

Vol. XXXV, No. 1]

[January 1993

पुराणम्  
PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

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

VASANTA PAÑCAMĪ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



**ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST  
FORT, RAMNAGAR, VARANASI (INDIA)**

Annual Sub.-Inland Rs. 200/-

Foreign \$ 30

## सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा. रामकरण शर्मा

भूतपूर्व कुलपति, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी; नयी दिल्ली

डा. रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर

भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे

डा. 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. 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.

Oscar Pujol, M.A.

-----

लेखेषु प्रतिपादितानि मतानि लेखकैरेवाभ्युपगतानि; न पुनस्तानि  
सम्पादकैर्न्यासेन वाभ्युपगतानीति विज्ञेयम् ।

Authors are responsible for their views, which do not bind the Editors  
and the Trust.

Authors are requested to use Devanāgarī characters while writing  
Sanskrit ślokas 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; द = ḍ; श् = ś; ष् = ṣ;  
in ].

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

## पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. XXXV, No. I]

[January 27, 1993

वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्कः

Vasanta-Pañcamī Number

### CONTENTS—लेखसूची

	Pages
1. मातृस्तवः [ Eulogy of Mātr̥s ] with notes —By <i>R.S. Bhattacharya</i>	1-11
2. The aim of the Purānic etymologies [ पुराणोक्तनिर्वचनानामुद्देश्यम् ] —By <i>Tiziana Pontillo</i> Istituto di Glottologia Universita Cattolica del Sarco Cuore Largo Gemelli, 1 20123 MILANO (ITALY).	12-27
3. Kaca and Devayānī : The wise and the foolish [ कचो देवयानी च; विज्ञोऽज्ञश्च ] —By <i>Subhash Anand</i> Jnanadeep Vidyapeeth, Pune	28-67
4. Puranic sources of Śrī Rāmānuja with reference to his Vedārthasaṅgraha [ श्रीरामानुजकृते वेदार्थसंग्रहनामके ग्रन्थे समुद्धृतानि पुराणवचनानि ] —By <i>Dr. N. Gangadharan</i> Reader, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Madras, Madras.	68-87
5. Pollution and Karman in the Pātityagrāmanirṇaya [ पात्तित्यग्रामनिर्णयसंज्ञके पुराणे पात्तित्यं कर्म च ] —By <i>Dr. Stephen Hillyer Levitt</i>	88-105

(2)

144-30 78th Road, Apt. I H  
Flushing, New York 11367, U.S.A.

6. Some comments on Dr. Chaturvedi's editorial policy  
on Puranic manuscripts 105-120  
—By *Oscar Pujol*  
All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi
7. Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust 121-128  
सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम् 129-135

## मातृस्तवः

[ Eulogy of Mātṛs ]

प्रचण्डमणिकुण्डलं भृकुटिभासुरोग्राननं  
करालमतिभीषणं विकृतवेषमत्युल्वणम् ।  
ज्वलत्परशुवल्लकीडमरुमुण्डखट्वाङ्गिनं  
नमामि वृषभस्थितां त्रिनयनां महाभैरवीम् ॥ २५

सितप्रवरपङ्कजे भ्रमरवृन्दनादाकुले  
सदा विमलविस्तृते विपुलराजहंसस्थिताम् ।  
स्थितां प्रवरविराजते ऋषिकुलोपसंसेवितां  
नमामि शिरसा पितामहसमुद्भवां मातरम् ॥ २६

शरच्छशिशतोज्ज्वलां तुहिनशङ्खकुन्दप्रभां  
स्फुरत्किरणभासितां सितवृषासने संस्थिताम् ।  
जटाविकटजूटके दधति चन्द्रलेखां तु यां  
नमामि त्रिशिखायुधां प्रमथनाथदेहोद्भवाम् ॥ २७

मयूरवरगामिनीं दरदशुद्धवर्णोत्कटां  
वर्णं च चरणं कलितघण्टिकां निशितशक्तिहस्तोद्यताम् ।  
प्रभासिकररश्मिभिर्ज्ञानज्ञानायमानांशुकां  
नमामि गुहसंभवां त्रिदशशत्रुनिर्णाशनीम् ॥ २८

तसीप्रचयचान्द्रप्रभूतकुसुमा पुञ्जोपमां  
गदामुसलधारिणीं धनुशङ्खचक्रायुधाम् ।  
गरुत्मरथसंस्थितां विपुलपुण्डरीकेक्षणां  
नमाम्यजितसंभवां विमलसिद्धिदां वैष्णवीम् ॥ २९

प्रभिन्नघनकज्जलच्छविवराहरूपाननां  
 कृपाणकरभासुरां परिघकालपाशोद्यताम् ।  
 कृतान्ततनुसंभवां प्रलयमेघघोषस्वरां  
 महामहिषवाहिनीं शुभकरीं नमाम्यादरात् ॥ ३०

विशुद्धकनकप्रभां चकितविद्युदुल्कोपमां  
 करीन्द्ररवसंकुलां विविधभूषणैर्भूषिताम् ।  
 स्फुरत्कुलिशधारिणीं सुरसमूहसम्पूजितां  
 नमामि वरदायिकां विपुलभोगदां शक्रजाम् ॥ ३१

दिवाकरशतप्रभां सितकपालमालाधरां  
 करालदशनाननां प्रलयवह्निपिङ्गेक्षणाम् ।  
 रुस्तनुघातिनीं रुधिरमांसमेदःप्रियां  
 नमामि शिवसंस्थितां शरणदां महोग्रायुधाम् ॥ ३२

चलच्छवणचामरप्रहतषट्पदारावितं  
 कपोलमदवारिणा दशदिशान्तरामोदयन् ।  
 गजेन्द्रवदनां शुभां सकलविघ्नविध्वंसनीं  
 नमामि गणनायिकां प्रमथनाथदेहोद्भवाम् ॥ ३३

स्फुटप्रकटविक्रमं सकललोकपालार्चितं  
 सुरारिकुलनाशनं प्रणतपापदुःखापहम् ।  
 नरो नमति मातरं स्तवति सर्वदेवस्तुता-  
 मवाप्य विपुलं सुखं व्रजति मातृलोकं परम् ॥ ३४

(देवीपुराण ८७/२५-३४; ८७/२४-३३ वङ्गीयसंस्क०)

## NOTE ON THE MĀTRSTAVA

The deities called *mātr̥s* or *mātr̥kās* (mother-goddesses) are well-known in the field of Tantric worship.<sup>1</sup> They are said to be the *śaktis* of the supreme Mother and their chief function is to help the Goddess in her act of killing demons.<sup>2</sup>

As regards the number and names of the *mātr̥s* we find divergent views, usually they are said to be seven,<sup>3</sup> eight<sup>4</sup> or nine.<sup>5</sup>

1. For a detailed study of *mātr̥s*, see T. B. Coburn: *Devīmāhātmya: The Crystallization of the Goddesses Tradition*; David Kingslay: *Hindu Goddesses*; E. O. James: *The Cult of the Mother Goddesses*; J. N. Tewari: *Goddess cults in Ancient India*.
2. ब्रह्मरुद्रादिदेवानां समाकारास्तु ताः स्मृताः। जगत्-कल्याणकारिण्यः स्वस्वसेनासमावृताः ॥ (D. Bhāg.), यस्य देवस्य या शक्तिर्यथा भूषणवाहनम् । तद्वदेव हि तच्छक्तिरसुरान् योद्धुमाययौ ॥ (Saptaśati 8.14); मातृगणः कर्तव्यः स्वनामदेवानुरूपकृतचिह्नः (Bṛhatsamhitā 58.56).
3. ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैव कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा। वाराही चैव माहेंद्री चामुण्डा सप्त मातरः॥ (quoted in the Śāntanarū on Saptasati 8.38); ब्रह्मण्याद्याः स्मृताः सप्त देवता मातरो बुधैः (Halāyudha's lexicon quoted in Vyākhyāsudhā on Amara 1. 1. 35).
4. ब्रह्मण्याद्या अष्टमातरः । ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैव कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा। वाराही नारसिंहैन्द्री चामुण्डा मातरः स्मृताः इति डामरतन्त्रे नवार्णविधाने उक्ताः (Nāgoji's comm. on Saptasati 8.38), ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैन्द्रा कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा। वाराही चण्डी चामुण्डा मातरोऽष्टावतः पराः ॥ (Kalpadrukos'a, p. 391, verse 105; mark the word ऐन्द्रा), ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैन्द्री वाराही वैष्णवी तथा। कौमारीत्यपि चामुण्डा चर्चिकेत्यष्टमातरः ॥ (quoted in Vyākhyāsudhā on Amara 1.1.35); ब्रह्मणा कार्तिकेयेन इन्द्रेण च यमेन च वराहेण च देवेन विष्णुना परमेष्ठिना ॥ २९ माहेश्वरी च-राजेन्द्र इत्येता अष्टमातरः (Varāha-p. 27.29-30a Cr. ed.; here the names of eight source-gods are stated from whom eight mātr̥s namely ब्रह्मणी, कौमारी, इन्द्रजा (i. e. ऐन्द्री), यमदण्डधरा, वाराही, वैष्णवी, योगेश्वरी and माहेश्वरी are said to appear (Varāha-p. 27.32.Cr.ed.); ब्रह्मणी वैष्णवी रौद्री कौमारी शिवदूतिका ऐन्द्री च नारसिंही च वाराही चाष्टमातरः॥ (quoted in Śāntanavī on Saptasati 8, 38); ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैव कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा। वाराही च तथेन्द्राणी चामुण्डा सप्त मातरः॥ अष्टमी तु महालक्ष्मी नाम्ना प्रोक्ता तु मातरः। (D. Bhāg.); ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चण्डी वाराही वैष्णवी तथा। कौमारी चैव चामुण्डा चर्चिकेत्यष्टमातृकाः॥ (an oft-quoted verse in Tantric works); ब्रह्मणी माहेशी कौमारी वैष्णवी च वाराही। इन्द्राणी चामुण्डी समहालक्ष्मीति मातरः प्रोक्ताः॥ (Prapañcasāra 7.11. mark the word चामुण्डी; here the names are eight in number). In some commentaries on Amara 1.1.36 the

According to some the number is 64 (vide Durgārcanapaddhati pp. 676-677); in the Viṣṇu-dharmottara-p. (1. 226), the number is nearly 200.

The following eulogy of the mātṛs in the metre Pṛthvī occurs in the Devī-purāṇa. Two editions of this Upapurāṇa are available—one in Bengali characters edited by Pt. Pañcānana Tarkaratna with a Bengali translation, published by the Bangabasi Press and the other in Devanagari characters edited by Dr. Puspendra Kumar Sharma with the help of a few MSS, published by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, New Delhi. The eulogy is called Mātṛstava in 87.24.

(Verse 25) The verse is highly perplexing since it eulogises one deity though it contains words of both masculine and feminine genders. As this *stotra* is called Mātṛstava, it cannot reasonably be held that the first three feet of the verse extol a male deity and the last foot a female deity.<sup>6</sup> It is also surprising to note that only the last foot has variants of masculine gender which goes against the context; Cp. 87. 15 (पूजयित्वा तु शक्तयः), 87.17 (परा शक्तिर्या सावाद्या), 87.22 (रुद्रदेव्यस्तु पूजिताः). That no male deity has been eulogised here is proved from the first two verses of Chap. 88 also.<sup>7</sup>

following verse mentioning eight names is quoted; ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरीन्द्राणी वाराही वैष्णवी तथा कौमारी चर्ममुण्डा च कालसंहारिणीति च॥

5. ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैन्द्री वाराही वैष्णवी तथा कौमारी चर्ममुण्डा च काली संकर्षिणीति च॥ (quoted in the comm. Śāntanavī on Saptasatī 8.38). The wellknown nine Durgās (नवदुर्गाः) are regarded as nine Mātṛs. They are Jagaddhātṛī or Brahmāṇī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Nārasimhī, Indrāṇī, Cāmuṇḍā and Kātyāyanī (or Lakṣmī) .
6. Curiously enough, the author of the Bengali translation has taken the masculine adjectival words as qualifying Mahābhairavi (a feminine word) without giving any remark. We have retained here the printed readings as our readings are not fully based on manuscript evidence.
7. दिव्यैः शिवागमैस्त्वेताः पूजिताश्च मुमुक्षुभिः । गारुडे भूततन्त्रे च कालतन्त्रे च पूजिताः ॥ साध्यन्ते सर्वकार्याणि चिन्तामणिसमा शिवा पाषण्डिभिर्भविष्यैस्तु बौद्धगारुडवादिभिः ॥ (88.1-2). Is the Kālatantra mentioned here a Buddhist work? Mark the word Baudha in verse 2.



Thus it is quite reasonable to hold that the masculine epithets are to be changed into feminine epithets (namely ०कुण्डलाम्, ०ग्राननाम्, ०भीषणाम्, ०ल्वणाम् and ०खट्वाङ्गिनीम्).

In the reading करालमतिभीषणाम्, there arises a problem about the non-feminine word करालम्. If it is changed into करालाम् it would render the metre defective. Kālī is usually described as करालवदना. Can we take the expression as करालमुखभीषणाम् in the sense of करालमुखेन भीषणाम् (the third case-ending showing *hetu*).

The verse evidently extols the goddess Mahābhairavī. This name is however not read in the well-known lists of mātṛkās. Mahābhairavī seems to be the same as Kālī described in Saptāśatī 7.5-7. This Kālī may be regarded as a mātṛkā; see the Viṣṇu-dharmottara-p. Sec 1, Ch. 226; see also the remarks of the comm. Śāntanavī (काली नाम शक्ति : कापि अपरा देवी, on 7.5). Mātṛkās are regarded as śaktis of various deities (See Saptāśatī 8.11-13).

The Beng. ed. reads भ्रुकुटि for भृकुटि (in the first foot). Both the forms are found in the lexicons and in poetical as well as Tantric works. The word is sometimes read with a long ī and three forms with long ī (भ्रुकुटी, भ्रुकुटी and भृकुटी) are mentioned in the Śāntanavī comm. on Saptāśatī 7.5, विकृतवेषमुल्वणाम् (read in the Dev. ed.) is corrupt as it is metrically defective.

The variant भास्मर for भासुर (in the first foot) is wrong, as there is no word as bhāsmara. *Bhāsmara* may be a slip of the scribe for *bhāsvara*.

( Verse 26 ) The verse eulogises the mātṛkā named Brāhmī also called Brahmāṇī, who is here said to come out from Pitāmaha (i. e. Brahmā); cp. Saptāśatī 8.14 and 11.12).

The reading स्थिति is corrupt as it cannot be construed with the other words in the verse. स्थितां is to be construed with सितप्रवरपङ्कजे, which is qualified by भ्रमरवृन्दनादाकुले and विमलविस्तृते. The expression विपुलराजहंसस्थिताम् is an independent adjective of मातरम्.

The expression प्रवरविराजिते in the third foot (read in both the editions) creates much difficulty, so far as its analysis is concerned. The word creates metrical fault also. It is difficult to conceive the correct reading of this expression.

संसेविता in the third foot (in the Beng. ed.) seems to be a printing error.

(Verse 27) The eulogises the mātṛkā Māheśvarī; Cp. Saptasāti 8.15 and 11.13).

The reading शशिशत (in the first foot) is better than the variant शशिकर as this shows development of brightness which is intended here.

The reading भाषितां (in the second foot) in both the editions is to be corrected to भासितां as the root Bhāṣa (भाष व्यक्तायां वाचि) is incompatible with rays (*kirāṇa*). वृषासनस्थिताम् read in both the editions is to be corrected to वृषासने संस्थिताम् for metrical reasons.

दधाति in the third foot cannot be accepted as it renders the metre defective. The reading दधति (in the Beng. ed.) is metrically faultless but the form is grammatically indefensible. It cannot be the root *dhā* of the Juhotyādi group but the root दध धारणे of the Bhvādi group, which is however ātmanepadin. Even if we take दधति (for दधते) as an example of Puranic licence, yet it is extremely difficult to construe this word with the rest of the words of the third and fourth feet. Are we to understand the sentence as meaning या (not याम् as read in the printed editions) जटाविकटजूटके चन्द्रलेखां दधति तां (which is to be understood) नमामि. This however is not a normal use of words.

त्रिशिखाभूतां in the fourth line (in the Dev. ed.) is not only metrically defective, but yields no proper meaning also.

(Verse 28) This eulogises the mātṛkā Kaumārī; Cp. Saptasāti 8.16, 11.14.

The variant गामिणी (in the first foot) is wrong. Had the word been analysed as मयूरवरगामः अस्ति अस्याः, then गामिणी would have

been correct. But as गाम् is no word, the word must be spelt with the dental *na*. The compound is to be analysed as मयूरवरं गामिनी (dvitīyā tatpuruṣa).

The meaning of *daradas'uddha* (read in both the editions) is not clear. Darada meaning red lead does not seem to be applicable here. Most probably the reading *darada* is corrupt. There is however no metrical fault in this reading.

The second foot is metrically defective. Moreover the expression वर्णं च चरणं bears no sense. There is no metrical fault in the meaningful remaining portion (निशितशक्तिहस्तोद्यताम्) of this foot, which shows that the portion वर्णं च....घण्टिकां requires to be corrected. The reading वर्णन्ध (in the Beng. ed. for वर्णं च) does not help in any way correct the reading of this portion. We propose here a conjectural reading: पदाकलितघण्टिकां<sup>8</sup>. It is difficult to explain how the corrupt reading वर्णं च....घण्टिकां came into existence .

In the third foot the Dev. ed. reads प्रभानिकररश्मिभिः. There is no *visarga* or *repha* after भि which is objectional; perhaps there is a printing mistake here. प्रभासिकररश्मि is a meaningful word, though it is better to read प्रभासिकररश्मि (प्र + भास् + णिनि = प्रभासिन्). The Dev. ed. reads ऋग्गायमानांशुकां which has no meaning and as such the reading is to be taken as corrupt. It is metrically faulty also. झनझनायमानांशुकां (the reading of the Beng. ed.) is metrically faultless. It bears a sense also (झनझनायमानम् अंशुकं यस्याः ताम्). झनझनायमान - making a twinkling sound. Since the *amśuka* (garment) has metallic ornaments it produces twinkling sound. The usual form is झणझणायमान (with a cerebral *n*); cp. the word झणत्कार.

The variant निर्णासनीम् for निर्णाशनीम् (in the fourth foot) is wrong. The reading निवर्हिणीम् is metrically defective. नाशनी is from

8. पदेन आकलिता पदाकलिता, पदाकलिता: घण्टिका: यस्याः ताम्

the word नाशन with the feminine suffix डीप्.<sup>9</sup>

(Verse 29) This eulogises the mātṛkā Vaiṣṇavī; Cp. Saptāśatī 8.18 and 11.16.

The reading of the first foot is highly corrupt and the reading तसी (Beng. ed.), the variants प्रभूतकुसुमातसौ and प्रभूतकुसुमापञ्चोपमां (Beng. ed.) do not show the original reading. Our conjectural reading is प्रभूतकुसुमातसीप्रचयसान्द्रपुञ्जोपमां<sup>10</sup> one compound word. The reading is slightly objectionable as कुसुमातसी (कुसुम+अतसी) is awkward, the usual form being अतसीकुसुम. Can the form be defended by taking it as कुसुमभूता अतसी? cp. वाहनकेसरी in Saptāśatī 2.50.

मुषल is read in the Beng. ed. (in the second foot). मुसल seems to be the earlier form, as it is derived from the root *mas* (मसी परिणामे)<sup>11</sup>.

The reading धनुशङ्ख in this foot must be corrupt as it creates metrical fault. The form धनु is unusual, the usual form being धनुस् which again creates metrical fault. We may read धनु with the prefix सु and thus keep the metre intact (सुधनुशङ्ख) though such an amendment is hardly justifiable. The variant चन्द्रायुधाम् is corrupt as चन्द्र cannot be taken as a weapon.

The Beng. ed. reads विपुल for विमल in the fourth foot, which is more acceptable.

(Verse 30) This eulogises the mātṛkā Vārāhī though the name is not stated here expressly; Cp. Saptāśatī 8.19 and 11.17.

The variant छविं in the first foot creates metrical fault. The whole first foot is to be taken as a compound word. About the grammatical correctness of वाहिनी in महामहिषवाहिनी explaining the word महावृषभवाहिनि, see Śantanavī in Saptāśatī 11.13.

9. See the comments of Bhāskara on the word दक्षयज्ञविनाशिनी—'यदात्र उपान्त्यस्वरोऽकारः पठ्यते तदा विनाशनशब्दात् ल्युडन्तान् डीप् इकारपाठे तु गिन्यन्तात् (on Lalitāsahasranāma, verse 171).

10. प्रभूतकुसुमातसीप्रचयस्य यः सान्द्रः पुञ्जः स उपमा यस्याः सा—the word is to be understood in this way.

11. Later lexicons read both the forms.

As the variant शूकरी (for शिवकरी) in the fourth foot creates metrical fault it is corrupt. Since the verse eulogises Vārāhī and since the name of the mātṛkā has not been expressly stated in the verse, some intelligent scribe replaced शिवकरी by it without noticing that the reading would create metrical fault.

(Verse 31) This verse eulogises the mātṛkā Indrāṇī (also called Aindrī); cp. Saptasatī 8.21 and 11.19.

The reading विद्युल्ललितोपमा in the first foot (Dev. ed.) is corrupt as it is metrically defective. Moreover ललित can hardly be used appropriately with विद्युत्; the compound is hardly satisfactory. Unfortunately no variant of this reading has been given in the Dev. ed. As the reading in the Beng. ed. is meaningful, it is accepted here.

The second foot has a variant कवीन्द्रवर. There is no appropriety in mentioning *kavi* here. As the use of both इन्द्र (in the sense of श्रेष्ठ) and वर with reference to one and the same entity is futile, we take the reading करीन्द्ररव as correct. संकुल may aptly be used with रव (and not with वर).

The fourth foot has a variant विपुलभागभवां (in the place of विपुलभोगदा) which is evidently corrupt as it corrupts the metre and yields no acceptable sense. The variant शत्रुजाम् (in the place of शक्रजाम्) seems to be written inadvertently by the scribe. It may also be supposed that the variant is due to the Bengali script in which the forms of क्र and व्रु are very similar.

(Verse 32) This verse seems to eulogise the mātṛkā Cāmuṇḍā, for in the Purāṇas she is said to kill the Demon Ruru. Cāmuṇḍā's description in the Saptasatī is in consonance with the epithets given in this verse. Cāmuṇḍā is said to be one of the mātṛkās in Prapañcasāra 7.11.

The Beng. ed. reads मालाधरी in the first foot. It is usual to use मालाधरा with the feminine suffix टाप्. The use of the feminine suffix

डीप् is sometimes found in such words in the *stotras* and Tantric works.<sup>12</sup>

The variant प्रलयरवीव पिङ्गोक्षणाम् in the second foot is metrically defective. Moreover रवीव पिङ्गोक्षणा is grammatically indefensible.

The reading ररूतनुघातिनी (in Dev. ed.) or ररूतनुघातिनी (in Beng. ed.) in the third foot is metrically defective. The correct Puranic form is ररू and not ररू. According to us the correct reading would be ररूद्वितनुघातिनी which is in consonance with the metre. It is said in the Varāha-p. that before the killing of the demon Ruru by Cāmuṇḍā, his body was divided into two parts (called Carman or Carma and Muṇḍa).<sup>13</sup> On account of these two bodies Cāmuṇḍā may rightly be described as ररूद्वितनुघातिनी. We may read ररूद्वितय also.

It is better to read मेदःप्रियां (in the third foot) as read in the Beng. ed. and not मेदप्रियां (as read in the Dev. ed.) as the stem is मेदस्. Some opine that as शिर is also used for शिरस्, so मेद may also be used for मेदस् (Cp. the maxim सर्वे सान्ता अदन्ताः in later grammatical works).

In the fourth foot there is a variant शिवसंस्थिता. The reading शवसंस्थिता is preferable, for Cāmuṇḍā is often described as प्रेतसंस्था<sup>14</sup> or शववाहना in Tantric works.

- 
12. For an unusual or far-fetched explanation of धरी in the word मालापुस्तकपाशासाङ्कुशधरी (Śaṅkara's Annapūrnāstotra 9), see the Sanskrit notes by Pandit Pañcānana Tarkaratna : "मालापुस्तकपाशासाङ्कुशा चासौ धरीश्चेति समासः । धरं पर्वतमिच्छति इति धरशब्दात् क्यचि कर्तरि क्विपि रूपम्" ।
  13. देवी च त्रिशिखेनाजौ तं ररूं समताडयत् तया तु ताडितान्तस्य दैत्यस्य शुभलोचनो चर्ममुण्डे उभे सम्मक् पृथग्भूते बभूवतुः॥ ३०। ररोस्तु दानवेन्दस्य चर्ममुण्डे क्षणाद् यतः। अपहृत्याहरद् देवी चामुण्डा तेन साभवत्॥ (Varāha-p. 95.30-31 Cr.ed., quoted in the Lalitāsahasranāma-bhāṣya, verse 196 on the name Caṇḍikā).
  14. On the meanings of प्रेत the comments of the Vivaraṇa comm. on Amarakośa 3.3.60 are worth noting: प्राण्यन्तरं नरकलोकस्यः प्राणिविशेषः प्राणुक्तः। अथवा मरणादूर्ध्वम् अकृतासपिण्डीकरणे प्रेतशब्दः । यथा 'सपिण्डीकरणादूर्ध्वं प्रेतत्वं विनिवर्तते' इति । मृतमात्रेऽपि, यथा प्रेतसंस्कारः.

(Verse 33) The mātṛkā eulogised here seems to be Gaṇanāyikā, though her name is not read in the well-known lists of mātṛkās.

The reading प्रहृष्टषट् (in the first foot) in the Dev. ed. is metrically defective. Moreover चामरप्रहृष्ट does not yield a good sense. The reading प्रहत (in the Beng. ed.) suits the metre and is meaningful also (चामरेण प्रहतैः षट्पदैः आराविताम्).

The reading दशदिशान्तरामोदयन्<sup>15</sup> (in Beng. ed.) is better than दशदिशान्तरं मोदयन्<sup>16</sup> (in the Dev. ed.).

The third and fourth feet have variant reading in which all adjectival words are read in the masculine gender referring to the deity Gaṇanāyaka. Since it is a verse of the Mātṛstava, a male deity cannot be extolled here, and as such the variant readings are to be taken as corrupt.

(Verse 34) The verse seems to extol not any particular mātṛ but mātṛs in general.

In the third foot the Beng. ed. reads यमति, which must be corrupt as the root *yama* in the sense of *uparama* (cessation) is intransitive while in the sentence there is the object मातरम्. Moreover the correct form in this root would be यच्छति and not यमति.

In this foot the Dev. ed. reads स्तवति and the Beng. ed. स्तुवति. Grammatically the word should be स्तौति from the root ष्टुब् स्तुतौ. स्तवति may be taken here in the sense of स्तवं करोति.

The reading देवस्तुता in the Beng. ed. seems to be a printing error, for a word in the first case-ending cannot be construed with the other words in this verse.

- R. S. Bhattacharya

15. It is to be analysed as दशदिशान्तः + आमोदयन्.

16. It is to be analysed as दशानां दिशानाम् अन्तरं मोदयन् (here the stem is दिशा and not दिश). *Antara* (meaning *avakās'a*) should have been used here in plural number. It would be wrong here to analyse दिशान्तरम् as अन्या दिशा for the word in this sense cannot be properly construed with *daśa*.

## THE AIM OF THE PURĀNIC ETYMOLOGIES

By

TIZIANA PONTILLO

[पुराणेषु यानि शब्दनिर्वचनानि दृश्यन्ते, तानि यद्यपि न ऐतिहासिक-विश्लेषणपराणि, तथापि भाषीयविश्लेषणद्वारा तानि पदार्थस्वभावज्ञाने साहाय्यं विदधति। शब्दवाच्यानामर्थानां गुणकर्मस्वभावादिकं निर्वचनबलेन लक्षितं पुराणकारैरिति दृश्यते ।

लेखकेन पुराणगतानां ६२६ निर्वचनानाम् परीक्षणं कृतम्। इमानि च तेन नवधा विभाजितानि। प्रत्येकं विभागानां स्वरूपं बहुभिरुदाहरणैर्विशदीकृतम् ।

एतदनन्तरं ब्राह्मणग्रन्थगतैर्निर्वचनैः सह पुराणगतानां निर्वचनानां तुलना कृता; दर्शितं च सादृश्यम् उभयशास्त्रागतानां निर्वचनानाम् ।

लेखकेन निरुक्तशास्त्रीया निर्वचनदृष्टिः प्रपञ्चिता, निरुक्तगतैर्निर्वचनैः सह पुराणगतानां निर्वचनानां तुलना च कृता; सिद्धान्तितं च यत् पुराणकारदृष्टिर्न निरुक्तकारदृष्टितोऽत्यन्तं भिद्यते।

पुराणेषु लौकिकनिर्वचनानि भूयांसि सन्ति—इत्यपि प्रदर्शितम् ।

यद्यपि ब्राह्मणग्रन्थ-निरुक्त-पुराणेषु निर्वचनविषये प्रायेण समाना दृष्टि-रूपलभ्यते तथापि पुराणगतानां निर्वचनानां यद् वैशिष्ट्यं तदत्र सुष्ठु प्रदर्शितम् ।]

The Purānic etymologies do not contain generally the historical analysis of words and, even though they look like true etymologies, they aim at another purpose. First we must consider that the etymologies in the Purāṇas are introduced only as digressions and they give us as a result a little pause in reading, which enables us to reflect on a person or upon a detail thoroughly. But indeed the real target of purānic etymologies is to help the readers reach the essence of the subjects in question through the linguistic analysis of words by which they are denoted. It is typical of many ancient cultures and of human sensitiveness at large to connect the idea of knowing an object with the one of uttering its name.<sup>1</sup> Ability to denote an

1. We see the value of the proper name in Brahṃavaivarta-Purāṇa 1. 22. 30, where there is a close correspondence between the name and the main



object by its suitable name means to recollect its shape, functions and characteristics or peculiarity, because the name is attributed to a thing according to these ones.<sup>2</sup> Indians usually derive words, apparently convinced that names denote things, animals or people on the base of a link between a peculiarity of the denoted object and a significant connected to it in point of view of logic or, at least partly, phonetics.<sup>3</sup>

While analysing 626 etymologies found in different Purāṇas<sup>4</sup>, several kinds of links could be recalled, ranging over from an easy and clear thought association up to an exposition of a whole myth, which explains the origin of a word. These Purāṇic etymologies were then classified according to a few categories related to the kind of link established between the denoted subject and the quoted significant. The following are the results :

a 239 etymologies link the subject to a verb or to another significant, that point out the function developed by it.

In Liṅga-Purāṇa 1. 59. 45 e. g. we read:

---

characteristic of the denoted man: "सन्तु तु नित्यवचनः कुमारः शिशुवाचकः।  
सन्तु कुमारं तेनेममुवाच कमलोद्भवः ॥"

This passage has been translated by R. N. Sen (*The Brahma-Vaivarta-Purāṇam*, translated into English by R. N. SEN, Bahadurganj, Allahabad vol. I 1920 vol. II 1922, 67) in the following way: "*Sanat* means permanent and *Kumāra* means child, hence *Brahmā-Kamalodbhava* gave him the etymological or derivative name of *Sanat-kumāra*". As for the value of proper names v. Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa VI. 1. 3. 10-20, where many proper names are attributed to the son of Prajāpati and Uṣas according to his different powers.

2. J. GONDA *Vedic literature: Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas* (A History of Indian Literature edited by Jan Gonda, I, 1), Wiesbaden 1975, as for the etymologies of Vedic literature, claims similarly: "These authors practised the art of etymology as a means of gaining knowledge of the ideas expressed by words, of penetrating into the hitherto unknown nature of an object or a person, of acquiring control over them".
3. Similarly Greek or Latin authors too seem recognize a close connection between name and denoted subject by giving a "*nomen-omen*" to the characters of a "mythos", especially of the theatre.
4. Apart from the Liṅga-Purāṇa and the Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa, that I analyzed by myself, I relate to the account of the etymologies given by Sindhu S. Dange "*Purāṇic Etymologies and Flexible Forms (Some glimpses)*", Aligarh 1989.

"नयनं चैवमीशस्य दक्षिणं भास्करः स्वयम्। तेषां जनानां लोकेऽस्मिन् नयनं नयते यतः" (The right eye of the Lord is the sun himself. The eye-*nayana*-<is so called> because it leads -*nayate* the people in this world). The function of the eye is explained by the etymology of the word *nayana* derived from the root *nī* to lead.

Similarly in *Liṅga-Purāṇa* 11. 20. 20 the word *ācārya* (preceptor) has been derived from many roots according to his different functions: "स्वयमाचरते यस्तु आचारे स्थापयत्यपि। आचिनोति च शास्त्रार्थान् आचार्य्यस्तेन चोच्यते॥" (Preceptor -*ācārya*- is called who practises-*ācarate*-<the doctrines> himself, who stabilises-*sthāpayati*- <others> in the practice -*ācāra*- <of those doctrines> and who arranges -*ācinoti*- the scriptural texts.)<sup>5</sup>

b. 201 etymologies recall a myth, that explains the ascription of the considered noun to that subject.

In *Liṅga-Purāṇa* 1. 53. 62, e. g., a myth of creation has been used for etymologising the word *aja*, the name of universe: तस्माद् द्विजः सर्वमजस्य तस्य नियोगतश्चाण्डमभूदजाद् वै। अजश्च अण्डाद् (sic) अखिलञ्च तस्माज् ज्योतिर्गणैर्लोकमजात्मकं तत्॥ (Therefore, o twice-born, the entire egg (i. e. universe) originated according to the order of the unborn -*aja*-, indeed from the unborn and *Brahmā-aja*=name of the first uncreated being- originated from the egg. Thus the whole world with the multitude of luminaries is that having the nature of the unborn-*aja*).

Similarly in *Liṅga-Purāṇa* 1. 41. 25-27 a name of *Kāla*, god of death, has been explained through the myth of his birth: "लोहितोऽभूत् स्वयं नीलः शिवस्य हृदयोद्भवः। वह्नेश्चैव तु संयोगात् प्रकृत्या पुरुषः प्रभुः। नीलश्च लोहितश्चैव यतः कालाकृतिः पुमान्। नीललोहित इत्युक्तस्तेन देवेन वै प्रभुः। ब्रह्मणा भगवान् कालः" (Born from Śiva's heart was blue by himself but

5. We can find a similar etymology in *Nirukta* I. 4: "आचार्यः आचारं ग्राहयति आचिनोत्यर्थान् आचिनोति बुद्धिम्" (The preceptor-*ācārya*-<is so called because he > imparts-*grāhayati*-the precept -*ācāra*-, arranges -*ācinoti*- the objects of knowledge -*artha*- and arranges -*acinoti*- the intellectual faculty.)

became red by contact with fire. Because such a Puruṣa, the Lord, was both blue *-nīla-* and red *-lohita-* by nature; since the Lord was a being (*pumān*) with the shape of *kāla*, he was named *nīlalahita* by the God and Lord *kāla* by Brahmā).

c. 80 etymologies state the moral or sacral value of the denoted subject through the origin of a word.

In Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa 2. 57. 9 e. g. one of 16 names of Durgā has been etymologised, by explaining the value of this goddess: "यशसा तेजसा रूपैर्नारायणसमा गुणैः । शक्तिर्नारायणस्येयं तेन नारायणी स्मृता॥" (She-Durgā-is mentioned as Nārāyaṇī as she is equal to Nārāyaṇa in respect of fame, lustre, shape and virtues and represents the energy of Nārāyaṇa).

More easily a Śiva's epithet has been explained by reminding the value, the Śiva's position among all beings: "सर्वेषामेव भूतानां परत्वात्पर उच्यते" (For his superiority *-paratva-* to all living Beings he is called Para).

d. 63 etymologies show the shape, the exterior side of the subject, through the significant employed in the etymology.

In Liṅga-Purāṇa 11. 15. 3-5 e. g. a Śiva's epithet (*Sadasatpati*) has been etymologised by analysing two forms assumed by him, the form of existent and the one of non-existent: "सदसद्रूपमित्याहुः सदसत्पतिरित्यपि तं शिवं मुनयः केचित् प्रवदन्ति च सूरयः। भूतभावविकारेण द्वितीयेन स उच्यते। व्यक्तं तेन विहीनत्वादव्यक्तमसदित्यपि उभे ते शिवरूपे हि शिवादन्त्यं न विद्यते। तयोः पतित्वाच्च शिवः सदसत्पतिरुच्यते॥"<sup>6</sup> (The wise and a few seers spoke of his form of existent *-sat-* and non-existent *-asat-* and called Śiva lord of existent and non-existent *-sadasatpati-*; with the change of form of the living being for its second form he is called manifested and because he is free from that, the unmanifested <is called> non-existent. Both of these are the forms

6. In *Liṅga Purāṇam*, Calcutta 1960, 422 we read really "*sadasatparirucyate*" but it seems to be a misprint.

of Śiva. There is anything but Śiva. Since he is the lord of both of them, Śiva is called *Sadasatpati* ).

Similarly the name Brahman has been explained in Liṅga-Purāṇa 1. 70. 16, according to its shape and its state.

"बृहत्त्वाद् बृहणत्वाच्च भावानां सकलाश्रयात्। यस्माद् धारयते भावान् ब्रह्म तेन निरुच्यते॥"

(For its massiveness-*br̥hatva*-and its state of becoming swollen -*br̥mhanatva*- and its being the source of every appearance it holds the beings; therefore it is called *Brahman*).

e. 15 etymologies described a rite that helps to understand the sacral birth of the word denoting that subject.

Durgā e. g. in Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa 11.57. 24-25 is called also Pārvaṭī because her name is connected with the rites of the festivals *Parvas*: "तिथिभेदे पर्वभेदे<sup>7</sup> कल्पभेदे प्रभेदतः। ख्यातौ तेषु च विख्याता पार्वती तेन कीर्तिता ॥ महोत्सवविशेषे च पर्वत्रिति प्रकीर्तिता। तस्याधिदेवी या सा च पार्वती परिकीर्तिता॥" (In the division of the lunar day, of the lunar month -*parvan*- and of the *kalpa*, she is so generally known in her denomination coming from the division and hence she is called *Pārvaṭī* An excellent great festival is called *Parvan* and who is its presiding goddess is called too *Pārvaṭī* ).

f. 14 etymologies use a simple thought association between the noun of the subject and the phonetically consonant significant.

In Liṅga-Purāṇa 1. 70. 135 e. g. we read: तदाचलत्वादचलाः पर्वभिः पर्वताः स्मृताः" (mountains are called *acalas* because they never move -*acalatva*-; they are called *parvatas* because they have knots -*parvan*). Thus the name of mountains has been connected with the root *cal* to move, preceded by the negative particle *a*, through the idea of state of motionless and it has been connected with the noun *parvan* (knot) because the peaks of mountains let us to think of the knots.

7. So the Vangavāsi edition, which puts *kalpabedhe* before *parvabedhe*. Mor and Jivānanda editions have *sarvabhede* for *parvabhede*.

g. 7 etymologies combine a similitude between the subject and another subject denoted by a similar noun.

In *Liṅga Purāṇa* 1. 49. 12 e. g. we read a similitude between the area near the *Niṣadha* (a mountain lying north of the *Himālaya*), the *Vedyardha*, and the half (*ardha*) of a whole sacrificial altar (*Vedi*), that represents the region composed of two districts in the *Himālayas*, one to the north and one to the south: अर्वाक् तु निषधस्याथ वेद्यर्धं चोत्तरं स्मृतम्। वेद्यर्धे दक्षिणे त्रीणि वर्षाणि त्रीणि चोत्तरे॥" (The area near *Niṣadha* is known as the northern *Vedyardha*. Thus there are three *Varṣas* (regions) in the southern half of sacrificial altar -*vedhyardha*- and three *varṣas* in the northern half).

h. 5 etymologies mention a component of the subject, through the significant quoted in order to explain the noun of subject.

In *Kūrma-Purāṇa* 1. 4. 62d e. g. the main component of the highest god is *sarva* (everything) and hence he is called *Sarva*: सर्वः सर्वमयो यतः (As he is full of everything, he is *Sarva*).

i. 2 etymologies build a simple grammatical link between the word denoting the subject and a phonetically similar significant linked to the word through a common semanteme.

In *Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa* 11. 9. 32a e. g. we find the word *Kāśyapī* (earth) simply connected with the masculine correspondent word *Kaśyapa*: "काश्यपी कश्यपस्येयम्".

S. S. Dange<sup>8</sup> mentions 9 "trends" of Purāṇic etymologies, among which 6 concern grammatical categories and 3 pertain to the content of etymologies. The last three are :

1. Etymologies based on a belief;
2. Etymologies based on a custom;
3. Popular etymologies.

Thus, at least two of the aforesaid categories seem to have been hinted at by this scholar too; namely her first class corresponds to

8. SINDHU S. DANGE op. cit., 3.

my category *b* or *c*; her second one is similar to my *e* above. Her third division at last, is in my opinion too large and rather indefinite since most of the Purāṇic etymologies can be defined popular and not scientific, according to the western etymological science.

The above mentioned etymological categories can be found more accurately explained in Helārāja's commentary on the third book of Vākyapadīya (III. 1. 23)<sup>9</sup> with reference to a classification of *Padārtha* (denotation of meaning). This grammarian lists six different categories of *Padārtha*: 1. *dravya* substance 2. *guṇa* attribute 3. *karman* action 4. *sāmānya* universal 5. *viśeṣa* essential property 6. *samavāya* inherence.

His first class (*dravya*) corresponds to my category *h*; his second (*guṇa*) is similar to mine *d*; his third (*karman*) seems to be fully matching with my *a* above.

The "component" of a subject is its substance<sup>10</sup> and *dravya* has been defined by K. V. Abhyankar<sup>11</sup> a "substance, as opposed to *guṇa*, property and *kriyā* action which exist on *dravya*"<sup>12</sup>.

The above mentioned category *d* -namely etymologies showing the shape is really an attribute of the denoted subject, a characteristic given to the subject from outside without changing its deepest being. K. V. Abhyankar defines *guṇa*: "Properties residing in a substance just as whiteness, etc. in a garment which are different from the substance (*dravya*)"<sup>13</sup>

9. Bhartṛhari in Vākyapadīya, III. 1. 23 claims: "तस्माद् द्रव्यादयः सर्वाः शक्तयो भिन्नलक्षणाः संसृष्टाः पुरुषार्थस्य साधिका न तु केवलाः" (all powers, the substance and the other ones, having different characteristics, realize jointly and not separately the purpose of man).

10. cf. above Kūrma-Purāṇa 1. 4. 62d.

11. K. V. ABHANKAR: *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, Baroda 1986, 202.

12. Monier-Williams too in his Dictionary defines the lemma "dravya" as "A substance; [...] the ingredients or materials of anything; elementary substance:".

13. K. V. ABHANKAR op. cit., 142.

"*Karman*", viz. the action, the office, the special duty of subject corresponds with my etymological category of "function" (see category *a*, above). K. V. Abhyankar too<sup>14</sup> claims: "*Karman* or object is to be achieved by an activity or *kriyā*; it is always syntactically connected with a verb or a verbal derivative"<sup>15</sup>. Then category *c* - etymologies stating the moral or sacred value - is partly similar to the one of "*viśeṣa*", viz. the essential property, the positive or negative peculiarity of a subject. My four etymological categories *b*, *e*, *f*, *g*, which are themes inherent in the subject can be reduced to "*samavāya*" (inherence).

The category of "*sāmānya*" was barred in the above given classification, because no correspondency was found. Such an analogy between the categories of *Padārtha* and the classification employed in the Purāṇas ratifies the supposition that Purāṇic etymologies do not aim at tracing a word-history. Neither do they attempt to build a hypothetical original root by comparison with another indo-european language. On the contrary the aim of these etymologies seems to be the one K. Raja rightly applies to the etymological Indian science in general.<sup>16</sup> "The aim of etymology in ancient India has not been to find out the history of the evolution of the form and meaning of words but to understand their essence or their real significance though linguistic analysis".

On the other hand in Skanda-Purāṇa IV. 30. 103 too we read: "श्मशब्देन शवः प्रोक्तः शानं शयनमुच्यते। निर्वचन्ति श्मशानार्थं मुने शब्दार्थ-कोविदाः॥" (By the word *śma* is denoted a *śava* -corpse- and *śāna* is said for *śayana* -sleeping-place. Persons well-versed in the meaning of words, o sage, give this etymology of the word *śmaśāna*). Hence the author of this passage in the Skanda-Purāṇa -as already

14. K. V. ABHANKAR op. cit, 110.

15. Indeed most etymologies of category *a* derive words from a verb.

16. K. RAJA Etymology and Interpretation in Ancient India in *Dr. V. Raghavan Shashyabdapurti Felicitation Volume*, Madras 1971, 180.

Nirukta III. 5 based at least some of his etymologies on the meaning and not on the history of words.

As for the works previous to the Purāṇas like the Brāhmaṇas, J. Gonda agrees with K. Raja when he says: "The etymologies were for the authors an important mean of penetrating into the truth and reality lying behind the phenomena".<sup>17</sup>

The etymologies of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa too can be classified not differently from the Purāṇas: out of 424 collected etymologies 157, in theme with the matter of the whole work, describe a rite, 133 employ a similitude, 105 recall a myth, 74 explain the function developed by the denoted subject, 16 state the moral or sacral value of the subject, 8 use a thought association between the subject and the significant, by which derives the word denoting it, 4 mention a component of denoted subject and 3 show its shape. This division corresponds to the previous Purāṇic etymologies and to the classification of *Padārtha* exposed in *Vākyapadīya* III. 1.23. Namely the above mentioned categories of rite, similitude, myth and thought association coincident with the *samavāya* category. The etymologies which explain the function developed by the subject correspond to the *karman*. The moral or sacral value of the subject is the same as the *viśeṣa*.

Similarly in the analysis of 720 etymologies of the most famous Indian etymological treatise, the Nirukta, the classification into categories seems to be very useful. The etymologies appear so distributed:

- 334 pertinent to a function of the considered subject;
- 141 pertinent to a thought association;
- 117 pertinent to a shape;
- 41 pertinent to a moral or sacral value;
- 19 pertinent to a similitude;

---

17. J. GONDA: The etymologies in the Ancient Indian Brāhmaṇas, "Lingua. International review of general linguistics" 5 (1955), 61.



- 10 pertinent to a component;
- 5 pertinent to a rite.

As regards the categories of Nirukta etymologies too one could notice their similarity to the categories of *Padārtha*. We find correspondance between the categories of thought association, similitude and rite and the *samavāya-padārtha*. Moreover the function of the denoted subject is the same as the *karman*. At last the shape corresponds to the *guṇa* category like as the moral or sacral value to the *viśeṣa* category.

Besides Yāska explains clearly that the aim of the Indian etymologies was to trace a science of meaning.<sup>18</sup> Indeed in the first three chapters of the Nighaṇṭu, i. e. in the Naighaṇṭuka-kāṇḍa, often only the etymology of the last word of a *sūtra* has been explained. The explanation of the previous words is supposedly implicit in the last one because the given terms are all synonyms; their meaning is therefore drawn out consequently.

---

18. On the contrary, when R. Roth in 1852 edited the Editio Princeps of the Nirukta (Yāska's Nirukta samt den Nighaṇṭavas herausgegeben und erläutert von R. Roth, Göttingen 1852), considered the Nirukta a treatise of historical linguistics and claimed: "der Sinn für Geschichte gieng ihm spurlos verloren und er beruhigte sich bei dem erlaubten unschodlichen Genuss der Lösung grammatischer Fragene".

According to J. Bronkhorst (J. Bronkhorst Nirukta and Aṣṭādhyāyī: their shared Presupposition "I. I. J." XXIII (1981), 1-14) the first scholar, who considered the Nirukta a Treatise of diachronic linguistics, was M. Muller. (M. MULLER über eine Stelle in Yāska's Kommentar zum Naighaṇṭuka, Provincialismen betreffend "Z. D. M. G.", 1853, 374-375).

L. Sarup too suggests a similar interpretation of Nirukta in "The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta". The Oldest Indian Treatise on Etymology, Philology and Semantics, critically edited from Original Manuscripts and Translated for the first time in English, with Introduction Exegetical and Critical Notes, Indexes and Appendices by L. SARUP, Delhi 1920-1927, 64: "Yāska's greatness, even if every one of his etymological explanations is proved to be wrong—as many are manifestly so, —lies in the fact that he is the first to claim a scientific foundation, and also the first to formulate general principles for etymology".

According to Skold<sup>19</sup> the very word "Nirukta", which is usually translated as "etymological interpretation of a word", should be translated as "explanation of a word", since the word derives from *nis vac*. In the times of the Nirukta this root meant only "to explain, to comment upon".

The Nirukta has been composed for the necessity of understanding the Ṛgveda. Yāska in Nirukta 1, 1 claims that his purpose was to explain the handed-down-by-heart list of words of Ṛgveda, i. e. the Nighaṇṭavas.<sup>20</sup>

In Nirukta 11.7 he remarks: तानि चेत् समानकर्माणि समान-निर्वचनानि, नानाकर्माणि चेन् नानानिर्वचनानि यथार्थं निर्वक्तव्यानि" (One should derive words in accordance with their meanings; if their meanings are the same, their etymologies should be the same, if the meanings are different, the etymologies should also be different). Yāska, therefore, could give two or more alternative valid etymologies of a word.

Sometimes the Purāṇas too give two or more etymologies of a word in the very same passage. For instance in Padma-Purāṇa, Uttara, 124, 61cd-62ab we read: "लोकशोकहरा काम्या धनपुष्टिसुखावहा कुशब्देन मही ज्ञेया मुद हर्षे ततो द्वयम्। धातुज्ञैर्निगमज्ञैश्च तेनैषा कौमुदी स्मृता॥" (She -*Kaumudī* = Festival of Lights- takes away the sadness of people, is desirable and brings wealth and nourishment. The word *ku* means earth and the second letter -*mud*-signifies joy, or delight. Hence she is known as *Kaumudī* by those who know the roots of words and the Vedas". On the contrary in the next *śloka* we read: "कुमुदानि बलेर्यस्माद् दीयन्ते तत्र भामिनि। अर्थाढ्यपार्थिवैर्भामे तेनैषा कौमुदी

19. H.SKOLD; *The Nirukta: Its Place in Old Indian Literature, Its etymologies*, Lund 1926, 109.

20. Skold defines the Nirukta a commentary on Nighaṇṭu and reminds that Durga, one of commentators of Nirukta, names the treatise of Nirukta as a *bhāṣya* (commentary) and his own as a *ṭikā*. cf. Skold, op. cit., 108.

स्मृताः॥" (As at that time lotuses are given as gifts to Bali by rich kings, o passionate woman, it is known as *Kaumudī*).<sup>21</sup>

The etymologies are really folk-etymologies but not to be discarded as they were not scientific.<sup>22</sup> Learned scholars of Indian culture uphold these etymologies. It is more than enough to remember, for instance, the opinion of Apte<sup>23</sup>: "Etymological equations based on the semantic identification of phonetically similar words [....] illustrate a tendency inherent in folk-etymology, whereby association by sound may affect the meaning, just as association by sense may bring about change in the form of words". Actually Coomaraswamy claims<sup>24</sup>: "It is assumed, in other words, that certain assonances which may or may not correspond to the actual pedigrees of words, are nevertheless indications of their affinities and meanings [...] All of which is anything but a manner of folk-etymology [...] in any case the folk tradition is a matter of the folk only in respect to its transmission, not its origin".

The etymological technique and its aim seem therefore to be rather omogeneous in the course of history. We can state that the etymologies of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, of the Nirukta and of the Purāṇas aim at explaining the meaning of words. But in the

- 
21. We read another similar example in Liṅga-Purāṇa 1. 34. 5. The adjective *bhasman* (devouring) related to the rite Triyāyuṣa, which liberates from sins, has been etymologised from three different roots: "भासयत्ये (sic) व यद् भस्म शुभं भासयते च यत् भक्षणात् सर्वपापानां भस्मेति परिकीर्तितम्॥" (Which shines -bhāsate- bright and which causes to reach prosperity -bhāvayate- is *bhasman*; since it devours -bhakṣaṇa- all sins it is called *bhasman*).
  22. On the other hand there is a similar question about the Purāṇic language in general, that has been judged popular Sanskrit by a few scholars. But Renou in *Histoire de la Langue Sanskrite* (Les langues du monde), Lyon 1956, 117 undertakes the defense of Sanskrit language claiming: "On craindrait de parler de sanskrit populaire [...] Il faudrait dire plutot: sanskrit vulgaire, au moins par la syntaxe, qui est extraordinairement relache, sanskrit desentrave par rapport a Pāṇini".
  23. V. M. Apte: *The Vedāṅgas* in *The Cultural Heritage of India*, I, Calcutta 1958, 277.
  24. A. K. Coomaraswamy "*Metaphysics*" in *Selected Papers* vol. II, Princeton 1977, 262.

Purāṇas there is a category of etymologies quite different from the above-mentioned categories, which appears neither in the Nirukta nor in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. Among the analysed Purāṇic passages I found 42 etymologies which explain the word denoting the subject in question by suggesting a syllable, a sound, a part of word and ascribe to it a logical meaning.

At first sight the arbitrary meaning attributed to a sound or a syllable for explaining the meaning of a word seems to make up for the lack of a right etymology from a proper significant.

For instance in Skanda Purāṇa 1. 2. 44, 39-40ab *tulā* (balance) is derived from two syllables: "ब्रह्मणस्त्वं सुता देवि तुला नामेति कथ्यसे<sup>25</sup> तुकारो गौरवे नित्यं लकारो लघुनि स्मृतः॥ गुरुलाघवसंयोगात् तुला तेन निगद्यसे॥" (you, o goddess, Balance by name, are said to be the daughter of Brahmā. *Tu* is always used in the sense of greatness and *la* is known to be used in the sense of small. Hence, you are called *tulā* as you are connected to both great and small measures.)

Similarly in Skanda Purāṇa II. 8. 1. 60 Ayodhyā is so derived: "अकारो ब्रह्म च प्रोक्तं यकारो विष्णुरुच्यते धकारो रुद्ररूपश्च अयोध्यानाम राजते॥" (In the word 'Ayodhyā' the letter *a* is said to denote Brahman,<sup>26</sup> *ya* stands for Viṣṇu and *dha* is the form of Rudra. Thus is the name Ayodhyā glorious).<sup>27</sup> In the last one, the word is not divided into the syllables *a*, *yo*, *dhyā* but only three phonemes of the word are recalled: the vowel *a*, the semi-vowel *ya*, the aspirate dental *dha*.

25. In the text (see also S. S. DANGE op. cit., 108) we read "*kathyate*" but the vocative case of the word "*devī*" and the following verbal form "*nigadyase*" suggest the replacement of "*kathyate*" with "*kathyase*".

26. The text (see also S. S. DANGE op. cit., 16) reads *Brahma*, but the after mentioned gods Viṣṇu and Rudra seem to suggest the replacement of the word *Brahma* with *Brahmā*.

27. Other examples of etymologies from syllables are in Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa 1. 44. 87; 1. 2. 26; 11. 57. 5; IV. 13. 57-59; IV. 27. 26; IV. 27. 32; Bahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa 1. 2. 28, 24cd-25a; II. 4. 39, 66cd, 67, 72cd; Matsya-Purāṇa 71. 20cd-21ab 157. 41; Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa XX. 51; Śiva-Purāṇa, Vidyeśvarasamhitā, 17. 4; Skanda-Purāṇa I. 3 (a), 4. 67cd-68ab; II. 3. 1. 63; VII 1. 20. 23cd-24ab.

The name Durgā too, in Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa IV. 27. 18-19, has been derived from a few syllables; namely the word Durgā has been divided into 5 different phonemes *d*, *u*, *r*, *g*, *a* (the syllables *da*, *u*, *ra*, *ga*, *a*): दैत्यनाशार्थवचनो दकारः परिकीर्तितः। उकारो विघ्ननाशार्थवाचको वेदसंमतः॥ रेफो रोगघ्नवचनो गश्च पापघ्नवाचकः। भयशत्रुघ्न-वचनश्चाकारः परिकीर्तितः॥" (According to the Veda the syllable *da* is said to mean destruction of demons, the syllable *u* to mean destruction of obstacles, the letter *ra* to mean destroyer of diseases, the *ga* to mean destroyer of sins; the syllable *a* is said to mean destroyer of fear and enemies). It is interesting to notice that to two syllables of word *Durgā* has been given a meaning through two words beginning respectively by these two syllables, *da*= *daityanāśa* and *ra*= *rogaghna*. To the syllable *u* probably corresponds the words *vighnanāśa*. On the contrary an arbitrary meaning has been attributed to the last two syllables: *ga*=*pāpaghna*, *ā*=*bhayaśatrughna*.

In Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa IV. 27. 27-28 a name of Durgā (*Māyā*) has been derived from four syllables, of which only one has been explained through a word beginning by that very syllable: "राज्यश्रीवचनो माश्च याश्च प्रापणवाचकः। तां प्रापयति या सद्यः सा माया परिकीर्तिता॥ माश्च मोक्षार्थवचनो याश्च प्रापणवाचकः। तं प्रापयति या नित्यं सा माया परिकीर्तिता॥" (*Mā* means royal majesty and *yā* means bringing to. She, who every day promotes it, is called *Māyā*. *Mā* means liberation and *yā* means bringing to; she, who promotes it forever, is called *Māyā*). First to the syllable *mā* corresponds the word *rājaśrī* (royal majesty) and to *yā* corresponds the word *prāpaṇa* (bringing to); then to the syllable *mā* corresponds the word *mokṣa* (liberation) and to *yā* corresponds as before the word *prāpaṇa*. The only word *mokṣa* begins by the very syllable *ma* of *Māyā*. But the meanings related to the other three syllables are not so arbitrary as it seems. Indeed the word *prāpaṇa* <  $\sqrt{prāp}$  (to attain) seems to allude to the verb of motion  $\sqrt{yā}$  (to go) and the word *rājaśrī* (royal majesty)

seems to allude to the adjective *mahat*, which implies greatness and majesty.

The allusive technique has been widely employed in Purāṇic etymologies. For instance the allusion to an etymology through synonyms has been frequently used. In Liṅga-Purāṇa 1. 54. 39 *abhra* (cloud) has been derived from *ap* (water) and  $\sqrt{bhr}$  (to bring) but the quoted etymology employs respectively two synonyms, namely; *vāri* (water) and  $\sqrt{varṣ}$  (to pour): "vārīṇi varṣatīty abhram"<sup>28</sup>. Moreover a synthetic expression alludes to a significant, from which the word derives. For instance in Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa 11. 9. 32b the word *acalā* (earth) has been explained with the compound *sthitirūpataḥ* (Due to her stationary or static form), which alludes to *a* in the sense of negation (*tadanyatvam*) and to root  $\sqrt{cal}$  (to move).

The etymology is more complex when, for instance, half a word is derived from a regular part of speech and the rest is alluded to by a synonym of another part of speech. In Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa 11. 3. 7. 351a e.g. we read: "mattaṁ yātīti matango" (He-elephant-is called *mātanga*, as he moves in infatuation). The word is derived from a compound *aluk*, of which the first part is the substantive *mattam*, in which the case-affix is not dropped, and the second one is the verb  $\sqrt{gam}$  (to go), to which the verb  $\sqrt{yā}$  (to go) alludes. Should we try to guess similar etymological patterns even in those Purāṇic passages, where the etymologies from syllables seem to be not intellegible and the meanings related to the syllables seems to be arbitrary? Likely their meaning has been alluded to by synonyms or by synthetic expressions related to the word, which begins by the mentioned syllable.

So we can assume that such etymological system was so obvious that any reference to it was useless. It was enough to allude

28. Monier-Williams too in his Dictionary writes: "*abhra* (sometimes spelt *abhra*, according to the derivation *ab-bhra*, water-bearer).

to a sound in order to make evident the right etymology of a word. Therefore the Purāṇas contain many mixed etymologies, which simultaneously refer either to a part of speech and to a synonym of another part of speech, or to syllables, or to syllables and to significant together. These mixed etymologies could represent a stage of supposedly oral evolution.

We must add that these etymologies, employing only a few parts of the word and putting together fragments of different words in order to create other words, are wholly different from the historical linguistic etymologies of western scholarship. Indeed these Sanskrit etymologies aim essentially at catching the right meaning of the words in order to understand the holy texts and they do not attempt to build the hypothetical Indo-european root.

## KACA AND YAYĀTI : THE WISE AND THE FOOLISH

By

SUBHASH ANAND

[ ययातिचरितमुपवर्णितं महाभारते आदिपर्वणि। ययातिचरितस्य द्वौ भागौ—  
पूर्वयायातम् उत्तरयायातमिति। चरितमिदमादौ समासेन ततश्च विस्तरेण  
वर्णितमिति दृश्यते । अत्र कच-देवयानी-कथा ययातिदेवयानीकथा च विशेषेण  
प्रोक्ता।

लघुययातिचरिते सत्यपि किमर्थं बृहद्दययातिचरितं प्रोक्तम्, किञ्च तयोर्वैशिष्ट्य-  
मिति लेखकेन विशदं विचारितम्। किञ्च ययातिचरितसंबद्धानां घटनानामन्योन्य-  
संबन्धो दर्शितो लेखकेन युक्तिभिः। प्रसंगतः पाश्चात्यविदुषः बुइटेनेन—महोदयस्य  
भारतीयविदुषो डांगेमहोदयस्य च ययातिचरितविषयकं मतं लेखकेन समीक्षितम्,  
अनयोर्मतयोरयुक्तता च प्रादर्शिता।

कथाविचारप्रसंगे लेखकेन ययाति-कच-देवयानी-शर्मिष्ठा-शुक्रादीनां गुणा  
दोषाश्च विस्पष्टं प्रदर्शिताः। कथायां यो भृगुवंशप्रभावः सोऽपि विज्ञापितः। कचस्य  
चरितेन सह कठोपनिषद्गत-नचिकेतसः चरितं तुलितम्; तथैव कच-ययातिचरितयो-  
र्वैसादृश्यमपि प्रदर्शितम् । ]

01. Some years ago I had the good fortune of reading V.S. Khandekar's *Yayāti*,<sup>1</sup> for which he received the prestigious Jnanapeeth Award in 1974.<sup>2</sup> This story had been in his mind for fortyfive years.<sup>3</sup> I thoroughly enjoyed reading his re-creation of a story first found in the *Mahābhārata* (=MBh),<sup>4</sup> and subsequently in many Purāṇas.<sup>5</sup> The reading inspired me to make a personal

1. Translated and abridged by Y.P. Kulkarni, New Delhi, Orient Paperbacks, 1978.

2. *Ibid.* p. 1.

3. *Ibid.* p. 3.

4. Cr. ed., *Ādiparvan*, chs. 70-88. References to this Parvan alone will be given by chapter- and verse-number only. The other Parvans will be indicated first by a corresponding number.

5. I could find this story, either partly or fully, in the following Purāṇas: *Kūrma* (Cr. ed., Varanasi, All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1972), 1.21; *Brahmāṇḍa* (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1973), 2.3.68; *Bhāgavata* (Gorakhpur, Gita Press, 1971), 9.18; Viṣṇu (Id., samvat 2033), 4.10; *Agni* (Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1966), 274; *Matsya*



study of this charming episode, and my study of the Upaniṣads further confirmed the initial inspiration.

02. The Yayāti-episode is part of a subsection of the first book of the *MBh*, and which according to some MSS is known as the Sambhava-parvan, because it begins with a question put by Janamejaya to Vaiśampāyana about the origins (*sambhava*, 59.8) of all. The whole Yayāti episode takes eighteen of the sixtyfive chapters that go to make this section. The MSS further divide the episode into two main parts. Here is a very broad structure of this narrative :

A. *Yayāti-upākhyāna* (chs. 70-80)

A1. the shorter version (70)

A2. the longer version (71-80)

A21. Kaca and Devayānī (71-72)

A22. Yayāti and Devayānī (73-80)

B. *Uttara-yāyāta* (chs. 81-88)

03. After reading the text here are some of the questions that came to my mind. The shorter version (A1) is enough to meet the character of the *Sambhava-parvan*, as it gives us the names of the father of Yayāti, and also of his sons, and indicates that the youngest became the successor of his father and continued his family. Why was the longer version (A2) brought in? The final redactor tries to justify this by making Janamejaya ask Vaiśampāyana a question about the marriage of Yayāti with the daughter of a Brahmin. The longer version that follows contains two parts of which the second (A22) appears to me sufficient, as I shall indicate a little later (para. 17), to answer Janamejaya's question. So I wonder why the narrator brought in the episode of Kaca and Devayānī (A21). About the second part (*Uttara-yāyāta*),

---

(Calcutta, Gurumandal Series, XIII, 1954), 24-34 (this Purāṇa has both the versions, and the text agrees with that of the *MBh*); *Liṅga* (id., XVI, 1960), 66-67; *Brahma* (id., XI, 1954), 12 and 146.

this is what Van Buitenen has to say: "It has nothing to do, however remotely, with *The Origins*, of which the story forms part."<sup>6</sup> We do come across references to Yayāti's fall from heaven later in the Epic (3.22.23, 80.67, 87.8, 205.17; 5.118.16-119.4). It is here that *Uttara-yāyāta* would fit in more logically. Hence one is naturally curious to know why the final redactor preserved this text in the *Sambhava-parvan*. The fact that it finds its place in the critical edition in the present location shows that it is found here in the most ancient MSS.

### 1. Yayāti-upākhyāna: A Story Retold

10. Yayāti was a great king, devout in his religious duties, and he ruled his people with righteousness. He had five sons, two from Devayānī, and three from Śarmiṣṭhā. While engaged in solemn sacrifices, he was cursed by Uśanas, and as a consequence became old. His desire for pleasure, however, was unabated. So he requested his eldest son to exchange with him his youth, so that he could continue a life of pleasure in the company of young women. The young man refused, and so did the other sons, except the youngest. Even after a thousand years of pleasure, Yayāti was not satisfied. Realizing the futility of it all, he returned the youth of his youngest son, and as a reward for his devotion made him king in his place.

11. After this shorter version is narrated, Janamejaya is eager to know how Yayāti managed to secure as his wife the daughter of Śukra, as she was most difficult to obtain (*parama-durlabhā*, 71.1). I fail to see how this question could arise. The shorter version does not mention the parents of Devayānī and Śarmiṣṭhā, even though Uśanas is spoken of. Also this is the first time that these two women are referred to in the Epic. We do come across references to Uśanas (who is also known as Śukra) earlier in the *Ādiparvan*

6. J.A.B. Van Buitenen, *The Mahābhārata*, 3 vols. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1973-78), vol. 1, p.5.

(59.35; 60.40). We are also told that he had a daughter, Jyeṣṭhā, who was married to Varuṇa. She had a son, Bala, and a daughter Surā (60.51). ( It is intriguing that Uśanas had a grand-daughter called Surā, because in the longer version of our story, we will see how he condemns Brahmins who drink *surā*.) Hence the longer version is not merely an expanded version of the original story. It is a fresh creation, and the sage who did this had his reasons, as we hope to show a little later. Let us now pass on to the longer version.

12. The Devas and the Asuras were fighting against each other. They employed Bṛhaspati and Śukra Uśanas respectively as their priests. The Asuras could revive all their companions who were killed in the battle, as Śukra possessed the life-bestowing knowledge. The Devas request Kaca, the eldest son of Bṛhaspati, to become a disciple of Śukra and acquire for them that knowledge. Śukra accepts Kaca as his disciple, and the young man succeeded in winning over not only his teacher, but also his daughter, Devayānī. The Asuras are not at all happy about this and so they kill Kaca. At the request of Devayānī, Śukra brings Kaca back to life. The Asuras kill him a second time, mix his ashes with wine and give it to Śukra to drink. This time Śukra can bring him back to life only at a great cost to himself: Kaca comes out of Śukra by bursting his stomach. As Śukra had already imparted the life-bestowing knowledge to Kaca, the young man now revives his own teacher. As he gets ready to return to the Devas, Devayānī urges him to accept her as his wife. Kaca firmly refuses to do so, telling her that as they both come from the same father, they are brother and sister. Devayānī is so annoyed with this refusal that she curses Kaca: he himself will not be able to use the knowledge he has acquired. Kaca too curses her: she will never marry a Brahmin. It is also strange that Devayānī, who is so confident of her father's love and care for her, does not tell Śukra about Kaca's refusal to marry her.

13. On receiving Kaca back in their midst, the Devas set out for war, with Indra as their leader. Indra sees Devayānī and Śarmiṣṭhā having bath, and he creates a wind and gets their clothes mixed up. Devayānī who unknowingly puts on the clothes of Śarmiṣṭhā, the daughter of the Asura chief, Vṛṣaparvan, is insulted by her, and even pushed into a dry well. Yayāti happens to come that way, and he pulls Devayānī out of the well. She tells her father that she will no longer live in the kingdom of the Asuras. Naturally Śukra, who is so devoted to his daughter, will follow her wherever she goes. Vṛṣaparvan becomes panicky at the thought of losing this great teacher and, so to placate him, he agrees to give Devayānī whatever she demands. The young girl asks that Śarmiṣṭhā be her life-long servant. Vṛṣaparvan agrees to this.

14. On another occasion, when these two girls are playing in the forest, Yayāti comes there. He is taken up by the beauty of Devayānī, and inquires about her family. Devayānī recognizes him, and requests him to marry her. Śukra willingly agrees to this, provided Yayāti promises never to take Śarmiṣṭhā to bed. In due time Devayānī has two sons. Śarmiṣṭhā too comes of age, and one day meeting Yayāti in an isolated place, tells him that in being Devayānī's maid, she was also his wife, and so he should beget a son in her. Yayāti agrees, not once, but thrice. One day Devayānī meets the three sons of Śarmiṣṭhā, and finding them so similar to Yayāti, inquires about their father. On coming to know the truth, she goes to her father and tells him about Yayāti's infidelity. Śukra curses Yayāti, who at once becomes old.

15. The remaining portion of this longer version is only a more dramatized form of the shorter version. If we compare these two versions we find two significant differences. In the first version there is no mention of Kaca at all. His story begins with the anxiety of the Devas to secure a victory over the Asuras. Their delegate succeeds in acquiring the life-bestowing knowledge. With this the Devas

begin their march against the Asuras, with Indra as their leader. Indra seems to be more keen on seeing the plight of women whose clothes get mixed up rather than conquering the Asuras (73.1-4). With this the Kaca-episode, which is otherwise a powerful story, comes to an unglorious end. Thus in terms of narration-sequence, the story of Kaca does not fit in with the rest of the story. One wonders why Indra waited for Kaca's return with the life-bestowing knowledge. He appears to be an expert in the art of blowing away the clothes of pretty women, as he did when he sent Menakā to seduce Viśvāmitra (66.1-6). It is also good to note the explanation offered by the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* for the mixing up of the clothes: while Devayānī and Śarmiṣṭhā were bathing in a river, Śiva came that way. The girls felt very embarrassed and hurriedly came out and put on whatever clothes they could lay their hands on (9.18.9-10).

16. The explanation offered by Van Buitenen that Indra is trying to alienate Śukra from Vṛṣaparvan does not suffice,<sup>7</sup> because if that were the real intention of Indra, he would have tried that stunt even before sending Kaca as disciple to Śukra, and only after its failure try another alternative, i.e., getting the life-bestowing knowledge through Kaca. Also were Kaca to accept Devayānī as his wife, then he could have easily alienated Śukra from the Asuras, because Śukra was so fond of his daughter that he would cross over to the other side were she to make that request. It was precisely because he loved her so much that he brought Kaca back to life, the second time at a great cost to himself. This was because she openly professed her love for Kaca, even saying that without him she would not be able to live (71.29. 37-38). We must also keep in mind that by the time Kaca finished his discipleship Śukra came to love him deeply, and so when the Asuras killed him the second time, Śukra saw that as an attack on his person, and he was convinced

7. *Op. Cit.*, p. 452.

that they hated him (71.39). In the present situation Indra's action seems useless, because now that the Devas have the life-bestowing knowledge they are in no way less than the Asuras. Thus Indra's action is a miserable anti-climax for the Kaca- episode. It only serves to link the Kaca-Devayānī episode with the Yayāti-Devayānī story.

17. Dange suggests that the Kaca-episode serves "to explain away the 'why' of the '*Pratiloma*' marriage between Yayāti and Devayānī."<sup>8</sup> The text does not give us any indication that Devayānī was anxious about her marriage. Secondly, when Yayāti meets them the second time, Devayānī naturally draws his attention, because Śarmiṣṭhā appears to be a small girl who would attain her youth and her first period much latter (77.6). Devayānī too is eager to marry Yayāti, and she reminds him that he has already accepted her hand (76.16, 20). There is also an indication that Śukra holds Yayāti in great esteem, and he makes this clear to Devayānī (73.36). This may well be a subtle suggestion to his daughter that the man who held her hand to pull her out of the well is the man who ought to hold her hand in marriage. Hence when Yayāti actually asks for her hand, Śukra is only too happy, and willingly frees Yayāti from any misfortune that may result from such a marriage that involves the union of a king and a Brahmin (76.27-32). Even if an explanation were needed for the *pratiloma* marriage, we can find a clue in the fact that due to her misbehaviour Śarmiṣṭhā was doomed to belong to the family of Devayānī: the best way of getting her into a royal family would be to ensure Devayānī's marriage to a king. This is exactly what happens, and eventually it is her son who succeeds Yayāti on the throne. Also we must bear in mind that the present Epic is the result of the editorial work of the Bhṛgu Brahmins, who appropriated an earlier text,

8. S.A. Dange, *Legends in the Mahābhārata*, (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1969), p. 157.

*Bhārata*, and made it a "vehicle of popular instruction."<sup>9</sup> It is also suggested that "although the connection of this episode [of Yayāti] with the main epic story is of a very slender character, it possesses considerable Bhargava interest, which is probably the reason why it has been excerpted here from some Puranic source."<sup>10</sup> This may also be one reason for the *pratiloma* marriage: the presence of a Bhṛgu Brahmin is important not only for Vṛṣaparvan, the king of the Asuras, but also for Yayāti, and his successors, who will gratefully remember that it was due to the daughter of a Bhṛgu Brahmin that their parents came together.

18. The second difference that we notice between the shorter and the longer version is that while in the former the old age of Yayāti is ascribed to a curse of Uśanas while the king was engaged in solemn sacrifices (70.38), in the longer version Yayāti incurs the wrath of his father-in-law for having taken Śarmiṣṭhā to bed (78.36). In order to host a sacrifice, the person had to be initiated, and abide by certain rules. This included the observance of perfect chastity.<sup>11</sup> From what we know of Yayāti's character as he appears in our story, it would have been very difficult for him to fulfil this demand. Its violation must have angered his priest, who cursed him with loss of energy, as a fitting punishment for a man who could not control his passion even for a short while to fulfil his religious duty.

19. These differences between the two versions of the story of Yayāti confirm what I said earlier (para. 11). The second version is a re-creation of an ancient tale recorded in the first version. In this process of retelling the story of Yayāti, the narrator has brought in

---

9. V. S. Sukthankar, "Epic Studies, VI: The Bhṛgus and the Bharata: A Text-Historical Study", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, XVIII, p. 75.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

11. P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* (Pune, B.O.R. I, 1930-60, rev. ed. vol. I, 1960; vol. II 1974), vol. II, p. 1139.

another story, the Kaca-Devayānī episode, which appears to be an independent episode. Hence if we try to understand these two episodes first, it will then be easier to understand the message the final redactor had in mind in bringing these two together.

## 2. Kaca: A Faithful Disciple

20. I could not find any reference to Kaca in the pre-Epic texts. Even in the *MBh* he is not mentioned anywhere else outside the chapters we are discussing in this study.<sup>12</sup> As we have noted earlier,<sup>13</sup> the story of Yayāti is found in seven Purāṇas, but only in one do we find the Kaca-Devayānī episode, that too in the *Matsya-purāṇa* (24), a text that depends heavily on the *MBh* for this unit. In the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* we have just one sentence telling us how Deva-yānī and Kaca cursed each other (9.18.22). Hence I am inclined to think that the story of Kaca and Devayānī does not belong to the Purāṇic tradition. From where then did the Epic editor get it?

21. According to Dange the Kaca-episode is an initiation legend,<sup>14</sup> and it "represents principally the rite of 'Upanayana' in the nature of it."<sup>15</sup> According to him the "main motif" of this story is "the swallowing and the disgorging of the initiate by the preceptor, with the gain of new life on the part of the initiate."<sup>16</sup> Accordingly he tries to trace the origins of the story in earlier Vedic texts where Soma or something else is swallowed and then disgorged.<sup>17</sup> He also thinks that there is an element of deceit in the behaviour of Kaca, and so tries to find earlier stories where a similar phenomenon is

12. I have come to this conclusion on the basis of the information supplied by S. Sorensen: *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata* (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1963), p. 365.

13. See note 5.

14. *Op. cit.*, p. 237.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 200.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 155.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 171-84.



noted.<sup>18</sup> Dange also notes that in the earlier literature we do have the idea of the teacher becoming pregnant with the disciple. He suggests that this presupposes a temporary death, which in its turn suggests freedom from the previous life and the acquiring of life immortal after conquering death.<sup>19</sup> This presence of the idea of temporary death makes him conclude that the Kaca-episode is an example of "the fine blending of the sacrificial rite of consecration described in the Brāhmaṇas and the initiation rites of the Savages."<sup>20</sup>

22. While many of the features of the Kaca-episode as pointed out by Dange are correct, I am not able to agree with his basic presuppositions. It is true that Kaca was swallowed up by Śukra, even though unknowingly, but he was not really disgorged. He came out by bursting open the stomach of his teacher. Also he was killed twice, and only in the second instance was he swallowed up by the teacher. Further, to take the act of swallowing and disgorging as the main elements would be to ignore many others which, as I shall show, appear to me of greater significance. Secondly Dange maintains that there is an element of deceit in the behaviour of Kaca because he "does not disclose the purpose of his stay in Śukra's hermitage," and because he "softly steals the mind of Devayānī and acquires the lore of immortality."<sup>21</sup> Even Van Buitenen is of the opinion that because he succeeds in winning over the love of Devayānī, Kaca "tricks the teacher of the Asuras."<sup>22</sup> This would have been true if Kaca had not given a true picture of his identity. Śukra knows that he is the son of the priest of the Devas, and he was not that naive not to guess the true reason of his wanting to be his disciple. The great teacher after having known Kaca for a thousand

---

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 163-71.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 190-97.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 155.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 235.

22. *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

years declares him to be sinless.<sup>23</sup> As for the evidence for the presence of elements from the culture of what he calls the savage tribes, it is strange that all the tribes that Dange mentions are not found in India.<sup>24</sup> He himself is quite aware of this, and so he says that the Kaca-story "most probably, is influenced by the rites of the aboriginal tribes of India, who might have had initiation rites quite similar to those of the savage tribes of other lands."<sup>25</sup> This way of arguing seems strange to me. Instead of suggesting what might have been, Dange would have sounded more convincing had he given data from the many tribes found in our land.

23. We have already noted that the Kaca-Devayānī episode does not appear to be of Purāṇic origin. We have also seen that Dange's effort to find its origin primarily in the sacrificial texts does not appear quite convincing. Hence the question: From where did the Epic editor get the material for this story? Speaking of the *Uttara-yāyāta*, Van Buitenen states that it is "a narrative dramatization of beliefs which also found expression in the Upaniṣads. From this point of view, the text appears to be of a *genre* with such texts as the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*."<sup>26</sup> It is my opinion that not only the *Uttara-yāyāta* but also the story of Kaca is inspired by the story of Naciketas as found in the *Kaṭha-upaniṣad*. Even Dange maintains that the story of Naciketas is "very much similar in spirit with our legend."<sup>27</sup>

24. A careful reading of the two stories reveals the following similarities between the two :

23. The critical edition reads "*śiṣyam nāgasam...* (71.39), but indicates some MSS that read "*śiṣyam anāgasam*".

24. *Op. cit.*, pp. 201-11, and 217.

25. *Op. cit.*, p. 211.

26. "Some Notes on the *Uttara-yāyāta*", *Adyar Library Bulletin*, XXXI-XXXII, p. 631.

27. *Op. cit.*, p. 200.

**Naciketas****Kaca**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| a. He is the son of Uśan Vājaśra-vas (1.1). <sup>28</sup>  | He becomes the son of Śukra Uśanas (71.48).   |
| b. He receives instruction from Yama/Death (1.4ss).  | He is instructed after facing death (71.26, 33).  |
| c. Being a Brahmin, his coming is like that of fire. It is dangerous to ill-treat him (1.7-8).             | In killing him, the Asuras are guilty of murdering a Brahmin ( <i>brahma-hatyā</i> ), which will burn them (71.39). |
| d. Being a Brahmin, he is welcomed with honour (1.9).  | Being Bṛhaspati's son, he is welcomed with honour (71.19).  |
| e. He receives from Yama three boons :   | He receives from Śukra three favours :  |
| 1. His father's anger comes down, and he again becomes loving (1.10).                                      | 1. His father is honoured by his being accepted as a disciple by Śukra (71.19).                                     |
| 2. He is instructed about the fire that leads men to immortality ( <i>amṛtatva</i> , 1.13).                | 2. After the Asuras kill him the first time, Śukra brings him back to life (71.26).                                 |
| 3. He is taught the meaning of death and the way to go beyond it (6.18).                                   | 3. He is given the knowledge that can bring the dead back to life (71.46).  |
| f. He is tempted by being offered pleasures that are hard to attain ( <i>durlabha</i> ), and beautiful wo- | He is tempted by Devayānī. It is supremely difficult for mortal men to win her as their bride                       |

28. The text reads: *uśan ha vai vājaśravasaḥ...* V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar (*Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*, Poona, Vaidika Samsodhana Mandala, 1958, p.11) think that *uśan* is the name of Naciketa's father. R.E. Hume (*The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads*, Madras, Oxford University Press, 1965, p. 341) and S. Radhakrishnan (*The Principal Upaniṣads*, London, George Alen & Unwin, 1968, p. 595) understand that word as a participle. The latter author, however, indicates the possibility of taking it as a noun.

- men who are not obtainable (*lambhanīya*) by mortal men (1.23). (*parama-durlabhā*, 71.1).
- g. The teaching given to him can not be understood by children (*bāla*, 2.6). The Asuras who oppose him are childish (*bāliśa*, 71.57)
- h. Only a good teacher can give this knowledge (2.7). Those disowning the good teacher are doomed (71.51).
- i. He is so much loved (*preṣṭha*, 2.9) by Yama, that he wants to have many more disciples like him. Śukra loves him so much that his murder is seen by him as an attack on his own person by the Asuras (71.39).
- j. He receives from Yama the knowledge that takes man beyond death (*amṛtyu-vidyā*, 6.18). He receives from Śukra the knowledge that revives even the dead (*sañjīvani-vidyā*, 71.46).
- k. Even the Devas did not have this knowledge (1.22). He secures for the Devas this knowledge (73.1).
- l. Yama is the only teacher who has this knowledge (1.22). Śukra is the only teacher who has this knowledge (71.9).
- m. To receive this knowledge men must observe celibacy (*brahmācārya*, 2.15). He is prepared to practise *brahmācārya* even for a thousand years (71.58).
- n. To attain this knowledge one must have a moral character and emotional balance (2.24). To attain this knowledge one must have a moral character and emotional balance (71.14).
- o. After his long instruction, Yama says to him: "Arise!" (*uttiṣṭha...* 3,14). Praising him, Devayānī says that he was always attentive ("*sadā utthitaḥ*", 71.38)

- p. He has with great success taken the more difficult path (*durgapathas*, 3.14). He was led to his teacher (*upanīta*) through the path (*pathin*) of death (71.41).
- q. By this knowledge he attains Brahman (*brahmaprāpta*, 6.18). By this knowledge he attains Brahman (*brahmabhūta*, 71.57).
- r. The Brahman he comes to at the end of his spiritual journey is pure (*Śukra*, 5.8, 6.1). He begins his spiritual journey by coming to the great Śukra Uśanas who is a Brahman.<sup>29</sup>

25. From this analysis it becomes clear that in composing the story of Kaca, our sage had in mind the story of Naciketas. The story of Naciketas is not merely the dramatization of an initiation rite or of the *upanayana-saṁskāra*, but the story of a disciple who in search of wisdom is tempted in different ways, but who by his discerning judgement and fidelity continues his search. I am inclined to think that the sage who created the story of Kaca has given us a dramatized version of the Naciketas-episode. In this new version, we have not merely the teacher and the disciple on the stage, but also the temptations come there in flesh and blood. What could have been the inspiration behind this dramatization?

26. Oldenberg has suggested that the story of the temptations of Buddha is inspired by the story of Naciketas as found in the *Kāthā-upaniṣad*.<sup>30</sup> According to him, Yama the God of Death now becomes Māra in the story of Buddha. The temptations too now take on flesh and blood in the form of his three daughters, who now try their best to distract Buddha from his meditation. It is my suggestion that the Asuras who try to prevent Kaca from getting the life-bestowing knowledge and Devayānī who pleads for his love are

29. Our story uses both the words, *brāhmaṇa* and *brahma*, to indicate the first *varṇa* (e.g. 71.39, 76.18).

30. H. Oldenberg, *Buddha: His Life, His Doctrine, His Order* (London, William and Norgate, 1882) pp. 54-59.

both further dramatization of the temptations of Buddha. The second source for the Epic sage was the ancient belief, already found in the *Atharva-veda* that the teacher carries the disciple in his stomach (*udare*, 11.5.3) for three nights. Kaca too finds his place in his teacher's stomach (*udare*, 71.41). I am also inclined to believe that the dialogue between Yama and Yamī, as found in the *Rg-veda*, is also one of the sources for the dialogue between Kaca and Devayānī. Yamī tries to convince Yama that already from their birth they are husband and wife, for they were united in the same womb (*garbha*). Yama tells her that she is his sister (*svasr*), and so what she is suggesting is wrong (*anṛta*), and it would be a sin (*pāpa*) on his part to marry her (X.10.4, 5, 12). When Devayānī urges Kaca to marry her, he reminds her that they come from the same stomach (*kuṣi*), and so she is his sister (*bhaginī*), and so it would not be right (*aniyojya*) on his part to marry her (72.12-14).

27. One question still remains: Why is it that the hero of this beautiful story is known as Kaca? Dange points to the practice of cutting the hair of the person to be initiated, and concludes: "In this way 'Kaca' (meaning hair) minutely hints at the 'Tonsured' pupil (initiate)."<sup>31</sup> I find this too far-fetched an explanation. I am inclined to think that the name Kaca is related to Kaccana, who "is identified with one of the greatest of the disciples" of Gautama Buddha.<sup>32</sup> He was one of the elders who expounded the teaching of the Buddha after his death.<sup>33</sup> To be counted among the elders (*thera*), the disciple was expected to have four qualities: 1. virtue, 2. memory and intelligence, 3. practice of ecstasy, 4. an emancipated mind and heart, free from all desire.<sup>34</sup> In the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa* we are told

31. *Op. cit.*, p. 216.

32. E.J. Thomas, *The Life of the Buddha* (London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1927), p. 43, ft. nt. 1.

33. *Ibid.* p. 250.

34. J. Hastings (ed.), *The Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 12 vols. (Edinburg, T. & T. Clark, 1908-26), vol. V, pp. 252-53.

that in one of his *avatāras*, Viṣṇu comes as the Buddha, precisely to confound the enemies of the Devas (1.3.24). The Asuras are the enemies of the Devas, and by instructing Kaca in the art of bringing the dead back to life, Śukra in a way deprived them of the advantage they had over the Devas. In this way he confounded them. We can say that Kaca had all the qualities the one aspiring to be a *thera* in the Buddhist Order was expected to have. In this way he was also worthy to be a disciple of Śukra, and he turned out to be his greatest disciple. We must also keep in mind that Naciketās, to whom Kaca is so similar, was the son of Gautama (*Kaṭha-upaniṣad*, 1.10-11).

28. From all what has been said so far, it seems clear that the story of Kaca is originally an independent narration, more in the line of the Upanishadic thought than that of Puranic narration. It is the story depicting not merely the initiation of a young man to sacred discipleship, but also of how this young man continues his search of wisdom, undaunted by the attack on his life from his enemies, undisturbed by the seductive charm of a young woman. It is thus the story of fidelity. Only this fidelity can make that young man worthy of true wisdom, the wisdom that really gives life, life eternal. The true disciple is the real son of his teacher. According to the Hindu tradition, the husband is reborn when he begets a son, and so the woman who enables him to do so is called *jāyā*.<sup>35</sup> Man is really born through wisdom, and so through his initiation, which is but the beginning of his quest of wisdom, he becomes a *dvija* (twice-born).<sup>36</sup> If this is his real birth, a birth which animals cannot have, then the person who is instrumental in this birth is truly his human father. Nay, true human paternity consists in imparting to

---

35. This word is explained as derived from the root *jan* (*jāyate*): to be born. V.S. Apte: *The Student's Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1970), p. 220.

36. See my article, "Sāvitrī and Satyavat: A Contemporary Reading", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, LXIX, pp. 7-8.

others that wisdom which alone can make man human. To impart true wisdom a teacher must die, for only this way it will not be he but divine wisdom instructing his disciple. But he need not regret his death, because it is in dying that he will live. His willingness to die is the proof that he really believes that there is such a thing as life eternal, and that through right discipleship one can come to that knowledge which alone can bring him to that life. His death will be the birth of his disciple, who will then continue his line, not biologically but spiritually, and that is truly human continuity. The death of Śukra is the birth of Kaca, but not merely that. It is the birth also of Śukra (71.48). To be born again, the disciple also needs to die. It is only in death that Kaca is really initiated (*upanīta*, 71.41).

### 3. Yayāti: An Unfaithful Husband

30. From what we know of Yayāti from the MBh and also from the earlier texts, it becomes clear that he was one of the great ancestors of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas. Already in the *R̥g-veda* we are told that he was famous for hosting great sacrifices (1.31.17; 10.63.1). In one hymn Agni and Indra are invited to the sacrifice in the company of Yadu, Turvas, Druhyu, Anu and Pūru (1.108.8). These five are the sons of Yayāti. So also in the *Maitri-ūpaniṣad* Yayāti is counted among the great rulers of this land (*cakravartin*, 1.4). Thus Yayāti and his five sons are famous in the historical memory of the sages responsible for the Epic. This can be seen in what may well be the earliest Puranic text about this great king:

यदुं च तुर्क्सुं चैव देवयानी व्यजायत ।

द्रुह्युं चानुं च पूरुं च शर्मिष्ठा वार्षपर्वणी ॥ (90.9).

This verse, which is introduced as a genealogical table (*anuvamśa*, 90.8), is part of a prose text which gives us a list of ancestors. Three things are stated in this short text: 1. We have the



names of two women, the two wives (*bhāryā*, 90.8) of Yayāti, even though his name is not mentioned. 2. We are given the name of the father of only one of these two women, i.e., of Śarmiṣṭhā. 3. We have the names of the five sons of Yayāti. In the *Bhūmi-khaṇḍa* of the *Padma-purāṇa* the names of the five sons of Yayāti are given at the very beginning of his story (64.11-12), while the names of the two wives come much later, that too when Yayāti thinks of marrying another woman (79.1). Thus at one stage of the development of this story, the two wives of Yayāti were not important characters of the story.

31. Our story gives us a very good picture of Yayāti. He is committed to *dharma*, and generous in hosting sacrifices (70.29-30). Elsewhere in the *MBh* also Yayāti appears as a great man and as a mighty king. He built temples and erected many sacrificial posts, and so due to his good deeds he was honoured by the Devas (1.169). He is also taken as an exemplar of royal virtues: Āstika is like him in strength (*prabhava*, 50.13); Satyavān is kind-hearted (*udāra*, 3.278.18) like him; and no king has been as generous in hosting sacrifices as Yayāti was (3.133.16). After having studied the story of Yayāti as found in the *MBh*, this is what Hildebeitel has to say: "The Yayāti legend thus provides the clearest, and probably the oldest, narrative on the composition of a full assemblage of royal virtues.... His legend has given him wide recognition as an exemplar of royal qualities."<sup>37</sup>

32. Even though Yayāti is so highly spoken of by the sages of the great Epic, still we do come across some texts that give us another picture of the same person. We are told that he fell down from heaven (3.80.67, 87.8, 205.17). We are informed that his merit was exhausted (*kṣīṇa-puṇya*, 3.22.23), or that in his foolishness (*mūḍha-vijñāna*, 5.118.16) he despised those who had

---

37. A. Hildebeitel, *The Ritual of Battle: Krishna in the Mahabharata* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1976), p. 209.

come to heaven before him, and so he was thrown out of heaven (5.119.1-4). I am inclined to think that the editor of the Epic has to face two hard historical traditions: one praising Yayāti, and the other speaking of some tragic fall in his life. Had it not been for the existence of these two traditions, the editor could have easily given us a picture of an ideal king, who was also the ideal ancestor of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas.

33. Our story gives us some indication as to what this tragic fall might have been. We are told that even when he was trying to help that poor Devayānī out of the well, into which she has been pushed by Śarmiṣṭhā, he notices her physical charm (73.16-18). Thus the king had a weakness for women. It is this that comes out forcefully even in the shorter version of his story. Even after many years of power and pleasure, even after having fathered five sons on two wives, he is not yet satisfied. He wants his sons to take over his old age so that he could continue a life of pleasure in the company of young women (70.35).<sup>38</sup> This sort of life of pleasure is bound to exhaust a person, and so it is not surprising that the king feels that he is exhausted even before his desire has been satisfied (70.37-39).

34. We have already taken note of what Sukthankar has to say about the Epic being appropriated by the Bhṛguṣ. A careful study of the story of Yayāti in both its versions shows that this process of Bhṛguization went through several stages. In the first stage, Uśanas, who is not only the son of Bhṛgu (60.40), but also the greatest in that family (*bhṛgu-śreṣṭha*, 75.1), comes as Yayāti's priest. Yayāti is hosting many sacrifices, and this meant that when he was initiated for this, he had to observe chastity. Given his weakness, he must have violated this norm. His teacher curses him, and as a consequence he becomes old (70.38). That this is already an indication of the process of Bhṛguization having set in becomes

---

38. It is significant that here we have the plural (*yuvābhiḥ*), and this means that besides his two wives, there were other women in his life.

clear from the fact that earlier the old age of Yayāti had been viewed as the natural outcome of his loose life (70.30). The *Bhūmi-khaṇḍa* of the *Padma-purāṇa* gives us another supernatural explanation of the old age of Yayāti—if that were needed at all: Indra is frightened by the penance of Yayāti, and so by a trick he gets Jarā (old age personified) and Madana (the god of desire) to take possession of him. It is in this state that he falls in love with another young woman, who agrees to marry him provided he succeeds in freeing himself from his old age. In this version too his youngest son comes to his rescue. Naturally the first two wives, Devayānī and Śarmiṣṭhā are not going to keep quiet about this new affair. Yayāti is so furious by their behaviour that he even orders his eldest son to kill them. He, of course, refuses to carry out his father's cruel command (chs. 75-80). Thus the presence of Uśanas is not needed to explain the old age of Yayāti. The curse given by Uśanas indicates not only the presence of the Bhṛḡu Brahmin, but also the first elements of moralization of the episode.

35. At this first stage of Bhṛḡuization, Uśanas is not yet the father-in-law of Yayāti, but only his priest. I think we can say this because even though the first version mentions the names of the two wives of Yayāti, and also of his priest, it does not tell us that this priest was the father of Devayānī. Also we have noted earlier that it is only later in this episode that we are first given to understand that Devayānī is Śukra's daughter. Earlier we were informed that Śukra's daughter was known as Jyeṣṭhā and she was married to Varuṇa (61.51). Also we noted that the text which appears to be the oldest Puranic account of Yayāti mentions the name of the father of Śarmiṣṭhā only (90.9).

36. In the second state of Bhṛḡuization, Śukra becomes the father-in-law of Yayāti. He is also the powerful teacher without whom the Asura king would be completely helpless (75.7). Devayānī not only becomes his daughter, but she also succeeds in

becoming the principal wife of Yayāti. The *Matsya-purāṇa* has this to say:

शर्मिष्ठा तस्य भार्याभूद् दुहिता वृषपर्वणः ।

भार्गवस्यात्मजा तद्वद् देवयानी च सुव्रता ॥ (24. 52).

We notice that in this text Śarmiṣṭhā is mentioned first. She might well have been the principal wife earlier, and that may well explain how her son succeeds her husband. Now the roles are reversed. When Devayānī finds out the truth of the sons of Śarmiṣṭhā, her grouse is not that her husband has been unfaithful to her, but that he has loved Śarmiṣṭhā more and has given her more sons than he has given to her (78.28). Her accusation against Yayāti would have had a different tone and content were she his only wife. The narrator now brings in the episode of the clothes of these two women getting mixed up to show how the daughter of a Brahmin comes to be the principal wife of a king. This mixing up of clothes does not call for any supernatural explanation, and we have seen earlier that even if some explanation were needed, it could have been supplied without bringing in the story of Kaca. At this stage too we notice some elements of moralization added. When after being pulled out of the well, Devayānī complains to her father, Śukra gives her a lecture on the greatness of forgiving one's enemies (74.1-7), and then he himself goes and gives a scolding to the king, speaking without thinking (*a-vicārayan*, 75.1), even telling him that he was no more prepared to live in his kingdom and that Vṛṣaparvan could go and drown himself in the sea for that matter (75.2-8).

37. The story of Yayāti as we have it till now anticipates two events that are important in the story of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas. Their great-grandfather, Śāntanu, is like Yayāti in more than one respect. He too was a good king, devoted to his people and generous in hosting sacrifices. In his old age, after fathering eight sons, he too fell in love with a young woman. The girl's father agreed to his marrying her provided her son succeeds him on the

throne. Hearing this Śāntanu went home, thoroughly depressed. In his case also, it was the youngest son, Devavrata, who came to his rescue by vowing not to accept the kingdom and not to marry, thus making it possible for his father to marry again. This heroic son came to be known as Bhīṣma (94.48-88).

38. The other episode anticipated in the story of Yayāti is the conflict between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas on account of the kingdom. The war is about to start. Last-minute efforts are made to prevent it. Even Dhṛtarāṣṭra tries to bring some reason to Duryodhana. In this context he recalls the story of Yayāti. His eldest son lost the kingdom because he was awfully proud (*darpa-pūrṇa*, *bala-darpa-vimohita*, *bala-darpita*, 5.147.7, 8, 11), and consequently very foolish (*su-manda-dhi*, 7). To succeed the father on his throne it is not enough to be the eldest son. One must prove himself to be worthy of it by humility and obedience. In like manner he, Duryodhana is not worthy to inherit the kingdom, and it lawfully (*nyāya-gata*, 31) belongs to Yudhiṣṭhira.<sup>39</sup>

Thus the episode of Yayāti anticipates the central conflict of the Epic story. If the eldest son of Yayāti is proud and foolish, then the youngest son is a great soul (*mahātmā*, 70.42). In like manner if Duryodhana is intoxicated with pride (*darpa-matta*, 2.60.1), and foolish (*manda*, 5.148.1), then Yudhiṣṭhira is a great soul (*mahātmā*, 5.147.31).

39. Besides the narrative significance, the story of Yayāti has a didactic function too. Yayāti is a man who is the victim of his lust. He is always in search of new game (*mṛga-lipsu*, 73.14; 76.3, 4), always thirsting for more pleasure (*pipāsita*, 73.14). His passion is so great that even after thousand years of life with Devayānī he falls for the charm of Śarmiṣṭhā (77.6). He knows well that he has been cursed by his father-in-law precisely on account of his infidelity, but that does not prevent him from searching for more

39. See verses 32-43 for what Dhṛtarāṣṭra told Duryodhana.

pleasure.<sup>40</sup> When he has enjoyed himself another thousand years with the youth of his son he is still unsatisfied (70.44). If the longer version states that he was satisfied, it is not the satisfaction of real contentment, but that of helplessness, because he is tired ("*trptaḥ khinnaśca*" 80.7). Thus the story of Yayāti is to tell us that the craving for pleasure is such that it cannot be overcome by giving in to it. This message of the story is made very explicit in a verse that we find in a related variant in the *Ādiparvan* (var. 693), but also in seven other Purāṇas in the context of the story of Yayāti.<sup>41</sup> It reads thus:

न जातु कामः कामानामुपभोगेन शाम्यति ।  
हविषा कृष्णवर्त्मैव भूय एवाभिवर्धते ॥

A fire only becomes bigger if we pour some clarified butter on it. So too passion becomes stronger if we give in to it. This wisdom is already given to us by the *Maitrī-upaniṣad* which, after giving us a list of some great kings, Yayāti being one of them, tells us that it is no use indulging our passions (*kāma-upabhoga*) because this body is ephemeral (*nis-sāra*, 1.3), and there is at the most a repetition of the same experience (*āvartana*, 1.4), in which man is trapped like a frog in a waterless well. Yayāti succeeds in pulling Devayānī out of the well, but he himself gets stuck in it.

#### 4. Devayānī: The Way to God

40. In the final stage of Bhṛguization of the story of Yayāti we note one significant change: Śukra becomes the only father-in-law of Yayāti, because he allows him to marry Devayānī on the condition that Śarmiṣṭhā will remain forever only a maid, and never become a co-wife of Devayānī. Even at this stage the story of Kaca

40. After being cursed he requests his sons to take upon them his sin together with the consequent old age. Eight times he uses this expression "*pāpmānam jarayā saha*", (79.3, 4, 8, 9, 16, 20, 25, 26).

41. *Liṅga*, 67.16b-17a; *Bhāgavata*, 9.19.14; *Brahmāṇḍa*, 2.3.68.97; *Brahma*, 12.40; *Matsya*, 34.10; *Viṣṇu*, 4.10.23; *Vāyu*, 93.95.

and the subsequent *Uttara-yāyāta* need not be brought in. But the fact is that in the text as we have it in the critical edition they are placed side by side, and some effort is made to relate them to each other. It has been suggested that the present text is one of the many stories in the *MBh* in which "curses form a prominent motif."<sup>42</sup> We have also noted that Dange thinks that the story of Kaca is meant to explain how a king gets married to a Brahmin maiden. Both these explanations ignore the fact that the stories of Kaca and Yayāti have a third part: the *Uttara-yāyāta*.

41. In my opinion, the present Yayāti story in the *Ādiparvan* is made up of three parts that have originally been independent units. As we have already noted above ( paras. 15-17 ), the story of Kaca is very loosely related to the story of Yayāti even in the present set-up: neither in terms of narration-sequence nor in plot-significance does it really form a unity with the Yayāti-episode. The *Uttara-yāyāta* too does not form an organic unity with what has gone before because "the theme is completely new and not prepared in anyway by the story of Yayāti."<sup>43</sup> Further as we have noted earlier (03), the contents of the *Uttara-yāyāta* do not really belong to the *Sambhava-parvan*, and also that there are enough occasions later on in the *MBh* where they could be placed more meaningfully. Hence I suggest that in interpreting the story of Yayāti as we have it in the *Ādiparvan* we must try to understand not only why these three parts have been somehow brought together, but also why this unit is placed in the *Ādiparvan*.

42. There is another factor that seems to be significant. On a careful reading of the text we notice that there are quite a few dissimilarities between Kaca and Yayāti. I could find the following:

---

42. N.B. Patil, *The Folklore in the Mahābhārata* (Delhi, Ajanta Pbs. 1983), p. 158.

43. Van Buitenen, "Some Notes on the *Uttara-yāyāta*", p. 618.

## Kaca

## Yayāti

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| a. | He is not afraid of death. Even after being killed once by the Asuras, he is not afraid to go to the forest all alone (71.32).                  | He is much afraid of old age. When Śukra curses him he pleads that old age should not get hold of him, as he is still hungering for more pleasure (78.34).                         |
| b. | He is prepared to observe celibacy for a thousand years in order to attain his goal (71.18).  | Even after a thousand years with Devayānī he falls for Śarmiṣṭhā (77.6). Then he has some years with Śarmiṣṭhā , and another thousand with some other women (70.44).               |
| c. | He is a desirable youngman ( <i>yauvanaga</i> , 71.22).   | Much against his will, old age overtakes him ( <i>jarā-abhibhūta</i> , 70.34 ).  |
| d. | Devayānī meets him in a secret place ( <i>rahas</i> , 71.24), and fails to seduce him.  | Śarmiṣṭhā meets him in a secret place ( <i>rahas</i> , 77.9), and succeeds in seducing him, not once, but thrice.  |
| e. | Devayānī tries to convince him that as he knows what is right ( <i>dharma-jñā</i> , 72.11), he also knows that what she is asking him is right. | Śarmiṣṭhā pleads with him to free her from what is wrong ( <i>a-dharma</i> ), and to give her a son, and thus enable her to practise that which is right ( <i>dharma</i> , 77.21). |
| f. | He tells her that what she is asking is not proper ( <i>a-niyojya</i> , 72.12), and so rejects her.   | He tells her that what she is suggesting is false ( <i>mithyā</i> , 77.18), but eventually gives in to her wishes.   |



- |   |   |
|---|---|
| g. He spends a thousand years with her (71.58), without feeling the power of her sexual charm, that too after she tried so much (71.24.). | He notices Devayānī's sexual charm already when he meets her for the first time, that to in that miserable condition in which she found herself in the well (73.17-18). |
| h. He is eventually blessed by Śukra ( 71.57 ).   | He is eventually cursed by Śukra (78.5).  |
| i. Welcomed by the gods, he becomes a sharer ( <i>bhāgabhāj</i> , in their life (72.21-23).   | He is thrown out of heaven by Indra, deprived of life in the world of the gods ( <i>suraloka-vihūna</i> , 83.5 ).   |
| j. Finally he attains Brahman ( <i>brahma-bhūta</i> , 71.57).   | Finally he falls a prey to the law of time ( <i>kāla-dharma</i> 70.40).   |

From this analysis it seems quite certain that the sage who is responsible for the text as we have it today wanted to bring out a contrast between Kaca and Yayāti. It was for this that he somehow managed to relate the two episodes: Devayānī married a king because she was cursed by Kaca. Why are these two different characters brought together ? It is my suggestion that Kaca and Yayāti represent two types of persons: those who follow *devayāna* (the way to the gods), and the others who follow *pitṛyāna* (the way to the fathers).

43. The doctrine of the two ways is already found in the ancient Upaniṣads. We have it in an instruction given to Śvetaketu and his father, an instruction which is reported in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-* (=B, 6.2.1-16), the *Chāndogya-* (=C, 5.3-10), and the *Kauṣītaki-upaniṣad* (=K, 1-4). The *Muṇḍaka-upaniṣad* tells us that the wise man (*dhīra*) goes beyond this world of birth and death (*śukra*) to the supreme Brahman ( *parama-brahma* ), while the man of

desire (*kāma*) is reborn (3.2.1-2). This path leading to the highest reality is called *devayāna* (3.1.6). Here we notice an opposition between *śukra* and *devayāna*. Later on, in a younger Upaniṣad, the *Kaṭha*, we have the story of Naciketas, to whom we have referred earlier. There is a striking similarity between the Śvetaketu and the Naciketas-episode. For the former I shall refer to the B-version, unless otherwise indicated.

## Śvetaketu

## Naciketas

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| a. His father is known as Gautama and Uddālaka Āruṇi (6.2.4; C, 6.8.1).    | His father is known as Gautama and Āruṇi Auddālaki (1.10-11).                                   |
| b. He is taught by a man from the land of Pāñcalas (6.2.1).                | He is taught by him who is the Lord of death ( <i>pañcatā</i> ). <sup>44</sup>                  |
| c. According to k, he is taught by Citra Gāṅgyāyani (1.1).                 | Citrugupta is one of the many attendants of Yama. <sup>45</sup>                                 |
| d. He is questioned about the dead (" <i>prajāḥ prayatyah</i> ", 6.2.2.).  | He questions Yama about the fate of a man who has passed away (" <i>prete manuṣye</i> ", 1.20). |
| e. He accepts his ignorance ( <i>Ibid.</i> )                               | The fact that he questions Yama means that he admits his ignorance.                             |
| f. His father is also ignorant of this matter (6.2.4).                     | The behaviour of his father indicates that he too is ignorant. <sup>46</sup>                    |
| g. He (and his father) is well received and offered a boon ( <i>vara</i> , | He is welcomed by Yama and offered three boons ( <i>vara</i> , 1.9).                            |

44. This is one among the many names of death indicated by *Amarakośa* (2.8.16).

45. Apte, *Op. cit.*, p. 208.

46. Radhakrishnan says that he is a "protagonist of external ceremonialism." *Op. cit.*, p. 595.

*Ibid.*).

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| h. | He is asked to choose wealth (C, 5.3.6).                                      | Yama offers him wealth and women (1.23).  |
| i. | He rejects this offer ( <i>ibid.</i> ).                                       | He rejects all this which will pass away (1.26-28).   |
| j. | The boon chosen by him is a divine boon ( <i>daiva</i> , 6.2.6).              | His third boon was not given even to the Devas (1.21).  |
| k. | No Brahmin has known this before (6.2.7).                                     | This is the greatest secret ( <i>parama-guhya</i> ) in an assembly of Brahmins (3.17).                                      |
| l. | The instruction begins with an explanation about fire (6.2.9).                | The instruction begins with an explanation about the fire later on known as Naciketas Fire (1.13).                          |
| m. | This instruction leads to the world of Brahman ( <i>brahmaloka</i> , 6.2.15). | This instruction leads to the world of Brahman ( <i>brahmaloka</i> , 3.16).   |
| n. | To get there one must cross the River Vijara (K, 1.3).                        | There one is not afraid of old age ( Jarā, 1.12).   |
| o. | Those who do not reach there are reborn ( <i>punarāvṛtti</i> , 6.2.15 ).      | Those who do not reach there come back to this world of birth and death ( <i>samsāra</i> , 3.7 ).                           |
| p. | Thus there are two ways: <i>devayāna</i> and <i>pitryāṇa</i> (6.2.2.)         | Some choose that which is better ( <i>śreyas</i> ), while that which is pleasant ( <i>preyas</i> ) appeals to others (2.1). |
| q. | To travel by the first path one must lead a moral life (C,5.10.8-9).          | Only he who has an upright character will benefit from this instruction (2.24).   |

From this analysis it becomes clear that the Naciketas-story, on which the story of Kaca is based, is itself a further dramatization of the Śvetaketu-episode. While the latter speaks of the two paths as *devayāna* and *pitryāna*, the former will talk about the better and the more pleasant. The message is the same. The Kāṭha-upaniṣad tells us that the better is chosen by the man of courage (*dhīra*) who has knowledge (*vidyā*) and wisdom (*viveka*), and who is free from desire (*kāma*). On the other hand, the foolish man (*manda*), due to his ignorance (*avidyā*), chooses that which is pleasant, and he is constantly running hither and thither in search of pleasure (2.1-6). To choose the better one must be prepared to practise tapas and observe celibacy *brahmacarya* (2.15). The *Kauṣītaki-upaniṣad* also indicates the need of study (*sva-adhyāya*, 1.1).

44. This doctrine of the two ways is found in the *MBh* also. Instructing his brother on the futility of earthly pleasure, Yudhiṣṭhira says that even the greatest king has only one stomach. Yet man always wants more, and his desire can never be fulfilled. In this context he speaks of the two ways: *devayāna* and *pitryāna*. The latter is chosen by those who are interested in sacrifices (*ijāna*), while those desiring liberation (*mokṣin*) choose the former, which calls for *svādhyāya*, *tapas*, and *brahmacarya* (12.17.14-15). Elsewhere we are told that the one who follows *devayāna* is in search of Viṣṇu, while the one who takes to *pitryāna* has a *tamas*-dominated (*tāmasika*) character.<sup>47</sup> The former goes to heaven, while the latter sinks to the lower world (12.315.30).

45. If the story of Kaca is related to Śvetaketu, and if the instruction given to the latter was about *devayāna*, then it will not be too much to suggest that Devayānī is to be understood not merely as a woman in flesh and blood, trying to seduce Kaca, and feeling awfully humiliated by her co-wife. She is all that, but she is

---

47. The person with such a character has an intellect darkened by ignorance and passion.

also a symbol, and as such she reminds the reader of the path that leads to God (*devayāna*). This explains better why she is considered to be of the same class as the immortals (*amaravarṇinī*, 74.16 ), and therefore supremely difficult to attain ( *parama-durlabhā*, 71.1). It is also for this reason that when the Devas depute Kaca to secure for them the life-bestowing knowledge, they advise him to win over the heart of Devayānī by self-control, good character, sweetness, competence, and proper behaviour, because by her being pleased (*tuṣṭā* 71.14) they will surely get what they need. It is significant that the Devas do not say that they will get what they need when Śukra is pleased. She herself claims that Kaca ought not abandon her for the sake of the first three *puruṣa-arthas* (*dharma-kāma-artha*, 72.16 ), and thus suggesting that she is the way to *mokṣa*, which is really the one goal that gives meaning to all other achievements.

46. Seen this way, Devayānī reminds us of that beautiful young woman we meet for the first time already in the *Ṛg-veda*. The eternal wisdom-giving Vāc says that she reveals her person (*tanu*) to the person she chooses, just as a well-dressed wife reveals her beauty to her husband (10.71.4).<sup>48</sup> The man chosen by her becomes a Brahmin Sage full of wisdom (*su-medhas*, 10. 125.5 ). This idea, that the man who aspires to attain *mokṣa* must be chosen by God, is also found in the *Kaṭha-upaniṣad*. Yama tells Nacike-tas that the Ātman reveals his body (*tanu*) to the person chosen by Him (2.23). In a certain sense, in as much as Devayānī is the daughter of Śukra (*śukra-tanayā*, 71.1), she is his embodiment (*tanu*), and it is through her that he reveals the life-bestowing wisdom to Kaca. The fact that she meets Kaca in the secret (*rahas*, 71.24) is evocative of intimacy between two lovers, between a

---

48. In some instances in the *Ṛg-veda* the word *tanu* is used reflexively. A.A. Macdonell, *A Vedic Grammar for Students* (Bombay, Oxford University Press, rep. 1966 ), p. 112.

husband and wife. In the instruction of Yama the word *śukra* also means the pure and immortal Brahman (61. 17). In this way the daughter of Śukra is symbolic of the grace of God, for the idea of being chosen is fundamentally the experience of grace, of being received favourably (*anu-graha*). Thus the wisdom needed to attain liberation and the way to attain it, both are the gifts of God. Devayānī and the *saṃjīvanī-vidyā*, both are from Śukra.

47. If Devayānī represents the way leading to God, then Kaca is the pilgrim who faithfully follows this way. We have already noted earlier that he has all the qualities needed to be a good disciple. He himself considers Devayānī to be more worthy of respect (*pūjanīya-tara*, 76.2) than her father. If the word *śukra* means the pure and eternal Brahman, it also means semen. As such it indicates this world. We have noted that the wise man who follows *devayāna* abandons *śukra* (*Muṇḍaka-upaniṣad*, 3.1.6, 2.1-2). Thus when Kaca tells Devayānī that for him she means more, there is a suggestion that he has opted for *devayāna* and not *pitṛyāna*. Also when he is actually accepted as disciple by Śukra this is how his life there is described by Vaiśampāyana:

And, accepting the term of the vow as it has been stipulated, he began to propitiate his preceptor and Devayānī, O Bhārata. And, paying constant court, the young man, who was at the height of his youth, sang and danced and made music before Devayānī to her great satisfaction. He made a habit of Devayānī, who herself was a virgin in the bloom of her youth, and delighted her with flowers and fruit and little errands, O Bhārata (71.21-24).<sup>49</sup>

It is clear that his service and devotion appear to be more directed towards Devayānī than towards her father (71.20-24). We are also informed that Kaca and Devayānī meet in a secret place. This too is significant. Yama tells Naçiketasa that God is to be found in a secret

49. Trans. Van Buitenen, *Op. cit.*, p. 176.

place ( *guhā*, 2.12). This idea is also found in the *Śvetāśvatara* (2.10), and the *Muṇḍaka* (2.1.10, 2.1; 3.1.7). Kṛṣṇa tells Arjuna that one must perform *yoga* in a secret place (*rahas*, 6.10). This is also what is suggested by the story of Kaca: he meets Devayānī in the secret (*rahas*, 71.24). Having been chosen by her he realizes his goal ( *saṃsiddha-rūpa*, 71.46 ), and eventually attains Brahman (*brahma-bhūta*, 71.57).<sup>50</sup>

48. Just as Kaca is symbolic of the faithful disciple, who embraces the way of life leading to God, so too Yayāti represents the man who finds more pleasure in this world and would like to have as much of it as possible. Devayānī does not complain that Yayāti has been unfaithful to her, but that in giving her rival three sons he has expressed more love for her. In this way she has been surpassed (*ati-vṛttā*, 78.27) by Śarmiṣṭhā. Thus Yayāti is not concerned with *mokṣa*, because he loves this life.<sup>51</sup> When he is overcome by old age, he requests his sons to take over this burden so that he could still divert himself ("*vihartumicchāmi*", 70.35). This plea indicates the basic attitude of a person who does not follow *devayāna*. Instead of directing all his efforts to that one goal of life, which gives meaning to all else, Yayāti wants to divert himself, go off the right path. He even uses the little spiritual energy (*tapo-vīrya*, 70.40) he has to secure for himself the youth he craves for. However much we love life here, we cannot escape the fact that all of us are inevitably heading for death. Old age is the anticipation of death. Hence when Yayāti becomes old he feels it as a great tragedy, and pleads with his sons that they have pity on him, and

50. According to some Purāṇas, Yati, the elder brother of Yayāti, renounced the world in his youth in search of liberation (*mokṣa-arthin*) and eventually attained Brahman (*brahma-bhūta*). see *Matsya*, 24.51; *Liṅga*, 66.63; *Brahmāṇḍa*, 2.3.68.14; *Brahma*, 12.3. I am not in a position to say anything about the possible relation between the story of Kaca and that of Yati.

51. J.M. Peterfalvi & M. Biardeau, *Le Mahabharata*, 2 vols. ( Paris, Flammarion, 1985-86 ), vol. II, p. 379.

give him their youth. In the shorter version the words *jarā* and *yauvana* come six and five times respectively (70.29-46). Yayāti feels overpowered by old age (*jarā-abhibhūta*, 70.34), as it destroys his youthful form (*rūpa-nāśinī*, 70.33). He is also conscious that though old age is natural to man, yet in his case it is also the result of his sin. In the longer version eight times we hear him linking his sin to his old age ("*pāpmānam jarayā saha*", 79.3, 4, 8, 9, 16, 20, 25, 26). Already in his refusal of all the wonderful things offered him by Yama, the wise Naciketas tells him that all these things exhaust (*jarayanti*, 1.26) the vitality of the senses, and the man who gets exhausted is essentially mortal (*ḥīryan-marṭyaḥ*, 1.28).

49. According to the Upaniṣads, the person who follows *devayāna* attains liberation. The others, that is those who take *pitṛyāna*, are reborn in this world. We have also noted that the three texts, describing the instruction given to Śvetaketu, contain an account of what happens to the person who does not follow *devayāna*. It has been suggested that the *Uttara-yāyāta*, which "assuredly is the oldest narrative account of the actual circumstances of transmigration", is "clearly linked with the Upaniṣadic accounts of the theory of transmigration."<sup>52</sup> This helps us to understand why the final editor of the *MBh* incorporated this text in the *Ādiparvan* in the context of the story of Yayāti. Kaca, following *devayāna*, attained Brahman. Yayāti, following *pitṛyāna*, was reborn, when the merit that he had acquired was exhausted (*kṣīṇa-puṇya*, 3.22.23).<sup>53</sup> By placing the whole story of Yayāti in the

52. Van Buitenen, *Op. cit.*, vol. 1, p.5. This scholar also suggests *Chāndogya*, 5.2-8, as the text to which the *Uttara-yāyāta* is "closely related." *Art. cit.*, p. 622.

53. The person who is reborn begins a journey again. This idea of travelling again and again seems to be suggested by the word *yayāti*, if it is seen as a distorted frequentative of the root *yā*. The correct form would have been *yāyāti*. See F. Kielhorn, *A Grammar of the Sanskrit Language* (Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1970), p. 202. The journey that leads again and again to *saṁsāra* is not an authentic journey, but its



*Ādiparvan*, the final editor so to says gives us a norm to understand the conflict that forms the central story of the *MBh*: it is precisely the result of giving *pitṛyāna* more importance than *devayāna*. It is thus an affirmation of the primacy of *devayāna*.

### 5. Śarmiṣṭhā: The Contemporary Crisis

50. Just as Devayānī is symbolic of *devayāna*, so too it seems to me that Śarmiṣṭhā is symbolic of those who ignore this noble path and lead a life that only serves to increase their misery. Śarmiṣṭhā is spoken of as being demonic (*āsuri*, 73.8). She is sinful in her determination (*pāpa-niścayā*) and much given to anger (*krodhavaḡa-parāyaṇā*, 73.13). In one case where we have the word *dharmajña* (78.29), we have some MSS that read *dharmiṣṭha*. I am inclined to understand the word *śarmiṣṭhā* in a similar way, that is, as a person who is given to *śarman*, just as the *dharmiṣṭha* is committed to *dharmā*. Now when Devayānī is trying to seduce Kaca, she tells him that without him she will not have *śarman* (71.45). Thus *śarman* is the pleasure/happiness that man and woman can give to one another. It is precisely this pleasure/happiness that Yayāti is so desperately seeking.

51. The *Chāndogya-upaniṣad* warns the person who would travel by *devayāna* that he ought to be on his guard, because

The plunderer of gold, the liquor-drinker,  
The invader of a teacher's bed, the Brahman-killer----  
These four sink downward in the scale,  
And, fifth, he who consorts with them (5.10.9).<sup>54</sup>

---

distortion. The life of Yayāti is not a *ūrtha-yātrā*, a holy journey in search of the supremely Holy, but a *mṛga-tṛṣṇā*, a mirage, because he himself is *mṛga-lipsu* (73.14; 76.4). He is like a thirsty traveller in the desert, running hither and thither in search of water (*jala-arthi*, 76.4), but all the while only chasing a mirage.

54. Trans. Hume, *Op. cit.*, p. 234.

Here we already have what Manu later will call *mahā-pātaka*, the great sins (11.54). He indicates how the five sins mentioned above mean more than just what the words signify. Thus false witness, incest and untruth would be equivalent to consuming alcohol, violating the teacher's bed and killing a Brahmin respectively (11.55-58). The *Nirukta* indicates the seven limits (*maryādā*), which are enumerated thus: "They are theft, adultery, killing of a learned man, abortion, drinking, habitual wickedness, and false accusation of a heinous crime." (6.27).<sup>55</sup> In this list one significant new item is abortion (*bhrūṇa-hatyā*). When Devayānī complains to her father about Yayāti's love-affair with Śarmiṣṭhā, she accuses him of having crossed (*ati-krānta*, 78.29) the *maryādā*. I am of the opinion that in the Yayāti-story we do have these great sins either actually committed, or somehow referred to.

52. When Śukra comes to know that the Asuras have killed Kaca again, he accuses them of killing a Brahmin (*brahma-hatyā*, 71.39), and tells them that murder will burn even Indra. As the Asuras had mixed the ashes of Kaca with liquor and given that to Śukra to drink, he pronounces a curse against all Brahmins, who henceforth would drink alcohol, declaring them guilty of murdering a Brahmin (*brahma-han*, 71.54). When Devayānī tries to seduce Kaca (72.8), he tells her that to him she was as worthy of respect as her father was, and that they are henceforth brother and sister (72.14). Therefore, were he to marry her he would not only be guilty of incest, which according to Manu was equivalent to violating the teacher's bed (*guru-talpa-gamana*), but also of actually committing that crime. To excuse himself for having had sex with Śarmiṣṭhā, Yayāti tells Śukra that she not only solicited him in a secret place, but she did that when she was in her season (*ṛtu-kāla*), and that according to the elders, not to give in to a woman in such a

---

55. Trans. L. Sarup, *The Nighantu and the Nirukta*, (Delhi, Motilal Banarasiidass, 1967). p. 108.

situation, would make him guilty of abortion (*bhrūṇa-han*, 78.32-33). Śukra is not at all convinced of this. He accuses Yayāti of theft (*caurya*), because there cannot be false behaviour (*mithyā-ācāra*) when *dharma* is at stake (78.35). Thus it becomes clear that the final editor of our story has skillfully brought in the doctrine of the great crimes. In this he is only faithful to the Upanishadic sources that inspired this story.

53. Explaining the genesis of his great novel, this is what Khandekar has to say

Sarmishtha [*sic*], Devayani and Kacha [*sic*] engaged my mind for a long time for different reasons, but in 1925 when I set out to write Yayati, it was not because of them. The final inspiration came from the character sketch of Yayati himself. I do not know if I would have written this novel, if in the decade 1942-52, I had not been witness to the strange happenings in the world and in our country--the strange spectacle of physical advancement and moral degeneration going hand in hand.<sup>56</sup>

Thus in writing that novel, the author is giving an expression to a deep concern. The present writer too shares in this concern and he believes that the doctrine of the great crimes, when reinterpreted, helps us to understand what is happening in our times.

54. The killing of a Brahmin (*brahma-hatyā*) is usually placed first in the list of the *mahā-pātakas*. The word *brahman*, derived from the root *brh*,<sup>57</sup> originally simply means the great one. In course of time different things have come to be considered great, and so today the word has many meanings: the supreme Being, the sacred texts, final beatitude, religious penance, celibacy, the priestly class, etc.<sup>58</sup> Putting some of these meanings together, we can come

56. Op. cit., p. 7.

57. Suryakanta, *A Practical Vedic Dictionary* (Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 493.

58. Apte, *Op. cit.*, p. 394.

to some kind of comprehensive definition of *brahman*: the final beatitude man attains by seeking the supreme Being through the observance of religious life under the guidance of sacred tradition, and by being faithful to his social responsibilities. The contemporary phenomenon, which disturbs Khandekar and other committed thinkers, is just the opposite of this. In that sense, the basic malaise of our society is precisely *brahma-hatyā*.

55. Like Yayāti, man today is not eager for final beatitude, but only for the fun and pleasure (*kāma*) he can get here and now, that too for himself. Not only that, like Yayāti who cursed his sons for not giving him their youth, he too exploits other human beings for his pleasure. Like that king, contemporary man "does know the difference between happiness and enjoyment," and so "Pleasure, momentary animal pleasure is mistaken for eternal happiness."<sup>59</sup> For such a person "Blind pursuit of pleasure is tending to be his religion."<sup>60</sup>

56. It is not for nothing that Śukra pronounces a severe judgement against those Brahmins who take to alcohol. He sees it as a deception (*vañcanā*) leading to a very severe loss of discernment (*ati-ghora-samjñā-nāśa*, 71.52). In the traditional society, the Brahmins were expected to be the teachers of right living. If they themselves become clouded, then it will be the case of one blind man leading another. Both will fall in the ditch.

57. In explaining the meaning of *guru-talpa-gamana*, Manu includes incest and other unbecoming sexual relations in this category. This too is so prominent a feature of our times: sexual promiscuity is taken as a sign of broadmindedness ! When sex becomes more important, then the dignity of the human person is forgotten. The human person becomes merely a tool. In trying to get Yayāti to sleep with her, Śarmiṣṭhā tells him that she is in her

59. Khandekar, *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

period. Thus she sees herself primarily as a production agent, granting that in this case the product is a child.

58. When Yayāti tries to defend himself for having had sex with Śarmiṣṭhā, he has recourse to the then accepted idea of *dharma*: when a woman is in her season, or when she herself requests, a man must oblige her, for otherwise in either case he would be guilty of *bhrūṇa-hatyā*. Śukra is not taken in by this sort of explanation. He accuses the king of theft, because he is only resorting to duplicity (*mithyā-ācāra*) in matters pertaining to *dharma*. This is exactly what modern man tries to do: he rationalizes his crime. Khandekar is acutely conscious of "the tendency to justify certain trends from half-baked authority from some science, or the degeneration of the human mind."<sup>61</sup> To me this is the greatest tragedy of contemporary life. There has always been sin in the world, and it will continue to be. But to rationalize it is perhaps the peculiarity of modern life. This is the contemporary form of *caurya*. Even though Yayāti knew what was expected of him (*dharma-jñā*), he transgressed the limits (*maryādā*) of propriety, and as a result experienced decay (*jarā*). So too modern man pretends to know what is right and wrong only to justify his transgression, and it is this that explains the crisis of our times.

## 6. Śukra: The Need of the Hour

60. This picture of our society naturally leads to a question: How do we get out of the mess we have created for ourselves? The *MBh* itself gives us an answer. After describing the way of life followed by the ignorant, the Epic gives us the following instruction:

There is an eightfold path of the Law (*dharma*) taught, the path of oblation, Vedic study, gifts, austerity, truthfulness, forbearance, self-control, and greedlessness. Of these the

---

61. *Ibid.*

first four travel the road of the Ancestor's Journey (*pitṛyāna*); one should perform a task not out of selfishness, but because it is to be done. The second four are the Divine Journey (*devayāna*), which is always travelled by the strict. And it is by way of this eightfold path that a man of pure soul should journey: by consistently correct intention, by correct subdual of the senses, by correct and precise vows, by correct service to the elder, by correct apportionment of food, by correct learning and transmission, by correct renunciation of rites, by correct suspension of thoughts: thus they perform their acts who wish to defeat transmigration (3.2.71-75).<sup>62</sup>

This lengthy quotation helps us to find an answer. To have a healthy individual in a healthy society, we need to follow a way of life which integrates the *pitṛyāna* and *devayāna*. These two paths taken together constitute *dharma*.

61. This holistic approach to life is symbolized by Śukra. The word *śukra* means not only semen but also, as we have seen, the pure immortal Brahman. The former ensures the continuity of human life here on earth, the latter is the goal to be attained if that life is to have any worth. Śukra is thus the symbol not only of *pitṛyāna*, but also of *devayāna*. These two paths are not opposed to each other, but serve to complement each other. In this complementarity there is a certain subsidiarity also. When his most beloved Devayānī has been humiliated by the daughter of the king of the same Asuras, who had earlier killed his most worthy disciple, Śukra decides to abandon them. For him the path to God and the person determined to follow that path are more important than the patronage of a powerful king. It is only when Śarmiṣṭhā agrees to be for ever subordinate to Devayānī that Śukra agrees to continue as the priest of the Asuras. Devayānī too suggests a synthesis. She

62. Van Buitenen, *Op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 226.

tells her father that without him and Kaca life will have no meaning for her. Śukra, the father, symbolizes the past, the source of wisdom. This wisdom can be handed down from generation to generation and enlarged precisely because of human continuity. On the other hand if wisdom is to be perpetuated, then it needs worthy recipients.<sup>63</sup> This is the reason why, even when Śukra knows that Kaca is the son of his rival, he accepts him as his disciple, for that is the only way he can hand over to posterity the wisdom he has. Moreover, for a truly wise man there is no friend and foe. What really matters for him is to find a person who will realize the value of wisdom and preserve it for posterity.



---

63. See my article cited above, pp. 17-18.

PURĀNIC SOURCES OF ŚRĪ RĀMĀNUJA WITH REFERENCE  
TO HIS VEDĀRTHA SAṄGRAHA

By

DR. N. GANGADHARAN

[ रामानुजकृते वेदार्थसंग्रहे तट्टीकायां तात्पर्यदीपिकायां च यानि पुराणवचनानि उद्धृतानि तान्याश्रित्य लेखकेन वचनानामेषामुपयोगिता प्रदर्शिता । अनयोर्ग्रन्थयोः प्रायेण शतं पुराणवचनानि उद्धृतानि, यानि अविद्या-विद्या-भगवज्-जीव-ज्ञान-कर्म-परमपदादिविषयकाणि । वचनैरेभिः पदार्थस्वरूपं विशदीकृतं ग्रन्थकारेण तट्टीकाकृता चेति दर्शितम् । श्रुति-ब्रह्मसूत्रगतशब्दानां तात्पर्यमपि पुराणवचनतो ज्ञातुं शक्यत इत्यप्युक्तमत्र । ]

This paper makes a brief survey of the main topics covered by Rāmānuja in his *Vedārthasaṅgraha* and by Sudarśanasūri in his commentary *Tātparyādīpikā* and the Puranic sources for their view-points. There are about hundred quotations from the Purāṇas, mostly from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and a few from the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, *Matsyapurāṇa* and *Liṅgapurāṇa*. The vedāntic tradition required the explanation of the *Prasthānatraya*, comprising the *Brahmasūtras*, *Upaniṣads* and *Bhagavadgītā* by the different schools of Vedānta system. While Śrī Rāmānuja has written the *Śrībhāṣya* explaining the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Gītābhāṣya* on the *Bhagavadgītā*, he has not written any exposition on the *Upaniṣads*. His *Vedārthasaṅgraha* has reconciled the important *Mahāvākyas* of the *Upaniṣads*.

*First two verses of the Vedārthasaṅgraha*: They briefly refer to his view-point and those of others. While the first verse refers to the *Upeyavastu*, the means of liberation and the distinction of Brahman from *cit* and *acit* etc., the second verse makes an obeisance to his preceptor Yāmuna and summarises the views of Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa in the first half and a refutation of those views in the second half. Primarily these two verses are



invocatory words for the successful completion of the work and for the prosperity of the readers and listeners of the work.

The first verse—

अशेषचिदचिद्वस्तुशेषिणे शेषशायिने ।  
निर्मलानन्तकल्याणनिधये विष्णवे नमः ॥

is an invocation to lord Viṣṇu. The other qualifying words refer to Him as a mine of auspicious qualities devoid of blemish and as reclining on the serpent Śeṣa. These qualifying attributes expressed in the fourth case indicate the nature of the perfect object that is to be attained (*upeya*). The word *namaḥ* indicates the means for the same. The distinction of Brahman from the *cit* and *acit* is indicated by the expression 'अशेषचिदचिद्वस्तुशेषिणे' in the first line of this verse. The *sāmānādhikarāṇya* of the terms *jagat* and *Brahman* has to be understood in the *śarīra* and *śarīrin* relationship. Only if it is understood in this way, there could be reconciliation between the भेदश्रुति and घटकश्रुति texts. The word वस्तु explains the supremacy of the entity that is referred to here. The word अशेष shows the manifoldness of चेतन. The specific addition of the words चिदचित् is to reject the view of Yādavaprakāśa that all are चेतन-s, and the view of Śaṅkara that the *sāmānādhikarāṇya* relationship between the *jīva* and Brahman on one side is one of identity of *svarūpa* and that between the *acit* and Brahman on the other side as only for the purpose of *bādha* (sublation). The expression *cidacit* is also to refute the view of Bhāskara. Bhāskara holds the view that the scriptural texts referring to the *jīva* and Brahman as different denote the *aupādhikabheda*, while the texts referring to *acit* and Brahman as different denote the *svābhāvīkabheda*. Hence in his opinion there is no uniformity in the sense conveyed by the *Bhedaśrutis*.

The qualifying attributes in the expression 'निर्मलानन्तकल्याणनिधये' are explained by Sudarśanasūri citing the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* verse —

समस्तहेयरहितं विष्णवाख्यं परमं पदम् । (I. 22. 53)

in addition to the Upaniṣadic passages such as अपहतपाप्मा (*Bṛhad. Up.* 6. 2. 21). These texts employ the words expressive of the sense such as 'devoid of blemishes' etc. as qualifying attributes of Brahman. This verse has been cited by Rāmānuja himself later in order to explain that the expression ' परमं पदं ' refers to Bhagavat-svarūpa. This will be dealt with later.

In order to understand the nature of the text let us remember here the second verse that summarises the view-points of Śaṅkara, Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa in the first half, discards their views in the second half and concludes with a glorification of his preceptor Yāmunamuni.

परं ब्रह्मैवाज्ञं भ्रमपरिगतं संसरति तत्  
 परोपाध्यालीढं विवशमशुभस्यास्पदमिति ।  
 श्रुतिन्यायापेतं जगति विततं मोहनमिदं  
 तमो येनापास्तं स हि विजयते यामुनमुनिः ॥

Prima facie this verse glorifies Yāmunācārya. Here the words परं ब्रह्मैवाज्ञं...संसरति in the first line summarises the view of Śaṅkara. The expression तत् परोपाध्यालीढं विवशं states the view of Bhāskara and अशुभस्यास्पदं that of Yādavaprakāśa.

Here the word परं denotes that Being different from all others as being the abode of auspicious qualities free from any kind of blemish. The word एव suggests the *virodha*. The word 'अज्ञ' signifies its *svarūpa* as concealed by *avidyā*. Thus Śaṅkara's view has been summarised.

Then, in the expression परोपाध्यालीढं विवशं the word पर refers to the distinct nature and not having any expectancy of some *upādhi*, आलीढं denotes the relation and विवशं means कर्मपरवशम्. Thus Bhāskara's view has been summarised.

Then the expression अशुभास्पदं conveys the view-point of Yādavaprakāśa.

The third line condenses the argument of rejection of the above views pointing out that these views are devoid of logic and reasoning and their spread in the world is like darkness.

Now we may briefly mention the main topics of discussion in the *Vedārthasaṅgraha*. After the first two invocatory verses and a brief summary of his own view, Śrī Rāmānuja explains the sense conveyed by the second verse (i) summarising the views of Śrī Śaṅkara, Bhāskara, Yādavaprakāśa and refuting the view-point of Śrī Śaṅkara (pp. 14-16), (ii) pointing out that the view-point is श्रुत्यपेत ( pp. 16-81) and (iii) establishing that it is also न्यायापेत ( pp. 81-130).

Then Śrī Rāmānuja explains after elaborate discussion the sense conveyed by the first verse which establishes his own view-point ( pp. 130-354). This section points out the अविरोध of the भेदश्रुति and घटकश्रुति texts relating to सामानाधिकरण्य, the *śarīra-śarīri-bhāva* between the world and brahman even before the creation, the authority for Brahman being the expression of all the words, and the pivotal points of the *śāstras*. It also explains the texts which appear to be favourable to a *bhedābheda* view. He then describes the different *śruti* texts explaining the process of creation and deluge. One of the important topic in this section is the refutation of त्रिमूर्तिसाम्य and establishment of the परत्व of lord Viṣṇu. Among these topics I have confined with those for which Śrī Rāmānuja has drawn profusely from the Purāṇas.

*Śrī Rāmānuja's view* (p. 5) : Śrī Rāmānuja summarises his own view in the first two lines after the invocatory verses :  
 "अशेषजगद्धितानुशासनश्रुतिनिकरशिरसि समधिगतोऽयमर्थः। जीवपरयाथात्म्य-  
 ज्ञानपूर्वकवर्णाश्रमधर्मेतिकर्तव्यताक-परमपुरुषचरणयुगलध्यानार्चनप्रणामादिः अत्यर्थ-  
 प्रियः, तत्प्राप्तिफलः। Explaining further Śrī Rāmānuja cites ( pp. 9-10) the *mahāvākyas* such as "तत्त्वमसि, अयमात्मा ब्रह्म, तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन  
 ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसाऽनाशकेन, ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्, तमेतं  
 विद्वानमृत इह भवति नान्यः पन्था अयनाय विद्यते" etc. which explain the

nature of the *antaryāmin*, the mode of its *upāsana*, the resultant benefit and the aids for the removal of the fear of mundane existence in the passage beginning with the words "अस्य जीवात्मनोऽनाद्यविद्यासञ्चित-पुण्यपापरूपकर्मप्रवाहहेतुक-ब्रह्मादि-सुर-नर-तिर्यक्-स्थावरात्मक-चतुर्विधदेहप्रवेशकृत-तत्तदात्माभिमानजनितावर्जनीयभवभयविध्वंसनाय" etc. While explaining the word अविद्या in the above passage, the commentator Sudarśanasūri quotes the verse—

श्रूयतां चाविद्यायास्वरूपं कुलनन्दन ।  
अनात्मन्यात्मबुद्धिर्या अस्वे स्वमिति या मतिः ॥

from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* ( VI 7. 10) and the *prāṭika* of the second line of the verse—

कर्मवश्या गुणाञ्चैते सत्त्वाद्याः पृथिवीपते ।  
अविद्यासञ्चितं कर्म तच्चाशेषेषु जन्तुषु ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* (II. 13-70) which occurs in the context of an exposition made by a brahmin palanquin-bearer to king Bharata about the body and the soul.

*Jivātmasvarūpa* : The next passage ( p-10) explains the *Jivātmasvarūpa*. There Śrī Rāmānuja points out that the soul is devoid of the manifold distinctions—"देवमनुष्यादिप्रकृतिपरिणामविशेषरूप-नानाविभेदरहितम्"। We find the authority for this view in the verses—

तथाऽऽत्मा प्रकृतेस्सङ्गादहम्मानादिदूषितः ।  
भजते प्राकृतान् धर्मानन्यस्तेभ्यो हि सोऽव्ययः ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* VI. 7. 24

and

पुमान्न देवो न नरो न पशुर्न च पादपः ।  
शरीराकृतिभेदास्तु भूपैते कर्मयोनयः ॥

*ibid.* II. 13. 98

The soul is always distinct from the different forms such as the *deva* etc. The statement of Śrī Rāmānuja is pointed out by Sudarśanasūri as signifying the unity of purpose of these two verses from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. So also we find the verse —

निर्वाणमय एवायमात्मा ज्ञानमयोऽमलः ।  
दुःखाज्ञानमया धर्माः प्रकृतेस्ते तु नात्मनः ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* VI. 7. 22 as the source for the sense conveyed by the expression 'ज्ञानानन्दगुणम्' in the passage describing the *jīvātma-svarūpa*.

Śrī Rāmānuja himself further states – "तस्यैतस्य कर्मकृतदेवतादि-भेदेऽपध्वस्ते स्वरूपभेदो वाचामगोचरः स्वसंवेद्यः " ज्ञानस्वरूपम् " इत्येतावदेव निर्देश्यम्" (p. 11). It is to be noted that we find the verse –

ज्ञानरूपमखिलं जगदेतदबुद्ध्यः ।  
अर्थस्वरूपं पश्यन्तो भ्राम्यन्ते मोहसंप्लवे ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1. 4. 40

as the source for the expression 'ज्ञानस्वरूपम्' in the above passage.

ANTARYĀMI : The passage ' एवंविधचिदचिदात्मकप्रपञ्चस्य उद्भव-स्थितिप्रलयसंसारनिवर्तनैकहेतुभूतः समस्तहेयप्रत्यनीकतया etc. ( pp. 12-13) concludes – "तच्छक्ति-तदंश-तद्विभूति-तद्रूप-तच्छरीर-तत्तनुप्रभृतिभिःशब्दैः, तत्सामानाधिकरण्येन च प्रतिपादयन्ति"। This passage is intended to explain the nature of *Antaryāmi*. For each one of these words *tacchakti*, *tadaṁśa* etc. in the above passage we can find the source in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*:

तच्छक्ति – परस्य ब्रह्मणः शक्तिस्तथेदमखिलं जगत् ।

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* I. 22. 56b explains the world as the power of *Parabrahman*.

तदंश – ये भविष्यन्ति ये भूताः सर्वे भूतेश्वरा द्विज ।

ते सर्वे सर्वभूतस्य विष्णोरंशा द्विजोत्तम ॥

*ibid.* I. 22. 17 describes chief of each class of beings in the present, future and past as the part-manifestations of lord Viṣṇu. So also the verse 'अतीता वर्तमानाश्च' in 22. 20.

तद्विभूति – विष्णुर्मन्वादयः कालः सर्वभूतानि च द्विज ।

स्थितेर्निमित्तभूतस्य विष्णोरेता विभूतयः ॥

*ibid.* I. 22. 32 explains Viṣṇu, Manu and others, Kāla and all other beings as the *vibhūti* of lord Viṣṇu who is the efficient cause of the existence of the world.

तद्रूप – परस्य ब्रह्मणो रूपं पुरुषः प्रथमं द्विज। *ibid.* 1. 2. 15a The first form of the Supreme Brahman is the Puruṣa.

तच्छरीर – शरीरं ते जगत्सर्वम् *Rāmāyaṇa* Yuddha 120.26.

तत्तनु- यत्किञ्चित् सृज्यते येन सत्त्वजातेन वै द्विज ।

तस्य सृज्यस्य सम्भूतौ तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1. 22. 38

तद्वपुः- यानि मूर्तान्यमूर्तानि यान्यत्रान्यत्र वा क्वचित् ।

सन्ति वै वस्तु जातानि तानि सर्वाणि तद्वपुः ॥

*ibid.* 1. 22. 86. All the embodied and non-embodied things are His bodies.

In further passages Śrī Rāmānuja explains that in all the examples cited, all the words signify the relationship of the *jīva* and Paramātman as that of *śarīraśarīribhāva*.

### All the words are from the Vedas :

Commenting on the statement 'नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि' *chānd. up.* 6. 3. 2 which states that all words denote a supreme Brahman different from the *jīva* and the word, Śrī Rāmānuja observes that people employing the words consider a part of the expressed as a complete expression on account of the inseparable nature of the Supreme Soul from things perceived etc. The understanding gets completed only by listening to *vedānta*. Then he remarks that all the words of the *Veda* convey their sense extending to the Supreme Soul. In this context Śrī Rāmānuja states that all the words are from the *Veda* etc. – वैदिका एव सर्वे शब्दाः आदौ वेदादेवोद्भृत्योद्भृत्य, परेणैव ब्रह्मणा सर्व-पदार्थान् पूर्ववत् सृष्ट्वा, तेषु परमात्मपर्यन्तेषु पूर्ववत् नामतया प्रयुक्ताः. After citing the verse –

सर्वेषां तु स नामानि कर्माणि च पृथक्-पृथक् ।

वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ पृथक्संस्थाश्च निर्ममे ॥

*Manusmṛti* 1. 21 as authority, Śrī Rāmānuja draws ( p. 46 ) from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*–

नामरूपं च भूतानां कृत्यानां च प्रपञ्चनम् ।

वेदशब्देभ्य एवादौ देवादीनां चकार सः ॥ 1. 5. 63

in support of his view-point and concludes श्रुतिश्च " सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ धाता यथापूर्वमकल्पयत् " इति। सूर्यादीन् पूर्ववत् परिकल्प्य, नामानि च पूर्ववच्चकारेत्यर्थः। एवं जगद्ब्रह्मणोरनन्यत्वं प्रपञ्चितम् .

*Tirodhānānupapatti:*

In the *Tirodhānānupapattiprakaraṇa* ( p. 81ff ) Śrī Rāmānuja points out the impossibility of *Tirodhāna* thus: निर्विशेषज्ञानमात्रं ब्रह्म, तच्च आच्छादिक-अविद्यातिरोहितस्य स्वरूपं स्वगतनानात्वं पश्यति. He then observes "तिरोधानं नाम प्रकाशनिवारणम्। स्वरूपातिरेकिप्रकाशधर्मानभ्युप- गमेन, प्रकाशस्यैव स्वरूपत्वात् स्वरूपनाश एव स्यात्।" प्रकाशपर्यायं ज्ञानं नित्यम्। स च प्रकाशः अविद्यातिरोहितः" इति बालिशभाषितमिदम्." Knowledge which is a synonym of *prakāśa*, is eternal. That *prakāśa* is covered or concealed by *avidyā*. This statement is exhibiting one's ignorance. In this context he points out that it is indescribable to hold the above view - " प्रकाशः नित्यो निर्विकारस्तिष्ठति " इति चेत्, सत्यामप्यविद्यायां ब्रह्मणि न किञ्चित्तिरोहितम् इति, " नानात्वं पश्यति " इति भवतामयं व्यवहारः सत्सु अनिर्वचनीय एव.

Here Advaitin raises an objection that even the Viśiṣṭādvaitin should concede to *Tirodhāna* and hence both the views are subject to same defect. Moreover this defect has to be accounted for by the Advaitin in regard to only one *ātman* whereas the Viśiṣṭādvaitin has to account in the manifold *ātman*. Śrī Rāmānuja begins to refute this objection of the Advaitin in the passage commencing with the words - अत्रोच्यते स्वभावतः मलप्रत्यनीकानन्तज्ञानानन्दैकस्वरूपम् and concluding with the words अविच्छिन्न- संप्रदाय-ऋग्यजुस्सामाथर्वरूपानन्तशाखं वेदं च अभ्युपगच्छतामस्माकं किं न सेत्स्यति?

*The significance of the term Bhagavat:* Śrī Rāmānuja's argument against the objection of the Advaitins leads him to explain the term Bhagavān. He first cites the verses from the Gītā and the *Mahābhārata* :

यो मामजमनादिं च वेत्ति लोकमहेश्वरम् । Gītā X. 3

द्वाविमौ पुरुषौ लोके क्षरश्चाक्षर एव च ।

क्षरस्सर्वाणि भूतानि कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते ॥ *ibid.* XV. 16

उत्तमः पुरुषस्त्वन्यः परमात्मेत्युदाहृताः ।

यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः ॥ *ibid.* XV. 17

कालं स पचते तत्र न कालस्तत्र वै प्रभुः ।

एते वै निरयास्तात स्थानस्य परमात्मनः ॥

*Mbh. Śānti Mokṣa* 25. 9

अव्यक्तादिविशेषान्तं परिणामर्द्धिसंयुतम् ।

क्रीडा हरेरिदं सर्वं क्षरमित्यवधार्यताम् ॥

and

कृष्ण एव हि लोकानामुत्पत्तिरपि चाव्ययः ।

कृष्णस्य हि कृते भूतमिदं विश्वं चराचरम् ॥ *Mbh. Sabhā* 38. 23

and explains the words कृष्णस्य हि कृते as कृष्णस्य शेषभूतम् । Śrī Rāmānuja derives further support from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* in the following verses:

शुद्धे महाविभूत्याख्ये परे ब्रह्मणि शब्दते ।

मैत्रेय भगवच्छब्दस्सर्वकारणकारणे ॥ VI. 5. 72

ज्ञानशक्तिबलैश्वर्यवीर्यतेजांस्यशेषतः ।

भगवच्छब्दवाच्यानि विना हेयैर्गुणादिभिः ॥ VI. 5. 79

एवमेव महाशब्दो मैत्रेय भगवानिति ।

परब्रह्मभूतस्य वासुदेवस्य नान्यगः ॥

तत्र पूज्यपदार्थोक्तिपरिभाषासमन्वितः ।

शब्दोऽयं नोपचारेण त्वन्यत्र ह्युपचारतः ॥ VI. 5. 76-77.

एवं प्रकारममलं नित्यं व्यापकमक्षयम् ।

समस्तहेयरहितं विष्णवाख्यं परमं पदम् ॥ I. 22. 53

कलामुहूर्तादिमयश्च कालो न यद्विभूतेः परिणामहेतुः (IV. 1. 84c) and क्रीडतो बालकस्येव चेष्टां तस्य निशामय (I. 2. 18b). Then he quotes from Manu, Yājñavalkya and Āpastamba in support of his view. The views



expressed in the quotations from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* may be summed up :

The word '*bhagavat*' is employed for denoting that Supreme Brahman, termed as *śuddha* and *mahāvibhūti*. It is the cause of all causes. It is also expressive of knowledge, power, strength, overlordship, energy and lustre. It is also bereft of the three qualities and their resultant sufferings which are to be avoided. Moreover the term '*bhagavat*' is applicable only to Vāsudeva, the Supreme Brahman and not to anyone else. This term having the characteristic of indicating the reverential objects is used mainly to denote the Supreme Soul and as *gaṇa* in the case of others. Time such as *kalā*, *muhūrta* etc. do not affect its greatness. It is eternal, all-pervasive, undecaying and free from all blemishes.

### Avidyā :

Then in the section establishing the incompatibility of the view about the nature of *avidyā*, Śrī Rāmānuja puts forth the objection of the Advaitin in his own way thus : 'ननु च किमनेन आडम्बरेण? चोद्यं तु न परिहृतम् and begins the reply उच्यते; एवमभ्युपगच्छतामस्माकम्, आत्मधर्मभूतस्य चैतन्यस्य स्वाभाविकस्यापि कर्मणा पारमार्थिकं सङ्कोचं विकासं च ब्रुवतां सर्वमिदं परिहृतम्; भवतस्तु प्रकाश एव स्वरूपमिति प्रकाशो न धर्मभूतः, तस्य सङ्कोचो विकासो वा नाभ्युपगम्यते । प्रकाशप्रसरानुत्पत्तिमेव तिरोधानभूताः कर्मादयः कुर्वन्ति । अविद्या चेत् तिरोधानम्, तिरोधानभूतया तया, स्वरूपभूत-प्रकाशनाशः पूर्वमेवोक्तः । अस्माकं तु अविद्यारूपेण कर्मणा स्वरूपनित्यधर्मभूतज्ञान-प्रकाशः सङ्कुचितः ; तेन देवादिरूपात्माभिमानो भवतीति विशेषः । This view-point has its source in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*:

अविद्या कर्मसंज्ञाऽन्या तृतीया शक्तिरिष्यते ।  
यया क्षेत्रज्ञशक्तिस्सा वेष्टिता नृप सर्वगा ॥  
संसारतापानखिलान् अवाप्नोत्यतिसन्ततान् ।  
तया तिरोहितत्वाच्च शक्तिः क्षेत्रज्ञसंज्ञिता ॥  
सर्वभूतेषु भूपाल तारतम्येन वर्तते ॥ VI. 7. 60-61.

Śrī Rāmānuja quotes these verses and summarises the sense conveyed by them – क्षेत्रज्ञानां स्वधर्मभूतज्ञानस्य कर्मसंज्ञया अविद्यया सङ्कोचं, विकासं च दर्शयति। There is constriction and expansion of knowledge arising from the *dharma* of the souls due to one's own action designated as *avidyā*. Thus there is gradation in the souls. We find the authority for this in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* verses –

अप्राणिमत्सु स्वल्पा सा स्थावरेषु ततोऽधिका ।  
सरीसृपेषु तेभ्योऽपि ह्यतिशक्त्या पतत्रिषु ॥  
पतत्रिभ्यो मृगास्तेभ्यस्तच्छक्त्या पशवोऽधिकाः ।  
पशुभ्यो मनुजाश्चातिशक्त्या पुंसः प्रभाविताः ॥  
तेभ्योऽपि नागगन्धर्वयक्षाद्या देवता नृप ।

VI. 7-64-66.

### Refutation of Bhāskara's View :

Then refuting the view of Bhāskara ( p. 112 ff) on Brahman as being associated with limiting adjunct (*upādhi* ), Śrī Rāmānuja states –

द्वितीये तु पक्षे उपाधिब्रह्मव्यतिरिक्तवस्त्वन्तरानभ्युपगमात्, ब्रह्मण्येव उपाधिसंसर्गात् औपाधिकास्सर्वे दोषाः ब्रह्मण्येव भवेयुः । ततः अपहतपाप्मत्वादि निर्दोषश्रुतयस्सर्वा विहन्यन्ते । यथा घटाकाशादेः परिच्छिन्नतया महाकाशाद्वैलक्षण्यम्, परस्परभेदश्च दृश्यते; तत्रस्था दोषा वा, गुणा वा अनवच्छिन्ने महाकाशे न संबध्यन्ते; एवम् उपाधिकृतभेदव्यवस्थितजीवगताः दोषाः अनुपहिते परे ब्रह्मणि न संबध्यन्ते इति चेत्, नैतदुपपद्यते।

Then citing the analogy of the *ākāśa* contained in a jar and elsewhere, Śrī Rāmānuja remarks that in the example, namely, Brahman, there would be limiting adjunct for Brahman leading to bondage and liberation at every moment if Bhāskara's view is taken. In this context, as the further argument proceeds, Śrī Rāmānuja observes परमार्थतस्तु आकाशो न श्रोत्रेन्द्रियम् and states, "वैकारिकादहङ्कारात् एकादश इन्द्रियाणि जायन्ते" इति हि वैदिकाः । This argument of Śrī Rāmānuja derives support from the verse in *Viṣṇupurāṇa*

तैजसानि इन्द्रियाण्याहुर्देवा वैकारिका दश ॥ I. 2. 46b

एकदशं मनश्चात्र देवाः वैकारिकास्मृताः । 47a

He himself explains this verse (pp. 11 7-18). *Ahaṁkāra* is of three kinds—*Vaikārika*, *Tajjasa* and *Bhūtādi*. They are said to be *Sāttvika*, *Rājasa* and *Tāmasa* in order. He further explains:

' तामसाद्भूतादेः आकाशादीनि भूतानि जायन्ते ' इति सृष्टिक्रममुक्त्वा, ' तैजसात् राजसाहङ्कारात् एकादश इन्द्रियाणि जायन्ते ' इति परमतमुपन्यस्य, ' सात्त्विकाहङ्कारात् वैकारिकाणि इन्द्रियाणि जायन्ते ' इति स्वमतमुच्यते—देवा वैकारिकास्मृताः इति ।

Śrī Rāmānuja begins to explain in detail (pp. 130 ff) his view expressed in the first invocatory verse, and quotes authoritative texts such as — यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन् पृथिव्या अन्तरो यं पृथिवी न वेद यस्य पृथिवी शरीरं—, यः आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोऽन्तरो...., द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया..... from the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* and other texts and draws support from the *Viṣṇupurāna* —

यत्किञ्चित् सृज्यते येन सत्त्वजातेन वै द्विज ।

तस्य सृज्यस्य संभूतौ तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः ॥ (II. 22. 38)

and observes that all the objects both *cit* and *acit* are the body of *Brahman* — सर्वशरीरं ब्रह्मेति ब्रह्मणो वैभवं प्रतिपादयद्भिः सामानाधिकरण्यादिभिः मुख्यवृत्तैः सर्वचेतनाचेतनप्रकारं ब्रह्मैव अभिधीयते ।

### Īśvara as the Soul of prakṛti and puruṣa :

Śrī Rāmānuja states ( p. 147 b) that the word *prakṛti* is also expressive of Īśvara, that is the soul of *prakṛti*, as *prakṛti* is also the body of Īśvara. The word *puruṣa* is also expressive of Īśvara, the soul of *puruṣa*. So also Īśvara is the soul of its modifications. He derives support for this view from the *Viṣṇupurāna*—

व्यक्तं विष्णुस्तथाऽऽव्यक्तं पुरुषः काल एव च । 1. 2. 18 and स एव क्षोभको ब्रह्मन् क्षोभ्यश्च परमेश्वरः। 1. 2. 31. He further points out that there is modification in the *prakṛtyamśa* in the Supreme Brahman and no change in *prakāryamśa*. So also all the goals of human existence are present in the *jīvamśa* of the Supreme Brahman. The

*prakāryamśa* is the *satyasaṅkalpa*, the *niyantr*, *niravadya* and *sarvakalyāṇa* *ṅunāśraya*.

Śrī Rāmānuja states ( pp. 194 ff ) in the passage beginning with the words सोऽयं परब्रह्मभूतः पुरुषोत्तमः निरतिशयपुण्यसञ्चयक्षीण अशेषजन्मोप-चितपापराशेः and concluding with the words अनन्यप्रयोजनावर्तनिरतिशय-प्रियविशदतमप्रत्यक्षतापन्न-अनुध्यानरूपभक्त्येकलभ्यः that the Supreme lord is to be attained by means of *bhakti* only and cites the view of Yāmūnācārya: उभयपरिकर्मितस्वान्तस्य ऐकान्तिकात्यन्तिकभक्तियोगलभ्यः (ज्ञानयोगकर्मयोगसंस्कृतान्तःकरणस्य इत्यर्थः). In that context he refers to the statement from the *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* –

विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।

अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्यया अमृतमश्नुते ॥ (II)

and explains *avidyā* as विद्येतरत् वर्णाश्रमाचारादिपूर्वोक्तं कर्म उच्यते and *vidyā* as भक्तिरूपापन्नध्यानम् . He draws support from the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*–

इयाज सोऽपि सुबहून् यज्ञान् ज्ञानव्यपाश्रयः ।

ब्रह्मविद्यामधिष्ठाय तर्तुं मृत्युमविद्यया ॥ VI. 6. 12

and quotes some more authoritative statements from the Upaniṣads and concludes भक्तिरूपापन्न-अनुध्यानेनैव लभ्यते, न केवलवेदनमात्रेण; न मेधया इति केवलस्य निषिद्धत्वात् . As already explained it is to be remembered here that the word *avidyā* has been used in the sense of *karma* in the above quotation from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. We find further support to his argument in the verses –

वर्णाश्रमाचारवता पुरुषेण परः पुमान् ।

विष्णुराराध्यते पन्थाः नान्यः तत्रोपकारकः ॥ Viṣṇupurāṇa II 8. 9

and स्वकर्मनिरतस्सिद्धिं यथा विन्दति तच्छृणु ॥

यतः प्रवृत्तिर्भूतानां येन सर्वमिदं ततम् ।

स्वकर्मणा तमभ्यर्च्य सिद्धिं विन्दति मानवः ॥ *Gītā* 18. 45, 46.

Śrī Rāmānuja then very emphatically asserts ( p. 202 ) अनेन चार्वाक-शाक्य-औलूक्य-अक्षपाद-क्षपणक-कपिल-पतञ्जलिमतानुसारिणो वेदबाह्याः वेदावलम्बिकुदृष्टिभिस्सह निरस्ताः . He then quotes from the *Manusmṛti* (12. 16)–

या वेदबाह्याः स्मृतयः याश्च काश्च कुदृष्टयः ।

सर्वास्ता निष्फलाः प्रेत्य तमोनिष्ठा हि ताः स्मृताः ॥ In that context he derives much support from the *Matsyapurāṇa* relating to the divisions of *Purāṇas* based on their subject matter.

The verse from the *Matsyapurāṇa* states: सङ्कीर्णाः सात्त्विकाश्चैव राजसाः तामसास्तथा (289. 13); he explains thus: केचिद्ब्रह्मकल्पाः सङ्कीर्णाः, केचित् सत्त्वप्रायाः, केचिद् रजःप्रायाः केचित्तमःप्रायाः इति कल्पविभागमुक्त्वा, सत्त्वरजस्तमोमयानां तत्त्वानां माहात्म्यवर्णनं च, तत्कल्पप्रोक्तपुराणेषु सत्त्वादि-गुणमयेन ब्रह्मणा क्रियते, इति च उक्तम् :

यस्मिन् कल्पे तु यत्प्रोक्तं पुराणं ब्रह्मणा पुरा ।

तस्य तस्य तु माहात्म्यं तत्स्वरूपं च वर्णयते ॥ इति ॥

Then he supplements with the further explanative verses from the *Matsyapurāṇa* :

विशेषतश्च उक्तम्—

अग्नेशिशवस्य माहात्म्यं तामसेषु प्रकीर्त्यते ।

राजसेषु च माहात्म्यम् अधिकं ब्रह्मणो विदुः ॥ 53. 68

सात्त्विकेष्वथ कल्पेषु माहात्म्यमधिकं हरेः ।

तेष्वेव योगसंसिद्धाः गमिष्यन्ति परां गतिम् ॥ 53. 67

संकीर्णेषु सरस्वत्याः पितृणां च निगद्यते । 53. 69b

इत्यादि . He explains further —एतदुक्तं भवति—आदिक्षेत्रज्ञत्वात् ब्रह्मणः तस्यापि केषुचिदहस्सु सत्त्वम् उद्रिक्तम्, केषुचित् रजः, केषुचित् तमः .

He further explains that because Brahmā is also a creation of the Lord, only those *Purāṇas* which are spoken by Brahmā in the *Sāttvikakalpa* are *yathārtha* (true to the sense) and others of conflicting nature as *ayathārtha* (not true to the sense). Here Śrī Rāmānuja quotes the *Gītā* verses about knowledge as produced from *sattva*, greed (lobha) from *rajas* and error and confusion (*pramādamohau*) from *tamas*. In that context Śrī Rāmānuja derives support from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*—

कथयामि यथापूर्वं दक्षाद्यैः मुनिसत्तमैः ।

पृष्टः प्रोवाच भगवान् अब्जयोनिः पितामहः ॥ 1. 2. 8

and state सर्वान् पुराणार्थान् ब्रह्मणस्सकाशात् अधिगम्यैव, सर्वाणि पुराणानि पुराणकाराः चक्रुः .

In the section devoted to सामानाधिकरण्यस्य-भगवदनुप्रवेशकृतत्वनिरूपण, the statement सोऽन्तरादन्तरं प्राविशत् from the Atharvaśiropaniṣad is taken for discussion ( p. 241). It is here pointed out by Śrī Rāmānuja that there is no conflict with the *śruti* passages declaring Nārāyaṇa as the Supreme Being. This text is explained by Sudarśanasūri thus :

सः—रुद्रः, अन्तरादन्तरं—जीवादन्तरं, परमात्मानम्, प्राविशत्—बुद्ध्या अगाहत; अनुप्रवेशशब्दस्य सम्यग्बोधनार्थत्वं लोकोक्तिसिद्धम् । सः रुद्रः स्वान्तर्यामिणं सर्वपदार्थान्तर्यामिणं च परमात्मानं तच्छरीरकं बुद्ध्या अनुसंहितवान्—इत्यर्थः ।

Here, in this context, Śrī Rāmānuja draws support from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*—

सर्वगत्वादनन्तस्य स एवाहमवस्थितः ।

मत्तस्सर्वमहं सर्वं मयि सर्वं सनातने ॥ I. 19. 85.

He himself explains this verse—अत्र " सर्वगत्वादनन्तस्य " इति हेतुरुक्तः, स्वशरीरभूतस्य सर्वस्य चिदं चिद्वस्तुनः आत्मत्वेन, सर्वगतः परमात्मा इति, सर्वे शब्दाः सर्वशरीरं परमात्मानमेव अभिदधतीत्युक्तम् । अतः "अहम्" इति शब्दः स्वात्मप्रकारिणं परमात्मानमेव आचष्टे ॥

### The Means of attaining lord Nārāyaṇa :

After having explained the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* verses about lord Nārāyaṇa being the supreme cause Śrī Rāmānuja begins to describe ( p. 248) the means of attaining Him :

प्राच्य—उदीच्य—दाक्षिणात्य—पाश्चात्यसर्वशिष्टैः सर्वधर्म—सर्वतत्त्वव्यवस्थायाम् इदमेव पर्याप्तम्, वैष्णवं च पुराणम्—"जन्माद्यस्य यतः" इति जगज्जन्मादिकारणं ब्रह्मेत्यवगम्यते। Then when there is a query as to जन्मादिकारणं किम्, he states that it has been accepted by all that it is " ब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेषप्रतिपादनैकपरतया प्रवृत्तम् " and draws the support from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*:

विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूतं जगत्तत्रैव च स्थितम् ।

स्थितिसंयमकर्ताऽसौ जगतोऽस्य जगच्च सः ॥ I. 1. 31. In order to show that the *upasāmhāra* is done by lord Viṣṇu, he again takes the support from *Viṣṇupurāṇa* :

प्रकृतिर्या मयाऽऽख्याता व्यक्ताव्यक्तस्वरूपिणी ।

पुरुषश्चाप्युभावेतौ लीयेते परमात्मनि ॥ VI. 4. 39

परमात्मा च सर्वेषाम् आधारः परमेश्वरः ।

विष्णुनामा स वेदेषु वेदान्तेषु च गीयते ॥ VI. 4. 40

He states at the end सर्ववेदवेदान्तेषु सर्वैः शब्दैः परमकारणतया अयमेव गीयते इत्यर्थः॥ He then proceeds : यथा सर्वासु श्रुतिषु केवलपरब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेष-प्रतिपादनायैव प्रवृत्तो नारायणानुवाकः, तथा इदं वैष्णवं च पुराणम् and cites the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* :

सोऽहमिच्छामि धर्मज्ञ! श्रोतुं त्वत्तो यथा जगत् ।

बभूव भूयश्च यथा महाभाग! भविष्यति ॥ I. 1. 4.

Śrī Rāmānuja draws support from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* verse –

यन्मयं च जगद्ब्रह्मन् यतश्चैतच्चराचरम् ।

लीनमासीद्यथा यत्र लयमेष्यति यत्र च ॥ I. 1. 5 in order to

explain that there is no Supreme Being other than lord Viṣṇu. Then he repeats the verse विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूतं already cited by him.

Then the *śruti* texts classify Brahman into three groups denoted respectively by the three words *satyam*, *Jñānam* and *anantam*. An explanation of these three denotations we find in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*:

परः पराणां परमः परमात्माऽऽत्मसंस्थितः ।

रूपवर्णादिनिर्देशविशेषणविवर्जितः ॥

अपक्षयविनाशाभ्यां परिणामर्धिजन्मभिः ।

वर्जितः शक्यते वक्तुं यः सदास्तीति केवलम् ॥

सर्वत्रासौ समस्तं च वसत्यत्रेति वै यतः ।

ततस्स वासुदेवेति विद्वद्भिः परिपठ्यते ॥

तद्ब्रह्म परमं नित्यम् अजमक्षयमव्ययम् ।

एकस्वरूपं च सदा हेयाभावाच्च निर्मलम् ॥

तदेव सर्वमेवैतत् व्यक्ताव्यक्तस्वरूपवत् ।

तथा पुरुषरूपेण कालरूपेण च स्थितम् ॥ I 2. 10-14.

The first line of the verse परः पराणां...विवर्जितः, among the above verses explains His supremacy over Brahmā and other gods and thus He is beyond the limitations of time, the word *paramātmān* denotes that He is beyond the limits of regions and the word *ātmasamsthita* denotes that He rests on His own self. Then the next line रूपवर्णादि...विवर्जितः in the same verse explains Him as devoid of the attributes of *jāti, guṇa* etc.

The next verse अपक्षयविनाशाभ्यां...केवलम् explains him as free from the six transformations ( *bhāvavikāra*) such as being born, exists etc. Then if one questions how He could be known, the second line points out that He is known to be ever-present. The next verse सर्वत्रासौ...परिपठ्यते points out that only lord Vāsudeva is thus the Supreme Brahman.

The subsequent verse (तद्ब्रह्म परमं...निर्मलम्) explains that He is not subject to the six transformations (*bhāvavikāra*) and eternal. The last verse तदेव सर्वमेवैतत्...स्थितम् explains the entire world of the forms of *puruṣa* and *kāla* as Brahman only.

After having substantiated the group of statements at the beginning, Śrī Rāmānuja now substantiates the group of statements at the end from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* :

स सर्वभूतप्रकृतिं विकारान् गुणादिदोषांश्च मुने! व्यतीतः ।  
 अतीतसर्वावरणोऽखिलात्मा तेनाऽऽस्तृतं यद्भुवनान्तराले ॥  
 समस्तकल्याणगुणात्मकोऽसौ स्वशक्तिलेशोद्धृतभूतवर्गः ।  
 इच्छागृहीताभिमतो रुदेहः संसाधिताशेषजगद्धितोऽसौ ॥  
 तेजोबलैश्वर्यमहावबोधस्ववीर्यशक्त्यादिगुणैकराशिः ।  
 परः पराणां सकला न यत्र क्लेशादयस्सन्ति परावरेणो ॥  
 स ईश्वरो व्यष्टिसमष्टिरूपः व्यक्तस्वरूपः प्रकटस्वरूपः ।  
 सर्वेश्वरः सर्वदृक् सर्ववेत्ता समस्तशक्तिः परमेश्वराख्यः ॥  
 संज्ञायते येन तदस्तदोषं शुद्धं परं निर्मलमेकरूपम् ।  
 संदृश्यते वाऽप्यधिगम्यते वा तद् ज्ञानमज्ञानमतोऽन्यदुक्तम् ॥



(VI. 5-83-87) and concludes इति परब्रह्मस्वरूपविशेषनिर्णयायैव प्रवृत्तम्॥ Sudarśanasūri, the commentator on *Vedārthasaṅgraha* has elaborately explained these statements.

Then Śrī Rāmānuja observes that the statements in other *Purānas* oriented towards other gods, have to be interpreted without being opposed to the above statements. But those which are completely opposed, have to be discarded on account of their *Tāmasika* nature.

The above discussion leads to the question of the equality of the three gods Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva.

### The refutation of the equality of the three gods :

Śrī Rāmānuja cites the verse—

सृष्टिस्थित्यन्तकरणीं ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवात्मिकाम् ।

स संज्ञां याति भगवान् एक एव जनार्दनः ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1. 2. 66 and explains ( pp. 259-60) that this verse does not speak of the equality of the three gods and the expression एक एव जनार्दनः denotes that Brahmā, Śiva and the entire universe have Janārdana as the soul. The subsequent passages in the *Vedārthasaṅgraha* substantiate this view drawing support from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*.

The statement ' जगच्च सः ' इति पूर्वोक्तमेव विवृणोति relates to the verse—

विष्णोः सकाशादुद्भूतं जगत्त्रैव च स्थितम् ।

स्थितिसंयमकर्ताऽसौ जगतोऽस्य जगच्च सः ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* I. 1. 31 referred to already. He further quotes from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*—

स्रष्टा सृजति चात्मानं विष्णुः पाल्यं च पाति च ।

उपसंह्रियते चान्ते संहर्ता च स्वयंप्रभुः ॥ I. 2. 67. and explains इति स्रष्टृत्वेन अवस्थितं ब्रह्माणं, सृज्यं च, संहर्तारं, संहार्यं च, युगपन्निर्दिश्य, सर्वस्य विष्णुतादात्म्योपदेशात्; सृज्यसंहार्यभूतान् वस्तुनः, स्रष्टृसंहर्त्रोः जनार्दनविभूतित्वेन

विशेषो दृश्यते । जनार्दनविष्णुशब्दयोः पर्यायत्वेन, ' ब्रह्मविष्णुशिवात्मिकाम् ' इति विभूतिमत एव स्वेच्छया लीलार्थं विभूत्यन्तर्भाव उच्यते; यथेदमनन्तरमेवोच्यते —

पृथिव्यापस्तथा तेजः वायुराकाश एव च ।  
सर्वेन्द्रियान्तःकरणं पुरुषाख्यं हि यज्जगत् ॥  
स एव सर्वभूतात्मा विश्वरूपो यतोऽव्ययः ।  
सर्गादिकं ततोऽस्यैव भूतस्थमुपकारकम् ॥

*Viṣṇupurāṇa* I. 2. 68-69.

स एव सृज्यः स च सर्गकर्ता  
स एव पात्यति च पाल्यते च ।  
ब्रह्माद्यवस्थाभिरशेषमूर्ति-  
विष्णुर्वरिष्ठो वरदो वरेण्यः ॥ *ibid.* I. 2. 70

Then anticipating an objection as to how it could be possible to construe Brahman, having no modifications and possessing all auspicious qualities, as the soul of the imperfect universe indicated by juxtaposition, Śrī Rāmānuja cites the verse स एव सर्वभूतात्मा... (I. 2. 69), and states that Viṣṇu Himself, the Supreme Brahman, is the soul of every being. Then he cites another verse from the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*—

तस्य सृज्यस्य संभूतौ तत्सर्वं वै हरेस्तनुः (I22. 38b). Then he concludes (p. 262) एतदुक्तं भवति—अस्य अव्ययस्यापि परस्य ब्रह्मणः विष्णोः विश्व-शरीरतया तादात्म्यमविरुद्धम् इति। आत्मशरीरयोश्च स्वभावाः व्यवस्थिता एव॥

### The Paramam Padam

There is an interesting discussion around the significance of the expression '*paramam padam*'. Citing the verse—समस्तहेयरहितं विष्णवाख्यं परमं पदम् (*Viṣṇupurāṇa* I. 22. 53) equating 'Viṣṇu, with '*paramam padam*', an objection is raised that in the passage—तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् (Rv. 1. 22. 20), the words '*parama pada*' also denotes *para svarūpa*. Śrī Rāmānuja refutes this view and points out that there is another *paramam padam* and that *parasthāna* is always described by the Sūris as being perceived.

Here Śrī Ramānuja explains the three different connotations of the word—क्वचित् परस्थानं च परमपदशब्देन प्रतिपाद्यते; क्वचित् प्रकृतिवियुक्तात्मस्वरूपम्; क्वचित् भगवत्स्वरूपम् ' तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ' इति परस्थानम् ।  
सर्गस्थित्यन्तकालेषु त्रिधैवं संप्रवर्तते ।  
' गुणप्रवृत्त्या परमं पदं तस्यागुणं महत् ॥

Viṣṇupurāṇa I. 23. 41

इत्यत्र प्रकृतिवियुक्तात्मस्वरूपम्;

" समस्तहेयरहितं विष्णवाख्यं परमं पदम् " इत्यत्र भगवत्स्वरूपम् ।

त्रीण्येतानि परमप्राप्यत्वेन परमपदशब्देन प्रतिपाद्यन्ते ।

The भगवत्स्वरूपम् is परमं पदम् because it is extremely impossible to be attained. The others also are designated as possessing the characteristic of परमं पदम् because they are भगवत्प्राप्तिगर्भा.



## POLLUTION AND KARMAN IN THE PĀTITYAGRĀMANIRŪAYĀ

By

STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT

[ स्कन्दपुराणीय-सह्याद्रिखण्डस्य उत्तरार्धेन संबद्धः खलु पातित्यग्रामनिर्णयो नाम ग्रन्थः। एकादशाध्यायात्मकेऽस्मिन् ग्रन्थे पतितब्राह्मणान् अधिकृत्य अष्ट आख्यायिका उक्ताः। आसु पातित्यविषयकाणि इतिवृत्तानि दृश्यन्ते। तुलुवक्षेत्रीयेण महाराष्ट्र-ब्राह्मणेन केनचिद् ग्रन्थोऽयं व्यरचीति विज्ञायते। भारत-पश्चिमभागसंबन्धोऽयम् इति निश्चीयते। एकादश-द्वादशशताब्दीकालेऽयं रचितः। आख्यायिकाः खलु बहुकालव्यापि-घटनाश्रिताः। इमा न सर्वांशत ऐतिहासिकवृत्तान्तपरा इति ज्ञेयम्। इदमत्र सिद्धान्तितं यदेभिः पतितैरस्पृश्यैर्ब्राह्मणैः सह न भोजनादिव्यवहाराः करणीयाः। ग्रन्थान्तरेष्वपि पतितब्राह्मणचर्चा अवलोक्यते। ब्राह्मणपातित्यविषये मैरियट्-महोदयेन इन्डेन-महोदयेन विशदो विचारः कृतः ।

एतत्कथनानन्तरं पातित्यस्वरूपादिविषये उपर्युक्तब्राह्मणपातित्यविषये च लेखकेन बहु विचारितम् आधुनिकदृष्ट्या, आख्यायिकानां स्वारस्यम् तद्विज्ञापित-तथ्यानि च विवृतानि । ]

The *Pāṭityagrāmanirūaya*, or 'Disputation on Communities of Fallen Brahmans', is a *purāna* text traditionally attached to the *uttarārdha* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*. This latter in turn is attached traditionally to the *Skandapurāna*.<sup>1</sup> The text relates eight stories of fallen brahmans in eleven chapters. These provide histories leading to the fall of the brahman groups concerned.

---

1. For an edition and translation of the *Pāṭityagrāmanirūaya* see S.H. Levitt, *The Pāṭityagrāmanirūaya: A Puranic History of Degraded Brahman Villages*, available from Xerox University Microfilms, Dissertation Copies, P.O. Box 1764, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106--Order No. 74-14, 100 as listed in *Dissertation Abstracts International*, vol. 34/12 (June 1974), p. 7711A.

The text has been affirmed by recent scholars alternately to be the work of a Maharashtrian brahman and to be of Tuluva origin.<sup>2</sup> We may say safely that the text is of western Indian origin.

The date of the text remains uncertain. The content of one of the large interpolations and the history of the textual tradition of which it is a part would have us date its composition prior to the twelfth century. Paleographically, the text can be dated to a period before the modern form of *Devanāgarī* 'bh' which made its appearance in the eleventh to twelfth centuries took on its more modern *Devanāgarī* distinctive features.<sup>3</sup>

The stories themselves appear to refer to events covering a large period of time.<sup>4</sup>

Total historicity cannot be claimed for these stories. The usage of Paraśurāma as a *deus ex machina*, for example, prohibits this. Historicity of general incident for at least some of these, however,

- 
2. See Jogendra Nath Bhattacharya, *Hindu Castes and Sects, an exposition of the origin of the Hindu caste system and the bearing of sects towards each other and towards other religious systems* (Calcutta: Thacker, 1896), p. 84, K.P. Padmanabha Menon, *History of Kerala* (Ernakulam: Printed at the Cochin Government Press: 1924-37), 1: 45 and 51. B.A. Saletore, *History of Ancient Karṇāṭaka, vol. I -- History of Tuluva*, Poona Oriental Series, no. 53 (Poona : Oriental Book Agency, 1936), esp. pp. 296-97, and B.A. Saletore, "The Tuluva Gramapaddhati", in S. Aiyangar Commemoration Volume (Madras: The Committee, 1936), pp. 116-17.
  3. See S.H. Levitt, "Orthographic Confusion Between 'bh' and 't' in *Devanāgarī* Manuscripts", in *Journal of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta* 21 (1979), 27-30 and G. Buhler, *Indian Paleography* (1904; Rpt. Calcutta: Indian Studies -- Past and Present, [1959]), 24.24, p. 74.
  4. The story of the introduction by Mayūravarmaṇ of brahmins from Ballabhī would place this event in the 4th century A.D. That of brahmins who served as litter-bearers for a *śūdra* chief also appears to refer to an early event. Others, such as the story of the brahmins who reared a tribal girl and the story of the brahman who gained eminence because of a tricky legal decision appear to be of considerably later date. Certain dating for the events of most of these stories, however, is not possible at the present time. Of note is that the dating of the events of certain of these stories through proposed identifications of kings and *munis* by B.A. Saletore in his *History*, pp. 342-47, is spurious alternately on account of poor methodology and on account of the utilization of corrupt text.

can be affirmed on the basis of possible identifications of some of the groups concerned with independent testimony from ethnographic sources and concord of these stories with those found more briefly in ethnographic sources.<sup>5</sup>

Each of the stories, with the exception of one the reconstructed text for which remains corrupt and fragmentary, ends with the admonition that one gains such fallen status oneself by mere sight of the people under discussion. All then add a penance to be performed, though in the case of one of the stories the penance it would seem is to be performed by the people discussed in the story itself.

One of the stories, and other of the stories by inference, includes an admonition that one is neither to eat with these untouchable brahmans, live with them, talk with them, or set out on a journey with them.

In two of the stories the fallen brahmans discussed are referred to as *śūdras*. Such a categorization is in accord with the traditional Sanskrit categorization of untouchables (*antyajas*) as *antyā-vasāyin-śūdras* (*śūdras* placed last in order), *niravasita-śūdras* (?—translation problematic) or *asprśya-śūdras* (*śūdras* not to be touched).<sup>6</sup> In one of the stories the fallen brahmans are described as giving rise to mental confusion in the world.

- 
5. The most certain identification is that of the brahmans in the story about brahmans who lied in a land dispute with the Kota brahmans listed in L.K. Anantakrishna Iyer., *The Mysore Tribes and Castes* (Mysore: Published under the auspices of the Mysore University, 1928-36), 2:314 and E. Thurston : *Castes and Tribes of Southern India* (Madras: Government Press, 1909), 4:31, For an instance of concord, compare for example the fall in status of the widows' bastards in PGN 2 with the story given for the fall in status of the Kotipattan brahmans in *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, 4:32.
  6. See P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Government Oriental Series, class B, no. 6 (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1930-62), 2.1: 165-79, esp. 167-68 and, regarding situations which lead to untouchable status, 168-71. The classification *Pañcama* is a conceptualization which arose in the Tamil-speaking area. See I. Karve, *Hindu*

Also of note is that in two stories by explicit statement and in one by justifiable inference the situation which eventually gives rise to fallen brahmans involves both social situation and *karman*.

The process of brahmans losing the prerequisites of brahman status, of being regarded as ejected from the brahman community and of being basically untouchable brahmans appears on the basis of ethnographic data from the British period to have been a not uncommon occurrence. There can be extracted from the various 'Castes and Tribes' volumes approximately one hundred such groups.<sup>7</sup> Additional groups not listed in these volumes can be found

---

*Society -- An interpretation* (Poona: Deccan Postgraduate College and Research Institute, 1961), p. 48 and H. Sharp, *Progress of Education in India 1912-17, Seventh Quinquennial Review*, Indian edition (London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1919), 1:206-7. Such a difference in the categorization of untouchables in the far south of India and elsewhere is reflected to a certain extent in the differential treatment given untouchables in different regions of India as described briefly, for Example, by J.A. Dubois, *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies*, tr. H.K. Beauchamp (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897), p. 53. Such a difference is also reflected by the difference in reactions to scheduling in Madras State as opposed to elsewhere in British India as noted by J.T. Marten in *Census of India, 1921* (Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing -- India, 1924), 1.1: 225. The course of British scheduling, primarily for purposes of educational and material advancement of untouchables, appears to have proceeded in somewhat of a definitional vacuum in which what the late Professor I. Karve has referred to as "the structural imbalance of the native classification" (*Hindu Society*, p. 48) was stressed more than the classification itself. Groupings which therefore would be categorized as *śūdras* by the indigenous system -- as was done by J.N. Bhattacharya in *Hindu Castes and Sects*, pp. 254-69, etc -- were regarded as not being *śūdras* at all. The formalization of the structural imbalance which had occurred in South India -- probably in part on the basis of mistranslation and misinterpretation of such Sanskrit terms as *niravasitaśūdra* and *antyāvasāyīnchūdra* as expelled *śūdra* or *śūdra* without a dwelling and *śūdra* dwelling lowest in place -- was generalized to all of India by British authorities and educated Indians alike as one which reflected ethnographic accuracy and the supposed historical primacy of South Indian orthodoxy.

7. Those 'Castes and Tribes' volumes consulted, other than those mentioned above in n. 5, were L.K. Ananthakrishna Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes* (Madras: Higginbotham and Co., 1909); W. Crooke, *Ethnographical Hand-book for the North-West Provinces and Oudh* (Allahabad; North-Western Province and Oudh Government Press, 1890); R.E. Enthoven, *The Tribes and Castes of Bombay* (Bombay: Printed at

to be listed in the various gazetteers compiled during the British period.<sup>8</sup>

Occasional references to such loss of brahman status occur also in Sanskrit literature other than in the *Pāṭiṭyagrāmanirṇaya*. *Kathāsaritsāgara* 7.48, for example, is spoken by a brahman visitor who has been mocked by the stupid sons of another brahman who was away at the time.<sup>9</sup> In it the brahman visitor tells the other brahman who has returned that his hospitality cannot be accepted:

Those stupid sons are fallen, as is your worship also on account of association with them. Because of this I cannot eat in your house. There would not be an appropriate penance (*prāyaścitta*) for me.

*Devalāsmṛti*, as quoted by Vijñāneśvara in *Mitākṣarāṅkā* on *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* 3.261 and by Aparārka in *Yājñavalkya-dharmaśāstranibandha*, noted by P.V. Kane, states with regard to fallen brahmans that "sin is passed from one man to another by

---

the Government Central Press, 1920-22); H.M. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal, Ethnographic Glossary* (Calcutta: Printed at the Bengal Secretariat Press, 1892); H.A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province* (Lahore: Printed at the Civil and Military Gazette Press by Samuel T. Weston, 1911-19); R.V. Russell, assisted by Rai Bahadur Hira Lāl, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1916). Not consulted was *Hand-Book of Castes and Tribes Employed on Tea Estates in North-East India* (Calcutta: Tea Districts Orphan Press, 1924) as it was viewed that this would not add much information.

8. Such, however, are not good sources for this. The appropriate volumes of the various Mysore gazetteers for example, B.L. Rice, *Mysore and Coorg, A Gazetteer compiled for the Government of India*, vol. 2 (Bangalore: Mysore Government Press, 1876), B.L. Rice, *Mysore and Coorg, A Gazetteer compiled for the Government of India*, rev. ed., vol. 2 (Westminster : Archibald Constable and Company, 1897), and C. Hayavadana Rao, *Mysore Gazetteer compiled for Government*, new ed., vol. 5 (Bangalore: Printed at the Government Press, 1930), list only one such group. Such listings, however, do indicate that all such groupings are not included in the 'Castes and Tribes' volumes.
9. Text as in H. Brockhaus, ed., *Katha Sarit Sagara, Die Marchen-sammlung des Sri Somadeva Bhatta aus Kaschmir, Erstes bis funftes Buch, Sanskrit und Deutsch* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1839).



conversation (with a sinner), by touching him, by his breath (coming in close contact with one's nose), by occupying the same vehicle (horse) or seat, by eating (in his company), by being a priest, by being his teacher of the Veda or making him one's teacher, or by matrimonial alliance."<sup>10</sup>

Such information as that outlined here with regard to fallen brahmans provides us with a good sample of data regarding a specific social situation against which we may test hypotheses advanced recently by McK. Marriott and R. Inden.<sup>11</sup> Attention will be focused here on the stories of the *Pāṭityagrāmanirūyaya*.

Our discussion might best be introduced by placing some of the hypotheses of McK. Marriott and R. Inden in the perspective of certain of the extant work on Indic concepts and by stating briefly those aspects of these hypotheses which are relevant to our purposes.

M.N. Srinivas has suggested that in India a person's normal condition is one of mild impurity which he exchanges for short periods of purity or serious impurity.<sup>12</sup> Aside from such periods of purity and impurity which one encounters constantly in one's daily routine, structural distance between castes is defined in terms of purity and pollution.<sup>13</sup> While information published to date is scanty, there does appear to be some evidence that one's position in the caste hierarchy is viewed generally as being the result of

---

10. *History of Dharmasāstra* 3:614.

11. See McK. Marriott and R. Inden, "Caste systems," in *Encyclopedia Britanica*, 15th ed., *Macropaedia* 3:982a-91b and McK. Marriott "Hindu transactions: diversity without dualism," in B. Kapferer, ed., *Transaction and Meaning* (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1976), pp. 109-42.

12. *Social Change in Modern India* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), p. 121.

13. See, for example, M.N. Srinivas, *Social Change*, pp. 119-20 and É.B. Harper, "Ritual Pollution as an Integrator of Caste and Religion," in E.B. Harper, ed., *Religion in South Asia* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), esp. pp. 151-52.

*karman*.<sup>14</sup> Thus, one's condition of relative purity and pollution within the structural framework of caste would be the result of *karman*.

*Śakti* is standardly viewed in classical Indological studies as the female creative force. Such takes on different specific aspects depending on the religious schema with which one is working. From an ethnographic perspective, J. Abbott has taken the view that *śakti* is a diffused supernatural cosmic power:

*Śakti* is a creative dynamic force or power in everything visible and invisible; in things animate and inanimate. It pervades everything assuming a separate entity in individual things in which it becomes a transmissible personality. It pervades thoughts and ideas; embodied in thoughts it may be the power of benediction; it is developed by the common will of many; gratitude transmits it as does a curse.<sup>15</sup>

C.G. Dielh, however, questions the impersonal aspect of *śakti*. He notes that it is problematic as to whether such a force is to be viewed as an impersonal fluidism or as a quality.<sup>16</sup> With regard to *tapas*, in its sense of the power obtained through religious austerity, we are clearly in a situation in which power is an acquired attribute, e.g. a quality, of the person concerned.

The suggestions of McK. Marriott and R. Inden, in 'neutral English' terminology, include that there is in the Indian consciousness a viewpoint which regards pollution and merit, for example, to

- 
14. See, for example, G.D. Berreman, *Hindus of the Himalayas: Ethnography and Change* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 84-86, P.M. Kolenda, "Religious Anxiety and Hindu Fate," in E.B. Harper, ed., *Religion*, P. 74, M.N. Srinivas, *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), pp. 25-26.
15. *The Keys of Power: A Study of Indian Ritual and Belief* (1932; Rpt. Seacaucus, New Jersey: University Books, 1974), p. 3.
16. *Instrument and Purpose; Studies on Rites and Rituals in South India* (Lund: C. Gleerup, [1956]), pp. 29-30. See esp. p. 29, n. 1 and p. 30, n. 1 for theoretical background references.

be the result of a material transfer between individuals, objects and actions. Pollution and merit are viewed here much as C.G. Diehl suggested we view *śakti*--as being attached always to something physical (= 'coded substance'). Further, the adage in the Western tradition that a person is what he eats is hypothesized by McK. Marriott and R. Inden as being embedded in the Indian consciousness to a more pervasive extent in that they suggest that the Indian views himself or herself as being continuously affected by such transfers of pollution and merit and as being the result of such transfers (= a 'dividual').

Such a situation is viewed by McK. Marriott and R. Inden as being so embedded in the Indian consciousness that it is axiomatic. It is viewed as a continuity in Indian thought which cannot be documented directly due to its axiomatic nature. In this it is unlike, let us say, the Tamil practice of viewing babies prior to a certain age, both male and female, as falling into the inanimate linguistic category. In such a case there is clear linguistic indication of viewpoint. It is also unlike the type of situation we are faced with in Vedic scholarship in which we are lacking the cultural context in which we might understand better what is being communicated. Vedic scholarship takes for granted that such a context could have been articulated by members of the culture.<sup>17</sup>

We here are faced with a situation much like that with which anthropologists are faced when attempting precise definition of indigenous terms in various cultures which do not possess texts which might allow comparison and contrast of specific usage in different contexts. As in such situations, here we too must observe specific usage in context for purposes of determining unarticulated presuppositions, much as did R. Firth in his discussion of the

---

17. W.N. Brown, "Mythology of India," in S.N. Kramer, ed., *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), p. 281.

Polynesian term *mana* or as did E.E. Evans-Pritchard from a somewhat different theoretical vantage in his discussion of the Nuer term *kwoth*.<sup>18</sup> One might then proceed to an intelligent elicitation and comprehension of educated indigenous explanation.<sup>19</sup> The similarity, however, is a formal one: it emerges from a focus on deducing import from usage in context.<sup>20</sup>

For methodological reasons demonstration of such presuppositions as advanced by McK. Marriott and R. Inden probably ought remain tied to an investigation of the import of specific linguistic forms. One might maintain in this way formal control through precise definition of focus and delimitation of variables. It is support for the hypotheses alone which can be garnered by testing these hypotheses' usefulness with regard to understanding behavior in the literature. In the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*, however, we have a text so well-suited to be tested profitably for such purposes that such an endeavor perhaps is not premature.

In the first of the stories of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* (PGN 1-2) Paraśurāma is approached by pregnant brahman widows who have been cast out from their native villages. Paraśurāma has compassion for them, goes with them to the *ūrtha* Kroḍeśa and settles

- 
18. R. Firth, "The Analysis of *Mana*: An Empirical Approach," in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 49 (1940), pp. 481-510 and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Nuer Religion* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956), esp. pp. 1-33, 106-22.
  19. P. Radin, *Primitive Man as a Philosopher* (1927; Rpt. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1957), esp. pp. xxviii-xxxix, 14-17. What one must strive for is the right question and the right person to whom to direct the question, not the right answer.
  20. In one instance, that presented by the hypotheses advanced by McK. Marriott and R. Inden, we do not possess texts which discuss the points of interest. We are obliged to examine, therefore, the context of terms for which there is a great deal of usage in context in order to determine whether or not such context entails the unarticulated presuppositions being considered. In the other instance we do not possess copious bodies of texts which allow comparison and contrast of given usage in different contexts. Such usage, therefore, must be elicited, observed and ordered. The formal similarity emerges from a necessary emphasis on context for purposes of deducing and demonstrating relevant presuppositions in both instances.

them near the *ūrtha* with the promise that their line will increase through the beneficence of Nārāyaṇa, who has been made their family deity. The widows give birth to sons and daughters, and the sons engage in various menial tasks in order to support their sisters. Many years pass. Paraśurāma then passes nearby on his way to Mahendra mountain and the widows approach him about this state of affairs. Paraśurāma therefore orders an *agnīdhra* priest who dwells near the ocean to purify the widows' 'bastards, to perform the necessary *saṃskāras* and to establish them.' The priest does this and establishes the widows' bastards and their families in a group of five villages. The sons, however, eventually ascend a nearby mountain and make an areca nut garden. They revert to gathering fruit and performing menial tasks. Because of this they lose their brahman status for fallen status. Even their mothers cannot mix with them lest they too should obtain the same status.

In the second story (PGN 3) eight poor brahmans together with their wives and children approach two wealthy and devout *śūdras*. They praise these in expectation of kind treatment and receive much wealth from the elder of the two. In consideration of this, they make a dwelling and serve the *śūdra* for twelve years. Then the *śūdra* decides to take a second wife so that he might have a son. As there are no litter-bearers for the marriage, he approaches the brahmans. They consent to carry his litter. Because of this the people of their village revolt against them and force them to flee. They go to the *śūdra* who realizes the offence he has caused them to commit and as a result gives them his wealth, his village and his newly married bride. The brahmans live happily and prosperously, but fallen in status.

The third story (PGN 4) relates a boundary dispute between the brahmans dwelling in Koṭīśvara and those dwelling in the village of Kūṭa (or perhaps between the brahmans of Koṭīśvarara and the mountain people) when an unidentified king Vasu ruled. The

dispute is referred to Vasu and he says that they will all question the earth on the matter. He commands spies to bring to him brahmans from 'the thirty-two villages', a group of villages established supposedly by Mayūrarman of the Kadamba dynasty. The brahmans of Koṭīśvara bury a man in the earth. Vasu and the brahmans from the thirty-two villages go to the boundary, worship the earth, and tell the earth that she must decide the dispute. The man in the ground says that the land belongs to the brahmans of Koṭīśvara. A voice in the sky informs everyone of the deceit. Vasu takes away the land of the lying brahmans and tells the brahmans of the thirty-two villages that they are to decide if the deceitful brahmans are to be excommunicated. The brahmans of Koṭīśvara are excommunicated and go to the ocean for penance. They meet Paraśurāma while they are staying there. Paraśurāma purifies them. They then make a dwelling with the approval of king Vasu. They remain fallen in status, however.

In the fourth story (PGN 5) many pregnant brahman widows coming from different countries in India meet at the Tuṅgabhadrā river. They see the seer Kaṇva performing austerities. Kaṇva tells them to go to Paraśurāma who is performing austerities on the shore of the Varāhī river. Paraśurāma directs them to a *nyagrodha* forest near the *ūrtha* Gokaṇṇeśa and provides a mark for their descendents to wear. They make a dwelling at the forest with the permission of the villagers and give birth to sons and daughters. These marry one another. All goes well. The children however, are *śūdras* and one becomes degraded by association with these.

The fifth story (PGN 6) is of a tribal girl who became separated from her group at a banner festival which was held when an unidentified king Candradatta ruled. Brahmans from Gujjara-grāma find the child, take her with them, raise her, and marry her to a brahman of a family in a neighbouring village. She gives birth to sons. All goes well until the family goes to another banner festival at

the same place. The girl is recognized by her kinsmen. The king asks the mother why she is trying to take away the status of a brahman woman. The mother informs the king of the situation. She leaves accompanied by the daughter, the daughter's brahman husband and the sons. The king commands the brahmans to speak the truth. The brahmans of the thirty-two villages excommunicate them.

For the sixth story (PGN 7) the reconstructed text remains corrupt and perhaps fragmentary. The sense appears to be that king Mayūrarman (*circa* 4th century A.D.) went to Ballabhī and returned with brahmans from there. Brahmans created by Paraśurāma object to giving these land. They say that Paraśurāma gave them the land. Mayūrarman gives these brahmans four villages and gives the remaining land to the brahmans whom he had just introduced to the area.

In the seventh story (PGN 8-9) a brahman from Gorāṣṭra arrives for lodging at the house of a brahman family of Vijaya, possibly during the reign of an unidentified king Vīra. During the night he witnesses the youngest wife kill her infant. The elder wife, who had cared for the infant as if it were her own, upon making the discovery is distressed. She cries out. She is accused of murder. An argument arises and the king is informed. He and his ministers cannot decide the case. The brahman from Gorāṣṭra has the king send for another Gorāṣṭrian brahman, perhaps the brahman's son. This brahman is noted to be expert in settling disputes. The king of Vijaya writes a letter to the king of Gorāṣṭra. The king of Gorāṣṭra informs the brahman that he is to leave for Vijaya on the next day. During the trip to Vijaya made by this Gorāṣṭrian brahman there are portents boding calamity. The brahman settles the dispute by an unusual strategem. The king punishes the younger wife and honours the brahman with two villages, wealth, cattle, clothing and eminence. Much time passes. The king's ministers are noted to be

enemies of this brahman's family. The brahman's son kills his wife and her paramour while they are making love and reports this to the ministers himself. The family is told to travel on a pilgrimage to holy spots in Gokarṇa. They meet a great *muni*. He gives them water from a certain *ūrtha*. They set firm a *śālagrāma* stone which they find there. They go, and at noon come to a breadfruit tree. They eat. At the tree's roots they find the *śālagrāma* stone in a basket. They get set to go. A voice in heaven tells them to stay and states that the *śālagrāma* stone will become their family deity. They make a dwelling with the permission of the villagers. They live without performing oblations to the gods or their deceased ancestors. The villagers do not associate with them because of this. When they realize their sin they go to the *muni* whom they had seen before. He purifies them. Nonetheless, they are said to be of fallen status.

The last story (PGN 10-11) relates that a Gorāṣṭrian *muni* together with his wife and disciples come to a king Hemamālin of the city of Kāñcanamālinī in Kaliṅga. Hemamālin honours the brahman. The brahman decides to test the king. With the left hand he offers the king unhusked barley grains, or perhaps winnowed rice, which had been purified by *mantras*. The king chides the brahman. The brahman displays anger and states his power. The king bows to the brahman to placate him. The brahman tells the king to stand. He demonstrates his power by throwing down the barley corns (?) from his right hand together with fire. The brahman puts out the fire. The king gives the brahman riches, female slaves and eight villages. The brahman praises and blesses Hemamālin and leaves for Gorāṣṭra. He arrives at the Caṇḍikā river. There he performs the appropriate rites, some with his wife. At evening he sees one of his slaves and falls in love with her. These two dwell by the river and in time she gives birth to eight sons by him. The brahman gives the eight villages to these sons, specifies their livelihood, summons his legitimate son, gives him directions as to



what ritual to perform with regard to these eight sons, and leaves with his wife to perform *tapas*. The legitimate son performs the tonsure ceremony and the initiation rites for the eight sons. He instructs the eight illegitimate sons as to their duties and instructs the female slaves to return to their native cities. Then, having raised non-brahmans to brahman status, he returns home.

It is difficult to interpret these stories in detail in part because they are sketchy where one would desire greater explicitness and in part because the customary law involved is not known. Certain points, however, do emerge.

Severe pollution and the *śūdra* status which this involves is in the majority of instances the result of behavior. Such, for example, is the case with regard to the brahmins who acted as litter-bearers, with the brahmins who lied in a land dispute, with the brahmins who reared and married off a tribal girl, and with the widows' bastards of the first story when they took up interdicted occupations after having been raised in status.

In the case of the two stories about pregnant widows' we possibly may have an exception to this. The status of these widows is not clear. That the widows and widows' bastards of the second of these stories (PGN 5) wear special marks by which they might be recognized as being of fallen brahmin status indicates that the widows are to be so interdicted even after being settled. In the first story, however, that the widows are not allowed to mix with their sons lest they too attain fallen status after these sons have reverted to menial occupations indicates that they themselves are no longer considered *patita*, or fallen.

Severe pollution and *śūdra* status, however, is not merely a matter of behavior or of engaging in social contact with these groups. It is in the two stories of the widows' bastards due to birth. Implied in the first of these stories (PGN 1-2) is that the status of one's birth determines one's behavior. Although one's status can be

raised by religious formula, as in this story and as in the case of the last story about the children of a brahman and a female slave, one's behavior does not change. Thus in the first story the brahmans revert to menial tasks and in the last story the outlined occupations for the illegitimate children are menial.

Behavior, however, is not necessarily a reflection of one's birth. The brahmans who lied in a land dispute appear to have been of good birth, for example. One cannot but wonder, though, whether in the story of the brahmans who carried the *śūdra's* litter the facts that they were originally poor brahmans and were brahmans who approached a *śūdra* for wealth have anything to do with their eventual lowered status. Implied in some of these stories, especially in that of the brahman who became a minister (PGN 8-9), is a longterm stability of status. For example, in this latter story, the act which led to the granting of eminence to these brahmans was the witnessing by one of the characters of a murder of a son by a mother. The event which leads to the fall in status is the murder of a wife and her paramour by a son and the reporting of this by the son to a minister. The parallelism between these two events is striking. When one considers the bad portents which occurred during the trip of the brahman who solved the murder one questions whether or not there is operating here a principle that implies that by whatever one's status is raised, by that one's status will be lowered.

Of interest is that in four of these stories, of the brahmans who reared a tribal girl and of the brahmans who lied in a land dispute, for example, such status is mediated by a judicial decision. However, such appears to have the effect only of bringing to everyone's attention that a fall in status has occurred. The fall in status itself has occurred already at the time of the decision. In the story of the brahman's who carried a *śūdra's* litter, the *śūdra* does not follow the same legal norms and instead established these brahmans. They remain interdicted by the community's standards,

however. Standardly in these stories, establishment of such fallen brahmins is a religious decision often effected by divine intervention, not a legal decision.

Also standardly, excommunication appears to be a decision of social peers--in the cases of the brahmins who lied in a land dispute and of the brahmins who reared a tribal girl for example. A parallel instance occurs in the ejection from the community of the family of brahmins a member of which killed his wife and her paramour. In this case it was other ministers who prescribed the ejection. Avoidance of such fallen brahmins, however, is the decision of the community at large, as in the case of the story of brahmin litter-bearers and in the last story after the surrounding communities observed that these brahmins did not perform certain rites.

On the basis of the story of the children of the brahmin and the slave girl it would appear that the acquisition of power through *tapas* has the effect of preventing the spread of the pollution to oneself and one's family. Such is supported by the raising of status of fallen brahmins in these stories by religious priests or a god, Paraśurāma, who is constantly depicted as engaging in *tapas*. Such priests appear not to be affected by their contact with people of such fallen status.

Possibly implied, also, is that raising or establishing such groups spends some of the *tapas* of the priest or god involved. Thus, Paraśurāma always goes off to perform *tapas* after his acts. Similarly, the brahmin of the last story goes off to perform *tapas* after he has given his illegitimate sons eight villages, instructed them as to their occupations and instructed his legitimate son regarding the necessary rites to be performed for them.

On the basis of descriptive references to Paraśurāma and a statement spoken by the brahmin of the last story the possibility is indicated that compassion (*dayā*) or affection (*sneha*) is required in

order to raise such groups. Should such be the case it argues for a concrete conceptualization of such item as referred to in the descriptive reference *dayānidhi* (a store of compassion) applied to Paraśurāma and in the statement by the brahman of the last story that the children of the female slave were *snehayukta* (bound by affection).

Stated in the two stories of pregnant widows is that it is actions in previous lives which have caused the calamitous situations of these women. Similarly, it is a trace of merit in previous lives which has enabled these women to encounter Paraśurāma. Such raises the question of whether *karman* was viewed as being involved in other of these stories. In all instances, including these stories of pregnant widows, fallen status flows naturally from social situations. The pregnant widows, for example, lost their husbands when young and did not have the stamina to commit *sañ*. In general, these stories emphasize social situation. The only clue to this question appears in the story of the brahman who became a minister. The portents which he sees on his way to Vijaya involve fate and destiny. There is *infra*-textual indication in the stories of the pregnant widows that the belief held by the author of these stories is that fate and destiny are the result of action in previous lives. There is indication, therefore, when one views the text as a unit, that fallen brahman status while it may be caused by situations in this life is also the result of *karman*.

In short, these stories lend support to the hypotheses of McK. Marriott and R. Inden:

Status appears to be contagious and to be carried by individuals from life to life.

There does not appear on the surface to be a differential categorization of various types of behavior. Lying--here perhaps an infraction of a vow (*vrata*), essential adoption of a stray tribal female child and performance of menial tasks which might involve

infractions of the brahmanical duty of non-injury (*ahimsā*) are equally cause for lowered status. A common category under which all such diverse behavior might fall might be deviations from duty which is in accord with universal cosmic law (*ṛta*). Such suggests that one might have indication here not of monism, but of a continuity of the Vedic dichotomy between the real and the unreal (*sat* and *asat*) and between what is in accord with universal cosmic law and what is not (*ṛta* and *anṛta*).

The acquisition of religious power appears to have the effect possibly of warding off contagion from such groups and may possibly be spent in such actions as raising the status of such polluted groups or establishing such groups. Such argues for a concrete conception of such power and the transfer of this concrete item.

While such points do not demonstrate the hypotheses in question, they do support these hypotheses handsomely.



## Symposium—I : Puranic language (1)

SOME COMMENTS ON DR. CHATURVEDI'S EDITORIAL  
POLICY ON PAURANIC MANUSCRIPTS

By

OSCAR PUJOL

In Purāṇa Vol. XXXIII, No 2 (July 1991), Dr. Uma kant Chaturvedi made highly original and thought provoking suggestions on the principles to be followed while editing paurāṇika manuscripts. On the same issue we find as well remarks of the Bulletin's editor, the eminent scholar Dr. R. S. Bhattacharya, who writes: "We have our own reservations about suggestions put forward by the learned author, but will wait for the comments of the scholars and students. We shall publish these comments in the future numbers of Purāṇa" It is in response to this call that the following lines are written. We won't be able to discuss all the different issues raised by Dr. Chaturvedi, but nevertheless we shall dwell at some length on a few important points. In his prefatory note Dr. Bhattacharya has added: "Of the above questions the points nos. VII and IX need immediate answer, as these points are small yet of constant day to day use. We will have to take some decision regarding it in our future publications." Point no. VII concerns the validity of *sandhi* between the last letter of a *pāda* and the next letter of the next *pāda* of the same *śloka*. We will discuss this point and hope to be able to throw some light on it. Owing to lack of time we won't be able to consider point number IX, which raises the question of optional *sandhi* even in cases of compound formations. In the next number we hope to further elucidate the *sandhi/asandhi* problem about which there is a lot to be said.

At the start one has to recognize Dr. Chaturvedi's cleverness in giving due importance to a fact that has been neglected, or rather quickly explained away, by most editors. How do we justify in the available manuscripts the massive preference for *anusvāra* instead

of final 'm' as stated by Pāṇini ? It is only an error of scribes ? Or a convention they adopted to ease their work ? Or, as Dr. Chaturvedi suggests, it is not an error nor a convention, but the sanction of a different grammatical tradition followed by the scribes.

Let us briefly summarise his arguments:

1) Dr. Chaturvedi is not only concerned with final *anusvāra*, but also for the appearance of *anusvāra* inside *padas* (*apadānta*), a practice usually forbidden by Pāṇini (अनुस्वारस्य ययि परसवर्णः) except in the case of sibilants and 'h'. He finds that on this question the indian grammarians are divided and advances at least three different opinions:

(a) The pāṇinian view as opposed both to final and medial (*apadānta*) *anusvāra*.

(b) The Kātantra view as quoted by the authors of the Sārasvata. According to our learned author, the original Kātantra view has been changed by the pāṇinīyas through the corruption of a certain *sūtra*. Instead of ' मोऽनुस्वारस्य व्यञ्जने ' we should read ' मोऽनुस्वारः'. The implications are quite important, since by the new interpretation the Kātantrikas will always enjoin a final *anusvāra* instead of 'm'. This is also confirmed by the statement of the Candrikākāra: 'कौमारा अवसानेऽप्यनुस्वारमिच्छन्ति'.

c) And finally the opinion of the Sārasvata School that makes optional both medial and final *anusvāra*.

3) After a perusal of 16 manuscripts belonging to the Garuḍapurāṇa Dr. Chaturvedī arrives at the following conclusions: most manuscripts in devanāgarī and telugu seem to follow option 'C'. Bengali manuscripts seem to follow option 'b' and only three out of the four nevēārī manuscripts follow the 'a' option. The author thinks that this results could be extrapolated to other subjects besides Purāṇas .

4) Dr. Chaturvedi maintains that some centuries back non-paninian systems were by far more popular in India and that the so-called errors of the Kāyastha class were no errors at all, but a

deliberate practice in accordance with the Kātantra and the Sārasvata systems of grammar.

5) Those errors do not spring out of ignorance, but reflect the divergence between two different grammatical traditions: the paninian and the one embodied by the Kātantra school. Both are of respectable antiquity as the Kātantra school is rooted in the Aindra systems of grammar, as suggested by Burnell. The differences between both grammars are in fact due to the differences in the Sanskrit they describe. The Paninian grammar is concerned with vedic and classical or brahminical Sanskrit, while the Kātantra describes *laukikasamskṛta*, popular Sanskrit. In the author's opinion both type are equally old and good and it would be a mistake to correct and substitute final *anusvāra* in the manuscripts for 'm' according to the precepts of Pāṇini, as this would mean to suppress an altogether different tradition. According to the author today's preference for editing manuscripts according to Pāṇini, is due to western influence. During the British rule western scholars became so fascinated with Pāṇini that they adopted it to the exclusion of everything else.

6) The final conclusion is that we should accept the paninian view while editing Vedas, Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads and Kāvya literature. But we should follow the *laukikasamskṛta* tradition while editing Purāṇas and Itihāsas

First of all in our discussion I will take for granted all the points stated by Dr. Chaturvedi regarding *sandhi* in the Sārasvata system. We are also ready to admit the theory that originally the Kātantra system regarded final *anusvāra*, but not medial. I am myself working on a bengali manuscript and I can say that it fully tallies with option 'b'. Moreover the manuscript, incidentally on paninian grammar, is remarkably free of grammatical mistakes. Final *anusvāra* really seems a rule rather than an exception. It appears quite plausible that the Kāyasthas studied sanskrit, whenever they did, with the help of non-paninian systems. We only have to remember the statement in the *Vyākhyānapriyā*:



छान्दसः स्वल्पमतयः शास्त्रान्तररताश्च ये ।  
 ईश्वरा व्याधिनिरतास्तथालस्युतश्च ये ॥  
 वणिकूसस्यादिसंसक्ता लोकयात्रादिषु स्थिताः ।  
 तेषां क्षिप्रं प्रबोधार्थम् . . . . . ॥

Moreover the available data confirms that even one Kāyastha became the reputed teacher of this school. We are talking about Trilocanadāsa, who is the second commentator on the Durgasīmhavṛtti and the author of the Kātantravṛttipañjikā. In that sense it is quite possible that the more educated Kāyasthas adopted the rule of final *anusvāra* in order to ease their work and imposed the practice on the less cultured. I think that there has been an excessive use of the dustbin called *Kāyasthājñāna*. It is an easy way to solve problems and to let unanswered real questions. At the same time one should not idealize the cultural level of the scribes. After all they did not want to take any responsibility about the work they were doing :

यादृशं पुस्तकं दृष्टं तादृशं लिखितं मया ।  
 यदि शुद्धमशुद्धं वा मम दोषो न दीयताम् ॥

In spite of this, there are certain points in Dr. Chaturvedi comments that are not, in my humble opinion, correct. Briefly they are the following:

1) There are not, after Pāṇini, two different grammatical traditions, but only several schools. We truly can say that non-paninian systems do not describe a different type of Sanskrit and that they tend to agree and follow Pāṇini. Indeed all these schools are based on the paninian system. The difference lies in the fact that they try to simplify the system, but not to change the actual rules. Moreover in course of time most of these systems have been amended and perfected along paninian lines. See for instance Belvalkar: "The text books in use prior to the advent of this school were intended rather for Pandits and monks than for merchants and agriculturist, in whom nevertheless the desire to learn the language of the Scriptures and of refined society was not quite absent. This led to the detection of inaccuracies and omissions in the original

version of the grammar, which came to be rectified in the course of study, so that the original *Sūtrapātha* of Śārvavarman experienced, in the course of the next centuries, the addition of the *taddhita* and *stripratya* and the substantial assimilation with Śākaṭāyana or Vararuci kṛtprakaraṇa"<sup>1</sup>

Similar things could be said about the Sārasvata School which was born out of a definite need. "This time the demand probably came from the Mohammedan rulers of India who felt it necessary to promote the study of Sanskrit, were it only for the purpose of criticising works written in that language. Gaisuddinn Khilji the peaceful and enlightened ruler of Malwa, Salemsah...and Jahangir...all these alike encouraged the study of the Sārasvata grammar as being the one calculated to produce the greatest results with the least effort".<sup>2</sup> The brevity and simplicity of this work was so remarkable that "sometimes this process was carried too far and then later it was found necessary to insert vārttikas...where it was discovered that even some of the commoner forms of words remained unnoticed".<sup>3</sup>

Examining the origins of the Crandra system also confirms the view that there is only one grammatical tradition but different schools. As Kātyāyana, trying to reflect the changes that took place in Sanskrit between his time and that of Pāṇini, supplements him and Patañjali in turn supplements Kātyāyana, so Candragomin after a few centuries supplements both of them. But Candragomin was a buddhist trying to write a treatise free from brahminical elements and for his own sect. In truth the Kāśika became responsible for assimilating for the Brahmins all the changes introduced by Candragomin.

2) Another point in which we disagree is on Dr. Chaturvedi's view that the preference for the paninian system is due to the fancy westerners got for it. He forgets both, first that the paninian system

1. Systems of sanskrit Grammar, Shripad Krishna Belvalkar, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Varanasi, 1976. p. 73.

2. Ibidem. 77-78.

3. Ibidem p. 79.

met with considerable resistance from some quarters of the western scholarship and second that it attracted also their attention. In reality the British started learning Sanskrit through the Sārasvata school and after switched to Pāṇini for more detailed study: "It is an interesting coincidence that when the British rulers of India were first actuated by a desire to acquaint themselves more thoroughly with the literature and the ancient traditions of their subjects through the medium of Sanskrit, one of the earliest and the easiest of anglo-sanskrit grammars that was written was Wilkin's, the basis for which was just this same Sārasvata"<sup>4</sup>. In point of fact the revival of Pāṇini did indeed take place, but as inspired by the Kaṃmudīkāras. If the europeans did eventually opt for Pāṇini was only because the paninian system was already the most reputed in India.

3) I think Dr. Chaturvedi is right when he speaks of two types of sanskrit: the cultured (*brāhmaṇasaṃskṛta*) and the popular (*laukikaṃskṛta*). But we differ when it comes to identify the nature of this two kinds of Sanskrit. In our opinion the *laukikaṃskṛta* is the so called Epic Sanskrit which in no way is older than the Sanskrit of Brāhmaṇas and the sūtra period which corresponds to the descriptions made by Pāṇini. "They (the epics) provide also evidence of the wide popularity of one type of Sanskrit literature among the masses of the people, since these works were reserved for no special or cultivated audience, but intended for public recital to the population in general. Their popular character is evidenced by their language"<sup>5</sup>. Burrow gives a list of the most common deviations of this type of sanskrit (confusion between *ātmanepada* and *parasmaipada*, *parasmaipada* terminations for passive verbs, confusion between the gerunds *-tvā* and *-ya*, unaugmented preterites, the prohibitive particle *mā* used with augmented aorist, *curādi* class and causatives using a middle participle in *-ayāna* instead of *-ayamāna*, neglecting the careful

---

4. Ibidem. p. 87.

5. The Sanskrit Language, T. Burrow, Faber and faber, London, 1973 p. 51-52.

rules of Pāṇini about the formation of feminine present participles in *-aī* and *-anī*, wrong distribution of *seṭ* and *aniṭ* forms etc). After enumerating these divergences Burrow adds: "These and other irregular forms correspond to what is found in early middle Indo-Aryan (Pali and the various dialects recorded in the inscriptions of Aśoka), indicating that Epic Sanskrit is a later form of Sanskrit than that of Pāṇini. No pre-paninian forms are found in the Epic<sup>6</sup>. "The general language of the middle classes displayed a mixture of Sanskritizing and Prakritizing tendencies"<sup>7</sup>.

I will quote Burrow at length to explain the genesis of this *laukikasamskṛta*: "The recitation and transmission of the Epic legends was not the business of the Brāhmaṇas, but of the Sūtas, a class of royal servants whose duties had originally included that of the charioteer. It was natural that their language should be of a more popular nature than that of the educated classes par excellence, the Brāhmaṇas. At the same time it is interesting that all along, in spite of the competition of Prakrit, Sanskrit was cultivated in much wider circles than in the priestly schools for whom Pāṇini's work was intended. Outside the brahminical schools the knowledge of grammatical theory must have been elementary to say the least, and in the early period at least the knowledge of Sanskrit on the part of the epic reciters must have depended primarily on usage and not on formal instruction. From this arose the tendency to approximate the language to the prevailing type of Middle Indo-Aryan (Pali & the Prakrits). Later when the gulf between the two became greater formal instruction in Sanskrit became a universal necessity, but by this period the epic style and the epic language had already established itself in its own right, and linguistic features such as those mentioned above were accepted and retained"<sup>8</sup>.

---

6. Ibidem. p. 52.

7. F. W. Thomas, JRAS, 1904, p. 469. Quoted by S. D. Laddu in Evolution of the Sanskrit language from Pāṇini to Patañjali, University of Poona, 1974, p. 7.

8. T. Burrow, op. cit. p. 53.

As said above regarding Candragomin, Kātyāyana and Patañjali were also instrumental in approaching and updating the *brāhmaṇasaṃskṛta* to the changes suggested by the usage of the *laukikasamskṛta* and at the same time they protected Sanskrit from a dangerous turn towards Prakrit "A 'difference from the norm of Pāṇini' was glaringly seen in many respects. So, when MIA (Pali & the Prakrits) or 'incorrect' words had thus made serious inroads in the speech, the task of giving the society a good correct language had, after Kātyāyana, again and all the more so, fallen, this time, upon Patañjali"<sup>9</sup>.

Another point in which we disagree lies in the assertion made by Dr. Chaturvedi that this *laukikasamskṛta* was the language in use in the administration before the advent of the brahminical reaction headed by Puṣyamitra. Truly this goes against the data furnished by the available inscriptions. It is well known that in the centuries that preceded the Christian era the different Prakrits were almost exclusively used for epigraphical purposes and it appears that the languages of the administration were also different types of Prakrits. The Sanskrit inscriptions become more frequent after the first centuries A. D. till they gain the upper hand in 150 A. D. with the Rudradāman inscription. It is even considered that the birth of the Brāhmī script was exclusively intended for Prakrit and that only later was adopted for Sanskrit. "So the new religious teachers (Jains and Buddhists) adopted the use of the Prakrit language for the benefit of the common people. This language gradually spread throughout the country and even outside and thus secured an honoured place like Sanskrit. And under the influence of this strong cultural movement, a simple and precise script was created for the use of this popular Prakrit language". "And since Prakrit has fewer sounds than Sanskrit, the script used by Aśoka has also fewer symbols and when this script was later on adopted for Sanskrit also

---

9. S. D. Laddu, op. cit. p. 7.

a few more sings were adopted".<sup>10</sup> And again: "Of course, at a later period when the Vedic culture was revived, even the Brahmins adopted the developed Aśokan Brāhmī script for their purpose. And this state of affairs explains why the earliest Brāhmī script used by Aśoka for Prakrit language does not posses the signs of Sanskrit language like *visarga*, *jihvāmūliya*, *upadhmanīya* etc., which were introduced into the script later on when it was used for the Sanskrit language also".<sup>11</sup>

To put in perspective the use of Sanskrit as an administrative language, the ascendancy of Prakrit and the subsequent neglect of Sanskrit we will quote again some passages. "In the third century B. C. Aśoka had his inscriptions engraved in various local dialects and ignored Sanskrit. It follows that the language of administration of the Mauryan empire was also in Middle Indo-Aryan, and not as universally the case later, in Sanskrit. If this process had not been reversed Sanskrit might have yielded place to the younger language, but quite the reverse happened and from the end of the Mauryan period a steady process set in which resulted in Sanskrit becoming the predominant language of literature, culture and administration". "Until after the Christian era the vernacular language alone was used for epigraphical purposes, and this means that business and administrative documents –all of which were written on perishable materials and have not survived–were composed in the same language. After the Christian era Sanskrit too begins to appear in inscriptions, at firs in competition with Prakrit, and finally in exclusive use. The inscription of Rudradāman (A. D. 150) marks the victory of Sanskrit in one part of India. In the South Prakrit remained in use longer and was not finally ousted by Sanskrit until the fourth or fifth century A. D."<sup>12</sup>

I think Dr. Chaturvedi blunders with imprecise observations when he tries to define his *laukikasamskṛta*. For *laukikasamskṛta*

10. G. S. Gai, Introduction to Indian epigraphy, Central Institute of indian languages, Mysore, 1986, p. 23-4.

11. Ibidem. p. 20.

12. T. Burrow, op. cit., p. 58.

sometimes he seems to understand Epic Sanskrit, sometimes pure Prakrit and sometimes also mixed Sanskrit. One should remember that the mixed Sanskrit adopted by the Mahāsaṅgika shows an overwhelming influence of Prakrit grammar and that Epic Sanskrit is in fact closer to paninian Sanskrit than to the mixed variety. Similar things could be said about the later *āgamic* Sanskrit as it appears in the tantrik manuscripts. Everything seems to point to the fact that if the Brahminical reaction had not taken place the prakritizing process of Sanskrit would have been so strong as to endanger its very existence.

4) Finally I think that, if we examine the phonetical observations of the *prātiśākhya*s, it is untenable to hold that the tradition of using *anusvāra* inside a pada and before a pause is older than the usual Paninian practice. Again it seems quite clear that those extended uses of *anusvāra* betray an influence of the Prakrits and that even Pāṇini was liberal enough to allow *anusvāra* in word-final position preceding a consonant. "Its optional use is further extended, even as early as Pāṇini, to word final position preceding a stop, where previous phonetic teaching had prescribed a homorganic (parasavarṇa)nasal".<sup>13</sup> The 'previous phonetic teaching' referred to by Mr. Allen is the Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya "मकारः स्पर्शपरस्तस्य सिस्थानमनुनासिकम्"<sup>14</sup>: "Later treatises extend this practice to morpheme-junctions within the word, even to intra-morphemic position (*apadānta*), being followed in this last extension by the graphic practice of manuscripts and of some printers. In Prakrit it is further extended to the position before an initial vowel"<sup>15</sup>.

In fact *anusvāra* was usually described as having both a vocalic and consonantal element. "The vowel element of the *anusvāra* became more prevalent later on in Pāli, Prākṛta, Apabhraṁśa and in the spoken modern languages while the consonant element became more predominant in Classical

13. W. Sidney Allen, *Phonetics in Ancient India*, OUP, London, 1953, p. 41.

14. TP, V. 27. Quoted by Mr. Allen in op. cit. p. 41, n. 2.

15. *Ibidem*.

Sanskrit".<sup>16</sup> "Graphic considerations may well underlie the later extension of *anusvāra* to replace homorganic ( *parasavarṇa*) nasals within a morpheme (*apadānta*)".<sup>17</sup> "Lithuanian here provides another parallel, in that indigenous grammars extend the nasal vowel-symbol...as a graphic device for writing the homorganic nasal before stops (e. g. *pir̥ti* for *pinti*)...Note also that the Sarva-saṁmata-Śikṣā, in prescribing this extension (32) acknowledges that *anusvāra* here 'lacks its peculiar properties'... (इत्यत्रानुस्वारोऽपि विधर्मकः)<sup>18</sup>.

Whitney and Max Muller also had a similar discussion concerning the usages of *anusvāra*. While Whitney was more in conformity with the restricted use of the *anusvāra*, Max Muller favoured the later option. Prof. Allen has also try to show the phonological implications and advantages of using *anusvāra* instead of *parasavarṇa*. But in doing so he is speaking from the point of view of modern phonetics and not reproducing the opinion of the ancient indian grammarians. As per their instructions, it seems quite clear that *anusvāra* was first exclusively restricted to postvocalic position before the sibilants and 'h' and that latter it was also allowed under the other circumstances recognised by Pāṇini. The further extensions of the other schools of grammar bear, in our opinion, the imprint of Prakrit influences.

#### 5) Conclusion :

a) Dr. Chaturvedi is right in pointing out that the extensive use of *anusvāra* is not an error but a deliberate use. In this sense his suggestions are quite fruitful and a new line of research could be open by looking more carefully and trying to find meaning in the so called scribe's errors. I think some interesting conclusions could emerge from a systematic observation of the grammatical anomalies in the puranic manuscripts.

16. A critical study of Sanskrit Phonetics, Vidhata Mishra, Chowkhamba, varanasi, 1972. p. 162.

17. W. Sidney Allen, op. cit. p. 44-45.

18. Ibidem, p. 45, n. 1.



b) Nevertheless when it comes to edit a text for his later printing the principle of universality should be kept in mind and stick, for the sake of unity, to a single type of Sanskrit. After all as I said earlier the differences between classical Sanskrit and Epic/Pauranic Sanskrit are not as sharp as Dr. Chaturvedi would like them to be. Moreover the extended use of *anusvāra*, as Dr. Chaturvedi recognizes, is also found in shastraic manuscripts and in texts that clearly belong to the paninian school. It is not therefore a mere peculiarity of a *laukikasamskṛta* as represented in his Epic/puranic incarnation, but a mere graphic device used both by followers of the non-paninian systems and followers of Pāṇini. It seems then that those usages started more as a graphic convenience than as a result of consciously following a different grammatical schools. We have also seen that the same graphic convention does exist, for similar reasons, in another language.

c) It is quite clear that the growing use of *anusvāra* reflects Prakrit influences. I think we should try to keep the Sanskrit as free as possible from this influences. We have seen how Prakrit started growing under the patronage of Buddhists and Jaina kings. At a certain point and in certain fields Sanskrit was almost completely replaced by Prakrit. In fact the real fight took place between *prākṛta* and *samskṛta* (both classical and epic) and not between *brāhmaṇasamskṛta* and *laukikasamskṛta*. It is thanks to the brahminical reaction that today we can use a type Sanskrit as wonderful in his structure and accurate in his expression as that of the classical times.

d) I think it is quite wrong to oppose the authority of the later systems of grammar to that of Pāṇini. The system of Pāṇini may have the disadvantage of its obscurity and difficulty, but no other system has effected a more detailed and precise description of the language than that of Pāṇini. On the other hand the later systems recognize their own limitations, because they are intended for people that contemplate grammar as a means to an end and not as

an end in itself. When this systems were amended, it was mostly on Paninian lines.

e) Nevertheless, in my opinion, while editing a pauranic manuscript on should keep in mind Dr. Chaturvedi's suggestions and at least keep a record on the use of the *anusvāra*. This will improve the quality of the edition and facilitate further research on thistopic.

## II

Now I will concentrate on the second part of this comments, concerning the application of *sandhi* in metrical forms. Dr. Chaturvedi asks himself: if at end of each *pāda* there is *yati*, that is to say a phonetic *avasāna*, why then the current practice in printed editions is to make *avasāna sandhi* at the end of only the 2nd and 4th *pādas*? What difference there is in fact between the 1st and the 2nd *pādas*? By the same token *sandhi* should take place in the 4th *pāda* of *yugmakas*, *kulakas* etc? These questions open up three possibilities regarding the use of *anusvāra*:

1. Respecting the *yati* and writing *anusvāra* at the end of the four *pādas*, according to the principles of the Sārasvata, the reinterpreted Kātantra and the reinterpreted Pāṇini.

2. According to the accepted practice and respecting the *avasāna* of the *yati* writing always 'm' instead of *anusvāra*.

3. The actual practice, which seems to Dr. Chaturvedi the most illogical one, since it takes into consideration the *yati* of th 2th and 4th *pādas*, but not that of the 1st and 3rd and it neither follows the Sārasvata principles nor the paninian one.

I think this problem has an easy solution, because these questions were already raised and solved by the ancient theoreticians. The recitation of *ślokas* is subjected to prosodic (*chandaḥśāstra*) laws that regulated the occurrence of *yati* and its relation with *sandhi*. These laws were laid down by the ancient teachers. Had Dr. Chaturvedi taken the trouble to consult the Piṅgalachandaḥsūtra he would have find the solution to his

problems. There is in fact a distinction to be made between the 2nd and the 1st/3rd *pāda*. The Piṅgalachandaḥsūtra explicitly says:

यतिः सर्वत्र पादान्ते श्लोकार्द्धे तु विशेषतः<sup>19</sup>

The commentary adds :

श्लोकार्द्धे तु विशेषतः, इत्यत्र सन्धिकार्याभावः स्पष्टविभक्तित्वञ्च विशेषः.<sup>20</sup>

That explains the usual practice of writing *virāma* at the end of the 2nd *pāda*. If we consider the exact relation between the two adverbs '*sarvatra*' and '*viśeṣataḥ*' we shall discover also the relations between *sandhi* and *yati* and the reason why *sandhi* is often respected at the end of the 2nd and 4rd *pādas*. *Sarvatra* means 'everywhere', 'at each place', 'in all cases' and '*viśeṣataḥ*' means 'especially', 'particularly', 'above all'. The presence of '*viśeṣataḥ*' relativizes the meaning of '*sarvatra*'. That is to say: '*sarvatra*' means 'in all cases where an exception does not apply', and '*viśeṣataḥ*' means that there are no exceptions at all. Indeed the context clarifies what are the exceptions that prevent *yati* at the end of the 1st and 3rd *pādas*.

*Yati* does not take place for instance when there has been an *ekadeśa* substitute in vowel *sandhi*, or a *yañ* substitute for a vowel, or between *upasargas* and *dhātus*. The *yati* disappears at the end of 1st and 3rd *caranās* when it happens in the middle of a *pada*, but a *yati* of the *samudrādi* type, a *yati* inside the *pāda*, should be respected even in *padamadhya* position (क्वचित्तु पदमध्येऽपि समुद्रादौ यतिर्भवेत्। समुद्रादाविति एतस्येदमेव प्रयोजनमस्ति यत् पादान्तयतिः पदमध्ये नोचितेति।)<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, according to Gaṅgādāsa, *yati* is not very convenient in *padamadhya* position: 'पदान्ते सा (यतिः) शोभां व्रजति पदमध्ये त्यजति च,<sup>22</sup> although it is accepted when it involves an internal vocalic *sandhi*, (पदमध्ये स्वरविहितसन्धिः). Dandin gives also a *śloka* the first part of which exemplifies the prevalence of *sandhi*

19. Quoted in the Chandomañjarī, Śrī Gaṅgādāsa, edited by Dr. Brahmananda Tripathi, Chaukhamba, Varanasi, 1988, p. 10.

20. Ibidem.

21. Ibidem. 12.

22. Ibidem. 12

over *yati*, and the latter half the opposite instances. to justify *yati* in some cases of *padamadhya* Dandin says that if the last part of a *pada* joins the next syllable of a word because of *sandhi* and the *yati* falls immediately before that syllable, the remaining part of the word before the *yati* shall be considered a full word (लुप्ते पदान्ते शिष्टस्य पदत्वं निश्चितं यथा। तथा सन्धिविकारान्तं पदमेवेति वर्ण्यते।)<sup>23</sup>

The authors are not always in agreement, but a conclusion comes to the surface quite clearly: we can write a *virāma* at the end of 2nd and 4th *caraṇas* because in both cases there are no exceptions to *yati*. But in the case of *samudrādi* syllables and *pādānta yati* concerning the 1st and 3rd *caraṇas* we better do the *sandhi* and then look if the *sandhi* supersedes the *yati* or not. I think that is the reason that justifies the current practice in writing *ślokas*.




---

23. Kāvyaḍarśa, 3, 153-154.

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST  
(July to December 1992)

### **GARUḌA PURĀṆA WORK**

During the period of these six months the Critical Apparatuses of Chapters 201 to 210 of the Ācārakhaṇḍa of the Garuḍa Purāṇa were prepared. The Critical Apparatuses of further chapters are also under progress. The introduction and critical notes are being prepared. We hope to start the printing in the coming year.

### **WORK ON TĪRTHAS**

The Trust has started to bring out the monographs on tīrthas. At first the work on Ayodhyā has been taken up. The Ayodhyā-Sarayū Issue of the Purāṇa Bulletin (XXXIII, No: 2) was first in this series. In this series a critical edition of the Ayodhyā Māhātmya of the Vaiṣṇava-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa has been also taken up. About twenty manuscripts of the Ayodhyā Māhātmya from different Manuscripts Libraries of India have been procured and collation of these manuscripts has been started. After the completion of the Ayodhyā work the work on the other Tīrthas will be taken up.

### **MATSYA PURĀṆA WORK**

The work of editing the Matsya Purāṇa was taken up first in the project of the critical editions of the Mahāpurāṇas. The work of editing was entrusted to Dr. V. Raghavan; unfortunately the work was not completed in his lifetime. Now the work of editing is entrusted to Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, a renowned scholar of Purāṇas and Indology. We hope that Dr. Bhattacharya will be able to complete the work within a few years.

### **PUBLICATION OF UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPTS OF THE PURĀṆAS**

About twenty-five years ago Trust started to publish the unpublished manuscripts of the Purāṇas. The first in this series was

Svalpa Matsya Purāṇa. The editing of the Svalpa Matsya Purāṇa was taken up by the late Professor Dr. V. Raghavan. More than two-third of the text was edited and serially published in the Purāṇa Bulletin. Due to sudden death of Dr. Raghavan the work was not finished. Later, we started the publication of the Mānasakhaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa in this series and half of the text is serially published in the Purāṇa Bulletin. The work is continued. Now the Trust has procured two rare manuscripts of the Agni Purāṇa from the India Office Library, London. Scholars like late Dr. Hazra opined that the vulgate Text of the Agni Purāṇa is of apocryphal character and the genuine Vahni Purāṇa (Agni Purāṇa) is represented by the India Office Library MSS. We hope that by presenting this text of the Agni Purāṇa, we will be able to give the genuine text of the Agni Purāṇa.

### SEMINAR ON SANSKRIT GRAMMAR

On the 7th and 8th September a seminar on Sanskrit Grammar was organised by the Trust under the Chairmanship of His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. Vishva Sanskrit Pratishthanam was co-sponsor of this seminar. The aim of the seminar was to pick up the correct forms of the words and roots, which can be used in many senses and by minimum vibhaktis the correct Sanskrit can be written and spoken. The eminent scholars of Varanasi discussed the proposal for spoken and written Sanskrit language presented by Pt. **Shri Krishna Dutt Tiwari** of the Kashiraj Nyasa, Ramnagar. The seminar was inaugurated by Dr. Vidya Nivas Mishra, the then Vice-Chancellor of the Sampurnanand Sanskrit University. Prof. Mishra, in his speech emphasised the need of such efforts and gave some solid solutions. Other speakers who addressed the seminar were :-

1. Prof. K. D. Tripathi
2. Prof. Ram Chandra Pandey
3. Prof. Krishna Shastri Kanitkar,
4. Dr. Ramesh Chandra Panda
5. Prof. Shashidhar Mishra
6. Acharya Ram Prasad Tripathi
7. Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai
8. Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya
9. Chaudhary Shri

Narain Singh 10. Shri Chandradhar Prasad Narain Singh (Bhanu Babu).

### VISITORS TO THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT

During this period the following eminent persons visited the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust and noted their views in the Visitors' Book—

1. Dr. Amarnath, Assistant Professor in K. D. S. University, Darbhanga, visited on 15th July 1992; He writes: "My mind is too pleased to see the Purāṇa Publication Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. The publications of the Trust are as medicines for preserving the Indian Culture. I wish development of this Department as it is."
2. Thirty-five girl students of B. Ed. Course of Sri Agrasena Kanya Post-Graduate College, Varanasi visited the department under the guidance of Dr. (Srimati) Shashi Prabha Agrawal, the Head of the Faculty of Education on 30th July 1992.
3. Prof. Gonsal Lopez Nadal - Universitat de les Elles Batears, Mallorca, Spain visited on 14th August, 1992 and noted remarks as under:-"During my third visit to Varanasi I have been able to witness the stupendous work on Puranic literature being done under the direction of His Excellency Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. Thanks to my friend Mr. Oscar Pujol, who has taken me to Ramnagar to visit this group of specialists doing their work with utmost reddish dedication".
4. Mr. Narendra Kumar of the Sanskrit Deptt. of St. Xavier College, Ranchi (Bihar) visited on 20th October 1992 and after having informations of the Purāṇas, wrote:-  
"During my visiting period for the last four years, I have been able to know the essence of the Purāṇas. The Purāṇas hold the instruction for activities and they are director and doer of the perfect sacred rites. I am suggested by this deptt".
5. Mr. Bijendra Pal, Superintending Engineer, Allahabad visited the Deptt on 25th November 1992 and noted—

"Today, it is an opportunity to visit the Museum and the Publication Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust."

6. Dr. (Smt.) Geeta Saklani came from Jodhpur (Raj.) on 3rd December 1992 and noted:—

"It's really nice to have to this All-India Kashiraj Trust. I am quite thrilled to see the arrangement and organisation of this centre. I pay my special thanks to all the staff of the centre".

7. Dr. Abul Hasan Akhtar, resident of B 19/26 Deoriabeer, Vijayanagar Road, Varanasi came on 31st December, 1992 to the Department and he was pleased to see the Persian and Urdu translations and transcriptions of the Purāṇas and minor puranic tracts.

### PURĀṆA GOṢṬHĪ

The Purāṇa Goṣṭhī was organised at Shivala Palace of the All-India Kashiraj Trust on 13th July 1992 on the occasion of the Vyāsa-pūrṇimā. The Purāṇa-goṣṭhī was held under the Chairmanship of His Highness Kashinaresh Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, chairman of the Trust. The editor of the Purāṇa Bulletin Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya recited Puranic Maṅgalācaraṇa verses. Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai, the Head of the Purāṇa Department presented the annual report of the Department and introduced the newly appointed scholars.

The veteran nonagenarian scholar Pt. Baladeva Upadhyaya highlighted in his opening speech the work which are being done by the Trust for the preservation of Indian culture. He pointed out that the Purāṇas were the most important repositories of Indian culture, knowledge and philosophy and that they explained the Vedas. He further expressed that the Purāṇas are compiled for the benefit of common men. Prof. Lallanji Gopal and Prof. Ram Chandra Pandey of Benaras Hindu University explained the merit of the Purāṇas and pointed out the different aspects of history, culture, and a strolgy preserved in the Purāṇas.

Dr. Uma Kant Chaturvedi discussed the language of the Purāṇas, especially the Ayodhyā Māhātmya and the Nṛsimha



Purāṇa. He contended that in Puranic literature we found many examples of Hiatus between last letter of the first and third pādas and first letter of the second and fourth pādas of the same śloka.

Other scholars who spoke on this occasion were Prof. Reva Prasad Dwivedi, Prof. Gopal Dutt Pandey and Dr. Jahnavi Shekhar Rai.

Finally the Vyāsa Pūrṇimā number of the Purāṇa Bulletin was presented to the Chairman by Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai. The Purāṇa Bulletin was presented to all the participant scholars also.

H. H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh requested the scholars to point out the archaeological, geographical, cultural and historical materials contained in the Purāṇas. At the end of the Goṣṭhī His Highness Maharaja of Benares thanked the participants for their interest in the puranic studies. The function concluded with tea and refreshments.

### RĀMALĪLĀ

The magnificent Rāmalīlā of Rāmanagar was celebrated this year from 10th September to October, 10, 1992 (Bhādrapada śuklā caturdaśī to Āṣvina śuklā caturdaśī of the 2949 V. S.). The Rāmalīlā is undoubtedly one of the most impressive events organised by the Trust. As usual, the saints, devotees and regular visitors (*Nemis*) participated daily in the month-long celebration. On peak days, the performance was attended by no less than hundred thousand spectators. The Rāmalīlā is not simply a representation, but the descent of Rāma on the earth. The Rāmalīlā actors (the Brahmin-boys, who play the role of Rāma, Lakṣamaṇa, Bharata, Śatrughna and Jānakī) usually start their first performance at the age of 8 or 9 years. The Rāmalīlā-actors are carefully trained for a period of two months so that they may become proper pātras (dramtis personae) for the dwelling the divine of Rāma and others.

Rāmalīlā was started every day in the presence of H. H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Sing and Yuvarāja Shri Anant Narain Singh. A good number of foreign visitors and scholars were

also present in this month-long function. For the saints provisions were supplied every day free of cost during the Rāmalīlā period.

### RĀSALĪLĀ

This year the Rāsalīlā was performed in the Prasiddha garden from 1st August to 13th August, 1992. The performers (traditional actors, Rāsamaṇḍalī) came from Mathura and Vrindavan. During the Rāsalīlā the Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa and Rādhāhasranāma were recited by Sanskrit scholars. The Rāsalīlā was daily enacted in the evening, after sunset. As usual, a large number of citizens, devotees and Sādhus witnessed the Rāsalīlā. H.H. Kashinaresh Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh and Yuvaraja Shri Anant Narain Singh were present through the whole performance of the Rāsalīlā.

### ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

#### 1. Maharaja Benares Vidyamandir Trust

#### MUSEUM

The Ramnagar Fort Museum is a good attraction for the visitors from the different parts of the country and abroad. The collection of old palanquins, elephant haudas, textiles, hukkās, torches, arms, ivory and specimen of Banarasi brass-works are some of the special features of the Museum. The unique clock (Dharmaghari) made at Ramnagar more than one hundred years ago, depicting all the Hindu zodiacal signs is a relevant illustration of the Museum's singularity.

Among the innumerable visitors to the Museum during this period the names of a few of the most eminent ones, who signed the Visitor-Book, and added important comments, are given here:—

1. Mr. N. Masyelu, Deputy Speaker of Manipur Legislative Assembly, wrote:

"I visited the old Fort Museum of Ramnagar Fort with my family members on 26th August 1992. This great museum preserves very nicely all old precious materials of the kingdom."

2. Mr. David Evans, Australian High Commissioner to India and Mrs. Pamela Evans, visited on 9th September 1992 and noted—"Thank you for the opportunity to see some of the rich heritage of Varanasi and the house of Benaras".

### WALL PAINTING COMPETITION

On the 30th December 1992 a Wall Painting Competition was organised for the local artistes. The artistes painted the historical and religious pictures on outer wall of the Maharaja Banaras Vidya Mandir Museum. These pictures adorn the outer wall of the Museum for the whole year.

The painting were judged by the Professors of the Deptt. of performing Arts, B. H. U. Prizes were given to the winning artistes.

### PAINTING COMPETITION

On the same day a Painting Competition was organised for the local children. The young boys and girls assembled in the Diwan Khana of the Fort in the forenoon and painted the pictures. The paper and colours were supplied to each competitor. They were also judged by the professors of the Banaras Hindu University. The first three winners were given special prizes; all other participants got a Consolation Prize each. At the end of the competition sweets were given to all the participants.

### 2. Kashi Naresh Maharani Dharma Karya Nidhi.

#### (a) DISTRIBUTION OF SWEETS

In the afternoon of the 2nd December, 1992 sweets were distributed to the boys and girls students of all the Primary and Junior High Schools of Ramnagar. Students in their school uniforms carrying their school banners gathered in the inner courtyard of the Fort under the guidance of their teachers. The total number of children who got sweets was more than six thousand.

On the same day in the evening sweets and clothes were distributed to children under 5 years of age. On the previous day (1st Dec. 1992) sweets and clothes were distributed to poor children of Bairat and Musakhand tribal belts in Chakia Tehsil.

**(b) HARIKĪRTANA**

In the evening of the 30th November, 1992 Harikīrtana was organised by the Trust. Devotees and Kīrtanias of Ramnagar and Varanasi recited the sacred names of the God and devotional songs on this occasion.

**3. Maharaja Kashiraj Dharma Karya Nidhi**

Under the auspices of this Trust rituals and religious functions are concluded during the whole year. This trust also runs four educational institutions, which are making steady progress. These institutions are:-

1. Maharani Ramratan Kunvari Sanskrit Pathashala, Ramnagar,
2. Maharaja Balavanta Singh Degree College, Gangapur,
3. Raja Manasa Ram Law College, Raja Talab,
4. Bharatiya Vidya and Yoga Kendra, Allahabad.

**Visit of His Majesty the King of Nepal**

His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, Chairman, hosted a breakfast for Their Majesties King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev and Queen Aishwarya Rajyalakshmi Devi Shah at the Nandesar Palace, Varanasi on 1 December 1992. The royal couple was on a personal visit to Kashi for Darshan of Sri Kashi Vishvanatha.



# सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम् (जुलाई-दिसम्बर १९९२)

## गरुडपुराणकार्यम्

अस्मिन् षण्मासात्मककार्यावधौ गरुडपुराणास्याचारखण्डस्य २०१ तः २१० पर्यन्ताध्यायानां पाठसमीक्षोपकरणं निर्मितम् । अग्रिमाध्यायानामपि पाठसमीक्षोपकरणकार्यं प्रचलति । सम्प्रति भूमिकालेखनं पाठ-समीक्षितपाठोपरि टिप्पणीलेखनं च प्रचलति । आशास्महे यदग्रिमवर्षे मुद्रणकार्यं प्रारम्भतां यास्यतीति ।

## तीर्थसंबन्धिकार्याणि

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन तीर्थानां विषयेऽपि कार्यं प्रारब्धम् । प्रथमतः अयोध्याविषयकं कार्यमुररीकृतम् । 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकायाः (३३.२) अयोध्या-सरयू विशेषाङ्कम् अस्मिन् कार्यसूच्यां प्रथममासीत् । अस्मिन् प्रसङ्गे स्कन्दपुराणान्तर्गत-वैष्णवखण्डीयायोध्यामाहात्म्यस्य पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणस्य कार्यं प्रारब्धम् । भारतस्थ-विविधग्रन्थागारेभ्यः अनेका हस्तलेखाः आनीतास्तेषां पाठसंवादलेखनकार्यं प्रचलति । अयोध्यामाहात्म्यस्य समाप्त्यनन्तरमन्येषां तीर्थानामपि कार्यं भविष्यति ।

## मत्स्यपुराणकार्यम्

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन मत्स्यपुराणस्य पाठसंपादनकार्यं महापुराणानां पाठसमीक्षितसंस्करणयोजनायां सर्वप्राथम्येन प्रारब्धम् । अस्य संपादनदायित्वं डा. वे. राघवन् महोदयोपरि आसीत् । किन्तु दुर्दैववशादस्य संपादनकार्यं डा. राघवन्महाभागानां जीवनकाले पूर्तिं नागच्छत् । संप्रत्यस्य संपादनस्य दायित्वं डॉ. रामशंकरभट्टाचार्यमहोदयाय प्रदत्तम् । डॉ. भट्टाचार्यमहोदयः पुराणानां भारतीय-विद्यायाश्च विश्रुतो विद्वान् । आशासे कतिचिद्वर्षेषु कार्यमिदं समाप्तिमियादिति ।

## पौराणिकाप्रकाशिहस्तलेखानां प्रकाशनम्

पञ्चविंशतिवर्षं प्रागेव न्यासेनाप्रकाशितहस्तलेखानां प्रकाशनकार्यस्यारम्भ अकारि। अस्मिन् क्रमे प्रथमम् आसीत् स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणम्, यस्य सम्पादनकार्यस्य डॉ. वे. राघवन् महोदयोपर्यासीद्भारः । स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणस्य २/३ अंशाश्च 'पुराणम्'

पत्रिकायां प्रकाशिताः । दुर्दैववशात् डॉ. राघवन्महोदयस्यासामयिकमृत्युवशात् कार्यं न सम्पूर्णतामगात् । तदनन्तरमस्माभिः स्कन्दपुराणीयमानसखण्डस्य प्रकाशनकार्य-मुररीकृतम् अस्यार्धांशश्च 'पुराणम्'-पत्रिकायां प्रकाशिताः प्रचलति च कार्यं सम्प्रत्यपि । वह्नि (अग्नि-) पुराणस्य न्यासेन द्वौ हस्तलेखौ लन्दनस्थ इण्डिया-ऑफिसलाईब्रेरीत आनीतौ । डॉ. हाजरा-महोदयसदृशाः विद्वांसः मन्यन्ते यत् वह्नि- (अग्नि) पुराणस्य प्रचलितपाठः प्रेक्षितकोटिभजते इण्डिया आफिस लाईब्रेरी संस्थया चास्योचितपाठस्योपलब्धि कृता । न्यासोऽयमग्निपुराणस्योचितपाठस्य अनयोर्हस्तलेखयोरधारेण सम्पादने समर्थो भविष्यतीत्याशास्महे ॥

### संस्कृतव्याकरणगोष्ठी

सितम्बर मासस्य ७-८ दिनाङ्कयोः तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशानामाध्यक्ष्ये संस्कृत-व्याकरणगोष्ठ्यायोजिता। विश्वसंस्कृतप्रतिष्ठानमप्यस्याः गोष्ठ्या आसीत्सहायोजकः । गोष्ठ्या उद्देश्यञ्चासीत्संस्कृतभाषायाः सम्भावनाः या प्रचलितभाषायां न्यूनविभक्ति-धातुप्रयोगेऽपि साधुत्वं भजन्ते । सम्पूर्णानन्दसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य तात्कालिक-कुलपतिना डॉ. विद्यानिवासमिश्रेणोद्घाटितेयं गोष्ठी । विश्वविश्रुतैः काशिस्थविद्वद्भिः काशिराजन्याससंस्थानीयेन पं श्रीकृष्णदत्ततिवारीमहोदयेन प्रस्तावितस्य प्रस्तावोपरि विचारःकृतः। प्रो. मिश्राः स्वकीयभाषणे संस्कृतभाषायाः कृते ईदृक्प्रयासस्य सराहना कृता, नवदिशाऽपि दर्शिता । अन्ये विद्वांसश्चासन् गोष्ठ्यां सम्बोधिताः—प्रो. कमलेशदत्त त्रिपाठी, प्रो. रामचन्द्र पाण्डेयः, प्रो. कृष्णशास्त्री कानिटकरः डॉ. रमेशचन्द्रपण्डा, प्रो. शशिधर मिश्रः, आचार्य रामप्रसाद त्रिपाठी, डॉ. गङ्गा सागर रायः, डॉ. रामशङ्कर भट्टाचार्यः, चतुर्धरश्रीनारायणसिंहः, श्रीचन्द्रधरप्रसादनारायण सिंहः (भानुबाबू) च ॥

### पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

अस्मिन् कार्यावधावधोनिर्दिष्टा विशिष्टा विद्वांसः सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागे आगताः, अभ्यागतपञ्जिकायामलिखञ्च तद्विषये—

१. १५ जुलाई १९९२ दिनाङ्के डॉ. अमरनाथः, दरभङ्गास्थ-कामेश्वरसिंहदरभङ्गा-संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य सहायक-प्राध्यापक आगच्छत् । स लिखति—“सर्व-भारतीयकाशिराजन्यासपुराणप्रकाशविभागं दृष्ट्वा प्रसीदति चेतः । इहत्यानि प्रकाशनानि भारतीय-संस्कृते रक्षायै महौषधरूपाणि सन्ति । कार्यमिदमतोऽपि प्रसृततरम् भवेद्—इति कामये।”

२. वाराणसीस्थ-श्रीअग्रसेनकन्यास्नातकोत्तरमहाविद्यालयीय-शिक्षा-सङ्घायाध्यक्षा डॉ. (श्रीमती) शशिप्रभा अग्रवाल-महोदया विद्यालयीय-शिक्षाशास्त्रिकक्षायाः पञ्चत्रिंशच्छात्राभिः सह ३० जुलाई १९९२ दिनाङ्के विभागे आगता । सर्वाश्छात्र्यः स्वाध्ययनविषयिण्यः संसूचनाश्चाङ्कितवत्यः ।
३. प्राचार्यगोसाललोपेजनदाल-महोदयः स्पेनदेशीय-मैलार्काविश्वविद्यालयात् १४ अगस्त १९९२ दिनाङ्के आगत्यात्रत्यं वैशिष्ट्यमङ्कते—"वाराणस्यां तृतीयवारा-गमनकाले तत्रभवतां महाराजानां डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहमहोदयानां निर्देशने विस्मयकरकार्ययुक्तं पुराणसाहित्यं द्रष्टुम् प्राप्तावसरोऽहम् । मम सुहृत् श्री आस्कर पुजोल धन्यवादार्हः, यस्य सहयोगेन रामनगरस्थानि कार्याणि द्रष्टुमहं समर्थः ।"
४. श्रीनरेन्द्रकुमारः सन्तजेवियरमहाविद्यालयीयः राँची (बिहार) तः २०-१०-१९९२ दिनाङ्के पुराणविषयकज्ञानानि सम्यगवगम्य लिखति—"गतचतुर्वर्षात्मकागमन-कालावधौ ज्ञानात्मस्वरूपाणि पुराणानि द्रष्टुमहम्प्राप्तावसरः । पुराणानि चास्मिन् क्षेत्रे सम्यक्-संस्कारस्य निर्देशकानि । अत्रागत्य प्रेरितोऽहम् ।"
५. प्रयागाद् अधीक्षणाभियन्ता श्रीविजेन्द्रपालः २५ नवम्बर १९९२ दिनाङ्के आगत्याङ्कते—"सङ्ग्रहालयस्य पुस्तकविभागस्य चावलोकनावसरोद्य प्राप्तः, अत्रत्यं यद्वृष्टं तत्रभावशाल्येव ।"
६. डॉ. (श्रीमती) गीता सकलानी जोधपुर (राजस्थान) तः ३-१२-१९९२ दिनाङ्के आगत्य लिखति—"सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य सर्वगुणोपेतां व्यवस्थां संस्थानज्वावलोक्य हर्षिताऽस्मि । संस्थानस्यास्य सर्वे सदस्याः धन्यवादार्हाः ।"
७. डॉ. अबुल हसन अख्तर महोदयः बी. १९/२६ ड्योडियाबीर, विजयानगर-मार्गम्, वाराणसीतः विभागे आगत्य संगृहीतान् पारसी-उर्दूभाषान्तरितान् प्रतिलेखान् पुराणान्, पौराणिकलघुग्रन्थाज्वावलोक्य सर्वथा हर्षितोऽभूत् ।

## पुराणगोष्ठी

१३ जुलाई १९९२ दिनाङ्के व्यासपूर्णिमागोष्ठ्यायोजिता । न्यासाध्यक्षाणां तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशमहाराजानामाध्यक्ष्ये आयोजितासीदियं पुराणगोष्ठी । आदौ 'पुराणम्'—पत्रिकायाः सम्पादकः डॉ. रामशङ्करभट्टाचार्यः मङ्गलाचरणे पौराणिक-श्लोकानां पाठमकरोत् । पुराणविभागाध्यक्षः डॉ. गङ्गासागररायमहोदयः पुराण-विभागीयवार्षिककार्यस्य विवरणं नवनियुक्तविदुषां परिचयञ्च प्रदत्तवान् ।

सर्वप्रथमं विख्यातविदुषा पद्मभूषणोपाधिनालङ्कृतेन प्राचार्यबलदेवोपाध्यायेन न्यासद्वारा सम्यक्सम्पादितानि संस्कृतिरक्षकाणि कार्याणि प्रतिपादितानि एतेषां महत्ता च । प्राचार्यवर्येणोपाध्यायमहोदयेनोपस्थापितं यत् पुराणानि खलु भारतीय संस्कृति-ज्ञान-दर्शनादिविषयाणां महत्त्वपूर्णस्रोतांसि, ज्ञानस्वरूपाणां वेदानां व्याख्यानानि च । तैरुद्भाषितं यत्पुराणानि सामान्यजनानामध्ययनार्थं निर्मितानि । काशीहिन्दू-विश्वविद्यालयीयेन प्राचार्य लल्लनजीगोपालमहोदयेन प्राचार्यरामचन्द्रपाण्डेयेन च कथितं यदितिहास-संस्कृतिज्योतिसम्बन्धिताः सर्व एव विषयाः पुराणेषूपलभ्यन्ते । डॉ. उमाकान्तचतुर्वेदिना विशेषतः अयोध्यामाहात्म्यस्य नृसिंहपुराणस्य च पौराणिक-भाषा-शब्दसङ्ग्रहौ चाख्यापितौ । डॉ. चतुर्वेद्यवदद्यत् पुराणेष्वनेकोदाहरणानि श्लोकानां प्रथम-तृतीयचरणानन्तरं द्वितीय-चतुर्थचरणारम्भेष्वप्यसन्धितशब्दाः सन्ति ।

अवसरेऽस्मिन् विशिष्टाः प्रवक्तारो विद्वांस इमे आसन्—प्राचार्यरेवाप्रसाद द्विवेदी, प्राचार्य गोपालदत्त पाण्डेयः, श्रीचन्द्रधर प्रसादनारायणसिंहः (भानुबाबू), डॉ. जाह्नवीशेखररायश्च ।

तदनन्तरं 'पुराणम्'- पत्रिकायाः व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः न्यासाध्यक्षेभ्यः डॉ. गङ्गासागर-रायमहोदयेन समर्पितः । सर्वेभ्य आगतविद्वद्भ्यः पुराणपत्रिकोपहारीकृता । न्यासाध्यक्षाः तत्रभवन्तः महाराजा डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवा अभ्यागत-विद्वद्भ्यः पुराणेषूपलब्धपुरातात्त्विक-भौगोलिक-सांस्कृतिकविषयेषु सहयोगार्थं स्वविचारप्रदर्शनार्थञ्च निर्देशाः कृतवन्तः । गोष्ठ्यन्ते तत्रभवन्त महाराजा उपस्थितविद्वद्भ्यः सहयोगार्थं धन्यवादान् वितरितवन्तः । अन्ते स्वल्पाहारः 'चाय'पानञ्च जातम् ॥

## रामलीला

रामनगरस्य विश्वविश्रुता रामलीलाऽस्मिन् वर्षे भाद्रपदशुक्लचतुर्दशीतः आश्विनशुक्लचतुर्दशी सं. २०४९ (१० सितम्बर १९९२ तः अक्टूबर १९९२) पर्यन्तं सम्पन्ना । सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्यैषा रामलीला एकमतीव प्रभावोत्पादकं कार्यमस्ति । पूर्ववत् सर्वेष्वेव दिवसेषु साधवः सन्ता नेमयश्च मासपर्यन्तं रामलीलां दृष्टवन्तः । विशिष्टदिवसेषु दर्शकानां संख्या लक्षमतिक्रामति स्म । रामलीलाया न केवलं नाट्यप्रदर्शनम्, अपितु भूमौ रामस्य यथार्थावतरणमस्ति । रामलीलायाः स्वरूपाः (ब्राह्मणबालका ये रामलक्ष्मणभरतशत्रुघ्नजानकीनां प्रदर्शनं कुर्वन्ति, ते) सर्वप्रथममष्टवर्षावस्थायां नववर्षावस्थायां वा प्रदर्शयितुमारभन्ते । स्वरूपाणां मास-द्वयं यावद्यथावत्प्रशिक्षणं भवति, यतस्तानि रामस्यान्वेषाञ्च निवासभूमयो भवेयुः ।



अनेके वैदेशिकदर्शका अध्येतारश्चापि रामलीलायाः दर्शनञ्चक्रुः । रामलीला-काले आगतेभ्यः साधुभ्यः भोजनसामग्र्यपि प्रतिदिनं निःशुल्का प्रदत्ता । तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवाः युवराज श्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंह-महोदयश्च रामलीलायां प्रतिदिनमुपस्थिता आसन् ।

## रासलीला

अस्मिन् वर्षे १ अगस्त १९९२ दिनाङ्कमारभ्य १३ अगस्त १९९२ दिनाङ्कं यावद् रामनगरस्थिते प्रसिद्धोद्याने रासलीला सुसम्पन्ना । रासलीलाप्रदर्शकाः (रासमण्डली) मथुरा-वृन्दावनत आगता आसन् । रासलीलाभूमौ श्रीमद्भागवत-महापुराणस्य राधासहस्रनाम्नश्च पाठः संस्कृतज्ञैः कृतः । प्रतिदिनं रासलीला सूर्यास्तानन्तरं सम्पन्ना । विशिष्टनागरिकाः भक्ताः साधवश्च रासलीलां दृष्टवन्तः । तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवाः युवराजः श्री अनन्त-नारायणसिंहमहोदयश्च प्रतिदिवसमुपस्थिता आसन् रासलीलाभूमौ ।

## सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

### १-महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासः

महाराजबनारससङ्ग्रहालयः विद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य सङ्ग्रहालयोऽतीवाकर्षकोऽस्ति भारतीयानां वैदेशिकानाञ्च दर्शकानां कृते । सङ्ग्रहालयस्यास्य सन्ति विशिष्ट-सङ्ग्रहीतवस्तुनीमानि - प्राचीनशिविकाः, हस्तप्रावरणानि ("हौदा" इति भाषायाम्), परिधानानि, 'हुक्का' इत्येतानि, प्रकाशयन्त्राणि, शस्त्राणि, हस्तदन्तनिर्मितवस्तूनि, काश्यां निर्मितानि 'ब्रास'वस्तूनि च । रामनगरे शतादपि वर्षेभ्यः प्राङ्निर्मिता धर्मघटिका, (यस्यां सर्वाण्यपि हिन्दूनक्षत्रादीनि सन्ति) विस्तारयति सङ्ग्रहालयस्यास्य प्रतिष्ठाम् ।

१९९२ तमे वर्षेऽसंख्यदशकेषु केचन एव विशिष्टदर्शनार्थिनो दर्शकपुस्तके स्वहस्ताक्षराणि कृतवन्तः स्वामूल्यसम्मतिञ्च लिखितवन्तः; तेषां नामानि इमानि—  
१. श्री एन. मास्येलु मणिपुरविधानसभायाः उपाध्यक्षः, अयं दर्शकपुस्तके लिखति—  
"रामनगरदुर्गस्थं प्राचीनसङ्ग्रहालयं सपरिवारमहं २६-८-१९९२ दिनाङ्के दृष्टवान् । सङ्ग्रहालयोऽयं पूर्वकालिकराज्यस्य सर्वाणि प्रचलितबहुमूल्यवस्तूनि रक्षति ।"

२. श्री डेविड इवान्सः, आस्ट्रेलियादेशस्य भारते उच्चायुक्तः सपत्नीकः (श्रीमती पामेला इवान्समहोदयया सह) ९-९-१९-९२ दिनाङ्के सङ्ग्रहालयमवेक्ष्याङ्कते-  
"वाराणसेयपरम्परा, काशीनरेशमहाराजानां च कतिचित् सुन्दरदृश्यार्थं भवद्भ्यः  
धन्यवादाः ।"

### भित्तिचित्रप्रतियोगिता

३० नवम्बर १९९२ दिनाङ्के स्थानिकचित्रकाराणां कृते भित्तिचित्र-  
प्रतियोगिताऽयोजिता । चित्रकारैः महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य बाह्यभित्तिषु  
ऐतिहासिकानि, धार्मिकाणि चित्राणि च निर्मितानि । भित्तिष्विमानि चित्राणि वर्ष  
यावत्तिष्ठन्ति । एतेषाञ्चित्राणां परीक्षणं काशिक-हिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयीयचित्र-  
कलाध्यापकैः कृतम्, विजेतृचित्रकारेभ्यः पुरस्काराश्च प्रदत्ताः ।

### चित्रकला प्रतियोगिता

तस्मिन्नेव दिने स्थानीयबालकानां कृते चित्रकलाप्रतियोगिताया आयोजनं जातम्।  
बालकाः रामनगरदुर्गस्य 'दीवानखाना'-प्राङ्गणे पूर्वाह्णे समागत्य चित्रनिर्माणं चक्रुः ।  
प्रत्येकप्रतियोगिभ्यः चित्रनिर्माणार्थं पत्राणि वर्णानि च प्रदत्तानि । इमानि चित्राण्यपि  
काशीहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयीयाध्यापकैः परीक्षितानि । विजेतृछात्रेभ्यः विशिष्टाः  
पुरस्काराः अन्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यश्च सम्मिलितेभ्यः छात्रेभ्यः सान्त्वनापुरस्काराः प्रदत्ताः ।  
अन्ते च प्रतियोगितायां सम्मिलितेभ्यः प्रत्येकं छात्रेभ्यः मिष्टान्नानि प्रदत्तानि ।

### २. काशिनरेश महारानी धर्मकार्यनिधिः

#### (क) मिष्टान्नवितरणम्

२ दिसम्बर १९९२ दिनाङ्कस्यापराह्णे स्थानिकप्राथमिक-लघुमाध्यमिक-  
पाठशालानाञ्छात्रेभ्यः मिष्टान्नवितरणं जातम् । सर्वे छात्राः स्वविद्यालयीयपरिधाने  
रामनगरदुर्गस्यान्तःप्राङ्गणेऽध्यापकैः सह समवेताः । केचन छात्राः स्वविद्यालयीय-  
परिचायकं केतनमपि गृहीत्वासन् । येभ्यः छात्रेभ्यः मिष्टान्नं प्रदत्तं तेषां संख्या षट्  
सहस्रादप्यधिकाऽऽसीत् ।

तस्मिन्नेव दिन सायंकाले ऊनपञ्चवर्षेभ्यः निर्धनबालकेभ्यः वस्त्राणि मिष्टान्नानि  
च वितरितानि । अतः पूर्वदिवसे (१ दिसम्बर १९९२ दिनाङ्के) चकियानगर-  
समीपवर्तिवैराट-मूसाखण्डनामक स्थाने निर्धनवन्यबालकेभ्योऽपि मिष्टान्नवितरणं  
वस्त्रवितरणञ्च जातम् ।

**(ख) हरिकीर्तनम्**

न्यासेनानेन २ दिसम्बर १९९२ दिनाङ्कस्य रात्रौ हरिकीर्तनस्यायोजनं कृतम् । रामनगरस्थाः वाराणसेयाश्च भक्ताः कीर्तनकाराश्च हरेर्नाम्नां भक्तिपद्यानाञ्च कीर्तनञ्चक्रुः ।

**३. महाराजकाशिराजधर्मकार्यनिधिः**

न्यासेनानेन वर्षपर्यन्तमेव धार्मिककृत्यानां सम्पादनं क्रियते । अनेन न्यासेन सततवर्धिष्यमाणान्यधोनिर्दिष्टानि शिक्षासंस्थानान्यपि सञ्चाल्यन्ते—महारानी रामरत्नकुवरि संस्कृतपाठशाला, रामनगरम्, महाराजबलवन्तसिंहमहाविद्यालयः, गङ्गापुरम्; राजामनसारामविधिमहाविद्यालयः, राजातालाब; भारतीयविद्या तथा योगकेन्द्रम्, प्रयागश्च ।

**नेपालनरेशानामागमनम्**

१ दिसम्बर १९९२ दिनाङ्के तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंह-शर्मदेवाः तत्रभवतां नेपालनरेशानां महाराजानां वीरेन्द्रवीरविक्रमशाहदेवानाम् अभिनिन्दनं नन्देश्वरप्रासादे प्रातः समयेऽल्पाहारेण कृतवन्तः । तत्रभवन्तः नेपालनरेशाः स्वपत्न्या महाराज्ञ्या ऐश्वर्यराजलक्ष्म्या सह काशीविश्वेश्वस्य दर्शनार्थमागता आसन् ।





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. Vacant.

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

3. Sri Krishna Chandra Pant, Ex. Minister, Govt. of India, 7, Tyagraj Marg, New Delhi.
4. Sri Lok Pati Tripathi, Ex. Minister, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Aurangabad, Varanasi.

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

5. Dr. R.N. Dandekar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
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.

The 'Purāṇa', Bulletin has been started by the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust with the aim of organizing the manifold studies relating to the Purāṇas. It specially discusses the several aspects of text-reconstruction, of the interpretation of the vast cultural and historical material, and of the obscure esoteric symbolism of legends and myths in the Purāṇas.

The editors invite contributions from all those scholars who are interested in the culture of Purāṇa literature in which the religion and philosophy of the Vedas have found the fullest expression.

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF FOUR NEW PROJECTS

The All-India Kashiraj Trust has resolved to introduce four new Projects for the advancement of Puranic learning. The Trust heartily requests all scholars interested in Puranic study for cooperation.

(1) Publication of monographs dealing with Puranic literature (i. e. works bearing the name of Purāṇa or Upapurāṇa) in all the regional languages of India. Each monograph should contain a detailed account of published works, of MSS. preserved in the libraries and the Private Collections and of works known through quotations.

(2) Publication of unpublished theses on important Puranic subjects.

(3) Publication of a series of monographs (not less than 100 pages) on the lives of the great sages as described in Puranic literature.

(4) Publication of Sanskrit Digests by traditional scholars on Puranic subjects. These digests may be published in the Bulletin also.