

Vol. XXXII, No. 2]

[July, 1990

पुराणम्
PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

*Published with the financial assistance from the Ministry of Education.
Government of India*

VYĀSA PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

Dr. V. Raghavan Commemoration Volume

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

Annual Sub.—Inland Rs. 100/-

Foreign £ 10

सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा० रामकरण शर्मा

भूतपूर्व कुलपति, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी; नयी दिल्ली

डा० रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर

भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे

डा० जे० गोण्डा. उटरेख्ट, नीदरलैण्डस्

डा० जोर्जो बोनाजोली

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. R. K. Sharma

Formerly Vice-Chancellor, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University,
Varanasi; 63 Vigyan Vihar, New Delhi - 110092.

Dr. R. N. Dandekar

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune

Dr. J. Gonda

Van Hogendorpstraat. 13 Utrecht, The Netherlands

Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli, M. A. (Milan), M. Th. (Rome)

EDITOR

Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, M.A., Ph. D., Vyakaranacharya

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

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

Editors of Dr. Raghavan Commemoration Volume

1. Dr. S. S. Janaki
2. Dr. N. Gangadharan
3. Dr. R. S. Bhattacharya

लेखेषु प्रतिपादितानि मतानि लेखकैरेवाभ्युपगतानि; न पुनस्तानि
सम्पादकेन न्यासेन वाभ्युपगतानीति विज्ञेयम् ।

Authors are responsible for their views, which do no
bind the Editors and the Trust.

Authors are requested to use Devanāgarī characters while
writing Sanskrit śloka and prose passages. They are also requested
to follow the system of transliteration adopted by the International
Congress of Orientalists at Athens in 1912 [ऋ = r; च् = c; छ = ch
ट = t; श् = ś; ष् = ś; ' = m].

Traditional Sanskrit scholars are requested to send us articles
in Sanskrit (i) dealing with the religious & philosophical matters in
the Purānas and (ii) explaining the obscure & difficult passages in
the Purānas.

व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः

Contents—लेखसूची

	Pages
कोशोल्लिखितो व्यासः (Vyāsa in the Lexicons)	i -iv
गद्यमयं विष्णुस्तोत्रम् (Eulogy of Vyāsa in Prose)	v-v
<i>Articles by Dr. V. Raghavan.</i>	
1. स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणम् [Purāṇa VI. 1, pp. 249-60] 251-261
2. Vālmīki and Kālidāsa [K. V. Rangaswamy Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, Madras, 1940 pp. 409-424] 262-276
3. Rāmāyaṇa : Quotations and Textual Criticism [Melanges D' Indianisme, Memorial Volume for Louis Renou. Institute de Civilization Indienne, Paris, 1968 pp. 595-604] 277-287
4. उदारिकृता रामायणव्याख्या (Uḍāri's Commentary on Rāmāyaṇa) [Gopālakrishnamacharya Book of Commemoration, Madras, 1942, pp. 206-220] 288-299
5. The Rāmāyaṇa in Sanskrit Literature [The Rāmāyaṇa Tradition in Asia, Delhi, 1980, pp. 1-19] 300-318
6. Bodhi and Viṣṇupada in North-West India and Toponymic Duplication [Indian Geographical Journal XVIII. iii, 1943, pp. 98-104] 319-325

7.	Buddhological Texts and the Epics [Adyar Library Bulletin XX (1956), pp. 349-359]	326-333
8.	Notes on Some Mahābhārata Commentaries [Studies in honour of P. V. Kane, Poona, 1941, pp. 351-355]	334-338
9.	Pañcamahāśabda [Indian Linguistics (Ralph Turner Jubilee Volume) 19 (1958), pp. 302-310]	339-348
10	Greater Gītā [J. O. R., Madras, XII (1938) pp. 86-122]	349-390
11.	The Bhagavad Gītā & Jain Literature [Bharatiya Vidya, Bombay, X (1949) pp. 80-87]	391-397
12.	Bhāskara's Gītābhāṣya [WZKSO. XII-XIII, Erich Frauwallner Festschrift (1968) pp. 281-294]	398-413
13.	The Śukānuśāsana (Śukānupraśna) [A.B.O.R.I. XLVIII-XLIX Golden Jubilee Volume, pp. 421-426]	414-420
14.	The Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa of Rāmabrahmānanda A. O. R., Madras, X. 1 (1953) pp. 1-55]	421-460
	Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust	1-3
	संस्कृतखण्डः		
	सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्	4-6

कोशोल्लिखितो व्यासः

(Vyāsa in the Lexicons)

- (१) अथान्ये ह्यवताराः स्युर्नरनारायणावृषी
अश्वो.... कपिलो व्यास इत्यपि ॥
.... व्यासः सत्यवतीसुतः ।
पाराशर्यो द्वैपायनः कृष्णद्वैपायनोऽपि च ॥
(वैजयन्ती १।१।३०, ३१ख, ३२ख)
कृष्णो नीले व्यासे
(वैजयन्ती ६।५।१४-१५)
- (२) व्यासो द्वैपायनः पाराशर्यः सत्यवतीसुतः ।
(an interpolation read after the verse 36 of the
ब्रह्मवर्गं in Amarakośa with the comm. Amarakośod-
ghāṭana).
- (३) कृष्णद्वैपायनो वेदव्यासः स्यात् सत्त्वभारतः ॥
व्यासः कृष्णः सात्यवतः कानीनो बादरायणः ।
पाराशरो माठरोऽपि पाराशर्यस्ततः पुनः ॥
द्वैपायनः....
(Kalpadrukośa, p. 82, Verses 126b-128a).
- (४) कृष्णद्वैपायनो वेदव्यासः स्यात् सत्यभारतः ॥
पाराशरिः सात्यवतो माठरो बादरायणः ।
(Trikāṇḍaśeṣa 2.7.19b-20a)
व्यासाद्यास्तु महर्षयः (Ibid. 2.7 15).
- (५) कृष्णाख्याः शस्त्रकव्यासधनञ्जयजनादर्नाः
(Śāśvata 28).
- (६) कृष्णस्तु केशवे । व्यासेऽर्जुने
(Viśvaprakāśā, ण-द्विक 17; the printed reading 'व्याप्तेऽ'
is corrupt).
कानीनः कन्यकाजाततनये व्यासकर्णयोः
(Ibid. न-द्विक 88).

- (७) कृष्णो वर्णान्तरे ध्वाङ्क्षे विधौ व्यासे धनञ्जये
(Nānārthasamgraha, p. 23).
- (८) व्यासो ना विस्तृतौ मुनौ
(Medinī स-द्वक 12; मुनौ = मुनिविशेषे).
- (९) व्यासो मुनि-प्रपञ्चयोः
(Anekārthasamgraha 2.604; मुनि = मुनिविशेष).
- (१०) कृष्णस्तु बीभत्सौ व्यासशस्त्रकविष्णुषु
(Maṅkhakośa 216).
- (११) माठरः स्याद् व्यासेऽपि
(Śabdaratnasamanvaya, र-तृतीय).
- (१२) सत्यरतः
(Śabdaratnāvalī, quoted in Śabdakalpadruma).

NOTES

It is interesting to note that various names of the great sage Vyāsa have been recorded in some of the lexicons. These works sometimes mention Vyāsa as one of the senses of certain words. These names indicate various characteristics of the sage, a detailed description of which is to be found in Itihāsa-Purāṇa literaturé.

Following names are recorded in the lexicons :

Kānīna, Kṛṣṇa, Kṛṣṇadvaiṇya, Dvaiṇya Pārāśara, Pārāśari, Pārāśarya, Bādarāyaṇa, Māthara, Vedavyāsa, Vyāsa, Satyabhārata, Satyavatisuta, Sattvabhārata, Satyarata and Sātyavata.

Kānīna—'The son of an unmarried woman'; see Kāśikā on Pāṇini 4. 1. 116 (कानीनो व्यासः कर्णश्च). Vyāsa was born while his mother Satyavati was unmarried; see Mahābhārata Ādi-p. 63. 69-84.

Kṛṣṇa—A poetical description of the dark complexion of Vyāsa is found in Droṇa-p. 71. 24, व्यासे व्यञ्जनमःप्रभे (shinning like the cloudless sky). According to V. Dh. U. 3. 85. 65 the image of Vyāsa should be कृष्णशान्ततनु. Another explanation of this name is given in the Revākhaṇḍa of the Skanda-p.; Vyāsa is called Kṛṣṇa on account of his being an *amśa* of Kṛṣṇa (97. 74). The word Kṛṣṇa for Vyāsa is often used in Itihāsa-purāṇa works; see Mbh. 18. 5. 36; Bhāgavata-p. 12. 6. 35.

Dvaipāyana—As the sage was born in an island he was called Dvaipāyana; see Mbh Ādi-p, 63. 86 (न्यस्तो द्वीपे स यद् बालस्तस्माद् द्वैपायनः स्मृतः), द्वैपायनो द्वीपजन्मा (Sk. Revā. 97. 74).

This island seems to be somewhere in the river Yamunā, for the Mbh. speaks of Yamunā-dvīpa (Ādi-p. 63-84) and Revā Khaṇḍa 97. 72 mentions सूर्यमुतातट (bank of the river Yamunā).¹ The word Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana means one who is kṛṣṇa as well as dvaipāyana.²

Pārāśara, Pārāśari, Pārāśarya—Since Parāśara was the father of the sage (Ādi-p. 63. 83-84) he was called by these names. In Pārāśara the secondary suffix is *an* (See Pāṇini 4. 1. 92; also 4. 1. 114); in Pārāśari the suffix is *in* (see Pāṇini 4. 1. 95); in Pārāśarya the suffix is *yan* (see Pāṇini 4. 1. 105). For the justification of the forms Pārāśarya and Pārāśara, see Kāśikā 4. 1. 105.

1. Sir Monier-Williams thinks that it was an island in the Ganges where Vyāsa was born : 'Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana so named because of his dark complexion and because he was brought forth by Satyavati on a *dvīpa* or island in the Ganges' (s. v. Kṛṣṇa).
2. The explanation of the word कृष्णद्वैपायन as given in the auto-commentary on the Maṅkha-kośa (216) is worth noting : कृष्णद्वैपायन इत्यस्य कृष्णशब्दस्य भीमोऽपि भीमसेन इति न्यायेन व्यासे प्रयोगः । अथ द्वैपायनशब्देनास्य 'चण्डश्च चण्डीपतेरंशो मुनि-द्वैपायनस्तु वः । रथयोजितगोविन्दो रुक्मिणीकः सदा मुदे ॥' इत्यादौ दुर्वासस्यपि वर्तनात् कृष्णशब्देनैव व्यासवाचिना विशिष्यते द्वैपायनशब्दः ।

Bādarāyaṇa—Since the island in which the sage was born was full of Badari trees (द्वीपे तु बदरीप्राये *Matsya*-p. 14. 16) he was called Bādarāyaṇa. Some are of the opinion that since the sage was a *gotra-apatya* of Badara (a remote ancestor of the sage) he was called Bādarāyaṇa; see Pāṇini 4. 1. 99 (the word Badara is read in the Naḍādi group).

Māṭhara—The word is not found to have been used for Vyāsa in Itihāsa-Purāṇa literature. The meaning of the word (as given in the comm. on the Uṇādisūtras)³ does not seem to have any intimate connection with any incident concerning the life of this sage.

Vedavyāsa, Vyāsa—Since the sage arranged the Vedas he was called by these two names (विन्यास वेदान् यस्मात् स तस्माद् व्यास इति स्मृतः *Ādi*-p. 63.88). Vyāsa is however a general name for all those sages who arranged the Vedas in the past *Dvāpara Yugas*. The author of the *Mahābhārata* and the original *Purāṇasāṃhitā* is the Vyāsa who is known as Pārāśarya, Sātyavata and Dvaipāyana.

Satyabhārata—It may be analysed सत्यं भारतं यस्य, one whose (literary composition called) Bhārata is true (i. e. it is a historical work and not a fiction). The name seems to be based on *Ādi*-p. 1.72.

Satyavati-suta, Sātyavata—Satyavati is the name of the mother of Vyāsa (*Ādi*-p. 63. 83). Sātyavata—offspring of Satyavati.

Sattvabhārata seems to be the corrupt form of Satyabhārata.

Satyarata—‘सत्ये रतः’, devoted to the search of truth; cp. the epithet सत्यवादिन् for Vyāsa in *Mbh.* 18. 5. 36.

—R. S. Bhattacharya

3. According to the commentaries on the different recensions of the Uṇādisūtras *māṭhara* means a *jñānin* or *muni* or a particular *muni*; see *Prakriyāsarvasva* on Uṇādi 5. 47; *Śvetavanavāsin*'s *vṛtti* on Uṇādi 5.41; *Ujjvaladatta*'s *vṛtti* on Uṇādi 5. 39.

गद्यमयं विष्णुस्तोत्रम्

(Eulogy of Viṣṇu in Prose)

(१)

गरुड उवाच—

जय जय त्रिभुवन जनमनोभवन विदलिताघगुण सकलगीर्वाणवन्दित-
चरणकमलयुगलपरिमलबहलरिपुवनविभञ्जन विद्योतमान सकलसुरासुरमुकुट-
कोटिविलसितनिजपीठकमल निरसितनिजजनहृदयतिमिरपटलबहल हिमकर
इव त्रिविधसन्तापसन्दोहहरणचरण जगदुदयस्थितिलयविलासविलसित-त्रिविध-
मूर्तिकीर्तिविस्फूर्जितजगदुदयसन्दोह दिनकर इव निजजनमानससरोजषट्पद-
विदितसकलवेद विद्योतमानमानस निजजनमुनिजनवन्दित पदनखनीरपवित्रीकृत-
गीर्वाण-मुनिमानसवन्दितचरणरजःप्रसादसारभूत जगतामधोश नमस्ते नमस्ते

(स्कन्दपु० विष्णुखण्ड, बदरिकाश्रम ४।१०) ।

(२)

नारद उवाच—

जय जय नारायण अपारभवसागरोत्तारपरायण सनकसनन्दनसनातन-
प्रभृतियोगिचयविचिन्त्यमानदिव्यतत्त्व स्वमायाविलासिताध्यासपरिणमिताशेष-
भूततत्त्वत्रितत्त्व त्रिदण्डधर त्रिणाचिकेतत्रिमधुत्रिसुपर्णोपगीयमान दिव्यगान
च्छन्दोमय स्वासनसुपर्णप्रिय भक्तप्रिय भक्तजनैकवत्सल स्वमायाजालव्यवहित-
स्वरूप विश्वरूप विश्वप्रकाश विश्वतोमुख विश्वतोक्षि विश्वतःश्रवण विश्वतःपाद-
शिरोग्रोव, विश्वहस्तनासारसनात्वक्केशलोमलिङ्ग सर्वलोकात्मक सर्वलोक-
सुखावह सर्वलोकोपकारक सर्वलोकनमस्कृत लीलाविलसितकोटिपद्मोद्भवसुद्रेन्द्र-
मरुदश्वि-साध्यसिद्धगणप्रणताशेषसुरासुरत्रिभुवनगुरो न कस्यापि ज्ञानगोचर
नमस्ते नमस्ते

(स्कन्दपु० विष्णुखण्ड, उत्कल० २०।२६).

A NOTE ON THE PURANIC PASSAGES IN PROSE

The Purāṇas contain a few eulogies in prose. Besides the two given above, prose eulogies are found in Vāmana-p. Chaps. 26, 60, 70; Brahma-p. 65. 49; Skand-p. Kumārikā 30.59; Uttarakhaṇḍa 12.28 ; Revākhaṇḍa 20. 57-58 ; Bhāgavata-p. 12. 6 ; Devi-p. 36; Narasiṃha-p. 10. 33-40; 31. 90; Kalki-p. 76. 97-100 (Some prose sentences in these eulogies seem to have been written in the Gāthā metre).

Besides these eulogies there are prose passages in the Purāṇas dealing with Puranic subjects; see Padma-p. 4.76, 4.112, 6.277-279; Varāha-p. 74, 80, 81, 82, Narasiṃha-p. 28. 1-12; Viṣṇu-p. 4. 1-24; Bhāgavata-p. 5. 1-26. (All such passages as contain prose mantras or prose formulae are excluded).

In connection with Puranic prose passages it is interesting to note that the editors of all the printed editions of the Matsya-p. regarded. 154. 555-575 as written in prose. In a note entitled मत्स्य पुराण का एक भ्रष्ट पाठ published in the Siddhānta (vol. 14.9), I showed that originally these passages were written in the Sragviṇī metre which became corrupt in later time. Afterwards Pt. Thakur Prasad Dvivedi in his article केषुचित् मत्स्यपुराणश्लोकेषु गद्यभ्रमः (published in Purāṇa, vol. I, pp. 72-79) dealt with the question in detail.

Whether these prose passages in the Purāṇas were originally written in verse is a matter of grave discussion. M. M. Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya had the conjecture that the first two prose lines in the Mahābhārata (लोमहर्षण पुत्रः . . . सत्रे) embodied the substance of a śloka now lost (Modern Review, August 1928, p. 176). It is not an exaggeration that a few Puranic passages bearing long compound words resemble the prose of the Kādambari of Bāṇa.

—R. S. Bhattacharya

॥ स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणम्* ॥

(१)

यस्मिन् सर्वमिदं जगज्जलनिधौ पोतायितं नित्यशः
यस्मिन् विश्वमिदं विवेकविरहाद्रज्जौ भुजङ्गायितम् ।
यो जातो दशधा विशेषविभवैर्मत्स्यादिभिर्लीलया
तस्मै श्रीपुरुषोत्तमाय सततं मत्स्याय नित्यं नमः ॥ १ ॥

अनेकदुर्बोधसुबोधकारिणो
जन्मान्तरोपार्जितदुःखहारिणः ।
पुनन्तु रक्षन्तु जगतीह^१ नित्यं
गुरोः प्रसादादित^२ पादपांसवः ॥ २ ॥

^३भुजङ्गरज्ज्वा मत्स्यस्य शृङ्गे नावमयोजयत् ।
उपर्युपस्थितस्तस्याः प्रणिपत्य जनार्दनम् ॥ ३ ॥

आवृत्तं (आभूत) संप्लवे तस्मिन्नतीते योगशायिनि(ना) ।
पृष्टेन मनुना प्रोक्तं पुराणं मत्स्यरूपिणा ॥
तदिदानीं प्रवक्ष्यामि शृणुध्वमृषिसत्तमाः ॥ ४ ॥

यद्भवद्भिः पुरा पृष्टः सृष्ट्यादिकमहं द्विजाः ।
तदा एक(तदेवैका०)णवे तस्मिन् मनुः पप्रच्छ केशवम् ॥ ५ ॥

* पाठसमीक्षित—संस्करणम्

१. वृत्तदोषः ।

२. ग. झा. रि. इ. पत्रिकायां '०चित्' । 'प्रसादायित' इति स्यात् ।

३. स्व. म. १.३—७—आ. म. २. १९—२३

सङ्केतविवरणम्

1. कुण्डलमध्ये प्रदर्शितः पाठः मुद्रितमूलमत्स्यपुराणीयः । 2. कुण्डलमध्ये दत्तः प्रश्नसङ्केतः (?) अस्माभिः सूचितं पाठं प्रदर्शयति । 3. श्लोकानां पादचतुष्टयप्रतिपादनार्थं 1, 2, 3, 4, संख्या दत्ता । 4. ग. झा. रि. इ.—Ganganath Jha Research Institute. 5. आ. म.—आनन्दाश्रम—मुद्रित—मत्स्यपुराणम् । 6. स्व. म.—स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणम् । 7. मु. ते.—मुद्रित—तेलुगुमत्स्यपुराणम् ।

मनुस्वाच—

उत्पत्तिं प्रलयं चैव वंशो(शान्) मन्वन्तराणि च ।
वंशानुचरितं चैव भुवनस्य च विस्तरम् ॥ ६ ॥
दानधर्मविधिं चैव श्राद्धकल्पं च शाश्वतम् ।
वर्णाश्रमविधानं च तथेष्टापूर्तसंस्थितिम् ॥ ७ ॥^१

तडागवापीप्रतिमाप्रतिष्ठा^२

निर्माणमेषां च सुविस्तरेण ।

प्रासादकूपादिसमण्डपानां (?)

स्वल्पेह(?)मत्स्ये कथिता(?)पुराणैः(णे ?)^३ ॥ ८ ॥

इति स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणे षट्पादकार्या(?)^४ साहस्रे प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥

(२)

मनुस्वाच—

^५चतुर्मुखत्वमगमत्कस्माल्लोकपितामहः ।

कथं च लोकानसृजद् ब्रह्मा ब्रह्मविदां वरः ॥ १ ॥

मत्स्य उवाच—

तपश्चचार प्रथममसु(म)राणां^६ पितामहः ।

आविर्भूतास्ततो वेदास्साङ्गोपाङ्गपदक्रमाः ॥ २ ॥

१. ६, ७—पद्ययोः क्रियापदमपेक्ष्यते । मध्ये 'मनुस्वाच' इति पदे यदि न स्यातां, तदा ५—पद्यस्थेन 'पप्रच्छ' इत्यनेनान्वयः सुलभः ।
२. तथा मत्स्ये २. २४—देवतानां प्रतिष्ठादि ।
३. 'स्वल्पे इह' इत्यत्र पुनस्सन्धिः कृत इति भाति । अथवा 'स्वल्पे हि' इति स्यात् ।
४. सर्वास्वेव पुष्पिकासु एवमेव । 'षट्पादपादकायाम्' इति ग. झा. रि. इ. पत्रिकायाम् (पृ० १८५) ।
५. स्व. म. २. १—५२ = आ. म. ३. १—५२
" " " ५३—१२ = " " " ६—१२
६. यद्यपि ब्रह्मा असुराणामपि पितामहः, तथापि स्व. म. पाठमपहाय आ. म. पाठः सूचितः, पूर्वस्य अप्रस्तुतत्वात् ।

पुराणं सर्वशास्त्राणां प्रथमं ब्रह्म शाश्वतम् (ब्रह्मणा स्मृतम्)
नित्यं शब्दमयं पुण्यं शतकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ॥ ३ ॥

अनन्तरं च वक्त्रेभ्यो वेदास्तस्य विनिस्सृताः ।
मीमांसा न्यायवार्ता च प्रमाणाष्टकसंयुता[:]^१ ॥ ४ ॥

वेदाभ्यासरतस्यास्य प्रजाकामस्य मानसाः ।
मरीचिरभवत्पूर्वं पुत्रोऽग्निर्भगवानृषिः ॥ ५ ॥

अङ्गिराश्चाभवत्पश्चात् पुलस्त्यस्तदनन्तरम् ।
ततः पुलहनामा वै ततः क्रतुरजायत ॥ ६ ॥

प्रचेताश्च ततः पुत्रो वसिष्ठश्चाभवत्पुनः ।
पुत्रो भृगुरभूत्तत्र नारदोऽपि(प्य) चिरादभूत् ॥ ७ ॥

दशेमान् मानसान् ब्रह्मा^२ यस्मात्पुत्रानजीजनत् ।
शारीरानथ वक्ष्यामि मातृहीनान् प्रजापतेः ॥ ८ ॥

अङ्गुष्ठादक्षिणादक्षः प्रजापतिरजायत ।
धर्मः स्तनान्तादभवद्दृढयात्कुसुमायुधः ॥ ९ ॥

भ्रूमध्यादभवत्क्रोधो लोभश्चाधरसत्तमः(०सम्भवः) ।
बुद्धेर्मोहः समभवदहङ्कारादभूत्ततः(०न्मदः) ॥ १० ॥

प्रमोदश्चाभवत्कण्ठान्मृत्युलोचनतो नृप ।
रभसः^३ करमध्यात्तु ब्रह्मसूनुरभूत्ततः ॥ ११ ॥

१. आ. म. 'संयुता' इति बहुवचनपाठस्तत्र 'न्यायविद्याः' इति बहुवचन-
शब्देनान्वेति । स्व. म. पाठे 'न्यायवार्ता' इति एकवचनपाठमनुसृत्य
'संयुता' इति एकवचनपाठः सूचितः ।
२. यस्मात्—इदं पदमनपेक्षितमत्र । बृहन्मत्स्यस्य मातृकासु मुद्रितपुस्तकेषु
चात्र बहुधा भिन्नः पाठो दृश्यते ।
३. आ. म. भरतः । भरतस्याप्रस्तुतत्वात् रभसस्य काम-मदादिसजातीयत्वात्
समञ्जसत्वम् ।

एते नव^१ सुता विप्राः(?) कन्यैका दशमी पुनः ।

अङ्गजा इति विख्याता दश(शा?) मो ब्रह्मणस्सुता(ः?) ॥ १२ ॥

इति स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणे

षट्पादकार्या(?) साहस्रे द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥

(३)

मनुस्वाच —

बुद्धेर्माहः समभवदिति यत्परिकीर्तितम् ।

अहङ्कारः स्मृतः क्रोधाद्(को वा?)^{*} बुद्धिर्नाम किमुच्यते ॥ १ ॥

मत्स्यरूपी भगवानुवाच—

सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चैव गुणत्रयमुदाहृतम् ।

साम्यावस्थितिश्चैतेषां^१ प्रकृतिः परिकीर्तिता ॥ २ ॥

केचित्प्रधानमित्याद्यामव्यक्तमपरे जगुः ।

एतदेव पुरा सृष्टिं प्रजापतिः करोति च ॥ ३ ॥

गुणेभ्यः क्षाभमाणेभ्यस्त्रयो देवा विजज्ञिरे ।

एकमूर्तिस्त्रयो देवा ब्रह्मविष्णुमहेश्वराः ॥ ४ ॥

१. दश पुत्रानुद्दिश्य नवत्वगणनमसङ्गतम्; तथापि 'नव' इत्येव सर्वत्र पाठः । मूलमत्स्यस्य मातृकासु नवसु रभस इति वा भरत इति वा उपक्रान्तं दशमपुत्रविषयमर्थं नास्ति । मूलमत्स्यद्रविडानुवादे च रभसं करमध्यं चानुदाहृत्य नवत्वमुक्तम् । भागवते ३.१२.२५ श्लो. आरभ्य समुद्दिष्टेषु ब्रह्मपुत्रेषु रभस इति वा भरत इति वा प्रस्तावो नास्ति ।
२. 'अङ्गजा' शब्दस्य कन्यानामत्वेन स्त्रीत्वे प्रथमैकवचनत्वे च सन्धिदोषः । 'अङ्गजाः' इति पुंसि प्रथमाबहुवचनत्वे 'शारीराः पुत्राः' इति पूर्वोद्दिष्टस्यानुवादः । आ. म. 'अङ्गजा' 'दशमी' 'सुता' इति स्त्रीत्व-एकवचनघटितः पाठः कन्यकान्वितत्वेन ग्राह्यः ।
३. स्व. म. ३.१—११ = आ. म. ३.१३—२३२
 ,, ,, ,, १२१ = ,, ,, ,, २३३
 ,, ,, ,, १२२—३६ = ,, ,, ,, २४२—४७
४. 'को वा' पाठः क्वचित् मूलमत्स्यमातृकासु दृश्यते ।
५. आ. म. ०तिरेतेषां । स्व. म. पाठे वृत्तदोषः ।

सविकारात्प्रधानात्तु महत्तत्त्वं प्रजायते ।

महानिति यतः ख्यातिर्लोकानां जायते सदा ॥ ५ ॥

अहङ्कारश्च महतो जायते मानवर्धनः ।

इन्द्रियाणि ततः पञ्च रक्षे (वक्ष्ये) बुद्धिरसानि (वशानि) ^१ तु ।

प्रादुर्भवन्ति चान्यानि तथा बुद्धि (कर्म) रसानि (वशानि) तु ॥ ६ ॥

श्रोत्रं त्वक्चक्षुषी जिह्वा नासिका चैव पञ्चमी ।

पायूपस्थ (स्थौ?) हस्तपादौ वाक् चेतीन्द्रियसङ्ग्रहः ॥ ७ ॥

शब्दः स्पर्शश्च रूपं च रसो गन्धश्च पञ्चमः ।

उत्सर्गानन्दनादानसत्यलोपाश्च (भगत्यालापाश्च) तत्क्रियाः ॥ ८ ॥

मन एकादशं तेषां कर्मबुद्धिगुणान्वितम् ।

इन्द्रियाण्येव या (इन्द्रियावयवाः) सूक्ष्माः तस्य मूर्तिः (ति ?) मनीषिणः ^२ ॥ ९ ॥

श्रयन्ति त (य ?) स्मात्तन्मात्राः शरीरं तेन स स्मृता (तेन संस्मृतम् ?) ^३ ।

शरीरयोगे जीवश्च शरीरीत्युच्यते बुधेः ॥ १० ॥

मनस्सृष्टिं विकुरुते नोद्यमानं सिसृक्षया ।

४ आकाशात् शब्दतन्मात्रात् वायुः स्पर्शगुणोऽभवत् ॥ ११ ॥

वायोश्च शब्द (स्पर्श ?) तन्मात्रात् तेज आयु (वि) भवेत्ततः ।

त्रिगुणं तद्विकारेण तच्छब्दस्पर्शरूपवत् ।

तेजोविकारादभवत् वारि राजश्चतुर्गुणम् ॥ १२ ॥

१. स्व. म. मातृकायाम् आसामीयलिखितायां सर्वत्रैव रेफ-वकारयोर्भ्रान्ति-
दृश्यते ।

२. तस्य मनीषिणः, तस्य चैतन्यात्मकस्य जीवस्य ।

३. शीर्यंत इति शरीरमिति यद्यपि प्रसिद्धा शरीरशब्दव्युत्पत्तिः, अत्रेन्द्रिया-
वयवास्तन्मात्राख्याः तत् श्रयन्तीति इन्द्रियाश्रयत्वात् शरीरमिति
व्युत्पत्तिर्दत्ता । दृश्यतां मनु. १.१७

यन्मूर्त्यवयवास्सूक्ष्माः तस्येमान्याश्रयन्ति षट् ।

तस्माच्छरीरमित्याहुः तस्य मूर्ति मनीषिणः ॥

एवमेव भविष्ये ॥ १.२.२८

४. अत्र प्रक्रिया क्वचित् संक्षेपेण क्वचिद्विस्तरेण दत्ता । मूलमस्ये सर्वत्र
यथावद्वत्ता (३.२३-२४)

रसतन्मात्रसंभूतं प्रायो रसगुणात्मकम् ।
भूमिस्तु गन्धतन्मात्राद्भूत्पञ्चगुणा ततः ॥ १३ ॥

प्रायो गन्धगुणा सा तु बुद्धिरेषा (षां ?)बलीयसी ।
एतैस्संपाति (दि) तं भुङ्क्ते पुरुषः पञ्चविंशकः ॥ १४ ॥

ईश्वरेच्छावशस्सोऽपि यतात्मा कथ्यते बुधैः ।
एवं षट्त्रिं (ड्विं) शकं प्रोक्तं शरीरमिह मानवैः ॥ १५ ॥

सांख्यं सांख्य (संख्या) गुणत्वं (०त्वात्) च कपिलादिभिरुच्यते ।
एवं तत्त्वात्मकं कृत्वा जगद्वेधा अजीजनत् ॥ १६ ॥

सावित्रीं लोकसिद्धयर्थं हृदि कृत्वा समास्थितः ।
ततस्सा जायते^१ तस्य भित्त्वा देहमकल्मषा ॥ १७ ॥

स्त्रीरूपमर्धमकरोदर्थं पुरुषरूपवत् ।
मातृरूपा^२ समाख्याता सावित्रीति निगद्यते ॥ १८ ॥

सरस्वत्यथ गायत्री ब्रह्माणी च परंतप ।
ततस्स्वदेहसंभूतामात्मजामिति कल्पयन् ॥ १९ ॥

कल्पान्ते^३ व्यथितस्तावत् कामबाणादितो विभुः ।
अहो रूपमहो रूपमिति चाह प्रजापतिः ॥ २० ॥

ततो वशिष्ठप्रमुखा भगिनीमिति^४ चुक्रुशुः ।
ब्रह्मा न किञ्चिद्दृशे तन्मुखालोकनादृते ॥ २१ ॥

अहो रूपमहो रूपमिति प्राह पुनः पुनः ।
ततः प्रणामनम्रां तां पुरस्तादवलोकयत् ॥ २२ ॥

अथ प्रदक्षिणं चक्रे सा पितुर्वरवर्णिनी ।
पुत्रेभ्यो लज्जितस्यास्य तद्रूपालोकनेच्छया ॥ २३ ॥

१. आ. म. ततस्सञ्जपतः । मूलमत्स्यमातृकासु 'सा जपतः, तां जपतः, स तथा जपतः' इत्यादयः पाठा दृश्यन्ते ।

२. आ. म. शतरूपा । अघः ३१ तमश्लोके पूर्वार्धं च दृश्यताम् ।

३. आ. म. दृष्ट्वा तां ।

४. मूलमत्स्यमातृकासु 'भगिनीति च'

आविर्भूतमथो वक्त्रं दक्षिणं पाण्डु संभ(गण्ड)वत् ।

विस्मयस्फुरद्दिक्पञ्च(स्फुरदोष्ठं च)

प्रश्नोऽभ्युदयशान्ततः (पाश्चात्यमुदगात्ततः) ॥ २४ ॥

चतुर्थमभवत्पश्चाद्रामकामशरोद्भवम् (पश्चाद्द्वामं कामशारातुरम्) ।

ततोऽन्यदभवत्तस्य कामातुरभया तथा(०तुरतया तथा) ॥ २५ ॥

तपस्तप्त्वा सदाकाशम् (उत्पतन्त्यास्तदाकाशम्)

आलोकयन् (०कन) कुतूहलात् ।

तेनाशु^२ वक्त्रमभवत्पञ्चमं तस्य धीमतः ।

अभवज्जनीभिश्चैव (आविर्भवज्जटाभिश्च)

तद्वक्त्रस्या(०द्वक्त्रं चा) भवत् (वृणेत) प्रभुः ॥ २६ ॥

सृष्ट्यर्थं यत्कृतं तेन तपः परमदारुणम् ।

तत्सर्वं नाशमगमत्सुतोपगमनेच्छया ॥ २७ ॥

ततस्तानब्रवीद् ब्रह्मा पुत्रानात्मसमुद्भवात् ।

प्रजासृजध्वमभितस्सदेवासुरमानुषाः ॥ २८ ॥

एवं वक्त्रात् (एवमुक्ताः) ततस्सर्वे

सिसृक्षुः (ससृजुः) विविधाः प्रजाः ।

गतेषु तेषु सृष्ट्यर्थं प्रत्यङ्मनसि तामिमाम् ॥ २९ ॥

उपयेमे स विश्वात्मा शतरूपामनिन्दिताम् ।

स बभूव तथा सार्धमतिकामातुरो विभुः ॥ ३० ॥

स लज्जां चकाम(चकमे)देव(ः)कमलोदरमन्दिरे ।

यावदब्दशतं दिव्यं यथान्यः प्राकृतो जनः ॥ ३१ ॥

ततः कालेन महता ततः(तस्य)पुत्रोऽभवन्मनुः ।

स्वायम्भुव इति ख्यातः स विभातीति(विराडिति)नः श्रुतम् ॥३२॥

तद्रूपगुणसामान्यादधिपु(पू)रुष उच्यते ।

वैराजा यत्र ते जाता बभूवुः(बहवः)शंसित (संशित) व्रताः ॥३३॥

स्वायम्भुवो(वा) महाभागास्सप्त सप्त तथापरे ।

स्वारोचितीत्याद्याः (०चिषाद्याः) सर्वे ते ब्रह्मानुत्यस्वरूपिणः ॥

उत्तमी(औत्तमि)प्रमुखोस्तद्वद् एषां तु (त्वं)सप्तमोऽधुना ॥ ३४ ॥

इति स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणे षट्पादकार्या (?) साहस्रे मनुत्पत्तिः तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥

१. अयं श्लोकः समनन्तरश्लोकात्परं व्युत्क्रमेण दृश्यते । तथैव मूलमत्स्ये च ।

२. आ. म. तेनोर्ध्वं

(४)

भगवानुवाच—

१ ततस्तु शतरूपायां सप्तापत्यान (न्य) जीजनत् ।

ये मरीच्यादयः पुत्रा मानसास्तस्य धीमतः ॥ १ ॥

तेषामयमभूल्लोकः पुराद्य(ह्य)व्यक्तरूपिणम् ।

ततोऽसृजद्वामदेवं त्रिशूलवरधारिणम् ॥

सनत्कुमारं रितुं (च विभुं) पूर्वेषामपि पूर्वजम् ॥ २ ॥

वामदेवस्तु भगवानसृजन्मुखतो द्विजान् ।

राजन्यानसृजद्वाह्वोर्विट्शूद्रानूरुपादयोः ॥ ३ ॥

विद्युतोऽशनिमेघांश्च रोहितेन्द्रधनुषि च ।

छन्दांसि च ससर्जादौ पर्जन्यं च ततः परम् ॥ ४ ॥

ततस्साध्यगणानीशस्त्रिनेत्रान् सृजत्प्रभुः ।

कोटयः (०टीश्च) चतुराशीति(र्ति) जरामरणवर्जितः (ताः) ॥ ५ ॥

रामो (वामोऽ)सृजन्नमत्यांस्तान् ब्रह्मणा विनिवारितः ।

‘नैवंविधा भवेत् सृष्टिः जरामरणवर्जिता ॥ ६ ॥

शुभाशुभात्मिका या तु सैव सृष्टिः प्रशस्यते ।

एवं स्थितस्स तेनादौ सृष्टिः (ष्ट्रैः) स्थानु (णु) रतोऽभवत् ३ ॥ ७ ॥

स्वायम्भुवो मनुर्धीमान् तपस्तप्त्वा सुदुश्चरम् ।

पत्नीमवाप रूपाह्यामनन्तां नाम नामतः ॥ ८ ॥

१. स्व. म. ४. १—२८ = आ. म. ४. २५३—५२

” ” ” २९, ३० = ” ” ” ५४, ५५

२. मु. ते. त्रिणेत्राद् । ‘त्रिनेत्रान्’ इति द्वितीयाबहुवचनान्तः पाठ एव प्रायिकः, किन्तु स दुर्घटार्थः । वामदेवः स्वनेत्रादेतान् ससर्ज इति चेत् सुघटोऽर्थः ।

३. अत्र विशिष्य तुरीये पादे, पाठबाहुल्यमन्वयदुर्घटता च मातृकासु मुद्रितकोशेषु च दृश्यते । इत्थमन्वयो भाति—एवं तेन प्रजापतिनिवारणहेतुना स वामदेवः आदौ सृष्टेः स्थितो विरतोऽभवत् ॥ एवमेव वायौ १०. ६४—

“ऊर्ध्वरेताः स्थितः स्थाणुर्याविदाभूतमप्लवम् ।

यस्माच्चोक्तं स्थितोऽस्मीति ततः स्थाणुरिति स्मृतः ॥”

प्रियव्रतोत्तानपादौ मनुस्तस्यामजीजनत् ।
 धर्मस्य चतुरा कन्या सूनृता नाम भावि (मि)नी ॥ ९ ॥
 उत्तानपाद (०दात्) तनया (०यान्) प्राप मन्थरगामिनी ।
 अपश्यन्ती (अपस्यतिः) वपुस्मन्तः (अपस्यन्तः)
 कीर्तिमान् ध्रुव एव च^१ ॥ १० ॥

उत्तानपादोऽजनयत् सूनृतायां प्रजापतिः ।
 ध्रुवो वसु (वर्ष) सहस्राणि त्रीणि कृत्वा तपः पुरा ॥ ११ ॥
 दिव्यमायतनं (० माप ततः) स्थानमनन्तं ब्रह्मणो वरम् ।
 तमेव पुरतः कृत्वा ध्रुवं सप्तर्षयः स्थिताः ॥ १२ ॥
 धन्या सा या मनोः कन्या ध्रुवा(त्) शिष्ट^२मजीजनत् ।
 अग्निकल्पा (०न्या) ह्रस्वच्छाया (तु सुच्छाया)^३
 शिष्टादाधातु (धत्त)^४ वै सुतान् ॥ १३ ॥

विप्रं^५ रिपुञ्जयं वृत्तं वृकणं वृकतेजसम् ।
 चा (च)क्षुषं ब्रह्मदौहित्र्यां वैरि (र)ण्यां^६ स रिपुञ्जयः ॥ १४ ॥
 वीरणस्यात्मजायां तु चक्षुषैवम् (चक्षुर्मनम्) अजीजनत् ।
 मनुर्वै राजकन्यायां नदुषायां (नड्वलायां)^७ स चाक्षुषः ॥ १५ ॥
 जनयामास तनयां (०यान्) दशपुत्रानकल्मषान् ।
 उरुः पुरः शतद्युम्नस्तपस्वी सत्यवाक् कविः ॥ १६ ॥
 अग्निष्णुर (०ष्टुद) तिरात (त्र)श्च सुद्युम्नश्चापराजितः ।
 अभिमन्युश्च दशमो नदुषायां (नड्वलायाम्) अजायत ॥ १७ ॥

१. अत्र द्वितीयान्तः पाठोऽपेक्ष्यते ।
२. विष्णौ (१. १३. १) 'शिष्टम्' ।
३. विष्णौ 'सुच्छाया' ।
४. विष्णौ 'शिष्टेराधत्त सुच्छाया' ।
५. विष्णावपि 'विप्रं' । अन्यत्र 'कृषं' 'रिपुं' इति बहुधा ।
६. आ. म. 'वीरिण्यां' । अस्या वीरणस्यापत्यत्वेन कथनात् 'वैरणी' इत्येव नाम ग्राह्यम् ।
७. आ. म. ४. ४०; भागवते ४. १३. १४; विष्णौ १. १३. ४. सर्वत्रास्या 'नड्वला' इत्येव नाम दृश्यते ।

उरुस्त्वजनयत्पुत्रान् स चा(षडा)ग्नेयी तु सुप्रभान् ।
अंशु^१सुमनसं स्वाति क्रतुमग्निरसोऽम्बुजम् (०मङ्गिरसं गयम्) ॥ १८ ॥

पितृकन्या सुनीथा तु वेनं वंशा (अंशा ?) दजीजनत् ।
वेनमन्यासितं (०न्यायिनं) विप्रा अमर्दन् तत्करादभूत् ॥ १९ ॥

पृथुनामा महातेजाः स पुत्रौ द्वावजीजनत् ।
^२अन्तर्धानं(नः)सुमारीचं(हर्विर्धानं)शिखण्डिन्यामजीजनत् ॥ २० ॥

हविर्धानात्पडाग्नेयी वृषलान् (धिषणा)^३ जनयत् सुतान् ।
प्राचीनर्वाहिषं सार्धं यमं शक्रं मरुं बलम् ॥ २१ ॥

प्राचीनर्वाहिर्भगवान् महानासीत् प्रजापतिः ।
^४हविर्धानात् (हाविर्धानिः) प्रजायन्त (प्रजायेन)
नवमं (बहवः) संप्रकीर्तिताः संप्रवर्तिताः ॥ २२ ॥

सुवर्णायां तु सामुद्र्यां दशाधत्त सुतान् प्रभुः ।
सर्वे प्राचेतसो राजन् धनुर्वेदस्य पारगाः ॥ २३ ॥

तत्रापारक्षिता (तत्तपोऽरक्षितं ?) धृत्या (वृक्षाः ?)
चतुर्लोक (ववृर्लोकं ?) समन्ततः ।^५
वेदावेदाश्च (तदादेशाच्च ?) तानग्नि
रदहदरि (द्रवि ?) नन्दन ॥ २४ ॥

१. विष्णौ, भागवते च 'अङ्ग' ।
२. विष्णौ १. १४. १; भागवते ४. २४.
३. आ. म. ४. ४५; विष्णौ १. १४. २.
४. आ. म. ४. ४६; विष्णौ १. १४. ३; भागवते ४. २४. ९, १३.
५. अत्र सूचितानां पाठानामाधारविषये दृश्यतां विष्णौ १. १५. १-४—
तपश्चरत्सु पृथिवीं प्रचेतस्सु महीरुहाः ।
अरक्ष्यमाणामावब्रुः बभूवाथ प्रजाक्षयः ॥
नाशकन् मरुतो वातुं वृतं खमभवद् द्रुमैः ।
दशवर्षसहस्राणि न शेकुः चेष्टितुं प्रजाः ॥
तान् दृष्ट्वा जलनिष्क्रान्ताः सर्वे क्रुद्धाः प्रचेतसः ।
मुखेभ्यो वायुमग्निं च तेऽसृजन् जातमन्यवः ॥
उन्मूलानथ तान् वृक्षान् कृत्वा वायुरशोषयत् ।
तानग्निरदहद्वोरस्तत्राभूद् द्रुमसंक्षयः ॥

भागवते च ४. ३०. ४४-४८, ४. ४-१६

सोमकन्या उरुपत्नी (तरुपुत्री?)^१ मारिषा नाम विश्रुता ।
तेभ्यस्तु दक्षमेकं सा पुत्रमश्रु (०ग्र्य) मजीजनत् ॥ २५ ॥

दक्षादनन्तरं वृक्षादौ(नौ)षधानि च सर्वशः ।
अजीजनत्सोमकन्या नदीं चन्द्रवतीं तथा ॥ २६ ॥

सोमाङ्गस्य^२ च तत्रापि दक्षस्याशीतिकोटयः ।
तासां तु विस्तरं वक्ष्ये लोके यस्संप्रतिष्ठितः ॥ २७ ॥

द्विपदाश्चाभवत् केचित् केचिद्बुलूक(°ल्मुक?)दानवाः ।
कर्णेमुखाः शङ्कुकर्णाः कर्णश्रावयशः(प्रावरणाः) तथा ॥ २८ ॥

जनयामास धर्मात्मा म्लेच्छान् सर्वाननेकशः ।
स सृष्ट्वा मानसान् दक्षः स्त्रियः पश्चादजीजनत् ॥ २९ ॥

ददौ स दश धर्माय कश्यपाय त्रयोदश ।
सप्तविंशतिः(तिं) सोमाय दक्षो नक्षत्रसंज्ञिताः ॥
देवासुरमनुष्यादि ताभ्यस्सर्वमजीजनत् ॥ ३० ॥

इति स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणे षट्पादकार्या(?)साहस्रे
आदिसर्गे चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥

१. विष्णौ १. १५. ७-९, ६०, ७३-४. अत्रेयं 'वाक्ष्यी', वृक्षसम्बन्धिनी
इति वर्णिता । अतश्चात्र स्व. म. पाठः 'उरुपत्नी' इति यो दृश्यते
स 'तरुपुत्री' इति स्यात् । भागवते ४. ३०. १३

२. विष्णौ १. १५. ९—

युष्माकं तेजसोऽर्धेन मम चार्धेन तेजसः ।
अस्यामुत्पत्स्यते विद्वान् दक्षो नाम प्रजापतिः ॥

VĀLMĪKI AND KĀLIDĀSA¹

वाल्मीकिरस्तु विजयी प्रथमः कवीनाम्
तस्यानुसारसरलः स च कालिदासः ।
अन्ये भवन्तु कवयो जयिनोऽथ मा वा
येषां कृतः कृतिषु नैव मयावगाहः ॥

—Utprekṣāvallabha's Bhikṣāṭana Kāvya, I. 5.

Beginning his poem, *Bhikṣāṭana*,² the fancy-fond southern poet Utprekṣāvallabha thought it sufficient to salute just two poets, Vālmiki and Kālidāsa. Indeed, he says that even for his own poetic culture, he found it enough to study these two, the first of the poets, *Prathamah Kavīnām*, and his most successful follower, Kālidāsa. When Utprekṣāvallabha enjoyed Kālidāsa, what struck him most was the ease with which Kālidāsa could tread the path blazed by the *Ādi Kavi* (*Tasyānusārasalaḥ sa ca Kālidāsaḥ*).

According to Rājaśekhara, even Vyāsa was a student of Vālmiki.³ Poet after poet went about the same mine for gems, and it was the pride of poems to wear some jewels from the Rāmāyaṇa. Aśvaghōṣa may be a Buddhist, but again and again, it is Rāma and situations in the Rāmāyaṇa that he is reminded when he portrays prince Siddhārtha in his *Buddhacarita*.⁴ It is Vālmiki's Rāvaṇa who said about the beauty of Sita :

1. At the end of the recent Kālidāsa Day celebrations in the Sanskrit Academy, Madras, Prof. K. V. Rangaswami Ayyangar, who presided over the occasion, asked me why I should not write this article. I am glad that a suitable occasion has soon come off to present this paper of mine to the Professor.
2. Kāvya-mālā Guṇchaka 12.
3. Pracaṇḍapāṇḍava, Act I, Viṣkambhaka.
4. *Buddhacarita* (Cowell edn.) VI. 36, VIII. 8, IX. 9.59. Besides the whole sequence in V. 47-62. description of ladies in several attitudes of sleep which the Buddha has to see is a close, line after line, imitation of Vālmiki's description of Rāvaṇa's harem in sleeping state, which Hanumān has to see, in *Sundara*, 10, śls. 35-49, as also 9. 36 66.

यद्यत्पश्यामि ते गात्रं शीतांशुसदृशानने ।
तत्र तत्र पृथुश्रोणि चक्षुर्मम निबद्धयते ॥

Sundara, 20. 15.

Aśvaghōṣa is one of those who laid their covetous eyes on the ruby of this idea. He gave it his setting in Buddha Carita X. 8.

भ्रुवौ ललाटं मुखमीक्षणं वा वपुः करौ वा चरणौ गतिं वा ।
यदेव यस्तस्य ददर्श तत्र तदेव तस्यानुबन्ध चक्षुः ॥

The verse had possessed the imagination of the Prākṛta poet Addharāja (Āḍhyarāja ?) also who, anxious to make us realise the beauty of Vālmiki's verse fully, says in a Gāthā : "Whatever limb of that damsel one saw, in that single limb did his gaze forget itself : *indeed few realised her entire beauty.*"

यस्य यत्रैव प्रथमं तस्या अङ्गे निपतिता दृष्टिः ।
तस्य तत्रैव स्थिता सर्वाङ्गं केनापि न दृष्टम् ॥ Addharāja.

Gāthāsaptasati, III. 34.

Kamba, the author of the *Tamil Rāmāyaṇa*, was also drawn by this verse but, like Aśvaghōṣa, he thought that the idea deserved a better context than the improper infatuation of Rāvaṇa for Sitā. Kamba accordingly offered it at the feet of Rāma. Though like Addharāja, he had to lay bare the suggested idea in Vālmiki's verse, Kamba showed his original flash when he finished : "Of that beauty, as of Truth, those about realised but parts and none in full."

तोळ कंडार तोळे कंडार तोडु कळर कमलमन्न
ताळ कंडार ताळे कंडार तडक्कै कंडारु महते
वाळ कोंड कण्णार यारे वडिविनै मुडियक् कंडार
ऊळ, कोंड समयत्तन्नान् उरुवु कंडारे ओत्तार ।

Bāla, Ulāviyaṛpaṭalam, 19.

One of the fine verses in the *Kirātārjunīya* is

तदा रम्याप्यरम्याणि प्रियाः शल्यं तदासवः ।
तदैकाकी सबन्धुस्सन् इष्टेन रहितो यदा । XI. 28

and it is to Vālmiki that Bhāravi owes the inspiration for this verse. It is Rāma who laments on the banks of the Pampā :

यानि स्म रमणीयानि तथा सह भवन्ति मे ।

तान्येवारमणीयानि जायन्ते मे तथा विना ॥ *Kiṣkindhā*, I. 69.

When Vyāsa strives in the cause of the welfare of the Pāṇḍava brothers, Bhāravi is reminded of Hanumān striving for Sugriva's weal. मनस्समाधाय जयोपपत्तौ in *Kirātārjuniya* III. 10 is from Rāmāyaṇa, *Kiṣkindhā* III. 38.

Bhavabhūti pays his tribute to Vālmiki with two dramas on the theme of the Rāmāyaṇa. In his *Uttararāmāyaṇa*, he actually quotes from the *Bālakāṇḍa* and the *Āraṇyakāṇḍa* of the Rāmāyaṇa. Bāṇa might omit to mention Vālmiki when he salutes poets in the beginning of his *Harṣacarita*, but we can see that a passage like—

अभिनवपटुपाटलामोदपरिमलं न केवलं जलं पवनमपि पातुम् अभूद्
अभिलाषः.....।

in the *Harṣacarita* II, takes the fancy of “drinkable breeze” from Vālmiki—शक्यमञ्जलिभिः पातुं बाताः केतकिगन्धिनः । *Kiṣkindhā*, 28.8. When the 17th century devotee of Rāma, poet Rāmabhadra-dīkṣita, describes in his *Rāmāṣṭaprāsa śataka*,⁵

“—रावणशिरस्तालीफलभ्रंशनाकेली—”

he was certainly having in mind passages in the Rāmāyaṇa where the shattering of the head of the foe is compared for its ease with the shattering of the fruits of the Palmyra :

अद्य ते पातयिष्यामि शिरस्तालफलं यथा । *Aranya*, 29.14.

—See also *Yuddha*, 76. 61.

It is just possible that the *Gaṅgāvatarāṇa*⁶ Kāvya of Nilakaṇṭha-dīkṣita owes its name to Rāmāyaṇa, *Bāla*, 48.22.

But in no other poet are we able to trace the influence of Vālmiki so much as in the greatest poet. The very names of Kālidāsa's poem *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasambhava* are taken from the Rāmāyaṇa, *Bāla* III. 9 and 37. 31. The *Meghasandēśa* was not only inspired by the *Hanumat-sandēśa* in the epic, but actually compares also the cloud to Hanumān. Śakuntalā, repudiated by the king and seeking mother Earth to be taken into

5. *Kāvya-mālā* Guccchaka 10.

6. *Kāvya-mālā* 76.

her bosom, and living in sage Mārica's Āśrama first as a pregnant woman and then as a mother, is an image cast in the mould of Sita sent to the forest in pregnancy and living in Vālmiki's hermitage with her two children. Love-mad Purūravas in Act IV of the Vikramorvaśīya is Rāma of the closing cantos of the Aranya and the opening cantos of the Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍas of the Rāmāyaṇa. In the first canto of the Raghuvamśa, Kālidāsa refers to his path having been blazed previously by Pūrvasūris, *i. e.*, by Vālmiki I. 4. In Raghu XV. 33 Kālidāsa describes the Rāmāyaṇa as "*Kavi-prathama paddhati*" and in XV. 41, calls Vālmiki "*Ādya Kavi*" In Raghu XIV. 70. Kālidāsa simply calls Vālmiki 'Kavi' poet par excellence. It is in the Ādi Kavi's kāvya that Kālidāsa soaked himself and again and again, it is with the thoughts and words of Vālmiki that Kālidāsa enriches his fancy and expression.

Among the many charms of Rāma described by Vālmiki is the natural smile which always accompanied Rāma's speech : Ayodhyā 2.40 : स्मितपूर्वाभिभाषी. How can Kālidāsa fail to mark this quality ? He bestows it, as a hereditary charm, on Rāma's grandson Atithi, Raghu XVII. 31 : प्रसन्नमुखरागं तं स्मितपूर्वाभिभाषिणम् ।

Ayodhyā 16 10 : Rāma together with Sitā is compared to Candra with Citrā. उपेतं सीतया सार्धं चित्रया शशिनं यथा । In Raghu, 1.46, Dilīpa, with Sudakṣiṇā, is described with the same simile चित्राचन्द्रमसोरिव ।

Ayodhyā 44.19 says that when Rāma went to the forest, the Royal Fortune, Lakṣmī, also followed him, even as Sitā.

कुशचीरधरं देवं गच्छन्तमपराजितम् ।

सीतेवानुगता लक्ष्मीः तस्य किं नाम दुर्लभम् ॥

Kālidāsa puts it in a slightly varied form in Raghu XII. 26. Sitā who followed Rāma to the forest looked like Lakṣmī who, though prevented by Kaikeyī, was still after merit.

बभौ तमनुगच्छन्ती विदेहाधिपतेस्सुता ।

प्रतिषिद्धापि कैकेय्या लक्ष्मीरिव गुणोन्मुखी ॥

Ayodhyā 45, 32. The river Tamasā lying on the way appears to Vālmiki as trying to prevent Rāma from going to the forest.

ददृशे तमसा तत्र वारयन्तीव राघवम् ।

In Raghū XIV. 51. the Ganges raises its waves like hands and standing in front, prevents Lakṣmaṇa from taking Sitā into the forest.

गुरोर्नियोगाद्द्वनितां वनान्ते साध्वीं सुमित्रातनयो विहास्यन् ।
अवार्यतेवोत्थितवीचिहस्तैः जह्नोर्दुहित्रा स्थितया पुरस्तात् ॥

Ayodhyā 43. 13 : Vālmiki says that when Rāma enters the forest, trees would put forth their best flowers and fruits, even though it is not the season for them.

अकाले चापि मुख्यानि पुष्पाणि च फलानि च ।
दर्शयिष्यन्त्यनुक्रोशाद् गिरयो राममागतम् ॥

Kālidāsa mentions that a similar welcome awaited Dilīpa, the protector, as he entered the forest :

* * आसीद्विशेषात्फलपुष्पवृद्धिः * * * ।
तस्मिन् वनं गोप्तारि गाहमाने ॥

Raghū, I. 14.

Ayodhyā 49.16-17. Rama describes hunting as a favourite and accepted sport of the kings. Kālidāsa praises the virtues of hunting as a pastime for the kings in both the Raghuvamśa and the Śākuntala.

परिचयं चल etc., Raghū IX 49.

मेदश्छेदकृशोदरम् etc., Śākuntala, II.5.

Ayodhyā 91.9 : Bharadvāja asks Bharata why he entered the Āśrama singly leaving back the army and the retinue. Bharata says :

ते वृक्षानुदकं भूमिमाश्रमेषूटजांस्तथा ।
न हिंस्युरिति तेनाहमेक एव समागतः ॥

Dilīpa, with the same intention, went to Vasiṣṭha's Āśrama, with only a few followers :

मा भूदाश्रमपीडेति परिमेयपुरस्सरौ ।

Raghū. I. 37.

In Act I of the Śākuntala, Duṣyanta says before entering Kaṇva's Āśrama :

तपोवननिवासिनामुपरोधो मा भूत् । एतावत्येव रथं स्थापय ।

It is Vālmiki who caught the sound of a chariot as "Snigdha-gambhīra". Ayodhyā, 114.1 :

स्निग्धगम्भीरघोषेण स्यन्दनेनोपयान्प्रभुः ।

Dilipa's chariot also moves like Bharata's :

स्निग्धगम्भीरनिर्घोषमेकं स्यन्दनमास्थितौ ।

Raghu, I.36.

In Raghu XII.18 Kālidāsa says that Bharata protected Rāma's kingdom as one would a trust, Nyāsa.

नन्दिग्रामगतस्तस्य राज्ये न्यासमिवाभुनक् ।

Bharata says in the Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyā 115. 14 :

एतद्राज्यं मम भ्रात्रा दत्तं सन्न्यासवत्स्वयम् ।

Again, Vālmiki uses the word 'San-nyāsa' in śls. 15. 17 and 20.

Closing her exhortation to Rāma for non-violence, Sitā says, Āraṇya, 9.25 :

क्षत्रियाणां तु वीराणां वनेषु निरतात्मनाम् ।
धनुषा कार्यमेतावदार्तानामभिरक्षणम् ॥

The hermits tell Duṣyanta in I.10, Śākuntala :

आर्तत्राणाय वः शस्त्रं न प्रहर्तुमनागसि ।

Āraṇya, 40.24 : Rāvaṇa tells Mārica :

प्राप्य सीतामयुद्धेन वञ्चयित्वा तु राघवम् ।

In the same connection, Kālidāsa uses the same words :

रक्षसा मृगरूपेण वञ्चयित्वा स राघवौ ।

जहार सीताम्— — ॥ Raghu, XII. 53.

Āraṇya, 52.29 : As Rāvaṇa was carrying Sitā away, Vālmiki is not able to help pausing a while to admire how fair Sitā shone like a streak of lightning amidst a dark cloudlike mass which Rāvaṇa resembled.

सा पद्मगौरी हेमाभा रावणं जनकात्मजा ।
विद्युद्धनमिवाविश्य शुशुभे तप्तभूषणा ॥

If Indumati marries the Pāṇḍya king, Kālidāsa says, that the union of the fair lady and the swarthy lord will be like the union of the lightning and the cloud :

इन्दीवरश्यामतनुनृपोऽसौ त्वं रोचनागौरशरीरयष्टिः ।
अन्योन्यशोभापरिवृद्धये वां योगस्तडित्तोयदयोरिवास्तु ॥

Rāghu, VI.65.

Āraṇya 64, 14-20 : When Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa were wandering after the loss of Sitā, not knowing even the direction in which she might have gone, the deer that were witness to Rāvaṇa's act, mutely pointed out to Rāma, the southern direction by turning thither again and again :

एते मृगा महावीर्या मामीक्षन्ते मुहुर्मुहुः ।
वक्तुकामा इव हि मे इङ्गितान्युपलक्षये ॥

* * * *

एवमुक्ता नरेन्द्रेण ते मृगास्सहसोस्थिताः ।
दक्षिणाभिमुखास्सर्वे दर्शयन्तो नभस्स्थलम् ॥
मैथिली ह्लियमाणा सा दिशं यामन्वपद्यत ।
तेन मार्गेण धावन्तो निरीक्षन्ते नराधिपम् ॥

In the Raghuvamśa Rāma points out to Sitā, as they fly home in the Puṣpaka, the place where the compassionate deer informed Rāma of the whereabouts of Sitā by turning their eyes towards the south.

मृग्यश्च दर्भाङ्कुरनिर्व्यपेक्षास्तवागतिज्ञं समबोधयन्माम् ।
व्यापारयन्त्यो दिशि दक्षिणस्यामुत्पक्षमराजीनि विलोचनानि ॥

Rāghu, XIII. 25.

The immediately following verses in Āraṇya 64, (27-32) form the inspiration for Kālidāsa's portrayal of the lovemad Purūravas in Act IV of the Vikramorvaśiya. Kālidāsa is not able to help taking an entire verse from this situation in the Rāmāyaṇa and putting it into the mouth of Purūravas.

कच्चित्क्षितिभृतां नाथ दृष्ट्वा सर्वाङ्गसुन्दरी ।
रामा रम्ये वनोद्देशे मया विरहिता त्वया ॥ 28.

See Vikramorvaṣīya IV.

Kiṣkindhā 1. 36-42. The sight of peacock couples dancing on the banks of the Pampā reduces Rāma to a pitiable condition. Rāma laments :

पश्य लक्ष्मण नृत्यन्तं मयूरमुपनृत्यति ।
शिखिनी मन्मथार्तेषा भर्तारं गिरिसानुषु ॥

* * * *

मयूरस्य वने नूनं रक्षसा न हृता प्रिया ।
तस्मान्नृत्यति रम्येषु वनेषु सह कान्तया ।

Purūravas in his love-mad state asks a peacock about the whereabouts of his beloved Ūrvaṣī. Vikramorvaṣīya Act IV.

नीलकण्ठ ममोत्कण्ठा वनेऽस्मिन् वनितां त्वया ।
दीर्घापाङ्गा सितापाङ्गा दृष्टा दृष्टिक्षमा भवेत् ॥

कथमदत्त्वैव प्रतिवचनं नर्तितुं प्रवृत्तः । * * * परव्यसन-
सुखिनं न पुनरेवं पृच्छामि ।

Kiṣkindhā 1. 85 : केचित्पर्याप्तिकुसुमाः पादपाः supplies the expressions in Kālidāsa's Kumārasambhava, III, 39 and III.54.

पर्याप्तपुष्पस्तवकस्तनाम्यः * * लतावधूम्यः and पर्याप्तपुष्पस्तवकाव-
नम्रा * * लतेव ॥

Kiṣkindhā 14.10.

मेघाभिकामा परिसंपतन्ती संमोदिता भाति बलाकपङ्क्तिः ।
वातावधूता वरपौण्डरीकी लम्बेव माला रचिताम्बरस्य ॥

The cranes flying at the cloud in the form of a garland can be seen in Kālidāsa, Megha I, 9 :

गर्भाधानक्षमपरिचयान्नूनमाबद्धमालाः
सेविष्यन्ते नयनसुभगं खे भवन्तं बलाकाः ।

The sight of birds flying in a row appearing like a garland pendant in the sky is met with more definitely in Raghu I. 42 :

श्रेणीबन्धाद्वितन्वद्भिस्तम्भां तोरणस्रजम् ।
सारसैः कलनिर्ह्रादैः क्वचिदुन्नमिताननौ ॥

Vālmiki describes in the next verse, Kiṣkindhā 28. 24, the green lawns during the rains, green like the body of parrots and spotted red with Indragopa insect.

बालेन्द्रगोपान्तरचित्रितेन विभाति भूमिर्नवशाद्वलेन ।
गात्रानुवृत्तेन शुक्रप्रभेण नारीव लाक्षोक्षितकम्बलेन ॥

In Vikramorvaṣīya, Act IV. 17, Purūravas does not merely describe the green lawn with red Indragopas as resembling the shawl of a lady, but actually imagines it to be the slipt Uttariya of Ūrvaṣī and tries to pick it up.

हृतोष्ठरागैर्नयनोदबिन्दुभिः निमग्ननाभेर्निपतद्भ्रिरङ्कितम् ।
च्युतं षष्ठा भिन्नागतेरसंशयं शुकोदरश्याममिदं स्तनांशुकम् ॥
कथं सेन्द्रगोपं नवशाद्वलमिदम् ।

Kiṣkindhā 30. 28 : It was sage Vālmiki who saw in the autumnal brooks with their thin streams flowing serpentlike, baring the sand-banks this side and that, the image of the new bashful brides revealing their reliefs little by little.

दर्शयन्ति शरन्नद्यः पुलिनानि शनैः शनैः ।
नवसङ्गमसंघ्रीडा जघनानीव योषितः ॥

Kālidāsa will not miss this verse; nor will Kālidāsa's cloud fail to linger over a river like that.

तस्याः किञ्चित्करधृतमिव प्राप्तवानीरशाखं
हृत्वा नीलं सलिलवसनं मुक्करोधोनितम्बम् ।
प्रस्थानं ते कथमपि सखे लम्बमानस्य भावि
ज्ञातास्वादो विवृतजघनां को विहातुं समर्थः ॥

Megha I. 41.

Vālmiki again comes to the slow-moving autumnal river which reminds him again of a similar image.

मीनोपसन्दर्शितमेखलानां नदीवधूनां गतयोऽद्य मन्दाः ।
कान्तोपभुक्तालसगामिनीनां प्रभातकालेष्विव कामिनीनाम् ॥

Kiṣ. 30.55.

Kālidāsa sees a similar lady in river Nirvindhyā in Megha I.28. Only the girdle of Kālidāsa's Nirvindhyā is not the chain of fishes as in Vālmiki, but a row of water-birds.

वीचिक्षोभस्तनितविहगश्रेणिकाञ्चीगुणायाः
संसर्पन्त्याः स्खलितसुभगं दर्शितावर्तनाभेः ।

A verse in the Autumn-description in the *Rtusamhāra* is nearer Vālmiki's verse.

चञ्चन्मनोज्ञशफरी-रशनाकलापाः ।
(नद्यः) मन्दं प्रयान्ति समदाः प्रमदा इवाद्य ॥3

In the *Vikramorvaśīya*, Purūravas imagines his *Ūrvaśī* in a river. Act IV. Śl. 52. तरङ्गभ्रूभङ्गा क्षुभितविहगश्रेणिरशना etc.

Sundara 4. 3 - Hanumān is described by Vālmiki as setting his foot not only in Laṅkā but on Rāvaṇa's head also. See also Sundara 34. 39. Kālidāsa takes the idea of placing the foot on Rāvaṇa's heads, in *Raghu*, XII. 52.

The image of a woman in a forlorn condition reminds Vālmiki of a neglected lyre, lying in a corner, with its strings broken and hanging about. One of the similes in his billowing description of *Sitā* in the *Aśokavana*, in the *Sundara Kāṇḍa*, is :

क्लिष्टरूपामसंस्पर्शदियुक्तामिव वल्लकीम् । 17.22

Kālidāsa transfers the simile to *Indumatī* as *Aja* takes her dead body on his lap. When the idyll of *Aja*'s life with *Indumatī* came to a sudden end, and there the beloved lay a corpse in her lover's lap, the image which most appropriately occurs to Kālidāsa is the sudden break in some great music, when the strings of the *Viṇā* get snapped.

प्रतियोजयितव्यवल्लकीसमवस्थामथ सत्त्वसंलवात् ।

Raghu. VIII. 41.

Sundara 36.4 and 66.7 : When *Sitā* received *Rāma*'s ring and *Rāma* received *Sitā*'s *Cūḍāmaṇi*, *Sitā* thought *Rāma* himself had come and *Rāma* thought *Sitā* herself had come.

गृहीत्वा प्रेक्षमाणा सा भर्तुः करविभूषणम् ।
भर्तारमिव संप्राप्ता जानकी मुदिताऽभवत् ॥
अयं हि शोभते तस्याः प्रियाया मूर्ध्नि मे मणिः ।
अस्याद्य, दर्शनेनाहं प्राप्तां तामिव चिन्तये ॥

In Raghu XII. 64-65, Kālidāsa says that Rāma received the Cūḍāmaṇi from Hanumān as if it were the very heart of Sītā, and as Rāma placed it on his heart, he felt the very embrace of Sītā.

Rāghu XII. 42 : Śūrpaṅkhā informing Khara and others of the new insult to the Rākṣasas offered by Rāma—

रामोपक्रममाचख्यौ रक्षः परिभवं नवम् ।

The second quarter is taken from Vālmiki, Sundara, 37. 31 :

चिन्तयामास लक्ष्मीवान् नवं परिभवं कृतम् ।

Sundara 38. 22 : The crow's mischief is described by Vālmiki in the words

वायसः सहसागम्य विददार स्तनान्तरे ।

Kālidāsa evidently could not even give thought, much less his own expression to the sacrilege committed by the crow ; he escapes by simply putting there what Vālmiki said with a 'Kila'.

ऐन्द्रः किल नखैस्तस्या विददार स्तनौ द्विजः ।

Raghu, XII.22

Yuddha 5.6 : Rāma yearns for the touch of the breeze even that blows from the direction where Sītā is.

वाहि वात यतः कान्ता तां दृष्ट्वा मामपि स्पृश ।

The separated yakṣa in the Meghadūta similarly embraces the northern breezas believing that they must have also been embraced by his beloved in Alakā.

आलिङ्ग्यन्ते गुणवति मया ते तुषाराद्रिवाताः
पूर्वस्पृष्टं यदि किल भवेद्ङ्गमेभिस्तवेति ।

Yuddha 22. 72 : The Setu that Nala built in the Rāmāyaṇa ran like the Svātīpatha, the milky way of the skies :

स नलेन कृतः सेतुः सागरे मकरालये ।

शुशुभे सुभगः श्रीमान् स्वातीपथ इवाम्बरे ॥

Kālidāsa's Setu also runs like the milky way. Rāma, speeding above in the Puṣpaka, asks Sītā to see his Setu on the waters below :

वैदेहि पश्यामलयाद्विभक्तं मत्सेतुना फेनिलमम्बुराशिम् ।
छायापथेनेव शरत्प्रसन्नमाकाशमाविष्कृतचारुतारम् ॥

Raghu X III.2

Raghu XII.94. The expression pertaining to the battle 'Kṛta-pratikṛta' is taken from Vālmiki, Yuddha 79.27 and 89.21.

एको दाशरथिः कामं यातुधानाः सहस्रशः ।
ते तु यावन्त एवाजौ तावांश्च ददृशे स तैः ॥

Raghu XII.45

the one Rāma giving fight to every one of the thousands of the enemies and thus appearing to be thousandfold to the enemies' eyes, might have been suggested by Rāmāyaṇa, Yuddha 94.26 :

ते तु रामसहस्राणि रणे पश्यन्ति राक्षसाः ।
पुनः पश्यन्ति काकुत्स्थमेकमेव महाहवे ॥

In the fury of the fight Rāma says, Yuddha 101.48—'O Vānaras, today you shall see the world rid of Rāvaṇa or Rāma'.

अरावणमरामं वा जगद् द्रक्ष्यथ वानराः ।

Kālidāsa puts the words in Rāvaṇa's mouth :

अरावणमरामं वा जगदद्येति निश्चितः । Raghu, XII. 83.

In Raghu XII.89, Kālidāsa says that Rāma had a great opinion of Rāvaṇa.

जेतारं लोकपालानां स्वमुखैरचितेश्वरम् ।
रामस्तुलितकैलासमरान्ति बह्वमन्यत ॥

Some of the expressions here are taken from the Rāmāyaṇa, Yuddha 114. 47-53, Māṇḍodari's description of Rāvaṇa, after the latter's death :

जेतारं लोकपालानां क्षेतारं शङ्करस्य च । etc.

There is ample evidence to show that Kālidāsa considered the Uttara Kāṇḍa a genuine part of Vālmiki's work. The cantos describing the banishment of Sītā in the Uttara Kāṇḍa and the Raghuvamśa have many parallels :

When at Rāma's behest, Lakṣmana took Sītā to the forests to leave her there Sītā had evil forebodings and spoke to Lakṣmaṇa :

नयनं मे स्फुरत्यद्य गात्रोत्कम्पश्च जायते ।

* * * *

अपि स्वस्ति भवेत्तस्य भ्रातुस्ते भ्रातृवत्सल
श्वश्रूणां चैव मे वीर सर्वासामविशेषतः ।

* * * *

इत्यञ्जलिकृता सीता देवता अभ्ययाचत ॥ Uttara 46.17.

Kālidāsa summarises the whole situation in one verse :

सा दुर्निमित्तोपगमाद्विषादात् सद्यः परिम्लानमुखारविन्दा ।

राज्ञः शिवं सावरजस्य भूयादित्याशशंसे करणैरबाह्वैः ॥

Other parallels in this context are the following :

Rāmāyaṇa, Uttara.

Raghuvamśa, XIV.

48.1

लक्ष्मणस्य वचः श्रुत्वा
वैदेही निपपात ह ।

48.2

सा मुहूर्तमिवासंज्ञा

48.3

मामिकेयं तनुर्नूनं
सृष्टा दुःखाय लक्ष्मण ।

48.4

किञ्चु पापं कृतं पूर्वम्

48.8

न खल्वद्यैव सौमित्रे
जीवितं जाह्नवीजले ।
त्यजेयं राजवंशस्तु
भर्तुर्मे परिहास्यते ॥

48.10

श्वश्रूणामविशेषेण
प्राञ्जलिप्रग्रहेण च ।
शिरसा वन्द्य चरणौ
कुशलं ब्रूहि पार्थिवम् ॥

54

—धरित्रीं
लतेव सीता सहसा जगाम ।

56

सा लुप्तसंज्ञा

57

आत्मानमेव स्थिरदुःखभाजं
पुनः पुनः दुष्कृतितनं निनिन्द ।

62

ममैव जन्मान्तरपातकानां
विपाकविस्फूर्जथुरप्रसह्यः ।

65

किं वा तवात्यन्तवियोगमोवे
कुर्यामुपेक्षां हतजीवितेऽस्मिन् ।
स्याद्रक्षणीयं यदि मे न तेजः
त्वदीयमन्तर्गतमन्तरायः ॥

60

श्वश्रूजनं सर्वमनुक्रमेण
विज्ञापय प्रापितमत्प्रणामः ।

48.11-13	61
वक्तव्यश्चापि नृपतिः * * जानासि च यथा शुद्धा सीता तत्त्वेन राघव ।	वाच्यस्त्वया मद्बचनात्स राजा वह्नौ विशुद्धामपि यत्समक्षम् ।
* * अहं त्यक्त्वा त्वया वीर अयशोभीरुणा जने ॥ 48.13	मां लोकवाद- श्रवणादहासीः । 62
यच्च ते वचनीयं स्यात् मया हि परिहर्तव्यम् । 48.24	कल्याणबुद्धेरथवा तवायं न कामचारो मयि शङ्कनीयः । 68
उद्विग्नां सीतां	सा * * विग्ना कुररीव * ।

Uttara 49. 11 : Vālmiki extends welcome to Sita :

स्तुषा दशरथस्य त्वं रामस्य महिषी प्रिया ।
जनकस्य सुता राज्ञः स्वागतं ते पतिव्रते ॥

Kālidāsa's Vālmiki says :

तवोरुकीर्तिः श्वशुरः सखा मे सतां भवोच्छेदकरः पिता ते ।
धुरि स्थिता त्वं पतिदेवतानां किं त्वं न येनासि ममानुकम्प्या ॥
Raghu, XIV.74.

Vālmiki had seen the whole happening in his Samādhi :
Uttara 49. 12 :

आयान्ती चासि विज्ञाता मया धर्मसमाधिना ।
कारणं चैव सर्वं मे हृदयेनोपलक्षितम् ॥

In the Raghu, XIV.72, Vālmiki says :

जाने विसृष्टां प्रणिधानतस्त्वां मिथ्यापवादक्षुभितेन भर्त्रा ।

Before sending Sita away, Rāma tells his brothers, Raghu,
XIV. 40 :

अवैमि चैनामनघेति किन्तु लोकापवादो बलवान्मतो मे ।

This is taken by Kālidāsa from a later context in the Uttara Kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyana, 97. 2-3, where Rāma says -

एवमेतन्महाभाग यथा वदसि धर्मवित् ।
लोकापवादो बलवान् येन त्यक्त्वा हि मैथिली ॥

Uttara 33. 13 : King Kārtavīryārjuna welcomes sage Pulastya and says :

इदं राज्यमिमे पुत्रा इमे दारा इमे वयम् ।
ब्रह्मन् किं कुर्मि किं कार्यम् आज्ञापयतु नो भवान् ॥

This, Himavān in Kālidāsa's Kumārasambhava borrows for welcoming the seven sages :

एते वयममी दाराः कन्येयं कुलजीवितम् ।
ब्रूत येनात्र वः कार्यमनास्था बाह्यवस्तुषु ॥

To have pointed out a few parallels in thought and expression is not to have measured fully the influence of Vālmiki on either Kālidāsa or the other notes. For it is to the Ādi Kavi and his Ādi Kāvya that the classic poets owe the very conception of their classic poetry.

“एतस्यैव * * अन्यानि * मात्रामुपजीवन्ति ।”

RĀMĀYAṆA
QUOTATIONS AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM

(A)

I. In this paper I propose to draw attention to and discuss some passages and contexts in Vālmiki *Rāmāyaṇa*. The purpose is their bearing on the textual criticism of the Epic, lower as well as higher. The relevance is the critical edition of the Epic being done from Baroda. The passages discussed relate to the portions of the Epic already edited and those still remaining to be edited.

II. Vālmiki's Epic has been held as the *Ādi-kāvya*, model and source of all later poetry and drama. The sister Epic, the *Mahābhārata* has several references to it, as also an account of the whole story of it in the *Rāmopākhyāna* in the third book. The *Hari-varṃśa* was very much under the influence of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Classical poems and plays, including the poems on the Buddha by Aśvaghōṣa and the works of the great Kālidāsa,¹ bear the impress and echoes of Vālmiki : those that are based on the Epic or have the same theme, use the verses of the original, refer to its episodes or have versions, motifs and story-elements differing from the original. The *Rāmāyaṇa* is related as a re-inforcement, *Upaṛṇi-haṇa* to the *Veda*, and the *Dharma Sāstra*; and particularly from Manu in the latter, there are verses, ideas and ideals, as well as important phrases and sayings incorporated into the Epic. The *Rāmāyaṇa* exemplifies also *Rājanīti*. In commentarial literature and in poetics, there is again a quantum of *Rāmāyaṇa* quotations. All this, falling under external testimonia, has to be taken into account.

III. The text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* has come down in three main recensions, the Southern, the Eastern edited by Gorresio and the North-Western published from Lahore. By and large, the

1. See pp. 263 ff.

Southern has been considered more valuable as preserving the original better. In two of his papers, the writer had occasion to point this out when discussing certain words, episodes and descriptions in the Epic². The critical edition in progress has upheld this position.

IV. With these preliminary observations, the data collected may be presented. The points of textual criticism arising from each will be discussed along with it. The numerous citations from the Epic which record no variants, or in which variants are not of much consequence will not be presented here; for the sake of completeness, they may be given as a sequel to this paper, on another occasion.

(B)

1. In the very opening verse of the Epic, such a well-known work as Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, on III 4.47, offers for the final quarter, a variant not recorded in the recensions or the manuscripts :—*Vālmīkir munipuṅgavaḥ* instead of *°puṅgavam*. But we need not dwell on this as there is no further textual problem arising from this.

2. From the first canto, first verse, we go to the last canto of Book One, verse towards the close, describing the love that Rāma and Sītā bore each other. Two verses here are reproduced by Bhavabhūti in Act VI of his play *Uttararāmacarita* and mentioned specifically as occurring in the place where they are now found. This quotation was discussed long ago by Weber at some length and by R. G. Bhandarkar briefly in the *Indian Antiquary*³. These verses occur in the Epic in the place mentioned, although there are considerable variations, particularly with reference to the Southern text.

3. Bhavabhūti's difference from the Southern text could be seen also in two other contexts. In the same context in Act VI of the *Uttararāmacarita*, Bhavabhūti reproduces a verse from the

2. See V. Raghavan, 'Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit', *Indian Linguistics*, S.K. Chatterjee Volume, Poona, 313-322 and 'Buddhological Texts and the Epics', *Adyar Library Bulletin*, Adyar, XX. 349-359.

3. *IA*. I. 1872 pp. 246-249; II. 1873. pp. 123-124.

context where Rāma is resting in Citrakūṭa and a crow comes down and harasses Sītā. The verse reproduced by Bhavabhūti *tvadartham iva vinyastaḥ* etc. as also the whole canto, is noted in the Southern text as an interpolation, *prakṣipta*. Additionally, the verse as cited by Bhavabhūti has many variants as compared with the form in which it occurs in the recensions in which it is found.

4. In the same canto, as already mentioned, the episode of the crow harassing Sītā occurs, as also the incident of Rāma lovingly placing a coloured mark on Sītā's cheek with mountain chalk. Both these Sītā recapitulates later in the *Sundarakāṇḍa*. The Critical Edition relegates this canto to the Appendix. It may be remembered however that Kālidāsa narrates this crow episode just in the context.

5. The Sandals, *pādukās* of Rāma which Bharata took for being installed as Rāma's Regent, offer a problem. In the Southern text, Vasiṣṭha, seeing the two brothers resolute in carrying through their respective vows, is said to have hit upon this idea of sandals as a solution to the impasse. But wherefrom did the sandals come? Were they what Rāma had brought with him from Ayodhyā or improvised for his use during the forest-stay? In Bhavabhūti's *Mahāvīracarita* we are told (IV. 54/55) that sage Śarabhaṅga had sent these sandals as presents to Rāma. This incident is seen in the version in Gorresio's text where it is said to have just then been sent through pupils by sage Śarabhaṅga, with this difference that they are golden according to Bhavabhūti and in a more natural manner, made of grass, *trṇa-pādukā*, in the Gorresio text. The Critical Edition relegates this too to the Appendix.

6. Taking leave of Bhavabhūti, and going back to the opening of Book Two, an important passage may now be discussed. Rāma's coronation as Crown Prince is being considered by Daśaratha and it is said that for consultation and approval, representatives came from different parts of the realm. Here the Southern text, in the Kumbhakonam edition, reads in canto 3, verse 24 : म्लेच्छाचार्याश्च ये केचिद् वनशैलान्तवासिनः The passage refers to representatives ruling in the east, south and so on and in respect of the N. W., it mentions the rulers as *mlecchācāryas*. This is an

important historical information and as far as the text of the Epic is concerned, it is a rare and difficult reading. Not being familiar and easy of understanding, it had undergone simplification into *mlecchāś ca āryāś ca*. In connection with his detailed study of the lost historical play *Devicandragupta* where there is a Śaka-pati whom Śaṅkara, commentator on Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita* glosses as Śaka-ācārya, the writer has shown⁴ that the concept of *mlecchācārya* is genuine, and further authenticated by its occurrence in a similar text in the sister Epic where the editor of the *Rājadharmā*, Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, had accepted the writer's arguments and adopted this as the correct reading⁵. In the Critical Edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* for this portion, this reading has not only been not adopted, but is not even recorded in the variants in the footnotes, nor is any explanation added in the further notes in the Appendix. The writer has with him two very old palm-leaf manuscripts of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and in both these manuscripts the reading *mlecchācāryāśca* is the one that is read.

7. In the coronation context (II.8.23ff.), *Rājanītiratnākara* makes two citations from Vālmiki, which offer variants, as also additional lines not found in the printed recensions, some of which however are found in manuscripts as recorded in the Critical Edition.

8. Reference was made at the outset to the sister Epic of Vyāsa and its usefulness in considering textual problems of Vālmiki's work. In *Droṇaparvan* (Kumbh. edn. 143.85-86; *Citraśālā* 143.67-68) Sātyaki slays Bhūriśravas when the latter had laid down his arms and was in *prāyopaveśa*, acting thus against the ethics of righteous warfare. Sātyaki gives many justifications for his act and ends up by invoking Vālmiki's authority to say that in war there is no question of *dharma* and *adharmā*.

अपि चायं पुरा गीतः श्लोको वाल्मीकिना भुवि ।
न हन्तव्याः स्त्रिय इति यद् ब्रवीषि प्लवङ्गम ॥

4. See V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa* 1963, pp. 874-5; also his note, *Indian Culture*, Calcutta, April 1939, pp. 443-4.

5. See *BORI*, critical edn. p. 638.

सर्वकालं मनुष्येण व्यवसायवता सदा ।
पीडाकरममित्राणां यत् स्यात् कर्तव्यमेव तत् ॥

The lines quoted from Vālmiki are to be found in Book VI canto 81 (M. L. J. Press edn.) where Indrajit, resorting to black magic and beheading a fake-Sītā, says these words. Hanumān, who is witness, remonstrates against the base act of femicide and Indrajit in reply to him, says this :

न हन्तव्याः स्त्रिय इति यद् ब्रवीषि प्लवङ्गम ।
पीडाकरममित्राणां यत् स्यात् कर्तव्यमेव तत् ॥

The middle line *sarvakālam manuṣyēṇa vyavasāyavatā sadā* found in the *Mahābhārata* citation, is missing in the current texts of Vālmiki in the Southern and Eastern recensions; but the extra line is found in the N. W. recension (VI.59.29). The text of this Kāṇḍa in the N.W. recension is based on ten manuscripts, of which four, in common with the Eastern and Southern texts, do not have the extra line found in the *Mahābhārata*, but six other manuscripts have that additional line.

(C)

V. The *Rāmāyaṇa* was composed as a natural heroic epic. When it grew as a religious book, and came to be even a basic text for a school of thought, a shift of emphasis took place, resulting in certain motifs attaining a new perspective and dimension, indeed a new colour and significance. What was originally a natural trait of the hero or an attribute or episode forming part and parcel of the heroic poem became an article of faith or the superhuman attribute of God incarnate or an act of power or grace which such an incarnation of divinity alone could display. In this transmutation even some characters of the Epic would appear in an altered conception, and what was a general feature common to the heroic milieu became special or unique to an *avatāra*.

i. The most telling illustration of this could be taken first, the episode of Rāvaṇa's brother Vibhiṣaṇa seeking asylum with Rāma, in VI.17.17. The critical words here are '*Nivedayata mām kṣipram* and '*tavāsmṛiti ca yācate*' in what Vibhiṣaṇa says. In response to this declaration and supplication from Vibhiṣaṇa, after

giving scope to his friends to have his say in the matter, Rāma makes the declaration, VI. 88.33 :

सकृदेव प्रपन्नाय तवास्मीति च याचते ।
अभयं सर्वभूतेभ्यो ददाम्येतद् व्रतं मम ॥

It is well-known that the Vibhīṣaṇa-episode has been doctrinised in the Śrīvaiṣṇava school as the Śāstra of *Prapatti* or taking refuge with the Lord and the two verses noted above, the declarations respectively of Vibhīṣaṇa and the Lord have been given the status of the canon of the Śaraṇāgati doctrine.

However much the context and the expressions may lend themselves to this religious orientation, it must be born in mind that the situation in the Epic is one of *Rājanīti* and a line of policy to be adopted in an emergent situation on the field of battle. The terminology and treatment in these chapters here are in the real manner of a war-council. Against the view of Sugrīva and others advocating rejection of the enemy's brother, Rāma replies to every point pressed by the speakers and finally makes his declaration that he will accept Vibhīṣaṇa. In doing so Rāma, a *dharmātmā*, upholder of *dharma* and *rājadharma* that he was, upheld just one of the noble principles of *dharmayuddha*, righteous warfare, enunciated by the *Smṛti-kāras* foremost among whom was Rāma's own progenitor, Manu. It is legitimate, nay, necessary even, too seek light in Manu, for the Rāmāyaṇa was a book of the Mānavas.⁶

Before citing Manu and Yājñavalkya, we may note the variants of this verse embodying Rāma's declaration. This verse is quoted in the commentary on the *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra*, reputed to be a work of Śaṅkara. There while glossing the Name *Suvrata*, this commentary reads the third quarter of this verse, not as one of universal application, 'abhayam *sarvabhūtebhyaḥ*' as now commonly read in all the recensions, but as one of particular reference to a particular individual answering to a specific feature, namely one doing the act of surrender on the field of battle and declaring himself as 'I am yours'—*tavāsmi*. Thus Śaṅkara reads it as 'abhayam *sarvathā tasmāi*'. This grant of

6. इक्ष्वाकूणामिदं तेषां राज्ञां वंशे महात्मनाम् ।
महदुत्पन्नमाख्यानं रामायणमिति श्रुतम् ॥

security is not something that Rāma made specially because of his divinity, but as a heroic act which all righteous and chivalrous warriors were enjoined upon to do as part of their *Rājadharmā* which they should uphold on or off the battlefield. The word 'nivedana' in Vibhīṣaṇa's declaration is a technical word having the meaning of declaring oneself to the opposite person as his own. This meaning is confirmed by Rāma's words that gloss, 'nivedana' as 'tavāsmīti ca yūcate'. Commenting on Yājñavalkya I. 166, *yaś ca ātmānam nivedayet*, Vijñāneśvara says यश्च वाङ्मनःकायकर्मभिः आत्मानं निवेदयति तवाहमिति. The sister Epic has more than one pointed passage on this. Thus the reading preserved in Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra*, in singular number, *tasmai*, is the original reading and syntactically also the singular fits in better here than the plural, *sarva-bhūtebhyah*; further the word of emphasis—*sarvathā*, meaning 'under all circumstances' preserved in the Śaṅkara-quotation, is also necessary in the verse. Thus a *sāmānya rājadharmā* had been made into a *viśeṣa mokṣadharmā*. The original reading preserving the former and found in Śaṅkara is not seen in any of the recensions, nor is it likely to come up in any manuscripts.

ii. As a second illustration, another basic element of the story proper may be taken, the three Queens of Daśaratha, the story of the birth of the sons and the problem of Sumitrā getting a share of the *pāyasa* twice after each of the two Queens and begetting two sons, and these two pairing off as associated to the two sons of two other Queens. Even Kālidāsa knows these three mothers as Queens of equal status and describes Sumitrā as a Magadha Princess (RV. IX. 17). Lakṣmaṇa and Śatrughna get attached to Rāma and Bharata, the former pair especially being attached to each other by great love and devotion. But the situation is not easy; questions arise as to why Sumitrā should be given a portion once after Kausalyā and again after Kaikeyī. An explanation could be found for this, as well as for her two sons becoming attached to the two sons of the two other Queens, if we go beyond to an earlier stratum of the Epic-story and look at this from the points of view of the historical and sociological milieu of the Epic age. In the eastern recensions of Gorresio, in I. 19.9, when the wives of Daśaratha are described, Sumitrā is introduced, not as a Kṣatriya Princess like Kausalyā and Kaikeyī, but as the

daughter of the half-caste wife of Vāmadeva, one of Daśaratha's Brahman counsellors :

सुमित्रा वामदेवस्म बभूव करणीसुता ।

Karaṇa, according to *Manu* X.22, is the name of the offspring of a fallen Kṣatriya pair. Such an *asavarṇa*-wife for a Brahman or Kṣatriya was permitted by *Smṛiti* and common in practice in that age; in the sister Epic, Dhṛtarāṣṭra had one such wife and before him his father had one and the noble and wise Vidura was her son. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Sumitrā is described as attending upon Kausalyā. This, her getting two shares of the *pāyasa* after each of the two Queens, and her two sons being more or less shadows of the two other Princes are explained now in the light of this information as to the real status of Sumitrā. That Gorresio's text records a persistent tradition, preserving this old sociological material, receives confirmation from the commentary *Jayamaṅgalā* on the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* I.13 which says, in explaining the scheme of apportioning the *pāyasa*, that Kausalyā and Kaikeyī as high-born Kṣatriya wives took each a share and then turned to Sumitrā who was of mixed caste and out of consideration that she was serving them, gave her, each of them, a portion, whereby she begot two sons⁷.

iii. A third illustration is Sītā's entry into fire, which, owing to considerations of some modern notion, the General Editor of the Baroda *Rāmāyaṇa*, sets aside as an interpolation. The writer has shown elsewhere how the fire-ordeal is both authentic and ancient, even as the *Vastrāpaharaṇa* of Draupadī at the end of the gambling in the sister Epic⁸.

iv. On the same occasion the writer had also given the naturalistic explanation of another controversial matter, this about Rāma, his shooting Vālin from behind a tree, which, from a

7. कौसल्या कैकेयी च क्षत्रिये । सुमित्रा तु वर्णसङ्करजा । तत्र कौसल्या कैकेयी चैकैकं पिण्डं प्राशितवत्यौ । ताभ्यां चावयोः परिचारिकेति पिण्डभागद्वयं दत्तं सुमित्रा प्राशितवती । ततश्च पुत्रद्वयं जनयिष्यति

8. See V. Raghavan, *Presidential Address to the XXIst All-India Oriental Conference*, Srinagar, 1961, pp. 9-11; *Proceedings* Vol. I, pp. 14-17.

wrong perspective, has always been mentioned as a criticism against Rāma; the evidence cited was from the art of hunting which was cultivated as sport by Princes.

v. An illustration could be given of how the evidence of geography and the collation of its material could help the determination of a passage where places, mountains, rivers and other landmarks occur. One such context is the journey in Book II canto 68 (Southern) of the messengers on horse sent by Vasiṣṭha from Ayodhyā to Kekaya to fetch Bharata. In the Critical Edition of this portion already made available, the large number of geographical names here show a textual mess, so to say. The editor makes his own choice, cites the variants in the footnotes and in his additional notes at the end of the volume exclaims in a philosophical mood of resignation that the face of the earth changes unrecognisably from time to time! But if the historical and geographical evidences available are collated, it is not impossible to reduce this portion to order. In a paper on some geographical names and toponymic duplication, with reference to the names *Bodhi* and *Viṣṇupada* in the N. W. the writer has shown, with additional confirmation from epigraphy, that the names *Bodhibhavana* and *Viṣṇupada* occurring in this context in the Epic (II. 68. 17, 19) as in the Southern text, are the correct reading.⁹

vi. There are the exploits of Rāma piercing with his powerful arrow the seven *sāla* trees and hurling far with his foot the carcass of demon Dundubhi. These two again are not special to the divine hero, but are among the general displays of feats of strength on the part of the ancient heroes, as has been shown by the writer in a paper on the Buddhological texts and the Sanskrit Epics.¹⁰

Two more motifs may be added; Hanumān's tail is set fire to at Rāvaṇa's bidding. This is the specific punishment ordained in *Arthaśāstra* for monkeys; says Kauṭalya in XIII. 4 :

नकुल-वानर-विडालःशुनाम्पृच्छेषु अग्नियोगमाधाय...

9. See V. Raghavan, *The Indian Geographical Journal*, XVIII. III. 1943, pp. 98-104; (published elsewhere in this volume),

10. *Op. cit.*

viii. There is the widely prevalent tradition that, in the Ahalyā-episode, the Sage cursed his wife to become a piece of rock. That this is old is seen from Kālidāsa himself mentioning it (*RV.* XI. 34). However this is not in Vālmiki where the form of the curse is that she would remain invisible to all, *adṛśya*. How then did the tradition of Ahalyā becoming piece of rock come? I think by extension or displacement of motifs, which is a common feature in folklore. Whenever the sages living in forests in the midst of rocks and mountains were molested by animals, demons or other troublesome persons, the curse that at once leapt to their lips was 'Fie upon you, become a rock', for this was the surest way of immobilising the mischief-makers. In the Rāmāyaṇa itself, there are two contexts in which this curse that the offender would become a piece of rock is seen. In I.64.12, when the celestial damsel Rambhā disturbs the sage Viśvāmitra in penance, he curses her to remain as rock ten thousand years.

यन्मां लोभयसे रम्भे कामक्रोधजयैषिणम् ।
दशवर्षसहस्राणि शैलो स्थास्यसि दुर्भगे ॥

Similarly when monkeys disturb his peaceful hermitage, sage Mataṅga administers (IV. II. 58) this curse that if he sees any mischievous monkey next day, it would be turned into a stone and would remain so for several thousands of years.

दिवसश्चाद्य मर्यादा यं द्रष्टान्धोऽस्मि वानरम् ।
बहुवर्षसहस्राणि स वै शैलो भविष्यति ॥

ix. Lastly, in the same episode there is also the popular tradition that for the crime committed by Indra, he was given the curse that his whole body would become covered with the female sexual organ. One could understand the rise of a popular tradition like this if he remembers that the punishment ordained in *Smṛtis* for this sin of *guru-talpa-gamana*, misbehaviour with elders' wives, is the branding of the culprit with the mark of that organ *bhagāṅkaṇa*. *Manu* IX. 237.

(D)

VI. The evidence of manuscripts of the Epic is of course of primary importance. The quotations from the Epic, it may be said, are liable to be vitiated by defects of memory. But it should

not be forgotten that if scribes of manuscripts were not subject to the same vagaries, such a volume of variants would not have accumulated; and on the other hand, the bulk of authoritative literature, grammar, lexicon, illustrative verses, has all been cited from memory and has been mostly correct and only rarely unreliable.

Secondly the manuscripts of the Epic are all of late date. The Epic citations, echoes, etc. are in reputed works of great antiquity.

Thirdly, the manuscript evidence can help in the presentation only of a text strictly confined to these manuscripts and a critical edition cannot be held to give us the *Ur*-text. The external testimony helps us to break through to some extent and give us glimpses of the original form of the text.

Fourthly, while some of this external testimony supports the superiority of the Southern text, early writers of repute knew a text different from it.

This paper on the *Rāmāyaṇa*-citations is an essay in emphasising the value of external testimonia. A text like the *Rāmāyaṇa*, cannot be viewed in isolation; a study of its manuscripts should be integrated with the wide spectrum of evidence of allied literature, of linguistic, literary, historical, sociological, geographical data, of indeed the entire cultural milieu, to use the most comprehensive expression, relevant to the Epic.

उडारिकृता रामायणव्याख्या

युद्धकाण्डे स्वकीयमादित्यहृदयसर्गव्याख्यानमुपसंहरन्नाह गोविन्दराजः “अयं च सर्गः केषुचित्कोशेषु न दृश्यते । उडारिणा न व्याख्यातश्च । आरम्भात्प्रभृति प्रबन्धप्रतिपादितनारायणपरत्वविरुद्धं चात्र प्रतिभाति सूर्यपरत्वम् । अस्मिंश्च काण्डे त्रिंशदुत्तरशतसर्गा उडारिणा गणिताः, एतदन्तर्भवे एकत्रिंशदुत्तरशतसर्गाः तेन गणिता भवेयुः” इति ।

उपरि च युद्धकाण्ड एव पुष्पकारुढरामप्रत्यागमनवर्णनसर्गे सेतुसमुद्रलङ्घनावसरे रामप्रोक्ततया दृश्यमानस्य “अत्र पूर्वं महादेवः प्रसादमकरोत्प्रभुः” इत्यस्य श्लोकार्थस्य रुद्रपरत्वं निराकृत्य समुद्रराजपरत्वं च प्रतिपाद्य गोविन्दराज एवमुपसंहरति—

“अथवा अस्मिन् सर्गे श्लोकाः प्रायशो व्यत्यस्ता दृश्यन्ते इत्युडारिप्रभृतिभिरुक्तम् । तथा चेदमर्थम् ‘अत्र मण्डोदरी’ इति श्लोकानन्तरं पठितव्यम् । तत्र च महादेवप्रसादः स्वपितृदर्शनमेव । अत एव भरतं प्रति हनुमत्प्रेषणावसरे वक्ष्यति “महादेवप्रसादाच्च पित्रा मम समागमम्” इति ।

एतस्माद् गोविन्दराजकृताद् उदाहरणद्वयाद् ज्ञायते “गोविन्दराजात्पूर्वं उडारिनामा कश्चन रामायणटीकाकृद् बभूव, सोऽपि गोविन्दराजवत्, अथवा ततोऽधिकतयापि च वैष्णवातिवादी बभूव, आदित्यवंशोत्पन्नेऽपि रामे आदित्योपस्थानं विष्णुपारम्यवादोपरोधकम् असांप्रतं मन्वानः आदित्यहृदयसर्गमेव न पपाठ, उपरि च ‘अत्र पूर्वं महादेवः’ इत्येतद्विवादाकुलितं श्लोकार्थं कतिपय-श्लोकेभ्यः पूर्वं पठित्वा वादस्य मूल एव कुठारमर्पितवान्” इति ।

इतः परमधिकं यत्किमपि व्याख्यातारमिमं उडारिमन्तरा नाबोध्येव । अस्य कालाभिजनादि दर्शयितुं च न किमपि गमकान्तरं नाद्यावद्ध्युपलब्धम् । नैतावता कालेनापि कुत्रचित्कोशागारे तद्ग्रन्थस्य कोशः कोऽपि प्रापि । सति चैवं तत्र तत्र कोशागारेषु के के अपूर्वाः कोशाः सञ्चिता इति सततं जागरूकेण मया अनन्त-शयनस्थले नूतनतया संचयीमानेषु कोशेषु अन्यतमे उडारिकृतरामायणव्याख्यायाः

1. एतस्मिन्नेव सर्गे कतिपयश्लोकेभ्यः पूर्वंम् ।
2. एतत्सर्गोपरि द्वितीये सर्गे श्लो० ११.

कोऽपि लेशो व्याख्यान्तरेण सह लिखितो दृष्टः, सोऽत्र श्रीमतां रामायणरसिकानां नामानुरूपं कृतनैकरूपगोपालनानां गोपालकृष्णमहाचार्याणां षष्टिपूर्त्यभिनन्दन-समये प्राप्तावसरं मत्वा विद्वदानन्दाय दीयते ।

अद्य किञ्चित्कालादारभ्य व्यापृतोऽस्मि रामायणामृतकतकटीकायाः कोशानां संग्रहे परीक्षणे च । तत्रोद्युञ्जानोऽहमश्रौषं तिरुवनन्तपुरे सर्वकला-शालार्थे संपादितेषु नूतनेषु कोशेषु कतककोशाः कतिपय वर्तन्त इति । तत्रत्या-ध्यक्षाणां डाक्टर् एल ए. रविवर्ममहाशयानामानुकूल्येन परीक्षार्थं ते कतककोशाः मया प्राप्ताः । ते च संपादनात्पूर्वं तिरुनेल्वेल्यभिजनानां श्रीमद्रामायणप्रवचन-प्रसिद्धानां बहुटीकाकृतपरिश्रमाणां केषाञ्चित् शास्त्रिवर्याणां कोशा आसन्निति ततोऽवगम्यते । तत्र कोशागाराधिकारिभिः २५६६ इति दत्तसंख्ये, 'कतकसङ्ग्रह' इति निर्दिष्टनाम्नि कोशे परीक्षिते सति, तत्र सुन्दरकाण्डे प्रथमात्सर्गात् यावन्नवमं कतकसङ्ग्रहस्थाने 'उडालि-व्याख्यानम्' दृष्टम् । उपलब्धस्य व्याख्यानस्य प्रतिसर्गं कतिपयश्लोकमात्रगामित्वाद् भाति, कतकटीकाया इव उडालिटीकाया अपि कोशेऽस्मिन् सङ्ग्रह एव व्यलेखि इति । श्लोकतत्प्रतीकग्रहणत इमे पाठभेदाः उडाल्यादृता दृश्यन्ते । एषु पाठान्तरेषु व्याख्योपात्तप्रतीकविवरणप्रमाणितेषु सन्देहो नास्ति । अन्येषु व्याख्योपक्रमदृश्यमानश्लोकोदाहरणमात्रप्रमाणेषु लेखक-प्रमादशङ्कावकाशो वर्तते एव ।

१. किञ्चिन्धाकाण्डसमापके श्लोके चरमपादस्य प्रसिद्धः पाठः
'जगाम लङ्कां मनसा मनस्वी' इति ।

उडालिना तु

'जगाम लङ्कां मनसा महात्मा'

इति पठ्यते ।

२. सुन्दरे प्रथमे पञ्चमश्लोके—
'नीललोहितमाञ्जिष्ठपत्रवर्णैः' इत्येव उडालिना पठ्यते, न तु 'पद्मवर्णैः'
इति ।
३. तत्रैव षष्ठश्लोकान्ते—
'देवकल्पैश्च पन्नगैः' इत्येतत् 'देवकल्पैः सपन्नगैः' इति पठ्यते इव
भाति ।
४. ततोऽनन्तरश्लोके 'तिष्ठन् कपिवरस्तत्र' इत्येतत् 'तिष्ठन् हरिवरस्तत्र'
इति श्लोकोदाहरणे दृश्यते, व्याख्याने तु 'कपिवरः' इत्येव दृश्यते ।

५. 'स स तस्योरुवेगेन सोन्माद इव लक्ष्यते'^३
इत्येतच्च 'स तु तस्याङ्गवेगेन' इति पठ्यते ।
५. 'यावज्जानामि वैदेहीं यदि जीवति वा न वा ।
तत्रैव चिन्तयिष्यामि दृष्ट्वा तां जनकात्मजाम् ॥'^४
इत्यस्मिन् श्लोके चरमपादे 'तां दृष्ट्वा' इति व्यत्यस्य पठ्यते ।
७. 'न विनश्येत् कथं कार्यम्' इत्यस्मिन्^५ श्लोके उडाल्यादृतः पाठः क
इति न स्पष्टतया ज्ञायते ।
८. 'यदा त्वां वानरः कश्चित्' इत्यत्र श्लोके^६ तृतीये पादे 'तदा त्वया हि
विज्ञेयम्' इत्येतत् 'तदा त्वयाभिविज्ञेयम्' इति पठ्यते ।
९. 'चन्द्रप्रकाशाश्च हि वक्त्रमालाः' इति श्लोको व्याख्यातुमुद्धृतः । तत्र
युगमपादेषु उडालेः पाठः क इति न स्पष्टं ज्ञायते ।
१०. पूर्वोद्धृत-श्लोकव्याख्यायामेव उपरिष्ठात् पञ्चदशात्सर्गात् 'तां समीक्ष्य
विशालाक्षीम्' 'वैदेह्या यानि चाङ्गेषु' इत्येतौ द्वौ श्लोकौ^७ उदाहृता-
वुडालिना । तयोश्च प्रथमस्य तुरीये पादे पाठभेद एष उपलक्ष्यते—
"कारणैरुपपादिभिः" इत्येतत्स्थाने "कारणैरुपपादयन्" इति । द्विती-
यस्य च तृतीयपादे 'आभरणजातानि' इति, न तु 'जालानि' इति ।
अन्तिम पादे 'गात्रशोभिन्यलक्षयत्' इत्ययं पाठो नादृतः, किन्तु
'शाखाशोभीनि' इति पाठ एवादृतः ।
११. पञ्चमसर्गान्तिमश्लोके तृतीये पादे 'दुःखाभिहतः' इति पठ्यते, न तु
'दुःखोपहतः' इति ।
१२. षष्ठसर्गान्तिमश्लोकः 'इतीव तद्गृहमभिगम्य'^८ इति सप्तमसर्गीयश्लोक-
व्याख्याने समुदाह्रियते । पाठश्च तस्यैवं दृश्यते—

3. कुम्भकोणसंस्करणे सुन्दर० १.७३; मद्रासूलाजेर्नल्लप्रेससंस्करणे सुन्दर० १.६८.
4. " " " २.३१; " " " २.३१.
5. कुम्भ० सु० २.४१ मद्रासू. ४१.
6. " " ३.४८; " ४७.८.
7. कुम्भ. सु. ५. २२; मद्रासू. २२.
8. " " १५.३४-९; " ४०-१.
9. " " ७.१५; " १५.

प्रासादसंघाभियुतं स्त्रीसहस्रसमाकुलम् ।

व्यूढकक्ष्यं च हनुमान् (?) विवेश (?)¹⁰ महागृहम् ॥

प्रचलितः पाठस्तु 'प्रासादसंघातयुतं स्त्रीरत्नशतसंकुलम् ।

सुव्यूढकक्ष्यं हनुमान् प्रविवेश महागृहम् ॥ इति ।

१३. पुष्पकवर्णने अष्टमसर्गे द्वितीयश्लोके द्वितीयपादारम्भः 'स्वयं कृतम्' इति, न तु 'कृतं स्वयम्' इति । चरमपादे च 'व्यराजत' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'व्यरोचत' इति पठ्यते ।

अत्र प्रथमपादे कतके तदनुसारिणि तिलके च 'तदप्रमेयप्रतिकार' इति पाठ आदृतः, स तु, 'अप्रतिकार' इत्येव पठता उडालिना उपेक्षितः ।

१४. नवमसर्गान्तिमश्लोकेऽन्तिमे पादेऽन्तिमं पदम् 'अनार्यकर्म' इति प्रचलितपाठे दृश्यते । उडालिना तु तद् 'अनार्यकर्मा' इति लङ्केश्वर-विशेषणतया पठ्यत इव ।

उडालिव्याख्यानत इदमन्यदपि स्पष्टम्, यद्गोविन्दराजो बहुत्र उडालि-पङ्क्तीः उपजीवति; तथा तीर्थीयेऽपि तत्र तत्र उडालिसंवादे दृश्यते, चेति ।

इतः परं यावल्लब्धमुडालिव्याख्यानं दीयते ।

॥ सुन्दरकाण्डः ॥

॥ उडालिव्याख्यानम् ॥

श्रीरामाय नमः । पूर्वस्मिन् काण्डे 'जगाम लङ्कां मनसा महात्मा' (कि० ६७.५०)¹¹ इति मनसा गमनं कृतम् । इदानीं कायेनापि गमनं कर्तुमैच्छदित्याह—तत इत्यादि (सु. १. १.) । चारणाचरिते पथि रावणनीतायाः आकाशे रावणहृतायाः पदं निवासस्थानमन्वेष्टुमियेष । एवं च सति विशेषणवैयर्थ्यं व्यवहितान्वयदोषश्च भवति । अतश्चारणाचरिते पथि सुरवर्त्मनि, तृतीयार्थे सप्तमी, गत्वेति शेषः¹² । तथा चोभयान्तराभावात् (?) आकाशमार्गेणैव गत्वा सीतायाः पदमन्वेष्टुमियेषेत्यर्थः । यद्वा अति (अत्र ?) गन्तुमिति पदमध्याहर्तव्यम् । शत्रुकर्शनो हनुमान् रावणेन हृतायाः सीतायाः पदं निवासस्थानमन्वेष्टुं चारणाचरिते पथि सुरवर्त्म(नि) गन्तुमियेषेति योजना ॥ १॥¹³

10. अत्र 'विवेश' इत्यतः पूर्वं वा परं वा अक्षर एकोऽपेक्षितः, 'प्रविवेश' इति स्यात् ।

11. मद्रास् लोजेर्नल् प्रेस् संस्करणानुसारेण ।

12. अयमन्वयः यद्वेति गोविन्दराजेन उपात्तः ।

13. तीर्थीये चेदं दृश्यते ।

‘नीललोहितमाङ्घ्रिष्ठपत्रवर्णैस्सितासितैः ।
 स्वभावविहितैश्चित्रैर्धातुभिस्समलङ्कृतम् ॥
 कामरूपिभिराविष्टमभीक्ष्णं सपरिच्छदैः ।
 यक्षकिन्नरगन्धर्वैः देवकल्पैस्सपन्नगैः (इच्च पन्नगैः?) ॥
 स तस्य गिरिवर्यस्य तले नागवरायुते ।
 तिष्ठन् हरिवरस्तत्र हृदे नाग इवावभौ ॥’ (५-७.)

अत्र यच्छब्दोऽध्याहर्तव्यः । ¹⁴इन्द्रनीलसमानवर्णैः रक्तवर्णैर्माङ्घ्रिष्ठसमान-
 वर्णैः सितासितैः शुक्लकृष्णैश्च । यद्वा कल्पावर्णैः । स्वभावविहितैः स्वभाव-
 सिद्धैः चित्रैर्धातुभिस्समलङ्कृतम् । सपरिच्छदैस्सालङ्कारैः यक्षकिन्नरगन्धर्वैः
 पन्नगैश्चापि आविष्टं यत् तस्य गिरिश्रेष्ठस्य तलं तस्य तत्र तले तिष्ठन् कपिवरः
 हृद(दे) नाग इवावभावित्यन्वयः ॥ ५—७ ॥

स (तु) तस्याङ्गवेगेन सोन्माद इव लक्ष्यते ।’ (६८)

सोन्माद इव अपस्मारीव परिभ्रमणफेनजलोद्गमनक्रोशादिना अयमुप-
 क्रमः(?)¹⁵ ॥ ६८ ॥

‘सोऽयं तत्प्रतिकारार्थी त्वत्तः संमानमर्हति ।’ (११४)

सागरादिभिर्वर्धितो यदुदधिः ¹⁶तत्प्रतिकारार्थी तस्योपकारस्य प्रत्युप-
 कारार्थी त्वत्तः तत्संमानमर्हति । त्वत्सकाशादातिथ्यस्वीकाररूपां पूजां प्राप्तुं
 योग्यो भवतीति भावः ॥ ११४ ॥

(इति सुन्दरकाण्डे प्रथमः सर्गः)

‘यावज्जानामि वैदेहीं यदि जीवति वा न वा ।

तत्रैव चिन्तयिष्यामि तां दृष्ट्वा जनकात्मजाम् ॥’ (२. ३१.)

जीवति न वेति वैदेहीं जानामि यावत् जानामि यदि जीवति (इति ?) तां
 जनकात्मजां दृष्ट्वा तत्रैव तस्मिन् काल एव चिन्तयिष्यामीति योजना ॥ ३१¹⁷

14. इदमपि गोविन्दराजेन स्वीकृतम् । तीर्थीये चेदं दृश्यते ।
15. अपि ‘अयमुपमाक्रमः’ इति स्यात् ? दृश्यतां तीर्थीयेऽस्य छाया ।
16. अत्र ‘त्वत्प्रतिकारार्थी’ इति श्लोकांशमुद्धरन्, त्वदातिथ्यप्रकरणापेक्षी’ इति
 विवृण्वंश्च गोविन्दराजः ‘सोऽयं त्वत्प्रतिकारार्थी’ इति पाठमादृतवानिति
 ज्ञायते ।
17. अत्रापि तीर्थीये संवादो दृश्यते ।

‘भूताश्चार्था विपद्यन्ते देशकालविरोधिताः ।

विकलवं द्रुतमासाद्य तमस्सूर्योदये यथा ॥’ (३९)

भूताश्च निष्पन्ना अपि विपद्यन्ते देशकालविरोधिताः देशकालाभ्यां विरोधिताः । विकलवमधीरमपण्डितम् । स्वामिना सचिवैश्च पूर्वमेव कृता अप्यर्थाः अविचारिणं द्रुतमासाद्य देशकालविरोधिताः सन्तः विनश्यन्ति ॥ ३९ ॥

‘न विनश्येत्कथं कार्यं वैकलव्यं च यथा मम (?) ॥’¹⁸

लङ्घनं च समुद्रस्य कथं तु न वृथा भवेत् ॥’ (४१)

कथं केन प्रकारेण । अत्र चत्वारः प्रकारास्संभवन्ति—अपराह्न एव लङ्कायाः प्रवेश इत्येकः, रात्रौ प्रवेश इत्यपरः, अनेनैव महता रूपेण प्रवेशस्तृतीयः, ह्रस्वेन रूपेण प्रवेश इति चतुर्थः ।¹⁹ तेषु प्रकारेषु केषु केषु प्रकारेषु रामस्य कार्यं न विनश्येत् मम वैकलव्यमपाण्डित्यं च न भवेत्, समुद्रलङ्घनं च यथा वृथा न भवेत् तथा कर्तव्यमिति शेषः ॥ ४१ ॥

(इति सु० द्वितीयः सर्गः)

‘भूय एव पुनर्वाक्यं बभाषे परुषाक्षरम् ।’ (३. ३५.)

भूयः भूयः परुषाक्षरं वाक्यं पुनश्च बभाषे इत्यन्वयः²⁰ ॥ ३५ ॥

‘न शक्यमद्य ते द्रष्टुं पुरीथं वानराधम ।’ (३६)

द्रष्टुं शक्यमिति वस्तु इयं पुरी न [शक्यम्] इति शक्यपुर्योस्समभिव्याहारः ।²¹ आर्षमव्ययमिति केचित् ॥ ३६ ॥

‘यदा त्वां वानरः कश्चित् विक्रमाद्वशमानयेत् ।

तदा त्वयाभिविज्ञेयं रक्षसां भयमागतम् ॥’ (४७-८)

नन्वेतच्छापवाक्यमिव प्रतिभाति कथमेतद्वरदानवाक्यमुपपद्यते ? तथा च श्रूयताम्—रावणस्य दिग्विजये नन्दिकेश्वरादिभिः सद्योविनाशशापे दत्ते सा (लङ्का) ब्रह्माणं प्रार्थयामास विनाशो मम मा भूदिति । स च तस्यै वरमदात्,

18. अयं पाठभेदो वा लेखकप्रमादो वेति न निश्चेतुं शक्यते ।

19. इयं प्रकारचतुष्टयोत्प्रेक्षा गोविन्दराजेन गृहीता ।

20. अयमन्वयः तीर्थीये च दृश्यते ।

21. ‘वा’ इति योजनान्तरतया स्मृतेयं योजना गोविन्दराजेन ।

‘तव सद्योविनाशो न भविष्यति, यदा तु वानरस्त्वामभिभविष्यति, तदा तव विनाशो भविष्यति’ इति ॥ ४७-८ ॥²²

(इति सु० तृतीयः सर्गः)²³

‘विनष्टशीताम्बुतुषारपङ्को

महाग्रहग्राहविनष्टपङ्कः ।

प्रकाशलक्ष्याश्रयनिर्मलाङ्कः

रराज चन्द्रो भगवाञ्छशाङ्कः ॥ (५.६)

शशी । शीताम्बु हिमम्, तुषारं (रः) पङ्कस्तमः । विनष्टः (घाः) शीताम्बुतुषार-पङ्कः (ङ्काः) यस्मिन् स तथा । महाग्रहाः शुक्रग्रहाः सित्यादयः (शुक्र-बृहस्पत्यादयो ग्रहाः) ग्रहणं छादनमिति यावत् । पङ्को मलम् । महाग्रहाणां ग्राहेण विनष्टः पङ्को यस्य सः महाग्रहग्राहविनष्टपङ्कः । स्वतेजसा महाग्रह-तिस्करणेनैव व्यक्तनैर्मल्य इत्यर्थः । प्रकाशलक्ष्याश्रय-निर्मलाङ्कः तेजस्समृद्धि-संयोगस्पष्टकलङ्कः । अतिश्वेते चन्द्रे परभागयोगेन कलङ्कस्याप्यौज्ज्वल्यं भवति ।

यद्वा महाग्रहग्राहविनष्टपङ्कः महाग्रहः सूर्यः, तस्य ग्राहः ग्रहणम्, रश्मिद्वारा संक्रमणमिति यावत् । महाग्रहग्राहेण विनष्टः विनाशितः पङ्कः तमः येन स तथोक्तः । चन्द्रस्य सूर्यस्य किरणसंक्रमणद्वारा तमोविनाशकत्वम्—‘सलिलमये शशिनि रवेर्दीधितयो मूर्च्छिताः तमो नैशम् । क्षपयन्ति दर्पणोदरनिहिता इव मन्दिरान्तरम् (रस्यान्तः) इति ज्योतिःशास्त्रप्रवर्तकेन वराहमिहिरा-चार्येणोक्तम्²⁴ ।

विनष्टशीताम्बुतुषारपङ्कः, शीताम्बु हिमं, तस्य तुषारा पृषता एव पङ्कः मालिन्यम्, विनष्टशीताम्बुतुषारपङ्को यस्मिन् स तथोक्तः । एतदपि सूर्यकिरणा-दित्यवगन्तव्यम् ।

प्रकाशलक्ष्याश्रयनिर्मलाङ्कः प्रकाशमृद्ध्याश्रयत्वाद् उज्ज्वलत्कलङ्कः सुव्यक्तचिह्न इति यावत् ॥ ६ ॥²⁵

22. गोविन्दराजेनोपजीवितमिदं विवरणम् ।

23. चतुर्थसर्गे किमपि नोपलक्ष्यते विवरणम् ।

24. तीर्थीये चायमर्थो दृश्यते ।

25. अत्रत्यानि प्रायः सर्वाणि वाक्यानि गोविन्दराजेन समुपात्तानि । तीर्थीये च तानि दृश्यन्ते ।

‘प्रकाशचन्द्रोदयनष्टदोषः

प्रवृद्धरक्षःपिशिताशदोषः ।

रामाभिरामेरितचित्तदोषः

स्वर्गप्रकाशो भगवान् प्रदोषः ॥’ (८)

नष्टदोषः नष्टतिमिररूपदोषः । **प्रवृद्धरक्षःपिशिताशदोषः**, प्रवृद्धः रक्षसां पिशिताशदोषः पिशितभक्षणरूपदोषः यस्मिन् स तथोक्तः । पिशितभक्षणस्य दोषत्वमविहितजीर्वाहिसाहेतुकत्वात् ।²⁶ **रामाभिरामेरितचित्तदोषः**, रामाः कान्ताः, अभिरामा रमणाः, रामाभिरामेभ्यः ईरितः अपनीतः चित्तदोषः प्रणयकलहरूपो येन स तथोक्तः ।²⁷ **स्वर्गप्रकाशः**, आनन्दजनकत्वात्स्वर्गासादृश्यम् । **भगवान्**, अत्र भगशब्देन श्रीरुच्यते । ‘भगः श्रीकाममाहात्म्य-’ इति । अत्र विरराजेत्यनुषज्यते ॥ ८ ॥

‘ततः प्रियान् प्राप्य मनोऽभिरामान्

सुप्रीतियुक्ताः प्रसमीक्ष्य रामाः ।

गृहेषु हृष्टाः परमाभिरामाः

हरिप्रवीरस्स ददर्श रामाः ॥’ (२१)

स हरिप्रवीरः मनोभिरामान् प्रियान् प्राप्य अभिश्रित्य **गृहेषु हृष्टाः** गृहेषु रमणप्राप्त्या **हृष्टाः परमाभिरामा रामाश्च ददर्श** । पूर्वार्धोक्ता नियतभर्तृका अभिसारिकासमभिव्याहाराद्, उत्तरार्धेन स्वगृहप्रणयादि (प्राप्त्यरमणा) वराङ्गना उच्यन्ते²⁸ ॥ २१ ॥

‘चन्द्रप्रकाशाश्च (हि) वक्त्रमालाः

वक्रकृति (?) पक्षमाश्च सुनेत्रमालाः ।

विभूषणानां च ददर्श मालाः

शतहृदानामिव चाग्र (रु ?) मालाः ॥ २२ ॥

वक्राणि अकृति (?) पक्षमाणि यासां ताः ।

26. अस्य संवादस्तीर्थीये च दृश्यते ।

27. तिलके इतो वाक्यद्वयमुद्धृतं दृश्यते ।

28. अयमर्थः केवलं गोविन्दराजेन स्वीकृतः । शब्दतोऽप्यस्य संवादः तीर्थीये दृश्यते । अत्र विवृतान् नायिकाभेदान् प्रति सन्देहो वर्तते; योऽर्थ उडालितो गोविन्दराजेन बुद्धः स नात्र सर्वथा प्रमाणम् । अत्र उडालिकोश इव तीर्थीये-ऽपि लेखदोषः संभाव्यत एव । ‘अनियतभर्तृका अभिसारिका, गृहप्राप्त्यरमणा वाराङ्गना च’ स्याताम् इति भाति ।

सीतामन्वेषमाणस्य हतमृतः स्त्रीणां मुखनयनादिदर्शनं मानुषरक्षस्त्व-
परिज्ञानार्थम् आभरणदर्शनं रामोक्तसीताभरणस्वरूपणार्थम् (स्वरूपनि-
रूपणार्थम्?) ।²⁹ एतच्च

‘तां समीक्ष्य विशालाक्षीं राजपुत्रीमनिन्दिताम्
तर्कयामास सीतेति कारणैरुपपादयन् ॥
वैदेह्या यानि चाङ्गेषु तदा रामोऽन्वकीर्तयत् ।
तान्याभरणजातानि शाखाशोभीन्यलक्षयत् ॥’ (सु. १५. ४०-४१)

इति राजपुत्रीत्वाभरणदर्शनेन सीतात्वनिर्णयस्य उपरि वक्ष्यमाणत्वाद्
अवगम्यते ॥ २२ ॥

‘सीतामपश्यन् मनुजेश्वरस्य
रामस्य पत्नी वदतां वरस्य ।
बभूव दुःखाभिहतश्चिरस्य
प्लवङ्गमो मन्द इवाचिरस्य ॥’ (२७)

चिरस्यापश्यन् चिरकालमन्विष्यापि अपश्यन् दुःखाभिहतः अचिरस्य सद्य एव
मन्द इव मूढ इव बभूव ॥ २७ ॥³⁰

(इति सु. पञ्चमः सर्गः)³¹

‘नारीप्रवेकैरिव दीप्यमानं
तटिद्भिरम्भोदवदच्यमानम् ।
हंसप्रवेकैरिव वाह्यमानं
श्रिया युतं खे सुकृतां विमानम् ॥’ (७.७)

तटिद्भिरिव स्थितैः नारीप्रवेकैः अम्भोदवद्, दीप्यमानमिति सम्बन्धः । नारी-
प्रवेकैः नारीश्रेष्ठैः । ‘प्रवेकानुत्तमोत्तमा’ इत्यमरः । अच्यमानं सर्वैरिति शेषः ।³²
हंसप्रवेकैः खे वाह्यमानं सुकृतां विमानमिवेत्यन्वयः । वाह्यमानम् उह्यमानम् ।
आर्षम् । स्वार्थं णिच् । अत एव संप्रसारणाभावः । यद्वा हंसप्रवेकैः वाह्यमानं
स्वामिनेति शेषः ॥ ७ ॥

29. अत्रापि उडालिः गोविन्दराजेनोपजीव्यते ।

30. अत्रापि अर्थतः उपजीवितं गोविन्दराजेन । तीर्थीये च संवादो दृश्यते ।

31. षष्ठे न कापि व्याख्या उपलभ्यते । षष्ठान्तिमश्लोकस्तु ७ १५० व्याख्याया-
मुदाहृतं दृश्यते ।

32. इतश्चोद्धृतं दृश्यते गोविन्दराजीये ।

‘नियुज्यमानाश्च गजासुहस्ताः
 सकेसराश्चोत्पलपत्रहस्ताः ।
 बभूव देवी च कृता स्व(सु)हस्ता
 लक्ष्मीस्तथा पद्मिनि पद्महस्ता ।’ (१४)

नियुज्यमानाः स्वयमेवात्मानं नियोजयन्तः । कर्मकर्तारि यक् । यद्वा नियुज्यमानाः स्वयमेव व्याप्रियमाणाः । **सकेसराः** सकिञ्जल्काः । पद्माकरविहारिगजाकार-निर्माणत्वात् सकेसरत्वम् । **पद्मिनि** पद्माकरे । यत्र विमाने स्वयमेव उत्पलपत्रा-भिषेककर्मणि प्रवर्तमानाः शोभनहस्ताः जलजकिञ्जल्करञ्जिताः उत्पलपत्रवर्षिणो गजाश्च पद्माकरे पद्महस्ता लक्ष्मीश्च कृता बभूवेत्ययमस्यार्थः ॥ १४ ॥^{३३}

‘इतीव तद्गृहमभिगम्य शोभनम्
 सविस्मयो नगमिव चारुशोभनम् ।
 पुनश्च तत्परमसुगन्धि सुन्दरं
 हिमात्यये नगमिव चारुकन्दरम् ॥’ (१५)

इतीव शोभनम् । इतीवेति निपातसमुदायः प्रकारवाची ।

‘प्रासादसङ्घाभियुतं स्त्रीसहस्रसमाकुलम् ।
 व्यूढकक्ष्यं च हनुमान् (प्र ?) विवेश महागृहम् ॥’ (६.४४)

इत्याद्युक्तप्रकारेण रमणीयं चारुशोभनं चारुमङ्गलं नगमिव स्थितं तद्गृहमभि-गम्य अभितो गत्वा सविस्मयः । अभवदिति शेषः । अभितश्चरित्वा सखीकरावणा-वस्थितप्रदेशं नागमदिति सविस्मयोऽभूदित्यर्थः हिमात्यये शीतकालात्यये वसन्त-इति यावत् । चारुकन्दरं नगमिव परमसुगन्धि सुन्दरं गृहं पुनश्चाभिगम्य अभितो गत्वा सविस्मयोऽभूत् । परिच्छेदानधिगमादिति भावः ॥ १५ ॥^{३४}

(इति सु० सप्तमः सर्गः)

‘तदप्रमेयाप्रतिकारकृत्रिमं
 स्वयं कृतं साध्विति विश्वकर्मणा ।
 दिवं गतं वायुपथप्रतिष्ठितं
 व्यरोचतादित्यपथस्य लक्ष्मवत् ॥ (८.२)

33. गोविन्दराजेनेदमपि उद्धृतम् । तीर्थीये च संग्रहणेदमुपलभ्यते ।

34. इदमपि सङ्ग्रहेणोपात्तं गोविन्दराजेन । तथैव तीर्थीयेऽपि वर्तते ।

अप्रमेयाप्रतिकारकृत्रिमम्, अपरिच्छेद्यम् अप्रतिक्रियं च यथा भवति तथा निर्वृत्तम् कृतम् । विश्वकर्मणा स्वयं साधिवतिकृतं निर्माणवेलायां प्रशंसापूर्वं कृत्तमिति यावत् । दिवं गतमाकाशगतम् । वायुपथप्रतिष्ठितं वायुमार्गभूतान्तरिक्षप्रतिष्ठितम् । स तस्य मध्ये भवनस्य संस्थितं महद्विमानम्' (८.१) इत्यभिहितत्वात् भूतलप्रत्यासन्नान्तरिक्षस्थितमिति ।^{३५} आदित्यपथस्य लक्षमवद् आदित्यमार्गस्य चिह्नमिव ॥ २ ॥

‘वहन्ति यं कुण्डलशोभिताननाः

महाशना व्योमचरा निशाचराः ।

विवृत्तविध्वस्तविशाललोचना

महाजवा भूतगणास्सहस्रशः ॥’ (७)

अत्र इवशब्दोऽध्याहृतव्यः क्रमगस्य (कामगस्य) दिव्यस्य विमानस्य साक्षाद्राक्षस-
बाह्यत्वानुपपत्तेः ।^{३६} चन्द्रकिरणानामप्यगोचरे रावणान्तःपुरे विमानरक्षणार्थं
साक्षाद्राक्षसानामवस्थानायोगाच्च । अस्मिन् श्लोके अभिहितभूतगणाः प्रकृतय
इति वेदितव्याः ।

कुण्डलशोभिताननाः कुण्डलैः शोभितानि आननानि येषां ते तथोक्ताः ।

महाशनाः, वह्नन्नमश्नन्त इव तुन्दिला इत्यर्थः । व्योमचराः, व्योमसञ्चारा-
वस्थापन्नाः निशाचराः, निशाचरा इव प्रतीयमानाः । विवृत्तविध्वस्तविशाल-
लोचनाः, विवृत्तानि विध्वस्तानि लोचनानि येषां ते तथोक्ताः । महाजवाः महा-
वेगयुक्ताः इति (इव) प्रतीयमानाः सहस्रशो भूतगणाः यं वहन्तीव कृताः, तं
विमानं ददर्श (८. ८.) इत्युत्तरत्र संबन्धः । युद्धकाण्डे च (१२५.२६) ‘ययौ तेन
विमानेन हंसयुक्तेन भास्वता’ इत्यत्र हंसशब्देन वाहकत्वाकारेण निर्मिताः हंसा
उच्यन्त इति व्याख्यातत्वात् ॥ ७ ॥

(इति सु० अष्टमः सर्गः)

‘इमानि मुखपद्मानि नियतं मत्तषट्पदाः ।

अम्बुजानीव फुल्लानि प्रार्थयन्ति पुनः पुनः ॥’ (९. ३८-९)

प्रार्थयन्ति प्रार्थयेरन् । नियतं नूनम् ॥ ३८-९ ॥^{३७}

(‘इति चामन्यत श्रीमानुपपत्त्या महाकपिः ।’ (३९)

35. अत्राप्युपजीवितं गोविन्दराजेन । संग्रहेण तीर्थीयेऽप्येतद्विलोक्यते ।

36. अंशतोऽयमर्थः तीर्थीये विलोक्यते ।

37. उपात्तमिदं गोविन्दराजेन । तीर्थीये चैतदस्ति ॥

इत्युपपत्त्या युक्त्या अमन्यत ॥ ३९ ॥^{३८}

‘उचितेष्वपि सुव्यक्तं न तासां योषितां तदा ।

विवेकः शक्य आधातुं भूषणाङ्गाम्बरस्रजाम् ॥’ (६६-६७)

उचितेष्वपि तासामङ्गेषु सावर्ण्यसारूप्यदिभ्रमेण भूषणानां तासामङ्गनानाम्
अम्बराणां स्रजां च विवेकः सुव्यक्तमाधातुं न शक्यः । सावर्ण्यादिगुणेन तासां
स्तनजघनादिष्वङ्गेषु भूषणाम्बराणि नाज्ञायन्त इत्यर्थः ॥ ६६-६७ ॥

‘बभूव बुद्धिस्तु हरीश्वरस्य

यदीदृशी राघवधर्मपत्नी ।

इमा (यथा) राक्षसराजभार्याः

सुजातमस्येति हि साधुबुद्धेः ॥’ (७२)

असाध्वी बुद्धिः कापेयात् प्रमादात्कृता, स्वयं त्वस्य बुद्धिस्साध्वीति प्रतिपादयितुं
साधुबुद्धेः इति प्रयोगः । ईदृशी धर्मबुद्ध्या (धर्मपत्नी चेत्) सुजातं सुकृतम् । यद्
वा इमा राक्षसराजभार्या यथा [तथा] स्वभर्तृविशिष्टाः सकलभोगयुक्ताः (तथा)
राघवधर्मपत्नी सीता ईदृशी स्वभर्तृसहिता यदि, अस्य रावणस्य सुजातमिति
साधुबुद्धेः हरीश्वरस्य बुद्धिः बभूव । अयं रावणः राघवधर्मपत्नीं यदि प्रत्यर्पयेत्
अस्य जन्म शोभनं स्यादिति हरीश्वरस्य बुद्धिर्जातित्यर्थः ॥ ८२ ॥^{३९}

चिन्तान्तरमाह—

‘पुनश्च सोऽचिन्तयदार्तरूपो

ध्रुवं विशिष्टा गुणतो हि सीता ।

अथायमस्यां कृतवान् महात्मा

लङ्केश्वरः कष्टमनार्यकर्मा ॥’ (७३)

कष्टमित्यार्तरूपः । पुनश्चाचिन्तयत् यद् वैदेह्या दृढव्रतत्वात् प (अतिव्रत्यभङ्गो)^{४०}
न भवेत् । अपि तु मिथ्यापवाद(मेव उत्पादितवान्) ^{४०}.....॥ ७३ ॥

(इति सु० नवमः सर्गः)^{४१}

38. ,, ,, । ,, ,, ।

39. इदमपि प्रायः सर्वमुपात्तं गोविन्दराजेन ।

40. इदमपि तथैव । कोशेऽत्र पङ्क्तिस्त्रुटिता । गोविन्दराजीयादुद्धृत्य
निवेशिता ।

41. एतावानेवायं उडालिव्याख्याग्रन्थः कोशे समुपलब्धः ।

THE RĀMĀYAṆA IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE

To attempt to describe the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Sanskrit literature would be like attempting to describe the immanence of God in creation. Indian literary tradition hold Vālmiki as the first poet, *Ādi Kavi* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Ādikāvya*, the first poem, apart from the *Vedic Ṛsis* and their hymns. He was the path-maker for the honeyed expressions of poetry, as Bhoja says in his *Rāmāyaṇa Campū* :

मधुमयभणितानां मार्गदर्शी महर्षिः । I.1

Modern historians of Sanskrit literature also express the same opinion e. g. Jacobi and Keith, who say : It (the *Rāmāyaṇa*) was the precursor of all homogeneous and artificial poems (i.e. *Kāvya*s) and 'the technique of poetry with regard to delineation, language and metre, which was brought to completion by Vālmiki, became the standard for the epic poetry of later times'. (P. 64, Jacobi, *The Rāmāyaṇa*, English Translation, Baroda). 'Vālmiki and those who improved on him in the period 400-200 BC. are clearly the legitimate ancestors of the court epic'. 'as they (the later poets) drew deeply upon it for their themes, so they found in it the models for the ornaments of their style.' 'Imitation in detail of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is frequent and patent and its language and verse technique deeply affected the whole of the history of the *Kāvya*.' (Keith. *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 43, 45). From the *Rāmāyaṇa* born the ideas, concepts and devices of the art of the poets,

इतिहासोत्तमादस्माज्जायन्ते कविबुद्धयः । I. 2. 385

as Vyāsa said of his own epic.

Vyāsa is included among those, indeed at the head of those, whose poetic minds were fed and formed by Vālmiki. In his usual interesting manner, Rājaśekhara, the poet-critic (of the end of the 9th and beginning the 10th Century A.D.), presents in the prelude to the opening act of his unfinished play on the *Mahābhārata*-theme, called the *Bālābhārata*, the sage-poets of the two epics in dialogue and makes Vyāsa address Vālmiki as master, *Upadhyāya* and the first poet, *Prathama-kavi*, and take his blessings.

Another indigenous treatment, a more elaborate and more literary and interesting treatment, of the primary place of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is to be found in the *Bṛhadddharma Purāṇa* which was probably composed in the 13th or 14th Century A.D. The *Rāmāyaṇa* which occupies a considerable portion of this Purāṇa text, is referred to here as *Mahākāvya*, and Vālmiki is described as the first manifestation of *Vāc*. The *Rāmāyaṇa* is described as the source and model of all *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* literature. Pleased with Vālmiki's production of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Brahmā asks Vālmiki to take up composing the *Mahābhārata* but Vālmiki replies : "I have composed the *Rāmāyaṇa* and am free from doubt, agitation and illusion; wherefore shall I vainly take up another work?"

कृतं रामायणं ब्रह्मन् व्यक्तं मोक्षस्य साधनम् ।
निःसन्देहो ह्यहं भूतः क्षोभमोहविवर्जितः ॥ 27.6-7

But adds "when Vyāsa comes, I shall impart to him the eternal seeds of poetry, *Kāvyaabijam sanātanam* (Sl. 11). Vyāsa and other sages come and Vālmiki gives them the seed matrix of poetry for composing the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* and says in conclusion "In the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, wherever Rāma's story comes, there my spirit will animate you all."¹

तेषु तेषु पुराणेषु महाभारत एव च ।
यत्र रामचरित्रं स्यात् तदहं तत्र शक्तिमान् ॥ 30.51

Along with the above traditional and literary treatment of the primary position of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and its relation particularly to the *Mahābhārata*, we may consider also from the critical and historical viewpoint the mutual relation of the two epics. In addition to several references to the characters and episodes of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and situations parallel to those in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata* has, towards the end of its third book (*Vana*), a subsection called the *Rāmopākhyāna*; and in addition to this long narrative of the whole story of Rāma in about 20 chapters, the *Mahābhārata* has also several short resumes of the story of Rāma in different contexts. There is also a precious quotation of three lines from Vālmiki, cited as authority, one line of which is missing from the Southern and Eastern recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Now the *Rāmopākhyāna*, in the *Mahābhārata*, which shows some diffe-

1. See pp. 71-3, my *Greater Ramayana*.

rences from the text of Vālmiki, yet discloses the influence of the latter and has several passages showing its minute acquaintance with Vālmiki's text. Jacobi, Winternitz and Sukthankar, the first editor of the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*, discussed this question of the relation of the *Rāmopākhyāna* in the *Mahābhārata* with *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* and concluded that the *Rāmopākhyāna* knew Vālmiki and represented a free summary of Vālmiki's text. In my study of this question in my *Greater Rāmāyaṇa*,² I adduced further evidences in support of the above conclusion and I am glad that the last editor of the now concluded critical edition of the *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* from Baroda, Dr. U. P. Shah, has supported the above view. (Pp. 29-30, Vol. 7, Introduction at the end of the last of the *Uttara Kāṇḍa*). It is also important to note that the *Rāmopākhyāna* already knows the full text of Vālmiki as it is current with the *Bala* and *Uttara Kāṇḍas* and knows also the longer verses; it is also noteworthy that its narrative opens with the story of Rāvaṇa, a feature found generally in the South-East Asian versions.

It is usually pointed out that the *Pāṇini Sūtras*, which refer to the characters of the *Mahābhārata*, have no references to the *Rāmāyaṇa*. A negative evidence like this is not of absolute value. In his introductory verses on the earlier poets in his *Harṣacarita*, poet Bāṇa praises Vyāsa, and after him several classical poets, but does not mention Vālmiki. However in the body of his works, especially the *Kādambārī*, there are numerous references to the story and characters of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Patañjali (mid. 2nd Cent. B.C.) knows the *Rāmāyaṇa*; in his *Mahābhāṣya*, on Pāṇini 1.1.57, he mentions *Rāvaṇi*; and on 6. 1. 57, *Kiṣkindhā Guhā*; *Kiṣkindhā* occurs also in the *Gaṇapāṭha*. More interesting than these is Patañjali's citation of two Anuṣṭubh verses making a humorous reference to a solitary monkey in the monkey army standing up and worshipping the Sun, which attests the popularity of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and works or writings based on its story.

बहूनामप्यचित्तानामेको भवति चित्तवान् ।
 पश्य वानरसैन्येऽस्मिन् यदकमुपतिष्ठते ॥
 मैवं मंस्थाः सचित्तोज्यमेषोऽपि हि यथा वयम् ।
 एतदप्यस्य कापेयं यदकमुपतिष्ठति ॥ I. 3. 25

2. See pp. 2-31, *The Greater Ramayana*.

Under III. 1.67 (5), Patañjali quotes the bit 'एति जीवन्तमानन्दः' which is in all likelihood Vālmiki V. 34.6, words uttered by Sītā.

The two epics had also become part of the discipline and education of young princes. Kauṭalya warns them in the section on control of senses (I.6.8) not to follow the example of Rāvaṇa and Duryodhana and go to ruin.

मानाद् रावणः परदारानप्रयच्छन् दुर्योधनो राज्यांशं च ।

Early Buddhistic literature, Pali and Sanskrit, knows the *Rāmāyaṇa*-story very well which it uses with orientation to its own purpose. There are several *Jātakas* which thus use the main-story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as well as its episodes. Some *Gāthās* and gnomic verses of the *Rāmāyaṇa* are also found in them. It is natural that a text popular among the orthodox should be used by the reformist sects, with modifications, to suit their own doctrines. This trend is best seen in the *Mahāyāna* works and Buddhological writings imbued with *Buddha-bhakti*. The personality of the Buddha was conceived like that of Rāma or Kṛṣṇa and his description as a *Mahāpuruṣa* with all his *lakṣaṇas* or his physical training and feats and tests of strength as a *Kṣatriya* prince, the description of the palace, the harem, etc., all these that we have in the works in Hybrid Sanskrit, the *Lalitavistara*, *Mahāvatsu*, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, etc., have not merely echoes but actual verbal parallels with the descriptions of Rāma, his personality, his qualities of head and heart and the descriptions of place and harem in Laṅkā in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The better known and more conspicuous parallels in ideas and expressions are in the two poems in classical Sanskrit by Aśvaghoṣa, the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda*. To the examples already shown and discussed by earlier scholars, I have added several telling ones in my paper on 'Buddhological Texts and the Epics'³. The *Mahāvibhāṣā* on the *Jñānaprasthāna* of Kātyāyanīputra written under Kaniṣka, speaks of the central theme of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and gives its extent as 12,000 ślokas. That the *Rāmāyaṇa* was recited in public, as it still continues to be recited and expoun-

3. *Adyar Library Bulletin* XX. 1956, Buddha Jayanti Number pp. 349-359.

ded, is mentioned in Kumāralāta's *Kalpanamaṇḍitaka* (end of 2nd century A. D.). Like Aśvaghōṣa earlier, Vasubandhu, later, was a great lover of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, according to *Paramārtha's* account of his life available in *Chinese*.⁴ If the *Rāmāyaṇa* continues to enjoy its vogue among the people of South-East Asia who follow the religion of the Buddha, there has already been a long historical background for the *Rāmāyaṇa* as part and parcel of the Buddhist writings and for Rāma as a *Bodhisattva*.

Jainism also used the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but with drastic changes in the story, incidents and characters. Starting with the *Paumacaria* of Vimalasūri (3rd or 4th Century A. D.), several works give us accounts of the Jain version of the Rāma story.

We may now come to the main stream of Sanskrit literature from where we left, the *Mahābhārata*. We referred to the observation in the *Bṛhaddharma Purāṇa* that wherever in the *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* literature, there is the Rāma-story, there the spirit of Vālmiki is active. The *Harivaṁśa*, a supplement (*Khila*) to the *Mahābhārata* imitates Vālmiki, has many evidences of his influence and above all, describes dramatic presentations of the *Rāmāyaṇa*; it mentions the dramatisation of two episodes especially, that of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga and that of Rambhā, Nalakūbara and Rāvaṇa. Earlier the episode of Śatrughna going against Lavaṇāsura and killing him is also described. These shows that the *Harivaṁśa* knew the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*⁵

In the vast *Purāṇa* literature there is hardly a *Purāṇa* or *Upa-purāṇa* that has not got a long or short narrative of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. I do not want to take your time by entering into the mass of this *Rāmāyaṇa-Rāma* material in the Puranic literature; I refer you to my study of all this in my book entitled 'The Greater Ramayana'.⁶ The study shows the permeation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in the Puranic literature, direct borrowings from Vālmiki, resumes of the story based on him, elaborations of the story, particularly of the later life of Rāma as King and developments of the story in the wake and under the impact of the cults

4. Watanabe, *JRAS*. 1907, pp. 97 ff.

5. See my *Greater Ramayana*, pp. 31-3.

6. pp. 33 to end.

of Rāma, Śiva and Devi-Śakti. All through, the aim of this literature is to keep before the people the elevating personality of Rāma as the embodiment of *Dharma* and his exemplary reign of righteousness, the *Dharamarājya* or *Rāmarājya*.

We started with Vālmiki as the *Ādikavi* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the *Ādikāvya*. The most important study then is of the influence and inspiration provided by Vālmiki for the classical poets and the influence of his work on classical Sanskrit literature, the poems and the plays, *Kāvyaś* and *Nāṭakas*. The ideal of the Sanskrit heroic poem and play, the *Mahākāvya* and *Nāṭaka*, is to present in the hero of the work a sublime personality of exalted character and ennobling qualities, such as Rāma was as depicted by Vālmiki. Two poets, both playwrights, the earlier Murāri and the later Jayadeva, in the prologues of their plays on Rāma the *Anargha-rāghava* and the *Prasanna-rāghava*, asked the question; 'Wherefore this taking up of Rāma as the theme again and again'? And answered with the counter-question: 'Where else could poets get a hero endowed with such qualities and how else could their literary gifts fulfil themselves than by dwelling on such a character?'

यदि क्षुण्णं पूर्वेरिति जहति रामस्य चरितं
 गुणैरेतावद्भिः जगति पुनरन्यो जयति कः ।
 स्वमात्मानं तत्तद्गुणगरिमगम्भोरमधुर-
 स्फुरद्वाग्ब्रह्माणः कथमुकरिष्यन्ति कवयः ॥ AR. I. 9
 स्वसूक्तीनां पात्रं रघुतिलकमेकं कलयतां
 कवीनां को दोषः स तु गुणगणानामवगुणः ।
 यदेतैर्निःशेषैरपरगुणलब्धैरिव जग-
 त्यसावेकश्चक्रे सततमुखसंवासरसतिः ॥ PR, I. 12

Similar tributes paid by poets to Vālmiki have all been collected and presented by me in a booklet 'Ādikavi-Kāvya-praśastayaḥ'⁷.

Apart from the central factor of the character of the hero and its delineation supplied by the *Rāmāyaṇa*, other features that go into the structure of the *Mahākāvya*, the description of other character like the heroine and other women, the anti-hero, of love and all its attendant feelings in union and separation,

the city and the country, nature with its hills, forests and rivers, the seasons, trees and flowers, the rise and setting of sun and moon, night and dawn, of polity and war, of life among the high and the low, etc.—in all these Vālmiki gave the model, standard and inspiration. It is not only the Rāma-Kāvya but all Kāvya derives the material and method from the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The model and influence include the use of metre and even the practice of varying the metre at the end of a canto.

Reference has already been made to Aśvaghōṣa's admiration for Vālmiki and his poem, and his borrowings from it. But the greatest poet of the classical ages, Kālidāsa, is the greatset admirer and follower of Vālmiki. A later poet, Utprekṣāvallabha, says in his poem, the *Bhikṣāṭana-kāvya* (I.5), that "two poets stand supreme, Vālmiki the first of poets and that Kālidāsa who treads his path with ease and grace; let other poets flourish or not, I have not taken any effort to dip into them."

वाल्मीकिरस्तु विजयी स कविः पुराणः
 तस्यानुसारसरलः स च कालिदासः ।
 अन्ये भवन्तु कवयो जयिनोऽथ मा वा
 येषां कृतः कृतिषु नैव मयावगाहः ॥

Kālidāsa's longest poem, the *Raghuvamśa*, deals with the royal line in which Rāma appeared, the line of Raghu. Kālidāsa called his poem after Raghu, because after Rāma, the most frequent name used for him by Vālmiki is Rāghava. The names of the two poems of Kālidāsa, *Raghuvamśa* and *Kumārasambhava*, are found in Vālmiki (I 3. 9 ; 37.31). The *Raghuvamśa* includes an account of the Rāmāyaṇa-story in seven cantos (IX-XV). With his *Raghuvamśa*, Kālidāsa became, next to Vālmiki, the leading Rāmāyaṇa-poet. The *Raghuvamśa* is one of the three Sanskrit sources of the Tamil Rāmāyaṇa which Kambar mentions.⁸ His *Meghasandēśa* is a creation inspired by Hanumān going along the skies as a messenger from Rāma to Sītā. More specifically, the theme of the *Meghasandēśa*; of the Yakṣa neglecting his duty, because of his being engrossed in love for his beloved and being

8. This is demonstrated by Sri K. R. Jamadagni in his Tamil translation of the *Raghuvamśa*. Coimbatore, 1969, Introduction pp. 37-41.

cursed by Kubera, is taken from the previous story of Virādha, who was formerly Tumburu the Gandharva engrossed in love for Rambhā and Kubera's curse on him described by Vālmiki in III. 4. 16-18. His Śakuntalā, repudiated by the King and living in the hermitage of sage Mārīca, and giving birth to her son there is an image cast in the mould of Sitā abandoned by Rāma, taken care of by Vālmiki and giving birth to her sons there. Not only in the story of Rāma in his *Raghuvamśa*, but in all his writings, both poems and plays, Kālidāsa has laid in his lines gold and gems culled from the mine of Vālmiki—ideas, similes and expressions; I have presented these in my paper 'Vālmiki and Kālidāsa'⁹, and I have since collected many more of these examples.

Such echoes and borrowal of expressions from Vālmiki are found in all poets beginning with the author of the next important *Mahākāvya*, Bhāravi. But we should concentrate here on the poets who wrote on the *Rāmāyaṇa*-theme. After *Raghuvamśa*, the next direct poem based on the *Rāmāyaṇa* is the *Rāvaṇavadha* of Bhaṭṭi who came after Bhāravi. Because Bhaṭṭi chose to illustrate Pāṇini's grammar also when narrating the story of Rāma, many have missed enjoying his poetry and noting the interesting details of the narrative as told in his poem. The *Bhaṭṭikāvya* has this further unique importance as the basis of the Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* Kakawin which is partly a close and partly a free translation of it. For the history of Sanskrit literature, Śrī Laṅkā was part of Bhārata-varṣa; and it was in that island that Kumāradāsa produced the next important *Rāmāyaṇa Mahākāvya*, the *Jānakīharāṇa*. The next noteworthy production in this line is the *Rāmacarita* of Abhinanda, who wrote in about 900 A.D. under the Palas of Bengal. Abhinanda was greatly devoted to Rāma and as shown by me,¹⁰ he is the same as the author of the *Laghu Yogavāsīṣṭha*, and also responsible for revising and amplifying the larger *Yogavāsīṣṭha*, which is sometime referred to as the *Mahārāmāyaṇa*. Abhinanda's *Rāmacarita*, not much read, contains fine poetry and is noteworthy also for the story-elements not found in the

9. K. V. Rangaswami Ayyangar Volume, Madras. 1940, pp. 409-424.

10. 'The Author of the Laghuyogavāsīṣṭha', S. K. De Memorial Volume, 1972, pp. 53-56.

original. The poem, planned in 100 cantos, is unfortunately incomplete; in the manuscripts the portion available, 36 cantos, takes us upto the fall of Kumbha and Nikumbha in the battle of Laṅkā. A greater polymath was Kṣemendra of Kashmir, of the 11th Century, who in his effort to present in shorter compass four of the longest works in Sanskrit and Prakrit produced a *Rāmāyaṇamañjarī* in 6,460 stanzas, following the course of the story as in Vālmiki. The text is full of reproductions of the words of Vālmiki and could be used as testimonia for textual criticism. In a verse in the end, Kṣemendra reflects on the course of the story, of Rāma's exile in the prime of his youth, forest life, loss of Sitā, the evil gossip about her and her abandonment and says. "It is all sorrow; may it lead you to blessed *vairāgya* and *viveka*."

सर्वं दुःखमयं तदस्तु भवतां श्लाघ्यो विवेकोदयः ।

A short account of the *Rāmāyaṇa* story in 293 verses also forms part of Kṣemendra's poem *Daśāvatāra-carita* on the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. This account, like the the *Rāmopākhyāna* in the Mahābhārata, starts with the story of Rāvaṇa to which it devotes one third of its length and takes Rāma's story from Pañcavaṭi and Rāvaṇa's attempt to carry Sitā away; it gives several episodes of the *Uttara Kāṇḍa* and concludes with a verse closely modelled on the verse with which Kālidāsa concludes his Rāma story in the *Raghuvamśa*, canto XV. To the royal polymath of Dhara in Malva, Bhoja, whose literary activities comprehended every branch of learning in Sanskrit, is credited the *Rāmāyaṇa Campū* in the mixed style of verse and prose, a work which has long formed part of the syllabus of Sanskrit study for youngsters. Bhoja's work is available only upto the end of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* and it became later a regular exercise for many young poets to compose the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* and complete Bhoja's *Campū*.

Prakrit poetry or play was an integral part of Sanskrit literature. Prakrit was also used for *Rāmāyaṇa* poems; the best creation in this language is the *Setubandha* or *Rāvaṇavadha* ascribed to the Vakataka King Pravarasena (5th Century A. D.); the poem, noteworthy chiefly for its poetry, has also points of interest in the narrative. For the general impact of the *Rāmāyaṇa* on

Prakrit poetry, we may note that the collection of lyrics, in that language associated with Hāla Sātavāhana, the *Gāthāsaptāśati*, has not only references to the characters and scenes in Vālmiki but also uses the fancies and conceits of Vālmiki. One *Gāthā* may be pointed out particularly (I.35) which shows how the *Rāmāyaṇa* was playing the role of a moral mentor of the people. When the chaste wife of the elder brother finds her younger-brother-in-law intent on her, she points to the *Rāmāyaṇa*-drawings on the wall and tells the whole day the story of how Lakṣmaṇa was devoted to Rāma and conducted himself.

देवरस्याशुद्धमनसः कुलवधूनिजककुड्यलिखितानि ।
दिवसं कथयति रामानुलग्नसौमित्रिचरितानि ॥ (Chāyā)

Incidentally, this shows also how the *Rāmāyaṇa* had already become the source of themes for the art of painting.

I am not now entering into the details in the narrative or the variations from Vālmiki in these poems; I am dealing with them in a course of lectures to be delivered shortly at the University of Poona.¹¹

The *Rāmāyaṇa*-poems of the classical period must have been more in number than what we have noticed above. A great many of the works of the classical period have been lost. Among these lost poems which are known from references and citations are some poems on the *Rāmāyaṇa*-theme. In the Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary *Mahāvīyutpatti* (beginning of the 9th Cent.), Title 7,629 is a work called *Sitāharaṇa* and in his *Pañcīkā* on the *Tattvasaṅgraha* of Śāntarakṣita Kamalaśīla mentions the *Sitāharaṇa* as a Kāvya. (GOS. XXX. ii. p. 16). Bhartṛmeṇṭha, the Kashmirian poet who wrote under Mātṛgupta the poem *Hayagrīvavadha*, is mentioned by Rājaśekhara in the prologue to his *Bālarāmāyaṇa* as an author on the *Rāmāyaṇa*-theme along with Bhavabhūti and himself. Bhoja refers in his *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa* to a *Sitānveṣaṇīya*, obviously a poem on the search for Sitā, a *Dilīpavamśa* and two Prakrit poems *Rāvaṇavijaya* and *Māricavadha*; the latter was, according to Abhinavagupta, who also mentions it in his commentary on the *Nāṭya Śāstra*, a *Rāgakāvya* intended to be sung

11. These have been since delivered and are to be printed.

in a single melody all through, namely the *Kakubha grāma rāga*. In the later ages, numerous *Mahākāvya*s on the *Rāmāyaṇa*-story were composed.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* figured along with the *Mahābhārata* in a class of poems called *Dvisandhāna* in which two stories were told in the same poem through the use of *Śleṣa* or *double entendre*. Daṇḍin, Dhanañjaya and Kavirāja were the pioneers in this class of poems but later poets out-did them by telling in the same poem three, four and five stories in all of which the *Rāmāyaṇa* figured. The large class of minor poems that arose in imitation of Kālidāsa's *Meghasandēśa* included some on Rāma's message to Sitā. In the equally large number of imitations of the *Gitagovinda* of Jayadeva, there are at least a score on the love-sports of Rāma and Sitā.

Later Sanskrit literature was produced in an age when the adoration of Rāma as God had developed to a high degree. This *Rāma-bhakti* gave a further fillip to the production of *Mahākāvya*s and *Khaṇḍakāvya*s with the *Rāmāyaṇa*-theme. A class of poems of the later ages which is specially to be noted in this connection is the *Stotras* on different deities. Of these those on Rāma are large in number. There were poets like the Śrīvaiṣṇava polymath Vedānta Deśika (of the 13th Cent.) who wrote 1,000 verses on Rāma's sandals which ruled Ayodhyā (*Pādukāsahasra*) and the resounding one in prose, the *Raghuvīragadya*. The poet, playwright and grammarian of the Tanjore Court at the end of the 17th Century, Rāmabhadra Dikṣita, wrote several hymns on Rāma and his bow and arrow. The Rāma poems, plays and hymns, the bulk of them still in mss, may run to few hundreds. Rāma poems, plays and hymns continue to be composed even today.

We shall now come to the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Sanskrit drama. We already saw from the *Harivaṃśa* the popularity of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with the actors. The earliest Rāma-plays that we have are those of the pre-Kālidāsa dramatist Bhāsa to whom two *Rāmāyaṇa* plays are ascribed, the *Pratimā* and *Abhiṣeka Nāṭakas*. The appearance of Bhavabhūti in the 7th-8th Centuries threw into oblivion several excellent Rāma-plays, produced before him, including

the *Rāmābhyudaya* of his own patron king Yaśovarman. No less than 13 Rāma-plays and several Acts of Rāma-plays now not available have been surveyed and reconstructed by me in my book "Some Old Lost Rama Plays."¹² An old Rāma play which I have discovered and am bringing out is the *Udattarāghava* of Anaṅgahaṛṣa Mayurāja, a Kalacuri prince. The best of these early Rāma-plays are the *Kṛtyārāvaṇa*, *Chalitarāma*, *Rāmābhyudaya* and the *Udattarāghava*. Among extant ones, those of Bhavabhūti lead : the incomplete *Mahāvīracarita* on the earlier story and the *Uttararāmacarita* on the later story. In the latter Bhavabhūti excels in the portrayal of the sentiment of pathos, *Karuṇa Rasa*. Next in importance are the *Anargharāghava* of Murāri who had the title 'Bāla Vālmiki' and the *Bālarāmāyaṇa* of Rājaśekhara. From South India appeared the *Āścarya Cūḍamaṇi* of Śaktibhadra. Along with the *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* of Bhāsa, the *Āścarya Cūḍamaṇi* is on the repertoire of the traditional Sanskrit theatre of Kerala, the *Kudiyattam*. King Bhimata of Kalanjara is eulogised by Rājaśekhara as author of five plays of which the one on the Rāmāyaṇa-story, the *Svapnadaśanana*, which is also lost, was the best. Closely modelled on the *Uttararāmacarita* is the *Kundamālā* of Dhiranāga, King of Anupa. Kṣemendra the polymath already mentioned as author of the *Rāmāyanamañjarī*, wrote a play on the later story of Rāma, *Kanaka-jānakī*, named after the golden image of Sitā with which, during Sitā's life in Vālmiki's hermitage, Rāma performed his Aśvamedha. Of the Rāma plays of the later ages, the best known is the *Prasannarāghava* of the logician Jayadeva of 1200 A. D. Rāmabhadra Dikṣita, already referred to as a Rāma-poet, produced a *Jānakīpariṇaya*, following the style of Bhavabhūti, Murāri and Rājaśekhara. Another contemporary of his of the Tanjore Manrata Court, Mahādeva, produced a play dealing with battle of Laṅka and dominated by magic and wonder and called the *Abhutadarpaṇa*. Like the Rāma-poems, the Rāma-plays of the later ages are in large number and they continue to be written even in modern times.

One of the works on the *Rāmāyaṇa*-theme which has been widely discussed is the *Mahānāṭaka*, the 'super-play'! Its resur-

12. Annamalai University 1961.

rection is ascribed to King Bhoja. Available in two recensions, it is an anthology of noteworthy verses on the various incidents of the *Rāmāyaṇa* culled from well-known *Rāmāyaṇa*-plays and arranged like a play and with the few stage directions. It was obviously used as the text recited for a *Rāmāyaṇa*-pageant, may be even a shadow-play. The later short one-Act play on the embassy of Aṅgada, the *Dūtāṅgada*, by Subhaṭa has also figured in the discussions of the historians of Sanskrit Drama. As it calls itself a *Chāyā-nāṭaka*, it was considered that it was used for the shadow-play but the real meaning of the term seems to be that the poet derives much of his verses from other Rāma-plays even as the *Mahānāṭaka* does.

The Rāma-plays are specially noteworthy for a feature which distinguishes them from the Rāma-poems. The differences from Vālmiki or details not seen in Vālmiki that one comes across in the Rāma-poems are due to differences of the recensions or versions of the story as current among the people in different parts of the country. But in the Rāma-plays there are variations which are the conscious product of the playwrights' imagination. According to the *Nāṭya Śāstra*, the heroic play, *Nāṭaka*, is to take for its theme a given story, well-known in *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* literature, and a hero who is thus a well-known figure, *Prakhyāta*. But the *Nāṭya Śāstra* of Mātṛgupta adds that the dramatist may introduce a few innovations in the theme (*kiñcid-utpādyā vastu ca*). Now the authors of the Rāma-nāṭakas who took up the *Rāmāyaṇa*-story also took advantage of the permissive statement mentioned above and from small things to bigger ones, introduced many inventive elements. The obvious justification for such innovations is that there were the well-known contexts in the *Rāmāyaṇa* with which one was not absolutely satisfied and consequently the poets thought of saving the concerned characters from blame, e. g., Kaikeyi's boons, Daśaratha succumbing to her demands, Rāma running after a golden deer, Sītā's unbecoming words to Lakṣmaṇa and so on. Taking advantage of the enmity of Rāvaṇa and the magic of the Rākṣasas, duplicate and fake Daśarathas, fake Kaikeyis, fake Rāmas and Lakṣmaṇs are brought in. Already Yośovarman, author of the *Rāmābhyudaya*, voiced a mild protest against these innovations and avoided these in his own Rāma-play. But his own court-poet Bhavabhūti and following him others, did

not hesitate to adopt these innovations. A second protest was lodged by the leading critic Ānandavardhana in his *Dhvanyāloka* (III. 11) :

सन्ति सिद्धरसप्रख्या ये च रामायणादयः ।
कथाश्रया न तैर्योज्या स्वेच्छा रसविरोधिनी ॥

But even this could not halt the play of the fancy of the authors of Rāma-plays. Some of these innovations stayed in the minds of readers and spectators and when we study the variations found in versions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in India and outside, especially the South-East Asia, we have to take into consideration these innovations also which the Rāma-plays had introduced

The *Rāmāyaṇa* had not only inspired Sanskrit poems and plays but is also the source of the Sanskrit poetic theory. It is from the incident of the sage-author Vālmiki being a witness to the cruel shooting of the male partner of the Krauñca bird-couple and the measured utterance in his sorrow-filled condition, *Śoka*, of what turned out to be a verse, *śloka*, that the *Rasa* theory of Sanskrit Poetics and Dramaturgy is derived. Ānandavardhana says in his *Dhvanyāloka* (I. 5) :

काव्यस्यात्मा स एवार्थस्तथा चादिकवेः पुरा ।
क्रौञ्चद्वन्द्ववियोगोत्थः शोकः श्लोकत्वमागतः ॥

The *Rāmāyaṇa* is quoted often in the *Alaṅkāra* and *Nāṭya* treatises to illustrate different concepts of poetics or dramaturgy. It is quoted in works of other branches too, lexicography, grammar and above all the digests of *Dharma śāstra* as the *Rāmāyaṇa* has always been a book of *Dharmas* and *Ācāras*. These quotations, a collection of which has been made by me, form external testimonia useful for textual criticism, as I have shown in my paper "Rāmāyaṇa Citations and Textual Criticism."¹³ The *Rāmāyaṇa* as book of *Dharmas* and *Ācāras* receives special attention in a special kind of commentary called *Dharmakūṭa* written on it in the Tanjore court.¹⁴

13. L. Renou Memorial Volume, Paris, 1968. pp. 515-604; see pp. 277-287 in this volume.

14. Printed by Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam and Sarasvati Mahal, Tanjore.

A study of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Sanskrit literature would include the commentaries written upon it. The *Rāmāyaṇa* commentaries arose later than even the commentaries on the *Mahakāvya*s. Although the *Rāmāyaṇa* has been in vogue in all parts of the country, and has three well-known recensions assignable to the North-west, East and the South, commentaries have not been numerous nor have they come forth from all parts of the country. Sarvajña Nārāyaṇa, Bhaṭṭa Devarāma, Kṛṣṇatīrtha, Lokanātha of Bengal, Vimalabodha, Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa or his patron Rāmavarman and perhaps Maheśa Tīrtha are from different parts of North India. The rest of the commentators had all been from South India, two from Andhra and about ten from the Tamil area. The earliest of the last mentioned is Uḍāli Varadarāja, c. 1200 A.D. whose identity and manuscripts of whose commentary were discovered by me.¹⁵ Uḍāli says that he collected *Rāmāyaṇa*-manuscripts from different parts of the country and clarified the readings in many places in the text.¹⁶ South India had cherished the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The Pallava, Chola, and Pandya kings, as seen from their inscriptions, made endowments for the public reading and exposition of the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*.¹⁷ This institution of public recital and exposition of Vālmiki continues with increased zeal to this day.

There is also the practice of the daily reading, *pārāyaṇa*, of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, so that not only the professional exponents of the Epic but also large numbers of individuals know Vālmiki by heart and can repeat off-hand many of the important verses and even large chunks of the text from contexts forming the highlights of Vālmiki. The importance of the South Indian text has been noted by the authors of the critical edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* who say; "A comparative study of N and S clearly show that

15. Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras, VII. 2; see pp. 288-299 in this volume.
16. At the III World Sanskrit Conference at Paris, June 1977, I presented a detailed analysis and study of this commentary.
17. See my 'Adult Education in Ancient India', Members of the Madras Library Association, 1944, pp. 57-65 and 'Methods of Popular Religious Instruction in South India', *The Cultural Heritage of India*, Calcutta, Revised edn., Vol. V. 1956, pp. 503-4.

S has generally preserved the text of R in an original or older form . . ." (P. xxiii Intro., *Bālakāṇḍa* Vol. I, pt. I, Baroda, 1956). a view which I had expressed earlier in my papers.

The permeation of the influence of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is also borne out by references to it in the inscriptions in Sanskrit and Prakrit. The kings were always compared to Rāma, as well as to other Rājarsi; many of the kings, particularly in the South, took titles after Rāma, the exemplary ruler and successful warrior, the *Vira Rāghava*, *Koṇḍa Rāma* and *Jaya Rama*. This was so in South-East Asia also, where we find in the Sanskrit inscriptions of Campa and Cambodia¹⁸, the local kings praised in terms of Rāma. The Cambodian Sanskrit inscriptions contain many references to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, its characters and episodes. As in India, so in Cambodia, the temples preserved manuscripts of the *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Purāṇas*. As early as the middle of the 5th Century, it is recorded in an inscription of King Bhavavarman that the Brahman teacher Somaśarman presented to the temple the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Bhārata* and the *Purāṇas* and arranged for their uninterrupted reading.

रामायणपुराणाभ्यां यो महाभारतं ददत् ।

अकृतान्वहमच्छेद्यां स च तद्वाचनस्थितिम् ॥

These inscriptions reflect a thorough knowledge of Vālmiki's original in South-East Asia as I have shown in my book on the *Rāmāyaṇa in Greater India*. This is to be specially noted, because the *Rāmāyaṇa* versions in the languages of these countries show many variations and the influence of popular versions of India and also local aberrations. The 7th century inscription of King Prakāśadharman of Campa speaks of the setting up of a temple for Vālmiki and in this connection describes Vālmiki as the first poet from whose *Śloka*, the *Śloka* praised by Brahmā arose and who sang the story of Viṣṇu who incarnated as man.

यस्य शोकात्समुत्पन्नं श्लोकं ब्रह्माभिपूजति ।

विष्णोः पुंसः पुराणस्य मानुषस्यात्मरूपिणः ॥

❀ ❀ ❀
कवेराद्यस्य महर्षेः वाल्मीकेः ।

पूजास्थानं पुनस्तस्य ॥

18. See my *Rāmāyaṇa in Greater India*, S. G. University, Surat, 1975, pp. 40-49.

It is clear from all this that the text of Vālmiki was known in South-East Asia with the *Bāla* and *Uttara Kāṇḍas*. In the Tibetan version also, there is a near-quotation from Vālmiki's text from the *Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍa*, the strong words of Rāma to the indolent and forgetful Sugrīva¹⁹.

The story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Sanskrit literature does not stop with Vālmiki's work and the poems and plays based on it. In the wake of the rise of different schools of philosophy and religion and the growth of *Bhakti* towards Rāma as God, a class of works rose bearing the name *Rāmāyaṇa* and dealing with Rāma as Godhead and oriented to the treatment of the story and the character of Rāma and Sitā to different philosophical and religious approaches. The earliest of these seems to be the voluminous *Bhuṣuṇḍi Rāmāyaṇa*, of which the first book has just been edited by Dr. Bhagavat Prasad Singh,²⁰ to which I have contributed an Introduction in English where I have examined the special character of the text and discussed its date. The *Bhuṣuṇḍi R.* assimilates the personality of Rāma to that of Kṛṣṇa, introduces *Madhura Bhakti* and makes a 'Bhāgavata' of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with Vraja, Gopis, etc. The *Bhuṣuṇḍi R.* is one of the sources of Tulaṣidasa. Next comes the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa* of the time of Rāmānanda and is a philosophical version of Vālmiki, written on the background of the Smārta Advaita tradition synthesised with Rāmabhakti, bringing Śiva also into the tradition of Rāma-bhakti. It is the best known of the Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇas* other than Vālmiki's. The *Adbhuta Rāmāyaṇa* is a short text in about 1,000 verses which glorifies Sitā identifying her with Śakti and Durgā and narrates her exploit of killing the hundred-headed Rāvaṇa before whom Rāma could not do anything. The *Adbhuta* gives also its own story of how Sitā became a daughter of Rāvaṇa. The fourth, the long *Ānanda Rāmāyaṇa*, is far more interesting in its numerous stories, particularly of Rāma as Ruler and records several of them that are current in religious discourses and performances of *Kīrtana* and *Kathā*. It notices divergent traditions on the same episode and tries to explain them. It is a late production of probably the age of Mahrata rule in South India. Manuscripts of it are

19. *Ibid.* pp. 13, 17.

20. Visvavidyalaya Prakasan, Varanasi, 1975.

rare.²¹ On the *Adhyātma*, *Adbhuta* and *Ānanda Rāmāyaṇas*, I have delivered lectures at the Bombay University, which are being printed.

These are just four in a large corpus of texts glorifying Rāma and incidentally narrating their own versions of the Rāma story. A version still in manuscript is the *Rāmāyaṇa* of the nether world, the *Mai Rāvaṇa caritra* or *Ahi-Mahi Rāvaṇa caritra* and Hanumān killing them. This story has its own significance as it had gone South-East Asia, and is included especially in the *Thai Rāmāyaṇa*. The *Bhuṣuṇḍi Rāmāyaṇa* mentions the following texts, and authors of works on Rāma and his story : *Rāmānukriḍā* perhaps on the boyhood sports of Rāma on the model of those of Kṛṣṇa, the *Rāmāyaṇas*, spoken by Hayagrīva, and *Samhītās* associated with Śuka, Śeṣa, Sītā, Parikṣīt, Pṛthivi, Lakṣmaṇa, Hanumān and Agastya. The Editor of the Bhuṣuṇḍi R. adds the texts *Śiva-samhitā*, *Lomaśasamhitā*, *Sadāśivasamhitā*, *Satyopakhyāna*, *Bṛhat-kosalakhaṇḍa* and a few others. The *Ānaṇḍa Rāmāyaṇa* also mentions at the end *Rāmāyaṇas* associated with Nārada, Bharata, Śvetaketu, Jatāyus, Devī, Guhyaka, Pulastī, Viśvāmitra, Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa, as also a text called *Ātmadharmā*. The list of manuscripts in the library, which once existed in Banaras, of Kavindrācārya Sarasvatī, one of those who held dialogues with Shah Jehan and Dara Shikuh, contains a list of 21 *Rāmāyaṇas*.²² the new names here are *Agniveśya R.*, *Mṛkaṇḍu R.*, *Āgama R.*, *Karma R.*, *Skanda R.*, *Aruṇa R.* and *Dharma R.* (probably the *Ātmadharmā* mentioned in the *Ānanda R.*). Some of these are short texts, e. g. *Agniveśya* which is available and deals with the chronology of the events of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and hence is called also *Samayanirūpaṇa Rāmāyaṇa*. In manuscript, there is also a work called *Citrakūṭamāhātmya*. The *Agastyasamhitā*, which is available, and is a dialogue between Agastya and Sutikṣṇa, deals with Rāma-worship along with some narrative.²³

21. It is published by Gopal Narayan & Co., Bombay. 2nd edn. 1926.

22. See GOS. XVII. 1921, pp. 23-4.

23. See my description of it in the *Adyar Library Bulletin*, Madras, I. 3 (1937) pp. 93-4.

A precious compilation which brings together the different story traditions and the esoteric meanings of incidents of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which should be mentioned in this connection, is the *Tattvasaṁgraharāmāyaṇa* which is in manuscripts and of which I have published an account and analysis in English.²⁴ Its author flourished in the 18th Cent. and belonged to a group of Advaitic Sannyāsins devoted to Rāma, led by Upaniṣadbrahmendra alias Rāmacandrendra Sarasvatī of Kanchi who wrote a number of works relating to Rāma, poems, songs, commentaries and expository treatises. Rāmabrahmendra himself wrote another work called *Rāmāyaṇa-tattva-darpaṇa* on Rāma being the Supreme Being and on *Rāmāyaṇa* being an embodiment of the *Gāyatrī*, following Vidyāraṇya's tract on the same subject called the *Rāmāyaṇa-rahasya*.²⁵ In the North the Vaghela King Viśvanāthasimha of Reva of the 19th Century similarly contributed a number of works, poems, commentaries, compilations on Rāma and Rāma-bhakti, a commentary on *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, *Rāmacandrāhnika*, *Rāmagītātikā*, *Saṅgīta-Raghunandana* etc. Much of this literature remains to be salvaged, worked upon and published. The *Rāmāyaṇa* literature is endless, *Rāmāyaṇam anantakam* as the *Bhūṣuṇḍī Rāmāyaṇa* says. As Tulasī said 'There is no counting of the *Rāmākathā* in this world' '*Rāmākathā kai miti jaga nāhi*. [1.32(3)]. The boundaries of the sway of this Rāma literature expands to the whole of Asia. Let this our Second International Conference on the *Rāmāyaṇa* be a contribution to the understanding and appreciation of this endless literature of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

24. Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras, X. i (1952-3) pp. 1-55; published elsewhere in this volume

25. Printed at Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.

BODHI AND VIṢṆUPADA IN N. W. INDIA AND TOPONYMIC DUPLICATION

The dust of one's own native soil, one's birth-place, one's mother-land, never leaves one's feet, however far, across land and even sea, one might migrate in quest of life, employment or adventure. The dust clings even to the disappointed and unemployed person who heaves in despair "I shall shake the dust of this place off my feet". The moment success attends him in his new habitation, he begins to ponder over with a warmth his original home; a nostalgia spreads over him, and he seeks some consolation by recreating his original home in the new milieu. The adventurous conqueror re-erects in his new territorial find, his proud native-land, and as a standing symbol of his superiority and gain re-names his new place after his own old home. With the migration and colonisation of peoples, there takes place thus a migration and colonisation of place-names also: If a Tanjorean in Madras feels like calling his bungalow 'Cauvery Baug', he is doing the same most natural thing which the authors of the names New York and New South Wales did.

The history of place-names in several parts of this vast country of India is full of instances of this toponymic migration, forming as it does a valuable aid to trace the history and fortunes of different peoples and their political power and cultural expansion. Tiruvālaṅgāḍu near Arakonam in the Chittore District and Tiruvālaṅgāḍu near Kumbhakonam in the Tanjore District is a case of topographical homonymy carrying in its womb the history of how during the reign of the Tanjore chiefs, in the 17th cent. A. D., the distinguished scholar Gaṅgādhara Vājapeyin of the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu in the northern district became at the instance of the southern prince, the donee of the Cauvery village of the same name. A perusal of Cola history and Cola inscriptions reveals to us the existence within south India of tracts of country and their chiefs called after the well-known north Indian territory and dynasty names. The Mazhavas and their Mazayarnāḍu (Uḍayārpālāyam) are known as Mālava. There was a Cedimaṅḍalam on

the banks of the Pennār, covering "the hilly area round about Tirukkoyilūr, Kiliyūr etc."¹, and its chiefs were called Cedirāyas. Similarly the country ruled over by the Bāṇas, the Naḍunāḍu, was called Magadhaimaṇḍalam, and it covered portions from Tiruppātiripuliyūr to Salem; and the former town, Tiruppātiripuliyūr, was actually called also Pāṭali- (Pātiri in Tamil) puttira after the renowned capital of the Magadha country in east India. When the Indian people went out of the country by land and sea and built the kingdoms of their Greater India, they called them Kāmboja and Campā. Close to Sumatra is an island called Madura. Says Col. G. E. Gerini in his valuable work "Researches on Ptolemy's Geography of Eastern Asia,"² p. 121 : "One should not be in the least surprised at finding so many Sanskrit names of peoples, regions, and cities transported here from India, especially from its northern part, and often distributed in a similar topographical order as they originally occurred there. This latter circumstance is particularly interesting, and constitutes perhaps the most striking example of what we may be permitted to term toponymic mimicry that we know of. Already we have noticed the homology in the distribution and relative location of geographical names, between the coast of Arakan and the western seaboard of India at similar latitudes. * * * The same imitation is carried on with some degree of accuracy in so far as the relative positions of the topographical names are concerned, from the Gulf of Martaban across to Lāos and the greater part of northern Indo-China. In fact, while we have here a second Mālwa and another Daśārṇa, representing respectively western and eastern Laos, as already noticed, we find, further north in Yünnan a second Gandhara, as well as Mithila and Videha or Videhā, a Campā in the east (Annam) and a Malaya in the south (Malay Peninsula). * * * * while its (Indo-China) southern divisions, including Malay Peninsula, were called after similarly located regions of South of India. Such coincidences are due to the fact that a double stream of emigrants from India flowed into Indo-China at a very

-
1. For Cedimāṇḍala and Cedirāyas, see Prof. K. A. Nilakantha Sāstrī, *Colas*, II, pp. 70 fn. 200, 202, 775. This tract was also known as Malāḍu; see *Colas*, I, pp. 53, 401.
 2. *Royal Asiatic Society Monographs No. 1. London, 1909.*

early period. * * * * the other coming from the south, reached Indo-China by sea and its influence extended mainly over the Malay Peninsula, Siam, Kamboja and Southern Annam”.

The idea of ‘Greater’ in the expression “Greater India” was expressed in ancient India by the Sanskrit word ‘Mahā—’ (Mahat-great), as for example, Mahākosala. A new adjoining territory thus comes to have the same name with the addition of the word ‘Mahat’, when there is an expansion of the people. Sometimes, owing to the pressure of a stronger power from one direction, there is a shift in the territory, as in the case of the Karṇāṭa that has fallen from Kalyāṇ in course of time to Mysore. Sometimes peoples transport themselves or shift too far, and thus even distant countries come to have the same name.

Leaving for the present the north Indian names which have migrated to south India, we can see that in north India itself this process called by Gerini ‘toponymic mimicry’ had its play. Recently, I came across an information in the Rāmāyaṇa which would be a good illustration of the process of toponymic duplication. The North-West of India is of great significance to anybody who values Indian culture. Pāṇini, the great Sanskrit grammarian hailed from Śālātura in this region.³ The north-western countries of Gāndhāra or Gandharva,⁴ Kekaya and Madra played important parts in the epics; from Kekaya came queen Kaikeyi who got Rāma banished; Gāndhāra and Madra contributed the queens Gāndhāri and Mādri to the Mahābhārata. The Sindhu-Sauviras, the Āraṭṭas and Bāhlikas belonged to this part of India. In the Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa we find, in cantos 100-101, Bharata, and his two sons Takṣa and Puṣkala, with the help of Bharata’s uncle Aśvapati Kekaya Yudhājī, conquer the Gāndhāra country or Gāndharva-viṣaya, and the two sons of Bharata establish themselves at Takṣaśīlā and Puṣkalāvata.⁵ The Kekaya and Gāndhāra were contiguous countries. In the Ayodhyākāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa, soon after the

3. For its location, see map IV. facing p. 54 of Cunningham’s Ancient Geography of India, edited with Introduction and Notes by S. N. Majumdar Sastri, Calcutta, 1924.

4. Strabo’s Gandaritis; Ptolemy’s Gandaroe.

5. Greek; Peukelaotis or Peucolaītis.

demise of Daśaratha, we have a description of Vasiṣṭha's messengers going from Ayodhyā to the Kekaya country to fetch Bharata who was staying with his uncle Yudhājit. The messengers go west, reach Hastināpura, cross the Ganges, traverse the countries Pāñcāla and Kurujāṅgala, cross the Sarasvatī at Kurukṣetra, and then cross another river Śaradaṅḍā. The next noteworthy landmark mentioned as lying on their way is a Tree called Satyopayācana with a Caitya at its foot. They enter Triliṅga⁶ then and then cross Ajakūla. The messengers then come to a place which is thus described in the different recensions :

बौद्धानां नगरं ययुः । N. W. Recension, II. 74.14.

बोधीनां नगरं ययुः । Gorresio's edn. II. 72.14.

ते बोधिभवनाच्च्युताः । Kumbhakonam edn. II. 68.17.

The messengers then cross the Śataḍru, the Bāhlika country and the Sudāsa country (Gorresio) or the Sudāman mountain (Kumbhakonam). Then they see what is uniformly found in all the editions as Viṣṇupāda.

विष्णोः पदं प्रेक्षमाणाः ।

After seeing this, they arrive at the Kekaya capital which is called in all the editions Girivraja.

गिरिव्रजं पुरवरम् ।

It is interesting to note that the huge trees, Vanaspatis, served as landmarks and objects of worship on the way. We have here a tree with a temple-structure at its foot, Caitya, which the messengers bow to.

समूलचैत्यमासाद्य वृक्षं सत्योपयाचनम् ।

अभिगम्य प्रणम्यैनम् । Gorresio and N. W.

सकूलवृक्षमासाद्य दिव्यं सत्योपयाचनम् । Kumbh.

From its descriptive name, Satyopayācana, we gather that travellers prayed to it and had their requests fulfilled by its divine qualities. A better known instance of such a tree occurs in the same

6. According to the different recensions of the Rāmāyaṇa, there are some slight differences in the place-names mentioned here. Thus Triliṅga in the N. W. recension occurs as Bhūliṅga in Gorresio's edition and Kuliṅga in the southern text.

Ayodhyākāṇḍa, the Banian known as Śyāma on the southern bank of the Jumna which the exiled brothers and Sītā pass by, and to which Sītā prays that they might carry out their vow of forest life and return safely.⁷ This Tree Satyopayācana was however not the only celebrated holy Tree on the way of the messengers; there was another, a Holy Peepul, or a group of them, Bodhinām nagaram or Bodhibhavanam, as the Rāmāyaṇa says, which we shall now consider.

The above-noted description of the journey of the messengers to Kekaya speaks of three places in the North-west of India, Bodhi, Viṣṇupāda and Girivraja, names which at once remind us of the east of India, of Bihar, of what was known as Magadha, the home of the Buddha and the country of the Mauryas. It is well-known that the capital of this eastern Magadha, Rājagṛha, had the other name Girivraja also. Bodhi and Viṣṇupāda are also well-known sites in Gayā. How do these names appear in the west of India? The explanation is the same toponymic process which we noticed at the opening of this article. The Bodhi or Aśvatṭha, the Holy Peepul, is a tree as much sacred to Brahminism, as to Buddhism, its sanctity going to the Vedic times. The Bodhi and Viṣṇupāda must have been two places sacred to Brāhmins in the North-west of India and these names of sacred places must have been taken by the people with them when they migrated from the west to the east, when expansion took place from the land of the Sindhu to that of the Ganges. Neither in Cunningham's Mahābodhi nor in R. L. Mitra's Buddha Gayā do we find any reference to a Bodhi, a Viṣṇupāda and a Girivraja in the N. W. of India. The latter, R. L. Mitra says that the Brahminical glorification and importance of sites at Gayā is a post-Buddhistic creation. But it is possible that even in Buddha's time there were in the east holy sites like Bodhi and Viṣṇupāda⁸ and these were not only pre-Buddha, but Brāhminical and really duplicated from the N. W. of India. That there was already in the time of Buddha a Holy Peepal tree one and half miles south east of Puruṣapura (Peshawar) is known from Cunningham's account in his Ancient Indian Geography (p. 91).

7. Ayodhyā 55, 23-25.

8. It is already well-known places of sanctity that a new prophet will naturally go to.

This Peepul was 100 ft. in height and the Buddha is said to have visited it. As for a Viṣṇupāda in the N. W. of India, we know that the Iron Pillar at Meharauli near Delhi on which we have the inscription of a king named Candra, whom Dr. R. C. Majumdar has recently identified on the basis of a Kotanese inscription as Kanīṣka⁹ mentions a hill named Viṣṇupāda on which the pillar originally stood.¹⁰ It is noteworthy that in the first verse of this inscription the king is said to have defeated first the Vaṅgas, then crossed the Sindhu and conquered the Vāhlikas. Regarding the Girivraja, capital of the Kekayas in the N. W., it is identified by Cunningham with Girjāk or the modern Jalālpur on the Jhelum.¹¹

All this would mean that Magadha in the east was a colony of the Magadha in the north-west, and that the Magadhan Capital Girivraja in the east was an off-shoot of the Kekayan capital Girivraja in the N. W. There is nothing unnatural in such a supposition when we find that the territory known as Gurajat was originally in the Punjab, and in Yuan Chwang's time was found to occupy a part of Rajputana.¹² The word Māgadha means a musician-minstrel, and the Gāndhāra country which gave us the musicians, Gandharvas, and this Magadha of Māgadhas might have been once contiguous territories. In Atharvaveda V. 22.14, fever is wished away to the regions of Gāndhāris, Mūjavants Aṅgas and Magadhas. From this and other Vedic references, orientologists generally assume¹³ that Magadha in the east, like Aṅga, Vaṅga with which Magadha is once mentioned as Vaṅga-

9. Candra, it is said, is the Sanskrit name which Kanīṣka assumed according to the Kotanese inscription. See R. C. Majumdar, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bengal*, IX. i. 1943.

10. See Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, pp. 139-142.

11. See Cunningham, *Arch. Survey*, II. Simla, 1871, p. 14. See map VI facing p. 120 of Cunningham's *Ancient Indian Geography*. It is strange that in the *Arch. Survey Memoir* (No. 58) by Dr. B. C. Law on Rājagṛha in *Ancient Literature*, there is no reference to a Girivraja in the N. W.

12. See map VI facing p. 120 and Notes p. 685, Cunningham's *Anc. Ind. Geo.* as also map facing p. 106, *Antiquities of Cambā State* by Vogel, pt. 1.

13. See *Vedic Index*, Macdonell and Keith, pt. II. pp. 116-7.

Magadha, and Videha were fresh Āryan colonies in the east, not yet sufficiently made orthodox, still populated with non-Āryans and hence held in disrepute during later Vedic times. To be held in disrepute in later Vedic times, a country may also very well be a region in the N. W., which some groups of the settlers had left for an eastern region either owing to the intrusion of aliens there¹⁴ or owing to the persistence there of unlivable conditions like the fever of Atharvaveda V. 22.14. A reference to an older habitat and its well-known name is more natural. Mūjavant is the place where Soma grew. The mention of these with Gāndhāra would indicate a north-western provenance for Magadha also. Even the Vaṅga in the compound Vaṅga-Magadha need not mean an eastern Vaṅga; for the Meharauli Pillar inscription speaks of a Vaṅga along with the Indus and the Vāhlikas. In the Ṛgveda, Magadha is not mentioned, but Kikaṭa is mentioned, and Kikaṭa is generally taken as Magadha. Is Kikaṭa then Kekaya? Are the eastern Magadha, and its Bodhi, Viṣṇupāda and Girivraja replicas of those in the N. W. Kekaya, brought to the east by the colonists?

14. Such a state when its people have fallen off from their customs is implied in the abuse which Karṇa pours on this country of Śalya, the Madras, as also on the neighbouring Gāndhāra and Vāhlika regions, in the Karṇa parvan of the Mahābhārata.

BUDDHOLOGICAL TEXT AND THE EPICS

Ever since the *Buddhacarita* of Aśvaghōṣa was first published, the influence of the epic *Rāmāyaṇa* on this Buddhist poet has been noted and also expatiated upon, e.g., by Cowell¹, Walter² Gawronski, Gurner,³ and Johnston.⁴ With reference to the description by Aśvaghōṣa (Canto V) of the Scene in the harem at night when the Prince was finally leaving it, a description which has palpable echoes of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Book V, where Vālmiki describes Hanumān seeing Rāvaṇa's harem at night, Johnston doubts Gurner's statement that Aśvaghōṣa knew all the three passages where this description occurs in Book V of Vālmiki's epic, i.e., cantos 9 and 11 besides 10. There is however no doubt that Aśvaghōṣa knew all the three passages; the picture of a big lotus-pond with its lotuses closed at night which Vālmiki aptly uses as comparison for the sleeping harem in both 9 and 11 (verses 36, 33),⁵ is repeated by Aśvaghōṣa with a slight variation in V. 62 :

सरसः सदृशं बभार रूपं पवनावर्जितरुग्णपुष्करस्य ।

To note some other examples of Vālmiki's influence : One of the well-known lines of Vālmiki in which he brings out the insatiable love of King Daśaratha for his son Rāma is *Rāmāyaṇa* II. 3.29:

1. *Buddhacarita*, Oxford, 1893, Introduction, p. xi.
2. See references in Johnston's Translation of the *Buddhacarita* (*Acts of Buddha*) Lahore, 1936, Introduction, p. xlviii.
3. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1927, pp. 347-368.
4. See footnote 2.
5. The main reference to the *Rāmāyaṇa* text in this paper are, as in Gurner's paper, to the text printed in the Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay; but I have made comparative citations from the other two recensions also, the Eastern published by Gorresio and the Northwestern published from Lahore. As I pointed out before (See my *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*, Ś. K. Chatterji Volume of *Indian Linguistics*, p. 317), there are more Southern text readings which are nearer to the older ones.

न ततर्ष समायान्तं पश्यमानो नराधिपः; Aśvaghōṣa could hardly forget this line; for he says of those men and women who gazed and gazed upon the Buddha :

तं देवकल्पं नरदेवसूनुं निरीक्षमाणा न ततर्षं दृष्टिः ।

Bud. Car. X. 7

And as Rāma entered the Daṇḍaka forest, the sages who looked at his fine physique, beauty, grace and the ascetic garb, which seemed to add to the charm of his personality, were struck with wonder :

रूपसंहननं लक्ष्मीं सौकुमार्यं सुवेषताम् ।

ददृशु विस्मिताकारा रामस्य वनवासिनः ॥

Rām. III. 1. 12

When the Buddha enters Rājagṛha, Aśvaghōṣa does not describe him differently :

गाम्भीर्यमोजश्च निशाम्य तस्य वपुश्च दीप्तं पुरुषानतीत्य ।

विसिस्मिये तत्र जनस्तदानीं स्थाणुन्नतस्येव वृषध्वजस्य ॥

Bud Car. X. 3

Every limb of the buddha was so perfect in proportion and beauty, that on whatever limb the eye gazed; there it was held :

भ्रुवौ ललाटं मुखमीक्षणे वा वपुः करौ वा चरणौ गतिं वा ।

यदेव यस्तस्य ददर्श तत्र तदेव तस्याथ बबन्ध चक्षुः ॥

Ibid. X. 8

This is a more elaborate statement of the *anuṣṭubh* that Vālmiki puts in the mouth of Rāvaṇa when he pours forth his infatuation for Sītā :

यद्यत्पश्यामि ते गात्रं शीतांशुसदृशानने ।

तत्र तत्र पृथुश्रोणि चक्षुर्मम निबध्यते ॥

Rām. V. 20. 15

The *Saundarananda* of Aśvaghōṣa is no less full of the echoes of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Here again, whether he is describing Śuddhodana or Siddhārtha, Aśvaghōṣa has always before him the physical moral and spiritual qualities with which Vālmiki described his Rāma, e. g.,

Saundarananda

Rāmāyaṇa

नावमेने परान्

न चावमन्ता भूतानां

II. 2

II. 1. 30

यत्र रामो भयं नात्र नास्ति तत्र पराभवः ।

II. 48. 15

वपुष्मान्

वपुष्मान् देशकालवित्

II. 4

II. 1. 18

कर्ता न च विस्मितः

वीर्यवान् न च वीर्येण महता स्वेन गर्वितः ।

II. 4

II. 1. 13

The N. W. text has विस्मितः itself.

II. 3.23

हितं विप्रियमप्युक्तो यः शुश्वाव उच्यमानोऽपि परुषं नोत्तरं प्रतिपद्यते ।

न चक्षुभे

II. 9

II. 1. 10

दुष्कृतं बह्वपि त्यक्त्वा सस्मार कथञ्चिदुपकारेण कृतेनैके न तुष्यति ।

कृतमण्वपि । न स्मरत्यपकाराणां शतमप्यात्मवत्तया ॥

II. 9

II. 1. 11

आत्मवत्तया

Cf. also II. i. 5 in Gorresio's ed.

II. 14

नोवाचाप्रियमण्वपि

सलिलेनेव चाम्भोदो वृत्तेना-

घर्माभितप्ताः पर्जन्यं ह्लादयन्तमिव प्रजाः ।

जिह्वदत्प्रजाः ।

II. 3. 29

II. 30

तेनारिरपि दुःखार्तो नात्याजि

This is a summary of the whole

शरणागतः ।

sequence of verses on *śaraṇāgata-*

II. 41

rakṣaṇa or the high virtue of affording protection to one who seeks refuge even though he be an enemy, which Rāma utters when receiving Rāvaṇa's brother Vibhī-
ṣaṇa (VI. 18. 22-34)

Saundarananda

Rāmāyaṇa

न तेनाभेदि मर्यादा कामाद्
द्वेषाद्भ्रयादपि ।
II. 42

नैव लोभान्न मोहाद्वा न ह्यज्ञानात्तमोऽन्वितः ।
सेतुं सत्यस्य भेत्स्यामि गुरोः सत्यप्रतिश्रवः ।
II. 109. 17

प्रियविप्रिययोः कृत्ये न तेना-
गामि विक्रिया ।
II 43

This ideal of *nirdvandvatā*—being
unruffled by the pairs of opposites—

is given expression to by Vālmiki
in the episode of Bharata meeting
Rāma in the Citrakūṭa; Bharata
praises Rāma's philosophic calm-
ness thus (II. 106. 2) :

को हि स्यादीदृशो लोके यादृशस्त्वमरिन्दम ।
न त्वां प्रव्यथयेद् दुःखं प्रीतिर्वा न प्रहर्षयेत् ॥
(Gorresio, II. cxiv. 27-8)

धर्मो विग्रहवानिव

II. 56

रामो विग्रहवान् धर्मः

II. 37. 13

Saundarananda XV 31-34 resemble Rāma's lecture to Bharata in *Rāmāyaṇa* II. 105. 15 ff. and would be one more evidence against Johnston's deduction that in Aśvaghoṣa's *Rāmāyaṇa* the episode of Bharata seeing Rāma in the forest did not exist.⁶

6. *Acts of the Buddha*, Introd., pp. xlix-x. Another evidence which Johnson cites to show that Aśvaghoṣa's *Rāmāyaṇa* did not have the episode of Bharata calling on Rāma (Book II) is *Bud. Car.* IX. 9, according to which Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadeva called on Rāma; Johnston calls the visit of Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadeva an 'episode', and says that the only reference in Vāmadeva going with Bharata is in *Māhābhārata* III. 15981. The conclusion drawn by Johnston is that "the entire passage recounting Bharata's visit to Rāma was not in the text the poet knew, that it had in its place an account of a *mission* [*italics mine*] headed by Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadeva with the object of inducing Rāma to return to Ayodhyā", etc. Now the evidence is too slender and the conclusion too sweeping. The *Māhābhārata* lines merely mention Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadeva among the numberless persons that went from Ayodhyā. This is mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa* also, in all its recensions. It hardly stands

Not only Aśvaghōṣa, but the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* too seems to know the episode of Bharata's visit. Among the verses here that Rāma speaks is one comparing the body to a well-built house which by passage of time, becomes dilapidated and falls :

यथागारं दृढस्थूणं जीर्णं भूत्वावसीदति ।
तथैव सीदन्ति नरा जरामृत्युवशंगताः ॥

Rām II. 105. 18

In the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, this is worked into a long sustained metaphor running into several verses, beginning with :

यथा हि पुरुषस्य भवेदगारं जीर्णं महन्तं च सुदुर्बलं च ।
विशीर्णप्रासादु तथा भवेत स्तम्भाश्च मूलेषु भवेयु पूतिकाः ॥

pp. 82 ff.⁷

बभूवासुलभैर्गुणैः

Bud. Car. II. 45.

बहवो दुर्लभाश्चैव ये त्वया कीर्तिता गुणाः ।

Rāma. I. 1.7

would show Aśvaghōṣa's knowledge of even the opening canto of the first book of the epic as it is now. "As regards the *Uttara-kāṇḍa*" (of the *Rāmāyaṇa*), says Johnston⁸, "I can find no reason to suppose that the poet [Aśvaghōṣa] knew any portion of it," But on the same page Johnston refers to *Saundarananda* I. 76 which shows Aśvaghōṣa's knowledge of Vālmiki having performed all the *saṃskāra-s* (not merely the teaching of the poem as Johnston states) for the two sons of Sitā; now, where could Aśvaghōṣa have

to reason to suppose that the chief royal preceptor and the other priests and counsellors did not go; in fact, when Bharata calls on the sage Bharadvāja, Vasiṣṭha and other priests are mentioned (II. 90. 4, 29); later again, Vasiṣṭha is mentioned (99.2); the *Bhārata* at any rate does not support the assumption of a *mission* headed by Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadeva; Aśvaghōṣa who wanted, for the sake of comparison, two elderly consellers, naturally singled out Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadeva.

7. Ed. *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, X, Kern and Nanjio, St. Petersbourg, 1912-3.

8. *Acts of the Buddha*, Introd., pp. xlix.

known of Vālmīki acting as the father, as far as the performance of all the *saṃkāra-s* are concerned, for Śītā's sons, except from the *Uttarakāṇḍa* ?

Saundarananda XI. 16.

अप्रियं हि हितं स्निग्धमस्निग्धमहितं प्रियम् ।
दुर्लभं तु प्रियहितं स्वादु पथ्यमिवौषधम् ॥

is a clear recast of the famous *Rāmāyaṇa* verse

सुलभाः पुरुषा राजन् सततं प्रियवादिनः ।
अप्रियस्य च पथ्यस्य वक्ता श्रोता च दुर्लभः ॥

which occurs twice, once as Mārīca's words to Rāvaṇa, III. 37 2, and again as Vibhīṣaṇa's words to Rāvaṇa, VI. 16.21.

Even the scrappy fragment of the *Śāriputraprakaraṇa*⁹ discloses passages where Aśvaghōṣa describes the Buddha in words used by Vālmīki for Rāma; p. 66, स पुरुषविग्रहो ब्रह्मः, cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 37.13. रामो विग्रहवान् ब्रह्मः । It is Tārā, wife of the monkey-king Vālin, who describes Rāma as the tree-like abode to which all good men resort : निवासवृक्षः साधूनाम् IV. 15 19. This expression is used by Aśvaghōṣa in the play (p. 66) with reference to the Buddha : सर्वा एव तावदेनं वासवृक्षीकुर्मः ।

It has been accepted by scholars¹⁰ that the new mythological and devotional orientation in Buddhism, the Buddha-bhakti, was an outcome of the influence of the epics and the Purāṇa-s and their Kṛṣṇa-bhakti and Rāma-bhakti. The influence of the epics and the Purāṇa-s, is therefore, not confined to Aśvaghōṣa's writings; it is common to the whole class of works, the *Lalitavistara*, the *Mahāvastu*, the *Saddharmapūṇḍarika*, etc., some of which, in part served as the source for Aśvaghōṣa. The *Lalitavistara* which calls itself a Purāṇa and the *Mahāvastu-avadāna* have parallels to

9. Lüders, *Bruchstücke budhistischer Dramen*, Berlin, 1911.

10. See Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, II, pp. 203, 230, 306; E. J. Thomas, *The Life of the Buddha as Legend and History*, pp. 10, 11, 12. Fousböll himself pointed out the Purāṇic and *Rāmāyaṇa* inspiration of the Śākya legend; Kern, *Index Buddhism*, p. 122; Kern, *SBE, Saddharmapūṇḍarika*, pp. xxv. xxviii.

the *Rāmāyaṇa* in ideas and expression as striking as those in Aśvaghōṣa's poems and play. The depiction of the Buddha as a superman, *mahāpuruṣa*, with a certain number of marks and characteristics of the body and qualities of greatness pertaining to head and heart (*lakṣaṇa-s*, *vyāñjana-s* and *anuvyañjana-s*), as also accomplishments in all the arts, sciences and pastimes, has pre-Buddhistic origins, and is adopted from the portrayal of the heroes in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*.¹¹

It is not in Aśvaghōṣa alone that the description of the harem at night is portrayed after the one in the *Rāmāyaṇa*; in the *Lalitavistara* and the *Mahāvastu* also, the description of the harem in the sleep contains echoes from Vālmiki. We see especially in *Lalitavistara*,¹² Vol. I, p. 206 : काश्चिद्वचपङ्कटवस्त्राः, काश्चिद्विधूतकेश्यः, काश्चिन्मृदङ्गमुपगृह्य¹³ परिवर्तितशीर्षशरीराः, काश्चिद्वीणावल्लक्याद्यपरिबद्धपाणयः; *Mahāvastu*,¹⁴ Vol. III, pp. 407, where a larger variety of musical instruments are mentioned, reminds us more strongly of the *Rāmāyaṇa* :

काचिद्वीणामुपगृह्य, काचित्तूणं, काचित्सुघोषकां, काचित् नकुलं, काचिद्वेणुं, काचित् महतीं, काचिद्वादिशं, काचिद्विकूटकं, काचिद् भ्रमरिकां, काचिदेकादशिकां, काचित् मृदङ्गं, काचिदालिङ्गिकां, काचित्पणवं, काचिद् दर्दुरं, काचित् परस्परस्य अंशे बाहां कृत्वा, काचिद् हनुकां गृह्य etc.

If the harem shunned by Siddhārtha reminded these Buddhologists of Rāvaṇa's harem, the army of Māra, the Satan of their theme, reminded them of the Rākṣasa-s and Rākṣasi-s described by Vālmiki as surrounding the captive Sītā in the Aśokavana—all the hideous forms, those with heads of diverse animals, some headless ones, others with more than one head, and yet other one-eyed and one-footed beings. Cf. *Lalitavistara*, p. 306; *Mahāvastu*, II, pp. 411-2; *Rāmāyaṇa*, V. 17.

In Book IV of the *Rāmāyaṇa* we have the episode of Rāma convincing the monkey-chief Sugrīva of his valour by piercing

11. Senart traced them through the epics to the Vedic literature itself. See Har Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, London, 1952, pp. 299ff.
12. Lefmann, Halle, 1902.
13. It should be उपगृह्य.
14. Senart, Paris, mdccclxxxii ff.

seven *sāla* trees with one arrow and by kicking and throwing afar with the toe, a carcass of huge weight (Canto 12). In the *Lalitavistara* and *Mahāvastu* these two exploits, along with the bending of a bow, are set forth under the general heroic accomplishments (*śilpa-prasādana*) of the prince and his companions: *Lalitavistara*, p. 145, describes the kicking and flinging afar of an elephant's carcass, and pp. 154-5, *dhanur-āropa* and *sapta-tāla-bheda*, and *Mahāvastu*, Vol. II, pp. 75-6, *hastikāya-utkṣepa* and *sapta-tāla-bheda*.

An unmistakable influence of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is seen on p. 130 of the *Lalitavistara* in the line

या श्री वैश्रवणे च वै निवसते या वा सहस्रेक्षणे

which is after the description of the opulent abode of Rāyaṇa in *Rāmāyaṇa*, V. 9. 8 :

या हि वैश्रवणे लक्ष्मीः या चेन्द्रे हरिवाहने ।

सा रावणगृहे सर्वा नित्यमेवानपायिनी ॥

In the description of qualities and personal features, the *Lalitavistara* shows echoes of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, some of which remind us of the opening canto of Book I of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the mention there of qualities in the question of Vālmiki and the answer of Nārada. This goes against the assumption of Johnston and others that the Buddhological texts do not know the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* or the beginning of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as we have it now.

Māyādevī was स्मितमुखी and पूर्वाभिलाषिणी in *Lalitavistara*, p. 26; cf. *Rām.*, II. 1. 13 पूर्वभाषी and II. 2. 40 स्मितपूर्वाभिभाषी in the description of Rāma. *Lalitavistara*, p. 106, सुविभक्तगात्रः can be compared to *Rāmāyaṇa* I. 1. 11 समविभक्ताङ्गः; सर्वसत्त्वहितसुखोद्यतः about Siddhārtha in *Lalitavistara*, p. 112 will certainly remind us of Vālmiki's question to Nārada, सर्वभूतेषु को हितः in *Rāmāyaṇa* I. 1. 3, and सर्वसत्त्वदयावतः, *Rāmāyaṇa* V. 30.6. These are only cases where an explicit parallel is seen, but there are whole passages and contexts in these works written under the general influence of the epics, and of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in particular. The early works of Buddha-bhakti assimilated the Buddha to Nārāyaṇa and expressly depicted Him in terms of Nārāyaṇa or Kṛṣṇa long before later Brahmanical writings thought of including the Buddha among the *avatāra-s*.

NOTES ON SOME MAHĀBHĀRATA COMMENTARIES

In his article on Mahābhārata Commentators in the *Annals* of the *BORI* (XVII, p. 185), Dr. V. S. Sukthankar mentions a commentator named Varada, of whom nothing more is known. Mr. P. K. Gode wrote to me that so far no MS of Varada's commentary on the *Mahābhārata* had been discovered. When I was engaged in writing a paper on *Ānandapūrṇa*, His Date and Works¹. I had occasion to examine a MS of a commentary on the *Mahābhārata* in the Adyar Library, entered both on the ticket tied to the MS and in Catalogue as that of Yajñanārāyaṇa. The examination disclosed that we had in this Adyar MS the only fragment, valuable indeed though very small, of the commentary of Varada on the *Mahābhārata*. There is just the beginning of Varada's commentary available here :—

Adyar XXX-A-29 महाभारत-व्याख्या—

चतुर्णां पुरुषार्थानां करे(र)णौ चरणौ हरेः ।
 वन्दे देवमुनीन्द्राणां शिरस्समान्यशेखरौ ॥
 भारताख्यानयशसौ गोस ।
 वन्दे मुनीश्वरौ ॥
 उपात्ते शब्दसस्यानां रसे वाल्मीकिभानुना ।
 तं पुनस्तेषु सज्जन्तं व्यासचन्द्रमसं भजे ॥
 महते भारतायास्तु देवसारात्मने नमः ।
 यस्य स्तुतौ...यां भवेदन्यच्च भारतम् ॥
 क महाभारतं काहं व्याख्यानं तस्य मे कथम् ॥
 पङ्गोर्गुरुडवेगेच्छा ममेच्छेयं च सोदरे ॥
 ऋषेरीतिव पूर्णस्य निर्गमे मार्गमिच्छतः ।
 बोध(म्बु)धेः परीवाहं को वा गाहेत भारतम् ॥
 ओष्ठेन दन्तान्(संवृत्य)तथास्यानि च पाणिभिः ॥
 हास्य .. सन्तो यद्व्याख्या(मीह) भारतम् ॥

1. Published since in the *Annals of Oriental Research*, University of Madras, Vol. IV, Pt. I, 1939-40.

तथापि महतोऽभ्यासात् प्रसादाच्च(महात्म)नाम् ।
 व्याख्यानसाहसित्वं मे भारतस्याभिरोचते ॥
 वैचित्र्यीश्वरसंक्षेपविस्तरोत्पादनेच्छया ।
 मुनिर्व्याचष्ट शिष्येभ्यो यास्ता भारतसंहिताः ॥
भेदसांकर्त्याल्लेखकानां → च → दोषतः ।
 श्लोकाः कोशेषु भिद्यन्ते तथाध्यायाश्च संख्यया ॥
 बहून्यनेकरूपाणि कोशानि प्रेक्ष्य सर्वशः ।
 व्याख्यायते वि....श्यमानात्र संहिता ॥
 भेदस्थानानि यान्यासां वक्ष्यामस्तत्र तत्र च ।
 समीचीनश्च पाठोऽस्यानेतृतात्र प्रवक्ष्यते ॥
 वरदाख्येन विदुषा व्यासभक्तेन भाषित(म्) ।
रमित्येत् व्याख्यानं वीक्ष्यतां बुधैः ॥
 मयापि भारते कश्चिदविज्ञातो..... ।
जिज्ञासा वर्तते मम सांप्रतम् ॥
 अत्र स्वबोध..... ।
कान् विवरिष्यामि कांश्चन ॥

Beyond this portion forming the preface of Varada to his commentary, the entire MS represents the commentary of Yajñanārāyaṇa. We do not know whether the prefatory verses of Vadara's gloss stop with the verse mentioning his name and the last two verses belong to his work or to that of Yajñanārāyaṇa.

The Beginning of Yajñanārāyaṇa's Commentary

MSS of Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary are available in some libraries. We can take MS No. R. 269 (a) of the Madras Triennial Catalogues which represents a MS of Yajñanārāyaṇa's Commentary from the Ādi to Āśramavāsika. On comparing this MS with the above noticed Adyar MS, we find that, at the beginning, the Madras Government Library MS (R. 269 (a) gives us a briefer version of Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary. The following is the opening of Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary from the Adyar Library; it mentions his father as Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa.

[Immediately following the Anuṣṭubh verses reproduced above]

अथ श्रुतिगतपथबहुविधात्मनाम् इतरेतरविरुद्धावभासानाम् अत्यन्ताविरुद्धतया
 गुस्वरसंप्रदाय.....अधिगतयाथात्म्यविशदतरधिषणस्य शङ्क(रनाराय?)णस्य तनुजो

यज्ञनारायणाभिधोऽहं तदुपदेशविस्तरैकमात्राधिगतशक्तिरपि स्वाशयबोधयाथार्थ्यम्) सज्जन[न]निकषोपलोषु निष्कृष्यैव परिगृहीतुकामो....भक्त्या च कांश्चिदत्रोपदेशमन्तरेणोपगन्तुमशक्यान् श्लोकान् यथाशक्ति विवारिष्यामि । प्रथमं तावदस्य संबन्धाभिधेयप्रयोजनानि श्रोतृजनप्ररोचनार्थं भगव(पारा)शय्येणाभिप्रेतं कथमनेनैव वेदार्थविवरणभूतेनाभिधीयत इति प्रतिपाद्यप्रतिपादकभावलक्षणसंबन्धः । प्रयोजनं त्विह परस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि वासुदेवे वस्थान....त् गीतासनत्सुजातमोक्षधर्ममङ्गिगीतादिषु प्रदेशेषु भगवता कृष्णद्वैपायनस्यायमेवाभिप्राय इति विज्ञायते । अथान्यत्र भारता....कुरुपाण्डवादिदेव....जनमरणाभ्युदयव्यसनवर्णनमिह संसारे वैराग्यप्रतिपादनार्थमेव भगवता कृतमिति विद्वद्भिर्मन्तव्यम् । इतिवृत्तमित्यर्थंभूतं विशिष्टवृत्तमिति यावत् । पुराण...सर्गादिभिः पुराणलक्षणैः पञ्चभिः युक्तत्वात् महाभारतमपि पुराणमितिहासश्च । अयमर्थ इति नरेन्द्रादीनां वृत्तेषु प्रकारान्तर....कासयति एवं वृत्तस यतीति इतिहासः । ब्राह्मी वेदप्रभवां वेदमूलामिति यावत् । आद्यमित्यादिभिः त्रिभिः श्लोकैः ग्रन्थारम्भे कर्तव्येष्टदेवतानमस्कारः । क्रयते । एवंविधं हरिं नमस्कृत्य व्यासमतं प्रवक्ष्यामीत्यन्वयः । आद्यं प्रधानम् । पुरुषं पुरि शरीरे शयानं, सर्वं पुरयन्तं वा । ईशानमोषितव्येषु ऐश्वर्यं प्रयुञ्जानमिति यावत् । पुरुहूतं पुरुभिर्महद्भिः यज्ञादावाहृतम् । पुरुष्टुतं....ऋषिभिः स्तुतम् । एकाक्षरं, एकं च अक्षरम् । व्यक्ताव्यक्तश्चेति । प्रकाशभूतो योगिनामव्यक्तोऽयोगिनाम् । अथवा इन्द्रियादिगोचरं वस्तु व्यक्तं, इन्द्रियागोचरमव्यक्तम्, इन्द्रियमेवमुभयात्ककम् । सनातनं चिरन्तनमिति यावत् । असच्च सच्चैव च यत् । असच्च कार्यजातं विनाशित्वात्, तस्य सत् परमकारणं देशकालायन....न्नत्वात् तस्य विश्व.....उपासकस्य दुःखं हरतीति हरिः । एवंभूतं नारायणं नमस्कृत्य व्यासस्य मतं वक्ष्यामीति [वक्ष्यामीति] वाक्यार्थः ।

See Madras Govt. MS. R. 269 (a) which begins only here. No. R. 1792 is another MS of Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary from Ādi to Śānti, in the same Madras Govt. Library, but that also, like R. 269 (a), presents a briefer version.

The next section of the commentary in the Adyar MS is also more elaborate than it is in R. 269 (a) and 1972.

सूतस्य इष्टदेवतानमस्कारेणाभिन्नः स च ग्रन्थस्य....ख्य प्र....श्वतो न प्रयुज्यते प्रवेशप्रायेण तदुभयं न संभवेत् । ततस्तन्त्रेण कर्तव्यमिति....त....नमस्करोति भगवान् व्यासः । एवंकरणे प्रयोजनं च.....अलङ्कृतमित्यादि श्लोकस्य पूर्वेणान्वयः 'पूर्णे हिमवतः पादे' इत्यादिरूपः समीचीनः पाठः । अनेन च महाभारतनिर्माणस्य कालो देशश्च कथ्यते !.....

वेदव्यासं नमस्कृत्य कृष्णं रामं जनार्दनम् ।

नारसिंहं च संस्मृत्य प्रवक्ष्यामि यथामति ॥

व्यासस्य मतानुसारेण महाभारतटीकामिति । यथा निष्प्रभेऽस्मिन् निरालोके etc. See Madras R. 269 (a).

The end of the Ādi in the Adyar MS (1. 29 a), corresponds to that in Madras R. 291 (a); the beginning and end of Sabhā in the Adyar MS (11. 29 a and 34 a) correspond to those in the Tanjore MS 8658 (New Des. Cat.), a MS of Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary on the Sabhā.

The Beginning of Ānandapūrṇa's Commentary

In the Tanjore New Descriptive Catalogues, we find under No. 8657 (in Vol. XV.), the description of a MS of a commentary on the M. Bhā. mentioned as *Yajñanārāyaṇa's*. The colophon shows that the MS extends up to the end of the Āraṇyaparvan, and it gives Yajñanārāyaṇa as the author of the commentary. A comparison here with the Adyar MS of Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary shows that the two MSS agree so far as the Āraṇya's end is concerned. But, it can be seen from comparing the beginning portion of the texts in the Adyar and the Tanjore MSS, that while the latter part of the Tanjore MS does represent Yajñanārāyaṇa's commentary, the former part does not. The former portion of the Tanjore MS represents the commentary of another writer whom we shall identify now.

Tanjore 8657 opens with six prefatory verses : 1. a Mālinī invoking Kṛṣṇa; 2. a Śārdūlavikrīḍita on Sarasvatī; 3. another verse in the same metre on the author; 4-5. two Anuṣṭubhs on the M. Bhā. and Vyāsa and 6. a Sragdharā mentioning a king in whose time the author wrote this commentary on the M. Bhā. This last important verse runs in the last line :

तस्मिन् श्रीकामदेवेः.....विजयते भारतार्थप्रकाशः ।

I would now invite attention to my article on the Date and Works of Ānandapūrṇa, in which, I have shown, on p. 2, that Ānandapūrṇa wrote under king Kāmadeva, the Kadamba king, the father-in-law of king Harihara II of Vijaynagar and whom, on epigraphical evidence, I placed at about A. D. 1360. That the Kāmadeva mentioned in the Tanjore MS of a M. Bhā. Vyākhyā is identical with the Kāmadeva mentioned by Ānandapūrṇa at the end of his *Prakriyāmañjarī* can be verified by another circumstance. The second verse in the Tanjore MS. 8657, जिह्वारङ्गतले मृगाङ्ककलया etc. on Sarasvatī is the same as the third introductory verse in Ānandapūrṇa's commentary on the *Brahmasiddhi*. See Madras Trien. Cat. No. R. 3967. Thus we have in the former part of the Tanjore MS

8657: the beginning portion of Ānandapūra's commentary on the *Mahābhārata*.

Some other works of Ānandapūrṇa

The third verse in the Tanjore No. 8657 is important for its information on the other works of the author; it runs :

येनाखण्डि कुतर्कपद्धतिरहो श्रीतर्कभाषासिना
येनाकारि विलोड्य युक्तिबहुलं टीकाद्वयी दर्पणम् ।
यस्य प्राङ्गणरङ्गरञ्जिततले शास्त्राणि नृत्यन्त्यलं
सोऽहं भारतसागरार्थनिचयं लोकस्य वक्तुं यते ॥

In the first two lines here, Ānandapūrṇa mentions a work of dialectic and two commentaries on a single treatise called *Darpaṇa*. While we are not able to say anything definitely about the work mentioned in the first line, we can say that the two glosses on a *Darpaṇa* mentioned in the second line are additions to our knowledge of this writer's works most of which have been noticed by me in the article on Ānandapūrṇa previously referred to.

In the *Des. Catalogues of the Palace and Curator's Libraries at Trivandrum*, there are two MSS of a commentary on the *Bhāgavata*, called *Bodhasudhā*, by a Vidyāsāgara Munindra who is, in all likelihood, Ānandapūrṇa : Palace Library Des. Cat. Vol. I, No. 196, Skandhas 10 and 11 and Curator's Library Des. Cat. Vol. I. No. 181, Sk. 10 and 11.

Under No. R. 3323, the *Madras Trien. Catalogues* describe a commentary on the *Mahābhārata*, the last colophon in which gives the author as Mahānandapūrṇa and the name of the commentary as *Vyākhyāratnāvalī*¹ which is also the name of Ānandapūrṇa Vidyāsāgara's commentary on the M. Bhā. Confusion is likely here, but I find on comparing the text of Mahānandapūrṇa's commentary with that of Ānandapūrṇa's that the two are different, though the former text seems to follow the latter.

1. The commentary on the Pauloma is called here *Kṛṣṇagītā* and that on the Āstika, *Viṣamapadīpikā*. For another ms. of the Pauloma portion, called *Kṛṣṇagītā*, see Des. Cat. *Trivandrum Curator's Library*, Vol. 1, No. 150. For another perplexing reference to *Kṛṣṇagītā*, see *Tanjore New Des. Cat.* No. 9098, a commentary on the M. Bhā.

PAÑCA-MAHĀ-ŚABDA

One was hearing of the *Pañca-mahā-śabda*, off and on, from the time of almost the earliest stage of Sanskrit research. After the early notices and surmises, a controversy went about its real significance and two divergent views were put forth by scholars. The last that was heard of it was in 1933.

In a paper on three copper plate grants from Ujjayani, read before the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Dec. 1824; see *Misc. Essays*, III. p. 267; *Transac. RAS.* I. 1827, 232) Colebrooke noted this epithet¹ given in the first plate to Lakṣmīvarmadeva of Dhārā (1137 A.D.), translated as the 'five great titles' and observed in the footnote that he was not entirely confident of the meaning of this passage.

In JAOS VI. (May 1860) Hall published three Sanskrit inscriptions in the first of which two Mahāsāmantas are conferred this distinction by the Sovereign; Hall translated the expression as five great titles and added somewhat copious suggestions in the footnote, in the form of several pentads of concepts : five Kalyāṇa-śabdās mentioned in *Baudhāyana Kalpa Sūtra—puṇyāha, svasti, ṛddhi, śrī, kalyāṇa*; the five epithets, *mahāyaśasvin, mahāpratāpin, mahādānin, mahādayālu, mahāprabhu* which is a mere conjecture; the five forms of sovereignty or royal power mentioned in the Vedic literature—*sāmrajya, bhujya, svārājya, vairājya, pārameṣṭhya*; the five royal titles found in inscriptions *paramabhaṭṭāraka, mahārāja, adhirāja, parameśvara, paramamāheśvara* (?)² An interesting parallel was also pointed by Hall from Byzantine annals where princes of the blood assumed exactly five titles : *despot, Sebastocrator, caesar, penhypersebastos, protesebatos*.³

The *Worterbuch* (1868) was the first to notice the reference in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and show with an authority that the expression

1. *Samadhigata-pañca-mahāśabdālaṅkāra-virājamāna*—p. 266, with Hall's notes. See also *JASB.* 1158 p. 226 fn. *Misc. Essays*, III, 1873 edn; older edn. p. 303. See also *Wilson As. Res.* XV. 508.
2. See *JASB.* 1858, p. 226 fn.
3. See *Gibbon*, liii.

mahāśabda referred to (five) offices under Sovereign conferred by him on subordinate rulers. Monier-Williams' Dictionary later reproduced this reference and meaning.

From 1869, a controversy started, scholars trying to prove on the basis of further and clearer statements in the epigraphs, and on the basis of the *RT.*, two different meanings.

In 1869, while editing an inscription of Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Mahamvanirāja found in the Amarnath temple and dated in A.D. 860 Bhau Daji translated this epithet⁴ given to the King as "the five great *insignia* of Royalty" (*JBBRAS* IX. p. 219). In the same volume of the *JBBRAS* (1870. p. 307), while dealing with some Kadamba inscriptions, Fleet translated the epithet into one who had "attained the five great *śabdās*" and added in the footnote that the five great *Śabdās* were "probably the *pañcamahāmantra* of the Jains" representing "the five degrees of *Arhat, Siddha, Ācārya, Upādhyāya* and *Sarvasādhu*", but that he could not verify this. Shortly afterwards (April 1871, *JBBRAS* X. pp. 25, 29), R. G. Bhandarkar, while editing a copper plate dated A.D. 495 of the King Praśāntarāga Dada of the Gūrjara dynasty of Broach, translated this epithet⁵ applied to the donor-king as one who had "obtained the five great sounds", but offered no further explanation of the term. In *JBBRAS* again (p. 167 ff., March 1874), Fleet, while dealing with the Raṭṭa Chieftains of Saundatti and Belgaum rendered it merely as the five great *Śabdās*, but in the footnote drew attention to the Dictionary of Monier-Williams (1872) where, on the basis of the *RT.* the expression was interpreted as referring to five titles of honour beginning with the word *mahā, mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, mahārāja*,⁶ etc.

The venue of the discussion then shifted to the *Indian Antiquary*, and in Vol. I. *IA.* (March 1872) while editing a Calukya grant of 1083 AD., S. P. Pandit touched upon this epithet⁷ applied

4. *Samadhigata-aśeṣa-pañcamahāśabda-mahāmaṇḍaleśvar-ādi.*
5. *Samadhigata-pañcamahārājādhirāja.*
6. Fleet evidently did not refer to *RT.* and reproduced these titles from inscriptions; for, the five titles spoken of in *RT.* are different.
7. *Samadhigata-pañcamahāśabdaḥ.*

to the donor here; he specified the sound further as 'certain musical instruments' but preferred the last mentioned view that the epithet referred to five titles. In *IA*. IV (June 1875), Fleet, in the course of his edition of some Sanskrit and old Canarese inscriptions, expressed himself again in favour of this meaning. In the same volume of *IA* (April 1875, p. 106 fn.), Bühler had subscribed to this view.⁸

As against this, Sir Walter Elliot, writing on the *Noubat* (*IA*. V. Aug. 1876, pp. 251-2), referred to the custom recorded by Ferishtah (Briggs II, pp. 299; III. 323) of playing *noubat* or band music five times daily at stated hours. Elliot referred also to Chanda's *Pr̥thvirāj Rāsau* which spoke of when describing Padam Sing, music playing five times a day', and related the expression *pañca-mahāśabda* to this practice. F. S. Growse took up the discussion in the same volume of *IA*. (V. Dec. 1876, pp. 354-55); after pointing out that the references cited by Elliot were not clear and that *noubat* meant 'a turn' or 'time for change of guard', he drew attention to the survival of the old *pañcamahāśabda* as 'five musical sounds' in modern Braj literature as *pañcaśabda*, in descriptions of festivities etc. He quoted also from Tulasī's *Rāmacaritamānasa* (Bk. I.), from the description of the wedding of Rāma—'*pañca-śabda-dhuni-maṅgala-gūnā*' where the commentary gave the five as the music instruments *tantrī*, *tāl*, *jāñjh*, *nakara* and *trumpet*. According to him, the epithet '*samadhigata-pañca-mahāśabda*' as applied to a king would mean that he had a brilliant court in which all kinds of music were constantly played.

Fleet again encountered the expression in a Calukya grant edited by him (*IA*. VII. Sep. 1878, pp. 211, 215) where the text itself spoke of the five great sounds of *daḍakka* (?) etc. and which he had obviously to take as musical. Examining the question in

8. Bühler was dealing here with a grant of Dhruvasena I of Valabhi; the grant does not use the word *pañcamahāśabda* but gives the King the five epithets denoting offices, *mahāsāmanta*, *mahāpratīhāra*, *mahādaṇḍanāyaka*, *mahākārtākṛtika* and *mahārāja*. With reference to these, Bühler said: "I think the five titles given to Dhruvasena are the five *mahāśabdās* mentioned so often in ancient grants". These five titles in the inscriptional evidence are not exactly the five given by Kalhaṇa.

the light of the evidence pointed out by Growse, K. B. Pathak (*IA. XII. Jan. 1883*, pp. 95-6), while editing a Canarese inscription where this term occurred, agreed with the view that the expression referred to music instruments, and cited from literary works of a much earlier period, a Jain work of Revakoṭyācārya and a Lingayat work called *Vivekacintāmaṇi* to confirm this interpretation. The former work, in the course of the description of a procession, speaks of the white umbrellas and other signs of royalty and the sounding of the *pañcamahaśabdas* and other auspicious drums,⁹ and the latter text gives the five great music instruments as *Śṛṅga, Tammaṭa, Śaṅkha, Bheri Jeyaghaṅṭe*.

Fleet had occasion to deal with the epithet again : in *IA. XIII* (p. 134, May 1884), when editing three inscriptions from Kanheri, he noted the occurrence of the word twice and, in both cases, along with the title *mahāmaṇḍaleśvara*, and translated it as the five titles commencing with the word 'great'. It was in his *Gupta Inscriptions (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum III. 1888*, pp. 296-8, fn. 9) that Fleet gave his full review of the situation regarding the interpretation of the term which occurred in *Tivaradeva's* inscription of about A.D. 800. Fleet noted here instances from inscriptions which associated with kings and chiefs the sound of a specific music instrument or instruments like *Tūrya* and *Damaru*, those in which '*aśeṣa-mahā śabda*' was used instead of the '*pañca-mahā-śabda*' (*Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kakka II, Śaka 734, IA. XII, p. 160*, and *Dhruva, II, Śaka 757, ib., XIV, p. 199*), and an instance which combined the two expressions into '*aśeṣa-pañca-mahā-śabda*' (*Śilāhāra Māmvaṇi, Śaka 782, JBBRAS IX, p. 219; XII, p. 329; Yādava Seṇadeva Śaka 1063, IA. XII, p. 126*).

An important point noted by Elliot and Fleet is that normally this honorific was applied to feudatories and heirs-apparent, but there were rare inscriptions which applied it to a paramount sovereign, e. g., *Pulakesin I. Rāṣṭrakūṭa Amoghavarṣa I, Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kakka and Devapāla of Dhārā (IA. XII, p. 218, Śaka 788; JBBRAS. XVI, p. 108, Śaka 679; AS of W. Ind. X. p. 111, Sainvat 1275)*. A further significant point mentioned by Fleet is that according to another epigraphical reference (*Bhojadeva of*

9. *Pañca-mahāśabdagaḷum baddavananda paregalum bājise.*

Gwalior and his subordinate Viṣṇu (?), this *pañca-mahā-śabda* was a distinction conferred on a feudatory, *mahāsāmanta*, by his Sovereign¹⁰

While such was the drift of the epigraphic evidence, the *R. T.* which used this expression thrice, gave us a totally different conception of the word. When describing Lalitāditya (A. D. 700-736), this work said (IV. 140-143; 512; 680) :

प्रीतः पञ्चमहाशब्दभाजनम् तम् व्यधत्त सः ।
 यशोवर्मनृपम् तम् तु समूलमुदपाटयत् ॥
 अष्टादशानामुपरि प्राक्सिद्धानाम् तदुद्भवैः ।
 कर्मस्थानैः स्थितिः प्राप्ता ततःप्रभृति पञ्चभिः ॥
 महाप्रतीहारपीडा (1) स महासन्धिविग्रहः (2) ।
 महाश्वशालापि (3) महाभाण्डागारश्च (4) पञ्चमः ॥
 महासाधनभागश्च (5) चेत्येताः यैरभिधाः श्रिताः ।
 शाहिमुख्या येष्वभूवन् अध्यक्षाः पृथिवीभुजः ॥

Commenting on the passage in his translation (1900), Stein said that at least for Kashmir, the significance of the term was clear that it denoted the five titles commencing with the word *mahā* (great,) and added that the musical significance shown was not its original meaning. The second reference in *RT.* is

मन्त्री पञ्चमहाशब्दभाजनम् जगतीभुजः ।
 तस्मिन् जयपुरे कोट्टे जयदत्तो व्यधान् मठम् ॥

The third reference in *RT.* (IV. 680) leaves no doubt in anybody's mind that the term referred to five offices, *karma-sthānas* :

तस्य पञ्चमहाशब्दान् ज्यायानुत्पलकोऽग्रहीत् ।
 अन्ये जगृहिरेऽन्यानि कर्मस्थानानि मातुलाः ॥

The data set forth above, epigraphical and literary, showed that there were two senses in which the expression *pañca-mahā-śabda* was understood : musical sounds and titles of offices. After the lapse of quarter of a century, Dr. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar

10. *Tad-pradatta-pañca-mahā-śabda. ASI. X. p. 101.* This conferment is borne out by many inscriptions and the *RT.*

reverted to this subject in the *JBBRAS.* (N.S.) Vol. I, pp. 238-245; he noticed eight inscriptions ranging from A. D. 913 to 1159 A. D., according to which the epithet is applied to Kings, feudatories, governors, and two teachers a Jain Ācārya and a Śāṅkarācārya. This extended non-regal application confirmed the musical meaning as against that of titles of offices. He drew attention to a Rajendra Cola epigraph at Nanjangud which made an endowment to provide for a deity the *pañcamahāśabda* comprising *Tiviri*, *Daṭṭa* (*Dakka* ?), *Khaṇḍikka*, *Jayaghanṭe* and (*Kāhala*). This meaning, Dr. Aiyangar confirmed further by citing Tamil lexicons and Tamil literary works, the *Bhārata-veṅbā* (9th cent.) and the *Periyapurāṇa* (end of 11th cent.). All this clearly showed that as far as the Dekkan and the South at least were concerned, there was no doubt about the five great sounds being five musical sounds—of five instruments or of four instruments and voice.

Without stopping there, Dr. Aiyangar analysed the main reference in the *RT.* and attempted to reconcile it to the meaning of musical sound, which, of course, is a failure, as the third *RT.* passage is clear beyond any doubt on the term signifying, according to Kalhaṇa, five offices. To this effect Padmanatha Bhattacharya replied in *JBBRAS.* (N.S.) VII 1931, pp. 48-51. He referred also to an inscription of a Kāmarūpa King Bhāskaravarman (c 600-650 A. D.), as using this expression and concluded that on the data before us, we had no option except to accept that while in Gupta or Southern inscriptions, the expression meant musical sounds, in Kashmir it did have the different meaning of five titles of offices. The last to write on the subject was Prof. C. S. Srinivasachari who contributed a paper on this term to the Baroda Session of the A.I.O.C. (1939, *Proceed. AIOC.* VII 653-8). In supporting the music-theory, Srinivasachari cited a Vijayanagara epigraph (Bukka, 1368 A.D., *E.C.* II) which conferred this distinction of enjoying the right to the *pañcamahāśabda* on the Jains of Sravanabelgola, equally with the Vaiṣṇavas and urged the argument that, were the term to mean offices like Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, the inscriptions would hardly have mentioned *pañcamahāśabda* together with Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara.

We may add now some more references to the *pañcamahāśabda*. An inscription of A.D. 757 in *EC.* (X, p. 16) refers to

mahāśabda, without *pañca*, but along with auspicious symbols—*gaṅgāyamunāpālīdhvajapaṭa-ḍhakkā-māhāśabdacinha*. Somadeva-sūri, in the colophon at the end of his *Yaśastilaka Campū*, (K. M. 70), mentions his patron Arikesarin III, the Lemulavāda Cālukya, as having the *pañcamahāśabda* in the Parbani plates¹¹ of the same king, mentioning Somadeva, the king is given the epithet 'samadhigata-pañcamahāśabda'; in the both the last two cases, the title, it must be noted, goes with the other title, *Mahāsāmantādhipati* borne by Arikesarin III who was feudatory under Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III.

Already we saw in Rajendra Cola inscription a Nanjangud that the term had been applied to the temple and deity. The Āgamas which deal with temples and temple-worship speak of it : the *Vātula* says that at daybreak, it is auspicious to sound the *pañcamahāśabda*; and in that connection defines the five great sounds as those emanating from the instruments of wood, metal, hole and conch and from the human voice.

अरुणोदयपूर्वे तु त्रिपातेन तृणादिका ।
 कुर्यात् पञ्चमहाशब्दम् तदाशुभनिवृत्तये ॥
 दारुजम् चैव शङ्खम् च लोहम् सूषिरमेव च ।
 गेयम् सर्वैः समायुक्तः शब्दः पञ्चविधः स्मृतः ॥

The *Kāmika* refers to its auspicious nature :

कुर्यात् पञ्चमहाशब्दम् सर्वैः राणितमोपहम् ।

In a late Tamil compilation on dance—the *Bharatasamgraha* of Aramvalattanār (pp. 66, 67, Annamalai University edn.), the *pañcamahāśabda* is defined and described in a special section and verse. As in the Tamil lexicons, here too, the five great sounds are equated to the five sources of music, the four classes of instruments—strings, hole, percussion, metal—and the fifth, the human voice. These show the completion of the process of the generalisation of the meaning of this expression.

An examination of the material presented above shows the following points : Granting that the bulk of the evidence, both

11. *Bharatiya Itihasa Samsodhana Mandal Journal*, XIII. iii pp. 85-92.

literary and epigraphical, means by the five great sounds five musical sounds, we may see that there is no unanimity as to what these five musical sounds are. While some epigraphs specify some instruments, some merely say *pañcamahāśabda* and a few drop the number 'pañca' or the adjective 'mahā'. From war-instruments, they become procession-instruments, then instruments in general, and then the five sources of music enumerated in music treatises, viz., the four classes of instruments and the vocal. As for its application, the older epigraphs use it mostly with reference to subordinates and occasionally with reference to a few sovereigns. Some references are clear on the point that the right to use these *śabdās* was a distinction conferred on a subordinate by the sovereign. Now, unless the sporting of these was part of the pomp and pageantry of a sovereign, there was no point on a subordinate being admitted to the distinction that he too might display them. Hence there is no contradiction in the application of this to sovereigns also, only we have to understand that while their display was a matter of course in the case of a sovereign, when conferred on a lesser person, it constituted a distinct point of honour and had to be mentioned. It was in later times when the conferment of these five instruments was no longer in vogue as an official mode of honouring or raising the status of a subordinate that the meaning of the term got so generalised that it was applied to Teachers and Temple-deities or was equated with the fivefold source of music.

Now, there is one point that has not been considered by the scholars who have written on it. Granting that the conferment of these instruments was an honour, what is the speciality of these instruments as such that they should be called the 'great' (*mahat*)? The instruments enumerated by some inscriptions are quite commonplace. This would cast a doubt about the ultimate authenticity or originality of the musical meaning.

The first passage in *RT* mentioning this (IV. 140-3) says that Lalitāditya raised the five out of the eighteen offices to a special higher status for the first time (*tataḥprabhṛti*). If these five titles should be old distinctions, why should Lalitādityā or Kalhaṇa raise them to a special status? Further the same five offices mentioned by Kalhaṇa are not referred to in the inscriptions. However, it should be noted that the inscriptions closely associate this

Pañcamahāśabda with subordinate worthies enjoying the title and status of *Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara* etc. In fact, in the bulk of references, it is these subordinates holding the position of *Mahāmaṇḍleśvara*, *Mahāsāmantādhipati* etc. that are said to have attained this distinction. There was thus an invariable connection between feudatories carrying these offices or positions and the honour of *pañcamahāśabda*.¹² It is from this fact that Kalhaṇa should have thought that the expression applied to these subordinates known by the official appellations similar to *Mahā-maṇḍeleśvara* etc.; and the inscriptions not being uniform or complete in giving the stations occupied by them, Kalhaṇa thought that for the first time he might specify the five titles of offices.

All that we can safely say is that while the term was common—sometimes merely as *pañcaśabda* (without 'mahā')—its original meaning was just 'five sounds' with which palaces resounded. While the tradition of 'five sounds' as a sign of royalty, pomp and splendour persisted, the exact identity of the five sounds might have been forgotten; consequently fresh identifications arose at different times and different places. Like the later inscriptions, ancient bardic poetry had occasions for panegyrics of Kings and must have had set formulae to refer to the glory of the King and the patron. It is interesting in this connection to come across the following in the *Soḍaśarājopākhyāna* in the *Abhimanyuvadha-upaparvan* of the *Droṇa-parvan* of the *Mahābhārata*. Here, while extolling the greatness of the King [Dilipa in the reading in Kumbhakonam edn. (61.12); Khaṭvāṅga, another name of the same, in the Citraśālā Press edn. (61.10-11)], the text says that in his residence the *five sounds* never waned; the noise of *Vedic recital*, of the twang of the *bow-string* and of the words (of hospitality) '*Drink, feast, have a bite.*'

पञ्च शब्दा व जीर्यन्ति दिलीपस्य (खट्वाङ्गस्य) निवेशने ।
स्वाध्यायघोषो ज्याघोषः पिबताश्नीतखादत ॥

12. The modern parallel of the British Crown and their subordinates, the Indian Rajah, might be recalled. The Crown conferred both titles or positions and sound-honour in the form of 'gun'; not infrequently, some Rajah spent heavily to increase the number of gun-shots conferred on them or to get this honour restored when it was taken away.

In the apparatus of the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata* it is said that the manuscript source in Śārādā does not have this episode in the *Droṇaparvan*, and that, it is original in the *Śānti* (ch. 29) and duplicated in *Droṇa*. In the *Śānti* version however, where all manuscripts and editions read this upākhyāna, we have the five śabdās reduced to three, the last three being epitomised under 'liberality' (*dāna*) in general¹³ and there is no variant noted here. For purposes of taking the popularity of an expression like this, the question of the relative reality or the comparative antiquity of a reading does not matter.¹⁴ Further, students of the *R̥g. Veda*, the Upaniṣads and the epics and descriptions of sacrificial sessions know that free lavish feeding was a major charity and a sign of royalty and patronage; the *mahāśālīka* was an epithet for Kings who maintained large feeding halls. From Sanskrit grammar we know that in spoken usage, there were some set formulae or combinations (*samāsas*), associated with this free feeding, *pibata-khādata*, *khādata-modata*, which are, so to say, popular slogans uttered by the generous hosts and his agents. But the reading in the *Śānti*-version with 'śabdo vai diyatām itī' looks less natural, and also formal, induced by desire to supply a syntactic 'itī', and substitute 'śabda' in the second half to correspond exactly with the śabda in the first half.

13. त्रयः शब्दा न जीर्यन्ते दिलीपस्य निवेशने ।
स्वाध्यायशब्दो ज्याशब्दः शब्दो वै दीयतामिति ॥

14. Really, the *Ṣoḍaśarājopākhyāna* is an independent old lay which *sūtas* went about singing on occasions of death for the consolation of the bereaved.

GREATER GĪTĀ*

The title of this paper is based on the analogy of Greater India. But the main intention is not to give a list of the imitations of the Bhagavad Gītā found in or ascribed to the several Purāṇas or similar compilations. These imitations are no doubt an interesting subject and the New Catalogus Catalogorum Office in the Madras University has been able to note up till now about a hundred such imitations of the Bhagavad Gītā.¹ The Gītā came to be the accepted form for presenting any spiritual discourse. There are three Gītās pertaining to Nānak and Sikhism, there is a Nārāyaṇa Gītā belonging to the Rāmānanda sect and there is one Jain Gītā. When a Sanskrit writer set his hand to make a Sanskrit version of the Bible, he called it Khṛṣṭu Gītā. When the gifted Mrs. Kṣamā Row wanted to record the Satyāgraha of Mahātmāji in classic form, she adopted the name Satyāgraha Gītā. From Madras appeared also a parody of the famous Surat session of the Indian National Congress called the Congress Gītā.

Leaving these and the Gītās found in or assigned to the several Purāṇas, let us examine the Itihāsottama or the Great Epic itself in which the Bhagavad Gītā appears. The Mahābhārata seems to be a fertile soil for Gītās. To Arjuna himself who forgets the teachings of the Bha. Gītā, the Lord addresses again the Anugītā in the Āśvamedhika. There is a Uttara Gītā in three chapters, commented upon by a Gauḍapāda which again is addressed by Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna who forgets the Bha. Gītā and which some mss. assign to the Āśvamedhikaparvan where the Anugītā occurs and some to the Bhiṣmaparvan where the Bha. Gītā occurs, but which is really not to be found in any part of the text of the Mahābhārata. Some of the other Gītās in the Mahābhārata are Śamyāka Gītā in Śānti, 175; the Mañki Gītā in Śānti, 176; the Hārīta Gītā in Śānti, 284; the Vṛtra Gītā in Śānti, 285; and the

* A paper read before the Sanskrit Academy, Madras, on the Gītā Day, Jan. '38.

1. See Appendix here for an alphabetical list of the Gītās.

Parāśara Gītā in Śānti, 296-304². Besides these discourses bearing the name 'Gītā'³ there are the valuable teachings inculcated in the sections,—the Dharmavyādha-ākhyāna, the Ajagara episode, the Yakṣapraśna, the Viduraniti, the Sanat-sujātiya, the whole Mokṣa dharma of the Śāntiparvan and the Vaiṣṇavadharma in the Ānuśāsanika found only in Southern mss. It is not the form of the Gītā but it is the spirit that is the Gītā which is important. The Gītā-spirit permeates the whole Epic, like electric energy; and because it has been made manifest in the form of a high-candle-power bulb at the door of the Bhiṣmaparvan, it cannot be said that the Gītā is available in the Mahābhārata in that place only. Like butter from butter-milk, the Bha. Gītā is a natural emanation from the Mahābhārata.

भारतामृतसर्वस्वगीताया मथितस्य च ।

सारमुद्धृत्य कृष्णेन अर्जुनस्य मुखे हृतम् ॥ Bhisma. 43.5.

It is true that great utterances excel themselves and outgrow their context for the sake of universal benefit and it is legitimate that philosophers build out of the Gītā each his own system of philosophy, emphasising Karma, Jñāna and Bhakti. But the process called spiritual does not seem to be a pure element of any one of these or a mere mixture of these but an unanalysable whole of Yoga in which Karman looks like Jñāna, Jñāna like Karman and both like Bhakti. Still a study of the Gītā in its context would show a primary emphasis on Karman; what is that philosophy for, which is not to guide us to act better or to act as we ought to? Action is something in the very nature of life and there is no getting rid of it. But this binding action itself will liberate us, only if we know how to do it. There is a saying in Sanskrit that there is no letter in the alphabet which is not a Mantra and no herb in the forest which is not a medicine; but one has to discover and apply. Similarly with our acts; there is no act of ours which we cannot turn into a powerful means of our spiritual elevation. How to transform this stone of a binding act into the gem or the gold of a liberating Yoga? Both Jñāna

2. References are to the Kumbhakonam edn. hear : under the passages cited in the further portions of this paper, reference is given to the Citraśālā Press edn. also.

3. For an explanation of the name 'Gītā', See Appendix.

and Bhakti give us the alchemic process necessary for this transformation. The agent should renounce all idea of himself being the proud doer, put himself reverently in the hand of God as his tool, offer his little act as a flower of worship to Him, and be free from the taint of attachment or the desire for the fruit. This makes life a Yoga and he who knows how to do his acts in this manner as Yoga becomes an adept in action, a Kuśala, a Dakṣa. When one has found this secret, he will no longer be faced with the perplexity—

कर्म त्यजेदिति चरेदिति च प्रवृत्ताः

भावेन केन निगमा इति न प्रतीमः ।

Nilakaṇṭha Dikṣita, Ānandasāgarastava.

This, I think, is the Gītā-spirit and this can be seen in the other parts of the Mahābhārata also. Mental crisis occurs frequently to men of action and when they find that of the two alternatives of doing a thing of duty with all its sorrowful consequences and of not doing it at all, the latter, as a sin of omission, is the lesser of the two evils. But this, Kṛṣṇa would call Prajñā-vāda. The call of the Gītā is to do what is one's duty, one's Svadharma, in the spirit that through him, the mere agent, God is going through His programme. This Gītā-spirit also is profusely seen in the other parts of the Great Epic. A third Gītā-spirit is the 'Samatva', the equanimity of mind, the 'Nirdvandvatā' or that weather-proof state of the mind which is not upset by the fluctuations in one's career, success-failure-insult, gain-loss and so on. This again one can see wherever he lays his hand in the Mahābhārata. When with the idea in one's mind that the dominant ideas of the Gītā must form the very basis of the Great Epic, that the story of the Epic can with advantage be read in full, in detail and with care to understand more and better the Gītā itself, one reads the Mahābhārata, one is greatly rewarded. I shall now point out from the other parts of the Mahābhārata Gītā-ideas and Gītā-expressions, actual presence of entire Gītā-passages and situations such as that which the Gītā helps man to face. Verily, there is a Gītā-complex throughout the Great Epic.

It is one of the teachings of the Gītā that Dharmas like Dāna have to be done without any motive दातव्यमिति यद्दानम्, Bha. G. 17. 20. Dharma has to be observed for its own sake and not because

its observance would bear material fruit. The Gītā does not countenance the saying ‘Honesty is the best policy’. All this is very well brought out in the calm reply of Yudhiṣṭhira to his perturbed wife, Draupadī, who, in Vana 31, finds fault with Yudhiṣṭhira for sticking to Dharma which is not only barren of good result but is productive of calamities also. Yudhiṣṭhira says :—

नाहं धर्मफलाकाङ्क्षी राजपुत्रि चराम्युत ।
 ददामि देयमित्येव यजे यष्टव्यमित्युत ॥
 अस्तु वात्र फलं मा वा कर्तव्यं पुरुषेण यत् ।
 गृहे निवसता कृष्णे यथाशक्ति करोमि तत् ॥
 धर्मं चरामि सुश्रोणि न धर्मफलकारणात् ।

Vana. 31, 2:4. Kumbh.

„ „ „ Chitraśālā.

In ch. 203 (Citrśālā) of the Vanaparvan, in the Mārkaṇḍeya samāsyā, there are passages which are to be found in the Gītā also. Mārkaṇḍeya says :—

बीजानि ह्यग्निदग्धानि न रोहन्ति पुनर्यथा ।
 ज्ञानदग्धैः पुनः क्लेशैर्नात्मा संयुज्यते पुनः ॥ 108,

which we hear again from Kṛṣṇa’s mouth—

ज्ञानाग्निः सर्वकर्माणि भस्मसात्कुरुते तथा । Bha. G. IV. 37.

Again—

Mārkaṇḍeya

Kṛṣṇa

नायं लोकोऽस्ति न परः
 न सुखं संशयात्मनः । 113.

संशयात्मा विनश्यति ।
 नायं लोकोऽस्ति न परः
 न सुखं संशयात्मनः ॥

Bha.. G. IV. 40.

And Kṛṣṇa’s verse in the Gītā, II, 46—

यावानर्थं उदपाने सर्वतः संप्लुतोदके ।
 तावान् सर्वेषु वेदेषु ब्राह्मणस्य विजानतः ॥

is summarised by Mārkaṇḍeya in a line—

विदितार्थस्तु वेदानां परिवेद प्रयोजनम् । 113.

One of the chief ideas of the Gītā is the Svadharmā yoga which is again and again dealt with, but is specially described in ch. 17 Śls. 45-48, after a description of the Svadharmas of the four Varnas :

स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरतः संसिद्धिं लभते नरः ।
 स्वकर्मनिरतः सिद्धिं यथा विन्दति तच्छृणु ॥
 यतः प्रवृत्तिभूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।
 स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ॥
 श्रेयान् स्वधर्मो विगुणः परधर्मात् स्वनुष्ठितात् ।
 स्वभावनियतं कर्म कुर्वन्नाप्नोति कित्त्विषम् ॥
 सहजं कर्म कौन्तेय सदोषमपि न त्यजेत् ।
 सर्वारम्भा हि दोषेण धूमेनाग्निरिवावृताः ॥

The theory of salvation through the dispassioned discharge of one's Svadharmā is based on the idea that, like Art, Svadharmā is governed by its own *internal* laws and has not got to be judged by *external* ideas. It is not the Dharma itself but how one does it; like *expression* in Art, the *spirit* in which the Dharma is done is the point. It is this, of all the ideas of the Gītā, that finds repeated expression throughout the Mahābhārata. Other instances will be shown in due course and here I am drawing attention to the exposition of this theory of salvation through doing one's Dharma in the reverential spirit of offering it to God, without despising one's Dharma, *bad though it is from an external standard*, by the hunter-philosopher in chs. 211-221 (chs. 207-216 Citraśālā) of the Vana-parvan. Here the Dharmavyādha enlightens the Brahmin Kauśika who asks him why he follows that avocation of living by killing animals. The Dharmavyādha says :—

स्वधर्म इति कृत्वा तु न त्यजामि द्विजोत्तम ।

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀

स्वधर्मं त्यजतो ब्रह्मन्धर्म इह दृश्यते ।

स्वधर्मनिरतो यस्तु धर्मः स इति निश्चयः ॥

कुले हि विहितं कर्म देही तं न विमुञ्चति ।

धात्रा विधिरयं दृष्टो बहुधा कर्मनिर्णये ॥

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀

कृषिं साध्वति मन्यन्ते तत्र हिंसा परा स्मृता ।
 कर्षन्तो लाङ्गलैरुर्वी घ्नन्ति भूमिशयान् बहून् ॥
 धान्यबीजानि यान्याहुत्रीह्यादीनि द्विजोत्तम ।
 सर्वाण्येतानि जीवा हि तत्र किं प्रतिभाति ते ॥

* * * *

जीवा हि बहवो ब्रह्मन् वृक्षेषु च फलेषु च ।
 उदके बहवश्चापि तत्र किं प्रतिभाति ते ॥
 सर्वं व्याप्तमिदं ब्रह्मन् प्राणिभिः प्राणजीविभिः ।

* * * *

सत्त्वैः सत्त्वानि जीवन्ति * * * ॥
 चङ्क्रम्यमाणा जीवांश्च धरणीसंश्रितान् बहून् ।
 पद्भ्यां हन्ति नरा विप्र * * * ॥
 उपविष्टाः शयानाश्च घ्नन्ति जीवाननेकशः ।

and so the Vyādha concludes :

वक्तुं बहुविधं शक्यं धर्माधर्मेषु कर्मसु ।
 स्वकर्मनिरतो यो हि स यशः प्राप्नुयान्महत्⁴ ॥

a philosophy which Kālidāsa's fisherman taught the bump-tious police-chief in the Śākuntala—

Fisherman :

अहं जालोद्गालादिभिः मत्स्यबन्धनोपायैः कुटुम्बभरणं करोमि ।

Police-chief :

विशुद्ध इदानीमाजीवः !

Fisherman :

भर्तः ! मैवम्—

सहजं किल यद्विनिन्दितं न खलु तत् कर्म विवर्जनीयम् ।
 पशुमारणकर्मदारुणः अनुकम्पामृदुरेव श्रोत्रियः ॥

We shall see again that it is with this view-point that everybody tries to persuade Yudhiṣṭhira to crown himself in the kingdom

4. For a similar question and a similar reply by another Dharmavyādha, see the *Varāhapurāṇa*, ch. 8, Bib. Ind. Edn., pp. 51-59.

which he is averse to accept in his sorrow consequent on the great war.

In the Dharmavyādihākhyāna, there are, besides, other passages which can be compared with some in the Gītā :

Vyādha.

Gītā.

न जीवनाशोऽस्ति हि देहभेदे
मिथ्यैतदाहुः म्रियतीति मूढाः ।

देहिनोऽस्मिन् यथा देहे
कौमारं यौवनं जरा ।

जीवस्तु देहान्तरितः प्रयाति

तथा देहान्तरप्राप्तिः

दशार्धतैवास्य शरीरभेदः ॥ 213.27. धीरस्तत्र न मुह्यति ॥ II. 13.

Vyādha, 214, 2-7.

विज्ञानार्थं मनुष्याणां मनः पूर्वं प्रवर्तते ।
तत्प्राप्य कामं भजते क्रोधं च द्विजसत्तम ॥
ततस्तदर्थं यतते कर्म चारभते महत् ।

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀

ततो लोभः प्रभवति मोहश्च तदन्तरम् । etc.

which can be compared with Gītā. II, 62-3 :

ध्यायतो विषयान् पुंसः सङ्गस्तेषूपजायते ।
सङ्गात् सञ्जायते कामः कामात् क्रोधोऽभिजायते ॥
क्रोधाद्भवति संमोहः etc.

Again the Vyādha says :

षण्णामात्मनियुक्तानाम् इन्द्रियाणां प्रमाथिनाम् ।
यो धीरो धारयेद्द्रुमीन् स स्यात् परमसारथिः ॥
इन्द्रियाणां प्रसृष्टानां हयानामिव वर्त्मसु ।
धृतिं कुर्वीत सारथ्ये धृत्या तानि जयेद् ध्रुवम् ।
इन्द्रियाणां विचरतां यन्मनोऽनुविधीयते ।
तदस्य हरते बुद्धिं नावं वायुरिवाम्भसि ॥ 215.24-27.

words which are found in the Gītā thus :

इन्द्रियाणि प्रमाथीनि । II. 60.
इन्द्रियाणां हि चरतां यन्मनोऽनुविधीयते ।
तदस्य हरति प्रज्ञां वायुर्नावमिवाम्भसि ॥ II. 67.

Vyādha :

चित्तस्य हि प्रसादेन
हन्ति कर्म शुभामुभम् ।

❀ ❀ ❀

लक्षणं तु प्रसादस्य
यथा तृप्तः सुखं स्वपेत् ।

निवाते वा यथा दीपो
दीप्येत् कुशलदीपितः ॥
216. 40-41.

Gitā :

प्रसादे सर्वदुःखानां
हानिरस्योपजायते etc. । II. 65.

यथा दीपो निवातस्थो
नेङ्गते सोपमा स्मृता । VI. 19.

In the Vṛihidraṇṇika of the Vana. sage Maudgalya refuses to go to Svarga from which one has to return and here we have the Gitā's ideal Paṇḍita or Sthitaprajña described in the verse—

तुल्यनिन्दास्तुतिर्भूत्वा समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्चनः ।
ज्ञानयोगेन शुद्धेन ध्याननित्यो बभूव ह ॥ 47.
261-46. (Citraśālā)

In the Yakṣapraśna which closes the Vana, some of the Ideas of the Gitā are found in the terse replies of Yudhiṣṭhira. दाक्ष्यमेकपदं घर्म्यं and घन्यानामुत्तमं दाक्ष्यं (ch. 314. Kumbh. 313 Citraśālā) put in a nutshell the implications of the Karmayoga of the Gitā—योगः कर्मसु कौशलम्. Similarly Yudhiṣṭhira's तपः स्वधर्मवर्तित्वम् and स्वधर्मे स्थिरता धैर्यम् emphasise the Gitā-doctrine of Svadharma, the greatest *Tapas* one can perform and the greatest *Sthairya* one can have. The Gitā-ideal of an equanimous mind, unassailed by the Dvandas, is thus effectively put by Yudhiṣṭhira in his definition of Kṣamā—क्षमा द्वन्द्वसहिष्णुत्वम्. And in his final reply, Yudhiṣṭhira gives us his picture of the best of men and the most fortunate of men, a fine Gitā-ideal :

तुल्ये प्रियाप्रिये यस्य सुखदुःखे तथैव च ।
अतीतानागते चोभे स वै पुरुष उच्यते ॥
(not found in Citraśālā).

समत्वं यस्य सर्वेषु निःस्पृहः शान्तमानसः ।
सुप्रसन्नः सदा योगी स वै सर्वधनी नरः ॥

314.123-4 (Kumbh.)

313. (Citraśālā)

In the Udyoga where the Lord visibly begins to take the strings in His hands : Sañjaya has met the Pāṇḍavas and Yudhiṣṭhira has told him that they were following what Kṛṣṇa decided. And Kṛṣṇa then speaks, opening with a plea for Karman. In the Gītā, He says :

न हि कश्चित् क्षणमपि जातु तिष्ठत्यकर्मकृत् ।
 कार्यते ह्यवशः कर्म सर्वः प्रकृतिजैः गुणैः ॥ III. 5.
 नियतं कुरु कर्म त्वं कर्म ज्यायो ह्यकर्मणः ।
 शरीरयात्रापि च ते न प्रसिद्धचेदकर्मणः ॥ III. 8.

Who can comment upon this better than Kṛṣṇa Himself and in what better manner than this in Udyoga—(ch. 29 Kumbh. and Citraśālā) :

या वै विद्याः साधयन्तीह कर्म
 तासां विद्यते फलं नेतरासाम् ।
 ❀ ❀ ❀
 सोऽयं विधिः विहितः कर्मणैव
 संवर्तते सञ्जय तत्र कर्म ।
 तत्र योज्यत् कर्मणः साधु मन्येत्
 मोघं तस्याल्पितं दुर्बलस्य ॥
 कर्मणामी भान्ति देवाः परत्र
 कर्मणैवेह प्लवते मातरिश्वा ।
 अहोरात्रे विदधत् कर्मणैव
 अतन्द्रितो नित्यमुदेति सूर्यः ॥
 ❀ ❀ ❀
 अतन्द्रिता भारभिमं महान्तं
 बिभर्ति देवी पृथिवी बलेन ।
 अतन्द्रिताः शीघ्रमपो वहन्ति
 सन्तर्पयन्तः सर्वभूतानि नद्यः ॥

A veritable poem on Karman.

The Viduraniti in the Prajāgara in the same Parvan contains a description (ch. 33 Kumbh. and Citraśālā) of 'Paṇḍita' not far removed from the Gītā's 'Sthitaprajña'. Vidura says.

यस्य कृत्यं न निघ्नन्ति शीतमुष्णं भयं रतिः ।

समृद्धिरसमृद्धिर्वा स वै पण्डित उष्यते ॥

Śl. 26. (Śl. 19. Citraśālā.)

न हृष्यत्यात्मसंमाने नावमानेन तप्यते ।

गाङ्गो ह्रद इवाक्षोभ्यो यः स पण्डित उष्यते ॥

Śl. 33. (Śl. 26. Citraśālā.)

In Ch. 35, Vidura says :

यथा यथा हि पुरुषः कल्याणे कुरुते मनः ।

तथा तथास्य सर्वार्थाः सिध्यन्ते नात्र संशयः ॥

Śl. 35. (Śl. 41. Citraśālā.)

which is put by Kṛṣṇa in the Gītā thus :

न हि कल्याणकृत् कश्चिद् दुर्गतिं तात गच्छति । VI. 40.

Then follows the Sanatsu'ātiya and of listening to it the fruit given is that man shall become the Nirdvandva of the Gītā :

यं श्रुत्वायं मनुष्येन्द्रः सर्वदुःखातिगो भवेत् ॥

लाभालाभौ प्रियद्वेष्यौ यथैनं न जरान्तकौ ।

विषहेरन् भयामर्षौ क्षुत्पिपासे मदोद्भवौ ॥

(Ch. 41. 11-12 (Kumbh. and Citraśālā.)

In XV. 11, the Lord says in the Gītā that only a Kṛtātma can see Him and not an Akṛtātma.

यतन्तोऽप्यकृतात्मानो नैनं पश्यन्त्यचेतसः ।

In Udyoga 68, (69 Citraśālā), Dhṛtarāṣṭra asks Sañjaya how Sañjaya could see the Lord and Sañjaya replies :

नाकृतात्मा कृतात्मानं जातु विद्याज्जनार्दनम् ।

Śl. 17 (Kumbh. and Citraśālā.)

and then gives Indriyanigraha as the means :

आत्मनस्तु क्रियोपायो नान्यत्रेन्द्रियनिग्रहात् ।

which the Lord stresses in Gītā, III. 41 and 43.

As the Lord is about to start on his mission, Yudhiṣṭhira argues for peace and points out, like Arjuna in the opening chapter of the Gītā, how unrighteous it is to kill one's own kinsmen :

ये पुनः स्युरसंबद्धाः अनार्याः कृष्ण शत्रवः ।
 तेषामप्यवधः कार्यः किं पुनर्ये स्युरोदृशाः ॥
 ज्ञातयश्चैव भूयिष्ठाः सहाया गुरवश्च नः ।
 तेषां वधोऽतिपापीयान् किन्तु युद्धेऽस्ति शोभनम् ॥
 पापः क्षत्रियधर्मोऽयं * * ।

Ch. 71. 52-54 (Kumbh.).

Ch. 72. 44-46 (Citraśālā).

Arjuna spoke in the same language on the field :

आचार्याः पितरः पुत्राः etc.

एतान् न हन्तुमिच्छामि घ्नतोऽपि मधुसूदन ।

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀

स्वजनं हि कथं हत्वा सुखिनः स्याम माधव ॥

And Kṛṣṇa briefly gave to Yudhiṣṭhira the same reply He gave to Arjuna later :

न भैक्षं क्षत्रियश्चरेत् ।
 स्वधर्मः क्षत्रियस्यैष कार्पण्यं न प्रशस्यते ॥
 न हि कार्पण्यमास्थाय शक्या वृत्तिर्युधिष्ठिर ।
 विक्रमस्व महाबाहो जहि शत्रुन् परन्तप ॥

Ch. 73. 3-5 Citraśālā.

which can be placed by the side of the Gitā, II. 3 :

क्लैब्यं मा स्म गमः पार्थ नैतत्त्वय्युपपद्यते ।
 क्षुद्रं हृदयदौर्बल्यं त्यक्त्वोत्तिष्ठ परन्तप ॥

But again and again, Yudhiṣṭhira asks “How could we kill our elders, preceptors, brothers and sons ?” After the war has been decided upon, Yudhiṣṭhira again asks :

कथं ह्यवध्यैः सङ्ग्रामः
 कथं हत्वा गुरुन् वृद्धान् विजयो नो भविष्यति ॥

Ch. 154.22. (Kumbh. and Citraśālā).

and thus now Arjuna who replies : Kṛṣṇa has settled that there should be war; it cannot be Adharma; so let us fight.” Is it this same Arjuna who threw down the Gāṇḍīva in the Gitā ?

We have reached the Bhīṣmaparvan now and the armies have gathered on Kurukṣetra. On seeing Bhīṣma at the head of the opposite army, Yudhiṣṭhira again wants to give up war. He tells Arjuna :

धनञ्जय कथं शक्यमस्माभिर्योद्धुमाहवे ।

(Ch. 21. Śl. 31, Citraśālā).

Again it is Arjuna who is clear-headed enough to prop up his fainting brother. Arjuna says :

न तथा बलवीर्याभ्यां जयन्ति विजिगीषवः ।

यथा सत्यानृशंस्याभ्यां धर्मेणैवोद्यमेन च ॥

त्यक्त्वाधर्मं तथा सर्वे धर्मं चोत्तममास्थिताः ॥

युध्यध्वम् अनहङ्काराः यतो धर्मस्ततो जयः ॥

* * * यतः कृष्णस्ततो जयः ॥

(Ch. 21. 10-12 Citraśālā).

In these minor Gitās, it is Yudhiṣṭhira who is the Arjuna : and it is Arjuna who is the Kṛṣṇa. What an irony that he who could say युध्यध्वमनहङ्काराः should himself faint and require same teaching from his friend and guide, the Lord !

Bhīṣma, the greatest of the figures in the Eqic, is himself an example of discharging one's Dharma without passion or pride. He, with Droṇa, fought for Duryodhana, out of a sense of duty. As Karṇa comes to him after his fall, Bhīṣma advises Karṇa—युध्यस्य निरहङ्कारः.

Young Abhimanyu's death is a crisis in Yudhiṣṭhira's mind. Vyāsa here consoles him and takes him out of his dejection with the Gitā-philosophy 'न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि'.

It is because Arjuna mistakenly considered himself as the agent who was going to destroy the Kauravas, he developed a mistaken pity and talked a clever philosophy of quietism which Kṛṣṇa ridiculed. Kṛṣṇa manifested Himself in His all-consuming form of Kāla and showed him how Arjuna was but a tool, Nimittamātra, nay, how Arjuna had only to kill formally the hosts killed already by the Lord. The Lord says :

कालोऽस्मि लोकक्षयकृत् प्रवृद्धो
 लोकान् समाहर्तुमिह प्रवृत्तः ।
 ऋतेऽपि त्वां न भविष्यन्ति सर्वे
 येऽवस्थिताः प्रत्यनीकेषु योधाः ॥
 तस्मात्त्वमुत्तिष्ठ यशो लभस्व
 जित्वा शत्रून् भुङ्क्व राज्यं समृद्धम् ।
 मयैवैते निहताः पूर्वमेव
 निमित्तमात्रं भव सव्यसाचिन् ॥
 द्रोणं च भीष्मं च जयद्रथं च
 कर्णं तथान्यानपि योधवीरान् ।
 मया हतांस्त्वं जहि मा व्यथिष्ठाः
 युध्यस्व जेतासि रणे सपत्नान् ॥ XI. 32-4.

This humility is brought home to Arjuna's mind again in a fine situation in Ch. 203 (202 Citraśālā) of the Dronaparvan. Arjuna showers arrows and as each arrow goes to kill one, Arjuna sees going in advance of each arrow a resplendent fire-like Being with a trident, killing the enemy in advance; and Arjuna's arrows fall on corpses, though the onlookers think that Arjuna it is who kills the enemies. Vyāsa appears before Arjuna and tells him that that Being is the Lord as Kāla, Rudra, the real destroyer. Arjuna :—

सङ्ग्रामे न्यहनं शत्रून् शरौघैर्विमलैरहम् ।
 अग्रतो लक्षये यान्तं पुरुषं पावकप्रभम् ॥
 ज्वलन्तं शूलमुद्यम्य यां दिशं प्रतिपद्यते ।
 तस्यां दिशि विदीर्यन्ते शत्रवो मे महामुने ॥
 तेन भग्नानरीन् सर्वान् मद्भृग्वान् मन्यते जनः ।

203. 4-6 (Kumbh.).

202. 4-6 (Citraśālā).

Vyāsa :

ईशानं वरदं पार्थ दृष्टवानसि शङ्करम् ।
 गन्धेनापि हि सङ्ग्रामे तस्य क्रुद्धस्य शत्रवः ।
 विसंज्ञा हतभूयिष्ठा वेपन्ति च पतन्ति च ॥
 (Śls. 10 and 25, Kumbh. and Citraśālā).

The next great situation of grief is for Dhṛtarāṣṭra who loses all his sons in the great war. And Vidura gives him the necessary advice. Here again we hear the Gitā echoing :

Vidura, Striparvan, Ch. 2.

Gitā, 11,

अभावादीनि भूतानि	अव्यक्तादीनि भूतानि
भावमध्यानि भारत ।	व्यक्तमध्यानि भारत ।
अभावनिधनान्येव	अव्यक्तानिधनान्येव
तत्र का परिदेवना ॥ Śl. 6.	तत्र का परिदेवना ॥ Śl. 28.

अदर्शनादापतिताः

पुनश्चादर्शनं गताः ।

नैते तव न तेषां त्वं

तत्र का परिदेवना ॥⁵ Śl. 13.

हतो हि लभते स्वर्गं

जित्वा च लभते यशः । Śl. 14.

न युद्धादधिकं किञ्चित्

क्षत्रियस्येह विद्यते । Śl. 18.

आत्मैव ह्यात्मनो बन्धुः

आत्मैव रिपुरात्मनः । Śl. 36. (35)

हतो वा प्राप्स्यसि स्वर्गं

जित्वा वा भोक्ष्यसे महीम् । Śl. 37.

धर्म्याद्धि युद्धात् श्रेयोऽन्यत्

क्षत्रियस्य न विद्यते । Śl. 31.

Same Gitā, IV. 5.

Ch. 3.

Ch. 2. 22.

यथा जीर्णमजीर्णं वा

वस्त्रं त्यक्त्वा तु पूरुषः ।

अन्यद्रोचयते वस्त्रम्

एवं देहा शरीरिणः ॥ Śl. 9.

वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाय

नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि ।

तथा शरीराणि विहाय जीर्णा-

न्यन्यानि संयाति नवानि देही ॥

The crisis which overtook Arjuna at the beginning of the battle overtook Yudhiṣṭhira completely after the end of the battle, especially when he learnt at the time of Tarpaṇa, that Karṇa was his elder brother. Yudhiṣṭhira became averse to going into the capital and crowning himself as king. The Gitā repeats itself here. Yudhiṣṭhira says;

यद्भैक्ष्यमाचरिष्याम वृष्ण्यन्धकपुरे वयम् ।

ज्ञातीन् निष्पुरुषान् कृत्वा नेमां प्राप्स्याम दुर्गतिम् ॥

Śānti. Ch. 7. 3. (Kumbh. and Citraśālā).

5. This verse with a slightly different second half occurs again in Mokṣadharmā, 174.17, Citraśālā.

In the Gitā, Arjuna said :

गुरूनहृत्वा हि महानुभावान्
श्रेयो भोक्तुं भैक्ष्यमपीह लोके । II. 5.

Yudhiṣṭhira :

त्रैलोक्यस्यापि राज्येन नास्मान् कश्चित् प्रहर्षयेत् ।

Śānti. Ch. 7. 8.

Arjuna in the Gitā :

अपि त्रैलोक्यराज्यस्य हेतोः किन्तु महीकृते ।

In this context, it is Arjuna who blazes up and asks Yudhiṣṭhira to shake off his Vaiklabya. Bhīma gives Yudhiṣṭhira an effective reply : If by retiring into the forest one could attain salvation, the deer, wild boars and birds should have attained salvation; if by not doing anything, salvation would be in hand, mountains are the greatest Siddhas !

नेमे मृगाः स्वर्गजितो न वराहा न पक्षिणः ।
अथान्येन प्रकारेण पुण्यमाहुर्न ते जनाः ॥
यदि सन्न्यासतः सिद्धिं राजा कश्चिदवाप्नुयात् ।
पर्वताश्च द्रुमाश्चैव क्षिप्रं सिद्धिमवाप्नुयुः ॥

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀
तस्मात् कर्मैव कर्तव्यं नास्ति सिद्धिरकर्मणः ।

Ch. 10. 23-28 (Kumbh. and Citrśālā).

In Nakula's reply to Yudhiṣṭhira here, we find the Gitā-idea of Akāmakarman done without Ahankāra—

अभिमानकृतं कर्म नैतत् फलवदुच्यते ।
त्यागयुक्तं महाराज सर्वमेव महाफलम् ॥

Ch. 12. 16. (Kumbh. and Citrśālā).

And then from Śl. 20 Nakula explains why Yajñas were established by Prajāpati, a subject which is similarly treated in Gitā, III. 9-16, सहयज्ञाः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा etc. Nakula then mentions several kinds of Yajña, Svādhyāyayajña, Jñānayajña etc. which are spoken of in the Gitā in Ch. IV—Daivayajña, Ātmasamyama-yajña etc.

Sahadeva's reply here puts in a nutshell that the taint of 'Mamatva' is death, and freedom from it is immortality,—the essence of the *Gītā*-doctrine of disinterested discharge of duty.

ममेति ह्यक्षरो मृत्युः न ममेति च शाश्वतम् । Ch. 13. 4.

In Ch. 15 here, Arjuna again points out that if fought without hate, taking it as duty, there was no sin in fighting :

मा च ते निघ्नतः शत्रून् मन्युर्भवतु भारत ।
न तत्र किल्बिषं किञ्चिद् हन्तुर्भवति भारत ॥

Ch. 15. 54. (Kumbh, and Citraśālā).

And varying the simile of body and clothes, Arjuna says that each new body is a new room which the Soul occupies :

यथा हि पुरुषः शालां पुनः संप्रविशेन्नवाम् ।
एवं जीवः शरीराणि तानि तानि प्रपद्यते ॥ etc.

Ch. 15. 57. (Kumbh. and Citraśālā).

In the next Ch. here Bhīma expatiates on the *Gītā*'s *Guṇa*, 'Sāmya', which Bhīma calls the sign of healthiness in man.

तेषां गुणानां साम्यं यत् तदाहुः स्वस्थलक्षणम् ।

Ch. 16. 13. (Kumbh. and Citraśālā).

Devasthāna then follows with his arguments against Yudhiṣṭhira's viewpoint. Here we find some *Gītā*-passages and *Gītā*-ideas occurring. Ch. 21, Śl. 3 (Kumbh. and Citraśālā) here runs thus :

यदा संहरते कामान् कूर्मोऽङ्गानीव सर्वशः ।
तदात्मज्योतिरचिरात् स्वात्मन्येव प्रसीदति ॥⁶

which is found in *Gītā* II, 58 in part. And quite in the *Gītā*-way is the fifth verse of Devasthāna—

यदासौ सर्वभूतानां न दुह्यति न काङ्क्षति ।
कर्मणा मनसा वाचा ब्रह्म संपद्यते तदा ॥

Ch. 21. 5. (Kumbh. and Citraśālā).

6. This verse occurs again in *Mokṣadharmā*, 174. 51, Citraśālā.

Vyāsa then appears on the scene and presents to Yudhiṣṭhira the Gītā-doctrine of Svadharma :

स्वधर्मं चर धर्मज्ञ यथाशास्त्रं यथाविधि ।

Ch. 23. 3, (Kumbh. and Citraśālā).

स्वधर्मे वर्तमानस्य सापवादेऽपि भारत ।

एवमात्मपरित्यागः तव राजन्न शोभनः ॥

Ch. 31. 23 (Kumbh.).

Ch. 32. 23 (Citraśālā).

Yudhiṣṭhira points to the lamenting widows of the dead warriors and denounces himself, on hearing which Vyāsa says that neither Bhīma killed nor Arjuna, but God as Kāla. And then after discourses by a number of persons for a length of 30 chs. Yudhiṣṭhira consents to enter the city for the coronation.

The next section in which we find the Gītā restated or enlarged upon or commented upon is the Mokṣadharmā section of Bhīṣma's discourse in the Śānti. In 173.40 (Kumbh.) Dākṣya is praised; in 173. 52-56 (Kumbh.), Sāmya is inculcated; in Ch. 175. (176 Citraśālā), we have the Śamyāka (Śampāka) Gītā; in Ch. 176 (177 Citraśālā), the Mañki Gītā and the Bodhya Gītā (178 Citraśālā).

In Ch. 210⁷ occurs Nārada's prayer on Kṛṣṇa called Anu-smṛti to which the Lord replies :

अहं भगवतस्तस्य मम चासौ सनातनः ।

तस्याहं न प्रणश्यामि स च मे न प्रणश्यति ॥ Śl. 65.

even as He said in the Gītā :

यो मां पश्यति सर्वत्र सर्वं च मयि पश्यति ।

तस्याहं न प्रणश्यामि स च मे न प्रणश्यति ॥ VI. 30.

Kṛṣṇa says here—

अपि पापसमाचारः स याति परमां गतिम् । Ch.210.69.

तस्याक्षयो भवेत्लोकः श्वपाकस्यापि नारद ।

किं पुनर्ये यजन्ते मां साधका विधिपूर्वकम् ॥ Ch.210.76-77

7. This prayer and reply are not found in the Citraśālā Edn. In the Vavilla Press Edn., it occurs in Śānti, Ch. 195.

even as He told Arjuna in the Gītā—

अपि चेत् सुदुराचारः etc. : स्त्रियो वैश्यास्तथा शूद्राः तेषु यान्ति परां गतिम् ।

Then यज्ञो दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि शरीरिणाम् । Ch. 210. 75.

Gītā „ „ मनीषिणाम् । XVIII. 5.

Again—कर्माण्याद्यन्तवन्तीह मद्भक्तोऽमृतमश्नुते । Ch. 210. 77.

Gītā आद्यन्तवन्तः कौन्तेय न तेषु रमते बुधः । V. 22.

Ch. 224. Śl. 47.

Gītā. IV, 19.

न ममेति च भावेन
ज्ञानाग्निनिलयेन च ।
अनन्तरं तथा कुर्याः
तानि कर्माणि भस्मसात् ॥

यस्य सर्वे समारम्भाः
कामसङ्कल्पवर्जिताः ।
ज्ञानाग्निदग्धकर्माणं
तमाहुः पण्डितं बुधाः ॥

Ch. 224. Śl. 48.

Gītā. III. 20-21.

यद्यदाचरति श्रेष्ठः
तत्तदेवेतरो जनः ।
तस्माल्लोकस्य सिद्धयर्थं
कर्तव्यं चात्मसिद्धये ॥

लोकसङ्ग्रहमेवापि
संपश्यन् कर्तुमर्हति ।
यद्यदाचरति श्रेष्ठः
तत्तदेवेतरो जनः ॥

Sānti, 350 Kumbh. 25 : The Lord tells Arjuna; यथा प्रमाणं हि कृतं लोकस्समनुवर्तते which is found in the Gītā as : स यद् प्रमाणं कुरुते लोकस्समनुवर्तते । Compare also Sānti, 350.3 and Gītā VII. 16.

In Ch. 231 (224 Citraśālā) Indra asks Bali who is defeated if he was not griefstricken, to which Bali magnificently replies in the Gītā-spirit, with the refrain—तस्माच्छक्रन शोचामि corresponding to the Gītā's न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि । Verse 16 (14 Citraśālā, here is the Gītā itself.

हतं हन्ति हतो ह्येव यो नरो हन्ति कञ्चन ।

उभौ तौ न विजानीतः यश्च हन्ति हतश्च यः ॥

Bali tells Indra that God as Kāla has already killed and that Indra need not take pride for his prowess, even as Kṛṣṇa told Arjuna in the Gītā : मयैवैते निहताः पूर्वमेव । Bali says :

दग्धमेवानुदहते(ति) हतमेवानुह्नयते । Śl. 22 (20 Citraśālā)

मा कृथाः शक्र पौरुषम् ॥ Śl. 27. (25 „)

Yudhiṣṭhira then asks Bhīṣma about the proper attitude when a calamity befalls one and Bhīṣma⁸ narrates the Indra-Namuci-sainvāda, which is of the nature as the Indra-Bali-sainvāda noticed above. With the same message, another Indra-Bali-sainvāda follows in Ch. 234 (227 Citraśālā), a message which is to be seen effectively expressed in Śl. 65 here—

शोककाले शुचो मा त्वं हर्षकाले च मा हृषः ।

In the Asita-Jaigīṣavya-sainvāda in Ch. 256 (229 Citraśālā), Bhīṣma teaches Stuti-Nindā-Avikriyā, the Nirdvandvatā of the Gītā. In Ch. 245 (230 Citraśālā), Vyāsa enlightens his son Śuka and here we find the 19th verse as one from the Gītā :

विद्याभिजनसंपन्ने ब्राह्मणे गवि हस्तिनि ।
शुनि चैव श्वपाके च पण्डिताः समदर्शिनः ॥⁹

This and some succeeding chapters, Vyāsa calls Sāmkhya. Another Gītā-verse occurring in this Sāmkhya-section of Vyāsa's teaching to his son is—

सर्वतः पाणिपादं तत् सर्वतोऽक्षिशिरोमुखम् ।
सर्वतः श्रुतिमल्लोके सर्वमावृत्य तिष्ठति ॥

Ch. 23. 5. 29 (Kumbh.) Ch. 239.29 (Citraśālā). Gītā XIII. 13.

Vyāsa then teaches Yoga in Ch. 246, stressing Sāmya and Nirdvandvatā. In Ch. 247 (241 Citraśālā), Śuka asks the question which Arjuna asks in the beginning of Ch. 3 of the Gītā. Why this contradiction—do Karman and give up Karman? कुरु कर्म त्यजेति च । And Vyāsa here gives the reply which Kṛṣṇa gave. In Ch. 257 (251 Citraśālā) is repeated the Gītā-verse आपूर्यमाणमचलप्रतिष्ठं etc.

In Ch. 268 (262 Citraśālā) a shop-keeper teaches magnificent wisdom to a Brahmin named Jājali. Like the Dharmavyādha, this shop-keeper does a Svadharmayoga with his avocation.⁹ He says :

8. See also Śānti, Mokṣadharmā, 308, Śls. 32-3 for the same idea and similar expression.

9. For a similar Tulādhāracarita, see the Padmapurāṇa (Anandāśrama edn.) Vol. III. Chs. 47 and 50.

या वृत्तिः स परो धर्मः तेन जीवामि जाजले । Śl. 6.
 नानुरुध्ये विरुध्ये वा न द्वेषि न च कामये ।
 समोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु पश्य मे जाजले व्रतम् ॥ Śl. 10.

This is followed by a number of verses in the Gītā-manner. In Ch. 270 (264 Citraśālā), the Tulādhāra says :

श्रद्धामयोऽयं पुरुषः यो यच्छ्रद्धः स एव सः । Śl. 17.

which can be found in the Gītā, XVII. 3.

In the next Ch. (265 Citraśālā), Bhiṣma presents the golden mean of युक्ताहारविहार युक्तचेष्ट found in the Gītā.

यथा शरीरं न म्लायेन्नैव मृत्युवशं भवेत् ।
 तथा कर्मसु वर्तेत समर्थो धर्ममाचरेत् ॥
 Śl. 15. (14 Citraśālā)

In Ch. 275 here, Kapila puts it more definitely—

नानशनः स्यान्न महाशनः स्यात् ।
 (267 . 76. Citraśālā)

which echoes the Gītā :

नात्यश्नतस्तु योगोऽस्ति न चैकान्तमनश्नतः । VI.16

In Ch. 279 (273 Citraśālā), Yudhiṣṭhira asks Bhiṣma the question which Arjuna puts in Gītā, 111. 16—

अथ केन प्रयुक्तोऽयं पापं चरति पूरुषः ।

and like Kṛṣṇa, Bhiṣma traces Pāpa to Kāma. (Śls. 3-12).

Ch. 284 (278 Citraśālā) has a Hārīta Gītā; ch. 285 (279 Citraśālā) a Vṛtra Gītā; and chs. 296-304 (290-298 Citraśālā) a Parāśara Gītā, in all of which many Gītā-ideas are given expression to.

In ch. 306, it is pointed out, as in the Gītā, that the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga are identical.

उभे चैते मते तत्त्वे मम तात युधिष्ठिर ।
 Śl. 7. (300. 8, Citraśālā)

an idea which is again emphasised in ch. 310-30 and ch. 321, 2-4. (305. 19 and 316. 4 Citraśālā) :

यदेव योगाः पश्यन्ति साङ्ख्यैस्तदवगम्यते ।
एकं साङ्ख्यं च योगं च यः पश्यति स बुद्धिसान् (तत्त्ववित्) ॥

found almost in identical words in the Gītā, V. 4-5.

In the Āśvamedhika, Yudhiṣṭhira is again sad; the coronation upsets him and a desire to retire into the forests seizes him again. Vyāsa convinces him with Gītā-arguments that Yudhiṣṭhira must stay in the kingdom. In the same context, the Lord Himself tells Yudhiṣṭhira that Kāma can never be eradicated totally but must be turned into paths of Dharma; for has He not said in the Gītā धर्माविरुद्धो भूतेषु कामोऽस्मि भरतर्षभ ? (VI. 11).

It is in the Āśvamedhika that a supplementary Gītā called the Anugītā, about twice longer than the Bha. Gītā, occurs in chs. 17-51.¹⁰ Arjuna tells Kṛṣṇa that he had forgotten the Gītā and asks Him to repeat His discourse. Kṛṣṇa chides him and gives out his teachings in the form of Itihāsas or old dialogues. This Anugītā is written entirely in the Gītā-spirit and the Gītā-vocabulary. A detailed comparison will be interesting though impossible here. Some striking similarities cannot however be ignored. In ch. 20 here, we find the verses :

सर्वमित्रः सर्वसहः शमे रक्तो जितेन्द्रियः ।
व्यपेतभयमन्युश्च कामहा मुच्यते नरः ॥
आत्मवत् सर्वभूतेषु यश्चरेन्नियतः शुचिः ।
अमानी निरभिमानः सर्वतो मुक्त एव सः ॥
जीवितं मरणं चोभे सुखदुःखे तथैव च ।
लाभालाभे प्रियद्वेष्ये यः समः स च मुच्यते ॥
न कस्यचित् स्पृहयते नावजानाति किञ्चन ।
निर्द्वन्द्वो वीतरागात्मा सर्वथा मुक्त एव सः ॥

(Ch. 19. 2ff, Citraśalā.)

and so on—verses which ordinarily may be mistaken to occur in the Gītā itself. Having communicated the Anugītā. Kṛṣṇa again asks Arjuna in the same words of the Gītā :

10. In the Citraśalā Press Edn, the Anugītāparvan begins at ch. 16 and goes up to the end of the Āśvamedhika in ch. 92. Within this, this Edn. calls ch. 20 *Brama Gītā*; chs. 31-34, *Brāhmaṇa Gītā*; chs. 35-51, *Guruśiṣyasaṁvāda*; chs. 33-51, *Uttāṅkopākhyāna*.

कच्चिदेतत्त्वया पार्थ श्रुतमेकाग्रचेतसा ।

Ch. 20. Śl. 55. (19. 55 Citraśālā)

Śl. 62 here is, again, a Gītā-verse :

इमं धर्मं समास्थाय येऽपि स्युः पापयोनयः ।

स्त्रियो वैश्याः तथा शूद्राः तेऽपि यान्ति परां गतिम् ॥

किं पुनः ब्राह्मणाः पार्थ क्षत्रिया वा बहुश्रुताः ॥

Ch. 20. Śl. 62, (19. 61-62 Citraśālā.)

Ch. 41 (44. Chitraśālā) of this Anugītā is a recast of the Vibhūti-yogādhyāya of the Gītā. The difference between these two chapters is that what is called the best of each class in the Vibhūtiyoga-chapter of the Gītā is called here the primal manifestation in that class,—Ādi.

आदित्यो ज्योतिषामादिः अग्निभूतादिरुच्यते ।

सावित्री सर्वविद्यानां देवतानां प्रजापतिः ॥

ओंकारः सर्ववेदानां वचसां प्राण एव च ।

गायत्री छन्दसामादिः ।

गावः चतुष्पदामादिः मनुष्याणां द्विजातयः ।

श्येनः पतत्रिणामादिः ।

हिरण्यं सर्वरत्नानाम् ।

अहं प्रजापतीनां सर्वेषाम् ।

पर्वतानां महामेरुः etc.¹¹

The next situation of a Gītā character is Kṛṣṇa's meeting with the Brāhmaṇa Udaṅka (Uttāṅka) who, on hearing of the war and the death of the Kauravas, began to curse Kṛṣṇa because, being capable of preventing that huge man-slaughter, Kṛṣṇa did not do His best to prevent it. Kṛṣṇa laid before Udaṅka the ultimate principles and His own real nature—the same method with which He brought round Arjuna on the battlefield. The whole of ch. 54 is based on the Gītā. One verse can be pointed out as the essence. Kṛṣṇa says (54.16 Citraśālā) :

धर्मस्य सेतुं बध्नामि चलिते चलिते युगे ।

11. For a similar Vibhūti-yoga embodied in a hymn on Śiva in the M. Bhārata itself, see. Anuśāsana. ch. 45. Sls. 305-314 and Śānti; 290, 129ff.

Cf. यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य etc. Gītā. And the Lord then, to complete Udañka's understanding, shows him, as He showed Arjuna, His own Viśvarūpa. Udañka realises that "All this is the Imperishable Lord Himself" :

विश्वकर्मन्मस्तेऽस्तु विश्वात्मन् विश्वसम्भव ।
 पद्भ्यां ते पृथिवी व्याप्ता शिरसा चावृतं नभः ॥
 द्वावापृथिव्योर्यन्मध्यं जठरेण समावृतम् ।
 भुजाभ्यामावृता आशाः स्वमिदं सर्वमुच्यते ॥

Āśvam. 55. 12-13. (Kumbh)

55. 7-8. (Citraśālā.)

APPENDIX

An Alphabetical List of the Gītās¹²

Recent imaginative expounders of the Bhagavad Gītā attach great significance to the name Gītā and, taking suggestion from the meaning 'song' emphasise that this scripture of the Hindus is not a difficult metaphysical text but that, like song, it appeals and produces 'Sāmarasya' and so on. The feminine form 'Gītā' is not quite happy then. It is invariably found, when quoted, in plural number as 'Gītāḥ'. Therefore 'Gītāḥ' does not stand by itself, but qualifies 'Upaniṣadaḥ', which forms the noun. It is only very rarely that 'Gītā' in the singular number occurs. In all the Gītās occurring in the Mahābhārata and in several other contexts of a similar nature in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas also, we find Gītā Itihāsam' 'Gītāḥ ślokāḥ'. To this characteristic old expression 'Gītāḥ ślokāḥ' 'Gītāḥ Itihāsaḥ' it is that we have to relate the name Gītā. The feminine form however is due to the Bhagavadgītā where the noun is 'Upaniṣadaḥ' and it is, again, after the name Bhagavad Gītā, that the form in the singular number also became current.

It is natural that the large number of the Gītās has been suggesting the idea of their collected publication to scholars and

12. With acknowledgments to Mr. E.P. Rādhākṛṣṇan, M.A., who made the provisional compilation of the Gītās.

publishers from time to time. In 1910, Mr. V. Kuppusvāmi Rāju began issuing from Tanjore his "Gītaikkottu" (Bunch of Gītās) with Tamil translations. In 1911 appeared from Calcutta "the Gītāgranthāvalī", twenty-five Gītās with Bengali versions, ed. by Upendranātha Mukhopādhyāya. In 1915, Ashtekar Co. of Poona published a volume of Gītās called the 'Gītāsaṅgraha', being the first part of a series unfortunately discontinued. A number of Gītās still remain to be published as can be seen from the following list.

The Gītās admit of a broad classification into close imitations of the Bhagavad Gītā, short dialogues or discourses of eminent persons on a single or a select number of moral and spiritual principles, like the Manki, Bodhya and other Gītās in the Śānti-parvan of the Mahābhārata, and others which are mere hymns or glorifications (Māhātmyas) like the Guru Gītā stotra. This classification applies to the Gītās in general and not to the translation of Christian scripture or the account of Gāndhiji's Satyāgraha movement which bear the name Gītā or to the satirical Gītā like the Congress Gītā.¹³

Agastya Gītā—Varāha Purāṇa; chs. 51-67, Venk. edn.; begins on p. 259 (ch. 51) in Bib. Ind. edn. Agastya enlightens King Bhadrāśva. Agastya appears even in ch. 50 describing some Vratas; evidently the theme of 'Vratas' is not enough to make a discourse a 'Gītā'. In ch. 51 Bhadrāśva enquires of Mokṣadharmā and here the Agastya Gītā begins. Agastya teaches spiritual wisdom through the parable of king Paśupāla; this Paśupālopākhyāna extends only up to ch. 53. Then again, Agastya begins the Vratas which go up to ch. 65 where the colophon calls the section Agastya Gītā; chs. 66-67 dealing with the greatness and worship of Viṣṇu are also called Agastya Gītā. Even after this Agastya continues to be the speaker.

Adbhuta Gītā or *Nānaka Gītā*—8 chs. purporting to be an original work of Nānak, Sikhism.

com. Kaiśavapada by Keśavānandasvāmin.

13. I am told that there is also a modern 'अगीता' on 'Tea' belonging to this comic category.

Edn. with Notes and Hindi version by Śaṅkarānanda Avadhūta. Moradabad, 1901. Br. Mu. Pt. Bks. Cat. 1892-1906. Col. 405.¹⁴

Adhyātma Gītā—Vedānta, Peters VI. 266.

Anu Gītā—Mahābhārata, Āśvamedhika, chs. 17-95.

For contents etc. *see* body of the article, above.

Arjuna Gītā—Kṛṣṇārjuna saṁvāda on Sannyāsa. TD. 9094. Other mss. also available.

Avadhūta Gītā—By Dattātreyā. 8 chs., also called Svātma-saṁvittiyupadeśa; in some colophons is added 'Svāmi Kārtika saṁvāde' the meaning of which is not borne out by the text, the first three chapters of which are put in the mouth of 'Avadhūta and the rest in the mouth of Datta.

Subject Advaita; sings eloquently of the state in which Advaita has been realised. Śls. 2-4, in last ch., are found in the Bhāgavata, XI, ch. II (Śls. 29-31) also.

The above account is based on a pocket edn. of this Gītā, of the N. S. Press, 1913. It is included in the Gītā saṅgraha (No. 8). Other edns. also are available. This Gītā has been commented upon by many.

In the Mss. MD. 4543 MT. 3231. 4063.4115.4249, the work is also called Avadhūta grantha and is described as a dialogue between Dattātreyā and Gorakṣa. In some other Mss. it is called 'Śvātmopadeśa' and 'Datta Gītā' or 'Dattātreyā Gītā' also. B. IV. 30 and 90 mention a Vidyā Gītā by Dattātreyā and B. IV. 36, an Adbhuta Gītā by the same. These two are evidently the same Avadhūta Gītā of which name *Adbhuta Gītā* seems to be a corruption.

In a Jodhpur ms. (No. 871) this Avadhūta Gītā of Dattātreyā is assigned to the Simhādrikhaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa. Jodhpur has a Datta Gorakṣa Gītā. Is it identical with this Gītā? Hiralal's CPB Catalogue mentions a Gorakṣa Gītā assigned to Dharma (?) —no. 1508.

14. The abbreviations used here for catalogues are as found in the Provisional Fasciculus of the New Catalogus Catalogorum of the Madras University.

In three Tanjore mss. (TD. 7589-91), this work is called Vedāntasāra.

Avadhūta Gītā—The Bhāgadata, XI. chs. 7 Śl. 25—9. Śl. 29. Kumbh. edn. This section is not called a Gītā in the Kumb. edn. but is so called in a ms. for which see L. 4047.

Aśmaka Gītā—The Mokṣasāmrajyalakṣmitantra is a compilation of moral and spiritual texts embodying many well-known texts and extracts therefrom. One of these is given as the Aśmaka Gītā from the Rājadharmā section of the Mahābhārata. See T. D. Vol. XIII. p. 5659. This Aśmaka Gītā is ch. 27 Kumbha., ch. 28. Citrasālā, of the Rājadharmā, where Aśmā, a Brāhmaṇa, teaches king Janaka the moral principles to be observed by kings. Neither edition of the Epic, however, calls this ch. Aśmaka Gītā, though Śl. 2 here has the words 'Aśmā Gītā (itihāsam)' which mode of expression forms the basis for the names Mañkī Gītā, Bodhya Gītā etc.

Aṣṭāvakra Gītā or Avadhūtānubhūti, or Aṣṭāvakraśāhita, or Aṣṭ. sūkta, or Adhyātmāśāstra, or Aṣṭāvakra simply, or Aṣṭ. grantha, or Aṣṭ. prakaraṇa. Advaita. Aṣṭāvakra's teachings to king Janaka. 20 or 21 short chs.

Numerous mss., many edns. No. 7 in the Gītāsaṅgraha.

Ātmadarśana Gītā by Buddhisāgara. Jain modern; 182 stanzas. Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1906-28. 202.

Īśvara Gītā—Sometimes called Śiva Gītā also. Kūrmapurāṇa, Uttarabhāga, chs. 1-11, forming the first part of Vyāsa-gītā which is another name of the whole of Book II of the Kūrmapurāṇa.

Subject : Adv., Yoga, Śiva-bhakti. Speaker : Śiva.
Verses : 426.

Many parallels in thought and expression between this and Bha. Gītā. Here Śiva as Cosmic dancer, shows his dancing Viśvarūpa form which is first described and is then followed by a hymn. Another noteworthy parallel is a Vibhūtiyoga ch. containing numerous verbal parallels with the same in the Bhagavad Gītā.

1. English Transl. by L. Kanno Mal, M. A. Motilal Banarasi Das, Lahore, 1924. Intro. draws attention to Gītā parallels.

2. L. Īśvaragītā, Fr. Edn. Text in Roman with Fr. Transl., Intro., Notes, and concordance of parallels with Bh. gītā, Śvetāśvatara and Kaṭha Ups.

Utathya Gītā—Mahābhārata, Sānti. Rājadharmā. chs. 90-91. Citraśālā Press Edn. Subject : Rājadharmā; expounded by sage Utathya to king Māndhātā.

Kumbh. chs. 90-91, but here not called a Gītā but only Ucathya Māndhātṛsasainvāda.

Uttara Gītā—a Kṛṣṇa-Arjuna sainvāda in three chs. on praṇava and its Upāsana and other Advaitic principles; sometimes ascribed to the Āśvamedhikaparvan and sometimes to the Bhīṣmaparvan in the Mahābhārata, but occurring in neither parvan in the Great Epic; frequently confounded with the Anugītā, an almost identical name, occurring in the Āśvamedhika of the Great Epic. Edn. Vāṇī Vilās, Srī Raṅgam, 1910 with a Gauḍapāda's gloss.

Uttara Gītāsāra—Advaita. Mysore II, p. 22. Extracts from this ms. were got and the text calls itself at the beginning Gītāsāra and Uttaraḡītāsāra in the colophon. It purports to contain 22 chs. of which the last is described as Gītāsārayoga. It assigns itself to the Bhīṣmaparvan.

Beginning :

अर्जुन उवाच —

वेदादिमूलं सकलस्वराणाम् + त्रिरत्नमूलं पुरुषं नमामि ॥ गीतासारं
महापुण्यं यः पठेत् सततं नरः । etc.

End : यत्र योगीश्वरः कृष्णः etc. Follows another mystifying
verse : स्वाभ्याम् (?) तु सुलभो ह्यात्मा नाभ्यामुपरि तिष्ठति । द्वाभ्यां त्रिभिः
चतुर्भिश्च पञ्चभिः षड्भिः जगदिति ॥

Col : इति श्रीमहाभा० शतशा० वैया० भीष्मपर्वणि उत्तरगीता-
सारोपनिषत्सु परब्रह्मविद्यायां योग० श्रीकृष्ण० गीतासारयोगो नाम
द्वाविंशोऽध्यायः ॥

This is a text different from the Uttara Gītā and the Gītā also.

Uddhava Gītā—The teachings of Kṛṣṇa to Uddhava in Skandha XI of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata purāṇa appear to have this name also. See Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1892, 1906, Col. 492.

Ṛbhū Gītā—Advaita; 27 chs ; from the Śīvarahasya, Book VI. Adyar I.p. 136a. Alwar 2063. Extr. 612. L 2333. M.D. 4567. Many more mass.

A Tamil transl. of this by Pichu Śāstrin alias Lokanāthasvāmin is available in print. There is an edn. in Telugu script with Telugu rendering.

Ṛṣabha Gīta—Mahābhārata, Rājadharmā, chs. 125-128 Citraśālā. On 'Āśā'; dialogue between sage Ṛṣabha and king Sumitra; same chs. in Kumbh. but not called Gītā there.

Ṛṣabha Gītā—On the Avatāra of Viṣṇu called Ṛṣabha. Hpr. III. 45.

Paliyam 871 (d) is entered as a Ṛṣabha Gītā without any more specification.

Aila Gītā—The Bhāgavata, XI. 26. Kumb. edn. On Duṣṭasaṅga and Satsaṅga.

Oṃkāra Gītā—TD. 23943. Is this Oṃkāramāhātmya or the Gītāsāra for which see TD. 8930.

Kapila Gītā—The Bhāgavata, Skandha III, chs. 25-32 Kumb. edn. Kapila's teachings to His mother Devahūti.¹⁵

Included in the Gītāsāṅgraha. (No. 6).

15. There is an imitation and reproduction of this in the Uttarkāṇḍa of the Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa, ch. 7. where like Kapila teaching His mother Devahūti, Rāma teaches His mother. Kausalyā. The following is a concordance of the corresponding verses in the two places.

Adhy. Utt. VII.		Bhāgavata, III, 22.
Śls. 52-66	=	Śls. 7-21.
„ 67-70	=	„ 24-27.
Śl. 71	=	Sl. 34.
„ 72	=	„ 35.

The verses are identical except for some verbal changes.

Kapila Gītā.—A Vedantic dialogue between Śiva and Pārvati in 5 chs. For an analysis of its contents see L. 1676. MD. 4343 MD. 8998. The last ms. adds the information that this Gītā belongs to the Padmapurāṇa.

Different from this, there is a Yogic text in 5 chs. ascribed to Kapilamuni and called in the colophons and outer sheets of mss. *Dṛṣṭāntara*, *Kapila Gītā* and *Siddhāntasāra Kapila Gītā*. See TD. 6737-6742 and notes on these mss. on p. 4967, TD. XI. For a Siddhāntasāra which is said to be from the Padmapurāṇa, is a Saṁvāda between Kapila and Siddharṣi and is also called *Kapila Gītā*, see TD. 6753.

Karma Gītā.—Ascribed to Padma purāṇa, but not found in the Ānandāśrama edn. of that purāṇa. Kṛṣṇārjunasaṁvād; on Karmans, good and bad, and their consequences. Very defective Sanskrit.

TD. 9054. Telugu Academy 58. Ujjain 1726.

Kāvaṣeya Gītā.—Granthapura p. 6. Descriptive catalogue of the same, Vol. 1, nos. 107-8.

In both these mss., there is a gloss which informs us that the Kāvaṣeyas imparted this Gītā to Durvāsas : that this Gītā appears in the Vyāsa-Sanat Kumāra saṁvāda in the Brahma purāṇa.

The Ānandāśrama edn. of the Brahma however, does not contain any Gītā like this.

Kāśi Gītā.—Another name. according to MD. 2462, of the Pañcakrośimāhātmya on the greatness on the Ganges, from the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa.

[*Kṛṣṇa Gītā*.—TD. 9028. The New Tanjore catalogue is wrong in describing this as a Gītā. It is, as Burnell says, a commentary on the M. Bhārata, Paulomaparvan.]

Kaula Gītā.—Śākta. Adyar II. p. 184b.

Khrīṣṭu Gītā.—14 chs. A Sanskrit version on the Bible.

MD. 14933, 14934.

Gaṇeśa Gītā.—Dialogue between Gaṇeśa and Vareṇya. Gaṇeśa Himself as supreme God expounds Karma (4 chs.), Bhakti (4 chs.)

and Jñāna (3 chs.) Verbal imitations of the Bhagavad Gītā abound here; 11 chs.

Edn. Ānandaśrama 52, with Nilakaṇṭha Caturdhara's gloss.

Found as chs. 138-148 of the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Gaṇeśa purāṇa. Gopāl Nārāyan Co., Bombay, 1892.

4th in the collection Gītāsaṅgrāha.

Garbha Gītā—8 chs. Vedānta, L. 2413. TD. 9056-64. MD. 2413-16. Mysore I. p. 177 (from M. Bhā). Dialogue between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna.

The colophons to MD. 2413 and TD. 9056 consider this as a part of the Bha. Gītā itself! named after the opening गर्भवासजरा मृत्युः etc. Arjuna asks why man should inhabit a womb, be born, grow old, die etc. Defective Sanskrit.

Ak. 129 is a *Garbha Gītā* said to be from the Viṣṇupurāṇa; Ak. 129.

Ānandaśrama 3205 is a गर्भगीता given as mantra.

Ed. by Upendranātha Mukhopādhyāya in his collection of Gītās.

Gītā prapūrti—A series of extracts from the Śrīmad Bhāgavatapurāṇa so as to form a supplement expanding the teachings of the Gītā¹⁶, with a gloss. By Gaura Govindarāya; Calcutta 1902. Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1892-1906, Col. 491.

Guru Gītā—According to Adyar II, app. b, there is a *Guru Gītā* belonging to the Viśvasāratantra.

L. 445 and Cs. V. 18 : *Guru Gītā* ascribed to the Rudrayāmala or the Brahmayāmala.

Some entries ascribe it to Vyāsa. B. IV. 50. Oppert 7466 (Vedānta).

Numerous mss. of a *Guru Gītā* from the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Skāndapurāṇa are found in the Catalogues.

16. On the Gītā and the Bhāgavata, see Dr. V. Raghavan, J. O. R. Madras, Vol. IX, pp. 156-169; 238-254; see also pp. 77-102 in this volume.

The text in all these seems to be the same, styled a stotra, on the greatness of 'preceptor'.

Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1892-1906. Col. 508 mentions a Guru Gītā or Sujñānadīpa in 4 chs., supposed to be from Skānda, Uttarakhaṇḍa, the theme being 'Advaita teachers.'

Goraḥṣanātha Gītā—CPB. notices a Gītā of this name and gives the author as Goraḥṣanātha and subject as Dharma! Jodhpur has a Goraḥṣa Gītā under Yoga and a Datta Goraḥṣa Gītā under Tantra. Ujjain, no. 1728, is an anon. Goraḥṣa Gītā and in the Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 18.2-1960, Cols. 391-2, we find a Goraḥṣanātha Gītā, Saptaśloki, Yoga, a panegyric on Goraḥṣanātha.

Govinda Gītā—Oppert P. 7545.

Is this a mistake for 'Gītāgovinda' ?

Janma Gītā—CPB. 173 . Dharma ?

Jīvanmukti Gītā—TD. 9089, 9090. Kṛṣṇārjunasaṁvāda defective Sanskrit; on the characteristics of the Jīvanmuktas.

Ak 758 has a Jīvanmukti Gītā which is ascribed to Dattātreya, to whom the Avadhūta Gītā is attributed. The Tanjore text of the Jīvanmukti Gītā does not agree with any part of Dattātreya's Avadhūta Gītā.

Jñāna Gītā—Advaita, No. XXXVI of the Jaṭāśaṅkar Mss. in the H. P. T. College, Nasik.

Tattva Gītā—A medical tract in 18 chs. Vaiṣṇava; Bhakti; purporting to belong to a 'Mūlaveda'. Edn. with Gujarati transl., com. etc. by Bhajanānanda Guru Brahmānanda, Vithalpur, Ahmedabad, 1911. Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1906-28, Col. 1080.

Tattvasāra Gītā—Ānandāśrama 6631. Compare Sāra Gītā below. Compare Tattvasāra, TD. 6736, a Saṁvāda between Iśvara and Kārttikeya on Yogic and Vedāntic topics in six chapters.

Tulasī Gītā—Ed. in the Gītāgranthāvalī by Upendranātha Mukhopādhyāya, Calcutta. 1911.

Dāyudo Gītā (David Gītā)—Oppert's old Index to the mss. in the Govt. Ori. Mss. Library, Madras.

This seems to be identical with the Sanskrit metrical version of "The Psalms of David" made by the Calcutta Baptist Missionaries with Native Assistant, printed in Devanāgarī at Calcutta in 1839 and in Telugu characters at Madras in 1843. American Mission Press, Madras 1849. In this last mentioned edn., the book is not called 'Gītā' but 'Gītāni'.

Devī Gītā—Assigned to the Kūmapurāṇa, Hpr. I. 174, This is represented by ch. 82 of the Kūrma, Bib. Ind. edn., where however, the name Devī Gītā is not given. Devī, as soon as She is born as daughter to Himavān shows him Her Viśvarūpa, telling Him in the words of the Gītā :

दिव्यं ददामि ते चक्षुः पश्य मे रूपमैश्वरम् ।

Himavān has a prayer on Her in which the Vibhūtiyoga of the Gītā repeats itself; see pp. 130-131. Then Devī gives Upadeśa to Her father Himavān. pp. 136-148, in which Gītā ideas and Gītā expressions are abundantly found.

Devī Gītā—Devībhāgavata, 7th Skandha. Venk. edn. Chs. 31-34. Devī as daughter of Himavān expounds Her true form. Bhakti, Karman and Jñāna to Her father.

Also called Bhagavatī Gītā. No 5 in the Gītāsaṅgraha.

Devīśa Gītā—A metrical exposition, in 7 chs., of monism and Yoga, cosmology and theology by Gaṇeśa, Benares, 1920, Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1906-28. Col. 276.

Nanaka Gītā—See Adbhuta Gītā above.

Nārada Gītā—On Gurubhakti; Kṛṣṇa Nārada saṁvāda; 42 verses, defective Sanskrit.

IO. 5982. TD. 9091. Other Mss. also available. Printed : Benares, 1915.

Nārāyaṇa Gītā—Rāmānanda sect, by Nilakaṇṭha. Oxi. 302.

Nīlā Gītā—30 psalms. Sanskrit translation of the Tamil Tiruppāvai of Śrī Āṇḍal or Godādevī, by Govardhanam Raṅgācārya, Bangalore 1898. Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1892-1906. Col. 428.

Parama Gītā—BORI. 407 of 1895-1902. Mr. P. K. Gode was kind enough to supply me with extracts from this ms. In two colophons it is called Paramasāra Gītā and in one verse at the end

Dharma Gītā. The final colophon calls it Parama Gītā. 16 chs. Jaina Dharma.

Parāśara Gītā—Mahābhārata, Śānti, Mokṣadharmā. Chs. 286-304, 291-298, Citraśālā. Parāśara teaches Janaka : subject : Dharma with reference to the different Varṇas and Āśramas and with general reference to Mokṣa.

Included also in Upendranātha Mukhopādhyāya's Gītā-granthāvali.

Pāṇḍava Gītā -Also called Prapanna Gītā.

Numerous Mss. and edns. Available in the Bṛhatstotraratnākara. No. 12 in the Gītāsaṅgraha. Mostly prayers to Kṛṣṇa, one verse spoken by each of the characters of the M. Bhārata and other sages.

Pitr Gītā—Varāhapurāṇa, Bib. Ind. Edn., pp. 100-101. On Śrāddha; Ślokas sung by the means : Ch. 13. Śls. 49-59.

Included also in the Gītāgranthāvali of Upendranāth Mukhopādhyāya.

Pitṛgītā [Kathana]—On Pitṛbhakti, Fl. 19; claims to form part of TakṣakavaṁśaPrakāśa of the Paḍmapurāṇa. 42 verses. I am not able to find this out in the Ānandāśrama edn. of the Paḍmapurāṇa in four volumes.

Pṛthivi Gītā—Ed. in the Gītāgranthāvali by Upendranātha Mukhopādhyāya.

Prāṇava Gītā—Spoken by Sūtapaurāṇika. Mysore I, p. 177. TD. 9093.

Prapanna Gītā—Another name of Pāṇḍava Gītā. See above.

Prākṛta Gītā (2)—Upanisadbrahma Mutt. 589.

Bodhānanda Gītā—A metrical summary in 12 chs. of 10 principal Upaniṣads by Bodhānandayajvan, pupil of Brahmānanda. Kalpati 1909. Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1906-28. Col. 174.

Bodhya Gītā—Mahābhārata, Śānti, Mokṣadharmā, ch. 177, Śls. 57-68 Kumbh. 178 Citraśālā. On Nirveda in all desires.

Included in the Gītāgranthāvali.

Brahma Gītā—Yogavāsiṣṭha, N. S. Edn. 1918, VI, (Nirvāṇa-prakaraṇa) Uttarārdha, ch. 128 and 173-186. Advaita.

Included in the *Gītāsaṅgraha*. No. 13b.

Brahma Gītā—Skānda, Sūtasamhitā, 4th section called Yajña vaibhavakhaṇḍa, Uparibhāga, Chs. 1-12. Brahman expounds Advaita and the greatness of Śiva. Edn. Ānandāśrama 25 with Mādhavācārya's gloss.

Included as No. 13 a in the *Gītāsaṅgraha*.

Brāhmaṇa Gītā—Mahābhārata, Āśvamedhika, Anugītā subsection Chs. 20-34, Ch. 20 is called *Brahma Gīta* in the Citraśālā edn. which is evidently an error for *Brāhmaṇa Gītā*. The Kumbh. Edn. does not give such a sub-division of the Anugītā.

Bhakta Gītā—See Auf. CC. I. p. 389b (Rādh. 43) where a *Bhakta Gītā Ṭikā* is noticed.

Bhagavatī Gītā—Another name of the *Devi Gītā* from the *Devībhāgavata*. See *Devi Gītā* above.

Bhavānīśaṅkara Gītā—A part of the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*. See MD. 2141, p. 1457, (colophon) and IO. 3422. (colophon).

Bhikṣu Gītā—S. R. Bhaṇḍarkar's Report of II Tour in Rajaputana and Central India, p. 9. Ānandāśrama 3274. Edn. with Bengali transl. Calcutta, 1876.

This is evidently ch. 23 of Skandha¹⁷ of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata, dealing with the ways to put up with sorrow and other afflictions.

Bhrgu Gītā—TD. 9092.

Mañki Gītā—Mahābhārata, Śānti, Mokṣadharmā, ch. 176, Śls. 4-54. Kumbh. 177 Citraśālā.

On the greater happiness of the renunciation of wishes as compared to their gratification.

17. Yogavāsiṣṭha, Nirvāṇa prakaraṇa, chs. 52-58, contain the largest number of quarter, half and full *Gītā* stanzas. See *Yogavāsiṣṭha* and the *Bha. Gītā*, by Mr. P. C. Divanji, Proceedings of the 12th Indian Philosophical Congress, 1936.

Included in the Gītāgranthāvali.

Mṛtyuñjaya Gītā—Hara gaurī saṁvāda. On Japa, Stotra. Brahmācintā etc. Hpr. I. 291.

Yama Gītā—Agnipurāṇa, ch. 382. Ānandāśrama edn. Yama's spiritual teachings to Naciketas.

Included in the Gītāsaṅgraha. No. 10(c).

Yama Gītā—Viṣṇudharma : Dharmarāja-yamadūta saṁvāda; ch. 20. On the avoiding of the Vaiṣṇavas by Death and his agents. MD. 14323.

The colophon does not give the name Yamagītā.

Yama Gītā—From the Viṣṇupurāṇa, III. ch. 7.

This is however not called Yamagītā in the Venk. edn. of the Viṣṇupurāṇa.

Included in the Gītāsaṅgraha. No. 10(a).

All the Yama Gītās, except the one in the Agnipurāṇa, are of the same topic : Yama's instructions to his Bhaṭas not to touch devotees of Viṣṇu.

Yama Gītā—Skānda. Lz. 333. Yama's instructions to his agents not to approach for killing the devotees of Viṣṇu. Similar eulogies of Viṣṇubhaktas by Yama occur in the Viṣṇupurāṇa, III. and the Bhāgavata, Ajāmilopākhyāna.

Yama Gītā—From the Nṛsimhapurāṇa, ch. 8. Gopal Narayan & Co. Edn. (1911). Subject same as in the above.

Included in the Gītāsaṅgraha. No. 10(b).

BBRAS. 1348. Yama Gītā stotra from the Skānda.

Yājñavalkya Gītā—In 12 chs.; a dialogue between sage Yājñavalkya and Gārgi his wife.

Calcutta Skr. College, III. 96; IO. 2494.5994; MD. 4362-4; TD. 6745-6746.

Different from this is the text (in 12 chs.) of the Yogiyājñavalkya (IO. 2495), though the Y. Gītā is also called in some mss. Yoga Y. Gītā. The Yogiyājñavalkya as addressed by Y. to the sages.

The Yā. Gītā is also called Yā. Samhitopaniṣad.

For edns. See Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1892-1906, Col. 391-2.

Yoga Gīta—Ānandāśrama 7657. Jodhpur. p. 56.

Rāgi Gītā—Quoted by Vidyāraṇya in his Bṛhadāraṇyaka-bhāṣyavārtikasāra, Chowkamba Edn. 1919, p. 57, Śl. 49. See also the Taittiriyāraṇyakabhāṣya of Sāyaṇa, Ānandāśrama Edn., Pt. II. p. 472.

‘तथा च रागिगीतायां पठ्यते वचनं त्विदम् ।
अपि वृन्दावने शून्ये शृंगालत्वं स इच्छति ।
न तु निविषयं मोक्षं कदाचिदपि गौतम ॥’

Rāma Gītā—Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa, Uttarakāṇḍa, ch. 5. Śls. 1-62. Rāma’s Upadeśa to Lakṣmaṇa. See Calcutta Skr. Series Edn. Pt. II. pp. 969-1001. Advaita. For an English transl. of this, see above edn., Pt. I. Intro. pp. 60-69. Included in the Gītā-saṅgraha as No. 2. See also Bṛhatstotra Ratnākara, Gujarathi Press Edn. Vol. II. pp. 533 ff.

Rāma Gītā—From the Tattvasārāyaṇa; 18 chs. Ed. by G. Krishna Sastri, Adyar, Ātmavidyā Series, I. *Ibid.* II, transl. in English.

For Mss see Adyar I. p 140a. This expounds the Anubhāvadvaita.

Rāma Gītā—Skānda, Nirvāṇakhaṇḍa; different from the previous; in 3 chs. (?).

For a Ms. see Cs, IV, 290.

Rāmagītāstotra—Lz. 197, 3. Ascribed to Rāmānuja (?).

Rāsa Gītā—Said to be from the Rāsollāsatantra.

Included in the Gītāgranthāvali.

Rudra Gītā—The Bhāgavata, IV. 24. Śls. 33-79. Kumbh. edn. Rudra on Viṣṇu’s greatness. Some Mss. call this Rudra Gītā, though it is not so called in the Kumbh. edn.

Alwar 2325. Bhan Dāji. 71. Kotah 1077.

Rudra Gītā—Varāhapurāṇa, Chs. 70-89.

Agastya who is the speaker in the previous chs. introduces Rudra in ch. 70 and makes Him speak about Viṣṇu as the supreme object of worship. Poor Śiva is made to say that He invented the 'Mohaśāstra' of Pāśupata to delude some people, and in ch. 71 is made to invent a story to explain why He gave out that Śāstra. In ch. 73 Viṣṇu shows Rudra His own Nārāyaṇa form, on the waters with Brahman in his naval. Rudra has a hymn on this form; this ch. corresponds to the Viśvarūpadarśana and Arjuna's prayer to Viśvarūpa in the Bhagavad Gītā. In ch. 74 Rudra begins a mythological geography, history and cosmogony, Bhuvanakośa, a prose account, with which the Rudra Gītā ends in ch. 89. See Bib. Ind Edn. of 1893, Varāhapurāṇa.

Rudra Gītā.—Chs. 6-10, IV Pāda, of the Bṛhad Brahma Saṁhitā of the Nārada-pāñcarātra. See ch. 6, Śl. 1 for the name. Viṣṇubhakti and Advaita Vedānta. Rudra enlightening king Bhadrabāhu. See Ānandāśrama edn. of the Bṛhad Brahma Saṁhitā.

Laghu Gītā.—In 18 verses; perhaps the well-known 18 verses from the 18 chs. of the Bhagavad Gītā.

Mysore I. p. 628. S. R. Bhandarkar, Deccan College Catalogue, p. 449. No. 572.

Vasiṣṭha Gītā.—Yoga Vāsiṣṭha, N.S. Edn. 1918, VI (Nīrvāna-prakaraṇa), Uttarārḍha, Chs. 39-40 on Svabhāvaviśrānti and Ātmaviśrānti.

Vāmadeva Gītā.—Mahābhārata, Śānti, Rājadharmā. Chs. 92-94, Citraśālā Press Edn. Subject : Rājadharmā; expounded by sage Vāmadeva to king Sumanas.

Kumbh. Chs. 92-94. Calls this only Vāmadeva Sumanas Saṁvāda.

Vicakṣnu Gītā.—Mahābhārata, Śānti, Mokṣadharmā. Ch. 265 Citraśālā. On Ahimsā and vegetarian offerings to God. Kumbh. Ch. 271, not called Gītā here; king given as Vicakṣhyu.

Viratagīta (ā).—Keonjhar 67.

Vṛtra Gītā.—Mahābhārata, Śānti, Mokṣadharmā, Ch. 265 Kumbh. Chs. 279-280 Citraśālā. Sāmya again,—'न शोचामि न हृष्यामि ।'

Vedānta Gītā—A compilation based on the Bhagavad Gītā and other sources, supporting the Nimbārka school. Edn. Bṛndāvan 1911.

Vaiṣṇava Gītā.—Kṛṣṇārjuna saṁvāda. On the superiority of the Vaiṣṇavas. Hpr. 1, 343. Kotah. 1082. Peters. IV. 24.

Included in the Gītāgranthāvalī.

Vyāsa Gītā.—The Uttarabhāga or the latter half of the Kūrmapurāṇa, in 45 chs., in which Vyāsa is the speaker, is called the Vyāsagītā. See Bib. Ind. edn.

Chs 1-11 in this Vyāsagītā form the Īśvaragītā in which Īśvara is the sub-speaker.

Therefore sometimes, chs. 12-45 alone are referred to as Vyāsagītā.

The Vyāsagītā deals with Āśramadharmas, Smṛti-topics, Māhātmyas etc. and is thus of miscellaneous contents.

Śamyāka Gītā.—Mahābhārata. Śāntiparvan, Mokṣadharmā, ch. 175. Kumbh. 173 Citraśālā, which calls this Śampāka Gītā. 'Sukha-duḥkhādinirdvandvatā' is inculcated. See esp. Śl. 5 Kumbh.

Śaṅkara Gītā.—Viṣṇudharmottara, Venkateśvara Press edn., I. Khaṇḍa. Chs. 52-65. A dialogue between Paraśurāma and Śaṅkara, the latter enlightening the former on Viṣṇu, His worship and on the stories of the Avatāras, Nṛsimha. Vāmana and Trivikrama. Ch. 56 here is called 'विष्णोः दिव्यविभूतिवर्णनम्' and it is almost a reproduction with some verbal changes of the Vibhūti Yogādhyāya of the Gītā. Ample correspondence with the Bhagavad Gītā is seen in this Gītā.

A Śaṅkara Gītā is quoted by Hemādri and Śūlapāṇi in the Kālamādhava.

Śaṅkara Gītā—Different from the previous; Umāmaheśvara saṁvāda; M.D. 2544; this Ms. contains two chs. both dealing with Chāyāpuruṣa.

Śānti Gītā—On resignation and the supreme Truth; by Kāśī-nātha Musthauphī with a copious Bengali commentary by his nephew. Calcutta, 1897. Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1892-1906. Col. 298. Found also in the Gītāgranthāvalī.

Śiva Gīta—When Rāma is suffering in his lovelorn state after separation from Sitā in the Daṇḍaka forests. Agastya and Śiva advise him. Philosophy—Advaita plus Śivabhakti. Verses of Gītā and Upaniṣadic passages found profusely. Here also a Viśvārūpadarśana and stuti occur. 16 chs. According to the colophon, part of the Padmapurāṇa, Uparibhāga but not traceable in the Ānandāsrama edn. of the Padma in 4 vols. In L. 1488. however, this same text is ascribed to the Matsya, Uttarakhaṇḍa.

Edn. (1) Jaffna, Kali 5016. in Grantha characters with a Tamil transl. by M. Muthukkumarasvamī Gurukkal.

(2) With Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī's gloss. Vāṇī Vilās Press, Śrīraṅgam, 1980 (Chs. 1-6).

(3) N. S. Press. Bombay (full). 1909.

(4) No. 4 in the Gītasaṅgraha.

Śiva Gītā—Is quoted many times in the Nityācārapradīpa of Narasimha, Bib. Ind. Edn., Vol. II.

The *Śiva Gītā* quoted by Hemādri in *Parīṣeṣa*. 2, 74, as from the Viṣṇudharmottara, is the Śaṅkara Gītā; see above.

Stein 215 Gives a *Śivagītā* from the *Śivapurāṇa*; the Venk. edn. in the *Śivapurāṇa* does not contain a Gītā like this.

Oppert Rice and a Benares Skr. College catalogue speak of a *Śiva Gītā* from the Skanda.

Śivarāma Gītā—Yoga and Advaita. Said to form part of a work called *Śukopadeśa*, otherwise known as *Advaitasudhārāsa* in which Śiva and Rāma converse.

Adyar I. p. 140. MT. 329 (14 chs.) Mysore I. p. 178.

Śivaśaṅkara Gītā—Quoted by Mādhava in his *Kālanirṇaya*, p. 114. A.S.B. edn. by Candrakānta Tarkālaṅkāra.

Śivottara Gītā—MT. 4063 (t) on *Śivamāhātmya*, in 3 Paṭalas, said to form part of the *Harivaṁśa*, Kṛṣṇa-Arjuna saṁvāda in *Dvārkā* when the two were sitting at ease.

Called *Śiva Uttara-gītā* evidently to distinguish it from the more well-known *Uttara-gītā* expounded by Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna, in which Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu is glorified.

Not found in the Venk. edn. of the *Harivaṁśa*.

Śiṣṭa Gītā—By a pupil of Nimbārka, Nimbārka school. Ak. 450,5. Bhr. 83. CPB. 5821. S. R. Bhandarkar, Deccan College, p. 249. No. 83.

Śruti Gītā—The praise of God by the Vedas themselves. The *Bhāgavata* X. 87. Kumb. edn. Has many commentaries.

Śaḍja Gītā—Found in the collection 'Gītāgranthāvalī'.

Sadāśiva Gītā—Quoted by Sundaradeva. Hall p. 18. Aufrecht CC. I. p. 691b.

There is a ms. of this name in the *Ānandāśrama*, Poona (No. 3985).

Is this identical with any of the *Śiva Gītās* given above ?

Sanatkumāra Gītā—8 chs. from the *Sanatkumārasamhitā* of the *Skanda*. MT. 3628(b). See also BP. Introduction. p. 4.

Sannyāsa Gītā—17 chs. by Yājñavalkya, Benares edn. 1917. (Br. Mu. Ptd. Bks. 1906-1928, Col. 937). Is this the Yājñavalkya *Gītā* or the Yogyājñavalkya ?

Sāra Gītā—Aufrecht's CC. mentions two *Gītās* of this name on I. p. 713a, one as a sequel to the *Bhagavad Gītā* and the other as dealing with Yoga. W. p. 358. Oudh. 1877, 64. Hall p. 15. NW. 412.

Compare *Tattvaśāra Gītā* above.

Siddha Gītā—Jodhpur. p. 60. Fl. p. 152.

Identical with the *Siddha Gītā* noted above ?

Siddhānta Gītā—Kṛṣṇārjuna samvāda in 8 chs. Adyar I. p. 135b. L. 303. TD. 9025-9027. Purports to be a part of *Atharvaṇa vedarahasya*. In TD. 9027, the colophon adds that this pertains to the *Laghunārāyaṇopaniṣad* (to be contrasted with the *Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad* !) of the *Atharvaṇavedarahasya*.

Siddhāntasāra Kapila Gītā—See above under the second *Kapila Gītā*.

Sudarśana Gītā—Chs. 2-13, Pāda I, the Bṛhad Brahma Saṁhitā of the Nāradapañcarātra. Devotion to Viṣṇu. Chs. 3-13 deal with the story of the devotee Śrīvatsa after whom the chapters have the sub-title, Śrīvatsacarita. In ch. 13, Śl. 228, this section is called by the name 'Sudarśana Gītā'. See also L. 4191.

See Ānandāśrama Edn. of the Bṛhad Brahma Saṁhitā.

Sūkṣma Gītā—IO. Ptd. Bks. II. 1. 1897. p. 214.

Sūta Gītā—Skānda, Sūtasāṁhitā, 4th section called Yajñavai-bhavakhaṇḍa, Uparibhāga, Chs. 1-8. Sūta expounds Advaita and Śiva's greatness. Edn. Ānandāśrama 25 with Mādhavācārya's gloss.

Sūrya Gītā—From the Karmakāṇḍa of the Tattvasārāyaṇa by Vasiṣṭha. Included in the Gītāsāṅgraha (No. 9). For a ms. see Adyar I. p. 140b. Sūrya's Upadeśa to Aruṇa, in 5 chs.

Saumya Gītā—Ascribed to the Padmapurāṇa- Mysore III. p. 3.

Smṛti Gītā—Oppert I. 6543. Is this Śruti Gītā ?

Haṁsa Gītā—No. 11 in the Gītāsāṅgraha; ascribed to the IX Skandha of the Bhāgavata. This is Śls. 15-42, Ch. 13, Sk. XI of the Bhāgavata, Kumbh. edn. where, of course, it is not called 'Gītā', but is called only Haṁsetihāsa.

Haṁsa Gītā—Mahābhārata. Śānti, Mokṣadharmā, Ch. 299 Citraśālā, Kumbh. 305, but called here only Haṁsa Sādhyā saṁvāda.

Included in the Gītāgranthāvalī, ed. by Upendranātha Mukhopādhyāya.

Haṁsa Gītā—Viṣṇudharmottara, Venk. edn., Khaṇḍa 3, Chs. 226.7 to 342 pp. 400-463.

Speaker Viṣṇu in the form of Haṁsa. On a variety of topics, Varṇāśramadharmā. Ācāra, Prāyaścitta, Kāmādidoṣanindā, Jñānā-diguṇaprasāmsā, Aṣṭāṅgayoga, Deva-atithi-brāhmaṇa-gopūjā, Iṣṭā-pūrta, Dānas, Stridharma, Rājadharmā including Vyavahāra etc., Sannyāsa and Viṣṇubhakti.

In ch. 340 dealing with Yatidharma, Upaniṣadic passages occur. In 342, there is a Viśvarūpadarśana, a Gītā-feature, on having which the sages exclaim in Gītā-words, 'नष्टो मोहः स्मृतिर्लब्धा' Śl. 22.

For a frag, ms. of this, see Lz. 350, having chs. 323-340.

Harita Gītā—Mahābhārata, Śānti, Mokṣadharmā, Ch. 268 Kumbh. 278 Citraśālā.

On what a Mumukṣu must do to achieve Mokṣa. Sāmya and other ideas well-known from the Gītā are met with here also.

Included in the Gītāgranthāvalī ed. by Upendranātha Mukhopadhyāya.

The Veṅu Gītā (X. 21.), the Gopiyugala Gītā (X. 35), the Gopikā Gītā. (X. 31) the Bhramara Gītā (X. 47), these sections of the Bhāgavata are really Gītās though some mss. of these sections style them Gītās. I have left them out of this list of Gītās.

THE BHAGAVAD GĪTĀ & JAIN LITERATURE

In 1945 when Sjt. Munshi was in Madras for some months on professional work, I, like some others connected with Samskrit activities here in Madras, who came into contact with him found that the Bhagavad Gītā was one of the leading passions of his heart; his great enthusiasm for the Gospel soon led to the inauguration of the Madras Gītā Samiti. In view of this interest of Sjt. Munshi in the Gītā and in view of the fillip given to Jainistic research in his Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, I hope, this short contribution of mine on Gītā and Jain literature would be an appropriate tribute to him on the occasion of his Ṣaṣṭipūr̥ti.

In a paper entitled "Greater Gītā" read by me before the Madras Samskrita Academy, and published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras¹, I showed how the Gītā-ideas and the Gītā-words permeated not only the entire Mahābhārata, but how these, as also the very Gītā-idea and the Gītā-form, permeated the entire field of Purāṇic and other similar religio-philosophical compilations in Sanskrit. In this short paper, I shall draw attention to the influence of the Bhagavad Gītā on Jain literature.

This is not the first time that the influence of the Gītā on Jain texts is noted. Sri P. K. Gode, in one of his numberless papers² has devoted some attention to this interesting subject. He drew attention to eight whole verses of the Gītā occurring in Haribhadrasūri's (8th cent. mid.) *Śāstravārttāsamuccaya* and *Lokatattvanirṇaya*, to parts of two more verses of the Gītā occurring in the *Śāstravārttāsamuccaya* and in the same writer's *Yogadṛṣṭisamuccaya*, another whole verse of the Gītā and an echo appearing in Raviṣeṇa's *Padmapurāṇa* (678 A. D.), a

1. Vol. XII. pp. 77-113 see also pp. 349-390 in this volume. See also JOR., Madras, Vol. IX. pp. 156-169, 238-254, my article on the Bhagavata and the Gītā; and JOR., Madras, Vol. XIII. pp. 71-82, 161-163, my articles on the Yogavāsiṣṭha and the Gītā.
2. See *Annals BORI*. XX-ii. 1940, pp. 188-194, the Bhagavad Gītā in the pre-Śāṅkara Jain Sources.

quotation from the *Gītā* with mention of the source in Śubhaśīla's *Bharateśvarabāhubalivyṛtti* (A. D. 1453), and some other echoes of the *Gītā* in Siddhasenagaṇi's commentary on Umāsvāti's *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*. Prof. Gode pointed out also how these Jain citations and echoes of the *Gītā* contained readings different from those of the vulgate *Gītā*.

Such writers as have preferred dwelling on fundamental spiritual truths, ethics, and the practical means of realising the spiritual life to writing dialectics against rival metaphysical systems, have always shown, to whatever denomination they formally belong, a great deal of similarity in thought and expression in their writings. Such unity is indeed the leading feature of all mystic writers, but in the works of some philosophers too, one finds it to an appreciable extent. As Prof. Gode has pointed in the case of the ex-Brahman Haribhadra, votaries of schools of thought flourishing in the same country, amidst the same people, who happen to change over from one attitude of mind to another, or who in the sweep of their scholarship master every system of thought, cannot avoid in their works the impress of the great classics they had read, though these latter happen to belong to writings of another school; and in the case of an outstanding work like the *Bhagavad Gītā*, it is but natural to expect its influence even on writings which fall out of the circle of Brahmanical literature.

We shall notice here some more examples of the influence of the *Gītā* on Jain literature. In his *Kavyakalpalatāvṛtti*, Amarachandra reproduces the Vibhūtis enumerated in *Gītā* X, almost all of them with a few minor alterations in connection with the setting forth of 'the best in every class'. See p. 21. Kashi Skt. Series edn.

Umāsvāti in his *Praśamarati* (Bib. ind.) speaks of the *Gītā* ideal of *Nirdvandvatva* in verse 241 where he says सुखमास्ते निर्द्वन्द्वः । The *Gītā*-ideal of *Samatva* is given expression to by Umāsvāti in the following terms :

आत्मारामस्य सतः समतृणमणिमुक्तलोष्टुकनकस्य । 252.

which remind us of *Gītā*: VI. 8—समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्जनः and III. 17 and 16 आत्मारतिः and इन्द्रियारामः.

Vedāntic expressions are freely used by Śubhacandra in his *Jñānārṇava*³ which, in many of its parts, reads more like a general spiritual treatise rather than a work of Jainism. In XVIII. 36-7, Śubhacandra reproduces Gitā II. 69.

यस्यां निशि जगत्सुप्तं तस्यां जागर्ति संयमी ।
निष्पन्नं कल्पनातीतं स वेत्यात्मानमात्मनि ॥
या निशा सर्वभूतेषु तस्यां जागर्ति संयमी ।
यस्यां जाग्रति भूतानि सा निशा पश्यतो मुनेः ॥

(p. 194).

Jñānārṇava XXX. 2 :

निस्सङ्गः संवृतस्वान्तः कूर्मवत्संवृतेन्द्रियः ।
यमी समत्वमापन्नः ध्यानतन्त्रे स्थिरी भवेत् ॥ (p. 304)

which is after Gitā II. 58 :

यदा संहरते चायं कूर्मोऽङ्गानीव सर्वशः ।
इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थेभ्यः तस्य प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठिता ॥

Jñānārṇava XXXII. 81. p. 330 :

आत्मात्मना भवं मोक्षमात्मनः कुरुते यतः ।
अतो रिपुर्गुरुश्चायमात्मैव स्फुटमात्मनः ॥

Gitā VI. 5-6 :

उद्धरेदात्मनात्मानम् ।
आत्मैव ह्यात्मनो बन्धुरात्मैव रिपुरात्मनः ।
बन्धुरात्मात्मनस्तस्य येनात्मैवात्मना जितः ॥

Jñānārṇava XXXII. 82. p. 30 :

पृथग्दृष्ट्वात्मनः कायं कायादात्मानमात्मवित् ।
तथा त्यजत्यशंकोऽङ्गं यथा वस्त्रं घृणास्पदम् ॥

uses Gitā II. 22 :

वासांसि जीर्णानि यथा विहाथ
नवानि गृह्णाति नरोऽपराणि । etc.

In the same terms in which the Gitā describes the Sthita-prajña, Yukta or Yogin and Bhakta, Kundakunda also describes

the Śramaṇa in his *Pravacanasāra*.⁴ In *Pravacanasāra* I. 14, 78 and III. 41, Kundakunda glorifies the same Samatvayoga of the Gītā through his description of the Śramaṇa.

श्रमणः समदुःखसुखः । I. 14.

एवं विदितार्थो यो

द्रव्येषु न रागमेति द्वेषं वा । I. 78.

जहाति यदि रागद्वेषौ

स आत्मानं लभते शुद्धम् । I. 81.

समशत्रुबन्धुवर्गः समदुःखसुखः प्रशंसानिन्दासमः ।

समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्चनः पुनर्जीवितमरणे समः श्रमणः ॥ III. 41.

Which echo Gītā :

II. 15. समदुःखसुखं धीरम् ।

XII. 13. समदुःखसुखः ।

II. 57. नाभिनन्दति न द्वेष्टि ।

II. 64. रागद्वेषवियुक्तैस्तु ।

VI. 8. समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्चनः ।

XII. 18. समः शत्रौ च मित्रे च ।

XII. 19. तुल्यनिन्दास्तुतिः ।

XIV. 24-25

समदुःखसुखः स्वस्थः समलोष्टाश्मकाञ्चनः ।

तुल्यप्रियाप्रियो धीरः तुल्यनिन्दात्मसंस्तुतिः ।

In III. 26, the *Pravacanasāra* describes the Śramaṇa as “युक्ताहारविहारः”, an expression taken from Gītā VI. 17—

युक्ताहारविहारस्य युक्तचेष्टस्य कर्मसु । etc.

The non-desire for the fruit of action, karma-phala-anicchā, is a well known basic Gītā-idea and Kundakunda has occasion to mention it in his *Samayasāra*,⁵ VI. 230.

यस्तु न करोति कांक्षां कर्मफलेषु । etc.

4. Edn. Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Rayacandra Jaina Śāstramālā 9.

5. Edn. Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Rayachandra Jaina Śāstramālā 10. I am making the citations in Sanskrit Chāyā.

The Samayasāra speaks of the absence of Rāga dveṣa also in VII 280 :

नापि रागद्वेषमोहं करोति ज्ञानी । etc.

We shall now see the works of Yogindu which are of the class of general spiritual and mystic writings mentioned by us at the beginning. Yogindu's Dohās remind us often of the Gītā. In I. 3 of his *Paramātmaprakāśa* Yogindu says :

परमसमाधिमहाग्निना कर्मेन्धनानि जुह्वन्तः ।

which may be compared with Gītā IV. 26, 27·

श्रोत्रादीनीन्द्रियाण्यन्ये संयमाग्निषु जुह्वति ।

.....

सर्वाणीन्द्रियकर्माणि प्राणकर्माणि चापरे ।

आत्मसंयमयोगाग्नौ जुह्वति ज्ञानदीपिते ॥

and Gītā VI. 37

यथैधांसि समिद्धोऽग्निः

and Gītā IV. 19.

ज्ञानाग्निदग्धकर्माणम्.

Yogindu's description of Paramātman in I. 34 and 41 of the *Paramātmaprakāśa* is in the very manner of the Gītā and its description of the soul which is un-affected and un-contaminated by anything pertaining to the body.

देहे वसन्नपि नैव स्पृशति नियमेन देहमपि य एव ।

देहेन स्पृश्यते योऽपि नैव मन्यस्व परमात्मानं तमेव ॥

यस्याभ्यन्तरे जगद् वसति जगदभ्यन्तरे य एव ।

जगत्येव वसन्नपि जगदेव नापि मन्यस्व परमात्मानं तमेव ॥

Compare Gītā IX. 4-6.

मत्स्थानि सर्वभूतानि न चाहं तेष्ववस्थितः ।

भूतभृन्न च भूतस्थः ।

यथाकाशस्थितो नित्यं वायुस्सर्वत्रगो महान् ।

तथा सर्वाणि भूतानि मत्स्थानीत्युपधारय ॥

Paramātmaprakāśa II. 46 (i)

या निशा सकलानां देहिनां योगी तस्यां जागर्ति ।
यत्र पुनर्जागर्ति सकलं जगत् तां निशां मत्वा स्वपति ॥

which is a reproduction of *Gītā* II. 69 या निशा सर्वभूतानाम् etc. The vulgate reading 'Niśā' here and in the *Jñānārṇava* may be noted : the *Kāsmīri* reading is 'Rāṭriḥ'.

Then follows a series of descriptions of *Jñānin* or *Paramamuni* which carries echoes from similar descriptions of *Sthitaprajña*, *Bhākta* etc. in the *Gītā*.

Paramātmaprakāśa II, 48-52.

नैव स्तौति निन्दति ज्ञानी न किमपि ।
परममुनिः द्वेषमपि करोति न रागम् ।
विषयाणामुपरि परममुनिः द्वेषमपि करोति न रागम् ।

Gītā II. 56. 57.

वीतरागभयक्रोधः । नाभिनन्दति न द्वेष्टि ।

Paramātmaprakāśa II. 100 puts the *Nirdvandva-yoga* and *Samatva-yoga* of the *Gītā* thus :

रागद्वेषौ द्वौ परिहृत्य ये समान् जीवान् पश्यन्ति ।
ते समभावे प्रतिष्ठिताः लघु निर्वाणं लभन्ते ॥

The *Gītā* emphasises *Samatva* again and again :
V. 18-19.

विद्याविनयसंपन्ने ब्राह्मणे गवि हस्तिनि ।
शुनि चैव श्वपाके च पण्डिताः समदर्शिनः ।
इहैव तैर्जितः सर्गः येषां साम्ये स्थितं मनः ।
निर्दोषं हि समं ब्रह्म तस्माद् ब्रह्मणि ते स्थिताः ॥

VI. 9.

सुहृन्मित्रार्युदासीनमध्यस्थद्वेष्यबन्धुषु ।
साधुष्वपि च पापेषु समबुद्धिर्विशिष्यते ॥

IX. 29. समोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु न मे द्वेष्योऽस्ति न प्रियः ।

XII. 13. अद्वेषा सर्वभूतानां मैत्रः ।

XVIII. 54. समः सर्वेषु भूतेषु ।

The illustration of the body and cloak in Gītā II. 22, वासांसि जीणानि etc. is thus elaborated by Yogīndu in II. 178-181 :

रक्तेण वस्त्रेण यथा बुधः देहं न मन्यते रक्तम् ।
 देहेन रक्तेन ज्ञानी तथा आत्मानं न मन्यते रक्तम् ॥
 जीर्णेण वस्त्रेण यथा बुधः देहं न मन्यते जीर्णम् ।
 देहेन जीर्णेन ज्ञानी तथा आत्मानं न मन्यते जीर्णम् ॥
 वस्त्रे प्रणष्टे यथा देहं न मन्यते नष्टम् ।
 नष्टे देहे ज्ञानी तथा आत्मानं न मन्यते नष्टम् ॥
 भिन्नं वस्त्रमेव यथा जीवदेहात् मन्यते ज्ञानी ।
 देहमपि भिन्नं ज्ञानी तथा आत्मनः मन्यते जानीहि ॥

In his briefer text the *Yogasāra*,⁶ Yogīndu mentions again freedom from likes and dislikes and consequent equanimity; this, given by Yogīndu as the essence of Jina-dharma, is also the essence of the Gītā.

Yogasāra 48 :

रागद्वेषौ द्वौ परिहृत्य य आत्मनि वसति ।
 स धर्मोऽपि जिनोक्तः—॥

Yogaśāra 100 :

रागद्वेषौ द्वौ परिहृत्य यः समभावः मन्यते ।
 तत् सामायिकं जानीहि स्फुटं जिनवर एवं भणति ॥

In fact, to Yogīndu it is this *one perfect soul* that is variously called by various schools, Arhan, Siddha, Ācārya, Upādhyāya, Muni, Ātman, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Buddha, Jina.

अर्हन्तपि स सिद्धः स्फुटं स आचार्यः विजानीहि ।
 स उपाध्यायः स एव मुनिः निश्चयेन आत्मा विजानीहि ॥
 स शिवः शङ्करो विष्णुः स रुद्रोऽपि स बुद्धः ।
 स जिन ईश्वरो ब्रह्मा स स अनन्त स सिद्धः ॥

Yogasāra, 104-5.

6. Included at the end of the above mentioned edn. of the Paramātmaprakāśa.

BHĀSKARA'S GĪTĀBHĀṢYA

1.

It was in 1953-4 when I was touring Europe searching for, examining and cataloguing Sanskrit manuscripts that I had the pleasure of meeting Prof. E. Frauwallner. There is therefore an appropriateness in my contributing to his Festschrift this paper on a work whose manuscript was the most important among my discoveries in that tour.

There had been for a long time a fragmentary manuscript of Bhāskara's Bhāṣya on the Bhagavadgītā in the Sarasvatī Bhavan, Banaras. Bhāskara's Bhāṣya on the Brahmasūtras has been known in the Banaras edition of 1915¹ and his Bhāṣya on Chāndogya Upaniṣad had also been known but only from his own citation in his Brahmasūtrā-Bhāṣya². Bhāskara's Bhāṣya on the third Vedānta Prasthāna, the Bhagavadgītā, although found in the Banares fragment, had not become known among scholars. So that all that had been written upon Bhāskara had rested solely on his Brahmasūtrā-bhāṣya. The Banares fragment of Bhāskara's Bhagavadgītā-bhāṣya had been gone through by me in the forties and had since then been one of the targets in my manuscript-hunts. While the numerous collections, catalogued and uncatalogued, used for the New Catalogus Catalogorum, as also other collections that I examined in different parts of India, failed to show up a manuscript of this work, I was fortunate in coming upon a manuscript of it containing a longer fragment in a London Library³ in my tour of Europe referred to above. Reference has already been made⁴ to an edition of the available portion of Bhāskara's Bhagavadgītā-bhāṣya, based on these two Mss., by the Sarasvatī Bhavan, Banaras.

1. Vindhyesvari Prasad Dvivedin, Chowkhamba Skt. Series 20, Banaras, 1915.
2. pp. 155, 240 under III. i. 8; IV, iii. 13.
3. Wellcome Medical Historical Research Library.
4. See WZKSO 11, 1967, p. 137.

2.

The Banares fragment of the Bhagavadgītā-bhāṣya of Bhāskara extends upto Chapter VII, Verse 16, with the opening lost and with two major gaps from II. 57 to III. 3 and from VI. 3 to VI. 26. The London Ms. extends from IV. 10 to IX. 33 with a gap in chapter VI coinciding more or less with the one in this chapter in the Banares Ms.

Some scholars⁵ had been led to doubt whether Bhāskara completed his Gītābhāṣya. It has already been pointed out⁶ that Vedānta Deśika the Viśiṣṭādvaita writer, refers in his commentary on the Gītā XVIII. 64 to Bhāskara together with other commentators, from which we should suppose that Bhāskara's Bhāṣya was complete. That it extended beyond the available portion is clear from the Dvaita writer⁷ Jayatīrtha quoting Bhāskara's queer Nirukti (etymology) of the name Keśava as it occurs in Gītā X. 35. Bhāskara as already mentioned, commented, like Śaṅkara, on the three Prasthānas of Vedānta—Upaniṣads, Sūtras and Gītā. It therefore stands to reason that Bhāskara's Gītābhāṣya was complete.

3.

A third and earlier reference to Bhāskara's Gītābhāṣya in Abhinavagupta's commentary on Gītā XVIII. 2 had been pointed out⁸. The Bhāskara cited by Abhinavagupta here had been taken as our Bhāskara by some other scholars too⁹. But it is likely that the Bhāskara cited by Abhinavagupta is different from our Bhāskara and belonged to Kashmir. The fact that Bhāskara's Gītā text follows mostly readings designated Kashmirian is not enough to show that our Bhāskara was a Kashmirian¹⁰. Belvalkar had

5. See p. 'dh', Preface (Nivedana) of the Benares Edition of this text.
6. Dr. B. N. K. Sarma, IHQ 9, 1933, p. 670.
7. Ibid. p. 672.
8. Ibid.
9. See Dr. T. R. Chintamani, edn. of Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on the Bh. Gītā, Madras University Sanskrit Series 14.
10. In fact, Bhāskara's commentary shows differences from accepted Kashmirian readings and rejects some of its additional verses; but of this more later.

shown that some Kashmiri readings are found in non-Kashmiri manuscript too.¹¹

There is a tradition recorded by the Advaitic writer Ānandānubhava, a bitter critic of Bhāskara, that Bhāskara was, like Śaṅkara, a South Indian, that he belonged to Karṇāṭaka and the Kashmirian scholars refused to have anything to do with his work. In connection with the controversy on two types of Sannyāsa (taking the fourth *āśrama* or the recluse-order) viz. *ekadaṇḍa* and *tridaṇḍa*, Ānandānubhava says in his *Nyāyaratnadīpāvalī*¹² in reply to Bhāskara's stand on *tridaṇḍa* and his criticism of *ekadaṇḍa*: *prasiddhāśrama-nindāyām api udiritapramāṇa-virodham katham sa śocyo laṭakaḥ karṇāṭavaṭur na paśyati* (p. 333). *nanu naitad veda-vākyam bhāskarācāryeṇa upalabdham. evam eva hi svagrantheṣv āha api cāsau dveṣopahatamatih paśyan api na paśyāmīti vadet, prasiddham hi tasya deveṣād bhāṣaṇam "kanthām vahasi durbuddhe" ityādi ata evāsyā kṛtaprayatnasyāpi paramahaṃsadeveṣam śāstre cākausalam unniya kāśmirakapaṇḍitair na granthaḥ parigrhitah.*

4.

The importance of the *Gītābhāṣya* of Bhāskara for settling the mutual chronological position between Śaṅkara and Bhāskara has already been shown¹³. This work is equally important to lay the ghost once for all of the doubts that had been raised¹⁴ about Śaṅkara's authorship of the *Gītābhāṣya*. In his paper on the question in Vol. IX (1965) of WZKSO (pp. 155-197). S. Mayeda proves the authenticity of Śaṅkara's *Bhāṣya* on the *Gītā*, depending mainly on a comparison of it with Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* whose authenticity is not questioned. While doing so, Mayeda says that he does not propose to resort to the evidence of references

11. *New Indian Antiquary*, July 1939, pp. 211-251; *ABORI* 19, pp. 335-48.
12. *Madras Govt. Oriental Library* edn. 1961, p. 333; also p. 317.
13. *WZKSO* 11, 1967, pp. 138—9.
14. See references in *WZKSO* 9, 1965, S. Mayeda's paper, p. 155; also *ABORI* 14, 1932—1933, p. 60, B. N. K. Sarma who refutes the theory and accepts Śaṅkara's Authorship of the *Bhagavadgītā-bhāṣya*.

to Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya in the works of other writers and adds "Verbatim quotations cannot be expected from this Bhāṣya (Śaṅkara's G. Bh.)" and "any conclusion drawn from this method may be indirect and not entirely reliable even though it may have some support."

In his two references to and citations from the Upadeśasāhasrī of Śaṅkara, Bhāskara, it has been shown, points out his finger at Śaṅkara by using the words 'It will go against you and you have said in your own Upadeśagrantha'. That Śaṅkara and his Gītābhāṣya were there before Bhāskara all the time he was writing, is all the more clear from several passages of Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya or its interpretations which Bhāskara reproduces and criticises, importing into his words the same vehemence and personal reference. Verbatim quotations, far from being such as not be expected, are to be found.

5.

Bhagavadgītā II. 17¹⁵, p. 48¹⁶ :

Bhāskara, after giving his interpretation, refers to others, the Māyāvādins, a term which he regularly uses against Śaṅkara, and reproduces verbatim words or gives a close *anuvāda* of Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on this verse. That Śaṅkara is reproduced is clear as Bhāskara's mention of the introduction of the verse (*avatārya*) agree verbatim with Śaṅkara's *avatārikā* to this verse.

Bhāskara :

Śaṅkara :

<p>apare tu māyāvādino anyathā avatārya varṇayanti —, itaśca śokamohau akṛtvā śitoṣṇādisah- anam yuktam kartum. kasmāt? yato ,na asataḥ' 'śitoṣṇādeḥ' 'vidyate bhāvaḥ'. bhavanam astitā.</p>	<p>itaśca śokamohāvakṛtvā śitoṣṇādi- sahanam yuktam. yasmāt 'nāsa- taḥ' iṭi. ,na asataḥ' avidyamāna- sya śitoṣṇādeḥ sakāraṇasya ,na vidyate' ,bhāvaḥ'. bhavanam astitā.</p>
--	---

15. This verse is No. 16 in Śaṅkara's text; it is No. 17 for Bhāskara because he reads after II. 10 the additional verse *tvam mānuṣeṇopahatāntarātmā* etc. found in the Kashmirian recension.

16. Page references are to the Banares Sarasvati Bhavan edn. to be issued.

The sentences that follow in Bhāskara form a close *anuvāda* of Śaṅkara. Some portions of this *anuvāda* may also be set forth here to show the closeness to Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara says that the dualities of *śoka-moha*, *śītoṣṇa* etc. do not have real existence as they are modifications, *vikāras* and himself raises the *āpatti* that then everything will be non-existence and replies. Bhāskara seizes this and following his earlier stigmatisation of Śaṅkara as *māyāvādin*, clubs him here with the Śūnyavādin.

Bhāskara :

nanu evam sarvābhāve śūnyavādaḥ prasajyeta. nāyam doṣaḥ. dve buddhi sarvaprāṇiprasiddhe bhavataḥ, viśeṣyabuddhiḥ viśeṣaṇa-buddhiśca. san ghaṭaḥ, san paṭa iti. tatra viśeṣya-viśaya-buddhiḥ ghaṭādiviśayā asat¹⁷, paṭādaḥ vyabhicārāt mithyā-buddhiḥ. yā punar viśeṣaṇa-
viśayā sadbuddhiḥ sā sarvatra vṛtṭeḥ amithyā. tasmāt saiva pāramārthikī. sarvo hi ghaṭādiviśayā śarīrādiviśayā ca prapañco māyāmātram asat iti manyante (p. 48).

Śaṅkara :

tadasattve sarvābhāva-prasaṅga iti cen, na. sarvatra buddi-dvayopalabdheḥ, sad-buddhir asad-buddhir iti, yadviśayā buddhir na vyabhicarati tat sat. yadviśayā vyabhicarati tad asat.

The following is a clear case in which Bhāskara's reproduction and criticism refer to Śaṅkara. Bhāskara reads II. 19 (18) *antavanta ime dehāḥ* etc., in its second half as *vināśino' prameyasya* and joins *vināśinaḥ* (perishable) with *dehāḥ* (bodies) in the first half, instead of *anāśinaḥ* in Śaṅkara, and has quite a detailed discussion about this difference in reading.

Bhāskara refers thus to Śaṅkara's reading and interpretation :
apare tu pāṭhāntaram kurvanti—*anāśino' prameyasya* iti. teṣāṃ api nityasya anāśina iti punaruktam. na tu pṛthivyā-

Śaṅkara who reads *anāśinaḥ* and takes it with *ātman*, gives this idea of two kinds of *nāśa* for body etc. nityasya anāśina iti na punaruktam, nityatvasya dvidvidhatvāt loke. nāśasya ca deho

17. Wrongly printed in the edn. as *viśayā sat*.

dānād āpekṣikam nityatvam bhasmībhūto adarśanam gataḥ
gaṇnam gṛhyate. etc. (p. 52). naṣṭa ucyate, vidyamāno' pi
anyathā pariṇato vyādhyādi-
yukto jāto naṣṭa ucyate. tatra
anāśino nityasyeti dvidvidhenāpi
nāśena asambandho asyeti arthaḥ.

Bhagavadgītā II. 22 (21), p. 56, *vedāvināśinam* etc. :

Bhāskara cites verbatim and refutes Śaṅkara's comments here which make out non-action as the purport of the verse.

Bhāskara :

atra kleśabhīravaḥ kecit sva-ma-
tam bhagavatyāropya varṇayan-
ti....viduṣaḥ sarvakarmapratīṣe-
ha eva prakaraṇārtho' bhīpreto
bhagavataḥ (iti). hantigrahaṇam
udāharaṇārtham. yāni karmāṇi
śāstre vidhiyante tāni aviduṣo
vihitāni iti bhagavato niścaya
ity atra abhidhiyate.

Śaṅkara :

....viduṣaḥ sarvakarma-pratīṣe-
dha eva prakaraṇārtho' bhīpre-
to bhagavataḥ. hantes tv ākṣepa
udāharaṇārthatvena kathitaḥ...
yāni karmāṇi śāstreṇa vidhiyante
tāny aviduṣo vihitāni bhagavato
niścayo avagamyate.

Bhagavadgītā II. 29 (28), p. 59, *avyaktādīni bhūtāni* etc.

Bhāskara :

svakāraṇe pralināni kārya-kār-
aṇa-saṅghātātmakāni bhūtāni.

Śaṅkara :

kārya-kāraṇa-saṅghātāt nakāny a-
pi bhūtāni uddiṣya śoko na yuktaḥ
kartum.

Again Bhāskara's refutation beginning with *apare tv āhuḥ* is of Śaṅkara's comments :

Bhāskara :

avyaktam adarśanam, tadādir
yeṣām tāni avyaktādīni iti.

Śaṅkara :

avyaktam adarśanam anupalabd-
hir ādir yeṣām etc.

Bhagavadgītā II. 47 (46), p. 70, *yāvānartha udapāne* etc. :

Bhāskara :

apareṣām vyākhyā-yāvān arthaḥ
sarvataḥ samplutodoke tāvān
udapāne; tatkāryam tatraiva
antarbhavātity arthaḥ (p. 59).

Śaṅkara :

sampadyate tatraiva-antarbhavat-
ity arthaḥ....tasmiṃs tāvān eva
sampadyate, tatraiva antarbhav-
atity arthaḥ.

Bhagavadgītā III starts again the great tussle between the upholders of *jñāna* and of *jñāna-karma-samuccaya*. Śāṅkara discusses and refutes at length the latter view and Bhāskara, while upholding the latter, refutes the former, directly as set forth by Śāṅkara.

Bhāskara :

anye punaḥ patrair iva phalāni chādayantaḥ praśnam uttaram ca anyathā varṇayanti., prajāhāti yadā' ityārabhya sarva-karma-tyāginām sāmkyānām jñānād eva kevalād niśreyasaprātir uktā. mama ca 'karmaṇy eva adhikāras te' iti karmaiva kevalam upadiṣṭam, na tata eva śreyaḥ-prāptir iti ākulita-buddhir arjuna uvāca 'jyāyasi cet' iti. uttaram ca bhāgavatam upad-yate sāmkyānām kevalād jñānād niśreyasaprāptiḥ, karma-yoginām tu karmaniṣṭhayaiveti¹⁸. dve niṣṭhe bhinnapurūṣa-viṣaye iti sarva-karma-tyāga eva samyagdarśinām sāmkyānām itihāsa-purāṇopaniṣatsu ca darśit-ah. (p. 79).

Śāṅkara :

tatra 'prajāhāti yadā kāmān' ityārabhya ā adhyāyaparisamāpteh sāmkyā-buddhyāśrithnām sann-yāsam kartavyam uktvā teṣām tanniṣṭhatayaiva ca kṛtārthatā uktā 'eṣā brāhmī sthitir' iti. arjunāya ca 'karmaṇy eva adhikāras te' 'mā te saṅgo' stvakarmaṇi' iti karmaiva kartavyam uktavān yogabuddhim āsṛitya, na tata eva śreyaḥ-prāptim uktavān; tad etad ālakṣya paryākulita-buddhir arjuna....praśnāp-ākaraṇa-vākyam ca bhagavatā uktam yathokta-vibhāya śāstre.tadapi asat, *sarvopaniṣatsu itihāsapurāṇa-yagaśāstreṣu* ca jñānaṅgatvena mumukṣoh sarva-karmasannyāsa-vidhānāt etc.

I have italicised the words in which Śāṅkara refers to all kinds of texts, Upaniṣads, Itihāsa, Purāṇas, and Yoga Śāstra as supporting knowledge and renunciation of acts; these are not unimportant as Bhāskara's reproduction of these words show. Śāṅkara follows up this reference to the texts by quoting from them one after the other and Bhāskara examines those quotations and the validity of the sense in which Śāṅkara takes them. Two of these are important. The first is a discussion which clinches the fact that Bhāskara is reproducing and refuting Śāṅkara.

18. As corrected by me with the help of the variants.

Among the Upaniṣadic quotations made first by Śāṅkara are *tasmāt nyāsam eṣām tapasā atiriktam āhuḥ, nyāsa evātyarecayat* from Mahā Nārāyaṇa XXI. 2 and XXIV. 1. Śāṅkara takes *nyāsa* here as *sannyāsa*, renunciation of acts, *karma-tyāga*, as the other quotations too confirm—*vyutthāya, na karmaṇā...tyāgenaike brahmacaryād eva pravrajat*. Commentators on Śāṅkara have also understood Śāṅkara in that way. Bhāskara while examining each of the texts quoted, catches Śāṅkara on this Upaniṣadic passage (*san*)*nyāsam eṣām tapasām atiriktam āhuḥ* and *nyāsa eva atyarecayat* and points out that in the context, the word *nyāsa* means *brahmā*; so indeed does the fuller passage run : *nyāsa iti brahmā* and so on; and it is wrong to give it the meaning *tyāga*. Says Bhāskara : *tad evam viruddham bhāṣamānaḥ katham grāhyavacanaḥ syāt. na ca upaniṣatsu sarvatyāga-gamakam liṅgam asti... itarāpi śrutiḥ, nyāsam eṣām tapasā atiriktam āhuḥ' iti. nyāsaśabdena tatra brahmābhīdhiyate, na karmatyāgaḥ....tadiha bhrāntiā tasya tyāgārthakatvaṁ kalpitam. (p. 81).*

But Śāṅkara, it may be pointed out, does know the fuller passage and the use in it of *nyāsa* in the sense of *brahma*. Śāṅkara takes the word *brahman* in neuter gender and explains how *sannyāsa* by its primary meaning of renunciation, signifies the establishment of oneself in the knowledge of the Absolute and thereby is equated with the Absolute, the *brahman*; there is therefore no such absurdity as Bhāskara points out in Śāṅkara's citation of the concerned passage here or in taking *nyāsa* as *tyāga*. Under Bh. G. V. 6, Śāṅkara says : *yogayukto vaidikena karmayogena īśvarasamarpitarūpeṇa phalanirapekṣeṇa yukto munir....brahma, paramātma-jñānaniṣṭhālakṣaṇatvāt prakṛtaḥ sannyāso brahmo-cyate, nyāsa iti brahmā, brahmā hi paraḥ' iti śruteḥ.*

The second set of quotations in Śāṅkara and Bhāskara, from Itihāṣa includes the portions called Śukānuśāsana and Śukānupraśna in Mokṣadharmā in the Mahābhārata and I have dealt with it separately elsewhere.¹⁹

Bhagavadgītā III. 4 *na karmaṇām anārambhāt* etc. is another crucial verse on which the advocate of jñāna and karma-tyāga

19. ABORI, Golden Jubilee Vol., Poona 1968, published elsewhere in this volume.

clashes with the Samuccayavādin. Bhāskara cites and refutes Śaṅkara here :

Bhāskara :

yathā idam eva sāmkyadarśanam āsritya sarvadharmatyāgam ekavaiṇavino vadanti, te api hi etena apāstā veditavyāḥ.... atra te pratyavatiṣṭhante: asmadarśane apīyam gītā ghaṭate. katham karmārambhād eva naiṣkarmyam aśnute, jñānotpattiyupāyatvāt karmaṇām. tasmāt karma kartavyam, tato jñānotpattiḥ, tato mokṣa iti. na ca sannyasanādeva jñānarahitāt siddhim samadhigacchati. tad idam apavyākhyānam anye pratyācakṣate. (p. 84).

Śaṅkara :

karmaṇām anārambhāt naiṣkarmyam nāśnuta iti vacanāt tadvi-paryayāt teṣām ārambhāt naiṣkarmyam aśnute iti gamyate.... karmārambhasyaiva naiṣkarmyopāyatvāt etc.

It is here that Bhāskara points out to Śaṅkara the contradiction in a statement in the latter's Upadeśasāhasrī.

Bhagavadgītā III. 20, *karmaṇaiva hi saṁsiddhim* etc. : Bhāskara introduces here almost verbatim, the two alternative ways in which, according to Śaṅkara, the verse could be construed and answers.

Bhāskara :

atra kecid aṅgulibhaṅgam kurvanto vyācakṣate-yadi janakādayaḥ prāptasamyag-jñānāḥ, tato lokasaṅgrahārtham karmaṇaiva saṁsiddhim āsthitāḥ, karma-sannyāse prāpte api asaṁnyasyaiva pravṛttakarmatvāt iti. atha aprāpta-jñānāḥ karmaṇā sattvaśuddhidvāreṇa jñānotpattim āsādyā muktā iti vyākhyeyaḥ śloka iti. tad etad asadarthoprekṣaṇam. (p. 94).

Śaṅkara :

yadi te (janakādayaḥ) prāptasamyagdarśanāḥ tato loka-saṅgrahārtham prārabdha-karmatvāt karmaṇā sahaiva, asannyasyaiva karma, saṁsiddhim āsthitā ityārthaḥ. atha aprāptasamyagdarśanā janakādayaḥ, tadā karmaṇā sattva-śuddhisādhanaabhūtena krameṇa saṁsiddhim āsthitā iti vyākhyeyaḥ ślokaḥ.

The following is a non-controversial point on which Bhāskara quietly adopts what is found in Śāṅkara.

Bhagavadgītā III. 37, *kāma eṣa krodha eṣa* etc. :

Explaining the mention of both *kāma* and *krodha* as "This Desire", "This Anger", implying their identity, Śāṅkara explains that it is Desire when obstructed by somebody turns into Anger : *sa eṣa kāmaḥ pratihataḥ kenacit krodhatvena pariṇamate, ataḥ krodho' pi eṣa eva.*

See Bhaskara here : *kāmaḥ sūkṣmaḥ. sa eva kenacit pratihataḥ krodhas sampadyate.* (p. 102).

Bhagavadgītā IV. 10, *vitarāgabhayakrodhaḥ* etc., explanation of the expression *jñāna-tapasā* in the second line.

Bhāskara takes *jñāna* and *tapas* severally, although, in such a construction, the singular number is inexplicable, and criticises Śāṅkara who takes, quite legitimately, the two as referring to the same thing, *jñāna* itself being the *tapas* that purifies.

Bhāskara :

jñānena tapasā ca pūta itiyarthaḥ, jñānam eva tapo jñānatapa iti kecit. tad ayuktam (p. 110).

Śāṅkara :

jñanameva paramātma-viśayam tapaḥ, tena jñānatapasā pūtāḥ parām śuddim gataḥ itarata-ponirapekṣajñānaniṣṭhā ity asya liṅgam jñānatapaseti viśeṣaṇam.

On the legitimacy of Śāṅkara's interpretation, Muṇḍaka I. 1. 9—*yasya jñāna-mayam tapaḥ* and Śāṅkara's Bhāṣya thereon may also be seen. Bhagavadgītā IV. 18, *karmany akarma yaḥ paśyēt* etc. is another ticklish verse. Bhāskara takes hold of Śāṅkara's interpretation of *karma* and starts his criticism of it calling Śāṅkara a *karma-dveṣin*, hater of *karman*.

Bhāskara :

apare tu karma-dveṣiṇaḥ svamatiparikalpita(m) śloka-bāhyam artham asmin āropayitum ihamānāḥbahu bhāṣante, prakṛtā-

Śāṅkara :

tasmin karmaṇi akarma karmābhāvam yaḥ paśyēt . . . nausthasya nāvi gacchantyām taṭastheṣu agatiṣu nageṣu pratikūla-gatidar-

sambaddham²⁰ ca karmaṇi vyā- śanāt ... ata ātmasamavetatayā
 pāre karmābhāvaṃ yaḥ paśyet. sarvalokaprasiddhe karmaṇi
 na hi paramārthataḥ kriyā nāma nadikūlastheṣv iva vṛkṣeṣu gatiḥ
 asti. yathā kila nauyāyino tīra- prātilomyena, akarma karmābh-
 gatavṛkṣeṣu gamanabuddhi-bhrā- āvam yathābhūtaṃ gatyabhāvam
 ntih, tathā sarvakriyābuddhir iti. iva vṛkṣeṣu yaḥ paśyet...
 (p. 116).

The next verse IV. 19 is introduced by Śaṅkara as being just a praise or commendation, *stuti*, of the previous verse, dealt with above. Bhāskara criticises this view of Śaṅkara.

Bhāskara :

stutyartha 'yam śloka iti kecit. tad etat karmaṇi akarmādi yat-
 tad ayuktam. (p. 118).

Śaṅkara :

tad etat karmaṇi akarmādi yat-
 hoktadarśitvam stūyate-yasyeti.

Bhagavadgītā IV. 21, pp. 120-21 : In the commentary on this verse, Bhāskara has difference with Śaṅkara on the nature of the *karman*, which one free from any desire etc. continues to do. Here Śaṅkara's words are reproduced and refuted by Bhāskara. Bhāskara interprets *śārīraṃ karma* in the verse as the Veda-enjoined *karman* to be performed with the body and senses and those routine acts, unavoidable and necessary to sustain the body; this latter is Śaṅkara's interpretation.

Bhāskara :

kim idam śārīraṃ nāma ? śārīra-
 nirvartyam, āho śārīra-sthityar-
 tham iti. na tāvat sthityartham....
 tasmāt śārīraṃ śārīrendriya-nir-
 vartyam śāstracoditaṃ karma.
 nanu pratiśiddham api śārīra-
 nirvartyaṃ syāt. naiṣa doṣaḥ,
 vaidikakarmaprakaraṇāt. keva-
 lam iti ca phalarahitam nanu
 śāstrīyaṃ karma kurvataḥ kilbi-
 śam nāpnotīya aprāptapratīṣe-
 dha-prasaṅgaḥ....apare tu śārīra-

Śaṅkara :

śārīraṃ śārīrasthiti-mātraprayo-
 janaṃ kevalam karma tatrāpi
 abhimānavarjitam, kiñca śārī-
 raṃ kevalam karmety atra kim
 śārīra-nirvartyam śārīraṃ kar-
 ma abhipretam, āhosvit śārīras-
 thitimātraprayojanam śārīraṃ
 karmeti....yadā śārīranirvartyaṃ
 karma śārīraṃ abhipretaṃ syāt
 tadā dṛṣṭādṛṣṭa-prayajanaṃ kar-
 ma pratiśiddham api śārīreṇa
 kurvan nāpnoti kilbiṣam iti bru-

sthiyartham bhikṣāṭana-aśana- vato viruddhābhidhānam prasa-
pānādi kurvanti iti yojayanti; jyeta; śāstrīyaṁ ca karma dṛṣṭā-
tadapi kevalam abhimāna-rahi- dṛṣṭa-prayojanaṁ śarireṇa kurvan
tam iti; tad apavyākhyānam. nāpnoti kilbiṣam ity api bruvato
aprāptapratīṣedhaprasaṅgaḥ....

And Bhāskara ends the criticism by using some strong words against Śāṅkara : *tasmād avyutpanna-vipralabdha-buddhiṣu vyākhyānam idam śobhate; nāsmāsu ye pramāṇa-vṛttam anurundhāmahe.*

Under Bhagavadgītā IV. 23, *gatasāṅgasya* :

Although Bhāskara makes no special citation here of Śāṅkara and refutation of it, his words here referring generally to Māyāvādins and renunciation of acts could refer only to Śāṅkara.

tadatra bhagvan-mata-vināśakāḥ kecin mahāmāyāvinaḥ asūtrakam iva paṭam²¹ kurvantaḥ karma-nivṛttim eva varṇayanto lokam vipratāryanti. (p. 122).

Bhāskara refers here to Śāṅkara as the destroyer of the intention of the Lord; he often refers to Śāṅkara as foisting his ideas on the text; on the other hand, he claims for himself that he follows closely the mind of the Lord. The colophon to ch. I of the Bhāskara-bhāṣya calls the work *bhagavad-āśayānuseraṇa*.

Bhagavadgītā IV. 24 *brahmārpaṇam* etc. : Here, after giving his interpretation, Bhāskara cites another with the words *nanu*, which is Śāṅkara's, and refutes it. According to Bhāskara, the verse is a statement of fact, not a mode of worship in which one thing is contemplated as another, nor a praise of knowledge.

Bhāskara :

nanu 'śreyān dravyamayāt' iti jñānaya jñāstutyartham prakaraṇam ? keyam ākasmikī pratibhā. etc. (pp. 123-4).

Śāṅkara :

atra tu samyagdarśanaṁ jñāna-yajñaśabditam anekān yajñāśabditān kriyāvīṣeṣān upanyasya 'śreyān dravyamyād yajñād jñāna-yajñaḥ' iti jñānam stauti.

It is in rejection of the view of an earlier commentator that this verse refers to a particular *dṛṣṭi* or *upāsana* that Śāṅkara gives his view that this is *stuti* or *jñāna*.

21. Printed wrongly as *sūtrakam iva paṭam*.

In Bhagavadgītā V. 8—9, Śāṅkara sees the complete abandonment or cessation of all activity : sarvakāryakaraṇaṣeṣṭāsu karmasu akarmaiva paśyataḥ samyagdarśinaḥ tasya sarvakarmasannyāsa eva adhikāraḥ, karmaṇo' bhāvadarśanāt etc. This provokes Bhāskara to a three-page excursus in which he not only criticises this view of complete non action, but makes many remarks directly against Śāṅkara, says that the latter is trying to seek textual authority for the wrong views to which he had been misled and expresses pity for him in a profuse manner (pp. 139-141).

Bhagavadgītā V. 13, *sarvakarmāṇi manasā* etc. : Bhāskara has succinctly criticised Śāṅkara here, with some words of Śāṅkara reproduced and the rest summarised.

Bhāskara :

karma-tyāga-vādīno anyathā vy-
ācakṣate samyagdarśi vidvān
sarvakarmāṇi nitya-naimittikād-
ini samyaṅ nyasya tyaktvā āste
sukham, vaśi jitendriyaḥ. kva
punar āste tadā-navadvāre śarīre
naiva kurvan na kārayan iti. tad
idam svapakṣarāgāviṣṭa-cetaso
apavyākhyānam. (p. 144).

Śāṅkara :

niṣṛttabāhya-sarvaprājāna itī
sukham āste ity ucyate. vaśi
jitendriya ity arthaḥ. kva katham
āste ity āha navadvāre pure etc.

Bhāskara's opening words at the beginning of his commentary on Bhagavadgītā VI echo the opening words of Śāṅkara on the same chapter and when Bhāskara, after giving his interpretation of the opening verse, says : *atra ekaveṅṇupāṇayaḥ karma-tyāginām mūrdhni padaṁ nihitam upalabhya, tad anyathā-kartum prayatamānā bahu asambaddham garjanti. gṛhasthasya stutyarthaṁ sannyāsitaṁ yogitvaṁ ca ucyate, na punar niragner akriyasya ca nirākaraṇaṁ kriyate iti tad asat.* and so (pp. 154-6), he is criticising Śāṅkara.

The *ekaveṅṇupāṇi* is the *ekadaṇḍi-sannyāsin* Śāṅkara; and it is his interpretation of this verse that Bhāskara is criticising here; it is Śāṅkara's words that the italicised portion in the above cited passage in Bhāskara refer to : *tasmān muner yogam āruruḥṣṭhaḥ pratipanna-gārhashtyasya agnihotrādi karma phala-nirapekṣam*

anuṣṭhīyamānam dhyānayogārohaṇasādhanatvam buddhi-śuddhi-dvāreṇa pratipadyate iti 'sa sannyāsi ca yogi ca' iti stūyate 'anāsr-itah' etc.

It is this taking of the verse by Śāṅkara as praise of the householder who has set himself on the path that Bhāskara criticises.

Bhagavadgītā VI. 47, last verse, *yoginām api sarveṣām* etc. : There is a parallel here on a non-controversial interpretation.

Bhāskara :	Śāṅkara :
yoginām iti. ādityam rudram anyām vā devatām ye yuñjate etc. (p. 165).	yoginām api sarveṣām rudrād- ityādidhyānaparāṇam madhye etc.

Bhagavadgītā VII. 8, *raso' ham apsu* etc. : Bhāskara's citation and refutation clearly refer to Śāṅkara.

Bhāskara :	Śāṅkara :
me rasarūpa-protā āpa iti kecid yojayanti. tad asat. (p. 171).	tasmin rasabhūte mayi āpaḥ protā ity arthaḥ.

Bhagavadgītā VIII. 3, *akṣaram brahma paramam* etc. : Under this, Bhāskara just cites without any criticism Śāṅkara's interpretation : *apareṣām vyākhyā-yajamānasya* etc. (p. 181).

Bhagavadgītā VIII. 12-13 speak of the final departure of the soul, leaving the body. Because of the contemplation of *omkāra* intended in the previous verse (11), and expressly mentioned in the next verse (13), Śāṅkara naturally takes the intermediate verse (12) as referring to gradual release, *krama-mukti*. Bhāskara however takes verse 13 and the whole-context as referring to immediate release, *sadyomukti*. Bhāskara's reference to and criticism under verse 13 are to be traced to Śāṅkara's words under verse 11.

Bhāskara :	Śāṅkara :
kecid atra kramamukti-abhiprā- yam idam, na sadyomukti-prad- arśanārtham iti vadanti. 'etad vai satyakāma param ca aparam	parasya brahmaṇo vācakarūpeṇa pratimāvat pratikarūpeṇa ca parabrahma-pratipatti-sādhana- tvena mandamadhya-buddhi-

ca brahma yad omkārah' iti nām vivakṣitasya omkārasya up-
 śruteḥ. omkāralambanopāsana- āsanam kālāntare mukti-phala-
 phalam idam kathyata iti. tad ap- muktam yat tad eva ihāpi...
 avyākhyānam, paravidyādhikār- pratipattyupāyabhūtasya omkā-
 āt. 'yad akṣaram vedavido vad- rasya kālāntara-muktiphalam
 anti' iti pratijñānāt katham kāl- upāsanam yogadhāraṇā-sahitam
 āntaramuktirūpam varṇyate. (p. vaktavyam....
 185).

The above instances of verbatim citations, close *anuvādas* and pointed criticism of Śaṅkara show, apart from the views and interpretations that Bhāskara held on the crucial philosophical and textual questions, two other points : that the Bhagavadgītā-bhāṣya of Śaṅkara is an authentic work of his and that Bhāskara wrote after Śaṅkara.²²

That Śaṅkara's is not the only commentary criticised by Bhāskara but that there were others before his which Bhāskara criticises as strongly, is borne out by Bhāskara's words. The first of the references to such commentaries which we may cite in this connection shows that there were commentators who adopted neither the vulgate text nor the Kashmirian readings but had, at places, their own peculiar readings. In Gītā II. 20 or 21, Śaṅkara, Bhāskara, Abhinavagupta and Rāmakaṇṭha read *nāyam bhūtvā* but Bhāskara cites a commentator who, he alleges, purposefully read here *nāyam bhūtaḥ*. "anye punar anyathā varṇayanti—nāyam bhūto bhavitā vā na bhūyaḥ iti pāṭhāntaram kṛtvā parabrahmopāsanam anayā gītayā lakṣyate . . . pāṭhāntarakaraṇam cāhopuruṣikāmātram. . . tasmāt yat kiñcit etat. evam tu pāṭhāntaram kurvanto arthāntaram svamatiparikalpitaṁ varṇayanto bahavo vyākhyātāro' bhiyuktāś ca ucyante. "(pp. 54—5).

The second context where such an earlier commentator other than Śaṅkara is quoted and criticised by Bhāskara is II. 45, pp. 68-69: *apare punar yuktaṁ vyākhyānam ananuserantaḥ tatprati mānam kalpayanto vadanti—sarveṣāṁ kila karmakaṇḍa-gatānām vākya-nām hi dvididham phalam anvaya-nibandhanam tātparya-samadhi-gamyam ca. tatra ānvayikaṁ svargabrahmavarcasādi-phalam*

22. See J. A. B. Van Buitenen, The Adyar Library Bulletin, XXV 1961, pp. 268-273, for the same conclusion based on the Brahmasūtra-bhāṣyas of the two.

anvaya-nibandhanam. śamadamādhētutayā anuṣṭhātrṇām vyavas-āyātmikāyām buddhau yogyatāpādanam (tātpraya-samadhigam-yam)²³. tatra anvayaphalam eva svargādi ye vadanti avipaścitaḥ tātparya-phalam ajānantaḥ iti yojayanti.

Here the other commentator says that there are two fruits for the performance of the ordained Karmans, one described as *anvayanibandhana*, i. e. got by the face-meaning, Heaven, Brahmanic lustre (*svarga*, *braama-varcas*) etc., and the other described as *tātparya-nibandhana* i. e. implied fruit viz. the engendering of contentment etc. helpful to a spiritual attitude. That the performance of Karma is meaningful as a means of purification of mind (*citta-śuddhi*) is acceptable to Śāṅkara; but it is not his view that this objective of Karma-performance should be deduced through a two-fold meaning of the Vedic injunction; in fact, according to the theory of *citta-śuddhi*, Karman is to be performed without thought or desire of the promised fruit of Heaven etc. The commentator who hit upon the original idea of two meaning of the Vedic injunction is also a Samuccaya-vādin like Bhāskara but his fertile mind wanted to find an authority (*tātprati mānam*)²⁴ for the view.

One of these earlier non-Śāṅkara commentators criticised by Bhāskara is an *upāsana-vādin* who interpreted Karman in *karma-yoga* in III. 3 as referring to such act as would lead to *apavarga*, e. g. *upāsana* of *udgītha* etc. Bhāskara says (pp. 82-3): anye punar anyathā ślokaṁ prasthāpayanti—karma adbhutam(?) udgīthādyupāsanaṁ. tena yogāt karmāṇy apavarga-bho(yo)gyāni bhavanti ityeva kṛtvā uktam. . . katham udgīthāvayavādyupāsana-karmaṇaḥ samṛddhyarthvānnā(tvāda) pavargayogitvam. . . .

Bhāskara refers to this commentator again under IV. 24 where *brahmārpaṇam* is taken by that commentator as contemplating *brahman* in *omkāra*. *anyu tu brahmārpaṇam iti omkāre brahmopāsanaṁ iti* etc. (p. 124).

We are not in a position to identify this commentator in the present state of our knowledge.

23. Missing in the edn.

24. Not *tātpratimānam* as printed.

THE SŪKĀNUŚĀSANA (SŪKĀNUPRAŚNA)*

In the elaborate introduction to his commentary on Ch. III of the *Bhagavadgītā* and the refutation here of the *Jñāna-karma-samuccaya* of earlier commentators, Śaṅkara argues that the renunciation of acts is a requisite *aṅga* for *Mokṣa* and supports it with citations from *Upaniṣads*, *Itihāsa*, *Purāṇa* and *Yoga Śāstra*. One of these quotations made by Śaṅkara on *Karma-tyāga* and *Jñāna* as the means of release runs thus :

- (1) कर्मणा बध्यते जन्तुः विद्यया च विमुच्यते ।
तस्मात्कर्म न कुर्वन्ति यतयः पारदर्शिनः ॥
इति शुकानुशासनात् ।

Now what is this *Śukānuśāsana* ?

Before proceeding to identify the text referred to by Śaṅkara, it may be noted that in his commentary of *Gītā* III. 3, Bhāskara quotes a text called *Śukānupraśna*. After refuting Śaṅkara's view of *Karma-tyāga*, Bhāskara cites in support a verse from this text :

- (2) तथा हि शुकानुप्रश्ने¹—
कर्मणा मनसा वाचा यो धर्मनिरतः सदा ।
अफलाकांक्षसिद्धश्च स मोक्षमधिगच्छति ॥ P. 81

The closeness of the names *Śukānuśāsana* and *Śukānupraśna* suggest that they refer to the same text in which instructions are imparted (*anuśāsana*) to sage Śuka in reply to his questions (*anupraśna*). It may be a text or an episode forming part of a text.

In Śaṅkara, the above quotation occurs, along with two other, after four quotations from *Upaniṣads*. Following the earlier

1. The p. ref. to Bhāskara's *Bh. Gītābhāṣya* is to the edn. of the available portion of this work, based on two fragmentary mss., one in the Sarasvati Bhavan, Banaras and another discovered by the present writer; it is to be issued by the Sarasvati Bhavan, Banaras.

enumeration by Śaṅkara of the textual authorities on the point argued by him, *Itihāsa* comes after *Śruti* and the first of the quotation in this second set is :

- (3) त्यज धर्ममधर्मं च उभे सत्यानृते त्यज ।
उभे सत्यानृते त्यक्त्वा येन त्यजसि तत्त्यज ॥

Bhāskara, who keeps close track of Śaṅkara, refers, after his own citation from *Śukānupraśna*, to the last mentioned quotation in Śaṅkara :

- (4) यत्तु 'त्यज धर्ममधर्मं च' इति तस्योत्तरश्लोकादर्थनिर्णयः 'त्यज धर्ममसङ्कल्पात्'² त्यजाधर्ममहिंसया' इति । फलसङ्कल्पत्यागो न स्वरूपत्याग इति । P. 82.

The verse 'त्यज धर्ममधर्मं च' is one quoted more often and is from the *Mokṣadharmā* section of the *Śānti Parvan* of the *Mahābhārata*, where it is found in the Critical Edition as verse 40 in Ch. 316. If we look through the *Mokṣadharmā*, we would find that it has a section in which Vyāsa teaches spiritual wisdom to his son Śuka, covering Chs. 224—46 in the Critical Edn. The *Śuka-anuśāsana* which means 'Teachings to Śuka' may be this section of *Mokṣadharmā*. Indeed it is, for the verse quoted by Śaṅkara as from *Śukānuśāsana* is found here as 233.7.

Śaṅkara quotes elsewhere also from this section, mentioning the source in a descriptive manner. Under *Gītā* II. 22 he says :

- (5) तथा च पुत्रायाह भगवान् व्यासः—'द्वाविमावथ पन्थानौ' इत्यादि ।

This is 233.6 of *Śukānuśāsana*. In his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, as also in his *Bṛhadāraṇyakahāṣya*, Śaṅkara quotes anonymously from this section. The verse 'Karmanā badhyate jantuḥ' etc. quoted in his *Gītābhāṣya* is quoted by Śaṅkara in his *Bṛhadāraṇyakahāṣya* II. iv where, in his introductory comments, he stresses that Sannyāsa or *Karma-tyāga* is a necessary *aṅga* of *Brahmavidyā*. Śaṅkara says here that the *Samuccayavādin* has not evidently heard of Vyās'a declaration and quotes not only the above-noted verse from Vyās'a's instruction in *Śukānuśāsana* but also its two

2. This word incorrectly printed as 'Śaṅkalpajam' is restored on the basis of the variant recorded in the footnote.

preceding verses forming Śuka's question on the same moot question.

(6) सर्वक्रियाकारकफलोपमर्दस्वरूपायां च विद्यायां सत्यां सह कार्येणाविद्याया अनुपपत्तिलक्षणश्च विरोधस्तैर्न विज्ञातो, व्यासवाक्यं च तैर्न श्रुतम् । * * *

यदिदं वेदवचनं कुरु कर्म त्यजेति च ।
कां गतिं विद्यया यान्ति कां च गच्छन्ति कर्मणा ॥
एतद्वै श्रोतुमिच्छामि तद् भवान् प्रब्रवीतु मे ।
एतावन्योन्यवैरूप्ये वर्तेते प्रतिकूलतः ॥

इत्येवं पृष्ठस्य प्रतिवचनेन —

कर्मणा बध्यते जन्तुः विद्यया च विमुच्यते ।
तस्मात् कर्म न कुर्वन्ति यतयः पारदर्शिनः ॥

Under *Brahmasūtra* I. iii. 28, Śaṅkara quotes anonymously

(7) अनादिनिधना नित्या वागुत्सृष्टा स्वयंभुवा ।
आदौ वेदमयी दिव्या यतः सर्वाः प्रवृत्तयः ॥

This is *Śukānuśāsana* 224 65, Critical Edn. It is to be noted that as it is, the Critical Edn. gives only the first half of the verse in the body of the text, relegating the other half to the footnotes, an example of the not infrequent phenomenon of external testimonia, of antiquity and authority as in the case of Śaṅkara, not supporting restorations based only on manuscripts of later dates. Belvalkar notes here in the footnotes Śaṅkara's quotation of this in his *Sūtrabhāṣya* I. iii. 28 and the commentator on *Mahābhārata*, Nilakaṇṭha, reading the second line of the verse as in Śaṅkara's quotation.

Under *Br. Sū.* II. iii. 29, Śaṅkara quotes 224.40 of *Śukānuśāsana* with just the mention of the name of Dvaipāyana :

(8) तथा चोक्तं द्वेपायनेन—
उपलभ्याप्सु चेद् गन्धं केचिद् ब्रूयुरनैपुणाः ।
पृथिव्यामेव तं विद्यात् अपो वायुं च संश्रितम् ॥ इति ।

Belvalkar notes Śaṅkara's quotation of this in his Critical Notes to this chapter at the end of the Śāntiparvan.

Another quotation by Śaṅkara from Śukānuśāsana is found under *Br. Sū. IV. ii. 14* :

- (9) स्मर्यते च महाभारते गत्युत्क्रान्तयोरभावः ।
 'सर्वभूतात्मभूतस्य सम्यग् भूतानि पश्यतः ।
 देवा अपि मार्गे मुह्यन्ति अपदस्य पदैषिणः ॥' इति ।

Close upon this, Śaṅkara speaks of Śuka proceeding towards the realm of the Sun, which apparently contradicts the fact that there is no such *gati* or *utkrānti* for one who had realised the Brahman. Explaining that this movement of Śuka in an embodied form refers to his progress towards the *Sūryamaṇḍala* for the eventual leaving of his mortal frame, and merging in all that exists, Śaṅkara quotes again from the same source :

(10) ननु गतिरपि ब्रह्मविदः सर्वगतब्रह्मात्मभूतस्य स्मर्यते—शुकः किल वैयासकिः मुमुक्षुरादित्यमण्डलमभिप्रतस्थे पित्रा चानुगम्याहृतो भो इति प्रतिशु-
 श्राव इति । न । सशरीरस्यैवायं योगबलेन विशिष्टदेशप्राप्तपूर्वकः शरीरोत्सर्ग
 इति द्रष्टव्यम् । सर्वभूतदृश्यत्वाद्युपन्यासात् । न ह्यशरीरं गच्छन्तं सर्वभूतानि
 द्रष्टुं शक्नुयुः । तथा च तत्रैवोपसंहृतम्—शुकस्तु मास्तात् शीघ्रां गतिं
 कृत्वान्तरिक्षगः । दर्शयित्वा च प्रभावं स्वं सर्वभूतगतोऽभवत् ॥ इति ।

The former *Sarvabhūtātma*^o is 231.23, but the latter *Śukastu*^o occurs in a later section, again dealing with Śuka, 320.19. The prose matter in Śaṅkara in the form of a *Pūrvapakṣa* represents the gist of the verses 320.23ff.

Under *Br. Sū. IV. ii. 13*, Bhāskara also quotes from the same source the verse quoted by Śaṅkara *Sarvabhūtātma*^o etc. and before it, another verse not quoted by Śaṅkara :

(11) स्मर्यते च (IV. ii. 13) । शुको वैयासिकिरादित्यमण्डलं प्राप्य
 स्वमहिमखापनं कृत्वा सर्वभूतोऽभवदिति स्मर्यते । गत्येकदेशे संबन्धाद् अचिरा-
 दिना गत इति गम्यते

सन्निरुद्धस्तु तेनात्मा सर्वेष्वायतनेषु वै ।

जगाम भित्त्वा मूर्धानं दिवमित्युत्पपात ह ॥

तथा चापरं स्मरणम्—सर्वभूतात्मभूतस्य etc. ॥

Of the two quotations in Śaṅkara, Belvalkar notes only the first *Sarvabhūtātma*^o, *Mokṣa* 231.23. The one following immediately in *Śaṅkarabhāṣya* (*Mokṣa* 320.19) is not noted. The

second quotation in Bhāskara, is the same as the first in Śaṅkara; regarding the first, it is obviously from the latter context of Śuka's ascent (*Mokṣa* 320), but it is not traceable there in the Critical Edn., nor in the Kumbhakonam or the North Indian editions.

Although the section specifically called *Śukānuśāsana* or *Śukānupraśna* ends with Ch. 246 in the Critical Edn., after some more chapters of diverse spiritual discourses, the *Mokṣadharmā* reverts to Vyāsa's instruction to Śuka, the story of Śuka's birth, Vyāsa asking Śuka to go to Janaka for some more instruction, Janaka as well as Nārada instructing Śuka, and finally Śuka going up, leaving his body, and becoming one with Brahman. This latter section *Śukābhipātana* or *Śukotpatana* is also quoted by Śaṅkara and Bhāskara as noted above, in their *Bhāṣyas* on the *Brahma Sūtras* when dealing with the Departure of the Enlightened.

When dealing with the persons qualified for the study of *Mokṣa*-texts, Bhāskara deals at the very outset with those who are non-eligible and quotes here a verse :

(12) सर्वस्तरतु दुर्गाणि सर्वो भद्राणि पश्यतु ।
श्रावयेच्चतुरो वर्णात् कृत्वा ब्राह्मणमग्रतः ॥

as from *Śukotpatti*. This too is from the latter section beginning with Ch. 310 Critical Edn. mentioned in the previous paragraph. The verse is 314.45, Critical Edn. and Śaṅkara also quotes it in part in his *Br. Sū. Bhāṣya*, *Apaśūdrādhikaraṇa*, I. iii. 38, dealing with the same topic which engages the attention of Bhāskara, strangely at great length, at the very beginning of his *Gītābhāṣya*.

So far as Śaṅkara's citations from these two sections on Śuka from the Great Epic are concerned, the data bearing on Textual Criticism are that in quotation No. 7 noted above, *Anādinidhanā*^o, the second line of the verse according to Śaṅkara has not been restored to the main body of the Critical Edn., but only noticed in the Critical Apparatus; and that in the quotation No. 9 noted above, Śaṅkara's quotation presents a reading for the whole of the second quarter, which is supported by Bhāskara, but is not recorded in the Critical Apparatus under 231.23.

Bhāskara's quotations offer further problems. The verse which Bhāskara quotes as from *Śukānupraśna* in support of per-

formance of *Karman* (see no. 2 above) is *not* found in the concerned chapters in the Critical Edn. or the Kumbhakonam or the North Indian editions. It is obvious that Bhāskara wants to make a special point by quoting from the same text as Śāṅkara quotes from in this context, a verse which supports a view opposite to what Śāṅkara holds here, i. e. a verse in support of *karman*. It is, therefore, unlikely that there is a mistake in Bhāskara's citation here. We should therefore take the more difficult path of tracing the verse than the easier one of holding Bhāskara's quotation suspect. In fact, my search has shown that the verse cited by Bhāskara is found in a text called *Śukānuśāsana* in which Vyāsa teaches Śuka and which occurs in the well-known collection entitled *Itihāsasamuccaya*³, compiled from the *Mahābhārata*. Ch. 18 of this compilation is given as *Vyāsa-Śukopākhyāna* forming part of Bhīṣma's discourses to Yudhiṣṭhira and is called in the end *Śukānuśāsana* :

शुकानुशासनं त्वेतत् अमृतत्वमवाप्स्यसि ।

The verse cited by Bhāskara in support of performance of *Karman* is found here as verse 85. The third foot of the verse as quoted by Bhāskara and as printed in the forthcoming publication of his *Gītābhāṣya* from Sarasvati Bhavan, Banaras, reads *Aphalākāṅkṣasiddhaś ca* which is inferior to the *Itihāsasamuccaya*-reading *Aphalākāṅkṣacittaś ca*, supported partly also by the variant recorded in the footnotes in the Banaras Edn.

The verse in citation No. 10 given above *Sanniruddhastu*^o preceded by a description of Śuka's progress to the *Sūrya-maṇḍala* etc. suggests its legitimate source as the same chapters in *Śukābhipātana* noted above, *Mokṣa*. 319-20, Critical Edn. But such a verse does not occur there in the critical or other editions of the Epic.

The *Śukānuśāsana* as included in the *Itihāsasamuccaya* has to be taken into consideration; many verses of it are traceable in the Critical Edn. of the Epic. It has several variants, difference in order of verses, and verses in adjacent or related chapters in the Critical or other editions; it has also verses, undoubtedly from the

3. Venkateswara Press edition, Bombay, 1917; see my article on it in *ABORI*, XVIII, ii, 1937, pp. 201-4.

Great Epic, but not in the section discussed here or its neighbourhood which I am trying to locate. The whole concordance, I shall present on another occasion.

It would suffice for the present to point out that, from what has been said above, this section of the *Mokṣadharmā* had been especially cherished by Vedāntins not merely as an aid for cultivating spiritual virtues in general but also as containing answers to and throwing light on specific questions in the framework of Vedāntic thought, as shown by the *Vedānta Sūtra* IV. ii. 13 itself, 'स्मर्यंते च' referring to it. Vyāsa himself speaks of its special value in the course of this same *anubhāsana* to his son in the *Mokṣadharmā* :

आत्मप्रत्ययिकं शास्त्रमिदं पुत्रानुशासनम् ॥

* * ऋक्सहस्राणि निर्मथ्यामृतमुद्धृतम् ॥

नवनीतं यथा दध्नः काष्ठादग्निर्यथैव च ।

तथैव विदुषां ज्ञानं पुत्रहेतोः समुद्धृतम् ॥

288. 13-15 Critical Edn.

THE TATTVASAṂGRAHARĀMĀYAṆA
OF
RĀMABRAHMĀNANDA

The Nature of the work

The Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa of Ramabrahmānanda is a compendious account of the Rāmāyaṇa story, embodying many popular versions of incidents and oriented to the cult of the worship of Rāma as the Supreme Being. It is well known that in the wake of the Bhakti movement, the worship of Rāma attained great importance, and the cult ramified widely and gave rise to a considerable literature taking the form of Upaniṣads, Purāṇic sections and independent Purāṇic compilations called Saṁhītās, philosophical and devotional versions of the Rāmāyaṇa like the Adhyātma, Abhuta and Ānanda, and independent digests on the methods and details of worship, recitation of Rāma's Name (Rāma-nāman) etc. In the process of this magnification, stories came up to explain such incidents in Vālmiki which obviously called for an explanation; thus a series of 'earlier stories', pūrva-vṛtta, arose, some of these being necessitated by the supposedly vulnerable points in the acts of Rāma. The mass of such stories, of Rāmamāhātmya grew so much and got spread over so wide a literature that to-day anyone who wants to have a collection of all these, is faced with the formidable task of collation of material scattered in numerous works many of which are in manuscripts. But fortunately for the student of Rāma-literature, a recluse named Rāmabrahmānanda Sarasvatī set himself to the task and produced a compendium of such Rāma-stories in a work of his called the Tattva-saṅgraha-rāmāyaṇa. Each word in the name of the work is significant. As *Rāmāyaṇa*, it adopts the same framework of the epic and sets forth the story in seven Kāṇḍas; as a *Saṅgraha*, it collects here all the stories bearing on Rāma's greatness and the incidents of his life found in the different sources; and as a work emphasising *Tattva*, the compilation aims at showing the inner significance and truth about Rāma as God Supreme

and at pointing out the reasons and circumstance which led to certain courses that the incidents in the Epic took. Rāma-bhakti is one of the most widespread forms of devotion and the esoteric interpretation of the Epic in accordance with the faith that Rāma is the Supreme Godhead is very much in vogue. To all such votaries of Rāma the work of Rāmabrahmānanda will be of great use. Nor is its use less to a student of the history and development of Rāma-stories and of the impact these had on the literature of the different parts of the country, particularly works like the Rāma-carita-mānasa of Tulasī produced under the spell of the Rāma-movement that gained a momentum at the hands of Rāmānanda of Banaras.

The Author

In South India one of the greatest and most popular figures to follow this cult of Rāmabhakti and to have attained 'siddhi' or spiritual realisation by the prescribed mode of repeating Rāma's Name a crore of times is the Saint-Composer Tyāgarāja (1767-1874 A.D.). An elder contemporary of his and a friend of his father Rāmabrahman, was Upaniṣadbrahman of Kāñcī, the well-known Advaitic Sannyāsin whose prolific literary output comprised, besides original tracts on Advaita and Bhakti, commentaries on the numerous Upaniṣads, the Gītā, the Brahmasūtra and other Vedāntic and devotional *prakaraṇas*, some of which have been published by the Adyar Library, and manuscripts of all of which are found in the Adyar Library, in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library and in the Library of the Upaniṣad Brahma Math associated with the author himself at Kāñcī. Of these special mention may be made here of works bearing on our present subject of Rāma-māhātmya : Rāmārcanacidvidyācandrikā, Rāmagītas, Rāmagītāvalī, Adhyātmarāmāyaṇavyākhyā, Rāmā-ṣṭapadi with vivaraṇa, Rāmatarāṅga etc.; on the allied and more general subject of Bhakti, he wrote the Bhaktivivekavivṛti, and on the doctrine of the recital of the Name of the Lord, closely related to the Rāma cult, he wrote the Upeyanāma-vivekavyākhyā, the Nāmārthavivaraṇa, the Nārāyaṇa-tāranāmāvalī with vyākhyā etc. This Upaniṣadbrahman was a pupil of Vāsudevendra, and of the same Vāsudevendra, there were a number of pupils like Rāmācandrendra and Svayamprakāśendra. Our author Rāmabrahmānanda

calls himself a pupil of Svayamprakāśānanda who is likely to be the same as the Svayamprakāśendra in the above mentioned group of authors of identical ideology believing in Advaita and Rāma-bhakti. In the Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa, the colophon runs :

इति श्रीनानापुराणागमादिनिष्ठरामतत्त्वसङ्ग्रहभूते श्रीमत्परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्य—श्री स्वयंप्रकाशानन्दसरस्वतीस्वामिपूज्यपादशिष्यश्रीमद्रामब्रह्मानन्दसरस्वतीस्वामिविरचिते तत्त्वसङ्ग्रहरामायणे उत्तरकाण्डे श्रीरामायण.....वर्णनं नाम द्वाविंशत्सर्गः ॥

Madras Des. Cat. No. 15738.

The colophon in his other work on the Rāmāyaṇa and its inner or higher significance, the Rāmāyaṇatattvadarpaṇā, runs :

इति श्रीपरमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यवर्यश्रीमत्स्वयंप्रकाशानन्दसरस्वतीपूज्यपादशिष्य—श्रीमद्रामब्रह्मानन्दसरस्वतीविरचिते श्रीमद्रामायणतत्त्वदर्पणे वैराग्यादिसाधननिरूपणं नाम षोडशप्रकाशः ॥

Adyar Ms. LIV. A. 47.

In the Mysore Oriental Library Ms. of the Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa, the author is given as Rāmacandra Sarasvatī, who, as pointed out above and as known from his many works in the Adyar Library and elsewhere, appears to be closely related to this group of writers; sometimes it looks as if Rāmacandrenda is the real name of Upaniṣad Brahmendra and the latter name was given to him on account of the Upaniṣad-commentaries written by him; in fact, when I pursued the matter with the present, the twelfth, incumbent of the Upaniṣad Brahma Math, His Holiness Śrī Iṣṭasiddhindra Sarasvatī, he was kind enough to place in my hands a list of the Math-succession, which confirmed my guess; according to this list, Rāmacandrenda and Upaniṣad Brahman refer to the same person. The Mysore Catalogue enters (I. p. 447) Upaniṣadbrahmayogin's Liṅgabhaṅgamuktiśataka as a work of Rāmabrahmayati. In Madras D. 4575 and Adyar 30 G. 13, Guṇatrayaviveka, we have a Svayamprakāśendra, pupil of Vāsudevendra and a devotee of Rāma, and we may take him as the guru of Rāmabrahmānanda, our author. In the Adyar Library and the Upaniṣad Brahma Math Library we have a Brahmasūtra-vṛtti,—Bhāṣyasārasaṅgraha or Spāṣṭārthadīpikā—whose author is given as Rāmabrahmendra, pupil of Vāsudevendra, and here

again we have, in all likelihood, the same author or one related to this group of writers. Our surmise is supported by the Upaniṣad Brahma Math list according to which Vāsudevendra had three disciples, Rāmacandrendra alias Upaniṣad Brahman. Kṛṣṇānandendra and Svayamprakāśendra; and Upaniṣad Brahman's successor in the Math was Rāmabrahmendra. All this would show that our author flourished about the end of the 18th cent. A. D. In this connection, there is however one point which requires explanation, viz., the absence of a ms. of the *Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa* from the Mss. Library of the Upaniṣad Brahma Math at Kāñcī; but the loss of important manuscripts even from their own native centres is not unknown in the history of libraries and manuscripts.

A rough idea of the age of our author can also be had from the source-books which he mentions for his *Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa*. Among these source-books is the *Harimāhātmyadarpaṇa*, which is represented by a manuscript in the Madras Govt. Oriental Library (D. 5410) and two in the Mysore Oriental Library (Catalogue I. p. 194) and Maharajah's Sanskrit College Library, Mysore (No. 1131). The work mentions its author in the course of the introductory verses as the son of King Śrīraṅga :

अस्ति श्रीरङ्गभूपालतनयो विनयोज्ज्वलः ।

बसवक्षितिपालाख्य सद्धर्मनिरतः शुचिः ॥

But in a set of concluding verses found at the end of canto 108, the author describes himself as son of King Jaṅgama and dedicates the work to Śrīraṅgarāja; Śrīraṅgarāja may be the patron-king of whom Basavabhūpāla was a subordinate and from epigraphy we know that subordinate and dependent chiefs would describe themselves as *sons* of their overlords. Such a feature pertains to the Keladi chiefs among whom Basavas are known, but they were all staunch Śaivites though, as kings they patronised Advaita and Dvaita too. Or Śrīraṅga may refer only to the deity at Seringapatam of whom the author was a devotee. It has not been possible to place this Śrīraṅga and this Basava son of Jaṅgama¹; most

1. Sri U. Lakshminarayana Rao draws my attention to a general Jaṅgammayya of 1545 A. D. serving under Timmarāja, younger brother of Rāmarāja, (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1920, p. 39).

probably this Basava was not of the Keladi family, but belonged to some other family of feudatory chiefs; as the last Śrīraṅga of the Vijayanagar line flourished in the period 1717-1759 A. D., this Basavabhūpāla cannot be later than 1759. C. Hayavadana Rao says in the account of literature in his history of Mysore in the *Mysore Gazetteer* (New edition, Vol. II. Pt. i. ch. IX. p. 415) that the Harimāhātmyadarpaṇa of Basavabhūpāla may belong to the 17th century A. D., a statement which, as Sri C. Lakshminarayana Rao points out to me, is probably based on what R. Narasimachar has said in the *Mysore Arch. Rep.*, 1922, p. 19. Dr. T. V. Mahalingam draws my attention to an earlier Basavarāja of the time of Śrīraṅga II A. D. 1571-84, who played an unfortunate part in the quarrels between Tirumalarāya and Venkaṭapatirāya². The meagre information in another work of this same Basava available in manuscript in the Mysore Oriental Library, called the Satibhūṣaṇa, is equally tantalising.³ The Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa which uses the Harimāhātmyadarpaṇa may therefore be assigned to a period between the later part of the 16th and the former part of the 18th century. In any case, Rāmabrahmānanda cannot be earlier than the 14th century A. D., as he quotes Vidyāraṇya extensively.

The Manuscripts

Of the Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa, there are three mss. in the Madras Govt. Oriental Library, of which only one is complete : D. 15738 (complete), R. 719 (begins in the middle of the Ayodhyākāṇḍa and goes to the 1st kāṇḍa but wants a few cantos in the end i. e. II. 13 to VII. 8) and R. 4532 (Bāla complete; breaks off in Ayodhyā). The Adyar Library has four mss. (Catalogue, I. p. 128) and three mss. are available in Mysore (Catalogue, I. p. 147 2 mss II p. 7).

The Plan of the work

As indicated at the outset the work represents a collection of all the stories and episodes relating to Rāma and his being the

2. Travancore Archaeological Series, Vol. I, Pp. 62, 63, 84; T. V. Mahalingam, Virappa Nāyaka and Vijayanagar, Madras University Journal, XXII. Sect. A. No. 9, 1951, p. 129.
3. I am thankful to Sri. Rangaswami Ayyangar of the above Library for sending extracts from the manuscripts.

great God as found in the different Purāṇas, Saṁhitās and Āgamas; the presentation in a single book of such widely scattered material has a value of its own. The method of exposition takes the narrative form so that the whole work represents an esoteric version of the Rāmāyaṇa, like the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa, but having the additional merit of being a variorum of Rāma-myth.

रामायणे पुराणेषु संहितास्वागमादिषु ।
 रामतत्त्वचरित्रादौ विशेषास्सन्ति भूरिशः ॥
 तत्तद्विशेषतात्पर्यमवगाहितुमक्षमः ।
 यत्र ये ये विशेषास्स्युस्तास्स्तान् संगृह्य सारतः ॥
 प्रसिद्धार्थस्य सङ्कोचैरप्रसिद्धार्थविस्तरैः ।
 स्वचित्ततुष्ट्यै प्राचीनैर्मणिभिर्मालिकामिव ॥
 श्लोकैर्नानापुराणादिनिष्ठैरेव न कल्पितैः ।
 कुर्वे रामायणं तत्त्वसङ्ग्रहाख्यं मनोरमम् ।

Madras. R. 4532.

The Sources

Rāmabrahmāṇaṇḍa gives his sources as: Dharmakhaṇḍa, Agastyasaṁhitā, Umāsaṁhitā, Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa, Brahma-purāṇa, Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa, Skandapurāṇa. Bhāgavata, Viṣṇu-purāṇa, (Rāma) Tāpanī upaniṣad, Hiraṇyagarbhasaṁhitā, Bhārata, Śeṣadharmā. Puruṣarthasudhāsindhu, Itihāsasamuccaya, Purāṇa-sāra and Harimāhātmyadarpaṇa. Some of these need no notes; of the rest: The Dharmakhaṇḍa is available in five mss. (D. 2299 and R. 1644, 1681, 1754, 2671), in the Madras Govt. Ori. Mss. Library; it purports to be a part of the Skandapurāṇa and deals extensively with the story of the Rāmāyaṇa; The Agastyasaṁhitā (Sutikṣṇa-Agastya-saṁvāda) has been explained at length in the *New Catalogus* [*Catalogorum*. Vol. I, pp. 20-21. The Umāsaṁhitā assigns itself to the Skānda (Southern version) and has an extensive section on the greatness of the Rāmāyaṇa set forth Kāṇḍa by Kāṇḍa (see Madras D. Nos. 2287, 2289 and R. 1796; other libraries too have mss. of it.) The Hiraṇyagarbhasaṁhitā is an Āgama text, available in a ms. in the Madras Government Oriental Library R. 2614. The Śeṣadharmā is a Purāṇic compilation represented by many mss. The Itihāsasamuccaya is a well-known collection of

episodes from the Mahābhārata. The Puruṣārthasudhāsindhu is evidently the Puruṣārthasuddhānidhi found in some mss. in the Madras Government Oriental Library, (D. Nos. 2470, 2471), a compilation based on the Purāṇas, making an analytical presentation of the stories from the Itihāsas and the Purāṇas under the four heads of the human endeavour, Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa and belonging to the rich corpus of literature which the Sāyaṇa-Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya renaissance brought forth. The Purāṇasāra, as the name shows, is an epitome of the Purāṇas, presenting in an analytical and useful a manner as the previous work, the stories of the Itihāsa-Purāṇas so as to bring out their ethical, devotional and philosophical teachings, under no less than 84 headings; this too appears to go to the same corpus of Sāyaṇa-Vidyāraṇya literature. The Harimāhātmyadarpaṇa has already been explained; it should be added here that its author expresses his devotion to Rāmā, and its first section is based on the Rāmāyaṇa. An authority not enumerated first but cited later is the Nirvāṇakhaṇḍa, which is, evidently, like the Dharmakhaṇḍa noted above, a section of the Skānda; a manuscript in the Asiatic Society of Bengal (No. 3927, Des. Cat. Vol. V) represents an extract from the Nirvāṇakhaṇḍa of the Skānda.

The present undertaking

The foregoing account will sufficiently justify the work undertaken in the sequel, viz., a detailed summary of the contents of the Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa, with notes wherever necessary. Scholars working on the ramification of the Rāma-epos will find useful material here; in fact, it is on the urge of one such important scholar engaged in research in the Rāma-epos, Rev. C. Bulcke, author of the *Rāmakathā* in Hindi, that I undertook this work.

The Tattvasaṅgraharāmāyaṇa is not yet printed; fortunately the strain of going through the manuscripts of the work was obviated by a verbatim Tamil rendering of the work available in print. The credit of having noted the importance and interest of the work goes to the sponsors of the Tamil translation : S. Rājā Śastri who did it with the help of Varakavi A. Subrahmanya Bhārati, and the enlightened N. Munisami Mudaliar of the Tamil periodical *Ānandabodhini*, who published it in 1916, offering the substantial

volume of 520 pages of double column matter for a nominal price of Rs. 3-8-0. (= 3.50).

The Author's second work

Rāmabrahmānanda wrote, as already mentioned, another work with the same purpose in view, the Rāmāyaṇatattvadarpaṇa, a ms. of which is available in the Adyar Library (LIV. A. 47.) and another in the Library of the Maharajah's Sanskrit College, Mysore. Among other things, the work is of interest for the many variant readings of important verses of Vālmiki which had come up in the wake of the metaphysical orientation given to the work. I have appended an analysis of that work also on the basis of its Adyar manuscript.

A Result of the Contents of the Tattva-Saṅgraha-Rāmāyaṇa

(With Brief Notes)

This work is a compilation (saṅgraha) based on a large number of other works.

The emphasis is on Tattva, i. e., the inner implications or the philosophical or religious significance of the various incidents of the story. Hence the name Tattva-Saṅgraha-Rāmāyaṇa.

In the following words, the author sets forth at the beginning (in the opening chapter) the nature and sources of his work :

“In the Rāmāyaṇa, the 18 Purāṇas and works like the Āgamas, the truth about Rāma is set forth in manifold ways. I am offering here a work for those who would desire to see all that collected in one place. The rare details found in all these are noted here; things found in brief are set forth here in due length and those dealt with already in extenso in other works are summarised.

The primary sources of this compilation are :

- (1) *Dharmakhaṇḍa*
 - (2) *Agastyaśāhītā*
- and (3) *Umāśāhītā*

Where the philosophical and religious significance is dealt with, the

(4) *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa*

is drawn upon sometimes, for the same purpose,

(5) *Brahmapurāṇa*(6) *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*(7) *Skandapurāṇa*(8) *Bhāgavata*(9) *Viṣṇupurāṇa*(10) *Rāmatāpanī Upaniṣad*(11) *Hiraṇyagarbha Saṁhitā*(12) *Bhārata*

and (13) *Śeṣadharmā*

are used. Similarly several Kalpas relating to the adoration of Rāma-mantra have also been laid under contribution.

Rāma-kathā, Rāma-stotra and Rāma-tattva are the three forms of the material and nothing has been set forth here which is, even in places where the authority does not go to the original āṛṣa sources, at discord with the intention of those source-books. Among such later derivative sources used here are :

Puruṣārthasudhāsindhu

Itihāsasamuccaya

Purāṇasāra

and *Harimāhātmya-darpaṇa.*"

The work then begins and is cast in the normal Purāṇic form.

There was an assemblage of sages on the banks of the river Gomatī at Naimiśa forest and they were discussing several subjects with Sūta. At that time sage Vālmiki arrived with his pupils which put them all in the thought of Śrī Rāma. And the sages began to ask Sūta about Rāma.

Here ends canto I of the Bālākāṇḍa.

The work is in 7 Kāṇḍas like the Rāmāyaṇa and each Kāṇḍa is divided into Sargas.

1. Bālakāṇḍa	35	Sargas
2. Ayodhyā-kāṇḍa	32	„
3. Āraṇya „	20	Sargas
4. Kiṣkindhā „	18	„
5. Sundara „	17	„
6. Yuddha „	42	„
7. Uttara „	22	„

1—BĀLA KĀṆḌA

Canto 1. Matter already set forth.

Canto 2. The sages ask Sūta: Rāma is said to be an incarnation of Viṣṇu in some sources :

- (a) Rāmāyaṇa, Bāla, the canto in which the gods pray to Viṣṇu to incarnate for destroying Rāvaṇa.
- (b) Padma purāṇa
- (c) Bhāgavata „
- (d) Kūrma „
- (e) Viṣṇu „
- (f) Dharma khaṇḍa-pūrvabhāga
- (g) Agastya saṁhitā
- (h) Hiraṇyagarbha saṁhitā
- (i) Rāmatāpani Upaniṣad
- (j) Bhārata

Canto 3. The sages continue : In some other works Rāma is said to be an incarnation of (I) Śiva (II) Brahmā (III) Śiva-cum-Viṣṇu (IV) Śiva—cum-Viṣṇu-cum-Brahmā, i. e., Trimūrtis, and lastly (V) the Supreme Being beyond the Trinity (Trimūrtis).

The works that speak of Rāma as an incarnation of Śiva are :

- (a) Dharmakhaṇḍa-Uttarabhāga
- and (b) Śeṣadharmā.

The following speak of Rāma as an avatāra of Brahmā :

- (a) Vālmīki himself in the actual description of the avatāra where the *Prājāpatya*-puruṣa appears with the Pāyasa.

and (b) Brahma purāṇa.

The view that Hari-Hara jointly incarnated as Rāma is found in :

- (a) Skanda purāṇa

and (b) Garuḍa purāṇa

The Trimūrti-theory is found in :

- (a) *Nirvāṇa-khaṇḍa*

and (b) in the hymn of Brahmā on Rāma in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki himself (end of Yuddha khaṇḍa).

For the view that Rāma is really the Satcit-ānanda Brahman beyond the Trimūrtis, Śiva, Brahmā and Viṣṇu, support is found in :

- (a) Viṣṇuyāmala

(b) Skānda

(c) Pādma

and (b) Brahmāṇḍa.

“Now”, the sages ask Sūta, “You tell us the truth of Rāma as you have known it.”

Canto 4. Sūta starts with a hymn on Rāma and his contemplation, and then replies :

Canto 5. Rāma is no doubt Para Brahman, but he is more a manifestation of Viṣṇu. Before coming to that question the real secret significance of the epic Rāmāyaṇa has to be comprehended, viz., that it is the embodiment of the Gāyatrī.

Sūta explains the significance of (I) Gāyatrī, (II) how Rāma is an embodiment of the divine attributes signified by Gāyatrī, as seen in the various descriptions of Rāma's qualities at different contexts in Vālmīki's text, (opening canto of Bāla, i. e. Saṅgraha Rāmāyaṇa, opening canto of Ayodhyā etc.) and (III) how and in what lines of Vālmīki's texts, each of the 24 letters of the Gāyatrī occurs,

- (a) first in the Saṁgraha Rāmāyaṇa and then
 (b) in the whole epic.

Canto 6. Now on the greatness of Rāma as revealed by Śiva to His spouse Pārvatī. Description of Śiva's presence Pārvatī requests Him to tell Her about the greatest deity to be worshipped.

Canto 7. Śiva replies that Rāma is that deity to be worshipped, Rāma who is a manifestation of Viṣṇu.

Canto 8. Pārvatī asks about the circumstances and causes of the Supreme God incarnating as Rāma.

Śiva replies after due contemplation of Rāma.

Canto 9. Śiva continues : Rāma is the transcendent Brahman, but manifested more out of the form of Viṣṇu.

Canto 10. How the Dvārapālakas of Viṣṇu, Jaya and Vijaya, were cursed by the sages Sanaka etc. to be born as demons *thrice* to give fight to Viṣṇu who desires to enjoy fights.

Canto 11. Lakṣmī told the two that in their first demoniac manifestation, Hiraṇyākṣa and Hiraṇyakaśipu, Mother Earth would be instrumental in bringing about the former's end; in the second manifestation as Rāvaṇa-Kumbhakarna, She herself (Lakṣmī) as Sitā would bring about their ruin; in the final manifestation Sudarśana (the Lord's Discus) would destroy them.

Birth of Jaya-Vijaya as Rāvaṇa-Kumbhakarna.
 Birth of their sister Śūrpaṅkhā and brother Vibhiṣaṇa.

Rāvaṇa's Tapas and offerings to Śiva and Śiva's boon to him.

Kumbhakarna's boon.

Vibhiṣaṇa gets his boon for a Dhārmika life from Brahmā.

Canto 12. Śūrpaṅakhā marries Vidyujjihva.

Rāvaṇa's marriage with Maṇḍodari and birth of Meghanāda.

Kumbha-Nikumbha, sons of Kumbhakarṇa.

Trijaṭā, daughter of Vibhiṣaṇa.

Rāvaṇa's depredations and harassment of the gods.

Gods' prayer to Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu's promise to be born as Daśaratha's son; his reference to Nandin's curse on Rāvaṇa.

Canto 13. The story of how Daśaratha was Manu's incarnation, and Kausalyā, of Manu's wife. Manu's three Avatāras, Daśaratha, Vasudeva (father of Kṛṣṇa) and Viṣṇuvrata (father of Kalki of the future).

Śiva continues Rāma's story.

Description of Ayodhyā; of Sarayū.

It may be noted that on the Sarayū is mentioned an island called Śrīraṅga. This is evidently, according to this story, the prototype of the South Indian Śrīraṅga, the shrine where the deity Raṅganātha, which was the family deity of Rāma, is said later to be left by Vibhiṣaṇa.

Daśaratha's rule, his dejection at not having a son; Sumantra advises Aśvamedha; Ṛṣyaśṛṅga assists in the performance of sacrifices and lastly of the Putrakāmeṣṭi sacrifice. Viṣṇu Himself is said to have appeared at this sacrifice, agreed to be born as Daśaratha's son and given the Pāyasa.

Canto 14. Daśaratha distributes the Pāyasa to his three queens : half to Kausalyā; half of the remainder to Sumitrā; half of the further remainder to Kaikeyī; the residue again to Sumitrā.

The sons are born as manifestations of Viṣṇu and his arms. Rāma first showed himself as God Viṣṇu to Kausalyā and then reduced Himself to a child's form. Kausalyā's prayer to Him. The child christened Ramā.

Bharata born as the embodiment of the Lord's Discus (Cakra)

Lakṣmaṇa—Ādiśeṣa's manifestation.

Śatrughna—manifestion of the Śaṅkha, the Lord's conch.

Naming of the children.

Appearance of Sitā at the tip of the plough in Mithilā.

Canto 15. The importance of the holy day of Rāma's Avatāra, the Rāma-navamī vrata.

Canto 16. The boys grow; Daśaratha thinks of their marriage. Arrival of Viśvāmīta.

Canto 17. Viśvāmītra asks for Rāma in connection with his sacrifice. Vasiṣṭha expatiates on the true greatness of Rāma and urges Daśaratha to send him with Viśvāmītra.

Canto 18. Viśvāmītra takes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa; the sage imparts the mantras Balā and Atibalā to the boys; Tāṭakāvadhā.

Canto 19. Viśvāmītra's yāga protected; Subāhu killed; Mārica driven away. Rāma adored by the sages. The method of worshipping Rāma is set forth; Rāma-upāsana is of two kinds : the advaitic form of contemplating upon Him as oneself and of worshipping him in the relation of master and servant.

The worship of Rāma in one's own heart (Mānasa-Pūjā).

Canto 20. The worship of Rāma in the Sālagrāma stone. The merits of worshipping with Tulasi; the same illustrated by the story of a fallen Brahman.

Canto 21. Further account of the merit of worshipping Rāma with Tulasi; merit of the rosary made of bits of Tulasi twigs.

Canto 22. The greatness of Rāma-mantra as expounded by Agastya to Sutikṣṇa. “Rāmo’ham”—‘I am Rāma’—the advaitic adoration—is the supreme type.

Canto 23. Agastya continues : Aṣṭāṅgayoga explained.

Canto 24. Viśvāmitra, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa leave for Mithilā. The Gaṅgā-story.

Welcome by king Sumāti of Viśālā en route. Viśvāmitra imparts to him the Rāma-mantra—“*Śrī Rāma jaya Rāma jaya Rāma.*”

Canto 25. Story of Ahalyā—Indra—Gautama.

Note here : (I) Ahalyā becoming stone; (II) Indra taking the form of a cock to give a false sense of day-break to Gautama and (III) Indra cursed not only with loss of vṛṣaṇa but with profusion of marks of ‘bhaga’ all over the body,—these three are mentioned.

Canto 26. Release of Ahalyā from curse. Ahalyā’s hymn to Rāma.

Canto 27. Gautama’s arrival; his hymn to Rāma; teachings to Gautama.

Canto 28. They enter Mithilā; Janaka receives them and orders the Śiva-dhanus to be brought.

Canto 29. The gods come to witness the breaking of the bow and the marriage of Rāma and Sītā. Śiva in particular takes Rāma on his lap, blesses him and asks him to break his bow and marry Sītā.

Canto 30. The bow is broken.

Again Śiva takes Rāma on his lap after the Dhanurbhaṅga; Śiva expatiates on Rāma’s greatness to Janaka and the assemblage.

Daśaratha arrives. The other three marriages are also proposed.

Canto 31. The marriage. It is attended by Śiva and Brahmā.

Canto 32. Brahmā's praise of Rāma.

Janaka refers to Nārada having once called on him and insisted on Sitā being given in marriage to Rāma. The merit of Kanyakādāna or offering a girl in marriage and performing her marriage.

Canto 33. The gods depart. Rāma, Daśaratha and party leave for Ayodhyā.

Paraśurāma appears on the way. Rāma quells his pride.

Canto 34. Gods, Śiva, Brahmā etc. come. Śiva explains Rāma's glory.

Rāma Himself, as Supreme God, declares his glories and 'Vibhūtis'.

Paraśurāma takes leave.

Canto 35. Rāma and Sitā enter Ayodhyā. Daśaratha. sends Bharata to Kekaya.

II—AYODHYĀ KĀṆḌA

Canto 1. Description of Rāma's qualities; Daśaratha's resolve to instal Rāma as Crown Prince.

Canto 2. Arrangements for the same. Vasiṣṭha's praise of Rāma.

Canto 3. The Gods now confer to prevent the coronation so that their plans to have Rāvaṇa killed by Rāma may go through.

Canto 4. At their instance Nārada comes to Rāma to remind him of the mission lying ahead.

Canto 5. Nārada's praise of Rāma.

Canto 6. *Sarasvatī is requested to create impediment to the coronation (by perverting the tongue of Kaikeyī) and she agrees.*

Mantharā poisons Kaikeyī, Kaikeyī demands her boons of Daśaratha.

- Canto 7. Rāma's resolve to go to the forest.
- Canto 8. Rāma instructs Lakṣmaṇa in the truths of philosophy and removes his anger at the turn of events; he instructs his mother too and consoles her.
- Canto 9. Rāma receives Kausalyā's blessings. The resolve of Śītā and Lakṣmaṇa to follow him.
- Canto 10. Rāma emptying his palace by gifts to the people. Vāmadeva on the greatness of Rāma, the killing of Rāvaṇa that he is going to accomplish and the efficacy of Rāma-nāman.
- Canto 11. Rāma's departure; Daśaratha and the subjects in grief. *Seeing all this Kaikeyī is moved, becomes afraid and asks Rāma to retrace his steps and not to go the forest, praises him as the Supreme God and prays to be pardoned for what she had said under Mantharā's instigation.*
- Before subjects and Brāhmins wake up, Rāma hastens away into the forest.
- Canto 12. Rāma imparting spiritual teachings to Sumantra. Rāma explaining to him Bhakti to Himself in all its forms.
- Canto 13. Meeting with Guha; crossing of the river. Rāma reaches Bharadvāja's Āśrama. The sage praises him. Rāma's reply. Then Rāma goes in the direction of Citrakūṭa Mt. *where Vālmiki lives.*
- Canto 14. Sumantra reaches Ayodhyā; Daśaratha's lament. Sumitrā consoles Kausalyā.
- Canto 15. Daśaratha passes away. Bharata arrives; his praise of Rāma, saluting of Kausalyā, uttering the 'Śapathas', and Kausalyā consoling Bharata.
- Cants 16. Vasiṣṭha advises Bharata to cast aside the sorrow and perform the obsequies and then to take up the kingdom.

Bharata performs the obsequies; he refuses to take the kingdom and announces his resolve to go to the forest and bring Rāma back.

Bharata and retinue reach Bharadvāja's Āśrama; they come to Citrakūṭa.

Canto 17. Bharata meets Rāma.

Canto 18. Bharata requests Rāma to return. Rāma explains to Bharata the impossibility of his going back on his resolve.

Canto 19. Vasiṣṭha too explains to Bharata Rāma's position. Finally Rāma presents his gem-set Pādukās to Bharata.

(Note: There is nothing said about the Sandals, nor any story relating to how they come.)

Rāma's teachings to Bharata.

Bharata and party return.

Canto 20. Rāma then comes back to Bharadvāja, stays with him for 15 days and comes with him to Banaras.

Greatness of Banaras and absolute salvation to those that abandon their bodies or die there.

Rāma bathes in the Ganges and worships Śiva. Sages crowd to see Rāma.

On their asking Sūta about the reason of Kāśī attaining that importance, Sage Agastya's discourse to Sutikṣṇa on Kāśī is narrated by Sūta. The chief greatness is that Śiva imparts into the ears of every person dying at Kāśī the Rāma-Tāraka-nāman.

Canto 21. The greatness of Rāma-Gayā at Gayā where Rāma goes.

The sages ask Sūta to narrate the further acts of Rāma. Sūta does so.

Rāma went to the banks of River Phalgunī in Gayā and wanted to offer Śrāddha. The Brāhmins there were undesirable, whereupon Rāma offered the

piṇḍa to Gayāsura asking him to take it direct by the tip of the tongue, so that the pride of the Brāhmins may be put down. Gayāsura did so. The Brāhmins thus subdued prayed to Rāma and Rāma blessed them. This is the story of Rāma-Gayā.

Incidentally the story is also told of Sītā cursing river Phalgunī to become a subterranean stream which explains its present absence.

Then Bharadvāja took leave and went to his āsrama at Prayāga, and Rāma turned towards Citrakūṭa where Vālmiki was.

Canto 22. *There Rākṣasas come against Rāma who slays them.*

Rāma comes to Vālmiki and pays his respects to him. Vālmiki receives him with due honour. Rāma expresses his desire to stay there for some time. Vālmiki points out that the most suitable place for Rāma and Sītā is the heart of the pure and devout; and refers to his own story of how he was blessed though he but repeated Rāma's name in the reverse order of the letters, म. रा.

Pārvatī now asks Śiva what this story of Vālmiki was and his recital of Rāma-nāman in a reverse order. Śiva narrates the story of the hunter who later became sage Vālmiki :

The seven great sages were once going through a forest during the time of a severe draught. A hunter attacked them. The sages called him to their side and asked, "You have been committing such crimes for the sake of your wife and family. Will you kindly go and ask them if they would share your sin also?" This set him thinking.

Canto 23. The sages promise not to leave the spot; the hunter goes home and returns with a negative reply and an awakened vision.

Canto 24. The hunter seeks knowledge from the sages.

Canto 25. The sages describe the greatness of Rāma and as they are thinking of how to impart spiritual wisdom to the hunter, an aerial voice is heard to pronounce the letters “Ma-rā”, and to direct the sages to impart this sacred Mantra to the hunter.

They do so.

Canto 26. The hunter in penance. His relations see this in surprise.

Canto 27. Heavenly damsels come to disturb his penance but Rāma the God appears before them and entices them and tantalises them as they are to reach and embrace him.

Canto 28. Śiva describes to Pārvatī how Vālmiki was enclosed within an ant-hill (Valmīka) during this Tapas.

Indra got perturbed at his severe penance but Bṛhaspati said that the Brahmarṣi and the poet-author of the Rāmāyaṇa was in the making, all for the good of the gods.

A long time passes and the seven great sages come there again.

Canto 29. Nārada reveals to the seven sages what he once heard at Kailāsa about the future incarnation of the Lord to put down Rāvaṇa and Vālmiki composing an epic on that story. The ant-hill is opened and Vālmiki is seen doing Rāma-nāma-japa. Brahmā and other gods come now. Lord Viṣṇu appears and blesses the sage as the future author of the Itihāsa on Rāma.

Canto 30. Vālmiki's hymn to Lord Nārāyaṇa.

Vālmiki then repairs to the banks of river Tamasā and builds a hermitage for himself there.

Nārada conveys to him the details of the Rāma story and the sage decides to compose the Rāmāyaṇa.

The greatness of Rāma-nāman.

This Vālmiki was living at the time of Rāma's visit at Citrakūṭa.

Note : In the original epic the Vālmiki whom Rāma calls on is not mentioned as the poet.

At Citrakūṭa, the mischief that Jayanta as crow did on the person of Sitā is narrated.

Nārada arrives, reminds Rāma of the divine mission and the work ahead.

Canto 31. Sage Atri's reception to Rāma. Anasūyā's praise of Sitā.

Canto 32. Anasūyā on the greatness of *Pātivratya*. An illustrative story for it : of how a devoted wife served her husband who took to evil ways, became lame, then destitute but still wanted to mate a courtesan; of how the wife helped him to this too, etc., a popular version of the *Ānimāṇḍavya* story in the Mārkaṇḍeya purāṇa.

Anasūyā then presents Sitā with red sandal paste, silk and ornaments.

III—ĀRANYA KĀṆḌA

Canto 1. Killing of Virādha; Śarabhaṅga attaining heaven.

Canto 2. The sages harassed by Rākṣasas wait upon Rāma and Rāma promises protection.

Rāma comes to Sutikṣṇa's hermitage. Sutikṣṇa's hymn on Rāma.

Now Pārvatī asks Śiva to tell her in extenso the details of the *worship of Rāma as Agastya taught Sutikṣṇa*.

Canto 3. Śiva does so.

Rāma is to be worshipped after getting His Mantra imparted by a Guru; He is to be worshipped in one's heart, in the Sun, in an idol, in fire or in the Sālagrāma pebble.

The daily routine for such a Rāma-worshipper.

The form of Rāma to be worshipped thus :
Rāma as seated on a throne in Ayodhyā under a Kal-
paka tree. The worship.

Canto 4. Rāma-daśāvaraṇādi-pūjā.

The mystic diagram (yantra) with Bijākṣaras etc.
to be drawn for the worship.

Canto 5. Do contd.

Canto 6. After receiving Sutiṣṇa's honour and worship, they
move on; *Mother Earth appears before Sītā and gives
her a pair of gemset Sandals to be used by Rāma for
removal of pain to feet and hunger.*

The sages again come and pray for help against
Rākṣasas.

Rāma now proceeds towards Agastyāśrama.

Agastya receives Rāma and presents him with a
divine bow, two quivers, a sword and Brahmāstra.

Canto 7. Agastya speaks out the truth about Rāma's real nature
as the Supreme Being.

Canto 8. They come across Jaṭāyus the eagle.

Lakṣmaṇa builds a hermitage on the northern bank
of the Godāvāri.

In the same locality was a sacred place called
Bhadrādri.

*This is evidently the Bhadrācala, where a famous
Rāma-shrine is found and with which the life of Saint
Rāmadāsa of the time of Tana Shah, Nawab of Gol-
conda, (1672-1687 A. D.) is connected. Once, here,
Rāma expounds to Lakṣmaṇa the Sādhanas of Bhakti
and Jñāna.*

Canto 9. Śūrpaṇakha arrives. Khara, Triśiras and Dūṣaṇa and
their army come.

Rāma tells Lakṣmaṇa of a story according to which the three Rākṣasas Khara etc. had been given a boon by Viṣṇu in their previous birth that they would be killed by Him (Viṣṇu) in his Rāmāvātāra and then blessed with salvation.

Canto 10. Gods and sages gather to see the battle. They all see Rāma in His Viśvarūpa form. To the three demons he appeared as Śiva whom they had in previous birth propitiated by their penance.

To quench His thirst Rāma struck a place with his bow and gave rise to a water spring; the place came to be called *Pānīya-yoga-nagara*.

To a little west, at another place he took a little rest; that place is called *Kiṅgḥākhyapura* (?)

For the fight that Rāma offered singly to all these demons, he came to be called Virarāghva.

The gods sing his glory and describe the truth of Rāma as Supreme Being in terms of advaitic philosophy. The whole passage is called "Veda-garbha-stotra", a hymn on Rāma.

Canto 11. Śūrpaṅkhā at Rāvaṇa's court. Indrajit eggs on his father but Kumbhakarna utters words of caution and wisdom: Kumbhakarna reveals the truth of Rāma having incarnated for his death.

Canto 12. Rāvaṇa and Mārica. The latter's advice.

Canto 13. Ravaṇa does not take Mārica's words but threatens to kill him whereupon Mārica agrees to help him.

At this juncture Nārda calls on Rāma and reminds him of the gods' mission on which Rāma had come. Only a year of exile still remains and Rāvaṇa has yet to be done away with.

Rāma understands and says that Rāvaṇa had come there to carry off Sitā.

He then creates a Māyā-Sītā for the further progress of the mission. He calls the Goddess of Death and asks Her to take Sītā's form and enter Laṅkā for its destruction through the good offices of Rāvaṇa himself.

Hymn to Rāma by real Sītā. Rāma conceals the Sītā on his own chest (where she always is as Lakṣmī).

Even Lakṣmaṇa is kept deluded enough by Māyā not to know this design.

Canto 14. Mārīca comes as the wonder-deer. When Mārīca fell his Tejas entered Rāma and became one with Him.

Canto 15. *Lakṣmaṇa had drawn a line of safety which none of evil design could cross to harm Sītā.*

Rāvaṇa came as a Sannyāsin and stood outside that line.

A hermit is said to be present nearby to help Sītā to receive and worship the guest (Rāvaṇa). *Rāvaṇa offers to read her palm, which tempts her out of the line of safety drawn by Lakṣmaṇa.*

Rāvaṇa assumes his real terrible form; Sītā swoons; owing to the old curse, being afraid to touch her person, *he breaks off the ground on which she stands and carries her away with that.*

Rāvaṇa intercepted by Jaṭāyus. Terrible encounter follows; unable to overpower the mighty bird, *Rāvaṇa adopts a ruse* : He asks Jaṭāyus "I shall tell you my secret of life; it is my toe; now you tell me where your secret of life lies." Poor truthful Jaṭāyus reveals that its secret of life is inside of its wings. Rāvaṇa at once chops off the wings and Jaṭāyus falls down.

(Note the popular story-elements in the scene of Rāvaṇa lifting Sītā.)

Sitā espies five monkeys on route and drops some of her ornaments and garment.

Some of the Vānara-women see Sitā and laugh at her; for this she curses them to be always devoid of covering over the upper part of their bodies.

Rāvaṇa places her in Aśokavana, worship her and then departs. Indra offers her divine Pāyasa to keep her up during the stay at Aśokavana.

Canto 16. Rāma returns from the hunt of Māriça and meeting Lakṣmaṇa on way enlightens him on the divine mission, Māyā-Sitā etc., and reveals that he himself has a curse by which he should undergo pangs of separation.

Now the story of Bṛndā's curse to Viṣṇu.

Jalandhara, son of the Ocean, was a terrible Asura whom Śiva, Viṣṇu and other gods were unable to account for. The secret of his strength was the impeccable chastity of his wife Bṛndā; so Viṣṇu adopted the ruse of guising himself as Jalandhara and depriving her of chastity. Śiva then easily destroyed the Asura. Bṛndā now understood the ruse and cursed Viṣṇu to undergo suffering and loss of his full divine consciousness. Later she gives up her life and Viṣṇu rears up at the place of her cremation three plants *Tulasī*, *mālatī*, *dhātrī*, which thus become sacred to Him.

Viṣṇu had then accepted to take upon Himself this curse of Bṛndā in the Rāmāvatāra.

Canto 17. Rāma goes about raving and searching for Sītā; as river Godāvārī is silent when he asks her, he curses her that all those that bathe there will become Caṇḍālas ! The Gods Brahmā etc. were perturbed and request Rāma to revoke the curse and restore the sanctity of the sacred river; upon which Rāma says that the sanctity will be restored by linking Godāvārī with the pool in which the great soul Śabarī bathes everyday and accordingly with the end of his bow, connects the stream of Godāvārī with the Śabarī-pool.

Canto 18. Coming in search of Sītā, Rāma sees Jaṭāyus and grants him salvation.

Canto 19. The brothers come across Kabandha; they kill him, and he requests cremation at their hands and praises Rāma. Then Śabarī : Rāma on Bhakti for which there is no consideration of sex or caste. The means of devotion :

(I) the associatian of great souls, (II) listining to the Lord's glories, (III) becoming enamoured of the Lord's qualities, (IV) singing of the Lord's qualities, (V) adoration of the *guru* and practice of yogic *yama* and *niyama*, (VI) worshipping the Lord with no other object in view, (VII) adoration of the Lord through His Mantra in proper form, (VIII) adoration of the Lord's other devotees; the viewing of all beings as embodiments of the Lord, casting away all mundane desires and being absorbed in the Lord and (IX) constant preoccupation with spiritual inquiry.

Śabarī attains salvation after giving up her body in Rama's presence.

Canto 20. On the greatness of Rāma-nāman. Illustrative story of a pious Brāhman of Avantī who became corrupt in his character by bad company but was saved by Rāma-nāman.

IV—KIṢKINDHĀ KĀṆḌA

Canto 1. The brothers reach Pampā: arrival of Hanumān; Rāma's promise to befriend Sugrīva and help him against Vālin.

Canto 2. Rāma blesses Hanumān who wants for himself nothing more than the permanent part of serving Him.

Sugrīva's arrival; pact of friendship before fire.

It may be noted that among the things promised by Rāma to Sugrīva are kingdom, wife Rumā and Tāra.

For the assurance of Sugrīva, the only demonstration of Rāma's strength mentioned here is the piercing of the seven Sāla trees.

- Canto 3. Immediately Rāma bestows on Sugrīva the divine vision and reveals to him His own Viśvarūpa.

Then Rāma imparts to Sugrīva the method of His own worship and initiates him in it.

The Dhyāna : how to contemplate Rāma, in the lotus of one's heart, on a throne with Sitā and others, in the pose of one imparting knowledge (ज्ञानमुद्रा). Rāma then imparts to Sugrīva the hymn of His own 1,000 Names. the *Rāma-sahasra-nāma-stotra*.

- Canto 4. Rāma-sahasra-nāma-stotra text, preceded by verses on the form in which Rāma is to be contemplated upon while reciting the hymn.

- Canto 5. Rāma garlands Sugrīva and sends him for the duel with Vālin. Only one encounter is mentioned. Vālin becomes a liberated Soul and attains salvation on being shot at by Rāma.

To Pārvati's question on how Rāma thought fit to shot at Vālin who was engaged with another, and how Rāma did so from an unseen place, Śiva narrates the previous story of how during the churning of the ocean Viṣṇu Himself had given Vālin *the boon that half of the direct combatant's strength would go to Vālin*; on the same occasion Viṣṇu had given Vālin a golden garland also. Secondly, if Rāma met him openly in fight, Vālin would fall at his feet as a refugee (śaraṇāgata) and that would make Rāma's promise to Sugrīva impossible of fulfilment : and Vālin and Rāvaṇa were friends and if Rāma did not kill Rāvaṇa his Avatāra would become futile.

- Canto 6. Rāma consoles Tārā and enlightens her, on her request, on the Spirit being of the form of knowledge, and of happiness and misery as belonging to the body and due to wrong identification of Soul with body.

- Canto 7. Coronation of Sugrīva. Rains set in. Rāma's spiritual discourse to Lakṣmaṇa under pretext of describing the rains.
- Canto 8. Rāma to Lakṣmaṇa on the duties of man according to Varṇa and Āśrama.
- Canto 9. The procedure for the repetition of Rāma-NĀMAN one crore of times—*Rāma-koṭijapa-vidhāna*—as set forth by Śiva to Pārvati. The process of doing this Japa includes the offering of water, fire-oblation, feasting of Brāhmins and offering of Dakṣiṇā to them.¹
- Canto 10. Sugrīva's delay. Rāmā's anger. Lakṣmaṇa's visit to Kiṣkindhā.
- Canto 11. Sugrīva sends monkeys in search of Sītā.
- Canto 12. The south-bound monkey party with Hanumān and others.

Hanumān's birth-story.

Hanumān, a manifestation of Śiva.

Śiva and Pārvati see on Mount Kailāsa a Vānara pair in love-sport; at that time Pārvati conceives an oversized baby which she transfers, even as it is first conceived in womb, to sage Gautama's daughter who was doing penance for the sake of a child; just at that time God Wind going that side took a fancy for this daughter of Gautama, to whom He transfers the child conceived by Pārvati; as a consequence of all this, Gautama's daughter bore to God Wind Āñjaneya, an ultimate manifestation of Śiva. As a child Hanumān jumped up to seize the red rising disc of the Sun, taking it to be a fruit; Indra struck him with *Vajra* and he fell and as his chin lengthened by this fall, he came to be called *Hanumān*.

1. The famous Saint-Composer Tyāgarāja is believed to have successfully done this one-crore-repetition of Rāma's Name.

Canto 13. All gods bestow boons on Hanumān. Indra affords him security from any future injury from his *Vajra*; Sūrya grants him scholarship, Varuṇa long life and absence of danger in water etc., Yama security against disease etc. etc.

Rāma gives Hanumān His Signet Ring.

Canto 14. As a talisman against any harm that the Rākṣasas of Laṅkā might do him, Rāma imparts to Hanumān the hymn called *Rāma-Vajra-Kavaca*, as given by Agastya to Sutīkṣṇa.

Canto 15. Monkeys go in search of Sītā.

Progress of Hanumān's party. When his companions feel fatigued, Hanumān assumes a huge form (*Viśvarūpa*) and carries them, making each monkey sit on a hair of his body.

They enter Svayamprabhā's cave.

Canto 15. Svayamprabhā described as a Yogini doing Rāma-nāma-japa for attaining salvation.

She left the cave and reached Rāma's presence. Rāma promises salvation to her.

Canto 17. The monkeys meet Sampāti. The story of Sāmpati.

Canto 18. The monkeys discuss about the difficulty of crossing the sea; Jāmbavān rouses up Hanumān's enthusiasm.

V-SUNDARA KĀṆḌA

Canto 1. Hanumān jumps from Mahendra. His encounter with Surasā; and then with Siṁhikā.

Canto 2. Encounter with Laṅkinī, guardian to Laṅkā-gate. Vanquished, she blesses him to enter Laṅkā for the victory of Rāma.

Canto 3. Hanumān's search for Sītā, in Laṅkā. Goes to Kumbhakarṇa's mansion, from there to Rāvaṇa's mansion, and sees him asleep amidst his women.

No mention of mistaking Maṇḍodari for Sītā.

Collects the clothes of Rāvaṇa and his women and goes away.

Comes to Aśokavana; sees Sitā there.

- Canto 4. Trijaṭā's dream about Rāma's triumph and Rāvaṇa's fall.

Rāvaṇa has been thinking always of the time when Rāma would come and kill him; he *was eagerly looking forward to death at Rāma's hands*; in sleep he had the dream that an emissary of Rāma had come to Aśokavana and so hastens there. He uses severe expressions towards Sitā so that the emissary might report all that to Rāma.

Hanumān however could not bear the sight; he jumps down, takes a huge form and fists Rāvaṇa so fiercely in his chest that Rāvaṇa beats retreat for the time being.

- Canto 5. This convinces Sitā of the visitor being some one from her husband. Hanumān announces himself to her. Hanumān relates the later part of Rāma's story (after Rāvaṇa's visit) and gives a minute physical description of Rāma. Gives the Signet Ring also. He then takes a terrible form and starts destruction of the grove.

- Canto 6. Rāvaṇa hears of it. Prahasta's suspicions about Hanumān being Rāma's emissary.

Rākṣasa armies now attack him and he accounts for them.

Killing of Jambumālin, son of Prahasta, the ministers' sons (Mantriputras), and

- Canto 7. Akṣa-Kumāra.

Indrajit arrives; Hanumān bound by Brahmāstra.

- Canto 8. Hanumān brought to Rāvaṇa's presence. Exchange of angry words between him and Rāvaṇa. Rāvaṇa orders his death, but Hanumān brushes aside with his tail the servants who approach him.

- Canto 9. Vibhiṣaṇa points out the impropriety of killing an ambassador. Hanumān's tail set fire to. Burning of Laṅkā by him.

In the chaos that followed the bonfire, the divine damsels imprisoned by Rāvaṇa got free and departed by air, blessing Hanumān.

He then flourished his tail, grown to inordinate length, so that it hit Rāvaṇa's face. Quenched his tail in the sea and reached Sitā.

- Canto 10. Takes Sitā's Cūḍāmaṇi and returns; joins his colleagues; all return and make havoc in Sugrīva's Madhuvana.

Arrival in Rāma's presence and report of the success of their mission. Gives Rāma the Cūḍāmaṇi and mentions the episode of the crow at Citrakūṭa.

- Canto 11. Rāma embraces Hanumān and blesses him; "You will remain for ever, present at every place where the recitation of my name goes on. You will finally become the four-faced Brahmā himself and assume the duties of creation, and then come to me in heaven. You are verily Śiva, imparting my mantra to all those who come to Kāśī." Rāma imparts to Hanumān his own षडक्षरमन्त्र and expatiates on the greatness of that mantra. Hanumān asks Rāma to tell him about His Vibhūtis or things in which Rāma is prominently manifest. Rāma gives out His Vibhūtis (a la the Vibhūtiyoga chapter of the Bhagavad Gītā).

- Canto 12. Further elucidation of worship and devotion and their means and ancillary duties. The reading of Rāmāyaṇa, its worship and listening to its exposition are part of these.

- Canto 13. Continuation of the worship of Rāma Mantra. Details of Japa, Homa, feasting of Brāhmins etc. Adoration and offering of water to Rāma's Sandals.

- Canto 14. How to contemplate. The Advaitic contemplation ('I am Rāma' रामोऽहम्) is best. Elaboration of this non-dualistic contemplation.

- Canto 15. The nature of Samsāra. The story of Dattātreyā and the Brāhman Vedaratha.
- Canto 16. The cure for the ills of Samsāra; continuation of Vedaratha-story. Then Śiva continues his discourse to Pārvati; Rāma-nāman the most potent means of salvation.
- Canto 17. The nature of the Kali-age.

IV—YUDDHA KĀṆḌA

- Canto 1. Sugrīva calls his army. They reach the seashore. Rāma requests the Sea to be still for a 100 Yojanas and the Sea agrees, and so has it been since that time. Rāvaṇa takes counsel. Prahasta and Maṇḍodari against fighting Rāma.
- Canto 2. Vibhiṣaṇa's advice.
- Canto 3. Vibhiṣaṇa comes to Rāma.
- Canto 4. Rāma affording security to Vibhiṣaṇa. Rāma accepting him despite opposition from friends.
- Canto 5. Rāma's praise of Vibhiṣaṇa.
- Canto 6. At this juncture, the daughter of the Sea sends Nārada to Rāma. On Nārada's advice, Rāma sees Kanyā Kumārī who was in penance, and desired to marry Rāma. Rāma was an Eka-patnivrata and was nonplussed at this request. He told her that he was just then going for the battle, and that if she succeeded in catching him up on his return, he had no objection to marry her; but now she should allow him (Rāma) to build a causeway there on the waters.

Then Vibhiṣaṇa suggests that Rāma should pray to the Sea-god. Rāma resorts accordingly to the supplication of the sea at a spot called Cakratirtha; he spread sacred grass (Darbha) and lay there (Dharbha-śayana).

The greatness of the spot where Rāma did Darbha-śayana.

Canto 7. Rāma thus spent four days but the Sea-god did not show himself up, whereupon Rāma took his bow and arrows and shot at the Sea which got dry. Samudrarāja (Varuṇa) now appeared with his queens. Varuṇa's praise of Rāma.

Rāma sends another shaft and fills the seas again with water.

Varuṇa's praise again of Rāma.

Canto 8. Samudra then asks Rāma to direct the monkey Nala to build the causeway. *Story of Nala*, of how while he was a child he had a *boon* from his father that whatever stone he flung into water, would float.

Canto 9. The building of the causeway.

Canto 10. The sanctity of the Setu.

Canto 11. Rāvaṇa sends Śuka and Sāraṇa to spy in Rāma's camp.

Canto 12. The two describe the greatness of Rāma and his army to Rāvaṇa.

Canto 13. Sugrīva's initial encounter with Rāvaṇa and his striking down of Rāvaṇa's crown.

Canto 14. Rāvaṇa arranges his forces at the city gate. Now Rāma addresses Sītā (the real one) who has been on his own person all along; he tells her that some place has to be found now for her, as it would be difficult to fight with Sītā on his person. *She proposes that she would go into the custody of her mother viz. Earth. Rāma says that fifteen days from then, he would send the Māyā Sītā into Earth's womb and then she, the real Sītā, should come out.*

Canto 15. Aṅgada's embassy.

Canto 16. Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in Indrajit's Nāga-pāśa. It is added that Rāma had previously granted a boon to Nāgas to submit to them for a while. The arrival of Garuḍa and release from Nāgapāśa. Killing of Dhūmrākṣa etc.

Canto 17. Rāvaṇa's first encounter and discomfiture.

Canto 18. Killing of Kumbhakarṇa.

Canto 19. Nārada arrives at this juncture. His praise of Rāma.

Canto 20. Killing of Atikāya.

Canto 21. Killing of Kumbha and Nikumbha. Indrajit's attempt to perform a black-rite at Nikumbhilā

Canto 22. Hanumān brings the Oṣadhi-hill, thanks to which all those whom Indrajit had laid low, rise up.

Vibhiṣaṇa's timely counsel that they should now interrupt Indrajit's black-rite. Lakṣmaṇa is sent there. 'Three days' fight between Lakṣmaṇa and Indrajit. Killing of Indrajit.

Canto 23. Further killing of leading warriors on Rāvaṇa's side.

Canto 24. Ravaṇa takes the field. A terrible fight follows. Rāvaṇa hits down Lakṣmaṇa with his Śakti. Whatever side Rāvaṇa turned, there he saw the figure of Rāma, bow and arrow in hand.

Canto 25. Hanumān goes to fetch the Sāñjivi-parvata. Whoever utters the 12 Names of Hanumān, while going on an errand will meet with sure success.

हनुमान् अञ्जनासूनुः वायुपुत्रो महाबलः । (४)

रामेष्टः फल्गुनसखः पिङ्गाक्षोऽमितविक्रमः ॥ (८)

उदधिक्रमणश्चैव सीताशोकविनाशनः । (१०)

लक्ष्मणप्राणदाता च दशग्रीवस्य दर्पहा ॥ (१२)

Rāma praises Hanumān and Hanumān flies to Mount Droṇa and brings it with the Sañjivi herb. *En route* Hanumān is intercepted by Kālanemi in the guise of a sage.

Canto 26. The killing of Kālanemi.

Canto 27. *Meantime Rāvaṇa had gone down to an underground place to perform a black-rite, on the advice of guru Śukrācārya. Vibhīṣaṇa tells Rāma about this and Rāma sends there Hanumān, Aṅgadā and others. Vibhīṣaṇa's wife Saramā shows the way to the exact spot. Rāvaṇa's rite is interrupted. Hanumān drags Rāvaṇa's wife Maṅḍodari by the hair. Rāvaṇa offers fight.*

Canto 28. Rāvaṇa consoles Maṅḍodari and starts for the battle.

Canto 29. The battle between Rāma and Rāvaṇa.

The gods present Rāma with chariot etc and send Mātali with it. The chariot has a 1,000 horses. (cf. Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa, Canto XII. हरिसहस्रयुजं निनाय)

Vibhīṣaṇa now tells Rāma that the secret of *Rāvaṇa's immortality is at his naval* and therefore asks Rāma to hit there Rāma does so.

Canto 30. Rāma throws the Brahmāstra too on his enemy. Rāvaṇa falls. The gods come and land Rāma who had now attained his full divine form.

RĀMA GĪTĀ

Canto 31. The sages now ask for the spiritual significance of it all, why the Lord got into such wrath, how the gods brought down that wrath, and how the gods hymned Rāma for this purpose.

Rāma had assumed the form of Parameśvara at the time of the killing of Rāvaṇa; the magnitude of His form was still growing after the event, so that the minor gods got frightened and approached the major gods Brahmā etc. Then they come in a body to Rāma and sing His praise. Śiva in particular requests Rāma to calm down. Rāma does so and makes Śiva a medium for the spread of Rāma-bhakti among beings.

Canto 32. Viṣṇu's praise of Rāma.

Canto 33. Brahmā's praise of Rāma.

The sages named Vālakhilyas praise Rāma.

Then Indra follows.

Canto 34. Rāma assumes his earlier form. Rāma asks Lakṣmaṇa to fetch Sitā.

Recollecting Bṛndā's curse, he chides Sitā in public and Sitā enters fire.

The gods again assemble and praise Rāma.

Canto 35. Now this Sitā, being in reality the Goddess of Death, assumes her original form.

Agni who had deposited the real Sitā with Mother Earth returns her to Rāma. Śiva's praise of Rāma. Indra's downpour of nectar which restores all dead monkeys on the field to life. Rāma declines Vibhīṣaṇa's offer of reception in Laṅkā-city. Vibhīṣaṇa brings the Puṣpaka Vimāna which all of them mount. They start on the return journey. Vibhīṣaṇa now submits to Rāma that *as the causeway to Laṅkā might be used in future by some powerful king to cross over and harass him, Rāma might demolish it. Accordingly Rāma strikes the causeway with the end of his bow and shatters it.* This gives the place of striking the sacred name DHANUṢKOṬI. The Setu is sundered at three places. The sanctity of Dhanuṣkoṭi. Rāma consecrates also a large number of Śiva-liṅgas at that spot according to a previous resolve of his and worships them.

Canto 36. An excursus into the comparative superiority of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva; the question arises as previously Śiva was said to have adored Rāma-Nāman and now Rāma is said to worship Śiva. The story of Bhṛgu going to meet the Trimūrtis and his curses to all of them, to Śiva that he should become a Liṅga, and to Brahmā that there would be no regular worship of him in the world; Viṣṇu, Bhṛgu actually kicked with his foot but the Lord cherished the spot of his kick as the Śrīvatsa

mark on his chest. Bhṛgu therefore considered Viṣṇu as the greatest of the three.

Canto 37. Having been cursed by Bhṛgu, Śiva did penance to please Viṣṇu; Viṣṇu said that in his Rāmāvatāra, he would himself worship Śiva's Liṅga-form, and invest it with due sanctity.

Canto 38. Rāma reaches in the Puṣpaka the banks of the *Cauvery* (?) where there was the hermitage of sage Tṛṇabindu. There Rāma had built a sand-causeway and therefore that got the name Rāmeśvara. (?)

Rāma stays there three days; the pool where he washed his bow is called Cāpatīrtha; Sītākulya is the pool where Sītā bathed.

They then reach Kiṣkindhā. They take the Vānara women there into the Puṣpaka.

They reach Bharadvāja's Āśrama.

Hanumān sent in advance. Bharata comes; the meeting of the brothers.

Canto 39. Rāma enters Ayodhyā.

Canto 40. Coronation of Rāma. God Vāyu gave Rāma a golden garland.

Canto 41. The Gods praise Rāma.

Canto 42. Rāma presents a pearl garland to Sītā which she gives to Hanumān. Hanumān's praise of Sītā.

Description of Rāmarājya.

VII—UTTARA KĀṆḌA

Canto 1. The sages now come one day and tell Rāma that seven seas beyond, there is a super-Rāvaṇa named Śatānana (hundred-faced demon) and he has an Asura with him called Rakta-bindu and that these have to be done away with.

Canto 2. This demon had obtained a boon of immunity from death at human hands. Sītā says that she would now go and finish him. Rāma approves and sends Sītā with Hanumān and all the chief monkeys and their army. They go by the Puṣpaka Vimāna.

Hanumān is here referred to by Rāma as a manifestation of Śiva himself. And in the battle, he assumes the terrible forms of Narasimha, Garuḍa, and horse. Sītā assumes a terrible form with 18 arms; the ferocious manner of her assault on the demon and her killing him is described. Sītā is praised by gods. The *Sītā-sahasra-nāman hymn*.

The hymn on the five-faced Hanumān (*Pañca-mukha-Hanumān*). They return to Ayodhyā.

Canto 3. The *Rāma-aṣṭottara hymn*—108 Names; the story of king Citravarman on its greatness. It is said that it was this Citravarman who was later born as Janaka, father of Sītā. The same story explains also, in a similar manner, the antecedents of sage Śuka, as a parrot.

.....Śiva tells Pārvatī.....He who contemplates upon the name of Śrī Rāma becomes liberated even in this life (*Jivanmukta*). There is also a sanctifying story to illustrate this and out of my love for you I shall narrate it to you.

There was of yore King Citravarman of the Kekaya country. A very righteous ruler, he was a pupil of sage Gārgya. He had a son named Vaijayanta, most intelligent, but dumb. Citravarman was sad that his only son was dumb and tried all sacred and secular remedies to remove his son's defect. When he was sorrowing about the futility of his labours sage Nārada came and, Him, the King saluted along with his son. Nārada who understood the King's sorrow said that as due reception to a guest was of supreme importance, the King ought not to remain depressed when a guest

like him had arrived. King Citravarman however explained to the sage, how the one son that he got through penance after a long time was endowed with intelligence in the faculty of hearing but not with that of speaking and that he would like to know of what karman of the past birth his dumbness was the result.

Nārada then narrated that his present son was previously the son of King Susandhi of the Solar race, bearing the name Prasenajit. Once he went to Vasiṣṭha's hermitage and saw there a beautiful parrot repeating the name of Rāma and requested his Guru to give him the parrot. The Guru gave it. On reaching back his palace however Prasenajit compelled the parrot not to go on repeating that name of Rāma, but to indulge in other talks. The parrot was accordingly made a plaything of his. In course of time Prasenajit passed away and the parrot went back to the hermitage of Vasiṣṭha and resumed the recital of Rāma's name. It is that Prasenajit who has been born as your son Vaijayanta and it is the sin of compelling the parrot to give up Rāma's name and his ignorant obstruction to the practice of devotion to Rāma that are responsible for his present dumbness. Now if he repairs to Vasiṣṭha's Āśrama again and sits there listening to the parrot's recital of Rāma's name, he will be free from the sin and regain speech.

Nārada then went away. Citravarman sent his son to Vasiṣṭha's hermitage and in accordance with Nārada's words, the son regained speech. When he came of age, Citravarman transferred the kingdom to his son and retired to the forest with his queen.

Then Vaijayanta built a city named after himself and ruled there. After death Vaijayanta was born in Mithilā as King Janaka; and the same parrot was born as sage Śuka, son of sage Vyāsa. The association of their previous lives drew the two together and King Janaka imparted spiritual wisdom to young Śuka as a result of which Śuka became a Jivanmukta.

Canto 4. The story of how Hanumān came to occupy the position of the emblem on Arjuna's banner.

Arjuna is proud of his bowmanship and asks Kṛṣṇa : While I can throw up a bridge of arrows to cross the waters, why is it that Rāma took the trouble of building an actual causeway ?

Kṛṣṇa wants to quell his pride. He replies : The huge monkeys that had to cross required a heavy causeway.

Arjuna claims that his own Śāra-setu (arrow-bridge) can stand any strain. Kṛṣṇa points out the vanity of comparing anything with the great battle of Rāma with Rāvaṇa, whereupon a wager starts and Hanumān is brought over to test the strength of Arjuna's arrow-bridge.

Hanumān's weight was so much that to save his poor cousin, the Lord himself had to take once again his tortoise-avatāra and bear up the arrow-bridge. Then out of regard for the same Lord who has now taken the form of Kṛṣṇa for a similar divine mission, Hanumān agrees to sit on Arjuna's banner, for Kṛṣṇa is sure that the mere roar of Hanumān from the flag-staff was enough to lay low the ranks of enemies.

Canto 5. Sītā in the family way. She desires to enjoy again the stay in the forests.

Sītā and Rāma now think about their future too : it was time enough for them to go back to Vaikuṅṭha and Sītā says that the denizens of Vaikuṅṭha are already pressing for their return.

Rāma *plans out* the town-gossip about Sītā staying in Rāvaṇa's palace, the abandonment of Sītā in Vālmiki's hermitage, the birth of the two sons there, crowning them as kings and then departing to Vaikuṅṭha.

Canto 6. Rāma was enjoying jokes with his court jesters, Vijaya, Madhumatta, Kāśya, Piṅgalaka, Kuśa, Kāliya, Bhadra, Dantavakra and Māgadha.

At the end, Rāma asks them what people say of him and his wife and brothers.

They report that people are talking ill about Sītā who had stayed in Rāvaṇa's palace.

Rāma at once remembers sage Bhṛgu's curse and decides to leave Sītā in Vālmiki's Āśrama.

The story of the enmity between sage Bhṛgu and Viṣṇu, how the latter killed the former's wife and the former cursed the latter to suffer separation from his own wife.

Another story of Vālmiki's penance and request to play the father to Goddess Lakṣmī,—to explain why Sītā was abandoned in his hermitage.

Pārvati asked Śiva how it came about that of all the hermitage Vālmiki's was chosen as a place of abandonment for Sītā. Śiva said that previously sage Vālmiki betook to the Milky Ocean and there performed penance for the propitiation of Viṣṇu. The billows of the Milky Ocean caused him a good deal of harassment and in a mood of vexation he exclaimed that as, evidently, the Milky Ocean was haughty with its being the father of Goddess Lakṣmī he would also do penance to become the father of the same Lakṣmī. Having sworn thus he left for the banks of the Ganges to do penance for the new purpose. Goddess Lakṣmī appeared before him and when Vālmiki expressed his desire that she should become his daughter the Goddess said that she would never be born of any physical womb, that in the Tretā age when her lord Viṣṇu would be born as Daśaratha's son, she would appear out of Earth as Janaka's daughter and in the end by reason of some of evil gossip provide an opportunity for taking shelter in his hermitage like his very daughter and that Vālmiki would derive the necessary parental joy by tending upon her two sons who would be born in his hermitage.

Canto 7. Śatrughna kills the demon Lavaṇa.

Birth of Kuśa and Lava to Sītā in Vālmiki's Āśrama. So named because they had their Rakṣā (talisman) with *kuśa* and *lava*.

Canto 8. The Aśvamedha sacrifice performed by Rāma.

Vālmiki comes with his two latest pupils; Kuśa and Lava sing his new epic Rāmāyaṇa.

Canto 9. Vālmiki brings Sītā and speaks to Rāma about his unjust abandonment of her. Sītā swears and asks Mother Earth to take her into her bosom; Sītā disappears. The Gods and Brahmā praise Rāma.

16 Names of Rāma which one should always recite at dawn.

After a time, the Queen mothers pass away.

Canto 10. Gārgya, from Bharata's uncle's court comes and offers to Takṣa and Puṣkala, the two sons of Bharata, the Gandharva kingdom of Yudhājit.

To Aṅgada and Candraketu, sons of Lakṣmaṇa, Rāma gave the territory on the west.

Canto 11. Now the God of Time comes in the guise of a sage to Rāma to remind him of the time to return. He adopts a plan to take Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. "Whoever would break into the privacy of Rāma and Kāla who were then conversing, had to be killed." Lakṣmaṇa was told of this order.

Canto 12. Sage Durvāsas comes; Lakṣmaṇa had to break into Rāma's private audience to Kāla and thus submit himself to the death penalty.

Lakṣmaṇa enters Sarayū and disappears.

Rāma then establishes his sons, Kuśa at Kuśāvati and Lava at Śīrāvati and decides to return to his heavenly abode.

The people desire to follow him; his whole band of monkey allies and Vibhīṣaṇa come. Śatrughna comes having entrusted his region to his sons.

To Vibhīṣaṇa Rāma gives the image of Raṅganātha worshipped in his family and asks him to live, rule and cherish his story till eternity. The image is given with its Vimāna or shrine.

Hanumān; Rāma asks him to take care of Laṅkā and Vibhīṣaṇa, for which Hanumān promises to remain always facing the southern direction.

Canto 13. Vibhīṣaṇa's hymn to Hanumān.

Canto 14. The story of the origin of the famous South Indian shrine Śrīraṅgam where Vibhīṣaṇa is said to leave the Raṅganātha image given by Rāma.

This image was originally worshipped by Brahmā on the banks of the celestial Virajā.

Then it came to the banks of Sarayū where the Ikṣvākus worshipped it for four Yugas.

Then it came to the banks of the Cauvery in Cola country. While coming to Laṅkā with the image given by Rāma, Vibhīṣaṇa rests *en route* at the present site of Śrīraṅgam but when he starts, he is unable to lift the image from its resting place.

Canto 15. Rāma asks Jāmbavān to take a boon; Jāmbavān says that having seen Rāma's valour and fight in Laṅkā, he very much desired to enjoy a duel with Rāma. This boon too he grants, but says that it will be carried out in his Kṛṣṇa-incarnation.¹

Rāma again turns to Hanumān : Blesses him to live till eternity and keep Rāma-bhakti alive.

Canto 16.

and 17. Rāma's spiritual teachings to Hanumān.

Canto 18. Rāma departs accompanied by the citizens of Ayodhyā.

1. This refers to the story of the gem Syamantaka and Kṛṣṇa marrying Jāmbavatī.

Canto 19. Rāma coming back to Vaikuṅṭha. The Vānaras and Ṛṣis who had taken part in the story of Rāma are re-absorbed into those Devas from whom they had manifested themselves.

The greatness of the Rāma-story and the Rāmāyaṇa epic.

Canto 20. The merit of listening to the recital and exposition of the Rāmāyaṇa as set forth in the text *Umā Saṁhitā*.

A story to illustrate the efficacy of Rāmāyaṇa-recital.

Canto 21. The same continued. Particular verses of the epic, तपःस्वाध्यायनिरतं etc., मा निषाद etc., इमौ कुमारी भद्रं ते etc. specified and the merit of reciting and listening to them extolled.

Two verses on Rāma and Sitā to be used in worship. Details of worshipping Rāma, Sitā and brothers in images.

Canto 22. The same topic continued.

Further specific verses, in the further parts of the epic up to the Uttara Kāṇḍa mentioned and the benefits of their recital set forth.

Śiva winds up his discourses on Rāma and his story to Pārvatī.

Sūta winds up his recital of the above to the sages.

The *Tattva Saṁgraha Rāmāyaṇa* is to rid one of any doubts about the real truth of the Rāma-incarnation.

Here ends the Uttara Kāṇḍa and the *Tattva Saṁgraha Rāmāyaṇa*.

Analysis of the Rāmāyaṇa-Tattvadarpaṇa—the Author's other Work on the Rāmāyaṇa

The work opens with a maṅgala-śloka on Rāma :

श्रीरामामरभूरुहः सकलदः सीतालताल्लिङ्गितः
व्याप्तान्डो गुणमूर्तिनिर्जरगणस्कन्धोपशाखः स्वभूः ।
नानालोककुलायगात्मपतगः सत्त्वादिकल्कः कथा-
गन्धस्सद्गुणपुष्पवान् विजयते मुक्ताध्वनीनाश्रितः ॥

The second verse is important, since the epithets used for Rāma therein are taken as the basic concepts of the theme of the work and expounded.

ज्ञातं परेशं मुनिभिर्जनार्थदं शुचिं गुणाधारमजं सशक्तिकम् ।
प्रणम्य रामं सदुपास्यविग्रहं करोमि रामायणतत्त्वदर्पणम् ॥

The authour then states it as his aim in this work to interpret the Rāmāyaṇa so as to bring out the truth that Rāma was the Para Brahman, Supreme Being.—(p. 2) श्रीरामायणाख्यं काव्यमचीकरत् । तच्च प्राचीनाचार्यैः बहुधा व्याख्यातम् । तथापि स्वमनीषापरितोषाय यथामति परब्रह्म-परतया उपपादयितुमुपक्रम्यते ।

There are a number of quotations from texts glorifying the Rāmāyaṇa, the chief of which invoked frequently being Vidyāraṇya's Rāmāyaṇarahasya¹ expounding the idea that the whole Rāmāyaṇa is an embodiment of the Gāyatrī : (P. 22.) कृत्स्नरामायणस्य गायत्रीस्वरूपत्वं तत्परत्वं च श्रीरामायणरहस्ये विद्यारण्यश्रीचरणैः संग्रहेणोपपादितम् । Vidyāraṇya's work, almost the whole of which is quoted, is met on the following pages : 22, 40, 104, 106, 163-4, 264, 347, 349, 351.

The other texts quoted are :

Agastyasamhitā pp. 96, 112, 141, 384, 408, 447.

Āpastamba (Dharmasūtra) p. 543.

Umāsamhitā (frequently) pp. 19, 42, 46, 48, 59, 141.

Dharmakhaṇḍa (used also in the Tattvasaṅgraha Rāmāyaṇa) pp. 17, 19, 43, 60, 135, 223, 376, 377, 430, 505.

Narasimha (Purāṇa) pp. 121, 143, 209.

Padma (Purāṇa) pp. 122, 138, 141, 176, 375, 447, 471.

1. Printed in the Śaṅkaragukulapatrikā.

Parāśara (Viṣṇupurāṇa) pp. 152, 575.

Brahmāṇḍa (Purāṇa) p. 141.

Bhāgavata (Purāṇa) pp. 170, 163-4, 201, 408.

Mahābhārata pp. 123, 125, 145, 232, 252, 408.

Do Mokṣadharmā p. 118.

Do Śāntiparvan p. 361.

Do Harivamśa p. 123.

Rāmagītā pp. 9, 131, 151, 379, 465.

Rāmatāpinī (Upaniṣad) pp. 141, 389.

Varāha (Purāṇa) p. 376.

Viṣṇupurāṇa pp. 66, 96, 101, 106, 121, 200.

Samkṣepaśārīraka p. 162.

Skānda (Purāṇa) pp. 18, 22, 51, 52, 121, 141, 375.

The following chapter-colophons give an adequate idea of the contents :

- | | | |
|----------|-----|--------------------------------------|
| Chapter. | 1. | Gāyātri-svarūpatvādi-kathana. |
| „ | 2. | Veda— „ „ |
| „ | 3. | Vibhiṣaṇa-Śaraṇāgatyādi-kathana. |
| „ | 4. | Śrī Rāmasya Parabrahmatā-kathana. |
| „ | 5. | „ Nārāyaṇa-sattvajñatvādi-kathana. |
| „ | 6. | „ sarva-mukti-pradātṛtvādi.kathana. |
| „ | 7. | „ manuṣyatva-nirākaraṇa. |
| „ | 8. | „ niyojyātvādi-nirāsa-nirūpaṇa. |
| „ | 9. | „ parama-pavitratva-kathana. |
| „ | 10. | „ Kalyāṇa-guṇa-svarūpa-nirūpaṇa. |
| „ | 11. | „ Upāsanā-kathana. |
| „ | 12. | Rāma-svarūpādi-kathana. |
| „ | 13. | Avatāra-nirūpaṇa. |
| „ | 14. | Rāmasya anekastrisametatva (as Lord) |
| „ | 15. | Tattva-jñātṛ-svarūpa-kathana. |
| „ | 16. | Vairāgyādi-sādhana-nirūpana. |

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(January to June 1990)

Garuḍa Purāṇa Work

During the period under review the critical apparatus of the 25 chapters (Chs. 101 to 125) was written. Writing of the critical apparatus of the further chapters is in progress. The editor is writing the introduction and critical notes on the readings.

Work on Mānasakhaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa

Further ten chapters (chs. 100-110) were edited during the period and the critical apparatus was also prepared for these chapters.

Veda Pārāyaṇa

From Māgha Sūkla Tṛtīyā to Pūrṇimā (29th January to 9th February '90) the text of Taittirīya Śākhā of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda was recited in the Vyāsa temple of the Ramnagar Fort. The reciter of the text was Pt. Subramanya Ghanapathi of Madras and the Śrotā was Sri Ram Ghanapathi of Varanasi. On the conclusion of recitation (Pāṭha) Dakṣiṇā and travelling allowances were given to the reciter and the Śrotā.

Visitors to the Purāṇa Department

1. Dr. Manavendu Banerjee, Department of Sanskrit, University of Jadavpur on 25. 1. 90.
2. Mr. Livio Giolo-Viz Rana Ca'Mori, 7.35042 Este (Padora) Italy on 29. 3. 90.

Many research students of Banaras Hindu University visited the Purāṇa Department for consulting the texts of the Purāṇas.

Publication of Dr. Raghavan Commemoration Volume

The late Dr. V. Raghavan was a world-renowned scholar of Indology and was one of the founder editors of the Purāṇa Bulletin. The Trust has decided to publish his articles relating to Purāṇic

studies in one volume in his memory. The two issues of the 'Purāṇa Bulletin (1990, Vol. xxxii No. 1. 2) are being published as Dr. Raghavan Commemoration volume. Two students of Dr. Raghavan, Dr. S. S. Janaki and Dr. N. Gangadharan are helping in the editing of this volume. The Senior-most Indologist, Dr. R. N. Dandekar, has written the foreword to the commemoration volume. It is hoped that this volume will be a befitting tribute to the memory of Dr. Raghavan and a valuable guide to the scholars of the Purāṇas.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

Maharaja Benares Vidya Mandir Trust Dhrupad Mela

The 1990 Dhrupad Mela was the 16th consecutive Mela. This year it was held on 21, 22 and 23rd February. The Mela was inaugurated by Yuvaraja Sri Anant Narain Singh, a trustee of the Maharaja Benares Vidya Mandir Trust. In His inaugural address, Yuvaraja Anant Narain Singh emphasised the need for popularising this old tradition of Indian Gānavidyā. He also spoke about the impact this mela has had in popularising this traditional style of music. Yuvaraja Anant Narain Singh lit a lamp to mark the inauguration of the Mela. Prof. Veerbhadra Mishra welcomed the Yuvaraja and other distinguished guests and artistes to the inaugural function.

On 23rd February Shivaratri day, Prof. Veerbhadra Mishra released the 5th Volume of the "Dhrupad Annual". Prof. Km. Premlata Sharma, Editor of the Annual, spoke on the contents of the volume.

The artistes who performed at the Mela included Sri Ustad Saiduddin Dagar, Sri Ramji Lal Sharma, Sri Vraja Bhushan, Sri Krishnadasa, Sri Raja Khusi Ra, Pt. Vidur Mullick, Sri Sukdeva Chaturvedi, Sri Srikant Mishra, Dr. Raj Bhan Singh, Sri Lakshman Bhatta Teland, Swami Pagaldas, Sri Tribhuvan Upadhaya, Dr. Ritwik Sanyal and others.

Maṅgalotsava

A Maṅgalotsava was organised by this Trust and was held on 13th and 14th March '90. Reputed artistes of Varanasi performed at this function. Distinguished citizens and District authorities attended the function. Both vocal and instrumental music and Kattḥak dance were performed in this Utsava.

Maharaja Udit Narain Singh Manasa Prachar Nidhi Navāha Pārāyaṇa of Rāmacaritamānasa

The Navāha Pārāyaṇa of Rāmacaritamānasa was arranged by this Trust in the Kali temple of Chakia from 26th April to 4th May '90. Pārāyaṇa was held in the mornings and discourses on Rāmacaritamānasa were given in the evenings. Sri Shambhunath Vyas and Sri Raghunandan Vyas delivered the discourses. A large number of public daily listened to the pravacana (discourse). His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh was present in the pravacana every day. On the conclusion of the Pārāyaṇa "Prasad" was distributed and the saints were fed,

सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्

(जनवरी—जून १९९०)

गरुडपुराणकार्यम्

अस्मिन् कार्यावधौ गरुडपुराणस्य समीक्षितपाठस्य पञ्चविंशत्यध्यायानां पाठसमीक्षोपकरणं निर्मितम् (अध्यायाः १०१-१२५) । पाठसमीक्षोपकरण-निर्माणकार्यम् अग्रिमाध्यायानां प्रचलति । संपादकमहोदयः भूमिकालेखने समीक्षितपाठोपरि टिप्पणीलेखने च संलग्नोऽस्ति ।

मानसखण्डकार्यम्

अग्रिमदशाध्यायानां (अ० १०-११) संपादनमस्मिन् कार्यावधौ पूर्णम् । एषामध्यायानां पाठसमीक्षोपकरणलेखनमपि पूर्णं जातम् ।

वेदपारायणम्

माघमासस्य शुक्लपक्षस्य तृतीयातिथिमारम्य पूर्णिमापर्यन्तं (२९ जनवरी १९९० दिनाङ्कमारभ्य ९ फरवरी १९९० दिनाङ्कं यावत्) रामनगरदुर्गस्थिते व्यासेश्वरमन्दिरे कृष्णयजुर्वेदस्य तैत्तिरीयशाखायाः पारायणं जातम् । पारायण-कर्ता मद्रासनगरवास्तव्यः श्री जी० सुब्रह्मण्यघनपाठिमहोदयः आसीत् । पारायण-श्रोता वाराणसेयः श्रीरामघनपाठी आसीत् । पारायणसमाप्तौ उभाभ्यां दक्षिणा, भोजनं, मार्गव्ययादिकं च प्रदत्तम् ।

पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

१. डा० मानवेन्दु बनर्जी—जादवपुरविश्वविद्यालयस्य संस्कृतप्राध्यापकः—
२५.१.१९९० दिनाङ्के ।
२. श्री लिवियो जियोलो—इटलीदेशवास्तव्यः २९.३.१९९० दिनाङ्के ।

हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य वहवः शोधछात्राः पुराणविषयकसामग्रीसंकलनार्थं पुराणविभागे आगताः । तेभ्यः अपेक्षिता सहायता प्रदत्ता ।

डा० राघवन् स्मारकग्रन्थस्य प्रकाशनम्

कीर्तिशेषः डा० वी० राघवन् महोदयः विश्वविश्रुतः प्राच्यविद्याविद् पुराणम् पत्रिकायाः प्रारम्भाङ्कादेव सम्पादकमण्डलस्य सदस्यश्चासीत् । न्यासेन तस्य स्मृतौ तद्रचितानां पुराणविषयकनिबन्धानां प्रकाशनाय निश्चयः कृतः । 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकाया द्वावपि अङ्कौ (जनवरी-जुलाई १९९०) तस्य स्मृतौ प्रकाशितौ भवतः । डा० राघवन् महोदयस्य शिष्या डा० एस० एस० जानकी शिष्यश्च डा० एन० गङ्गाधरन् अस्य ग्रन्थस्य संपादने सहायभूतौ स्तः । वरिष्ठेन प्राच्यविद्याविदा डा० रामचन्द्रनारायण—दाण्डेकरमहाभागेनास्य स्मृतिग्रन्थस्य प्रस्तावना लिखिता । आशास्महे ग्रन्थोऽयं डा० राघवन्महोदयस्य स्मृतेः उचितः उद्बोधकः भविष्यति ।

सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

महाराज-बनारस-विद्यामन्दिर-न्यासः

ध्रुपदमेला

१९९० वर्षीयः ध्रुपदमेलापकः षोडशो क्रमागतो मेलापकः आसीत् । इदमायोजनं फरवरीमासस्य २१-२३ दिनाङ्केषु संपन्नम् । मेलापकस्योद्घाटनं महाराजबनारस विद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य न्यासधारिणा युवराज श्री अनन्त-नारायणसिंहमहोदयेन २१ फरवरी दिनाङ्के कृतम् । स्वकीये उद्घाटनभाषणे युवराजः श्री अनन्तनारायणसिंहमहोदयः अस्याः प्राचीनभारतीयगानविद्यायाः प्रचारस्यावश्यकतां प्रदर्शितवान् । तेन अस्य मेलापकस्य देशेऽस्मिन् अस्याः गानविद्यायाः प्रचारे प्रभावस्यापि निर्देशः कृतः । मेलापकस्यारम्भस्य प्रतीकरूपेण युवराजेन श्री अनन्तनारायणसिंहमहोदयेन दीपः प्रज्वलितः । प्रो० वीरभद्रमिश्र-महोदयेन उद्घाटनावसरे युवराजस्य अन्येषां विशिष्टातिथीनां कलाकाराणां च स्वागतं कृतम् ।

२३ फरवरी दिनाङ्के शिवरात्रौ ध्रुपदपत्रिकायाः पञ्चमाङ्कस्य प्रकाशनो-द्घाटनं प्रो० वीरभद्रमिश्रमहोदयेन कृतम् । पत्रिकायाः सम्पादिका प्रो० कु० प्रेमलताशर्मा पत्रिकायाः निबन्धानां परिचयमदात् ।

अस्यां मेलायां आगताः केचन प्रसिद्धाः कलाकारा इमे—श्री उस्ताद सईदुद्दीन डागर, श्री राजखुशी राम, पं० विदुरमल्लिक, श्री शुकदेव चतुर्वेदी, श्री श्रीकान्तमिश्र, डा० राजभान सिंहः, श्री लक्ष्मणभट्टतैलङ्ग, स्वामि पागवदास, श्री त्रिभुवन उपाध्यायः, राजा छत्रपतिसिंह, डा० ऋत्विक् सान्यालादयः ।

मङ्गलोत्सवः

महाराज बनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासेन १३-१४ मार्च दिनाङ्कयोः मङ्गलोत्सवः आयोजितः। वाराणस्याः प्रख्याताः गानविद्याविशारदाः अस्मिन् उत्सवे स्वगानविद्यां प्रदर्शितवन्तः। अस्मिन् उत्सवे विशिष्टा नागरिका जनपदस्याधिकारिणश्चोपस्थिता आसन्। स्वरसंगीतस्य, वाद्यसंगीतस्य, कथकनृत्यस्य च प्रदर्शनमस्मिन्नुत्सवे जातम्।

महाराज उदितनारायसिंह मानसप्रचारन्यासः

रामचरितमानसस्य नवाहपारायणम्

अनेन न्यासेन चकियानगरस्थिते कालीमन्दिरे २६ अप्रैल १९९० दिनाङ्क-मारभ्य ४ मई १९९० दिनाङ्कं यावत् श्रीरामचरितमानसस्य नवाहपारायणं जातम्। रामचरितमानसस्य परायणं पूर्वाह्णे जातम् सायंकाले च रामचरितमानसमधिकृत्य नवसु दिवसेषु प्रवचनं जातम्। प्रवचनकर्तारौ श्रीशम्भुनाथव्यासः श्रीरघुनन्दनव्यासश्च आस्ताम्। प्रतिदिनं बहुसंख्यकाः जनाः प्रवचनम-श्रुण्वन्। तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशा महाराजा डा० विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवाः प्रतिदिनं प्रवचनेषु उपस्थिता आसन्। पारायणसमाप्तौ प्रसादवितरणं साधुभोजनं च जातम्।

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, New Delhi.
4. Vacant.

Trustees nominated by His Highness the Maharaja Banaras :—

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

Donation made to All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi, will qualify for exemption under Sec. 80G of the Income Tax Act, 1961 in the hands of donors.

Statement of ownership and other particulars about

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

1. Place of PublicationFort Ramnagar, Varanasi
2. Periodicity of PublicationHalf-yearly
3. Printer's NameVinaya Shankar
NationalityIndian
AddressRatna Printing Works,
B21/42 A, Kamachha, Varanasi
4. Publisher's NameYogendra Narain Thakur
General Secretary, All-India
Kashiraj Trust
NationalityIndian
AddressAll-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi.
5. Editors' NameR. K. Sharma (New Delhi),
with Address Dr. R. N. Dandekar (Pune),
R. S. Bhattacharya (*Editor*)
(Purāṇa Deptt., Fort Ramnagar
Varanasi).
NationalityIndian.
6. Name of the ownerAll-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.

Printed at the Ratna Printing Works, Kamachha, Varanasi.