पुराणम्
PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

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

VYĀSA PŪRṆMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

लेखेषु प्रतिपादितानि मतानि लेखकैरेवाभ्युपगतानि; न पुनस्तानि
सम्पादकैर्न्यासिन 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 = ṛ; च् = c; छ् = ch; ट् = ṭ; श् = ś; ष् = ṣ;
ṁ].
   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

व्यासपूर्णिमाङ्कः
Vyāsa-Pūrṇimā Number

CONTENTS—लेखसूची

व्यासविषयकाणि कानिचन विशिष्टानि मतानि

(Some remarkable views about Vyāsa)

(1)

रामात् पूर्वमप्यस्ति व्यासावतार:, तृतीययुगमारभ्य व्यासो बहुषु जज्ञिवान्, इति कौर्मे (Bhāgavatatātparya-nirṇaya of Madhva 1.1.37).

(2)

पूर्वेषु तृतीयादिचतुर्महायुगेषु व्यासाचार्यस्तु व्यासानां द्रोणादीनाम् आचार्य एव भविष्यति, न तु व्यास: । चरमे तु अष्टाविंशे महायुगे तु व्यासश्च आचार्यश्च भविष्यति, न त्वन्यव्यासनामाचार्य: (Chalāri-nārāyaṇācārya's comm. Bhāgavata-tātparya-nirṇayaprabodhinī on Bhāg. 2. 7. 36).

(3)

दत्तव्यासादिरूपेषु ज्ञानकार्यस्तथा प्रभु: (Mahābhāratatātparya-nirṇaya of Madhva 2.25).

NOTES

(1)

The view (appearance of Vyāsa before Rāma) propounded here is a novel one and is unknown to the other Purāṇas. The line quoted by Madhva is however not found in any editions of the Kūrma-p., which has a chapter (I.50 cr. ed) on the incarnations of Vyāsa. None of the Mss. reads this line.

Maddhva seems to use a different recension of the Kūrma-p. This recension was well-known to the teachers of his school, as is proved from Vanamālidāsa's Madhvamukhālaṅkāra in which श्रीमुष्णमाहात्म्य of the Kūrma-p. has been quoted (p. 5). This recension was unknown to the Vaiṣṇava teachers of northern India. That is why Jīvagosvāmin once remarked that he had quoted Kūrma-p. verses from the works of Madhva (मध्वाचार्यधृतं कौर्मवचनम्, Bhaktisandarbha, p. 165)

The Śaiva teachers of south India were also aware of a recension of Kūrma-p. which is different from the extant Kurma-p. The Liṅgadhā-raṇacandrikā of the Vīraśaiva sect quotes verses from the Kūrma-p. (pp. 264-265) which are not found in the extant Kūrma-p.[1]

(2)

The significance of the passage is not quite intelligible and it seems that the printed reading is slightly corrupt.

A distinction is here shown between Vyāsa and Vyāsācārya. The latter is said to be the teacher of Vyāsas, namely Droṇa and others (Droṇa is to be corrected to Drauṇi).

(3)

Vyāsa is regarded as one of three **avatāras** that promulgate **jñāna**.

It is to be noted in this connection that according to the Gauḍīya-vaiṣṇava school **avatāras** are of four classes. Vyāsa falls under the **prābhava** class. Incarnations of this class are said to be the promulgators of **śāstras** (like Dhanvantari, Kapila and others). That is why the epithet ज्ञानशक्त्यवतार is given to Vyāsa, who is also regarded as one of the twenty-five *līlāvatāras* (Saṁkṣepabhāgavatāmṛta 27).

---

1. There was a Mahākūrma-p. also from which passages have been quoted by Rūpagosvāmin in his Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu (pūrvabhāga, laharī 2).

शिवस्तोत्रम्

शिवस्तोत्रमिदं त्रिषु पुराणेषु पठ्यते-पाद्ये सृष्टिखण्डे (२८/१५७-१७५), स्कान्दे प्रभासक्षेत्रमाहात्म्ये (१३१/७-१२), स्कान्दे अवन्तीक्षेत्रमाहात्म्ये (३८/११-२४) च । पद्मपुराण- गतस्तोत्रस्य पाठे श्लोकसंख्याया आधिक्यमास्ति, अतस्तदेव स्तोत्ररूपेण गुद्रितम्, तदितरपुराणद्वय- गतानि पाठान्तराणि च यथास्थानं प्रदर्शितानि । यः श्लोको यस्मिन् पुराणे न पठ्यते तस्य तथैव निर्देशोऽपि प्रदत्तः । पुराणनामोल्लेखं विना यानि पाठान्तराणि निर्दिष्टानि, तानि पद्मपुराण-गतस्तोत्रपाठ- संबद्धानीति विज्ञेयम् । पाठान्तरनिर्देशे लाघवदृष्ट्या श्लोकसंख्यैव प्रदत्ता, नाध्याय- संख्येति द्रष्टव्यम् ।

अत्रेयं शब्दसंक्षेपरीतिः—अ.=अवन्तीक्षेत्रमाहात्म्यम्; प्र=प्रभासक्षेत्रमाहात्म्यम्; स=सृष्टिखण्डः ।

कृत्स्नस्य योऽस्य जगतः सचराचरस्य
कर्ता कृतस्य च तथा [1]सुखदुःखहेतुः ।
संहारहेतुरपि यः पुनरन्तकाले
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १५७ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

यं[2] योगिनो विगतमोहतमोरजस्का
मत्त्यैकतानमनसो[3] विनिवृत्तकामाः ।
ध्यायन्ति[4] निश्चलधियोऽमितदिव्यभावं
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १५८ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

य[5] श्चेन्दुखण्डममलं विलसन्मयूखं
बद्ध्वा सदा [6]प्रियतमां शिरसा बिभर्ति ।
यश्चार्धदेहमददाद्[7] गिरिराजपुत्र्यै[8]
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १५९ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

योऽयं सकृद् विमलचारुविलोलतोयां
गङ्गां महोर्मिविषमां गगनात् पतन्तीम् ।
मूर्ध्ना ददे स्रजमिव प्रतिलोलपुष्पां
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजानि ॥ १६० ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्येत—अ., प्र.</div>

यः   सिद्धचारणनिषेवितपादपद्मो ।
गङ्गां महोर्मिविषमां गगनात् पतन्तीम् ।
मूर्ध्ना दधे स्रजमिव त्रिजगत् पुनन्तीं
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥

<div align="right">(अ. ३८।१४; नान्यत्र)</div>

⁹कैलासशैलशिखरं ¹⁰प्रति कम्प्यमानं
कैलासशृङ्गसदृशेन   दशाननेन ।
¹¹यः पादपद्म ¹²परिवादनमादधानस्
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६१ ॥

¹³येनासकृद् ¹⁴दितिसुताः समरे निरस्ता
¹⁵विद्याधरोरगगणाश्च   वरैः समग्राः ।
¹⁶संयोजिता मुनिवराः फलमूलभक्षास्
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६२ ॥

¹⁷दग्ध्वाध्वरं च नयने च तथा भगस्य
पूष्णस्तथा दशन-¹⁸पङ्क्तिमपातयच्च ।
¹⁹तस्तम्भ यः कुलिशयुक्तमहेन्द्रहस्तं
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि²⁰ ॥ १६३ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

²¹एनस्कृतोऽपि ²²विषयेष्वपि सक्तभावा
²³ज्ञानान्वयश्रुतगुणैरपि   ²⁴नैवयुक्ताः ।
यं संश्रिताः सुखभुजः पुरुषा भवन्ति
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६४ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

अत्रिप्रसूतिरविकोटिसमानतेजाः
सन्त्रासनं विबुधदानवसत्तमानाम् ।
यः कालकूटमपिबत् समुदीर्णवेगं
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६५ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते-अ., प्र.</div>

ब्रह्मेन्द्ररुद्रमरुतां[25] च   सषण्मुखानां
योऽदाद् वरांश्च[26] बहुशो भगवान् महेशः ।
[27]नन्दिं च मृत्युवदनात् पुनरुज्जहार
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६६ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

आराधितः[28] सुतपसा हिमवन्-निकुञ्जे
धूम्रव्रतेन   मनसापि[29]   परैरगम्यः ।
संजीवनीं समददाद् भृगवे महात्मा
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६७ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

नानाविधैर्गजबिडालसमानवक्त्रै-
र्दक्षाध्वरप्रमथनैर्बलिभिर्गणौघैः   ।
योऽभ्यर्च्यतेऽमरगणैश्च सलोकपालैस्
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६८ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—अ.; प्र.</div>

क्रीडार्थमेव भगवान् भुवनानि सप्त
नानानदी-विहग-पादप   मण्डितानि ।
सब्रह्मकानि [30]व्यसृजत् [31]सुकृताहितानि
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १६९ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

यस्याखिलं जगदिदं वशवर्ति नित्यं
[32]योऽष्टाभिरेव तनुभिर्भुवनानि भुङ्क्ते ।
[33]यः कारणं सुमहतामपि कारणानां
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १७० ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—अ.</div>

शङ्खेन्दुकुन्दधवलं   वृषभप्रवीर
मारुह्य यः क्षितिधरेन्द्र-सुतानुयातः ।
[34]यात्यम्बरे हिमविभूतिविभूषिताङ्गस्
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १७१ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—अ., प्र.</div>

शान्तं मुनिर्यमनियोगपरायणं तै
35र्भिमैर्यमस्य पुरुषैः प्रतिनीयमानम् ।
भक्त्या नतं स्तुतिपरं प्रसभं ररक्ष
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १७२ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते--अ.; प्र.</div>

यः सव्यपाणिकमलाग्रनखेन देवस्
36तत्पञ्चमं प्रसभमेव पुरः 37सुराणाम् ।38
ब्राह्मं शिरस्तरुणपद्मनिभं39 चकर्त
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १७३ ॥

यस्य प्रणम्य चरणौ वरदस्य भक्त्या
स्तुत्वा च वाग्भिरमलाभिरतन्द्रिताभिः ।
40दीपैस्तमांसि नुदते स्वकरैर्विवस्वांस्
तं शंकरं शरणदं शरणं व्रजामि ॥ १७४ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—अ.</div>

ये त्वां सुरोत्तमगुरुं पुरुषा विमूढा
जानन्ति नास्य जगतः सचराचरस्य ।
41ऐश्वर्यमाननिगमानुशयेन पश्चात्
42ते यातनां त्वनुभवन्त्यविशुद्धचित्ताः ॥ १७५ ॥

<div align="right">न पठ्यते—प्र.</div>

यः पठेत् स्तवमिदं रुचिरार्थं
    मानवो ध्रुवकृतं नियतात्मा ।
विप्रसंसदि सदा शुचिसिद्धं
स प्रयाति शिवलोकमनादिम् ॥

<div align="right">(प्र. १३१/१२)</div>

नायं श्लोकः पार्श्वे पठ्यते ।
यः पठेत् स्तुतिमिमां शुचिकर्मा, यः शृणोति सततं शिवभक्तः । विप्रसंसदि सदा शुभकर्मा, स प्रयाति शिवलोकमखण्डम् (अ. ३८।२४) ।

NOTES ON THE STOTRA

If is interesting to note that some of the Purāṇas are found to contain such stotras as are almost or to a great extent identical. A capital example of such stotras was published in the Purāṇa, Vol XXV, No. 2. Another example of this kind is given here.

The occurrence of such identical or highly similar verses is not accidental—it must be due to some cause connected with the technique of composition of the Purāṇas . We shall deal with this causal factor in some future issue of the Purāṇa

Whether this stotra was originally composed in the lowest number of verses (as is found in the Prabhāsakṣetramāhātmya) and came to be gradually increased by the authors of the Avantīkṣetramāhātmya and the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa of the Padma-purāṇa is a matter of grave discussion.

The metre of the verses is Vasantatilakā.Only the last verse यः पठेत् स्तवमिदं रुचिरार्थं (in Prabhāsakṣetramāhātmya) or यः पठेत् स्तुतिमिमां शुचिकर्मा (in Avantīkṣetramāhātmya) is in the metre Svāgatā.

There are a few metrical defets in the printed readings of this stotra:

The reading सब्रह्मकानि व्यसृजत् (foot 3 of the verse 169) is defective as the fifth letter (नि) has become guru on account of being followed by a conjunct letter (व्य). The reading in the Avantīkṣetramāhātmya (सब्रह्मकानि ससृजे verse 21) may be accepted, though the correct form is ससर्ज (the root सृज being parasmaipadin). We can take the form ससृजे as a Puranic licence

We find the mixture of two metres in one place. The first foot of the verse 8 in the Prabhāsakṣetramāhātmya (येनासुराश्चापि दनोश्च पुत्राः) is in Indravajrā while the other three feet are in Vasantatilakā. Though the reading in the Avantīkṣetramāhātmya (येनासकृद् दितिसुताश्च दनोः सुताश्च) is different from the reading in the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa to some extent, yet there is no metrical fault in it. The reason for the defective reading in the Prabhāsakṣetra is not easy to determine.

The reading याष्टाभिरेव तनुभिः (verse 170) is incorrect; it is to be corrected to योऽष्टाभिरेव (यः referring to शिव; see the 3rd foot) as is read in the Prabhāsakṣetra, verse 9. वक्त्रैः (for वक्रैः) seems to be more correct.

Following points are to be noted regarding this stotra:

1. The stotra was utterred by three different persons in three Puranic works: Rāma is the extoller in the Śṛṣṭikhaṇḍa, Dhruva, the son of Uttānapāda in the Prabhāsakṣetremāhātmya and the demon Andhaka in the Avatīkṣetramāhātmya. It is noteworthy that Dhruva the wellknown devotee of Viṣṇu is shown here as a devotee of Śiva.

2. In Śṛṣṭikhaṇḍa Śiva is called Ajagandha (अजगन्धं च देवेशं देवदेवं पिनाकिनम्, 28.154)-an obsolete name.

3. Most of the deeds of Śiva are referred to in this stotra, namely

(i) Holding Gaṅgā on the head;

(ii) Making the mountain Kailāsa firm when it was moved by Rāvaṇa;

(iii) Destroying the sacrifice of Dakṣa;

(iv) Giving boons to daityas, dānavas and the like;

(v) Protecting his devotee Nandin from death;

(vi) Teaching Saṁjīvanī-vidyā to Bhṛgu;

(vii) Cutting the fifth head of Brahmā;

(viii) Drinking poison (Kālakūṭa).

Besides these, the stotra speaks of the bull of Śiva, the *ardhanāriśvara* aspect, and the eight forms (*aṣṭamūrti*).

<div align="right">

R. S. Bhattacharya

</div>

---

1. सुखदु:खदाता (अ. ११)
2. यं योगिनां (अ. १२)
3. तानमनसा (अ. १२)
4. येऽखिलधियोऽ मितदिव्यभूतिं (अ. १२)
5. यश्चन्द्रखण्ड (अ. १३)
6. सुरसरिच् छिरसा (अ. १३)
7. देहमभजद् (अ. १३)
8. राजपुत्री (अ. १३)
9. कैलासतुङ्गशिखरं प्रविकम्पमानं (प्र. ७)
10. प्रविकम्पमानं (अ. १५)
11. य: पादपद्मपरिपीडनया दधार (प्र. ७);
    य: पादपद्मपरिपीडनसेव्यमान: (अ. १५)
12. परिपीडन (पाठा.)
13. येनासुराश्चापि दनोश्च पुत्रा (प्र. ८)
14. दितिसुताश्च दनो: सुताश्च (अ. १७)।

15. विद्याधरोरगगणैश्च वृताः समग्राः (प्र. ८)

16. संयोजिता न तु फलं फलमूलमुक्ताः (प्र. ८)

17. दक्षाध्वरे च नयने (अ. १६)

18. मपातयच्च (अ. १६)

19. व्यस्तम्भयत् कुलिशहस्तमथेन्द्रमीशं (अ. १६)

20. बहुषु पद्मपुराणकोशेषु न पठ्यतेऽयं श्लोकः ।

21. एवं कृतेऽपि (अ. १८)

22. विषमेष्वपि (पाठा.)

23. ज्ञानेन च श्रुत (अ. १८)

24. तेन युक्ताः (अ. १८)

25. विद्युमरुतां च (अ. १९)

26. वरान् सुबहुशो (अ. १९)

27. सूतं च मृत्यु (अ. १९)

28. धितस्तु तपसा (अ. २०)

29. तपसा च परै (अ. २०)

30. ससृजे सुकृताभिधानि (अ. २१)

31. सुक्षताहि (पाठा.)

32. योऽष्टाभि (प्र. ९)

33. यः कारणं परमकारणकारणानां (प्र. ९)

34. यात्यम्बरं प्रलयमेघविभूषितं च (पाठा.)

35. भीमैर्महोग्रपुरुषैः (पाठा.)

36. तत्पञ्चमं च सहसैव पुरातिरुष्टः (प्र. १०); तत्पञ्चमं प्रसभमेव करालरन्ध्रम् (अ. २२),

37. मेव पुराणमालम् (प्र. १०)

38. मेव पुराणमालाम् (प्र. १०)

39. तरणिपद्मनिभं (अ. २२)।

40. दीप्तस्तमांसि नुदति स्वकरैर्विवस्वांस् (प्र. ११)

41. ऐश्वर्यमानविगमेऽनुशयेन पश्चात् (अ. २३)

42. ते यातनामनुभवन्ति यथाहमेव (अ. २३)।

CREATION AND THE GREAT GODDESS
IN THE PURĀṆAS[1]

By

(MS.) Tracy Pintchman

[परशक्तिरूपाया देव्याः स्वरूपं तस्या विभिन्नानि रूपाणि चाधिकृत्य लेखेऽस्मिन् विशदो
विचारो विहितः । देवीकृताः सृष्टयश्च विशेषेण विचारिताः । किमर्थं देवी शक्ति-माया-प्रकृति-
महामाया-मूलप्रकृत्यादिभिः शब्दैरभिलाप्या भवति, सत्त्व-रजस्तमोगुणैर्मुक्ता सा किं कार्यं कया
दृष्ट्या विदधाति इत्यादिकं सर्वमत्र विवृत्तम् । देवीयं न केवलं शाक्तपुराणेषु, प्रत्युत वैष्णव-शैव-
पुराणेषु चोपवर्णिता । एषु वर्णनेषु यो भेदः, सोऽप्यत्र स्फुटं प्रदर्शितः । शक्तिरूपा देवी पुराणेषु
बहुभी रूपैश्चित्रिता—निर्गुणरूपा, निर्गुणब्रह्मशक्तिरूपा, सगुणब्रह्मशक्तिरूपा, शिवविधुकृष्णपरा,
सर्वशीर्षरूपा, स्वप्रतिष्ठा, दुर्गालक्ष्मीसरस्वत्यादिभेदभिन्ना चेति । एषां रूपाणां समन्वयोऽत्र
दर्शितः ।]

In exploring the rise of the Great Goddess (Devi or Mahādevi) in
South Asia from about the sixth century on, scholars have tended to focus
their attentions on decidedly Śākta literature and movements. This is true
even of studies pertaining to the Great Goddess's nature and manifesation
in the canon of Brahmaṇical Hinduism where she appears primarily in the
Purāṇas and is most developed in Śākta tests like the Devī-Māhātmya
(5th or 6th century C. E.), in which her identity is first clearly articulated,
or the much later Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa (ca.1000-1200 C. E.). But if
we look at the collection of Purāṇas---especially the Mahāpurāṇas---as a
whole, we find that the Great Goddess is much more generally itegrated
into these materials than one might think.

Many of the Purāṇaś recognize the existence of a Great Goddess. And
in the Purāṇas, as in other contexts, the Goddess is often identified with the
principles *śakti*, *māyā*, and/or *prakṛti*. Thes three principles are borrowed
largely from Upaniṣadic speculation and/or Brahmanical philosophy.
Śakti, from $\sqrt{śak}$, "to be able", essentially means "power" and often deno-
tes the active dimension of Brahman that causes creation to come into
existence. *Prakṛti* usually refers to the principle of materiality consisting
of the three "Strands" (*guṇas*)---*sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*---as opposed to
the principle of pure consciousness, *puruṣa*. According to Sāṁkhya
philosphy, *prakṛti* evolves in the presence of *puruṣa* and gives rise to

twenty-three categories of entities, the *tattvas,* which constitute creation. The trem *māyā* from √*mā,* "to measure", generally denotes creative yet delusory power or the material form that results form the activation of such a power. As the first *māyā* is often equated with *śakti*; as the second, with *prakṛti.* In both cases, the use of the term *māyā* stresses the illusory, impermanent, and changeable nature of creation in relation to the fully real, eternal, and unchanging nature of the Absolute.

In many of the Purāṇas *śakti, māyā,* and *prakṛti* come to be consistently identified as feminine principles, and different goddesses, depending on the text, are assimilated to them. The development of such associations is inseparably linked to the formulation in the Hindu tradition of a Great Goddess (Mahādevī), for when a goddess is identified with *śakti, māyā,* and *prakṛti,* she is perceived to transcend her own individual identity and is elevated to the status of Great Goddess. Generally speaking, the identity of Mahādevī in the Purāṇas has much less to do with *who* she is than *what* she is. In fact, *who* she is changes from text to text—any goddess can be elevated to the status of Great Goddess depending on sectarian perspective, and often more than one goddess is so identified—but *what* she is does not. Her essential nature as *śakti, māyā,* and/or *prakṛti* transcends any personal, individual identity and cuts across sectarian lines, for the same patterns are found in a variety of Purāṇas that hold different sectarianallegiances.

The existence of a Great Goddess and her identification with these three principles is first strongly asserted at least within the Brahmanical tradition in the Devī-Māhātmya. But in the centuries following the Devī-Māhātmya, the identity of the Great Goddess as *śakti, māyā,* and *prakṛti* is adopted and developed throughout the Purāṇas. I wish to make two initial arguments about the way in which this whole complex is portrayed in these materials: a contextual argument and a structural argument.

I. Contextual: The identity of the Great Goddess as *śakti, māyā* and *prakṛti* often appears in the context of accounts of primary (*sarga*) found in several of the Purāṇas, including Sectarian Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva Purāṇas and those that are cross-sectarian or non-sectarian[2]. All of the Mahāpurāṇas contain material regarding cosmogony, both primary (*sarga*) and secondary (*pratisarga* or *visarga*). Most, in fact, contain several accounts that are sometimes incompatible. Although each creation narrative is different from every other, there are nevertheless certain

patterns pertaining to cosmogony that are found throughout the Purāṇas as a whole. In several of these accounts, śakti, māyā, and/or prakṛti play active roles, and the identity of the Great Goddess with these principles is articulated and clearly related to cosmogonic functioning[3].

II. *Structural:* It is usually assumed that when the Great Goddess is identified with the principles śakti, māyā, and prakṛti, they are also simply identified with one another. But in fact many of the Purāṇas correlate these principles with different levels of Mahādevī's identity which in turn correspond to different stages in the process of creation. So śakti, māyā, and/or prakṛti generally represent different aspects of the Great Goddess that are manifest in different ways at different phases of the cosmogonic process. The same general sequence of events is found in both non-Śākta and Śākta cosmogonies.

(1) Several non-Śākta Purāṇas explicitly equate śakti, māyā, and/or prakṛti with the Great Goddess, who is usually homologized with the female consort of whichever---god---either Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, or Śiva—is said to be Brahman. On the highest level, the Goddess is Brahman's inherent creative power or śakti and exists within Brahman's Nirguṇa dimension as his inseparable aspect. As śakti she is the impelling cause of creation, the impulse that sets the cosmogonic process into motion. When this Śakti is also identified with the principle māyā, it is often construed as encompassing both the creative and delusive capacities possessed by Brahman. This level of the Goddess's identity corresponds to the initial stage of consmogony in which the first impulse towards creation arises within the Absolute.

On a lower level, once the Goddess is separated out from Nirguṇa Brahman and becomes an independent entity, she is identified as the material principle of creation, prakṛti. As such, she is the immediate source of the manifest cosmos. When this level of the Goddess is identified with māyā, it is generally construed as indicating the material principle that is distinct from Brahman and in which the drama of continual birth and rebirth (saṁsāra) unfolds. This level of the Goddess's identity corresponds to the activation of the creative impulse and the commencement of the mechanisms of cosmogony, usually construed in terms of Sāṁkhya categories.

Finally, the Goddess is also often identified as the great divine female who is the source of all other goddesses.

(2) Śākta texts like the Devī-Māhātmya and the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa postulate yet another level of the Goddess. Mahādevī herself is identified as Nirguṇa Brahman, in which capacity she is called Śakti, Nirguṇa Śakti, or primordial (*ādya*) Śakti[4]. As Nirguṇa Brahman, the Goddess is eternal and unchanging. This level of the Goddess's identity transcends the other levels that we find in Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva contexts and remains uninvolved in cosmogonic action. But the Goddess is also described as the possessor of creative powers or *śaktis* by means of which she creates the universe. On the highest level, then, *śakti* is something that the Goddess **is**, but on this level, *śakti* is something that the Goddess *has*[5]. Finally, she is also identified as *prakṛti* and as the source of all other female divinities. These aspects of the Goddess are then correlated with the stages of creation described above.

This general framework can be schematized as follows :

Stages of Manifestation

The Goddess	*Creation*
(Only Śākta texts)	
The Goddess as Primordial or Nir-guṇa Śakti	Beyond creation and the cosmo-gonic process
The Goddess as the inherent energy (*śakti or māyā*) of Brahman	The initial impulse towards crea-tion represented by the activation of the *śakti* inherent within Brahman
The Goddess as the material foun-dation of the cosmos (*prakṛti/māyā*) that is distinct from Brahman	The beginning of the creative process
The Goddess as the source of other goddesses	The manifestation of various goddesses from Devī

We can trace the development of these patterns throughout the Purāṇas.

A. *Early Purāṇic cosmogonies:* The role of the Great Goddess in
Purāṇic cosmogonies must be understood in the context of Purāṇic
cosmogonies in general[6]. Various explanations of primary creation in
many of the early Purāṇas—for example, the Viṣṇu (ca. 300-500 C. E.),
Vāyu (ca. 300-500 C. E.), Mārkaṇḍeya (ca. 300-600 C. E.), and
Brahmāṇḍa (ca. 400-600 C. E.), Purāṇas—adopt philosophical catego-
ries and then subsume them under a theistic perspective[7]. These categories
are borrowed largely from proto-Sāṁkhya or Sāṁkhya, the Upaniṣads,
and Vedānta or Vedānta-type speculation. The supreme divinity, usually
Viṣṇu in this group of texts, is both Nirguṇa and Saguṇa Brahman. In
accounts favoring Sāṁkhya categories, Nirguṇa Brahman ·is usually
described as transcending and incorporating both *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*.
Saguṇa Brahman is also often identified as *puruṣa*. Through the
interaction of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti, prakṛti* is disturbed; the twenty-three
tattvas begin to evolve, and the process of creation begins. In other
Purāṇas, ·such as the Kūrma Purāṇa (ca. 550-800 C. E.) and the
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, there are accounts that describe primary creation as
resulting from Nirguṇa Brahman's primordial creative power. This power
is usually called *śakti* or the *śakti* of *māyā* possessed by Brahman[8].

B. *Introduction of the Feminine Principle in Cosmogony* : In some
Purāṇas dating from about this period and later, the principles *prakṛti,
śakti*, and/or *māyā* are equated with the goddes appropriate to the
sectarian perspective of the text, who is often lauded as the Great Goddess,
but these principles are not placed in any cosmogonic sequence. The
Devī-Māhātmya fits into this category[9].

The Devī-Māhātmya focuses on a Great Goddess, essentially Durgā,
who is identified as both Nirguṇa and Saguṇa Brahman. As Nirguṇa
Brahman, she is the ultimate, highest reality. She is also described as the
eternal source of the *trimūrti,* Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva and is thus higher
than all of them[10]. In her *saguṇa* form, she is embodied as Devī, the
Great Goddess, and is portrayed as a great slayer of demons and
protectress of the gods. One well-known myth details the origin of the
Goddess from the collective energies of the gods. The *asura* Mahiṣa
defeats the gods in battle and usurps them; the gods become angry and
emit great heat, which arises from their anger. All their emitted heat

becomes unified and transforms into the Goddess, Devī, who thus embodies the collective energy (*tejas*) of the gods[11].

Although there are no passages describing the mechanisms of cosmogony *per se* in the Devī-Māhātmya, nevertheless the Goddess is described as instrumental in creation and plays three different cosmogonic roles. As Brahman, she is the supreme creator who wills creation and by whom the cosmos is sent forth. Thus she is the efficient cause of creation. As the immediate source of the universe, she is Mūlaprakṛti, primordial Prakṛti. Thus she is the material cause, the basic matter from which the cosmos is formed. And, finally, she is creation itself. According to the text, the world is her form. The entire universe with all its parts, everything movable and immovable, is ultimately identified with Devī.[12]

The Great Goddess is also called Śakti and Mahāmāyā. As Śakti, she is the power that makes possible not only creation, but also maintenance and destruction of the universe as well[13]. Thus she transcends creation and controls its rhythms. Yet she is also immanent, for it if said that she abides in all beings in the form of *śakti* and is described as the *śakti* of all that is[14]. As this universal-abiding power, she is present everywhere and in everything. The Goddess is also extolled as Mahāmāyā and is described as both creative and deluding[15].

Other Purāṇic texts that are non-Śākta also identify the principles *śakti, māyā*, and *prakṛti* with goddesses but do not place them in any cosmogonic sequence. In one account in the Kūrma Purāṇa, for example, Lakṣmī, Viṣṇu's spouse, is described as the *śakti* by means of which Viṣṇu creates, the *śakti* of *māyā* with which he deludes his creation, and *prakṛti*, the material principle that serves as the immediate source of creation[16]. One rather late section of the Varāha Purāṇa (ca. 750-1500 C. E.)[17] contains an account of a goddess called Sṛṣṭi who is the source of creation and consists of the unified energies (*śakti*) of the three male divinities Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva[18]. She assumes three different forms, each of which is associated with a different god, a different function, and a different color:

> The bright body with beautiful hips is Brahmī, and creation comes forth from her auspiciously as ordained by Brahmā's creative role (*brahmasṛṣṭi*). The beautiful, red-colored, middle body is the goddess Vaiṣṇavī, who bears conch and disc. She is known as Kālā. She protects the whole universe and is called

Viṣṇumāyā. The black-colored body, the goddess Raudrī, bears a
trident and has a terrible face. She destroys the universe[19].

The three colors of this goddess's different forms—white, red, and
black—are those that are associated with the *guṇas* of *prakṛ*ti. Thus this
goddess is implicitly identified with *prakṛti*.

These narratives recognize the existence of a Great Goddess and
identify her with the principles *śakti, māyā*, and *prakṛti*, but none of them
clearly describes the relationship of these different principles with one
another.

C. Manifestation of the Goddess in Cosmogonic Sequence : In several
Purāṇas, the levels of the Goddess and the sequence of events in creation
are more clearly correlated. As different textual perspectives influence
the way in which cosmogony is narrated, one must consider the relevant
Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva, and Śākta texts separately.

*1. Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas and Vaiṣṇava Sections of Cross-Sectarian
Purāṇas*

The Nārada Purāṇa (ca. 850-1000 C. E.) explicitly features
goddesses in descriptions of the mechanisms of creation. According to one
account, Mahāviṣṇu alone is said to exist as Brahman at the dawn of
creation. He possesses a supreme *śakti*, which when activated stimulates
the cosmogonic process. This *śakti*, which is also referred to as Viṣṇu's
māyā, is described both knowledge *(vidyā)* and ignorance *(avidyā)*[20].
These categories of *vidyā* and *avidyā* are borrowed from Advaita
Vedānta philosophy, according to which knowledge of *vidyā* constitutes
the understanding of Brahman without qualities *(nirguṇa)*, and ignorance
or *avidyā* is the absence of this understanding. *Avidyā* on the level of
epistemology is correlated with *māyā* on the level of ontology. In this
passage of the Nārada Purāṇa, *avidyā* is declared to be the false belief
that the world is other than Viṣṇu; *vidyā* is the correct understanding of the
unity of everything in Viṣṇu. The universe appears as distinct only
because of *avidyā:*

> When the universe is understood to be different from Mahāviṣṇu,
> then may ignorance *avidyā*, the cause of suffering *(duḥkha)*, be
> attained. Oh Nārada, when the conditions "knower", "to-be-
> known," and so on disappear, this comprehension *(buddhi)* of the

oneness of everythig is called *vidyā*. Thus the *māyā* of Mahā-
visnu, if seen as distinct from him, bestows worldly existence
(*saṁsāra*), but if realized with the comprehension of non-
difference from him, it brings about the destruction of worldy
existence *(saṁsāra)*[21].

This two-faceted *śakti* leads to worldly existence (*saṁsāra*) only if its
manifestation as *avidyā* is activated. If its *vidyā* side is activated, how-
ever, it leads to the end of the cycle of continual rebirths *(saṁsāra)*. Thus
it has the potential to be creative or destructive, either ushering in creation
of causing its cessation.

As a creative energy the *śakti* of Visnu is described as the source of
the entire universe of mobile and immobile beings, which it also pervades,
and is equated with various female divinities. The influence of Advaita
Vedānta, which stresses the all-pervasiveness of Brahman, is again
apparent:

> The entire universe of mobile and immobile beings is produced
> from Visnu's *śakti*, from which all these things, whether they
> move or not, are diffeent... [J]ust as Lord Hari pervades the entire
> universe, so also does his *śakti*, oh sage, just as the burning
> capacity (dāhaśakti) resides in charocal, pervading its own
> substratum[22].

The text then declares that this śakti of Visnu is called Umā, Laksmī,
Bhāratī, Girijā, Ambikā, Durgā, and so on, explicitly equating the
cosmogonic power of the supreme Brahman with diverse goddesses. The
side of Visnu's potency, then, that creates and sustains the world is clearly
identified as feminine in nature.

This *śakti* is also described as supreme *prakṛti* :

> His *śakti* is the great *māyā*, the trustworthy upholder of the world.

> Because of its being the primary material cause of the universe, it
> is called *prakṛti* by those who are knowledgeable[23].

Although Visnu's śakti is identical with him on the highest level as *vidyā*,
as primordial *prakṛti* it is emerged from him as a distinct entity. The text
asserts that Visnu engages himself in the creation of the three worlds, and
three forms evolve from him: time (*kāla*). *Purusa*, and *prakṛti*. When
prakṛti is agitated through *purusa*, *mahat* evolves; from *mahat* evolves
buddhi, from which *ahaṃkāra* originates in turn. The rest of the *tattvas*
then arise in succession.[24]

The different levels of identification of the feminine principles associated with Viṣṇu and the corresponding stages in creation in this section of the Nārada Purāṇa can be schematized as follows :

Stages of Manifestation

The Feminine Principle	Creation
Śakti/māyā as the inherent energy of Viṣṇu, identified as various goddesses (Umā, Lakṣmī, Durgā, etc.)	The initial impulse towards creation is represented by the activation of Viṣṇū's śakti/māyā
Prakṛti as the manifestation of śakti/māyā, distinct from Viṣṇu	The beginning of primary creation through the agitation of prakṛti and the evolution of the tattvas

The Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa (ca. 1400-1600 C. E.) elevates Kṛṣṇa to supreme status and identifies his consort with kṛṣṇa's śakti and with prakṛti.[25] There are several different accounts of creation in this text. According to one account, Ātman splits himself into two parts in the beginning of creation by the power of yoga. The right side is called puruṣa, and the left, prakṛti. The significance of prakṛti in the process of creation is recounted in a passage where Nārāyaṇa explains to Nārada the meaning of the term prakṛti according to some rather creative etymology.

> Oh child, who is fit to describe the essence of prakṛti ? Nevertheless, I will describe it to you as I heard it from the mouth of Dharma. Pra—means distinguished (prakṛṣṭa), and—kṛti means creation (sṛṣṭi). Which goddess is distinguished in creation, she is called Prakṛti. Accordig to scripture (śruti), pra-means the pre-eminent guṇa sattva, kṛ-means the middle guṇa rajas, and-ti means tamas. She, therefore, who has the three guṇas as her own form is possessed of all powers (śakti) and is pre-eminent in causing creation; therefore, she is called Prakṛti. Pra-means first, and-kṛti means creation. And that goddess who is first in creation is therefore called Prakṛti[26]

Just as Kṛṣṇa is eternal, so is Prakṛti, for the two are indissolubly connected. Kṛṣṇa cannot create without her, for she is also his creative power, śakti. In order to explain the nature of this śakti, the text again

resorts to folk etymology. We are told that *śak*-means majesty (*aiśvarya*), and-ti means strength (*parākrama*); hence Śakti is the bestower (*dātrī*) of all majesty and strength[27]. Although the equation of *prakṛti/śakti* with *māyā* is found in the text, the Goddess's manifestation as *māyā* is subordinated.

On the highest level, this Goddess is Kṛṣṇa's inherent *śakti* and is described as the activating energy of Kṛṣṇa without whom he could not properly function in his capacity as creator[28]. She is described as consisting of all the *śaktis* in Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and it is said that without her the whole world remains as if dead[29]. And just as Kṛṣṇa is Nirguṇa on the highest level, so is she. When the goddess prakṛti is *nirguṇa*, she is the counterpart of Kṛṣṇa's *nirguṇa* form. It is in fact remarkable that the Brahmavaivarta identifies a level of Prakṛti that is *nirguṇa*, since Sāṁkhya speculation describes *prakṛti* as inherently possessed of *guṇas* and is thus usually described as *triguṇā*, "having three *guṇas*", by nature. Yet we are told :

As the power (*śakti*) of burning in fire end the radiance in the sun, oh sage,as the whiteness in milk and coldness in water, as sound in the sky and smell in the earth, thus always are Nirguṇa Braman and Nirguṇa Prakṛti.[30]

The postulation of a level of *Prakṛti* that is beyond qualities, hence beyond the three *guṇas,* is probably a reflection of the fact that Prakṛti is equated with the *śakti* of Kṛṣṇa/Brahman. If Brahman is in his *nirguṇa* state, it follows that his inherent *śakti* must also be *nirguṇa*. Since *prakṛti* is here homologized with Kṛṣṇa/Brahman's *śakti*, the significance of this principle is reinterpreted to conform with the new context.

This Goddess is also Mūlaprakṛti Īśvarī, the goddess primordial Prakṛti[31], who is Mahādevī. All female forms are portions of Prakṛti. So, for example, she is said to be the source of all human women, who are descended from her parts or digits.[32] She is also the source of all other female divinities, whom she transcends. In the process of creation she assumes five forms and becomes manifest as Durgā, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī, and Rādhā[33]. These five different goddesses who spring out of Prakṛti appear to be simply her partial incarnations, but in fact Rādhā and Durgā are identified with her and with one another[34].

Because of the Vaiṣṇava orientation of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, it ultimately favours Rādhā as the supreme feminine principle and Great Goddess.[35] Sometimes, however it is Durgā, not Rādhā, who is elevated

to this status. In the account of creation at the beginning of the Brahma Khaṇḍa, Kṛṣṇa is said to be present at the time of creation. When he decides to create,the *guṇas* emerge from his right side. The tattvas are then evolved from the *guṇas*. Nārāyaṇa also comes out of his right side; Śiva emerges from the left, and Brahmā, from his abdomen. Various other beings also spring from Kṛṣṇa's body, including the goddess Mūlaprakṛti, who springs from his intellect (*buddhi*). This goddess Mūlaprakṛti is identified as the goddess Durgā. It is through her that the world becomes possessed of power (*śaktimat*). Rādhā emerges quite a bit later from Kṛṣṇa's left side[36]. Durgā is Prakṛti, but she is also the supreme *śakti* composed of the accumulated energy (*tejas*) of the gods[37].

The role of Prakṛti in cosmogony is also described in an account that C. Mackenzie Brown in his book on the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa calls creation by copulation[38]. When Kṛṣṇa desires to create, he divides himself into two parts. The right side becomes the male Puruṣa, who is the second self of Kṛṣṇa, and the left becomes the female Prakṛti[39]. When he sees his female counterpart, Kṛṣṇa (Puruṣa) is overtaken with just and succumbs to his passion. The two make love, and Kṛṣṇa discharges semen into her womb. Prakṛti sweats and breathes hard during coitus; her perspiration becomes the cosmic waters, and her breath becomes the wind and the life-breath (*prāṇa*) of all living creatures.[40]

In this account the familar theme of the interaction of Puruṣa and prakṛti that provides the initial impulse catalyzing the genesis of the cosmos is reinterpreted and clad in more colorful mythological clothing than the other accounts that we have seen. Prakṛti is not only clearly female, but she is also the sexual partner of the supreme male being, who makes love to her and impregnates her. Although, as Brown notes, there is a tendency in this Purāṇa to want to elevate Prakṛti to an equal status with Kṛṣṇa or even to postulate her superiority to him, ultimately Prakṛti is subordinate to Kṛṣṇa on the ontological level. As Brown points out, it is Prakṛti's equality wiht Kṛṣṇa that is called into question throughout the text, not his equality with her[41].

The different levels of the Goddess and the corresponding stages of creation in the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa can be schematized as follows :

Stages of manifestation

The Goddess	Creation
Rādhā/Durgā as Kṛṣṇa's inherent śakti, also called Nirguṇā Prakṛti	Kṛṣṇa's inital impulse to create
Rādhā/Durgā as Saguṇā Prakṛti, the material principle that emerges from Kṛṣṇa but is distinct from him	The emergence of the gunas from Kṛṣṇa's body or creation through copulation of Kṛṣṇa (Puruṣa) and Prakṛti
Rādhā/Durgā as the Great Goddess Prakṛti who is the source of other goddesses	The manifestation of different goddesses from the goddess Prakṛti

2. Śaiva Purāṇas and Śaiva Sections of Cross-Sectarian Purāṇas

Just as some of the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas equate certain creative principles with female counterparts of Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa, Śaiva Purāṇas do the same with respect to the consorts and wives of Śiva. We will focus our analysis on the Śaiva sections of the Kūrma Purāṇa and the Liṅga and Śiva Purāṇas.

The Kūrma Purāṇa contains an account of secondary creation (pratisarga) that absorbs principles from primary creation (sarga). In this account, Brahmā produces Rudra out of his mouth. At Brahmā's command, Rudra splits himself into male and female forms. The female who springs from Rudra is called Īśānī, "female sovereign", and is described as Māheśvarī, Śaṃkarī, or Śivā—the female counterpart of Maheśvara or Śaṃkara, which are epithets of Śiva, or Śiva himself—and as the supreme goddess who creates the world. Though singular, she has different forms as different goddesses; they represent portions of her and are the śaktis inherent in creation[42]. Ih her different forms as various śaktis, she pervades the world[43]. As the supreme Śakti, she is also identified with Viṣṇu's māyā, with which he deludes the world. As Śakti in the form of māyā, she is also called upon ot manifest the universal form (vaiśvarūpya) of Śiva. Thus she is linked with both Viṣṇu and Śiva[44].

As Śiva's counterpart, the goddess Śakti is equal to him in the process of creation, and everything is said to spring form Śiva and Śakti. Śiva is śaktimat, "possessed of śakti", and all other śaktis and possessors of śakti are born of the goddess Śakti. Although Śiva and Śakti are said to be

equal, they are also distinct. Whereas Śiva is described as the enjoyer
(*bhoktṛ*), Śakti is that which is enjoyed (*bhogya*). Śiva is the thinker,
whereas Śakti is the thought[45]. Śakti is said to have a status that is more
or less equal to Śiva's, yet this is not actually quite the case.Here, as in the
Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, the supreme goddess is ultimately subordinate
to the god with whom she is associated. This is borne out in the fact that
although it is said that ultimately there is no distinction at all between Śakti
and the possessor of Śakti (*śaktimat*,=Śiva), nevertheless it is Śiva who
possesses the Goddess. Śakti is never described as the possessor of Śiva.

On the level of primary creation, Śakti is higher than *prakṛti* and is
described as the source of both *prakṛti/pradhāna* and *puruṣa*. Coming
near Śambhu (Śiva), who is the lord of the entire universe in the form of
time (*kāla*), Śakti, who is called *Māyā* in this passage, splits herself. She
becomes *pradhāna* and *puruṣa*[46]. As Śiva's *śakti*, she is beyond *pra-
dhāna/prakṛti*, yet she becomes *prakṛti* at the beginning of creation. It is
said that Śiva produces the entire world, beginning with *pradhāna*,
depending on her. Although the text does not incorporate the evolution of
the *tattvas* into this discussion of creation, we are told that Śakti is the
source of not only *pradhāna* and *puruṣa*, but also *mahat*, as well as vari-
ous other creations.[47]

The Goddess's role in cosmogony is the same as in the other Purāṇas
that we have explored. The different levels of the Goddess and the
corresponding stages of creation in this part of the Kūrma Purāṇa can be
schematized as follows:

Stages of Manifestation

The Goddess	Creation
Śivā/Śakti as Śiva's inherent energy (*śakti*), also called *māyā*	The presupposition of creation
Śakti as Prakṛti/Pradhāna	The dawn of manifest creation

The cosmogony of the Liṅga Purāṇa, which is also Śiva in
orientation, has many similar themes but emphasizes the identity of the
feminine principle as *prakṛti* rather than *śakti*. In this text Śiva, who is
said to be devoid of any mark of characteristic (*aliṅga*), is described as the
root of manifest *pradhāna* or *prakṛti*, who is characterized (liṅga).

The non-characterized (*aliṅga*) is the root of the characterized (*liṅga*). That which is characterized is called the unmanifest (*avyakta,=prakṛti*). The non-characterized is called Śiva, and the characterized is said to be related to Śiva (*Śaiva*). They call that which is characterized *prakṛti* and *pradhāna*; but the highest entity, the non-characterized—which is without attributes, unchanging, undecaying, free from smell, color, and taste, (and) devoid of sound, touch, and so-forth—is named Śiva[48].

Prakṛti originates from the body of the *aliṅga* Śiva of its own accord (*svayam*). The agency by means of which Śiva becomes *prakṛti* is designated as *māyā*. Thus, *māyā* is the power by which the non-characterized (Śiva), becomes characterized (*prakṛti*), but *māyā* is not explicitly identified with *prakṛti*. It is said that *prakṛti* is originally unmanifest but when observed by Śiva becomes possessed of the *guṇas*. This latter form of *prakṛti* is called Śaivī, "the female form pertaining to Śiva". Śaivī Prakṛti is the source of the cosmos. She is described as the unborn (*ajā*), unique mother of the universe consisting of red, white, and black colors (the three colors of the *guṇas* of *prakṛti*). At the time of creation, *mahat* is evolved out of the *guṇas* of Prakṛti at the behest of Puruṣa. *Mahat* enters the unmanifest form of Prakṛti, which leads to the creation of the manifest world. The triple *ahaṃkāra* evolves out of *mahat*, which leads to the creation of the rest of the *tattvas*[49].

As Śaivī, Prakṛti is the female counterpart of Śiva. She is his feminine side, and it is she who gives rise to creation. She is also the Great Goddess, Mahādevī, who is the source of all goddesses and who has many forms. As Mahādevī, she is also well known as Umā, Śivā, and so on, and the text asserts that although she appears to be subordinate to Śiva, since he creates her, ultimately there is no difference between them[50]. The different levels of the Goddess and the corresponding stages of creation in the Liṅga Purāṇa can be schematized as follows :

Stages of Manifestation

The Goddess   *Creation*

Śaivī Prakṛti as unmanifest Prakṛti   The presupposition of creation inherent within the body of Śiva

The manifestation of Prakṛti by means of *māyā* or by means of Śiva's glance	Evolution of *mahat* out of the *guṇas* of *prakṛti* and the entrance of *mahat* into unmanifest *prakṛti*
Prakṛti/Śivā/Umā as the Great Goddess who is the source of all other goddesses	Manifestation of different goddesses from the goddess Prakṛti

Many of the cosmogonic themes found in the Liṅga Purāṇa are also found in the Śiva Purāṇa (ca. 800-1000 C. E.) but in a slightly different form. In this purāṇa's account of cosmogony, Nirguṇa Brahman alone exists at the beginning of creation. Having no form, Brahman wishes to create one, so he forms a *saguṇa* self that is called Īśvara or Sadāśiva. When Īśvara is created, Parabrahman becomes hidden (*antar √dha*)[51].

Without changing his body in any way, Īśvara/Sadāśiva creates the form Śakti from himself. This Śakti is called by many names including Pradhāna, Prakṛti and Māyā. She is the goddess of all (Sakaleśvarī), the prime cause (Mūlakāraṇa), the generator of everything. Together, the two create Śivaloka, the realm of Śiva. Śiva then creates Viṣṇu, who undertakes austerities. From the body of Viṣṇu, water currents begin to flow. It is said that this flowing forth of water is the result of Śiva's *māyā*, although the precise nature of the effect of *māyā* on Viṣṇu is not explained. Brahman (Śiva) in the form of the waters then pervades the entire void. Meanwhile, the *tattvas* are evolved from *śakti/prakṛti*, and Viṣṇu goes to sleep in the waters of Brahman[52].

Śakti is Śivā, the female side of Śiva. It is said that although she appears to be born from him in his form as Sadāśiva, she is not born; rather, she is manifested from him. In truth, she is as eternal and all-pervasive as Śiva and exists as part of him :

Hara, the most excellent lord, sent forth a goddess from a portion of his body. Those who are knowledgeable about Brahman say that this goddess, who is endowed with divine attributes, is the highest *śakti* of that supreme Śiva, the highest Self. Bhavānī (=Śivā) is that goddess who manifested from the body of Śiva and in whom there is found no birth, death, old age, and so forth.... She is the Goddess who, pervading this whole world with her might, stands (in it). That goddess wondrously appeared as if she were embodied. And she deludes this whole world with *māyā*.

Although (it appears that) she was born from the lord (Īśvara, =Śiva), in reality she is not born[53].

This Śakti is the source of the manifest cosmos and has several forms. In this text, usually the primary consort of Śiva—Umā or Durgā—is identified as Prakṛti or Śakti, and other goddesses are considered to be her manifestations. In one passage, for example, the goddess Umā, who is called the supreme goddess (Parameśvarī), is identified as Prakṛti. She is the source of Vāc, Lakṣmī, and Kālī, the wives of Brahmā, viṣṇu, and another wife of Śiva himself. These three are her individual *śaktis*[54]. Śakti is then reborn as Satī and Pārvatī[55], and these two goddesses are also lauded as the primordial Prakṛti or Śakti[56].

The different levels of the Goddess and the corresponding stages of creation in the Śiva Purāṇa can be schematized as follows:

Stages of Manifestation

The Goddess	Creation
Śakti as the inherent *śakti* of Śiva	The presupposition of creation
Śakti as Prakṛti/Pradhāna/Māyā, manifested from the body of Śiva	The separation of Śakti from the body of Īśvara/Sadāśiva at the dawn of creation
Śakti/Umā, etc. as the Great Goddess who is the source of other goddesses	Manifestation of different goddesses from the Goddess

3. The Śākta Purāṇas

The Vaiṣṇava and the Śaiva Purāṇas that we have thus far explored incorporate the feminine principle into the mechanisms of creation by identifying creativ eprinciples, *śakti, māyā,* or *prakṛti,* with a goddess who is conceived to be a unique Great Goddess. Although this goddess is supreme as a goddess or feminine principle, she is nevertheless subordinate to the god, either Viṣṇu or Śiva, who is extolled as the highest divinity and is ultimately identified as Nirguṇa Brahman. In Śākta texts like the Devī-Māhātmya, as we have seen, Mahādevī herself is the highest divinity and is the source of all other gods, including Viṣṇu and Śiva. As Nirguṇa Brahman, she is beyong the *guṇas.* But her essential nature as the cause of creation does not change, although she is conceived to be greater than

any other divinity, nor does the way in which the levels of her identity
unfold. So she appears in cosmogony as *śakti, māyā,* and *prakṛti* as in
the other texts that we have explored above. I will focus my analysis on
the Devī-Bhāgavata Purrāṇa (ca. 1000-1200 C. E.)[57].

The Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa follows in the tradition of the Devī-
Māhātmya in identifying the Goddess as both Nirguṇa and Saguṇa
Brahman and thus as the ultimate overlord of creation[58]. She therefore
takes the place held by Viṣṇu in the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas and Śiva in the
Śaiva Purāṇas. When her identity as Nirguṇa Brahman is emphasized in
the text, she is often called Nirguṇa Śakti or Mahāmāyā. She is the
highest, primordial (*ādya*) Śakti, the mother of all the worlds, eternal and
omnipresent, the ultimate support of all that exists. This aspect of her is
also said to transcend the *guṇas* of *prakṛti*[59]. Thus a clear distinction is
made between the Goddess as primordial Śakti or Mahāmāyā and
prakṛti, which she transcends.

As Saguṇa Brahman, the Goddess is depicted as a great cosmic queen.
In places she is described as sitting on a throne composed of Brahmā,
Viṣṇu, and Śiva in their various forms, thus emphasizing her superiority
over the male gods[60]. She dwells in maṇidvīpa, "the island of gems',
which is her supreme abode. Her form is overwhelming, even to the gods.
One passage describes Brahmā's impression of the Goddess when he,
Viṣṇu, and Śiva are transported up to Maṇidvīpa in the Goddess's celestial
chariot. They see first a couch with a jeweled carpet spread over it. Then
they catch sight of the figure seated on the couch :

A beautiful woman was seated on that most excellent of couches,
wearing a red garland and red clothes, anointed with red
sandalwood paste, red eyed, having a beautiful face, red-lipped,
glorious, equal in splendor to ten millions of lightning flashes and
ten millions of beautiful women... . Such a one had never been
seen before[61].

The Goddess assumes her saguṇa form when she engages in creation.
As in the Devī-Māhātmya, the Goddess plays three cosmogonic roles. As
Brahman, she is the efficient cause of creation, the willful agent who
catalyzes the whole cosmogonic process. The epithets Śakti and
Mahāmāyā, which designate the Goddess as Brahman, are thus often used
to denote her in her role as the creator of the universe. Yet she is also the
material basis of creation, *prakṛti* or *mūlaprakṛti*. And, finally, she is
embodied as creation itself.

When the Goddess wills to create the cosmos, she does so without effort or desire. Although she is the cause of creation, she remains unchanged (*nirīha*)[62]. It is said that with one portion she remains Nirguṇa Sakti, but she also becomes three *śaktis* that are involved in creation : sattvic *śakti*, rājasic *śakti*, and tāmasic *śakti*. The names of these three creative powers reveals the influence of Sāṁkhya categories, for they are named after the three *guṇas* of *prakṛti*. The Goddess resolves herself into these three forms when she desires to create. Her sattvic aspect becomes Mahālakṣmī, her rājasic aspect becomes Sarasvatī, and her tāmasic aspect becomes Mahākālī[63]. Because these goddesses are manifestations of the Great Goddess herself, who is Brahman, the relationship between the three goddesses and their spouses—Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva—is the opposite of that which we see in the Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva Purāṇas, and the goddesses function at a higher level than their husbands. The superior status of the Goddess over the three male divinities in again affirmed when it is said that the assuming of female form by these three *śaktis* for purposes of creation is deemed *sarga*, primary creation, whereas the further resolution of them into the male deities Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva is denominated *pratisarga*, secondary creation. Thus the three gods are subordinated to their female counterparts.[64]

A different account of the mechanisms of creation draws more upon the basic conceptual framework of Advaita Vedānta but subsumes Sāṁkhya categories as well. It is said that before the universe is created, only the Goddess exists as Parabrahman. Her self (*ātman*) is incomprehensible, undefinable, and unparalleled. this self is possessed of a single inherent power (*śakti*) called *māyā*. The *māyā* of the Goddess is also beyond qualification. It cannot be said to be either existent, nor nonexistent, nor both :

> The Goddess said :.... Formerly, I alone existed. There was nothing else whatsoever.... At that time, my own form was named intellect (*cit*), consciousness (*saṃvid*), and supreme Brahman. I am incomprehensible, undefinable, unparalleled.... My perfect (*siddha*) śakti is known as *māyā*. It is neither existent, nor non existent, nor both, nor self-contradictory. This indefinable entity always exists[65].

The Goddess's *māyā/śakti* is divided into *vidyā*, which is liberating, and *avidyā*, which is the Goddess's creative power. United with her *śakti* of *māyā*, Devī turns toward creation[66]. In this capacity, she acts as Saguṇa

Brahman. Whereas descriptions of her *nirguṇa* form delineate Śakti and Mahāmāya as something that the Great Goddess is, descriptions of her *saguṇa* form use the terms *śakti* and *māyā* to denote something that she possesses.

The two types of *māyā*, *vidyā* and *avidyā*, are also said to be different kinds of causes and thus play different roles in cosmogony. It is said that when the Goddess's *māyā* is united with itelligerce (*caitanya*), it is the instrumental or efficient cause (*nimitta*) in creatio; when it transforms into the manifest world, it is the material cause (*samavāya*)[67]. This latter form of *māyā* is equated with *avidyā māyā*, the creative power of the Goddess. It is also identified with *prakṛti* as the immediate source of the manifest cosmos that gives rise to all of creation, beginning with the *tattvas*.Thus *prakṛti* is a function of Devī's power of *māyā* (*māyā śakti*). It is said that although it appears to be the Goddess's inherent *māyā*, not the Goddess herself, who is both the efficient and the material cuase of creation, the Goddess is ultimately identical with her *māyā*, and on the highest level of reality there is no difference between them[68]. Any differences are only conceived during creation as a function of the Goddess's cosmogonic role; during the periods of dissolution when creation has been destroyed, Devī along exists with *māyā* latent within herslef.[69]

As Prakṛti, the Goddess is the material ground of the manifest cosmos. She is described as the root of the tree of the universe[70], the mother of the worlds, the prime cause and ultimate support of all that exists in creation. As primordial cause, she contains the effect, creation itself, latent within her. Sne not only creates the cosmos, but also is its form. Thus the universe is simply a transformation of the Goddess herself. This equation of the Goddess with the manifest universe is damatically illustrated in a passage in which diverse parts of the cosmos are equated with different parts of her body. The sun and moon are equated with her eyes and the quarters with her ears. The universe is said to be her heart. The earth is her loins, and the midregions her navel. Different gods and portions of the worlds are also equated with her different body parts.[71]

Whiile onceding to the ultimate identity of all forms of the Goddess, the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa nevertheless asserts a hierarchical relationship among her different aspects. As Nirguṇa Brahman, she is primordial Śakti or Mahāmāya, beyond attributes and without qualifications. As Saguṇa Brahman, she is endowed wiht *māyā*, a creative power that participates in

both her transcendent and immanent forms. As *prakṛti,* finally, she both activates and is identified with the creative *māyā* with which she is endowed, the power of ignorance (*avidyā*).

The different levels of the Goddess and the corresponding stages of creation in the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa can be schematized as follows:

Stages of Manifestation

The Goddess	Creation
The Goddess as Parabrahman, Primordial or Nirguṇa Śakti, or Mahāmāyā	Beyond Creation
The Goddess as Saguṇa Brahman, the possessor of creative powers (*śaktis*) or a single inherent creative *śakti* called *māyā* and the source of other goddesses	The initial impulse towards creation that is represented by the activation of the Goddess's creative *śaktis* and the manifestations of the three primary goddesses from the Goddess
The Goddess as Prakṛti or Māyā reduced to the five elements (*avidyā māyā*)	The beginning of creation

Concluding Remarks

I wish to conclude with two further suggestions pertaining to some of the possible historical and socio-political implications of this material.

III. *Historical :* The Great Goddess, like the other gods and goddesses of the Hindu Pantheon, develops over time as a result of the blending of Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical religious tendencies and divinities. Yet the essential identity of the Great Goddess appears to be constructed at least initially largely in and by the Brahmanical tradition, which provides the context for her definition. The conflation of mythological and philosophical categeories that we find in the Purāṇas provides the framework for the equation of goddesses with principles. The goddesses are not necessarily Vedic-Brahmanical, but the framework and the principles are both taken straight from orthodox Brahmanical philoso-

phical systems. These are then placed in a logical cosmogonic sequence and are viewed as different levels of manifestation of a single, inherently feminine cosmogonic power. The result is the postulation of a unique, allencompassing principle that is expressed on different levels of creation in diiverse ways but that can be understood in a theistic framework as a Great Goddess no matter what the sectarain allegiance of the given text might be. One might even argue that the identity of the Great Goddess as a cosmogonic principle manifest in stages as *śakti, māyā,* and *prakṛti* is in fact her defining characteristic[72].

IV. *Socio-political :* Finally, I would like to suggest that the formulation of the Great Goddess within Purāṇic cosmogonies may well be tied to larger concerns. We may well ask, why is there a Great Goddess, and why is she constructed in this way? My own sense is that the rise of the Great Goddess in the Brahmanical tradition may be tied at least somewhat to issues of Brahmanical hegemony.

In India during the period when most of the Purāṇas that incorporate the Great Goddess into their cosmogonies were recorded, the Brahmanical tradition was increasingly challenged by non-Brahmanical trends that called into question the validity of the core, "orthodox" tradition. The greatest threat came from the increasing attention placed on devotion to various divinities that were not part of the Vedic-Brahmanical tradition. The rise of *bhakti* as a expression of spirituality and the related rise and spread of non-Brahmanical devotional movements offered an alternative to the hierarchical, caste-conscious religiosity of the Brahmin priests and provided a vehicle for the expression of more popular spiritual values. In the face of such challenges, the Brahmanical tradition was forced to absorb and accommodate non-Brahmanical elements in order to escape becoming completely irrelevant.

As many scholars have noted, among those elements that were absorbed by the Brahmanical tradition in post-Vedic times is included the celebration of various non-Vedic goddesses. But it is noteworthy that in the case of Purāṇic cosmogonies, female divinities are subsumed under structures that are derived from orthodox (*āstika*) Brahmanical philosophical systems. The theology of the Great Goddess is developed within these parameters. Thus, the Goddess is constructed in a way that accommodates non-Brahmanical devotional impulses while manitaining and upholding the religious and philosophical claims of the Brahmanical

heritage by retaining "orthodox" (*āstika*) ideas yet reconceptualizing them vis ā vis more popular tendencies. The Brahmanical tradition thus is able to maintain its authority and, at the same time, to strengthen its appeal. In this way, tensions between the Brahmanical system and non-Brahmanical systems are to some extent mitigated.

1. This article is based on my Ph. D. dissertation. Much of the material here is quoted directly from this document or represents a revised version of my original research. See Tracy Sue Pintchman, "Deciphering the Goddess: The Feminine Principle in Brahmanical Hindu Cosmogony and Cosmology", Ph. D. dissertation (June 1992: University of California, Santa Barbara, U. S. A.).

2. There is some dispute in the Purāṇas themselves with respect to exactly which texts should be included in this list. The main disagreement concerns whether the Śiva Purāṇa should be included as a Mahāpurāṇa replacing the Vāyu Purāṇa or whether it should be classified as an Upapurāṇa. If we include both, the result is a list of nineteen Purāṇas: Agni, Bhāgavata, Bhaviṣya, Brahma, Brahmāṇḍa, Brahma-vaivarta, Garuḍa, Kūrma, Liṅga, Mārkaṇḍcya, Matsya, Nārada, Padma, Skanda, Śiva, Vāmana, Varāha, Vāyu, and Viṣṇu.

3. In the contexts in which these three principles are originally developed, they are often construed as consmogonic or at least are associated with the process of creation in some way. See Pintchman, "Decipherig the Goddess", chapter two.

4. I capitalize the names of cosmic principles, such as *śakti, prakṛti, māyā, mahāmāyā,* and so forth when they are used as epithets of the Great Goddess and designate her status as an independent, supreme goddes. Similarly, I capitalize *puruṣa* when it is used as an epithet of the god identified as Brahman.

5. Thomas Coburn makes the distinction between Śakti as what the Goddess is and *śakti* as power possessed by individual deities. See his article "Consort of None, *Śakti* of All: The Vision of the *Devī-māhātmya*", in *The Divine Consort: Rādhā and the Goddesses of India,* edited by John S. Hawley and Donna Marie Wulff (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986) p. 160.

6. For an excellent study of the cosmogonies of the early Purāṇas, see Madeleine Biardeau, *Cosmogonies Purāṇiques*, Etudes de Mythologie Hindoue, vol. 1 (Paris: Ecole Francaise D Ectreme Orient, 1981).

7. Viṣṇu Purāṇa I. 2, Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa I.I.3. 8-24, Brahma I. 34-40.
   For The dating of the Purāṇas, see Ludo Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, vol. 2., fasc. 3 of *A History of Indian Literature,* ed. J. Gonda (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986). The dates that I give for the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa are those proposed by P. V. Kane, but other scholars propose dates ranging from 700 B. C. E. to 1045 C. E. See Rocher, p. 249.

8. See, for example, Bhāgavata Purāṇa 1.3.30-31 and Kūrma Purāṇa 11.3.21-22.

9. For detailed analysis and careful translation of the Devī-Māhātmya, see Thomas Coburn's studies *Devī-māhātmya: The Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition* (Delhi, etc.: Mtilal Banarsidass, 1984), and *Encoun- tering the Goddess: A Translation of the Devī-Māhātmya and a Study of the Its Interpretation* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1991).

10. Devī-Māhātmya I. 48.

11. Devī-Māhātmya 2.1-12.

12. See, for example, Devī-Māhātmya 1.47-48, 4.6, 11.2-3.

13. Devī-Māhātmya 11.10.

14. Devī-Māhātmya 1.63, 5.18.

15. Devī-Māhātmya 1.42-43.

16. Kūrma Purāṇa I.1.34-38.

17. These are the dates proposed by Rajendra Chandra Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs (Dacca*: University of Dacca, 1948), pp. 103-106. Hazra dates different chapters and sections of the Purāṇa separately. He dates this section not later than 1400 C. E.

18. Varāha Purāṇa 89.3-28.

19. Varāha Purāṇa 89.27-29.

20. Nārada Purāṇa Pūrva Khaṇḍa 3.3-6.

21. Nārada Purāṇa Pūrva Khaṇḍa 3.7-9 .

22. Nārada Purāṇa Pūrva Khaṇḍa 3.10-12.

23. Nārada Purāṇa Pūrva Khaṇḍa 3.27.

24. Nārada Purāṇa Pūrva Khaṇḍa 3.28-32.

25. This Purāṇa is technically Kṛṣṇaite, but as Kṛṣṇa is an avatāra of Viṣṇu, we will include it in this section. For a detailed analysis of this Purāṇa, see C. Mackenzie Brown, *God As Mother: A feminine Theology in India; An Historical and Theological Study of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* (Hartford, Vermont: Claude Stark and Co., 1974).

The relationship between Kṛṣṇa and the goddess Prakṛti/Sakti in this text is quite complex. In chapter eitht of his study, Brown differentiates among four types of relational models of analogies; (1) substance and attribute, (2) efficient and material cause, (3) support and supported or container and contained (*ādhāra and ādheya*) and (4) self (*ātman*) and body. I won't take the time here to dwell on these models, but I just wish to note that Brown makes these distinctions.

26. Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 1. 4ff.

27. Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 2.11.

28. See Brown, *God As Mother*, p. 128.

29. Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 2.74-76.

30. Brahma Khaṇḍa 28.23-25. For a discussion of *nirguṇa* as an epither of *prakṛti*, see Brown, *God As Mother*, pp.134-135.

31. See, for example, Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 1.12.

32. Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 1. 1ff.

33. For a detailed discussion of the five forms of Prakṛti and the historical roots of this concept, see Brown, *God As Mother*, pp. 142-167.

34. Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 55.52, 65.25. See also Brown, *God As Mother*, p. 121.

35. Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 55.10-22, 55.55, 55.57.

36. Brahma Khaṇḍa 1.1-2,3.1-77, 5.25-27.

37. Brahma Khaṇḍa 6.56. The influence of the Devī-Māhātmya is apparent here.

38. Brown differentiates between this creation story and the above-described account of the division of Prakṛti into the five goddesses, which he calls the divisional manifestation of Prakṛti. See Brown, *God As Mother*, Chapter nine.

39. Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 2.27-29.

40. Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 2.33-53. See also Prakṛti Khaṇḍa 54.112-121 and Gaṇeśa Khaṇḍa 45.21-42. In this last·passage, a similar story of creation is narrated, only here it is Durgā who is equated with *prakṛti*.

41. Brown, *God as Mother*, pp. 140-141.

42. Kūrma Purāṇa 1.11.7-13.

43. Kūrma Purāṇa 1.11.22-30.

44. Kūrma Purāṇa 1.11.34-35.

45. Kūrma Purāṇa 1.11.42-47.

46. Kūrma purāṇa 1.11.40-41.

47. Kūrma purāṇa 1.11.222, 224.

48. Liṅga Purāṇa 3.1-3.

49. Liṅga Purāṇa 3.4-28. There·is another account of creation in the Purāṇa that proposes a Sāṃkhya-type cosmology without interpreting *prakṛti* as feminine. See chapter seventy.

50. Liṅga Purāṇa 16.32-35, 87.13: *umāśaṃkarayorbhedo nāsti*.

51. Śiva Purāṇa Rudrasaṃhitā I. 6.8-18.

52. Rudrasmhitā I. 6.19-59.

53. Vāyavīyasaṃhitā I. 16.6-11.

54. Rudrasaṃhitā I. 9.45-49.

55. Rudrasaṃhitā I. 16.41-42: "Having become Satī, Śivā was married by Śiva. At the sacrifice of her fater, having cast off her body, which she did not take again, she went back to her own region. And Sivā incarnated again as Pārvatī at the request of the *devas*. Having performed very severe austerites (*tapas*), she again attained Śiva".

56. Rudrasaṃhitā II. 24. 35 and III. 6.45.

57. Although the Devī-Bhāgavata is generally held to be an Upa-Purāṇa and is not included in most lists of the Mahā-Purāṇas, I nevertheless include it in my analysis

because of its importance in the Śākta tradition. Furthermore, C. Mackenzie Brown has argued that the status of the Devī-Bhāgavata is actually somewhat open to discussion. See especially pp. 5-6, 17-24). In This book, Brown also shows that the Devī-Bhāgavata is heavily influenced by the Devī-Māhātmya, the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, and the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, all of which are included in the standard list of Mahā-Purāṇas. The form and content of the Devī-Bhāgavata are thus shaped substantially by the Mahā-Purāṇic tradition. See Brown's introduction to *The Triumph of the Goddess : The Canonical Models and Theological Visions of the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1990), especially pp. 5-6, 17-24.

58. The ninth book of the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa corresponds closely to the Prakṛti Khaṇḍa of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, except that Devī replaces Viṣṇu as supreme deity. Because the mythological material is substantially the same in both Purāṇas, we will not address this portion of the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa. For a detailed analysis of the relationship between the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa and the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, see Brown, *The Triumph of the Goddess*.

59. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa I.2.1-10, 19; I. 5. 47-49; I. 12.44.

60. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa VII. 29.7, XII. 12.12.

61. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa III. 3.37-42.

62. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa I. 5.60-61.

63. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa I. 2.19-20.. See also III. 24. 36-38.

64. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa I. 2.21-22. I.4.46-48 associates the same three *śaktis* with the same gods and asserts that the male divinites would be unable to fulfill their functions without their *śaktis*.

65. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa VII. 32. 1-4.

66. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa VII. 32.7, 42-45.

67. VII. 32.8. The term used, *samavāyitva*, usually indicates an intimate or inherent relation existing between or among entities. The term *samavā- yikāraṇa*, however, can indicate a material or substantial cause. In this context, the force of *samavāyitva* is probably the same as that of *samavāyikāraṇa*.

68. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa VII. 33.1.

69. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa III. 6.6-7

70. Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa III. 10.15.

71. VII. 33.21-41. This description of the cosmos as the manifestation of the body of Brahman, here identified with the Goddess, parallels a similar description in Bhāgavata Purāṇa II. 6. Since the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is Vaiṣṇava in orientation, however, it identifies as Brahman not the Goddess but Kṛṣṇa/Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa.

72. For an elaboration of this thesis, see my Ph. D. dissertation.

PURĀṆIC ETYMOLOGIES: SOME REMARKS *

by

Dr. S. G. Kantawala

[कथादिप्रसङ्गेषु अन्तरान्तरा बहूनां शब्दानां निर्वचनानि पुराणकारैरुक्तानि । लेखेऽस्मिन् मरुत्-दण्ड-शन्तनु-शब्दानां निर्वचनमधिकृत्य विचारो विहितो विस्तरेण । विचारप्रसंगे शास्त्रान्तर-दर्शितैर्निर्वचनैः सह पुराणगतानां निर्वचनानां तुलना कृता । पुराणानि प्राक्तनाचार्यचिन्तितानि निर्वचनानि अनुसरन्ति न वेत्यपि स्फुटं प्रदर्शितम् ।]

Purāṇas are a rich and important branch of vast Sanskrit literature; formally they are said to deal with five or ten topics;[1] additionally they deal with some other topics sometimes also. They also deal with several stories, myths and legends, some of which have their germs traceable to the Vedic literature. In course of the narration of stories, myths and legends and /or while discussing some other topics they try, sometimes, to explain some vocables by giving their "etymology"[2] or offer derivational explanations. In this paper it is proposed to discuss *nirvacanas* of the vocables marut, *śantanu* and *daṇḍa* as given in purāṇas.

Marut :

Maruts are 'prominent deities in the RV (=Ṛgveda).... They form a troop, gaṇa,. or *śardhas*...."[3] and are "mentioned only in plural"[4] and their number is said to be thrice or thrice seven or fortynine also[5]. In the Purāṇas their number is said to be fortynine (Matsya-Purāṇa=MP. 7.57)[6]. While giving the story of their birth purāṇas state that Indra entered Diti's womb stealthily and divided the embryo into fortynine parts. When they cried very much aloud, Indra told them "not to weep': *"mā rodiṣṭa"* (MP 7. 58) or *"mā rudata"* (MP 7.62) or *"mā rodīḥ"* (Viṣṇu-Purāṇa 1.21.39; Bhāgavata-Purāṇa 6.18. 62, 64; Brahma-Purāṇa 124. 73)[7]. The Epic also explains the vocable *marut* by stating *mā rudaḥ* or *mā rodīḥ*.[8] Thus the Purāṇas associate the vocable *marut* with *mā+√rud*, wherein phonetically the long vowel *ā* is shortened to *a*. Here the single letter *ma* is read as a condensed word, i. e. to say *mā as ma*[9].

Yāska[10] offers three derivations of the vocable *marut* as follows ;

(i) *mā+√ru*, "which roars in measures", "of measured sound" (√*mi+√ru*)

(ii) *mā+√ruc* "that which shines in measures" or "of measured brilliance" (*√mi+ √ruc*)" and

(iii) *mahad+√dru*, "that which runs a great deal." The derivative explanation in Purāṇas, *viz, mā + √rud* takes into account only the advice and consolation given by Indra to these gods in their embryonic condition in Diti's womb; but it does not refer to or explain or reflect their character, physical appearance etc. In the purāṇas, *e.g.* MP 7.55 they are said to be "*Sūryavarcasaḥ*" "having the illuminating brilliance of the sun." In the RV 7.59[11] they are described as "*Sūryatvacaḥ*", "possessed of sunlike (blazing) bodies"[12]. In RV 10.78.3 they are described as "*agnīnāṁ na jihvā virokiṇaḥ*, "brilliant like the flames of Agnis (fires)".

It is significant to note here also the descriptive epithet *virokiṇaḥ* in RV 10.78.3. Looking to the brilliance-aspect of Maruts one is reminded of the etymology of the vocable from √*mar*, to shine, in the Ṛgvedic context[13], wherein this meaning 'seems to accord best with the description of the Maruts" according to A. A. Macdonell[14] and it may be said that this derivation thends to accord well with the Purāṇic description of Maruts, as they are described as "*Sūryavarcasaḥ*" as noted earlier. Incidentally, the *upabṛṁhana*-role played by the Purāṇas here may be noted[15].

From the derivational point of view it may be noted that this is a case of primary compound or a base-compound[16], *i. e. ma-rud<mā+√rud*. Here there is not only a phonetic change, but also a phonemic change, i. e. mā reduced to *ma* and *rud* has a zero-affixation[17].

daṇḍa:

The vocable *daṇḍa* is of Ṛgvedic antiquity and it means "stick", "cudgel", "stafff", as in "*daṇḍā eved go-ajanāsa āsan....../*" RV. 7.33.6 *a* i. e. "Bharatas were (very few and limited) like the *sticks* used for driving the cows."[18] It may be observed that there is a small nucleus of Dravidian element in the RV and the vocable *daṇḍa* finds its parallels in Dravidian words, *e.g.* Ta. taṇṭu, stalk, staff, ka. *daṇṭu* stalk, *daṇḍa*, staff etc[19].

In the context of the chapters on polity the MP (225. 17) derives the vocable *daṇḍa* from √*dam* and √*daṇḍ*, when it observes that *yasmād daṇḍo damayati durmadān daṇḍayaty api/damanād daṇḍanāc*

caiva tasmād daṇḍaṁ vidur budhāḥ// i. e. to say, it is called *daṇḍa* because it subdues the uncontrollable and also punishes them; on account of subduing and punishing it is called *daṇḍa.*

The Mahābhārata (=Mbh) (Śānti-parvan, 15.8 *cd*=MP 225.7 *cd*) and Agni-Purāṇa (226.16 with *varie lectiones*) also derive it from √dam and √daṇḍ[20].

Thus it is obvious that the vocable daṇḍa has two semantic nuances, viz. (i) to subdue, to control, when derived from √dam and (ii) to punish, when derived from √daṇḍ. The Gautamadharmasūtrā derives it also from √dam, to control[21]. Yāska gives two derivations; (i) from √dad and (ii) from √dam.[22]

In the context of its being derived from √dad the story of the Syamantakagem is referred to and M. A. Mehendale points out a valid relationship between the verb *dad,* "to owe" and its derivative *daṇḍa* (punishment) and also that it establishes the use of *dhārayati* "to owe" for Yāska's days[23]. It may be noted, passingly, that the MP 45.6 uses the vocable "*bhūṣitaḥ*" in the context of the Syamantaka-gem being put on (*kadācit margayāṁ yātaḥ Prasenas tena bhūṣitaḥ/*) The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (10.564 & 13) uses the vocable *bibhran* (√bhṛ) and *pratimucya* (*prati + √muc,* to put on) respectively *(sa taṁ bibhran maniṁ* Kaṇṭhe; *tam ekadā maṇiṁ kaṇṭhe pratimucya*). It may be observed that the version of the story in the MP appears to be earlier than the one in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa[24].

In the context of the Epic and Purāṇic derivation of the vocable *daṇḍa* from √dam it may be noted that Purāṇas follow the Aupaman-yava-tradition as noted by Yāska in his Nirukta.[25]

Śantanu :

Śantanu is renowned king of the Epic fame, wherein he appears as a forefather of Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. Epics and Purāṇas decribe him as a great physian (*mahābhiṣak*) (MP 50.43) and the praise of his being a great physian is introduced by a stanza, (MP. 50.42; Cf Mbh. Cr. Ed. 1.90.48);.which explains derivationally why he was called Śantanu. The MP (50.43-44) goes on to say that whomsoever an old person or a diseased one he touched with his hands, he became young; hence he was called *śantanu* and this is his *Santanutva.* (Cf. Mbh. Cr. Ed. 1.90.48).

The Vāyu-Purāṇa (99.238-239) refers to his touch-therapy which rejuvenated the old. The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (9.22.13-14) refers not only to the magic and miraculous power of his touch-therapy, but adds also that it gave the foremost peace. This seems to assume that the old age was not looked upon favourably then. The Mbh Cr. Ed. 1.92.18 tries to explain the vocable Śantanu (v. 1. Śāntanu) patronymically. Out of these two explanations the earlier one (i. e. as given in the glorificatory stanza) takes the vocable Śantanu as a compound base i. e. śam+tanu.

Yāska refers to the story of Śantanu in his Nirukta (2.10-12), while commenting on RV 10.98.7 and gives two derivational explanations : (1) śam tano' astu "peace to thee, O body !"[26] (śam+tano)[27] and (ii) śam asmai tanvā astu' "peace to him in his body."[28] (śam+tanu)[29].

Durga[30] explains the passage as follows : (i) On seeing a diseased person, he says, 'let there be happiness, o body !" and the person becomes free from disease. (ii) Let there be happiness (śam) to him (for him) (tasmai) with his body (tanvā) (in his body).

The aforegoing discussion tends to suggest that Epics and Purāṇas appear to favour the idea of curing a diseased person, i. e. making him free from disease, as noted in the Nirukta and adds the idea of rejuvenation by the touch-therapy of hand.

Finally it may be observed that Purāṇas follow generally the Nirukta in deriving the words. En passant it may noted that some tracts in the Purāṇas are common to the Epics. Methodologically Purāṇas seem to introduce an etymology by the use of Yasmāt or some times without it and then it is concluded by tasmāt+, or tena smrtam or niruktam ucyate[31].

---

*   Paper presented to the indian him gnishis section of the 35th Session of the All-India orientel Cunferened held as Hardwar on 16,17 & 18 Nomber, 1990

1.   Cf. sargaś ca pratisargaśca vaṁśo manvantarāni ca/vaṁśyānu- caritam ceti puraṇaṁ pañcalakṣaṇam// MP 53.64,
     sargaś cātha visarpaśca vrtti rakṣāntarāni ca/ vaṁśo vaṁśānucaritaṁ saṁsthā hetur apāśrayaḥ// Bhāgavata-Purāṇa 12.7.9;
     For details vide Upadhyaya Baladeva, Purāṇavimaśa, (Hindi), Varanasi, 1965, pp. 125 ff.

2.   "Etymology" refers to "the history of form". (Vide Hockett Charles F. A Course in Modern Linguistics, Delhi, 1973, p. 394; on "derivation" vide ibid., pp. 240 ff).

3.   Macdonell, A. A., Vedic Mythology, Delhi, 1971. p. 77.

4. Macdonell, A. A., *op. cit.*, p. 78.

5. Macdonell, A. A., *op. cit.* p. 78; *Vide Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, 2.5-13 wherein seven groups each of seven (7×7=49) of Maruts are mentioned (*vide* Tripathi Gaya Charan,
   Vaidika Devatā; Udbhava aura vikāsa (Hindi), Delhi, 1982. pp. 447-448.

6. *Vide* also Hopkins, E. W., *Epic Mythology*, Delhi, 1968, pp. 96, 170.

7. *Vide* also Chitrav Shastri, Siddheshvar, *Prācīna-caritrakośa* (Marathi), Poon, 1964, p. 623.

8. Hopkins, E. W., *op. cit.* p. 96.

9. Varma, Siddheshwar, *The Etymologies of Yāska*, (V. I. Series No. 1), Hoshiarpur, 1953, p. 97.

10. *Nirukta* (with Durga's commentary, Venkateshwar Steam Press, Bombay, VS. 1982) 11. 13; *Vide* Varma Siddheshwar, *op. cit.* p. 97; Skold, Hannes, *The Nirukta*, Lund, 1926, p. 299.

11. Sarup, L., *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta*, Translation, OUP, 1921, p. 173, Skold Hannes, √ru, to shine. (*ibid.* p. 299).

12. Velankar, H. D., *Ṛgveda Maṇḍala* VII, Translation, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. 1963. p. 138.

13. *Vide* Macdonell, A. A., *op. cit*, p. 81.

14. Macdonell, A. A., *op. cit*, p. 81; *vide* also Chitrav Shastri Siddheshwar, *op. cit.* p. 623.

15. *Vide* kantawala S. G., Two Legends from the Purāṇas: A Study in Upabṛṁhaṇa, *Dr. Ludwik Sternbach Commemoration Volume* (Indologica Taurinensia, Vols. VIII-IX (1980-81) Torino, Italy, pp. 215 ff.

16. In a primary compound or a base compound two bases are joined together (*vide* Hall Jr. Robert A., *Introductory Linguistics*, Delhi, 1969, p. 177).

17. On Zero-affixation *vide* Hall Jr. Robert A., *op. cit.* pp. 178 ff.

18. Velankar, H. D., *op. cit.* p. 85.

19. Burrow, T., *The Sanskrit Language*, London, 1955, pp. 383 ff.

20. *Vide* Kane P. V., *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. III. BORI, Poona, 1973, pp. 21-22. In the MP *daṇḍa* is elevated to the lofty position of a deity. (*Vide* Kantawala S. G., *Cultural History from the Matsya-Purāṇa*, Baroda, 1964, p. 118;.MP. 225.8=Manusmṛti 7.25. For the description and operation of *daṇḍa* as an expedient (*upāya*) *vide* MP. Chapter 225.

21. Gautamadharmasūtra 11.28; *vide* Kane P. V., *op.cit*, p. 21.

22. Nirukta 2.2; *vide* Skold Hannes, *op. cit*, p. 258; L. Ssarup translates √dad as "to hold" (*ibid*, p. 224).

23. Mehendale M. A., Yāska's Etymology of *Daṇḍa*, *Nirukta Notes*, Series 1, Poona, 1965, pp. 22 ff, on pp. 24 ff (ibid), there is a discussion of the story of Akrūra and the Syamantaka-gem. Durga quotes RV 7.33. 11*d* "*Viśvedevāh puṣkare tvā*

dadanta). H. D. Velankar (*ibid*, p. 8 7) and R. N. Dandekar (The Two Births of Vasiṣṭhā ; A Fresh Study of Ṛgveda VII. 33. 9-14, *Gedenscrift fur Hermann Guntert*, 1974, Inspruch, p. 277.) render *adadanta* as 'held'. Sāyaṇa explains if as "*adhārayanta*".

24. According to R. C. Hazra MP. Chapter 45 is assignable to a period cither in the last quarter of the third or the first quarter of the fourth century A D. *(Studies in the Purāṇic Records of Hindu Rites and Customs*, Delhi, Second Ediction, 1975, p. 50).

25. *damanād ity Aupamanyavaḥ/Nirukta* 2.2; *vide* Varma Siddheshwar, *op. cit.* p. . 20.

26. Sarup, L., *op. cit.* p. 29.

27. Hannes Skold reads *tana* : (*op. cit.*p. 333); "children" for *tano,* which is not convincing.

28. Sarup, L., *op. cit,* p. 29.
     V. K. Rajwade renders this passage as follows :
     (a) "Oh (disease) body, let there be welfare *i. e.* Sound health to thee!"
     (b) "Let him have happiness physically."
     (Yāska's Nirukta, Notes, BORI, Poona, 1940, p. 350).

29. Skold Hannes, *op. cit,* p. 333.

30. Nirukta, p. 134.

31. *Vide* Kantawala, S. G., Purāṇic Etymologies (on the vocable *Purāṇa), Indological Studies* (Journal of the Department of Sanskrit, University of Delhi, Delhi), Vol. II, No. 1, Agust, 1973, pp. 13 ff; Purāṇic Etymologies, *Gopinath Kaviraja Abhinandana Grantha,* Lucknow, 1967, pp. 278 ff; *vide* also Mchendale M. A., Upaniṣadic Etymologies, *Munshi Indological Felicitation* volume, *Bhāratīya Vidyā,* Vols. xx-xxi, 1960-61, pp. 40 ff.

VEDIC MANTRAS IN THE CHAPTER ON PRATIṢṬHĀ IN THE GARUḌAPURĀṆA

Dr. N. Gangadharan

[गरुडपुराणीये प्रतिष्ठाविषयकेऽध्याये केचन वैदिका मन्त्राः पठिताः, सूक्तानुवाकादीनां नामानि चोक्तानि । मन्त्रादीनां पाठमाश्रित्यात्र विचारो विहितः । लेखकेन पाठगता अशुद्धयो दर्शिताः संशोधिताश्च ।]

The Garuḍapurāṇa Ācārakhaṇḍa ch. 48 describes the procedure for performing the installation of all deities. In that connection the Purāṇa refers to about 70 vedic mantras. These have been included in the Alphabetical index of mantras in the Garuḍapurāṇa in my Garuḍa-purāṇa: A Study App. pp. 72-81 based on the printed text. Now when the work relating to the critical edition of this Purāṇa is in progress, I have noticed some differences in the readings between the printed texts and manuscripts as follows :

1. While most of the mantras have been read identically and correctly both in the printed text and the manuscripts, some of the mantras are read differently in the manuscripts.

2. A few of the mantras are spelt wrongly in the manuscripts. They have to be emended on the support of oral tradition and application.

3. Some others could not be identified.

4. A few others refer to the mantras by their names.

I describe below only the problamatic readings in order to elicit expert opinion about them.

I

The mantras read wrongly in the printed texts, but correctly in the manuscripts are taken up at first ;

i. अग्निं संसुप्ति   48.15 a
अग्निं संसुप्तिमन्त्रेण यमो नागेति दक्षिणे ।
पूज्या रक्षोहनावेति पश्चिमे उत्तरेऽपि च ॥
वात इत्यभिषिच्याथ आप्यायस्वेति चोत्तरे ।

The manuscripts read अग्निं सुप्ति च. But could not be found in the Vedic concordance. Though there is no reference that it should be assigned

in the east, from the references to the other directions in the succeeding words, it is implied that it should be in the east.

The critically constituted text reads—

अग्निं सुप्तिं च मन्त्रेण यमो नागेति दक्षिणे ।
पूज्या रक्षोहणावेति पश्चिमे   उत्तरेऽपि च ॥
वात इत्यभिषिच्याथ आप्यायस्वेति चोत्तरे ।

ii. The mantras to be used for the worship of the guardian deities of the directions are referred to in 48.20 in the printed text as किञ्चे दधातु आचात्वा भित्रादेवीति सप्तमी. While most of the readings in the manuscripts are corrupt, व 3 reads भित्वा देवेति which is partly corrupt. The actual usage in RV. I. 24.3 अभित्वा देव has been taken to emend the reading. आचत्वा seems to be a mistake for आ घ त्वावान्त. iii. The hymns of the Sāmaveda such as the देवव्रतं, भारुण्ड and रथन्तर have been spelt wrongly in the printed text as वेदव्रतं, भेरुण्ड or भीरुण्ड and रथन्त. The correct readings are found in the manuscripts. iv. The शुक्रिय hymns of SV. 33-40 are spelt wrongly in the ptd. text as स्वक्रिय. The mss however read सुक्रिय.

II

Then the mantras which both the printed text as well as the manuscripts read wrongly have to be emended on the basis of the actual usage and tradition:

i. For the worship of the gurdian deities of the quarters the text mentions a series of mantras in verses 19-20.

त्रातारमिन्द्रमन्त्रेण   अग्निर्मूर्द्धेति चापरे ।
अस्मिन् वृक्ष इतश्चैव प्रचारीति परा स्मृता ॥ etc.

Here the reading अस्मिन् वृक्ष in both the printed texts and manuscripts is worng. यस्मिन् वृक्षे RV. X. 135.1 addressed to Yama is the correct reading as in usage. Hence it has been emended.

ii. In the context of assigning different mantras of the four Vedas in the four directions, the printed text and the manuscripts read तन्नयामीति पश्चिमे 48.37d. The correct reading is उन्नयामि. VS. 11.82d; TS. 4-1-103d.

iii. In the context of assigning different mantras on the different parts of the image, the printed text reads मूर्द्धा भव तथा मूर्ध्नि (48.70) and the manuscripts read मूर्द्धानं तु, मूर्द्धाभरं, मूर्धा भवं and मूर्द्धा भव. But the correct reading seems to be मूर्द्धा भुव RV. 10.58.

III

The correctness of the readings of the following mantras could not be decided. Some of these could not be traced in the Vedic concordance of Bloomfield.

इतः in 48.19c. This may probably be either इतो वा सातिमीमहे RV. 1.6.102 or इत ऊती वो अजरम्. RV. 8.99.7a

किव्वे दधातु   in 48.20a

आच त्वा   in 48.20a

both used for the worship of guardian deity.

The latter may be a mistake for आ घ त्वावान्त

RV. I. 30.14.

विद्याः   in 48.31c   used for आलम्भन; probaldy विद्या ह वै ब्राह्मण-माजगाम ViDh 29-9a etc,;

Nirukta

घृतोदस्य   in 48.42d   for assigning milk and curd.

क्षारोदस्य   in 48.42c   probably corruprion for क्षीर॒स्य चोदकस्य च

AV. 1-15-4b

इमं वस्त्र   in 48.47 b   for offering cloth.

कविहाविति   in 48.47c.   The manuscripts read कविहिरिति, कवहिरिति, कवेहिरिति and कविहीति. The mantra is used for bringing the deity to the pavilion.

वासं दास्यं सहाजिनम् in 48.53b. Most of the manuscripts read सदास्यञ्व सवाजिनम्.

श्लोकाध्यायं   in 48.54b and ब्रह्माण in 48.54c.

These are among the mantras to be muttered by an adhvaryu priest in the south. The last mantra is read in all the manuscripts as ब्राह्मणम्. see index below.

उदरेष्वातिलो न्यसेत् in 48.78d. The munuscripts read प्रातिलो॰, प्रतिलो॰, चातिमो॰, आतिमो॰, स्वातिलो॰, स्वायिनं॰, वातिलो॰, and आतिलो॰.

Obviously the mantra is to be assigned on the belly. Could it be a reference to तिलो-सि सोमदेवत्या. Āśval-gṛh sū. 4-7-11a ?

IV

The following are the other mantras referred to here. They are referred to by their names such as अथर्वशिरस्, कुम्भसूक्त, गायत्री, ज्येष्ठसाम, देवव्रत, नीलरुद्र,

पवमान, पुरुषसूक्त, भारुण्ड, रथन्तर, रुद्र (रुद्राध्याय), वामदेव्य, वृषाकपि and श्रीसूक्त. Some of these have been identifeed based on Ram Santkar Bhattacharya's पुराणगत वेदविषयक सामग्री का समीक्षात्मक अध्ययन in Hindi (referred to by pages).

अथर्वशिरस्	–	probably reference to अथर्वशिरोपनिषद्
कुम्भसूक्त	–	probably a mistake for स्कम्भसूक्त AV.10.8 (RSB.p.198)
गायत्री	–	ओं भूर्भुवस्वः तत्सवितुर्वरेण्यं etc.
ज्येष्ठसाम	–	उदुत्यं RV. 1.50.1a and चित्रं RV. 1.1.15.1 (RSB.p.174)
देवव्रत	–	mentioned in Tāṇḍyabrāhmaṇa 8.2.6 and Saṁvidhānabrāhmaṇa 2.4.3 (RSB-p. 175)
नीलरुद	–	could not be identified.
पवमान (पावमान्य)	–	स्वदिष्ट्या मदिष्ट्या RV. 9.1.1a; SV. 1.468a
पुरुषसूक्त	–	सहस्रशीर्षा पुरुषः
बृहत्	–	a Sāman mentioned in Gautama dh. sū 3.10-10 etc.त्वामिद्धि हवामहे SV. 1.234 (RSB. pp. 175-76).
भारुण्ड	–	उद्वयं तमसस्परि ज्योतिः पश्यन्त उत्तरम्.
रथन्तर	–	अभि त्वा शूर नोनुमो वा । आ दुग्धा इव धेनव ईशानमस्य जगतः ।(RSB. p. 176) .
रुद्र (रुद्राध्याय)	–	नमस्ते रुद्र मन्यवे
वामदेव्य	–	कया नश्चित्र आ भुवत् SV. 1.169a
वृषाकपि	–	seems to be the hymns after कुन्तापसूक्त AV.20.127-36 (RSB . p. 212).
श्रीसूक्त	–	हिरण्यवर्णां हरिणीं

See also the index below for the source of the hymns identefied.

Alphabetical Index of these mantras as in the Critical Edition :

अग्न आयाहि	(anga āyāhi)	1.48.12	SV. 1.1a.
अग्निम् ईळे	(agnimīḷe)	I. 48.11	RV. 1.1.1a.
अग्निं सुप्ति	(agnim supti)	1.48.15.	could not be identifed
अग्निर्ज्योति	(agnirjyoti)	I.48.36.	SV. 2. 1181.
अग्निर्मूर्धा	(agnir mūrdhā)	1.48.19. 48.37.	RV. 8.44.16a.
अथर्व (वा) (ण)	(atharva (vā) (ṇa)	1.48.56 48.74	denotes the Atharvaveda-saṁhitā

अथर्वशिरस्	(atharvaśiras)	I.48.65	denotes the Upaniṣad of that name
अभि त्वा देव	(abhi tvā deva)	I.48.20	अभि त्वा देव सवित: RV. 1.24.3.
आ च त्वा	(ā ca tvā)	I.48.20	आ probaly a misrake for आ त्वावान्न RV.1.30.14.
आतिल	(ātila)	I.48.78	reading doubtful; profably तिलो-सि
आप्यायस्व	(āpyāyasva)	I.48.16. 48.43	RV. 1.91.16a.
इमं वस्त्र	(imam vastra)	I.48.47.	could not be identified.
इमं मे गाङ्ग	(imam me gaṅga)	I.48.37	cf. imam me gaṅge RV. 10.75.5a
इमा रुद्र	(imā rudra)	I.48.11.	of. RV. 1.114.1a
इषे त्वा	(īṣe tvā)	I.48.11.	TS. 1.1.1.1; VS. 1.1.22.
उत्तिष्ठ ब्रह्मणस्पते	(uttiṣṭha brahmaṇaspate)	I 48.80	RV. 1.40.1a.
उन्नयामि	(unnayāmi)	I.8.16.	cf. उन् नयामि स्वान् VS. 11. 82d; TS. 4.1.10.3d.
कविहौ	(kavihau)	I.48.47	reading doubtful.
किञ्चे दधातु	(kiñce dadhātu)	I.48.20	reading doubtful.
कुम्भसूक्त	(kumbhasūkta)	I.48.56. I. 48.74	probably स्कम्भसूक्त AV. 10.8 (RSB. p. 198)
क्षारोदस्य	(kṣārodasya)	I.48.42.	cf. Kṣīrasya codakasya ca AV. 1.15.4b; mss. read क्षारोदस्य.
गणानां त्वा	(gaṇānām tvā)	I.48.30	RV. 2.23.1a
गन्धद्वारा	(gandhadvārā)	I.48.46.	RV. Kh. 5.87.9a.
घृतोदस्य	(ghṛtodasya)	I.48.42.	could not be traced
ज्येष्ठसामन्	(jyeṣṭna sāman)	I.48.55. 48.73.	उदुत्यं RV. I-50-1 and चित्रंRV.1.1-15-1
तम् ईशानं	(tam īśānam)	I.48.16.	cf. tam iśānam. RV. 7.6.4c.
तेजोऽसि	(tejo'si)	I.48.43.	AV. 7.89.4.
त्रातारम् इन्द्रं	(trātāram indram)	I.48.19 48.79.	RV. 6.47.11a.

त्रियम्बक	(riyambaka)	I.48.79	probably त्र्यम्बकं यजामहे RV. 1-59-12a
दीर्घायुष्ट्वा	(dīrghāyuṣṭvā)	I.48.79.	probably one of the mantras beginning दीर्घायुत्वाय.
देवव्रत	(devavrata)	I.48.55.	A sāman mentioned in Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa etc. (RSB. p.175)
देवस्य त्वा	(devasya tvā)	I.48.81. 48.84.	Cf. devasya tvā savituḥ. VS. 1.24.
द्रुपदादिव	(drupadādiva)	I.48.41.	AV. 6. 115.3a.
नीलरुद्र	(nīlarudra)	I.48.56.	could not be identified.
पवमान (पावमान्य)	(pavamāna) pāvamenya)	I.48.53.	svādiṣṭayā madiṣṭayā. RV. 9.1.1.
पितृ	(pitṛ)	I.48.54.	probably the पितृसूक्त.
पुरुषसूक्त	(ṇuruṣasūkta)	I.48.54.	RV. 10.90.1a (sahasraśīrṣā puruṣaḥ)
प्रचारी	(pracārī)	I.48.19.	could not be identified.
बृहत्	(bṛhat)	I.48.78.	त्वामिद्धि हवामहे SV. 1.234
ब्राह्मण	(brāhmaṇa)	I.48.54.	probably the Yajurveda-brāhmaṇa
भारुण्ड	(bhāruṇḍa)	I.48.73. 48.55.	उद्ध्यं तमस्परि RV. I.50.10
मूर्ध्वा भव	(mūrdhā bhava)	I.48.79.	cf. mūrddhā bhuvo bhavati R.V. 10.88.6a.
मैत्र	(maitra)	I.,48.54. 55 and 56	cf. maitrah śarasi. VS. 39.5.
यज्ञा यज्ञ	(yajñā yajña)	I. 48.38.	cf.yajña yajña vo agnaye. RV. 6.48.1a.
यमो नाग	(yamo nāga)	I.48.15.	could not be identified.
यस्मिन् वृक्षे	(yasmin vṛkṣe)	I.48.19.	RV. 10.35.1
या ओषधी	(yā oṣadhī)	I.48.40. 48.43. 48.45.	RV. 10.97.1a.
याः फलिनी	(yāḥ phalinī)	I.48.40.	RV. 10.97.15a.
योगे-योगे	(yoge yoge)	I.48.32.	cf. yoge yoge tavāstaram RV. 1.30.7a.

रक्षो हनन्	rakṣo hanan	I.48.15.	cf: VS.5.25. probably one of the hymns beginning रक्षो हणौ such as रक्षोहणौ वलगहनौ पर्यूहामि वैष्णवी VS.5.25; the mss. reading has to be emended.
रथन्तरसामन्	(rathantara sāman)	I.48.85.	अभि त्वा शूर नोनुमो वा SV. 1.233
रुद्रसूक्त	(rudrasūkta)	I.48.54. 48.73.	namaste rudra manyave TS. 4.5.1.1.
वात	(vāta)	I.48.15	cf. vāta ā vātu bheṣa- jam RV. 10.186.1a.
वामदेव्य	(vāmadevya)	I.48.53.	कया नश्चित्र आ भुवत् SV.1. 169; RV.4.31-1a
वास्तोष्पति	(vāstoṣpati)	I.48.30	cf. vāstoṣpate prati jānīhi yasmān, RV. 7.54.1a
विद्या	(vidyā)	I.48.31.	cf. vidyā ca me Ap. MB. 2.5.5.and vidyā ha vai brāhmaṇam Vi. Dh. 29.9a etc.
विश्वतः चक्षुः	(viśvataḥ cakṣuḥ)	I.48.48.	RV. 10.81.3a.
विष्णोर्लोक	(viṣṇorloka)	I.48.16.	cf. Viṣṇorloke mahīyate RVKH. 9.115.1b.
वृषाकपि	(vṛṣākapi)	I.48.53.	seems to be the hymn after कुन्तापसूक्त AV. 20. 127-36.
शन्नो देवी	(śanno devī)	I.48.12. 48.78	शं नो देवीरभिष्टये RV. 10.9.4a; AV. 1-6.1a; SV. 1.33
शम्भवाय	(śambhavāya)	I.48.48.	part of the Rudra?
श्रीश्च ते	(śrīśca te)	I.48.79.	cf. śrīśca lakṣmīśca TAA. 10.64
.श्रीसूक्त	(śrīsūkta)	I.48.53.	RVKH. 5.87.1a hiraṇyavarṇām hariṇīm
श्लोकाध्याय	(ślokādhyāya)	I.48.54.	could not be identified.

सदास्यं	(sadāsyam)	I.48.53.	could not be identified.
सवाजिन	(savājina)	I.48.53.	cf. sa vājinam magavadbhyo dadhāti RV.7.95.3c
सवितुर्वः	(savitur vaḥ)	I.48.84	cf. savitur vaḥ prasava ut VS. 1.12.31; 10.6.
सुक्रिय	(sukriya)	I.48.54.	the शुक्रिय humns of VS. 33-40; read as सुक्रिय in mss and wrongly as स्वक्रिय in ptd.rexts.

SOME PURANIC MYTHS OF THE DURGĀKUṆḌA MANDIR IN VĀRĀṆASĪ

By
Hillary P. Rodrigues

[अस्ति वाराणस्यां दुर्गामन्दिरं दुर्गाकुण्डश्च । स्थूल-दृष्ट्या एते न प्राचीने इति प्रतिभाति । यतः पुराणेषु अनयोर्विषये स्पष्टं कथनम् उपलभ्यते, अतः अनयोः प्राचीनता सिद्धा, इति मार्कण्डेय-स्कन्द-देवीभागवतादि पुराणानि आश्रित्य लेखकेन विस्तरेण प्रतिपादितम् ।]

Among the many ways that the purāṇas function in contemporary Hinduism, as repositories of mythic history they often serve as links to a glorious past, legitimating and authenticating the present. They very word *purāṇa*, meaning "old or ancient," suggests antiquity, and is appropriately ascribed to much of the narrative material of these texts, if not their dates of compilation. Purāṇas sometimes define themselves as texts containing five characteristic topics (*pañcalakṣaṇa*): accounts of creation (*sarga*), re-creation (*pratisarga*), Manu cycles (*manvantara*), genealogies (*vaṃśa*), and dynastic histories (*vaṃśyānucarita*). While it is true that most purāṇas adhere rather inconsistently to this classification, it nevertheless reinforces their role as documents which connect human history to cosmic beginnings.[1]

Scholars generally acknowledge that the purāṇas represent collections of tales, some of which are indeed ancient. To what extent particular stories are historically accurate and what their "dates" of composition might be are questions as challenging as are attempts to date the compilations of extant versions of these works. The purpose of this paper is not be enter the discussion on the historical truth of certain purāṇic tales, but to show how a renowned temple in Banaras successfully links its history to places and events in purāṇic accounts, thus authenticating itself. In turn, the living reality of enduring worship at the temple validates the stories within these authoritative texts[2].

Sthalamāhātmyas or Sthalapurāṇas

Due to India's rich mythic history numericous places have enjoyed the presence of incarnate deities or heroes. Thus a remote cave in Madhya Pradesh is said to have served as a shelter for the Pāṇḍavas during their

thirteen year exile, and an almost inacoessable mountain peak in the
jungles of Kerala is the spot where Rāma first met Hanumān during his
fourteen years of forest wanderings. In fact, the *Mahābhārata* and
Rāmāyaṇa alone contain numerious such mythic accounts of divinized
beings whose journeys and deeds have sacralized virtually the entire sub-
continent. But only a fraction of this profusion of mythically recognized
sanctified places throughout India enjoy the presence of marker shrines
and temples. Additionally, there are innumerable holy sites, with or
without shrines, quite unconnected to some distant, renowned, mythic
event. And yet, every shrine, no matter how nmall or new, possesses its
own tales of origin and the reasons for its sacrality. It is precisely a
collection of such stories, telling of the "glorification" of a site (*sthala*),
which is known as a *sthalamāhātmya*.

The sacrality of sites which are not connected to some ancient event
may depend on some recently manifest divine presence, human or other.
The reputation of such new holy places grows primarily through the tales
of visitors which may eventually be committed to song or writing. Thus
māhātmyas are not strictly written "texts" but a corpus of accounts, oral,
written, even iconographic, which tell of a place's sacred origins and
miraculous happenings. Diverse examples of "compiled" *māhātmyas*
might be the well-known *Koil Qlugu* of the Sri Ranganāthaswāmi temple
in Śrī īrangam, Tamil Nadu, or the *Cidambaramāhātmya* of the
famous temple of Śiva as the Lord of the Dance (*natarāja*). Similarly,
the Bhāgavatī Karni Mātā temple records (*bahi*) in Deshnok, Rajasthan,
or the local, plain story (*prakaṭakathā*) in devotional songs (*bhajana*) of
the healing goddess Āvarī Mātā, whose temple is located near Chittaur-
garh, Rajasthan, are examples of less well-known compilations.[3]
Examples of iconographic *māhātmyas* may be the *bas-relief* entitled
"Descent of the Gaṅgā" in Mahabalipuram, or the image *clyster* of
elephant, spider-web, *ṛṣi*, tree, and Devī around the Śiva *liṅga*, telling the
mythic origins of the Jambukeśvara temple at Tiruvanikovil, in Tamil
Nadu[4].

Such "glorifications" of place (*sthalamāhātmya*) are more often
referred to as *sthalapurāṇas*, a term which links the notion of "place" to
ancient "text" (*purāṇa*)[5]. More importantly, it suggests that a necessary
ingredient in the glorification of something is its connection to antiquity.
Indeed, *sthalamāhātmyas* of all sorts are found in the purāṇas, and some
purāṇas may be considered as collections of different māhātmyas, or

nothing but a single māhātmya. Thus the *Matsya Purāṇa* contains a māhātmya of Prayāga, the *Skanda Purāṇa* is a collection of many māhātmyas, including those of Banaras (*Kāśī*) and Kedarnāth. Meanwhile, the *Brahma Purāṇa* is essentially a māhātmya of Orissa. These purāṇic māhātmyas have wider circulation through organized recitations which may often occur far from the immediate environs of the holy place in question thus expanding its reputation. As part of the purāṇic corpus they forge an authoritative connection between the contemporary religious life of a site and the primordial past.

There is a tendency, among sectarians and some scholars, to distinguish and hierarchically rank these diverse forms of purāṇic literature. Thus from top to bottom we would find Mahāpurāṇas, Upa-purāṇas, and finally, Māhātmyas (among which are the *sthalamāhātmyas* or *sthala-purāṇas*), though it is not always clear which are the greater and lesser purāṇas, and what the difference is between māhātmyas and certain purāṇas. And speculation continues as to whether the māhātmyas were independent compositions which were appended to the purāṇas, or integral parts of them. Both the notion of a hierarchy, and the ambiguity in precise ranking of items within that structure, appear vital in what one might term "the puranic process", namely, the means in which new purāṇas are created or older ones supplemented[6].

Thus a priest at a sacred site may relate the praiseworthy story of that place to a visiting pilgrim or regular devotee, referring to it neither as a *sthalapurāṇa* nor as a *māhātmya*. When asked where these stories come from, he may say that all or some are found in "the purāṇas." Or he might name a purāṇa and then refer to it as a Mahāpurāṇa. This tendency to glorify something by connecting it to the main web of tradition, whose every strand can be traced to the centre and is thus equally supreme is common in the Hindu tradition. Deities and sacred places are two of the most obvious representatives of such glorifications. At the centre, also the apex of the hierarchy, are the Absolute Brahman and the Vedas. But the identification of a particular deity with the Absolute Brahman or the linkage of a particular story to the Vedas is rarely solely direct. These are also negotiated through a complex pathway of relationships to other hierarchically superior deitles or related authoritative texts. Thus Swāmi Bhāktivedānta Prabhupada, of the International Society for Kṛṣṇa Consciousness (ISKCON) is identified by his disciples as an incarnation of Śrī Caitanya, who in turn is identified

with Śrī Kṛṣṇa and thus with Viṣṇu, and ultimately with Brahman. Similarly, a loose selection of stories of a place may be collated into a *sthalapurāṇa*, these identified with a māhātmya, the māhātmya linked to a purāṇa, the purāṇa identified as a Mahāpurāṇa, and the Mahāpurāṇas identified as a Veda[7].

An interesting example of the complex interplay between purāṇa and *sthalapurāṇa*, is found at the famous temple *(mandir)* of the Devī at Durgā Kund in Banaras. There, the temple's lossely-structured sthala-purāṇa is composed of historical fact and oral legends, but most importantly, has roots in the myths contained in several purāṇas. It is precisely this purāṇic connection which gives the Durgāmandir a privileged position among Banaras's many temples. This is not a case of a purāṇa containing an independent māhātmya of the temple, or of a māhātmya being constructed separately from the purāṇas. Rather it is a case of a māhātmya in process, where the temple's story is interwoven with the threads of pre-existing myths from the rich tapestry of the purāṇas[8].

A Brief History of the Durgā Temple in Banaras

The Durgā temple *(mandir)* which overlooks a large water tank known as Durgā Kuṇḍa stands to the south of the city centre. It is built of pink sandstone, probably quarried at Chunār some thirty kilometers distant, and painted a maroon-red ochre. Built in the northern *(nāgara)* architectural style, the temple boasts a tall spire *(śikhara)* over the inner sanctum *(garbhagṛha)* and a porch *(maṇḍapa)* supported on ornately carved pillars. It is surrounded by a quadrangle which houses subsidiary shrines and rest quarters *(dharmaśālā)* for pilgrims. Although popularly known as the "Monkey Temple" due to the presence of many of these playful, gregarious, and mischievous creatures, it is actually the temple of the goddess Durgā, and one of the best known temples in Banaras.

The Durgāmandir, as it currently appears, represents several succ-essive phases of construction. The *śikhāra*, which houses the *garbhagṛha* was built by one of Banaras's most illustrious benefactresses. A pious widow from Nator in East Bengal (now Bangladesh), Rānī Bhavānī was queen of one of the largest landholdings *(zamindār)* in all of India. After her husband's death, she spent much time in Banaras, earning almost divine status for her generous donations to *brāhmaṇas,* women, the poor, and the devout. She contributed to the building of the *pañcakrośī* pilgrimage route which encircles the sacred city, and constructed pilgrim resthouses along the way. She rebuilt temples, built religious schools and

residences, and distributed massive quantities of food daily.[9] Rānī Bhavānī is known to have constructed the *śikhara* of Durgāmandir, in the late 1760's, a decade or so before her equally illustrious contempo-rary, Rānī Ahilyābai of Indore, rebuilt Banaras's most famous temple, Kāśī Viśvanātha. During subsequent phases of construction, after Rānī Bhavānī's death, the porch and quadrangle were added by other generous patrons, so that the temple took on close to its modern appearance about a hundred years ago.[10]

The Legendary Past

While this modern history of the temple, from Rānī Bhavānī onwards, is somewhat clear and easier to piece together, it is the earlier legendary and mythic history of the site which concerns us here, for, according to all local accounts, the Durgā temple was not built upon a previously insignificant site. Rather, it was built upon a site which had long enjoyed the privilege of being a seat of the goddess Durgā. Rānī Bhavānī's act, therefore, was one of reconstruction and revival.

A legendary tale, extremely well-known to worshippers at the Durgāmandir, concerns a sacred *pippal* tree. It seems that when Rānī Bhavānī decided to build a temple to Durgā, she chose a site already sacred to the goddess, where a dilapidated shrine housing a central image and some small stone icons was the centre of fervent worship[11]. The Devī, it is said, appeared to the queen in a dream and enjoined her to build a more fitting edifice of worship in that location. When the Rānī approached the *pūjārīs* of the old shrine with her proposal, they were delighted, but pointed out that they would not cut down the large, venerated pippal tree which grew there and was inhabited by the goddess herself. Miraculously, however, the tree suddenly withered and died, confirming the Devī's approval of the Rānī's intentions. This story suggests that the origins of the Durgāmandir and certainly the sacrality of the site are much older than the present edifice.

Another tale concerns Kukuṭeśvara Mahādeva, a *pūjārī* at the ancient shrine. Once, a group of bandits (*dacoits*) prayed to Durgā, promising her a human sacrifice in gratitude for victory in a certain venture. When she granted them success, they returned to the temple in search of a victim. Unable to find a suitably pure candidate, they chanced upon the *pūjārī*, who after praying to the Devī, allowed himself to be offered up to her. He is now venerated in a nearby shrine in the form of a *liṅgam*. The story suggests that the goddes of the site was worshipped with blood (even

human) sacrifices long before Rānī Bhavānī built her temple on it. This "prestige of antiguity" is a compelling explanation why Durgāmandir is the only place in all of Banaras which still has the privilege of sanctioned blood sacrifice[12].

Such tales and others, which I have called legendary, whose historical merit I shall not here consider, are the threads which conneot the historical present to the mythical past. In the case of the Durgāmandir, that mythical past is contained in certain puranic tales.

Purāṇic Myths
On the Sanctity of Durgā Mandir and Durgā Kuṇḍa

Diana Eck points out how detailed geographical descriptions may constitute portions of māhātmyas[13]. These exist, in part, due to the importance placed on sanctified space, and in a more practical vein, to provide information for wandering pilgrims. Ultimately, they also serve to identify sites which have been cast into obscurity. For instance, many of the ancient temples in Banaras had been obliterated, often after several attempts at reconstruction, during the Muslim rule from the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries. The eighteenth century, Rānī Bhavānī's period, saw a strong spirit of Hindu revivallsm, in which many of the city's forgotten temples were restored to prominence. In those efforts, the *Kāśī Khaṇḍa* of the Skanda *Purāṇa* has proved indispensable. It is the text most often referred to by priests and pandits as the authoritative source for identifying the locations of the city's ancient shrines[14].

Although the date of the *Kāśī Khaṇḍa* is uncertain, as part of the Skanda Purāṇa, it is considered to have timeless authority[15]. The *Kāśī Khaṇḍa*, unequivocally states that the person who performs the worship of Durgā through her pilgrimage in Banaras, is freed from thousands of afflictions, and more specifically that bathing in Durgā kuṇḍa cleanses one from the sins accumulated in nine rebirths (*navajanma*).

दुर्गाकुण्डे नरः स्नात्वा   सर्वदुर्गार्तिहारिणीम् ।
दुर्गां सम्पूज्य   विधिवन्नवजन्माघमुत्सृजेत् ॥ ८७ ॥[16]

Furthermore, the Devi is particularly pleased with sacrificial offerings, which, though not stated explicitly, are most likely construed as blood sacrifices (*māhābali*).[17]

नाशयिष्यति विघ्नौघान् सुमतिञ्च प्रदास्यति ।
महापूजोपहारैश्च   महाबलिनिवेदनैः ।
दास्यत्यभीष्टदासिद्धिं दुर्गा काश्यां न संशयः ।
प्रतिसंवत्सरं तस्याः कार्या यात्रा प्रयत्नतः । ८५ [18]

These two references strongly link the Devī of the *Skanda Purāṇa* to the Durgāmandir at Durgā Kuṇḍa, for there is no other goddess temple in Banaras which currently is so obviously associated with both a *kuṇḍa,* and with blood sacrifice[19].

The Devī at Durgāmandir is also known as 'Kūṣmāṇḍā Devī, an appellation most commonly used in the context of the nine Durgā (*navadurgā*) pilgrimage in Banaras which takes place during both the spring and autumn *navarātras* (nine nights)[20]. During these festivals, devotees may visit a different Durgā temple on each of the nine days. Kūṣmāṇḍā Devī is the fourth of these Durgās. Yet at all times of the year, including the *navarātras,* if a pilgrim were to enter the city and ask for the temple of the goddess Durgā, he would most likely be directed to the Devī at Durgā Kuṇḍa. Thus although several Devīs in the city are identified as Durgā during the Navadurgā pilgrimage, and although the Devī at Durgā Kuṇḍa is known by another name in that ocntext, her most renowned epithet is as the great goddess Durgā[21]. Actually, it would not be far-fetched to say that the temple at Durgā Kuṇḍa is perhaps the best known temple to the goddess, under the epithet of Durgā, in all of India[22].

The Kāśīkhaṇḍa also recounts how the Devī got her name[23]. Once, when a great demon named Durga (or Durgama) threatened the gods with the power he had acquired through the performance of asceticism, they approached Śiva for help. He passed the task onto the Devī who sent Kālarātri, one of her energy manifestaions (*śakti*) as a messenger to tell the demon to desist. However, when Kālarātri (Black Night) approached, the demon tried to catch her. She burned the demon's attendants with her breath, returned to the Devī who dwelt in the Vindhyas (*vindhyācala-kṛtālayām*), and prepared for war. The Devī produced thousands of energy manifestations (*śakti*) from her body which defeated the demon's armies. Ultimately he engaged her in combat, but she destroyed all his weapons. He began to change shapes, but she injured each of these, finally killing him while he assumed the shape of a buffalo (*mahāmahi-ṣarūpa*). She took the name Durgā (the Unassailable) from the demon she had conquered.

The Kāśīkhaṇḍa goes on to say that the very same Durgā, with her
śaktis, Kālarātri and others, always protects Banaras.

सा दुर्गा शक्तिभिः सार्धं काशीं रक्षति सर्वतः ।
ताः प्रयत्नेन सम्पूज्याः कालरात्रिमुखा नरैः ॥ ८८ ॥[24]

Since Kālarātri is the name of the sixth of the city's nine Durgās, the
KāsiKhaṇḍa reinforces the role of these Durgās as city protectors. The text
also seems to imply that the prime residence of the goddess is
Banaras, specifically at Durgā kuṇḍa.

Also noteworthy in this story is that the Devī dwelt in the
Vindhyas. The most prominent temple to the goddess under the epithet
of Vindhyavasinī Devī in those mountains is located near Mirzapur, some
eighty kilometers from Banaras. A local legend says that after slaying the
demon Durgā, the Devī rested at Durgā kuṇḍa, thus sanctifying the
place. When the great sword (asi) slipped from her hand, it split open the
Asi river, which lies just south of Durgā Kuṇḍa in the direction of
Vindhyācala[25]. Thus this legend links the cult of Vindhyavāsinī Devī to
the Devī of Durgāmandir. The Purāṇic tale suggests that though the
Devī may have had her abode in the Vindhyas she is ever-present in
Banaras as Durgā with her *śaktis*.

Another well-known myth which is only occasionally cited to account
for the ancient sanctity of the site of the Durgāmandir concerns Satī, the
spouse of Śiva. When Satī killed herself after being insulted by her
father, Dakṣa, Śiva carried her corpse wherever he went in the heavens. To
rectify the cosmic imbalance caused by Śiva's mourning, Viṣṇu entered
the body of the goddess in the form of an insect and slowly caused her
limbs to break away and fall to the earth (in most accounts, he severed her
limbs with his discus). Where each body part fell, the earth was sanctified,
and these spots have come to be known as seats of the Devī, or the Śākta
Pīṭhas. Some worshipppers claim that the Durgāmandir is built on the site
where Satī's right thigh (*jaṅghā*) fell[26]. There is, however, no written
support in any purāṇa to confirm this identification, even though the
listed locations and numbers of the Śākta pīṭhas vary considerably. Most
Banārasis familiar with the Satī myth uphold that the Viśālākṣī temple in
the city rather than Durgāmandir is such a Devī pīṭha since it is listed in
many compilations including the Devī *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (Book VII,
Chapter 30, lines 55-84) and the *Matsya Purāṇa* (XIII, 26-56).

The above example is useful evidence of the important role played by the purāṇas in authenticating the claims made by the particular site (e. g. Viśālākṣī mandir as a Śakta pīṭha), while not supporting another (e. g. Durgāmandir). It is almost as if worshippers, out of great devotion but weaker knowledge of "canonical" truths, may ascribe to the temple all manner of attributes. Similarly, the Devī of the temple may be given a large variety of epithets and identifications. However, not all these strands of possibility are confirmed by the "canonical" tradition which is best known by the pandits and purāṇic reciters.[27] The priest of the sacred site (tīrtha-purohita) stands between these two extremes: the worshipper's multitude of possible identifications at one end, and the pandit's more limited selection f permissible (i. e; traditional) ones on the other. It would appear that in the interaction between these three a fusion may take place, especially if one remembers that the purāṇas are essentially "texts in process", not static entities. The recitation of a purāṇa can take up to a month, during which time the storyteller resides at the site of recitation imbibing its living traditions and legends from local storylellers, pandits, temple priests and worshippers. He may incorporate some of these into his ongoing recitation as a natural part of the art, but only where the insertion is likely to appear relatively seamless. The listeners, in turn, among whom are the temple priests and worshippers, then hear confirmation of the glory of their deities, cities, or temples in the purāṇas[28].

How Durgā Worship Came to be Established in Banaras

I found that although the Kāsī Khaṇḍa is cited by temple priests to authenticate the ancient sanctity of the temple site, identified through the demon Durgā myth, the kuṇḍa, the blood sacrifices, and the navadurgā pilgrimages, these officials prefer another puranic myth to identify how the Devī came to take up residence in Banaras. This tale is found in the Devī Bhāgavata *Purāṇa* and is worth recounting in some detail[29].

The king of Ayodhyā, Dhruvasandhi, had two beautiful wives Manoramā and Līlāvatī, each of whom gave birth to a son. When Dhruvasandhi died in an unfortunate hunting accident, Sudarśana, Manoramā's son, though a minor, was expected to ascend the throne. However, Līlāvatī's father, Yudhājit saw this as an opportunity to install his own grandson, Śatrujit, on the throne. He hurried over to Ayodhyā accompanied by his allies and their armies. War eventually broke out and when Vīrasena was slain by Yudhājit, Manoramā fled with her son and legitimate heir, Sudarśana, towards Banaras. En route, she took refuge at

the hermitage of the sage Bhāradvāja, who dissuaded the pursuing armies
of Yudhājit from killing Manoramā and her child.

Sudarśana began to grow, and one day, mistaking a term he
overheard his older playmates say, began to repeat the seed syllable
(bīja-mantra), "Klīm". This spontaneous initiation (dīkṣā) into the
bīja of Kāma, also sacred to the Devī, enabled him to master quickly the
martial, moral, and political sciences. He began to get frequent visions of
the Supreme Goddess, who one day gave him a chain mail armour and
weapons. Meanwhile, Śaśikalā, daughter of the king of Banaras (Kāśī),
who was fast coming of age, secretly fell in love with the young prince
through stories she had heard about him. One day she too had a dream in
which the Devī appeared and granted her the boon of marriage to
Sudarśana.

The king of Kāśī, Subāhu, sensing his daughter's maturation,
arranged for her marriage (svayaṁvara), and invited all the eligible
neighbouring princes. Among these came Śatrujit, accompanied by his
father, Yudhājit. Choosing the icchā svayaṁvara, where a bride may
select her husband by her own free will, Saśikalā told her father that she
wanted Sudarśana, and sent a message for him to come to Kāśī. When
Sudarśana arrived in Kāśī on a chariot which had been given to him by
kings who were former allies of Yudhājit, it created a stir among the
princes. Yudhājit threatened to kill Sudarśana and Subāhu if Śaśikalā
persisted in her decision. Subāhu tried in vain to get his daughter to
reconsider her choice, but she remained adamant. She told him not to
fear, since the outcome of the confrontation was in the hands of the Devī.

Subāhu finally conceded and secretly married Śaśikalā to Sudarśana.
He gave them a small retinue of soldiers and servants, offered Manoramā
the throne of Banaras, which she declined, and himself prepared for
certain war. Inevitably, when the kings heard of the marriage, they were
enraged and waited to ambush Sudarśana when he set out from Kāśī,
accompanied by Subāhu.Unperturbed, despite knowledge of the
upcoming ambush, Sudarśana repeated the Kāma bīja, and took refuge
in the Devī's protection.

A horrible battle broke out and as it grew more dreadful, the goddess
appeared mounted on her lion, beautiful, and holding many weapons.
Subāhu and Sudarśana bowed to her in devotion as her lion roared and
the quarters began to assume a dreadful appearance. Although the rival
kings lost heart, Yudhājit did not, and he launched an attack at

Sudarśana. Enraged, the goddess Durgā joined the fray and slew
Yudhājit, Śatrujit, and several other of their allies. Thus the battle ended
in favor of Sudarśana, and Subāhu, the king of kāśī, began to sing the
praises of Devī Durgā.

Pleased with Subāhu's praises, the Devī appeared to him and granted
him a boon. He asked that she remain always in Banaras being
worshipped under the name of Śrī Durgā Devī and that she protect the
city and make it renowned for as long as it stood on the face of the earth.

नगरेऽत्र त्वया मातः स्थातव्यं मम सर्वदा ।
दुगदिवीति नाम्ना वै त्वं शक्तिरिह संस्थिता ॥ ५ ॥
रक्षा त्वया च कर्तव्या सर्वदा नगरस्य ह ।
यथा सुदर्शनस्त्रातो रिपुसंघातनामयः ॥ ६ ॥
तथाऽत्र रक्षा कर्तव्या वाराणस्यास्त्वयांम्बिके ।
यावत्पुरी भवेद्भूमौ सुप्रतिष्ठा सुसंस्थिता ॥ ७ ॥[30]

She granted his wish. Subāhu established an image of the Devī in
Banaras, had temples built, and encouraged her worship. The inhabitants
of Kāśī grew in love and devotion to the Devī and began to worship her
with the same zeal as they did Śiva in the Viśvanātha temple.

सुबाहुरपि काश्यां तु दुर्गायाः प्रतिमां शुभाम् ।
कारयित्वा च प्रासादं स्थापयामास भक्तितः ॥ ४१ ॥
तत्र तस्या जनाः सर्वे प्रेमभक्तिपरायणाः ।
पूजां चक्रुर्विधानेन यथा विश्वेश्वरस्य ह ॥ ४२ ॥[31]

Sudrśana was successfully restored to the throne in Ayodhyā where
he, too, established and encouraged Durgā worship.

This myth is well-known and regularly referred to by the sacred
specialists of Durgāmandir and the surrounding shrines who identify the
Durgā Kuṇḍa mandir as the original site where Subāhu established his
temple. It is certainly a very compelling identification, for the only temple
which can adequately stake the same claim in modern day Banaras is the
Annapūrṇā mandir which is visited by most Banarasis and pilgrims who
take the *darśana* of the Śivaliṅga at the nearby Viśvanātha temple.
However, the Devī of Annapūrṇā temple is best known by that name
(despite her identification as Mahāgaurī, one of the city's nine Durgās
during the Navadurgā pilgrimage) or as Bhavānī. There are a series of
independent myths which link her to the nurturing role suggested by her
name, Annapūrṇa (She who is Replete with Sustenance). The Durgā

temple at Ramnagar again does not qualify for this identifiction due to its location outside the sacred perimeter of the city.

Summary

Thus the summarized *sthalamāhātmya* of the Durgā Kuṇḍa temple and its goddess would be that the Devī, after her creation by the gods in order to slay Mahiṣa (as recounted in the Second Episode of the *Durgā Saptaśatī* of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*), was again called upon to slay Śumbha and Niśumbha (the Third episode of the *Durgāsaptaśatī*)[32]. After slaying this pair of demons, the Devī tells of future incarnations. Among these she recounts how she will appear to slay the demon Durgama, and become famous under the name of Durgā. This "prediction" comes true in the *Kāśī Khaṇḍa* myth, which further tells us that the Devī came to reside in Banaras at Durgā Kuṇḍa.

The question which next arises is the place of the Sudarśana and Subāhu myth, for if the Devī already resided at Durgā Kuṇḍa, why did her worship need to be re-established there? A possible answer lies in the conception of reality as cyclical. The Devī's slaying of the demon Durga took place at a time in the mythic past when the battle between good and evil was essentially cosmic. It was fought between gods and demons, and had divine proportions[33]. The site of the Durgāmandir was chosen and sanctified by the Devī, *in illo* tempore, during some earlier Manu-cycle (*manvantara*). The Sudarśana story is a connection between the events of that divine period and what appears to be a cycle of human history. It reenacts the perennial battle between good and evil, but with human players, for Sudarśana and Subāhu are worshippers of the Devī, while the arrogance of Yudhājit and Śatrujit link them with the demons. Thus when Subāhu, the king of Kāśī, estabilshes Durgā worship at Banaras, he is actually setting a human precedent, but merely re-establishing her presence there.

It is to this mythic history that the near legendary deeds of Rānī Bhavānī are joined, for she continues the chain of cyclic reconstructions of the temple, and the revival of Durgā worship in Banaras.

After close scrutiny, R. C. Hazra concluded that the *Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa* was composed by a "Smārta Śākta brāhmaṇa of Bengal and.... He migrated to Benares (probably because it was the best place of residence for a Devī-worshipper), lived there for a long time, and then wrote the Devī-Bhāgavata."[34] Hazra based this on an appraisal of the author's intimate familiarity with the countryside of Banaras and Bengal,

and supposed that the Vaiṣṇava rulership of Bengal and Orissa in the twelfth century would make Banaras a more favorable place for Śāktas. Were this true, we could surmise a sizable Durgā cult in Banaras at thàt time.[35] Was there an ancient temple on the site of the Durgāmandir at that time, where this author worshipped?[36] Did Rānī Bhavānī, experiencing the discomfort of British and Islamic power under Warren Hastings and Siraj-ud-allah in Bengal, rebuild this Durgā temple which was previously an important devotional centre for Bengali Śāktas in Banaras like herself ? Although hard evidence prevents an unequivocal answer to these questions, devotees have little doubt about the sacred antiquity of the temple.

Conclusion

Thus the worshippers and sacred specialists at Durgā Kuṇda mandir suggest identifications of both the site and its Devī with the aforementioned myths contained in the Mārkaṇḍeya, Skanda, and Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇas. More importantly, these identifications are compelling due to their specificity, and due to the absence of equally strong competing claims from other temples. One of the consequences of such successful identifications is authenticity.

The living temple is a manifestation of faith and a locus of religious activity, with a solidity matched by the purāṇic texts. The purāṇas, whether considered to be divinely revealed (śruti) or traditional (smṛti), carry at least the fairly substantial authority accorded to the latter group of sacred writings. Their myths and legends are "true" stories, not according to the parameters of historical science, but as accepted versions of past events. When temple and text are successfully linked, they authenticate each other. Thus the fame, power, and popularity of the Durgāmandir are in many ways dependent on the authority of the purāṇic texts. Similarly, this living reality of the thriving temple and its resident goddess is testament in flesh and stone to the "truth" of the purāṇic myths.

It is the temple officials, primarily the priests (pūjārī) who serve as a link between the worshipper, who represents the religious life of the temple, and the pandit or vyāsa, the repositories of purāṇic lore. Essentially, these pūjārīs collate and transmit their selection of purāṇic myths, oral legends, and historical facts, which forms the temple's māhātmya, to visiting pilgrims, worshippers, pandits, and purāṇic storytellers. Based on their skill, a mini-purāṇa is composed, which may naturally cotain exact

or facsimile reproductions of preexisting purāṇic tales. This *sthalapurāṇa* is like a bead, gradually changing shape and lustre, waiting to be selected and threaded into some larger purāṇic necklace. Thus, while generally recognized as mediators between human beings and the gods in ritual worship, temple *pujārīs* also serve as mediators between the present and the past, between the worshipper and the pandit, between the mundane world of historical fact and the divine cosmos of mythic truth.

---

1. A detailed discussion of the *pañcalakṣana* is found in Ludo Rocher, *The Purāṇas* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986), pp. 24-30.

2. The field work for this paper was conducted during a fourteen month period from 1990 till the end of 1991 in Banaras where my research was concerned with Durgā worship in the city. I am especially grateful to the *mahants* of Durgāmandir, particularly the late Parasnath Dubey, and to the head *pūjārī*, Ramprasad Dubey, whose generosity of spirit made my work possible. I am indebted to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the School of Graduate Studies of Mc Master University for funding my project, the Shāstrī Indo-Canadian Instiute for facilitating it, and the History of Art department at Banaras Hindu University with whom I was affillated.

3. See, for instance, Hari Rao (V. N.) *Koil Qlugu: The Chronicle of the Śrīrangam Temple with Historical Notes* (Madras, 1961). The *māhāt- mya* (or *mahīmā*) of Avari Mātā may be found "compiled" in audio cassette recordings such as Bhanvar Lāl, *Āvarī Mātā Kī Prakaṭa Kathā*(Delhi: Yuki Cassettes, 1989).

4. While one could convincingly argue that any iconographic representation is a "glorification" of sorts, I have, selected examples which possess "narrative" dimensions.

5. The "texts' of *sthalapurāṇas*, though at times written, are more often oral.

6. A recent discussion of "canonicity" and the larger process of puranic compilation is found in Cheever Mackenzie Brown, *The Triumph of the Goddess : The Canonical Models and Theological Visions of the Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (New York: SUNY Press, 1990).

7. The *Vāyu Purāṇa*, for instance refers to itself as a Veda. For the relationship between Veda and Purāṇa, see L. Rocher, The Purāṇas, pp. 13-17.

8. There are, of course, other temples in Banaras which lay claim to the same identifications and utilize some of the same purāṇic myths, but with less success.

9. On Rānī Bhavānī's contributions to Banaras see Dr. Raghunath Bhattacharyya, "Lokamātā Mahārānī Bhavǎnī," *Bengal and Vǎrāṇasī: A Study in Cultural Synthesis and National Integration (Bengal's Contribution to Vārāṇasī)*, ed. Dr. Ram Dular Singh, trans. Miss Anima Das (Calcutta: Bibliographical Society of India, 1986), p.1-18.

10. For some early historical details of the temple see, M. A. Sherring, *Banaras* (Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1990), p. 157-166. Originally published in 1868.

11. Accounts vary considerably about the appearance of the original site, prior to Rāṇī Bhavānī's construction. All claim that the main "image" of the Devī currently housed in the inner sanctum (*garbhagṛha*) is the same one that existed there from time immemorial. It is a self-manifested (*svayambhu*) expression of the Devī in the rock, only vaguely ressembling the common goddess form as a mound (*piṇḍa*), being much flatter, and possessing markings which cause it to be designated a *yantra*.

12. Blood sacrifice does occur in other parts of the city, such as the sacrifice of pigs at Piśāca Mocana Kuṇḍa, though this is not done on the premises of a temple.

13. See for instance, Diana Eck, "Sanskrit Sources for the Study of Vārāṇasī," *Purāṇa* XXII, No. 1 (1980), pp. 81-101.

14. A good example, in print, of such efforts is found in Kuber Nāth Sukul, *Vārāṇasī-Vaibhava* (Patna: Bihār Rāṣṭrabhāṣā Pariṣad, 1977).

15. Scholars suggest that it is later than the twelfth century, since there is no mention of it in *Tīrthavivecana* Kāṇḍa of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* by Lakṣmī- dhara, a twelfth century digest (*nibandha*) with extensive coverage of Banaras.

16. *Kāśī Khaṇḍa (Skanda Purāṇa)*, Gurumaṇḍala Granthamālāyā No. XX, Vol. IV (Calcutta: 1961), p. 521.

17. The term *bali* is used almost synonymously with blood sacrifice in the later purāṇas. See for instance, K. R. Van Kooij, *Worship of the Goddess according to the Kālikā Purāṇa* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), p. 21, 52-54.

18. *Kāśīkhaṇḍa (Skanda Purāṇa)*, p. 520-21.

19. The Durgāmandir at Rāmnagar is also situated on a tank, and although there are no blood sacrifices commonly occuring there nowadays, the presence of a Chinnamasta shrine on its premises, as well as its association with the royal family would suggest that it could make claims to be the temple referred to in the Kāśī Khaṇḍa. However, its location across the Gaṅgā, in Rāmnagar, which in not considered to be within the sacred perimeter of kāśī proper, such a claim would be insubstantial.

20. The list of htese niñe Durgās, found in the Armour of the Goddess (*Durgā-Kavaca*), is as follows: Śailaputrī, Brahmacāriṇī, Citraghaṇṭā or Candra- ghaṇṭā, Kūṣmāṇḍā, Skandamātā, Kātyāyanī, Kālarātrī, Mahā- gaurī, and Siddhidātrī. *The Durgā Kavaca*, though not found in any extant version of the purāṇas is often ascribed to them. It is generally considered to be a limb (*aṅga*) of the *Devīmāhātmya* (or *Durgā-saptaśatī*), and recited together with that "Glorification of the Goddess".

21. The lesser-known temples among the nine Durgās of Banaras enjoy large numbers of visitors only during the *navarātras* and then too, primarily on their particular

days. They are generally known by their "lesser names." Thus Śailaputrī Devī temple gets most of its visitors on the first day, Śkandamātā Devī is visited on the fifth day. Even the temple visited on the eighth day, which is the most popular Devī temple in Banaras, Mahāgaurī Devī, is famous as the residence of the Devī Annapūrņā (not known primarily as Durgā). Several other of the city's Devīs are identified with Durgā, but are better known by their specific epithets. These include the Saṅkaṭā Devī mandir at Saṅkaṭā Ghāt, and the small Mahiṣamardinī mandir near Tulsī Ghāt, both of which have images of the goddess destroying the buffalo demon, Mahiṣa.

22. There is no fool-proof way of ascertaining the validity of this statement. It is based on a subjective appraisal of its national and international reputation more than on sheer numbers. Considering the immense popularity of Banaras as a pilgrimage and tourist destination for Indians and foreigners, and the certain occurance of the Durgā temple in most guide books to the city, it is well-known to Hindu and non-Hindu alike. The temple also enjoys prominence in the listings of highly popular and respected modern anthologies of sacred places, such as *Kalyāṇa Śakti Aṅka*, Vol. 1 (Gorakhpur: The Gītā Press, 1934, reprint 1991), and *Kalyāṇa, Tīrthāṅka* Vol. 31, No. 1 (Gorakhpur: The Gītā Press, 1957).

23. The story is told in great detail in Chapters 71 and 72 of the *Kāśīkhaṇḍa*.

24. *Kāśīkhaṇḍa (Skanda Purāṇa)*, p. 520-21.

25. This legend is also noted in Diana Eck, *Banaras, City of Light* (Princeton,Princeton University Press, 1982), p. 167.

26. This association of this myth with the Durgā Kuṇḍa mandir is given in L. P. Vidyarthi, M. Jha, and B. N. Saraswati, *The Ṣacred Complex of Kashi (A Microcosm of Indian Civilization)* (Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, 1979), p. 300-301.

27. Although I use the term "pandit" here, I am including in the category all custodians of "canonical" sacred lore. Of course there is no such thing as a Hindu canon, since the religious tradition is vast and diverse. The beiiefs and Sanskrit religious literature of the *brāhmaṇa* classes (R. Redfield and M. Singer's "Great Tradition") roughly circumscribe the notion of a canon. Also pertinent in this discussion is M. N. Srinivas's concept of Sanskritization. See M. N. Srinivas, *Religion and Society among the Coorqs of South India* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952) and Milton Singer, *When a Great Society Modernizes* (New York: Praeger, 1972).

In Banaras, temple priests often refer worshippers to learned individuals, pandits, for details about a particular purāṇa or the passages to which the priests have alluded. Such *pandits* are rarely familiar with the exact and complete content of all the sacred texts since these are far too voluminous and numerous, though knowledge of Sanskrit may enable them to read any of these. The specific content of particular

purāṇas are most often fully known by *vyāsas* or *bhets*, who are commissioned by temples or commu- nities to recite these texts..

28. This is an oversimplification of a highly complex process which involves the interplay of "soft" (e. g., oral) and "hard" (e. g., written, audiotaped) forms of purāṇic recitation (which may be partial, complete, or elaborated), as well as the relationship between the Sanskrit text and the accompanying interpretive translation in the vernacular.

29. See *Devī-Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, Skandha III, Chapters 14-25.

30. *Devī Bhāgāvatam Mahāpurāṇam*, Third Section, Chapter 24, lines 5-7 (Kāśī: Paṇḍita Pustakālaya, 1969), p. 168.

31. *Devī Bhāgavāta Mahāpurāṇam*, Third Section, Chapter 25, lines 41-42.

32. I have desisted from repeating the myths of the *Durgā Saptaśatī* here since they are extremely well-known and do not pertain specifically to the Durgā Kuṇḍa mandir.

33. Even this battle is a re-enactment of the earlier battle between the Devī and the demon Mahiṣa. The demon Durga also takes the shape of buffalo (*mahiṣa*) before he is killed.

34. R. C. Hazra, *Studies in the Upapurāṇas, Vol. 2 Śākta and Non-Sectarian Upapurāṇas* (Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1963), pp. 353-359.

35. A. S. Altekar cites inscriptional evidence of the installation of an image of Caṇḍī (Durgā) in a temple erected in her honour in Banaras in the 6th C. E. See, A. S. Altekar, *History of Banaras (From Earliest times down to 1937*) (Banaras: The Culture Publication House, Banaras Hindu University, 1937), p. 27, referring to *Epigraphica Indica*, IX, p. 69. The Bhārata Kalā Bhavana of Banaras Hindu University displays numerous Durgā images (as Mahiṣāsuramardinī) from Banaras and vicinity, dating from the twelfth century and earlier.

36. C. M. Brown points out the possibility of multiple authorship ("a small group of Goddess devotees from Bengal") for the initial purāṇa. See C. M. Brown, *The Triumph of the Goddess*, p. 10.

NARA-NĀRĀYAṆA AS DESCRIBED IN THE PURĀṆAS

By

Ram Shankar Bhattacharya

The Purāṇas speak highly of the twin sages Nara and Nārāyaṇa and show the uniqueness of their character by saying that they, unlike other gods, conquered Kāma without being arrogant or wrathful to him. Followings pages embody a brief account of the life and activities of these two sages as described in the Purāṇas. That these two sages possess a highly glorified position in the field of Puranic lore may be known from the well-know verse नारायणं नमस्कृत्य नरं चैव नरोत्तमम् ' read in the beginning of almost all the Purāṇas.

In the Purāṇas the word Naranārāyaṇa (containing the names of two sages) is, in many places, used in singular number[1], which shows intimate relation or constant companionship between these two sages[2]. They are regarded as the two parts of one *sattva* (नारायणं नरं चैव सत्त्वमेकं द्विधा स्थितम्, Mbh. Udyoga p. 49. 20). In the present article the word Naranārāyaṇa will usually be treated as one single name, unless there arises some necessity to mention the two names separately. We have hardly given any hyphen between the two names as there is no possibility of confusion in the names.

It should be clearly noted that Nārāyaṇa in this article is not the same as the god Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa. Here Nārāyaṇa is chiefly a sage though he is regarded as an *aṁśa* (portion) or incarnation of Viṣṇu or even aspects or forms of Viṣṇu and is given such epithets as are visually given to Viṣṇu. There are however a considerable number of Puranic passages where the precise character of Nārāyaṇa (whether he is a sage or the same as God Viṣṇu) is not clearly discernible. As for example in the Puranic statement that Śrī, the daughter of Bhṛgu and Khyāti, was married with Nārāyaṇa, Nārāyaṇa is the God Viṣṇu as may be known from relevant Puranic passages. Again when the Purāṇas say that in the churning of ocean Nārāyaṇa assumed the form of Mohinī, Nārāyaṇa is to be taken as the God Viṣṇu, but in the same incident when it is said that Nārāyaṇa appeared with Nara and fought against the demons, Nārāyaṇa is the sage Nārāyaṇa as is clear from the mention of Nara.

It is worth while to note the position of Nara-nārāyaņa in the scheme of *avatār as* as conceived in the Gauḍīya school. According to this school these two sages belong to the class of līlāvatāras (who are twentyfour in number) and sometimes they are said to form one single *avatara*. They are also regarded as persons showing the glory of dispassion (*vairāgya*). In the fourfold classification of *avataras* (namely *āveśa, prabhava, vaibhava and parāvastha*) Nara and Nārāyaņa fall under the *vaibhava* class (See the Bṛhad-bhāgavatāmṛta of Sanātana- gosvāmin and the Saṃkṣepabhāgavatāmṛta of Rūpagosvāmin). According to the Saṃkṣepabhāgavatāmṛta, the four brothers Nara, Nārāyaņa, Hari and Kṛṣṇa constitute one single *avatāra* (14).[3]

Though some Purāṇas expressly state that Nara and Nārāyaņa were of human forms (नररूपेण तिष्ठति, Sk. Badarikāśrama 8.19; see also D. Bhāg. 6.10.19-21, 30) and though words like *muni, ṛṣi* and the like are frequently used at the time of referring to them, yet it is reasonable to regard them as mythical, for they are said to be the offspring of Sādhyā or Mūrti (the daughter of Dakṣa) and Dharma (born of Brahmā). The assertion that they appeared in the Cākṣuṣa manvantara also tends to prove the mythical character of these two sages.[4]

Glorious position of Naranārāyaņa

The highly exalted position of these two sages may be known from the statements of Puranic authors as given below:

(1) These two sages are regarded as the incarnations or portions of Viṣṇu, or even Viṣṇu himself.[5]

(2) Epithets like *praśānta, mahat, jñānin, mahāmati, bhakta-pravara, lokabhāvana* and the like are frequently used for them. See Bhāg. 3.4.22; 11.4.6; Kālikā-p. 37.127; Br.Vai.p. 2.63.27-28; 4.22.48, etc.

(3) Besides the general epithets like *muni, ṛṣi, yogin, bhāgavata* etc[6]., more significant epithets are applied to them. They are regarded as *paramahaṁsa-paramaguru* in Bhāg. 5.19.11 and D. Bhāg. 8.11.2 and *devar ṣis* in Vāyu-p.61.83. Nārāyaņa is said to be the best of *muni*s as Kumāra (i. e. Sanatkumāra) is the best of *brahmacārins* (नारायणो मुनीनां च कुमारो ब्रह्मचारिणाम् Bhāg. 11.16.25).

(4) The celibacy of these two sages has been praised in a lofty way in Bhāg. 3. 31. 37 saying that there is no other being who cannot be deluded

by women (तत्सृष्टसृष्टसृष्टेषु कोऽन्वखण्डितधीः पुमान् । ऋषिं नारायणमृते योषिन्मय्येह मायया)[7].

(5) The passages like नारायणं नरसखं शरणं प्रपद्ये (in Bhāg. 11. 7. 18) show that the two sages are regarded as capable of delivering people from the miseries of the mundane existence. Similarly, passages like अखिलात् प्रमादान् नारायणः पातु नरश्च हासात् (Bhāg. 6. 8. 10) i. e.'let Nārāyaṇa protect people from *pramāda* (heedlessness) and Nara from *hāsa* (*garva*, pride)' show the supremacy of the lordly powers of these sages.

(6) The two eulogistic verses uttered at the birth of these two sages as given in Bhāg. 4. 1. 46-47 (such verses are not found at the birth of other sages) and Nārada's song, directed to these two sages as given in Bhāg. 5. 19. 12-15 also point to their highly glorified position. The eulogies addressed to Nara-nārāyaṇa by various persons (see Bhāg. 4. 1. 56-59; 12. 8. 40-49 etc;) may also be considered in this connection.

(7) The worship of Naranārāyaṇa as shown in the Purāṇas is a positive proof of their deified character, see Bhāg. 5. 4. 5 (नारायणं भगवन्तं वासुदेवमुपासीनः). There are *āvāhana-mantras* of these sages in V. Dh. U. 3. 106-96-97 and also *mantras* for worship in Bhāg. 5. 19. 11 (ओं नमो भगवते - - - नरनारायणाय----) and in D. Bh āg. 8. 11. 2 (ओं नमो भगवते- - -)[8].

Naraṇarāyaṇa—two sādhya devas
The Purāṇas, expressly declare that Nara and Nārāyaṇa, the sons of Dharma, are *sādhyas*.[9] It is also stated that Nārāyaṇa was made king or lord of the *sādhyas* by king Pṛthu (नारायणं तु साध्यानाम्, Vāyu-p. 30. 6; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2. 8. 6). These clearly show that these two sages belong to the *sādhya* class. Since these two sages belong to the *sādhya* class, they are regarded as *devarṣis* (Vāyu-p. 61. 83) (*sādhya* being one of the *gaṇadevatās*, see Amarakośa 1. 1. 10).

According to the Purāṇas the *sādhya devas* are the offspring of Dharma and Sādhyā;[10] they are twelve in number and they appeared in the Cākṣuṣa manvantara (Vāyu-p. 66. 14; 67.41; Matsya-p. 203. 10-12; 213. 11-12).[11]

Parentage of Naranārāyaṇa
Since Naranārāyaṇa belongs to the *sādhya* class of beings and since this class is born of Sādhyā (one of the daughters of Dakṣa)[12] and Dharma,it is needless to say that Dharma and Sādhyā were the parents of Naranārāyaṇa.[13] There are even express statements on this. As for

example Sk. Revā 192.9-10 says that Dharma and Sādhyā gave birth of Nara, Nārāyaṇa, Hari and Kṛṣṇa.[14] The Purāṇas have little to say about Hari and Kṛṣṇa and it would be too much to assume any real connection of this Kṛiṣṇa with Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa.

A different view about the name of the mother of Naranārāyaṇa is found in the Bhāgavata, which seems to be followed by two Puranic works of Vaiṣṇava character. According to the Bhāgavata the name is Mūrti.[15] That Mūrti is the name of the wife of Dharma is stated in the Purāṇas in various occasions.[16]

There must be some reason for this difference in the name of the mother of Naranārāyaṇa, especially when the view is not found in comparatively earlier Purāṇas. It seems that since the Bhāgavata is based on the Vaiṣṇava āgama, the present view must have been taken from some Agamic work. It is gratifying to note that the Bhāgavata view is found in the Sāttva-saṃhitā 2.12 (नारायणो नर ऋषिप्रवरावभूतां धर्मस्य दक्षदुतर्यहिधिमूर्ति पत्याम्) -Mūrti is the daughter of Dakṣa).

There is another point of difference in the Bhāgavata view. According to the Bhāgavata-p. Mūrti is the daughter of Svāyambhuva Dakṣa and Prasūti (4. 1. 49) while Sādhyā is said to be the daughter of Prācetasa Dakṣa.

There is an important problem concerning the view of the Sāttvatasaṃhitā, which holds another view about the parentage of these sages . It says that Dharma and Ahiṃsā gave birth to Nara, Nārāyaṇa, Hari and Kṛṣṇa (12. 139) [17].

The view is found in the Vāmana-p. also (धर्मं च स समाहूय भार्ययाऽहिंसया सह, 2.12). Apparently this is a problem. But the Purāṇa itself in its later chapter says that Ahiṃsā, the wife of Dharma gave birth to four sons, namely Sanatkumāra, Sanātana, Sanaka and Sanandana who were devoted to *yogaśāstra* (34. 69-70 Cr. ed.). This shows either Ahiṃsā is another wife of Dharma, or this Dharma is different from Dharma, the father of Naranārāyaṇa.

Sectarian views about the birth of Naranārāyaṇa are also found in the Purāṇas. According to the Kālikā-p. Nara and Nārāyaṇa are born of the Narasiṃha incarnation—Nara from the human part and Nārāyaṇa from the lionine part (30. 124-126). As to why the two sages were connected with these two parts an explanation may be hazarded: it is quite natural to associate Nara with the human part, for Nara means a man. Since

Nārāyaṇa is depicted as more powerful than Nara[18] in Puranic stories,[19] Nārāyaṇa seems to have been associated with the lionine part.

In the Avantikhaṇḍa (3.29-30) of the Skanda-p. these two sages are said to come out from the blood of Śiva. This view seems to be based on the warrior-character of these sages as depicted in the Purāṇas; see Skanda, Badarikāśrama 8.19; Nāradīya-p. 2. 67, 66-67; D. Bhāg. 4.9 and Vāmana-p. 7.39-8.32 (battle between Prahlāda and Naranārāyaṇa).

Relation between Nara and Nārāyaṇa and their characteristics

According to the Purāṇas Nara is the younger brother of Nārāyaṇa;[20] he is the companion as well as the helper of Nārāyaṇa in his deeds[21]; the name Nara has some basis.[22] The Purāṇas sometimes describe them as warriors.[23] Bodily characteristics of these sages are stated in some Purāṇas. They are described as wearing skin of the black antelope, as possessing matted hair, as holding water-jars, stuffs, rosaries of beads, as having *pavitras* in hand etc.[24] According to the Bhāgavata and Padma Purāṇas the complesion of Nara and Nārāyaṇa is white and black respectively, while according to the Viṣṇudharmottara the complexion of these two sages is *śyāma* and *nīla* respectively. Again, while according to the Bhāgavata-p. the sages have four arms each, according to the Viṣṇudharmottara Nara and Nārāyaṇa have two and four arms respectively. The reason for the difference in the views of these two Purāṇas is difficult to determine. The V. Dh. U. seems to follow the tradition of artistes. Is this tradition partly different from the tradition of the Purāṇas ?

Place of ansterities practised by Naranārāyana

Almost all Puranas declare that Nara-nārāyaṇa practised austerities at Badarī, sometimes called Badarī-āśrama, Badarī-āśrama-maṇḍala. Badarikā or Badarikāśrama[25]. The place is called so on account of its having a forest of Badarī trees[26]. It is situated on the hill called Gandhamādana[27]. in the Himalayan region[28]. The hill seems to have two peaks[29]. The two sages are said to remain there for a long time or for the whole life as the epithets सुचिरोषित (Mbh. An u ś ā sana-p. 167. 43). and आकल्पादास्थितो तप: (Nāradīya-p. 2. 67. 5) indicate. Sages are said to repair to this place to meet Nara-n āryāna; see Mbh. Śānti-p. 339. 111.

This place of practsing penance by Nara-nārāyaṇa came to be called Naranāryāna-sthāna, Naranārāyaṇālaya and Naranārāyaṇa-āśrāma for obvious reasons[30].

Badarī is also called by the name Viśalā (Skanda Badarikāśrama 1.59). It is also said that it is called Muktipradā, Yogasiddhidā, Viśālā and Badarikāśrama in the four *yugas* respectively (Sk. Badarikāśrama 1.57). Badarī is said to be a seat of Devī in the name Urvaśī 7. 30. 79). The Urvaśīsaṁgama-tīrtha is situated here (Nārādiya-p. 2. 67. 76) For a charming description of Badarī, see Kālikā-p. 32. 34-37[31].

A few other places are also connected with Naṛanārāyaṇa. Hiraṇyāsaṁgameśvara is said to be a place of practising austerities by these sages in Padma-p. 6. 135. 5-6. It is situated on (or near) the Sābhramatī river (modern Sabarmati).

Similarly Viṣṇusaras is said to be a seat of Naranārāyaṇa (Padma-p. 1. 3. 61)[32].

Performance of austerities by Naranārāyaṇa

The Purāṇas describe the practice of austerities by Naranārāṇa in various ways. On account of the performance of *tapases* such epithets as तापस, तपस्विन्, तपःकर्तृ and the like are given to these sages[33]. The Purāṇas further inform us that the sages performed austerities by remaining unmarried (i.e. by following the vow of celebacy)[34]. and that the purpose[35] of practising austerities was to attain liberation or to propagate *dharma* and to establish peace for people. It is gratifying to note that according to the Bhāgavata 5. 19. 9 and Śiva-p. 4. 19. 1 it is Bhāratavarṣa where the sages performed austerities and the sages will continue their practice till the end of the *kalpa* (i. e. Śvetavarahakalpa).

From the Puranic descriptions of austerities[36] it appears that the austerities were awful, severe, acute and violent, that the sages remained without food and drink for long periods of time, that they were not disturbed by lust, greed, grief, etc. and that they controlled their senses and placed the mind on *ātman*. Miraculous powers resulting from their austerities have also been stated in some Purāṇas (Sk. Revā 192. 13b-16). The Sāttvata-saṁhitā on which the story of Nara-nārāyaṇa as given in the Bhāgavata-p. is based , also speaks of several austerities of these sages (धीरोपकारकरुणाशयकायशुद्धं तीव्रं तपः प्रचरतां सुरराजतापम्, 2. 12).

Acts of Naranārāyaṇa

A few acts of Naranārāyṇa are described in the Purāṇas. It is needless to say that in the Puranic accounts of these acts there are differences in details. As for example in the episode of the churning of the ocean some Purāṇas simply speak of the presence of Naranārāyaṇa, while others describe the fight of these sages with the demons. There is no definite means to determine whether the mention of the fight is a later augmentation or the non-mention of the fight is the result of condensation.

It may be easily observed that there are such epithets of these two sages in the Purāṇas as are based on various acts performed by them. As for example the epithet अनेकजयिनो संख्ये (Mbh. Udyoga 196. 12) is based on the victories of these two sages in battles with demons.

From the Puranic statements about the nature of Naranārāyaṇa it appears that these two sages chose that path which, in the words of Gītā, is known as *lokasaṁgraha*. (the guidance of people).

It is remarkable to note that the Devībhāgavata put up some questions about the reason for the various acts done by Nara-nārāyaṇa in 4.1.12b-20 and 4.10.1-16[37]. It is the curse of Bhṛgu that is said to be the reason for assuming various incarnations by Viṣṇu (D. Bhāg. 4.10.29). The incident of the curse is elaborately described in 4.10.32-12. 8. The curse of Bhṛgu is stated in other Purāṇas also (भृगुशापच्छलेनैव मानयन् मानुषीं तनुम् ।....Kūrma—p. 1. 23. 72 Cr. ed.).

In the present article no attempt will be made to take up a comparative study of the Puranic description of these episodes for reasons of space. Here we will simply give Puranic references along with very brief accounts of the episodes.

Following acts of Naranārāyaṇa are chiefly described in the Purāṇas:

1. Victory over Kāma and creation of Urvaśī

These two (two aspects of one single act) are the most meritorious acts of Naranārāyaṇa (especially of Nārāyaṇa). The Purāṇas describe this incident in a highly eloquent manner and remark that Nārāyaṇa conquered Kāma without being enraged to him, thus showing his supreme position in comparison to other divinities (Bhāg. 11. 4. 11).

It is said that while Nara and Nārāyaṇa were practising austerities in the Gandhamādana mountain, Indra became afraid of them thinking that they would conquer his kingdom (heaven). Consequently he sent Kāma with some *apsarases* to disturb the sages. The sages, instead of being disturbed, welcomed Kāma and the *apsarases* calmly with a composed

mind. Nārāyaṇa, with a view to showing his indifference to physical beauty, created from his thigh an *apsaras* called Urvaśī (as she was born of the ūru, thigh, of Nārāyaṇa) whose superb beauty excelled that of the *apsarases* (who had come there with Kāma to delude him) and graciously presented her to Indra who wanted to distract him from performing austerities. The *apsarases* and Cupid became ashamed of their behaviour; they came back to Indra and informed him that the sages had no intention to occupy his kingdom.[38]

The episode with differences in details is stated in several Purāṇas; see D. Bhāg. 4. 5-7; Matsya-p. 61. 21-26; Bhāg. 11. 4. 7-15 (here the name Nārāyaṇa is absent though the sage is called *dharmasuta*), Vāmana-p. 6. 1-7. 20 (Cr. ed.), Padma-p. Sṛṣṭi 2. 23-28); V. Dh. U. Kh. 1, Ch. 129; 3. 35. 1-5a); Sk. Revā 192-193; Sk. Badarikāśrama 17. 62-65; Sk. Avantī, Chap. 8; Viṣṇudharma 102-103 (see Studies in the Upapurāṇas, Vol. I, p. 129).

(1A) in connection with the above episode there is one remarkable incident in the description given in the Revākhaṇḍa of the Skanda-p. it is the *viśvarūpadarśana* (the vision of the universal form) of the *apsarases* (Ch. 193) through the power of Nārāyaṇa.

(2) Fight with the demon Prahlāda

Prahlāda once came to Naimiṣāraṇya and he saw there Nara and Nārāyaṇa practising austerities though they held bows and arrows. The dialogue between the sages and Prahlāda gave rise to a fight and at last Prahlāda was defeated by Naranārāyaṇa and was ordered to go to his kingdom; See Vāmana-p. 7. 39-8.72 and D. Bhāg. 4. 7. 18-4. 16; see also D. Bhāg. 4. 16. 17-19.

(3) Fight with the king Dambhodhava

Dambhodbhava was highly proud of his power and prowess and being advised by Nārada he came to Badarī and requested Naranārāyaṇa to fight with him. The king was defeated by Nara and came back to his capital; See Mbh. Udyoga-p. 96.5-39. The incident was known to Kauṭilya (मदाद् दम्भोद्भव इति, Artha-śāstra 1.6). A very brief account of the incident may be found in the Jayamaṅgalā comm.[39] on Arthaśāstra, which evidently seems to have summarized the description given in the Udyoga-p.

(4) Naranārāyaṇa's worship of Śiva

While Naranārāyaṇa was practising austerities at Badarī, Śiva came to the Kedāraliṅga and told the sages to receive boons from him. The sages requested Śiva to remain in the Kedāraliṅga. Śiva agreed and he remained in the *liṅga* in the form of *jyotis*; see Śiva-p. 4. 19. 6-7.

(5) Naranārāyaṇaś bringing devas to the world

Nara and Nārāyaṇa are said to bring the *devas* and *devarṣis* of the Janaloka to the world through their power of austerities; see Kālikā-p. 34. 25-28.[40]

(6) Protection of yajña by Naranārāyaṇa

Seeing the wrathful Śiva, *yajña* fled to the Naranārāyaṇāśrama and Śiva, holding a bow and arrows, followed *yajña*. When Nārāyaṇa pressed Śiva's neck *(kaṇṭhapīdana)* Śiva was overcome with fear *(vihvala)* and *yajña* fled to the heaven *(div)*; see V. Dh. U. 1. 235. 4-11.

(7) Naranārāyaṇa's fight with the demons in the incident of the churning of the Kṣīroda ocean

In this incident Nārāyaṇa and Nara appeared for the *devas* and fought with the demons by using discus *(cakra)* and arrows respectively (Matsya—p. 250. 25-28). (The mention of the use of arrows of Nara is worth noticing, for Nara's association with weapons has been expressly stated in the Purāṇas). See also V. Dh. U. 1. 43. 30 ff.

(8) Giving boon to Mārkaṇḍeya

In Bhāg. 12. 8.6-9.34 sage Mārkaṇḍeya is said to practise austerities somewhere in the northern slope of the mountain Himālaya. When his mind was engrossed in Lord, He appeared before him in the form of Naranārāyaṇa (Mārkaṇḍeya's eulogy to Naranārāyaṇa is given in 8.40-49). Being asked by Nārāyaṇa to take a boon from him, Mārkaṇḍeya prayed Him to show his *māyā*. Mārkaṇḍeya's vision of **māyā** is described in detail in 9. 10-34.

Teachings and doctrines of Naranārāyaṇa

Views of Naranārāyaṇa are found in two forms in the Purāṇas—in the form of teachings, or instructions or advices given to sages etc. and in the form of doctrines (mostly on philosophical matters) ascribed to those sages. A modest list of Puranic passages containing these two kinds of

views is given here. We are not going to take up any kind of discussion on these views here for reason of space.

In this connection it is to be noted that the views of the sage Nārāyaṇa are not to be confounded with the views of God Nārāyaṇa. This distinction is however not always easily discernible. Even the use of the word *ṛṣi* with Nārāyaṇa is not always the sure sign in taking Nārāyaṇa as the sage. An attempt is made here to give those Puranic passages only that seem most probably to belong to the sage Nārāyaṇa (son of Dharma).

Bhāgavata-p.

1. Mentioning Nara-nārāyaṇa as the sons of Dharma and his wife Mūrti, the Purāṇa tells us that the sages preached that kind of karman which leads to the knowledge of the self and further inform that they themselves practised it (निष्कर्म्यलक्षणमुवाच चचार कर्म, 11. 4. 6.).

2. It is said that Nārāyaṇa, the dear companion of Nara, spoke to Nārada that pure wisdom which cannot be attained easily. This knowledge may be attained by those embodied beings that bathed themselves in the dust of the lotus-feet of the devotees of the Lord, who claim nothing as their own:

ज्ञानं तदेतदमलं दुरवापमाह नारायणो नरसखः किल नारदाय ।
एकान्तिनां भगवतस्तदकिञ्चनानां पादारविन्दरजसाप्लुतदेहिनां स्यात् ॥
(7. 6. 27)

3. Nārada is said to proclaim *sanātanadharma* which he heard from Nārāyaṇa, the son of Dharma and the daughter of Dakṣa (7. 11. 5-6). The discourse is in five chapters (11-15), dealing with *āśrama-dharma*. Chap. 11 has a very brief account of *Varṇadharma* and *sāmānyadharma*, and chap. 15 has a good number of verses on *mokṣadharma*.

4. From Bhāg. 10. 87. 4-11 it appears that the views proclaimed in the Śruti-stuti verses (10. 87. 14-41) were originally stated to Nārada by Nārāyaṇa who dwelt in the Nārāyaṇāśrama i. e. Badarikāśrama.

5. The sage Nārāyaṇa is said to speak out the Bhāgavata-p. to Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana and Nārada (Bhāg. 12. 4. 41).

6. The sage Mārkaṇḍeya was taught by Hari in the form Naranārāyaṇa (Bhāg. 12. 8. 32-9. 7). (The sage realized the nature of māyā through the grace of the Lord).

Devībhāgavata

When the *apsarases* became love-smitten to Nārāyaṇa (after the creation of Urvśī by him from his thigh) Nārāyaṇa promised to become their husband when he would be born as Kṛṣṇa in the 28th Dvāpara (4. 6; 4. 17). In Chap. 17 while talking with *apsarases*, Nārāyaṇa spoke about the erotic sentiment-*(sṛṅgārarasa)* and its sthāyi-bhāva(the lasting feeling) and declared कारणेन विना कार्यं न भवेत् (4. 17. 11-12; no effect comes into existence without a cause).

From 8. 1.6 to the end of the 8th Skandha there is a dialogue between the sage Nārāyaṇa (speaker) and Nārada (Vyāsa here reproduces to Janamejaya what Nārāyaṇa said to Nārada). Here the well-known Puranic tales are told, along with the geography of the earth, method of Devī-worship etc.

The ninth skandha is also in the same dialogue (in 50 chapters). Here is the description of the five forms of Prakṛti (namely Durgā, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī and Rādhā) and the five parts of Prakṛti (namely Gaṅgā, Tulasī, Manasā, Ṣaṣṭhī and Maṅgalacaṇḍī) with necessary details. The tenth skandha also is in the same dialogue. It deals with the worship of Devī; the story of the Vindhya mountain, lives of some of the Manus and the killing of the demon Aruṇa by Devī. The eleventh skandha (in the same dialogue) deals with *sadācāra* elaborately describing Tantric and Vedic processes. The twelfth skandha (in the same dialogue) deals with Gāyatrī, dīkṣā, Devī Bhuvaneśvarī etc.

It appears that in these chapters the author of the Purāṇa made Nārāyaṇa speak chiefly about the popular themes of his times. Such long dialogues dealing with heterogeneous matters are usually not meant to present the views actually held by the speaker. In such dialogues the names of the speaker and the hearer are given to show authoritativeness and antiquity of the topics discussed.

Skanda-p.

In the Revākhaṇḍa the incident of creating Urvaśī is given with much detail. At the time of speaking to the *apsarases* Nārāyaṇa spoke about the nature of *paramātman, jīvas,* and the world (192. 70-81 and 86). The views propounded here are : omnipresence of Viṣṇu-Vāsudeva, creation of all creatures by *paramātman; samadṛṣṭi* (the eye of evenness) to all is the *samygdṛṣṭi* (right knowledge); in reality there is no difference in the world.

Varāha-p.

Nara said that Nārāyaṇa who was लोकमार्गप्रदर्शक (48. 16) and who had practised austerities with me in the Badarī tīrtha, assumed the forms of various avatāras (Matsya, Kūrma etc.) and performed various acts (48. 16-26).

Brahmavaivarta-p.

The whole of the second Khaṇḍa (called Prakṛtikhaṇḍa) of this Purāṇa is in the dialogue of Nārāyaṇa (speaker) and Nārada. (Here Nārāyaṇa is the sage of the Badarī tīrtha; see. 1. 29. 1). The subjects are mostly popular tales. As this Purāṇa is apocryphal, it is needless to mention the topics of this dialogue here.

The third Gaṇapatikhaṇḍa is also in the same dialogue.

Viṣṇudharmottara-p.

The sage Nārāyaṇa instructed Nārada about the method of worshipping Vāsudeva in Kh. 3, Chap. 352.

Mahābhārata

In the story of Dambhodbhava (Udyoga, Ch. 96) there are no verses bearing *upadeśas* on some philosophical matters, yet there are a few verses on proper duties of a Kṣatriya king (ब्रह्मण्यो भव धर्मात्मा....अविदित्वा बलाबलम्, 34a-37).

In Śānti-p. 61 we find some verses of Nārāyaṇa (Nārāyaṇa-gītam, 13) on the duties of four stages of life (*āśramadharmas*) (verses 13-21). This Nārāyaṇa seems to be the sage Nārāyaṇa as the expression अत्यन्ततपःप्रयुक्तम् उच्यमानम् suggests. This expression serves no purpose if Nārāyaṇa is taken as God.

There is a dialogue between the sage Nārāyaṇa (speaker) and Nārada in Śānti-p. Chaps. 334. 7-345. 28. In this dialogue we find teachings of Nārāyaṇa along with tales etc., see 343. 28-45 (about *kṣetra, avyakta* etc.; it is called *guhya-samuddeśa* in 334. 45); 339. 18-76 (God, the three guṇas, the four vyūhas, māyā, the Śvetadvīpa and its inhabitants, Brahmā); Ch. 344. 1-24 (teachings of Nara-nārāyaṇa on the glory of Vāsudeva).

The Śānti-p. referred to the philosophical views of the sage Nārāyaṇa in more than one place:

(i) प्रवृत्तिलक्षणं धर्ममृषिर्नारायणोऽब्रवीत् (217.2)

(ii) प्रवृत्तिलक्षणश्चैव धर्मो नारायणात्मकः (347.91)

(iii) प्रकाशं भगवानेतद्दृषिर्नारायणोऽमृतम् ।

भूतानामनुकम्पार्थं जगाद जगतो गतिः ॥ (217.38)

The illuminating knowledge (*prakāśam*) is depicted in 217.37 which speaks of *vikāra, prakṛti* and the eternal puruṣa. Thus it is clear that Nārāyaṇa is also the promulgator of Sāṁkhya.

In passing we want to quote an *upadeśa* of Nārāyaṇa given to warriors (quoted in a non-Puranic work) with a view to encouraging them to embrace death in the battle-field:

यदि समरमपास्य नास्ति मृत्यो-

र्भयमिति युक्तमतोऽन्यतः प्रयातुम् ।

अथ मरणमवश्यमेव जन्तोः

किमिति मुधा मलिनं यशः कुरुध्वम् ॥

(quoted in Nītimayūkha, p. 105).

(0 warriors), if you can escape the fear of death by leaving fighting in the battle field, it is reasonable to go elsewhere; but if death is inevitable to all creatures, then how is it that you defile your fame by running away from the battle-field.

(It appears that the verse is quoted from some work which was ascribed to the warrior-sage Nārāyaṇa).

Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna as incarnations of Nārāyaṇa and Nara

A remarkable declaration is found in several Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata that Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍava Arjuna of the Dvāpara-yuga are the incarnations or the portions of Nārāyaṇa and Nara respectively.[41] This identification seems to have some Agamic basis as may be known from the statement of Jīvagosvāmin: अर्जुने तु नरावेशः कृष्णो नारायणः स्वयम् इत्यागमवाक्यं तु श्रीमदर्जुने नर-प्रवेशापेक्षया,Kramasandarbha on Bhāgavata-p. 2. 1. 57).

The Purāṇas inform us that Viṣṇu's assuming the bodies of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna is caused by the curse of the sage Bhṛgu (भृगोः शापवशात्, D. Bhāg. 4. 17. 23) and that this curse is the result of their *prārabdha karman* (momentum of past actions).[42]

Puranic works are unanimous in asserting that the purpose of assuming the bodies of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna by these two sages is 'to remove the burden of the earth' (भूभारहरण)[43]

The reason for taking Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna as the incarnations of Nārāyaṇa and Nara respectively is not difficult to seek. It is, according to us, the actively following of the path of *karmayoga* for *lokasaṁgraha*

(chiefly by Kṛṣṇa and secondarily by his follower-companion Arjuna) which is said to have been promulgated and taught by Nārāyaṇa and Nara in the days of yore.

Since Kṛṣṇa was conceived as an *aṁśa* or an incarnation of Viṣṇu, or even as Viṣṇu himself and Arjuna as his devoted disciple and a dear friend and since both of them fought against unrighteousness and acted to establish dharma, it was quite natural to consider them as the incarnations of Nārāyaṇa and Nara respectively. The *śyāma* (dark-green) and *nīla* or *kṛṣṇa* (black) complexion of Naranārāyaṇa (as stated in the Purāṇas) seems to strengthen this notion.

It may be further stated that since the entering in the householder's stage by Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna was not in consonance with the character of Nārāyaṇa and Nara as they were life-long celebates, a story was framed by Puranic authors to justify the marriage of Kṛṣṇa (incarnation of the elder brother Nārāyaṇa) with many women (Nārāyaṇa's promise to marry the *apsarases* in some future birth). The marriage of Kṛṣṇa justifies the marriage of Arjuna who was a little younger than he.

An esoteric explanation of the relation between Nara (Arjuna, the embodied self) and Nārāyaṇa (Kṛṣṇa, the supreme self) is also given in the Br. Dh. P.[44] Here the statement नरनारायणमयं तन्महाभारतं विदुः (1. 30. 34) shows the importance of the role played chiefly by Kṛṣṇa and secondarily by Arjuna in the Mahābhārata war and the incidents connected with it. (Cp. the well-known saying that the Mahābhārata is the *kārṣṇa-veda*).

About the incarnations of Naranārāyaṇa in the Dvāpara yuga the Purāṇas are found to contain two such views as are more or less different from the above view.

1. It is stated in Sk. Avantī-khaṇḍa (27. 107-109) that Sāndīpani, the teacher of Kṛṣṇa, declared that Kṛṣṇa and his elder brother Balarāma were the incarnations of Nārāyaṇa and Nara respectively. As this view is not in other Purāṇas it is quite reasonable to hold that the view is simply a revised form of the previous view. Since Arjuna was not the brother of Kṛṣṇa (while Nara was the brother of Nārāyaṇa) Balarāma was given the place of Arjuna (though he was elder than Kṛṣṇa). As Balarāma was fond of quarrel and battle, it was natural to conceive him as the incarnation of the warrior-like Nara.

2. The Vāyu-p. (66. 61) says that Indra and Viṣṇu appeared as Nara and Nārāyaṇa in the Vaivasvata manvantara.[45] This passage undoubtedly refers to Arjuna (Nara) and Kṛṣṇa (Nārāyaṇa) as is

indicated by the expression 'vaivasvata manvantara' (Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna appeared in the Vaivasvata manvantara). This conception seems to have some basis. Since Arjuna is regarded as the son of Indra, the Purāṇa mentions Indra as appearing as Nara, who is said to appear as Arjuna. In fact both Nara and Nārāyaṇa are regarded as the two forms of one and the same Viṣṇu.

Date of the appearance of Naranārāyaṇa

Only a few Puranic passages speak of the date of the appearance of the sages Nara and Nārāyaṇa which are going to be shown here.

Some Purāṇas use the word *turya* (fourth) while referring to the incarnation of Naranārāyaṇa[46] Apparently it means that Naranārāyaṇa appeared after the appearance of the first three incarnations.

A careful study of the Puranic passages reveals that here the word *turya* is not used to show chronological order, it simply shows the order of enumeration (*gaṇanākrama*) as has been rightly remarked by the commentator Śrīdhara on Bhāgavata 1.3. 6 (प्रथमद्वितीयादिशब्दा निर्देशमात्र-विवक्षया) ।

The Br. Dh. P., at the time of dealing with the incarnations of Viṣṇu, uses the word *tatas* ('after that') while speaking of the appearance of Naranārāyaṇa: ततो भूयस्तपःकर्ता नरो नारायणस्तथा (2.11.63), i e. Naranārāyaṇa appeared after the Varāha incarnation which is preceded by the two other incarnations, namely Nārada and Brahmacārin (i. e. Sanatkumāra). This however does not help us decide the date precisely.

It is gratifying to note that some Purāṇas mention a particular period of the appearance of Naranārāyaṇa.[47] According to these Purāṇas the two sages appeared, with other Sādhya devas, in the sixth manvantara called Cākṣuṣa. It is also stated that these two sages appeared in other manvantaras also. It is needless to say that in some places the printed readings of the Puranic verses given in the footnote are so corrupt that it becomes difficult to understand them fully, though the general meaning is more or less clear.

It may also be noted that the Mahābhārata informs us that Nara and Nārāyaṇa began to practise austerities when Prajāpati Dakṣa performed the sacrifice (Śānti-p. 342. 107-108). That Dakṣa performed the sacrifice in the Cākṣuṣa manvanara is stated in some Purāṇas.

1. भगवते....नरनारायणय (Bhāg. 5.19.11); ऋषिकृषभाय नरनारायणाय (D. Bhāg. g 11.2); नरनारायणो भूत्वा तुर्ये तेपे स्वयं हरि: (Garuḍa-p.1.1.18.).

2. Cf. Bhāg.-p. 5.19.9 (भगवान् नरनारायणाख्य:) Where Naranārāyaṇa is taken as a single name of Bhagavat.Cf. Śrīdhara's remarks: ऋषी भूत्वेति एकावतारत्वं दर्शयति (on Bhāg 1.3.9).

3. Similarly Sanaka and three other sages (known as चतु:सन as सन occurs in each of these names) are said to constitute one Avatāra (see Saṁkṣepabhāgavatāmṛta 14).

4. It is needless to say that both these names are found in other fields also. As for example there is a Nara in the dynasty of Pṛthu (Vṣnu-p. 2.1.38) and of Pūru (Bhāg. 9.21.1). Similarly Nārāyaṇa is found to be the name of several persons one of the prominent example being the son of Ajāmila (Bhāg. 6.1.24).

5. विष्णोरंशौ (V. Dh. U. 1. 129. 2; D. Bhāg 4. 1. 14); हरेरंशौ (Bhāg. 4. 1. 59); अंशेन .... (Br. Vai. p. 4. 22. 48); The Viṣṇudharma describes them as extremely small of Vāsudeva (Studies in the Upapurāṇas, vol. I, p. 133). अनुग्रहायाविरासीद् नरनारायणो हरि: (Bhāg. 12. 8. 32; नरनारायणरूपो हरि:, Comm.); अवतारो हरे: (Śiva-p. 4. 19. 1); नरनारायणौ साक्षाद् भगवानेव केवलम् (Sk. Badarikāśrama 7.60); मदंश: (Br. Vai. p. 4. 124. 94); वैष्णवांशौ (D. Bhāg 4. 10. 1); विष्णोरंशांशकाः (Sk. Revā. 192. 10); हरेरंशौ (Kalki-p. 20. 11).

6. Bhāg. 1. 3. 9; 3. 4. 22; 5. 19. 11; D. Bhāg. 4. 1. 17; 6. 12. 12; V. Dh. U. 1. 129. 2; Br. Vai. p. 4. 22. 48; Kālikā-p. 34. 25-26; Mbh. Śānti-p. 217.2, 38; ज्ञानिनां श्रेष्ठौ (Br. Vai. P. 4. 22. 48).

7. On account of the life-long obeservance of celibacy Nārāyaṇa told the *apsarases* (who came to delude him at the bidding of Indra) who were love-striken to him that as he could not marry them in his present life he would marry them in the 28th Dvāpara assuming the form Kṛṣṇa: अस्मिन् जन्मनि चार्वङ्ग्य: कृतसंकल्पवानहम् । आवाभ्यां च न कर्तव्य: सर्वथा दारसंग्रह: ॥ (D. Bhāg. 4. 17. 9).

8. It is interesting to note that the Brahmāṇḍa-p. speaks of the characteristics of a stone (śilā) called Naranārāyaṇa:

नरनारायणो देव: शोणचक्र: सुशोभन: ।
तमालदशसंकाश: स्वर्णपङ्कविलेपन: ॥

(quoted in Prāṇatoṣiṇi. p. 353). The Nāradīya-p. also speaks of the Naranārāyaṇa śilā (along with four others) in the Badarīkṣetra in 2. 67. 29.

9. साध्यौ धर्मसुतौ प्रोक्तौ नरनारायणावृषी (V. Dh. U. 1. 129. 2); धर्मान् नारायण: साध्य: (Sk. Prabhāsa 19. 93); in Vāmana–p. 8.5 and 8.29 the word *sādhya* refers to Nārāyaṇa. Afterwards *sādhya* came to be used conventionally for these two sages ; see Nāradiya–p. 2. 6. 75 where साध्यसन्निधि refers to Naranārāyaṇa.

10. साध्या: साध्यसुता: स्मृता: (Matsya–p. 203. 10); see also Matsya-p. 5. 17; साध्या साध्यान् व्यजायत (Garuḍa-p. 1. 6. 26; Saura-p. 28.6; Kūrma-p. 1. 15. 8 cr. ed; Śiva-p. 5. 31. 20; Brahma-p. 3.30).

11. Some important pieces of information about the *sādhya devas* are found in the
    Purāṇas. They are said to appear in other manvantaras also. It is not necessary to
    deal with this matter here.

12. The names of ten daughters are: अरुन्धती, वसु, यामा, लम्बा, भानु, मरुत्वती, संकल्पा, मुहूर्ता,
    विश्वा and साध्या; see Matsya 203; Brahma 3.29; Vāyu-p. 66. 2-3; Garuḍa 1. 6. 24;
    Kūrma-p. 1. 15. 7 Cr. ed; Sk. Revā 192.8-9. There are slight variations in these
    names as read in the Purāṇas.

13. Naranārāyaṇa is usually described as born of Dharma; mention of Sādhyā as the
    mother is found in a few places. The word Dākṣāyaṇī (for the mother) simply
    means 'the daughter of Dakṣa'; it may be sādhyā or Mūrti (according to a few
    Purāṇas) which is to be decided with the help of the context. Mark the following
    passages: धर्मपुत्रौ (D. Bhāg. 4. 1. 12); नरनारायणौ धर्मपुत्रौ D. Bhāg. 4. 16. 5 ; तथा
    नारायणो राजन् नरश्च धर्मजावु D. Bhāg. 6. 10. 2); धर्मात् स्वायंभुवात् पुनः, नरनारायणौ तत्र
    जज्ञाते Vāyu-p. 66. 13-14); धर्मसुतौ प्रोक्तौ नरनारायणौ (V. Dh. U. 1. 129. 2); तुर्ये
    धर्मकलासर्गे नरनारायणावृषी (Bhāg. 1.3.9; here *kalā* means part, i. e. the wife, whose
    proper name is not mentioned); धर्मसुतो भूत्वा.. (Br. Vai. P. 4.22. 48); Dharma
    married ten daughters of Dakṣa and in them he gave birth to four sons Nara and
    others (D. Bhāg. 4. 5. 9 to 15; here there is no mention of the name of the wife of
    Dharma); धर्मपुत्रौ तपोधनौ D. Bhāg. 4. 10. 1); धर्मसुतः श्रीमान् नारायणः D. Bhāg. 4. 22.
    31); see also Br. Vai P. 1. 1. 59-61 (धर्मेण दत्तं पुत्राय.. नारायणाय); Padma-p. 5. 22.
    23-24; तासां साध्या महाभागा पुत्रानजयत्नृप ॥ नरो नारायणश्चैव हरिः कृष्णस्तथैव च I (Sk. Revā
    192. 9 b-10 a); हृद्भवो ब्रह्मणो योऽसौ धर्मो दिव्यवपुर्मुनि । दाक्षायणी तस्य भार्या तस्यामजनयत्सुतान् ॥
    हरिं कृष्णं च देवर्षे नरनारायणौ तथा । Vāmana-p. b. 1-3 Cr. ed.) नारायणो नाम..पुत्रो धर्मस्य
    Mbh. Droṇa 200.57) .

14. Devībhāgavata 4. 5. 9 b-15 and Vāmana-p. 6. 1-2 Cr. ed. say that both Hari and
    Kṛṣṇa were engazed in yoga-practice. These two sages accepted house holdership as
    has. been remarked by Rūpagosvāmin -एतौ गृहिणौ बभूवतुरिति तत्रैव उच्यते
    (Laghubhāgavatāmṛta, p. 54; तत्र refers to the Nārāyaṇīya sec. of the Śānti-parvan.

15. धर्मस्य दक्षदुहितर्यजनिष्ट मूर्त्यां नारायणो नर इति स्वतपःप्रभावः (Bhāg. 2. 7. 6); धर्मस्य
    दक्षदुहितर्यजनिष्ट मूर्त्यां नारायणो नर ऋषिप्रवरः सुशान्तः Bhāg. 1. 4. 6); मूर्तिः सर्वगुणोत्पत्ति—
    नरनारायणावृषी... (Bhāg. 4. 1. 52); योऽवतीर्यात्मनांशन दाक्षायण्यां तु धर्मतः (Bhāg. 7. 11. 6;
    here Dākṣāyaṇī must be Mūrti). धर्मान्मूर्त्यां लब्धजनी........(Nāradiya—p. 2. 67. 4); धर्मस्य
    पत्नी मूर्त्यासीत्तस्यां जातौ......नर-नारायणौ.... (SK. Badarikāśrama 7. 60).

    Mūrti is read here with a longī. Readers should carefully note the similarity of the
    verses of the Bhāgavata and the Sāttvata-saṁhitā. It appears that the verse of the
    Sattvatasaṁhitā (or a similar verse of any other Āgamic work) is imitated by the
    author of the Bhāgavata. That Mūrti is one of the wives of Dharma is stated in later
    Purāṇas; see Kalki-p. 20. 122-12.

16. देवसेना यथा स्कन्दे धर्मे मूर्तिस्तथा सती (D. Bhāg. 9. 18. 98); यथा मूर्तिर्महासाध्वी
    धर्मवक्षःस्थलश्रिता (Br. Vai. p. 4. 59. 20).

17. Though this view is not found in other Purāṇas, yet it was wellknown to the scholars of modern times. John Dowson in his Dictionary on Hindu Mythology refers to this view (sons of Dharma and Ahiṁsā, s. v. Nara-nārāyaṇa). According to Dr. Bhandarkar the name Ahiṁsā is significant for it shows the introduction of a new system of religion (Vaiṣṇavism Śaivism ---p. 33).

18. ततो गुणैः सुबहुभिः श्रेष्ठो नारायणोऽभवत् (Mbh. Udyoga 96.40)

19. Nārāyaṇa is said to be नराग्रज (elder brother of Nara) in Vāmana–p. 8. 28 Cr. ed.; नरस्तस्यानुजः (D. Bhāg. 4. 22. 32)

20. एष नारायण सखा नरस्तव भविष्यति । तव एकाकिनः संख्ये तमसाश्च महामुनिः । विज्ञानस्य परीक्षायै तेजो लोके भविष्यति (SK. Avantīkṣetra 3. 29-30); संग्रामदेवकार्येषु लोकानां परिपालने॥ एस नारयण सखा नरस्तव भविष्यति। अथासुरवधे सख्यं तब कर्ता महामतिः ॥ (Padma–p. 5.14. 281e-29).

21. नरो नामैष पुरुषः परमास्त्रविदांवरः । भवतोक्तो नर इति नरस्तस्माद् भविष्यति ॥ (Padma-p. 5. 14.27)

22. धनुर्बाणधरः (for Nārāyaṇa((SK. Badarikāśrama 8.19); नरनारायणौ यत्र शस्त्रं न्यस्य तपःस्थितौ (Nāradīya–p. 2. 67.67; यत्र refers to the Astratīrtha at Badarikāśrama, also called Naranārāyaṇāvāsa, 66.67); तयोरग्रेद्धृते शुभ्रे धनुषी लक्षणान्विते । शार्ङ्गमाजगवं चैव तथाक्षण्यौ महेषुधी ॥ (D. Bhāg. 4.9.5; तयोः refers to Naranārāyaṇa); तयोश्च पार्श्वयोर्द्वये धनुषी लक्षणान्विते । शार्ङ्गमाजगवं चैव अक्षय्यौ च महेषुधी (Vāmana-p.7.46; तयोः refers to Naranārāyaṇa).

23. कृष्णाजिनधरौ मुनी समुन्नतजटाभारौ (Vāmana-p. 7.45); तौ शुक्लकृष्णौ नवकञ्जलोचनौ चतुर्भुजौ रौरववल्कलाम्बरौ। पवित्रपाणी उपवीतकं त्रिवृत् कमण्डलुं दण्डमृजं च वैणवम् ॥ पद्माक्षमालामुतजन्तुमार्जनं वेद च साक्षात् तप एव रूपिणौ। तपत्-तडिद्वर्णपिशङ्गरोचिषा प्रांशू दधानौ विबुधार्षभार्चितौ ॥ (Bhāg 12. 8.33-34); पुरुषस्तत्र वर्तेते नरनारायणावृषी ॥ पुरुषस्तत्र वर्तेते नरनारायणावृषी॥ श्वेत एकस्तु पुरुषः कृष्णो ह्येकस्ततः पुनः। (Padma-p. 6.,2 3b-4a) दर्वश्यामो नरः कार्यो दिभुजश्च महाभुजः। नारायणचतुर्बाहु नीलोत्पदलच्छविः। तयोर्मध्ये च बदरी कार्या फलविभूषणा॥ बदर्यमनु तौ कार्यौ अक्षमालाधरावुभौ। कृष्णाजिनधरौ दान्तौ जटामण्डलधारिणौ ॥ (V. Dh. U. 3. 76. 3-4); जालपादभुजौ तौ तु पादयोचक्रलक्षणौ। व्यूढोरस्कौ दीर्घभुजौ तथा मुष्कचतुष्किणौ ॥ ३६ षष्टिदन्तावष्टदंष्ट्रौ मेघौघसदृश- स्वनौ। स्वास्यौ पृथुललाटौ च सुभ्रूसुहनुनासिकौ ॥ (Śānti-p. 343. 36-37).

24. ख्यातो बदरिकाश्रमः, नरनारायणौ यत्र तेपाते (D. Bhāg. 6. 12.12); नारायण......तपो बदरिकाश्रमे (D. Bhāg. 7. 11.6); see aslo Bhāg 3. 4. 22; 7. 11.6; 12.9.7; D. Bhāg 6. 1-. 33; Nāradīya-p. 2. 67.4; Varāha-p. 48. 16.

The āśrama is on the bank of the ganges: बदरिकाश्रमे गङ्गाया विपुले तटे (Vāmana-p. 6.4 cr. ed.) It seems to be near gaṅgādvāra (बदरी यातो गङ्गादरान्तिकं खलु, Kālikā-p. 32-33); नरनारायण-स्थानं भागीरथ्योपशोभितम् (Mbh. Vana-p. 145. 41); see here the editorial note (in the Gita press ed) about the justification of mentioning Bhāgīrathī though the hermitage of the sages is situated on the bank of Alakanandā.

25. ययतुर्गन्धमादनम् ॥ यत्रास्ति बदरीवृक्षो बहुग्रफलान्वितः । (Nāradīya-p. 2-67 4b-5a); बदरितरुपयोगतः । बदरी कथ्यते प्राज्ञैः.(Sk. Badarikāśrama 1.59); स बदर्युपाख्यम् (Bhāg. 11.4. 7; बदरीभिरुपाख्यायते यस्तम्, Śridhar बदरीवनसंयुतम् (Br. Vai. p. 1.20.)

26. श्रयेते तौ महात्मानौ नरनारायणावुभौ । ....तप्यते गन्धेमादने (Mbh. Udyoga 96. 15); तथा
    नारायणनरौ गन्धमादनपर्वते..तेपतुः परमं तपः (Sk. Revā 192. 11); गन्धमादने चचार विपुलं तपः
    (Matsya-p. 61. 21); see also Padma-p. 5. 22.23-24. The Gandhamādana hill is
    called Nārāyaṇagiri (Sk. Revā 194. 33-34). Thus hill is said to be the abode of
    Kimpuruṣas (Mbh. Vana-p. 158. 38).

27. प्रालेयादं समागम्य तीर्थे बदरिकाश्रमे (D. Bhāg. 4. 5. 13; Vāmana-p. 6. 4. cred). हिमवतः पृष्ठे
    बदरीति (Varāha p. 141. Cr. ed.). There is difference of opinion about the
    identification of Gandhamādana. It is identified with a part of the Rudra Himālaya,
    or with a part of Kailāsa range, or with that part on which Badarikāśrama is
    situated. Usually it is identified with that part of Himālaya through which the river
    Alakanandā flows.

28. उभयोर्नगयोस्ती तु स्थितौ (Sk. Badarikāśrama 7. 61; refers to Naranārāyaṇa); It refers to
    two adjoining hills, both called Gandhamādana, which are the place of practising
    austerities.

29. Gandhamādana is called Naranārāyaṇasthāna in Viṣṇu-p. 5. 37.23-33;
    नरनारायणस्थानं बदरीत्यभिविश्रुतम् (Mbh. 156-14; see also Vana-p. 177.8-9; बदर्याख्यं....
    नारायणाश्रमम् (Bhāg 9.3.36; mark the non-use of Nara in the name; a similar use is
    found in Bhāg 10.87-5 and Sk. Badarikā 2. 31-32. see also Bhāg. 10.52.4; 9.1.31;
    अलङ्कृतं दीपवत्या मालिन्या रम्यतीरया नरनारायणस्थानं गंङ्गये वोपशोभितम् ॥ (Mbh. Adi-p. 71.
    29; seen by Duṣyanta); नरनारायणं द्रष्टुं बदर्याश्रममाद्रवत् (Śānti-p. 339. 111).

30. See Kālikā-p. 32. 33a-37 (ददर्श बदरीं...मृदुशाद्वलमञ्जरीम् (३६) स्वच्छायां मसृणां शीर्ण-
    शुष्कपत्र-विवर्जिताम्। गङ्गातोयौघसंसिक्तशिखामूलान्तराखिलाम् (३७)।

31. रम्यं विष्णुसरोनाम......(६१).......नरनारायणौ ब्रह्मा मनुः स्थाणुश्च पञ्चमः। तत्रं दिव्या त्रिपथगा प्रथमं तु
    प्रतिष्ठिता ॥ ६४ (पद्म १/३/६१-६४). This place connected with Bhāgīrathī is named
    Bindusaras in other Purāṇas.

32. नरनारायणौ चैव तापसाविति नः श्रुतम् (Mbh. Udyoga—p. 96.1. 4); तपःकर्ता नरो नारायणस्तथा
    (Br. Dh. p. 2. 11.63).

33. See the saying of Nārāyaṇa to the apsarases: अस्मिन् जन्मनि चार्वङ्ग्यः कृतसंकल्पवानहम् ।
    आवाभ्यां च न कर्तव्यः सर्वथा दारसंग्रहः ॥ (D. Bhāg. 1: 17.9).

34. तपश्चोग्रं मुक्त्यर्थम् (D. Bhāg. 4.1.17); लोकानां स्वस्त्येऽध्यास्ते तपः (Bhāg. 7.11.6); कर्तुं
    धर्मव्यवस्थानम् (Sk. Prabhāsa 19.93). नरनारायणौ चैव जगतो हितकाम्यया तप्येतां च तपः
    (Vāmana-p. 6.3).

35. तपो घोरमनिर्देश्यं तप्यते (Mbh. Udyoga 96.15); मृदु तीव्रं तपो दीर्घं तेपाते (Bhāg. 3.4.22); यौ
    चक्रतुस्तपश्चोग्रम् (D. Bhāg. 4.1.17); निराहारौ जितात्मानौ निःस्पृहौ जितषड्गुणौ (D. Bhāg.
    4.1.14); see also Mbh. Droṇa-p. 200.58-59; Śānti-p. 334.11-12a;' आत्मन्यात्मानमाधाय
    तेपतुः (Sk. Revā 192.11); आत्मशमोपेतं दुश्चरं तपः (Bhāg. 1.3.9); नरनारायणो भूत्वा तेपे
    तपः(Garuḍa-p. 1.1.17); ततो भूयः तपःकर्ता नरो नारायणस्तथा (Br. Dh. p. 2.11.63);
    नरनारायणौ चैव तप्येतां च तपः Vāmana—p. 6. 37; नरनारायणौ ... पित्रोराज्ञामनुप्राप्य तपोऽर्थं
    कृतमानसौ (Sk. Badarikāśrama 7. 60b-61a); भगवानपि तत्रैव नरूप्पेण
    तिष्ठति..आनन्दमृषितृन्दस्य जनयन् तप आस्थितः (Sk. Badarikāśrama 8.19).

36. नरनारायणौ देवौ पुराणौ ऋषिसत्तमौ ॥ १२ धर्मपुत्रौ महात्मानौ तपस्त्त्वेरतुरुत्तमम् ॥ यौ मुनी बहुवर्षाणि पुण्ये बदरिकाश्रमे ॥ १३ निराहारौ जितात्मानौ निःस्पृहौ जितषड्गुणौ । विष्णोरंशौ जगत्स्थेम्ने तपस्त्त्वेरतुरुत्तमम् ॥ १४ तयोरंशावतारौ हि जिष्णु-कृष्णौ महाबलौ । प्रसिद्धौ मुनिभिः प्रोक्तौ सर्वज्ञैर्नारदादिभिः ॥ १५ विद्यमानशरीरौ तौ कथं देहान्तरं गतौ । नरनारायणौ देवौ पुनः कृष्णार्जुनौ कथम् ॥ १६ यौचक्रतुस्तपश्चोग्रं मुक्त्यर्थं मुनिसत्तमौ । तौ कथं प्राप्तुर्देहौ प्राप्तयोगौ महातपौ ॥ १७ ... विपरीतमिदं भाति नरनारायणौ च तौ ॥ १९ तपसा शोषितात्मानौ क्षत्रियौ तौ बभूवतुः । केन तौ कर्मणा शान्तौ जातौ शापेन वा पुनः ॥ २० (देवीभागवत ४/२/१३ ख-२०).

37. A few sacred shrines in the Badarikāśrama are found to be connected with this episode. One of them is the Urvaśīkuṇḍa (see Varāha-p. 141. 52 cr. ed.). It is mentioned in the Nāradīya-p. (2. 67. 65) also, which is said to be situated in the Naranārāyaṇāvāsa. On account of the creation of Urvaśī at Badarikāśrama it came to be known as Urvaśī-tīrtha (SK. Badarikāśrama 7.67). Badarī is also said to be a pīṭha, where Devī exists in the name of Urvaśī (D. Bhāg. 7. 30. 79). The Urvaśīsaṁgama-tīrtha in the Badarī-kṣetra is mentioned in Nāradīya-p. 2. 67. 76.

38. दम्भोद्भवो नाम राजा वीर्यीवलेपाद् भूतावमानी लोकाभिभवनशीलः कञ्चिद् योद्धुम् अनासादयन् विदह्यमानो नारदादुपलभ्य अधिकप्रभावौ नरनारायणौ बदरिकाश्रमं जगाम । तत्र तौ अभिभवन् नरेण इषीकाभिःछादितः सबलो ननाश. The expression ननाश indicates that Dambhodbhava got destroyed with his army. According to the Mahābhārata he became highly afraid of the sage Nara by observing the sky filled with the arrows of Nara, and fell down to the feet of Nara who forgave him (पादयोर्न्यपतद् राजा) - - - verses 33a–34b) This shows that the word ननाश is to be taken in the secondary sense.

39. नारायणो नरश्चोभौ परमावृषिसत्तमौ । तपसाऽऽराध्य परमं तेजोमयमनामयम् ॥ २६ आनिन्याते जनगतान् देवान् देवर्षिसत्तमान् । ये मृता अमराः पूर्वं गणशस्तान् पृथक्-पृथक् । तपोबलेन महता सर्जयामासतुर्मुनी ॥ २६ (कालिकापु. अ. २४) ।

40. कृष्णार्जुनौ नामतो वै नरनारायणौ युवाम् (Bṛ. Dh. P. 2. 11. 83); तयोः (नर-नारायणयोः) अंशावतारौ हि जिष्णुकृष्णौ महाबलौ (D. Bhāg. 4. 1. 15; Jiṣṇu is the another name of Arjuna); see also D. Bhāg; 4. 17. 23; अहं नरः स्वयं साक्षात् कृष्णो नारायणः स्वयम् (said by Arjuna, SK. Nāgara. 152. 31); यथा मे नारदः प्राह व्यासश्च सुमहातपाः । नरनारायणावेति संभूते मनुजेष्विति (Mbh. Anuśāsana 167. 44; said by Bhīṣma at the time of his death); नारायणो वासुदेवो नरश्चैवार्जुनाह्वयः (B. Dh. p. 1. 30. 24); नरनारायणांशौ द्वौ । १७ । द्वापरेऽर्जुनशौरिणौ (D. Bhāg. 4. 16. 18; mark the word शौरिन्; usually शौरि is used); ताविमौ वै भगवतो हरेरंशाविहागतौ । ...कृष्णौ यदुकुरूद्वहौ ॥ (Bhāg. 4. 1. 58-59; here कृष्ण means 'black in complexion'; यदूद्वह is Kṛṣṇa, while कुरूद्वह is Arjuna); नरनारायणा- वुभौ । अर्जुनश्च तथा कृष्णस्तावेव स्वेच्छया स्थितौ (B. Dh. P. 1. 30. 22); तथा नारायणो राजन् नरश्च धर्मजावुभौ ॥ २१ ॥ जातौ कृष्णार्जुनौ काममंशौ नारायणस्य तौ (D. Bhāg. 6. 10. 21b–22a; here the second Nārāyaṇa is often said to be the lord of *paravyoman* or the lord Viṣṇu); भ्राता ते फाल्गुनं नाम विद्ध्येनं नरदैवतम् (Sk. Revā 95.2; ते refers to Yudhiṣṭhira).

41. तत्प्रारब्धवशात् पुण्यं करोति च यथा तथा । पापं करोति मनुजस्तथा देवादयोऽपि च ॥ २० ॥ तथा नारायणो राजन् नरश्च धर्मजावुभौ (D. Bhāg. 6. 10. 20-21a).

42. नरनारायणांशौ द्वौ.....॥१७ धराभारावतारार्थं जातौ कृष्णार्जुनौ भुवि ॥ १८ (D. Bhāg. 4. 16. 17-18);
कृष्णार्जुनौ..भूभारहरणाय.. (D. Bhāg. 4. 17. 23); भारव्ययाय च मुवः (Bhāg. 4. 1. 59);
..कृष्णार्जुनौ नामतो वै नरनारायणौ युवाम् । भूत्वा भारं भुवो हृत्वा पृथ्वीं संसुखयिष्यति (Br. Dh. P. 2.
11. 83 b-84a); नरनारायणौ द्वौ तु पुराणावृषिसत्तमौ ॥ तौ मन्त्रियोगाद् विप्रर्षे क्षितौ जातौ महाद्युती ।
भूमेर्भारावतरणं महावीर्यौ करिष्यतः (Mbh. Vana-p. 47. 10, 14; here मत् refers to Indra); एवं
लोका वदिष्यन्ति नरनारायणावृषी । उद्यतौ दहतः क्षत्रं लोककार्यार्थमीश्वरौ ॥ Śānti–p. 339-100;
stated referring to the acts of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna.

43. जीवात्मपरमात्मानौ नरनारायणावुभौ । अर्जुनश्च तथा कृष्णस्तावेव स्वेच्छया स्थितौ ॥ २२ नारायणो
वासुदेवो नरश्चैवार्जुनाह्वयः । नरनारायणमयं तन्महाभारतं विदुः ॥ २४ (Br. Dh. P. 1. 30. 22,. 24).

44. शतक्रतुश्च विष्णुश्च जज्ञाते पुनरेव हि । वैवस्वतेऽन्तरे ह्यास्मिन् नरनारायणौ सुरौ ॥ (Vāyu-p. 66. 61).

45. तुर्ये धर्मकलासर्गे नरनारायणावृषी । भूत्वात्मोपशमोपेतमकरोद् दुश्चरं तपः ॥ (Bhāg. 1. 3. 9)
नरनारायणौ भूत्वा तुर्ये तपे स्वयं हरिः । धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय पूजितः स सुरासुरैः ॥ (Garuḍa–
p. 1. 1. 17).

46. ततो भूयस्तपःकर्ता नरो नारायणस्तथा । (Br. Dh. p. 2. 11. 63).

47. धर्मस्यैवावतारोऽभूच् चाक्षुषे मनुसंभवे । नरनारायणौ धर्मपुत्रौ ख्यातौ महीतले ॥ (D. Bhāg. 4. 16. 5);
वैकुण्ठः स पुनर्देवः संप्राप्ते चाक्षुषेऽन्तरे ॥ धर्मो नारायणः साध्यः साध्यैः सह सुरैरभूत् । स तु नारायणः
साध्यः प्राप्ते वैवस्वतेऽन्तरे ॥ (Vāya–p. 66. 134 b–135); एवमुक्त्वा तु ते सर्वे चाक्षुषस्यान्तरे मनोः ।
तस्माद् द्वादश संभूता धर्मात् स्वायंभुवात् पुनः ॥ नरनारायणौ तत्र जज्ञाते पुनरेव हि (Vāyu-p. 66.
13–14a); ततस्ते वै पुनर्देवा वैकुण्ठाः प्राप्य चाक्षुषम् । साध्यानां द्वादश सुता जज्ञिरे धर्मसूनवः ॥
(Vāyu-p. 67. 41); ततः प्रभृति शापेन भृगुनैमित्तिकेन च ॥ जज्ञे पुनः पुनर्विष्णुः कर्तुं धर्मव्यवस्थितिम् ।
धर्मान् नारायणः साध्यः संभूत श्चाक्षुषान्तरे ॥ ९३, यज्ञं प्रवर्तयामास स वै वैवस्वतान्तरे । प्रादुर्भवि तदा
तस्य ब्रह्मा चासीत् पुरोहितः ॥ ९४ (Sk. Prabhāsakṣetra 19. 92 b–94).

CLARIFICATION, SUGGEESTIONS &· NOTES

Presented by:

Banibrata Mahanata

[This is in continuation of the report of the Rāmāyaṇa Workshop published as an introduction to Dr. G. S. Rai's article 'Kāṇḍa Structure of the Rāmāyaṇa and authenticity of the Uttarakāṇḍa' published in our special Ayodhyā-Saryū number]

The Wheat Question

We had occassion to note under topic no. 15, page 113, 'Rice seems to have been the main cultivation of Vālmīki's India. Wheat was known in India in the time of Vālmīki' as a cultivated crop i. e. as a foodstuff. It is not that wheat itself was completely unknown. In fact, the following reference to it needs some discussion-

The description of Hemanta season (3.16.16);

बाष्पच्छन्नारण्यानि यवगोधूमवन्ति च। शोभन्तेऽभ्युदिते सूर्ये नदद्भिः कौञ्चसारसैः ॥

To understand the proper perspective we must look into the thematic structure of this Sarga. It can well be divided into three parts-

1. Śl.1-8: description of human habitat and agricultural and other activities.
2. Śl. 9-26: description of the forest in the winter season (naturally, it is longer than the previous one as Rāma was dwelling in the forest itself).
3. Śl. 27-40: rememberance of Ayodhyā and Bharata.Śl. 41-43 form the epilogue.

Now, it is to be noted that in first part concerning agriculture, wheat is not named. 'Śasya' seems to mean paddy crop, as is clear by the śloka 6, because it is paddy alone which ripens in *Āgrahāyaṇa*. As a contra-distinction, barley and wheat have been mentioned in the context of forests. It may be argued that there might have been barley and paddy fields bordering the forest, and so there is nothing unusual in their description along with the forest. In fact, in the very next śloka, paddy has also been describfled (3.16.17):

खर्जूरपुष्पाकृतिभिः शिरोभिः पूर्णतण्डुलैः। शोभन्ते किंचिदानम्राः शालयः कनकप्रभाः ॥

and if paddy was an agricultural crop, which admittedly was, then *yava* and *godhūma* (wheat) as well might have been an agricultural crop. The argument, apparently attractive, is nevertheless unsatisfactory for the following reasons-

1. It does not explain the non-mention of wheat crop in the first part.
2. There is a qualitative difference between the mention of '*godhūma*' in   Śl 16 and that of '*śāli*' in Śl. 17. In the latter śloka, *śāli* has been described independently of the forest. So, it may be taken as a description of the paddy fields bordering the forests. The former description is not so. यवगोधूमवन्ति is not an independent description of wheat crop but it forms an adjective of forests. Thus, what is being described is "the forests having (or endowed with) barley and wheat corps". So, description of wheat is a part of the description of the forest itself and can only be taken as a forest product. Thus it seems that by the time of Vālmīki, wheat was not yet 'domesticated' and was still only a wild crop. In this connection, it may be noted that some scholars have conjectured, basing on the etymology that *godhūma* was in ancient times not taken as a cereal producing plant but was rather used to make smoke to keep mosquitoes and gnats off the cows. Mention of *yava* along with *godhūma* does create some difficulty, as its antiquity as a cereal considered older than the wheat. The above description makes the issue live and we seek further elucidation from the scholars. Our conjecture is,-

(i) paddy was the oldest cultivated crop in India, and rice the staple food of Indians.

(ii) Wheat cultivation was a much later development.

(iii) Barley cultivation might have come in vogue before wheat, but after paddy. Even so, barely might have gained ritualistic recognition before it became a part of Indian menu.

The time of composition (Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa) should be analysed in the light of the above discussions.

In parting, we may note that rice mentioned in Śl. 17. (Supra) might be the uncultivated wild variety of it as contra-distinct from the description of the Śloka 5 and 6. It is well-known that there are still some such varieties of rice eg. *tinni* (Hindi) and they are considered as *muni-annam* as cultivation was prohibited for *munis*. Thus, paddy in Śloka 17 might refer to either the cultivated variety or to the wild variety (as description is

independent of the forest), while mention of wheat in the Śloka 16 can refer only to the wild plants of wheat.

Regarding the wild and cultivated varieties of rice, barley and wheat we may further make some observations. The references of rice in the Indian literature are quite profuse. The reference of wheat on the other hand is much more scanty. Not only that, even the grammar of Pāṇini mentions a number of varieties of rice. And so does Caraka in the *Annapānavidyādhyāya* (Ch. 27) of Sūtra-sthāna mentions different varieties of rice from the Śl. 8-12. It is followed by another three ślokas which probably enumerate those varieties which are reaped in or about September. The next three ślokas (Sl. 16-18) give the names of Śyāmaka ('*Sanvā* in Hindi) and allied varieties of rice. It includes *Nīvāra* and *Priyaṅgu-*

सकोरदूषः श्यामाकः कषायमधुरो लघुः । बातलः कफपित्तघ्नः शीतः संग्राहिशोषणः ॥

हस्तिश्यामाकनीषारतोयपर्णीगवेधुकाः । प्रशान्तिकाम्भः श्यामाकलौहित्याणुप्रियङ्कणः ॥

मुकुन्दो झिण्टिगर्मूटी वरुका वरकास्तथा । शिविरोत्कटजूर्णाह्वा श्यामाकसदृशा गुणैः ॥

Nīvāra and *Priyaṅgu* occur in literature frequently. They are uncultivated crops mostly used by the *munis* in forests. The commentator Cakrapāṇi notes that *Priyaṅgu* is the '*Kaṅganī*'. Probably it is the same as what is known as '*Kakunī*' in the Hindi heartland. It is still used mainly to feed the domesticated birds. The above list begins with *Koradūṣa*. Cakrapāṇi says,

"कोरदूषादयः कुधान्यविशेषाः । कोरदूषः कोद्रवः,.........श्यामाकादयोऽपि तृणधान्यविशेषाः ।"

Tṛṇadhānya seems to denote that these varieties were not cultivated and used to grow like grass. About गणेधुक Cakrapāṇi is more specific.

गणेधुको चुलुंचः, स ग्राम्यारप्यभेदेन द्विविधः ।

Thus, in the above quoted Valmikian śloka (3/16/17) the possibility of some wild varieties of rice being mentioned is confirmed.

Caraka, after describing the rice varieties proceeds to describe barley (*yava*). Only two, varieties are mentioned, the *yava* in Sl. 19 and वेणुयव in Śl. 20. Unfortunately, Cakrapāṇi does not comment on the later śloka. So, we cannot confirm whether वेणुयव is a wild variety or not. Caraka comes to wheat next (21-22)

सन्धानकृद्वातहरो गोधूमः स.।दुशीलतः । जीवनो बृंहणो वृष्यः स्निग्धः स्थैर्यकरो गुरुः ॥

followed by,

नान्दीमुखी मधूली च मधुरस्निग्धशीतले । इत्ययं शूकधान्यानां पूर्णो वर्गः समाप्यते ॥

Cakrapāṇi notes नन्दीमुखीयविका, मधूली गोधूमभेदः । Apparentiy यविका is what we call जई. Its grains are barley-like though longer and is used as

cattle feed. Quite likely, it might have been the original wild grain 'yava' consumed by cattle and animals. मघूली read along यविका might have been a similar wild variety of wheat. We think that Caraka, after describing 'yava' in Śl.19 and 20 ends the description of cereals with wheat in Śl. 21. The Śloka 22 is a sort of addendum describing two varieties, one each of barley and wheat respectively. They were not regular cereals for human consumption but came under Śukadhānyas nevertheless. Probably, these were original breeds growing wildly from which the later strains were derived either independently or by cross-breeding with imported Iranian or Central Asian varieties. The later development must have taken place long after Vālmīki.

It is clear that the above study is only indicative and in no way definitive. The matter needs deeper probe and investigation into the agricultural history of India as also the dietary and culinary habits of Indians in different eras. We invite scholars to throw more light on the subject.

II
Rāmāyaṇa Predates Present Vedic Texts

It has been said in our report that 'we dare say that the Ur-*Rāmāyaṇa* predates the famous Vedic mantra ग्रीष्म इध्मः शरद्धविः (Puruṣa Sūkta)' (Page 113, topic No. 14). Now, the Rāmāyaṇa, admittedly mentions the *Vedas*. So the above sentence seems to be a contradiction. Further, it is generally agreed that the Vedas very much predate the Rāmāyaṇa and so the above assertion seem outrageous.

The point needs some clarification. The Vedas, no doubt, have been mentioned in Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa but it does not at all prove that the composition, content and text of the Vedas in his time was the same as is today. Let us not presume anything. As to the second objection, the idea is not all that novel and much less 'outrageous'. It can be discussed from two angles, modern and traditional. We take up the modern school first.

Scholars of the Harappan culture have noted its surprising continuity with the later Purāṇic, Āgamic (Tāntrika), yogic and even folk culture constituting Hinduism. This phenomenon can be explained in three ways-

1. Vedic culture predated the Harappan culture and the later Indian culture was its logical development.
2. The Harappan culture was a non-Aryan culture predating the Aryan invasion.
3. The Harappan culture was a pre-Vedic Aryan culture.

The first view is in accordance with the tradititonal Indian view. The followers of the second view seem to hear the echo of the earlier Harappan culture in the later Indian tradition. They suggest a re-search of the ancient texts for reconstructing the memories of that 'long forgotten, mystic civilization'. The scholars subscribing to the third school of thought have called the Harappan culture as the 'lineal progenitor' of later Hinduism, because after all, both were the cultures of the same Aryan race. Thus we see that there is nothing very absurd in some ancient Sanskrit texts being pre-Vedic, or atleast preserving the pre-Vedic tradition. Attemps to search for the pre-Vedic elements in the extant Saṁskṛta texts should be welcome and are not to be abhorred at.

Purely from the traditional point of view also, concept of a pre-Vedic (*Vedas* as we know today) *Rāmāyaṇa* is quite consistent. The antiquity of the *Rāmāyaṇa* vis-a-vis *Vedas* can be easily demonstrated-

1. At the beginning of every '*kalpa*' the *Vedas* illumine the heart of Brahmā and he creates the universe accordingly.

2. Any creation of a particular '*kalpa*' does follow the pattern of the previous creation, yet it differes from it as well. The differences might sometimes be quite large. According to the *yoga-Vāśiṣṭa*, even the physical laws might differ, giving rise to quite different species of flora and fauna. Some '*Kalpas*' may not even see the coming of man or may see quite different type of human beings.

3. Thus, the different creations being different, the inspiring force behind each creation (ie. the *Vedas*) must also be different. Different effect presumes different cause.

4. What is true of the great cycle (i. e. '*kalpas*') is also true, on a smaller scale, for the subcycles (ie. *Caturyugīs*). Each *Caturyugī*, nevertheless, spans over millions of years and so involves geographical and geological as well as great cultural changes.

5. The Vedas, of necessity, stand in need of re-editing and rewriting at the beginning of atleast some Caturyugīs, if not of all. In the traditional parlance, some *mantras* are 'wiped out' or 'withheld' from the human memory and new *mantras* dawn to the seers. If no such updating is done, the *Vedas* will become outdated, irrelevant, contradictory to prevalent facts, and even incoherent.

6. The history of the Rāmāyaṇa belongs to the '*tretā*' of the twenty-fourth subcycle. At present, it is the Kaliyuga of the twenty-fourth subcycle. So, it would be quite surprising if the contents of the *Vedas*

have not changed since then. Thus the *Vedas* at the time of Vālmīki and the Vedic culture evolving out of it is quite likely to be at some variance at least from the present culture. It follows that the Rāmāyaṇa pre-dates the present Vedic text.

Lastly in this connection it can be noted that the Indian tradition itself holds that the *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa* are at least as old as the *Vedas* themselves, if not more (as the very name *Purāṇa* itself suggests).

The above view may well explain quite different geology and geography as is exhibited by the Rāmāyaṇa. Even, there might have been big changes in the biosphere since then curiously enough, wherever we find enumerations of trees and animals in the Rāmāyaṇa, it is accompanied by a plethora of textual variants. The only explanation can be that the original text has been lost, at least of these parts. May be with the changing biosphere, the names of different species of flora and fauna were changed from time to time and place to place. Such attempts to adapt the Vālmīkian text to the contemporary realities is atleast clearly proved in the case of geographical and geophysical changes as shown by us in our report in the context of Vālmīki and South Indian geography.

III
Vedic Reference in the Rāmāyaṇa

We have not said that the *Rāmāyaṇa* is older than the *Vedas;* we have only said that Vālmīki might predate the *present text* of the *Vedas.* It becomes incumbent now to discuss various references of the *Vedas* in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki and see what was the form of the *Vedas* at the time of Vālmīki. We do not have with us a comprehensive list of such references and so a thorough discussion is not possible here. We will just make a few notes and request the scholars to see how far they are supported or contradicted by other references. We will considere here the validity of the Puranic tradition that the *Vedas* were first divided into four books-

Ṛgveda, yajurveda, Sāmaveda and *Atharvaveda* by Vyāsa. So, from the traditional point of view there ought to be no mention of these four books in the Rāmāyaṇa. As said above, only a few comments are offered here.

1. Generally the Vedas are mentioned in plural number. Of course, this is the common custom as each individual vedic *mantra* itself is called *Veda* or *Śruti*. It in no way pre-supposes the four specific books.

2. The critical edition reads *Yajurveda* in the following śloka (5.33.14):

यजुर्वेदविनीतश्च वेदविद्भिः सुपूजितः । धनुर्वेदे च वेदे च वेदाङ्गेषु च निष्ठितः ॥

(a) The oldest manuscript   Ṅ₁ is illegible for this śloka and D5 is missing. Ś₁ omits ślokas 14-16, B4 omits 14 a. b.Ñ₂ V₂ B₁₋₃ transpose a b and c d. Thus the authenticity of this śloka, and that of the first half a b in particular, is not free from challenge.

(b) N₂ B₁₂ D₁₋₄, 6, 1D, 11read ऋजुर् for यजुर् (with the variant *Vidy*   *ā* for *veda* in N₂ B₁ D₆). V₂ read *Vidy*ā veda. So, the text needs some consideration. We think ऋजुर् to be the more likely reading, because either as a corruption or as a correction we consider more likely reading, because either as a corruption or as a correction, we consider ऋजुर् यजुर् ore likely than यजुर् ऋजुर् So, this śloka cannot be relied upon to prove the occurence of the *Yajurveda* in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

3. Now we come to the following śloka (4. 27. 34):

मासि प्रौष्ठपदे ब्रह्म ब्राह्मणानां विवक्षताम् । अयमध्यायसमयः सामगानामुपस्थितः ॥

(a) Firstly, sequence of this *śloka* is different in different sets of manuscripts.   Ś₁ B₁₂ gives a sequence different than the accepted tex,. B₃ yet another sequence, while D3.11 transpose *ślokas* 34 and 35. So, we cannot be absolutely sure of its authenticity.

(b) The reference here is only to Vedic psalm singers. Certainly they existed even before Vyāsa re-edited the *Vedas* and compiled a separate book called the *Sāmaveda*. May be these early psalm-singers had their own traditional special ritual. Hence a reference of the book called *Sāma Veda* need not necessarily be inferred here.

4. Taking the Puranic theory of Vyāsa's editing of *Vedas* to its logical conclusion, some scholars have suggested the following śloka (2. 29. 13) to be an interpolation:

कौसल्यां च य आशीर्भिर्भक्तः पर्युपतिष्ठति । आचार्यस्तैत्तिरीयाणामभिरूपैश्च वेदवित् ॥

We will consider the validity of the above argument.

(a) The śloka occurs in every manuscript used in the critical edition. It is true that the selection of manuscripts used in the critical edition is very inadequate from the point of view of scientific sampling. Nevertheless the śloka must be considered prima facie genuine. But does it contradict our original thinking?

(b) Very often different *śākhās* of the *Vedas* represent different versions of the intrinsically same text. And certainly, Vyāsa did not create these textual variants. They existed even before him and the followers of different text recensions must have been

designated by the receensions which they followed. Hence this śloka also does not contradict the contention that the Vālmīkian references of *Vedas* pertains to a stage earlier than the classification of the *Vedas* into four books by Vyāsa.

IV
Purāṇa in Rāmāyaṇa

1. As in the case of the *Vedas*, in the case of the *Purāṇas* also Vyāsa is said to have re-edited them and classified the Purāṇic tradition into 18 specific books. Before the classification, what might have existed must have been one single composite *Purāṇa-Saṁhitā*. Let us see if the *Rāmāyaṇa* can throw some light in this matter.

   (a) To the best of our remembrance Vālmīki does not mention either the number of *Purāṇas*, viz-18, nor the name of any *Purāṇa* as we know it.

   (b) It is an interesting question whether Vālmīki uses the word *Purāṇa* in singular or in plural or in both. Scholars need investigate it. We just point out here one interesting reference (4.61.3):

   'पुराणे सुमहत्कार्यं भविष्यं हि मया श्रुतम् । दृष्टं मे तपसा चैव श्रुत्वा च विदितं मम ॥'

   The relevant part of the crctical apparatus is as follows;:

   V$_{1.2}$ B$_1$. 2.4 तु महत्; G$_2$ च महत्(fo r सुमहत॰ D4.6.7.13 पुराणेषु महत्कार्यं (D$_7$ ^{0} कृत्यं).

   We agree with the adapted text. Apart from the weight of the manuscriptal evidence, we think that, either as a corruption or as a correction, पुराणे सुमहत्> –पुराणेषु महत् to be more likely than पुराणेषु महत् >–पुराणे सुमहत्. We do not know if Vālmīki uses the word Purāṇa in pural number at other places. Nevertheless, the reference in singular here is very significant. *Vālmīki* does not name any *Purāṇa* in particular but uses the generic word Purāṇa itself in singular. The natural conclusion is that in his time there was only one *Purāṇa Saṁhitā* which has been designated as *Purāṇa*. We feel that the references of *Purāṇa* in the Vedic literature are probably in singular only. This all goes to show the existence of a pre-*Vyāsa Purāṇa saṁhitā*.

2. We find several references of past events and stories in the *Rāmāyaṇa* which could only have been taken from the *Itihāsa* and the *Purāṇa*. Interestingly the commentators uptodate have not been able to locate in the extant *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* works the sources of some of these

references. This also confirms our view that the Puraṇic sources of *Vālmīki* must have been the original *Purāṇa saṁhitā*, now lost. A critical study of such 'source-untraceable' references of *Rāmāyaṇa* is incumbent, not only for the *Rāmāyaṇa* scholars, but for the Purāṇic scholars no less.

3. At present, there is dispute as to which of *Purāṇas* formed the group of 18 *Mahā Purāṇas*. We get various lists. Generally modern scholars are very suspicious about the future events foretold in the Purāṇas. But, interestingly, all the different list of 18 *Mahāpurāṇas* include *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* in it. The only logical inference can be that in the original Purāṇa-saṁhitā itself there must have been a 'future section', or 'future events' scatterred here and there. Vālmīkian study goes to confirm it. We have quoted the *śloka* (4/61/3) above .It occures in the context of *Ṛṣi*, named *Niśākara* telling Sampāti of the future events, namely, the story of Rāma. Howsoever, the *Sarga* might be repugnant to some modern scholars, the fact remains that it has the unanimous support of all the manuscripts, practically every line of it. So, the *Bhaviṣya-kathā* seems to be an integral and ancient part of the original *Purāṇa saṁhitā*. It is natural that taking advantage of this fact, later interpolators must have conflated the old texts at their will. Nevertheless, to consider all such futuristic narration to be inter-polations after their happening is over generalisation and not permitted by scientific methodology. It might be a pure superstition, but it cannot be denied that Indians believed in them and some matters existed in their oldest texts.

In the above context, it will be noted that in the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*, *Sītā*, while arguing her case for accompanying *Rāma* to the forest, says that she had heard of many *Rāmāyaṇas* but in none of them Sītā did not accompany *Rāma* (infra; next section). A funny argument no doubt for the modernears and some scholars have tried to hold it as a later concept developed out of devotionalism. In fact, the writer of the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* has done nothing new. He has just developed the Vālmīkian tradition to its logical end. And certainly, this can be no ground for ascribing a late date to the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*.

RāmāyaNa in PurāNa

The quotation noted under the previous topic (*Rāmāyaṇa* 4. 61. 3) goes to show two facts:

(a) *Purāṇa (saṁhitā)* was known to the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

(b) *Purāṇa* contained *Rāmāyaṇa* even at the time of *Vālmīki*.

We have alveady considered the first point. A few comments on the latter aspect-

1. At present practically all of the *Purāṇas* mention Rāma and many contain the story of *Rāmāyṇa*. Of these, the most elaborate one is that which is told in the still unpublished *Vahni Purāṇa* (VP) (vide Hazra commemoration Volume pp. 60-171). Practically the whole of the latter half of this *Vahuni Purāṇa* is consitituted of *Rāma*'s story. An interesting feature is that the story is told by *Vasiṣṭha* to King *Ambarīṣa*. Thus the framework of the story demands a futuristic version. Yet, while the interlocutory framework starts in futuristic terms, the story itself is narrated in past tense. This needs some explainations. According to the *Rāmāyaṇa, Rāma*'s story told in the *Purāṇa saṁhitā* must have been in future tense as is evident from the 61 st *sarga of Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍā Rāmāyaṇa* (supra). It is natural to presume that when the original *Purāṇa Saṁhitā* was split into various *Purāṇas* and *Upa purāṇas* the *Rāma-kathā* was put in the VP. This is clear from the futuristic set-up and the volume of the *Rāma-kathā* in VP. Even so, the Rāma's story as is present in the extant VP. does not represent the origin.al version of VP. because it is in the past tense. This is further verified by the fact that the present VP. *Rāma-kathā* very closely follows a particular sub-recension of the central recension of *Rāmāyaṇa* (represented by the manuscripts D$_4$.5.7 of the critical ed.). So, the present VP. Must have taken shape much after this sub-recension had been crystallised. It is not to argue that VP. must be assigned a late date, but rather to suggest that the coming into being, even of the sub-recensions of the Rāmāyaṇa, was much earlier than 400-500 AD.(the date assigned to VP). The All important inference from this is that not only the current *Agni-Purāṇa* is spurious, as shown by Dr. Hazra, but even the present VP. is an apocryphal text. Still, we may presume that VP. is nearer to the original Puranic tradition.

2. The reference to the futuristic Rāma-kathā in *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* (2.4.77-78) is as follows:

रामायणानि बहुशः श्रुतानि बहुभिर्द्विजैः । सीतां विना वनं रामो गतः किं कुत्रचिद्वद ।

The same idea has been further dev·.loped in *Udārarāghava* (5 48)

'रामायणानीह पुरातनानि पुरातनेभ्यो बहुशः श्रुतानि ।

न क्वापि वैदेहसुतां विहाय रामो वनं यात इति श्रुतं मे ॥

Most likely the latter work has the former as its source.Dr. Bulke has dated the *Udārarāghava* in the 4th century and the *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa* in the 14th-15th century. Such a late date for AR. seems unwarranted and is not based on any firm evidence. The use of plural number with puranic *Rāmāyaṇa* can be well explained as a large number.of manuscripts of the *Rāmāyaṇa* also have the plural number in 4.61.3 (*supra*). Even so, it is not unlikely to assume that the original *Purāṇa-saṁhitā* contained a *Rāmāyaṇa* and after it was divided into a number of *Purāṇas* by *Vyāsa*, the different *Purāṇas* varied to have *Rāma*'s story in them because of the popularity of *Rāmāyaṇa*. In this process, helped by the chaotic political conditions at different periods in the Indian history, the original Puranic *Rāmāyaṇa* seems to have been lost. Vp substituted it with a new version based on a particular sub-recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, maintaining though, the futuristic nature of the original. *Nṛsiṁha Purāṇa* has a pretty long version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as story. Its text seems to follow probably the southern vulgate traditions. The other local traditions of *Rāmā*'s story must also have affected the development of different version in different *Purāṇas*. In the above quoted *Udārarāghava śloka*, the ' पुरातनानि ' word seems to imply these very Purāṇic sources.

VI
Itihāsa Material in Rāmāyaṇa

Itihāsa is a sister genre of *Purāṇa* and has always been considered so in the tradition and hence the compound phrase *Itihāsa-Purāṇa*. Practically every Itihāsa material is essentially of the Purāṇic nature as it could well have found a place in the Purāṇa itself. On the other hand, all the Purāṇic material certainly cannot be called Itihāsa, eg., cosmological, geographical, cyclicity of creation etc. The very meaning of the word Ithihāsa is 'it had been so'. Similarly, the futuristic elements of Purāṇa could never have been called Itihāsa and hence the above discussed futuristic Rāmāyaṇa could have only been a part of Purāṇa and not of Itihāsa. We find that the reference of Purāic Rāma-kathā in Rāmāyaṇa is in keeping with this distinction between Itihāsa and Purāṇa.

At present, only Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata are referred as Itihāsa in Sanskrit literature. We think it to be misnomer. The very meaning of

the word Itihāsa implies the old tradition and the annals accumulted
through the ages without any specific authership. On the other hand
Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata are specific works assigned to specific
authors. So they are essentially kāvya-works and not Itihāsas. The reasons
for this confusion are not far to be searched for. It seems that the original
Itihāsa-saṃhitā was lost at some later date and the fragments of it were
absorbed into the Purāṇas and Mahābhārata. The reason was obvious.
Purāṇa was a sister genre of Itihāsa and the Itihāsa material was of
essentially purāṇic nature. Further, Vyāsa, being the co-auther of
Purāṇas and Mahābhārata both, some of the floating itihāsa material
went to conflate the original, 24,000 śloka saṃhitā (initially called 'Jaya')
into one lakh *śloka*-saṃhitā (Mahābhārata) turning it into an Itihāsa
work. On the analogy of Mahābhārata, the term Itihāsa was extended to
Rāmāyaṇa as well.

The existance of a seperate Itihāsa genre is evident by several
medieval works as well. There is a work called Itihāsa-samuccaya and
several other texts like it. Specially of Itihāsa-samuccaya there are a quite
large number of manuscripts and several of them of at least 4 or 5
centuries old. Unfortunately sufficient critical attention has not been given
to these studies. There are shorter and longer versions of it. At least most
of the material contained in it is common with Mahābhārata. It has been
assumed that it is a compilation of stories from *Mahābhārata*. We
suggest that it might well have been the other way round. It can be safely
said that originally these stories must have been borrowed by conflated
Mahābhārata (the original being Jaya-saṃhitā) form some prototype of
ancient *Itihāsa* work. The nature of the stories contained in the *Itihāsa
samuccaya* lend support to it. But, for it we must examine what could
have been the nature of *Itihāsa* stories.

As explained above, it might not always be easy to distinguish a
Itihāsa-story from a *Purāṇa*-story. There are very many references of
such stories in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and which of them belong to *Itihāsa* and
which of them to *Purāṇa* is a complex problem. We think that the
references in the Rāmāyaṇa of cosmological, geographical, futuristic,
purely genealogical and mythological material, like *Devāsura-
saṅgrāma* etc, must pertain to the Purāṇic sources. On the other hand,
the stories like that of the Brahmin told by Sītā to Rāma in the Araṇya-
kāṇḍa, Sarga 9-(Bombay ed.) might well have been from the Itihasic
source. It starts with introductory पुरा किल and ends with एवमेतत् पुरावृत्तं. The

latter phase literally means 'Iti'-'ha'-'āsa'. The similarity of a Jātaka story with this particular story lends further support to its Itihāsic nature. The very definition of a Jātaka story brings it within the compass of 'Iti' 'ha' 'āsa' ('it had been so'). On the analogy of it, the story of the pigeon referred to by Rāma in the 18th sarga of the Yuddhakāṇḍa (Bombay ed.) can also be put in the Itihāsa category. Similarly 'Gāthās' referred to in Rāmāyaṇa and other texts might also have been part of Itihāsa works. The very word gāthā suggests legends and Itihāsa. The gāthās ascribed to Yayāti are very famous. We think that the Yayāti-carita itself was originally a part neither of the Purāṇa nor of Mahābhārata but of Itihāsa saṁhitā. The Purāṇas were content with giving the genealogies of various ruling dynasties and chronoligical history of some period or family. On the other hand, Itihāsas were elaborate biographies of some king or person in particular. By this measure, the stories of Daṇḍa, Ilā, Vṛtra, Nṛga, Yayāti etc. might have been incorporated into the Rāmāyaṇa from Itihāsa saṁhitā. Thus the conjecture is that Itihāsa saṁhitā might have been constituted of, firstly, the larger biographies and secondly, the smaller ancient stories illustrating points of Dharma and Nīti. As said above, the references of Devāsura-saṅgrāma, churning of the ocean, the three mighty steps of Viṣṇu, the burning of Tripura etc in the Rāmāyaṇa might have pertained to Purāṇas.

VII

The Rāma-kathā in RāmāyaṆa vis-a-vis Itihāsa-Purāṇa Tradition

There are various versions of Rāma-kathā in Indian tradition. Generally, it is accepted that the events of Rāma's life not found in Vālmīki are later developments. Such a generalisation is rather unfortunate and unwarranted by the evidence. The concept of Rāmāyaṇa being the Ādi-Kāpva in the sense of being the first poetical work in Sanskrit has helped this attitude. It is rather difficult to believe that in the state of culture in treatā, testified to by Vālmīki, poetry had not already flourished. If it be so, then certainly Vālmīki cannot be called the 'First Poet'. We think this is a misnomer. We give below at least two cosent reasons to prove the point.

1. The Rāmāyaṇa itself declares that there were poets & poetical works even before Vālmīki. It is rather unfortunate that some parts of the Rāmāyaṇa text have been discarded from the original and relegated to the appendix as interpolations by the editor of the Uttarakāṇḍa (critical

ed.) against the testimony of all the manuscripts. This has been done on the basis of pure, subjective, conjectural, so called 'higher criticism'. The editors of the *Mahābhārata* and even the editors of the other *Kāṇḍas* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* had, as a matter of policy, avoided such cuts[1]. We strongly disagree with the critical edition and hold the appendix 1, no. 13 of *Uttarakāṇḍa* to be part of the original, probability of some lines being interpolations notwithstanding para. The twenty-seventh line of appendix 1, no. 13. runs as:

एतदेव हि काव्यं ते काव्यानामुत्तमं श्रुतम् ।

and is further supported by the line 32.

न ह्यन्योऽर्हति काव्यानां यशोभाग्राघवादृते

These go to indicate that-

    (i) There were other *Kāvyas* already extant at the time of *Vālmīki*.

    (ii) Rāma was considered the fittest person to be the subject of poetical eulogies in his lifetime and probably there were poetical works glorifying his deeds, even in his time.

2. The only hindrance to the above theory is the universal tradition of calling Vālmīki 'Ādi-Kavi'. We try to explain the phenomenon on the basis of Dr. G. S. Rai's article, '*Kāṇḍa* structure of *Rāmāyaṇa,* (पुराणम् Vol XXXIII No. 2 Special Ayodhyā-Sarayū No.). The Ur-*Rāmāyaṇa* had two parts, *Paulastyavadha* and *Ramābhyudaya*. An alternative name for the latter was *Uttara Kāvya,* and on the analogy of it, the former was called *Ādi-Kāvya*. We will not go into detail here, but the inquisitive scholars may find sufficient evidence for such an inference in the colophones of the manuscripts of the *Uttar-Kāṇḍa* and *Yuddha-Kāṇḍa*. An analysis of the uses of words *Ādi-Kāvya* and *Uttara* in the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* itself will make the point clear. Of these two parts, it was the *Ādi Kāvya* alone which was taught to and sung by Lava-Kuśa and it established the fame of Vālmīki as the 'Ādi-Kavi' i. e. the poet or creator of the '*Ādi-Kāvya*'. Subsequently, when the *Kāṇḍa* divisions were introduced in the *Rāmāyaṇa* the term *Uttara kāvya* was converted into *Uttara-kāṇḍa* and the epithet *Ādi-Kāvya* was confined to *Ādi-Kāṇḍa* incorporating the Bāla and Ayodhyā Kāṇḍas. The latter usage was further restricted to the *Bāla kāṇḍa* alone. This restricted tradition of calling *Bāla-Kāṇḍa* the '*Ādi-Kāṇḍa*', is still followed by the North-eastern & North-Western recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as also in the vernacular *Rāmāyaṇas* of these regions.

Thus, the possibilities of Rāma-Kāvyas even at the time of Rāma opens
up new vistas of conjectures and thought. There is the famous śloka of
Shrīmad Bhāgavata

यस्यामलं नृपसदस्सु यशोऽधुनापि गायन्त्यघच्नमृषयो दिगिभेन्द्रपट्टम् । (9/12/21ab)

'Whose glory is still sung by the Rsis' goes to show that the tradition of
Rāma Kavya was really a hoary one when *Bhāgavata* was composed. it
might well have been a contemporary of Rāma himself. The tradition of
bards is certainly much older than the time of the Rāmāyaṇa. These bards
must have eulogised Rāma, the 'prima-donna' of his time, to the best of
their abilities. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* itself we find Gods and *rsis* hailing
Rāma (सभाजित:, प्रपूजित:) along with showeving of flowors. Some verbal
singing of prasises seems inherent in these references. Kālidāsa also seems
to think so. And it was not for nothing that he said, लोकत्रयगीतकीर्ति:

With the above preliminary discussion we will now try to conjecture what
might have been the contents of such *Rāma-Kāvyas*.The first thing to
be remembered is that the *Rāmāyaṇa* does not purport to be a
'biography' of Rāma, much less a comprehensive one. It is essentially
a poetic work governed by a certain thematic unity. That unity can be
looked upon in two ways:

The thematic unity of each part is defined by its sub title: *Paulastya-
Vadha* and *Rāma-abhyudaya*. That is why the necessity of the birth
of Rāma is referred to in the *Bāla Kāṇda* itself. The exile of Rāma is
described in detail because it was directly connected with *Rāvaṇa-
Vadha*, while the journey of Bharata to Rajgriha is just casually
referred to and the deeds of Rāma in the intervening period between
marriage and exile is totally skipped over. The reader is never made
oblivious of the hidden divine plan of *Rāvaṇa-vadha* even at the time
of Rāma's refusal to return back to Ayodhyā at Citrakūṭa. It seems
that the case for Rāma's return to Ayodhyā was not only advocated by
Bharata but supported even by Vasiṣṭha, the highest authority on
Dharma of his time. The issue, it seems was ultimately decided not
purely on the merit according to the *Dharma-Śāstra* but on some
ulterior considerations, as is born out by the undermentioned and the
following ślokas (2 104 4):

ततस्त्वृषिगणाः क्षिप्रं दशग्रीववधैषिण: । भरतं राजशार्दूलमित्यूचु: संगता वच: ॥

The Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa has further developed this aspect. May be, the
presentation of AR seems a bit crude but its authenticity is nevertheles

rooted in Vālmīki's work itself. Even earlier, this divine plan behind Rāma's exile for the destruction of Rāvaṇa is hinted at indirectly

न दोषेणावगन्तव्या कैकेयी भरत त्वया । रामप्रव्राजनं एतत्सुबोदर्कं भविष्यति ॥

(2/86/28)

(The vowel even after an *anusvāra* in third pada is our emendation demanded by the manuscriptal evidence). Naturally Bharadvāja could not have, at that point of time, suggested more than this. It seems that by this time Kaikeyī too had grasped the enormity of her sinful act and was repentant.

असमृद्धेन कामेन सर्वलोकस्य गर्हिता । कैकेयी तस्य जग्राह चरणौ सव्यपत्रपा ॥ (2/86/26)

For सव्यपत्रपा there are variant texts,'सा व्यपत्रपा', 'न व्यपत्रपा', 'नौ व्यपत्रपा', 'चा व्यपत्रपा' 'वा व्यवपत्रपा' S₁ D₆ change the whole *caraṇa* महर्षेश्चरणौ तदा. The eastern recension reads लज्जयान्विता or लज्जयानता or some such variations. The eastern text is just an attempt to clarify the meaning, which in our opinion, it just an attempt to clarity the meaning, which in our opinion, it had understood correctly. It seems that Kaikeyī's mind was clouded by some temporary abrration and the inference of later *Rāmāyaṇas*, that it too was a part of divine intervention seems to be in keeping with the Valmikian spirit. In fact this thread of divine planning runs all through the story. Probably, it could not have been stated more clearly than in 3. 30. 30-31 (Bombay ed.):

एतदर्थं महाभाग महेन्द्रः पाकशासनः । शरभङ्गाश्रमं पुण्यामाजगाम पुरंदरः ॥
आनीतस्त्वमिमं देशमुपायेन महर्षिभिः । एषां वधार्थं क्रूराणां रक्षसां पापकर्मणाम् ॥

And thus, the mystery of the Śarbhaṅgāśrama episode is clarified here. The clarification is necessary as Vālmīki's narration is disciplined severely by his strict sense of thematic unity. Indra's visit to Śarabhaṅga would have remained irrelevant otherwise and could not have found a place in the *Ādikāvya* called Paulastya Vadha. That divine purpose is laid thread bare before the reader in the sarga 61 of the next *Kāṇḍa*. We have already quoted (Supra) the third śloka of it, the divine purpose is further emphasised in the śloka 13 c d.

इहस्थस्त्वं तु लोकानां हितं कार्यं करिष्यसि ॥

This is why we prefer the non-southern text, especially the eastern one, for the Sl. 5 cd,

कस्मिंश्चिदर्थे धर्मज्ञ नियुक्तः सत्यविक्रमः.

This is the only text which explains तस्मिन् and अस्मिन् variations of कस्मिन्. The agent of the verb नियुक्तः is intentionally kept undefined as it was a

part of the divine plan working behind the observable events. The other
recensions have tried in a crude way to supply that agent in more than
one ways by introducing पित्रा' with various sub-differences or
changing into पितुर्निदेशमाचरन्. The interest and the intervention of gods is
reflected in various places and episodes throughout the story of
Hanumān's journey to Laṅkā and the subsequent battle in the
Yuddhakāṇḍa. It culuminates ultimately in direct intervention when
Indra sends his own chariot for Rāma. The final denouement is the
killing of Rāvaṇa when (6.37.27):

निपपातान्तरिक्षाच्च पुष्पवृष्टिस्तदा भुवि । किरन्ती राघवरथं दुरापा अल्पचेतसाम् ॥

(For the text of the last caraṇa we have followed our emendation though
the other variants do not change the sense materially.) And, (6.97. 28):

राघवस्तवसंयुक्ता गगने च विशुश्रुवे । साधु साध्विति वाग्भ्या देवतानां महात्मानाम् ॥

This is the fulfilment of the purpose of the story which has started with the
पुत्रेष्टि-यज्ञ and the involvement of gods in that yajña who were sufferring
at the hands of Rāvaṇa. And it is at this exact point where the thematic
development compels Vālmīki to end the *Ādi Kāvya* i. e. *Paulastya
Vadha*. The narration hence on is the theme of *Rāma-abhyudaya*.
This is much for the poetic unity of the first part of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

As to the thematic unity of the second part of the *Rāmāyaṇa,* called
Uttara Kāvya, it is defined by its name, *Rāma-abhyudaya*. As explained
by Dr. G. S. Rai in his article (Supra), the word *Rāma-abhyudaya*
connotes Rama's coronation, glory of *Rāma rājya* and his final
ascension. The narration of the second part is kept strictly on these rails.

2. As promised above, we will now explore another view of the thematic
unity of the *Rāmāyṇa*. In a way, this second view can be called more
powerful, for it explains the unity of both the parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*
by a single principle. And that single principle is the definition of
Rāmāyaṇa as सीतायाश्चरितम् महत्. We would like to point out here that
the adjective महत् put as a case in opposition or in parenthesis
should be construed in the sense of defining relative and not
nondefining relative. That is, it is is not the intention of the poet to say
that "I will narrate Sita's story and that story is a great work'. The
intention is to say, "I will narrate that story of Sita which is great". Thus
the purpose of *Rāmāyaṇa* was not to produce a comprehensive
biography of Sīta. The poet meant only to sing that story or stories of
her life where her character had blossomed in its full glory and these
stories, from the Indian point of view, were certainly her exile, her

kidnapping, her coronation, her banishment and the final disappearance into the Mother Earth. That is why, in the Ur-*Rāmāyaṇa*, there were only casual references to her birth, marriage and her marital-life in Ayodhyā etc.

The above discussion was necessary to understand that there might well have been deeds of Rāma, significant in themselves and known to Vālmīki, yet the poet was bound to ignore them in his great epic because of the discipline imposed by the thematic unity of the work. We will consider the possibilities of some such events below.

1. The most important of such events in Rāma's life is probably that which is testified by Vālmīki himself, mentioned casually though:

ददौ चास्त्राणि दिव्यानि यस्मै ब्रह्मा महौजसे । दानवेन्द्रं हतं दृष्ट्वा तिमिध्वजसुतं रणे ॥ (2.39.11)

One may look with amusemut at the difficulty of the commentators to explain this text. They have not been able to find any Puranic or Itihasic testimony for the event referred to here. We hope the modern scholars will do something better and please to trace evidences for it, Kataka's explanation may seem funny, but actually it seems inspired by the non-southern recensions of this śloka which is—

अस्त्राणि यस्मै दिव्यानि विश्वामित्रो ददौ स्वयम् । तं त्वं सर्वास्त्रविद्वांसं न शोचितुंमर्हसि ।

Clearly, the southern recension is the authentic version here, being the diffichilior text. The attempt of Maheśvaratīrtha (followed by Govindarāja) is worth commending, though scorned at by Kataka.

तीर्थस्तु कदाचिद्रामो वैजयन्तं नगरं निरुध्य तत्रत्यतिमिध्वजाख्यशम्बरस्य दानवस्य पुत्रो हतवान् तेन प्रीतो ब्रह्मा ect. इति बलात्कल्पयति ।

To do away with all these difficulties the non-south versions have changed the text itself; this is yet another classical example of the 'adaptation process' working in the development (or corruption:) in the history of the Vālmikian text. We have seen above (and in our original note in the special Aydohyā Sarayū number) the attempts to change and adapt the texts according to the then geographical and geological realities in subsequent ages. Here is an attempt at adapting the text according to the then 'scriptural realities'. It seems this story was completely lost in the subsequent Itihāsa-Purāṇa tradition and scholars were forced to change the text accordingly. The editor of the critical ed. does disappoint us here by shedding no light in his critical notes on this very interesting and important śloka. No scholar of *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* can afford to neglect this śloka.

Two concrete realities crytallise from the above discussion.

(a) There were definitely some events no less important in Rāma's life which Vālmīki was aware of. Yet, he has chosen not to describe them in his Rāmāyaṇa. (We think, out of consideration of thematic unity).

(b) No doubt, it is true that there have been subsequent developments in the Rāma literature after Vālmīki, and substantial additions too. Yet, it is equally no less true that some portions of the ancient Rāma Kathā tradition have got lost in subsequent times.

2. The *Ānanda Rāmāyaṇa* devotes considerable space to the tīrtha *yātras* made by Rāma. Howsoever a recent work it might be, yet this tradition seems to be deep rooted in the hoary Puranic tradition itself. Different *Purāṇas* associate different *tīrthas* all over India with Rāma in different ways. It is not unlikely that they may have actually taken place and Vālmīki was aware of it, yet has not mentioned it because of the considerations discussed above. After all, concept of tīrtha was much older than Vālmīki and is testified by the poet himself, when he describes Citrakūṭa as

महर्षिसेवितः पुण्यः सर्वतः सुखदर्शनः ॥ (2. 48. 25)...........................

....

यावता चित्रकूटस्य नरः शृङ्गं व्यवेक्षते । कल्याणानि समाधत्ते न पापे कुरुते मनः ॥
(2/48/27)

Similarly there is the Valmikian testimony for the holiness of rivers like Gangā and Yamunā.

Be as it may, it to clear that these points demand greater attention than hitherto bestowed upon. Our hypothesis is that the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki does not offer a comprehensive biography of Rāma for which *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* tradition must be explored into.

VIII
Hiatus-Compound (Sandhi-Samāsa in Itihāsa Purāṇa-Literature)

It has been successfully argued by Dr. U.K. Chaturvedi, that Hiatus is permissible even in compounds (Ayodhyā Tīrtha Praśaṁsā: Purāṇam VoL. 33/2). We agree with his interpretation that not only there is no bar against hiatus in compound but that the Sūtra ' संहितायाम् ' 6. 3. 114, read with 6.1.12, goes to indicate the contingency of Asaṁhitā even in compounds. Relying on this argument, he has accepted the reading:

सुवर्णदानगोदानअन्नदानेषु यत् फलं (ATP 2 9 ab)

as it is is found in the manuscripts. It is in fact a very fortunate and important finding because mostly the manuscripts get rid of such hiatus by various devices. The word गोदान and अन्नदान in this śloka were parts of different *caraṇas* and so the later scribes have overlooked that both were part of a compound and thereby forgot to remove the hiatus. Clearly, if such hiatus be situated in one *caraṇa* itself, the chances of obtaining it intact in any manuscript is certainly very low. Nevertheless, the time tested text critical methodology can be employed to reconstruct the original hiatus texts. We present here an example from the *Vāmana Purāṇa* (VP) where the learned editor, probably due to timidity, has failed to cash upon such a situation. In the 17th chapter of VP (critical ed. All India Kashiraj trust) we find different offerings for the lord prescribed for different months. The word गुडोदनम् or गुडैदनम् occurs in śloka 47b. Clearly it is an example of the Pāṇinīya *Sūtra* अन्नेन व्यञ्जनम् *Kāśikā* notes here that--

संस्कार्यमन्नं, संस्कारकं ब्यंजनम् । दध्ना उपसिक्त ओदन:, दध्योदनः । क्षीरौदनः,

वृत्तौ क्रियाया अन्तर्भावादन्नव्यञ्जनयोः सामर्थ्यम् । The dish गुडोदनम् is still current in the traditional villages of eastern U. P. The rice is cooked in cane juice and in absence of the latter, in *guḍa* and water. It is virtually a *Pāyasa* cooked in water instead of milk and is used in ceremonial occassions, probably because milk is considered a bit in-auspicious. About the word गुडोदनम् we may note that if we do not resort to *samāsa*, a simple तृतीया विभक्ति (instrumental case) will not carry the required sense. ' गुडेन ओदनम् ' will only mean rice with *guḍa* and not a special dish of rice in which a chièf ingredient is *guḍa*. Similarly, we think that 'दध्योदनः' is not only rice eaten with curd but a special dish of rice cooked in curd. This dish too is popular in eastern U. P. villages and is something like *Khicharī* in which curd is used in place of pulse. The use to turmeric and other ingredients of *Khicharī* make it look & taste very mcuh like *Khicharī* itself. We think that the Kāśikā has not understood this usage properly and simply उपसिक्त: will not do because it would only mean rice steeped in or mixed with curd. We agree, nevertheless, that cooking is not strictly necessary. It will be sufficient if the rice is 'processed' with curd. 'Processing implies something more than mere mixing. In this sense, the compound दध्योदनः may be formed even in the sense of उपसिक्त:.

In the background of the above discussion, we now come to the śloka 34 of the 17th sarga of V.P. It seems that in ancient times when honey was

found in plenty, a dish similar to गुडोदनम् cooked or processed with honey was common धूपं श्रीवृक्षनिर्यासं नैवेद्यं मधुनोदनम् (17/38ab)

The wavy line denotes that the editor is not sure of his text. We will discuss the text in two ways.

Firstly, on the intrinsic literary merit we may say that ' मधुना ओदनम् ' is not at all a happy text as the instrumental case does not carry the real meaning (Supra). The text, grammatically speaking, should be मधु ओदनम्. Hiatus here is mandatory as the metre will be spoiled otherewise. So, we propose the amendation, मधु ओदनम्.

Now we will consider the above text from the point of view of manuscriptal evidence. The various variants of मधुनोदनम् are as follows -

दे$_4$ कलमो^{0} (for मधुनो^{0}) कारा. ^{0}सोदनं, ब$_{1-3}$ न$_1$ ^{0}चौ(न$_1$ चो)दनं,

ब$_2$ ^{0}चन्दनं, दे $_{2.3}$ ^{0}नोदकं, दे$_7$ ^{0}वोदनं (for ^{0}नोदनम्).

(The śloka is not found in manuscript शा$_1$) The obvious and elementary deduction from these variants is that the manuscripts point to the hiatus text मधु ओदनम् in the archetype. Thus we find that the literary and grammatical considerations converge with the manuscriptal evidence and put the hiatus—compound मधु ओदनम् beyond any reasonable doubt. Apparently, the editor seems to have fought shy of a hiatus compound and has not gone in for the proposed emendation.

Now, we take an example from the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Hundreds of examples can be pointed out from the *Rāmāyaṇa* where the manuscriptal evidence clearly indicates an emendation and restoration of hiatus compounds. We will consider here only the following example which indeed is a rare example, as at least one manuscript has retained the hiatus compound text and we are spared the boldness of resorting to emendation. It is only the implicit faith of the editors of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in the southern recension that has prevented them from opting for the correct text. The critical ed. reads: निशाकरस्य महर्षे: प्रभावादमितात्मन: ॥ (4. 62. 1 0a,b)

The variants of the first caraṇa are as follows-

a)   N̄$_2$ B$_{3-4}$ D$_{1.3.4.7.11}$ तस्पर्षे:; V$_1$ damaged; V$_2$ विप्रर्षे;

B$_1$ D$_{5.6.8-10}$ राजर्षे:; D$_{12}$** र्षे:; Ś$_1$ N̄$_1$ D$_{13}$ निशाकरस्यर्षेस्तस्य: (For महर्षे:)

V$_3$ निशाकरमहर्षेस्तु; D$_2$ निशाकरऋषेस्तस्य:;

M$_3$ ऋषेनिशाकरस्यैव

Any student of textual criticism would have picked up D2 text निशाकरऋषेस्तस्य as the original reading, provided he had no bias for, or against, any particular recension or manuscript, or had no aversion

against hiatus compounds. It is trite that in the case of lectio de ficchilior
other considerations like general superiority of any particular recension
has to give way. It is really a bad slip.

In the above case, only one other point we would like to make. In the
text proposed by us there are in fact two types of irregularity. Firstly, that
of a hiatus in a compound. To remove the hiatus V_3 simply changes the
text to निशाकरमहर्षेस्तु. To understand fully the other variants we must point
out to another irregularity and that is of the diction. In the present style of
Sanskrit निशाकरऋषे: is not considered correct and happy usage. Rather, it
should be निशाकरस्यऋषे:. वाल्मीकिमुनिनाविरचित is not considered appropriate.
The preferred current usage is वाल्मीकिना मुनिना विरचितं. On the basis of our
limited experience of the *Rāmāyaṇa* text we can safely say that
वाल्मीकिमुनिना is a perfectly correct Valmikian diction and was used
profusely in the pre-classical literature. This obsolete diction had forced
the later scribes first to split निशाकरऋषे: into निशाकरस्य ऋषे:. The metrical
considerations have made S_1 N_1 D_{13} to change it into निशाकरस्य ऋषेस्तस्य,
while M3 has opted for the permutation ऋषेर्निशाकरस्यैव. The 'महर्षे:', 'नस्यर्षे:',
'विप्रर्षे:', 'राजर्षे:' text belong to one class. They have done away with तस्य of
the original for metrical reasons after splitting निशाकरऋषे: into निसाकरस्य ऋषे:
and have filled up the resulting lacuna in four different ways. All these
texts are clearly of tertiary nature and low level texts, the महर्षे: text being
the worst, as it makes even the metre unhappy. We hope that these three
examples (one from *Ayodhyā tīrtha Prasaṅga* of the Nṛsiṃhapurāṇa,
another from the *Vāmana Purāṇa* and the third from the *Rāmāyaṇa*)
will convince the text critics of the validity of hiatus compounds. It will be
good for the Indian textual criticism to accept this reality, the sooner the
better.

Another thing to be noted is that of the three possible usages निशाकरस्य
ऋषे: (or निशाकरस्यर्षे, निशाकरर्षे:) and निशाकरऋषे:, the last one is the easiest for a
layman to comprehend. Acceptance of this text in Vālmikian language
does support the contention of Dr. Umakant Chaturvedi (supra) that
according to Vālmīki there were two styles of Sanskrit, Brahminic and
Laukika (popular style). The Itihāsa-Purāṇa works, being popular
writings, had adopted the popular style of Sanskrit as distinct from
Brahminic style.

---

1. In fact, in the other Kāṇḍas, many passages have been incorporated in the original on
   much weaker evidence. We think many of them are really interpolations. To accept
   those passages as original & discarding the passages supported by unanimous
   testimony have made a mockery of the editorial policy of the critical ed.

QUESTION BOX

Questions are invited under this column from scholars, students and public alike seeking information about Puranic matters and problems. The internationl community of scholars is requested to answer and satisfy the questioners. Never-the-less, we assure the questioners of at least some immediate response. We have constituted a panel of the following scholars: (1) Padmabhusan Acharya Baladeva Upadhyaya, (2) Prof. Maheswari Prasad, B. H. U., (3) Dr. Rama Shankar Tripathi, B. H. U, (4) Dr. N. Gangadharan, Madras University and (5) Dr. Ram Shankar Bhatta- charya, A. I. K. Trust. Responses of these scholars may or may not constitute a comprehensive answer, or may even be an expression of their inability in some cases. For a fuller discussion the help of the academic world at large is solicited to make the column a success.

(1)
Ocean at the Vindhya Hill

Sir,

The report on Rāmāyaṇa workshop (Ayodhyā-Sarayū special number of Purāṇa) says that according to the older Valmikian text, on the southernside of the Vindhya hill there was an ocean which Hanūmat crossed. This seems a bit surprising as it goes against the present geographical condition. Is there any corroboration of it in different Puranic texts, or in Jain and Buddhist traditions of Rāmāyaṇa, or in the folk tradition, or in the traditions of Rāmāyaṇa stories prevalent in other countries? If not, why?

Yours
Shri Krishna Dutt Tiwari
All-India Kashiraj Trust,
Ramnagar, Fort, Varanasi.

(2)
River Sindhu and Sindhu Deśa

Respected sir,

There are detailed descriptions of Gaṅgā, her origin, *tīrthas* and cities on her bank, as also her confluence with the ocean in the Purāṇas. The same is true about Yamunā, Narmadā and many other rivers. The longest river, and geographically among the oldest in India, is Sindhu. It is said to be the cradle of Vedic Hunduism. Please inform where we can find descriptions of her origin, *tīrthas* and cities on her bank and its confluence with the ocean. The description of Sindhu seems rare in the Purāṇas.

Can scholars give any explanation?

Please also let me know what specific area of the land was known as Sindhu-deśa in the Purāṇas and in other literary sources of India.

Yours
Kumari Shiva Priya Singh,
M. A. Geography (B. H. U.)

(3)
Volcano

Dear Sir,

I should like to know if the ancient Indians knew the phenomena of volcano. Indian literature abounds in references of earth-quakes. Are there similar references of volcanoes as well? What is the original Sanskrit word for valcanoes? Some say that the word ज्वालामुखी currently used in Hindi for volcanoes is of recent origin after the advent of English and that originally ज्वालामुखी might have meant the flame of fire but not volcanoes.

Yours faithfully,
A. P. Singh
Theoretical Research Unit
National Geographical Research Institute.
Hyderabad.

<div align="center">

(4)

Kanyākumārī Confluence of seas
</div>

Respected sir,

It is generally said that there is a confluence of two or three seas at Kanyākumārī. I am told that the tradition is quite old as Dara Sikoh wrote a book named Sāgara-saṅgama, implying confluence of two cultures. I should like to know the Puranic and other ancient sources for this tradition. Kindly also let me know the names of the seas which meet at Kanyākumārī.

<div align="right">

Yours faithfully,
Akash Vineet Sahai
B. H. U., Varanasi.
</div>

<div align="center">

(5)

Varāha and Kūrma Concepts
</div>

Dear sir,

In the Rāmacaritamānasa of Tulasīdāsa, at the time of Rāma's breaking of Śiva's bow, Lakṣmaṇa commands the elephants of the quarters, the tortoise, the snake and the boar to hold the earth firm so that it may not shake:

दिसि कुंजरहु कमठ अहि कोला। धरहु धरनि धरि धीर न डोला ॥ (१/२६०/१).

The order of the tortoise, snake and boar seems relevant. There is a beautiful iconographical representation of the idea at Maharaja's Palace, in the staircase leading to the Palace at Ramnagar Fort, Ramnagar, Varanasi. The above three are depicted there one above the other holding the earth (fort). The tortoise is placed lowest. The idea of tortoise supporting snake (Śeṣanāga) is again referred to in Tulasīdāsa's Rāmacaritamānasa 5.35.8 where Śeṣanāga has been described to bite at the back of the tortoise (his support) being unable to hold the earth at the time of the march of Rāma's army. The idea is said to have been inspired by a *śloka* of Hanumannāṭaka. I would like to know if the reference here to tortoise and the boar is to the Varāha-avatāra and the Kūrma-avatāra or they are independent of their avatāras and represent here the permanent astro-geological forces keeping the earth in balance. Have the scholars of Varāha myth studied this aspect?

Again Jayadeva in Dasāvatāra stotra says:

क्षितिरतिविपुलतरे तव तिष्ठति पृष्ठे। धर्यणधरणकिणचक्रगरिष्ठे । केशव धृत-कच्छपरूप!
जय जगदीश हरे ॥ (Gīta-govinda 1.1.2)

Unlike the other Puranic references, it is the earth and not the
Mandara mountain which is on the back of the tortoise. Again, the word
तिष्ठति suggests a stationary condition of the earth, and not the revolution
of the Mandara involved in the churning process. This seems to indicate,
not the story of the churning of the ocean, but the permanent position of
the earth. But again, here is another difficulty. In the tortoise-snake-bear
system (T-S-B system) tortoise does not support the earth directly; it
supports only the Śeṣanāga which in turn supports the boar which is the
direct support of the earth.

Is it that Jayadeva has confused the two traditions? Any way the
relationship, if any between the T-S-B system and the avatāra-theory needs
clarification. Normally avatāra is a temporary phenomenan conceived
with a particular event while the T-S-B system represents a permanent
phenomenon. Please help.

<div style="text-align: right">

Yours sincerely
Vishveshvari Devi
Kadamkuan, Patna
BIHAR

</div>

<div style="text-align: center">

(6)
Four-handed Kṛṣṇa

</div>

Sir,

The Vaiṣṇava tradition says that Śrīkṛṣṇa never went a step outside
Vṛndāvana. Classical Pandits find an interesting support for it in the
Bhāgavata 10. 39. 40-46 (Gita Press). Be as it may, but it remains true
that in Vṛndāvana, Bhāgavata never describes four-handed Kṛṣṇa, while
at Dvārakā, we find four-handed Kṛṣṇa. As is evidenced by the 60th
Adhyāya of 10th skandha where we find Kṛṣṇa consoling offended
Rukmiṇī with all his four hands (śl. 25-27). The same is irrevocably true
by the episode of Pauṇḍraka and Kāśirāja who claimed to be the real
Vāsudeva and added two fake hands. The famous śloka of Gītā, after the
exibition of Virāṭ-form by the Lord, does clearly indicate that four-handed
form of Kṛṣṇa was the normal form in the Mahābhārata battle: किरीटिनं
गदिनं चक्रहस्तमिच्छामि त्वां द्रष्टुमहं तथैव । तेनैव रूपेण चतुर्भुजेन सहस्रबाहो भव विश्वमूर्ते ॥

(II.46). The same is confirmed by व्यपेतभीः प्रीतमनाः पुनस्त्वं तदेव मे रूपमिदं प्रपश्य (11.49 b) and इत्यर्जुनं वासुदेवस्तथोक्त्वा स्वकं रूपं दर्शयामास भूयः (11.50a).

Some commentators have tried to show that the normal form of Lord Kṛṣṇa on the chariot was two-handed. But it seems to be twisting the meaning to a set purpose.

Now, Mr. Editor, I would request you to answer two questions:

1. Is there any other mention of four-handed Kṛṣṇa in Mahābhārta? The question is important, the Gītā being an integral part of Mahābhārata.

2. Which Purāṇas describe the two-handed Kṛṣṇa and which ones the four-handed form? Again, which of the Purāṇas, like Bhāgavata, contained the dual aspect of Kṛṣṇa?

<div style="text-align: right">

Yours sincerely
Sita Kant Mishra, M. A.
Darbhanga (Bihar)

</div>

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

A new endeavour

The totality of Purāṇa literature costitutes probably the largest and the oldest encyclopaedia of human knowledge. The pieces of information contained therein are so wide and various that it is virtually a gold-mine for inter-disciplinary studies. But the great volume of this literature is so prohibitive that it is impossible for anyone to master all this knowledge and information. The Purāṇas have another aspect too. They bear great popular interest which no academic study shoud ever ignore. So, we were thinking of starting a new Question-answer Column to provide information for inter-disciplinary studies and also to satisfy the public interest and curiosity. We put this suggestion to Padmabhusan Baladeva Upadhyaya, the venerable scholar of Varanasi. The nonagenarion scholar very enthusiastically offered to head the panel of the local scholars who might be requested to respond to the questions. The idea of setting up a panel is to assure the questioners that if they part in a question, they will at least get some response, and that too from eminent scholars. Their responses in no way dimish the necesity for a more thorough discussion by our national and foreign scholars. All such discussions will be published by us. Though now it is only a very small nucleus, but in due course it may develop into a BANK OF CLASSIFIED PURANIC INFORMATION. We solicit co-operation from our readers, scholars and public in general.

Puranic archaeology

We may note here two interesting phenomena. On one hand, we find that archaeology has unearthed about seven hundred or so Harappan sites of deserted cities, the identification of which remains obscure. On the other hand, there are hundreds of references to the cities and tīrthas in the Purāṇas, Upa-purāṇas and miscellanious puranic literatre published and unpublished. It may be an exercise worthwhile to compare these unlocated places with the Harappan sites. Correct identification in some cases is not impossible. Again, there are reports of new archaeological finds in Meghalaya indicating a traditional Hindu and Buddhist culture flourishing in these so-called tribal acas. Cannot a study of Puranic geography help us uncover this culture and identify the archaeological

finds? Not only that, even in cases of identified cities and tīrthas, new archaeological finds indicate different Puranic texts which may be collated. Again this archaeological evidence may go a long way in dating both the archaeological finds and the Puranic archaeology. It also brings out the need for the Puranic scholars to keep abreast of the new archaeological developments and to correlate them with Puranic knowledge. The whole thing needs a major reorientation of our outlook and the Government and its agencies like University Grants Commission should take a lead in this matter. We propose to do our small bit by starting a new column 'Archaeological Notes and Information' from our next issue. Its purpose will however be very limited. It is just to keep the Puranic scholars up to date with the archaeological studies. Of course, any detailed Puranic archaeological study by our contributors will always be welcome.

Time-Scale Tests

It is suggested that the name Sāketa is alien to the Puranic tradition. Cannot we use it as a time-scale test and say that the Purāṇas in which the word Sākata occurs, or at least those portions of the Purāṇas in which it occurs are of a comperatively late origin. In the present issue another time-scale test has been hinted at in the Supplementary Report of the Rāmāyaṇa workshop. The suggestion is that in most ancient period, rice was the most important crop of India and wheat as a cereal was unknown. This suggestion needs testing. There are no index verborums of Rāmāyaṇa and Purāṇas and a comprehensive index verborum, which includes even the textual variants, is a far cry. In absence of all these, the above testing is not very easy. Nevertheless, if the scholars find it true, it might be a valuable guide in regarding those Purāṇas or the portions of these which mention wheat as a foodstuff as comparatively later works. We request our scholars to comment on the Sāketa problem and the wheat problem.

BOOK REVIEW

SOME ASPECTS OF THE VARĀHA KATHĀ IN EPICS AND PURĀṆAS by Dr. Maheswari Prasad; pp. 183; published by Pratibha Prakashana, 29/5 Shaktinagar, Delhi-110007; price–Rs. 200.00.

The book under review contains a comparative and critical study on the legend of Varāha as found in the Purāṇas and the epics. It is gratifying to note that the author has used manuscript material also and thus has made his study as perfect as possible.

A careful reader of the book will surely observe that there is an element of sound judgement running through the book with evidence of deep study and scholarship. It would be no idle compliment to say that the pages of the book demand close and unfailing attention with concentration.

The author has traced here the origin of the Varāha myth, the kernel of the *kathā* and has reasonably shown the gradual development or long process of transformation of the *kathā*. In the course of discussion the author has admirably shown the earlier and later portions of the Purāṇas and the epics and has also shown in which text the *kathā* has been introduced in a later age. He has not failed to afford some reasons for the absence of the *kathā* in a particular Purāṇa and for the changes in the nature of Varāha. Author's observations on the variant readings in the Puranic verses and the conclusions drawn from them are in many places illuminating and I believe that a large number of these conclusions will be accepted by scholars.

The following two points may be taken into consideration by the author:

1. Puranic authors are found to use various words to denote a legend or tale, namely *kathā, ākhyāna, upākhāyana, carita* etc. Is there any particular reason for using the word *kathā* in connection with the Varāha legend ? So far as I know the word is not frequently used in connection with this legend. (In Mbh. Vana-p. 142. 63 *kathā* is used in connection with this legend).

2. It is surprising that nowhere the author says anything about the etymology or the derivative sense of the word Varāha. Nirukta 5.3 and 5.4 (with the commentaries), Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī on Dhātupāṭha 2. 2 may be

considered in this connection. According to Vāyu-p. 51. 30 Varāha is a kind of cloud.

I am to say something about a few inaccuracies: (1) Matsya-p. 248.44 does not read गोविन्द इति ततो (as has been quoted on p. 101), but गोविन्देति ततो. The reading गोविन्द इति ततो makes the line metrically defective. The form गोविन्देति is sanctioned by grammar. (2) In the use of *prātipadika* forms a few errors are found. *Parasmaipadi* (p. 84, fn. 1) is to be corrected to *parasmaipadin*.

(3) The only glaring mistake in spelling (or in proof correction) is found on p. 159, 1. 21, which reads *upabṛhmaṇa*; it requires to be corrected to *upabṛṁhaṇa*.

In some places the author has quoted articles of scholars without mentioning the Journal in which it was published (see p. 88, fn. 1). The name of the Journal is however given in the Bibliography (see p. 174). The process is clumsy. Similarly in some places the number of the volume and pages are given without giving the name of the Journal (p. 52). The Bibliography (p. 171) however mentions the name of the Journal.

Since the author is interested in the Purāṇas I would ask him to go through such works as Laghubhāgavatāmṛta of Rūpagosvāmin (with the commentary by Baladeva) and Bṛhadbhāgavatāmṛta of Sanātanagosvā-min with the auto-commentary in which the Puranic views about *avatāras* are given according to the Vaiṣṇava point of view (with 'chronological' considerations).

In conclusion I would request the author to append a collection of those highly charming Puranic *stutis* of Varāha that are composed in elegant metres. One of such *stutis* occurs in the Revā-khaṇḍa of Skanda-p. (149. 22) in the Śārdūla-vikrīḍita metre . According to the editor of the Vaṅgavāsī edition the verse has a double meaning-one referring to yajñavarāha-rūpī Hari and the other to devarūpī Hari.

R. S. Bhattacharya

1
MAHARAJ KUMAR DR. RAGHUBIR SINH
Of SITAMAU (MALWA)

Maharaj Kumar Dr. Raghubir Sinh (born on Feb. 23, 1908) breathed his last in the morning of Feb. 13, 1991 at Sitamau, Malwa. His life was full of diversity and he has scaled many peaks of a successful life. He inherited a legacy of opulence and empire but by the dint of his hard work acquired a leading position amongst the contemporary historians of our country. It was a rare amalgam of a person blessed by both Lakshmi and Saraswati. His special forte was the history of mediaeval India, in which area he was an undisputed authority. He had acquired an acute historical vision and critical ability to sift facts from fancies from his teacher the renowned historian Sir Jadunath Sarkar. He became in his lifetime the unique authority on the history of Malwa.

The life of Maharaj Kumar Dr. Raghubir Sinh was a unique synthesis of two contradictory attributes. On the one hand, he was an objective and impartial analyst of history devoid of all feelings of attachment. On the other hand, he was a sensitive human being who created literary gems of great pathos and emotional depth. His poetic essays have enriched Hindi Literature. The preface to his book शेष स्मृतियाँ (Surviving Memories) was written by the eminent critic Pandit Ramachandra Shukla who lavished fulsome praise on this book. The eulogistic comment by Pandit Shukla establishes the high place occupied by Maharaj Kumar as a top litterateur. Dr. Sinh was an emotional and sensitive person in his private life also, and his literary creations are a reflection of this aspect of his personality.

Maharaj Kumar had submitted a dissertation entitled 'Malwa in Transition' for the award of the D. Litt. degree in History to the Agra University. The examiners were so impressed by the scholarship and literary presentation of this work that the requirement of an oral examination was dispensed with and the Agra University awarded him the D. Litt. degree without viva. This happened to be the first D. Litt degree of the University. Maharaj Kumar was closely involved with the History of India project of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan. Many researchers have benefitted by the guidance and suggestions offered by Maharaj Kumar.

During the second World War Maharaj Kumar volunteered his services to the Indian Army and served at Vishakhapatnam, Madras, Peshawar, Rawalpindi, Quetta etc.

Maharaj Kumar played a very important constructive role in the merger of Indian states into the Indian Republic after independence. He also served as a prominent member of the Rajya Sabha for two terms beginning from 1952. He was an able parliamentarian and contributed significantly to the development of healthy parliamentary procedures. After his retirement from the Rajya Sabha he devoted himself full time to the service of his literary interests. He established the Natnagar Research Institute in Sitamau in 1975 and donated his priceless collection of books to this institute. On account of his able direction and careful nurturing this institute has become a prominent institution and now gets Government support for its multifarious activities.

Maharaj Kumar had very close and intimate friendly contact with the Kashiraj. He was one of the founder trustees of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. He was also a founder trustee of the Maharaj Banaras Vidya Mandir Trust and invariably attended all the functions organised by the two trusts. It was Dr. Raghubir Sinhji who read out the felicitation for the king of Nepal, Sri Mahendra Vikrama Shah Dev presented by the All-India Kashiraj Trust in 1965.

I had the privilege of meeting the Maharaj Kumar and obtaining his parental blessings whenever he came to attend the functions of the Kashiraj Trust. My last meeting was in March 1988 when Maharaj Kumar came to participate in the marriage of Yuvaraj Sri Anant Narain Singhji. Though he was in frail health and needed support in walking and his sight was also failing his sensitive heart was as full of vitality as that of a young man of sixteen.

We have lost not only an erudite historian but also a compassionate and sensitive litterateur. Every one has to be bound by the fetters of time, 'वायुरनिलमथेदं भस्मान्तं शरीरम्' Iśa-up. 17

We pay our homage to the departed soul.

—Ganga Sagar Rai

2
DR. RAGHUNATH SINGH

Dr. Raghunath Singh passed away on April 27, 1992 at his home in Gheehatta, (Aurangabad) Varanasi. Dr. Singh had been a senior freedom fighter, able parliamentarian, sharp lawyer and an erudite scholar. Probity in public life was his hall mark.

Dr. Raghunath Singh was born on the fourteenth day of the bright half of Vaiśākha (a day hallowed as Nṛsiṁha Jayantī) in the year 1908 AD in the village Khewali near Rameshwar in the vicinity of Varanasi. The maternal grand-father of Dr. Singh's father, Sri Batuk Nath Singh, lived in Varanasi City and young Raghunath's upbringing and education took place in that holy city. Later on he inherited the vast properties of this family. He passed M. A. (History) and LL.B. examinations of the Banaras Hindu University.

Dr. Singh had been greatly influenced even in his childhood by the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and he incurred the wrath of the British imperialism for the first time at the tender age of 12. The brutal treatment received by him at the hands of the Imperial Government attracted the attention of the Mahatma, who deplored such acts in his paper 'Young India'. This was, however, only the beginning and Raghunath Singh underwent incarceration several times for a total period exceeding several years. After independence, he represented Varanasi in the Lok Sabha for three consecutive five-year terms from 1952 to 1967.

Dr. Singh did not permit his busy public and political schedule to hinder his literary activities. After retiring from the Lok Sabha he devoted himself full time to the cultivation and enhancement of his academic interests. He obtained the Ph. D. and D. Litt. degrees at an age when persons usually think of closing down their affairs. His literary activities and interests ranged over a vast area spanning Vedic studies, Buddhist Philosophy, Economics etc., but his first love always remained the historical studies pertaining to Kashmir. Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī, which describes the historical developments in Kashmir from the Mahābhārata War to 1149 AD, in 7826 Ślokas is specially famous in this field. Dr. Singh brought out a scholarly translation of this vast text in 4 parts. He also published translations of the various other Rājataraṅgiṇīs authored by Jonaraja, Śrīvara and Śrī Śuka. These texts cover the history of Kashmir upto 1540 AD. In addition to these translations which made these

erudite texts on the history of Kashmir available to a wider reader, Dr. Singh himself authored a Rājataraṅgiṇī in Sanskrit Ślokas covering the period 1540 A. D. to 1975 AD. In this way, Dr. Singh has made available an authentic history of Kashmir from the Mahābhārata War to the present age in an easily intelligible form.

In addition to his historical studies on Kashmir, Dr. Singh brought out a thorough study of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. His Buddha-Kathā is an authentic history of the Buddhist religion. He has contributed to the literature in the form of political essays, Travelogues, stories and novels. All of these are highly rated for their deep analysis and literary merit.

Dr. Singh was a man of probity, a successful practiser and expositer of Gandhian philosophy and a dedicated person who was almost completely free of self-interest. He was a shining example of honesty and integrity in public life. He never aspired to benefit from his public activities and he guarded his vast resources as a trustee for the future generation. He had no issue and his wife passed away many years before his death. There is no known instance of an aspesion being cast on his personal character throughout a long and distinguished career in public life. Surrounded by plenty of wealth, authority as well as social status he led a life of an ascetic. He was an embodiment of the old traditions of Varanasi and of simple village life.

Dr. Singh possessed considerable administrative skill and he served as the Chairman of Indian Zinc Board and Indian Shipping Board for some time. Both these organisations prospered under his stewardship. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the UCO Bank for an extended period and contributed significantly to its working and policies.

Dr. Singh was for a long time a trustee appointed by the Govt. of India in the All-Indian Kashiraj Trust. The trust benefitted greatly during these years through his experience, erudition and vital interest in the activities of the Trust. He religiously and scrupulously attended all conferences, functions and activities organised by the Trust. Even when he was unable to move freely he participated in the activities of the trust, taking help from an attendant. He had immense respect and affection for the Kashiraj Maharaj Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh as is evident from this short note he addressed to the latter: 'अनन्त श्री विभूषित धर्मप्राण काशिराज को इस अकिञ्चन का शतशः प्रणाम–रघुनाथसिंह' ।

His death has not only deprived the Kashiraj Trust of a valued guide and friend but the whole area of academic, educational and literary

activities has suffered a loss. Kashi has lost an honest, sincere and learned son.

Some of his important contributions are as follows:

1. कल्हणकृता राजतरङ्गिणी (in 4 volumes)

2. जोनराजकृता राजतरङ्गिणी, 3. श्रीवरकृता राजतरङ्गिणी (in 3 volumes); 4. श्रीशुककृता राजतरङ्गिणी, 5. श्री रघुनाथसिंह–कृता राजतरङ्गिणी (in 2 volmes); 6. कौटिल्य-अर्थशास्त्र (in 3 volumes); 6. काश्मीर कीर्तिकलश, 7. काश्मीर कीर्ति शिखर 8. काश्मीर कीर्तिशेष, 9. धर्मनिरपेक्ष राज्य, 10. आधुनिक राजनीति का क ख ग, 10. जागृत नेपाल 11. ऋग्वेद कथा, 12. बुद्ध कथा, 13. रामायण कथा, 14. विश्व के धर्म प्रवर्तक, 15. आर्याना, 16. आस्ट्रेलिया, 17. सर्वधर्म समभाव, 18. दक्षिण पूर्व एशिया, 19. भिखारिणी, 20. इन्द्रजाल, 21. संस्कार, 22. मैं, 23. कहाँ, 24. एक कोना, 25. चौर,ा 26. लावारिस, 27. जवाहरलाल नेहरू का महाप्रयाण 28. Towards Freedom 29. Consider 30. World Chronology etc.

We pay our homage to the departed soul.

–Ganga Sagar Rai

3
PROF. J. GONDA

Professor Jan Gonda, one of the members of the Editorial Board of the Purana Bulletin of the All-India Kashiraj Trust died on the 28th of July, 1991 at the ripe age of 86 years. Prof. Gonda was a member of the Royal Dutch Academy and of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was an eminent scholar of Sanskrit and Indology of international repute. His selected Studies, I-V (Thematically arranged papers) were presented to him on the occasion of his 70th birth-day in 1975. Volume VI, in two parts, containing his papers written during 1971-91 and arranged chronologically was published as a Commemoration Volume just after his demise. Prof. Gonda was also a contributor to the Purana Bulletin of the All-India Kashiraj Trust from its beginning.

We pay our respectful homage to the memory of the great savant.

—**Ganga Sagar Rai**

ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

Garḍa Purāṇa Work

During this period the Critical Apparatuses of Chaptrs 211 to 225 of the Ācārakhaṇḍa of the Garuḍa Purāṇa were written. The Critical Apparatuses of remaing four chapters will be completed soon. In the coming year, we are planing to start the printing of the Critical edition of the Ācārakhaṇḍa of the Garuḍa Purāṇa.

Work on Tīrthas

The collation of the Ayodhyā Māhātmya of the Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa is in progress. As reported, we have procured about twenty manuscripts of the text. Recently, we have received one manuscript from the Government Sanskrit College, Calcutta and another from the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore. Besides this , we have started the collation work of another Ayodhyāmāhātmya, which belongs to the Rudrayāmalatantra.

Publication of the Unpublished
Mss of the Purāṇas

As reported earlier, we have procured two manuscripts of the Vahni Purāṇa from the India Office Library. Work on these manuscripts will be taken up after procuring the Ms. from the Asiatic Society, Calcutta. The work of Mānasa-khaṇḍa is also in progress. Meanwhile, we have taken the work of editing the Vāsiṣṭhī Liṅga Purāṇa. Three manuscripts of this Purāṇa are deposited in the Sarasvati Bhandar Library of His Highness, the Maharaja of Benares. We will report the contents of this text soon.

Veda-Pārāyaṇa

The traditional recitation of the Taittirīya Śākhā of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda was organised by the All-India Kashiraj Trust at the temple of Vyāseśvara during the Śukla Pakṣa of Māgha. On this occasion the Taittirīya Saṁhitā of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda was recited. The reciter was Pt. Sundar Ram Sharma and the Śrotā of the recitation was Pt. Shri Ram Murti Ghanapathi. At the end of the Pārāyaṇa presents were given to the reciter and the śrotā and their travelling expenses were also taken care of.

Visitors to the Purāṇa Department

During this period following scholars visited the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. Some of them recorded their opinions also, which are given here:—

1. Mr. I. Corrion, Special Correspondent of El Pais, the first newspaper of Spain, on 19. 1. 1993. He comments:—

"Aquil pasado no es inhospito sino acogedor, Y lo cierto es que el momento presente se desdibuja hasta perder toda su importancia. Una visit memorable."

"(Here the past is not inhospitable but welcoming the feeling of time fades away till it loses all its importance. A great visit.)"

2. Prof. Virendra N. Sharma, Professor of Astronomy & Physics, University of Wisconsin, U. S. A. on 4. 2. 1993. He writes:—

"It was a pleasure to talk to Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. The Fort of Ramnagar has a very valuable Islamic globe engraved in 1225 A. H. I beleave the scholars have no idea about it. Similarly, there are models of instruments, one sees at Jantar-Mantar of Jaipur. In addition, there are some instruments constructed according to Hindu Books. I must say that the time, I spent at the fort in the company of the Maharaja was very exciting and worth-while."

3. Dr. (Smt.) B. Sommaiah, Department of Basic Principles, Faculty of Ayurveda, B. H. U. on 4. 2. 1993. She comments:—

"It is really nice library preserving all the ancient books of Purāṇas. I pay special thank to staff of the Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh."

4. Dr. Pratibha Samal and Dr. Pranava Jyoti, Department of Basic Principles, Faculty of Ayurveda, B. H. U. on 4. 2. 1993.

5. Mr. Govind Vithal, Shivala Varanasi on 18. 2. 1993.

6. Dr. Uma Marina Vasci, 25/117, Shakti Nagar, Delhi visited on 18. 2. 1993 and took some important pieces of information for her tutorial work.

7. Prof. David Kinsley and Dr. Randal F. Schnoor, Department of Religious Studies, Mc Master University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada visited on 1. 3. 1993 and saw the collation the Purāṇas.

8. Dr. K. Chadramauli, Bombay on 1. 3. 1993.

9. Dr. Reinhold Grunendal, University Library, Department of Indology, University of Gottingen, Germany on 1. 3. 1993.

10. Dr. E. R. Ramabai, Reader in the Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras on 15. 5. 1993. She comments:—

"I am much impressed by the working of the Purāṇa Department. The Museum is well maintained by the staff of the department."

11. Dr. N. Gangadharan, Reader in the Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras on 15. 5. 1993.

12. Dr. G. Krishnamoorthy, 10, 3rd Main Road, Madras, on 15. 5. 1993.

13. Neena Srivastava a post-graduate student in the Department of Geography, B. H. U. on 12. 6. 1993.

Besides these many scholars of the different Colleges and Universities visited the Purāṇa department for consulting Puranic texts and they were helped by the department.

ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

1. Maharaja Banaras Vidyamandir Trust.

(a) DHRUPADAMELĀ

The Nineteenth Dhrupad Melā was held at Dhrupada Tīrtha, Tulsi Ghat on 17, 18, 19 February 1993 under the auspices of Maharaja Banaras Vidya Mandir Nyas. This year, some financial assistance was also provided by the North Central Cultural Zone.

Eminent dhrupadias and pakhawajis from all over the Country participated in the Melā. Some of the prominent musicians were Pt. Siyaram Tiwari, Pt. Vidur Mallick, Ustad Sayeeduddin Dagar, Raja Chhatrapati Singh, Swami Pagaldas, Pt. Jotin Bhattacharya, Dr. Ritwik Sanyal, Smt. Ashoka Dhar, Sushri Aloka Nandy and many others. Foreigners both men and women performed with excellence the art music of dhrupad this year.

The Swati Tiremal Travancore Award was given to eminent pakhawajis Pt. Ramji Upadhyaya & Pt. Laxmi Narayan Pawar.

(b) MAṄGALOTSAVA

The annual maṅgalotsava was organised on 9th March, 1993. Several talented singers from Varanasi gave their recitals. Instrumental music also played an important role during the Maṅgalotsava. The Maṅgalotsava was organised in the Dīwānakhānā of the Ramnagar, Fort. Officials and citizens from Varanasi and Ramnagar listened to the performance and delighted in the meliferous cadencies of Hindustani music.

The festival was also attended by the eminent foreign scholars, the fond of Hindustani music.

2. Maharaja Udit Narain Singh Mānasa Pracāra Nidhi

Under auspices of the Maharaja Udit Narain Singh Mānasa Prachara Nidhi a nine-day pravacana (discourse) and pārāyaṇa of the Rāmacaritamānasa were organised in the Kālī temple of Chakia. The Navāha-pārāyaṇa was performed from Vaiśākha Śukla pratipadā to Vaiśākha Śukla Navamī, 2050 Vikram Era, (23rd April to 1st May, 1993). As usual a large number of citizens attended the pravacanas

(discourses), which were also daily attended by His Highness the Maharaja of Benares. On the last day (Vaiśākha Śukla Navamī) Brāhmaṇa-bhojana (feeding of Brāhmaṇas) was arranged and gifts were distributed.

The 36th Session of the All-India
Oriental Conference

The 36th session of the All-India Oriental Conference was held in Poona on 28-30 May, 1993. Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai represented the conference as represetative of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. Dr. Rai contacted the scholars and apprised them about the activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. It was resolved in the Conference that a separate section of epics and Purāṇas is necessary as the classical section is so big that it could not be possible to held proper discussions on all the papers. The final decision will be taken in the next session to be held in Rohtak in 1995. Dr. N. Gangadharan of Madras University also contacted the scholars in this regard.

Chairman's visit to Kanchipuram

Chairman, His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh visited Kāncīpuram on the invitation of His Holiness Jagadguru Sankaracharya of Kanchi Kamakoti Pīṭham to attend the Kanakābhiṣekam of His Holiness Jagadguru Śaṅkarācārya Mahāsvāmī Śrī Chandrashekharendra Sarasvati Svami in connection with his centenary celebrations at Kāncīpuram on the 26th of May 1993. His Highness was accompanied by Yuvraj Ananta Narain Singh Bahadur on this occasion.

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम्
(जनवरी–जून १९९३)

गरुडपुराणकार्यम्

कार्यावधावस्मिन् गरुडपुराणस्याचारखण्डस्य २११ तः २२५ पर्यन्तानामध्यायानां पाठसमीक्षोप-
करणं निर्मितम् । अग्रिमचतुर्णामध्यायानामपि पाठसमीक्षोपकरणकार्यमाश्वेव पूर्णतां प्राप्स्यति ।
अग्रिमवर्षे गरुडपुराणस्थाचारखण्डस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंस्करणस्य मुद्रणकार्यस्य प्रारम्भाय संनद्धा
वयम् ।

तीर्थसम्बन्धिकार्याणि

स्कन्दपुराणान्तर्गतवैष्णवखण्डीयायोध्यामाहात्म्यस्य पाठसंवादकार्यं वर्धिष्णु । प्रायः विंशतिहस्तलेखा
अस्माभिः प्राप्ताः । सद्य एव कालिकातास्थ-सर्वकार-संस्कृत-महाविद्यालयात् मैसूरविश्वविद्यालयीय-
प्राच्यशोधसंस्थानाच्च हस्तलेखौ प्राप्तौ । एतदतिरिक्तमस्माभी रुद्रयामलतन्त्रस्थत्रिंशदध्यात्म-
कायोध्यामाहात्म्यस्यापि पाठसंवादकार्यं प्रारब्धम् ।

पौराणिकाप्रकाशितहस्तलेखप्रकाशनकार्यम्

वह्नि (अग्नि)-पुराणस्य द्वौ हस्तलेखावानीतौ इण्डिया-आफिस-लाइब्रेरीत अस्माभि- रिति तु
पूर्वमेव विज्ञापितम् । एतद्धस्तलेखद्वयसम्बन्धिकार्यं कालिकातास्थएसियाटिक-सोसायटीतः
हस्तलेखप्राप्त्यनन्तरं प्रारप्स्यते । मानस-खण्डकार्यमपि वर्धिष्णु । अत्रान्तरेऽस्माभिः वशिष्ठीलिङ्ग-
पुराणस्य सम्पादनकार्यमप्युररीकृतम् । पुराणस्यास्य त्रयो हस्तलेखाः तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशानां
सरस्वतीभण्डारग्रन्थालये संरक्षिताः । एतद्विषये वयं शीघ्रमेव विज्ञापयिष्यामः ।

वेदपारायणम्

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन व्यासेश्वरमन्दिरे कृष्णयजुर्वेदीय-तैत्तिरीयशाखायाः पारायण-
मायोजितम् माघमासस्य शुक्ले पक्षे । अस्मिन्नवसरे कृष्णयजुर्वेदस्य तैत्तिरीयसंहितायाः परायणं
जातम् । पारायणकर्ता पण्डितसुन्दररामशर्ममहोदयः, पारायणश्रोता चासीत् पण्डितश्रीराममूर्ति
धनपाठिमहोदयः । पारायणसमाप्तौ पारायणकर्तृश्रोतृभ्यां दक्षिणा, मार्गव्ययादिकञ्च प्रदत्तम् ।

पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

अस्मिन् कार्यावधावधोलिखिता विद्वांसः सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागे आगताः, तेषु
केचनालिखञ्च तद्विषये तथाहि –

१. श्री आई. कोरियन-स्पेन-देशीय-सर्वप्रथम-समाचारपत्रस्य विशेषसंवाददाता १९-१-१९९३
दिनाङ्के । स निरूपयति–'अत्रत्यानि भूतकालिकवस्तूनि नानातिथ्यानि, अपितु
तात्कालिकनष्टप्रभावानां रक्षकाणि । सुखावहोऽभ्यागमः ।'

२. प्रो. वीरेन्द्र एन. शर्मा—संयुक्तराज्यामेरिकादेशीय—विस्कोन्सिन-विश्वविद्यालयस्य   खगोल भौतिकशास्त्रविभागीय: प्राचार्य: ४-२-१९९३ दिनाङ्के । स लिखति—

'तत्रभवता डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मणा सह अत्यानन्ददायिका वार्ता सञ्जाता । रामनगरस्थदुर्गे एका महत्वपूर्णा यावनिका गोला १२२५ यावनिकशाके मुद्रिताऽस्ति । आशासेऽहं शोधार्थिनां नास्ति ज्ञानमस्मिन् विषये । एवमेव, सन्ति यन्त्राणामुपमानान्यपि, तेष्वेकं तु जयपुरस्थ—जन्तर-मन्तरे रक्षितोपमानवत् । हिन्दू-धर्मशास्त्रानुसारत: विरचितानि कानिचिच्चन्त्राण्यपि सन्ति । तत्रभवतां महाराजानां सान्निध्ये य: मदीय: काल: व्यतीत:, स प्रोत्साहक: सफलश्चेति वक्तुं क्षमोऽहम् ।'

३. डॉ. (श्रीमती) बी. सोमैय्या—काशीहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयीय—आयुर्वेदसंकायस्य मौलिकसिद्धान्त-विभागीया—४-२-१९९३ दिनाङ्के । सा अङ्कते ।

'वस्तुत: मनोरमोऽयं पुस्तकालय: पुराण-संबद्धानि सर्वाणि प्राच्यपुस्तकानि संरक्षति । तत्रभवतां महाराजानां डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मणां सर्वेभ्यो नियोगिगणेभ्यो विशेषधन्य-वादान् वितरामि ।'

४. डॉ. (श्रीमती) प्रतिभा समल, डॉ. (श्रीमती) प्रणव ज्योति च—काशी हिन्दू-विश्वविद्यालयीयायुर्वेदसङ्कायस्य मौलिकसिद्धान्तविभागीये—४. २. १९९३ दिनाङ्के ।

५. श्री गोविन्द विट्ठल:—शिवाला, वाराणसी-वास्तव्य: १८-२-१९९३ दिनाङ्के ।

६. डॉ. (श्रीमती) उमा मेरिना वाश्ची—२५/११७, शक्तिनगर-दिल्ली-वास्तव्या १९-२-१९९३ दिनाङ्के आगत्य स्व शैक्षणिककार्यार्थं काश्चन ससूचनाश्च संगृहीतवती ।

७. प्रो. डेविड किन्स्ले, डॉ. रन्दाल एफ. स्कनूर-महोदयश्च—कनाडा-देशस्य हैमिल्टन-ओण्टा-रियोस्थ-मैक्-मास्टर-विश्वविद्यालयस्य धर्मशिक्षाविभागीयौ १. ३. १९९३ दिनाङ्के आगत्य पौराणिकपाठसंवादकार्याणि दृष्टवन्तौ ।

८. डॉ. के. चन्द्रमौलि-महोदय: मुम्बईवास्तव्य: १. ३. १९९३ दिनाङ्के ।

९. डॉ. रीइंहोल्ड गुनेण्डॉल-महोदय: जर्मनीदेशीय-गोटिंजन-विश्वविद्यालयस्य भारतीयशास्त्र-विभागस्य विश्वविद्यालयीय-पुस्तकालयीय: १-३-१९९३ दिनाङ्के ।

१०. डॉ. (श्रीमती) ई. आर. रामाबाई—मद्रासविश्वविद्यालयीय—संस्कृतप्राध्यापिका—१५. ५. १९९३ दिनाङ्के । सा अङ्कते—'पुराणविभागीयकार्यं द्रष्ट्वा सर्वथा प्रभाविताऽहम् । दुर्गस्थसङ्ग्रहालयो विभागीयकार्यकर्तृभि: सुसज्जित: ।'

११. डॉ. एन्. गङ्गाधरन्—मद्रासविश्वविद्यालयस्य संस्कृतप्राध्यापक: १५. ५. १९९३ दिनाङ्के ।

१२. डॉ. जी. कृष्णमूर्ति-महोदय:—मद्रासवास्तव्य: १५. ५. १९९३ दिनाङ्के ।

१३. नीना श्रीवास्तवा—काशीहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयस्य भूगोलविभागस्य स्नातकोत्तरकक्षाया: छात्री १२. ६. १९९३ दिनाङ्के ।

एतदतिरिक्तम्, विभिन्नमहाविद्यालयानां विश्वविद्यालयानाञ्च छात्रा: पुराणविषयक-सामग्रीसङ्कलनार्थं पुराणविभागे आगता: । तेभ्य: अपेक्षिता सहायता प्रदत्ता ।

सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

१. महाराज-बनारस-विद्यामन्दिर-न्यासः

(क) ध्रुपदमेला

एकोनविंशतितमो ध्रुपद-मेलापकः वाराणस्यां तुलसी-घट्टे १९९३ वर्षस्य फरवरी-मासस्य १७-१९ दिनाङ्केषु संपन्नः । अस्मिन् वर्षे 'उत्तरमध्यसांस्कृतिकजोन' संस्थया अपि काचिदार्थिकी सहायता प्रदत्ता ॥

प्रमुख-ध्रुपदकलाकाराः पखावजविशेषज्ञाश्च मेलापके स्वकलायाः प्रदर्शनं कृतवन्तः येषु पं. सियाराम तिवारी, पं. विदुर मल्लिक, डॉ. सयीदुद्दीन डागर प्रभृतयः प्रमुखः आसन् । स्वातितिरूमाल-ट्रावनकोर-पुरस्कारः पं. रामजी उपाध्याय, पं. लक्ष्मी नारायण पवार-महोदयाभ्यां प्रदत्तः ।

(ख) मङ्गलोत्सवः

आयोजितः खलु वार्षिकः मङ्गलोत्सवः ९. ३. १९९३ दिनाङ्के। वाराणसेयाः वादकण्ठसङ्गीतज्ञाः सुष्ठु प्रदर्शनं कृतवन्तः मङ्गलोत्सवे । मङ्गलोत्सवोऽयं रामनगर-दुर्गस्थ-'दीवानाखाना'-स्थाने आयोजितः । वाराणसीस्थाः रामनगरस्थाश्चाधिकारिणो नागरिकाश्च भारतीय-सङ्गीत-श्रवणस्यानन्दमनुभूतवन्तः ।

मङ्गलोत्सवे भारतीय-सङ्गीतप्रेमिण अनेके विशिष्टा वैदेशिका अपि उपस्थिता आसन् ।

२. महाराजउदितनानारायणसिंह-मानस-प्रचार-निधिः

श्रीरामचरितमानसस्य नवाहपारायणं प्रवचनञ्चायोजितं चकियानगरस्थे कालीमन्दिरे महाराजउदितनारायणसिंह-मानस-प्रचार-निधिना । नवाहपारायणमिदं २०५० वैक्रमाब्दस्य वैशाखमासस्य शुक्लपक्षस्य प्रतिपदातो वैशाख-शुक्ल-नवमीं (२३ अप्रैलतः १ मई १९९३) यावदायोजितम् । प्रवचनकालेषु बहवो भक्ता उपस्थिता आसन् । तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्माणोऽपि प्रवचनसमयेषूपस्थिता आसन् । अन्तिमे दिवसे (वैशाख-शुक्ल-नवम्याम्) ब्राह्मण-भोजनस्य प्रसाद-वितरणस्य चायोजनं जातम् ।

अखिलभारतीय-प्राच्यविद्यासम्मेलनस्य षटिंत्रशत्तमं सत्रम्

१९९३ वर्षीय-मईमासस्य २८-30 दिनाङ्केषु सर्वभारतीय-प्राच्यविद्या-सम्मेलनस्य षट्त्रिंशत्तमं सत्रं सम्पन्नं पुण्यपत्तननगरे । सम्मेलने सर्वभारतीयकाशिराज्यन्यासस्य प्रतिनिधि-रूपेणासीदुपस्थित: डॉ. गङ्गासागरराय-महोदयः । डॉ. रायः विद्वद्भिः सह सम्पर्कं स्थापितवान्, सर्वभारतीयकाशिराज्यन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणमपि सूचितवान् । सम्मेलने पारितं यत् पुराणइतिहास-विषयकस्य एकस्य पृथ्गिविभागस्यावश्यकता शास्त्रीय-विभागवदस्ति, परन्तु सर्वोपस्थापितपत्रोपरि वार्ताऽसम्भवासीत् । विषयेऽस्मिन् १९९५ तमे वर्षे रोहतक-नगरे सम्पद्यमाने सत्रेऽन्तिमनिर्णयः भवितेति । मद्रासविश्वविद्यालयीयः डॉ. एन. गङ्गाधरन्-महोदयोऽप्यस्मिन् विषये विद्वद्भिः सह स्थापितवान् सम्पर्कम् ।

न्यासाध्यक्षाणां काञ्ची-यात्रा

न्यासाध्यक्षास्तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशमदेवाः काञ्ची-कामकोटि-पीठाधीश्वरैर्भगवद्भिः जगद्गुरुशङ्कराचार्यैराहूताः सन् मई मासस्य २६ तमे दिनाङ्के भगवतां जगद्गुरुशङ्कराचार्यमहास्वामि-श्रीचन्द्रशेखरेन्द्रसरस्वती-स्वामिनां शतकोत्सवे आयोजिते कनकाभिषेके उपस्थित्यर्थं काञ्चीपुरम् अगच्छन् । अस्मिन्नवसरे युवराजः श्री अनन्त-नारायणसिंहोऽपि तत्रभवद्भिः काशिनरेशैः सहागच्छत् ।

SUPPLEMENT

TO

पुराणम्

PURĀṆA

VOL. XXXV., NO. 2; JULY 1993
(Index to Vols. XXXI to XXXV
A-Classified Subject-Index
B-author-Index)

PREPARED
by
OSCAR PUJOL M.A.

ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT, RAMNAGAR, VARANASI.

PURĀṆA

	Year	Volume	past	Pages
January,	1989	XXXI	1	1-14+1-90 + 1-10 + 283-322
July,	1989	XXXI	2	91-173 + 1-24 + 323-410
January,	1990	XXXII	1	i-viii + 1-249 + 1-12
July,	1990	XXXII	2	i-v + 251-466 + 1-6
January,	1991	XXXIII	1	1-127 + 1-30
July,	1991	XXXIII	2	1-163 + 1-236
January,	1992	XXXIV	1	1-111 + 1-28
July,	1992	XXXIV	2	1-92
January,	1993	XXXV	1	1-135
July,	1993	XXXV	2	137-268+1-32

A-SUBJECT-INDEX
I. PURĀṆA-GENERAL
EDITION OF SANSKRIT TEXTS

STOTRAS & MAHIMĀS

TEXT & TEXTUAL CRITICISM

LITERATURE, GRAMMAR & LEXICOGRAPHY

21. Dr. Raghunath Singh (obituary)
    By Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai

22. J. Gonda (obituary)
    By Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai

BOOK REVIEWS

ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

II PURĀṆ-PARTICULAR AND RRELATED WORKS

(1) ANANDARĀMĀYAṆA

(2) BHĀGAVATA PURĀṆA

BHATTACHARYA, R. S. PUṛĀṇA DEPTT