

Vol. XXXVII, No.1]

[January 1995

# पुराणम् PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

*Published with the financial assistance from the Rastriya Sanskrit Sansthan,  
New Delhi*

MĀGHA-PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



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

Annual Sub.-Inland Rs. 200/-

Foreign \$ 30

## सम्पादक-मण्डल

- डा. रामकरण शर्मा  
भूतपूर्व कुलपति, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी; नयी दिल्ली  
डा. रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर  
भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे  
डा. जोर्जो बोनाजोली

### EDITORIAL BOARD

- Dr. R.K. Sharma  
Formerly Vice-Chancellor, Sampurnanad Sanskrit University,  
Varanasi; 63 Vigyan Vihar, New Delhi - 110092.  
Dr. R.N. Dandekar  
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune  
Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli, M.A. (Milan); M. Th. (Rome)

### EDITOR

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

### ASSOCIATE EDITORS

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

-----

लेखेषु प्रतिपादितानि मतोऽपि लेखकैरेवाभ्युपगतानि; न पुनस्तानि  
सम्पादकैर्न्यासेन वाभ्युपगतानीति विज्ञेयम् ।

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

Authors are requested to use Devanāgarī characters while writing Sanskrit ślokas and prose passages. They are also requested to follow the system of transliteration adopted by the International Congress of Orientalists at Athens in 1912 [ऋ = r̄, च् = c; छ् = ch; ट् = t; श् = ś; ष् = ṣ; ढ् = 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

Vol. XXXVII. No. 1]

[February 14, 1995

## माघपूर्णिमाङ्कः

MĀGHA-PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

Contents-लेखसूची

	Pages
1. गङ्गास्तोत्रम् संग्राहकः रमापद चक्रवर्ती वाराणसी	1-2
2. Heretical doctrines in the Purāṇas [पुराणगतानि नास्तिकमतानि] By Dr. R.N. Dandekar ; Bhandarkar Oriental Research Intitute-Pune.	3-20
3. Some Puranic records on Śūdras [शूद्रविषयकाणि पुराणवचनानि] By Prof. S. G. Kantawala, M.A., Ph.D. ; Dept. of Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit, M. S. University of Baroda, Baroda.	21-26
4. Development of a theory of creation [सृष्टिपरस्य मतविशेषस्य विकासः] By S. Jena, M.A., Ph.D. ; 395/L F.M. Nagar P.O.-Baramunda Colony Bhuvaneswar, Orissa 751003.	27-37

5. Genesis of Kubera in the Epics and Purāṇas 38-48  
[इतिहासपुराणोक्ता कुबेरोत्पत्तिः]  
By C. Satapathy ;  
Nayagarh College  
Nayagarh, Orissa 752069.
6. Role of Compassion in the Puranic thoughts 49-73  
By Prof. Asoke Chatterjee Sastri, M.A.; Ph.D.;  
Dept. of Sanskrit  
Calcutta University.
7. Lesser known minor Purāṇas 74-78  
By Dr. N. Gangadharan, M.A., Ph.D.;  
Director,  
Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute  
Bombay.
8. Identity of Hiraṇyanābha—A 79-86  
Kṣatriya yogin  
By Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, M.A. Ph.D.;  
Vyakaranacharya;  
All-India Kashiraj Trust.  
Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi.
9. The Upper date of Ayodhyā-māhātmya of 87-101  
Skanda Purāṇa  
By Dr. Jahnvi Shekhar Roy ;  
All-India Kashiraj Trust,  
Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi.
10. A proto-kāṇḍa division of the Rāmāyaṇa 102-112  
as reflected in later Rāma kāvyas.  
By Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai, M.A., Ph.D.;  
All-India Kashiraj Trust  
Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi
11. Book Reviews 113-114
12. Question Box 115-118
13. Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust 119-124
14. सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम् 125-129

## गङ्गास्तोत्रम् (अगस्तिमुनि-विरचितं गङ्गाष्टकम्)

भगवति भवलीलामौलिमाले तवाम्भः-  
कणमणुपरिमाणं प्राणिनो ये स्पृशन्ति ।  
अमरनगरनारीचामरग्राहिणीनां  
विगतकलिकलङ्कातङ्कमङ्के लुठन्ति ॥ १

ब्रह्माण्डं खण्डयन्ती हरशिरसि जटावल्लिमुल्लासयन्ती  
स्वर्लोकादापतन्ती कनकगिरिगुहागण्डशैलात् स्वलन्ती ।  
क्षोणीपृष्ठे लुठन्ती दुरितचयचमूनिर्भरं भक्षयन्ती  
पाथोधिं पूरयन्ती सुरनगरसरित् पावनी नः पुनातु ॥ २

मज्जन्मातङ्गकुम्भच्युतमदमदिरामौलिमत्तालजालं  
स्नाने सिद्धाङ्गनानां कुचयुगविगलत्कुङ्कुमासङ्गपिङ्गाम् ।  
सायं प्रातर्मुनीनां शयकुसुमचयैश्छन्नतीरस्थतीरं  
पायान्नो गाङ्गमम्भः करिकरभकराक्रान्तरहस्तरङ्गम् ॥ ३

आदावादिपितामहस्य नियमव्यापारपात्रे जलं  
पश्चात्पन्नगशायिनो भगवतः पादोदकं पावनम् ।  
भूयः शम्भुजटाविभूषणमणिर्जह्मोर्महर्षेरियं  
कन्या कल्मषनाशिनी भगवती भागीरथी दृश्यते ॥ ४

शैलेन्द्रादवतारिणी निजजले मज्जज्जनोत्तारिणी  
पारावार-विहारिणी भवभयश्रेणीसमुत्सारिणी ।  
शेषाहेरनुकारिणी हरशिरोवल्लीदलाकारिणी  
काशीभूतिविहारिणी विजयते गङ्गा मनोहारिणी ॥ ५

कुतोऽवीचिर्वीचिस्तव यदि गता लोचनपथं  
त्वमापीता पीताम्बरपुरनिवासं वितरसि ।  
त्वदुत्सङ्गे गङ्गे पतति यदि कायस्तनुभृतां  
तदा मातः शातक्रतवपदलाभोऽप्यतिलघुः ॥ ६

भगवति तव तीरे नीरमात्राशनोऽहं  
 विगतविषयतृष्णः कृष्णमाराधयामि ।  
 सकलकलुषभङ्गे स्वर्गसोपानसङ्गे  
 तरलतरतरङ्गे देवि गङ्गे प्रसीद ॥ ७

मातर्जाह्ववि शम्भुसङ्गमिलिते मौलौ निधायाञ्जलिं  
 त्वत्तीरे वपुषोऽवसानसमये नारायणाङ्घ्रिद्वयम् ।  
 सानन्दं स्मरतो भविष्यति मम प्राणप्रयाणोत्सवे  
 भूयो भक्तिरविच्युता हरिहरद्वैतात्मिका शाश्वती ॥ ८

गङ्गे त्रैलोक्यसारे सकलसुरवधूधूतविस्तीर्णतोये  
 पुण्ये ब्रह्मस्वरूपे हरिचरणरजोहारिणि स्वर्गमार्गे ।  
 प्रायश्चित्तं यदि स्यात् तवं जलकणिका ब्रह्महत्यादिपापैः  
 कस्त्वां स्तोतुं समर्थस्त्रिजगदघहरे देवि गङ्गे प्रसीद ॥ ९

इति गङ्गाष्टकम् । श्रीरामजी । श्री संवत् १८१२ वर्षे आश्विनवदी २  
 सोमवासरे लिखितं गुमानीरामेण शुभमस्तु (सरस्वती भवनपुस्तकालय, सं. सं. वि.  
 वि. पाण्डुलिपि संख्या १८५७५)

संग्राहकः  
 रमापद चक्रवर्ती

## HERETICAL DOCTRINES IN THE PURĀṆAS

By

R. N. DANDEKAR

[नास्तिकपराणि मतानि आचरितानि चेत् तानि भवन्ति पतनकारणानि बलवतामपि-इति पुराणकारा मन्यन्ते स्म । एतां दृष्टिम् अनुसरन्त्यः काश्चन कथा अपि पुराणेषु (शिव-लिङ्ग-विष्णु-पद्म-देवीभागवत-मत्स्यपुराणेषु) दृश्यन्ते-नास्तिकमतानुवर्तनेन पराजयो भवतीति आसु कथासु व्यक्तं दर्शितम् । यतो जयिनोऽसुरा नास्तिकमतानुयायिनो जाताः, अतस्ते देवैः पराजिता बभूवुरिति पुराणकाराणामभिप्रायः ।

आसु कथासु अर्हत्-मायाशास्त्र-कर्मवाद-मायापुरुष-श्रुतिस्मृतिविरुद्ध-दृष्टप्रत्यय-संयुत-सर्वसंमोहन-बर्हिपत्रधर-मार्जनी-विज्ञानमय-अनेकान्तवाद-दिग्वासोधर्म-बहुवासो धर्म-केशोत्पाटनादयः शब्दाः प्रयुक्ताः । एभिः शब्दैः प्रतीयते यज् जैन-बौद्ध-चार्वाक-सिद्धान्ताः एव नास्तिकसिद्धान्तरूपेण पुराणेषु प्रतिपादिताः । एष्वपि जैनमतमेव प्राधान्येन प्रतिपादितम् इति दृश्यते - इति विदुषा लेखकेन प्रमाणपुरःसरं प्रतिपादितम् ]

The Purāṇas \* seem to have believed that surreptitious implantation of heretical ideology and practices within a community was a sure way of bringing about the speedy downfall of that community, howsoever mighty that community might have otherwise been. The *Śiva-Purāṇa* for instance, gives in this context the following account (Rudrasaṁhitā, Yuddhakhaṇḍa, chapters 1-5)

After Skanda, the son of Śiva, had killed Tārakāsura, the three sons of the latter, namely, Tārakākṣa (the eldest), Vidyunmālin (the middle one), and Kamalākṣa (the youngest), practised severe penance in Meruguhā disregarding all pleasures and pains of the seasons. As the result of that penance, Brahmā appeared before the three brothers and offered them a boon. They implored Brahmā that they should eternally remain immune against fatal attacks from others. Such immunity, they declared, was more precious than any other favour. Brahmā, however, admonished them by telling them that no being, except Hara (Śiva) and Hari (Viṣṇu), can ever become immortal. He, therefore, asked them to choose another boon. Thereupon, the sons of Tāraka told Brahmā that, though they were capable of over-powering the three worlds, they had no home of their own to live. They, therefore, asked for three cities as their abodes-Tārakākṣa

desired a city of gold situated in the heaven, Vidyumālīna a city of silver situated in the sky, and Kamalākṣa a city of iron situated on the earth. They would live in these cities separately for a thousand years, at the end of which period the three cities would be joined together. Thereafter Brahmā commanded Maya, the demon architect, to create the three cities, provide them with all the appertenances for pleasure and enlightenment, and hand them over to the three brothers<sup>1</sup>. Appalled by the ominous portents arising from the three cities of the sons of Tāraka, Indra and the other gods went of Śiva and sought succour from him. Śiva, however, expressed his unwillingness to do anything against the inhabitants of Tripura, who, he vouched, were deeply devoted to him. Viṣṇu, to whom the gods later repaired, also endorsed Śiva's contention. But he did not want to throw the gods to the winds. He, therefore, thought of the Yajñas (Sacrifices), who instantly appeared<sup>2</sup> on the scene. On having been duly propitiated by the gods, the Yajñas produced various kinds of warriors who prepared themselves to fight Tripura. But they proved miserably ineffective.

Thereupon Viṣṇu planned another strategy, namely that of causing disturbance in the religious rites of the Śiva-worshipping Tripura-dwellers. Curiously enough, as usual, the Śiva-Purāṇa categorically insists that whatever Viṣṇu did on this as well as on similar other occasions was at the bidding of Śiva himself. Viṣṇu produced out of his own body a Puruṣa (Māyāpuruṣa), who had a clean-shaven head, wore withered garments, carried a woven wicker vessel, and held in his hand a bunch of pieces of cloth (*puñjikā*) which he waved at each step. He was a Muni (ascetic) who put a piece of cloth over his mouth and uttered the words *dharma dharmā*<sup>2a</sup> in a faltering voice. With hands joined in reverence he said to Viṣṇu : "Pray tell me, O Lord, by what names I am to be known, what my abode is going to be, and what mission will be assigned to me." Viṣṇu told him that he was born but of his (Viṣṇu's) own body and was, therefore, without doubt, of the same form as his. "Your name will be Arihat"<sup>3</sup>. said Viṣṇu. He further adjured him: "Do you compose an illusive scripture (Māyāśāstra) in the Apabhraṃśa dialect, consisting of 16, 000 verses,<sup>4</sup> which will counter the religion prescribed by the Śrutis and the Smṛtis, discard Varṇa and Āśrama, and teach the doctrine of Karma (Karmavāda). Do you thereby misguide the residents of the three cities. Through my favour, you will not be touched by any blemish for doing this. Let your teachings demolish the Vedic religion completely. When their Vedic religion is demolished, the Tripura-dwellers themselves will be



destroyed. Thereafter do you go to the desert region and continue your activities there till the beginning of the Kaliyuga. You will reveal your new Dharma in the Kaliyuga and expand in through your disciples and disciples' disciples. Ultimately you will attain to me as your goal."

At this behest of Viṣṇu, the ascetic with the shaven head produced four disciples who were quite similar to himself. They too had clean-shaven heads, wore soiled clothes, carried (wicker) vessels, covered their mouths with cloth, and held in their hands besoms made of pieces of cloth (*mārjaṇi*).<sup>5</sup> They walked slowly lest they might injure living beings and spoke nothing except uttering, from time to time, the words *Dharmo lābhaḥ param tattvam*<sup>5a</sup>. They were duly initiated by the Māyāpuruṣa in the heretical doctrines. Viṣṇu duly accepted these four disciples also as belonging to himself. He further enjoined that the word *pūjya* be prefixed to their names and that they be also called Ṛṣi, Ācārya, and Upādhyāya. They might further assume Viṣṇu's own names. The name Arihan, according to Viṣṇu, would conduce to the destruction of all sins.

The Māyāpuruṣa accompanied by his four disciples, went to Tripura and began to exert his delusive doctrines and practices. But lo, his māyā proved utterly ineffective in Tripura on account of the profound influence of the prevailing Śiva-worship. So Viṣṇu thought of another intrigue, of course as the Śiva-Purāṇa insists, in accordance with the wishes of Śiva himself. He asked Nārada to go to Tripura and feign getting initiated by the Māyāpuruṣa in his unique doctrines. Having done so, Nārada approached the Lord of Tripura and eulogised before him his new teacher's outstanding accomplishments. As expected, Nārada's words carried great weight with the Lord of Tripura who eventually decided to become initiated by the Māyāpuruṣa, together with his brothers and the residents of Tripura. Thereupon, Arihan imparted his teachings to the newly initiated lord of Tripura. He began by claiming that his highly esoteric teachings constituted the very essence of Vedānta (*vedāntasārasarvasva*). He then continued: "The world is beginningless; there is no creator nor creation; the world has evolved out of itself and also dissolves into itself. Ātman alone is the sole lord of all that is embodied—from Brahmā down to a blade of grass. There is no controller-god. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva are the names of mere embodied beings just as Arihan is my name. All embodied beings perish in course of time. They are all equal, as, for instance, in respect of food, copulation, sleep, and fear. Therefore, no one should kill any other being. No other Dharma in the world is nobler than compassion for living beings; and no other sin is

more abominable than injury to others. If protection is granted to even one single being, it will amount to protection being granted to the three worlds. Non-injury (*ahimsā*) is the most supreme religion. Non dependence on others is true salvation; eating whatever one desires is tantamount to heavenly bliss."

Arihan further said : "Sages have declared four gifts as being the most laudable, namely, assurance of security to the frightened, medicament to the sick, education to students, and food to the hungry. But, even among these, security to the frightened is by far the most precious. One should earn wealth in various ways, and by means of it one should fully gratify one's body and mind. There is no sense in trying to give pleasure to others. The heaven and the hell are experienced by the living beings in this very world, and nowhere else, for, happiness is heaven and misery is hell. When the body is cast in the midst of enjoyment, when affliction ends together with all desires, when ignorance dies away—that is the paramount salvation. No being shall be injured, no violence shall be perpetrated—this is the most authoritative Vedic injunction. To assert that killing is admissible in sacrifices like the Agniṣṭoma is patently erroneous. It is, indeed, strange that one hopes to attain heaven by cutting off trees, slaughtering animals, making blood-mire, and burning sesame-seeds and clarified butter in fire".

After having thus expounded his doctrines to the Lord of Tripura, the Māyāpuruṣa addressed himself to the citizens of Tripura with due deference. He began by emphasizing that his teachings were such as conceded credence only to the things that were perceptible by the senses, guaranteed happiness to the body, were indicated in the Buddhist scripture, and were consistent with the Vedic lore. He continued : "The Śrutis declare *ānanda* (happiness) to be an aspect of Brahman. This is to be understood in the literal sense. One should, therefore, assiduously seek pleasure and happiness while one's body is hale and hearty, while one's sense-organs are intact, and while old age is still far away. Those who desire happiness should be ready to surrender even their own bodies for the sake of the suppliants. It is not oceans, mountains and trees that constitute the real burden of the earth; it is such persons as do not regard their lives as being intended for the gratification of the needy. Body is transient and the amassed wealth is subject to depletion. Realizing this, one should fully enjoy all bodily pleasures. Caste-distinctions among the people are quite irrational, for, humanness being common to all, how can one think in terms of higher and lower ? The creation of this world is traced back to Brahmā. How can the sons born of the same body constitute different

castes ? Hence no difference of any kind should be entertained between man and man."

Consequently, through his teachings, the ascetic Māyāpuruṣa, with his disciples, succeeded in thoroughly demolishing the Vedic religious rites which were being practised in Tripura. He repudiated woman's vow of fidelity to the husband and man's vow of continence. He also impugned the holy practices pertaining to divine service, *śrāddha*, ritual, pilgrimage, etc. He further spurned the worship of gods like Śiva, Viṣṇu, Sūrya, and Gaṇeśa. As a result, the residents of Tripura became utterly irreligious, and Viṣṇu's *māyā* and evil fortune (*alakṣmi*) prevailed everywhere. Only Nārada, who had successfully intervened in the whole affair at Viṣṇu's bidding, escaped scotfree from the overpowering delusion. Thereafter, Viṣṇu reported to Śiva that the Tripura-dwellers had discarded the Vedic way of life and thought and had adopted the Buddhist scripture. They had thus become spiritually vulnerable, and the ground was thereby duly prepared for their annihilation.

The account given in the *Liṅga-Purāṇa* (ch. 71) is more or less similar to, though much shorter than, that given in the *Śiva-Purāṇa*. However, it differs from the latter in certain details. For instance, it specifically mentions *Upasad* as having appeared before Viṣṇu when he thought of Yajña<sup>6</sup>. Viṣṇu asked the goblins who had originated from the *Upasad* to destroy the three cities of the sons of Tāraka, but the goblins themselves perished in the encounter. Further, the *Liṅga-Purāṇa* mentions that Viṣṇu himself composed the heretical scripture (*Māyāśāstra*)<sup>7</sup>, which consisted of sixteen lakhs of verses,<sup>8</sup> which accepted the validity only of direct perception (*dṛṣṭapratyayasamīyuta*), and which was intended to delude everybody (*sarvasamīmhana*), and taught it to the Māyāpuruṣa whom he had produced from his own body. In the *Liṅga-Purāṇa*, Nārada is introduced not in order that he should induce the Lord of Tripura to get himself initiated by the Māyāpuruṣa (as in the *Śiva-Purāṇa*). He associates himself with the Māyāpuruṣa Muni<sup>9</sup> in the latter's activity of deluding the residents of Tripura. Nārada is shown to have been instrumental particularly in encouraging the licentiousness of women. Ultimately Viṣṇu is said to have himself proclaimed the establishment of the heretical religion in Tripura as the result of which the *Śrauta* and the *Smārta* Dharma was destroyed, the worship of Śiva and the *Liṅga* was abandoned, the morality of women fell into disrepute, and obnoxious behaviour prevailed everywhere. That was a signal for Śiva to attack.

The *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* (3.17-18) introduces this topic in a context different from that of the destruction of Tripura. The question was raised

as to who the Nagnas were and how they had originated. The Vedic lore served as a protective covering for the different Varṇas. But those who foolishly rejected that covering were rendered naked (*nagna*). They came into being in the following way : In a long-drawn war, the gods were defeated by the demons led by Hlāda.<sup>10</sup> So, as usual, they approached Viṣṇu for help. The demons were faithful practitioners of the Vedic Varṇadharmā. They could not be overpowered by normal means. Viṣṇu, therefore, produced from his body Māyāmoha<sup>11</sup>, who was naked, had a clean-shaven head, and carried in his hand a bunch of peacock-feathers.<sup>12</sup> He was duly commissioned to beguile the demons and thereby make them vulnerable. Accosting the demons who had been engaged in penance on the banks of the Narmadā, Māyāmoha asked them whether their penance was intended for some gain in this world or for beatitude in the yonder world. "If you desire salvation", he told them, "do you heed my teachings which will lead you to the desired goal. Do you deserve (*arhadhvam*) my new religion which is quite adequate (*arha*) for salvation". He then imparted to them the doctrine of 'might be-might not be' (*anekāntavāda*), and, by making them give up the Vedas gradually turned them into Ārhatas.

Thereafter the same Māyāmoha, now clad in red garments, said to other groups of the Asuras : "If you desire either heaven (*svarga*) or salvation (*mokṣa*), desist from the religious practices which entail the slaughter of animals. Do you understand that all that exists is composed of discriminative knowledge (*vijñānamaya*).<sup>13</sup> This world subsists without support (*anādhāra*),<sup>14</sup> is engaged in the pursuit of erroneous knowledge, and is vitiated by passions etc. Do you know (*budhyata, budhyadhvam*) this". Having been thus persuaded to acquiesce in these teachings, the Asuras abandoned the Vedic religion and became Bauddhas. They began to indulge freely in censuring the Veda, the Brahmanic gods, the sacrificial rites, and the Brāhmaṇas. Māyāmoha finally adjured the demons to believe and accept only what is rational and not what is claimed to have fallen from the heaven.<sup>15</sup> Eventually the demons forfeited their armour of Vedic religion and Varṇadharmā—they became *Nagna*—and were soon overpowered by the gods.

The *Padma-Purāṇa* (Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa, ch. 13) narrates how Bṛhaspati, the preceptor of the gods, craftily prepared the ground for the promotion of heretical religion among the demons through Māyāmoha. It does not, however, connect this with the Tripura-episode. The gods, alarmed by the ominous portents of the might of the demons which had grown

tremendously as the result of the boon given to their preceptor Śukra by Śiva, went to Bṛhaspati and entreated him to delude the demons by means of heretical teachings. Thereupon, while Śukra had been deliberately kept away from the demons through the intrigue of Viṣṇu and Indra, Bṛhaspati went over to the demons disguising himself as Śukra. Even after his return, Śukra could not convince the demons of his true identity. On the contrary, the demons persisted in their faith in Bṛhaspati, who was disguised as Śukra, and prayed to him for the knowledge by means of which they could attain salvation, Bṛhaspati began by telling them that the Vedic lore had originated from Vaiśvānara and was a source of great sorrow to the people. He continued: "Yajña (the *śrauta* Dharma) and Śrāddha (the *smārta* Dharma) are invented by selfish priests for their own gain. How can the food offered in Śrāddha to the priests in this world satiate the Pitaras in the other world? Śiva and Viṣṇu are, by their very nature and known behaviour,<sup>16</sup> incapable of imparting any religious doctrines. The gods are addicted to wine and the Brāhmaṇas are generally meat-eaters. Obviously there can be no heaven for meat-eaters, nor for those who indulge in mere sexual pleasures. To claim that earth (*mṛd*) and ashes (*bhasma*) conduce to religious purity is utter nonsense".

Having thus prepared the necessary anti-Vedic atmosphere, Bṛhaspati wondered how he could hasten the condemnation of the demons to hell. He, therefore, meditated upon Keśava (=Viṣṇu), who thereupon produced Māyāmoha.<sup>17</sup> Māyāmóha was an ascetic, who was naked, had a cleanshaven head, and carried in his hand a bunch of peacock's feathers.<sup>18</sup> By means of various arguments (*anekārthavāda*)<sup>19</sup> he tried to impress upon the Daityas the fact that the religion of the naked (*digvāsas*) was far superior to the teachings of the Veda which they had been following.<sup>20</sup> The Dānavas then gave up the Vedic religion and adopted the religion sponsored by Māyāmoha. Since they did so after Māyāmoha had invoked them with the words, "Do you deserve (*arhadhvam*) my religion", they came to be known as Ārhatas. They hailed Māyāmoha with the words, "*namo' rhantāya* (salutation to Arhanta)".<sup>21</sup>

Thereafter Māyāmoha, now wearing red garments, addressed another group of Asuras as follows: "If you desire heaven (*svarga*) or liberation (*mokṣa*), discard the religion which prescribes the slaughter of animals in its rites. Do you realize that all that exists is but *vijñāna*,<sup>22</sup> and that this world is supportless,<sup>23</sup> is engaged in the pursuit of erroneous knowledge, and is vitiated by passions etc." He further tried to impress upon them that the Vedic religion was, in every respect, thoroughly irrational. Later he asked Bṛhaspati (disguised as Śukra) to initiate the Dānavas formally in

the new religion.<sup>24</sup> The Dānavas, led by Bṛhaspati, went to the banks of the Narmadā.<sup>25</sup> There they were asked to abandon their clothes, take up peacock's feathers and rosaries of *guñjikā*, and have the hair on their heads plucked out. This entire procedure was formerly laid down by Arhat and was later strictly observed by the twenty-four Tirthankaras. To be born in the family of Śrāvakas in Bhāratavarṣa, to go through rigorous mortification (characterised by the plucking out of hair),<sup>26</sup> praying to Arhat with appropriate *mantras*<sup>27</sup>—all this was said to lead to *svarga* or *mokṣa*. The Dānavas were told that the real tapas consisted in the control of sense-organs, compassion for the fellow-beings, and renunciation of this-worldly life. All else was but a farce. The demons were further asked not to worship other gods; they were also asked to observe strictly the rules regarding food and drink.<sup>28</sup> Having been thus beguiled into rejecting their ancient Vedic religion and accepting what they thought was the true Rṣidharma, the demons were isolated from their leader Prahlāda and had, finally, to surrender themselves to the gods.

The *Devī-Bhāgavata* (4. 12-14), like the *Padma-Purāṇa*, narrates the episode of Bṛhaspati having gone to the Daityas in the disguise of Śukra and deluded them with false doctrines. It, however, adds (4.13) an interesting aside in that context. The question is raised as to how Bṛhaspati, who was the preceptor of all *vidyās*, could stoop to perpetrating this kind of fraud. How would the gods, the disciples of this Bṛhaspati, be expected to remain truthful and straightforward? Vyāsa is then represented as offering some kind of justification for Bṛhaspati's conduct. Among other things, he says: "The gods, too, like any other embodied beings, are slaves of passions. Similarly, everyone is seen to be prone to pose as a paragon of virtue; but when one finds oneself in a difficult situation one throws off one's mask. Even the gods show no compunction in having recourse to patently objectionable means in order to achieve their desired ends. Their lives, like those of the humans, are subject to various vicissitudes, good and bad. We should not, therefore, expect anything special from the gods."<sup>29</sup>

When Śukra returned to the demons after his ten-year tryst with Indra's daughter, Jayanti, which, too, had been craftily manipulated by the gods, he saw Bṛhaspati engaged in initiating the demons into the anti-Vedic Jaina-Dharma. Bṛhaspati vehemently urged the demons to abhor Vedic ritual which entailed slaughter of animals. He affirmed that non-injury (*ahimsā*) was the most supreme religion. Even an incendiary should not be killed. Śukra tried his best to plead with the demons that he was their real preceptor and that the person who had been teaching them all these years was but a fake. When, finally, he failed to convince them,

he realized that such was verily the destiny of the demons.<sup>30</sup> He, however, cursed them that, since they had lost all discretion, they would be defeated by the gods. That was enough for Bṛhaspati. He, therefore, assumed his original form, went back to the gods, and reported to Indra the success of his mission. It may be noted that in this whole context, the *DevīBhāgavata* does not introduce the episode either of the Māyāpuruṣa or of Tripura.

The *Matsya-Purāṇa* (chh. 131-32) seems to attribute the demolition of Tripura to destiny<sup>31</sup> and not to its heathenisation through the Māyāpuruṣa. For a long time, the demons lived happily with their families in Tripura, worshipping the gods, honouring the Brāhmaṇas, and religiously striving for *dharma*, *artha*, and *kāma*. Soon, however, there entered into the three cities the fearful evils of misfortune, hunger, thirst, strife, and dissension. Maya, the architect of Tripura, saw in his dream these evils (in the form of four damsels and two men)<sup>32</sup> enveloping the demons like diseases. The dream portended sure disaster for Tripura and the demons. Overcome by adverse destiny, the demons discarded truth and religious conduct and took to many forbidden practices. They thus brought themselves to the verge of utter destruction.

However, in another context (ch. 47), the *Matsya-Purāṇa*, like the *Padma-Purāṇa*, narrates—though rather briefly—how Bṛhaspati, the preceptor of the gods, taking advantage of the absence of Śukra, the preceptor of the demons, who, as the result of Viṣṇu's *māyā*, was made to go away to enjoy the company of Indra's daughter, Jayantī, went over to the demons in the disguise of Śukra and deluded them with his deliberately perverted teachings, for ten years. But the *Purāṇa* does not give any details of these teachings of Bṛhaspati. Nor does it mention (as does the *Padma-Purāṇa*) the additional activity of any Māyāpuruṣa. Disowned by his pupils (the demons), after his return, the real Śukra cursed them that they would be defeated by the gods. When, later, after having come to realize the trick played on them by Bṛhaspati, the penitent demons led by Prahlāda approached Śukra to seek his forgiveness, the latter consoled them by telling them that whatever had happened was ordained by destiny (*diṣṭa*). As has been seen earlier, the *Matsya-Purāṇa* refers to adverse destiny (*daivaparidhvasta*) also in connection with the Tripura-episode (131.39).<sup>33</sup> It may be incidentally pointed out that, in the concluding portion of ch. 47, the *Matsya-Purāṇa* mentions Buddha, but not in relation to any heterodox doctrine. On the contrary, the advent

of Buddha is said to have been intended for the establishment of Dharma and the annihilation of the Asuras.

As indicated earlier, for the purpose of this paper, the term heretical religion is intended to denote anti-Vedic religion. According to the Purāṇas, the Daityas were originally faithful practitioners of Vedic Dharma. They are described as devoutly worshipping the Brahmanic divinities, genuinely honouring the Brahmanas, and religiously striving for *dharma*, *artha*, and *kāma*.<sup>34</sup> They are said to have been particularly favoured by Śiva<sup>35</sup> who was stoutly disinclined to do anything that would harm them.<sup>36</sup> The gods were convinced that, unless and until some kind of disturbance was caused in the Vedic way of life and thought to which the demons had stubbornly adhered, the latter would remain totally invulnerable. They, therefore, tried to insinuate heretical doctrines into the community of demons and thereby spiritually demoralise and militarily weaken them. The Puraṇic accounts about how the gods did this are miserably confused, inconsistent, and mixed up. Three main strands of heretical religion may, however, be identified in this connection. These are

Jainism, Buddhism, and, to a very small extent, Lokāyata (sheer materialism). The agency through which the heretical thought and practices were insidiously instilled among the demons is said to have been either the Māyāpuruṣa alone,<sup>37</sup> or Bṛhaspati alone,<sup>38</sup> or Bṛhaspati and the Māyāpuruṣa jointly.<sup>39</sup>

The Purāṇas seem to imply that the heretical religions—particularly Jainism and Buddhism—originated primarily to counteract the prevailing Vedic ideology and practices. Surely, this implication is historically quite untenable. It is now generally agreed that Jainism and Buddhism have their roots in a pre-Vedic non-Aryan thought-complex. Further, the mention in the Purāṇas that the Māyāpuruṣa who was instrumental in propagating the heretical doctrines was produced by Viṣṇu from his own body would suggest that those heretical doctrines were only incidental and served but a transient purpose, that they were just a part of the Māyā through which Viṣṇu ensured the proper maintenance of the universe. Such a suggestion, again, is patently unwarranted in view of the fact that Jainism and Buddhism have arisen quite independently and obviously possess a fundamental value. Bṛhaspati is mentioned in the context of the propagation of the heretical doctrines—whether playing the principal role or a subordinate role—presumably for two reasons : firstly, as the repository of all knowledge and the preceptor of the gods, Bṛhaspati would prove a fitting match for Śukra, the preceptor of the demons, who had acquired phenomenal power through Śiva's boon;<sup>40</sup> and secondly, Bṛhaspati was traditionally recognized as a pioneer of materialism.<sup>40a</sup>



The dominant strand in the process of heretical indoctrination as represented in the Purāṇas is evidently that of Jainism. The appearance, dress, and behaviour of the Māyāpuruṣa (and his disciples) unmistakably bring to mind the Jaina ascetics.<sup>41</sup> The clean-shaven head, woven wicker vessel, *puñjikā* (or *mārjanī* or *barhipatra*), mouth covered with a piece of cloth—all these are typical marks of Jaina monks. Only the reference to soiled garments is not relevant in this context.<sup>42</sup> Elsewhere,<sup>43</sup> Māyāmoha is specifically referred to as having been *digambara*.<sup>44</sup> The fact that the Māyāpuruṣa was named by Viṣṇu as Arihan<sup>45</sup> clinches his identity with Mahāvira.<sup>46</sup> He is also referred to as Arhanta,<sup>47</sup> and his followers as Ārthatas.<sup>48</sup> The play on the words, *arhata*, *arhadhvam*, in the latter case is noteworthy. The Māyāpuruṣa is said to have produced four disciples who were similar to himself.<sup>49</sup> This does not conform to the Jaina tradition, for, Mahāvira is believed to have had eleven Gaṇadharas (original disciples), Indrabhūti Gautama having been the chief among them. However, among the honorifics of the Māyāpuruṣa's four disciples, *pūjya*, *ācārya*, and *upādhyāya*<sup>50</sup> do have the sanction of the Jaina tradition.<sup>51</sup> Among the practices sponsored by the Māyāpuruṣa, the plucking out of hair is deferentially mentioned.<sup>52</sup> This, too, is specifically a Jaina practice. That the four disciples of the Māyāpuruṣa walked slowly in order to avoid any possible injury to living beings, that they spoke nothing except uttering the words *dharmalābha*,<sup>53</sup> and that they observed strict rules regarding eating and drinking<sup>54</sup>—all this is clearly reminiscent of the Jaina monastic discipline. At the same time, some actions attributed to the Māyāpuruṣa are not attested by the Jaina tradition. For instance, at the behest of Viṣṇu, the Māyāpuruṣa is said to have composed a Māyāśāstra containing 16,000 verses.<sup>55</sup> But this Māyāśāstra can hardly be said to signify the early Jaina religious texts like the *Pūrvas* and the *Āgamas*.<sup>56</sup> The mention of Apabhramśa<sup>57</sup> in that connection is also purely imaginary. The claim that the Māyāśāstra accepted the validity only of direct perception and logic<sup>58</sup> as against *apauruṣeya śabda*<sup>59</sup> admirably suits the Jaina tradition.<sup>60</sup> Viṣṇu's advice to the Māyāpuruṣa that he might go to the desert region after having completed his mission and that he might reveal his Dharma in the Kaliyuga and extend it through a chain of disciples, and his promise that he (the Māyāpuruṣa) would attain him (Viṣṇu) as his goal<sup>61</sup> are irrelevant and inconsequential so far as Jainism is concerned.<sup>62</sup> The same may be said about the actual initiation of the Dānavas into Jainism having been accomplished on the banks of the Narmadā.<sup>63</sup>

It has been unequivocally mentioned, in one passage, that the heretical teachings by means of which the demons were deluded and alienated from their ancient Vedic Dharma constituted the Jaina

Dharma.<sup>64</sup> But, as enunciated in the various Purāṇas, these teachings cannot be said to be doing justice to the Jaina Dharma. They are not only not profound or learned, but they are often naive, wrongly or inadequately stated, self-contradictory, and confusing. The Māyāpuruṣa claims that his teachings represent the very essence of Vedānta<sup>65</sup> and that they are consistent with the Veda,<sup>66</sup> and in the same breath he declares that they are duly indicated in the Buddhist scriptures.<sup>67</sup> Elsewhere the Māyāpuruṣa contends that *ahimsā* is the most authoritative Vedic injunction.<sup>68</sup> All this is, to say the least, fantastic. Actually, the Veda is not unoften censured as being thoroughly irrational<sup>69</sup> and a source of great sorrow to the people.<sup>70</sup> And, was the teaching of the Māyāpuruṣa not avowedly intended for the dislodgement of the Vedic religion ?<sup>71</sup> The heretical doctrines were clearly directed against *Śruti-Smṛti* and Varṇa-Āśrama.<sup>72</sup>

From among the Jaina doctrines, the *jīva-vāda*,<sup>73</sup> the *karmavādā*,<sup>74</sup> and the *anekāntavādā*<sup>75</sup> are specifically—but only superficially—mentioned. It is also stated—again, superficially—that the world is beginningless and that there is no creator nor creation as such.<sup>76</sup> Emphasis is rightly put on the value of life, and *ahimsā* (non-injury to living beings) is frequently glorified.<sup>77</sup> The slaughter of animals in the ritual, which is permitted by the Vedic religion, is ridiculed and condemned outright.<sup>78</sup> Compassion for the living beings is said to be the noblest Dharma,<sup>79</sup> and even the surrender of one's body for the sake of the suppliants is recommended.<sup>80</sup> All human beings, it is stressed, are equal,<sup>81</sup> humanness being common to all of them.<sup>82</sup> Castedistinctions are, therefore, said to be utterly unwarranted.<sup>83</sup> It is further pointed out that, when the body is cast off in the midst of enjoyment, when affliction ends together with all desires, and when ignorance dies away, one reaches the stage of paramount salvation.<sup>84</sup> And, finally, the peculiar Jaina character of the heretical teachings is clearly brought out when it is pronounced that to be born in the family of Śrāvakas in Bhāratavarṣa is the choicest blessing to be sought after.<sup>85</sup>

The indications of Buddhism in the heretical doctrines represented in the Purāṇas are much fewer, more casual, and less distinct. We no doubt do come across such references as that the Māyāpuruṣa claims his teachings to have been derived from the Buddhist scripture<sup>86</sup> and that, as the result of the Māyāpuruṣa's indoctrination, the Tripura-dwellers adopted the Buddhist scripture;<sup>87</sup> but these references are evidently quite formal and can hardly be taken at their face-value. They only reflect the pretentious idiom of the Purāṇas. Elsewhere, one and the same

Māyāmoha is shown to have taught the Jaina and the Buddhist doctrines respectively to two separate groups of demons, the only difference being that, while teaching the Buddhist doctrines, he is described as wearing red garments (*raktāmbāradhṛt*).<sup>88</sup> In one of such passages, we come across the play on the words *budhyata-budhyadhvam*<sup>89</sup> (as, in an earlier passage, on the words *arhata-arhadhvam*<sup>89a</sup>) which suggests that in this case the initiates subsequently became Bauddhas.<sup>90</sup> It may be incidentally noted that the Māyāpuruṣa is sometimes referred to as Muni, and that, at least in one context (LP 71. 79), the commentator interprets the word *muni* as denoting Śākyamuni.<sup>91</sup>

However, two specific Buddhist doctrines are seen to have been taught by the Māyāpuruṣa : (1) that all that exists is composed of *viññāna*<sup>92</sup> and (2) that this world subsists without any support.<sup>93</sup> But these doctrines have not been elaborated. On the whole, one gets the impression that, while speaking of the heretics, the authors of the Purāṇas have in mind the Jainas far more emphatically than the Buddhists. This is, indeed, quite understandable, for, historically speaking, the authors of the Purāṇas (and the common people) must have come into more direct and constant contact with the Jainas (both mendicants and householders) than with the Buddhists (or, for that matter, with any other heretical sect). In this context it is pertinent to note that, if the Purāṇas have presented the Jaina teachers in a somewhat unfavourable light, the Jaina authors too are not found wanting in their misrepresentation of Hindu legends and personalities.<sup>94</sup> As for Buddhism, the attitude of Hinduism towards that religion seems to have been generally conciliatory and assimilative. For instance, MP 47. 247 mentions Buddha without reference to any heterodox doctrine. There, the advent of Buddha is actually connected with the establishment of Dharma and the annihilation of the Asuras.

It is, indeed, difficult to isolate the specific Lokāyata elements in the heretical teachings as set forth in the Purāṇas. It is not unlikely that the authors of the Purāṇas have mistakenly included among the Jaina (and the Buddhist) tenets some views which can be regarded as being manifestly Lokāyata. For instance, one such view is that the *pratyakṣa pramāṇa* alone possesses ultimate validity.<sup>95</sup> Another such view is that "the words of authority do not fall from heaven".<sup>96</sup> The insistence that the word *ānanda* (even in a statement such as *ānando brahmaṇo lūpam*) has to be understood in its literal, every-day, physical sense of 'pleasure' or 'happiness'<sup>97</sup> is clearly indicative of materialistic hedonism. One is urged to seek pleasure and happiness while one's body is hale and hearty, while one's sense-organs are intact, and while old age is still far away.<sup>98</sup> The Lokāyatikas believe that the heaven and the hell are experienced by the

living beings in this very life and in this very world—that there is neither rebirth nor the other world.<sup>99</sup> One should, therefore, earn wealth in all possible ways and fully satiate one's body and mind by means of it.<sup>100</sup> Happiness in this world is heaven and misery is hell.<sup>101</sup> Bṛhaspati is generally recognized as a prominent pioneer of the materialistic school of thought. It is, accordingly, highly significant that he should have been represented in the Purāṇas as having been assigned to the task of preparing suitable ground for the propagation of heretical doctrines through the Māyāpuruṣa.<sup>102</sup>

The main purpose of the propagation of the heretical doctrines among the Dānavas was to demolish the ancient Vedic religion by which they had all along loyally sworn. As a result of the heretical teachings imparted by the Māyāpuruṣa (or Bṛhaspati), the Dānavas are said to have repudiated Brahmanic scriptures, disowned Brahmanic gods, abandoned Brahmanic religious practices, and derided Brahmanic priests.<sup>103</sup> This much, if at all, may be conceded as being plausible. But the assertion that those teachings also brought about utter moral degradation, as implied by such descriptions as those of women giving up the vow of fidelity to their husbands<sup>104</sup> and of men disregarding the vow of continence,<sup>105</sup> would seem to fall grossly wide of the mark

\* The Purāṇas taken into account for the purpose of this paper are : Śiva-Purāṇa (ŚP, mainly as the basis), *Liṅga-Purāṇa* (LP), *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* (VP), *Padma-Purāṇa* (PP), *Devī-Bhāgavata* (DB), and *Matsya-Purāṇa* (MP). Exact references to important relevant passages will be found in foot-notes from No. 34 onward. This paper forms the third instalment in the series, "Gleanings from the Śivapurāṇa". For the first two instalments, see Purāṇa 28 (1), 7-31; 28 (2), 100-127.

1. Cf. the different version pertaining to the three cities as given in Ś P B 3.4.4.3.
2. The *Liṅga-purāṇa* (ch. 71) specifically mentions Upasad in this context.
- 2a. The Jaina Munis usually respond to salutation with the word dharmalābha.
3. *Arihat(n)* (destroyer of enemies like passions etc.) is evidently a later Sanskritised form of *Arihanta* which itself is the Prakrit form of the original Arhat (the Worthy one).
4. The reading in the *Śiva-Purāṇa* is *ṣoḍaśasahasrakam*. The *Liṅga-Purāṇa* reads *ṣoḍaśalakṣakam*.
5. The word used in the earlier context is puñjikā.
- 5a. See fn. 2a above.
6. See fn. 2 above.
7. According to the *Śiva-Purāṇa*, Viṣṇu had asked the Māyāpuruṣa to compose the scripture.
8. See fn. 4 above.
9. The commentary on L P 71. 79 says: 'muniḥ 'śakyamunis tu yaḥ' ity amaraḥ. It thus seems to suggest that the Māyāpuruṣa was Gautama Buddha.
10. Hlāda is presumably the same as Prahlāda of the other Purāṇas.

11. Māyāmoha is identical with the Māyāpuruṣa of the Śiṣa-Purāṇa.
12. *barhipatradharaḥ*. The Śiṣa-Purāṇa mentions *puñjikā* or *mārjanī*. See fn. 5 above.
13. This is suggestive of the Buddhist Yogācāra doctrine.
14. This is suggestive of the Mādhyamika-Śūnyavāda.
15. This obviously refers to the *apauruṣeyatva* of the Veda.
16. In this context, the Purāṇa mentions, among other things, that Śiṣa is *ardhanārīśvara*, is surrounded by goblins, and is adorned with bones, and that Viṣṇu is usually engaged in killing. It also refers to the episodes of adultery in which Soma and Tārā and Indra and Ahalyā were involved. See fn. 94.
17. See fn. 11 above.
18. Seen fn. 12 above.
19. *Anekāntavāda*, which the *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* mentions, is evidently intended here.
20. One version of the *Padma-Purāṇa* (ġub, Saṁskṛti-Saṁsthāna, 1968) reads; *digvāsasām ayaṁ dharmo, dharmo yaṁ bahuvāsasām*.
21. The version of the *Padma-Purāṇa* mentioned in fn. 20 reads *namo* rhate.
22. See fn. 13.
23. Seen fn. 14.
24. In the *Śiṣa-Purāṇa* and the *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa*, the Māyāpuruṣa (Māyāmoha) is described as having himself initiated the demons. See fn. 102.
25. The *Śiṣa-Purāṇa* does not mention the Narmadā.
26. The Purāṇa seems to attach great importance to the plucking out of hair : *keśānām utpātanam ca paramam dharmasādhanam*, etc.
27. Further on, in this very context, the Purāṇa mentions *pañcāṅga-mantra*. Here, probably, the *mantra*, *namo arihantāṇam, namo siddhāṇam, namo āriyāṇam, namo uvajjhāyāṇam, namo loe savvasāhūṇam*, is intended.
28. The Purāṇa specifies : *ekasthāne* (v.1. *ekasya vai*) *sadā bhaktam bhoktavyam karasampuṭe / tataḥ sthāne sthitam* (v. 1. *tatra peyam sthitam*) *toyam keśakīṭavivarjitam / tulyam priyāpriyam kāryam nānyadṛṣṭihataḥ kvacit / bhoktavyam etena vibho ācāreṇa*.
29. This characterization of the gods is made to serve as a background for the glorification of Devi who alone represents the highest divinity.
30. Such reference to destiny, which is a common motif in Sanskrit literature, is also found in the account of the *Matsya-Purāṇa*.
31. See fn. 30.
32. The Purāṇa mentions (wrongly ?) three men : *catasraḥ pramadās tatra trayo martyā bhayāvahāḥ*.
33. See fn. 30.
34. V.P. III. 17. 39; pp. Sṛṣṭi. 13. 363; MP 131. 10. 16.
35. Incidentally, from the historical point of view, Śiṣa was basically a pre-Vedic non-Aryan god. See Dandekar, *Vedic Mythological Tracts*, 199-277.
36. ŚP 2. 5. 3. 6.
37. According to Śp, LP, and VP.
38. According to DB and MP.
39. According to PP.
40. PP Sṛṣṭi, 13. 223-27.
- 40a. Cārvāka, the great sophistical teacher, is believed to have been a pupil of Bṛhaspati.
41. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 2-9; 28-30.
42. There are two main sects among the Jaina Sādhus-the Śvetāmbara and the Digambara. The Śvetāmbara Sādhus wear white garments, while the Digambara Sādhus are nude.

43. VP 3. 18. 2; PP. Sṛṣṭi. 13. 352, 384. Also see fn. 20 above.
44. Nudity for the Jaina mendicants is believed to have been first introduced by Mahāvira. The practice was presumably borrowed from Gośāla Ājīvika. VP 3. 17. 6 says that the Veda serves as a protective covering for the different Varnas. Those who rejected the Veda became *nagna* (naked).
45. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 9.
46. Mahāvira, the 24th Tirthaṅkara, has come to be known as Kevalin, Jina, Vira, and Arhat (Arihanta, Arihan). Curiously enough, PP Sṛṣṭi. 13. 387, 390 seems to mention Arhat and the 24 Tirthaṅkaras separately.
47. PP Sṛṣṭi. 13. 364; fn. 21.
48. VP 3. 18. 11; PP Sṛṣṭi. 13. 361.
49. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 24.
50. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 34. Why the Māyāpuruṣa and his four disciples were asked (ŚP 2. 5. 4. 35) also to assume Viṣṇu's names is not clear.
51. According to Jainism, Arhat, Siddhā, Ācārya, Upādhyāya, and Sādhu are the five Parameṣṭhins. See fn. 27.
52. PP Sṛṣṭi. 13. 385-386.
53. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 29-30. See fn. 2a.
54. PP Sṛṣṭi 13. 408-409; fn. 28. However, *svargo' bhilaṣitāśanam* (ŚP 2. 5. 5. 18.) is understandable. Presumably it belongs to the materialistic strand. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 18 further says that *aparādhinatva* (non-dependence on others) is tantamount to salvation. A mention may be made here of the five *vratas* laid down by Mahāvira, namely, non-injury, truth, non-stealing, chastity, and possessionlessness. A Jaina Muni is expected to observe these *vratas* uncompromisingly; a Śrāvaka may observe them partially (*ekadeśa*).
55. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 10, 11; fn. 4, 7.
56. Or, for the matter of that, any Buddhist scripture.
57. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 11.
58. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 35; LP 71. 74. It is generally averred that the Brahmanic texts are selfcontradictory and confusing while the Jaina texts are definite and straightforward.
59. See fn. 15. VP 3. 18. 29. It is claimed that the Jaina ideology is based on the direct experience of the various Tirthaṅkaras.
60. This equally applies to Buddhism.
61. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 20-22.
62. This applies also to Buddhism.
63. PP Sṛṣṭi. 13. 382.
64. DB 4. 13. 55; in this passage, it is Bṛhaspati who is said to be propagating these teachings. Also see fn. 11, 37-39.
65. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 3.
66. *Vedapara* (ŚP 2. 5. 5. 35). It may be possible to suggest that the word *Veda*, in this context, denotes the Digambara Jaina texts which are referred to as the four Vedas, namely, *Prathamānuyoga*, *Karanānuyoga*, *Dravyānuyoga*, and *Caranānuyoga*. But this would be too far-fetched. Or, the word *vedapara* may be understood to have been employed here in order that the new initiates should not feel that the Māyāpuruṣa's teachings were alien.
67. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 35.
68. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 31.
69. PP Sṛṣṭi. 13. 376,
70. PP Sṛṣṭi. 13. 319-320. Here, the *Trayī* is connected with Vaiśvānara.
71. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 49.

72. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 10.
73. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 5. This is a cardinal teaching of the Jainas. Jīva is believed to be characterized by *pariṇāmi-nityatā* (changeless eternity). Its chief characteristics are consciousness or knowledge and energy.
74. ŚP 2. 5. 4. 11. Karman is the subtle principle which is attracted towards the Jīva through the Jīva's own action and binds the Jīva. According to the Jainas, action or conduct of body, speech, and mind is the principal constituent of merit and demerit.
75. VP 3. 18. 10; PP Śrṣṭi. 13. 360; fn. 19. This is the same as the Syādvāda or the Saptabhaṅginaya, the "Doctrine of Probables". According to it, an object is to be viewed not from one standpoint only but from many angles of vision.
76. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 4.
77. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 18-20; DB 4. 13. 56; etc.
78. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 32-33; VP. 3. 18. 15; PP. Śrṣṭi. 13. 366; DB 4. 13. 57.
79. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 16; PP Śrṣṭi. 13. 401.
80. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 38.
81. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 15.
82. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 42.
83. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 42-48.
84. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 29-30. According to the Jainas, only human beings (according to the Digambaras, only males) are entitled to *mokṣa*. On attaining liberation, a Jīva frees itself completely from the operation of the *leśyās*. PP Śrṣṭi. 13. 403 refers to the state attained by the Tirthaṅkaras.
85. PP Śrṣṭi 13. 388-389. The Jaina community is usually divided into Muni-Āryikā (mendicants) and Śrāvaka-Śrāvikā (householders).
86. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 35.
87. ŚP 2. 5. 6. 28.
88. VP 3. 18. 14-18 : PP Śrṣṭi 13. 365-66. That the same person taught the Jaina as well as the Buddhist doctrines is unimaginable. Actually, there existed a kind of rivalry between the Buddhists and the Nirgranthas. It may be further pointed out that the fact that only the difference in connection with the garments is specifically mentioned here does not imply that the other features of the appearance, dress, and behaviour of the Māyāpuruṣa as a Jaina Muni are applicable also to a Buddhist monk.
89. VP 3. 18. 16. 18.
- 89a. See fn. 48.
90. This is, however, not expressly mentioned (as in the case of the Ārhatas). In PP Śrṣṭi. 13. 366, the Buddhist character of the teaching of the red-garmented monk seems to have been suggested by the the word *nirvāṇa*. This word is also used in VP 3. 18. 15.
91. See fn. 9.
92. VP 3. 18. 16; pp Śrṣṭi. 13. 367. See fn. 13.
93. VP 3. 18. 17; PP Śrṣṭi. 13. 368. See fn. 14.
94. In some of the texts included in the Śvetāmbara Jaina canon, the Purāṇic legends have been made fun of. It is also seen that characters like Vyāsa, Kṛṣṇa, Yudhiṣṭhira, etc. have been portrayed by the Jaina authors in an irreverential manner. The *Dhūrtākhyāna* by Haribhadrasūri (middle of the 8th century A. D.) is perhaps the most typical work of this genre. It may be noted that there are no such Buddhist works. Also see fn. 16.
95. ŚP 2. 5. 5. 35. (*dṛṣṭārthapratyayakara*) : LP 71. 74 (*dṛṣṭapratyay-asamīyuta*).
96. VP 3. 18. 29; fn. 15.

- 
97. Ś P 2. 5. 5. 36
98. Ś P 2. 5. 5. 37. Significantly enough, in this passage the very word *saukhya* is employed.
99. Ś P 2. 5. 5. 28.
100. Ś P 2. 5. 5. 26.
101. Ś P 2. 5. 5. 28.
102. P P Sṛṣṭi. 13. 318-348; fn. 40a. Bṛhaspati prepares the ground for Māyāmoha's teachings, and, after Māyāmoha has imparted his teachings, Bṛhaspati also performs the formal initiation of the demons into the heretical religion (P P Sṛṣṭi. 13. 383 ff.). In DB 4. 12-14 and MP 131-132, Bṛhaspati is represented both as the teacher and as the initiator. See fn. 24.
103. Ś P 2. 5. 4. 10. ff; 5. 49-54; L P 71. 90-95; P P Sṛṣṭi. 13. 318-338.
104. Ś P 2. 5. 5. 50; L P 71. 83-89. It is suggested that this has a reference to the order of nuns sponsored by the two heretical religions.
105. Ś P 2. 5. 5. 50.



## SOME PURĀNIC RECORDS ON ŚŪDRAS : A BRIEF REVIEW\*

By

DR. S. G. KANTAWALA .

[पुराणानि त्रिधा विभक्तानि दृश्यन्ते महापुराणानि, उपपुराणानि, ज्ञातिपुराणानि (स्थलपुराणानि, स्थलमाहात्म्यानि वा) च । पुराणरचनायाः कालो बहुधा भिद्यते ।

वर्णव्यवस्था प्राचीनभारतस्य प्रमुखं वैशिष्ट्यम् । बह्वीनां जातीनाम् उल्लेखो दृश्यते वैदिकसाहित्ये । अन्त्य-अन्त्यजन्मेत्यादिभिः शब्दैः चाण्डालादीनां ग्रहणं भवति; अन्त्यजेति शब्दः प्रामुख्येन शूद्रम् अभिधत्ते, स च कृष्णवर्णः । अस्य स्थानं समाजे सर्वनिम्नम् ।

पुराणेषु शूद्रवर्णविषये, शूद्रावान्तरभेदविषये, शूद्रकृत्यविषये च विशदं विवरणं मुपलभ्यते । उद्धोषितमत्र यद् अस्पृश्यतादोषो नास्ति तीर्थेषु । ]

Purāṇas are one of the important literary sources of ancient and medieval Indian history and culture <sup>1</sup>. They are broadly divided into *Mahāpurāṇas* (Major Purāṇas) and *Upapurāṇas* (Minor Purāṇas), while some are known as *Jñāti-Purāṇas* (Caste-Purāṇas) or *Sthala-Purāṇas* or *Sthala-māhātmyas*<sup>2</sup>. *Jñāti-Purāṇas* (Caste-Purāṇas) may be looked upon as "social documents"<sup>3</sup>. Some of the extant "Major Purāṇas", e.g. *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Viṣṇu*, *Matsya*, *Mārkaṇḍeya* are assignable to a period of 300 A. D. to 600 A. D., while some other "Major Purāṇas", e.g. *Agni*, *Garuḍa* are assignable to a period of 600 A.D. to 900 A.D. and some others are assigned to a period later than 900 A.D.<sup>4</sup>

One of the distinguishing features of the ancient Indian society is its Caste-System.<sup>5</sup> The *R̥gveda* (=RV) has references to *ārya* and *dāsa* in the context of its society: it mentions wood-workers, carpenters carriage-builders; cabinet-makers, metal workers, smiths, cattle-traders, artisans and labourers<sup>6</sup>, but in the same text "there is not.... to be found..... that caste-distinction which imparts a peculiar stamp to the whole of the social life of the Indians of later times,<sup>7</sup>" however a reference is sought in the famous *Puruṣaśūkta* (RV 10.90), which deals with the creation of world "as produced from some original material"<sup>8</sup>. The act of creation is here treated as a sacrifice in which the *Puruṣa* is the victim. In reply to a query as to what happened to the different parts of this *Puruṣa* (Primeval Giant) (RV. 10.90.11) it proceeds to reply: "His mouth was Brāhmaṇa, his two arms were made the warrior, his two thighs the Vaiśya; from his two feet the Śūdra was born." (RV. 10.90.12)<sup>9</sup>. But it is significant to note that the term *varṇa* neither occurs in RV 10.90.12 nor in any stanza of

this hymn i.e. RV. 10.90. The later works describe the social organisation in terms of the "cāturvarṇya-model." Purāṇas follow the same varṇa-model, while speaking of the social organisation. There is a plethora of literature on the caste-system<sup>10</sup>. But they leave some scope for the treatment of some aspects of some varṇas in Purāṇas. It is, therefore, proposed to review some aspects of the "Śūdravarna" as reflected in some Purāṇas.

"In the early Vedic literature several of the names of castes that are spoken in the Smṛtis as *antyaajas* occur."<sup>11</sup> The various references in different texts show that by the term *antyaja* more than one low caste are denoted. Various castes, eg. *cāṇḍāla*, *paṇḍita* and others are denoted by the common term *antyaja*. The term *antyaja/antyanman* literally means "last born" or "lowest born" and naturally it refers to "Śūdra" who was the last as well as the lowest born one according to the account of the origin of four social orders. (cf. *padbhyaṁ śūdro ajāyata/RV.10.90.12*).<sup>12</sup>

In the Purāṇas are met with the terms like : *antyaaja*, *antya-janman*, *antāvāsīn*, *asprśyājāti* etc. in the context of the Śūdra-varṇa<sup>13</sup>.

The Manusmṛti 8.279 uses the term *antyaaja* in the sense of "Śūdra" according to Kullūka<sup>14</sup>. In the Matsya-Purāṇa (=MP) 207.19 a blackbull is recommended to an *antyanman* in the Vṛṣotsargavidhi<sup>15</sup>. *En passant* it may be stated that the Mahābhārata (Cr. Ed. 12.181.5) states that the colour of the Śūdra is black and the recommendation of a blackbull suggests the penetration of the colour-concept into the domain of religious practices. The vocable *antyanman* refers here, i.e., MP. 207,19 to *śūdra*, because it occurs after the mention of the other three higher varṇas and also because there is the conspicuous absence of the term *śūdra* here.

The MP 227.49 (datable to c. 650-1000 A.D.)<sup>16</sup> lays down that the punishment for a sexual intercourse with an *antyaaja* woman is the observance of the Cāndrāyaṇavrata. It (i. e. MP 227.54=Manusmṛti 11.175) further lays down that if a Brahmin unknowingly or unintentionally (*ajñānataḥ*) approaches a woman of an *antyaaja* caste or of a *cāṇḍāla*-caste or who eats the food of such persons or accepts presents from them becomes fallen, i.e. he loses his caste-status; but if he does it intentionally, he becomes their equal i.e. he becomes a *cāṇḍāla* or an *antyaaja*. This indicates a stage of distinction between an *antyaaja*-caste and a *cāṇḍāla*-caste. The MP 227.57 refers to the sexual relations of a Brahmin (*dvija*) and a *vṛṣalī* (Śūdra-stri)<sup>17</sup>. It is tempting to note that Kullūka renders *antyaaja* by *śūdrā* in Manusmṛti 8.179,<sup>18</sup> but it is

interesting to note that the Manusmṛti 8.68 mentions the vocable *śūdra* and *antyā* and the latter is explained as *cāṇḍāla* by Kullūka. (cf also Manusmṛti 4.61). The term *antyāja* occurs in the MP 255.14 also<sup>19</sup>.

"The position of the Śūdras was undoubtedly the lowest in the social scale"<sup>20</sup> and the term "śūdra was in fact, a generic term applicable to all those castes, the members of which were not entitled to perform the *upanayana* and to study the Vedas. The Śūdra caste comprised a number of distinct subcastes. The Sūtras mention the names of more than a dozen subcastes which were included in the śūdrācaste..... . According to the Dharmasūtras all such sub-castes among the Sudras owe their origin to the intercaste marriages."<sup>21</sup> Moreover, the term *antyā/antyāja* is becoming "a generic appellation for all lowest castes like the *cāṇḍāla*"<sup>22</sup> and according to Ram Sharan Sharma "whether the unfouchables and the mixed castes were regarded as Śūdras by Manu is not clear."<sup>23</sup> There are various subdivisions of *antyajas* e.g. seven, twelve etc.<sup>24</sup>.

The Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa refers to pollution by touch or contact with certain persons and animals and it lays down that the impurity arising out of contact or touch with them is removable by a bath with clothes<sup>25</sup>. The *antyavasāyin* is included in this list. He is an offspring of a *cāṇḍāla* male and a *niṣāda* female (Manusmṛti 10.39; 4.79). The directive for purification indicates that the impurity ("untouchability") is not by birth; but it appears to be by circumstances or situations; possibly it is related to psychological, religious and/or hygienic considerations. It is significant to note the vocable *aspr̥ṣyajāti* occurs in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa<sup>26</sup>. The idea of the "untouchability arose out of the ideas of ceremonial purity, first applied to aboriginal Śūdras in connection with the sacrificial ritual and expounded and extended to other groups because of the theoretical impurity of certain occupations"<sup>27</sup>. The idea of transmission of pollution by the touch of a Śūdra (and hence untouchable) came in existence in later times after the age of Śūtras<sup>28</sup>. The Kūrma-Purāṇa refers to an *antyāja* and an *antyavasāyin* and states that a contact with them is a sin and hence it is to be avoided<sup>29</sup>.

The Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa<sup>30</sup> refers to several subcastes. Some of which appear to be professional or occupational and some are the result of miscegenation. The Brahma-Purāṇa also refers to some occupational or professional castes and other subcastes<sup>31</sup>. Some Purāṇas speak of *Sat-śūdras* and *Asat-Śūdras*, for example, according to the Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa *Bhilla*, *Gopa*, *Kubara*, *Nāpita* are *Sat-śūdras*<sup>32</sup>. It may be noted that a *Bhilla* is an *antyāja* according to some Smṛtis, e.g. Arṅgiras, Atri

and Yama<sup>33</sup>. Taking the Smṛti-authority and the Brahma-vaivarta-authority together one is tempted to observe that both the terms are interchangeable sometimes.

From the foregoing discussion it appears that some of the tracts in the Purāṇas are modelled on the lines of the Smṛti-texts. Under these circumstances the Purāṇas share the views of the Smṛtis, generally, wherever the term *antyaja* or its synonym occurs and where it is synonymous with the term *sūdra*. It reflects him as standing on the lowest rung of the society, as the creationistic accounts of the society describe. In some cases it tends to refer to castes like *cāṇḍālas etc.*, which are the result of miscegenation (a result of the *anuloma* or the *pratiloma* unions). In such cases there is the semantic expansion. The idea of the transference of impurity is by touch and it has its origination in the ideas of impurity, pollution connected with particular professions or occupations.

Passingly a reference may be made here to tracts on *tīrthayātrās* in Purāṇas. The ancient Indian lawgivers, while dealing with the them of the *tīrthayātrā* grow catholic and liberal and this is evinced in their declarations that "the rules of untouchability are suspended at *tīrthas*"<sup>34</sup> and this suggests that even "*cāṇḍāla*.. is deemed eligible for *tīrthayātrā*"<sup>35</sup>. This indicates a liberal attitude towards *sūdras*, *cāṇḍālas* and other such castes by suspending the concept of touchability and untouchability and this indicates further that this idea is not inherent but circumstantial.

---

\* Paper submitted to the seminar on 'untouchability in Ancient India' on 29-31, March, 1994 by the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

1. Vide Kantawala, S.G., Purāṇas and Epics as sources of Religious, Social and Cultural History of India, Journal of the M.S. University of Baroda, Vol. XIX, No. 1, 1970. pp. 45ff. On the periodization of Indian History Vide Dandekar, R.N., Recent Trends in Indology Poona, 1978, pp. 49 ff.
2. Vide Kantawala, S.G., Purāṇo (in Gujarati), Sāhityadarsana (Bharatiya. - 2), Sardar Patel University, Vallabh Vidyanagar, 1975, p. 126. Das, Veena, Structure and Cognition, (Aspects of Hindu Caste and Ritual), OUP, 1977, pp. 10 ff.
3. vide Das, Veena, A Sociological Approach to the Caste-Purāṇas : A Case Study, Sociological Bulletin, Vol. XVII, No. 2, September, 1968, pp. 141-164.
4. Vide Kane, P.V., History of Darmaśāstra (=HDS), Vol. V., part II, Poona, 1962, Chronological Table, p. xiii.
5. For details vide Ghurya, G.S., Caste and Class in India, New York, 1952, pp. 2ff ; Kane, P.V., HDS, Vol. II, Part I, Poona, 1974, pp. 23ff. The "cste-system" is a loose translation of the term "*varṇavyavasthā*", (vide Danekar R.N., op. cit., pp. 57ff)

6. *Vide* Winternitz, M. A History of Indian Literature, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1927 (translated by Mrs. S. Ketkar ), pp. 65ff. *Vide* also R.C. Majumdar and A.D. Pusalkar (Editors), The Vedic Age, Bombay, 1971, pp. 387 ff.
7. Winternitz, M., *op. cit.*, p. 66.
8. Macdonell, A.A. A, Vedic Reader, OUP., 1954, p. 195.
9. Macdonell, A.A., *op. cit.*, p. 201.  
It may be noted here that this creation-myth is connected with the Yamamythology in the Veda (*Vide* Dandekar, R.N., Vedic Mythological Tracts, Delhi, 1979, pp. 130 ff.)
10. For a brief mention of some works *vide* Kane , P.V., HDS, Vol. II, Part I, Second Edition, Poona, 1974, p. 19, fn. 50.
11. Kane, P.V., HDS, Vol.II, Part I, p. 165; *vide ibid*, chapter IV for detailed information; also *vide ibid*, p. 70.
12. Cf. Pādaja MP 15.14., Viṣṇu-Purāṇa 1.6.6.
13. For a discussion on Śūdras *vide* e.g. Kantawala, S.G., Cultural History from the Matsya Purāṇa, Baroda, 1964, pp. 34 ff; Patil, D.R., Cultural History from the Vāyu-Purāṇa, Poona, 1946, pp. 37 ff, 149 ff; Desai N.Y., Ancient Indian Society, Religion and Mythology as Depicted in the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa. (A Critical Study). Baroda, 1968, pp. 16 ff; Pai, G.K., Cultural History from the Kūrma-Purāṇa, Cochin, 1975, pp. 160 ff; Sheth Surabhi, Religion and Society in the Brahma-Purāṇa, Delhi, 1979, pp. 60 ff; Raval, A.J., Indian Society, Religion and Mythology (A Study of Brahma-vaivarta-Purāṇa), Delhi, 1982, pp. 31 ff.
14. antyajah śūdrah/Kullūka on Manusmṛti 8.279.
15. R.C. Hazra assigns the Chapter 207 of the M P to a period of C 400-1100 A. D. and remarks further that it may be assigned probably to 550-650 A. D. (Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, Dacca, 1940; pp. 176 ff.)
16. *Vide* Hazra, R. C., *op. cit.*, pp.176 ff.
17. Hindi Translation, in the 'Matsya-Purāṇa with Hindi Translation, Kalyāṇa, February, 1985, p. 899. It is significant to note that the MP 227. 58 refers to the *cāturvarṇya*-structure, when therein there is the mention of the term *caturṇām* i. e. *caturṇām varṇānām*.
18. *vide* Manusmṛti 11.175. Buhler renders the term *antyajaja* as "of very low caste" (*vide* SBE. Vol. XXV, p. 466). For the interpretation of different commentators *vide ibid*, pp. 466-467, fn. 176.
19. According to R.C. Hazra (*op. cit.*, pp. 176 ff.) the chapter 255 is datable to c 650-1000 A. D.
20. Ram Gopal, India of Vedic Kalpasūtras, Delhi, Second Edition, 1983, p. 115.
21. Ram Gopal, *op. cit.*, p.115.  
Dharmasūtras of Gautama, Apastamba, Bauddhāyana and others are assignable to a period of 600 B. C. to 300 B.C. (*Vide* Kane, P.V. HDS, Vol. II, Part I, p. xii). The Manu is assigned to a period of 200 B.C. to 200 A.D. (Kane , P.V., *op. cit.*, p. xi).
22. Kane, P.V., *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70.
23. Sharma, Ram Sharan, Śūdras in Ancient India, Delhi, 1958, p. 208.
24. *Vide* for details Kane I, .V., *ibid.*, pp. 70-71.
25. *Vide* Desai, N. Y., *op. cit.*, pp. 17-18; *vide* also Kane, P.V., *ibid.*, p. 71; on *niṣāda vide ibid.*, pp. 86-89.
26. Desai, N.Y., *op. cit.*, p. 17.
27. Kane, P.V., *op. cit.*, p. 159.
28. Ram Gopal, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
29. Pai, G.K., *op. cit.* p. 203.

28. Ram Gopal, *op.cit.*, p. 125.
29. Pai, G.K., *op.cit.* p. 203.
30. Rawal, A.J., *op.cit.*, pp. 31 ff.
31. Sheth Surabhi, *op.cit.*, pp. 62-63.
32. *Vide* Raval, A.J., *op.cit.*, pp. 33 ff; on this two varieties of *sūdras*: *sat* and *asat*; *vide* Ghurye, G.S., *op.cit.*, pp. 96,99,105.
33. *Vide* Kane, P.V., *op.cit.*, p. 89, p. 70 fn. 170; p. 101.
34. Rangaswami Aiyangar, K.V., *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara, *Tīrthavivecana Kāṇḍa* (GOSI No. XC VIII, Baroda 1942). Introduction p. xxv, *vide* also *tīrthe spr̥ṣṭāspṛṣṭir nāduṣyati/ibid.*, p., xxv. fn. 4; *vide* also *ibid.*, p. xxv, fn. 3.
35. Rangaswami Aiyangar, K.V., *ibid.*, p. xxv.

## DEVELOPMENT OF A THEORY OF CREATION

By

S. JENA

[सृष्टिविषये वेदब्राह्मणेषूक्तानि मतानि भिद्यन्ते । पुराणोक्ता या सृष्टिप्रक्रिया तस्यां सांख्यप्रभावोऽवलोक्यते । सृष्टिकर्तुर्ब्रह्मणः शरीरस्य स्त्रीपुरुषभेदेन द्विधा विभागः, ततश्च नामरूपात्मकस्य जगतः प्रादुर्भाव इति यन्मतं वेदपुराणयोर्विवृतं तस्य क्रमिको विकासो यथा जातः, तथात्र प्रतिपादितः । पुराणोक्तमतेन सह वेदोक्तमतस्य यो भेदः, सोऽपि सुष्ठु प्रदर्शितः; वेदपुराणगतमतभेदोऽपि चर्चितो लेखकेन । ]

So far as Hindu Mythology is concerned, different theories of creation are stated to have been evolved in ancient India. Prior to the advent of Purāṇic age, accounts of creation like the Cosmic Egg Theory, the origin of all beings from the great puruṣa (as stated in the Puruṣasūkta, *R̥gveda*, x. 90), the creation of seven mind-born sons and the division of creator's body into two parts--male and female--were in vogue in the period of Vedas and Brāhmaṇas. In fact these were the different theories prevailing in the Veda and Brāhmaṇa period explaining the origin of things and beings in the world. It is in the Purāṇic age that Sāṃkhya theory of creation gained ascendancy over other ancient theories. The aim of the present paper is to show the gradual development of a theory i.e., the concept of the division of creator's body into male and female, from which this universe of names and forms is supposed to have come into existence.

As all thoughts or concepts are ultimately traceable in the Vedas, this concept of creator's body being divided into two parts--male and female--is found out, first of all in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (1.4) in a rudimentary form. Here we are told that the Ātman alone existed in the beginning. He had no delight because he was alone. He desired a second. He was as large as a woman and a man closely embraced (यथा स्त्रीपुमांसौ संपरिष्वक्तौ).

He thereupon split himself into two parts--male and female. He copulated with her. Therefore human beings were produced. When the female noticed that the male was her producer and yet her lover, she transformed into a cow to hide from him, whereupon her divine partner became a bull, the woman then became a mare, while the male became a

horse, she became a she-goat, the other a he-goat, finally a ewe, when the other became a ram. It was thus, that all the goats and sheep and all things that exist in pairs down to the ants were born.

*The Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*, the compilation of Purāṇa texts on the five characteristic topics of *sarga*, *pratisarga*, *vaṁśa manvantara* and *vaiśānucarita* goes a step further when it takes up this Upaniṣadic idea of primal self dividing his body into male and female. In the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (1. Abschnitt Textgruppe I<sup>1</sup> verses 24-25a) the text runs as follows:

सृज्यामानाः प्रजा नैव विवर्धन्ते यदा, तदा ।  
द्विधा कृत्वात्मनो देहमर्धेन पुरुषोऽभवत्, ॥ 24 ॥  
अर्धेन नारी, तस्यां स ससृजे विविधाः प्रजाः ॥ 25 a ॥

When the seven mind-born sons produced offsprings, but those offsprings did not multiply, the self-born Lord Brahmā divided his body into two parts—one half male and the other half female. He begot on her different creatures of the world. It is through his union with her that he produce different creatures of the world.

We notice here a very minute difference that the Upaniṣadic concept of primal self dividing his body into two halves is given up in the *Pañcalakṣaṇa* text and the self has been replaced by the Lord, the creator. It seems with the development of concept of Hindu trinity the authors of the *Purāṇa*-texts did not like the idea of the self co-habiting with his own half. This act was shifted to Lord Brahmā, who was yet to emerge as the Lord of creation in the Purāṇic age. Thus we notice that in the *Pañcalakṣaṇa* stage though the same Vedic tradition is followed, significant changes have been incorporated.

Coming to 1st Abschnitt, Text-guppe IIA 7.Kapitel of the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*, we see an enhanced form of this old myth of creation. It has gone some farther steps than the account given in 1.Abschnitt, Text-gruppe . I of the *Pañcalakṣaṇa* Text. In 1st Abschnitt, Text gruppe II A 7.Kapitel <sup>2</sup> veses 14-17 the text reads as follows:

ततो ब्रह्मात्मसंभूतं पूर्वं स्वायम्भुवं प्रभुम्  
आत्मानमेव कृतवान् प्रजापाल्ये मनुं द्विज । 14 ।  
शतरूपां च तां नारीं तपोनिर्धूतकल्मषाम्  
स्वायम्भुवो मनुर्देवः पत्नीत्वे जगृहे विभुः । 15 ।  
तस्माच्च पुरुषाद् देवी शतरूपा व्यजायत



प्रियव्रतोत्तानपादौ प्रसूत्याकृतिसंज्ञितम् । 16 ।  
 कन्याद्वयं च धर्मज्ञ रूपौदार्यगुणान्वितम्  
 ददौ प्रसूतिं दक्षाय, आकूतिं रुचये पुरा । 17 ।

For the continuance of creation the mind-born sons had to accept consorts. For the purpose Brahmā divided himself into two persons—the first male or Manu Svāyambhuva and the first woman or Śatarūpā. Manu Svāyambhuva took Śatarūpā as his wife. From the union of Svāyambhuva Manu and Śatarūpā were born two sons.—Priyavrata, Uttānapāda and two daughters—Prasūti, Ākūti. Prasūti and Akūti<sup>3</sup> were given in marriage to Dakṣa and Prajāpati Ruci respectively.

In the version of the story as presented in 1st Abschnitt, Text-gruppe I, verses 24-25a of the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*, Brahmā divides his body into two halves (द्विधा कृत्वात्मनो देहम्—one half male and the other half female. He copulates with the female half and produces different creatures of the world (तस्यां स ससृजे विविधाः प्रजाः) . In this account no name is given to the two parts of Brahmās body when actually they are separated, but in the version presented in the 1st Abschnitt, Text grduppe ITA, 7. Kapitel, verses 14-17 of the *Pañcalakṣaṇa* Text, Brahmā though dividing his body into two parts like the former, produces first man called Manu Svāyambhuva and the first woman called Śatarūpā. In the former version while the two divisions of Brahmā's body go without names, in the latter the male part is designated as Manu Svāyambhuva and the female part as Śatarūpā. We know, it is Svāyambhuva Manu from whom the human race has its origin and he is regarded as the first progenitor of mankind. *Mānasī sṛṣṭi* fails to perpetuate the creation. The seven mind-born sons do not succeed in the act of creation. The offspring produced by them do not grow, or multiply, after the birth of Svāyambhuva Manu and Śatarūpā the concept of mental creation (*mānasī sṛṣṭi*.) undergoes a change and it is replaced by *mainthunī sṛṣṭi*. *Maithunī sṛṣṭi* is hereafter said to play a vital role in advancing the cause of creation.

We notice this theory of creation in an altered form when we come to 1st Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIB, 7. Kapitel<sup>4</sup> verses 7-18. With all other accounts remaining mostly the same, this text-group gives an exposition of Śatarūpā as to who she is. Here the text reads as follows:

स्वां तनुं स ततो ब्रह्मा तामपोहत भास्वराम्  
 द्विधा कृत्वा स्वकं देहमर्धेन पुरुषोऽभवत् । 7 ।  
 अर्धेन नारी, सा तस्य शतरूपा व्यजायत  
 प्रकृतिं<sup>5</sup> भूतधात्रीं तां कामाद् वै सृष्टवान् प्रभुः ॥  
 सा दिवं पृथिवीं चैव महिम्ना व्याप्य धिष्ठिता<sup>6</sup>  
 ब्रह्मणः सा तनुः पूर्वा दिवमावृत्य तिष्ठति । 9 ।  
 या त्वर्धा सृज्यते नारी शतरूपा व्यजायत  
 सा देवी नियुतं तप्त्वा तपः परमदुश्चरम् । 10 ।  
 भर्तारं दीप्तयशसं पुरुषं प्रत्यपद्यत  
 स वै स्वायम्भुवः पूर्वपुरुषो मनुश्च्यते । 11 ।  
 तस्यैकसप्ततियुगं मन्वन्तरमिहोच्यते  
 लब्ध्वा तु पुरुषः पत्नीं शतरूपामयोनिजाम् । 12 ।  
 तथा स रमते सार्धं तस्मात् सा रतिरुच्यते  
 प्रथमः संप्रयोगः स कल्पादौ समवर्तत । 13 ।  
 विराजमसृजद् ब्रह्मा सोऽभवत् पुरुषो विराट्  
 सम्राट् स शतरूपस्तु वैराजस्तु मनुः स्मृतः । 14 ।  
 स वैराजः प्रजासर्गं ससर्ज पुरुषो मनुः  
 वैराजात् पुरुषाद् वीराच्छतरूपा व्यजायत । 15 ।  
 प्रियव्रतोत्तानपादौ पुत्रौ पुत्रवतां वरौ  
 कन्ये द्वे च महाभागे याभ्यां जाता इमाः प्रजाः । 16 ।  
 देवी नाम्ना तथाकृतिः प्रसूतिश्चैव ते शुभे  
 स्वायम्भुवः प्रसूतिं तु दक्षाय व्यसृजत् प्रभुः । 17 ।  
 प्राणो दक्षस्तु विज्ञेयः संकल्पो मनुश्च्यते  
 रुचेः प्रजापतेश्चैव आकृतिं प्रत्यपादयत् । 18 ।

C.P. 2 Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Text gr. I. SL. 1-15

In referring to the two divisions of Brahmā's body the redactor of the Purāṇa texts like *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Kūrma* and *Liṅga* speaks of Śatarūpā. Śatarūpā is not born of any womb (अयोनिजा). As Hazra rightly points out, Śatarūpā is "Brahmā's *Prakṛti* sustaining the entire creation and pervading the earth and heaven by her greatness and said to be his former body as he existed by covering the sky" <sup>7</sup> Śatarūpā born of half the body of creator practised severe austerities for a million years and had Svāyambhuva Manu, <sup>8</sup> the first man born of Brahmā as her husband. From the first union of this couples which took place in the

beginning of the kalpa were born two sons named Priyavrata and Uttānapāda and two daughters—Prasūti and Akūti. Prasūti and Akūti were offered in marriage by Manu Svāyambhuva to Dakṣa and the patriarch Ruci respectively.

We observe here that when the account of creation presented in 1st Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIA, 7. Kapitel is silent on Śatarūpā, this version as given in 1st Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIB, 7. Kapitel depicts her identity in a somewhat laconic form. By referring to Śatarūpā as Brahmā's *prakṛti* (प्रकृतिं भूतधात्रीं ताम्) the redactor of the texts like *Vāyu*, *Brahmāṇḍa*, *Kūrma* and *Liṅga* takes her to be an inseparable part of the body of Lord Brahmā.

Śatarūpā is our main concern. She is the centre of our discussion. Coming to 1. Abschnitt, Textgruppe III (ch. 3 30ff) we see that the redactor of *Matsya* not only clarifies our doubts centering round Śatarūpā, but also the story altogether takes a different turn.

Desirous of creation when Lord Brahmā was engaged in muttering Sāvitrī, his body broke into two parts—one male and the other an extremely beautiful female variously named as Śatarūpā, Sāvitrī, Gāyatrī, Sarasvatī and Brahmāṇi. As she was born from his own body (स्वदेहसम्भूता), Lord Brahmā took her to be his own daughter (आत्मजा). At the sight of Śatarūpā Brahmā became so much struck with passion that he could not desist from looking amorously at her and continued to praise her beauty repeatedly. It so happened that when Śatarūpā circumambulated for paying him obeisance, Brahmā developed four more faces for stealing glances at her. Advising his mind-born sons to engage themselves in creation, he got married to Śatarūpā, repaired to his lotus-abode and like an ordinary person (यथान्यः प्राकृतो जनः) enjoyed her union for a hundred divine years (अब्दशतं दिव्यम्). As a result of their union after a long time (महता कालेन) Śatarūpā gave birth to Svāyambhuva Manu who was also known as Virāṭ and Ādipuruṣa.<sup>9</sup>

From 1. Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIA 7. Kapitel we know that when Brahmā's body is dismembered into two parts, the female part is known as Śatarūpā. As regards Śatarūpā 1, Abschnitt, Text-gruppe IIB, 7. Kapitel says that she is *prakṛti* of Brahmā upholding the entire creation (प्रकृतिं

भूतधात्रीम्), but it is this text-group where the redactor of *Matsya* not only speaks of Śatarūpā elaborately, but makes clear her relation with Brahmā, the great progenitor of the three worlds. Born of his body (स्वदेह सम्भूता) though she is taken to be the daughter of the self-born Lord, owing to her exquisite beauty Brahmā marries her and this act of Brahmā amounts to a father's incest with his own daughter.<sup>10</sup>

We know, after noticing the failure of mind-born sons in the act of creation, Brahmā simply breaks his body into two parts and gives rise to a male entity and a female entity which are respectively named as Manu Svāyambhuva and Śatarūpā in the second and third versions of the story. There is no reference to Brahmā's taking any help for creating Manu or Śatarūpā. But the redactor of *Matsya* is careful in saying that when for the sake of creation (लोकसृष्ट्यर्थम्), Lord Brahmā is continuing his meditation, centering all his thoughts on Sāvitrī, the most beautiful female comes out. The male part (अर्धं पुरुषरूपवत्) is born, but the mythologer is silent on it. And the most beautiful female is Śatarūpā who is not different from Gāyatrī, Sāvitrī, Brahmāṇi or Sarasvatī. As pointed out by the redactor of *Matsya*, Brahmā and Sāvitrī form a couple, they reside together, they cannot be conceived to be living apart, Sāvitrī or Gāyatrī forms a part and parcel of the splendiferous body of Brahmā representing the entire Vedic lore.<sup>11</sup> And therefore the *Purāṇakāra* is justified in speaking of Śatarūpā as taking her birth from the body of Brahmā when the latter is deeply absorbed in the recitation of Sāvitrī (सावित्री हृदि कृत्वा समास्थितः, संजपतस्तस्य).

Besides, from all other versions, this *Matsya* version of the story is unique in the sense that when in all other versions either the union of the male part and female part or the union of Manu and Śatarūpā, is held responsible for the growth or advancement of creation, in this version Lord Brahmā takes Sāvitrī or Śatarūpā as his wife; and Svāyambhuva Manu is said to have taken birth on account of their union. Unlike other versions, Svāyambhuva Manu instead of being the husband of Śatarūpā is presented here as the son of the latter. In this version Manu, however, takes Anantā as his spouse who bears him two sons - Priyavrata and Uttānapāda.<sup>12</sup>

We find a still more developed form of this theory of creation in the first account of *Vaiṣṇava* of the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (2. Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Text-gruppe 1).<sup>13</sup>

The text as given in it runs thus:

CP. 1. Abschnitt, Text gr. II B 7 Kapitel, Sl. 90-16a

संसृष्टासु प्रजास्वेवमापवो वै प्रजापतिः  
 लेभे वै पुरुषः पत्नीं शतरूपामयोनिजाम् । 1<sub>1</sub> ।  
 आपवस्य महिम्ना तु दिव्यमावृत्य तिष्ठतः  
 धर्मेणैव मुनिश्रेष्ठाः शतरूपा व्यजायत । 1<sub>2</sub> ।  
 सा तु वर्षशतं तप्त्वा तपः परमदुश्चरम्  
 भर्तारं दीप्ततपसं पुरुषं प्रत्यपद्यत । 1<sub>3</sub> ।  
 स वै स्वायम्भुवो विप्रा पुरुषो मनुश्च्यते  
 तस्यैकसप्ततियुगं मन्वन्तरमिहोच्यते । 1<sub>4</sub> ।  
 वैराजात् पुरुषाद् वीरं शतरूपा व्यजायत  
 प्रियव्रतोत्तोनपादौ वीरात् काम्या व्यजायत । 1<sub>5</sub> ।  
 काम्या नाम सुता श्रेष्ठा कर्दमस्य प्रजापतेः  
 काम्यापुत्राश्च चत्वारः सम्राट् कुक्षिर्विराट् प्रभुः । 6 ।  
 उत्तानपादं जग्राह पुत्रमत्रिः प्रजापतिः  
 उत्तानपादाच्चतुरः सूनृता सुषुवे सुतान् । 2 ।  
 धर्मस्य कन्या सुश्रोणी सूनृता नाम विश्रुता  
 उत्पन्ना वाजिमेघेन ध्रुवस्य जननी शुभा । 3 ।  
 ध्रुवं च कीर्तिमन्तं च आयुष्मन्तं वसुं तथा  
 उत्तानपादोऽजनयत् सूनृतायां प्रजापतिः । 4 ।

Creation began from Brahmā. And it is Brahmā who divided himself into two parts—male and female. The male part was Manu Svāyambhuva and the female part was Śatarūpā. And with the union of Svāyambhuva and Śatarūpā. maithuni ṣṣṭi took place. As usual Śatarūpā practised severe penance and won Svāyambhuva Manu (Vairāja) as her husband. She bore him a son—Vīra. Vīra got married to Kāmyā, the daughter of Prajāpati Kardama and she gave birth to six sons—Priyavrata, Uttānapāda, Samrāj, Kuksi, Virāj, and Prabhu. Prajāpati Atri accepted Uttānapāda as his son. Uttānapāda got married to Sūnṛtā, the daughter of Dharma and she bore him four sons—Dhruva, Kīrtimat, Āyusmat and Vasu.

What we notice in this version is that this version as presented in 2. Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Textgruppe 1 of *Vaṁśa* is a big departure from the version of the story as given in 1. Abschnitt, Textgruppe III of the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*. In the second and third version of the story presented in 1. Abschnitt, Text-gruppe IIA, 7. Kapitel and 1. Abschnitt, Text gruppe IIB, 7. Kapitel when two sons—Priyavrata, Uttānapāda and two daughters—Prasūti, Ākūti— are stated to have been born from the union of Svāyambhuva and Śatarūpā, in this first account of *Vaṁśa* Śatarūpā is said to bear only one son—Vīra. And it is due to the marriage of Vīra and Kāmyā, the daughter of Prajāpati Kārdama that six sons like Priyavrata, Uttānapāda, Samrāj, Kuṣi, Virāj and Prabhu are produced. We also come across another subtle yet remarkable difference that when the earlier two versions already referred to (i.e., 1st Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIA, 7. Kapitel and 1st Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIB, 7. Kapitel) give in details the line of progeny proceeding from Prasūti and Ākūti, the two daughters of Manu and Śatarūpā, and as such they are silent on the descendants of Uttānapāda, this first account of *Vaṁśa* takes up discussing the line of progeny coming from Uttānapāda and his wife Sūnṛtā, the daughter of Dharma.

Then we come to the second account of *Vaṁśa* as presented in 2. Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Text gruppe II<sup>14</sup> of the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*. Manu Svāyambhuva, the son of Prajāpati Brahmā an Śatarūpā as stated earlier in 1. Abschnitt, Text gruppe III of *sarga-pratisarga* continued rigorous penance (तपः सुदुश्चरम्.) and got Anantā, the paragon of beauty (रूपाद्दयाम्) as his wife. Svāyambhuva Manu was blessed with two sons born from her—Priyavrata and Uttānapāda. Sūnṛtā, the daughter of Dharma came to be the wife of Uttānapāda and she gave birth to four sons—Apasyati, Apasyanta, Kīrtimat and Dhruva.<sup>15</sup>

In the first account of *Vaṁśa* we notice that owing to the union of Svāyambhuva Manu and Śatarūpā Vīra is born and owing to the union of Vīra and Kāmayā six sons including Priyavrata, Uttānapāda and four others are produced, but according to the second account of *Vaṁśa*, the marriage of Svāyambhuva Manu and Anantā results in the birth of only two sons—Priyavrata and Uttānapāda. Like the first account of *Vaṁśa*,

account this also speaks of the marriage of Uttānapāda with Sūnṛtā and goes on discussing the line of progeny coming from them. Out of the four sons born from Sūnṛtā when the first account of *Vaṁśa* refers to them as Dhruva, Kīrtimat, Vasu and Āyusmat, the second account of *Vaṁśa* speaks of them as Dhruva, Kīrtimat, Apasyati and Apasyanta.

Thus if we take into account the detailed analysis of all these text-groups, we will find many points of difference in them, but this is not our job to go into the minute study of all the aforesaid versions. We see only how the concept of self dividing itself into two parts in the Upanaṣadic period has been transformed into two divisions of Brahmā's body in the Purāṇic age and how it has developed stage by stage and has given rise to the different text-groups till we meet with its final culmination in the first and second account of *Vaṁśa* in the 2nd Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Textgruppe I and II of the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa*.

1. 1. Abschnitt, Textgruppe I is represented by Agni Purāṇa 1.17,6b-17; Brahma Purāṇa 1.31-56, Harivaṁśa 27-53 (Calcutta Edn 1834-39=Harivaṁśa I.1.1.15-40 (Cr, Edn. Poona, 1976) and Śiva Purāṇa (Dharma Saṁhitā) 51.3-28.
2. 1st Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIA, 7. Kapitel is constituted of Agni 20.17b-20a, Garuḍa 5.19-32, Mārkaṇḍeya 50.1-32; Padma 11.3. 163b-195a; Padma 2.V.3. 155b-187a; Viṣṇu I. 7.1-33; cfr. Varāha 2.43-56.
3. In the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Ch. 50.15-16) it is Ṛddhi who gets married to Ruci.
4. 1st Abschnitt, Textgruppe 11B, 7. Kapitel is represented by Brahmāṇḍa I.9.92; Kūrma 8.1-28; Liṅga 70. 260b-324; and Vāyu 10.1-67.
5. See also 1. Abschnitt, Textgruppe IIB, 7. Kapitel verses 61-62.

एव प्रीतात्मनस्तस्य स्वदेहार्धाद् विनिःसृता  
 नारी परमकल्याणी सर्वभूतमनोहरा । 61 ।  
 सा हि कामात्मना सृष्टा प्रकृतेः सोमरूपिणी  
 शतरूपेति सा प्रोक्ता सा प्रोक्तैव पुनः पुनः । 62 ।

As pointed out by Kirfel in the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (p.113), these lines are found only in the text of Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa (I.9.14-15). Though it is generally admitted that the earliest Purāṇas like Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa are

based upon one text-kernel, the redactor of the Brahman̄ḍa text seems to have made certain improvements here apart from the common verses found in both. And that is why these lines are put separately by Kirfel.

6. On a comparison of these verses with 1. Abschnitt, Textgruppe I, verses 24-25 the critic can clearly notice the phase by phase development done by the redactor of Purāṇa-texts. And as such Kirfel is right when he points out the older texts in bold letters whereas the later verses are shown in small letters.
7. Hāzra, R.C. "An aspect of Epic and Purāṇic Mythology", PURĀṆA (Dr. R.C. Hazra Commemoration Volume), Vol. XXVII, No. 1, PP. 2-3.
8. Svāyambhuva Manu is also called Vairāja (वैराजस्तु मनुः स्मृतः-14). The redactor of Purāṇa-texts such as Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Kūrma and Liṅga uses Vairāja, Puruṣa, Manu, Śatarūpā or Samrāj as synonyms.
9. Vide 1. Abschnitt, Text-gruppe III Ch. 3.30-34, 41-45.

सावित्रीं लोकसृष्ट्यर्थं हृदि कृत्वा समास्थितः  
 ततः संजपतस्तस्य भित्त्वा देहमकल्मषम् । 30 ।  
 स्त्रीरूपमर्धमकरोदर्थं पुरुषरूपवत्  
 शतरूपा च सा ख्याता सावित्री च निगद्यते । 31 ।  
 सरस्वत्यथ गायत्री ब्रह्माणी च परन्तप  
 ततः स्वदेहसम्भूतामात्मजामित्यकल्पयत् । 32 ।  
 दृष्ट्वा तां व्यथितस्तावत् कामबाणार्दितो विभुः  
 अहो रूपमहो रूपमिति चाह प्रजापतिः । 33 ।  
 ततो वसिष्ठप्रमुखा भगिनीमिति चुक्रुशुः  
 ब्रह्मा न किञ्चिद् ददृशे तन्मुखालोकनादृते । 34 ।  
 × × ×  
 ततस्तानब्रवीत् ब्रह्मा पुत्रान् आत्मसमुद्भवान्  
 प्रजाः सृजध्वमभितः सदेवासुरमानुषाः । 41 ।  
 एवमुक्तास्ततः सर्वे ससृजुर्विविधाः प्रजाः  
 गतेषु तेषु सृष्ट्यर्थं प्रणामावनतामिमाम् । 42 ।  
 उपयेमे स विश्वात्मा शतरूपामनिन्दिताम्  
 स बभूव तया सार्धमतिकामातुरो विभुः  
 सलज्जां चकमे देवः कमलोदरमन्दिरे । 43 ।  
 यावदब्दशतं दिव्यं यथान्यः प्राकृतो जनः  
 ततः कालेन महता तस्याः पुत्रोऽभवन् मनुः । 44 ।  
 स्वायम्भुव इति ख्यातः, स विराडिति नः श्रुतम्  
 तद्रूपगुणसामान्यादधिपुरुष उच्यते । 45 ।

10. Of course this problem gives ample scope to the redactor of *Matsya* for a philosophical discussion on the matter and in reply to this intricate question, the *Purāṇakāra* suggests that the four-faced Lord Brahmā presides over the Vedas; and Gāyatrī forms a part of Brahmā (अङ्गभूता). Whether embodied or unembodied they are said to form a couple. Wherever there is Virañci, there is goddess Sarasvatī and wherever there is Bhārati (the goddess of speech) there is Prajāpati (the lord of creatures). The multitude of Vedas is traditionally known as Brahmā and Sāvitrī resides in it, so the Lord incurs no fault for his union with Sāvitrī.

अन्यच्च सर्ववेदानामधिष्ठाता चतुर्मुखः  
 गायत्री ब्रह्मणस्तद्वदङ्गभूता निगद्यते । 7 ।



अमूर्तं मूर्तिमद् वापि मिथुनं तत् प्रचक्षते  
 विरञ्चिर्यत्र भगवांस्तत्र देवी सरस्वती  
 भारती यत्र यत्रैव तत्र तत्र प्रजापतिः । 8 ।  
 वेदराशिः स्मृतो ब्रह्मा सावित्री तदधिष्ठिता  
 तस्मान्न कश्चिद् दोषः स्यात् सावित्रीगमने विभोः । 10 ।

Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa 1. Abschnitt, Text gruppe III, Ch. 4.7-8, 10

11. Vide *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* 1. Abschnitt, Text-Gruppe, III, Ch. 4. 7-10
12. Though Manu taking Anantā as his wife is found out in *Matsya* Ch. 4. 33ff., in the *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* Kirfel puts it in 2. Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Text-gruppe II of *Varṇs'a* because the genealogy described in it shows the later stage of development after 2. Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Text-gruppe I of *Varṇs'a*.
13. 2. Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Text-gruppe 1 is constituted of Agni 18.1-31a; Brahmāṇḍa I. 36. 83-116b, 37.22b-60; Brahma 2.1-57; Harivaṁśa 54-114, (Calcutta Edn. 1934-39)=Harivaṁśa I. 21-56 (Cr Edn. Poona, 1976), Śiva Purāṇa (Dharma Saṁhitā) 52.1-53.21; Vāyu 62.71-98, 63.22-56; Viṣṇu I.13.1-9a, 14.1-7, 15.1-10, 72-84; Cp. Garuḍa 6.1-13; and Kūrma 14.1-65.
14. *Matsya* Ch. 4.33-55 forms 2. Abschnitt, 1. Kaṭipitel, Textgruppe II of *Varṇs'a*.
15. Vide 2. Abschnitt, 1. Kapitel, Textgruppe II,

स्वायम्भुवो मनुधीमो स्तपस्तप्त्वा सुदुश्चरम्  
 पत्नीमवाप रूपाढ्यामनन्तां नाम नामतः । 33 ।  
 प्रियव्रतोत्तानपादौ मनुस्तस्यामजीजनत्  
 धर्मस्य कन्या चतुरा सूनुता नाम भामिनी । 34 ।  
 उत्तानपादात् तनयान् प्राप मन्यरगामिनी  
 अपस्यतिमपस्यन्तं कीर्तिमन्तं ध्रुवं तथा । 35 ।  
 उत्तानपादोऽजनयत् सूनुतायां प्रजापतिः । 36a

*Matsya Purāṇa* ch. 4

# GENESIS OF KUBERA IN THE EPICS AND THE PURĀṆAS

By

C. SATAPATHY

[कुबेरस्योल्लेखोऽथर्वणि दृश्यते । अयं राक्षसादीनाम् अधिपतिरूपेण ब्राह्मणग्रन्थेषु वर्णितः । आरण्यकेषु सूत्र-ग्रन्थेषु च कुबेरवर्णनमुपलभ्यते, क्वचिद् कुबेरवैश्रवणेति नाम्ना । कुबेरसंबद्धेषु प्राणिषु 'इतरजनेति' शब्दो वेदे प्रयुक्तः—आर्यभिन्नो देशवासिचरो जन एवेतरजन इति विज्ञायते ।

वैश्रवणस्य कुबेरस्य यच्च चरितं पुराणेषु महाभारते रामायणे च विशदरूपेणोप-वर्णितम्, लेखकेन तदत्र समीक्षामुखेनालोचितम् । एषु ग्रन्थेषु चरितवर्णने अन्तरान्तरा यान्यूनाधिकते अवलोक्येते, तयोः को हेतुरित्यपि प्रदर्शितमत्र । कुबेरसंबद्धे तीर्थविषये, शिवादिदेवविषये, रावणादि-राक्षस-चरितविषये, हरिकेशादियक्षविषये च पुष्कला चर्चा कृता लेखकेन । कुबेरसंबद्धा या कथा लोके प्रचरन्ति ततोऽस्य लोकप्रियता सिध्यति ।]

Kubera is well known in Indian mythology as the lord and giver of wealth, the lord of the Northern direction and the king of the yakṣas. The origin of the concept of Kubera is traced to the Atharvaveda 8.10.28 in a hymn to *virāj*. It is said that *virāj* 'the shining one', in the form of a cow made striding in different regions yielding subsistence to all. After striding the regions of Devas, Asuras, Gandharvas etc. She came to the *itarajanas*<sup>1</sup>. Kubera-*vaiśravaṇa* became her calf and the milk she yielded was *tirodhā* 'concealment' on which the *itarajanas* subsist. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 13.4.3.10. Kubera appears as the king of the Rākṣasas and the evil-doers and robbers throng around him. The Āśvalāyana śrauta sūtra 10.7.6. indicates that Kubera-*vaiśravaṇa* is associated with the knowledge of spells relating to the *piśācas*. In the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 1.31 Kubera-*vaiśravaṇa* is characterised as an embodiment of concealment and as the king of kings who overpowers enemies by force. He has his capital-city on the three mountains. He is invoked to make the enemies disappear and to grant food and wealth. He is also prayed to fulfil the desires of his devotees. A sacrifice entitled *Vaiśravaṇa yajña* is laid in his honour. In the Sūtra literature Kubera receives offerings '*baḷi*'.<sup>2</sup> In the marriage ceremony the priest offers the oblations to *Vaiśravaṇa* and *Īśāna* for the sake of the bride groom. Kubera is worshipped and invoked in many a *gṛhya*-rites<sup>3</sup>. Besides these references the Vedic texts do not furnish us with the legends regarding the

origin of Kubera, but the epic-puranic texts are prolific in nature in this respect. The two epics, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas appear to be the bedrock of Kubera's mythology<sup>4</sup>. Hence an attempt is made here to trace the genesis of Kubera in the epics and the Purāṇas.

In the later part of the Rāmāyaṇa (7.2.3) the origin of Kubera is traced to God Brahmā thus: Pulastya, the son of prajāpati (Brahmā) performed penance on the slopes of Meru. Due to his curse Tṛṇavindu's daughter got impregnated. Pulastya, on Tṛṇavindu's request, married her and she gave birth to Viśravas. Viśravas eventually gained as his wife, Devavarṇinī, the daughter of Bharadvāja, who gave birth to a very wonderful son, possessed of valour and all the virtues of a Brahmin. The sage Pulastya was very much delighted at the birth of the son of Viśravas and he named the boy as Vaiśravaṇa.

The tradition runs: Vaiśravaṇa (Kubera) was pious from his birth. He considered *dharma* to be the highest goal in the worlds. So he repaired to the forest for penance and continued it for thousand years. Pleased with his austerities Brahmā and other gods appeared before him. He was asked to pray for a boon. Then Vaiśravaṇa expressed his desire to become a guardian of the world (*lokapāla*) and its protector (*lokarakṣaka*). Brahmā informed him that he (Brahmā) had created earlier Yama, Indra and Varuṇa as three guardians of the world and was about to create the fourth *lokapāla* (guardian of the world). So Brahmā granted him the boon of equal status with Yama, Indra and Varuṇa. Vaiśravaṇa was also granted the position of the lord of wealth, an aerial car, Puspaka by name and equal status with the gods. But Prajāpati did not assign a place of residence to Vaiśravaṇa. So he approached his father and prayed to him for a residence. Viśravas directed him to reside and rule over Laṅkā the magnificent city on the Trikuṭa mountain, situated on the shores of the southern ocean.

Like the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata also records similar tradition with certain modifications and additions. The Mahābhārata records two versions of the birth of Kubera. In one passage (*Mbh.* 3.87. 1-3) he is said to have been born in the hermitage of the sage Viśravas, which was situated in the country of Avanti, on the bank of the westward flowing river Narmadā. In another passage of the same (*Mbh.* 3. 258.12-16) it is stated that Kubera was born of Pulastya, the mind-born son of Brahmā and begotten through a cow<sup>5</sup>. Having deserted his father, Vaiśravaṇa went to his grandfather, Prajāpati. The Grandsire was very much pleased

with him and granted him immortality (*amaratva*), sovereignty over all the wealth (*dhaneśatva*) and the guardianship of the world (*lokapālatva*). The friendship with Īśāna was also conferred on him and he was granted a son named Naḷakūbara. Besides, he got Laṅkā as his capital which was guarded by hosts of Rakṣases.

Another tradition<sup>6</sup> seems to emphasise his achievements through penance in a sacred place called Kubera Tīrtha. As a consequence Kubera attained the lordship over the treasure, friendship with Rudra, godhood, guardianship of the world, son Nalakūbara, the aerial car Puṣpaka yoked by the swans and the lordship over the Nairṛta Rakṣases.

Further in the two Epics Kubera's relation with the family of Rāvaṇa (*rāvaṇakuḷa*) is established. We are informed by the Rāmāyaṇa (7.9) that the sage Viśravas also married Kaikaśī, the daughter of the Rakṣas Sumāli. Her sons were Rāvaṇa, Kumbhakarṇa, Vibhīṣaṇa and the only daughter was Sūrpaṇakhā. The Rāmopākhyāna of the *Mbh.* 3.258-259 gives a different version of the birth of the Rakṣases like Rāvaṇa and others. It is said that Vaiśravaṇa, deserting his father Pulastya, was attached to his grandfather, Prajāpati. Angered at this his father begot of himself one Viśravas, with half of his own-self, for wrecking a vengeance on Vaiśravaṇa. Viśravas disliked Vaiśravaṇa. In order to get his favour Kubera sent to Viśravas three demon maids to wait upon him. They were Puṣpotkaṭā, Rākā and Mālinī, who became the mothers of the Rakṣasa brothers and sister; Rāvaṇa and Kumbhakarṇa were born to Puṣpotkaṭā, Vibhīṣaṇa was born to Mālinī and Khara and Sūrpaṇakhā were born to Rākā.

In the birth-story of Kubera, in the Epics, it is to be noted that the Rāmāyaṇa makes Kubera the grandson of Pulastya whereas Pulastya has been described as the father of Kubera in the Mahābhārata. The Rāmāyaṇa gives the name of his mother as Devavarṇinī while the *Mbh.* mentions that he was born of a cow. It is very interesting to remember that the *Mbh.* has kept up the Atharvaṇic tradition, where Kubera-Vaiśravaṇa has been delineated as the calf of Virāj, who came to the other folks as a cow.

Further the birth-account of Kubera is unique in two respects. In the first place his origin is traced to Prajāpati Brahṁā and secondly, he is related with the race of Rāvaṇa. It is possible to suppose that Kubera was accepted as a Brahmanic deity when the Aryans completely overawed the primitive people; there started the cultural synthesis between the two. After the Aryanisation of this deity, his birth is linked with Prajāpati-Brahṁā,

who had already attained considerable prestige among the Aryans. The tracing of his origin to the creator-god is to glorify him; but at the same time his earlier nature as the leader of the Rakṣases was not lost sight of as is indicated by his relation with the Rāvaṇakula. But in the *Mbh.* Rāvaṇa is mentioned only with reference to the story of Rāma, while Kubera is mentioned independently in a large number of passages, which suggests that Kubera was very popular before the Rāvaṇa-story and his relation with Rāvaṇa was established much later<sup>7</sup>.

In the genesis of Kubera a fusion of two distinct cultures-Aryan and pre-Aryan, is clearly discernible. Prajāpati is a Vedic deity while Pulastya is virtually unknown in Vedic literature and is found mentioned in the Epic-Puranic tradition of Ṛṣis<sup>8</sup>. Likewise Viśravas is referred to as a *muni*.<sup>9</sup>

The ancient Indian culture-complex is marked by the blending of two cultural trends - the ṛṣi-culture and the muni-culture. The Ṛṣis sponsored the Indra-cult, recited prayers, performed *homa* and lived as householders while the munis sponsored the Rudra-Śiva-cult, practised *yoga*, austerities and glorified a life of renunciation, isolation and wandering mendicancy. The Ṛṣis are the representatives of the Vedic Aryan current of thought while the Munis represent the indigenous tradition<sup>10</sup>. Thus it appears that to mention Kubera as the son of muni Viśravas seems to emphasise his pre-Aryan origin very well.

The birth-story of Kubera is also related in the Purāṇic texts. It is difficult to determine, with any degree of exactness, the date of composition of anyone of the Purāṇas. However in utilising the Purāṇic accounts, it is not necessary to make any distinction between the Mahāpurāṇas and the Upapurāṇas, as some of the Upapurāṇas are historically as genuine and trustworthy as any of the Mahāpurāṇas<sup>11</sup>. The different Purāṇas contain different stories regarding the birth of Kubera. Some of them agree with others in some way and differ in the other, whereas there are altogether different stories also to highlight the birth of Kubera. Sometimes they appear to be sectarian redactions. In view of this the stories are taken up one after the other to provide a clear insight into the genesis of Kubera.

In almost all the tradition, Kubera is accepted as the son of Viśravas, but the details vary. Let us first take the Purāṇa texts of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa. Pargiter and Kirfel accept both these texts as rooted in one text-kernel. The birth of Kubera is related in these texts<sup>12</sup> thus : In *tretāyuga* there was a king Tṛṇavindu whose daughter (not named in the

Rāmāyaṇa) was Ilavilā (Iḍaviḍā). She was given in marriage to Pulastya and Viśravas was their offspring. Viśravas married Devavarṇinī, the daughter of Bṛhaspati (mentioned as the daughter of Bharadvāja in the Rāmāyaṇa). Besides he had three other wives-Puṣpotkaṭā and Vākā, the daughters of Mālyavat and Kaikaśī, that of Mālin. Devavarṇinī gave birth to Vaiśravaṇa. Vaiśravaṇa was endowed with divine conduct and sacred Vedic knowledge. He was possessed of the form of Rakṣas and asuric strength. The uncouth form of the Rakṣas includes three legs, an extremely huge body, a big head, a very broad chin, eight teeth, yellow beards, spike like ears, short hands and a tawny complexion. Consequently his father named him Kubera, the word *ku* being used in the sense of decrying and *bera* meaning body<sup>13</sup>.

It is to be mentioned here that these statements regarding Kubera's deformity do not agree with the Rāmāyaṇa and the *Mbh.* account. Kubera is stated to be possessed of prowess and he is the most wonderful. He is said to have all the qualities of a Brahmin (Rām. 7.3.5). His appearance was so charming and shining that the firmament was illuminated by his effulgence (*Mbh.* 3.42.8). However the Rāmāyaṇa refers to one of his bodily deformities. In the Rāmāyaṇa (7.13) Kubera is known as Ekākṣipiṅgala (the tawny-eyed one). The myth relates that Kubera had gone to the mountain Himavat to practise penance. Having controlled his senses he practised the fierce rite relating to Rudra. There he happened to see Lord Śiva with Umā, who possessed extra-ordinary beauty. He cast his left eye on the Devī with the object to know who she was and nothing else. At this his left eye got scorched and assumed a tawny colour through the supernatural powers of the Devī<sup>14</sup>. The later part of the myth says that Kubera went to other places of the mountain and practised severe penance invoking Rudra. The latter was then pleased with Kubera and granted him (Kubera) his (Śiva's) friendship and announced that the name Ekākṣipiṅgala would remain for ever. The myth (*Rām.* 7/13.22-31) is no doubt an explanation of one of the names of Kubera.

It is further noteworthy that the friendship of Kubera with Śiva is traced to the boons of Brahmā but in the present myth Śiva himself granted such privilege which might suggest the sectarian tendency to glorify Śiva as the supreme godhead.

From the Brahma Purāṇa (97.2ff) we learn that Kubera was the eldest son of Vaiśravaṇa. Rāvaṇa, Kumbhakarna and Vibhīṣaṇa were his step brothers. Instigated by his mother, Rāvaṇa with his brothers attacked

Kubera and proclaimed that he who gave shelter to Kubera would be punished. Kubera sought help of Pulastya who asked him to go to the river Gautamī. Kubera went there and practised penance. Being pleased Śiva bestowed upon him the status of Dhanapāḷa (the protector of wealth). The holy place also got famous by the names Paulastya-Dhanada and Vaiśravaṇa.

According to another tradition (*Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 4.1.36.37) Pulastya, the fourth mind-born son of Brahmā begot through his wife Havirbhu two sons, the elder one is the sage Agastya and the other one is the great ascetic Viśravas. To the latter was born the celebrated deity Kubera, son of Idaviḍa.

The *Agni Purāṇa* (11.2) version refers that Viśravas had two wives-Puṣpotkaṭā and Kaikaśī. The elder one Puṣpotkaṭā gave birth to Dhaneśvara (Kubera). However another tradition (*Padma Purāṇa* 5.6.17-19) states that Viśravas had two wives named Mandākinī and Kaikaśī and Mandākinī, the first one gave birth to Dhanada (Kubera). Thus it seems that the above traditions are not unanimous as regards the name of Kubera's mother. She is variously named Devavarṇinī, Ilavilā, Iḍaviḍā, Puṣpotkaṭā and Mandākinī. However, all these texts assign Viśravas, the fatherhood of Kubera.

On the other hand another version of the story (*Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* 1.10.5-10) introduces a different legend of Kuber's birth. It is stated that Kubera was born as a son to the sage Viśravas as a result of a curse pronounced by a Brāhmaṇa (*brahmaśāpena*). We are informed that Utathya, being desirous of giving fee to his spiritual teacher, Pracetas, zealously (*yatnataḥ*) asked Dhaneśvara for a crore of gold coins. Being insipid (*viraso bhūtvā*) Dhaneśvara prepared to give him the desired wealth. But the Brahmin was enraged at this and reduced him to ashes. As a result he was reborn as Kubera, the son of Viśravas.

A very interesting account of the birth of Dhanada (Kubera) is to be met with in the *Varāha Purāṇa* (30.2-6). It is said that when Brahmā entertained the desire to create the universe, his body became full of wind which began to come out of his mouth in the form of a shower of limestone. After sometime Brahmā checked the storm and asked the mass of limestone to have a physical form and be calm. Thus addressed, it assumed a physical form and Brahmā commanded him to protect the wealth and the reward of all the deities. This physical form became Dhanapati (Kubera). It is worth mentioning that the *Mahābhārata* refers to Kubera as the guardian deity of the wealth stored under the earth which

refers to the mineral wealth. This tradition probably attempts to mythologise the concept in a slightly revised form.

The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa (3.15.2ff) version of the story states the birth of Kubera thus : Iivalā, was the wife of muni Viśrayas, who was devoted to the worship of Śiva. In the meanwhile there was a very cunning Brāhman named Yakṣaśarman who was born of a *dīkṣita* (consecrated for sacrifice). Yakṣaśarman was used to the worship of a Yakṣinī. But it so happened that he, once raped the beautiful wife of his friend. As a consequence of such sin he became a lepor and the Yakṣinī leaving this lepor Brāhman went to Kailāsa, the region of Śiva. Yakṣaśarman, being very hungry, once saw the worship of Śiva on Śivarātri and in the next morning when he did *pāraṇā* (taking of food after a vow), died then and there in the temple of Śiva. In the next birth he was born as the king of Karnāṭaka. He devoted himself to the worship of Śiva. Ruling over the country for a century he handed over his kingdom to the best of his sons. He then repaired to Kāśī and propitiated Śiva through worship. At the end of three years Śiva appeared in the form of a *jyotirlinga*. The king was purified by worshipping the *liṅga* and after death entered the womb of Iivalā. He was born at the dead of night in an inauspicious moment for which he was called Kubera.

The *Matsya Purāṇa* (180.5ff) version states that Kubera was in his former birth, the son of a Yakṣa called Pūrṇabhadra. His name then was Harikeśa. He was devoted to Brāhmanas and to *dharma*. From his very birth he turned a devotee to Śiva. His father, however, did not appreciate his attitude. Naturally Yakṣas are fond of flesh and blood and are given to violence. It did not behove of him to act like a human being and divert one's attention to Śiva. But Harikeśa did not listen to his father; so he was driven out of his home. Thereupon he came to Vārāṇasī and began practising severe penance, with his mind intent upon Śiva. He even reduced himself to a mere skeleton. When Śiva and Pārvatī saw this, Pārvatī took pity on him and requested Śiva to show favour. As a consequence he was made the chief of the gaṇas and also the lord of wealth.

The story of Harikeśa Yakṣa also occurs in the *Skanda Purāṇa* (Kāśīkhaṇḍa, ch.32) but in a modified form where both the father and the son are depicted as devotees of Śiva and even the birth of the son is considered to be the reward of penance performed by the father in devotion to lord Śiva.



The myth probably suggests the earlier prevalence of the Yakṣa-cult which was later on replaced by the rising cult of Śiva. It may further point to the fact that Yakṣa-cult was never violently eradicated but rather was assimilated and was given a place of honour in the orbit of Śiva-cult<sup>15</sup>.

According to an altogether different tradition<sup>16</sup> it is said that Kubera was known as Guṇanidhi in the former birth. He was the son of Yajñadatta, a person who was a *dikṣita* and who lived in the city called Kāmpilya<sup>17</sup>. Guṇanidhi indulged in gambling without his father's knowledge. He got money from his mother and spent them on gambling. Once his father came to know of it and in wrath abandoned him. He then went on wandering; and once being fatigued as he was sitting under a tree, he saw in a temple a devotee worshipping Śiva with great pomp and with many types of food. After the worship the devotee went to sleep, thereafter Guṇanidhi entered into the inner apartment (*garbhāgāra*) of the temple to steal the food. As the light from the wick was weak, he tore the end of his garment, made a wick out of it and set it to light. When he took the food and ran hastily, he hit violently someone who was sleeping on the floor. The wounded man called for help. The temple guards came to his rescue and bit Guṇanidhi to death. The attendants of Yama claimed the body, but the Gaṇas of Śiva also hastened to obstruct them. The gaṇas of Śiva would not allow them to take his body on the ground that as he prepared a wick from the end of his garment and protected the weak wick, he had actually served Śiva. The gaṇas of Śiva carried Guṇanidhi (his soul) to the region of Śiva. After some years of enjoyment there he was born as the son of a king of Kaṣiṅga, Arindama and was named Dama. Dama eventually became the king of Kaṣiṅga and pinned his faith on Śiva. By giving a lamp in the Śiva temple on *Śivarātri*, Dama in the next birth, became the king of Alaka (Kubera).

It is further related that he performed severe penance in honour of Śiva appeared before him along with Pārvatī. Infatuated with pride he thought, could Pārvatī have practised more penance than I? While he was thus contemplating with his gaze fixed on her, his left (*vāma*) eye burst out, as he looked at a beautiful woman (*vāṃā*). But Śiva had compassion for him and he said to Pārvatī to look upon him as her son. Śiva gave him the boon that he would be the lord of the Guhyakas, Kinnaras, Yakṣas, kings, Puṇyajanas and also the lord of wealth. Thereupon Devī said to him. "As your body is deformed, you be Kubera (*Ku* = deformed, *bera* = body). Owing to jealousy for her he was tawny in one eye and broken in the other".

A similar story, as regard the origin of Kubera, on the pattern of *Skanda Purāṇa* and *Śīva Purāṇa*, is to be found in *The Saura Purāṇa* (26.45ff) also. The story runs like this : A Brāhmana named Somaśarman in Avanti left home in greed of gain; his wife, deserted by him, developed illicit relation with a Śūdra; as a result she was blessed with a son named Duḥsaha. Due to such confusion of caste, the child so born, was looked down upon by his kinsfolk. So he grew wayward and wicked, and finally broke into a temple of Śīva to plunder. But since the wick of his lamp failed during his efforts to find the treasure, he had to light no fewer than ten wicks more, thus unconsciously paying homage to Śīva. At last one who was sleeping in the temple awoke and stunned the intruder with a blow from a club, and the temple guards put him to death. He was born again as an unrighteous and wicked king, Sudurmukha of Gāndhāra. But with the store of little merit earned in his former birth he maintained well lighted lamps in Śīva's temple. He was ultimately slain by his foes, but by this time all his evil deeds had been exonerated by his piety and he was born next as Kubera, the son of Viśravas.

A study of the different birth stories as referred to above reveal several facts. Kubera's status and position as traced to the boons of Brahmā or to the grace of Śīva etc., suggest his late inclusion into the Hindu pantheon. In one tradition he is shown in his previous birth as the son of a Yakṣa and his becoming a devotee of Śīva afterwards, suggests the suppression of his cult as a result of the growing Śīva cult. In some legends Kubera is connected with stealing which might refer to his earlier nature, where he is described as the leader of the thieves and wrong-doers. However one thing is very clear that in most of the birth-stories Kubera's connection with Śīva is very significant and it probably suggests their association in a pre-Aryan religious complex. Moreover the various stories about Kubera's birth which have been briefly noticed above, indirectly indicate his popularity among the masses.

- 
1. The very expression *itarajana* used with reference to the associates of Kubera may be suggestive. According to Vedic Index of Names and Subjects *jana* besides meaning man as an individual with a tendency to the collective sense commonly denotes a people or a tribe or a class of beings in the R̥gveda and later. *Pañcajanāh*, the five classes of beings, are frequently referred to. Thus *itarajanāh* rendered as other folks may mean people other than the Aryans i.e. the indigenous pre-Aryans.
  2. *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra* 1. 11 cf. *Kāṭhaka Gṛhyasūtra* 20.1-2.
  3. *Bhāradvāja Gṛhyasūtra* 1.8, 2.5, *Vaikhānasa Gṛhyasūtra* 1.4, 5.1-6, *Kauśika sūtra* 74.3 etc.

4. *Yasmād Viśravaṣo' patyaṁ sādṛśyādvīśravā iva/  
tasmād vaiśravaṇo nāma bhaviṣyatyēṣa viśrutah.//*

Rāmāyaṇa 7.3.8.

Cf. *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* 1.219.3-6.

5. Throughout India the cow serves as a natural symbol for motherhood. Aditi (RV. 1.153.3) and Pṛthvī (RV. 1.160.3) are identified with the cow in the R̥gveda. Rudra is the father of the Maruts through the cow Pṛāṣṇi (RV 1.23.10: 1.85.3; 5.52.16). Indra is said to be born of a cow. It is pointed out in connection with a *Kāmyeṣṭi* that a man desirous of prosperity should offer to Indra a cow, which has become barren after giving birth to one calf. In this first birth of the calf, Indra was born. After giving birth to Indra, the cow became barren (TS. 2.1.5) also cf. N.J. Shende, *Mythology of the Yajurveda, JUB, Vol. XXVII, p. 31.*
6. *Mbh.* 9.46.22-27.
7. Cf. Kamil Bulke, *Rāmākathā: Utpatti aur vikās* (Hindi), p. 417.
8. *Vāyu Purāṇa* 2.1.15-66; 2.38.9-116; *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* 1.2.36. 17-78; 3.4.1.9-114; *Śiva Purāṇa* 5.34.34-65 etc. Mitchiner, who has studied the tradition of the seven Ṛṣis, has included Pulastya in the second main list of the seven Ṛṣis, namely Marīci, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vaśiṣṭha. These Ṛṣis are primarily associated with the southern region as opposed to the Saptaṛṣis of the first main list namely Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Bharadvāja, Gotama, Atri, Vaśiṣṭha and Kaśyapa, who belonged to the North. According to the Vedic authors the Himalayan region or the northern region was the most sacred being the region with which the Ṛṣis of the second main list came to be associated. "By associating such Ṛṣis as Agastya and Pulastya with the Northern region, their claims to at least equal status with the Ṛṣis of the First main list are thereby furthered". See John F. Mitchiner, *The Tradition of the Seven Ṛṣis*, pp. 117f.
9. In the RV the word *muni* is used to denote inspired, impelled and maddened. It is certain that the word is not traceable to Indo-European origin. Pānini mentions the word under *Uṇādi Sūtra* (*manerucca/4. 122*), which makes it clear that the word could not be derived according to the rules of Sanskrit grammar. The word is, however, derived from the root *man* (to think). This word is generally found in Kannaḍa language and there the meaning is one who becomes angry. This meaning appears to be nearer to its R̥gvedic meaning. Thus it appears that the word is taken from an existing pre-Aryan language with whom the Aryans came in contact. Cf. Yaduvaṁsi, Śaivismata (Hindi), pp. 7f.
10. R.N. Dandekar, *Rudra in the Veda, JUP (HS)* (1953) p. 94, also see V.G. Rahurkar, *Seers of the R̥gveda*, Introduction p. XV. In the *R̥gveda* (1.132.1; 4; 5; 6.56.8; 7.17.14 etc.) the munis seem to have been clearly distinguished from the Ṛṣis. *The Amarakoṣa* in clear terms distinguishes between the *munis* and the *ṛṣis* : *Vācaṁyamo muniḥ/2.7.42; ṛṣayaḥ satyavacasah/2.7.43.*
11. R.C. Hazra, *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, Vols. I and II.
12. *Vāyu Purāṇa* 2.9.30ff, *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* 2.3.8.36 ff also cf. *Liṅga Purāṇa* 1.64.75ff, *Kūrma Purāṇa* 1.18.8ff and *Skanda Purāṇa* 7.1.20.16ff.
13. *kutsāyāṁ kviti śabdoyāṁ śarīraṁ beramucyate.  
kuberaḥ kuśarīratvāt nāmnā vai tena so'ñkitaḥ"*

*Vāyu Purāṇa* 2.9.39;  
*Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* 2.3.8.44b-45a.

14. Why does seeing the goddess entail punishment ? The motif may be linked to the prohibition on witnessing the sexual act, a theme of considerable importance in Hindu mythology. Thus Ilā (Sudyumna) is transformed from a man into a woman—that is castrated, for stepping into a grove in which Śiva had been making love to Pārvatī (*Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 9.1.13-35; *Devī Bhāgavata* 1.12.16.22). Arjuna leaves for pilgrimage when he violates the pact of the Pāṇḍava brothers and sees Yudhiṣṭhira with Draupadī. For a clear insight into the motif refer to W.D.O. Flaherty, *Śiva the erotic ascetic*, pp. 302-10.
15. V.S. Agrawala in his article "Yakṣa Worship in Vārāṇasī" *Purāṇa* Vol. I. pp.198-201 discusses the myth and remarks, "The struggle for supremacy between the Yakṣa and Śaiva cults would naturally have taken a long period and the final triumph of Saivism in Vārāṇasī may be assigned to the Gupta period....."
16. *Skanda Purāṇa*, Kāśīkhaṇḍa, Ch. 13; *Śiva Purāṇa*, 2.17.19.
17. In ancient geography of India, Kāmpilya is the capital of Pāñcāla. In the present state of our knowledge, the place can now be identified with Kampil, eight miles north-east of Kāimaganj in the district of Farrukhabad, U.P. and is situated on the bank of the old stream of the Gaṅgā

## ROLE OF COMPASSION IN THE PURĀNIC THOUGHTS

By

ASOKE CHATTERJEE

[ वैदिको धर्मः प्रयोजनदृष्टिप्रधानः । लौकिकार्थप्राप्तये देवता आहूयन्तेऽत्र । धर्मेऽस्मिन् आधारभूतममृततत्त्वं विद्यते, यद् अनुशासनसदाचारयोर्मूलम् । यथा विशेषधर्मा वर्णाश्रमव्यवस्थिताः सन्ति तथा सामान्यधर्मा अपि, ये सर्वे राराधनीयाः । जैनबौद्धादिधर्मेष्वपि एषां सामान्यधर्माणां सत्ता लक्ष्यते ।

एषां धर्माणां विशेषतः प्रतिपादनं पुराणकारैः कृतम्; कथाश्रयेण प्रपञ्चिता इमे धर्माः पुराणेषु । कारुण्यं सामान्यधर्मभूतम् । हिन्दूधर्मः कारुण्यप्रधानः ।

पुराणवर्णितकारुण्यविवरणात् प्राक् पुराणवाङ्मयं पौराणिकधर्मधिकृत्य च विशिष्टा चर्चा कृता लेखकेन । तदनन्तरं पौराणिकीं दृष्टिमवलम्ब्य कारुण्यविषयकः विशिष्टो विचारः कृतः । देवोपासनादिभिः, कर्मभिः क्षमादिसद्गुणैश्च सह कारुण्यस्य यः संबन्धः, स वैशद्येन विवृतोऽत्र । ]

Religion is a matter of experience, it cannot be entirely theoretical. Although every religion and Hinduism more so, has a ceremonial aspect, yet, religion in its true sense of the term is actually a direct awareness of the world of values. The rites and ceremonies are often nothing but indirect methods to prove the importance of these basic values. The culture of a country is reflected in her religion and the culture of India is no exception. Each civilisation has its own pivot, i. e., ancient Greece was devoted to art and ancient Rome was committed to politics. If we compare these civilizations with that of India we will find that the civilizations having their feet on secularism have faded into oblivion while Indian civilization stood undaunted weathering many a fierce storm of changed political and religions atmosphere, because her foundations are the eternal values of philosophy and moral code, and not the sifting sands of pseudo-secularism. There came a succession of spiritual leaders who are the true bearers of culture which is a synthesis of sweetness and truth. Sweetness is what expresses itself as universal love and light is what is called spiritual enlightenment. Their call is not meant for any particular sect or school but for the whole of humanity. Their message and teachings are not for a particular time or place but for the entire world and for eternity.

The Vedic religion is necessarily utilitarian. It practices a barter system in which the Vedic priest worships and invokes a particular god or gods in sacrifice and expects mundane affluence in exchange. Yet it has to be admitted that there was a great principle lying under all the practical and selfish considerations : the principle of truth or *Rta* which manifested itself in general discipline and code of conduct. This moral aspect of the primitive religion took shape in later times and by the age of the Epics and Purāṇas became a rigid social norm. The consideration of right and wrong, virtue and sin often rested on this code. Transgression of this code became equivalent to committing grave sin, and the judgement was to be given accordingly.

Generally the principle of moral obligation comprised of acknowledgement of specific duties attached to each caste and each stage of life. But apart from these there were universal duties also. Society is composed of all sorts of people in mutual interaction and is not a homogeneous fraternity of persons belonging to the same caste or profession. Hence there must be some duties which cut across all caste and creed and are necessary for the upkeep and progress of the social vehicle. There are also the transcendental matters which demand same sort of treatment from every body. Thus doing good to others, entertaining guests, feeding the domestic animals and offering oblations to manes are considered essential by all. Similarly inflicting unnecessary pain to living beings, forcible and unjust possession of others' properties are to be censured and helping those who are in distress and honouring the elders are fundamental conditions of social existence and therefore a universal duty. Sexual purity, monogamy for a woman and compliance of marital code are as much necessary for personal happiness as for social concord. Then again, keeping the senses under control and practising cleanliness in word, thought and deed are essentials of moral purity. Hospitality, charity kindness, patience and tolerance are the basic qualities. These things are recognised from the Vedic age—if consciously but in an indirect manner. These trends became prominent after being into contact with other religious thoughts like Jainism and Buddhism whose humanitarian principles left significant marks over Brahmanism. The principles of non-violence in deed, word and thought could not stop sacrifices but it brought subtle changes in otherwise cruel rites. For this in the Purāṇic ages we find Hinduism greatly changed.

The Brāhmaṇas who were the custodians of the national religion were a highly intellectual class and not apt to acquiesce in defeatism. They

assimilated all the points of strength that were found in Buddhism and Jainism and made Brahmanism stronger. Thus numerous tales of self sacrifice, charity and nobility have served as beacon lights through the ages and illumined the path of conduct of the Hindus. In depicting the code of a householder's life (*varṇāśramadharmā*) it gives emphasis on duties to elders and the unable, and scattering bounty all around in the form of planting trees, building high ways, sinking wells, digging tanks and providing food, shelter and treatment for destitutes, animals and sick and infirm persons.

Here comes the question of compassion. In the above analysis, it has been endeavoured to prove that Hinduism is essentially a compassionate religion. The spirit of compassion cannot be induced overnight, so if we try to find compassionate spirit in the Purāṇas, it presupposes the fact that the spirit is brought forward from earlier stages. The fundamental truth of a religion in compassion—otherwise the religion cannot survive the test of time. The luminous spirit of compassion sparkles in the haze of confusing tales and anecdotes, apparently unrelated with any kindred spirit. It exposes itself in the eyes of the observer, unfolds its beauty to the connoisseur and proves that Hinduism with all its questionable aspects is essentially great and benevolent.

### ***Position of the Purāṇas***

The Purāṇa literature can be termed as quasi-religious. They contain secular matters but their position is no less venerable than that of the Vedas themselves. If the Vedas were the chief instrument of the elites, Purāṇas were the very own property of the common people.

The word Purāṇa originally means ancient or old narrative; it also means a particular type of literature preserved through the ages in the ballads and legends. These stories and anecdotes found place in an extensive literature comprising 18 mahapurāṇas and in almost the same number of upapurāṇas. It should be mentioned that whatever may be the date of the compilation, individual stories date back even to the early Vedic period. These stories apart from religious, social and political views, also contain ethical matters which reflect the moral code of the day. We shall come back to that question later.

Sacred lore is the primary subject of the Vedic literature and references to secular matters are generally incidental therein, only to highlight some religious point. It is obvious from the ancient texts that there were actually two prominent traditions in ancient India—the

brahmanical tradition and the kṣatriya tradition. The distinction between these two is very important. The Vedic texts had the specific charge of religious matters while other texts took care of secular needs. The Vedic literature alias the brahminical tradition makes no acquaintance with the religious thoughts and rites of ancient age while the kṣatriya <sup>this</sup> tradition reflected in Purāṇas and Itihāsas helps us to form an idea about the secular atmosphere. Nevertheless, study of both the traditions side by side makes the picture complete. The two traditions, no matter to what extent they agree or differ, are bound by a common bond, the bond of humanity, the bond of magnanimity, the bond of compassion. This trend like an invisible thread runs the whole of Indian thought and belief—religious and secular alike. Even wildly different topics like pilgrimage, medicine, prāyaścitta etc. have a bearing on philanthropy bordering on compassion. Tolerance is the pivot and endurance is the keyword of Indian life. From these aspects social justices, and customs have sprung up. Centering upon this, the famous Indian philosophical traditions thrived because the welfare of mankind is nothing but the collective welfare of individuals.

The Purāṇas are generally considered posterior to Vedic literature although some of the legends are really very old. They betray their intimate relationship with common people. Like a living organism it has undergone changes from time to time with the changes in the social and religious life of the people and has thus been able to preserve considerable material for the study of the life of common people.

The Religions of the Hindus is not at all stoic. It had the broadness to acknowledge and accept demands of the changing time. A living society must have both the power of continuity and the power of change to prove its life force. The current of religion always changed its course according to the trend of different ages and made necessary adjustments. Thus the Purāṇas clearly show popularity of different deities favoured in different ages.

According to the Brāhmaṇical traditions, as recorded in the Atharvaveda and the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, the Purāṇas have as much a sacred origin as the Vedas. The former says that the Ṛks, The Sāmans, the metres and the Purāṇas originated from the residue of the sacrifice together with the Yajus. The latter, on the other hand, ascribes the origin of the four Vedas, Itihāsa, Purāṇa etc. to the breath of *Mahābhūta*. These



traditions though fundamentally different, are unanimous in their recognition of the sacredness of the Purāṇas. The proof of the sanctity is the term fifth Veda applied to the Purāṇas.

The Purāṇas are supposed to contain five characteristics:

*sargaśca pratisargaśca vaṃsomanvantarāṇi ca  
vaṃsānucaritaṃ caiva purāṇam pañcalakṣaṇam*

| ' [Vāyu 4.10-11, Matsya 53.63, Agni 1.14]

Technically they should contain theories about creation, recreation, should include genealogy of gods and sages, must have descriptions of cosmic cycles, accounts of royal dynasties etc. All these characteristics have their roots in the material namely tales, anecdotes, ballads and lore that had come down through ages.

*ākhyānais' copākhyānair gāthābhiḥ kalpajoktibhiḥ  
purāṇasamhitāṃ cakre purāṇārthavis āradāḥ*

(Brahmāṇḍa ii 34, 21, Vāyu 60.21 Viṣṇu III 6 16)

**The 18 mahāpurāṇas are:—**

- 1) Vāyu Purāṇa, 2). Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, 3) Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa,
- 4). Viṣṇu Purāṇa, 5). Matsya Purāṇa, 6) Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 7). Kūrma Purāṇa, 8). Vāmana Purāṇa, 9). Liṅga Purāṇa, 10). Varāha Purāṇa,
- 11), Padma Purāṇa, 12). Nārādīya Purāṇa, 13). Agni Purāṇa,
- 14). Garuḍa Purāṇa, 15). Brahma Purāṇa, 16). Skanda Purāṇa,
- 17). Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, 18). Bhaviṣya Purāṇa.

The aim of the Purāṇas was to depict the Hindu religion in a different way. What was described quite stiffly in the Vedas and the Upaniṣads is told here through legends and anecdotes so that even the most simple mind gets the message correctly. Even the rituals are described in a simplified way here.

Vedic religion is, broadly speaking, polytheistic and therefore affords ample scope for an exuberant growth of myths and legends. Further, like every polytheistic religion it is conspicuously tolerant in attitude. This fact has resulted in the assimilation by it of varied mythological trends.

The Brāhmaṇa phase has been quite rigid in its spirit and absolutely devoted to rituals. It provided no scope for mythology. A religion, in order to becoming popular, needs a simple and uniform spiritual doctrine, a good deal of mythology, certain easy practices of worship and a sort of generally elastic attitude. The failure of the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads in this respect naturally resulted in an indirect encouragement to the non-Vedic religious thoughts which were becoming gradually but surely

predominant in several ways. Taking advantage of the favourable conditions already created by the Upaniṣads through their refusal of the absolute authority of the Vedas, non-Vedic religious systems such as Buddhism and Jainism quickly spread. They adopted from Vedic mythology, Brāhmaṇic ritualism and Upaniṣadic spiritualism though in a different form whatever was beneficial to them. At the same time, they scrupulously steered clear of the weak points.

These non-Vedic religious movements although could not maintain their existence for long, left considerable impression on the general spirit of the Hinduism as a whole. The Hinduism of pre-Buddhistic era and post-Buddhistic era is definitely not the same. The most remarkable change is that the earlier religion was rigid and to some extent cruel. But this later religion is more flexible with scope for consideration of other angles and views. It still talks of punishments but always leaves an alternative to avoid punishment also. For example the cult of *prāyaścitta* takes care of many a formidable sins. This is compassion, which acknowledges failures and shortcomings, does not leave the path of righteousness but at the same time shows the way to rectification. This is undoubtedly the influence of non-Vedic religious movements which are far more generous and broad in their outlook compared to the Vedic religion.

The Purāṇic religion, if it can be called so, is in essence different from Vedic religion in this respect. The religion, gleaned out from the encyclopaedic character of the Purāṇas, though apparently resemble the ancient religion is more gentle and generous. The mythologies are numerous but they have always one ulterior motive to depict an ideal stand about a particular thing, to show what is right and what is wrong, to teach the consequences of mistakes.

The Purāṇas are taken as substitutes for the Vedic literature. They show the easiest way to attaining peace and perfection in life, the ideal way of life and solve difficult problems of life through myths and stories. It is wonderful to note the way in which Purāṇas make a synthesis among the different doctrines, between Vedic and non-Vedic views of life and conduct. Purāṇic literature represents all religious faiths most respectfully and somehow make them look unified—a unity in diversity.

The harmony which the Purāṇas brought about in the doctriness of 'knowledge' 'action' and 'devotion' and in the Vedic and non-Vedic views of life and conduct, exerted its influence in all strata of Hindu society, with the result that the life of the average Hindu of the present day, presents a texture into which various ideas and practices of different times and

regions have been interwoven with an unparalleled symmetry. Even an illiterate Hindu, living far away from the seats of learning, is not totally ignorant of the principles and philosophical truths in the Purāṇas. As a result he has a very broad view of life and a deep sense of tolerance and adjustment which can rarely be expected elsewhere from a person like him. This is so only because of the fact that the epics and the Purāṇas have played a very important part in the life of the Hindus for more than two thousand years. They have brought home to the common man the wisdom of the saints of the highest order without creating any discord. The author of these works took every individual into consideration and made such prescriptions as would benefit him in his social and religious life. The sense of values developed by these works and the moral codes set in these works smack of practical wisdom. It accepts certain lapses of human nature and offers to show ways to get over them. This acceptance of a human being as a whole is the basic proof of human aspect of these sacred books.

Compassion is a unique word. It includes in its periphery a variety of noble feelings like love, devotion, generosity affection, forgiveness, sympathy etc. These feelings should be the basis of life. The instinct of give and take, forgive and forget, makes the life worth living for a person and his associates. This message is delivered over and over again like a refrain in these popular works through numerous legends and anecdotes. To err is human but the effort to rectify the mistakes elevates one to a super-human level.

The time has come to re-interpret the myths and legends of the Purāṇas and Itihāsas. The sociological aspects of these stories must be investigated. Here an attempt is made to study the Hinduism of the Purānic literature as a compassionate religion where customs and rites take the back seat and magnanimity and compassion is taken as the true spirit.

Hinduism always had a wide compass. It was like an ocean where different streams of sectarian thoughts and beliefs merge. The Vedic religion although was principally ceremonial had an underlying philosophical basis which allowed all basic truths in their proper perspective. These truths blossomed in genuine emotions. Compassion was their common name. The word has a rainbow-like character which contains a variety of hues. Sentiments like love, devotion, wifely duty, sympathy, affection, the attitude of a preceptor towards his disciple or vice

versa, the attitude of a particular god towards the devotee, penances, repentance—everything has a bearing on compassion.

The Purāṇas preach the same Hinduism as the Vedic scriptures but in a different manner. They mainly preach through stories. Many stories may apparently seem simple anecdotes without any such religious colouring but minute or close observation will prove that these legends also have some lessons in compassionate thoughts.

It is true that the spirit of the Purāṇas is religious. For this virtue plays a prominent role in the legends. This virtue can be interpreted in many ways, in the duties of a son, of a wife, of a disciple. Devotion is another emotion which is found in many aspects. We cannot actually categorise these emotions but they all come under the broad term compassion. An effort is made in the following pages to show a glimpse of such compassionate anecdotes and the reigning emotion therein.

### **Devotion**

Devotion can be twofold, man to man and man to god. Man to man devotion can be of many kinds, of a disciple to his preceptor, of a wife to her husband or of a servant to his master. Numerous stories glorify this devotional emotion. There is an underlying principle of give and take in devotion. Apparently it is without a selfish end but when a devotee surrenders his whole self to somebody there is bound to be some sort of response—it might be only pleasure but it might be some reward in the guise of a boon or blessing. The mere pleasure of an elder or a venerable person is sufficient to give rise to an amount of good fortune to be enjoyed here or after death. Good gestures are never wasted, real sacrifices are never in vain—such is the teaching of the anecdotes. Here are some excellent and most touching examples of devotion. Wifely devotion is very much highlighted in the Purāṇas. These texts gave emphasis on chastity, monogamy and total selfless devotion of a wife to her husband which extends beyond the bar of births. In Viṣṇu Purāṇa (III. 18) we have the story of a king called Śatadhanu. His wife Śaivyā was very chaste and pious. The couple was always engaged in virtuous deeds. Once they met a sinner on their way back from their daily dip in the Gaṅgā. The king spoke to the wicked man and this sin led to his next birth as a dog. The queen was again a princess who remembered her previous birth. She sought the particular dog and reminded it of their previous birth. This went on for several births until he was born as the son of king Janaka. Then the princess married him and enjoyed life together. The perseverance of the princess through various low births of her husband and the earnest

endeavour to see him through is amazing. This single-minded devotion is really praiseworthy.

The Garuḍa Purāṇa (64th chapter) tells us a story of similar selflessness. Brahmin Kauṣika was suffering from leprosy but he had the good fortune of having a very noble wife who thought the world of him. The brahmin was also of a wicked nature. Once he wanted to visit a beautiful prostitute and his wife carried him to her. On her way, the brahmin offended a sage who cursed him that he would die with the sunrise. Such was the power of the chastity that the wife stopped sunrise altogether as she did not want her husband to die. She had no complaint about the unjust and unfair conduct of her husband who was sick of body and of mind. There is a sequel to this story where the brahmin ultimately gained the favour of the gods through the intervention of Anasūyā and was cured.

A third story in the same spirit is found in the Brahma Purāṇa (111th chapter). Surasena, the king of Pratiṣṭhānapura, had a snake as a son. The king and the queen kept this as a secret. When the snake was grown up he wanted to marry. A marriage was arranged with Bhogavatī, the princess of the eastern region without giving away the secret. After the wedding Bhogavatī came to know about the true identity of her husband. This did not upset her at all, instead she served him as a wife should. This magnanimity led to some power which made them remember their former birth. The snake remembered that he was a follower of Śiva in his previous birth and Bhogavatī was his wife in that birth too. A curse from Lord Śiva made him take his birth as a snake. Bhogavatī urged him to go to a sacred place and please Lord Śiva. By his grace he got back his normal appearance.

We can always argue that the ancient code of conduct demanded such selflessness from the wives. The moral code differed in the case of a husband. But there are stories where husbands really went out of the way for their wives who were not so devoted or were lacking in other qualities. That a strong bond of love, affection and a profound sense of responsibility was natural between a couple is obvious from the anecdotes. We can call it love. We can call it genuine kindness—whatever it is, it comes within the periphery of compassion.

A glaring example of such emotion is found in the well-known story of Sūrya and his wife Samjñā. Different Purāṇas offer different versions of the story but the main outline is the same. Samjñā (a variation in names is also found) could not bear the degree of lustre of the sun ; so she created a

replica of her own self Chāyā and went away. This substitute could not treat Saṁjñā's and her own children in equal manner and this gave her away. Sūrya in Saṁjñā's pursuit went to Uttarakuru in the guise of a horse because at that time Saṁjñā took the shape of a mare. Ultimately he agreed to get rid of some of his lustre for the sake of his wife. This was a painful process but he endured it for the sake of Saṁjñā. This is our relevant point. Sūrya could have left Saṁjñā alone, he could have cursed or punished her. But instead he made painful adjustment so that his wife could live with him in comfort. This is no less sacrifice.

Brahma Purāṇa (100th chapter) gives us a curious story about Kaśyapa's wives-Vinatā and Kadrū. It seems that these two ladies were quite unmanagable. Kaśyapa left them pregnant and warned them not to do anything untoward. As soon as Kaśyapa's back was turned they were involved in mischief making. They went to a sacrifice arranged by the great seven sages and misbehaved. The sages cursed them and turned them into rivers. Kaśyapa came back, heard this and pleaded for his wives. He pleased Śiva with eulogies and got back his wives with no harm done. But Kadrū was incorrigible, she immediately got into another scrape by laughing at the brahmins. Their curse made her blind. Kaśyapa had to plead again for his wife. This story proves how Kaśyapa overlooked all the behaviorial lapses and protected them in all situations even if the responsibility of creating that situation lay with them.

The same spirit of love is detected in the story of sage Kaṭha (Brahma, 121st chapter) where he made his ugly wife beautiful by his own penances.

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa tells us about king Uttānapāda who was besotted with his wife Bahutā. Bahutā on the other hand was not in love with the king, and misbehaved with him all the time. The king tried not to mind. Once Bahutā surpassed all decorum and insulted the king before a full court. This time the king got angry and sent the queen to the forest. In the mean time a brahmin came to him and said that his wife was missing. The king went out and after a long search found her. In the process he also learnt that Bhautā was taken to the region of the snakes and the snake princess Nanda was protecting her. The king then took the help of the former brahmin to get rid of his wife's aversion and brought her home. The queen in turn helped the snake princess to get over her dumbness which was the result of her father's curse. The brahmin with the power of a sacrifice restored the princess' power of speech. This story is another example of a husband's love and affection for his wayward wife.

The most prominent example of filial devotion is the legend of Yayāti and Pūru told in many Purāṇas. This is a famous story of ancient times. It seems that the story was so touching that even in ancient times it got enough publicity to find a place in almost all the Purāṇas. Yayāti was not satisfied with his quota of enjoyment when he faced old age. So he wanted to exchange it with the youth of one of his sons. One by one all the sons found some excuse to refuse. But Pūru, the youngest one, gladly accepted. After being satiated, Yayāti returned Pūru's youth, gave him blessings and nominated him as his successor to the kingdom.

The Brahma Purāṇa has another story of this trend. Sumati, the son of Pramati, freed his father from the bondage by the Gandharvas.

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa narrates a story about a disciple's concern for his preceptor. The sage Bhūti was very temperamental and was prone to get angry all on a sudden. Once he went away giving the responsibility of taking care of Agni on a disciple called Śānti. Unfortunately for Śānti the sacred fire was doused. This made Śānti very afraid of his preceptor's wrath. He knew he had no escape for his so-called negligence of duty as it appeared. He desperately tried to pacify Agni who took pity on him and came to give away boons. Śānti first asked for the sacrificial fire to be ignited, then asked for a son for his preceptor and also requested his change of heart. On his return the sage himself sensed a certain change in his own nature. So he searched for a reason and came to know the whole incident. This story proves not only the selflessness of the disciple but his total devotion to his preceptor which enabled him to overlook all his lapses and prompted him to grant him things that were desired by the sage.

Ancient texts betray a closeness between man and God. It is true that gods were placed in a advantageous position but nevertheless they were always at hand. There was a continuous communication between the gods and the mortals. In every other incident we find that whenever man calls a deity earnestly he not only appears before him but also grants him with his desired object. This relationship has so many points of admiration. The deity is always an epitome of benevolence. He gives and gives even at the cost of the discomfort of his own clan at times. Gods never stopped to think about the consequences, never weighed the balance of right and wrong and never calculated the sum of profit and loss. Hence in the process, sometimes the giver became the loser. It landed them at precarious situations, made them lose their land, the heaven, and roam about in wilderness. But these did not deter them from granting more boons, showing unestimated bliss over the mortals. This granting has a

lining of fathomless love and compassion for the lesser beings. Sometimes of course such unselfish affection is rewarded with equally passionate love (*anurāga*) or devotion (*bhakti*) culminating in total surrender.

Such are the stories of Prahlāda, Dhruva and Bali. All these three stories are found in various Purāṇas depicting Lord Nārāyaṇa as the prime deity. Prahlāda took birth in the line of the demons but he was a devotee of Nārāyaṇa from the very beginning. When his father Hiranyakaśipu came to know about this undemonlike behaviour, he did everything to dissuade him. Tortures knew no bounds. But Prahlāda was undaunted and he came out from every tricky and dangerous situation by the grace of his favoured deity. At last Nārāyaṇa killed Hiranyakaśipu to save the creation from his atrocities. The account of Prahalāda's life shows the constant but invisible vigil of Viṣṇu over his devotee. Prahlāda is the symbol of ultimate devotion while Viṣṇu proves to the mankind that total dependence never goes unanswered.

Dhruva's story carries another type of texture. Dhruva turned to Viṣṇu after being hurt by his stepmother. He felt so humiliated that it became almost a challenge to him to attain something hitherto unattainable just to prove his own value. So he left the comfort of his home and began his search for the unknown. The sages were sympathetic enough to advise him initially about the right path. Dhruva cruised through his misery by dint of his doggedness and innocence. He reached his ultimate goal by sheer tenacity overcoming all sorts of opposition. Viṣṇu appeared before him and granted him a unique status of having an exclusive place (*loka*) all by himself. This legend is an excellent instance of compassion where the desolate child is taken under the wings of the all powerful Viṣṇu. Even an ignorant child is not ignored by the highest deity, he consoles him, protects him and bestows him with his desired object.

The myth of Bali is also very well known and told in various Purāṇas. Bali, although a demon, was very pious and a true devotee of Lord Viṣṇu. Once he occupied the heaven. Gods went to Viṣṇu to restore their favourite land. Viṣṇu took the dwarf incarnation as the son of Aditi. Then as Bali was giving away things to all candidates, the dwarf produced himself as a candidate and asked for land comprising three steps only. Śukra the preceptor of the demons saw through this plot and tried to prevent Bali. But Bali did not want to refuse any candidate even if it cost him the heaven or even life. The dwarf covered the heaven with one step, then the rest of the universe with the other, now a third foot emerged



from his navel and he wanted a place to keep it. Bali offered his own head and thus he had to remove himself to *Pātāla*. This smacks of undiluted devotion. The devotee here is placed morally higher over the favourite deity. The deity stoops down to deception to gain his own selfish end and the devotee even after knowing the true identity of the dwarf did not step back.

There are numerous examples of magnanimity and generosity of different deities. Some of these anecdotes are real gems of the literature. They expose many faceted charm of the noble nature of the gods. One of such stories is found in the Brahma Purāṇa (86th chapter). It narrates how Yama went to take a dead son of aged parents. But seeing the extent of their misery, he could not take him away, instead he went away to practise penance to bring an end to the misery of mankind. This is very significant because Yama is the Lord of death and he should not be moved by the scene of death. But it seems he is not complacent and the real sorrow touches him even.

The Brahma Purāṇa has another story of the same spirit. Here Yama is on the receiver's end. He went to claim a devotee of the Mahādeva, but could not. Mahādeva not only protected his devotee but also killed Yama to end his harassment. At last at the request of the gods, Mahādeva revived Yama but got the assurance in exchange that all his devotees would be exempted from the clutch of death. This assurance has definitely an unfair ring in it but Śiva overlooked that on the plea that a true devotee should be protected by all means. This proves how blind can the patron be in the case of his devotees.

The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇas describe in details the different activities of Lord Kṛṣṇa. There are many incidents of his nobility and generosity towards ordinary people in general. His suppression of the snake Kālīya amounted to saving the land of the Nandas from poison. But even there he showed compassion when Kālīya's wives implored for mercy. He let them go to the ocean safely.

This trend of forgiveness or kindness is very common in the gods. A stark enemy, if once bends down to seek protection or repents, is forgiven immediately. In this context we must mention the story of the encounter between Mahādeva and Andhaka demon. This demon was not only wicked but also cast a lustful eye to Pārvatī. Pārvatī somehow managed to evade his dirty hands. Andhaka fought Śiva with great valour and at last seeing the defeat inevitable sought his protection. Śiva at once forgave

him and pierced him with his *śūla* which cleared him of all sins. Thus a purified soul he was entitled for supreme bliss.

We can always hold Śiva responsible for or too kind nature. He is most easily pacified and he bestows the devotee with everything he desires promptly. Many a time this leads to future complications. Take the case of Bhasmāsura who got a boon from Śiva and became invincible. It is the shrewdness of Lord Viṣṇu that saved the situation for the gods. The same compassion was felt for Bhagīratha when out of anger he hid Gaṅgā in his matted locks. Bhagīratha was landed in a difficult situation when all his efforts seemed to be in vain. But Śiva took pity on him and released Gaṅgā after teaching him a lesson. Brahma Purāṇa (169th chapter) has a glaring example of the protective spirit of a patron deity namely Mahādeva. Bhilla, a hunter of low birth, used to worship Mahadeva in a most unconventional way. The image of Mahādeva which he worshipped belonged to a brahmin called Veda. In Veda's absence, Bhilla used to come and worship his favourite deity with raw flesh and other things. But Mahādeva was pleased with his sincerity. Once Veda remained hiding to find the person who was responsible. What he saw was unbelievable. Naturally he demanded an explanation from the deity. Mahādeva established his point by proving the sincerity and devotion of Bhilla.

There is a very interesting story in the Garuḍa Purāṇa (8th, Uttarakhaṇḍa). It shows to what extent the protective spirit of a patron deity can go. It tells of a band of ghosts who committed most hateful sins. A pious brahmin accidentally comes to their company. The ghosts wanted to eat him. But the brahmin who was a devotee of Lord Viṣṇu stuck to the name of his favoured deity. This actually led to their collective emancipation along with the brahmin as they all experienced the coveted appearance of the Lord himself. It proves that good company is beneficial to all. It can bring good fortune to even the most condemned.

While on the subject of souls it would not be irrelevant to mention that kindness to the unsatisfied souls is quite common in the Purāṇas. There are ways to release them from hell, from their suffering, from their low status. It is prescribed to keep lamps on at particular heights so that the wandering spirits can find their way easily.

### **Kindness**

Kindness is another noble emotion which glorifies the giver. This great emotion is reflected everywhere in the Purāṇas. The very fact that the gods granted boons to the devotees, or protected them in their misery, saved them from tricky situations, proved time and again that the stream of

kindness or charity was over flowing all the time. Sometimes the charity was misplaced, or the boons were misused but that was never taken into consideration. Like the gods the sages also had the same disposition. They also possessed great power and often used them for the welfare of mankind. They aimed at salvation but worked for general good. They too did not look for any return. Sometimes they did the good turn on their own, without being asked even. This proves that the penances purified their souls to such an extent that they really crossed the limits of the conception of selfishness. Selflessness or rather projection of one's self in the entire universe was the main theme of the penances and whoever reached the end of the path could identify himself with the sorrows and joys of other beings. We have numerous such stories in the Purāṇic literature, but here are a handful of them to prove the point.

The Brahma Purāṇa (85th chapter) in the course of praising Kṣudhā Tīrtha tells that the sage Kaṇva once pleased both Gaṅgā and Kṣudhā. Both of them appeared before him and offered customary boons of his choice. He asked nothing for himself but for the posterity's sake he asked for the assurance that no one belonging to his clan should ever suffer from the pangs of hunger. He did not stop at that but extended his good fortune to the general world by asking that anyone who would be able to eulogise Kṣudhā should be exempted from hunger.

The story of Śunaḥṣepha is an ancient one. The version in the Brahma Purāṇa (104th chapter) says that Hariścandra got his son by the grace of Varuṇa and promised the deity that he would perform the sacrifice with his new born son. But when the time came he deferred the issue again and again. At last the god got angry and gave the king an ultimatum. The king was in a very tricky situation and did not know what to do when somebody advised him that he should buy somebody's son to replace his own for the sacrifice. He bought Śunaḥṣepha whose father was in dire need of money and had two other sons. But actually Śunaḥṣepha was not sacrificed. It seems that even the rigid sacrificial system was enough repulsed by this most hateful gesture and made allowances for the performance to go without human sacrifice. This was not an easy matter. To go beyond the prescribed rules of the sacrifices means a lot. Only profound compassion felt for the poor innocent child, whom everybody disowned, prompted the god to protect him. It is a story of great tragedy because his father wanted the eldest son who would save him from the danger of the next world and the mother wanted the youngest one whom she loved most. The king who usually should protect his subjects from

being unfair victims was asking for his life. So the boy had nobody to turn to and was resigned to fate when the compassion took hold of the situation.

The Brahma Purāṇa (125th chapter) narrates an interesting story. It shows that not only gods, sages or men of higher birth had this compassionate nature even the living beings of lower births showed great nobility of mind. Here is a story of birds who showed unparalleled generosity of nature. It comes in the context of praising the Yamatīrtha. An owl and a pigeon lived there with their families. The families were very hostile to each other and finally there was a fight. The wives of the two birds did not want fight and invoked Agni and Yama who were the patron gods of the pigeon and the owl family. Each invoked the other family's patron gods and both appeared before them. But they, except for the end of hostilities, did not want anything for themselves but asked for general welfare.

Vaśiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra are the two very wellknown sages in the epics and Purāṇas. There are humorous legends and myths around these two personalities. The sage Viśvāmitra was a Kṣatriya by birth but became a brahmin by dint of penances. This proves his tenacity and forceful nature. But Vaśiṣṭha was of a more amicable disposition. Both served the world and the mankind beyond all measure. Glimpses of their magnanimity :

The Vāmana Purāṇa (21st chapter) narrates the story of king Śambaraṇa belonging to the lunar race. He was a disciple of Vaśiṣṭha. Once the king accidentally met Tapatī, the daughter of Sūrya and fell in love with her at once. He did not know the identity of the maiden so felt absolutely miserable. Vaśiṣṭha understood his condition and taking initiative went to the solar region and asked Sūrya to give Tapatī to Sambaraṇa. A preceptor generally looks after the virtue of his disciple but here we see that a preceptor driven by pity goes out of the way to provide his disciple with his desired wife.

The rivalry of the sage Vaśiṣṭha and the sage Viśvāmitra was highly publicised even in the days of yore. The 40th chapter of the Vāmana Purāṇa has this unusual story. Once the river Sarasvatī was put into a great predicament. Viśvāmitra made up his mind to kill Vaśiṣṭha and ordered Sarasvatī to bring him to her otherwise he would put her into trouble. Sarasvatī had no escape and had to go to Vaśiṣṭha to tell him everything. Vaśiṣṭha took pity on the river and allowed her to carry him to Viśvāmitra. Sarasvatī took Vaśiṣṭha to Viśvāmitra's hermitage but while the sage was on the look out of an appropriate weapon to kill him,

Sarasvatī carried Vaśiṣṭha away out of the reach of the cruel sage. For this, a curse was inevitable and it took a long time and a lot of concern on the part of the sages to get Sarasvatī out of this situation. The sage Vaśiṣṭha had no reason to listen to the unfair demand of Viśvāmitra. He was equal to his rival in all aspects if not better equipped to fight him. But he took pity on Sarasvatī and got ready to sacrifice himself for her sake. Sarasvatī on the other hand, risked the wrath of the sage to save Vaśiṣṭha as best as she could.

It would not be irrelevant to mention the nobility of king Kuru in this context. We find this anecdote in the 22nd chapter of the Vāmana Purāṇa. Once king Kuru wanted to do something which would bring him imperishable fame. For this he started to till the land with a golden plough, using the ox of Śiva and the buffalo of Yama. Indra felt curious and went to enquire. The king told him that he wanted to sow the seeds of virtue, truth, charity, forgiveness, purity, giving gifts, restraint and celibacy. When asked he also said that he had the seeds in his body. Viṣṇu went to test him and asked for the seeds. The king first stretched his right hand which was cut into pieces with the *cakra*, then went to other hand, thighs and head. Then the Lord was pleased and blessed him. The king did not ask anything for himself, not even salvation. He wanted to make the place sacred enough to enable people who would perform virtuous deeds there to attain emancipation. This is an instance of unparalleled nobility which proves the elevation of a man's nature to a level where selfishness vanishes totally. This dedication of self for the welfare of mankind is truly remarkable.

There are stories of kindred spirit where kindness without reason is depicted. Such a story in the Viṣṇupurāṇa (IV.3) tells us that the sage Aurva saved the life of the unborn son of king Bāhu. When the queen conceived, a cowife became jealous and gave some poison which postponed the birth indefinitely. Seven years passed and when the king died the queen attempted to end her life. But the sage Aurva felt sorry for the unborn son who would bring a lot of good fortune to the humanity. So he intervened and dissuaded the queen from committing suicide. By his grace, the son was born. He was brought up under his care. There was no earthly reason to get involved for the sage other than pure compassion. The same nobility is found when we read in the 164th chapter of the Brahma Purāṇa that Pavamāna took a two faced bird to the sacred place of Gadādhara Tīrtha for his salvation. There was no expectation, no ties. He did it simply for the sake of doing a good turn.

A story of a different taste but of the same spirit is found in the Vāyu purāṇa (90th chapter). Other Purāṇas also have the same story. It is about the birth of Jamadagni, father of Paraśurāma. The sage Ṛcika wanted to have a son through his wife Satyavatī. At the same time, her mother-in-law too, wanted another son. So Ṛcika prepared some 'caru' and gave two separate portions for Satyavatī and her mother-in-law. Unfortunately the portions got mixed up and Satyavatī ate the mother-in-law's portion and vice versa. When Ṛcika came to know this, he warned Satyavatī that she would have a son of violent nature who would even kill his own mother. Satyavatī was very sad on hearing this and begged her husband not to punish her so. The sage took pity on the poor girl and amended that it would not be her son but her grandson who would be of such a nature. The helpless misery of his wife prompted the sage to exert his power to defer the birth of Paraśurāma.

### *Dutifulness*

The sense of duty and responsibility has a bearing on compassion. It is the feeling that one should do his duty sincerely so that others do not suffer which is akin to compassion. It presupposes the broadness of nature, nobility or generosity. There are stories galore in the Purāṇas to prove that such an emotion was placed very high in the age of the Purāṇas. It was considered one of the most important qualities of a real man. It also reflects the correct sense of values which is highly praised in any time and in any context.

One of the most famous legends which exposes this spirit is the story of Bhagīratha's attempt to bring Gaṅgā down to earth. This story has many facets to show. One of them is the sense of duty of Bhagīratha which prompted him to accept tremendous hardship to release his ancestors from the bondage of the curse. He really, in the true sense of the term, moved heaven and earth to bring Gaṅgā down. He faced all sorts of misery and sufferings, upsets and frustrations to be finally successful. It was sheer tenacity and the will to succeed that got him through.

A most touching story is found in the 80th chapter of the Brahma Purāṇa. It tells the tale of a couple of pigeons. The female bird was caught by a cruel hunter who had to pass the night on the same tree the birds had their nest. At night the male bird missed his partner and relented aloud. This made the caged female bird announce her existence. The male bird then offered to free her. She not only refused this opportunity but also justified the act of the hunter saying that this was his natural job and he should not be blamed for this. Moreover she urged the male bird to

treat the hunter as a guest and provide him with as much comfort as possible. The climax came when the male bird offered to sacrifice his body to provide him with a meal. The whole episode left the hunter speechless and stunned. He repeated and censored his own hateful nature and desired to turn a new leaf. Such virtue is almost incredible. Even in that age such conduct was most unusual.

A sequel to the famous Śunaḥṣepha legend (Brahma purāṇa 150th chapter) tells us that after all that happened Śunaḥṣepha did not reject his father mentally. His father went to hell as a consequence of his own action and when Śunaḥṣepha came to know about this he felt genuinely sorry for his father. He performed appropriate religious rites to enable his father to go to heaven. Is there a greater example of dutifulness and universal compassion ?

### ***Affection***

We have discussed earlier that the word compassion represents a variety of emotions such as pity, amity, sympathy, affection, benevolence, forgiveness, love and what not. It is difficult to ascertain where pity ends and sympathy begins, or what is the subtle points of difference between affection and love. So this categorisation really means nothing. It is done only to show different shades of the feeling. As a prism, held to the throws up a variety of colourful rays, so the word compassion can be interpreted in diverse ways. It is only a manner of speaking not a real classification. Any way, some of the stories in which the emotion of affection comes to the fore are described below:

The story of the sage Saubhari depicts two emotions, the impartiality and the affection. The sage desired for a domestic life seeing the content life of a fish. So he came to king Māndhātṛ and asked for the hands of one of his fifty daughters. The king was reluctant to give his daughter to such an old person, at the same time he was scared of the sage's wrath, which could be disastrous for him and his family. The sage himself put an end to the dilemma by saying that he would present himself to the princesses and anyone who was willing would be welcome by the sage. The sage at this point showed rare insight of human nature. He made himself so young and handsome that all the princesses were anxious to get him as husband. After their marriage, the sage treated all of them with unique impartiality and made them very happy. When their father went to know about their well being each astounded him by telling that her husband spent all the time with her only. Such equal treatment had no parallel in the whole literature.

Here is a story of motherly affection in the 81st chapter of the Brahma purāṇa. It has an atmosphere of reality about the story. After the slaughter of the Tārakāsura, Kārttikeya went on an amorous spree with the wives of the gods. When the news reached Pārvatī she was acutely embarrassed. Being the mother of a grown-up son, her hands were somehow tied. She could not scold or beat her son now. But such repulsive acts were to be stopped at any cost. So Pārvatī divided her own personality and put a part in each of the celestial wives. So next time when Kārttikeya wanted to enjoy a divine woman, he found his mother's shadow in her and could not proceed. A mother hates to see her children censored. She always wants to see them in glory. This fall from glory of her son hurt Pārvatī very much. So she dealt with the situation in a discreet and effective manner.

Such round about way of teaching lessons is not rare between the preceptor and the disciple or a god and his close associate. The Brahma purāṇa (90th chapter) has a story bearing the same stamp. It is about Lord Viṣṇu and his associate Garuḍa. Garuḍa became rather insolent at one time. He refused to release a snake even when ordered. So to put him to his place Viṣṇu put his foot down. At once Garuḍa was humbled. Such actions were not to vindicate but to elevate one's self so that the standard of behaviour never falls.

### **Sympathy**

Sympathy is also a very noble emotion. It melts the heart and expands it. It brings identification of separate souls and the sorrows of a separate soul become one's own sorrow. In a way it removes the outward barrier between separate individuals.

There are excellent instances of this noble emotion in the whole Purāṇic literature. The entire conception of magnanimity stands balanced on some factors one of which is sympathy felt for other beings.

A somewhat unusual story is found in the 35th chapter of the Brahma Purāṇa. It is a sequel to the popular legend of Umā's penance for getting Mahādeva as her husband. After the completion of the penance she got what she desired and Mahādeva himself came to grant her the desired boon. But as he was leaving he wanted to test Umā's credentials as the mother of the Universe - a seat she was going to occupy. He took the disguise of a boy who was attacked by a crocodile while bathing in a lake. Umā was attracted by the screams and rushed to his rescue. She begged the crocodile to release him who told her that it could comply only in exchange it wanted all the virtues accrued from the long hard penances. It



meant that Umā had to forego her eligibility to get Mahādeva as her husband. It looked like a most hard decision but Umā agreed readily to get the boy free. By doing this she proved her credentials not only to Mahādeva but to all people of all times that she could put others' misery above everything. Her own happiness was never considered. This is the ideal stand for a mother whose sympathy, affection and protective nature is going to be tested time and again. Even for a completely unknown boy she gave away her own future happiness acquired with such a huge price.

The 74th chapter of the same Purāṇa gives a new twist to the otherwise known story of the descent of Gaṅgā. It does not portrait Bhagīratha as the prime executor of the great event but says that the sage Gautama came to know about the mental agony of Pārvatī for her co-wife Gaṅgā. The fact that she was Mahādeva's favourite made her intensely jealous. To relieve her from this agonising state of mind the sage Gautama took the initiative of separating Gaṅgā from the close proximity of Mahādeva and pārvatī and hence arranged for her descent to the earth.

The Viṣṇu Purāva (II. 13) narrates an anecdote of an unusual type. It depicts an extremely strong sympathy for animals. The pious king Bharata once saw a doe die in childbirth. The king felt intense sympathy for the motherless calf and reared it up. Soon he got so much attached with the deer that he had no concentration left for his penances. Even at the time of death he had only the deer on his mind. This made him a deer in his next birth. Ultimately he became the famous tactive (*jaḍa*) Bharata. The main point of the story is that the king did not hesitate to sacrifice his precious virtue for the sake of sympathy.

### **Forgiveness**

Forgiveness and tolerance are the very essence of a religion. The broadness of any religion depends on the factor whether it possesses the spirit of accomodating others' views, can accept others' vulnerability and does not impose its own ideas. The policy of adjustment and acceptance should be predominant among the essential characteristics. We can say without any doubt that forgiveness is the pivotal feature in Hinduism. Numerous curses and their consequences prove authoritatively that lapses and weaknesses are and will be there always but to overcome and to ignore and to accept is the greatest form of virtue. A curse is a sort of punishment and punishment is necessary for discipline but repentence, the desire to rectify, the measure of self elevation is more important. It is readily acknowledged and we find time and again that the giver of the

curse forgets and forgives and takes the initiative to lessen the impact. It never nullifies the whole effect because discipline demands that no action would go futile but a way to soften the blow is always found. Each story containing a curse can be an example of this spirit but a few are mentioned here to substantiate our point.

First comes the famous (or infamous) Ahalyā episode. Almost all the Purāṇas have this story which pictures Indra in a shameful set up. The Brahma Purāṇa (87th chapter) digresses slightly from the usual course of the story. It says that after the infliction of the curse, Indra found it would be impossible for him to face the world. So he implored and begged for the offensive marks of his body to be changed and Gautama forgot the enormity of the sin committed by the king of the gods and prescribed a way to lessen the impacts.

The 92nd chapter of the same Purāṇa has a most unusual story which at the same time repulses and melts the heart of the reader. It was the story of a woman called Mahī. She was widowed at a young age. Restless at home she left her son in the care of sage Gālava and went out to see the world. Not unexpectedly she became a prostitute in due course. Several years passed, the son grew up and it was his turn to see the world. By a quirk of fate, the mother and the son met without knowing each other and Mahī became her son's mistress. After some time, again by the strange working of fate, they came to know about each other's identity. What followed was distasteful and heart rending. Both wanted to end their lives. But the sage Gālava felt sympathetic at their condition and he showed them reason, dissuaded them from doing something foolish and led them mental peace.

Another story, that smacks of rare spirit of forgiveness, is the one of Maṇikuṇḍala and his friend Gautama told in the 170th chapter of Brahma Purāṇa. Gautama was a wicked person while his friend Maṇikuṇḍala was virtuous. Gautama challenged his friend about virtue and in the process Maṇikuṇḍala lost his wealth, hands and even eyes to his cruel friend. Then Gautama left him dying. But he was not to die. He was found by Vibhiṣaṇa who with the application of special herbs brought by Hanūmat along with the Gandhamādana hill, cured him. He also restored him to his previous affluent state. At this stage, Maṇikuṇḍala first remembered his friend Gautama. After a long search, he found him in a miserable condition. Maṇikuṇḍala brought him along to share his good

fortune with him. No analysis is required to highlight the spirit of real compassion.

### ***Benevolence***

Benevolence is another noble emotion. It is a feeling cherished for the weaker by the stronger or the more powerful. It is remarkable because the stronger can ignore or overlook the plight of the weaker but some inner compassion prompts him to take up the case and fight for or at least share his misery.

The 93rd chapter of the Brahma Purāṇa unfolds this interesting story. Once there was a severe drought. The sage Viśvāmitra asked his disciples to secure to get hold of some sort of food. They brought nothing but a dead dog. Viśvāmitra decided to perform the sacrifice with the available flesh. He told his disciples to prepare it. Indra, in no time, came to know about this and to stop this abnoxious deed he took away the meat and returned with a pot of honey. Viśvāmitra was very angry and was about to curse the king of the gods. He wanted solid food for his dependents and a pot of honey was no food. Indra was scared at his attitude and to pacify him sent the rain clouds immediately. Thus the world was saved.

The story of the great sacrifice of the sage Dadhīci is very famous from ancient times. He sacrificed his life so that the most powerful weapon *vajrā* could be made out of his bones. This legend is found in Vedic literature even. But the Brahma Purāṇa (110th chapter) gives us a different version. Here we see that after a successful campaign against the demons, the gods did not find the weapons useful and left them in the care of Dadhīci. His wife Lopāmudrā was against this. Many years passed by, the unused weapons seemed to lose their lustre and efficacy. At last Dadhīci decided to assimilate within himself the rest of the collective lustre of the divine weapons. No sooner did he do so than the gods appeared there to claim their weapons. Dadhīci had no alternative but to offer his own body out of which fresh weapons could be made. Such sacrifices are really rare and speak volumes about the benevolence of the person concerned.

The encounter between the mountain Vindhya and the sage Agastya is quite wellknown. But a variation of the story found in the 18th chapter of the Vāmana Purāṇa makes it more piquant. Here we find the part of Vindhya's standing on the path of the Sun's traverse intact. But Agastya is not depicted in this story as the preceptor. He comes to Vindhya as an old

man and asked for access to the South. Vindhya relented at once. Agastya went south not to come back again. Here Agastya gives up his known surroundings for the welfare of the general public, on the other hand, Vindhya was kind enough to give up his rigid position for the sake of an insignificant old man.

The 138th chapter of the Brahma Purāṇa narrates a story of a different taste. The king Śaryāti wanted to test the depth of love of the wife of the sage Madhuchandas. So he spread the rumour that both the king and the sage died. The queen immediately took measures to verify the rumour while the sage's wife took it to heart and died with grief. This put Śaryāti in a tricky situation. To bring back the sage's wife he entered the fire. Next Madhuchandas came to know about everything and regretted the king's sacrifice. He worshipped the sun and revived the king with divine grace. This story brings to our notice the selfless broadness of mind which prompts sacrifice of life without hesitation for other's sake.

In ancient times it was taken for granted that a king's life is dedicated to the welfare of his subject. Any digression from the established norm called for strict disciplinary action. But generally the kings were benevolent enough to put the demands of his subjects above everything.

The chapter called Devīmāhātmya in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa tells us about king Suratha who lost everything to his enemies. He came to stay for some time in the hermitage of the sage Medhas. But his mind was always agonised for his subjects and friends he left behind. He met a Vaiśya there who told him that he had been driven away by his wicked family. Both suffered from the strong bonds of affection. Affection melts heart which results in benevolence.

The above discussion brings into forefront only a very few of the vast number of legends and myths that produce one or the other facet of compassion. But it is sufficient to show and establish beyond all doubt that Hinduism in the age of the Purāṇas was a compassionate religion. This is this inherent nobility that made Hinduism immortal. It is also to be borne in mind that a religion can not develop this nobility all on a sudden. It is true that Hinduism from the day of its conception has gone through many stages over thousands of years and has retained many characteristic features of outside influences within itself, but the trend was there all along. The spirit of the early Vedic religion, however primitive it might look, had generosity and broadness of thought as the basic principles and

with the right background, later Hinduism blossomed into a truly compassionate religion.

Although the legends and anecdotes have been utilised to glean out compassionate sentiment here, incidental topics of discussion in the Purāṇas like *Dānadharma* possess the same altruistic spirit. *Dāna* does not mean gifts to Brāhmaṇas only but it includes scattering generosity all around in the form of planting trees, building highways, sinking wells, performing *śraddhas* for the known and unknown spirits, trying to release manes caught in their own web of misdeed etc. It is remarkable that always such charitable performances are extended towards unknown and poor souls who are suffering for their sin. On the other hand rites concerning the *prāyaś citta* proclaim the fact that all sins are pardonable if repented. This is very significant. The duties specified for the four *varṇas* and *āśramas* keeps wide scope for benevolence, hospitality, charity and the atmosphere of give and take. So we can safely conclude that the Hindu society based on the compassionate principles of a truly noble religion reflect the idealism of eternal value. The Hinduism, standing on Purāṇic ethics, embraces all the factors that contribute to the progress and wellbeing of the individual society and the world at large. These factors include both the possession of virtues and proper execution. Dharma contributes to the preservation, progress and welfare of human society as a whole. Purāṇas have made a successful attempt at reconciling common virtue with individual righteousness. The former includes the possession of certain humanising virtues and actions based thereon which result in the welfare of the entire creation. The latter is the practical aspect of the former within a particular limit by an individual belonging to a class characterised by certain prominent qualities.

## LESSER KNOWN MINOR PURĀṆAS

By

DR. N. GANGADHARAN

[प्रसिद्धेभ्यः पुराणोपपुराणेभ्यो भिन्नानि सन्ति बहूनि गौणानि पुराणानि, येषु कानिचन प्रकाशितानि दृश्यन्ते । एषु गौणपुराणेषु कानिचन तद्वाक्योद्धरणतो विज्ञायन्ते, कानिचन वैयक्तिकसंग्रहसूच्यां निर्दिष्टानि, येषां विषयवस्तुनि ज्ञातुं न शक्यन्ते, कानिचन पुनरेतादृशानि येषां नामतो विषयवस्तूनां परिज्ञानं भवति, सन्ति कानिचन हस्तलेखविवरणग्रन्थेषु निर्दिष्टानि, येषां कतिपय-वाक्यानि उद्धृतानि विवरणग्रन्थेषु । लेखेऽस्मिन् प्रायेण पञ्चाशतो गौणपुराणानां नामानि उल्लिखितानि । ]

Since the study of the Purāṇas made by H. H. Wilson, there has been a growing interest in the study of the Purāṇas. R C. Hazra in his study of the Puranic Records on the Hindu Rites and Customs,<sup>1</sup> has discussed the topics on dharma in the major Purāṇas. Later there were studies on some of the individual major Purāṇas. In the past few decades studies on some of the Upapurāṇas as well as R. C. Hazra's Study of the Upapurāṇas<sup>2</sup> in two volumes appeared. Besides the Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas, there are a good number of minor Purāṇas. Although they may fail to enjoy the same recognition as the Mahāpurāṇas, they enable us in understanding the religious and cultural traditions in the different regions of India during the past few centuries.

I have been working on a project for which I have sought the financial support from the University Grants Commission. Meanwhile I have made a random survey of the material collected in the New Catalogus Catalogorum section of the Sanskrit Department of the University of Madras. There are about 60 titles of Purāṇas besides 20 titles of Saṁhitā texts. Some of the titles are very fascinating. I describe here the interesting details relating to these works.

These texts may be divided under the following heads:

1. Works known through citations,
2. Works in lists of private collections giving no clue to infer about their contents,

3. Works in lists of private collections enabling us to infer their contents from their titles,
4. Works noticed in Descriptive Catalogue of manuscripts giving some extracts of the works.

Under the first category we may mention the *Laghubrahma-vaivartapurāna* quoted in the *Nirnayasindhu* of Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa.<sup>3</sup>

Under the second category we may mention the following works:

*Abhinavabhāgavata*<sup>4</sup> *Kāraṇapurāna* by Śrīśaila Śeṣakavi<sup>5</sup> *Gaṇeśabhāgavata*,<sup>6</sup> *Gadāpurāna*,<sup>7</sup> *Gṛhyabhāgavata*<sup>8</sup> *Jaiminipurāna*,<sup>9</sup> *Bṛhadbrahmapurāna*,<sup>10</sup> *Bṛhadvāmanapurāna*<sup>11</sup> *Mantra-bhāgavata*<sup>12</sup> by Govinda with his own commentary, *Mallapurāna*,<sup>13</sup> *Mahāpurāna*<sup>14</sup> *Mahāvāyupurāna*<sup>15</sup> *Mahāśiva-Purāna*<sup>16</sup> *Mausalapurāna*<sup>17</sup> *Lakṣmīpurāna*,<sup>18</sup> *Laghunārādīya-purāna*<sup>19</sup> *Laghumatsyapurāna*,<sup>20</sup> *Vṛṣapurāna*,<sup>21</sup> *Satyapurāna*,<sup>22</sup> *Sarasvatīpurāna*<sup>23</sup> *Sītajayapurāna*<sup>24</sup> and *Harivijaya*<sup>25</sup>

Though some of these titles seem to be relating to some titles already known as Manāpurānas, we are not able to infer anything definitely in the absence of extracts.

Under the third category we may mention the names of the following works:

*Kālībhāgavata*<sup>26</sup> seems to be referring to the popular *Devībhāgavata*.

*Kṛṣṇapurāna*<sup>27</sup> could be dealing with legends relating to lord Kṛṣṇa.

*Gaṇeśapurāna*<sup>28</sup> is a well-known text having many mss. and available in print. It is devoted to legends relating to the origin and worship of lord Gaṇeśa.

*Gopālābhāgavata*<sup>29</sup> is quite likely to be a version of legends of lord Kṛṣṇa.

*Gomatīpurāna*<sup>30</sup> is obviously about the river Gomatī and sacred spots on its banks.

Similarly the *Narmadāpurāna*<sup>31</sup> dealt with sacred spots on the river Narmadā.

*Vināyakapurāna*<sup>32</sup> is obviously related to legends about lord Vināyaka. *Svalpamatsyapurāna*<sup>33</sup>. A sample edition based on the Grierson I.O. manuscript was made by Dr. Raghavan in the early issues of the *Purāna Bulletin*.

Under the last category we may refer to the following works: *Adhyātmabhāgavata*,<sup>34</sup> *Jaiminibhāgavata*,<sup>35</sup> *Dharmapurāṇa*,<sup>3</sup> *Nilamatapurāṇa*,<sup>37</sup> *Parānandapurāṇa*,<sup>38</sup> *Paśupatiapurāṇa*,<sup>39</sup> *Basavapurāṇa*,<sup>40</sup> *Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa*,<sup>41</sup> *Bhūgolapurāṇa*,<sup>42</sup> *Bhairavapurāṇa*,<sup>43</sup> *Mahābhāgavata*,<sup>44</sup> *Maudgalapurāṇa*,<sup>45</sup> *Vikhyātapurāṇa* or *Vikṣādhapurāṇa*,<sup>46</sup> *Viśvakarmapurāṇa* or *Mūlastambapurāṇa*,<sup>47</sup> *Viṣṇurahasya*<sup>48</sup> and *Vaiśyapurāṇa*.<sup>49</sup>

Among these works the *Dharmapurāṇa*<sup>50</sup> deals with topics on *dharma* and devotes a major part to Pañcākhyāna defined in the work as:

पित्रोरर्चा च पत्युञ्च समा सर्वजनेषु च ।  
मित्राद्रोहो विष्णुभक्ति रैते पञ्च महामखाः ॥

and illustrated with suitable stories.

The *Nilamatapurāṇa*<sup>51</sup> is a well-known text relating to Kashmir and available in print.

The *Parānandapurāṇa* in 46chs describes creation, legends of Devavrata, king Rājivalocana, Susruti and Sumukha, glorification of the Bhagavadgītā, origin of Śilāda and Nandin, marriage of Satī and her self-immolation, destruction of Tripura and the Śivasahasranāman spoken by Dakṣa.

The *Adhyātmabhāgavata* gives a spiritual meaning to incidents in the career of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his amorous sports described in the *Bhāgavata*. For instance, it explains the incident of Yaśodā making an attempt to tie up with a chord her son. The chord although lengthened repeatedly always fell short by two *aṅgulis*. The two *aṅgulis* represent the two *guṇas*, Rajas and Tamas. Yaśodā failed to bind him up, as she was not in fullness of Sattva. She had the trace of Rajas and Tamas still with her. The work explains Rasa as the union of the devotees with the absolute.

The *Jaiminibhāgavata* in 69 chs. seems to be dealing with the life history of lord Kṛṣṇa as known from the extracts.

The *Paśupatiapurāṇa* is obviously related to description of sacred spots in Nepal.

The *Basavapurāṇa* is related to the origin of Basava (adored by the Liṅgāyats in Karnataka) and legends relating to him and tentets.

The *Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa* is a well-known text printed in the Bib. Ind. Series.

The *Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa* is a well-known text printed in the Bib. Ind. Paraśurāmakṣetra i.e. Kerala.



The *Bhairavapurāṇa* seems to be devoted to Saivite legends. As the Madras ms. is incomplete and injured only extracts of chs. 45 and 46 have been given. They deal with the conquest of Śabara and Karttikeya.

The *Maudgalapurāṇa* is an elaborate work in 79 skandhas establishing the supremacy of lord Gaṇeśa describing his different manifestations such as Vakratuṅḍa, Ekadanta, Mahodara, Gajānana etc.

The *Vikhyāta purāṇa* or *Vikṣādhapurāṇa* in 21 ch. stated to be from the Kedārakalpa describes the pathways to heaven, Vaitarīṇī etc.

The *Viśvakarmapurāṇa* or *Mūlastambhapurāṇa* has been printed in Kannada script from Bangalore towards the end of the last century. It gives an account of Viśvakarman, the divine architect, and his descendants the artisans, their customs, religious rites etc.

The Mahābhāgavata recounts the exploits of Devī and urges her claims for being worshipped as the Supreme Deity.

The *Viṣṇurahasya* in 55 chs. is given as a portion of *Vasiṣṭhapurāṇa*. From the beginning of the extracts it seems to be an exposition about the greatness of lord Viṣṇu.

The *Vaiśyapurāṇa* as the name suggests seems to be describing the details relating to the origin of the artisan class.

Before concluding I would like to mention that the Jaina versions of the Purāṇas have not been covered by me now. But in the survey I have made I came across the titles-Nāśaketupurāṇa or *Nāsiketupurāṇa* and Rāmapurāṇa. Similar to the Naciketas in the *Kathópaniṣad*, we have a Jaina account of Nāśaketu. Obviously the above mentioned title is devoted to the legends about Nāśaketu.

The *Rāmapurāṇa* appears to be a Jaina Purāṇa since it is found in a Jaina collection of mss.

From a random scrutiny of the titles of the *Purāṇasarāhitā* texts most of them seem to be devoted to one of the gods Śiva, Viṣṇu etc.

---

(references to mss. are as in the New Catalogus Catalogorum)

1. Dacca, 1940.
2. Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series XI and XXII 1960, 1963.
3. Hazra, Studies in the Upapurāṇas II. p. 626.
4. R.A. Sastri II. 162. TE. 23555.
5. Tel. Academy 172.
6. R.A. Sastry II. 183. IV. 267.
7. Kavindracharya 1417.
8. Krsnapur 55.

9. CPB. 1829-34. Udaipur II. 36.1.
10. Allahabad 167
11. Ibid.
12. IB. 322. PUL. II.
13. Kotah 632.
14. BORI. 250 of 1895-1902. Mad Uni. R.K.S. 314 (b). Svadi 50.
15. Mandlik Sup. 163 (1).
16. Anandasrama 7846.
17. Mysore I.P. 167.
18. Visvabharati 2602.
19. Bharatpur II.1.
20. Assam
21. CPB. 5322.
22. CPB. 6186.
23. Wai
24. R.A. Sastri II 191.
25. Harshe 27.
26. Ramanath Nando 47.
27. Cabaton .1.424. Elankulattu Kurur Bhattatiri 9.
28. There are a good number of manuscripts.
29. Baroda 631. 989.
30. Baroda 9148.
31. CPB. 2430-2433.
32. Oppert II. 2214.
33. PURĀṆA VI. 1.249-60, VIII. 1. 192-226, X.2.49-114, X.1.115-136, X.2.137-78, and XVI.1. 178-190.
34. RASB. V. 4120.
35. IO. 6944. 6945 MT. 3171. RASB.V. 4119. Visvabharati 1370.
36. Assam. Mithila 1024. RASB. 4121. 4122. CPB. 2026. Ani. SSPC.F. 79. F. 160.
37. There are many mss.
38. Jodhpur. RASB.V 4132. 4133.
39. Oxf. II. 1173.
40. Mad. Uni. 277. MD. 2349-2351.
41. There are many mss.
42. BORI. 122 of 1899-1915. IO. 6747. 6748. Skt. Coll. Ben. 1897-191, P. 199. no. 812.
43. MD 2356. Mysore I.P. 627. Sringeri Mutt 257. R.A, Sastri II. 185.
44. IO. 3547. Kotah 613.614. RASB.V. 4112-4116.
45. IO. 3570-3571. 3572-75. etc. Pvd. Bombay, 1976.
46. RASB.V. 4141-4143. Vangiya P.115.
47. I.O. 3153. 6466.6467. Mysore N.D. VI. 17905-7/ Extra p. 146 34785. Extr. P. 204
48. M.D. 2358. MT. 5852. -
49. Mysore II.p.7
50. Cabaton I.416. BORI. 376 of 1886-92. CPB. 2569/2573.
51. Malakheda 39. R.A. Sastri II. 179 (Svetamber Jain Mutt, Idar)

# IDENTITY OF HIRAṆYANĀBHA— A KṢĀTRIYA YOGIN

By

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

## I

[स्मृतः कोसलदेशीयो राजपुत्रो हिरण्यनाभ-नामा । नान्यासु उपनिषत्सु स्मृतोऽयम् । शतपथब्राह्मणे तु सपुत्रोऽयम् उल्लिखितः । अयं परिव्राजको बभूवेत्यपि अत्रोक्तम् ।

हिरण्यनाभस्य जन्म-कर्मादि केषुचित् पुराणेषु समासतो वर्णितम् । अत्रोक्तं यदयं दाशरथिरामपुत्रस्य कुशस्य वंशे प्रादुर्भूतो विश्वसहस्य तनयरूपेण । दक्षिणकोसले चास्य राज्यमासीत् । अस्माद् याज्ञवल्क्येन योगोऽधिगतः । हिरण्यनाभकृते ग्रन्थे अध्यात्मयोगविद्या विवृता, विशेषतश्च मनोनाशप्रक्रिया हृदयग्रन्थिभेदनप्रक्रिया च ।

अयं सामवेदशाखाविशेषस्य प्रवर्तक आसीत् । अस्य शिष्याणां ख्यातिः प्राच्यसामगरूपेण जाता । आसीच्चास्य कृत-नामा शिष्यः सामवेदशाखाकारः, योऽस्माद् योगं लब्धवान् । रघुवंशकाव्ये कालिदासेनायं वर्णितः । रघुवंशीयं विवरणं न सर्वांशतः प्रामाणिकमिति प्रतीयते ]।

In the Praśna-up. we find the following passage :

अथ हैनं सुकेशा भारद्वाजः पप्रच्छ-भगवन् हिरण्यनाभः कौसल्यो<sup>1</sup> राजपुत्रो<sup>2</sup> मामु-  
पेत्य एतं प्रश्नम् अपृच्छत्-षोडशकलं भारद्वाज पुरुषं वेत्थ.....(6.1)

No further information of this Hiraṇyanābha is found in the Upaniṣads.

Mention of Hiraṇyanābha is however found in some Vedic Saṁhitās, Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras. The relevant passage in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is noteworthy :

अभिजिदतिरात्रस्तेन ह पर आट्णार ईजे  
कौसल्यो राजा । तदेतद् गाथया अभिगीतम्—  
आट्णारस्य परः पुत्रोऽश्वं मेध्यमबन्धत ।  
हिरण्यनाभः कौसल्यो दिशः पूर्णा अमंहत ॥

(XIII 5. 4. 4)

From the commentaries by Durga and Skanda on Nirukta 1.14 we know that आट्णार means : *āṭṇasīla* (one who habitually wanders, i.e. a *parivrājaka*). This shows that the rājaputra Hiraṇyanābha became a

*sannyāsin* in the last part of his life. See also Śaṅkhāyana Śrautasūtra XVI. 9. 13 and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 2.6.

Curiously enough the Purāṇas contain some passages that throw much light on the life and activities of this Hiraṇyanābha<sup>3</sup>. The life of Hiraṇyanābha as described in these works shows that not only Janaka and his descendants were *ātmavids* (see Viṣṇupurāṇa IV. 5. 14.) but a few kings of other dynasties also were yogins of high prominence.

Now we are going to quote relevant Puranic passages. It is needless to say that the readings of these passages are corrupt in some places which may be corrected with the help of comparative study. These verses occur in the description of the dynasty of Kuśa, son of Rāma.

The Vāyu-p. (88. 206b-209a) reads :

व्युषिताश्वसुतश्चापि राजा विश्वसहः किल ॥  
हिरण्यनाभकौशल्यो वसिष्ठस्तत्सुतोऽभवत् ।  
पौत्रस्य जैमिनेः शिष्यः स्मृतः सर्वेषु शर्मसु ॥  
शतानि संहितानां तु पञ्च योऽधीतवांस्ततः ।  
तस्मादधिगतो योगो याज्ञवल्क्येन धीमता ॥  
पुण्यस्तस्य सुतो विद्वान् ..... ।

[The Beng. ed. reads व्युषिताश्व (206b) and पुष्प (209a)].

The Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa (II. 63.207b-210a) reads :

व्युषिताश्वसुतश्चापि राजा विश्वसहः किल ॥ 207  
हिरण्यनाभः कौशल्यो वरिष्ठस्तत्सुतोऽभवत् ।  
पौष्यश्चेच्च स वै शिष्यः स्मृतः प्राच्येषु सामसु ॥ 208  
शतानि संहितानां तु पञ्च योऽधीतवांस्ततः ।  
तस्मादधिगतो योगो याज्ञवल्क्येन धीमता ॥ 209  
पुष्पस्तस्य सुतो विद्वान् ..... ।

It will be shown afterwards that here the readings in Brahmāṇḍa-p. (Venk. ed.) are better than those in the Vāyu-p. (Ananda. ed.).

The Viṣṇu-p. (IV. 4. 48) reads :

ततो व्युथिताश्वः, ततश्च विश्वसहो जज्ञे । हिरण्यनाभस्ततो महायोगीश्वरजैमिनि-  
शिष्यः, यतो याज्ञवल्क्यो योगमवाप

(Jiv. ed. with the comm. of Śrīdhara)

The Bhāgavata (IX. 12. 3-4) reads :

खगणस्तत्सुतस्तस्माद् विधृतिश्चाभवत् सुतः ।  
 ततो हिरण्यनाभोऽभूद् योगाचार्यस्तु जैमिनेः ॥ 3  
 शिष्य कौसल्य आध्यात्म्यं याज्ञवल्क्योऽध्यगाद् यतः ।  
 योगं महोदयमृषि हृदयग्रन्थिभेदनम् ॥ 4  
 [v.1. विसृष्टि (3); v. 1. भेदकम् (4)]

The comm. Śrīdhara observes : जैमिनेः शिष्यो योगाचार्यः (verse 3); तदाह यतः सकाशात् कौसल्यो याज्ञवल्क्य ऋषिः आध्यात्म्यं योगमध्यगात् ।

The Śivapurāṇa (V. 38. 24-26) reads :

तत्सुतस्त्वगुणसत्त्वासीत् तस्माद् विधृतिरात्मजः ॥ 24  
 हिरण्यनाभस् तत्पुत्रो योगाचार्यो बभूव ह ।  
 स शिष्यो जैमिनिमुनेर्हार्त्मात्मविद्याविशारदः ॥ 25  
 कौशल्यो याज्ञवल्क्योऽथ योगमध्यात्मसंज्ञकम् ।  
 यतोऽध्यगान्नृपवराद् हृदयग्रन्थिभेदनम् ॥ 26

The Garuḍa-p. (1. 138. 42) reads :

उषिताश्वो गणाञ्जज्ञे ततो विश्वसहोऽभवत् ।  
 हिरण्यनाभस्तत्पुत्रः तत्पुत्रः पुष्पकः स्मृतः ॥

## II

From these Puranic passages we can gather the following facts about Hiraṇyanābha :—

(A) Hiraṇyanābha appeared in the dynasty of Kuśa, son of Rāma, after 15th or 16th generation. This is to be regarded as approximate for the simple reason that the readings in the printed Purāṇas are corrupt in many places. Moreover the enumeration of the decendants in the Puranic lists of royal dynasties is not always precise; a few non-significant kings may not have been mentioned by the authors of the purāṇas.<sup>4</sup>

(B) The name of the father of Hiraṇyanābha is विश्वसह as is read in the Vāyu, Viṣṇu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas. विधृति read in the late Bhāgavata and Śiva purāṇas seems to be of later origin. The name having the same sense as विश्वसह<sup>5</sup> seems to have been coined chiefly for metrical reasons. विसृष्टि is undoubtedly the corrupt form of विधृति. Hiraṇyanābha is said to be the eldest (*variṣṭha*) son of his father. *Vasiṣṭha* (the reading in Vāyu-p.) is to be corrected to *variṣṭha*.

(C) Hiraṇyanābha was an inhabitant of Kosala i. e. Ayodhya. Since he was a descendant of Kuśa, to whom the kingdom of Kosala was given by

Rāma with its capital Kuśasthali on the table-land of the Vindhya hill,<sup>6</sup> he is rightly called Kausalya (or Kauśalya). This Kosala is sometimes called Dakṣiṇa Kosala, for which Kosala is also used by the authors of the Purāṇas; see Garuḍa-p. I. 68. 17 where Kosala is the same as Dakṣiṇa Kosala.

The Bhāgavata also uses the word कौसल्य, which is wrongly construed with Yājñavalkya by the commentator Śrīdhara. This means that Yājñavalkya, the disciple of Hiraṇyanābha, was an inhabitant of Kosala. This is untenable as there is no grounds to hold this view. Kausalyaḥ ought to have been construed with हिरण्यगर्भः योगाचार्यः. The Śiva-p. (कौशल्यो याज्ञवल्क्योऽथ) seems to be misled by the Bhāgavata.

(D) The Viṣṇu-p. clearly says that Hiraṇyanābha was a disciple of Jaimini, a great yogin. The Bhāgavata is also of the same opinion (योगाचार्यो हिरण्यनाभो जैमिनेः शिष्यः—words so arranged as to yield the sense clearly).

A question may be raised about the validity of this view as no sage named Jaimini is described as a great yogin in the Itihāsa-purāṇas or in the yogic works.

The problem may be solved if we think that Hiraṇyanābha was one of the later promulgators of Sāma-veda-recensions and that Jaimini was the first promulgator of the Sāma-veda-śākhās. Thus it may reasonably be concluded that Hiraṇyanābha was an indirect disciple of Jaimini in the field of Sāmaveda.

The problem may be solved in another conjectural way. We may read the Viṣṇu-p. passage as हिरण्यनाभस्ततो महायोगीश्वरः जैमिनिशिष्यः, thus construing महायोगीश्वरः not with Jaimini but with Hiraṇyanābha. It is not necessary that all epithets of a substantive are to be read before it as is held by Rhetoricians.

(E) The Vāyu and other Purāṇas declare that Yājñavalkya achieved yoga from Hiraṇyanābha.

It is unfortunate that such a valuable information is not found in the available works on yoga. Even the yogic works ascribed to Yājñavalkya, namely योग (गि)—याज्ञवल्क्य and बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्य (or बृहद्योगियाज्ञवल्क्यसंहिता) do not speak of Hiraṇyanābha as the teacher of Yājñavalkya.

There is however no doubt about the existence of Yājñavalkya, the yogin.<sup>7</sup>

It is remarkable to note that the Gita press edition of the Viṣṇu-p. reads : तस्माद् हिरण्यनाभः, यो महायोगीश्वराज् जैमिनिशिष्याद् याज्ञवल्क्याद् योगमवाप (4. 4. 107). Unless a critical edition of the Purāṇa is available nothing can be said on this point. That Yājñavalkya was a disciple of Jaimini is unknown to the Purāṇas.

(F) We get no precise description of the treatise composed by Hiraṇyanābha. The Purāṇas simply say that it deals with yoga which is आध्यात्म्य, अध्यात्मसंज्ञक, हृदयग्रन्थिभेदन (or ०भेदन) and महोदय. [अध्यात्मन्+अण्=आध्यात्म; cp अध्यात्मन्+इक (ठक्)=आध्यात्मिक].

For the first two epithets, cp. Kāṭha-up. 1. 2. 12 (अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन देवं. ....). This is the reason for describing a yogin as अध्यात्मचिन्तक, अध्यात्मज्ञ or अध्यात्म्यविद् (see Śānti-p. 275. 18; 310. 10, 15; 202. 4; Aśvamedha-p. 39. 24; Manusmṛti 6. 82). For the entities discussed in *adhyātmavidyā*, see Śānti. p. Chaps. 194, 247 and 285; Nārādīya-p.I. 44. 1

According to the comm. Śrīdhara *mahodaya* means 'one endowed with supernormal powers (महान्त उदयाः सिद्धयो यस्मिन् तम्). The explanation does not seem to be original. The word *mahodaya* occurs in the Muktika-up. (2.39) in the sense of *manonāśa*. This sense may be accepted here, for *manonāśa* is one of the chief themes of yoga works. This may be compared with Praśastapāda's use of the word *mahodaya* in the benedictory verse of his bhāṣya (पदार्थधर्मसंग्रहः प्रवक्ष्यते महोदयः) which is explained to mean आत्यन्तिकी दुःखनिवृत्तिः (vide Nyāyakandali).

The expression हृदयग्रन्थिभेदन (or ०भेदन) meaning 'the breaker of the knots of the heart' (the suffix *ana* in the sense of agent) shows an established conception of *yogavidyā*; cp. भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिः (Muṇḍaka-up. 2. 2. 8) and गुहाग्रन्थि (Muṇḍaka-up. 3. 2. 9); in the latter *guhā* stands for *hṛdaya*; cp. तस्मादिदं गुहा हृदयम् (Śatapatha Br. XI. 2. 6. 5).

### III

From the passages (in the chapters on *vedaśākhāvibhāga*) of the Vāyu and other Purāṇas it appears that Hiraṇyanābha was one of the promulgators of *Sāma-veda-śākhās*. It is stated that Hiraṇyanābha was the direct disciple of Sukarman in *Sāma-veda*, who was the grandson of Jaimini, the first promulgator of *Sāmaśākhās*. Hiraṇyanābha is said to have composed 500 *Sāma-sarṅhitās* and taught them to his disciples who were afterwards called *prācya-sāmagas* (Eastern *sāman*-chanters)<sup>8</sup>. स्मृतः

सर्वेषु शर्मषु (the reading in Vāyu-p.) requires to be corrected to स्मृतः प्राच्येषु सामसु (the reading in Brahmanḍa-p.).

Kṛta (sometimes read as कृति or कत in the Purāṇas) was another disciple of Hiraṇyanābha in yoga as well as in the Sāmaveda. He was the son of the King Sannati or Sannatimat, who belonged to the dynasty of Pūru of the lunar race.<sup>9</sup>

Kṛta was a versatile scholar of the Sāmaveda. He is said to be one of the Udīcyasāmaga disciples of Hiraṇyanābha in some Purāṇas, while in others one of the prācyā-sāmaga disciples. He had twenty-four disciples in the Sāmaveda, who were called Kārtas or Kārtis.<sup>10</sup>

Between the two readings पौत्रस्य जैमिनेः शिष्यः (Vāyu-p.) and पौष्यञ्जेश्च स वै शिष्यः (Brahmanḍa-p.) concerning Hiraṇyanābha the first reading seems to be acceptable, for Hiraṇyanābha was the disciple of Sukarman, who was the *putra* of Jaimini according to the Viṣṇu-purāṇa. None of the Purāṇas say that Hiraṇyanābha was the disciple of Pausyñji.

In the Raghuvamśa (18. 24-27)<sup>11</sup> Kālidāsa referred to this yogin and said that he was a Kausalya, i. e. an inhabitant of the Kosala *Janapada*. The poet further informs us that Viśvasaha became an ascetic after appointing his son Hiraṇyanābha king of his country who ruled the Uttarakosala *janapada*.

The mention of Uttarakosala in connection with Hiraṇyanābha presents some difficulty, for he appeared in the dynasty of Kuśa to whom the *janapada* on the table land of the Vindhya hill was given by Rāma, while Uttarakosala was given to the other son Lava (Rāmāyaṇa 7. 107. 17; Vāyu-p. 88. 199-200). Does it suggest that Uttarakosala came to be ruled by the descendants of Kuśa afterwards ?

According to Kālidāsa Kausalya is the name of the son of Hiraṇyanābha (18. 27; कौसल्य इति प्रसिद्ध औरसो धर्मपत्नीजः सुतौऽभूत्—Mallinātha). The view is, however, not countenanced by any Purāṇa. The reason for this non-traditional view requires to be determined.

The name of the son of Hiraṇyanābha is given as पुष्य, पुण्य or पुष्पक in the Purāṇas, while the Śatapatha Br. gives the name as पर (who performed a horse-sacrifice). In the absence of manuscript material it seems proper to correct the Puranic name.

A doubt may be raised as to how a person highly devoted to songs (sāmans are really songs; cp. गीतिषु सामाख्याः Pūrvamīmāṃsā-sūtra 2. 1. 36) may become a yogin of high order. In reply we may simply say that



sāman songs are helpful in attaining one-pointedness, which is the firm basis of all yoga practices, as has been stated in the Yājñavalkya-smṛti : यथाविधानेन पठन् सामगानमविच्युतम् । सावधानस्तदभ्यासात् परं ब्रह्माधिगच्छति ॥ (3. 112). Puranic authors were fully aware of the power of sāman songs; that is why they emphatically declared 'सामानि यो वेद स वेद ब्रह्म' (Vāyu-p. 79. 95; Brahmāṇḍa-p. II. 15. 68). The Puranic statement is found in slightly different form in an authoritative work of the Vedic tradition also; see Bṛhaddevatā 8. 130 (सामानि यो वेद स वेद तत्त्वम्).<sup>12</sup>

1. Śāṅkara explains कौसल्य as कोसलायां भवः. Madhvācārya also explained it in the same way. Kosalā is another name of Ayodhyā (see Vaijayantikos'a 4. 3. 5; Kalpadru-kos'a. p. 17, verse 15).

Some editions seem to read *kausalya* with *palatal s'*. According to Max Muller 'there is no authority for the *palatal s'*', (S. B. E. vol. 15, p. 283 fn.) In the Purāṇas also the word is sometimes read with palatal s'. According to the Paninian tradition the word is to be spelt with dental s; see commentaries on Pā 4. 1 .171 (वृद्धेत्कोसलाजाद—), Tattvabodhini on Uṇādi-sūtra 106 (वृषादिभ्यश्चित्) and Auṇadikapadārṇava 1.443. The Bhāgavata verse हिरण्यनाभः कौसल्यः ..... (12.7. 77) is quoted in the Carañavyūha (sec. on Sāmaveda). The comm. Mahīdhara explains कौसल्य by *kosala-putra* (p. 46), which is unacceptable.

2. Śāṅkara explains *rājaputra* as जातितः क्षत्रियः.
3. In many passages of the printed Purāṇa the name is read as हिरण्यनामिन् or हिरण्यनाभि. There is no doubt that the correct form is हिरण्यनाभ. Names of kings ending with नाभ are found in the Purāṇas, e. i. कुशनाभ (the name of the son of Kuśa, son of Rāma, Rāmāyaṇa 1. 32. 2).
4. cp. एते इक्ष्वाकुदायादा राजानः प्रायशः स्मृताः । वंशे प्रधाना ये तेऽस्मिन् प्राधान्येन तु कीर्तिताः ॥ (Vāyu-p.88. 213); सर्वे प्राधान्यतः प्रोक्ताः समासेन (Kūrma-p. I. 214 in कुरुवंशवर्णन).
5. Use of synonyms in proper names is often found in the Purāṇas. As for example अन्तर्धान is used for the king अन्तर्धि, शत्रुमर्दन for the king अरिमर्दन; पिप्पलाशन for the sage पिप्पलाद; शिलाशन for शिलाद; हिरण्यचक्षुस् for the demon हिरण्याक्ष etc. As the proper names were often based on the *guṇa-karmans* of persons, the tendency of using synonyms came into existence in natural course.
6. कुशस्य कोशला राज्यं पुरी चापि कुशस्थली ।  
रम्या निवेशिता येन विन्ध्यपर्वतसानुषु ॥  
(Vāyu-p. 88. 199; Braāhmāṇḍa-p. 2. 64. 199). The division of Kosala into northern and southern is not stated in Vedic literature.
7. See Yājñavalkya-smṛti 1. 2 (मिथिलास्थः स योगीन्द्रः) and 3. 110 (योगशास्त्रं च मत्प्रोक्तम्) and the Janaka-yājñavalkya dialogue on Sāṅkhyā-yoga views in Śānti-p. (Chaps 303-306 cr. ed.).

8. For a detailed treatment of the contribution of Hiraṇyanābha in the field of the Śāma-veda, see the present writer's work पुराणगत वेदविषयक सामग्री का समीक्षात्मक अध्ययन, pp. 299-305.
9. सन्नतिमतः कृतोऽभूद् यं हिरण्यनभो योगमध्यापयामास, यः चतुर्विंशतिं प्राच्यसामगानां चकार संहिताः (Viṣṇu-p. 4. 19. 13); तस्य वै संनतेः पुत्रः कृतो नाम महाबलः ॥ ४२ ॥ शिष्यो हिरण्यनाभस्य कौशलस्य महात्मनः । चतुर्विंशतिधा तेन सप्राच्याः सामसंहिताः ॥ ४३ ॥ स्मृतास्ते प्राच्यसामानः कार्तयो नाम सामगाः । (Harivaṃs'a 1.20. 42b-44a).
10. For a detailed account of the activities and disciples of Kṛta, see पुराणगत वेदविषयक सामग्री का समीक्षात्मक अध्ययन, pp. 303-304.
11. आराध्य विश्वेश्वरमीश्वरेण तेन क्षितेर्विश्वसहो विजज्ञे ।  
पातुं सहो विश्वसखः समग्रां विश्वंभरामात्मजमूर्तिरात्मा ॥ २४ ॥  
[v.1. विश्वसखो, विश्वसमो, विष्णुसमो for विश्वसहो;  
v.1 विश्वसहः, विश्वसृजः for विश्वसखः]  
अंशे हिरण्याक्षरिपोः स जाते हिरण्यनाभे तनये नयज्ञः ।  
द्विषामसह्यः सुतरां तरूणां हिरण्यरेता इव सानिलोऽभूत् ॥ २५ ॥  
पिता पितृणामनृगंस्तमन्ते वयस्यनन्तानि सुखानि लिप्सुः ।  
राजानमाजानुविलम्बबाहुं कृत्वा कृती वल्कलवान् बभूव ॥ २६ ॥  
कौसल्य इत्युत्तरकोसलानां पत्युः पतङ्गान्वयभूषणस्य । २७ क.
12. About the date of Hiraṇyanābha the view of Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri is given here : "According to the Praśna Upaniṣad, Hiraṇyanābha, the father, was a contemporary of Sukeśa Bhāradvāja (6.1) who was himself a contemporary of Kausalya Āśvalāyana (1. 1). If it be true, as seems probable, that Āśvalāyana of Kosala is identical with Assalāyana of Sāuatthī mentioned in the Majjhima Nikāya (II. 147 et. seq.) as a contemporary of Gotama Buddha, he must be placed in the sixth century B. C. Consequently Hiraṇyanābha and his son Hairaṇyanābha too, must have flourished in that century" (P.H.A.I.p. 91). As the identity shown above is extremely doubtful, the date of the teacher is to be determined afresh.

# THE UPPER DATE OF AYODHYĀMĀHĀTMYA OF SKANDA PURĀṆA

BY

JAHNAWI SHEKHAR ROY

[बाकरमहोदयेन स्कन्दपुराणीयायोध्यामाहात्म्यखण्डरचनायाः कालस्य पूर्वसीमा ख्रीष्टीय १०९३ रूपेण निर्धारिता । एतत्-प्रयुक्ताभिर्युक्तिभिः एतत्खण्डरचनायाः कालः ख्रीष्टीय ११८४ वर्षादवागम् इति सिध्यति । पूर्वोक्तं मतं पाठक-तिवारीभ्याम् इतिवृत्तविद्भ्याम् अभ्युपगतम् । एताभ्यामिदमपि उक्तं यद् एतत्खण्डरचनायाः कालस्यावरसीमा ख्रीष्टीय- ११४८ भवितुमर्हतीति ।

एतेषां विदुषां विशेषतश्च बाकर-महोदयस्य मतानि लेखकेन ऐतिहासिकदृष्ट्या शिलालेखाद्याधारेण च विशदं समीक्षितानि; अयोध्यागतानां नदीतीर्थादीनां यत् परिवर्तनं जातं तदपि स्फुटं दर्शितम्-ग्रन्थकालनिर्धारणे एवंविधभौगोलिकपरिवर्तनानां उपयोगस्य सार्थक्यमपि व्यक्तीकृतम् । सिद्धान्तितं च गहडवालवंशीय-जयचन्द्रस्य राज्ञः कतिभ्यश्चित् शताब्दीभ्यः प्राग् विरचितोऽयं खण्डः । अवरसीमाविषये इदमेव निश्चप्रचं वक्तुं शक्यते । पूर्वसीमायाः निर्धारणं दुःशकं; दृढप्रमाणेषु उपलब्धेषु सत्स्वेतव तत् कर्तुं शक्यते । ]

## [Introduction]

Dr. Bakker has put the upper date of Ayodhyāmahātmya (AM) as 1093 A.D., that is, the date of the Candradeva inscription of Ayodhyā.<sup>1</sup> Rather, he pushes the date a little more forward. If we accept his argument, AM must have been composed after 1184 A.D., that is, the date of the installation of Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur temple by king Jaycandra. Dr. Pathak, V.S. and Dr. Tiwari, J.N<sup>2</sup> agree with it (1093 A.D.) and further add that the lower limit of the date of the composition of AM should be 1148 A.D., viz, the date of the construction of Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur at Svargadvāra as given in Jaycandra's inscription found in the ruins of the Tretā-kā Ṭhākur mosque built by Aurangzeb<sup>3</sup> Apparently, it seems that both, Dr. Bakker and on the other hand Dr. Pathak and Tiwari, agree on the upper date. But actually it is not so. Dr. Pathak and Tiwari in fact, dismiss the main argument of Dr. Bakker as speculative.<sup>4</sup> The two set of arguments annul each other. So, it becomes imperative to

see if any substantive evidence remains to warrant the fixing of the upper date at 1093 A.D. at all. We give below the two sets of arguments and our conclusion thereafter.

## [2] DR. BAKKER'S ARGUMENT

Dr. Bakker quotes the Candradeva inscription (Infra) and admits that it does not at all mention installation of any temple or even any idol; yet, he says "We believe that the temple, or at least the idol, actually owes its origin to Candradeva (moon-god), and that the name Candrahari and the legend of its origin, viz., the pilgrimage of Candra, refer to a historical deed of this king as recorded in the inscription"<sup>5</sup>. He goes on to give the Skanda Purāṇa's version of the story of Candra (moon) establishing the Candrahari temple at Svargadvāra.

Dr. Bakker then goes on to explain the omission of the installation in the Candradeva inscription. The point is that the question of explanation comes only if there be any substantive evidence first, conforming the basis of the belief that the said inscription refers to the Candrahari temple at Svargadvāra. Dr. Bakker finds this basis in the following facts:

- (a). The original name of the Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur was Dharmahari, there-by forming a set of twin temples, Candrahari and Dharmahari temple at Svargadvāra.
- (b). Aurangzeb demolished both of them which were in perfect symmetry with each other, thus forming a set of twin mosques at Svargadvāra.
- (c). The story given in AM regarding the installation of Candrahari and Dharmahari are very much similar, thus forming a twin set of mythologies.
- (d). It is proved by the epigraphical evidence that the Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur temple (that is the original Dharmahari temple) was installed by Gāharwāl king Jaycandra. And now, as if, to extend the concept of the 'twin', a Gāharwāl king must be found out who could have established the Candrahari temple. Fortunately for Dr. Bakker, Gāharwāl king Candradeva's visit to Svargadvāra is testified to by epigraphy (Supra). Finding a happy coincidence in the names Candradeva and Candrahari, he jumps to the belief that Candradeva must have installed the Candrahari idol. Accordingly the upper date of AM, which mentions Candrahari temple, is bound to be 1093 A.D. .

Thus the whole argument of Dr. Bakker revolves round the equation of Dharmahari with Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur. We examine below the validity of his arguments in two parts.

(1). Even if we grant the Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur=Dharmahari equation, can it prove that Candradeva established the Candrahari idol at Svargadvāra?

(2). Is the 'Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur=Dharmahari' equation valid ?

(1). *Candradeva's connection with Candrahari:*

**(a). The Copper plate evidence:**

The copper plate simply mentions that the king worshipped the Vāsudeva, whose idol might have pre-existed. It can be safely assumed that later on when Jaycandra visited Ayodhyā, he also took his bath where his grand father had, and worshipped the ancient temple of Candrahari standing at the western end of the ghāt. Finding the eastern end of it vacant, he constructed a temple of Rāma known as Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur (equated with Dharmahari by Dr. Bakker). We just do not understand that how this can be the basis of conjecture of Candradeva establishing the Candrahari idol. Had the name of Jaycandra's temple been Jayahari, there could have been an argument, how-so-ever weak, that Candradeva might have established Candrahari idol.

**(b) The 'twin' argument:**

Dr. Bakker says that on the either side of the Svargadvāra ghāt there seems to have been two mosques constructed by Aurangzeb 'very similar to each other and with the perfect symmetry'. We may accept this evidence of 'twin mosques' as the learned scholar has done a comprehensive field study (though no photographs and diagrams have been adduced).

He proceeds to connect the above symmetry with the uniformity of the legends of origin of Dharmahari and Candrahari temples in AM. We fail to see any connection. The simple fact seems to be that Aurangzeb found two important Hindu temples on the either side of the most important ghāt in Ayodhyā proper. He just demolished them, and purely from architectural point of view, constructed two mosques in their places. On the basis of architectural symmetry imposed by Aurangzeb, one is not entitled to conjecture or expect that the original temples also must have been symmetrical, or their legends of origin analogous, or the period of their installations was the same, or that the persons of the same family would have installed them. Aurangzeb must have been unaware of any

mythological uniformity and certainty; he was interested only in demolishing important Hindu temples. Whether they were established by the same family was quite irrelevant for him. Thus the twin theory fails in toto.

We may add here that the uniformity between the legends of Dharmahari and Candrahari is very common place and can form no basis for any serious conjecture. Generally we find in Tīrtha Māhātmyas, e.g. Kāśī Khaṇḍa, stories of many men and gods coming to the *tīrthas* and establishing the idols and naming them on their own name. The stories of Candradeva and Dharmahari coming to Ayodhyā, found in AM, follows the same general pattern. Even in AM, the legend of the installation of Viṣṇuhari is also not very different from that of Candrahari and Dharmahari. Thus the similarity between the legends of Dharmahari and Candrahari is of no avail to conjecture that the members of the same Gāharwāl family should have established the two temples.

(c) As to the similarity of the names, Candrahari and Candradeva, it is just an ordinary coincidence of no significance. Since the time of Hariś-candra and even of a greater personage Rāmacandra, there must have been millions of people named 'Candra' and even on this date thousands of such 'Candras' must be walking over this holy land of Bhārata Varṣa. Innumerable Candra's must have visited Candrahari temple; certainly all of them could not have established the temple.

## 2. The Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur=Dharmahari Equation:

This is the basic conjecture of Dr. Bakker and it can be decisively falsified:—

(a) The nomenclature Dharmahari creates another problem. If the name of original temple was Dharmahari, then how and why at all it was changed to Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur? Dr. Bakker has no explanation. It may be noted that all the ancient temples of AM have retained the original names. Why then there be an exception in the case of Dharmahari?

(b) The very nomenclature, Dharmahari goes against Dr. Bakker's theory. In the picture conceived by him, Jaycandra, while taking his bath at Svargadvāra must have been aware of the fact that his grand father had constructed a temple at the west end of Svargadvāra and had named the idol after his own name. So, while constructing a temple at the eastern end of Svargadvāra, he would have very naturally named it 'Jayahari'

and not 'Dharmahari'. Dr. Bakker says <sup>6</sup>that Jaycandra 'styled himself as an incarnation of 'Dharma'. Unfortunately the foot note attached to the statement only says that he was an incarnation of Nārāyaṇa, which was quite understandable for a Vaiṣṇava king. We may also note that Dharmāvātāra has traditionally been a popular epithet of Hindu kings in general and there is no reason to assume that in the name 'Dharmahari' there is any hidden reference of Jayacandra.

(c) The most unsurmountable difficulty is the fact that there is still another temple known as Dharmahari quite different from Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur. Now the only question remains that which is the correct location of the Dharmahari temple as mentioned in the Skanda Purāṇa. We give here Dr. Bakker's own admission: "The temples at the top of these ghāṭs are, according to OAS, Candrahari (in the west) and Dharmahari (in the east) whereas OA adds the Nāgeśvara temple in between them. This traditional length of Svargadvāra would endorse the view that the present Dharmahari temple still occupies its ancient location, besides which the river might formerly have run, that is much closer to the town than is the case now-a-days. This site would then have marked the eastern end of Svargadvāra".<sup>7</sup> But in the very next sentence he says 'As has been argued in I, 52f. There are some indications that the Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur (that is now the ruined mosque of Aurangzeb ) 250m east of Candrahari was the original location of Dharmahari".<sup>8</sup>

We just do not know how to make the above two statements compatible. The Tretā-kā Ṭhākur is much near (250m) to Candrahari, while the place of Dharmahari, still preserved, is quite away from the Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur site. The fact of Dharmahari temple retaining its original location has again been admitted by Dr. Bakker. He says "It has been argued (I,52f) that originally the Dharmahari temple might have been situated on the site that is today occupied by the ruins of a mosque. The traditional length of the Svargadvāra ghāṭs, however, on the east end of which Dharmahari is likely to be situated, would endorse the view that the present Dharmahari temple still occupies the ancient location (see Intro. AM 10). Along this site the Śarayū river might formerly have run."<sup>9</sup> Thus with Dharmahari temple retaining its original location given by AM up till now, the case for original Dharmahari temple being at a different site, viz., that of Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur, simply can not be argued and is ruled out. Thus the equation 'Dharmahari =Tretā-kā Ṭhākur completely breaks down.

(D) There is one more apparent contradiction in equating Tretā-kā Ṭhākur=Dharmahari. According to AM, Candrahari should be a Viṣṇu temple belonging to the remote purāṇic age. The Tretā-kā Ṭhākur is, on the other hand, a historically datable temple dedicated to Śrī Rāma. Thus, there is no reason to confuse the two. Most of the temples mentioned in AM are Viṣṇu temples and Dharmahari belongs to the chain of several Hari (Viṣṇu) temples.<sup>10</sup> Tretā-kā Ṭhākur (Rāma) temple just does not fit in this set up. It is clearly a temple outside the purview of AM.

Thus in our view Dr. Pathak's and Tiwari's calling Dr. Bakker's hypothesis speculative is understandable.

### 3 Dr. Pathak's and Dr. Tiwari's Argument:

These two scholars totally reject Dr. Bakker's 'Tretā-ka Ṭhākur' equation but believe in the theory of Candradeva establishing Candrahari idol only on the basis of Candravati plate. According to them, <sup>11</sup>the epigraphic evidence suggests that the tradition of AM synchronizes with the foundation of Gāharwāl dynasty". Then they go on to refer to the Candravati plate of Candradeva and the legend of installation of Candrahari given in AM and remark, "The purāṇic imagery here is very transparent and it is not at all difficult to see that the Viṣṇu temple built by the Gāhadvāla king Candra at Svargadvāra tīrtha is being referred to. This temple must have been constructed shortly before v.s. 1150 (=1093 A.D.) when the king performed the PiṇḍapitṛYajña on the amāvasyā day".<sup>12</sup> Apparently, the learned scholars take it for granted that the said inscription provides sufficient evidence of Candradeva installing a Vāsudeva temple at Svargadvāra. As noted above, Dr. Bakker very clearly says that 'The installation of an idol is not mentioned in the inscription'.

Thus we are forced to refer to the original inscription for ascertaining the correct position. The relevant portion of the said inscription is as follows: सूर्यो पराग पर्वाणि जनित सरयू घर्घरा घमर्षणे स्वर्ग द्वार नाग्नि तीर्थे स्नात्वा विधिवन्मन्त्र देव मुनि मनुज भूत पितृगणां स्तर्पयित्वा तिमिर पटल पाटन पटुम [समु]-ष्ण रोचिषमुपस्थाय क्षितिजलदहन पवन गगन यजमन्न तुहिन किरि [र] पारूणवपुषःशोषधीपति शकल शेखरं समभ्यर्च्य भगवत्स्त्रिभुवन त्रातुर्वासुदेवस्य पूजां विधाय प्रचुरपायसेन हविषा हविर्भुजं हुत्वा पितृपिण्डयज्ञनिर्व्वर्त्य.....। \* 13

Our comments are as follows:-

(A) All that is referred to is that Candradeva worshipped the lord Vāsudeva, *along with other* gods, after a dip at Svargadvāra ghāt, on the



confluence at Saryu and Gāghrā. There is no mention of any Candrahari idol here.

(B) Only the worship of Vāsudeva is mentioned. There is no mention of any installation, or even existence of any idol or temple.

(C) Even if we take the word 'Vāsudeva' to mean any particular idol or temple, then, *prima facie*, it seems to suggest a pre-existing temple. So, if we interpret the word 'Vāsudeva' to mean Lord Candrahari then it will be logical to assume that there was already the Candrahari temple in existence where the king Candradeva made his worship. Thus, this inscription gives the lower, and not the upper, date of the construction and existence at Chandrahari temple. The question of Gāharwal king establishing it does not arise.

(D) But, as said above, the word 'Vāsudeva' does not connote any temple at all. It may be noted that the worship of Vāsudeva is mentioned along with the worship of other gods as well. It seems that the worship was part of the daily routine worship of the gods by the king. It is possible that he might had had a portable idol of Vāsudeva or Śālagrāma Śilā with him. Even without any portable idol a Hindu can, and does, worship Vāsudeva or any favourite god of his choice through *dhyāna*, *japa*, *stotra* or otherwise.

The last view seems to be more natural in view of the worship of other gods as well being mentioned in the inscription. This is confirmed by other Gāharwāl inscription, which the earlier scholar's have missed to notice. In all there are four inscriptions of Chandradeva known to us <sup>14</sup> viz. (1) Candravati plate of Candradeva . 1150, E.I. Vol. XIV, p. 194 (2) Candravati plate of Candraddeva, V.S. 1156, E.I. Vol. XIV, P. 198. (3) Candravati plate of Candradeva . 1148, E.I. Vol. IX, p. 302 (4) Copper plate grants of the kings of Kanāwāj, A Copper plate grant of Candradeva and Madanapaladeva. V.S. 1154, Inidan Antiquary, vol. XVIII, 1889, P.11.

All the above inscriptions mention the worship of 'Vāsudeva'. We have quoted above the inscription number.

1. The relevant text of the inscription number 2 runs thus:

"तृतीयायां शनिदिने अद्याक्षत तृतीयायां युगादिपर्वणि जनित सुरसरिद्वरणाघमर्षणे श्री मदादिकेशव घट्टे स्नात्वा विधिवन्मन्त्रदेव मुनिमनुज भूतपितृ गणास्तर्पयित्वा तिमिर पटल-पाटन पटुम हसमुष्णरोचिषमुपस्थाय क्षितिजलदहन पवनगगन यजमानतु हिनकिरिरणारूणव पुषमोषधि पतिशकल शेखरं समभ्यर्च्य भगवती वासुदेवस्य पूजां विधाय प्रचुरपायसेन हविषा.....!"

Clearly a holy bath at the confluence of Ganges and Varuṇā at Ādi Keśava ghāṭ Vārāṇasī is mentioned here. After the bath the king performed Tarpaṇa, and thereafter performed the worship of Sun, Mahādeva and Vāsudeva. Thus the gods worshipped on the confluence of Sarayu and Ghāghrā in Ayodhyā (Ins.No. 1) and that on the confluence of Gaṅgā and Varuṇā (Ins.No. 2) are the same.

The inscription number 3, mentions a bath near Śauri-Nārāyaṇa:

"1148 Karttika Su di..... ady=cha śau (Śau) ri nārāyaṇa-samipe snātvā Vidhivan=maṁtīra-deva-pu (mu) nimanuja-bhūta-pitrigaṇāms =tarpp-ayitvā timira paṭala-pātanaPa (tuma) hasaṁs (sam=) (ushṇa-rochi) shaṁ Samabhyarchya tribhuvana-tratur=Vāsudevasya Pūjām Vidhāya pruchura pāyasena havishā havirbhujam hutva mātāpitror atmana ścha puṇya-praya sobhivṛiddhaye."

Here again we find the same three gods being worshipped by Candradeva, viz. Mahādeva, Sun and Vāsudeva.

The fourth inscription is a copper plate grant issued under the seal of Madanapāla declaring (conforming) the grant of a certain village to a certain brahmin by Candradeva, his father. The portion relevant to us runs as follows:

"Chatuṣpa (shpa) mchasa (śa) d-adhika-sa (Śa) taikādasa (śa)-saṁvatsarē Māghe mā-si su (śu) kla-pakshē tṛtīyāyām Soma-dine Vārāṇasyām uttarāyana(ṇa)- saṁkrāntau ankataḥ saṁvat 1154 Māgha su di 3 some Vārāṇasyām déva-śrī-Tilochana-ghaṭṭe Gaṁgāyām snātvā śrīma-

[n-mahār?] āja-śrī-Chaṁdradévena vidhivan=maṁtra-déva-muni-manuja-bhūta-pitri-gaṇāms-tarppayitvā timira-paṭala-pāṭana=paṭu-mahasam= Ushṇarochisham =upasthāy= Aushadhipati-sa kala-(śa) (se) kharaṁ samabhyarchchya

[tri] bhuvana-trātur=Vāsudevasya pūjām vidhāya prachura-pāyasena havishā havirbhujām hutvā mātā-pitrōr-atmanaś-cha puṇya-yaśó (śo)-bhivṛddhaye.....".

Here also we find the same formula describing the rituals of the king as in the inscription number 1 (Supra).

It is thus clear that worshipping Vāsudeva along with other gods was a part of daily ritual performed by king Candradeva. It is totally wrong to connect these gods with any particular tīrth, unless specifically mentioned in any particular inscription. The word 'Vāsudeva' occurs in all these inscriptions and there is no basis for connecting the Vāsudeva of the Candravati plate number I with the Candrahari temple at Svargādvra. There might, or might not, have been any Vāsudeva temple at the Svargadvāra. The word Vāsudeva there does not itself connote lord Candrahari.

We may support the above conclusion by further studies of the inscriptions of other Gāharwāla kings as well. There is a copper plate inscription of GovindCanrda.<sup>15</sup>

"Syām Ravi-dine Śrīmad Vārāṇasyām Gaṅgāpiyām snātvā vidhivanmantra dāva-muni-manwja-bhuta pitṛi-gaṇaṁs tarpayitvā timira-pāṭala-pāṭana-paṭum ahasam ushṇarochisham upasthay Aushadhipati śa kala-śese kharaṁ Samabhuarchchya tribhuvanatrātur Vāsudevasya pūjām vidhaya prachura-pāyasēna havishā havirbhujām hutvā mātāpi trōr ātmanaś cha puṇya yaśó bhividdhye....."

We quote below another inscription of the same king:<sup>16</sup> "संवत्सहस्रैके द्विषष्ट्युत्तर शताभ्यधिके कार्तिक शौर्णमास्ये भौमे दिनेऽपि संवत् 1162 सुदि 5 भौमे अर्धैह श्री मद्विष्णुपुरावासित श्री विजय कटके सकल कल्मषक्षयकारिण्यां गंगायां स्नात्वा ॥ यथा विधानं मंत्र देव ऋषिमनुष्य भूतपितृस्तर्पयित्वा । सूर्य भट्टारकं संपूज्य । भगवन्तं महेश्वरं समभ्यच्चर्य । विश्वाधारं वासुदेवं समाराध्य । मंत्रपूतं भूतवह हुत्वा । पंचाल देशे जीआवतोपत्तलायां उसिथागामे समस्त विषय साशर्ववति समस्त महत्तम जनपदान्मंवोधयति समाज्ञापयति.....!"

All this evidence is sufficient to conclude that not only Candradeva, but the Gāharwāla dynasty itself was, in general, worshipper of Vāsudeva along with other gods, particularly Sun and Śiva. These grants mention worship of Vāsudeva irrespective of the place where they took bath and

made the donations concerned. The last one is an occasion of donation made at Vārāṇasī, yet it mentions worshipping at Vāsudeva, the protector of three worlds. It is proved beyond doubt that his Vāsueva worship was part of king's daily ritualistic worship and does not connote any local Vāsudeva temple.

Thus Dr. Pathak and Dr. Tiwari are not justified in connecting the Candravati plate with Candrahari and in dating AM accordingly.

#### 4 Conclusion: our view:

##### (A) Location of Svargadvāra:

In view of the above, it becomes incumbent upon us to study the Candravati plate V.S. 1150 de novo. The greatest anomaly in identifying the 'Vāsudeva' with Candrahari at Svargadvāra is the mention of Ghāghrā-Sarayu confluence in the copper plate. The Candrahari at Svargadvāra is situated at the eastern end of 'Ayodhyā', Faizabad is to the west of Ayodhyā, and Gopratāra forms its western end. The Sarayu confluence is further up westwards of Faizabad. In this situation, Candrahari at Svargadvāra can in no way be associated either with Ghāghrā or with confluence. This is admitted by Dr. Bakker himself.<sup>17</sup> Thus the whole theory of identifying 'Vāsudeva' of the copper plate with Candrahari is still-born. The difficulty has been felt by Dr. Bakker<sup>18</sup> and he promises to resolve the same in part II Chapter 71. In fact, nothing of the sort is done in part II, Chapter 71, except for noting that, 'from the inscription of Candradeva, as well as from the Tīrthakalpa of Jinaprabhasūri, it ensures that the confluence of the Sarayū and Ghāghrā was thought to be in the vicinity of Ayodhyā (i.e. Svargadvāra) and these two testimonies thus support the thesis that in the 12th and 14th centuries, when the *S* recension was composed, the saṅgama lay further east within three Yojanas of Ayodhyā'.<sup>19</sup> This quotation, taken in its context, says only this that the confluence of Ghāghrā was at three Yojanās west of Gopratāra in Faizabad. This only underlines the problem and does not solve it. The learned scholar has tried to skip over the difficulty by adding the words i.e. 'Svargadvāra' after the word 'Ayodhyā' in the above quotation, which is unjustified. Probably, keeping the weakness of this solution in mind, Dr. Bakker has translated the words: 'सरयू-घाघरा धर्मषणे स्वर्गद्वार नाम्नि तीर्थेस्तात्वा'. of the Candravati plate as 'he took a bath at the ghāṭ called the Svargadvāra in the sin-effacing river of the 'Sarayū/Ghāghrā'. In this translation the question of confluence does not arise as Sarayū and Ghāghrā are the names of the same river.<sup>20</sup> This

interpretation can be supported by, at least, the local tradition which calls the whole river as Goghrā (Ghāghrā) and 'the name Sarayū is reserved for only that part of the same river that runs through the 'Ayodhyā 21<sup>kṣetra</sup>'.

Thus, it becomes impareitive to decide which of the two interpretations is correct. No doubt the phrase 'सरयू-घर्षरा घर्मषणे' is a bit ambiguous. Fortunately, we need not go into grammatical semantics, as a similar phrase occurs in another copper plate of Candradeva himself (Inscription number 2, Supra). There the phrase 'सुर सरिद्वरणाघर्मषणे' clearly refers to the confluence of Ganges and Varuṇā as the well-known Ādi Keśava ghāt in Vārāṇasi is situated at the very confluence of Ganges and Varuṇā. So, we can definitely say that the similar expression in the Candravati plate no doubt refers to the confluence of Sarayū and Ghāghrā. Having fixed the meaning thus, we are now in a position to face squarely the problem of locating Svargadvāra at the confluence of the two rivers.

Surprisingly Dr. Bakker himself has, in his researches, culled sufficient matter to resolve the mystery of 'Svargadvāra' at the Ghāghrā-Sarayū confluence'. He has noted that<sup>22</sup> according to the Ayodhyā tradition there were two Svargadvāras. One, the Candrahari-Svargadvāra' in the north east of Ayodhyā, while the other was Gopratāra-Svargadvāra (at the west in Faizabad). According to him the name Svargadvāra was originally reserved for Gopratāra, and Candrahari Svargadvāra was a later development. Dr. Chaturvedi, U.K.<sup>23</sup> has corrected him by asserting that Gopratāra and Svargadvāra (Candrahari) were two separate ghāṭs since time immemrial and were mentioned in Rāmāyaṇa itself. However, due to textual corruption and misunderstanding in the later Rāmāyaṇa text tradition the name Svargadvāra came to denote Gopratāra (as well). We need not go into the question of deciding what was the meaning of Svargadvāra originally. At least, there is no controversy about he fact that in the mediæval period the name Svargadvāra denoted both the ghāṭs, Candrahari - Svargadvāra and Gopratāra - Svargadvāra as well. We have to decide which of the two ghāṭs is meant by the author of the Candravati plate. From straight common sense point of view the mention of the confluence of Ghāghrā and Sarayū rules the Candrahari Svargadvāra out. As to the Gopratāra and its nearness to the confluence the researches of Dr. Bakker shed

sufficient light. He has noted in the chapter 71 of part II, and elsewhere, that at the present time the confluence is at paska (2 yojnas i. e. 14. 4 km. of Ghṛtācī tīrtha), While in the older days it was at Ghṛtācītīrtha (3 yojanajs i. e. 21.5 km. west of Gopratāra). We are advised by the Rāmāyāṇa workshop not to rely too much on the distances given in the text in absence of a good critical edition and there is no critical edition of Skanda Purāṇa text. Fortunately the Skanda purāṇa version gives the location of the confluence vis-a- vis Gopratāra in words as well. The relevant text as noted by Dr. Bakker are, <sup>24</sup>

‘अस्माद् गुप्तहरेः स्थानान् निकटे संगमे शुभे’ [58.59]  
 गोप्रतारे च तीर्थोऽस्मिन् सरयू-धर्धराश्रिते [58.65]  
 गोप्रताराभिधं तीर्थं मपरं वर्तते ऽ नधे  
 सन्निधौ संगमस्यैव महापातकनाशनम् [59.1]

These statments are independent of the actual distance between Gopratāra and the confluence. In view of these, especially the Śloka 58.65, the author of the Candravati plate was fully justified in writting सरयूधर्धराधर्मषणे स्वर्गद्वारनाम्नि तीर्थे denoting Gopratāra-Svargadvāra, whatever might have been the actual distance between the confluence and Gopratāra at the time when the copper plate grant was made. Thus there remains no doubt that the word 'Svargadvāra' stands here for Gopratāra - Svargadvāra and not the Candrahari. All the unnecessary confusions and mystery have arisen because of wrongly taking this Svargadvāra to mean Candrahari - Svargadvāra.

Thus the very basis of dating the Candrahari temple and the Ayodhyā Māhātmya by Dr. Bakker, and Dr. Pathak and Dr. Tiwari is completely demolished. The mistake is a result of commendable, though unwarranted, modern zeal for dating. As to the phrase ' भगवतो वासुदेवस्य ' the question of the exact meaning remains open. As shown above, prima facie, it seems to refer to daily ritual of the king, though there is a Viṣṇu temple at Gopratāra as well.

**(B) Dr. Pathak and Dr. Tiwari's lower date of AM:**

Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur is a dated temple. It was built by Jaycandra in A.D. 1184 (Supra). It was an important temple and is not mentioned in AM. Therefore, Dr. Pathak and Dr. Tiwari surmise that AM was written before

this date. It may be so, but it is not a very strong argument. Not only the Skanda Purāṇa, but none of the versions of AM, mention this temple. According to Rāmāyaṇa workshop it is difficult to assert that all the versions of AM were composed before this date, So, it will be safer to say that the core material of the Ayodhyā-māhātmya, which different versions have drawn upon, pre-dates Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur. The Rāmāyaṇa workshop further warns that the 'Tīrtha-māhātmyas in general describe the traditional tīrthas alone whose antiquity is shrouded in mysterious past. They are very reluctant to incorporate the dated well-known temples of historic origin'. Thus some version of AM could well have ignored Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur as it was a new construction at a new site and not a renovation or reconstruction of some older purāṇic temple.

**(C) Geographical dating of AM:**

Dr. Bakker has provided sufficient matter to enable us to make an altogether new approach to the problem of dating. The evidence is quite clear, but has been ignored by the valiant researcher, because of his one-pointed approach. Let us take the facts as they are given by Dr. Bakker. 25

The Candrahari Svargadvāra ghāṭ, as it originally was, must be a unique one in many respects. It spread over 1157 meters a rare phenomenon - reminding probably of Svargadvāra at Puri. It formed the northern, as well as north-eastern river front of the city, with the river curving around. Thus it presented a convex ghāṭ frontage, just opposite to the concave frontage at Vārāṇasi. It seems that Dharmahari and Candrahari formed a 'temple twin' marking respectively, the eastern and the western end of the ghāṭ respectively.

The present geography is quite different. Now the Svargadvāra ghāṭ is a straight strip, Candrahari to Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur, covering only a distance of 250 meters, unlike the older extant of 1157 meters. Thus the ghāṭ has shrunk by more than three-fourth of its original length. At present the course of the river runs off tangentially extending the Candrahari - Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur straight line. Originally, the river bent to her right towards Dharmahari temple and onwards.

The above facts give rise to an interesting conjecture. After all, there might be some truth in Dr. Bakker's taking Candrahari and Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur as temple twins. Why did Jaycanda choose that particular site for the Tretā-kā-Ṭhākur temple? The obvious explanation is that it was the

then west-end of the Svargadvāra ghāṭ and it was a vacant land with no temple there, while the east end was marked by Candrahari temple. In the older days the east end was marked by Dharmahari temple. Thus due to the geographical change in the course of the river a lacuna was created by the shrinking of the original Svargadvāra ghāṭ and there remained no temple to mark the new east-end of Svargadvāra probably, the aesthetic sense of the king prompted him to build a new temple (Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur) at the modern west end of Svargadvāra. Thus Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur is the modern substitute for the older Dharmahari temple, if not the original Dharmahari temple as conjectured by Dr. Bakker. Hence we must congratulate him on his finding at least, some nexus between Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur and Dharmahari temples.

Thus it is clear that the modern river front geography of north eastern Ayodhyā had taken shape by the time of Jayacandra or even much before him. The rivers take quite some time in changing their course and settling in their new course. The river must have established in her new course by the time of Jayacandra. Thus the inescapable conclusion is that AM, giving the older geography of Svargadvāra, must have been written a few centuries before king Jayacandra of Gāharwāla dynasty, and that is the *lower limit* of the date of composition of AM. The *upper limit*, shrouded in antiquity, still eludes us asking for new approaches.

To conclude with, we may classify the history of Ayodhyā in geographical time-frame. According to Dr. Chaturvedi, U. K., between the period of the ancient course at Sarayū and the modern course of Sarayū at Ayodhyā, there was yet another period, when the river flowed through the Tillottamā (Tilodaki) channel<sup>26</sup>. If that be so, it constitutes the medieval period. The three periods thus are :

(1) Ancient Period : Starting from time immemorial it ends with the water of Sarayū running through the Tillottamā channel. The AM belongs to this period. (ii) Medieval Period : It is the period when the Sarayū ran through Tillottamā, leaving the older channel dry. (iii) Modern Period : In this period Sarayū took back to its original course but instead of turning to the right, round the Svargadvāra in the east, it ran off straight tangentially. This modern period starts quite some time before Jayacandra and continues with some changes upto the present time. Tretā-Kā-Ṭhākur was built some time during this period.



The concept of medieval period is Dr. Chaturvedi's original conjecture and needs further proof, and it might be controversial. As regards ancient and modern periods there can be no doubt and none has been raised.

We end the article by thanking the Rāmāyaṇa workshop of the Purāṇa Department for the valuable discussions. In fact, this paper is a result and summary of it.

1. Bakker, Hans, Ayodhya, Groningen, 1986, Part I. Chap.3, pp. 51-53.
2. Dr. Pathak, V.S. & Tiwari, J.N. Purāṇa Vol. XXXVI, No.2 July, 1994, PP. 283.
3. Bakker, Ayodhyā, Part I, Chap.3, P. 52 and also see, Purāṇa vol. XXXVI, No. 2, July, 1994, P. 295.
4. Ibid, pp. 184.
5. Bakker, Ayodhyā, Part I, Chap.3, p. 52.
6. Ibid. p 53.
7. Ibid part II Chap. 10, p. 74.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid. Chap. 14, p. 101.
10. Ibid. Part I, p. 53-54.
11. Purāṇa, Vol. XXVI, No.2, July 1994, p. 284.
12. Ibid.
13. Candravati plate of Candradeva, V.S. 1150, E.I. Vol. XIV, p. 194.
14. Niyogi, Roma, The Histoy of the Gāhadvāla dynasty, Calcutta, 1959, p. 245.
15. E. I. Vol. VIII, p. 154.
16. Ibid, p. 153.
17. Bakker, Ayodhyā, part II, p. 75.
18. Ibid, part I, p.51
19. Ibid, part II, Chap. 71, p. 51.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid, Part II, p. 48.
22. Ibid, pat II, p. 75 and 329
23. Purāṇa Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, July, 1991, p.127-130 (Sanskrit sec.)
24. Bakker, Ayodhyā, part II, pp. 407.
25. Ibid, pp. 74.
26. Purāṇa. Vol, XXXIII, No. 2, July 1991, pp. 177.

A PROTO-KĀṆḌA DIVISION OF THE RĀMĀYAṆA AS  
REFLECTED IN LATER RĀMA KĀVYAS.

By

GANGA SAGAR RAI

[वाल्मीकिरामायणं संस्कृतकाव्यस्य उपजीव्यतां भजते । कवीनां परमाधाररूपेण चास्य महत्त्वं सर्वैरङ्गीकृतम् । संस्कृतकविभिर्नाटककारैश्चात्यन्तसमादरेण महर्षिवाल्मीकेः रामायणस्य च स्मरणं कृतम् । अस्माभिः पूर्वं (पुराणम्, जुलाई 1991 अङ्के) विवेचितं यन् मूलतो वाल्मीकिरामायणं भागद्वयात्मकमासीत्—पूर्वभागो यस्य नाम आदिकाव्यं पौलस्त्यवधम् वा आसीत्-, उत्तरभागो यस्य नाम उत्तरकाव्यं रामाभ्युदयो वा आसीत् । मूलतः काण्डानां स्थितिरपि संदिग्धा वर्तते । उत्तरवर्तिकाव्यग्रन्थेषु न केवलं रामाख्यानस्यापि तु काण्डविभागस्यापि प्रभावः स्पष्टतयाऽवभासते । अस्मिन् निबन्धे रामचरितवर्णनपराणां काव्यत्रयस्य—रामचरित-सेतुबन्ध-रघुवंशाख्यस्य -विमर्शः कृतः । एषु काव्यग्रन्थेषु वाल्मीकीयकाण्डविभागस्य प्रभावो दृश्यते]

It has been established by our Rāmāyaṇa Workshop and in particular by the author in his paper 'Kāṇḍa structure of the Rāmāyaṇa' (Purāna, Vol. XXXIII. 2, July, 1991) that the original Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa was divided in two parts—the *Ādikāvya* or *Paulastyavadha* and the *Uttarakāvya* or *Rāmābhyudaya*. A theory can be stipulated that the present ending of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* after the *Rāmābhiṣeka* was the tradition of Vyāsa (the author of the the *Purāṇas* and the *Mahābhārata*). The Purāṇic tradition seems to have enjoyed greater popularity in later times not to include the tragic events of Sītā's exile in the daily ritualistic recitals. This paper shows the gradual shifting of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* ending from its original position to the current position. This shifting is reflected in the *Rāmakāvya* genre. The paper had been presented in the International Seminar on Rāmāyaṇa held in January, 1994 at the Oriental Institute of Sayaji Rao Gaekwad University, Baroda and is not published as yet. We reproduce it here in view of its relevance to the Purāṇic tradition. The question remains, has any of the *Purāṇas* or *Upapurāṇas* followed the original Rāmāyaṇa tradition of closing *Yuddhakāṇḍa* at the end of *Rāvaṇavadha*?

It has been claimed in the Rāmāyaṇa itself that it is the परं कवीनामाधारः. This is vindicated not only by the similarity of subject matter, style etc. of the later Rāmakāvya but also by the beginning and the ending of the different Kāvya and even by their *sarga* divisions. The Kāṇḍa divisions of the Rāmāyaṇa have been looming large over the structure of later Rāmakāvya and guiding them. As an illustration of this, we will consider the three well-known Rāma-Kāvya of high repute, namely,

1. Rāmacarita of Abhinanda
2. Setubandha of Pravarsena, and
3. Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa

### Rāmacaritam of Abhinanda :\*

This beautiful work in forty *sargas* begins with the appearance of autumn on the Mālyavat Hills with Rāma wailing for his beloved: अथ माल्यवतः शृङ्गे etc.<sup>1</sup>

This beginning has earned praise from the editor as being very dramatic and he speaks highly of the originality and independent thinking of the poet. Surprisingly, in his Rāmāyaṇamañjarī, Kṣemendra breaks the story at Mālayavat. The story from the advent of monsoon and onwards has been put in the Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍa proper, while the first half of the Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍa material has been put under a subtitle, 'Kiṣkindhā parva'.

Working on this lead and in search for some Kāṇḍadivision near about advent of monsoon or autumn we find that the MS B3 in the colophon of IV. 28 of the Cr. edition mentions Laṅkā Kāṇḍa instead of Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍa describing the advent of autumn. The editor has naturally put the remarks '(Sic)' after it. Rāmacarita of Abhinanda also starts the story exactly from this point. Is it mere accident that the scribal slip has occurred to coincide with the beginning of Rāmacarita so very exactly?

Further V<sub>1</sub> omits the colophon itself. Had he some doubt or confusion about naming the Kāṇḍa? Let us explore some subsequent Kāṇḍa colophons. Strangely, we find Laṅkākaṇḍa mentioned in, at least, the following *Sargas* :-

- Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa, Sarga 28
- Sundarakāṇḍa, Sarga 24
- Sundarakāṇḍa, Sarga 27
- Sundarakāṇḍa, Sarga 28

It is worth reminding that some consider Abhinanda to be a Bengali poet and Laṅkā Kāṇḍa appears for the first time in Sarga IV. 28 in Bengali MS B3. According to some he belonged, at least originally, to

Kashmir. Interestingly, Laṅkāparvaṇi nomenclature in the above list is found in D 10 Ms of north-western recension. It is clear from the above that at some remote time Lankākāṇḍa began with Sarga IV. 28. Moreover, some Mss mention the word *Udyoga* also in the colophon in the same and subsequent sargas at least in the following cases :

KĀṆḌA NAME	SARGA	COLOPHON (SARGA X NAME)	MSS.
Kīṣkindhā	28	Udyogasenācodano	D 4
		Udyoga senānumodano	D 13
	34	Udyoge	D2
	38	Udyogabalāgamah	V 1
	39	udyoga,	(D 4)
		Sugrivodyoge	(D3)
		pūrvadigvarṇanam	D 3.4
Sundarakāṇḍa	49	Udyogakāṇḍe	D 4
	50	Udyogaparvaṇi	D 4
	1	Udyogaparvaṇi	D 4
	43	Udyoge	D 2
	53	Udyogaparvaṇi	D 3
Yuddhakāṇḍa	2	Udyogaparvaṇi	D 3 12
	5	Samāgama udyogaparvaṇi digvijayaśca Samāpto, Yam Sunderakāṇḍaḥ	D 2
		Samāptamudyogaparva Digvijayaśca	D 10

[Some Mss mention the name Digvja(ca)ya also. But that is a different problem though interesting.]

It may be noted that the third Anukramaṇī (Bāla, Appendix 1—;1) the oldest Kāṇḍa-wise epitome of Rāmāyaṇa closes the Sundarakāṇḍa with the 5th Sarga of the Yuddhakāṇḍa. Interestingly, the last mention of *Udyogaparva* in the above list is at the same Sarga, i.e. VI. 5. Combining the above two evidences it seems a safe bet that some time back from Sarga: IV. 28 up to the end of *Paulastyavadha* (VI. 97) was one Kāṇḍa. Being a long one, it was divided into two *Parvans-Udyoga* and *Yuddha*. The former ending at VI. 5, the later portion was called *Yuddha* (some Mss mention *Yuddhaparvaṇi* in a systematic way in place of *Yuddhakāṇḍa* or alongwith it). Thus the author of *Rāmācarita* has simply taken the subject matter of the proto-Laṅkā Kāṇḍa for the theme of his epic.

So, we think that the later redactor who introduced the Kāṇḍa division at the advent of autumn should share some of praises so lavishly showered on the poet by the learned editor (*Supra*). As to the originality of Abhinanda in not narrating the earlier part of Rāma's story (all that contained before IV. 28) the reason is not far to see. When there were no Kāṇḍa-divisions in the *Paulastyavadha*, the proto colophon ending the Sarga VI. 97 must have read *ityārṣe Paulastyabadhe* etc. As the subsequent Kāṇḍa-divisions were introduced unlike the other Kāṇḍas the colophon of *Paulastyavaddha* must have got mixed up and read as *ityārṣe Lankākāṇḍe Paulastyavadhe* etc. Thus Laṅkā-kāṇḍa was quite naturally thought to be the *Paulastyavandha*, the reason was that the people long back had forgotten the Kāṇḍaless original *Paulastyavadha*. Pravarsena's inspiration in calling his work Rāvaṇavaho is quite likely to have been inspired by this colophonetic misunderstanding as extent of his work exactly covers the theme of proto Laṅkā-Kāṇḍa suggested here.

The ending of *Rāmacarita* is no less interesting. Admittedly the poet left his work incomplete at the Sarga 36. The last four Sargas have been completed by two different poets. The first version is printed in Appendix I and the second in Appendix 2. The last two *Ślokas* of Sarga 40 in the first version describe the fire ordeal of Sītā and the subsequent blessings and praises and the festivities in the Rāma's camp, alongwith the coronation of Vibhīṣaṇa. No colophon has been given here and the editor has noted that the work is still incomplete. It seems a curious coincidence indeed that the author died (or something happened to him) and he could not complete the work and the person who took up to complete it is also struck with the same misfortune. We think that the work is complete. The ending here seems to tally exactly with the Marāthī *Rāmavijaya* which closes its Yuddha-Kāṇḍa at this point. The scribe, as well as the editor, unaware of this proto Kāṇḍa ending have missed the completeness of the work. The coronation of Rāma is not described here because neither *Paulastyavadha* nor the proto Laṅkā Kāṇḍa contained it. This ending of Appendix I and Marāthī *Rāmavijaya* suggest a proto ending of Kāṇḍa at the last Sloka of VI. 106 or of VI. 108 of the Rāmāyaṇa. The Appendix 2 version is still more interesting. We will discuss the last 5 *Ślokas* of this version. The *Śloka* 100 and 101<sup>2</sup> tally exactly with the archetypal ending of the *Paulastyavadha* at 6.27. The *Śloka* 100 paraphrases Śl. VI. 27 and *Śloka* 101 is an elaboration of *śloka* 28. The last *pāda* of *śloka* 102 is तच्चानुजेन सह पुष्पकमारुरोह and this tallies exactly with Kāṇḍa ending at sarga VI. 110 with the passage 3368 \* in the non-south Mss forming the link.

3368\* स तु पवनपथं गते (v.i. गतिं) विमाने  
 दशरथवंशविवर्धनः (v.I. विभूषणः) प्रतीतः ।  
 (v.I मनुजपतिर्वसुधातलं निरीक्ष्य)  
 क्षितितलमवलोकयन् प्रहृष्टो (v.r. द्रुमगिरिगहनं ससागरान्तं)  
 नगरशतैरुपशोभितं समृद्धैः ॥  
 (v.I समुद्रं, . समृद्धं)

Kālidāsa seems to have followed this traditon (for the ending of *Paulastyavadha*). Śloka: 103 ends 'जगाम नगरीं निजराजधानीम् tallying with Pravarsena's ending corresponding with the ending of sarga VI. 112 of Vālmīki as we shall see later on. The last śloka (104) ends with 'स्फीतो राज्याभिषेकस्त्रिभुवनजनतानन्दकृत्सुन्दरेऽह्नि'. Here we find the agreement with the vulgate tradition.

It is not impossible that apart from the present vulgate ending the author was aware of the other four proto Kāṇḍa endings; of the first through the third *Anukramaṇī*, which certainly was in the version of the author who was northerner; of the second through Kālidāsa, and of the third through Pravarsena and of the fourth through vulgate as might also be through the diversities found in the MSS themselves. Thus he has simply synthesized all the four endings.

## 2. Setubandha:

Kāvyaṃālā edition, Reprinted by Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, New Delhi, 1982.

The first twelve ślokas of the epic contain the Maṅgalācaraṇa. The story opens with—

अथ प्रतिपन्नविरोधे राघवमन्मथशरेण मानाभ्यधिके ।  
 विद्धया बालिहृदये राज्यश्रियाभिसारिते सुग्रीवे ॥ 1.1.3  
 व्यवसायरविप्रदोषे रोषगजेन्द्रदृढशृङ्खलाप्रतिबन्धः ।  
 कथं कथमपि दाशरथेर्जयकेशरिपञ्जरो गतो घनसमयः ॥ 1.1.4

The clever poet has used locative absolutes to remind the reader of the background of the story and the only finite verb is at the end of the last *pāda* गतो घनसमयः (1.14). This clearly indicates that the story begins with the advent of autumn marking the end of the rainy season. This beginning tallies exactly with the proto Kāṇḍa division discussed in the first section where *Laṅkā Kāṇḍa* begins with the Sarga 28 of the *Kiṣkindhā Kāṇḍa*. Had not the poet used the locative absolutes in the above śloka the story would have started with at least from the *Bālivadhā*. It is clear that the *Rāmayaṇa* text which the author had before him must have begun the *Laṅkā Kāṇḍa* at this particular place (VI.2., Sarga 28). Guided by this *Kāṇḍa* division he begins with 'गतो घनसमयः' and to remind the readers of

the background of the story he indicates the events of the previous Kāṇḍa by locative absolutes.

There is yet even a more curious point here. The śloka 35 does indicate the sending of monkeys in search of Sītā in a rather oblique way<sup>3</sup>. The very next śloka announces that Hanumat has come back to Rāma. Thus we find that all the details of the Sundara Kāṇḍa etc. are skipped over. Hanumat's report to Rāma has been given in a few ślokas but the emphasis is on the march of Rāma's army. The second Canto begins with

अथ पश्यति रघुतनयश्चटुलं रोषशतदुःखव्यतिक्रमणीयम् ।

अमृतरससारगुरुकं कार्यारम्भस्य यौवनमिव समुद्रम् ॥ II 2

and thereon the description proceeds in a normal detailed way. It seems that the epic proper begins from canto second, the first being in the nature of an epilogue. This fact is suggestively indicated by using the word *atha* at the beginning of the first śloka of Canto 2. The mystery of the above text situation can be fully revealed only by having a look at the proto Kāṇḍa structures of the Rāmāyaṇa.

The third Anukramaṇī of Rāmāyaṇa (Bāla Kāṇḍa, App I. 1.) begins with the Yuddha Kāṇḍa from the Sarga 6 of the Yuddha Kāṇḍa (the tradition of ending Sundarakāṇḍa at 6/5 is still preserved in MS. D 2). It is exactly at this point of story from where the poet started the second canto with an *atha*. We have already seen in the previous section that there was two subdivisions : Udyogaparva of the proto Laṅkā Kāṇḍa (Sarga IV. 28-6/5) and the Yuddhaparva (VI. 6-97). It is very clear that Pravarasēna had the story of the *Yuddhaparva* in his mind as his main them. In order to give the contextual background of the march of Rāma's army he incorporated a brief relevant sketch of the story available in the *Udyogaparvan* the first part of Laṅkā-Kāṇḍa. Thus we find that the beginning of the Setubandha was in difference to the proto Laṅkā Kāṇḍa beginnings, and the word *atha* in the second Sarga marks the ending of proto Kāṇḍa division Udyoga and beginning of Yuddhaparvan which the poet must have had in the Mss before him. The words of Śl. 2/2..... *Kāryārambhasya Yauvanam* now can be seen in a new light. *Kāryārambha* is nothing but *udyoga* hinting at the above Udyoga Parva. Coming to the ending we find it even more interesting. The last two ślokas are

गृहीत्वा जनकतनयां काञ्चनयष्टिमिव हुतवहे विशुद्धाम् ।

प्राप्तः पुरीं रघुपतिः कर्तुं भरतस्य सफलमनुरागम् ॥

अत्र समाप्यते एतत् सीतालम्भेन रामाभ्युदयम् ।  
रावणवध इति काव्यमनुरागाङ्कं समस्तजननिर्दोषम् ॥

XV. 94-95.

Strangely, the author does not describe at all Rāma's meetings with Bharata or his coronation (inspite of all his love and respect for the hero), though he describes in detail the last rites of Rāvaṇa. The expression *Prāptaḥ Purīm* also, in absence of subsequent description, remains hanging in the sky, so to say. Again, every thing will become clear by a look at the proto Kāṇḍa structure of the Rāmāyaṇa. Originally the *Yuddha Kāṇḍa* ended at *Rāvaṇa-Vadha* (Sarga 97) and rest of the story of *Yuddha Kāṇḍa* was contained in *Rāmābhyudaya*. Its forward shift we have noted above. It seems that there was a tradition of ending the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* at the sarga 111 where Rāma sees Ayodhyā from the *Puṣpaka Vimāna* in the sky<sup>4</sup>. This is the exact point where Pravarasena ends his epic. Tulasidāsa ends the *Yuddha Kāṇḍa* with Rāma in *Puṣpaka Vimāna* as also Kālidāsa with slight modifications. If we assume that Pravarsena's text had this ending then the word 'प्राप्तः' (śloka 94) is very well explained by colophons of various MSS (S. D8. 12) actually naming the sarga 111 as *Rāmāprāptih*. The reason is simple. By the time of Pravarasena, the ending of पौलस्त्यवध (लंकाकाण्ड) had been shifted to Sarga 111.

### Raghuvamśa

Kāṇḍa division of Rāmāyaṇa has not only inspired the various beginnings and endings of the later Kāvya's but it has been refleted even in Sarga breaks in them. Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa is a very good illustration of it. The Rāmāyaṇa story contained therein begins with canto 10 and ends with canto 15. To appreciate the sarga-division of this part of Raghuvamśa one has to keep in mind certain basics of developments of Vālmīkian Kāṇḍa structure viz.

1. **Ādi part of Bāla Kāṇḍa:** Originally the sargas 5 to 17 of Bāla Kāṇḍa alongwith the Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa formed a composite Kāṇḍa connected by some lines of star passages. Later on, a full fledged *Bāla Carita* from sarga 18 to end of the present *Bāla Kāṇḍa* written by single author seems to have been substituted for the sketchy narrations of star passages. Subsequently, the whole of the Bāla Kāṇḍa was separated from the Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa. Even still the manuscripts have maintained the distinct identify of the *Ādi* portion of Bāla Kāṇḍa by their colophon



recitals. Thus we find the very word *Bālacarita* mentioned in the colophon from sarga 18 thereon but not in the earlier sargas. There are other indications as well in the MSS to indicate a separate identity of the *Ādi* Part. A MS said to be written by the great Tulasīdāsa himself preserved in Sarasvatī Bhaṇḍāra Library of His Highness the Maharaja of Banaras, mentions the word *Ādi Kāṇḍa* for Bāla Kāṇḍa in the colophons of sarga 1 to 17 while the other subsequent colophons mention Bālakāṇḍa.

2. **Bālacarita** : This name has been given by the colophons of the MSS from Sarga 18 up to the end of the Bāla Kāṇḍa.

3. **Paulastyavadha** : Present Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa up to the death of Rāvaṇa (VI. 97) gives the story of the original *Paulastyavadha* minus the matter contained in *Ādi Bāla Kāṇḍa* and the star passages. This portion has been from time to time divided into several Kāṇḍas according to the tests of the different people. It is quite possible that Kālidāsa was able to conjecture the spurious nature of these Kāṇḍa divisions, even if he had no any MSS before him devoid of these Kāṇḍa divisions. Therefore, he put the whole thing in one Sarga.

4. The story from VI. 98 up to the end of the present Uttara Kāṇḍa was known as Rāmābhyudaya (vide Aunkramaṇī No. 3). It seems the phrase a misreading 'सभविष्यं सहोत्तरम्' gave rise to the concept that Rāmābhyudaya had an Uttara part containing the *Bhaviṣya* Story. This Misconception can be traced back to the epitome in the third sarga of the Bālakāṇḍa:

अनागतं च यत्किञ्चिद्रामस्य वसुधातले ।  
तच्चकारोत्तरे काव्ये वाल्मीकिर्भगवानृषिः ॥ I. 3.39

giving rise to the idea that Uttarakāvya had to contain only the future events. The correct interpretation should be that Uttarakāvya is adjectival of Rāmābhyudaya (the correct text given by D 2):

रामाभिषेकाभ्युदये सर्वसैन्यविसर्जनम् ।  
स्वराष्ट्ररञ्जनं चैव वैदेह्याश्च विसर्जनम् ॥ I. 3.28

(by च in 28c the earlier events e.g. coronation of Vibhiṣaṇa etc. (after Rāvaṇavadha) may be included in the *Abhyudaya*.) we think that the correct construction of I. 3. 28 should be सर्वसैन्यविसर्जनं चैव वैदेह्याश्च विसर्जनम्, अनागतं च यत्किञ्चिद् इति सर्वं उत्तरे क अभ्युदये चकार. Both the ślokas being *Ekānvayī*.

There is a controversy as to exactly what part and upto what extent the Rāmāyaṇa was taught to Lava-Kuśa by Vālmīki. It seems that according to some manuscripts Lava-Kuśa sung Rāma's story up to S.

*nirvāsana*. Very interestingly all the MSS from VII.52 and onward unanimously write Uttarakāṇḍa in the colophons, but in the earlier Sargas some of them do not name the Kāṇḍa at all or seem to be hesitant to do so. Without going into details we can safely say that at least in the same recension there was Kāṇḍa division or sub-division after *Sītā-Nirvāsana*.

Now we are in a position to see how above traditions map out the sarga division of Raghuvamśa's *Rāmacarita*.

1. *Sarga 10*: It contains exactly the subject matter contained in the *Ādi* portion of the *Bālakāṇḍa*. The Ślokas X. 1 and X. 2 of the Raghuvamśa practically eacho the śloka 1.9.1 of Rāmāyaṇa. To support the phrase *evam prabhāvasya* Kālidāsa has the whole Sarga nine. The last śloka of Ten *Suragaja iva* (86) reminds śloka 1.17.20, śloka 82 represents ślokas 15 cd-19 of I. 17. It is clear that by the time of Kālidāsa *Bālacarita* had got acceptance as part of the Rāmāyaṇa but the separate identity of the *Ādi* portion of the *Bālakāṇḍa* was still maintained inspiring the ending of the Sarga ten which contain the story of just up to the story in *Ādi* portion.

2. *Sarga 11*: The 11th Sarga contains exactly the story contained in the *Bālacarita*, part of the *Bālakāṇḍa* and Kālidāsa has assiduously separated it from aforesaid *Ādikāṇḍa* portion.

3. *Sarga 12* : It was not difficult for Kālidāsa, a clever poet with insight to see that the division of the different Kāṇḍas was arbitrary and not the part of original Rāmāyaṇa in view of so transparent fluidity in them. He narrates the bulk of *Paulastyavadha* in this sarga. But never the less, he does not end the Sarga exactly at *Rāvaṇavadha*. He continues the description of Rāma taking off from Laṅkā on *Puṣpaka*.

It has been discussed in our article 'Unities in the Rāmāyaṇa' how there has been a tendency to shift the ending of the *Paulastyavadha* and some have preferred to end it with Rāma in *Puṣpaka* in the sky. There, it has been discussed that quite likely some Rāmāyaṇa traditions ended the Kāṇḍa at this dramatic moment. As shown before, Pravarasena followed the tradition of ending the *Paulastyavadha* at VI. 110. After the last śloka in the Critical edition non-south MSS insert here 3368\* .

स तु पवनपथं गते (v. 1. ०तिं) विमाने दशरथवंशविवर्धनः (०विभूषणः) प्रतीतः ।  
 (v. 1. मनुजपतिर्वसुधातलं निरीक्ष्य)  
 क्षितितलमवलोकयन् प्रहृष्टो (v. 1. दुमगिरिगहनं. ससागरान्तम्) नगरशतै-  
 रुपशोभितं समृद्धैः ॥ (v. 1. ०समुद्रं , ०संमृद्धं).

This śloka seems to have captured the imagination of Kālidāsa. Addition of 3368\* supports the conjecture that here, there might have been a proto Kāṇḍa division.

4. The Sargas 13-15 form the subject matter of *Rāmābhyudaya*. Of these we take sarga 15 first. It contains exclusively the story after *Sītā-Nirvāsana* (contained in Sarga 51) upto the end of the *Uttara Kāṇḍa*. Clearly it reflects the division or sub-division referred to above. Sarga 14 is a very important sarga. The typical characteristic of *Rāmābhyudaya* was that it put Rāma's coronation and *Sītā-Nirvāsana* in the same Kāṇḍa. This old tradition has been maintained in some vernacular works also. It seems a good conjecture that *Rāmābhyudaya* was still existant as a Kāṇḍa at the time of Kālidāsa, but with a subdivision marking post *Sītā Nirvāsana* story. The only difficulty comes in with sarga 13. We think, he separated Sarga 14 from 13 for poetic reasons to put the whole of the *Puṣpaka* journey in one sarga, and to combine that with the matters contained in Sarga 14 would have awkwardly lengthened the Sarga. Thus, Sargas 13 and 14 contained the story of *Rāmābhyudaya*, minus the story of future and *Uttara* part.

Another pastulation can also be possible here. In the śloka I. 3. 28 if we do not take च to include some previous episodes also in the *Abhyudaya* the strictly speaking Rāma's meeting with Bharata will be included in the Yuddhakāṇḍa itself and *Rāmābhyudaya* will begin with coronation of Rāma itself. May be Kālidāsa understood it that way and he put the meeting with Bharata in the Sarga 13 and described the story from Rāma's coronation up to *Sītā Nirvāsana* in Sarga 14.

In conclusion we think that a detailed study of the Sarga breaks of the different Rāma-Kāvya of antiquity will throw interesting lights on the proto-Kāṇḍa-division in the Rāmāyaṇa.

\* Published from the Gaekward Oriental Series, Baroda, Vol. XLVI, 1930, edited by Ramaswami Sastri, Siromani.

1. अथ माल्यवतः शृङ्गे काकुत्स्थस्य वियोगिनः ।  
दुर्निवाराश्रुसंयोगो जगाम जलदागमः ॥ 1.1  
निर्मलेन्दुर्नभो रेजे विकचाब्जं बभौ सुरः ।  
परं पर्यश्रुवदनो मन्त्रतुर्भतितारुभौ ॥ 1.5
2. For the various attempts to shift forward the original ending of paulastyavadha, see "the spiritual unity of two parts of Rāmāyaṇa and its implications.  
दशमुखरिपुमौलौ त्वम्बराल्लम्बमाना

सुखरकरमुक्ता पुष्पवृष्टिः पपात/40.100 cd

चिन्ताकुले रघुपतौ स्फुटमुल्लसन्ती

गीर्देवता भगवती स्फुटमन्तरिक्षात् ।

क्रव्यादमन्दिरचिरोषितराजपुत्री-

स्वीकारसंशयविकारमपाचकार ॥ 40.101

3. रामस्यादृश्यमाने आशाबन्ध इव चिरगते हनूमति.
4. ततस्तु तां पाण्डुरहर्म्यमालिनीं विशालकक्ष्यां गजवाजिसंकुलाम् ।  
पुरीमयोध्यां ददृशुः प्लवंगमाः पुरीं महेन्द्रस्य यथामरावतीम् ॥ VI. 111.3।

## BOOK REVIEWS

PILGRIMAGE STUDIES : TEXT AND CONTEXT; edited by Dr. Lallanji Gopal (General Editor) and Dr. D.P. Dubey; published by the Society of Pilgrimage Studies; 4A/2/1 Muirabad, Allahabad-211002; Price Rs. 350=00. U.S. \$ 50.

The book under review (which is the second volume of Transactions of the Society of Pilgrimage Studies) is composed of a collection of 22 articles by eminent scholars wellknown for their deep scholarship. Besides articles on general matters on pilgrimage institution, there are a few articles that deal with particular *tīrthas* like Citrakūṭa, Ayodhyā, Gayā, Vārāṇasī etc. and also with the worship of deities like Hanumān. We agree with the editors that 'the present volume meets the need to focus attention on the importance of pilgrimage'. There is no exaggeration in holding the view that by reading this book one becomes able to understand the values of pilgrimage tradition in Hinduism, Buddhism and Christianity. It is regrettable to note that there is no article on the pilgrimage tradition of Jainism, in which the *tīrtha*-cult has a prominent place.

By way of criticism the reviewer wants to draw the attention of the respective authors to the following points:

1. The book should have contained a discussion on the classes of sacred places as given in the Tantras, Purāṇas etc. As for example the Avantikhaṇḍa of the Skanda-p. speaks of five kinds of sacred places, namely *śmaśāna*, *ūṣara*, *kṣetra*, *pīṭha* and *vana* (1.41). (Reasons for these names are also given in this chapter). The essential characteristic of a *tīrtha* as given in the Purāṇas (सद्भिः समाश्रितो भूमिभागस्तीर्थतयोच्यते Sk. Kumārikā-khaṇḍa 11.11) deserves to be quoted in this book.

2. Brahma-p. 70.16-19 have been quoted to show that there are four kinds of *tīrthas*, namely *daiva*, *asura*, *ārṣa* and *mānuṣa* (p.12). Here the author means to say that a *mānuṣa* *tīrtha* is that which is created by a king. It is not understood why the word *maṇuṣya* (from which the adjectival word *mānuṣa* is formed) is to be taken in the restricted sense of a king. The Purāṇa has no indication to this effect.

I may inform the author that besides this division there are other kinds of division of *tīrthas* in the Purāṇas which deserve to be mentioned in a work on pilgrimage. As for example *tīrthas* are divided into *cara* (e.g. rivers and the like) and *sthāvara* (e.g. mountains, temples and the like that are stationary) in SK. Kumārikā 60.20-22. Similarly there is a *kṛta-ākṛta* division of *tīrthas* in SK. Prabhāsakṣetra-māhātmya 26.37. *Tīrthas* are said to be *guhya*, *atiguhya*, *guhyaḍ guhya* in this very work in 8.71-79.

3. It is stated that there is difference in the enumeration of sites constituting the great seven cities (p. 13). From the difference as shown in the footnote 43 it appears that the difference is not based on some country-wide tradition or on some authoritative text but on a local custom only. In fact there is no difference of view in the Puranic enumeration of the seven holy cities; see Padma-p.6.203. 52; Nārādiya-p. 1.27.35; SK. Kāśī 6.68; 23.7; Brahmāṇḍa-p.4.40.91; Garuḍa-p.2.38.5-6; SK. Dvārakā 24.81; Br. Dh. P.2.24.6.

4. It is remarked that 'only a few Puranic passages say that the river Sarasvatī in its concealed form joins the Gaṅgā and Yamunā at prayāga' (p. 146). It is unfortunate that the author does not mention the names of those Purāṇas that hold this view. It is interesting to note that the Bṛhaddharma-p. expressly states the above view : ततोऽग्निकोणमुखतो ययौ गङ्गा धरातले । यमुना च तथा गुप्ता संगताभूत् सरस्वती ॥ १३ प्रयाग इत्ययं देशः पुण्यः परमतः परः । ततः सर्वमुखी गङ्गा पूर्वोत्तरे व्यराजत (2.22.13.14). The significance of the epithet सर्वमुखी in verse 14 deserves to be noted.

5. As the word *kṛṣṇa pakṣa* has been rendered by 'dark fortnight' so *śukla pakṣa* should have been rendered by 'bright fortnight' and not by 'light fortnight' as has been done on p. 67.

6. A minor correction is needed (on the page on dedication) in the verse of Mbh. Vana-p. 80.51- महात्मन is to be corrected to महात्मनः

I want to close this review with the request to the able editors of this volume that they should utilize also a few such Sanskrit works on pilgrimage that were composed by those who visited the shrines personally. One of such works is the *Tīrtha-prabandha* (in verse) by Vādirāja Svāmin of the Madhava sect. The author begins his *tīrthayātrā* from the Rajatapīṭha- pura in southern Kaṇāṭaka.

-R.S. Bhattacharya

## QUESTION-BOX

[Scholars are earnestly requested to send us articles or notes bearing their well-considered opinions on the questions (or problems) put forward in this column for solution.

The column was started from the *Vyāsā-pūrnimā* Number (XXV.2) containing six questions. We have received some more questions for this column which shows the growing interest of scholars in the Puranic field. Questions from the lovers of the epics and Purāṇas are solicited-Editor.]

(7)

### *FIVE HUSBANDS OF DRAUPADĪ*

Sir,

The story of Draupadī having five husbands has been a point of controversy since the time of the Mahābhārata. I shall like to know if the fact of her having five husbands is clearly attested by the Puranic evidence as well. I shall also like to know if the propriety of her marrying five persons is discussed in the Purāṇas. Kindly give the necessary references.

Yours sincerely  
P.R.P.Verma (Advocate)  
Kabirnagar, Varanasi

(8)

### *KUMĀRASAMBHAVA THEMETHIN THE PURĀṆAS*

Sir,

I have been working on the Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa. The story is said to be based essentially on the Puranic versions. It is well known that Kālidāsa was an admirer of Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa. In the 23 sarga of the Bālakaṇḍa there seems to be another version of the burning of Kāmadeva, quite different from the popular version. The main differences are as follows:-

a. The event took place after the marriage of Pārvati and not before it.

b. Mahādeva was going somewhere when Kāmadeva attacked him and not sitting in meditation.

c. The event took place somewhere near the confluence of Gaṅgā and Sarayū down in the plains, not in the Himalayas.

One does not understand why Kālidāsa did not follow this version which apparently seems to be earlier. Please let me know if any Purāṇa or Upapurāṇa or any other source in Sanskrit literature has followed the Valmikian tradition. The divergence is very clear and the commentators have taken great pains in straining the meaning to conform with the popular version.

Yours

G.Livio

(At present in Varanasi)

(9)

### THE MAHĀBHĀRATA THEME IN THE PURĀṆAS

Sir,

My question is two-fold. Firstly, where can I find the central story of Mahābhārata war in the Purāṇas ? Please give all the references as far as possible . In particular a śloka in the Bhāgavata (1.15.11) referring to the popular story of the number of Durvasa and his party being satisfied by Kṛṣṇa eating just a śāka leaf from Draupadī's pot given by the sun:

यो वो जुगोप वनमेत्य दुरन्तकृच्छाद् दुर्वाससोऽ रिविहितादयुताग्रभुग्ः ।  
शाकान्नशिष्टमुपयुज्य मतस्त्रिलोकीं तृप्ताममस्त सलिले विनिमग्नसङ्घं ॥

The story is here only referred to and not described. It is said that the reference is to Mahābhārata. But I am told that it is only an interpolation in the Mahābhārata, and is supported by only a few manuscripts. Thus probably it is a very late interpolation and the authorship of Bhāgavata cannot be so late.. I shall like to know if the story of Draupadī's pot and the Durvāsā episode is found at other places also in the vast Puranic literature which the Bhāgavata might referred to .

Thanking You,

Yours Sincerely  
Vishveshwari Devi  
Patna



(10)

*THE RIVER BRAHMAPUTRA IN THE PURĀṆAS*

Dear Sir,

While still waiting for answer of my earlier query regarding the river Sindhu, I shall like to know where I can get details regarding the river Brahmaputra in the Purāṇas. Why it is so that the references of Brahmaputra and Sindhu are so meagre in the Purāṇas ? At present the main stream of Gaṅgā seems to flow through Padmā which bifurcates near Farakka. This Padmā joins Brahmaputra. The confluence of two such long and mighty rivers is not a common phenomenon in geography. Has this confluence found any mention in the Puranic literature ? Hindus love *tīrthas*, and this confluence deserves to be one of the greatest *tīrthas*. I will be thankful if you can give me a list of the tributaries of the Brahmaputra according to the Purāṇas.

Thanks,

Yours sincerely  
Shiva Priya Singh  
Nagwa, Lanka, Varanasi

(11)

*VAIDYANĀTHA TEMPLE AT DEOGARH*

Sir,

I hail from Bihar. In my area the most popular temple is at Vaidyanāthadhāma, Deogarh. The name of the deity is Jhārkhāṇḍī, the province being called Jharkhand Pradesh. There are many reasons about the deity. I shall like to have authentic Puranic references about the temples and the deity. Is Jhārkhāṇḍī one of the names of Mahādeva and what is its Puranic derivation ? Please oblige.

Yours  
Niraj Kumar Chaudhuri  
M.Ed., B.H.U.

(12)

*KUMBHAKARṆA'S SIX-MONTHS' SLEEP*

Sir,

The story of Kumbhakarṇa getting confounded by the Māyā of Gods and asking for a boon of six months' sleep is too well-known to be reminded of. But Rāmāyaṇa in Yuddhakāṇḍa, sarga 61, sl. 13 (Bombay edition) says:

एतेन जातमात्रेण क्षुधार्तेन महात्मना ।  
भक्षितानि सहस्राणि सत्त्वानां सुबहून्यपि ॥

and this necessitated the famous curse from Brahmā. His hunger is thus something like the hunger of new born Hanumān. It must have happened many years before Rāvaṇa and his brothers went for penance. Of course the Uttarakāṇḍa version gives the popular version but there is no doubt that the whole *Rāvaṇa-carita* there is an interpolation. Its contradiction with the Yuddhakāṇḍa version is another proof of it. It is quite possible that Kumbhakarṇa earned his curse even before the birth of Vibhīṣaṇa, the latter being junior. The question is interesting not only structurally but from the grammatical point also. The question is, could Vibhīṣaṇa have been justified in using *Liṭ lakāra* in describing this event ?

We shall like to know if the story of baby Kumbhakarṇa being cursed by Brahmā is corroborated directly or indirectly, anywhere in Puranic and Itihāsa literature. If not, is there any explanation for this major divergence ?

Yours

Ramayana workshop  
purāṇa Department  
All-India Kashiraj Trust,  
Ramnagar

## ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(July to December, 1994)

### **GARUḌA PURĀṆA WORK**

During this period revision of the Critical Apparatus of chapters 101-150 of the Ācārakāṇḍa of the Garuḍa Purāṇa has been made. The printing of the critical edition has been started. Critical notes on selected readings are being prepared by the editor. The work of collecting the quotations from Nibandha, and Dharmasāstra texts is also in progress.

### **WORK ON TĪRTHAS**

Some more manuscripts of the Ayodhyāmāhātmya have been procured from the Bihar Rastrabhasa Parisad, Patna and Asiatic Society, Bombay. Collation of these manuscripts will be taken up soon.

### **WORKS ON UNPUBLISHED MSS OF THE PURĀṆAS**

1. Editing of Vāsiṣṭha Liṅga Purāṇa is in progress.
2. Work of editing the Varuṇa Upapurāṇa on the basis of a single manuscript is also going on.
3. The work of the Mānasakhaṇḍa is also in hand.

### **VISITORS TO THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT**

During the period of these six months many scholars and eminent persons visited the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust. The following eminent persons expressed their views in the Visitors Book :-

1. Dr. R.C. Sharma, Director, Bharat Kala Bhawan, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi visited on 23.9.1994. :-  
'Delighted to be here in the abode of learning and early scripture'.
2. Dr. R.K. Sharma, Member of the Editorial Board of the Purāṇa Bulletin, Prof. S.G. Kantawala Dr. K.K. Mishra, Dy. Director, Rastriya Sanskrit Sansthan and Shri S.N. Sahi, Dy. Director, Finance & Research and Publications, Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, New Delhi visited on 19.11.1994. to review the work of the Purāṇa project. They expressed :-  
"We are immensely impressed with functioning of the Purāṇa Bulletin and the Purāṇa department. All best wished for the Purāṇa Bulletin and the Purāṇa department".

3. Smt. Veena Sharma, DII/3, Pandara Road, New Delhi-110003 and Dr. (Smt.) H.S. Santha, Department of History, B.H.U., Varanasi visited on 26.12.1994. They wrote :-

"We have been most impressed and inspired by the work being done here on the Purāṇas. The meticulousness and dedication is touching. In fact it would not be surprising or even an exaggeration that under the aegis of Kashinareshji the culture and history of India is fully capitalised".

### PURĀṆA GOṢṬHĪ

This year the Purāṇa Goṣṭhī (Seminar on Purāṇas) was held on July, 21, 1994 at the Shivala Palace of the All-India Kashiraj Trust under the Chairmanship of His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. After Maṅgalācaraṇa and Vyāsavandanā Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya presented Vyāsa-Pūrṇimā issue of the Purāṇa Bulletin to His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. Dr. Bhattacharya briefly informed the audience of the contents of the journal. He said that both the issues of the Purāṇa Bulletin of this year contained the matter on Ayodhyā and Sarayū. Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai, Incharge of the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust informed the scholars about the work done in the Department in the last year. His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh said that the aim of the All-India Kashiraj Trust in establishing the Purāṇa Department was to revive the old school of *paurāṇikas* which was held in high esteem in old traditional schools of Vedic interpretations. Acharya Baladeva Upadhyaya, the seniormost scholar of Sanskrit in the nation said that according to Sastric instruction *Dharma, Artha* and *Kāma* were held in equality. He praised the Puranic work being done in the Purāṇa Department. Pt. Vishwanath Shastri Datar said that since the Sadācāra of Vedic learning is not properly observed the proper understanding of the true knowledge is not received. Among the other scholars present in the seminar were Prof. Ram Chandra Pandeya, Prof. Yadunandana Upadhyaya, Prof. Shukadeva Singh, Dr. Ramesh Chandra Panda, Dr. Gopal Dutt Pandeya, Dr. Rama Shankar Tripathi, Dr. Mahesh Chandra Joshi and Shri Vaikunth Nath Upadhyaya were important.

After the Purāṇa Goṣṭhī His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh released a book titled '*Bhārata ke Mahān Sādhaka*' written by Shri Dasharath Narain Shukla, executive officer of the Vishwanath Temple. Shri Shukla spoke about the contents of the book.

At the last, his Highness thanked the scholars for their keen interest in Purāṇa work of the Trust.

Breakfast and tea was served to the scholars.

### RĀMALĪLĀ

The famous Ramalīlā of Ramanagar was celebrated from *Bhādrapada Sukla Caturdaśī*, 2051 Vikram era (18th September, 1994) to *Āśvina Śukla Pūrṇimā* (18th October, 1994). As usual thousands of visitors attended the Rāmālīlā daily. A large number of *sādhus*, *Nemis* and devotees also saw this monthlong Rāmālīlā. Free provisions were daily supplied to all the sādhus for the Rāmālīlā period. A good number of foreign visitors and scholars were also present during the Rāma līlā period. His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh and Yuvaraja Shri Anant Narain Singh attended the Rāmālīlā every day.

### RĀSALĪLĀ

This year the Rāsālīlā was performed in the *Prasiddha* Garden from *Śrāvaṇa Śukla Dvītiya* (9th August, 1994) to *Śrāvaṇa Pūrṇimā* (21st August, 1994). The Rāsālīlā was enacted by a *Rāsamaṇḍalī* of Vrindavana. Every day His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh and Yuvaraja Shri Anant Narain Singh were present in the Rāsālīlā. During the Rāsālīlā period the tenth Skandha of the *Bhāgavatamahāpurāṇa* was recited by Dr. Raja Ram Shukla and Pt. Ganapati Shukla. Before and after the recitation the *Rādhāsahasranāma* was recited every day by the same scholars. On the last Pūrṇimā day the Rāsālīlā was performed in the Ramnagar Fort. After the conclusion of the Rāsālīlā Dakṣiṇā and other expenses were paid to the actors and the reciters.

## ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

### 1. Maharaja Benaras Vidyamandir Trust

#### MUSEUM

The Museum run by the Maharaja Benaras Vidyamandir Trust is a good attraction for the visitors from the different parts of the country and abroad. The collection of the old palanquins, elephant *haudās*, textiles, arms, *hukkās*, torches, ivory and specimen of Banarasi brass-work are some of the special features of this Museum. The unique clock (*dharma ghari*) made at Ramnagar more than one hundred years ago, depicting all the Hindu Zodiacal signs is a relevant illustration of the Museum's singularity.

During the year 1994 among the innumerabale visitors to the Museum the names of a few of the eminent persons, who signed the visitor's Book and added impottant comments, are given here :-

1. Mr. A.K. Saran, Judicial Magistrate, Varanasi visited on 4th January, 1994.
2. Justice C.V. Jani, Justice of the Gujrat High court visited on 4.1. 1994.  
"A fantastic collection".
3. Ms. Anichika Ishu, Japan, on 25.10.1994. She commented :-  
'I have enjoyed the wonderful articles presented in the Museum. Especially Munnial's works are very much impressive. Shri J.P. Pathak showed me around with great interest'.
4. Swami Medhananda, Nillon Vedanta Kyokan, Japan visited on 25.10.1994
5. Shri Sandipan Sen, Ramakrishna Mission Vidyamandira, Belur Math, Howrah, West Bengal visited on 25.10.1994.

#### WALL PAINTING COMPETITION

On the 7th December, 1994 a Wall Painting Competition was organised by the Maharaja Benaras Vidyamandir Trust for the local artists. The artists painted the historical and religious pictures on the outer wall of the Museum of the Maharaja Benaras Vidyamandir Trust. These pictures adorn the outer wall of the Museum for the whole year. The paintings were judged by the professors of the Department of Performing Arts, B.H.U. Prizes were given to the winning artists.

#### PAINTING COMPETITION

On the same day a Painting Competition was organised for the local children. The young boys and girls assembled in the 'Diwānakhānā' in the forenoon and painted the pictures. The paper and colours were supplied to all the competitors. Their paintings were also judged by the Professors of the Banaras Hindu University. First three winners were given special prizes and all the other participants got consolation prizes .

At the end of the competition sweets were given to all the participants.

## 2. Kashinaresh Maharani Dharmakarya Nidhi

### (a) DISTRIBUTION OF SWEETS

In the afternoon of the 7th December, 1994 sweets were distributed to the boy and girl students of all the Primary and Junior High Schools of Ramnagar. Students in their school uniforms carrying their school banners gathered in the inner courtyard of the Fort under the proper guidance of their teachers. The total number of children who got sweets was 5250. Besides this, 152 teachers and 51 *dais* (maid servants) were present with school children for their guidance. Sweets were given to all the teachers and *dais* also.

On the 18th December, 1994 sweets and clothes were distributed to poor children of Bairat and Musakhand tribal belts in Chakia Tehsil.

### (b) HARIKIRTANA

In the evening of the 7th December, 1994 a Harikirtana was concluded by the Kashinaresh Maharani Dharmakarya Nidhi. Devotees and *Kirtanias* of Ramnagar and Varanasi recited the sacred names of the God and devotional songs on this occasion.

## 3. Maharaja Kahiraj Dharmakarya Nidhi

Under the auspices of this Trust ritual and religious functions are conducted during the whole year as these are the main tasks of the Trust. This Trust also runs four educational institutions, which are making steady progress.

These institutions are :-

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

Besides this, from this year this Trust started three new colleges :-

1. Maharani Gulab Kunvari Mahila Degree College, Pindara;
2. Maharani Jayanti Kunvari Kanya Inter College, Chakia; and
3. Kashinaresh Maharani Mahila Degree College, Chakia.

## THE 4TH INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON ASIAN AND EUROPEAN THEATER

A Seminar was organised by the All-India Kashi Raj Trust in collaboration with the European Institute for Theater Research (Barcelona), the Tribhuvan University (Kathmandu) and the Banaras Hindu University (Varanasi) from 15 to 19 October 1994 in Varanasi. The aim of this seminar was to establish the terms of a dialogue between European and Asian theater. Three academic sessions were held, 12 research papers were presented along with a special lecture on Ramlila delivered by Dr. Suresh Avasthi.

The second academic session of this congress was held at Fort Ramnagar conjointly presided by His Highness the Maharaja of Varanasi, Prof. Joseph-Angel Gomez (president of the congress) and Dr. Bhanu Shankar Mehta. In his address His Highness the Maharaja of Varanasi introduced to his foreign guests the figure of Tulsidas and requested them to prepare translations in Spanish of the Ramcaritamanas.

At the end a screening of an excellent documentary on Ram Lila featuring Dr. Bhanu Shankar Mehta as main host prepared the audience for the experience of watching a real theatrical and liturgical event: the coronation of Lord Rama amidst crowds of devotees and spectators in the Ram Lila ground .



# सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम् (जुलाई-दिसम्बर, १९९४)

## गरुडपुराणकार्यम्

अस्मिन् कार्यावधौ गरुडपुराणस्याचारखण्डस्य १०१ तमाध्यायतः १५० तमाध्यायं यावत्पाठसमीक्षोपकरणं पुनः शोधितम् । पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंस्करणस्य मुद्रणकार्यं प्रारब्धम् । सम्पादकेन विशिष्टपाठानामाधारेण समीक्षात्मिका टिप्पणी विरच्यते । निबन्ध-धर्मशास्त्रादिग्रन्थेभ्य उद्धरणानां सङ्ग्रहकार्यं वर्धिष्णु ।

## तीर्थसम्बन्धिकार्यम्

'पाटलिपुत्र'-स्थ-'बिहारराष्ट्रभाषापरिषद'-'मुम्बई'-स्थ-'एशियाटिक सोसायटी'-संस्थाभ्याम् अयोध्यामाहात्म्यस्यान्ये हस्तलेखाः प्राप्ताः । एतेषां हस्तलेखानां पाठसंवादकार्यं शीघ्रमेव प्रारप्स्यते ।

## पौराणिकाप्रकाशितहस्तलेखकार्यम्

१. वाशिष्ठलिङ्गपुराणस्य सम्पादनकार्यं वर्धिष्णु ।
२. वरुणोपपुराणस्य सम्पादनकार्यमेकस्य हस्तलेखस्याधारेण प्रचलति ।
३. मानसखण्डसम्बन्धिकार्यमपि प्रचलति ।

## पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

षण्मासात्मकेऽस्मिन् कार्यावधानेके विद्वांसो विशिष्टजनाश्च सर्वभारतीयकाशि-राजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागे आगताः । अधोनिर्दिष्टा विशिष्टजना अभ्यागतपञ्जिकायां स्व-स्वविचारानलिखन्-

१. डॉ. आर. सी.शर्मा-काशीहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयीयभारतकलाभवनस्य निदेशकः २३-९-१९९४ दिनाङ्के आगतः । सोऽलिखत्-'अत्रत्येन विद्यायाः प्राच्यशास्त्रस्यचायतनैर्न मुदान्वितः ।

२. डॉ. रामकरणशर्मा-'पुराणम्'-पत्रिकायाः सम्पादकमण्डलस्य सदस्यः, प्रो. एस. जी. कांटावाला, नवदिल्लीस्थराष्ट्रियसंस्कृतसंस्थानस्य निदेशकः, डा. कमलाकान्तमिश्रः, तत्रत्य'वित्तविभाग-(शोध प्रकाशन-)'स्योपनिदेशकः, श्री एस. एन. साहीमहोदयश्च पुराणविभागीयकार्याणामवलोकनार्थं १९-११-१९९४ दिनाङ्के आगताः । तेऽलिखन्-

'पुराणविभागीयकार्यैः अत्यन्तं प्रभाविता वयम् । 'पुराणम्'—पत्रिकायाः पुराणविभागस्य च कृतेऽनेकाशुभकामनाः ।'

३. श्रीमती वीणा शर्मा—डी. II/३, पाण्डारारोड, नवदिल्ली-११० ००३, डॉ. (श्रीमती) एच. एस. शान्ता—काशीहिन्दू विश्वविद्यालयीय—इतिहासविभागीया च २६-१२-१९९४ दिनाङ्के आगते । ते अलिखताम्—'अत्रत्यानि पुराणविषयक—क्रियमाणानि कार्याणि दृष्ट्वा प्रभाविते अत्यन्तं हर्षिते चावाम् । काशिनरेशस्य निर्देशने भारतीयेतिहासः संस्कृतिश्च पल्लविता भविष्यति , अत्र न संदेहलेशः ।'

## पुराणगोष्ठी

अस्मिन् वर्षे २१ जुलाई १९९४ दिनाङ्के सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य शिवालाप्रासादे तत्रभवतां काशिनरेशाणां डॉ. विभूतिनारायण-सिंहशर्मदेवानामाध्यक्ष्ये पुराणगोष्ठ्यायोजिता । मङ्गलाचरणव्यासवन्दनानन्तरं डॉ. राम-शङ्करभट्टाचार्येण 'पुराणम्'—पत्रिकायाः व्यासपूर्णिमाङ्कः तत्र— भवद्भयः काशिनरेशेभ्यः डॉ. विभूतिनारायण-सिंहशर्मदेवेभ्यः समर्पितः । डा. भट्टाचार्येण पत्रिकास्थलेखानां संक्षिप्तपरिचयोऽपि दत्तः । सोऽकथयद् यदस्य वर्षस्य उभावपि अङ्कौ अयोध्या—सरयू-सम्बन्धिलेखान् धारयतः । पुराण-विभागाध्यक्षः डॉ. गङ्गासागररायः वर्षपर्यन्तकृतस्य पुराण-विभागीयकार्यस्य विवरणं प्रस्तुतवान् । तत्रभवन्तः महाराजाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहा अवोचन् यत् सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागस्य स्थापनाया उद्देश्यम् आसीत्—प्राचीनपौराणिकसम्प्रदायस्य पुनरुज्जीवनम्, यतो वैदिकव्याख्यायाञ्चासीदस्य विशिष्टं महत्त्वम् । राष्ट्रस्य वृद्धतमो विद्वान् आचार्यो बलदेवउपाध्यायोऽवोचद् शास्त्रानुसारेण धर्मार्थकामाः समानरूपेण सेवितव्याः । तेन पुराणविभागीय-कार्याणां प्रशंसनं कृतम् । पं. विश्वनाथ—शास्त्री दातारोऽवोचद्दत्तदाचारस्य श्रुतिशीलसम्पत्तेश्च हासाद्विद्यायाः सम्यगर्जनं न भवति ।

उपस्थितेषु विद्वत्सु प्रमुखा आसन् प्रो. रामचन्द्रपाण्डेयः, प्रो. यदुनन्दन उपाध्यायः, प्रो. शुक्रदेवसिंहः, डॉ. रमेशचन्द्रपण्डाः, डॉ. गोपालदत्तपाण्डेयः, डॉ. रमाशङ्कर त्रिपाठी, डॉ. महेशचन्द्रजोशी, श्रीवैकुण्ठनाथ उपाध्यायश्च ।

पुराणगोष्ठ्या अन्ते तत्रभवन्तो महाराजाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवा विश्वनाथ मन्दिरस्य कार्यपालेन श्रीदशरथनारायणशुक्लेन विरचितस्य 'भारत के महान् साधक'—नामकग्रन्थस्य विमोचनं कृतवन्तः । श्रीशुक्लः पुस्तकस्थ-विषयाणां परिचयं दत्तवान् ।

अन्ते महाराजा न्यासस्य पौराणिककार्येषु सहयोगार्थं विद्वद्भ्यो धन्यवादान् वितरितवन्तः ।

विद्वद्भ्यो स्वल्पाहारः 'चाय'-पानञ्च समर्पिते ।

## रामलीला

वर्षेऽस्मिन् रामनगरस्य सुप्रसिद्धा रामलीला भाद्रपदशुक्लचतुर्दशीत आश्विनपूर्णिमापर्यन्तं, सं. २०५१ (१८ सितम्बर, १९९४ तः १८ अक्टूबर, १९९४ पर्यन्तं) सम्पन्ना । पूर्ववद्वर्षाकाणां प्रतिदिनं संख्या सहस्राधिकास्ति । बहुसंख्याकाः साधवः 'नेमी'-जनाः, भक्ताश्च मासं यावत्प्रचलितां रामलीलां दृष्टवन्तः । रामलीलावधौ साधुभ्यो निःशुल्कं भोजनसामग्री वितरिता । वैदेशिकदर्शका विद्वांसश्चोपस्थिता आसन् रामलीलायाम् । तत्रभवन्तो महाराजाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंहशर्मदेवा युवराजाः श्री अनन्तनारायणसिंह-शर्मदेवाश्च प्रतिदिनमासन्नोपस्थिता रामलीलाभूमौ ।

## रासलीला

श्रावणशुक्लद्वितीया-(९ अगस्त १९९४)तः श्रावणपूर्णिमा-(२१ अगस्त १९९४) पर्यन्तमस्मिन् वर्षे रामनगरस्थप्रसिद्धोद्याने रासलीला सुसम्पन्ना । रासलीलेयं वृन्दावनादागताया रासमण्डल्या कृता । तत्रभवन्तो महाराजाः डॉ. विभूतिनारायणसिंह युवराजा श्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंहाश्चोपस्थिता आसन् प्रतिदिनं रासलीलाकाले । रासलीला-स्थले डॉ. राजारामशुक्लेन पं. गणपतिशुक्लेन च श्रीमद्भागवतमहापुराणस्य दशमस्कन्धस्य राधासहस्रनाम- सम्पुटितः पाठः कृतः । अन्तिमे पूर्णिमादिवसे रामनगरदुर्गे रासलीलाभवत् । रासलीला-समाप्तौ संविभागीभ्यो पारायणकर्तृभ्याञ्च दक्षिणादिकं प्रदत्तम् ।

## सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

### १. महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासः

#### सङ्ग्रहालयः

महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासस्य सङ्ग्रहालयोऽतीवाकर्षकोऽस्ति भारतीयानां वैदेशिकानाञ्च दर्शकाणां कृते । सङ्ग्रहालयस्यास्य प्राचीनशिविकाः हस्तिप्रावरणानि ('हौदा' इति भाषायाम्), परिधानानि, शस्त्राणि, 'हुक्का' इत्येतानि, प्रकाशयन्त्राणि, हस्तिदन्तनिर्मितवस्तूनि, वाराणस्यां निर्मितानि 'ब्रास', वस्तूनि च विशिष्टानि सन्ति । रामनगरे शतादपि वर्षेभ्यः प्राङ्निर्मिता धर्मघटिका, यस्यां सर्वाण्यपि हिन्दूभक्षत्रादीनि सन्ति सङ्ग्रहालयस्यास्य प्रतिष्ठां विस्तारयति ।

१९९४ तमे वर्षेऽसंख्यदर्शकेषु ये विशिष्टदर्शनार्थिनो दर्शकपुस्तिकायां स्वहस्ताक्षराणि कृतवन्तः स्वामूल्यसम्मतित्वं लिखितवन्तः, तेऽत्र प्रस्तूयन्ते—

१. श्री. ए. के. शरणः—न्यायिकदण्डाधिकारी-वाराणसी ४ जनवरी १९९४ दिनाङ्के आगतः ।

२. न्यायमूर्तिः श्री सी. वी. जानी-गुजरातोच्चन्यायालयीयः ४-१-१९९४ दिनाङ्के आगतः । सोऽलिखत्-प्रमोदावहः सङ्ग्रहः ।
३. म०अनिचिका इशू-जापानदेशीयागता २५-१०-१९९४ दिनाङ्के । सालिखत्- 'सङ्ग्रहालयस्थवस्तूनि दृष्ट्वा मुदिताऽस्मि । विशेषतः मुन्निलालस्य कार्याण्यतीवाकर्षकाणि । श्री जयप्रकाशपाठकः स्नेहपूर्वकं मम मार्गदर्शनं कृतवान् ।'
४. स्वामी मेघानन्दः-जापान-देशीय-'निलॉन-वेदान्तक्योर्कॉन्'-संस्थानीयः २५-१०-१९९४ दिनाङ्के आगतः ।
५. श्री सन्दीपन सेनः-रामकृष्णसेवाश्रमविद्यामन्दिरम् बेलुरमठः, हावड़ा (पश्चिमवङ्गप्रदेशः) २५-१०-१९९४ दिनाङ्के आगतवान् ।

### भित्तिचित्रप्रतियोगिता

७ दिसम्बर १९९४ दिनाङ्के महाराजबनारसविद्यामन्दिरन्यासेन स्थानीय-चित्रकाराणां कृते भित्तिचित्रप्रतियोगितायोजिता । चित्रकारैः महाराजबनारस- विद्यामन्दिर-न्यासीयसङ्ग्रहालयस्य बाह्यभित्तिष्वैतिहासिकानि धार्मिकाणि च चित्राणि निर्मितानि । वर्षं यावत्तिष्ठन्तीमानि चित्राणि सङ्ग्रहालयभित्तिषु । काशीहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयीयचित्र-कलाध्यापकैरेतेषाञ्चित्राणां परीक्षणं कृतम्, विजेतृचित्रकारेभ्यः पुरस्काराश्च प्रदत्ताः ।

### चित्रकलाप्रतियोगिता

तस्मिन्नेव दिने स्थानिकवालकानां कृते चित्रकलाप्रतियोगिताया आयोजनमभवत् । बाला रामनगरदुर्गस्य 'दीवनखाना-' प्राङ्गणे पूर्वाह्णे समागत्य चित्रनिर्माणं चक्रुः । प्रतियोगिभ्यश्चित्रनिर्माणार्थं पत्राणि वर्णानि च प्रदत्तानि । इमानि चित्राण्यपि काशिकहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालयीयाध्यापकैः परीक्षितानि । विजेतृछात्रेभ्यो विशिष्टाः पुरस्कारा अन्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यःश्च सम्मिलितेभ्यश्छात्रेभ्यः सान्त्वना-पुरस्काराश्च प्रदत्ताः ।

अन्ते च प्रतियोगितायां सम्मिलितेभ्यः प्रत्येकं छात्रेभ्यः मिष्टान्नानि प्रदत्तानि ।

### २. काशिनरेशमहारानीधर्मकार्यनिधिः

#### मिष्टान्नवितरणम्

रामनगरस्थ-प्राथमिक-लघुमाध्यमिक-पाठशालानाञ्छात्रेभ्य मिष्टान्नवितरणञ्जातम-पराह्णे ७ दिसम्बर १९९४ दिनाङ्के । सर्वे छात्राः स्व-स्वविद्यालयीयपरिधाने रामनगर-दुर्गस्थान्तःप्राङ्गणेऽध्यापकानां निर्देशने समवेताः । येभ्यश्छात्रेभ्यो मिष्टान्नं प्रदत्तं तेषां संख्या ५२५० आसीत् । एतदतिरिक्तं विद्यालयीयछात्राणां निर्देशनार्थं १५२ अध्यापकाः ५१ परिचायिकाश्चाप्यागताः । अध्यापकेभ्यः परिचायिकाभ्यश्चापि मिष्टान्नानि दत्तानि ।

## हरिकीर्तनम्

काशिनरेशमहारानीधर्मकार्यनिधिना (न्यासेन) ७ दिसम्बर १९९४ दिनाङ्के सायङ्काले हरिकीर्तनस्यायोजनं कृतम् । रामनगरस्था वाराणसेयाश्च भक्ताः कीर्तनकाराश्च हरेर्नाम्नां भक्तिपद्यानाञ्च गानमकुर्वन्निस्मिन्नवसरे ।

### ३. महाराजकाशिराजधर्मकार्यनिधिः

न्यासेनानेन स्वकीयोद्देश्यपूरणार्थं वर्षपर्यन्तमेव धार्मिककृत्यानां सम्पादनं क्रियते । न्यासेनानेन चतुर्णां संततवर्धियमाणानां शिक्षासंस्थानानामपि सञ्चालनं क्रियते । तानि संस्थानानीमानि—

१. महारानीरामरत्नकुंवरिसंस्कृतपाठशाला, रामनगरम्;
२. महाराजबलवन्तसिंहमहाविद्यालयः गङ्गापुरम्;
३. राजामनसारामविधिमहाविद्यालयः, राजातालाबम्;
४. भारतीयविद्यायोगकेन्द्रम्, प्रयागश्च ।

एतदतिरिक्ता अस्माद्वर्षात्त्रयोऽन्ये नवीनाः महाविद्यालया अपि प्रारब्धा न्यासेन—

१. महारानीगुलाबकुंवरि-महिलामहाविद्यालयः, पिण्डरा;
२. महारानी-जयन्तीकुंवरिकन्योच्चतरमाध्यमिकविद्यालयः, चकिया;
३. काशिनरेशमहारानीमहिलामहाविद्यालयः, चकिया च ।

## एशियायी-यूरोपीयनाट्यशालाया अन्ताराष्ट्रिया सङ्गोष्ठी

१५-१९ अक्टूबर १९९४. दिनाङ्केकान्ताराष्ट्रिया गोष्ठी एशियायीयूरोपीय-नाट्यशालाया आयोजिता । गोष्ठीयं सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासेन यूरोपीय-नाट्यशाला-शोधसंस्थान-(बार्सिलोना)-त्रिभुवनविश्व-विद्यालय(काठमाण्डु)-काशीहिन्दु-विश्वविद्यालय-(वाराणसी)-संस्थानां साहाय्येनायोजिता । यूरोपीयनाट्यशालानाम् एशियायीनाट्यशालानाञ्च सामञ्जस्यस्थापनमासीद्गोष्ठ्या उद्देश्यम् । गोष्ठ्यां शैक्षणिकसत्राण्यायोजितानि । १२ शोधपत्राण्यपि विद्वद्भिः प्रस्तुतानि, डॉ. सुरेश अवस्थी-महोदयेन रामलीलामाश्रित्याभिभाषणमपि प्रदत्तम् ।

गोष्ठ्या द्वितीयं वैचारिकसत्रं रामनगरदुर्गे आयोजितम् । सत्रस्याध्यक्षश्चासन् तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः, प्रो. जोसफ-एंगिल गोमेज-महोदयाः (गोष्ठ्यध्यक्षः), डॉ. भानुशङ्करमेहता-महोदयाश्च । तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशाः स्वकीयेऽभिभाषणे वैदेशिकविदुषः तुलसीदासस्य कार्याणां परिचयं दत्तवन्तः, रामचरितमानसस्य स्पेनिश-भाषायामनुवादार्थ-माह्वानमपि कृतवन्तः ।

अन्ते डॉ. भानुशङ्करमेहता-महोदयः रामलीलायामभिमञ्च्यमानस्य रामराज्याभिषेकस्य नाट्यशास्त्रीयं शास्त्रीयञ्च महत्त्वं प्रतिपादितवान्, रामराज्याभिषेकस्य मञ्चनं भक्तानां दर्शकानाञ्चोपस्थितौ भवति रासलीलाप्राङ्गणे इत्यपि समुपस्थापितवान् ॥

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

### Critical Editions and Translations

1. Vāmama Purāṇa – Critical Ed. Edited By A.S. Gupta	Rs. 250
2. Vāmama Purāṇa – Text with English Translation	Rs. 200
3. Vāmama Purāṇa – Text with Hindi Translation	Rs. 100
4. Kūrma Purāṇa – Critical Ed. Edited By A. S. Gupta	Rs. 200
5. Kūrma Purāṇa – Text with English Translation	Rs. 200
6. Kūrma Purāṇa – Text with Hindi Translation	Rs. 100
7. Varāha Purāṇa – Crit. Ed. Edited By A.S. Gupta	
Ordinary edition	Rs. 265
Deluxe edition	Rs. 1000
8. Varāha Purāṇa – Text with English Translation	
Ordinary edition	Rs. 220
Deluxe edition	Rs. 700
9. Varāha Purāṇa – Text only	Rs. 100
10. Varāha Purāṇa – Text with Hindi Translation	Rs. 240
11. Devīmāhātmya – Edited By Dr. V.S. Agrawal	out of Print
12. Svargakhaṇḍā of the Padma Purāṇa – Edited By Ashoke Chatterji	RS. 40
13. Rāmācaritamānasa—Critical edition	Rs. 30

### Studies

14. Matsya Purāṇa:—A Study, By Dr. V.S. Agrawala	Rs. 40
15. Garuḍa Purāṇa : A Study, By Dr. N. Gangadharan	Rs. 40
16. Nārada Purāṇa : A Study, By Dr. K. Damodaran Nambiar	Rs. 75
17. Nīti-section of the Purāṇārthasaṅgraha	Rs. 5
18. Vyāsa-Praśasti - By Dr. V. Raghavan	Rs. 5
19. Greater Rāmāyaṇa - By Dr. V. Raghavan	Rs. 30
20. Viṣṇupurāṇa- Viṣayānukramaṇi - By Madhavacharya Adya	Rs. 5
21. Bṛhaspati-Saṁhitā of the Garuḍa Purāṇa – By L. Sternbach	Rs. 10
22. Mānavadharmāśāstra (I-III) and Bhaviṣya Purāṇa	Rs. 20
23. Dr. Hazra Commemoration Volume, Part-1	Rs. 150

- |  |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| 24. Index of Names in the Liṅga Purāna – By<br>Dr. N. Gangādhara                                   | Rx. | 100 |
| 25. Deities and Deification in the Brahma Purāna–<br>By Dr. Ashoke Chatterji                       | Rs. | 50  |
| 26. Dr. V. Raghavan Commemoration Volume   | Rs. | 102 |
| 27. Ayodhyā– History, Archaeology and Tradition<br>Edited By Dr. Lallanji Gopal                    | Rs. | 200 |
| 28. Purana – A Half-yearly Research Journal<br>Annual Subscription – Inland Rs. 200; Foreign \$ 30 |     |     |
| 29. Dhrupad Annual – Annual Subscription   | Rs. | 100 |

To be had of—(i) the General Secretary, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort, Ramnagar, Varanasi-221008 (India) or (ii) all leading Indological Book-sellers.





THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
OF  
THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

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

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

2. Vacant.

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

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

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

5. Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,  
Poona.
6. Pt. Shri Giridhari Lal Mehta, Chairman, Bellis India Ltd., Infar  
India Ltd., Trustee-Trust Estates of Baldeo Ram Mehta and  
Saligram Mehta; 4, Clive Row, Calcutta 700001.
7. Padmabhushan Pt. Baladeva Upadhyaya, M.A. Sahityacharya,  
Vachaspati; Formerly Director, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University;  
Ravindrapuri, Varnasi.

Donation made to All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort, Ramnagar,  
Varanasi, Will qualify for exemption under Sec. 80G of the Income  
Tax Act, 1961 in the hands of donors.

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

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

### **ANNOUNCEMENT OF FOUR NEW PROJECTS**

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

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

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

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

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