
५. ईतयो न प्रवर्तन्ते तस्मान्मृत्युकृतं भयम् ।
विजित्य शत्रून्समरे वशे कृत्वा महीतलम् ।
भुक्त्वा राज्यं चिरं कालमिन्द्रलीके महीयते ॥ तत्रैव, ४।१३९।३७-४२

(सप्तदशश्लोकादाराभ्य विशतिश्लोकं) यावदस्य व्याख्यामुपवर्णिताः सन्ति । राज्ञां सामुद्रिकं लक्षणं अग्निपुराणे गरुडपुराणे च प्रदर्शितम् । एषु केचन श्लोकाः रघुवंशस्य व्याख्यायामपि उद्धृताः सन्ति । अन्येष्वपि सामुद्रिकग्रन्थेषु विभिन्नेषु छन्देषु राज्ञां सामुद्रिकं लक्षणं वर्णितमवलोक्यते । सामुद्रिकलक्षणात् भिन्नं राज्ञां किञ्चित् लक्षणं भवति यस्य परिज्ञानं कुण्डल्या स्वभावेन च ज्ञायते । अतः 'यत्राकृतिस्तत्र गुणाः वसन्ति' इत्यादिकं वराहमिहिरस्य कथनं विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणे अस्य समर्थनं च दृष्ट्वा कथयितुं पार्यते यत् आकृतेः स्वभावेन सह किमपि सम्बन्धः भवतीति सत्यम् ।

नीतिवाक्यामृते, कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रे, वार्हस्पत्यार्थशास्त्रे च राज्ञां स्वभावयुक्तं लक्षणमेव चित्रितम् । तत्र राज्ञः गुणाः आत्मसंपत्तयः कथिताः ।^१ कौटिलीयार्थशास्त्रानुसारेण राज्ञां गुणाः—वाग्मिता, प्रगल्भता, स्मृतिः, मतिः, औदार्यम्, संयमः, अश्वानां गजानां च संचालननिपुणता, शीलम्, दूरदर्शिता, गम्भीरता, कामः, क्रोधः, लोभः, मोहः, चाञ्चल्यम्, पैशुन्यमादिशून्यता, मृदुपूर्व-भाषणं इत्यादयः ।^२ वाल्मीकिरामायणस्य वालकाण्डे अयोध्याकाण्डे च प्रथमाध्याये रामस्य शरीरे एतेषां गुणानां वर्णनं कविना कृतं वर्तते ।

भविष्यपुराणानुसारेण राज्ञां लक्षणविधाने कमलवन्नेत्रम्, गम्भीरश्च स्वरः, विशालं वक्षस्थलम्, हस्तौ पादौ च रक्तवर्णौ नखाश्च रक्ताः दीर्घा नासिका इत्यादिकं राजलक्षणम् ।^३ केकराक्षो जनः भवति क्रूरः, नीलकमलाक्षो जनः वेदज्ञश्च भवति मन्त्री ।^४ दीर्घभ्रूसम्पन्नो जनः भ्रविहीनश्च भवति दरिद्रः । पञ्चदशश्लोकादारभ्य चतुर्विंशतिश्लोकं यावत् सामान्यस्यैव जनस्य लक्षणं तत्र लिखितं वर्तते । पञ्चविंशतिश्लोके राज्ञस्य लक्षणं पुनः उद्घाटयति छत्राकारेण संशोभितं शिरः मण्डलाकृतिभिः सम्पन्नो जनः दरिद्राः जनाः बहुकेशयुक्ताः भवन्ति मृदुभिः केशैः संशोभिताः जनाः धनिकाः भवन्ति राजपदं वा अलंकुर्वन्ति ।^५

महाकविकालिदासेनापि रघुवंशे इमानि लक्षणानि प्रदर्शयन् सामुद्रिक-ज्ञानस्य परिचयं दत्तम् । तेन स्वयमेव कथितम्—

१. कामन्दकनीतिसारे—२।४।४ ॥

२. अर्थशास्त्रे—६।१।६

३. नासिकालोचने बाहू स्तनयोरन्तरं हनुः ।

इति दीर्घमिदं प्रोक्तं पञ्चकं भूभुजा नृप ॥ भवि० पुराणे—१।२७।१-१०

४. क्रूराः केकरनेत्रास्तु गंभीरैरर्थसम्पदः ।

नीलोत्पलाभैर्वेदविदी भृशं कृष्णैस्तथाचिता ॥ तत्रैव—१।२७।११-१४

५. केशैर् चातिबहुलैर्मृदुभिर्पाथिवो भवेत् ॥ भवि० पु० १।२७।१५-२९

छायामण्डललक्ष्येण तमदृश्या किल स्वयम् ।

पदमा पद्मातपत्रेण भेजे साम्राज्यदीक्षितम् ॥ रघुवंश-४।२२ ।

भविष्यपुराणस्य राजलक्षणमस्ति अतीव महत्त्वपूर्णम् । अग्निपुराणस्य द्वापञ्चाशदध्यायेषु तत्रापि २१८ तः २६९ श्लोकात्मकेषु वर्तते राजनीतेः चर्चा । अत्र सन्ति केचनांशाः परशुरामपुष्करसंवादस्यापि एतस्यैव । विषयस्य चर्चा वर्तते विष्णुधर्मोत्तरस्य तृतीयखण्डेऽपि । तत्र राजनीतेः वर्णनं द्वितीयखण्डस्य एकपञ्चाशदध्याये तृतीयखण्डे दृश्यते । अग्निपुराणस्य २४३ तमे अध्याये विष्णुपुराणस्य द्वितीयखण्डे अष्टाध्याये च एतानि लक्षणानि प्राप्यन्ते । गरुडपुराणस्य ११६ तमे अध्याये वृहत्संहितायाश्च ६७-६९ तमे अध्यायेषु राजलक्षणं निर्दिष्टमस्ति । वाल्मीकिरामायणस्य सुन्दरकाण्डे पञ्चत्रिंशदध्याये सप्तविंशतिश्लोकेषु लक्षणं मूलतया चित्रितम् वर्तते । किंतु गोविन्दराजेन, नागेशभट्टेन, माहेश्वरतीर्थेन, शिवसहायेन, त्र्यम्बकप्रभृतिनापि तत्रस्यां व्याख्यायां अनेकेषां सामुद्रिकं ग्रन्थानामूल्लेखः कृतः । राज्ञां सप्तविंशतिलक्षणानि क्रमेण संख्यानुसारेण च परिगणितानि । तत्र तानि सन्ति—एकाधिकः; द्विशुक्लः; त्रिगम्भीरः, त्रीत्रिकम्, त्रिप्रलम्बः, त्रिव्यापकः, त्रिवलिमानम्, त्रिविनतम्, त्रिकालज्ञः त्रिविपुलः; चतुर्लखः, चतुःसमम्, चतुष्किष्कुः, चतुर्शुक्लः कृष्णश्च, चतुर्गन्धः, चतुर्ह्रस्वः; पञ्चसूक्ष्मः; षडुन्नतः; सप्तस्नेहः; अष्टवंशः; नवामलः; दशपद्मः,—दशव्यूहः, दशान्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलः; चतुर्दशसमद्वन्द्वः, षोडशाक्षः एतेषां व्याख्या निम्नप्रकारेण शोभते—

धर्मस्याधिक्यं कथ्यते 'एकाधिकता' । दन्तानां नेत्रप्रान्तानां (पुत्तली-विहीना) शुक्लता 'द्विशुक्लतापदेन' वाच्या । नाभिप्रदेशस्य स्वरस्य हृदयस्य च गम्भीरता त्रिगम्भीरपदेन कथिता । त्रित्रिके नवगुणानां समवायः वर्तते । प्रत्येकं च त्रिकं त्रिषु वर्गेषु विभक्तम्—(१) अनसूया, दया क्षान्तिश्च । (२) मंगलाचारः, शुचिता स्पृहाश्च । (३) औदार्यम् अनायासेन थुत्कारम् शौर्यञ्च । आचार्यकोटल्येन एते आभिगमिकगुणेन कथिताः । त्रिप्रलम्बपदेन बाहू वृषिश्च गृह्यते । त्रिव्यापकपदेन दिग्देशजातयः क्रमेण तेजसा यशसा श्रिया च सुशोभिताः गृह्यन्ते । नाभिप्रान्तसमीपे त्रिवलीनां सम्भावना एव त्रिवलिमानपदेन गृह्यते । देवानां ब्राह्मणानां गुरुणाञ्च समक्षे नम्रतया स्थितिः त्रिविनतपदेन कथिता । हृदयस्य ललाटस्य मुखमण्डलस्य च व्यापकता त्रिविपुलता अस्ति । पादयोः करयोश्च ध्वजछत्रादीनां चिह्नं चतुर्लखपदवाच्यम् । अंगुलीनां पीठस्य हृदयस्य कटिप्रदेशस्य च प्रशस्तता चतुःसमतापदेन कथ्यते । षडधिकनवत्यङ्गुलप्रमाणं ततोऽधिकं वा औन्नत्यं चतुष्किष्कुपदेन कथ्यते । समक्षीयाः चत्वारः दंष्ट्राः चन्द्रवत् शुक्लाः भवन्ति । इयमेव चतुर्दंष्ट्रता कथ्यते ।

अङ्गोः पुत्तलिकानां भ्रूलतानां इमश्चुकूर्वादीनां केशस्य कृष्णता चतुःशुक्लकृष्णतापदेन ज्ञायते । नासिकायाः मुखस्य स्वेदस्य कुक्षेश्च सौगन्ध्यं

चतुर्गन्धता कथ्यते । ग्रीवायाः जहूनुद्वयस्य मणेश्च लघुता चतुर्ह्रस्वतापदेन कथ्यते । अंगुलेश्च पर्वाणि नखाः दन्ताः त्वचा च भवेयुः वर्तुलाकाराः कृशाः दीर्घाश्च इत्यादिकं सूक्ष्मदीर्घतापदेन कथ्यते । इन्द्रः अक्षिणीललाटं नासिका स्तनमध्यगतं च भागः, मतान्तरेण वक्षःप्रदेशस्य कुक्षेः नखस्य मुखस्य ग्रीवायाश्च औन्नत्यं कथ्यते षडोन्नततापदेन । केशानां त्वचायाः लोम्नः दृष्टेः वाण्याः दन्तानां नखानाञ्च चिक्कणता सप्तस्निग्धतापदवाच्या भवति । जपनाधः सन्ध्यस्थलं जघनद्वयं हस्तौ पीठश्च हृदयमपि समानं भवेत् तदा अष्टवंशता नाम सार्थकं भवेत् । नासिकायाः अक्ष्णोः कर्णयोः दायोः मेढस्य मुखस्य स्वच्छता नवामलतापदवाच्या भवति । जिह्वायाः अधरयोः तालुप्रदेशस्य नेत्रयोः करपादानां मुखस्य शिश्नप्रदेशस्य कमलवदाकृतिः दशपद्मतापदेन कथ्यते । हस्तयोः पादयोः मुखस्य ग्रीवायाः हृदयस्य शिरसः श्रवणयोः ललाटस्य उदरस्य पृष्ठप्रदेशस्य दीर्घता दशव्यूहतापदेन कथ्यते । महात्मागौतमस्य एतानि लक्षणानि दिव्यावदाने, अवदानशतके जातकग्रन्थेषु च प्रायेणोपलभ्यन्ते । दशाङ्गुलिसहितभुजानां दीर्घता जानुपर्यन्तं भवेत् शिरपर्यन्तं व्यापकता दीर्घता च समानरूपेण भवेदिति, दशन्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलता^१ पदेनोच्यते । पादयोः कटिप्रान्तस्य नितम्बस्य वक्षप्रदेशस्य स्तनयोः वृषणः कर्णयोः अधरयोः ऊरुप्रदेशस्य जघनप्रदेशस्य हस्तयोः अक्ष्णोः पारस्परिकं साम्यं चतुर्दशसमद्वन्द्वता कथ्यते । चतुर्दशविद्ययानुसारेण अक्षिभ्यां निरीक्ष्य विचारणं षोडशाक्षता पदेनोच्यते ।

एवं प्रकारे एतानि सप्तविंशतिकलक्षणानि अतीव महत्त्वपूर्णानि सन्ति । क्रमानुसारे प्रथमाङ्कादारभ्य षोडशपर्यन्तं गणनं तत्र च चतुर्दशविद्यानामुल्लेखः बुद्धिपूर्वकं विश्ववस्तूनां तत्रानुसन्धानं राजनीतेः वैशिष्ट्यं वर्तते । एतानि लक्षणानि महापुरुषेषु बुद्धविक्रमादित्यमहावीरादिषु रामकृष्णादिकेष्वपि आसन् । येषां प्रभावः युगान्तं यावत् जनेषु आसीत् । क्वचित्-क्वचित् पुराणेषु लक्ष्यते क्रमवैपर्यम्, पाठभेदः, न्यूनाधिकता क्रमविपर्यस्तता च । अत्र रचितासु टीकाष्वपि महती विचारणा प्रस्तुता वर्तते । यस्य प्रस्तुतीकरणे समयस्य व्ययाधिक्यं भवेत् तस्मात् विरमामि ।

डॉ० गंगाधरन् एम० लिट्० महोदयेन 'गरुडपुराण ए स्टडीज' नाम्नि-पुस्तके ३८, ३९ एवं १७४ तमेषु पृष्ठेषु किञ्चित् विषयानुकूलचर्चा कृता एतद्विषये किंतु तत्र संकेत मात्र मेव विद्यते ।

१: देवीभागवते (९।१७।११), मत्स्यपुराणे (१४।१।६१), वाल्मीकिरामायणे (३।४७।२४), भट्टिकाव्ये (५।१८), विष्णुधर्मो (२।८।२२), पार्णिनि-अष्टा (२।१।५५), अग्निषु (२४३।२२) ऽपि अस्य शब्दस्य व्याख्या-कृता । टीकाकारैः तत्र अनेकाः संभावनाः कृताः सन्ति ।

THE VARĀHAPURĀṆA AND THE VARĀHA-VIṢṆU
THEME IN SANSKRIT POETRY

by

S. V. SINGH

[वर्तमानवराहपुराणस्य रचना केषांचित् सांप्रतिकविदुषां दृष्ट्या ख्रीष्टीयाब्दस्य नवमे दशके वा शतके जाता । किन्तु साहित्यिकविवरणेषु शिला-लेखेषु च वराहेण पृथिव्युद्धारस्य विवरणम् अस्मात् प्राचीनकालेऽपि प्राप्यते । अत्र विदुषा लेखकेन प्रस्तावितं यद् एषां विवरणानां मूलं वराहपुराणमेवासीत् । अतो वर्तमानवराहपुराणस्यापि मूलं किमपि प्राचीनं वराहपुराणमासीद्यस्यान्वेषणं विद्वद्भिः कार्यम् । साहित्यग्रन्थेषु प्राप्तस्य विवरणस्योदाहरणमपि अत्र लेखकेन प्रदत्तम् ।]

The Varāhapurāṇa as available to-day in its two recensions, namely, the *Dākṣiṇāṭya* (the Southern) and the *Gauḍīya* (the Eastern) is generally assigned to the 9th-10th centuries A. D. But the Varāha-Viṣṇu theme in Sanskrit Poetry is much older, at least 500 years older, which means that the Varāha-Viṣṇu concept does not originate with the extant Varāhapurāṇa. Should it be presumed, therefore, that there was a strong far-floating tradition of Viṣṇu incarnating himself as *Varāha* (the boar) for the succour of the Earth-goddess from death by drowning in the doomsday deluge? Or does the existing Varāhapurāṇa presuppose another older and original vision of the Varāhapurāṇa presumably irretrievably lost? The answer seems to be 'yes'. Otherwise, how could the sculptor of the massive stone-statue of the boar at Eran (Madhya Pradesh) engraved with the inscription of the Scythian King Toramāṇa of the 5th century A. D., get the idea of the sculptural composition of the Purāṇic concept to Varāha-Viṣṇu? It is presumptuous to say that the following verses of the *Matsyapurāṇa*(259, 28-31) of a later date prescribing the details of the carving of Varāha-Viṣṇu stone-statues may be taken to be the source of inspiration for the royal sculptor who made the Stone Boar at Eran bearing Toramāṇa's inscription of 510 A. D. :—

‘महावराहं वक्ष्यामि पद्महस्तं गदाधरम् ।
 तीक्ष्णदंष्ट्राग्रघोरास्यां मेदिनीवामकूर्परम् ।
 दंष्ट्राग्रेणोद्धृतां दान्तां धरणीमुत्पलान्विताम् ।
 विस्मयोत्फुल्लनयनामुपरिष्ठां प्रकल्पयेत् ।
 दक्षिणं कटिसंस्थं तु करं तस्य प्रकल्पयेत् ।
 कूर्मोपरि तथा पादमेकं नागेन्द्रमूर्धनि ।
 संस्तुयमानैः लोकेशैः समन्तात् परिकल्पयेत् ।’

i. e. ‘Now to describe the carving of the Varāha-Viṣṇu statue. It should be made to be holding lotus in one hand and mace in the other and should show terror-striking mouth inset with tusks of sharp ends. By the left strong boney elbow it should be supporting the Earth-goddess holding lotus and beaming with smiling eyes wide open in wonder. It’s right hand should be shown as resting on the waist. One of its feet should be shown as placed on the Tortoise (*Kūrma*) and the other on the hood of the Serpent-king (*Śeṣa*). Myriads of gods and demigods should be shown as surrounding it and singing hymns in its honour’.

If we assign, however, Ist Century A. D. to the Matsyapurāṇa as some historians of the Purāṇa-literature think, then also the question of the first full version of the Varāhapurāṇa again raises its head. Where is that original Varāhapurāṇa of which the extant Varāhapurāṇa happens to be some sort of a copy or recast? The story of Varāha-Viṣṇu rescuing the Earth-goddess from drowning in the doomsday deluge must needs be presumed to be originating from the original version of the Varāhapurāṇa. Only then the Matsyapurāṇa should justifiably be supposed to be alluding to it. Let us hope that the untiring efforts of researchers in the Purāṇas will some day be crowned with success and the confusing chronological darkness enveloping them dispelled.

The problem of the extant Varāhapurāṇa of the 9th-10th Century A. D. and that of the Varāha-Viṣṇu theme in Sanskrit poetry of the 3rd-4th Centuries A. D. may be solved by supposing an all-round floating tradition of the Boar-incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu forming common heritage for artists in sculptural as well as poetic al compositions of earlier days.

The very first verse of Toramāṇa’s inscription (510 A. D.) is an invocation to Varāha-Viṣṇu. It run as follows :—

‘जयति धरण्युद्धरणे घनघोणाघातघूर्णितमहीध्रः ।

देवो

वराहमूर्तिस्त्रैलोक्यमहागृहस्तम्भः ॥

i. e. ‘Homage to Lord Varāha-Viṣṇu who in the operations of salvaging the Earth-goddess from the great Deluge makes the mountains reel at the mighty strokes of his tusks and looks standing erect like the pillar of support for the huge far-flung mansion of the Universe’.

The zoomorphic representation of Lord Viṣṇu at Eran must be recognized as the source of inspiration for the sculptors of Varāha-Viṣṇu statues in the temple dedicated to the deity at Khajuraho. The sculptural craftsmanship of the massive Eran boar approximates the poetical craftsmanship of the invocatory verse dedicated to Varāha-Viṣṇu. While the Eran Boar-statue is a representation in stone of the mythical concept of Lord Viṣṇu as *Varāha* (boar), the invocatory verse as a reorientation of the same intended to hint at the political stability of Imperial India in the 5th Century A. D.

It is in the Gupta period (4th-5th Century A. D.) that we find imposing and inspiring statues of Lord Viṣṇu in His *Varāhāvataṛa*. These Gupta-period statues show the *Varāha* (the boar) raising the goddess Earth from the Ocean, resting one foot on the Snake-God (*Śeṣanāga*) and surrounded by crowds of gods and demigods standing rapt in wonder and prayerful adoration. Viśākhadatta, a Sanskrit dramatist of reknown and presumably a high-ranking government official of the Imperial Guptas, has composed equally imposing and inspiring verse at the end of his drama, the *Mudrārākṣasam* wherein he refers to the succour of the Earth goddess by Varāha-Viṣṇu and hinting at his equation with Candragupta Vikramāditya II (3rd-4th Century A. D.) on the basis of the protection of the vast Indian empire from the foreign marauders by the prowess of his arms. The verse, technically termed as the ‘*Bharata-Vākya*’ (the last benedictory verse) of the *Mudrārākṣasam* runs as follows:—

‘वाराहीमात्मयोनेस्तनुमतनुबलामास्थितस्यानुरूपां

यस्य प्राग्दन्तकोटिं प्रलयपरिगता शिश्रिये भूतधात्री ।

स्लेच्छैरुद्वीज्यमाना भुजयुगमधुना पीवरं राजमूर्त्तेः

स श्रीमद्बन्धुभृत्यश्चिरमवतु महीं पार्थिवश्चन्द्रगुप्तः ॥’

i. e. 'May the illustrious King Candragupta (Candragupta Vikramāditya II of the 3rd-4th Century A.D.) whose mighty arms protect, now-a-days, the Mother Earth (the *Bhāratamātā*) from the molestations of the foreign marauders just as, aeons ago, the Boar-incarnation of Lord Viṣṇu, protected it by the sharp ends of the tusks from the ravages of the doomsday deluge, rule surrounded by the scions of his dynasty and the officials of his state over to far-flung Indian empire for years and years to come'.

It is but evident that the dramatist Viśakhadatta of the 4th Century A. D. in his poetic depiction of the Varāha-Viṣṇu image could not have been inspired by the Varāhapurāṇa of the 9th-10th centuries A. D. The Varāha-Viṣṇu image in the above verse of Viśakhadatta presupposes his close observation of some monumental Varāha-Viṣṇu statue of his times i. e. the heyday of the Gupta empire. But we have no answer to the question as to the source of the sculptor's inspiration in the carving of Varāha-Viṣṇu statues in minutest details in the 4th century A. D. and presumably somewhat earlier. No textual authority of the Purāṇas can be pointed out in regard to the carving of the form and the features and the gestures of the Varāha-Viṣṇu statues in that early centuries. Such a textual authority can be only the earlier original version of the Varāhapurāṇa which is yet lying in utter oblivion. It will be too much to presume that the stray allusions to Varāha-Viṣṇu and to goddess Earth found in the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas might have provided the impelling inspiration for sculptural representation of those times.

It is to be noted that the monumental Varāha-Viṣṇu statues of the Gupta period and the period immediately succeeding it were so artistically carved that they could suggest the heroic sentiment and inspire the observant Sanskrit poets in their verse-compositions breathing heroism.

There is a continuity of the Varāha-Viṣṇu theme in Sanskrit poetry of the later centuries also. Rajānaka Ratnākara, a noted Sanskrit poet of Kashmir (8th century A. D.) has composed (vide his *Mahākāvya*, namely the *Haravijaya*) many poetic lines on the Varāha-Viṣṇu theme. Only one will suffice to illustrate the point. The *Haravijaya* verse (Canto 4. 18) runs as follows :—

दंष्ट्रागृहीतगुरुसंभ्रमभूतधात्री-
पर्यस्तकातरतरे क्षणपातपीतम् ।
यच्छृङ्गनिर्झरजलस्रुतिभिर्दुधाव
पातालपङ्ककल्पं वपुरादिकोलः ॥'

i. e., 'The Ādikola, the First Great Boar washed the dirty mud of the bottomless ocean sticking to his body, the same mud which was cleaned by the pity-inspiring restless sidelong looks of the Earth-goddess stricken with terror from the clutches of His sharp tusks, with water falling in torrential showers from the sides of his massive head.'

It is the emotions of valour and heroism that happen to be the central suggestion of the above verse also. The polymath Kṣemendra of Kashmir, a contemporary of King Ananta and his son and successor king Kalaśa (1032-1083 A. D.) composed a beautiful verse on Varāha-Viṣṇu concealing covert allusions to the unsettled political conditions of the times having no remedy but the Divine Providence. His verse is as follows :—

‘वराहं नौमि सानन्ता येनोत्क्षिप्ता क्षितिः परम् ।
अधोधृतार्धच्छत्रेव तलस्थार्कतपासहा ॥’

i. e., 'My homage to Lord Viṣṇu in His Varāha-form who raised the goddess Earth along with Her couch of the reclining Serpent-king (*Śeṣanāga*) from the depth of the ocean so high as to show her like a lady shading herself from the scorching heat of the sun shining from beneath by the Serpent-King's hood spread out in the fashion of an umbrella.'

It is clear from the above that the Varāha-Viṣṇu theme in Sanskrit poetry till the 10th century A. D. was so poetically treated as to evoke the emotions of valour and afford the aesthetic relish of the Heroic. But, slowly and surely, the trends change in later centuries. The extant Varāhapurāṇa glorifying Lord Viṣṇu and propagating the religion and philosophy of Vaiṣṇavism may be responsible for them. The socio-political state of affairs of the times seems to be the foremost cause responsible for all this change. The inimitable Sanskrit lyric, the Gīta-Govinda of Jayadeva of Bengal (12th Century A. D.) illustrates the point. The following Gīta-Govinda verse (1.7) of invocation to Lord Viṣṇu in His Boar-incarnation is surcharged with the feelings of love and devotion to the Divine —

वसति दशनशिखरे धरणी तव लग्ना ।
 शशिनः कलङ्कलेव निमग्ना ।
 केशव धृतशूकररूप जय जगदीश हरे ॥

i. e., 'Homage to Keśava (Kṛṣṇa or Viṣṇu), the Lord of the worlds in His Boar-incarnation. Homage to Him whose tusk-ends providing seat for the Earth-goddess looks beautiful like the shining moon to which cling the black spots darkening its lustre.'

With the passage of time, the Varāhapurāṇa in its present form began to occupy a place of importance in the literature of the Purāṇas. It becomes a sacred textual authority for Śrī Vaiṣṇavism and Viśiṣṭādvaitism of the Āḷvars and the Ācāryas. Beautiful verses glorifying Varāha-Viṣṇu begin to be written by Śrī Vaiṣṇava poets and philosophers of the School of Rāmānuja (11th Century A. D.). The descriptions of the dalliance of Varāha-Viṣṇu with *Dharanī* (the goddess Earth) as found in the extant Varāhapurāṇa start finding support for the erotic Sanskrit poems on the Varāha-Viṣṇu theme of those days. We quote below a verse of Vedāntadīśika, the greatest Śrī Vaiṣṇava Sanskrit poet of the 13th-14th centuries A. D. invoking Lord Varāha-Viṣṇu for His providence—

पत्युर्दक्षिणपाणिपङ्कजपुटे विन्यस्तपादाम्बुजा
 वामं पद्मगसार्वभौमसदृशं पर्यङ्कयन्ती भुजम् ।
 पोत्रस्पर्शलसत्कपोलफलका फुल्लारविन्देक्षणा
 सा मे पुष्यतु मङ्गलान्यनुदिनं सर्वाणि सर्वं सह ॥

i. e., 'May the Earth-Goddess, the symbol of tolerance, placing her left foot on the lotus-like right palm of Her loving husband Varāha-Viṣṇu, lying on the couch formed by His left arm as strong and stout as the reclining body of the Serpent-King (*Śeṣanāga*), showing Her cheeks flushed with ecstatic shyness at the touch of His amorous mouth and smiling in her full-blown lotus-eyes. Cater for our material and spiritual good, ever and for ever.'

To sum up, we are in a position to say that the Varāha-Viṣṇu theme in Sanskrit Poetry is much older than the existing Varāha-Purāṇa. It is only the Varāhapurāṇa in its original form yet to be discovered that may show itself as the main spring of inspiration for Sanskrit poetry dedicated to Lord Varāha-Viṣṇu. Let us wait for that day.

AN APPRAISAL OF THE DATA REGARDING TEMPLE
ARCHITECTURE GLEANED FROM AGNI PURĀṆA*

By

TAHSILDAR SINGH

[अत्र अग्निपुराणे प्राप्तस्य मन्दिरनिर्माणविषयकविवरणस्य
साङ्गोपाङ्गं विवेचनं प्रस्तुतम् । लेखकेन एतद्विषयकगरुडपुराण-
विवरणस्यापि तुलना अग्निपुराणेन सह कृता । लेखकेन एतद्विषये
ऊहितं यद् अग्निपुराणे गरुडपुराणे च एतद्विषयाणां रचना कालक्रमेण
समकालमेव कृता ।]

With its almost indubitable ancient origin dating back to the later Vedic period, the extensive Purāṇic literature seems to have been more intimately connected with the life of Indian masses than the Vedic itself. It exhibits umpteen changes from time to time in concordance with the changes in the social, cultural, and religious life of Indian people as if proving itself a living organism. By virtue of these changes, and by studying and investigating the appreciably significant materials, preserved in the various Purāṇas, mixed up with Vedic lore, it has been easy to draw a satisfactorily clear picture of the life of the people of ancient and sometimes even medieval India.

Agni-Purāṇa : nature, scope and date of composition

Agni Purāṇa, a topic from which it is proposed to discuss here, represents a great and commendable literary effort performed in such an epoch of ancient Indian life which witnessed multifarious progress with a notable development in the domain of literary and cultural pursuits. It belongs to that phase of Purāṇic development when the Purāṇic literature was enlarged by the addition of sectarian and some other matters, hence unrepresentative. Agni-Purāṇa seems, apparently, a summarization and compilation of works on various subjects. Its present extant form is formed by frequent and subsequent additions and interpolations to the original kernel, made

* The edition utilised for references is edited by Acharya Baladeva Upadhyaya and published by Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi (1966).

during a long span of time spread over three to four centuries. The time of this processing appears to be, as surmised by some scholars after a critical study of the present matter, the period stretched over almost three to four centuries from A. D. 700 or 800 to A. D. 1000 to 1100.¹ R. C. Hazra² proclaims that the extant Agni-Purāṇa is an apocryphal work of the 9th cent. which attained great popularity along with the spread of Tantricism. The genuine Agni-Purāṇa had to save itself from extinction under a different title, namely Vahni-Purāṇa, wrongly regarded as an Upapurāṇa by modern scholars. However, here I propose to evaluate the evidence furnished by the extant Agni-Purāṇa, most probably a work of the 9th cent.³

Quite true to its encyclopaedic nature and shape, the present extant Agni-Purāṇa consists of an amazingly large number of subjects ranging from mythology, religion, philosophy, cosmogony, polity, sociology, poetics, dramaturgy, history, geography, medicine, military science, phonetics, grammar and lexicography to art.

While dealing with the aspects of art, Agni-Purāṇa does not discuss them all and sundry but selects only temple⁴ and city⁵ architecture and iconography with iconometry⁶ of certain deities.

Architectural Terminology

Like other scriptures providing material of *Vāstuvidyā*⁷, Agni-Purāṇa also has used a specific Sanskrit for denoting and descri-

1. Gyani, S. D., *Agni-Purāṇa : A study*, pp. 288-89. The Chowkhambha Sanskrit Studies, vol. XLII. The Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi (1964).
2. Hazra, R. C., "*Studies in the Genuine Āgneya-Purāṇa*" Our Heritage, vol. I part II pp. 209 ff, (1953).
3. De, S. K., *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, I, pp. 102-4, and Hazra, R. C., *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, pp. 134-40, Calcutta (1940). For a detailed discussion see Gyani, S.D. *Agni-Purāṇa : A Study*, pp. 27ff.
4. *Agni-Purāṇa*, chs. 38, 41, 42, 43, 65, and 104.
5. *Ibid*, chs. 105-6.
6. *Ibid*, chs. 44-55.
7. For a list of such terms applied in other texts see also Singh, Tahsildar "Some Reflection on temple architecture from Garuḍa Purāṇa" *Purāṇa*, vol. XXII Varanasi (1980) pp. 180-81, and "Bhaviṣya Purāṇa and Br̥hatsaṁhitā on Temple Architecture: A collative study" *Purāṇa*, vol. XXIII No.1 Varanasi (1981), pp. 67-68.

bing different parts of the temple. The alphabetical list of such terms along with their English meanings is as follows :

āmalasāraka	a ribbed member of pinnacle symbolising an 'āmalaka'
bhadra	a projection, also <i>nirgama</i> .
bhaumya	comprising <i>bhumis</i> i. e. storeys.
bhitti	wall, also <i>jaṅghā</i> .
bhramaṇa	circumambulation, also <i>pradakṣiṇā</i> .
dāruja	wooden.
dvāra	doorway.
dvārapāla	door-guardian.
garbha (gṛha)	sanctum of temple.
ghaṭa	literally "pitcher", used for a decorative motif of similar shape.
gopura	ornamental gateway of the precinct also <i>prākāradvāra</i> .
iṣṭaka	(made of) brick.
jagatī	platform.
jaṅghā	wall, particularly the portion embellished with sculptures.
kalaśa	pitcher, crowning member of a spire, a half-round moulding.
kaṅṭha	constriction below the finial of the superstructure.
maṇḍapa	hall
madhyasandhi	junction of sanctum and hall, (<i>kapilī</i> ?)
mañjarī	small spire, generally erected above a miniature shrine.
mithuna	couple, supposed as an auspicious decorative motif.
mukhamaṇḍapa	entrance porch, also <i>prāggrīva</i> .
mṛṇmaya	terracotta figure.
nemi	periphery of the platform around the temple, the open place for <i>pradakṣiṇā</i> .
nirgama	projection, <i>bhadra</i> .
patravallī	foliage and creeper motif of decoration.
piṇḍikā	pedestal, also <i>pīṭhikā</i> .
pradakṣiṇā	circumambulatory (path) around the sanctum.
pīṭhikā	pedestal, see <i>piṇḍikā</i> .

prāgdvāra or	entrance porch, see <i>mukhamaṇḍapa</i> .
prāggrīva	
prākāra	precinct (wall).
pratihāra	door-guardian, also <i>dvārapāla</i> .
pratimā	icon.
rathaka (thikā)	projection on walls decorated with sculpture
śākhā	vertical ornamental fillet of doorjamb.
śikhara	spire of temple.
stambha	pillar.
śukanāsa	antefix attached to the front facade of spire comprising a large arched niche (<i>candraśālā</i>) also called <i>sukāṅghri</i> .
śuśiraka	perforated part like latticed window.
udumbara	door-sill.
vedī	an altar, a pedestal, a moulding.
vedikā	a balcony, railing.

Fruits of consecrating a temple

In chapter 38 Agni Purāṇa enumerates the fruits gained as the result of the consecration of a temple to Vāsudeva and some other gods. Erection of a temple was considered as an act of religious merit assuring freedom from the sins of a thousand births or providing a seat in the heaven (*Viṣṇuloka*) and liberating from the sufferings of hell. It states "the person who builds a temple for Kṛṣṇa, the son of Vāsudeva, is born as a man of good deeds and his family is purified. He who builds temples for Viṣṇu, Rudra, Sūrya, Brahmā, Lakṣmī, Caṇḍī and other deities acquires fame (*kīrti*) and religious merit (*puṇya*)". Thus, the entire chapter is full of inspiration for constructing different temples for different deities or a Hindu pantheon.

Laying the foundation-stone

Before discussing general characteristics of a temple Agni-purāṇa provides a detailed description of the ceremonies held at the time of laying the foundation-slab.⁸ After worshipping the *Vāstupuruṣa* and invoking many auspicious and celestial emblems like *padma*, *mahāpadma*, *mokara*, *kacchapa*, *nanda*, *śaikha* and *padmīnī* oblations should be offered in the fire for Agni, Lokeśa, Soma and Puruṣottama etc. Then, the excavated ground (as the receptacle

8. *Agni-Purāṇa* ch. 41.

of the foundation) should be filled up with well-burnt bricks (*iṣṭaka*), measuring 12×4 *anṅulas*. The excavation (its depth and breadth) should be commensurate with the dimensions of the proposed divine edifice. A *pīṭhabandha* (excavation) which is more than half of the breadth of the temple (*prāsāda*) is to be deemed as the best, a quarter less than that measure is middling (*madhyama*) while that which is half of the first one (*uttama*) occupies the lowest (*kaniṣṭha*) place in the order of merit.

In the last *śloka* of this chapter there is one more remarkable piece of information. It is about the doors of the temples. It proposes that the temples built in central and eastern parts of the village and situated in all other quarters of heaven should face west, while those erected in the northern, southern or western parts of the village should face the east.

Sāmānya Lakṣaṇa : Plan, elevation and embellishment

These aspects of temple-building are dealt with in an elaborate manner in chapters 42 and 104. There are, apparently, some repetitions also. Amazingly enough chapter 42 contains a sizeable material⁹ tallying with that of *Hayasīrṣa Pāñcarātram*,¹⁰ particularly the 18 *ślokas* of the beginning are exactly the same. This necessitates a scrutiny to decide which text is earlier and which is later with the copied text of the former. However, to be brief, it seems probable that *Agni Purāṇa* has taken some matter directly from *Hayasīrṣa Pāñcarātram* which is an important *samhitā* of Āgamic literature, datable to the post-Gupta period.¹¹

The square ground selected for temple erection should be levelled and divided into sixteen equal parts. Out of these four

9. *Ibid*, 42. 1-18.

10. *Hayasīrṣa Pāñcarātram*, Paṭala 13, edited by Pt. Bhuvan Mohan Samkhyatirtha, Varendra Research Society, Rajshahi, East Bengal, 1952.

11. It is significant to note that most of the *samhitās* of Āgamic literature were composed before 9th cent. A. D. mainly in the period of Post-Gupta rulers and the heyday of Pratihāra-empire.

central parts should be engaged for construction of *garbhagrha*.¹² The remaining twelve are to be used for raising the *bhitti*. The *janghā*'s height should be equal to the length of the *āyata* i. e. *garbhagrha* and double the *mañjarī*'s height. An open platform for *pradakṣiṇā* having the quarter breadth of the *mañjarī* should be constructed around the *prāsāda*. Of the same breadth will be the *nirgamas* on both sides. The extent of *jagatī*, in front of the edifice, should be equal to the height of the *śikhara* or it may be its double also suitable to the grandeur and gravity of the monument. Aligned with the line of *garbhagrha* a *mukhamaṇḍapa* should be elevated, ornated with *stambhas* in the centre and situated in front of the *maṇḍapa*. It may be either equal to *maṇḍapa* or one *pāda*¹³ longer than the *garbhagrha*. The *śukanāsa* should be erected above the front doorway. The gods should be sculptured at the distance of a *pāda* inside the temple. On the *prākāra*, the thirty-two *Antagas* should be carved.¹⁴

Besides this common type of *prāsāda* there is one more variety distinguished by its measurements commensurate with the *pratimā* installed inside the *garbhagrha*. The measurement of the cult image is treated as unit for the plan and elevation. According to this theory the auspicious *piṇḍikā* should be proportionately carved according to the measurements of the main cult-image. The

12. *Agni-Purāṇa*, 42.2. Here is a wrong reading '*kuryādāyasa-manvitam*' which carries no coherent meaning. It should be *kuryādāyatamanvitam*' where *āyata* refers to *garbhagrha*. M. N. Datta Sastri in his *Agni-Purāṇa*, (A prose English translation), vol. I, Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series, Varanasi 1967 says, "the four central squares of which are to be filled up with iron". It conveys no meaning. So the *āyasa* may be substituted by *āyata* which also occurs in the following lines. See *Agni-Purāṇa* 42.3

13. '*Pāda*' literally means a step which will turn equal to 12 inches when used as a unit of measurement, see Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary p. 617.

14. '*Antaga*' means 'one who walks on the frontiers'. See, Monier Williams, Sanskrit English Dictionary, p. 42-43. It seems to suggest certain guardian deities.

length of *piṇḍikā* should be half of the *garbhagr̥ha* whose width, length and height are always equal and hence it is cubical. The height of the *śikhara* will be double of the height of the *bhitti*. The *bhramaṇa* i. e. *pradakṣiṇā* should measure one-fourth of the *śikara*. The projection of the *rathakās* should be equal to the eighth part of the *garbhagr̥ha*. The *rathakas* should be superimposed by arches. The *śukanāsa* should be constructed upto half the height of the *śikhara* aligned with four lines drawn upwards and converging to a point. Above this point a *siṃha* should be carved. After establishing the *śukanāsa* the *madhyasandhis* should be constructed on both sides. On the top a small *vedī* is to be elevated making room for the *āmalasaraka*, *kalaśa* and other crowning members of the spire. The height of the door-frame should be double its own breadth. Its *śākhās* should be carved above the *udumbara*. *Caṇḍa* and *Pracaṇḍa* should be sculpted as door-guardians on the lower parts occupying the quarter part thereof. They should be carved as holding *daṇḍa* and cautiously looking into all directions. On the lintel *Śrī* should be beautifully carved along with the elephants holding *ghaṭas* full of water and anointing her.¹⁵

The height of *prākāra* would be one-fourth of the height of *prāsāda*. The *gopura* would be smaller than the *prāsāda* by the quarter part of its (*prāsāda*'s) own height, e. g. if the *prāsāda* is 100 metres high the *gopura* would be 75 metres high. An image of a certain deity measuring five cubits would be erected on a *pīthikā* of one cubit. The *Garuḍa-maṇḍapa* should be constructed in front of the main temple. The other divinities, namely *Varāha*, *Nṛsiṃha*, *Śrīdhara*, *Hayagrīva*, *Jāmadagnya*, *Rāma*, *Vāmana*, and *Vāsudeva* should be enshrined facing eight quarters of east, south, west, north, south-east (*Āgneya*), south-west (*Nairṛtya*), north-west (*Vāyavya*) and north-east (*Īśāna*) respectively.¹⁶

Chapter 104 provides different types of plan and elevation. It proposes to divide the land into four sections, one of which would contain *bhitti*, another *piṇḍikā* and the remaining two the

15. This form of *Śrī* appears to be that of *Gajalakṣmī* seated as *lalāṭabimba* being anointed by elephants.
16. This enlisting of all *Vaiṣṇava* divinities along with *Gajalakṣmī* as *lalāṭabimba* suggests the establishment of a *Vaiṣṇava* temple.

garbhagrha. If it is divided into five sections the *piṇḍikā* would be placed in the central one. Perforated walls should be raised in one such division. The sanctum should occupy two such parts of the plot out of these five. The *śikhara* should cover the place equal to three such parts while the rest would be engaged by *bhittis*. If the plot for the temple is divided into six parts one part would comprise *bhittis* and the *piṇḍikā* and *garbhagrha* would be built to extend over two such divisions. Thus the *piṇḍikā* and *garbhagrha* would be equal here. The height of the temple should be double the extent of the plot or even more than double. The breadth of the *jagatī* should be one-third of the half of the extent of the plot. Thus it would be commensurate to one-sixth part of the whole extent. The open *pradakṣiṇā* (*nemi*) should be left around the *prāsāda*. The external circumference (*paridhi*) would be equal to one-third of the whole plot and the *rathakas* would be raised on this *paridhi*. The images of eight or four gods (*devas*) namely Cāmuṇḍā Bhairava and Natesa etc. should be enshrined on these *rathakas*, on the exterior walls of the *prāsāda*.¹⁷

This *pradakṣiṇā* would be optional in the *prāsādas*. Āditya should be placed on the east wall and Skanda and Agni on the north and west with Yama etc. in the respective directions presided by them. The two parts out of four of the *śikhara* should be covered by *śukanāsa*. Thus *śukanāsa* will be half of the *śikhara*. The third would be occupied by *vedikā* and *āmalasāraka*.¹⁸ The *vedī* should be divided into ten parts. The breadth of the *skandha* should be equal to five of these parts. The *grīvā* should measure equal to four such parts while the image of Pracanda (placed on *grīvā*) should be commensurate with the measurements of three such divisions. The *piṇḍikā* should be extended either upto two corners of the *garbhagrha* or it should occupy half of the *garbhagrha*. It may equal even one-fifth part of it. It may measure, to be very precise, a hundred and six *aṅgulas*.¹⁹

17. Unlike chapter 42, this chapter proposes consecration of a Śaiva temple which is distinguished by the names of the divinities to be installed on the exterior projections of the temple walls.

18. See also *Agni-Purāṇa* 42.15-16.

19. *Agni-Purāṇa*, 104.26.

Comparative Classification

Like *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, *Agni Purāṇa* also classifies the temples in five categories, each consisting of nine models and thus producing a list of 45 types of temples.²⁰

A comparative list is given below²¹

Agni-Purāṇa	Garuḍa-Purāṇa
1. Vairāja (Square)	Vairāja (Square)
Meru	Meru
Mandara	Mandara
Vimāna	Vimāna
Bhadra	Bhadra
Sarvatobhadra	Sarvatobhadra
Caruka ²²	Rucaka
Nandika	Nandana
Nandivardhamāna	Nandivardhana
Śrīvatsa	Śrīvatsa
2. Puṣpaka (rectangular)	Puṣpaka (rectangular)
Valabhī	Valabhī
Gṛharāja	Gṛharāja
Śālāgrha	Śālāgrha
Mandira	Mandira
Viśāla	Vimāna
Brahmamandira	Brahmamandira
Bhavana	Bhavana
Prabhava	Uttambha
Śivikāveśma	Śivikāveśma
3. Kailāsa (Circular)	Kailāsa (Circular)
Valaya	Valaya
Dundubhi	Dundubhi
Padma	Padma

20. See *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, I. 47.19-27, and my article, "Some Reflections on Temple Architecture from *Garuḍa Purāṇa*", vol. XXII, No. 2 pp. 184 ff.

21. The similarity in these two lists will strengthen our bases for dating *Agni-Purāṇa* nearer to *Garuḍa* i. e. 9th cent. A. D.

22. *Caruka* seems to have emerged out of the reversed spelling of *Rucaka* which is given as a different reading. See *infra Agni Purāṇa* p. 170.

Mahāpadma	Mahāpadma
Vardhanī	Mukulī
Uṣṇīṣa	Uṣṇīṣī
Śaṅkha	Śaṅkha
Kalaśa	Kalaśa
Khavṛkṣa	Guvāvṛkṣa
4. Maṅika (apsidal)	Mālīka (apsidal)
Gaja	Gaja
Vṛṣabha	Vṛṣabha
Haṁsa	Haṁsa
Garutmān	Garuḍa
Rkṣṇāyaka	Simha
Bhūṣaṇa	Bhūmukha
Bhūdhara	Bhūdhara
Śrījaya	Śrījaya
Prthivīdhara	Prthivīdhara
5. Triviṣṭapa (Octagonal)	Tripiṣṭapa (Octagonal)
Vajra	Vajra
Cakra	Cakra
Svastika	Muṣṭika
Vajrasvastika	Vabhru
Citra	Vakra
Svastikakhaṅga	Svastikakhaṅga
Gadā	Gadā
Śrīkaṅṭha	Śrīvṛkṣa
Vijaya	Vijaya or Śvetavijaya

Erection of Door and Banner

The doors should be erected so as to face the main cardinal points of the compass and not as to open on the angular points. Four doors on four cardinal points in a temple are considered best (*uttama*) while three doors are supposed medium (*madhyama*) and inferior (*kanyasa*). The height of a doorframe should be double or even triple its width. The *śākhās* are equal to the desirable height while *udumbara* is additional. It is not calculated in original height. The door should be decorated with two, five, seven or nine ornamental vertical strips (*śākhās*). Below the (*śākhās*), the door-guardians are to be sculpted, occupying the quarter part of

the door-jamb. The rest of the jambs should be embellished with scrolls, foliage and couples.²³

Also, chapter 61 of Agni Purāṇa is fully devoted to the description of the establishment of door-frames and banners. Though it is confined to the rituals following and preceding the erection of a door, it gives some details. The gods Caṇḍa, Pracāṇḍa are said to be carved on the bottom of the door-jamb along with Lakṣmī on the upper portion.²⁴ In the sanctum the image of Hari (Viṣṇu) should be installed.

The flag is considered as *Prakṛti* and the staff as *Puruṣa*. The hoister of a banner (which destroys all evils) on the top of a temple resides as many thousand years in the region of Viṣṇu as there are the number of atoms in the different parts which constitute the temple.²⁵

It proclaims here that a temple is nothing but another form of the divine image of Viṣṇu.²⁶ The various parts of a temple symbolize different parts of a divine image.²⁷ The *śukanāsa* of the temple's *śikhara* is the nose, the two *rathakas* are two arms, the *aṇḍa* is the head, the *kalaśa* is the hairs, the *kaṇṭha* is the neck, the *vedī* is the shoulder, the *praṇāla* is the anus, the *sudhā* is the skin, the *dvāra* is the mouth, the *pratimā* is the life, the *piṇḍikā* is the vital energy, the *prakṛti* is the shape or form and the image of god *keśava* is the soul. Thus the temple is comparable to a living organism.

Consecration of the Divinities

Chapter 43 of Agni-Purāṇa provides a detailed list of divinities to be enshrined in different directions and subsidiary shrines of the main prāsāda. It suggests a *pañcāyatana* temple for Vāsudeva (Viṣṇu).

-
23. See also *Bṛhatsamhitā*, 56.14-15 where the number of *śākhās* is described as '*tripañcasaptanavabhiḥ*' and the phrase '*Pādavarṇābhiḥ*' is read as '*patravallībhiḥ*'. However, the expressions in *Bṛhatsamhitā* appear to be more accurate and appropriate.
24. *Agni-Purāṇa*, 61.5
25. *Ibid*, 61.17-19
26. *Ibid*, 61.19
27. *Ibid*, 61.23-27.

In the four corner shrines there should be installed the images of Vāmana, Nṛhari (Nṛsimha), Aśvaśīrṣa (Hayagrīva) and Śūkara (*Varāha*) incarnations in the south-east (*āgneya*) south-west (*nairṛta*) north-west (*Vāyavya*) and north-east (*īśāna*) directions respectively (see appendix I) or Nārāyaṇa in centre, Ambikā in *āgneya*, Bhāskara (sun) in *nairṛta*, Brahmā in *vāyavya* and Liṅga (Śiva) in *īśāna*, (see appendix 2) or in a *navadhāma*²⁸ temple Indra and other *lokapālas* (regents), totally eight, should be installed on eight cardinal points with Vāsudeva in centre (see appendix 3). A *pañcāyatana* also may be made in a *navadhāma* with Purusottama (Viṣṇu) in centre (*madhya*), Lakṣmī-Vaiśravaṇa in the east, Mātṛs (mother-goddesses) in the south, Skanda and Gaṇeśa in the north-east, Sūrya and other *grahas* (planets) in the west, the ten *avatāras* (Matsya etc.) in the north, the goddess Caṇḍikā in the south-east, the goddess Ambikā in the south-west, and the goddess Sarasvatī in the north-west (see appendix 4).

In a *trayodaśālaya* (a temple with twelve sub-shrines) Viśvarūpa Viṣṇu should be enshrined in the centre along with goddess Padmā in the sub-shrine of the north-east corner and Keśava and other manifestations of god Viṣṇu in different corners starting with the east.²⁹ (see appendix 5).

Dikpālas

Chapter 56 entitled '*dikpālāyāgakathanām*' describes the position of eight *dikpālas*, one at each cardinal point, with their elaborate iconographic details. According to it, Indra, Agni, Yama, Nairṛti, Varuṇa, Vāyu, Kubera or Soma and Īśāna should guard the directions, respectively east, south-east, south, south-west, west, north-west, north, north-east. The *vāhanas* are in the same order, *gaja* (elephant), *chāga* (goat), *mahiṣa* (buffalo), *nara* (man), *makara* (croco-

28. *Navadhāma* denotes a temple with eight sub-shrines along with the central as the ninth one, as the *pañcāyatana* denotes a temple with four sub-shrines.

29. These are the twelve-forms (*dvādaśamūrtis*) of god Viṣṇu. One of them, namely Nārāyaṇa, is not installed in the sub-shrines because He is already in the central one. H. Daniel Smith's, *Vaiṣṇava Iconography*' may be referred to for the list of *dvādaśamūrtis*. See pp. 160 ff.

dile) and *marud* (antelope). The *vāhana* of Kubera is not specified while Īsāna is provided with *vṛṣa* (bull).

Saptabhauma Sabhāmaṇḍapa :

Chapter 65 discusses the methods of building *sabhāmaṇḍapa* in front of the temples. After examining the ground on which the hall (*maṇḍapa*) is to be built, the *vāstuyāga* ceremony should be performed. Now, the *saptabhauma* (seven storeyed) hall sacred to Hari (Viṣṇu) should be constructed, following the same rules which are applied in erecting the mansions of a king. It should be built consisting of one, two, three or four *śālās* (enclosures or courts). The *maṇḍapa* comprising four *śālās* is considered the best of all. After building seven storeys one by one the *saptabhauma* hall should be consecrated with all the rituals which are consequent on the installation of a divine icon.



Prof. Dr. LUDWIK STERNBACH
(1909—1981)

PROF. DR. LUDWIK STERNBACH

(1909-1981)

Indological studies have sustained a severe blow in the sudden demise of Dr. Ludwik Sternbach on March 25, 1981. He passed away as the result of a heart attack as he was returning in a taxi after attending a meeting in Paris. He was a devoted researcher and an indefatigable worker and bore a charming personality, affable, affectionate and disarming, qualities which his close friends and fellow-workers, including the present reviewer, can vouch for.

Dr. Sternbach's life and career were highly varied and eventful. He was born in Cracow (Poland) on Dec. 12, 1909 as the son of an eminent lawyer and studied law in the Jagellonian University at Cracow (1927-30). On passing out of the University, he worked in a judicial court (1931-32), then under a local lawyer (1932), and commenced independent practice as a Member of the Bar at Cracow in 1937. His interest in Indian Culture and law prodded him to study Sanskrit, which he did under Prof. Mme. Helena Willmann Grabowska of the Department of Indian Philology, combining his studies with his profession. He took his LLD in 1933 and Ph. M. (Philosophy and Sanskritology) in 1936, his specialisation being *Dharmaśāstra* and *Arthaśāstra*. Since his professor was the lone member of the staff of the Department, he volunteered to assist in giving lectures and looking after the Library (1933-37), when he was taken as a Reader in the Department (1937-38).

In the wake of the Nazi occupation of Western Poland and persecution of Jews, Dr. Sternbach escaped penniless to Lwow in Eastern Poland, then under Russian occupation. At Lwow he got an Assistant's job under Prof. Stasiak in the Institute of Indian Philology and Culture of the University of Jan Casimir (now Iwan Franko). When things began to hot up there, too, he left Lwow and reached India *via* Turkey and Iraq.

In India, the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay gave asylum to this academic pilgrim and he was accepted as Professor of *Dharmaśāstra* and Indian Culture. In this capacity he became associated also with the Bombay University. The seven years (1940-47), which he spent in India, lecturing in the said two institutions, visiting other University centres, and associating with

Indian scholars was the most formative period in the academic career of the ardent aspirer after learning that Dr. Sternbach was. Thus, when the UNO was set up after the Second World War and Dr. Sternbach was drafted to it as Deputy Director of Research in the Department of Trusteeship on Non-Self-Governing Territories, in 1947, he left India not only as a *Dharmaśāstra-vidvān*, but also as a *Loka-kathā-vidvān* (Master of Indian folk-tales). Throughout his tenure in the above and senior capacities in the UNO at Paris, Geneva and New York, Dr. Sternbach continued, with zest, his Indianistic studies, which led him to still another allied field, *viz.*, the rich *subhāṣita* literature in Sanskrit and developed into a *Subhāṣita-vidvān*, too. His literary output and published writings during his tenure in the UNO from 1947 to 1970 is so prodigious that he seemed too have pursued his academic studies with as much interest and ardour as his official duties.

When his term of Office at the UNO came to a close in 1970, he joined the University of Paris Nouvelle as Professor of Indology, where he lectured on Indian Culture for two years (1970-72) and later in the same capacity in the College de France for four years (1972-76). During the last years of his life, he maintained close, though informal connection with the said institutions and pursued his academic studies and publication activities unremittingly. Throughout his life, he suffered from poor health and impaired vision but that did not deter him from world travel, frequent visits to India and lecturing at Universities and Institutes in the countries that he visited.

While the subjects taken up for study by Dr. Sternbach were more of a general than of a technical nature, what is lost in depth is amply made up in expanse. Thus, the published writings of Dr. Sternbach is, to say the least, stupendous both in bulk and in variety. More than thirty titles, in about fifty volumes, some of them extending through a few hundred pages each, besides a hundred and fifty scholarly papers and over two hundred literary review is, indeed, an enviable record even for an assiduous academician. His early writings centered round the gnomic and didactic, and sociology, law and politics in ancient India. While he presented through the 6-volume *Cāṇakya-nīti-text-tradition* (1963), and other similar text-editions, pithy Sanskrit texts prescribing the path of righteousness and avoidance of pitfalls in life, in his exegetical works like the 2-volume *Juridical studies in ancient Indian law* (1965, 1967),

he correlated those texts with social customs and legal tradition of the land according to the Dharmaśāstras and Smṛtis. His *Bibliography of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra* (Hoshiarpur, 1973) and *Bibliography of Dharma and Artha in Ancient India* (Wiesbaden, 1973) are very useful reference books on the subject. From amongst his works on Sanskrit *Subhāṣita*, three deserve special mention. First, his two substantial *Supplements* (Wiesbaden, 1965; Turin, 1974) to the well-known *Indische Spruche* by O. Boethlingk. The second is his 2-volume *Descriptive catalogue of poets quoted in Sanskrit anthologies and inscriptions* (1978, 1980), which forms the largest ever detailed documentation of about 2000 authors, many of them known only through their stray verses. The third is *Mahāsubhāṣitasanġraha*, his *magnum opus*, a 20-volume "extensive collection of wise sayings and entertaining verses in Sanskrit with Introduction, English translation, Critical notes and Indices." Five volumes, each containing five to six hundred pages, have already been issued by the V. V. Research Institute, Hoshiarpur and further volumes were under preparation when the hands of death snatched away Dr. Sternbach in the midst of his work. Possibly, he had a premonition of his death, for he entrusted the continuation of the compilation and publication of this priceless work to the V. V. Research Institute, through a 'Dr. Ludwik Sternbach Foundation' which the Institute has since set up. He was in the Editorial Board of *Purāṇa Bulletin* and a member of several learned bodies and was the recipient of several honours, but what he cherished most were the honorary doctorates which the Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi and the Kameshwar Singh Sanskrit University, Darbhanga, conferred in him, both in 1980.

Soft-spoken, persuasive and unbelievably courteous, this Senior Officer of the UNO who has achieved, in the literary field, perhaps, more than a well-placed academician, has left a void in Indological scholarship. Indeed, his numerous friends and admirers, both in India and in the West, will miss his benign presence in the sessions of the World Sanskrit Conference, of which he was the Secretary-General and the live force.

—K. V. Sarma

802 1981

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
(January-June, 1981)

Varāha Purāṇa Work

We have edited and printed the whole text of the Varāha Purāṇa consisting of 215 Chapters (=218 Chapters of the Venkateśvara edition). The Appendices and the Introduction of the Critical edition as well as the English translation of the whole Purāṇa have already been prepared and printed. These two volumes will be presented to 5th session of International Association of Sanskrit studies being held in Vārāṇasī in Oct., 81.

Garuḍa Purāṇa Work

The collation of the manuscripts of this Purāṇa continues. Five Paṇḍits are full-day engaged in collating the Devanāgarī manuscripts available at present. Śāradā manuscripts and Telugu manuscripts have also been requested. Meanwhile a list of all the places having manuscripts of Garuḍa Purāṇa or parts thereof has been prepared.

Veda Pārāyaṇa

From first day of white fortnight of lunar month of Māgha upto 15th day, the Ghanapāṭha of Śukla Yajurveda was recited in Vyāseśvara temple of Ramnagar Fort. The reciter was Pt. Anjaneya Sharma while Pt. Vishwanath Subrahmanya Śarma was Śrotā. At successful conclusion the usual Dakṣiṇā, food and gifts were presented to them.

Purāṇa Pāṭha and Pra vacana

According to fixed Schedule the recitation of Purāṇas took place in different temples.

Viṣṇusahasranāma Work

The collation of Viṣṇu Sahasranāma MSS is thoroughly going on. Many MSS or their photocopies have been procured and their collation also will be made.

सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जनवरी-जून १९८१)

वराहपुराणकार्यम्

वराहपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षितं संस्करणं पूर्णरूपेण संपादितं प्रकाशितं च जातम् । पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणे २१५ अध्यायाः (वेङ्कटेश्वर संस्करणे २१८ अध्यायाः) सन्ति । पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणस्य परिशिष्टानि भूमिका च संपूर्णा जाता । आंग्लभाषानुवादोऽपि प्रकाश्यमानो वर्तते । इमौ द्वौ भागौ अन्तरराष्ट्रीय-संस्कृतविदुषां वाराणस्याम् अक्टूबरमासे भाविनि पञ्चमे सम्मेलने उद्घाटिते भविष्यतः ।

गरुडपुराणकार्यम्

गरुडपुराणस्य हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवादकार्यं प्रचरति । उपलब्धानां देव-नागरीहस्तलेखानां संवादलेखनकार्ये पञ्च पण्डिताः पूर्णरूपेण संलग्नाः सन्ति । शारदालिपिहस्तलेखस्य प्राप्तये तेलगुलिपिहस्तलेखस्य प्राप्तये च प्रार्थना कृता वर्तते । गरुडपुराणस्य हस्तलेखा येषु स्थानेषु वर्तन्ते तेषां स्थानानां सूची अपि संकलिता जाता ।

वेदपारायणम्

माघमासस्य प्रतिपत्तिथिमारभ्य पूर्णिमापर्यन्तं रामनगरदुर्गस्थे व्यासे-श्वरमन्दिरे शुक्लयजुर्वेदस्य घनपारायणं श्रीआञ्जनेयघनपाठिमहोदयेन कृतम् । श्रीविश्वनाथसुब्रह्मण्यमहोदयः श्रोता आसीत् । पारायणसमाप्तौ पारायणकर्त्रे श्रोतृमहोदयाय च विहिता दक्षिणाः भोजनं च प्रदत्तम् ।

पुराणपाठः प्रवचनं च

यथापूर्वं विहितस्थानेषु पुराणानां पाठः जातः ।

विष्णुसहस्रनाम

विष्णुसहस्रनामस्तोत्रस्य हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवादकार्यमपि सम्यग्रूपेण प्रचलति । अनेके हस्तलेखाः, तेषां फोटोप्रतिर्वा संवादार्थमानीताः सन्ति येषां संवादः शीघ्रमेव भविष्यति ।

Visitors to the Purāṇa Department

1. K. H. Jack, University of New Castle upon Tyne on 9.2.1981.

He writes in the visitors' book : 'I am very greatly impressed and delighted that this work of the Purāṇa continues and enlightens people everywhere.....This is a wonderful enterprise and I hope and trust that it will flourish always.

2. Kenneth Zeph—Australia on 3.2.1980.

'I have been greatly impressed and delighted to see such an important work on the Puranas being carried out here in Ramnagar. I am looking forward to the publication of the critical editions of the Mahāpurāṇas. I wish all the best in their fine undertaking.'

3. S. V. Singh on 5.6.1981.

Sanskrit Teachers Conference

A Conference of the Sanskrit Teachers from all over India was held in the Saṃpūrṇānanda Sanskrit Viśvavidyālaya in Vārāṇasī on the 27th of February, 1981. At the conclusion of the Conference, the delegates met the Chairman of the Trust, Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh who is also promoter of Sanskrit learning and President of the Viśva Sanskrit Pratiṣṭhān of Pondicherry. The teachers were received in the Divān Khānā of the Fort and introduced to H. H. the Mahārāja of Banāras. A tea party was offered to them.

Italian Foreign Minister in Rāmṇagar

On the 28th of February, 1981 the Italian Foreign Minister Mr. Emilio Colombo paid a visit to the Chairman of the Trust along with a large delegation of 18 Members of Parliament. The Minister and H. H. the Mahārāja had a conversation on which a cultural collaboration between the Trust and the Institute for the Middle and Far East (IsMEO) was prospected. The delegation was shown the publications of the Purāṇa Department and offered a refreshment. H. H. the Mahārāja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh was kind enough to show the illustrious visitors the Museum. The visitors took keen interest in the explanations given by the Chairman.

पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

१. डा० के. एच. जैक महोदयः न्यूकेसल अपान टाइन विश्वविद्यालयीयः—१.२.१९८१ दिनाङ्के । एष महाभागो दर्शकपुस्तिकायां लिखति— अहं अतीव प्रभावितः प्रसन्नश्चास्मि यदेतत् पुराणकार्यं प्रचलति सर्वत्र जनान् ज्ञानान्विताञ्च करोति ।.....इदं महत्त्वपूर्णं कार्यमस्ति अशासे विश्वसिम् च यदेतत् कार्यं सदैव वृद्धिं यास्यति ।
२. डा० केनेथ जेफमहोदयः—आस्ट्रेलियादेशस्थः—३.३.८१ दिनाङ्के स लिखति—अहमत्र रामनगरे एतादृशं महत्त्वपूर्णं पुराणसंबंधिकार्यं क्रियमाणं दृष्ट्वा अतीवप्रभावितोऽस्मि । अहं महापुराणानां अति-शोभनानां पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंस्करणानां प्रकाशनस्य प्रतीक्षां करोमि ।
३. डा० सत्यव्रतसिंहः, संपूर्णानन्दसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य भूतपूर्वः कुलपतिः—५.६.८१ दिनाङ्के ।

संस्कृताध्यापकानां सम्मेलनम्

२७ फरवरी १९८१ दिनाङ्के संपूर्णानन्दसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालये सर्व-भारतीयसंस्कृताध्यापकानां सम्मेलनं जातम् । सम्मेलनसमाप्तौ सम्मेलन-प्रतिनिधयः सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यासस्यध्याक्षान् संस्कृतविद्यायाः अन्यतम पोषकान् च महाराजान् डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयान् रामनगरदुर्गे दृष्टवन्तः । महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदया पान्डिचेरीनगरस्थस्य विश्वसंस्कृतप्रतिष्ठानसंस्थाया अध्यक्षा अपि सन्ति । प्रतिनिधयः रामनगर दुर्गस्थदीवानखानास्थाने महाराजैः सह संगताः । प्रतिनिधिभ्यः अल्पाहारस्य व्यवस्था आसीत् ।

इटली देशस्य विदेशमन्त्री रामनगरे आगतः

२८ फरवरी १९८१ दिनाङ्के इटलीदेशस्य विदेशमन्त्री श्री इमिलो कोलम्बो महाभागः इटली संसदः १८ मन्त्रिभिः सह दुर्गे न्यासाध्यक्षान् महाराज डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयान् दृष्टवान् । महाराजैः सह विदेशमन्त्रिणः वार्तालापे न्यासेन सह इटलीदेशस्य मध्यातिपूर्वसंस्थानेन सह सांस्कृतिकसहयोगस्य संभावनाया विमर्शो जातः । प्रतिनिधिभ्यः पुराणप्रकाशनानि दर्शितानि अल्पाहारश्च प्रदत्तः । विशिष्टातिथीन् तत्रभवन्तो महाराजाः सग्रहालयं प्रदर्शितवन्तः । प्रतिनिधयः महाराजानां व्याख्यानेन अतीव प्रभाविता आसन् ।

Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at the Palace

Mr. Pio-Carlo Terenzio, Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Geneva (Switzerland) and his wife, visited the Fort on 13.4.1981. The illustrious visitor and his consort were received and honoured by H. H. the Mahārāja. They were offered breakfast in the Palace itself and conversated with the Chairman of the Trust.

Demises of Dr. Ludwik Sternbach

Dr. Ludwik Sternbach passed away on 25 March, 1981. He was a member of the Editorial Board of our Bulletin. The Chairman of the Trust as well as all the members of the Editorial Board and the staff of the Bulletin express their condolence and pray for the repose of his soul. (See Obituary in other part of the Bulletin).

R. N. Dandekar New Member of Editorial Board

H.H. Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, Chairman of the Trust, has appointed Dr. R. N. Dandekar, world-renowned Indologist, as a Member of the Purāṇa Committee and Purāṇa Bulletin. We welcome the appointment and hope that by his knowledge and long experience the work of the Purāṇa will progress considerably.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

Mahārāja Banāras Vidyāmandir Trust Maṅgalotsava

The annual Vasanta maṅgalotsava took place on 24-25-26 March, 1981 in the evenings. The three-day programme was held under the patronage of the Chairman of the Vidyamandir Trust, H. H. Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. The first two evenings were dedicated to vocal and instrumental music performed by the students and the staff of the musical College, B. H. U., Varanasi. Among them some foreign students also showed what they had already assimilated of the Indian music. The instruments played were Sitar, Tabla, Sarod, Sarangi. On the third day a programme of dance was performed by the students of the same College. Eminent persons like the Registrar of the University and illustrious musicians attended the programme with keen interest.

अन्तरसंसत्संस्थानस्य महामन्त्री रामनगरदुर्गे

मि० पिओ कार्लो टेरेन्जिओ जेनेवा नगरस्थस्य (स्विटजरलैंड देशस्य) अन्तरसंसत्संस्थानस्य महामन्त्री तस्य पत्नी च १३.४.८१ दिनांके रामनगर दुर्गे आगतौ। महामन्त्री तस्य पत्नी च तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः सभाजितौ। ताभ्यां सह महाराजास्तत्र भवन्तः काशीनरेशा वार्तालापं कृतवन्तः अल्पाहारं च प्रदत्तवन्तः।

डा० लुडविक स्टर्नबाखमहोदयस्य देहावसानः

'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः संपादकमण्डलस्य सदस्यः डा० लुडविक स्टर्नबाख-महोदयः २५ मार्च १९८१ दिनाङ्के दिवंगतः। न्यासस्याध्यक्षाः पत्रिकायाः संपादनसमितेः सर्वे सदस्याः कर्मचारिणश्च स्वशोकं ज्ञापयन्ति दिवंगतात्मनः शान्त्यै च प्रार्थयन्ति (तस्य जीवनवृत्तंपत्रिकाया अन्यपृष्ठेषु पूर्वमागतम्)।

डा० दाण्डेकरमहोदयः संपादनसमितेः सदस्यो नियुक्तः

न्यासस्याध्यक्षैस्तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहो-दयैः प्राच्यविद्याया विश्वविश्रुतो विद्वान् डा० रामचन्द्रनारायण दाण्डेकर महो-दयः पुराणप्रकाशनसमितेः 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाश्च संपादकमण्डलस्य सदस्यो नियुक्तः। वयमेतां नियुक्तिमभिनन्दामः। आशास्महे डा० दाण्डेकरमहोदयस्य पाण्डित्येन व्यापकानुभवेन च पुराणकार्यस्य प्रगतिर्भविष्यति।

सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

(१) महाराज बनारस विद्यामन्दिरन्यास मङ्गलोत्सवः

१९८१ वर्षस्य मार्चमासस्य २४, २५, २६ दिनाङ्केषु रामनगरदुर्गे मङ्गलो-त्सवः संपन्नः। एष उत्सवः महाराज बनारस विद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्याध्यक्षाणां तत्र भवतां महाराजानां डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयानां संरक्षणे संपन्नः। प्रथमयोर्द्वयोर्द्विवसयोः कण्ठसंगीतस्य वाद्यसंगीतस्य च प्रदर्शनं जातम्। अस्मिन् प्रदर्शने हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य संगीतमहाविद्यालयस्य अध्यापकाः छात्राश्च प्रदर्शनं कृतवन्तः। केचन वैदेशिकछात्रा अपि स्वपठितभारतीय-संगीतस्य प्रदर्शनं कृतवन्तः। सितार-तबला-सरोद-सारङ्गी-वाद्यानां वादनं जातम्। तृतीयदिने तस्य महाविद्यालयस्य छात्रैः नृत्यस्य प्रदर्शनं कृतम्। हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य कुलसचिवेन सह विशिष्टा जनाः संगीतज्ञाश्च कार्यक्रमं दृष्टवन्तः।

Museum

The Museum is visited continuously by many people and groups of students, who are particularly attracted by the armory and fine ivory works. Twice a day guided tours are organized by the U. P. Government Tourist Office. Several foreign tourist also visit the Museum. Among the illustrious persons who visited it in this period we note :

1. H. K. Humagai, Leader of Bhutan's delegation.
2. Maj. Gen. A. M. Joglekar, CE HQ Central Command, Lucknow—on 8-2-1981.
3. Mr. Emilio Colombo, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Italy—on 28-2-1981.
4. Mr. Pio Carlo Terenzio and Luisa Terenzio—on 13-4-1981.
5. Mr. Roxin Janvieri, British High Commissioner, New Delhi—on 4-6-1981.

Dhrupad Mela

On the 2, 3, 4 March, 1981 the seventh Dhrupad Mela was organized at Tulsi Ghat, Varanasi under the auspices of the Vidya-mandir Trust, which sponsors the revival of a branch of music less known. Varanasi is a traditionally good seat of musicians, who find many occasions to express their talent to an always very interested audience. The Dhrupad Mela which takes place during three nights attracts the attention of those who are more sensitive to the traditional values of the Indian music. As usual a good number of people attended the performance.

MAHARAJA UDIT NARAIN SINGH MANASA
PRACARA NIDHI

Navahna Pārāyaṇa

As usual the Navaha Parayana and Pravachana was performed in Kali Temple of Chakia for Nine days. H.H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh attended the discourses every day. On concluding day the sacrifice and feeding of Brahmanas took place,

संग्रहालयः

बहवो जनाः समुदायाः छात्राश्च संग्रहालयं सततं पश्यन्ति । ते शस्त्रा-
गारेण हस्तिदन्तनिर्मितवस्तूनां दर्शनेन च अतीव प्रभाविता भवन्ति । दिने
द्विवारम् उत्तर प्रदेशशासनेन निर्दिष्टा यात्रिण आगच्छन्ति । अनेके वैदेशिकपर्य-
टका अपि संग्रहालयं द्रष्टुमागच्छन्ति । अस्मिन् कार्यावधौ अधोनिर्दिष्टा विशिष्टा
जनाः संग्रहालयं दृष्टवन्तः—

१. एच. के. हुनाई—भूटानदेशस्य पर्यटकानां नेता ।
२. मेजर जेनरल ए. एम. जोगेकर, लखनऊ, ८.२.८१ दिनाङ्के ।
३. मि. ऐमिलिओ कोलम्बो—इटलीदेशस्य विदेशमन्त्री । २८.२.८१ दिनाङ्के
४. मि. पिओ. कार्लो टेरेन्जिओ तथा श्रीमती लुसा टेरेन्जिओ—
१३.४.८१ दिनांके ।
५. मि. रोक्सन जेनिवरी—ब्रिटिश उच्चायुक्तः ४.६.८१ दिनांके ।

ध्रुपदमेला

१९८१ वर्षस्य मार्चमासस्य २,३,४ दिनाङ्केषु महाराज बनारस विद्या-
मन्दिरन्यासस्यान्तर्गतं वाराणस्यां तुलसीघट्टे ध्रुपदमेलाया आयोजनं सम्पन्नम् ।
एष न्यासः संगीतविद्यायास्तासां शाखानां पुनरुज्जीवनाय प्रयतते येषां प्रचारो
न्यूनतया वर्तते । वाराणसी संगीतविद्यायाः प्रसिद्धं स्थानमस्ति यत्र संगीतज्ञाः
स्वविद्यायाः प्रदर्शनार्थं स्थानानि लभन्ते । रात्रित्रयात्मकमिदं प्रदर्शनं श्रोतृ-
गामावर्जनं करोति । श्रोतृणां संख्या सदैव विपुला भवति ।

महाराज उदितनारायणसिंह मानस प्रचार निधिः

नवाह्नपारायणम्

पूर्ववदस्मिन् वर्षेऽपि चकिया नगस्थे कालीमंदिरे श्रीमद्रामचरित मानस
ग्रन्थस्य नवाह्नपारायणं सञ्जातम् । एषु नवषु दिवसेषु एतद्विषये प्रवचनमपि
सञ्जातम् । तत्र भवन्तः काशीनरेशा महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायण सिंह
महोदयाः प्रतिदिनं प्रवचनेषु उपस्थिता आसन् । पारायणसमाप्तौ हवनभोज-
नादि कार्यं सम्पन्नम् ।

Essay Competition

This year also the Essay Competition for Graduate and Post Graduate students organized by the Maharaja Udit Narain Singh Mansa Pracara Nidhi.

The first prize was given to Sri Anil Kumar Singh, B. H. U. Varanasi, who got Rs. 100 with certificate. Judges were Laksmi Sankar Vyasa, Acharya Visvanath Mishra and Chandradhar Prasad Narain Singh with the Choti Rajkumari. The prizes were distributed by the Chairman of the Trust, Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh in the Fort of Ramnagar. A special function was also organized at Thakurbari, Kamaccha, on 25.4.1981 to commemorate the death anniversary of Sant Harihara Baba, a famous commentator on Tulsidas literature in late XIX century.

निबन्ध-प्रतियोगिता

अस्मिन्नपि वर्षे अनेन न्यासेन स्नातकछात्राणां कृते स्नातकोत्तर छात्राणां च कृते तुलसीसाहित्यविषये निबन्धप्रतियोगिता आयोजिता आसीत् । प्रथमपुरस्कारः श्रीअनिलकुमारसिंहाय प्रदत्तः । अस्मै शतरूप्यकाणां पुरस्कारः प्रमाणपत्रं च प्रदत्तम् । श्री लक्ष्मीशंकर व्यासः, श्रीविश्वनाथ प्रसाद मिश्रः, श्रीचन्द्रधरप्रसाद नारायण सिंहः, कनिष्ठाः महाराज कुमारी च परीक्षकाः आसन् । न्यासाध्यक्षैस्तत्र भवद्भिः काशिनरेशै महाराजैः डा० विभूतिनारायण सिंह महोदयैः रामनगर दुर्गे पुरस्कारः प्रदत्तः । वाराणस्यां कमच्छा स्थिते ठाकुरवाड़ी स्थाने २५.४.८१ दिनांके तुलसीसाहित्यस्य टीकाकर्तुः सन्त हरिहर बाबा महोदयस्य स्मृतौ एकोत्सवः सम्पन्नः जातः ।

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.; 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 Singh, M. A., D. Litt.;
Raghubir Niwas, Sitamau (Malwa).
6. Pt. Giridhar 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.

Donation made to All India Kashi Raj Trust, Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi will qualify for exemption under Sec. 80G of the Income Tax Act, 1961 in the hands of donors, vide certificate No. 58/59 (253/80-81/Tech) dated 9.12.80

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

Statement of ownership and other particulars about

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Place of Publication | ...Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi |
| 2. Periodicity of Publication | ... Half-yearly |
| 3. Printer's Name | ...Vinaya Shankar |
| Nationality | ...Indian |
| Address | ...Ratna Printing Works,
B21/42 A, Kamachha, Varanasi |
| 4. Publisher's Name | ...Yogendra Narain Thakur
General Secretary, All-India
Kashiraj Trust |
| Nationality | ...Indian |
| Address | ...All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi. |
| 5. Editors' Name
with Address | ...R. K. Sharma (New Delhi),
Dr. R. N Dandekar (Pune),
Sri A.S. Gupta (<i>Editor-in-Charge</i>)
(Purāṇa Deptt Fort Ramnagar,
Varanasi). |
| Nationality | ...Indian. |
| 6. Name of the owner | ...All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi. |

I, Yogendra Narain Thakur, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true, to the best of my knowledge.

Yogendra Narain Thakur
Publisher.