

Vol. XXXVII No. 2]

[July, 1995

पुराणम्  
PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

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

VYĀSA PŪRṆMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



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

**Annual Sub.-Inland Rs. 200/-**

**Foreign \$ 30**

## सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा. रामकरण शर्मा

भूतपूर्व कुलपति, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी; नयी दिल्ली

डा. रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर

भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे

डा. जोर्जो बोनाजोली

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. R.K. Sharma

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

Dr. R.N. Dandekar

Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune

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

## EDITOR

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

## ASSOCIATE EDITOR

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

Oscar Pujol, M.A.

-----

लेखेषु प्रतिपादितानि मतानि लेखकैरेवाभ्युपगतानि; न पुनस्तानि  
सम्पादकैर्न्यासेन वाभ्युपगतानीति विज्ञेयम् ।

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

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

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



# पुराणम्-PURĀṆA

Vol. XXXVII. No. 2 ]

[July 12, 1995

## व्यासपूर्णिमाङ्कः

VYĀSA-PŪRNIMĀ NUMBER

### Contents—लेखसूची

	Pages
1. वैदिकग्रन्थेषु व्यासोक्तयः <i>Compiled By R. S. Bhattacharya</i>	133
2. विष्णुस्तोत्रम् <i>Compiled By R.S. Bhattacharya</i>	134
3. The back-ground of the Purāṇic etymologies [पौराणिकनिर्वचनानां पृष्ठभूमिः] <i>By Tiziana Pontillo</i> Istituto di Glottologia Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Largo Gemelli, 20123 Milano (Italy)	135-144
4. Bhakti in the philosophy of the Purāṇas [पौराणिकदर्शने भक्तिः] <i>By Prof. Raghunath Giri ;</i> B 37/ 165 A Girinagar, Birdopur Varanasi 221010	145-163
5. Nīlasundaragiri— A Puranic viewpoint [नीलसुन्दरगिरिविषये पौराणिकं मतम्] <i>By Dr. Kailash Chandra Dash</i> Dept. of History B.G.B . College, Bhuvaneswar, 751014, Orissa	164-170

6. Impression on the architectural activities from the Liṅga Purāṇa 171-175  
 [लिङ्गपुराणोक्तानां वास्तुशास्त्रीयकर्मणां प्रभावः]  
 By Dr. Vaijayanti Navangul ;  
 Dept. of Art History and Aesthetics  
 Faculty of Fine Arts  
 M.S. University of Baroda 390002
7. Purāṇic Sidelights of the Mahābhārata 176-190  
 [महाभारतीयकथा विषये पौराणिकः प्रकाशः]  
 Chairman, Central Valuation Board,  
 Mayukh (Ground Floor) , Bidhan Nagar,  
 Calcutta 700091
8. Some noteworthy readings in the Kūrma Purāṇa 191-196  
 [कूर्मपुराणस्य केचन दर्शनीयाः पाठाः ]  
 By Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya;  
 All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi
9. Question Box 197-204
10. Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust 205-207
11. कर्माविवक्षायां प्रयोगसाधुत्व-विमर्शः 208-212  
 डा. रमेश चन्द्र पण्डा;  
 संस्कृतविद्याधर्मविज्ञानसंकाय,  
 काशी-हिन्दू-विश्वविद्यालय
12. श्रीमदास्करपूजोलस्य प्रबन्धस्य समीक्षणम् 213-217  
 डा. उमाकान्त चतुर्वेदी  
 संस्कृतमहाविद्यालय, मुमुक्षुभवन, वाराणसी
13. सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम् 218-220

## वैदिकग्रन्थेषु व्यासोक्तयः

(१)

नैनं वैद्युतो हिनस्ति । य एवं वेदेति । स होवाच व्यासः  
पाराशर्यः—विद्युद्वधमेवाहं मृत्युमैच्छमिति, इति

(तैत्तिरीयारण्यक १। ९। २).

(२)

एतस्माद् व्यासः पुरोवाच-भृग्वङ्गिरोविदा संस्कृतोऽन्यान् वेदान  
धीयीत नान्यत्र संस्कृतो भृग्वङ्गिरसोऽधीयीत । सामवेदेऽथ  
खिलश्रुतिब्रह्मचर्येण चैतस्मादथर्वाङ्गिरसो ह यो वेद स वेद  
सर्वमिति ब्राह्मणम्

(गोपथब्रा. पूर्वभाग १। २९)

(३)

सोऽयं प्राजापत्यो विधिः । तमिमं प्रजापतिर्बृहस्पतये प्रोवाच,  
बृहस्पति नारदाय, नारदो विश्वक्सेनाय, विश्वक्सेनो व्यासाय  
पाराशर्याय, व्यासः पाराशर्यो जैमिनये, जैमिनिः पौष्पिण्ड्याय ....

(सामविधानब्राह्मण ३।९।८)



## विष्णुस्तोत्रम्

अष्टशक्तिसहितो वनमाली पीतचैलकुसुमावलिशोभः ।  
 पङ्कजाकरविराजितपादः पातु मामवहितेन्द्रियवर्गः ॥ ११ ॥  
 भक्तहृत्कमलराजितमूर्तिर्दुष्टदैत्यदलनोत्थितकीर्तिः ।  
 बद्धसेतुरविताश्रितलोकः पातु मामनुदिनं भुवनेशः ॥ १२ ॥  
 स्थिरचलत्रिविधतापहिमांशु! भासमानतरणिप्रतिभासः ।  
 एक एव बहुधा कृतवेषो माययावतु महामतिरीशः ॥ १३ ॥  
 भक्तचिन्तनकृते कृतरूपः शैशवेन बहुशासितभूपः ।  
 वेदमार्ग उरुधा हितकारी रीतिरीशितुरियं गुणशाली ॥ १४ ॥  
 यज्ञभुग् हृदयबन्धनधारी विश्वमूर्तिरबलांशुकहारी ।  
 पालनेऽपि महतां बहुदेहो रास एष तनुमानवतान् नः ॥ १५ ॥  
 प्रेमभक्तिपुरुषैरुपलभ्यः पुरुषः कृतसमस्तनिवासः ।  
 दास्यवृन्दहृषितो निजदासः प्रेक्षणैककरुणोऽवतु विश्वम् ॥ १६ ॥  
 कण्ठलम्बिततरक्षुनखाग्रकुष्टगोपरमणीकुचभारः ।  
 लीलया युवतिभिः कृतवेषः शेष एष भवतादुपशान्त्यै ॥ १७ ॥  
 दण्डपाणिरयमेव जनानां शासितात्मनियमोक्तहितानाम् ।  
 पावनाय महतामनुशाली विश्वदुःखशमनो भवतान्नः ॥ १८ ॥  
 (स्कन्दपु.विष्णुखण्डान्तर्गतबदरिकाश्रममाहात्म्य ४।१११-११८).

R. S. BHATTACHARYA

1. This line seems to be metrically defective as it contains 12 letters. The reading may be corrected to 'चञ्चलत्रिविध .....': स्थिर-चल being opposite in nature cannot reasonably be taken as qualifying त्रिविधदुःख .



# THE BACK-GROUND OF THE PURĀNIC ETYMOLOGIES

By

TIZIANA PONTILLO

[पुराणेषु बहूनां शब्दानां निर्वचनानि विद्यन्ते । नैकहेतुप्रतिष्ठितानि इमानि निर्वचनानि । अतएव तानि क्वचित् वर्णविपर्ययमूलकानि, क्वचिद् वर्णमात्र- मूलकानि, क्वचिद् वर्णपरिवर्तनमूलकानि, क्वचिद् विश्वासविशेषमूलकानि, क्वचिदाचारमूलकानि, क्वचिल् लौकिकदृष्टिमूलकानि, क्वचित् काल्पनिकधातुमूलकानि चावलोक्यन्ते । निरुक्तेऽपि एतादृशी दृष्टिर्विद्यते ।

पुराणोक्तानामेतेषां निर्वचनानां प्रामाण्यम् अप्रामाण्या चाश्रित्य विचारणा कृता लेखकेन । पृथ्वीप्रभृतीनां केषांचन शब्दानां निर्वचनानि च विशेषतः परीक्षितानि । पुराणोक्तनिर्वचनैः सह वैदिकानां केषाञ्चन निर्वचनानां सादृश्यं वैसादृश्यं चोपदर्शितम् । ]

The subject of Purāṇic studies has often been restricted to their contents rather than to their style. Indeed the composers of the Purāṇas seem to take more care of subject matter than of its expression, which is far from grammatical accuracy<sup>1</sup>. In the Purāṇas we find many popular expressions rather than the correct words of poetic literature or grammatical tradition<sup>2</sup> and we come across many simple etymologies, explaining the phases of the world or similar mythological subjects.

Renou devotes a few pages of his History of Sanskrit<sup>3</sup> to Purāṇic language, conscious of dealing with a peculiar language worth a specific analysis. Unfortunately he too does not mention Purāṇic etymologies. Sindhu S. Dange, in an interesting work about the Purāṇic Etymologies<sup>4</sup> lists more than 300 etymology-related passages quoted from all the Purāṇas. Her book enables us to peep into the development of Sanskrit language. The given etymological inventory constitutes a kind of link between ancient and recent Sanskrit.

In her introduction she<sup>5</sup> writes: "following in the foot-steps of Yāska, they 'the composers of the Purāṇas' have tried to give the derivations of several words [...], taking recourse to several methods [...]". She mentions also some trends of the collected etymologies, namely;

- a. Etymologies based on metathesis
- b. Etymologies based on the single letters in a word, taking them as individual separate units
- c. Etymologies based on the process of assimilation
- d. Etymologies based on the loss of a letter

- e. Etymologies based on the change of one or more letters
- f. Etymologies based on a belief
- g. Etymologies based on a custom
- h. Popular etymologies
- i. Etymologies based on some hypothetical roots.

Some of these classes are referred also to the Nirukta in a work of Skold<sup>6</sup>, for instance the above-mentioned phonological rule b is the equivalent of the following Skold's rule, according to which: "In some inflected forms no sound of the original root is present or else only the consonant reappears".

Rule d is similar to another etymological trend of Skold, who notices the dropping of some elements in the etymologised words<sup>7</sup>

S.S. Dange does not proceed further with her inquiry about affinity between Purāṇic and Yāska's etymologies. She only concludes that "The composers of the Purāṇas appear to wear the mantle of Yāska", and refers to a passage of the Nirukta<sup>8</sup>, where the etymologist says that to analyse any word we should always start from its meaning (arthanityaḥ parīkṣeta)<sup>9</sup>. According to Dange, Yaska's idea "has served as a guiding principle for the composers of the Purāṇas" too.<sup>10</sup> These composers seem 'to be fully convinced' like Yāska - 'of the doubtful nature of the grammatical processes'<sup>11</sup>. As a matter of fact, in the paragraph concerning the etymological principle presented in Nirukta ii, 1, Yaska, advises that "one should not attach too much importance to the grammatical form"<sup>12</sup>

With regards to the comparison between Yāska's derivations and Pāṇini's derivations, we are led to notice with S.Bhate that<sup>13</sup>; "the difference between the two disciplines is [...] that of emphasis on one or the other aspect of derivation: it is the **phonic** similarity as well as the similarity of meaning which is of a greater significance for Yāska who attaches the least importance to regular grammatical formation, while it is the other way around in Pāṇini's grammar". The statement can be supported by noticing that in the Aṣṭādhyāyī the irregular words form a very small group, while in the Nirukta the irregular formations outnumber the regular ones.

Nevertheless Yāska mentions a general principle of etymological derivation which is valid at least for the regular words of the four word-classes, i.e. nouns and verbs, prepositions and particles (Nirukta I,12). The principle ascribed to Śākaṭāyana and to the Nairuktas (Etymologists) claims: "nāmāny ākhyātājānīti śākaṭāyano nairuktasamayaś ca",



"Śākaṭāyana holds that nouns are derived from verbs. This, too, is the doctrine of the etymologists"<sup>14</sup>.

Soon after (Nirukta I, 12), Yāska tells us of a deep controversy between Gārgya and Śākaṭāyana<sup>15</sup> : "na sarvāṇītī Gārgyo vaiyākaraṇām caike, tad yatra svarasaṁskārau samarthau prādeśikena vikāreṇānvitau syātām / saṁvijātāni tāni yathā gaur aśvaḥ puruṣo hastīti" ("not all words" - say Gārgya and some of the grammarians - but only those, the accent and grammatical form of which, are regular and which are accompanied by an explanatory radical modification. Those nouns, such as cow, horse, man, elephant &c., are conventional")<sup>16</sup>

We cannot be certain, in my opinion, that "Yāska's fundamental notion about language is that all words can be reduced to their primordial elements, which he calls roots", as Sarup affirms in his introduction to the critical edition of the Nirukta.<sup>17</sup> While relating to the controversy between Gārgya and Śākaṭāyana, Yāska makes some remarks by which the theory of the derivation of all words from roots is destroyed. Perhaps the most interesting remark is the one we can read in Nirukta I, 12: "atha cet sarvāṇy ākhyātājāni nāmāni syur yaḥ kaścātat karma kuryāt sarvaṁ tat sattvaṁ tathācakṣīran/yaḥ kaścādhvānamaśnuvītāśvaḥ sa vacanīyaḥ syāt [...] athāpi cet sarvāṇy ākhyātājāni nāmāni syur yāvadbhir bhāvaiḥ saṁprayujyeta tāvadbhyo nāmadheyapratilambhaḥ syāt", "Now, if all nouns are derived from verbs, every person who performs a particular action should be called by the same name, i.e., whosoever runs on the road should be called "runner" (aśva = horse) [...] Further, if all nouns are derived from verbs, a substantive should obtain as many names as the actions with which it connected".

However the majority of cases of the etymologies in the *Nirukta* are derived from root, in accordance with the fundamental principle of Sarup. To be more precise, out of 720 etymologies, 557 have been derived from roots. Among these, 27 words are derived from roots only, without giving any explanation or referring to any thought association with them. These words are deverbative, adjectives or substantives connected with the corresponding verb, like the word "Karma" action √kṛ make (*Nirukta* III, 1) or "kṣetram" field √kṣi dwell (*Nirukta* X, 14), or the adjective "tigma" sharp √tij sharpen (*Nirukta* X, 6). These etymologies are pure grammatical derivations. Yet for the most part etymologies are based on roots having only thought association which is implied or explained by Yāska himself. Some roots are linked with a word through a simple association of ideas; e.g. in *Nirukta* XII, 7, we read: "aruṣīr ārocanāt" (red

< ā + √ruc to shine). Actually, the colour red is one of the most vivid colours in the natural world and, moreover, it is directly connected with the symbol of fire, shining by nature. In the same manner the word "gaṇa" group, in *Nirukta* VI, 36 has been derived by Yāska from the root gaṇ to count ("gaṇo ganaṇāt") as a group is like a countable entity.

The etymologies of the *Nirukta* are not always that easy. We have for example from significant which are different from simple roots. So the etymology of the word "tugvan" ford, in *Nirukta* IV, 15, is derived from the root √gam to go, juxtaposed to the indeclinable "tūrṇam" (in a hurry). There are indeed many etymologies, which do not apply to roots but only to other significant, such as substantives, adjectives, indeclinables or compounds. Among the etymologies not concerning a derivation from a root, 72 are related to substantives, 32 to adjectives, participles or gerundives, 8 to indeclinables, 7 to pronouns, 136 to compounds and to expressions of colloquial speech<sup>18</sup>.

In noticing how many various significant are employed in these etymologies, we realize that they are quite different from the derivations set forth by western linguistics, according to whom all similar words of the Indo-European languages go back to common roots. Indeed the most famous Indian etymologist, Yāska, uses all the parts of speech to explain the origin of words. In *Nirukta* III, 15 for instance, Yāska employed the word "dhava" (man), a probable "apax", to explain the meaning of the lemma "vidhavā" (widow). The etymology given with three more alternatives is as follows: "api vā dhava iti manuṣyanāma / tadviyogād vidhavā". The definition of "widow" is right. She is the woman, who has been separated from her man. Even if "dhava" was, as it would be better to think, a word intentionally invented for this etymology, in my opinion that should not lessen the meaningfulness of the derivation. I do not feel like defining this etymology as false or unscientific, with respect to western etymologies. In order to understand the meaning or the essence of the word, it does not really help to know that "vidhavā" is connected with the Latin word "vidua" (widow, unmarried), or with the old church slavonic word "vidova" (widow) or with the Greek word "ἡθεοζ" (single). In this way the semantic field upon which the hypothetical Indoeuropean word "uidhoua" is reconstructed has been shown and we have a correct phonetic derivation. But the peculiar etymology, given by the *Nirukta*, succeeds in reaching the essence of the denoted subject of the word. Although most etymologies found in Sanskrit texts are - from scientific point of view - absolute failures, part of them are interesting and noteworthy. They



represent an important stage in the development of the etymological method and of the linguistic thought. It is inexact to consider the *Nirukta* as a grammatical study or a treatise of historical linguistics; on the contrary, we are supposed to read a treatise upon the meaning of words. A similar opinion can be read in an article of Kahrs.<sup>19</sup> "Yāska's intention was to explain the 'tattvam' or 'essence' of things by stating explicitly the semantic contents of the words denoting them"<sup>20</sup>. In the same way, the Purāṇic etymologies, while neither scientific or entirely correct and acceptable by modern standards, nevertheless are very meaningful and worthy of our serious consideration if we are to understand Indian thought or the Indian world along with its myths, traditions and logical processes. In *Śiva Purāṇa* II, Pārvatikhaṇḍa 22, 25, for instance, the name Umā (Pārvatī), the daughter of Himālaya and Menā, is derived from the exclamation "U ! Mā !" (OH ! Don't")<sup>21</sup> uttered by her mother when Umā was going to the forest for practising penance, in order to get married with Śiva: "*tapo niṣiddhā tapase vanaiḥ gantuṃ ca menayā / hetunā tena sometī nāma prāpa śivā tadā*") (As she was prevented from going to the forest for practising penance, she got the name Umā)<sup>22</sup>. The Sanskrit-English Dictionary edited by Sir Monier-Williams has the word Umā derived from the root √ve plait, interweave and Piantelli in his Italian edition of *Hindu Myths* by Wendi Doniger O'Flaherty<sup>23</sup> suggests a sanskritization of the semitic word "Um" (mother). Obviously Monier-William's and Piantelli's derivations are quite likely to be more scientific than the one of the Śiva-Purāṇa, but this latter work helps us enter the Indian world by means of an expression of the colloquial speech. Indeed, among 628 etymologies found in different Purāṇas<sup>24</sup>, of which 121 are in the Liṅga-Purāṇa, 255 are the derivations from roots, 257 from substantives, 67 from adjectives, 12 from indeclinables, 7 from pronouns, 68 from compounds and 7 from the expressions of the colloquial speech, viz only 41 % of the words are derived from a root<sup>25</sup>.

With regards to the etymologies of the Brāhmaṇas, viz. a work previous to the *Nirukta*<sup>26</sup>, Gonda shares an opinion similar to the one expressed until now about the *Nirukta* and the Purāṇas<sup>27</sup>. He claims: "These etymologies were, for the authors, an important means of penetration into the truth and reality lying behind the phenomena". The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, for instance, just as the purāṇas, does not have the linguistic research of etymologies as its main object, but aims to explain the meaning of the words and, once again just as the Purāṇas, derives the words not only from their roots but from all the parts of speech. More

precisely only 188 out of 424 examined passages, reconnect the etymology to a root whereas there are 129 words derived from substantives, 45 from adjectives, participles or gerundives, 11 from indeclinables, 7 from pronouns, 61 from compounds, 8 from expressions of colloquial speech.

While in the Nirukta the derivations from roots were 77% of all the etymologized words, in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and in the Purāṇas they are only about 40 %<sup>28</sup>. Special emphasis has to be placed on the percentage of the etymologies from substantives in these two latter works: in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa they constitute 31 % and among the 628 Puranic etymologies considered they constitute 41 %. In the Nirukta they constitute only 10%.

Therefore we can assume an evolution of the etymological system, which aims to make all the words derive first from roots and then from all the significant, especially from the substantives. We might as well set the limits of the first history of the Sanskrit etymologies with the Brāhmaṇas on one side and with the method established by Pāṇini on the other. In the Brāhmaṇas we have a wide range of significant, from which the words are made to derive. On the contrary, in the Aṣṭādhyāyī the analysis of all the words in stem and suffix is employed in the attempt to relate all the words to a root. The etymologies of the contemporary Nirukta<sup>29</sup> (only 77% from root) are more irregular: Scharfe explains its "apparent archaism" as "the special in some ways conservative position of the etymologists"<sup>30</sup>

Afterwards when Yāska has established the etymological rules, the Purāṇas wandered from them with their derivations coming from different significant, especially from substantives, and, in their derivations, went back to the etymologies of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. But when Yāska writes<sup>31</sup> *athāpi sattvapūrvo bhāva ity āhuḥ/ aparasmād bhāvāt pūrvasya prade'so nopapadyata iti* ("Further, it is said that a becoming is preceded by a being, hence the designation of a prior {becoming} is not tenable"), in my opinion, he points us this etymological method that we find in the Purāṇas; he advises us of deriving the "becoming" (verbs) from the "being" (substantives) and not vice versa. Perhaps the Purāṇas, which aim, among other things, to recount the antiquities of the Indian world, are filled with mythological digressions, which deal exhaustively with varṇas and consequently lists numerous names of gods, Ṛṣi, kings etc. It is clear therefore that the Purāṇas are overflowing with substantives and above all with proper nouns.



Observing the etymologies which relate to the proper nouns <sup>32</sup>, in order to explain the starting point of the nouns of Ṛṣi or of gods, of characters, of mythological places, which the Purāṇas plentifully describe, we can assume a genesis of such a method of derivations from substantives for the Purāṇas. In Agni Purāṇa 112, 6cd, for instance, the derivation of the name of Benaras is exposed, referring to two geographic names: "*Varaṇā ca nadī nāsī madhye vārāṇasī tayoh*" ("the city of Vārāṇasī is in between the rivers, Varaṇā and Nāsī. Hence it is known as Vārāṇasī")<sup>33</sup> In *Skanda Purāṇa* IV, 18cd-19cd we also find an interesting explanation of the names Varaṇā and Asi, derived respectively from the causal root *ni+√ṽṛ* to ward off (because Varaṇā wards off obstacles at the holy place) and from the compound "mahāsi" great sword (because Asi has the form of a big sword).

In the *Nirukta* too, there are many etymologies of proper nouns coming from other proper nouns, which later are derived from common nouns. Yāska, for instance, dealing with patronimics or matronimics often gives us also the derivation of the father's name and of the mother's name, proceeding with his inquiry into the etymology. Indeed in the *Nirukta* (*Nirukta* VI, 10), for instance, we read: "*Uśijaḥ putraḥ auśija/uśij vaṣṭeḥ kāntikarmaṇaḥ*" ("Auśija son of Uśij; Vśij is derived from the root *√vaś*, meaning to desire"). In *Nirukta* IX, 24 we read also: "*Bhārmyaśvo bhṛmyaśvasya putraḥ/bhṛmyaśvo bhṛmayo'syāśvāḥ. aśvabharaṇād vā*" ("Bhārmyaśva a son of Bhṛmyaśva. Bhṛmyaśva means one whose horses are always wandering, or he is so called from horse-breeding").

In *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* I, 13 88 we read an instructive etymology which employs a name to explain a common noun: "*prānapradānāt sa pṛthur yasmād bhūmer abhūt pitā/tatas tu pṛhivīsaṁjñām avāpākhiladhāriṇī*" ("Due to his bestowing life (upon the earth), Pṛthu became the father of the earth. Therefore he who gives sustenance attained the name Pṛthivī")<sup>34</sup>. "Pṛthivī" (earth), in *Nirukta* I, 13-14, had been the earth of the matter of the aforesaid controversy between Śakaṭāyana and Gārgya. One of the objections to the theory according to which all words are derived from verbs, had been introduced by means of the example of "Pṛthivī". In *Nirukta* I, 13, it had been observed: "*athāpi niṣpanne' bhivyāhāre' bhivicārayanti/prathanāt pṛthivīty āhuḥ/ka enām aprathayisyat/kim ādhāraśceti*" "Further, people indulge in sophistry with regard to current expressions, e.g., they declare that 'Pṛthivī' is so called on account of being spread (prath) but who could have spread it, and what was the base?". Tho the objection Yāska replies evading the question: "It is, indeed, broad to look at ("*atha vai darśanena pṛthuḥ*"), even if it is not spread by others ("*aprathitā ced anyaiḥ*")"<sup>35</sup>.

But the link between the root quoted and the word "Pṛthivī", which the author the *Nirukta* refuses to search for, may be found in *Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa* VI, 1, 1, 15<sup>36</sup>. Yāska seems to have forgotten the myth, hidden behind the etymology of the word "Pṛthivī" which is apparently linked to the root √prath to spread. The passage in the *Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa* is: "tām aprathayat sā pṛthivy abhavat", "He spreads ('aprathayat') it and became Pṛthivī". The subject "sā" does not allude to "pṛthivī" earth but to a different subject, formerly presented: "abhūd vā'iyam pratiṣṭheti/tad bhūmir abhavat", "viz., it became ("abhūd"), indeed, a basis (pratiṣṭhā=safe place, basis); afterwards became "bhūmi" (earth)". The female pronoun employed in the former passage therefore, is not "Pṛthivī" but "bhūmi", which means "earth" as "Pṛthivī". With the help of this passage of the *Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa*, what the basis ("ādharma"=basis, ground), on which the earth had been spread becomes apparent. In *Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa* I, 1, 6, the creation of the world by Prajāpati is described; then to the question "ka enām aprathayiṣyat" (Who could have spread it ?) we must answer "Prajāpatir enām aprathayat". Viṣṇu-Purāṇa I, 13, 88 has given a very different etymology: it has joined Pṛthivī to Pṛthu. The mythological link, between the earth and a king, was created perhaps because the matter dealt with the etymology of a patronymic noun.<sup>37</sup> The authors of the *Nirukta* and of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* settle the etymology of Pṛthivī in a different way from the *Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa*. Yāska resorts to a root, according to his main etymological principle, whereas the composer of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* resorts to a proper noun as his rule, referring the derivation to another myth.<sup>38</sup>

1. Renou too, in *Histoire de la Langue Sanskrite (Les langues du monde)*, Lyon 1956, 116, claims: "En gros, la langue purāṇique nest autre que la langue de l'épopée privée de ses archaïsmes et, en majeure partie, de ses singularités morphologiques. Ceci ne veut pas dire que le Purāṇa soient écrits en sanskrit correct [...]".
2. L. Renou, *op. cit.*, 117: "On craindrait de parler de sanskrit populaire [...] Il faudrait dire plutôt: sanskrit desentrave par rapport à Pāṇini".
3. L. RENOUE, *op. cit.*, 215-224.
4. S.S DANGE *Purāṇic Etymologies and Flexible Forms (Some glimpses)*, Aligarh 1989.
5. S.S.DANGE, *op. cit.*, 2.
6. H. SKOLD *The Nirukta. Its Place in Old Indian Literature. Its Etymologies*, Lund 1926, 179-181
7. Skold (*op. cit.*, 179-180) writes: "The middle element may be dropped [...] A consonant is dropped before another [...] Two sounds may be dropped".
8. The passage is *Nirukta* II, 1 (The Nighaṇṭu and the *Nirukta*. Critically Edited from original Manuscripts and Translated for the first time in English, with Introduction, Exegetical and Critical Notes, Indexes and Appendices by L. Sarup, Delhi 1920-1927, 44): "āthānanvite 'rthe 'prādeṣike vikāre 'rthanityaḥ parikṣeta kenacid



vṛttisāmānyena/ avidyamāne sāmānye 'py akṣarvarṇasāmāyān nirbrūyāt/na tv eva na nirbrūvāt".

L.SARUP (*op.cit.*, 21) translates this passage in this way: "In case the accent and grammatical forms are not regular and are not accompanied with a radical modification, one should always take his stand on the meaning of the word and endeavour to derive it from some similarity of form, or if there is no such similarity, of a single letter or syllable".

9. We can find the same principle in Nirukta II, 7: "*tāni cet samānakarmāṇi/ samānānirvacanāni/nānākarmāṇi cen nānānirvacanāni*" ("If their [of nouns] meanings are uniform their etymologies are uniform; if their meanings are multiform, their etymologies are multiform")
10. S.S. DANGE, *op.cit.*, 2.
11. "viṣayavatyō hi vṛttayo bhavanti" (Nirukta II, 1).
12. "na saṁskāram ādriyeta" (Nirukta II, 1).
13. S.BHATE, Pāṇini and Yāska: principles of derivation, "A.B.O. R. i." , LXII (1981),241.
14. The composer of Uṇādi sūtras too seems to be convinced that all words derive from roots. The formation of Uṇādi words is very arbitrary and complicated but lets us by means of Uṇādi suffixes relate derivative words of uncertain bottom to roots, which are held to be their origin.
15. We know very little about them. The works running under their name are spurious and their quotations are highly suspect. Scharfe in Grammatical Literature (A History of Indian Literature edited by J. Gonda, V, 2), Wiesbaden 1977, 85 in account of the Nirukta I, 12 claims: "From these sentences it is clear that Śākaṭāyana was not an etymologist but a grammarian; and that Gārgya was not a grammarian. But Gārgya cannot have been an etymologist [...] because the etymologists subscribed all to the doctrine of general derivability". Perhaps Gārgya was the author of the Pada-pāṭha of the Sāmaveda.
16. In introduction to The Uṇādi Sūtras printed in The Siddhānta Kaumudī, ed. and trans. by Ś C.Vasu, Delhi - Varanasi -Patna 1962, 145-146, Dr.Rajendralal Mitra holds that the Nairuktas or etymologists (except Gārgya) "prove the possibility of the undertaking, by the *Nirukta* and Uṇādi Sūtras [...] that all nouns derive their origin from verbs", whereas the Vaiyākaraṇas or grammarians and the etymologist Gārgya "deny the possibility of deriving the Uṇādi words from verbal roots". This author thus interprets the two classes of scholars in ancient India, considered by Yāska in a different way. The Nairuktas claim that the Uṇādi words can be derived from verbal roots, while Vaiyākaraṇas remark that the Uṇādi words cannot be derived from verbal roots.
17. "Yāska's fundamental notion about language is that all words can be reduced to their primordial elements which he calls roots" (L.Sarup, *op.cit.*, 57).
18. Adding the ciphers, given for the different classes of derivations, we have a number bigger than 720, which is the total of the passages entirely considered. It is apparent that the difference between two numbers is due to the great number of words, whose manifold alternative etymologies have been given.
19. E.KAHR'S *Yāska's Nirukta : the quest for a new interpretation.*, "Indologica Taurinensia", XII (1984), 142.
20. SKold in *The Nirukta. Its Place in Old Indian Literature. its etymologies*, Lund 1926, 174, claims : "It is often rather difficult to decide what is an etymology, and what is not {....}. I have decided to take the term 'etymology' in as broad a sense as possible [....] I have also incidentally noted some explanations of pure sematological purport".
21. This popular etymology seems to resort to the pattern of mother whom we find in the scientific etymology of Sanskrit word *ambā* (mother). It is derived, according to R.C. Hazra - V. R. C. HAZRA *The words tryambaka and ambikā, Purāṇa*, XXIV, 1

- (1982), 41-62- from the root amb to sound. Indeed Hazra notices that the mother is so called, "because a naturally affectionate mother (even among the lower animals) has to make particular sounds to warn her little children against dangers or to call them to her side for thier safety". The sounds uttered by Menā, in order to warn her daughter against the danger of extremely drawn out penance are "U! Ma!".
22. We can find the same etymology also in Padma-Purāṇa, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa 40, 289 - 290 ab.
  23. W.DONIGER O'FLAHERTY, *Hindu Myths. A Sourcebook translated from the Sanskrit*, Aylesbury 1975; Edizione italiana a cura di M.Piantelli, Dall'ordine il caos, Parma 1989.
  24. Apart from the Liṅga-Purāṇa and the Brāhmavaivarta-Purāṇa, that I analyzed myself. I rely on the account of the etymologies given by S.S Dange (*op.cit.*).
  25. Even If we take into consideration only the etymologies of the Liṅga-Purāṇa in order to employ the datum coming from a research into a whole work, the results do not change so much. They show 48 cases of etymologies from roots, 33 from substantives, 14 from adjectives, 1 from indeclinables, 25 from compounds. The derivation from pronouns and from the expressions of the colloquial speech quite disappear, but we find a lot of derivations from substantives and from compounds.
  26. The *Nirukta* dates back to V o IV century B.C., whereas the *Brāhmaṇas* date back to the period ranging from the Xth century until the VIIIth century B. C. Cf. O.BOTTO, *Letterature antiche dell'India* (Storia delle letterature d'Oriente), Milano 1967, 7; 32.
  27. J.GONDA, *The Etymologies in the Ancient Indian Brāhmaṇas*, "Lingua, International Review of general linguistics" 5 (1955), 61.
  28. in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa the words derived from a root are 44% and among the Purāṇic etymologies considered are 41%.
  29. Cf. H.SCHARFE, *Grammatical Literature* (A History of Indian Literature edited by J. Gonda, V, 2), Wiesbaden 1977, 117-123.
  30. H.SCHARFE, *op.cit.*, 118.
  31. *Nirukta* I, 13 (controversy between Gārgya and Śakaṭāyana).
  32. We can find other etymologies relating to a proper noun in *Brahma Purāṇa* IV, 113; *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* I, Brahmakhaṇḍa, 9, 11; *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*, Prakṛti khaṇḍa I IX, 33a; *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* I, 2, 37, 3cd; *Matsya Purāṇa* 50, 32; *Skanda Purāṇa* IV, 30, 69cd-70ab, *Vāmana Purāṇa* I, 3, 27, 28ab-30ab.
  33. This text might be corrupt. Different readings give "*Varanā ca cāsīr madhye*" This etymology from Varāṇā and Asī (instead of Nāsī) is reported also in *Vāmana Purāṇa* I, 3, 27, 28 ab-30ab (Varāṇā+Asī) and in *Skanda Purāṇa* IV, 30, 69cd-70ab (Varāṇā+Asī).
  34. We can find the same etymology of Pṛthivī derived from Pṛthu in *Brahma Purāṇa* IV, 113, in *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* I, 2, 37cd, in *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* I, Prakṛtikhaṇḍa 9, 33a.
  35. We can find a similar idea in ancient Bulgarian word "strana" country, whose etymology resorts to the indo-european root str̥ to spread.
  36. The same myth of "Pṛthivī" is quoted by means of the same words also in *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* VI, 1, 3, 7.
  37. It is not surprising to find on the etymological field names and common nouns examined in the same way. the aim of Indian etymologies is always to catch the essence of the subject denotated by the tested words, either referring to things, or to animals, or to persons. A similar custom was common in the Greek epic poetry and in the tragedies whose authors attributed the so-called "nomen-omen" to their characters.
  38. Out of 628 Purāṇic etymologies considered, quite a third (201) of them uses a myth to explain the etymologised word.



# BHAKTI (DEVOTION) IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE PURĀṆĀS

BY

RAGHUNATH GIRI

[पुराणेषु महाभारते च भक्तेः स्वरूपं माहात्म्यं प्रामाण्यं फलं च यथा वर्णितं तदत्रोपस्थापितं समासविस्तराभ्यां यथायथम्, श्रुतिमतैः सह एतेषां सादृश्यमपि दर्शितम् । विषयेऽस्मिन् आधुनिक विदुषां मतान्यपि दर्शितानि । भक्तिपरक-ग्रन्थानां शाण्डिल्यसूत्रादीनां मतान्यपि अन्तरान्तरा पुराणमतोपोद्वलकरूपेण उद्धृतानि ।

भक्तेः कतिपये भेदा दृष्टिभेदाश्रिताः पुराणेषु प्रतिपादिताः । एतेषां भेदानां सविस्तरं विवरणमत्र प्रदत्तम् ; श्रवणादीनि भक्तेरङ्गानि च विवृतानि ।]

In the synthetic philosophy of the Śiva Purāṇā Devotion (*bhakti*) or service (*Sevā*) of Śiva is regarded as the chief means to attain Śiva's abode<sup>1</sup> or supreme reality (*Sat Vastu*)<sup>2</sup>, the supreme goal of human life. According to this synthetical approach *bhakti* does not exclude other means, it includes them. The means are often classified under three heads; devotion, detachment and knowledge,<sup>3</sup> but *bhakti* dominates them. It is more inclusive and certain than the others. On the one hand it generates knowledge<sup>4</sup> and detachment and on the other hand it makes the devotee able to obtain both pleasure (*bhukti*) and liberation<sup>5</sup>. The devotion to supreme Reality produces such a mental satisfaction in the devotee that he does not desire the wordly goals (*Artha, Dharma, Kāma*) any more. The supreme goal liberation seems to be at hand for him, because the veil of ignorance, the mystery of the world and secrecy of supreme Reality do not obstruct him<sup>6</sup>. All the other sources such as the Vedas, penances and the scriptures do not reveal supreme Reality so vividly as is revealed by devotion.<sup>7</sup>

## Faith as The Root of Devotion and The Means of Supreme Knowledge

Devotion is not only the chief means of liberation but also of supreme knowledge. We shall discuss the nature of devotion later on : here we take it for granted that faith is the root of devotion. And on this assumption, we consider the role of faith in gaining knowledge. Faith is often condemned and rejected as an unreliable source of knowledge by both scientists and metaphysicians. The modern world is distinguished from the ancient world

on account of scientific equipment, scientific method and scientific temper. All concepts, assertions and assumptions, which depend upon faith are criticised and rejected. None of them is reliable from the scientific standpoint. Science has developed new temper which plays a dominant part in the modern society. Stating the importance of this scientific temper Dr. Radhakrishnan has said, "The scientific temper with its restless intellectual questioning, its reluctance to accept anything on trust, its capacity to doubt has been the spur to all adventure and experiment. It does not accept any view without scrutiny or criticism, and is free to ask questions and doubt assertions, This spirit has given us an amazing mastery over the material environment.<sup>8</sup> The scientific method has given a new mode of thinking and believing. Nothing is accepted without proper scrutiny, examination and sufficient ground. To accept anything without proper and sufficient ground is treated as non-scientific and is regarded as dogmatic acceptance or groundless assertion. But the advocates of this scientific method forget the limitations of this method. As this method relies upon material instruments, it can examine, test and scrutinize only material things. It cannot go beyond the material world. All its assertion and rejection would be reliable only in this sphere. If it asserts or rejects something beyond its limitation, it would not be a true assertion or true rejection. If the scientific method is regarded as trustworthy and universal method on account of its emphasis on the principle that nothing should be accepted without sufficient ground, then the other aspect of this method should not be overlooked. If to accept anything without sufficient ground is unscientific, then to reject any thing without sufficient ground is also unscientific. But the advocates of this method emphasize the first aspect only and do not care for the second. And due to this they not only criticize but reject all the religious views regarding the nature of Soul, God, virtues, vices etc. But when it is judged impartially, it is very clear that on the one hand these concepts are beyond their sphere and on the other hand their rejection is made without sufficient ground. As the scientists reject objects of faith regarding it as dogmatic and blind, so the metaphysicians also reject the objects of faith on the same ground. According to the reasoning (*tarka*) only can be the valid means of knowing in this sphere, where senses and scientific method fail to function. The method of reasoning is supreme in the field of metaphysics. All assertions, criticism, denial and rejection in metaphysics are based on reasoning.

There are certain philosophers, who are not prepared to regard any view or thought, which is not based on reasoning, as philosophical



thought. For them reasoning or rational arguments for and against are the only means to accept and reject any concept, any view or any opinion. Any assertion and rejection without this is unreal, false and unphilosophical. There is no place for faith in philosophy according to them. To have faith means to accept anything without reasoning and to accept anything without reasoning is a blind acceptance, a dogmatic assertion. But if we consider the real scope of reasoning, we see that metaphysicians have given more importance to reasoning than it deserves. Undoubtedly reasoning is an important means, but it is not the final and complete means to reveal Reality. Like perception and scientific method it also has its limitation. It depends upon intellect which is not absolute but relative. The relativity and different grades of intellect are sufficient to show the limitation of reasoning. Nothing can be universal and absolute, if its ground is relative. The superiority and inferiority of intellect would make the reasoning superior and inferior. Thus the principle proved by one person with the help of inferior reasoning can be disproved or rejected by some superior reasoning. Vyāsa has rightly observed this inability of reasoning when he says that reasoning does not stand on very firm ground. Nothing can be proved finally and absolutely by the help of reasoning. Moreover, it can function rightly only in the sphere of intellect. The thing beyond the approach of intellect cannot be proved or disproved by reasoning.<sup>9</sup> The limitation of reasoning is shown by Kaṭha and Muṇḍaka Upaniṣads, when they assert that the nature of soul (*Ātmā*) is beyond the approach of reasoning and intellect.

The limitation of perception, scientific method, and reasoning, forces us to rely on some other means of valid knowledge to proceed towards the enquiry into the nature of supreme Reality, which is beyond the approach of intellect, mind, speech, reasoning and observation. Sāṅkhya and Vedānta accept verbal testimony as the means of valid knowledge enabling us to go beyond the sphere of reasoning. To accept verbal testimony as a means of knowledge is nothing but to realize the importance of faith. Faith is neither blind nor dogmatic in its own sphere. It becomes so when it interferes with the sphere of experience and reasoning and tries to establish its monopoly in this sphere also. In the sphere of the empirical world faith cannot reject experience and reasoning. But beyond that, faith is as reliable as reasoning in its own sphere. The sages of the Upaniṣads have also accepted the importance of faith for spiritual realization. We find a story in Chāndogya Upaniṣad, in which Uddālaka, the father, teaches his son, Śvetaketu. The subject-matter

of his teaching is the nature of supreme Brahman, who is attributeless, indeterminate, unknowable and yet the cause of the whole universe. The father tries his best to convince his son by many arguments, but the son always expresses his doubt. Then the father asks his son to bring a fruit of a banyan tree and to see into it. The son does so and replies after the enquiry of the father, that he perceives seeds inside the fruit. The father again asks the son to break the seed and to look into it and to tell him what he perceives. The son does so and replies that he perceives nothing there. Then the father persuades the son to keep faith in this "nothing" which is the cause of the big tree. Really speaking it is not nothing but something about which it is not possible to say anything. It is only a matter of faith<sup>10</sup>. This faith does not mean mere acceptance; it means firm assurance in the inner heart. Faith prompts us to proceed towards spiritual enquiry. If we analyse the faculties of human mind, we find that faith has an essential place. It is such a simple mode of consciousness that it cannot be further analysed. Human mind cannot function properly without it in life. In the words of Dr. Radhakrisnan we can say that to live without faith is impossible<sup>11</sup>. Faith functions in two ways; on the one hand, it becomes the ground of all empirical knowledge, scientific invention as well as of reasoning; and on the other hand it helps us to proceed further than the approach of reasoning and sense experience. The Gītā also asserts that faith is the prerequisite of pure knowledge, and Vāyaviya Saṁhitā declares faith as the basis of all spiritual activities. Faith is the easiest way to realize the supreme nature of Śiva. All the other means such as karma, penance, meditation, knowledge, etc., become fruitful only in the company of faith. They are futile without faith

Faith (Śraddhā) is essential also for devotion. The term Śraddhā is used from the time of Ṛgveda, and denotes some kind of emotional attitude. The sages of Ṛgveda realize the importance of faith in burning the sacrificial fire and in offering the oblation in it.<sup>12</sup> The Yajurveda mantra states that Satya (Truth) was offered to Śraddhā, while asatya (falsehood) was given to Aśraddhā.<sup>13</sup> Sāyaṇa in the commentary on the above mantra says that the emotional attitude (Abhilāṣa) in the person (Puruṣagata) is śraddhā. The Vedānta-Sāra defines faith as belief on the spiritual teaching of the guru.<sup>14</sup> So far as we think Sāyaṇa's definition seems to be more reliable because it hints towards the origin or psychological nature of faith. It seems to us also that faith is some kind of emotional aspect of mind. It may differ from person to person as it depends upon the mind of the individual. The Gītā classified faith into



three kinds based on the dominance of the *guṇās* viz. *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. These three kinds of *Śraddhā* can be distinguished by the help of their objects respectively. According to the *Gītā*, a person of *Sāttvika śraddhā* worships God, and one of *rājasika śraddhā* worships *yakṣas* and *rakṣasas* and the person of *tāmasika śraddhā* worships devils and ghosts. Thus *śraddhā* is determined by the natural disposition of the mind and expresses in the object of belief. The *Vāyavīya Saṁhitā* also accepts the three classes of the persons according to their mental attitude (*bhāva or śraddhā*). It states that the person of *śāttvika bhāva* proceeds towards liberation, the person of *Rājasika bhāva* proceeds towards accomplishments, and person of *Tāmasika bhāva* goes towards merely sensual pleasure.<sup>15</sup>

### The Nature of Devotion

To be clear about the nature of *Bhakti*, it seems necessary to discuss a few definitions of devotion given by the exponents of devotion. *Śāṅḍilya* in his *Sūtra* defines *bhakti* as supreme attachment to God (*sā parānuraktirīśvare*). In this definition the word *parā* (Supreme) may be regarded as an adjective of the second word *anurakti* (attachment) and in that case the definition would be like this "supreme attachment to God is devotion". *Svapneśvara*, the commentator on *Śāṅḍilyasūtra*, does not think it proper to make the word 'parā' as the adjective of *anurakti*. He clearly says that the word 'parā' is not a part of definition. It is used here to distinguish this devotion from the secondary devotion (*gauṇī bhakti*) defined and explained by the same author in his *sūtra* 2.20. He further says that the word *īśvara* (God), shows the supreme aim of devotion and excludes the lower aims; as devotion means simply the attachment to the object of faith and love. According to *Svapneśvara*, *Śāṅḍilya* does not want to include other objects of faith in devotion and so he gives the word *īśvara* to exclude the remaining objects from the object of devotion. Thus here devotion means the emotional attitude towards God. As a mental mode or faculty of mind it can be compared with the attachment of a person to the objects of sensual pleasure. *Prahlāda* wants to get the same pleasure (*prīti*) in God, which is obtained by the common man in the objects of sensual pleasure.<sup>16</sup> *Svapneśvara* explains the word *prīti* as *āśakti* (attachment) and argues in the support of his explanation that the locative suffix is possible only when the meaning would be accepted according to his explanation. If it is interpreted as the pleasure produced by the objects, the locative suffix would not be possible because there is no



rule for locative suffix in this sense. Attachment is always associated with pleasure. Hence attachment may be called *prīti*. Patañjali also accepts the necessary relation of pleasure and attachment. Putting simply the description of Svapneśvara, we can say that attachment to God is devotion. It differs from the occasional meditation and the occasional worship of God. The latter cannot be called devotion as there is neither eternity nor continuity in them. Similarly this attachment of God differs from the knowledge of God. The former is devotion but the latter cannot be devotion. Their differences can be explained with the help of some empirical illustrations. Attachment and love can be synonyms. But knowledge and love cannot be so. We can say without any misunderstanding that we know our enemies, but we never mean thereby that we love our enemies. If both the words love and knowledge are regarded as synonyms, the above two expressions would be equivalent. As we accept the first statement and reject the second, so it is clear that knowledge is not devotion.<sup>17</sup>

Śāṅḍilya seems to be very careful to differentiate devotion from action (*karman*) and knowledge (*jñāna*). He argues that devotion and actions (sacrifices etc.) cannot be identified because action depends upon the sweet will of the doer (agent)<sup>18</sup> and brings limited and transitory results but devotion neither depends upon the sweet will of the agent nor gives limited pleasure. In empirical experience also the attachment of a person towards his son and wife does not depend upon his free will. Sometimes this type of attachment is seen even against the sweet will of a person. Hence it seems that devotion as attachment cannot be dependent on the sweet will of the devotee. In this way it differs from action which depends upon the sweet will of the agent. Our scriptures emphatically state that the results of karma are impure, transitory and of decaying nature<sup>19</sup> while the result of devotion is eternal and infinite. Similarly Śāṅḍilya<sup>20</sup> tries to prove that knowledge and devotion cannot be identical, because these two do not create the same mental attitude. Attachment is differentiated only on account of its objects, son, wife, wealth and God. But knowledge is distinguished, on the one hand on the basis of its different objects, and on the other on the basis of its effects upon the mind, for example, the knowledge of a friend and knowledge of an enemy. Both these varieties of knowledge have different objects as well as different effects. The former produces a favourable attitude while the latter produces an unfavourable attitude. Śāṅḍilya concludes that attachment or love or devotion is absolutely different from action and knowledge,

because attachment is opposed to hatred (dveṣa) but neither knowledge nor action is likewise opposed to (dveṣa).<sup>21</sup> In other words we can say that love and hatred related to one object cannot exist together in the mind of a person. None can say that he loves and also hates a person at the same time. But there is no psychological difficulty in saying that he knows and hates him. Swapneśvara explains the statement of Śāṅḍilya that devotion is the opposite of hatred. He points out that it does not mean that devotion is something negative, the absence of hatred or indifference. It is a positive emotional attitude and it differs from hatred not only in its nature but also in its motivation. Hatred makes one depart from the thing hated but attachment makes one endeavour to obtain the object of attachment. It seems from the above description that devotion may be identified with desire, because desire stands against hatred in both the ways, in its nature as well as in its motivation. Therefore Svapneśvara distinguishes devotion from desire also. He says that devotion is not like other mental modes. It is a special attribute of the soul. This is a permanent path to obtain the supreme abode (God). That which is not like this is not devotion, e. g. hatred. Though attachment is very similar to desire, it is not desire because desire may be possible for a thing which may exist or may not exist, or may be a transitory thing but devotion is possible only to a permanent Being (God). It is a peculiar kind of emotional attitude which is expressed in the following ways 'I take delight in him', I am very much pleased with him or 'I am attached to him'.<sup>22</sup> Nārada agrees with Śāṅḍilya about the nature of devotion. He also defines devotion as supreme love.<sup>23</sup> He also distinguishes this love from desire and argues that desire cannot amount to devotional attitude, because on the one hand it is directed by selfishness, and on the other hand it proceeds towards worldly objects. But there is no chance of selfishness in devotion; it dawns after cessation of all desire either for worldly objects or for heavenly objects<sup>24</sup> It is very clear that this devotion is not a mere renunciation or negation or absence of one or another mental mode. It is a positive emotional attitude, the singleheartedness towards God and indifference to all that is antagonistic to Him.<sup>25</sup> Nārada mentions some other views on devotion.<sup>26</sup> He says that Parāśara regards devotion as the love for the worship of God.<sup>27</sup> According to Garga, it is indulgence in the contemplation of His glory and greatness.<sup>28</sup> Nārada states that Śāṅḍilya harmonises both these views and says that devotion is love of His worship and indulgence in the discussion of his glory and greatness. Nārada, giving his own conclusive view, says that devotion is the dedication of all observances whatsoever to Him, and



the feeling of extreme uneasiness in losing Him from one's memory.<sup>29</sup> This constant love of God is complete peace, self-proved, indescribable and pure bliss like the dumb man's enjoyment of some tasteful thing.<sup>30</sup> It is ever-growing and ceaseless flow of a subtle feeling.<sup>31</sup> The Śiva Purāṇa agrees with Nārada and Śaṅḍilya about the nature of devotion. The Koṭirudra Saṁhitā defines devotion as the sprout of pure love (*śatpremāṅkura*).<sup>32</sup> As it seems to us, the word 'sat' as the adjective of love shows permanence and purity in it and the metaphorical expression of love as sprout shows the single-pointedness and ever-growing nature of the sprout of love. The first adjective excludes the condition and selfish motive from love and the second expression excludes staleness from it.

We see that all these three views regarding the nature of devotion are similar in the sense that all of them agree that devotion is a mode of mind; it is an emotional attitude, though they call the same emotional attitude by different names such as anurakti, parama-prema or satpremāṅkura. Now we try to discuss two important questions which arise on the issue that devotion is an emotional mode, and which are answered in different ways by different thinkers. The first question is, "Is devotion a blind mental attitude" ? and the second : " Does it mean a special mode or any mode or all modes of mind ? " According to Nārada, the first question is replied negatively. He states that love is not a blind mode of mind. And a devotee should not accept anything blindly. He should have always the knowledge of the majesties of the Lord. If devotion were to be regarded as a mere instinct, love without reason, how could it be distinguished and differentiated from animal love ? . Animal love can be compared to the love of a paramour who seeks his beloved only for sexual enjoyment. All his efforts, surrender and renunciation are guided by this mean selfish motive. But devotion is completely free from such a motive. The devotee proceeds towards the love of God with the knowledge that it is his only goal to please God, and he feels pleasure in pleasing Him. Devotion is not a give and take business like sale and purchase, it is voluntary surrender of one's own pleasures to please the supreme Lord with complete knowledge of one's own weakness and the glory of the Lord.<sup>33</sup> Śaṅḍilya does not agree with Nārada on this issue. He is not ready to accept knowledge as the prerequisite of devotion. He does not negate the presence of knowledge before devotion; he simply negates its causal relation to devotion. He says that it may be possible in many cases of devotion, that knowledge exists prior to devotion and becomes helpful in strengthening it but this does not mean that without knowledge devotion can never arise.



Devotion is an emotional attitude of mind and may arise even without knowledge. He supports his view with an illustration of the attachment of a young woman to a handsome young man. She begins to love him or is attached to him at first sight. Her love or attachment does not wait for the knowledge of the merits of the young man. Śāṅḍilya gives historical examples of such love which does not require knowledge as its pre-requisite. He says that the wives of the cowherds of Vṛndāvana were attracted by and attached to Śrī Kṛṣṇa only by his handsomeness. They are regarded as devotees and they achieved liberation.<sup>34</sup> In the synthetic approach of the Purāṇa, this problem is solved in two ways. On the one hand, there is no difference in knowledge and devotion (when knowledge and devotion are taken in their supreme sense), therefore the question of one being the pre-requisite of the other does not arise. And on the other hand, in the lower state of knowledge and devotion, they are mutually dependent. Without some knowledge devotion is not possible, and without some faith knowledge is not possible. It asserts that a person may get some knowledge without devotion, but his knowledge does not amount to discriminative knowledge.<sup>35</sup> But a person having devotion obtains discriminative knowledge.

Now we may take up the second question for consideration. To make the second question more clear we may put it in this way; should emphasis be laid on mental state or on the object? If we lay emphasis on the mental mode we can say that one or another mode is devotion. But if we put emphasis on the object (God) towards which the mental modes are directed, we can say that any mental mode can amount to devotion provided it proceeds towards God. The Bhagavadgītā suggests the possibility of worshipping God with *Sarvabhāva*, and it is differently interpreted by Ācārya Śaṅkara and Ānanda Giri. According to Śaṅkara *sarvabhāva* means *sarvātmabhāva*. It means that the devotee should worship God regarding Him as the soul of every thing.<sup>36</sup> But according to Ānanda Giri, *sarvabhāva* means all mental states including speech and action also.<sup>37</sup> We see that both these views can be supported by one or the other verse of the Gītā. When Lord Kṛṣṇa identifies Himself with all beings and says that nothing is beyond him,<sup>38</sup> he refers to His *puruṣottama* form which penetrates the three worlds<sup>39</sup> and asserts that those who know Him as *Puruṣottama*, know Him as all, and worship Him with *Sarvabhāva*.<sup>40</sup> He also asserts that those who perceive Him in all beings and perceive all beings in Him, never forget Him and also remain always in His mind.<sup>41</sup> All these references stand in the support of Śaṅkara's interpretation.<sup>42</sup>

But in other context, Kṛṣṇa asks Arjuna to fix his mind on Him, to be devoted to Him, to adore Him as well as to make obeisance to Him.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, He asks Arjuna to offer Him every thing, whatever he eats or whatever he performs as sacrifices, offerings or penance. He further states that the devotees who fix their mind on Him with complete faith and worship Him with all devotion, are regarded as the best Yogis.<sup>44</sup> These statements favour the interpretation of Ānandagiri. The Śīva Purāṇa also follows the tradition of the Gītā and supports both kinds of Sarvabhāva. The Vāyavīyasamhitā states that Śīva pervades the universe with His eight-fold form<sup>45</sup>. Thus all the beings are the different names and different forms of Śīva. In other words, they are Śīva in different forms and different names. Thus to worship Śīva means to worship all beings, and vice versa the worship of all beings is the worship of Śīva. It is not necessary to give water to each part of a tree to nourish it. To water the root is to nourish the whole, the trunk, branches, leaves and flowers.

Similarly when Śīva is worshipped and satisfied, the whole universe as the different parts of his body is nourished and satisfied. We see that a father or a grandfather becomes happy to know the satisfaction and pleasure of his son and grand-son, similarly Śīva as the father of all beings, feels happy to see all beings happy. Thus the worship of all beings becomes the worship of Śīva. If any one behaves otherwise, and disturbs or harms any being of the universe, he disturbs and displeases Śīva.<sup>46</sup> The above description shows that Śīva Purāṇa agrees with the Gītā that all the beings are the forms of Śīva and he should be worshipped as the soul of all beings. The Vāyavīya Samhitā asks the devotee to do everything for Śīva and to direct all his mental states to Him.<sup>47</sup> This suggestion is undoubtedly in favour of the second type of interpretation of the word Sarvabhāva. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa lays more emphasis on the second type of the interpretation of Sarvabhāva and enumerates the different mental states with their classical examples to show that each and every mental state amounts to devotion. The mental states which become devotion in relation to God are enumerated in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa as follows:

*Kāma* (sex), *dveṣa* or *krodha* (hatred or anger), *bhaya* (fear), *sneha* (affection), *aikya* (blood relation) and *Śauhārda* (devotion). Each of the above-mentioned mental states is adopted as the means to concentrate on God and it is stated that persons have achieved their supreme goal by the help of these mental states. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa tries to substantiate each case with classical examples: *Kāma* is adopted as a means of



concentration by the cowherd girls of Vṛndāvana, and they achieved their goal with the help of this. Kaṁsa (the maternal uncle of Śrī Kṛṣṇa) attained God with fear, Śiśupala and many other kings did so with *dveṣa* (hatred), Vṛṣṇis with blood-relationship (*Śambandha*), Yudhiṣṭhira with *sneha* (affection), and men like Nārada with *bhakti* (devotion).<sup>48</sup> According to Madhusūdana all mental states cannot be regarded as devotion. He explains devotion as an instrument to convert the mind into pure tranquil state. It is the spirit of joy (*harṣa*) which moulds the mind into pure *rati* that develops into pure bliss (*Śānta rasa*) and presents in its course the full knowledge of God's greatness.<sup>49</sup> Thus it can be said that tranquil state of mind is devotion. So far as the other mental states are concerned, *sneha* (affection) comes closest to devotion in point of purity. It flows from superior to inferior and inferior to superior. In the first case, traditionally it is called *Vatsalya rasa*, and in the latter *Preya rasa*. These three sentiments, Śānta, Vātsalya and Preya are endowed with profound tranquility and are completely free from external disturbances. Therefore they are regarded as pure devotional sentiments. He excludes *Kāma*, (sex), hatred and fear from the scope of pure devotion, *Kāma* (sex) develops into physical association, it may arouse the craving for God as well as corresponding amorous sentiment, which may create the highest craving and impetuosity, but it cannot amount to pure sentiment at best it may be regarded as a mixed sentiment. Hatred and fear may modify themselves into a religious feeling provided they are not totally opposed to the craving for God. But they fail to achieve the status of *rasa* (pure religious sentiment) as they are associated with unfavourable elements.

All the above views regarding the nature of devotion may be synthesized on the basis of their common characteristics. All of them accept that devotion is a special kind of mental state, and the object of such a mental state should be only supreme being (God) and not other object of the world. They differ in calling the same sentiment by different names such as *rati* (pleasure), *prema* (love), *Paramaprema* (supreme love), *āśakti* (attachment), *harṣa* (exhultation) *ullāsa* (joy), *abhilāṣa* (affection) etc. and in including or excluding one or other mental state from devotion.

In our religious literature, we find a large number of names and forms of devotion. Narasimha Purāṇa calls devotion as *sammāma* (Honour) and *bahumāna* (excess of honour) respectively observed by Arjuna and Ikṣvāku.<sup>50</sup> The Mahābhārata states that the devotion observed by Vidura is called *prīti* (delight).<sup>51</sup> The devotion of cowherd



girls is called viraha (grief at separation)<sup>52</sup> The devotion of Upamanyu is named as *itaravicikitsa*<sup>53</sup> The devotion of Yama is called *mahimākhyāti* (description of glory)<sup>54</sup>. Similarly devotion is called *tadarthaprāṇasthāna* (Preservation of life for his sake) as in the case of Hanumāna. *Tadīyatā* (belong to him) in the case of Uparicaravasū, Sarvatadbhāva (the idea that he is the all) in the case of Prahāda, *apratikūlya* (absence of enmity) in case of Bhīṣma. But this list is not exhaustive, it is only illustrative, and many other forms and names may be included in it as is stated by Svapneśvara.

### Classification of devotion.

In our religious literature devotional sentiment is described in different ways and is classified in various ways. But often it is said to be of two kinds, para (higher) and apara (lower), or mukhya (primary) and gaṇa (Secondary). The higher kind of devotion is undoubtedly the supreme goal of human life. It is stated as supreme, unconditional, undisturbed love of the Lord. A devotee who obtains such a love does not care for liberation any more<sup>55</sup>. But this supreme devotion is obtained by the supreme grace of Śiva,<sup>56</sup> and a long and hard preparation from the side of the devotee is necessary to achieve the grace of God. The Vāyavīya Saṁhitā states the process as follows:— A person desirous to obtain supreme grace should perform properly, regularly and continuously his duties recommended by the Vedas and the Smṛtis . Such performance purifies the mind in the course of many births. The purification of mind generates detachment in him from wordly pleasure. In course of time, when this detachment becomes very strong knowledge dawns. This knowledge pleases Śiva and makes the devotee feel his helplessness. Then he begins the devotional practices prescribed in Śaivadharmā, and as a consequence of these practices he becomes entitled to get supreme devotion; then the supreme grace of Śiva emerges and supreme devotion arises in the devotee. Grace removes all ties and makes him able to enjoy pure tranquility. Nārada asserts that this supreme devotion is the highest goal of human life. It is pure, absolute and self-evident.<sup>57</sup> This stage of devotion is the aim, purpose or end of all the devotional practices<sup>58</sup> At this stage the devotee gets the intuitive and direct realization of supreme being. This is the highest stage of love. It is the final goal of all the spiritual means, this is not the means of any thing else. Nārada calls it parama prema, and Śāṅḍilya calls it anurakti<sup>59</sup>. It is the reservoir of nectar and immortality, it is the state of perfection and accomplishment and

complete satisfaction<sup>60</sup>. All desires, suffering and misery, hatred and envy disappear for ever<sup>61</sup>. The devotee obtains supreme bliss and enjoys the supreme joy of his own self<sup>62</sup>. It is not obtained only by self effort. It manifests itself in any person<sup>63</sup>. It is the supreme love, and beyond description and conception of the mind. It is compared to the feeling of a dumb man, who enjoys tasteful things<sup>64</sup>. At this stage the devotee becomes one with God. He sees only God, hears only Him and thinks and meditates only on Him. This is called Nirguṇa or Parā bhakti in the Śīva Purāṇa.

The other, *aparā bhakti* or *saguṇa bhakti*, is said to be of two kinds, *vaidhī* and *svābhāvīkī*. Each of them is again of two kinds, *naiṣṭhikī* and *anaīṣṭhikī*. The former, again, is of six kinds, but it becomes of many kinds due to the injunctions and prohibitions of different Āgamas and Tantras<sup>65</sup>. According to Nārada there are two principles to distinguish secondary devotion, and according to each principle the secondary devotion can be of three kinds. As the first principle Nārada takes the natural property of the mind of a man through which he proceeds towards devotional practices, and shows that corresponding to the three properties *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, devotion also is of three kinds and is called by the corresponding names. As the second principle, he takes the aim or purpose of the devotee by which he is motivated towards devotional practices and mentions three kinds of devotees, *ārta*, *jijñāsu* and *arthārthī*<sup>66</sup>. We find the reference to the former three kinds in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, where these three are clearly and distinctly defined. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa takes the motive and insight of the devotee, which are controlled by the attributes of Prakṛti, to show the distinguishing feature of these three kinds of devotion. In *tāmasa* devotion, the devotee is motivated by pride and he has diversity, violence, pride and envy in his attitude when he proceeds towards devotional practices for worldly pleasure, name and fame, with the attitude of discrimination regarding the images of God to be worshipped. But in *sāttvika* devotion, the devotee is not inspired by selfish motives, he performs all his actions either for the sake of duty or for the sake of the abolition of the sins or for the sake of offering them to God<sup>67</sup>. The latter three kinds of devotion mentioned by Nārada are found in the Gītā and the Śīva Purāṇa<sup>68</sup>. These are not defined in the text but are explained in the commentaries on the Gītā on the basis of their etymological meaning and illustrated with classical examples. When a devotee proceeds towards the love of God to save himself from a great danger, he is called *ārta bhakta*. The classical examples of this kind of



devotion are Draupadī and Gajendra, who wanted to save themselves from their enemies. The second kind of devotee proceeds towards love of God for certain material things to fulfill his own desire. Dhruva is the classical example of this kind of devotion. He began to love God for the sake of kingdom. The third (*jijñāsu*) proceeds towards the love of God only to know Him in a better way. He proceeds neither for material gain nor for protection from affliction or danger, Uddhava is the classical example of this kind of devotion. When we come to discuss their relative importance we see that Nārada gives more importance to the previous ones than the subsequent ones in both groups. So far as the first group is concerned it is accepted without any objection, but the same is not true for the second group. According to Nārada the subsequent ones become inferior to the previous ones in the second group also. But the Rudra Saṁhitā takes the opposite view and regards the previous ones as inferior to the subsequent ones<sup>69</sup>. Rudra Saṁhitā and the Gītā regard these three as inferior to the fourth who is regarded as the soul of the Lord and is called *jñānī*<sup>70</sup>. Śāṅḍilya also does not give any relative importance to these, he regards them as of one group called secondary<sup>71</sup>.

### Ninefold devotion

Devotion, as a means or practical process, has nine constituent parts or nine successive stages which are often regarded as nine kinds of devotion. The Rudra Saṁhitā enumerates these nine in successive order as follows:—

Śravaṇa, (to hear), *kīrtana* (to sing), *smaraṇa* (to remember), *sevana* (to serve), *dāśya* (subservience), *arcana* (worship), *vandana* (to pray), *sakhya* (friendship) and *ātma-samarpaṇa* (self-surrender)<sup>72</sup>. The devotee proceeds towards supreme love or supreme devotion through these stages. A brief description of these nine parts may be given.

**Śravaṇa** :—The literal meaning of the word is to hear. But it is explained to mean listening with due respect to the glories of Śiva attentively and in a happy mood<sup>73</sup>. It is the first stage of devotion as it creates a desire for reality which is not perceived<sup>74</sup>. On this stage the hearing of God's name plays a very important part<sup>75</sup>. It is repeatedly said that the name of Śiva purifies the heart and removes sin<sup>76</sup>. It is compared to the forest conflagration in which the mountains of sin are burnt to ashes<sup>77</sup>. The importance of the name in devotion is emphasized by saying that the name has more power to destroy sin than the ability of the sinner by which he commits sins.<sup>78</sup> Along with the hearing of the name of Śiva



the hearing of His sports, glories, tales and anecdotes are also recommended at this stage of devotion. The devotee is distinguished from others because he keeps himself busy in hearing the name, tales and stories of Śiva.

**Kirtana** :—It means to sing or to recite the name, fame, deeds, incarnation of God with love, respect and knowledge. It is a verbal sacrifice; mantra, japa and prayers—all are included in it. Every body, without any distinction of grade, caste, creed and sex, is benefited by this devotion. It is the remedy for worldly afflictions and gives peace to all who engage in it<sup>79</sup>.

**Smarana** :—The first two stages are recommended for engaging the external organs in the name, fame and glories of Śiva, smarana is to engage the mind in Him. The devotee makes his mind free from all fears, and keeps complete faith in the Lord who is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient. Thus, at this stage, the devotee always keeps the Lord in his mind. He never forgets Him nor fears any thing<sup>80</sup>.

**Sevana** :—The above-mentioned three stages are the purificatory stages, as they purify the body, heart and mind of the devotee. They do not have any direct relation to the body or statue of Śiva. They are concerned with His name, fame and glories. The fourth stage relates the devotee to the statue or body of Śiva. Here the devotee prepares his heart, senses, and body to abide in the grace of Śiva. Thus, in this stage, the devotee keeps his body in the service of Śiva, and makes suitable offerings to Him<sup>81</sup>.

**Dāsyā** :—It means to regard one-self as the servant of Śiva, and to keep one-self busy in those activities which are regarded as the duty of a good servant<sup>82</sup>.

**Arcana** :—It means to offer water, flower, fruits etc. to the Lord according to the method<sup>83</sup> of worship<sup>84</sup>. It is not necessary to spend a lot of money in this worship. It can be done only with that money which can be saved by the devotee for this purpose<sup>85</sup>. The materials are not very important in the worship. The desire to worship and offer the materials is more important. Hence in the absence of materials one can worship Śiva with imaginary materials<sup>86</sup>.

**Vandana** :-Literally it means to pray to Him. But at this stage the devotee is asked to recite the prayers and mantras, to meditate on the glories of Śiva, and to fall down on the earth like a stick to pay homage<sup>87</sup>

**Sakhya** :-It means to have complete faith in the supreme power of the Lord, by which He performs every thing for the benefit of the devotee. Hence he thinks that there is no evil in the world as every thing happens by the order of the Lord and for the good of the devotee<sup>88</sup>.

**Ātmasamarpaṇa** :-It means complete surrender of the body, speech mind and all the other things belonging to or possessed by the devotee. He offers his all to please God. He does not keep any thing for himself.

1. साध्यं शिवपदप्राप्तिः साधनं तस्य सेवनम् (विद्येश्वरसंहिता 3.18 a)
2. वेदान्तवेद्यं सद्द्वस्तु 3.52 (विद्येश्वरसंहिता 3.5 b)
3. यत्र गीतं त्रिकं प्रीत्या भक्तिज्ञानविरागकम् (विद्येश्वरसंहिता 3.4b)
4. .... ज्ञानवैराग्यजननी ..... (रुद्रसंहिता सृष्टिखण्ड 23.36a)
5. तन्माता मम भक्तिश्च मुक्ति-मुक्ति-फलप्रदाः (रुद्रसंहिता सृष्टि खण्ड 23.15a )
6. धर्मार्थकामैः किं तस्य मुक्तिस्तस्य करे स्थिता ।  
समस्तजगतां मूले यस्य भक्तिः स्थिरा त्वयि । (विष्णु पुराण 1.20.27)  
भक्तिगम्यस्सदा त्वं वा ..... (रुद्रसंहिता, प्रथमखण्ड)
7. नाहं वेदैर्न तपसा न दानेन न चेज्यया । शक्य एवविधो द्रष्टुं दृष्टवानसि मां यथा ॥  
भक्त्या त्वनन्यथा शक्य अहमेवविधोऽर्जुन । ज्ञातु द्रष्टुं च तत्त्वेन प्रवेष्टुं च परंतप ॥  
(भगवद्गीता 11.53-54)
8. Recovery of Faith by Radhakrishnan, p. 10
9. तर्कोऽप्रतिष्ठः स्मृतयश्च भिन्ना, नैको मुनि  
र्यस्य वचः प्रमाणम् । धर्मस्य तत्त्वं निहितंहुहायाम्  
महाजनो येन गतः स पन्थाः ॥ (महाभारत 3.312.117)
10. एवं महान्यग्रोधस्तिष्ठति श्रद्धत्स्व सोम्येति (छान्दोग्य उप. 6.12. 2)
11. Recovery of Faith by Radhakrishnan, p. 40
12. श्रद्धावान् लभते ज्ञानं तत्परः संयतेन्द्रियः । (भगवद् गीता 5.37)
13. भावेकात्मा क्रिया..... (शिवपु. वायवीय संहिता उत्तर खण्ड 10.60).
14. गुरूपदिष्टवेदान्तवाक्येषु विश्वासः श्रद्धा । (वेदान्तसार)
15. त्रिविधा भवति श्रद्धा देहिनां सा स्वभावजा  
सात्त्विकी राजसी चैव तामसी चेति तां शृणु (भगवद्गीता 17.2)
16. या प्रीतिरविवेकानां विषयेष्वनपायिनी । त्वामनुस्मरतः सा मे हृदयान्मापसर्पतु ॥  
(विष्णुपुराण 1.20.13)
17. ज्ञानमिति चेन्न द्विषतो ऽपि ज्ञानस्य तदसंस्थिते (शाण्डिल्यसूत्र 1.7.4)
18. न क्रिया कृत्यनपेक्षणाज्ज्ञानवत् (शाण्डिल्यसूत्र 1.7.7)
19. तद्यथेह कर्मचितो लोकः क्षीयते एवमेवामुत्र पुण्यचितो लोकः क्षीयते ।

दृष्टावदानुश्रविकः सह्यविशुद्धिक्षयातिशय युक्तः ।

(छान्दोग्योपनिषद् 8.1.6, 2.23.1) (सांख्यकारिका 2)

20. तत्संस्थस्यामृतत्वोपदेशात् अत एव फलानन्त्यम् (शाण्डिल्यसूत्र 1.18)
21. द्वेषप्रतिपक्षभावाद्रसशब्दाच्च रागः (शाण्डिल्यसूत्र 1.1.6)
22. ननु द्वेषविरोधित्वं न रागत्वे लिङ्गमुदासीनत्वेन अनेकान्तिकत्वादिति ।  
उच्यते- द्वेषकार्यं निवृत्तिस्तदविरोधिनी प्रवृत्तिरिति....(शाण्डिल्यसूत्र, स्वपेश्वरभाष्य 1.1.6)
23. सा तु परमप्रेमरूपा (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 2)
24. सा न कामयमाना निरोधरूपत्वात् । निरोधस्तु लोकवेदव्यापारन्यासः ।  
(नारद भक्ति सूत्र 7-8)
25. तस्मिन्नन्यता तद्विरोधिषूदासीनता अन्याश्रयाणां त्यागोऽन्यता । (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 3011)
26. तत्लक्षणानि वाच्यन्ते नानामतभेदात् (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 15)
27. पूजादिष्वनुराग इति पाराशर्यः (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 16)
28. कथादिष्विति गर्गः, आत्मरत्यविरोधेनेति शाण्डिल्यः (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 17,18)
29. नारदस्तु तदर्पिताखिलाचारता तद्विस्मरणे परमव्याकुलतेति (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 19)
30. अनिर्वचनीयम् ..... मूकास्वादत्..... ( नारदभक्तिसूत्र 2,60,59,51,52,24,49 )
31. प्रतिक्षणवर्द्धमानमविच्छिन्नं सूक्ष्मतरमनुभवरूपम् ( नारदभक्तिसूत्र 54 )
32. सुलभा यत्प्रसादाद्धि सत्प्रेमांकुरलक्षणाः ( शिव. कोटिरुद्रसंहिता. 41.19 )
33. तत्रापि न महात्म्यज्ञानविस्मृत्यपवादः  
तद्विहीनं जाराणामिव  
नास्त्येव तस्मिंस्तत्सुखसुखित्वम् (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 22-24)
34. दृष्टत्वाच्च, अतएव तदभावाद् वल्लवीनाम् । (शाण्डिल्यसूत्र 1.2.13,14)
35. भक्तौ ज्ञाने न भेदोऽस्ति तत्कर्तुस्सर्वदाऽसुखम् ।  
विज्ञानं न भवत्येव सति भक्तिविरोधिनः । (शिवपु. रुद्रसंहिता, सतीखण्ड 23.16)  
भक्तिज्ञाने न भिन्ने हि शम्भुना वर्णिते द्विजाः ।.....  
शम्भुभक्तिरस्यैव भवेत् ज्ञानोदयोद्भूतम् । 41.24.25 कोटिरुद्र संहिता (शि. पु.)
36. सर्वभावसर्वात्मना (भगवद्गीता शांकरभाष्य 18.62).
37. सर्वभावमनोवृत्त्या वाचा कर्मणा चेत्यर्थतः (भगवद्गीता, आनन्दगिरिभाष्य 18.62)
38. मत्तः परतरं नान्यत् किञ्चिदस्ति धनंजय । मथि सर्वमिदं प्रोतं सूत्रे मणिगणा इव ।  
(भगवद्गीता (7.7)
39. यो लोकत्रयमाविश्य बिभर्त्यव्यय ईश्वरः । ..... (15.17-18)
40. यो मामेदमसंमूढो जानाति पुरुषोत्तमम् । स सर्वविद्भजति मां सर्वभावेन भारत ।  
(भगवद्गीता 15.19)
41. यो मां पश्यति सर्वत्र सर्वं च मयि पश्यति ।  
तस्याहं न प्रणश्यामि स च मे न प्रणश्यति । (भगवद् गीता 6.30)
42. सर्वभावेन सर्वात्मचित्ततया (भगवद् गीता शांकरभाष्य 15.19)
43. मन्मना भव मद्भक्तो मद्याजी मां मनस्कुरु ।  
मामेवैष्यसि यत्कैवमात्मानं मत्परायणः । (भगवद्गीता 9.34)
44. यत्करोषि यदश्नासि यज्जुहोसि ददासि यत् ।  
यत्तपस्यसि कौन्तेय ततुकुरुष्व मदर्पणम् । (भगवद्गीता 9. 27)
45. मय्यादेश्य मनो येमां नित्ययुक्ता उपासते ।  
श्रद्धया परयोपेतास्ते मे युक्ततमा मताः । (भगवद्गीता 12.2)



46. वृक्षस्य मूलसेकेन शाखा पुष्पति वे यथा ।  
शिवस्य पूजया यद्वत् पुष्पत्यस्य वयुर्जगत् ।  
देहिनो यस्य कस्यापि क्रियते यदि निग्रहः ।  
अनिष्टमष्टमूर्तिः कृतमेव न संशयः । (वायवीयसंहिता उत्तरखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 3.29-32)  
(शतरुद्र संहिता (शि. प्र.) 2.13-16)
47. तन्निष्ठास्तत्परास्सर्वे तद्युक्तास्तदुपाश्रिताः सर्वक्रियाः प्रकुर्वाणास्तमेव मनसा गताः ।  
(वायवीयसंहिता पूर्वखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 3.46-47)
48. गोप्यः कामाद् भयात् कंसो याषाञ्चैद्यादयोनुपाः ।  
सम्बन्धाद् वृष्णयः स्नेहाद् यूयं भक्तया वर्य विभो । (भागवत पुराण 7.1.30)
49. हर्षः चित्त सम्मुल्लासकथ्यते स चतुर्विधः ।  
एकः परानन्दमयः श्रीशामाहात्म्यकारणम् .....  
तज्जन्यायाम् द्रुतौ शुद्धा रति गोविन्दगोचरा । (भक्ति रसायन 2.12.13)
50. नरसिंहपुराण 25.22
51. महाभारत (उद्योग पर्व) 99.24
52. यो विष्णुपुराण 5.18.17
53. महाभारत (अनुशासन पर्व) 14.186
54. विष्णुपुराण 3.7.10
55. अहेतुक्यव्यत्वहिता या भक्तिः पुरुषोत्तमे ।  
सालोक्य सार्ष्टिं सामीप्य सारूप्येकत्वमप्यत ।  
दीयमानं न गृह्णन्ति विना मत्सेवनं जनाः । 3.29.12b-13 (भागवतपुराण 3.29.12b-13)
56. प्रसादादेव सा भक्तिः प्रसादो भक्ति संभवः । (शिवणु वायवीयसंहिता उत्तरखण्ड 7.27)
57. स्वयं प्रमाणात्, शान्तिरूपात् परमानन्द रूपाच् । (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 59-60)
58. स्वयं फलरूप तेति ब्रह्म कुमारः (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 30)
59. सा तु परम प्रेमरूपा (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 2)
60. अमृत स्वरूप च (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 4)
61. यत्प्राप्य न किञ्चिद् वाञ्छित न शोचति न द्वेषिं न रमतेनोत्साही भवति । (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 5)
62. यज्ज्ञात्वा मन्को भवति, स्तब्धो भवति आत्मगरामो भवति । (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 6)
63. प्रकाशयते क्वापि पात्रे (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 53)
64. अनिर्वचनीयं प्रेमस्वरूपम् । मूकास्वादनवत् (नारदभक्ति सूत्र 51, 52)
65. वैधी स्वाभाविकी या यो वरा सात्ववरा मता ।  
नैष्ठिक्येनैष्ठिकीभेदाद् द्विविधं द्विविधं हि ते ।  
षडविधा नैष्ठिकी ज्ञेयां द्वितीयेकविधा स्मृता ।  
विहिताविहिता मेदात्तामनेकां विदुर्बुधाः ।.....  
रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड 23.18b-20  
कोटिरुद्रसंहिता 41.20b-22
66. गौणी त्रिधा गुणभेदादात्तादिमेदाद्वा । (नारदभक्तिसूत्र 56)
67. कर्मनिर्हारमुद्दिश्य परस्मिन्वा तदर्पणम् ।  
यजेद्यष्टव्यमिति वा पृथग्भावः स सात्त्विकः । 3.29.10 (भागवतपुराण 29.10)
68. चतुर्विधा भजन्ते मां जनाः सुकृतिनस्सदा । .....  
आर्तो जिज्ञासुरर्थार्थी ज्ञानी चैव चतुर्थकः ष

43.4-5-रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड (शि. प्र.); भगवद्गीता 7.16

69. उत्तरोत्तरश्रेष्ठस्तेषां दक्ष प्रजायते । (रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 43.4)
70. तेषां ज्ञानी नित्य युक्तो एकभक्तिविशिष्यते ।  
उदारा सर्व एवेते ज्ञानी त्वात्मैव मे मतम् । (भगवद्गीता 7.17-18)
71. गौणं त्रेविध्यमितरेण स्तुत्यर्थत्वात् साहचर्यम् । (शाण्डिल्य सूत्र 72)
72. श्रवणं कीर्तनं चैव स्मरणं सेवनं तथा दास्यं तथार्चनं देखि वन्दनं मम सर्वदा ।  
सख्यमात्मार्पणं चेति नवांगानि विदुर्बुधाः ।  
रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 23.21-23  
रोचिपुष्पलंबिका (शि. प्र.) 41.23  
श्रवणं कीर्तनं स्मरणं पाद सेवनम् ।  
अर्चनं वन्दनं दास्यं सख्यमात्मनिवेदनम् । (भागवतपुराण 7.5-23)
73. कथादेर्नित्यसन्मानं कुर्वन्देहादिभिर्मुदा ।  
स्थिरासनेन तत्यानं यत्तच्छवणमुच्यते । (शिव. रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड 23-25)
74. प्रत्यक्षं चक्षुषा दृष्ट्वा तत्र लोकः प्रवर्तते ।  
अपत्यक्षं हि सर्वत्र ज्ञात्वा श्रोत्रेण चेष्टते । (शिव. विद्येश्वरसंहिता 2.24)
75. यन्नामसकृच्छ्रवणात् पुल्कसकोऽपि विमुच्यते संसारात् । (भागवतपुराण 6.16.44)
76. शिवनाम मुखे यस्य सदा शिव शिवेति च । पायानि न स्पृशन्त्येव खदिरांगारकं यथा  
(शिव. विद्येश्वरसंहिता 23.6-7)
77. शिवेति नाम दावाग्नेर्महापातकपर्वताः ।  
भस्मी भवन्त्यनायासात्यत्यं सत्यं न संशयः । (शिव. विद्येश्वरसंहिता 23.23)
78. पापानां हरणे शम्भोर्नाम्नः शक्तिर्हि पावनी ।  
शक्नोति पातकं तावत्कर्तुमनापि नरः क्वचित् । (शिव. विद्येश्वरसंहिता 23.41-42)
79. सदाशिवकथाप्रश्नः पुरुषांस्त्रीन्नुनाति हि ।  
वक्तांरं पृच्छकं श्रोतृजान्द्वीसलिलं यथा । रुद्रसंहिता सृष्टिखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 1.22-24
80. व्यापकं देवि मां दृष्ट्वा नित्यं सर्वत्र सर्वदा ।  
निर्भयत्वं सदा लोके स्मरणं तदुदाहृतम् । रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 23.27-28
81. सदा सेव्यानुकूलेन सेवनं तद्वि गोगणैः । रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 23.29a
82. हृदयामृतभोगेन प्रियं दास्यमुदाहृतम् ।  
सदा भृत्यानुकूलेन विधिना मे परात्मने । रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड (शि. प्र.) 23.29h-30a
83. अर्पणं षोडशानां वै पाशाद्यादीनां तदर्चनम् । (शिव. रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड 23-30b)
84. यथाशक्ति सदा कुर्यात्क्रमाच्छिवपदप्रदम् । (शिव. विद्येश्वरसंहिता 11. 29b)
85. तत्र द्रव्याणि मनसा कल्पयित्वा विशोधय च ।  
ध्यात्वा विनायकं देवं पूजयित्वा विधानतः । (शिव. वायवीयसंहिता उत्तर खण्ड 23.3)
86. मन्त्रोच्चारणध्यानाभ्यां मनसा वचसा क्रमात् ।  
यदष्टागेन भूस्पर्शं तद्वै वन्दनमुच्यते । (शिव. रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड 32.31)
87. मंगलामंगलं यद्यत्करोतीतीश्वरो हि मे । सर्वं तन्मंगलायेति विश्वासः सख्यलक्षणम् ।  
(शिव. रुद्रसंहिता सतीखण्ड 23.32)
88. कृत्वा देहादिकं तस्य प्रीत्यै सर्वं तदर्पणम् ।  
निर्वाहाय च शून्यत्वं यत्तदात्मसमर्पणम् । (शिव. रुद्रसंहिता, सतीखण्ड 23.33)



# NĪLASUNDARAGIRI : A PURĀNIC VIEWPOINT

By

KAILASH CHANDRA DASH

[भारतस्य पूर्वदक्षिणदिशि पुरुषोत्तमधाम जगन्नाथधाम वा विद्यते यत् नीलगिरिरिति शब्देनोच्यते स्कन्दादिपुराणगतेषु पुरुषोत्तमक्षेत्रमाहात्म्येषु, नीलादिमहोदयनामके स्थलमाहात्म्यपरे ग्रन्थे च । स्थानमिदं सारलादासकृते ओड्रभाषीये महाभारते नीलसुन्दरगिरिरिति शब्देन निर्दिष्टम् । अर्वाक्कालिके साहित्ये नीलगिरिशब्दः सुप्रचलितो जातः ।

अस्य नाम्नः को हेतुरित्यस्मिन् लेखे विस्तरेण विचारितम्; नीलसुन्दरगिरिशब्द ओड्रभाषीये महाभारते किमर्थं प्रयुक्त इत्यपि चिन्तितम् ।

विचारप्रसंगे लेखकेन बहवो विषया उपस्थापिताः—पुरुषोत्तमक्षेत्रस्य प्राचीनता, धर्मशास्त्रादिषु स्थानस्यास्य उल्लेखः, शांकर-संप्रदायदृष्ट्यास्य महत्त्वम्, सुन्दरपर्वतस्य नामान्तराणि, मन्दिरनिर्माणस्य कालश्च ।]

The Dhāma of Puruṣottama-Jagannātha, a significant sacred centre in South-eastern India, has been stated as Nīlagiri<sup>1</sup> in the texts like .Puruṣottama Kṣetra Māhātmya<sup>2</sup> (as incorporated in the *Skanda Purāṇa* and the other Purāṇas)<sup>3</sup>, *Kapila Saṁhitā*<sup>4</sup>, and *Nīlādri Mahodaya*<sup>5</sup> But the Oriya poet *Sāralā Dās* (15th century A.D.), in his magnum opus *Mahābhārata* refers to this sacred centre as *Nīlasundaragiri*.<sup>6</sup> In the post-sāralā Dās Period in Orissa the Oriya literature has utilised the name *Nīlagiri* in connection with the description of Puruṣottama Kṣetra; although the mediaeval Bhakti literature in Oriya called *Nīlasundara Gitā* has accepted this Nīlasundaragiri as stated in *Sāralā Mahābhārata*.<sup>7</sup> The present paper aims to study this Puranic name of Puruṣottama Kṣetra (*Nīlagiri*) and the reasons for the name. It will also present the secret behind the name of *Nīlasundaragiri* of *Sāralā Dās*. The study is based on the analysis of Puranic literature (Oriya and Sanskrit) as well as the epigraphic evidences.

## II

The sacred centre Puruṣottama Kṣetra on the sea-shore of Utkala was in existence before the compilation of *Mahābhārata* (in Sanskrit); but then it was possibly not famous as a centre of Viṣṇu.<sup>8</sup> The *Vana Parva* of *Mahābhārata* refers to *Mahāvedī*, on the sea-shore of Orissa<sup>9</sup>. In chapter 114 of the *Vana Parva*<sup>10</sup> the sage Lomaśa acquaints *Yudhiṣṭhira* with the

sacred places of Kaliṅga. He first acquaints him with the shrine of *Virājā* situated on the bank of the river *Vaitaraṇī*. *Yudhiṣṭhira* after having taken a plunge into the river *Vaitarāṇī* heard a voice which *Lomaśa* explained to be that of the dwellers of the forest reciting *mantras*. Then he explained to *Yudhiṣṭhira* the sacredness of the spot from where the voice came. He said that once the self-existent (*Svayambhū*) performed a sacrifice there and gave the entire earth to *Kāśyapa*. The earth was angry and sank into the Netherland. *Kāśyapa* propitiated her and she uprose and showed herself in the form of an altar. The bottom of the altar reached the sea. *Yudhiṣṭhira* was advised by *Lomaśa* to ride upon the altar and then to bathe in the sea. The sacred place (*Mahāvedī*) described in this passage evidently refers to a sacred centre other than the shrine of *Virājā* situated on the bank of the river *Vaitaraṇī*. The place has been accepted by the learned scholars as *Puruṣottama Kṣetra*<sup>11</sup>.

The *Mahāvedī* was a very famous name in India in the period of the compilation of *Mahābhārata* and the name continued in the mediaeval phase.<sup>12</sup> The *Vedī* on the sea-shore of Utkala which was famous in India during the period of the compilation of *Mahābhārata* was in size and extent like a small mountain. According to *Mahābhārata* this exalted place was covered with forests and possibly for that reason the same was utilised by a tribal section as their sacred site. Of course, *Mahābhārata* does not connect this centre with the sacred site of the tribal section. But the *Mahābhārata* does not state that it was the centre of worship of an Aryan deity. Had there been the worship of an Aryan deity on this site, the compiler of *Mahābhārata* would have given a reference to the deity, but the same is silent about it, although it refers to *Virājā*, another sacred centre. Hence on the basis of this interpretation we can presume that the hightened altar (*Vedī*) on the sea-shore of Utkala was utilised by the tribal people as their religious centre. Before 3rd century A.D. Aṅga, Vaṅga and Kaliṅga (of Eastern India) were accepted as the land of the *Mlecchas* as the Purāṇic sources and the *Dharmaśāstra* texts refer to this fact.<sup>13</sup> These texts state that the Aryans did not like to visit these countries for the reasons stated above.<sup>14</sup> From this point of view also we may state that the *Vedī Kṣetra* on the sea-shore of Utkala was possibly the sacred centre of a tribal section. Many years after the compilation of *Mahābhārata* this zone was called *Nilagiri*. This name *Nilagiri* has been frequently stated in the Sanskrit texts of the ancient and the mediaeval phase.<sup>15</sup> The reasons for naming the *Vedī kṣetra* as *Nilagiri* and by whom such a name was given are not known. Only we can hazard a speculation on this aspect.



*Ādi Śaṅkara's Smārta-mata* and his *Govardhana Pīṭha* were closely connected with the worship of *Puruṣottama-Jagannātha*. *Śaṅkarācārya*, in the 9th century A.D. after a long quest for establishing a sacred centre in the East on the sea-shore, found this *Vedī Kṣetra* (surrounded with many Śaiva shrines) as an ideal site.<sup>16</sup> In all probability the name *Nilagiri* was attributed to *Puruṣottama Kṣetra* by him. *Giri* is the symbol of Śiva (Śiva being called *Giriśa* as well as *Girijāpati*).<sup>17</sup> According to *Puruṣottama Kṣetra Māhātmya* the Brāhmaṇa *Vidyāpati* first occupied the *Vedī Kṣetra* under the tribals and this became a part of the legendary account (*Indradyumna* legend) which was utilised in the *Purāṇas* as *Vidyāpati's* first connection as a messenger of *Indradyumna*, the king of *Mālava*.

*Nilagiri* was the ancient name of *Puruṣottama Kṣetra* either due to the effort of *Śaṅkara* or due to the geographical location of the site. But *Sāralā Dās*, the Oriya poet of 15th century A. D., accepted *Puruṣottama Kṣetra* as *Nīasundaragiri*.<sup>18</sup> *Sāralā Dās* modified many aspects on the study on *Puruṣottama Kṣetra* as presented in the Purāṇic literature before him and *Nilasundaragiri* was one of such modifications. The account on the antiquity of the *Puruṣottama Kṣetra* as presented by *Sāralā Dās* has been borrowed mainly from the traditional accounts or the prevailing traditions. The learned poet probably had visited the sacred *Kṣetra* of *Puruṣottama* frequently. He was also aware of the many views on the origin and the antiquity of the *Kṣetra*. Hence he was able to present the *Kṣetra* from different points of view.

The *MūṣalīParva* of *Sāralā Mahābhārata* refers to a part of the *Puruṣottama Kṣetra* as *Sundaragiri*. This is also stated in the *Vana Parva* of *SāralāMahābhārata*.

(I). *MūṣalīParva; Sundara Parvata* (Mountain) is inside the *Yamanika Tīrtha* and near the *Nilakapavata* (Cornucopian or wish-granting tree). It is also very near the sea.<sup>19</sup>

(II). *Vana Parva* describes the *Sundara Parvata*:

*Nilagiri* hid herself in the *Pātāla* (the Netherland). But I (*Sundaraparvata*) existed. *Nārāyaṇa* was pleased with me. In the *Satya Age* My extent was about sixteen lakh *yōjana*; the *Tretā* my dimension (extent) was about thirteen lakh *yōjana*. In the *Age of Dvāpara* my area covered. 12 lakh *yōjana*. *Anśumati* (Sun) moves within my active area. When I revealed my own self, the Sun began to hide himself due to my power (*teja*). For that reason *Virañcī*

prayed me that He was moving on the space. The horses of His chariot having come across the top of my head perished. Ninety-nine wheels of His chariot were destroyed because they dashed on the top of my body. Only one wheel of His chariot remained. Hence He gave up southern direction in fear of me. If I can hide myself the Sun can move. Therefore the Sun said, "O the best of mountains, hide your real shape. In all ages your shape would diminish." <sup>20</sup>

This passage refers to a part of Puruṣottama Kṣetra as *Sundara parvata* in ancient time. In course of time the heightened area began to recede and took the form which we see to-day.

*Sāralā Dās* has stated this area as *Sundara parvata* which is not correct. Before *Sāralā Dās* the zone was probably named *Sindūra parvata*. In all probability a part of Puruṣottama Kṣetra connected with the sea assumed the colour of *Sindūra* (yellow) due to the first solar ray. For that reason the place was locally called *Sindūra pura*. The poet might have chosen this name either from popular memory or from traditional account, because during the time of *Sāralā Dās* the name Puruṣottama Kṣetra was only popular. The existence of *Sindūra pura* was in oblivion. In popular memory *Sindūra* became *Sundara* (*Sindūra* is also now-a-days called *Sundara* in local Oriya tone). In this way *Sindūra pura* became *Sundara pura*. *Sāralā Dās* picked up the distorted name *Sundaragiri* from popular memory. *Sāralā Mahābhārata* has deep respect for popular tradition. Possibly in order to establish his views on Puruṣottama Kṣetra before the common people of his time (who did not have the opportunity to read Sanskrit texts on Puruṣottama Kṣetra) *Sāralā Dās* accepted *Sundara* for *Sindūra*. As a result *Sindūra parvata* became known as *Sundara parvata* in his text. In the post-*Sāralā* period this mistake/distorted pronouncement became very famous in Orissa.

### (III)

Three copper plate grants of the reign of the Gaṅga king Coḍagaṅga (A.D. 1078-1147) indirectly connect Puruṣottama Kṣetra (wholly or partly) with *Sindūra pura*. <sup>21</sup> According to his copper plate records, Coḍagaṅga occupied Utkala, exterminated the Somavaṁśī rule and then he was decorated with the rank of sovereignty of the whole of Utkala. <sup>22</sup> Coḍagaṅga was both *Parama- Māheśvara* and *Parama- Vaiṣṇava* till A.D. 1115 which is stated in the Yembārām copper plate grant. <sup>23</sup> We like to presume that this *Sindūra pura* was connected with Coḍagaṅga's decision to accept Vaiṣṇavism as the only important religion officially or



his acceptance of *Parama-Vaiṣṇava* as the only important officially accepted religious epithet. From the beginning of his reign Coḍagaṅga was attributed with the imperial religious epithet *Parama-Māheśvara* and this epithet was continued for many years. It was connected with his family tradition.<sup>24</sup> How could Coḍagaṅga suppress this epithet from A.D.III6-17?<sup>25</sup> What was the actual necessity of his stay with the people of *Sindūra pura* as stated in the copper plate grants? The present scholar can only speculate that during the time of Coḍagaṅga a part of the *Puruṣottama Kṣetra* was known as *Sindūra pura*. The king was staying at that place for some years at least from A.D.III6 and the only important motive of his presence at *Sindūra pura* was his earnest endeavour for the construction of a huge temple for Viṣṇu-Puruṣottama and the temple was completed during this period<sup>26</sup>. Many centuries after the reign of king Choḍagaṅga *Sindūrapura* was corrupted as *Sundarapura* and its importance was lost. In all probability during the reign of Choḍagaṅga this site (*Sindūrapura*) was the centre of worship of the deity *Puruṣottama* and the area included *Nīlakaṅṭha*, *Bilveśvara*, *Indradyumna Sara* and the *Guṇḍicā* zone. But Coḍagaṅga constructed a temple for Viṣṇu-Puruṣottama at another site (which is now the seat of *Jagannātha* and His Associates) and then the images were shifted from *Sindūrapura* to this site for worship.<sup>27</sup> As a result the importance of *Sindūrapura* was not felt any longer. In popular memory the name remained in a corrupt form. Had it not been stated in the *Sāralā Mahābhārata* it would have been difficult to present this early name of *Puruṣottama Kṣetra*. But once a year during the *Ratha Yātrā*, *Guṇḍicā zone* (the area of *Sindūra pura*) finds its significance and that bears a distant echo of *Sindūra pura*.

- 
1. For *Nīlagiri* see Ganguli, N.M., *Orissa and her remains*, 1986, Gian Publishing House, Delhi, p. 398. Mishra, K.C. *The cult of Jagannātha*, 1971/1984, p. 71-100. Padhi, B.M, *Dāru Devatā* (Wooden Deity), Cuttack, 1975, p. 1-14. Stietencron, H.V., "Advent of Viṣṇism in Orissa", in *The Cult of Jagannātha and the regional tradition of Orissa* (hereafter cited CJRTO), ed. Eschmann, A H. Kulke and G.C. Tripathy, 1978-186, p. 25-30.
  2. *Puruṣottama Kṣetra Māhātmya*, *Skanda Purāṇa*, Venkateswar Press, Bombay, first chapter.
  3. *Ādhyātmya Rāmāyaṇa* (Yuddha Khaṇḍa), Chapter-IV refers to *Nīlādri Śikhara*. Also see No. 1.
  4. For reference on *Kapila Saṁhitā* see Ganguli, op. cit., p. 398-400.
  5. *Nīlādri Mahodaya*(ed, Sridhara Mahajpatra Sharma), 1985, Cuttack, p.2.
  6. *Sāralā Mahābhārata*, *Mūṣālī Parva* and *Vana Parva*, Cultural Affairs, Government of Orissa, 1968-70.
  7. Mishra, K.C., op. cit., p.214.  
*Nilasundara Gitā* was composed by the mediaeval Oriya poet Śekhara Dās.



8. Orissan scholars have been tempted to establish the importance of the Puruṣottama Kṣetra even in the pre-Mahābhārata phase. Such a view is based on a wrong interpretation of the texts available to them. Surya Narayana Das states that in the *Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* there is a reference to Puruṣottama Kṣetra. According to Das, *Rājaraṣi Janaka* in his golden plough-share cultivated the sands on the southern sea-shore and got *Vedamati*. The area is evidently Puruṣottama Kṣetra. But it is not correct. The sandy zone near the southern sea-shore may not definitely refer to Puruṣottama Kṣetra; it may indicate any other place. Das, Surya Narayana, *Jagannātha Mandira O Jagannātha tattva* (The temple and the cult of Jagannātha), 1985, Cuttack, p. 16-17.
- K.S. Behera's view in this respect is very convincing.
- In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the family deity of the Ikṣvāku is called Jagannātha. In the Mahābhārata, Jagannātha is mentioned as one of the thousand names of Viṣṇu. It will appear that for tracing the antiquity of Puruṣottama-jagannātha any reference to Puruṣottama-jagannātha should not be accepted where there is no definite or corroborative evidence to hold such a view. Behera, K.S., "Antiquity of Deity Puruṣottama: Jagannātha at Puri" in *The cult and culture of Lord jagannātha*, ed. Daityari Panda and Sarat chandra Panigrahi, 1984, Cuttack, p. 118-119.
9. Ganguli, *op. cit.*, p. 399.
10. *Ibid.*  
*Vana Parva*, 114 th chapter, Ślokas-22-24.  
 Panigrahi, K.C. *History of Orissa, Hindu period*, 1981, Cuttack, p. 335-337.
11. Panigrahi, *op. cit.*, p.337.  
 Stietencron, H.V. *op. cit.*, *CJRTO*, p. 29. Ganguli *Op.cit.*, p. 399, Geib, R., *Indradyumna-Legende. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Jagannatha Kultes*, Wiesbaden, 1987, p.25.  
 Mishra, K.C., *op. cit.*, p. 7.  
 Padhi, B.N., *op.cit.*, p. 1-2.
12. Edilpur copper plate grant of the period of the Sena king Sūrya Sena states the Puruṣottama Kṣetra as *Vedī Kṣetra*. The date of the record cannot be fixed beyond A.D. 1220. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXX, p.215. *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXXIII, 1960, p.315.  
*Corpus of Bengal inscriptions*, ed.S.K. Maity and R.R. Mukherji, 1967, P. 335, stietencron H.v. *op.cit.*, *CJRTO*, p.29.
13. Thapar, Romila, *Ancient Indian Social History, Some interpretations*, Delhi, 1978, p. 162.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *See. No. 1*
16. Mishra, Satchidananda, "Āchārya Śaṅkara O Śrī Jagannāthamka pratiṣṭhā (Āchārya Śaṅkara and the consecration of Śrī Jagannātha), *Jhaṅkāra* (Oriya Monthly Magazine), April, 1985, p. 17-28.  
 Mishra, Satchidananda, "Śrī Puruṣottama Vighraha pratiṣṭhā", *Koṅārka*, Orissa Sahitya Academy journal, No. 72, 1989, p.8-20.  
 Śaṅkarāchārya's role in the development of the Puruṣottama Kṣetra has been stated by K.N. Mahapatra. According to *Mādalāpāñji* the images of Śaṅkara and *Padmapāda* used to be worshipped on the *Ratna-sinhāsana* of Jagannātha till the time of Rājā Divyasiṃha Deva of Khurdhā (A.D. 1787-1793) when they were removed from that place and were later on broken by the Vaiṣṇavas. *Mādalāpāñji* 1940, Prachi edition, p.81.  
 Mahapatra, K.N., 'Antiquity of Jagannātha Puri as a place of pilgrimage', *Orissa Historical Research Journal* (hereafter cited *OHRJ*), Special volume, 1982, p. 152.  
 Recently G.N. Dash (a noted writer on Orissan tradition and history) does not accept the view of *Mādalāpāñji*. Dash has accepted the fact that the image of Śaṅkara was identical with that of *Vairava* and that *Mādalāpāñji* wrongly connected the image

with Śaṅkarāchārya. But Dash has accepted the other image stated in *Mādalāpāñji* as *Padmācārya* (a disciple of *ĀdiŚaṅkarāchārya* and his group in the early stage of the development of the Puruṣottama Kṣetra.

For the views of G.N. Dash see his book in Oriya *Khadyotara Dyūti*, 1984, Cuttack, p. 42-57.

17. *Ibid.*
18. *Puruṣottama Kṣetra Māhātmya*, *loc. cit.*, Chapter-VII.
19. *Vana Parva, Mūṣalī Parva of Sārālā Mahābhārata*, *loc. cit.*
20. *Yamañjika Tirtha Nilakalpe vaṭe Sundara parvata Maudadhira nikaṭe (Musali parva, toc. cit.*
21. Nīlagiri Parvata ye Pātāle gopyahelā/Mārāyaṇa prasanne more nāme chihna rahilā/Satyayuge muhi satara lakṣya yojana/Tretāyara tera lakṣya yojana āyatana/Dvāpara yuge dvādaśa lakṣya yojana mroe śhali/Mamateja abhyantara gamai Anśumāli/  
Muhi yeva nija kāyā vikāśill rūpa/Mamateja lāgiṇa ye Āditya hoileka gopya/Se nimite tusti; mote kalā ka Virañci/Muhi Dinakara nātha sūnye jāuachi/Tohara śīrāgrate hāboḍante mohora kāha/Ratha caka bhājiṇa hoilā guṇḍāmaye/Sate caka nirvāṇa mohara Rathe ādi/Aneśata ratha caka bhājiṇā tohara śikhara lāgi/Yekā caka mātra rahilā mora ratha/Dakṣiṇa diga pantha teji mu gamili utara diga pantha/Muhi tohara bhaye upeksili Dakṣiṇa pantha-bhūmi/Tohara gopya gale ye pārai muhi gami/ Tu yeve Girivara gopya kara nija kāye/Yuga yugāntara tu hoibu kṣiṇamaye/Vana Parva, *loc. cit.*, p. 112-113.
22. Yembārām copper plate grant of the śaka year 1039, Viśākhāpatnam grant of the śaka year 1040 and pālakoṇḍā copper plate grant of the śaka year 1040 refer to *Sindūrapura*.  
See Mukunda Rao, N., *Kalinga under the Eastern Gaṅgas*, 1991, Delhi, p. 172. *Indian Antiquary* Vol. XVIII, No. 80.  
Dash, Kailash Chandra, "Gangeswar-Choḍagaṅga and the temple of Puruṣottama Jagannātha", *OHRJ*, Vol. XXXII, No.3 and 4, p. 75 and 82.
23. Temburu grant of A.D. 1129 refers to this fact. *Bhāratī* (Telugu journal ), August, 1968, p. 12-12.  
The three copper plate grants stated above also refer to Choḍagaṅga's sovereignty over the whole of Utkala.
24. Yembārām copper plate grant of the śaka year 1037 is the last copper plate grant (so far discovered) to refer to both the imperial religious epithets-Parama Māheśvara and parama Vaiṣṇava. I have presented a paper on this aspect in the 53rd session of the Indian History Congress (1993) at the Kakatiya university (Warangal ).  
For the copper plate grant see Mukunda Rao, op. cit., p. 172.  
Ramchandra Rao, C.V., *Administration and Society in Mediaeval Andhra under the Later Eastern Gaṅgas and the Sūryavaṅśa Gajapatis*, Nellore, 1976, p. 329-337.
25. Coḍgaṅga suppressed this official religious epithet *Parama Māheśvara* from A.D. 1116-17. All his copper plate grant starting from Yembārām grant of the śaka year 1039 refer to only *Parama Vaiṣṇava*.
26. See my paper in *OHRJ*, Vol. XXXII, No. 3 and 4, p. 65-84.
27. Dash, Kailash Chandra, "Nīla Mādhava and Gāla Mādhava: A study of a legendary tradition on the early phase of the Jagannātha cult", *The Journal of the Asiatic Society*, Calcutta, Vol. XXXIII, No. 1 and II, p. 90-98.



# IMPRESSION ON THE ARCHITECTURAL ACTIVITIES FROM THE LINGAPURĀṆĀ

BY

VAIJAYANTI NAVANGUL

[ गरुडादिषु पुराणेषु वास्तुशास्त्रविषयिणी चर्चावलोक्यते । निर्माणविषयकाणां केषाञ्चन शब्दानामर्था अत्र विस्तेण विवेचिताः ]

Art and architecture has historically been an integral part of the aesthetic and cultural expression of our country. In the context of fast eroding cultural heritage Purāṇas are landmarks for preserving a rich and well-defined structural data from the early era. In another words Purāṇas are not only treatises of philosophical, religious, geographical impact but they may be looked upon as a source of great literary inspiration in various branches of knowledge like astronomy, astrology, metallurgy, medicine, sociology, arts and what not ! A perusal of the above list together with contemporary sciences akin to it, exhibits how widely the author of Purāṇas cast his net for collecting the material about the historical facts. Many theories and observations may be postulated on the basis of diverse theoretical references occurring in an extensive puranic literature of which we are proud of!

After a general introduction to the subject as a whole it is not desirable to review all these works, rather some of them, especially valuable from the stand points of *vāstuśāstra*, are proposed to highlight. *Matsya Purāṇa*, *Garuḍa purāṇa*, *Bhaviṣya purāṇa* and *Agni purāṇa* are noteworthy for making us aware the traditional perspective so far the architectural development is concerned. All these Purāṇas devote some chapters to *Vāstu-vidyā* and Image worship.

Quite a few research work has come down to us to this field which prominently speak an artist's workmanship, which is almost lost to us in the colonial period. Still the subject awaits for a fresh enquiry in this direction. Earlier attempts focussing on temple parts, ground plan, varieties of temples, the material used for erecting the monuments etc. evince the historical background to some extent but they are not suggesting the later on-going process of utilitarian in the practical field and its technical side. Hence this attempt is mainly purported to investigate the purāṇic background on the temple architecture aiming its impact on later *śilpa* texts, if possible to some extent.



It is to be borne in mind that Purāṇas are not the works on *śilpaśāstra*, though they ensure textural evidences. They are short compendiums on śilpa, possibly there are precursors and then Puranic ṛṣi might have borrowed from those extant texts.

Moving to the constructional phase it seems that puranic decades had already passed the primitive stage. Matsya purāṇa, the earlier supposed one, especially, recounts twenty types of temples like *Meru*, *Mandara*, *Kailāsa*, *Sarvatobhadra*, *Nandivardhana*, *Kumbha*, *Pādonaka* and so on (MP, V.S. Agrawal p. 369). A peep into the Brāhmaṇas furnishes us the then condition of religious structures. From the study of Brāhmaṇas it appears that all the buildings/constructions within the sacred precinct, are accessory and subservient to religious performances. viz. the hall, *maṇḍapa*, *garbhagrha* intimately connected with image worship.

Some Vedic hymns are also helpful in reconstructing the origin of architectural history of our land. *Ṛgveda* refers to a lord of the house (*Vastospati*), *harmya*, Varuṇa's mansion (RV. VII. 88. 21). It also mentions two names of an artists viz. *Vis'vakarmā* and *Tvaṣṭā*. Such expressions collectively trigger memories of known śilpa texts like *Samarāṅgaṇa Sūtradhāra*, *Śilpa-ratna*, *Vāstusāra* etc. They engender an understanding of building activities growing throughout the ages. Thus having a wide currency in the literature for a temple or a shrine, the subject itself is accustomed to unequal attention when by the life of puranic era, the activity of building a temple formed a uniformed style, which essentially requires constructional techniques.

*Matsya purāṇa*, *Garuḍa purāṇa*, *Agni purāṇa* provide technical names to the different parts of the temple i.e. *pragriva*, *bhitti*, *amalakasāra*, *śikhara*, *gopura* etc. which are retained in the current architectural field. From ancient times each of these words indicated a peculiar structure. Each had a different shape and form which in later growth is losing its position because of the western pattern adopted in elevation of the superstructure and so on. Few are retained among the practitioners. Mediaeval period had a bearing of the post terminology copiously than the present one.

Looking through the Liṅga purāṇa Chap. 77 which advocates phallic worship by making Śiva's shrines either in any style, adds outstanding contribution to the stylistic paraphernalia. The act of building a temple or a shrine was deemed highly virtuous since past many years. It accrues highest rewards to the devotees, assures freedom from all sins, bestows perfect knowledge, all pleasures, benefit of great sacrifices and so on. It is

to be noted here that the Hindu temple is built with the favour of devotion as were of offering and pious liberality, in order to secure for a builder, a place in heaven observes Stella Kramrisch (Hindu Temple Vol. 1 p. 142). She further remarks that temple is a *tīrtha* in art in her learned exposition on the evolvement of temple architecture; in individuality. It is a means of communication ground us, as though a living organism. It is a distinguished work of an artist's talent.

*Prāsāda*, as far as preserved temple show, consists of thick walls, and a roof, forming a dark square chamber entered through a door with a more or less elaborated frame, supplements Tarapada Bhattacharya, which creates, visual representation of a temple as such : (Vāstu-vidyā-cansons on Indian Art P. 443). Moreover he notes some changing phenomenon in the constructional experiments, e.g. the roof is flat in the early temples. It seems that a raised plinth or a terrace is a sub-structure of the body of the temple and frequently it accomodates a path of circumambulation (op. cit.)

Resources from *Liṅga purāṇa* are assets in the development and growth of architectural style. The Purāṇa virtually emphasises on three styles namely *Nāgara*, *Drāviḍa*, and *vesara*, a. though it's output is scanty. *Liṅga purāṇa* insists on the *śivabhakti*, by any means, either by buidling a temple called *Nāgara*, *Drāviḍa* or *Kesara* with all the strength in the words.

- (1) "तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन भक्त्या भक्तैः शिवालयम् ।  
कर्तव्यं सर्वयत्नेन धर्मकामार्थसिद्धये"
- (2) केशरं नागरं वापि द्राविडं वा तथापरम् ।  
कृत्वा रुद्राख्यं भक्त्या शिवत्लेके महीयते"

This couplet is extremely thought provoking in the stylistic realm. No doubt this is a reliable specification regarding the distinct styles which show linkage with later stylistic settlement referred to and classified by Bhoja in *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, by Bhuvandevācārya in *Aparajitāpīcchā* or by Thakkur per in *Vāstuāra*. Though it is a disputable matter, these quotations supply on a major break through to study on *śilpa śāstras*.

Scholars have ventured on this point. They attest *Nāgara* style to the *Nagara*, a urban structure which is highly decorative. The word *Nāgara* is derived from *Nagar*.a So it means pertaining to a city or a town. According to this view a *prāsāda* of a stone or baked bricks should be built for decorating the towns. *Nāgara śikharaś* are rectangular and the temples are devoid of *adhīṣṭhāna*. Another meaning of the word *nāgara* is



universe. So the temple is the universe, in a likeness to is *nagara*, for it rests on the *Nagar Vāstupuruṣa*. These derivations are not convincing so far the structure is concerned. The name *nāgara* with its classifications, frequently occur in BS, SS, ISP, AP. Some of these texts inform now to make *Nagaradvāra*, *Mandovara Āmalaka*. Their centre seems to be in M.P. *Nāgar* temple inculcates *amalaka*. It is a square from the bottom to the *śikhara*.

The *Drāviḍa* pattern is found in South India. The temple has a *Kalaśa* and not *amalaka* and domelike shape. It stands on the *adhiṣṭhāna* or *Pṭtnha*. It also hints at a huge and tall *gopura*. In the *Drāviḍa* temple the body is square while its dome shape is six-sided or eight-sided.

Coming to the *Vesara* style, in plan it is *Drāviḍa* while in shape it imitates *Nāgara*. The *śikhara* is curvilinear; scholars enunciate *Vesara* style as an assimilation of two styles. *Vesara* means a mule. In this type preference is given to the circular cupola, octagonal domeshape of the *Drāviḍa* type.

All these discussions pertaining to the styles persistently has been a controversial view-point, since we did not have enough factual data to make substantially well argued conjecture for the point discussed. *Liṅga purāṇa* used the word *Kesara* instead of *Vesara*.

*Nāgara*, *Drāviḍa* or *Vesara* styles cannot be restricted to the geographical divisions because *Nagara* temples are found upto the river *Tungabhadra*. On the other hand those of *Drāviḍa* style temples extend as far north as Ellora.

It appears that by the time of *Liṅga purāṇa* three trends, familiarly known as *Nāgara*, *Drāviḍa* and *Kesara* were well established still we cannot explore the matter in detail.

At this juncture, I would like to bring to the attention of scholars, some points in discovering hidden meaning in each style for their resettlement.

To start with the *Nāgara* style the word may be derived from the word *agara* which means a collective place, comprising sub units, *na* in the word *nāgara* is not in the negative sense, but the 'na' particle has a positive meaning. In RV *na* means *sa*. Thus *nāgara* implies collective temples or collective shrines situated on a particular area. If *Nāgara* style follows *nagara* architecture then it would mean that *nagara* is akin to city architecture, a *śālā* (flat roof) type houses.

About the *Drāviḍa* style I propose to derive the word from *dra/drā*-cave or hole where invocation is done wholeheartedly; *vila* means to cry. We do have evidence of cave architecture from past. Following the



reading *Keśara/Kesara* from *Liṅga purāṇa* instead of *Vesara*, than the entire outlook changes. *Keśara/Kesara* may be linguistically analysed. There is a word in Ṛgveda, *Kāsāra* which means a pond, a lake, pool (RV. 10.43). With the common phonetic changes like a/e, and ś/s, the verbal from *Keśara* will mean the structure which is made in the water. viz. temple in a lake or water or a lake palace, bridge etc. : Varuṇa's mansion in the water is referred to in Ṛgveda in the second palatalization –K changes to V.

Herein I supplement another word to strengthen my view-point. The word *vesarda* may be derived from the word *Veshanta* which means a small pond or pool. Again here comes the same phenomenon that is interchange of syllables like ś/s and t/r. (very rare) : T Burrow in Sanskrit Language cites the examples of phonetic changes.

While suggesting the above stand-point one major aspect belonging to the structure is taken into account. That is of measurements. In the preparation of plans proportions are important. For the measurements or for the method followed on the division of area and so on, we may trace to MP (Matsya Purana) since it esteems what is called *Kṣhetramāna*. Not only the *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, *Agni purāṇa* also deals with the divine structures which are usually constructed in proportion to the lengths of images. There is another type of method which is based on the proportions of the door frames. The third variety is followed while making a ground plan, is an area on which the image would be installed.

The distinction in the elevation also depends on the shape and number of pillars. The change in structure is noticeable when accessory structures like Porch (*maṇḍapa*) *Prāgriv (antarāla maṇḍapa)*, terraces (*Budra*), *mañjari (śikara)* etc. are manifested alongwith the sanctum. The entire elevation rests on pillars or on the *adhiṣṭhāna*, that is to say from bottom to top, with some experimentation in *maṇḍovara* or the superstructure. At this point I would like to pinpoint my observation, since *ksetramāna* is one of the the major criteria in discussing the varieties of the temples. Purāṇas like *Matsya*, *Garuḍa*, *Agni* highlight on measurements concomitant to distinct temples.

To sum up, in these circumstances the *Kṣetramāna* pertaining to area may be looked up as a means to construct the houses or *śālā* type architectre which may be blended in a *nāgar* style.

According to my observation, the view point that prevails over in the case of *Drāviḍa* style is that it depends on the proportions of *dvāramāna*, and the third *Vesara* style emerges out from the structure on the pillars.

## PURANIC SIDELIGHTS ON THE MAHĀBHĀRATA

By

PRADIP BHATTACHARYA

[सन्ति काश्चन आख्यायिकाः कथा वा या पुराणेषु महाभारते चोभयत्र वर्णिताः । उभयशास्त्रगतेषु एषु वर्णनेषु सर्वांशत ऐकरूप्यं न दृश्यते। अस्य ऐक्यरूप्याभावस्य केनापि कारणेनावश्यं भवितव्यमिति निश्चप्रचम् ।

पुराण-महाभारतोक्तानां कासाञ्चन कथानाम् ईदृशं भेदमाश्रित्य लेखकेनात्र विशिष्टो विमर्शः कृतः । मत्स्यगन्धा-एकलव्य-द्रौपदी-चरितानि विशेषतो विचारितान्यत्र । दर्शितमत्र लेखकेन यत् सभायां दौपद्याः केशाकर्षणपूर्वकमानयनं यथा पुराणेषूक्तं न तथा तस्यै कृष्णकर्तृकं वस्त्रप्रदानम्, यत् खलु महाभारते व्यक्तमुक्तं सभापर्वणि । अन्यत्रापि महाभारते नेदमुक्तमिति विज्ञेयम् । एतेनेदं गम्यते यद् वस्त्रप्रदानरूपं कर्म अर्वाक् कालिकलेखककल्पितं कृष्णमहिमप्रदर्शनार्थं न तथ्यमिदमिति]

Very interesting light is thrown on some of the characters and events of the *Mahābhārata* in some of the Puranic works, particularly the *Harivaṁśa* and the *Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.

The *Mahābhārata* tells us of the ancient enmity between two branches of Ajamiḍha's descendants: the Pāñcālas of Kāmpilya and Ahicchatra and the rulers of Hastināpura. This came to a head when Saṁvaraṇa lost Hastināpura to the Pāñcālas (his agnate cousins) and took shelter in the west where Vasiṣṭha came to his rescue and restored him the kingdom with the help of Śaka, Hūṇa and Pahlava hordes. It is this traditional enmity which Droṇa exploits to wreak his vengeance on Drupada through the Hastināpura Princes. Drupada had performed penance to obtain a son for killing Bhīṣma [*Udyoga Parva* 189.4], who obviously represented to him the oppression of Hastināpura which had taken away half his kingdom. That is how Śikhaṇḍī is born. Again, for the same reason Dhṛṣṭadyumna, the Pāñcāla crown-prince, is commander-chief of the allied Pāñcāla-Matsya-Cedi-Magadha-Pāṇḍava forces against Hastināpura. For the same reason, the battle does not end till all the Pāñcālas have been decimated by Aśvatthāmā. Hastināpura at that stage is left clear of the dynasty of Ajamiḍha, for neither Yudhiṣṭhira nor Parīkshit can be said to



carry in their veins the blood of Kuru the last drops of which have been soaked up by the arid plains of Kurukṣetra.

The *Harivaṁśa* Parva of the *Harivaṁśa* presents additional information narrated by Bhīṣma in chapter 20, śloka 50-73 to Yudhiṣṭhira. A king named Ugrāyudha was born in one of the branches of Ajamiḍha's dynasty which was known as "Paurava". Ugrāyudha wiped out the Nīpa king of Kāmpilya, who was the ancestor of Drupada, along with his family. After the death of Śāntanu, Ugrāyudha had the effrontery to send Bhīṣma a message during the very period of mourning for handing over Gandhakālī (Satyavatī) to him in return for considerable wealth. Ugrāyudha appears to have been feared for his irresistible dazzling discus which put all enemies to flight on mere sight. In the message, Bhīṣma was advised that if he valued the welfare of the kingdom and the subjects and himself, he should acknowledge Ugrāyudha's suzerainty. Bhīṣma was about to take up arms in defence of the minor Vicitravīrya (significantly there is no mention of the elder son Citrāṅgada here) when the counsellors pointed out that the period of mourning was not over and he was still in an "unclean" state according to the scriptures and that Ugrāyudha was irresistible because of his *cakra*. They decided to apply the strategies of intrigue, bribery and peace first and only then destroy the enemy when he was unprepared as Indra had done with the asura Śambara. Bhīṣma, thereupon, refrained from going into battle. As a matter of fact, we do not have any evidence in the epic of Bhīṣma's prowess in any battle till he abducts the Kāśī princesses. And that skirmish remains the solitary instance of his prowess till the Kurukṣetra war (he is quite easily laid low in the battle over Virāṭa's cattle).

However, peaceful attempts etc. failed with wicked Ugrāyudha who had his eyes set on Gandhakālī's beauty and extending his hegemony over Hastināpura. Satyavatī's desperation for obtaining heirs to the throne (she is described as 'hungry for grandsons'), which strikes us as exaggerated in the *Mahābhārata* becomes quite understandable in the light of this experience. She was obviously aware of the greedy eyes of neighbouring kings on the empty throne of Hastināpura, particularly in the context of Bhīṣma's peculiar detached witness stance.

In the meantime, somehow Ugrāyudha's terrifying discus became ineffective. Bhīṣma merely states that this was because of his unholy lusting after another's wife, which is incorrect because Satyavatī was no

one's wife at that stage but a young widow. He adds that the virtuous roundly condemned Ugrāyudha, which means that Bhīṣma's counsellors succeeded in mobilising public opinion against him and he must have been weakned somehow so that his enemies no longer feared him, which is sought to be conveyed by the loss of the effectiveness of the discus which used to terrify them.

After the mourning period was over, Bhīṣma fought Ugrāyudha for a period of three days and killed him. Thereupon, Pṛṣat (Drupada's father) attacked Kāmpilya and, with Bhīṣma's permission, occupied it. That is how the Pāñcālas came back to their ancestral kingdom. Obviously, this occupation was in some way dependant on the goodwill of Hastināpura, which was rubbed into Drupada when he was defeated and deprived of half his kingdom (he was permitted to retain the traditional Pāñcāla capital Kāmpilya while the Ahicchatra portion was taken away under Hastināpura's control).

This same *parva* in the *Harivaṁśa* tells us in chapter 18, s'hlokas 26-46 of the previous birth of Śatyavatī, of which the chapter on "Partial Incarnations" in the *Mahābhārata* is innocent. It appears that the river Acchodā.....renowned as the source of the lake Acchodā.....was the mind-born daughter of a group of ancestral spirits known as Agniṣvāttas, but was unaware of this. Once she had seen in the heavens Amāvasu, son of Āyu (Pururavā's son) in the company of the apsarās Adrikā and had taken him as her father. Because of this sin, she had to be born on earth of Adrikātturned-fish, begotten by this Amāvasu reborn as Uparichara Vasu, king of Cedi. As Acchodā had committed a gross fault, she would be known, the ancestors told her, as *Dāśeyī Satyavatī*, that is, "Satyavati of the Dāsa clan", born in a low caste in the twenty-eighth Dvāpara yuga. Bhīṣma refers to Satyavatī precisely in that fashion in the *Mahābhārata*, *Udyoga Parva*, 174.1.

In chapter 58 śloka 26 we are given a different version of the previous birth of Śāntanu. According to the epic, Śāntanu is Mahābhīṣa—a king of the solar dynasty-re-born. Here, however, we are told that he is the incarnation of Samudra, the eastern sea (i.e.the Bay of Bengal), cursed by Viṣṇu whom he had dared to soak in high-tide accompanied by Gaṅgā. Because Samudra had become peaceful when Viṣṇu commanded "Śānta" his earthly incarnation is named Śāntanu. Gaṅgā is cursed to



accompany him on earth because she had kept Samudra company in his effrontery.

The *Devī Bhāgavata Purāna* tells us in Book II chapter 1 śloka 36-38 that king Uparichara Vasu of Cedi adopted the male child brought to him by a fisherman, and that this child became the redoubtable king of Matsya. Thus, here we find a link between the ancestry of Virāṭa's kingdom and the Cedi kings, who are agnate cousins of the Hastināpura dynasty. Typically, the female child was returned to the fisherman and brought up by him, named Kālī, because of her dark complexion; Matsyodarī, being found within a fish in the Yamunā river; and Matsyagandhā because of the fishy odour of her body. This Purāṇa provides a very interesting detailed account of the conversation between her and Parāśara in II. 2.1-36 which amplifies the epic account we are familiar with.

Parāśara was on a pilgrimage and reached the right bank of the river Yamunā where he asked a fisherman to take him across. As the fisherman was eating, he bade his enchanting sweet-smiling nubile daughter to row the sage across the river. Inflamed by her youth, the sage caught her right hand. Thereupon, the dark girl smiled and said:

What you are about to do,  
does it befit your ancestry,  
your asceticism or the scriptures ?

Your family reputation is unimpeachable;  
in Vasiṣṭha's clan you are born.  
Hence, O dharma-knower, what is this  
you wish, enslaved by desire ?

Best of Brāhmaṇas ! I feel on earth  
achieving Human-birth is a rarity.  
Even rarer specially among men  
is Brāhmaṇa-hood.

Best of twice-born! you are high-born  
virtuous, scripture-versed, dharma-knowing.

Hence, O Indra of Brāhmaṇas, though you see  
my body fish-odorous, yet why  
do un-Aryan feelings in you arise ?

O twice-born! I doubt not  
 Your wisdom is most prescient.  
 But what auspicious marks you see in my body  
 that you approach to possess me ?  
 Are you so possessed by desire  
 that your own dharma you forget ?

Saying this she mused:

"Oh! This dvija has lost his senses  
 mad to possess me. Now in doing so  
 he will upset the boat and drown,  
 for he is desperate, his heart  
 pierced by desire's five arrows,  
 and none can withstand him."

Musing thus, the girl told the great sage,  
 "Great one, be patient till we reach the other bank."

Sūta said, Parāśara heeded her well-meant advice.  
 He let go her hand and sat quiet.

But reaching the other side  
 the sage, desire-tormented,  
 seized Matsyagandhā again for coition.  
 Quivering, annoyed, she spoke  
 to the sage before her:

"O best of sages ! My body stinks.  
 Can you not sense it ? Coitus  
 ought to delight both equally."

As she spoke, in a flash the girl turned  
 fragrant-for-a-yojana,  
 Yojanagandhā, lovely-faced, beautiful.

Making his beloved musk-fragrant, enchanting  
 the sage, desire-tormented, seized her right hand

Then auspicious Satyavatī, finding the sage  
 bent on coition, said

"All people and my father on the bank  
 can see us. It is daylight.



Such beastly conduct doesn't please me.  
 It disgusts me.  
 Hence, O best of sages,  
 wait till night falls.

Coitus is prescribed for men  
 only at night, not at daytime.  
 In the day it is grievous transgression;  
 If seen brings great disrepute.  
 Grant this desire of mine, wise one.

Finding her words logical,  
 the generous sage at once  
 shrouded all in a mist  
 by his powers.

As the mist arose deep darkness  
 shrouded the bank.

Then the desirable woman spoke  
 to the sage in dulcet tones:

"I am a virgin, O tiger among twice-born.  
 Enjoying me, you, ll depart where you will.  
 But infallible is your seed, O Brāhmaṇa.  
 What will be my fate ?

What shall I tell my father  
 if today I get pregnant ?  
 When you have left after enjoying me  
 what shall I do ? Tell me."

Parāshara said, "Beloved, today having delighted me  
 you shall regain virginity.

If still you fear, woman, ask  
 what boon you will."

Satyavati said, 'Best of twice-born,  
 you ever honour others.

Do that so neither my father nor anyone  
 knows anything. Do that whereby  
 my virgin status is not destroyed.

May your son be like you  
wondrously gifted.  
May this fragrance forever  
grace my body.  
May my youth remain ever fresh  
ever new.

In response, Parāśara tells her that since he feels this overpowering attraction for her despite her repellent odour, there must be a supernatural cause for it. He assures her of her son's world-wide fame as arranger of the Vedas, author of the Purānas, and promptly proceeds to enjoy her and leaves after bathing in the Yamunā.

The remarkable strength of a fisher-girl's character is what strikes us as we go through the relevant verses. Though just a teenager who has reached puberty, she is not to be brow-beaten by a sage, however famous he might be. As a matter of fact, she reads him quite a lesson in propriety and resists his importunate advances with admirable presence of mind. Noticing his passion, she takes care not to refuse him as that might provoke him into forcing her and upsetting the boat into the river in the process. She buys time by requesting him to wait till they reach the other bank of the river, and hopes that his passion will cool in the meantime. Parāśara appreciates her sound sense, and waits till they reach the other shore (in the *Mahābhārata* his importunity is not to be denied, and he takes her in the boat, in mid-stream, which certainly tries the imagination!).

When his ardour remains unquenched on the other side of the Yamunā, she is clearly irritated (quivers in annoyance). The nubile woman in her is also conscious of the malodour infesting her body, which she herself finds disgusting as she draws his attention to it more than once, hoping it will put him off. with a maturity and frankness which astonishes us even in the closing years of the twentieth century, she reminds him that sexual intercourse ought to be an experience equally delightful for both partners. Parāśara counters this by making her body musk-fragrant instantly, but still she does not give in.

Her dignity as a human being is of paramount concern to Satyavati and she points out the gross animality of performing coitus in full view of everyone in broad daylight. She reminds him that they will be visible to her father. when Parāśara is obdurate, she begs him to be conscious of



social calumny and wait till nightfall when at least privacy will be ensured. Once again the sage is forced to acknowledge the rationality of this fisher-girl's arguments.

Then, even after Parāśara has shrouded them in an impenetrable mist, she raises the final objection: what happens to her after he has enjoyed her and left ?

For, again with a maturity rare at her tender age, she knows that he has no intention of marrying her. It is just that he is temporarily obsessed by a compulsive desire to enjoy her body. So, her concern is her reputation. How is she to face her father and the world if she becomes pregnant ? Parāśara assures her of regaining her virgin status, and appreciating how hard she has been fighting to protect herself, and with what remarkable intelligence putting off step by step the inevitable, gaining something for herself all the time, he offers her boons. This is where we find, at last, the woman in Satyavatī revealing her inmost feminine desires: she wants the fragrant body-odour to remain permanently, and her youth to be unfading-gifts for which Helen was famed and surely what all women of all time everywhere have always desired!

The mystery of the unimpaired virgin status of Satyavatī becomes somewhat more comprehensible in the light of the insights into her character which this account gives us. Both Satyavatī and her granddaughter-in-law Kuntī were gifted boons of retaining their virgin status even after giving birth to sons. This state of *virginity* refers not just to a physical condition, but to an inner state of being which remains untrammelled by any slavish dependance on a particular man. Mādri presents the exact opposite of this, the *married* woman who is dependant on what others think, because of which she does what she may not actually approve, such as giving in to Pāṇḍu's lustful approaches against her better judgment, resulting in his death. "She is not one-in herself but acts as female counterpart or syzygy to some male", points out Dr. M. Esther Harding in *Woman's Mysteries* (Rider, 1971, p. 125) On the other hand, "the woman who is psychologically virgin is not dependant in this way. She is what she is because that is what she is... (she is ) one -in herself [and] does what she does not because of any desire to please, not to be liked or to be approved, even by herself...but because what she does is true. Her actions may, indeed, be unconventional" (ibid.p.126) . If this is

true of Kuntī who exemplifies this rare quality in all the crucial decisions concerning her sons and in the ultimate choice at her life's very end when all that she seemed to have aimed for had been achieved, it holds equally true for Satyavatī.

We must not forget that the rare maturity we have seen in her here is carried forward to her becoming the veritable arbiter of Hastināpura's destiny. It is she who is responsible for turning the dynasty of Kuru into the lineage of a Dāśa maiden, a woman belonging to a low caste, by making her bastard son beget sons on his widowed step-sisters-in-law. Long before Mahāpadma Nanda established a *sūdra* dynasty in Pāṭaliputra, Satyavatī did so in Hastināpura! And when that dynasty is established, when she has seen the corridors of the palace echo to the shouts of 106 grandchildren, this fisher-girl has no problem in leaving all this royal splendour and gracefully retiring to the forest, realizing that "the green years of the earth are gone". The remarkable maturity of her character strikes us all the more because Bhiṣma, who is as old if not older than her, a born prince and much famed as the wisest patriarch in Bhārata, fails to detach himself in like fashion. As a matter of fact, he does not even try! Instead, he lives on, decrepit and powerless, watching in frozen fascination the suicide of the clan.

The *Devī Bhāgavata* also provides another valuable insight. This is in VI, chap 24 recording Vyāsa's strenuous objections against his mother's insistence that he act according to the *niyoga* custom of levirate. In book I, chapter 20 Vyāsa narrates to Janamejaya that following the death of his son Śuka he was so upset that he returned to his birthplace in search of his mother and found out from the fishermen that she had been married to king Śāntanu. He, then, settled on the banks of Sarasvatī to be near his mother and was delighted to hear of the birth of his two step-brothers. However, when she asked him to beget sons on Ambikā and Ambālikā, he pointed out to her that intercourse with wives of others was a grievous sin. Moreover, a younger brother's wives were like daughters. Having studied the Vedas he could not possibly commit such a transgression. Vyāsa goes to the extent of telling Satyavatī that preserving the dyansty by adopting heinous means is improper. Satyavatī counters this by arguing that improper directives of elders ought to be obeyed and such obedience will not attract any blame, particularly when such action will remove the sorrow of a grieving mother. Bhīṣma also urges Vyāsa to obey his



mother's command. That is when Vyāsa gives in and engages in "this disgusting task" (VI. 24.56). Acknowledging that his attachment to worldly ties kept increasing with the birth of three sons, Vyāsa also wonders whether sons who are the products of adultery (*vyabhicārodbhava*, 25.28) could ever be the source of happiness for him. Later, Vyāsa tells us how he wandered in grievous pain searching for the Pāṇḍavas after hearing of the gutting of the house-of-lac, tracked them down in *Ekacakrā* and sent them to Drupada's capital, and was deeply gratified when they succeeded in celebrating the Rājasua sacrifice. The human side of Vyāsa, subject to attachment, agitated by joys and sorrows like anyone of us, is revealed only in this Purāṇa.

This Purāṇa also presents a remarkable debunking of the most celebrated of *yajñas*, the Rājasūya. In Book III, chapter 12 Vyāsa himself raises questions about the value of performing this *yajña* when within a month of this supposedly the most auspicious of all sacrifices presided over by none other than Kṛṣṇa himself calamity befell the Pāṇḍavas. The explanation he advances is an eye-opener as it provides an insight missing in the epic. Vyāsa states that the motive with which the sacrifice was performed, the state of mind of the Pāṇḍavas, was responsible for the ill effects that followed. They were swollen with arrogance, he states and there might have been other inauspicious elements vitiating it (śloka 33). Such a vitiating element is found in the *Bhaviṣya Parva* of the *Harivaṁśa* Book X.71.3 where Uddhava advises Kṛṣṇa to encourage Yudhiṣṭhira to hold the Rājasūya sacrifice because it will be doubly beneficial— in the course of the *digvijaya* (world-conquest) he can get Jarāsandha, their mortal enemy, killed and earn the gratitude of the kings imprisoned by him while, simultaneously, assisting Yudhiṣṭhira to realise his ambition to become emperor. Again, in Book VI, chapter 16 ślokas 51-53 Vyāsa tells Janamejaya that his ancestors, the Kauravas and Pāṇḍavas were overtaken by destruction because of greed. Because of greed they ruthlessly oppressed blood-relations so much so that all their progeny were wiped out.

In the *Bhaviṣya Parva* of the *Harivaṁśa*, Book II śloka 15 ff. we are told that the Rājasūya Yajña is the seed of war. The first such *yajña* was performed by Candra, and was followed the the very first battle between devas and asuras over Tārā, Bṛhaspati's wife who had left him for Candra after his liaison with Mamatā, famed as the Tārakāmaya Battle. When

Varuṇa performed the Rājasūya, another devāsura war followed. After Hariścandra's Rājasūya Yajña the "Āḍi-baka" battle broke out in which kṣatriyas were decimated.

There is an interesting fact about the famous Aśvamedha Yajña as well in the *Bhaviṣya Parva*, chapter 5. Janamejaya condemns it and declares that he shall be the last monarch to institute this sacrifice because during its performance when his ravishingly beautiful queen Vapuṣṭamā of Kāśī lay down with the corpse of the horse, it came alive and had intercourse with her (Indra apparently entered the horse being smitten with the queen). Thus, both the most famous of ritual sacrifices turn out to be ill-omened!

One of the puzzles of the epic, the non-appearance of Kuntī's brother Vasudeva to help her in her extremity is answered in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* X.82.19-22. Here Kuntī meets her kin when they visit Kurukṣetra for pilgrimage during the solar eclipse and accuses them of not even enquiring after her in her extreme danger despite being so powerful a clan. She exclaims that there is none as unfortunate as her for her own brother and parents do not even remember her. Vasudeva's reply reveals the plight of the Yādavas. He tells Kuntī that they were busy running from pillar to post trying to save themselves from Kaiṁsa and Jarāsandha and had only now been able to live normally in Dvārakā.

The very strong Yādava connection with the Pāṇḍavas rooted in Kuntī is usually thought to have been cemented by Kṛṣṇa fostering Arjuna's marriage to Subhadrā (he goes to the extent of advising Arjuna against taking chances in a *svayamvara* because there is no knowing on whom his sister's fancy will fix, and recommends abduction!). However, in the *Viṣṇu Parva* 90.76-77. of the *Harivaṁśa* we find Kṛṣṇa going further. A Yādava maiden named Bhānumatī is raped by the demon Nikumbha. After rescuing her, to save her honour Kṛṣṇa summons Sahadeva and marries her off to him. He reassures Sahadeva with the interesting information that by Durvāsā's boon Bhānumatī's virgin status remains intact as she has been taken against her will. We recall that Sahadeva's mother Kuntī, too, had received the identical boon and that this had come about because of the *mantra* Durvāsā had gifted her with.

Another hint of the importance of the Yādava connection is provided in the *Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa* II.11.13. Here after Janamejaya's marriage with the Kāśī princess Vapuṣṭamā, their conjugal bliss is



compared to that of Arjuna and Subhadrā in the past, not with Arjuna and Draupadī !.

The fratricidal nature of the battle of Kurukṣetra has been stressed by every writer on the epic. However, the incredible intricacy of the web woven by Vyāsa comes home to us only after perusing the *Harivaṁśa*, rightly known as the supplement to the *Mahābhārata*. If Satyavatī is accepted as the Cedi king Uparicara Vasu's progeny, the blood-relationship of the Kuru dynasty with Magadha and Cedi is established because both Jarāsandha and Śiśupāla who are killed by Kṛṣṇa, have a common ancestor in Uparicara Vasu. Again, Balarāma's mother Rohiṇī is the daughter of Śāntanu's brother Bāhlika (a datum not given in the epic but available in the *Harivaṁśa Parva* 35.4). Thus, the blood-relationship of Hastināpura with the Vṛṣṇis/Yādavas does not begin with Kuntī, as is commonly presumed, but goes back two generations to Śāntanu's time !.

We also realise that intermarriage within prohibited degrees was practised by the Yādavas. Was this one failing which destroyed the moral fibre of this clan resulting in the senseless carnage of Prabhāsa wiping them out wholly by their own hand ? Kṛṣṇa and his first wife Rukmiṇī have a common ancestor in Yadu and belong to two branches of the same clan, tracing their origin to his sons Bhīma and Vidharbha respectively. Besides her, Kṛṣṇa marries daughters of two sisters of his father Vasudeva. Pradyumna marries the daughter of Rukmī, his mother's brother. Pradyumna's son Aniruddha marries Rukmī's grand-daughter Rukmavatī. Rukmī himself is killed by Balarāma despite this close relationship ! Kṛṣṇa, of course, kills his paternal aunt's son Śiśupāla and his mother's brother Kaṁsa, while another paternal aunt's son Dantavakra of Karuṣa is a mortal enemy and ally of Jarāsandha.

Besides this, there is yet another startling secret hidden away in the *Harivaṁśa Parva* chapter 34. Here we learn that Śūra of the Vṛṣṇis had five daughters and ten sons of whom the first was Vasudeva. One of these sons named Devaśravāḥ had a son named Śatrughna who, for some unstated reason, was brought up by the Niṣādas and because of that came to be known as Ekalavya (32-33). In other words, the person of whose skill in archery Arjuna is so jealous that he gets Droṇa to destroy it by using the play of *guru dakṣiṇā* is none other than the son of his mother's brother, his own cognate cousin ! Discarded by his father and grievously



injured in early life by his aunt's son, Ekalavya appears to have joined their enemies thereafter. We find him leading the Niṣādas as their king as an ally of Pauṇḍraka against his agnate cousins Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma. He is defeated by Balarāma and takes shelter in an island (Bhaviṣya Parva 102.4-7). Later he fights on the side of Duryodhana in the battle of Kurukṣetra and Kṛṣṇa claims to slain him, that is his own agnate cousin. Subsequently, in the *Āśvamedhika Parva*, chapter 83, we find the enmity carried into the next generation with Ekalavya's son seizing the sacrificial horse and being slain by Arjuna.

Yet another interesting factor revealed in the Purāṇas, which is not clear from the epic, is the marital relations with asuras which is unique to the lunar dynasty and not found in the solar dynasty. Both, of course, have a common progenitor in the eponymous Vaivasvata Manu, himself the son of Vivasvān-Sūrya. Through his son Sudyumna a different dynasty is founded ruling over Utkala and Gayā. When Sudyumna is turned into a woman, Ilā, and gives birth to Purūravāuḥ through Budha (son of Candra), this son is not permitted to rule in the heartland of the kingdom as he is regarded as Manu's daughter's son. That is why he has to shift to Pratiṣṭhāna (Prayāga/Allahabad) which becomes the seat of the lunar dynasty (*Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* 111, *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 17-18) till the time of Kuru who shifts the capital from Prayāga to Kurukṣetra (*Harivaṃśa Parva* 31.47). In the *Harivaṃśa* we find that after the Asuras took the side of Candra in the Tārakāmaya War against the Devas, the lunar dynasty married Asura princesses. Thus, Purūravāḥ's son Āyu marries Prabhā the daughter of Asura Svarbhānu. Their son Yayāti begets Pūru on Śarmiṣṭhā, daughter of Asura Vṛṣaparvā. This incursion of Asura blood appears to doom the lunar dynasty as agents of the mighty conflagration of Kurukṣetra in which not only the Candravamśa but also the last descendant of Rāma in the Sūryavamśa is wiped out. Ironically, this last scion of the Sūryavamśa fights on the side of Duryodhana and is slain by Abhimanyu. That is somewhat symbolic as Abhimanyu is the incarnation of Candra, and Brhadbhala is the last of the Kośala kings descended in the Solar dynasty.

New light is thrown on the entire question of the infamous attempt to strip Draupadī naked in the Hastināpura court in the *Devī Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (III.12.16; IV.1.36; 17.38). Both Vyāsa and Janamejaya refer only to the dragging of Draupadī by her hair in the catalogue of

catastrophes suffered by the Pāṇḍavas. There is no reference to stripping and the miraculous rescue by Kṛṣṇa. The *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, too, though devoted to the apotheosization of Kṛṣṇa because of which his miraculous intervention to protect Draupadī's modesty would have been an obvious incident to highlight, only refers to Draupadī being dragged by her hair and does not mention the stripping. That urges a second and closer look at the epic itself.

We find that the *vastraharaṇa* is not referred to even once except in the *Anukramaṇikā Parva*, Śloka 156, in the lament of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. Immediately after this horrifying incident is supposed to have taken place we find Kṛṣṇa visiting the Pāṇḍavas in the forest. Here Draupadī narrates her misfortunes to Kṛṣṇa (III.12.61-63,121) mentioning being dragged by the hair, but makes no reference to the attempt to strip her of her single garment. Kṛṣṇa and Yudhiṣṭhira in the *Udyoga Parva* (29.40; 31.16), enumerating to Sañjaya the atrocities committed by the Dhṛtarāṣṭras, do not mention it. Kṛṣṇa speaking to Yudhiṣṭhira on the same subject before the peace-embassy does not mention it (V.73.18-19). Most important of all, Draupadī herself, furious at everyone arguing in favour of a truce, when listing all that she has suffered, does not mention it (V. 82.24-25,36). When Kṛṣṇa meets Kuntī after arriving in Hastināpura on his peace embassy, she enumerates her sorrows, and as many as four times refers to Draupadī having been dragged into court in her single garment while menstruating (V. 90 50-51,57,82.86), but does not refer to any attempt to strip her. Again, while telling Kṛṣṇa what to convey to her sons for stirring up their blood, Kuntī does not refer to this but only to the humiliation in the court (V.137. 18,22). Kṛṣṇa in the course of his embassy in the Hastināpura court mentions to Dhṛtarāṣṭra all that the Pāṇḍavas have suffered at the hands of Duryodhana, speaks of Draupadī being dragged into the royal court (V. 95.59) but does not mention the attempted stripping which ought to have been highlighted as the grossest atrocity. Again, when he upbraids Duryodhanas here by enumerating all his misconduct, there is no reference to the stripping of Draupadī (V. 128.8). When Karṇa is facing death and Kṛṣṇa criticises him for his misdeeds, there is no reference to the stripping and only to Draupadī being dragged into the court. Finally, at Dvaipāyana Lake when Yudhiṣṭhira berates Duryodhana for all the evil he has done in order to provoke him to emerge from the lake and fight, he makes no reference to Draupadī



being stripped although he mentions her being dragged into the assembly hall. Even in the very killing of Duḥśāśana, Bhīma refers to Draupadī being dragged by her hair and only asks him with which hand he had dragged her, and Duḥśāśana boastfully displays the hand in question, but neither refers to any stripping. In each case it is the insult to which Draupadī was subjected by being dragged into the royal court in a single garment while in her monthly period which features with the occasional additional detail of her being dragged by her hair.

*The internal evidence, therefore, suggests that the vastraharaṇa of Draupadī and the preservation of modesty by Kṛṣṇa's miraculous intervention is an interpolation.* The comparatively recent character of the interpolation can be estimated when we notice that even in Bhāsa's play Dūtavākya (circa 4th century B.C.) both Duryodhana and Kṛṣṇa only refer to Draupadī being dragged by her hair and not to her being stripped. This passage, including the appeal to Kṛṣṇa for succour, was inserted into the epic after the *Bhāgavata* and the *Devī Bhāgavata* purāṇas had been composed. That makes it a fairly late interpolation and the contribution of the Vaiṣṇavite *bhakti* movemnt. Confirmation of this diagnosis is available from the Critical Edition of the *Sabhā Parva* which omits Draupadī's appeal to Kṛṣṇa as also that of the *Karṇa Parva* which omits reference to the stripping in Bhīma's speech during the slaying of Duḥśāśana.



## SOME NOTEWORTHY READINGS IN THE KŪRMA PURĀṆA

By

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

[अत्र कूर्मपुराणस्य केषाञ्चित् पाठानामर्थादिविषये विमर्शः कृतः ।]

(1) The Kūrma-purāṇa [=KP] reads : श्रीपतेरुदरं भूयः प्रविवेश कुशध्वजः (1.9.25). Here Kuśadvaja undoubtedly means Brahmā. Surprisingly enough the word is not found in any of the lexicons known to us.

The dictionary of Monier Williams however mentions kuśaketu as a name of Brahmā and remarks that the meaning is found in Galanos' Dictionary (s. v. Kuśa). (Ketu is the same as *dhvaja*). Unfortunately this dictionary is not with us .

Though no direct proof can be given from Sanskrit literature, yet there is reason to believe that the Kuśa grass has some connection with Brahmā. The Mārkaṇḍeya-p. 91.11 is found to extol Brahmāṇi as कौशाम्भःक्षरिका<sup>1</sup> which evidently shows this connection.

It is quite likely that in some Puranic tale Brahmā has been connected with the Kuśa grass. Unfortunately we have not come to know of such a tale.<sup>2</sup>

(2) Describing the Vāmana incarnation KP. says that Vāmana learnt *samācara* from Bharadvāja:

कृतोपनयनो वेदानध्यैष्ट भगवान् हरिः ।  
समाचारं भरद्वाजात् त्रिलोकाय प्रदर्शयन् ॥  
(1.16.44)

What is meant by *samacara* here? Usually the word means manners, customs, virtuous conduct, behaviour, usage. But these cannot be construed with the verb अध्येष्ट : (he studied or read).

The word *samācāra* is used in Brahmasūtra 3.3.3 and according to Śaṅkara it means वेदव्रतोपदेशपरग्रन्थः ।

It is quite reasonable that KP. uses the word in this very sense in the above verse.

(3) While mentioning Rāma's marrying Sītā, KP. compares it with Kārttikeya's marrying Senā: सेनामिव च षण्मुखः (1.20.25; Saṅmukha,

having six faces, is a name of Kārttikeya). In fact the actual name of the wife of Kārttikeya is Devasenā. The use of Senā for Devasenā is in accordance with the rule विनापि प्रत्ययेन पूर्वोत्तरपदयोर्विभाषा लोपो वक्तव्यः (Kāśikā 5.3.83)<sup>3</sup>

A similar example is found in KP. 1.11.227 (योगिनां त्वं कुमारकः) in which Kumāraka is used for Sanatkumāra. The secondary suffix *ka* is in *svārtha*.

(4) KP reads: महाकल्पश्च कल्याणाम् (2.11.10).

It is somewhat difficult to determine the import of mahākālpa. Mahākālpa is not the name of any kalpa (For a list of *kalpas*, see Sk. Revā, ch. 13). It may be said that as *mahāpralaya* is a particular kind of *pralaya*,<sup>4</sup> so *mahākālpa* must be a particular kind of *kalpa*. *Kālpa* of a higher kind is however not mentioned in the Purāṇas.

It appears that some particular *kalpas* have been regarded as *mahākālpas* on account of some reasons (appearance of some great *avatāra* or occurrence of some great event); for example, the Pādma kalpa is regarded as a *mahākālpa* in Viṣṇu-p. 1.3.27. According to the comm. Śrīdhara *mahākālpa* is a secondary (*avāntara*) kalpa which, on account of possessing some glorious merit, has been regarded as *mahākālpa*.<sup>5</sup>

(5) In the eulogy of Śiva KP. reads:

यया सन्तरते मायां योगी संक्षीणकल्मषः ।

अपारतरपर्यन्तां तस्मै विद्यात्मने नमः ॥ (1.10.68)

The reading *apāratara* does not yield any good sense; it seems to be corrupt. A careful consideration of the variant readings reveals that it ought to be corrected to *अवारपारपर्यन्ताम्*.

*Avārapāra* is a well-established word, for it has been used by Pāṇini in his sūtra (4.2.93). राष्ट्रवारपाराद् घञौ According to the comm. Prakriyāsarvasva *avāra* means *avāktīra* (the near bank) and *pāra* means *paratīra* (the distant bank). Thus *avārapāraparyanta* would mean 'embracing all far and near'; cp. the word *parāvāra* in Muṇḍaka-up. 2.2.8 (तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे), in which *parāvāra* means cause (*para*) and effect (*avara*); see Śaṅkara's bhāṣyā परं च कारणात्मना, अवरं च कार्यात्मना ।

(6) In सर्वोपनिषदां देवि गुह्योपनिषदुच्यते



(1.11.232) the significance of the word *guhya* requires to be determined, for *guhya* may aptly be applied as an epithet to all the Upaniṣads. The word *guhyopaniṣad* is found in 1.15.195 (वेदान्तगुह्योपनिषत्सु गीतः) also. It occurs in Matsya-p. 248. 73 and in Harivaṁśa 3.34.40 (गुह्योपनिषदासनः). The word is found in Śvetāśvatara Up. 5.56 also.

It appears that *guhya upaniṣad* means that portion of an Upaniṣad which chiefly deals with the nature of brahman.

(7) While referring to Śiva KP. uses the word *pitāmaha* in 1.29.64; similarly it uses the word for Sūrya in 1.41.1.

In these places the word is to be taken in a broader sense ('the great father') and not in the conventional sense of Brahmā.

(8) In the passage शंकरो धर्मवाहनः (1.7.28) *dharma* stands not for *dharma* (merit) but for the bull; cp. वृषो हि भगवान् धर्मः (Mbh. Śānti-p. 342. 88).

(9) The word *brahman* (neuter) is used as an epithet to the unmanifested *prakṛti* or *pradhāna* of Sāṁkhya in 1.4.89 (ब्रह्माग्रे समवर्तत) (This is found in Vāyu-p. 4.20 and in other Purāṇas also; see also the Puranic passage quoted in the comm. Ujjvalā on Āp. Dharma Sūtra 1.8.22.4).

The use of *brahman* for *prakṛti* is justifiable as it is the ultimate material cause of all internal and external entities. All kinds of activities fall under the *guṇas* (i. e. *prakṛti*); that is why some Purāṇas ascribe creation and dissolution to the *prakṛti* (एतदेव जगत्सृष्टिं करोति विकरोति च, Matsya-p. 3. 15; एतत् = अव्यक्त प्रधान), and some go to the length of saying that the Mahat principle comes out on account of 'the act of seeing' of *prakṛti*; ईक्षणादेव प्रकृतेर्महत्तत्त्वमजायत (SK., Kumārikā-khaṇḍa 37. 7).

While referring to *prakṛti*, Sāṁkhyan works also use the word *brahman*; see प्रकृतिः प्रधानमधिकुरुते, ब्रह्म अव्यक्तं बहुधात्मकं मायेति पर्यायाः (Māṭhara-vṛtti on Sāṁ. Kā. 22).

(10) KP. 2. 37. 13 says that according to Sāṁkhya (एतत् सांख्यदर्शनम्) *ātman* (i. e. *puruṣa*) is *eka*. Since it is an established fact that Sāṁkhya accepts the plurality of *puruṣas*, some may take the reading as doubtful.

According to us the reading *eka* is correct, for *eka* in the above passage does not mean 'one in number', but it means 'simple', 'non-composite' unmixed (*asaṁhata*, *ekarasa*, *akhaṇḍa*); cp. असंहतस्य

एकात्मकस्य ब्रह्मणः (Śārīrakabhāṣya on Br. Sū 1.1.5). We may say that here *eka* stands for *ekarūpa* (of one and the same form) in which sense *eka* is used in many places in śāstric works.

This *ekatva* of *puruṣa* is in consonance with the view of Sāṅkhya-kārikā II which says that both *vyakta* and *puruṣa* are opposite in character (तद्विपरीतः) and both *avyakta* and *puruṣa* are similar in some points (तथा च पुमान्). Now as *avyakta* is *eka* (one in number), so *puruṣa* is *eka* (of one form or nature). Here the same word *eka* is used in two different senses.<sup>6</sup> The comm. Gauḍapāda has expressly remarked 'तस्मात् पुरुषोऽप्येकः'

(11) I want to conclude the article by referring to the peculiar reading of a verse. KP. 1.11.281-282 contains an enumeration of fourteen *vidyās* :

शिक्षा कल्पो व्याकरणं निरुक्तं छन्द एव च ।  
ज्योतिःशास्त्रं न्यायविद्या मीमांसा चोपबृंहणम् ॥ 281 ॥  
एवं चतुर्दशैतानि विद्यास्थानानि सत्तम ।  
चतुर्वेदैः सहोक्तानि धर्मो नान्यत्र विद्यते ॥

Curiously enough the number of *vidyāsthānas* comes to 13, the names being Śikṣā, Kalpa, Vyākaraṇa, Nirukta, Chandas, jyotiḥśāstra (i.e. Jyotiṣa), Nyāyavidyā, Mīmāṃsā and Upabṛiṇṇaṇa (i.e. Itihāsa-Purāṇa).<sup>7</sup>

It is well known that in the established list of 14 *vidyāsthānas* four Vedas, six Vedāṅgas, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, Dharmaśāstra and Purāṇa (in which Itihāsa is included) are enumerated.<sup>8</sup>

Thus it is clear that the KP. list does not mention Dharmaśāstra. It should be noted that the particle च cannot stand for the 14th *Vidyāsthāna* (i.e. Dharmaśāstra), for here the purpose of the verse is to give the names of the *Vidyāsthānas* and च cannot stand as the name of any *śāstra*.

Thus it stands to reason that the reading of the second line of verse 281 deserves to be corrected. That the reading विद्या is corrupt may be proved by the fact that *vidyā* cannot reasonably be the name of any *vidyā* or *vidyāsthāna*.

It may be conceived that the original reading was न्यायधर्मो (*Dharma* standing for Dharmaśāstra). This is however highly doubtful, for the



reading is not supported by the variants and it is difficult to explain how the word *dharmā* was changed into *vidyā* by the scribes.

These verses with the same readings have been quoted by Bhāskara in his commentary on *Lalitāsahasranāma* (on verse 129). It is unfortunate that a scholar like Bhāskara failed to notice this discrepancy.

A conjecture may be hazarded about the occurrence of the word विद्या in the place of धर्म in न्यायधर्मो (conceived as the original reading). It may be surmised that the word *dharmā* was discarded by some scribe willingly as he thought that since *dharmā* (meaning merit) was said to exist in the *vidyāsthānas* only (धर्मो नान्यत्र विद्यते), *dharmā* could not be the name of any *vidyāsthāna*. The vacant place was filled up with the word *vidyā* by the scribe on account of its being capable of signifying *dharmā* (merit), without considering the impotence of this word in conveying the sense of *Dharmaśāstra*. It is needless to say that this conjecture possesses little strength and we request scholars to afford a better solution of the problem.

1. हंसयुक्तविमानस्ये ब्रह्माणीरूपधारिणि ।  
कौशाम्भःक्षरिके देवि नारायणि नमोऽस्तु ते ॥  
कुशस्येदमम्भः कौशाम्भः (comn. Caturdharī); कुशो धर्मः, तस्येदं कौशम् (Comm. Śāntamavī )
2. It may be noted in this connection that *Brahmā* has a few names that have become more or less obsolete. The lexicon Śabdārṇava reads *Saja* and Sarvānanda's comm. on the *Amara* reads *Sañja* as the names of *Brahmā*; see also *Jajjāta's* comm on *Caraka*, *Cikitsā* 1.50 in which *yajña* is taken as a name of *Brahmā*.
3. See *Mahābhāṣya*, *Paspaśāhnika*: अथवा पूर्वपदलोपोऽत्र द्रष्टव्यः, अत्यन्तसिद्धः सिद्ध इति । तद् यथा देवदत्तो दत्तः, सत्यभामा भामेति. There is a similar rule नामैकदेशग्रहणे नाममात्रग्रहणम्. The form *Satyā* is found in the *Mahābhāṭata* (उवाच सत्या सत्कृत्य पाञ्चाली धर्मचारिणीम्, *Vana-p* 232. 60); for the use of *Bhāmā*, see *Kathāsaritsāgara* 39. 197 (स दृष्ट्वा शोभितं वध्वा तां शौरिमिव भामया)
4. The comm. on the *Vyāsabhāṣya* passage कल्पप्रलयमहाप्रलयेषु (1.25) show the distinctive character of these two kinds of *pralayas*; see also the comm. on *Śāriraka-bhāṣya* passage कल्पान्तरप्रभवप्रलययो रपीति.
5. On तस्यान्तेऽभूत् महाकल्पः (Viṣṇu-p 1.3.25) Śrīdhara observes: महाकल्प इति अवान्तरकल्प एव, पुष्करप्रादुर्भावादिगुणैर्महत्त्वान् महाकल्प इत्युच्यते.
6. As to how one and the same word can denote different senses in the same context or sentence, the reply is that in a work like *Śāmkhyakārikā* which is composed in the

sūtra-style (though the sentences are in verse), the fault of vākyabheda does not apply : अथैकत्वादेकं वाक्यमिति न्यायस्य सूत्रान्यविषयत्वाद् न वाक्यभेदः (comm. Vivaraṇa on Pañcapādikā, p. 82). This is the reason for describing the sūtra as viśvatomukha (स्वल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद् विश्वतोमुखम्..... सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः).

7. cp. इतिहासपुराणाभ्याम् वेदं समुपबृंहयेत् (Mbh. Ādi 1.267); see also Vāyu-p. 1.201; Padma-p. sṛṣṭi 2.51; Śiva-p. Vāyaviya 1.1.36).
8. पुराणन्यायमीमांसाधर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।  
वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥

(Yāj. Smṛti 1.3)

अङ्गानि वेदाश्वत्वोरो मीमांसा न्यायविस्तरः ।

पुराणं धर्मशास्त्रं च विद्या ह्येताश्चतुर्दश ॥

(Viṣṇu-p. 3.6. 28).



## 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 Vyāsa-pūrṇimā number (XXXV. 2) containing six questions. It is gratifying to note that Dr. N. Gangadharan of the Sanskrit Deptt. of Madras University has send his opinions on all the six questions (see below). 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*

The story of Draupadī having five husbands has been a point of controversy since Mahābhārata itself. 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. Please give the necessary references.

Your's etc.  
PRP Verma (Advocate).  
Kabirnagar, Varanasi

(8)

### *KUMĀRASAMBHAVA THEME IN PURĀṆAS.*

Sir,

I have been working on the Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa. The story is said to be based essentially on the Puranic version. It is well known that Kālidāsa was an admirer of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa. In the 23rd Sarga of the Bāla Kāṇḍa 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 Pārvatī 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 Upa Purāṇa 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 PURĀṆAS.*

Sir,

My questions are twofold. 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 Bhāgavata [1/15/11] referring to the populer story of the hunger of Durvāsā and his party being satisfied by Kṛṣṇa eating just a śaka leaf from Draupadī's pot given by the Sun.

यो वो जुगोप वनमेत्य दुरन्तकृच्छ्रद दुर्वासससोऽरिविहितादयुताग्रभुग्यः  
शाकान्नशिष्टमुपयुज्य यतस्त्रिलोकीं तृप्ताममंस्त सलिले विनिमग्नसङ्घः ॥

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 have referred to.

Yours  
Vishweshwari Devi  
Patna



(10)

*THE RIVER BRAHMAPUTRA IN PURĀṆAS.*

Dear Sir,

While still waiting for the 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.

Yours

Shiva Priya Singh.  
Research Scholar (Geog.)  
Nagwa, Varanasi,

(11)

*VAIDYANĀTHA TEMPLE OF DEOGRAH*

Sir,

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

Yours

Niraj Kr. Chaudhuri  
M.Ed.  
B.H.U.

(12)

*KUMBHA-KARṆAS 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 Rāmāyaṇsa in Yuddhakāṇḍa, sarga 61, sl. 13 (Bombay edition) says,

एतेन जातमात्रेण क्षुधार्तेन महात्मना ।  
भक्षितानि सहस्राणि सत्त्वानां सुबहून्यपि ॥

and this necessiated the famous curse from Brahmā. This 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 Yuddha-kāṇḍa 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 jsutified 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, any explanation for this major divergence ?

Yours etc

Ramayana workshop

Purana Deptt., All India Kashiraj trust.

## QUESTION BOX ANSWERS

With reference to the questions raised in the QUESTION BOX in the Purāṇa Bulletin XXXV, No. 2 (July 1993), I wish to offer my comments and explanations as follows:

(1)

With reference to the question of Shri Krishna Dutt Tiwari about the Ocean at the Vindhya hill, I advice the scholar to consult the Critical



edition of the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa for the reference. Quite often we find descriptions and references to lakes and tanks extending to a long stretch. For example the descriptions of the lakes Pampā and Acchodā in the Kādambarī of Bāṇa Bhaṭṭa may be mentioned. The poets use such expressions in order to show that they were very extensive. Moreover we have such a tradition. I may draw the attention of the scholar to BALSAMAND AND SARDAR SAMAND near Jodhpur. The word samand obviously is a corrupt form of the Sanskrit word Samudra. The above two are extensive lakes. However in the Puranic tradition there is no reference to any ocean as being situated south of the Vindhya hill.

(2)

With reference to the question of Kumari Shiva Priya Singh about the river Sindhu and Sindhu Deśa, I wish to point out that the river Sindhu was well-known as a mighty river in olden days referred to in the Vedas etc. According to Puranic tradition the river Sindhu is a branch of the heavenly Gaṅgā. The river Gaṅgā when it descended on the earth fell into seven streams, the main stream of which was Gaṅgā. Out of the rest, Sītā, Cakṣus and Sindhu flowed towards the west and Hlādinī, Pāvanī and Nalinī flowed to the east:

नलिनी ह्लादिनी चैव पावनी चैव प्राच्यगाः ।

सीता चक्षुश्च सिन्धुश्च तिस्रस्ता वै प्रतीच्यगाः ॥ Matsya 120.40

वस्वोकसारा नलिनी पावनी च सरस्वती ।

जम्बूनदी च सीता च गङ्गा सिन्धुश्च सप्तमी ॥ Mbh. Bhīṣma 120.40

One could attain heaven by bathing in the river Sindhu and it is mentioned as one among the rivers that should be remembered every morning :

ता नदी सिन्धुमासाद्य शीलवान् स्वर्गमाप्नुयात् । Mbh. Anu. 25.8

शतद्रुश्च विपाशा च चन्द्रभागा सरस्वती ।

सिन्धुश्च देविका चैव प्रभासं पुष्कराणि च ॥ Mbh. Bhīṣma 120.40

Moreover we have the tradition of invoking seven rivers for being present in the water gathered for worship :

गङ्गे च यमुने चैव गोदावरि सरस्वति ।

नर्मदे सिन्धु-कावेरि जलेऽस्मिन् सन्निधिं कुरु ॥

It is mentioned as flowing through the regions - Darada (Gilgit) north Kashmir, Jaguda (south Afghanistan), Gāndhāra (divided by the Sindhu into two parts, Aurasa or Raurasa (Hazara), Kuhū (Kubhā, Kabul river), Śiva-Paura (the pore tribe along the Indus), Vasati (identified with Śibi region in Baluchistan), Saindhava (Sindhusagar Doab), Indra Maru (Same as Indravaktra of the Mahābhārata, identified as the dry area of Makran desert in Baluchistan). The identity of the other names are not certain :

दरदांश्च सकाशमीरान् गान्धारान् रौरसान् कुहान् ।  
 शिवशैलान्द्रिपदान्वसतींश्च विसर्जमान् ।  
 सैन्धवान्द्रन्धकरकाञ्छमठाभीररोहकान् ॥  
 शुनामुखांश्चोर्द्धमरून्सिन्धुरेतान्निषेवते ।

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa I 2.18. 47 b-49a.

Sindhu as a country is known from the reference to Jayadratha, King of Sindhu as having been present at the Svayaṁvara of Draupadī: भागीरथो बृहत्क्षत्रः सैन्धवश्च जयद्रथः (Mbh. Ādi, 185. 21). The identity of Sindhu des'a is uncertain about

(3)

Although we have reference to Sindhu as a sacred river we do not have any reference to the sacred places on the banks of the river in the Purāṇas. However further investigation has to be made for its absence.

Regarding the question of A.P. Singh about Volcano, I am doubtful whether there was any reference to volcano in the Purāṇas. The scholar may consult the following books : Geography of the Purāṇas by S.M. Ali, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India by D.C. Sircar and Development of Geographic Knowledge in Ancient India by Maya Prasad Tripathi. The scholar may also refer to Bṛhatsaṁhitā—A Study by Ajay Mitra Sastri.

(4)

On the query relating to the names of the seas which meet at Kanyākumārī made by Akash Vineet Sahai, I wish to point out that the present Kanyākumārī is at the confluence of the Bay of Bengal, Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean. But there is a popular view that the original



Kanyākumārī was further in the south at the tip of an extensive land called Lamuria which got submerged in the ocean as known from the reference in the Tamil classic Cilappadikāram. Kanyākumārī was the first setu. I invite the attention of the scholar to the description given under Kanyākumārī in Vettam Mani's Puranic Encyclopaedia published by M/S Motilal Banarsidess. Further investigation is being made about the reference to the the oceans meeting at Kanyākumārī. It may be discussed in the next issue.

(5)

Regarding the question of Vishveshvari Devi about Varāha and Kūrma concepts, I wish to offer my explanation.

There is no contradiction between the Purānic references to the avatāras of Viṣṇu as the Tortoise and the Boar on one side and the reference in Gītagovinda 1st Astapadi. Poet Jayadeva has made a brief reference to the same incident of churning the ocean. In the Bhāgavatapurāṇa we have an elaborate description of all the avatāras and it is said that the lord took the form of a Tortoise whose shell became the base of the Mandara mountain in order to make it firm when the churning was begun and it was shaking. (Bhāgavata I.3.16). Though the reference to supporting the earth on the back has not been made, it is understood that the Mandara mountain resting on the earth was supported by Tortoise manifestation.

It appears that the concept of Kūrma, Śeṣanāga and Varāha is independent of the concept of Avatāras. One has to explore further on this problem. As the Mandara mountain was shaking it was held by lord Viṣṇu assuming the form of a tortoise. Only such a description we find in early Purāṇas. It is worth investigating whether the involvement of Śeṣanāga and Varāha is based on a later tradition.

(6)

Regarding the question of Sita Kant Mishra about Four-handed Kṛṣṇa, there are different accounts relating to the life of Kṛṣṇa, the earliest one found in the Mahābhārata is concerned only with the later part of his life in association with the Pāṇḍavas. There are other accounts in the Harivaṁśa, Brahmapurāṇa, Viṣṇupurāṇa, and Bhāgavatapurāṇa, which are not only inconsistent, but mutually contradictory. The

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa was written mainly to glorify Rādhā. The Bhāgavatapurāṇa combines both the epic and Puranic accounts. The Vaiṣṇava tradition referred to by the scholar is probably based on the Mahābhārata account. A perusal of all the accounts would show that he had his birth in Mathurā, brought up in Gokula, moved to Vṛndāvana, left for Avantīpura for his education at the hermitage of Sandīpani, but recalled to Mathurā to arrest the invasion of Jarāsandha, enraged at Kāṁsa's death, ultimately migrated to Dvārakā on the west coast. There were different views about the human character of Kṛṣṇa. Brahmanic literary works lend support to both the human and divine character of Kṛṣṇa. I invite the attention of the scholar to the discussion A.D. Pusalker had made in his *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas* published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan in 1955. which discusses in detail the historicity of Kṛṣṇa in ch. V.

When we accept divine characteristics of lord Kṛṣṇa it is logical to accept that he had four hands. But I am doubtful whether we have such descriptions in the early Purāṇas. This will be discussed later.

N. Gangadharan  
Madras

## ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(January-June 1995)

### GURUDA PURĀṆA WORK.

Revision of the Critical Apparatus continued during this period. Printing of the Critical edition has been started and first twenty chapters are in the printing press. The editor is working on the critical notes of the selected readings. The collection of the quotations from Nibandha works on Dharma Śāstra is in progress.

### WORK ON THE TĪRTHAS.

The Telgu Ms of the Adyar Library of the Ayodhyā Māhātmya has been transcribed in the Devanāgarī and its collation will be made. The collation of the Ms procured from Asiatic Society, Bombay has been started.

### WORKS ON UNPUBLISHED PURĀ ṆAS.

The Purāṇa Department has taken up the work on the following unpublished Purāṇa MSS.

1. Vāsiṣṭha Liṅga Purāṇa
2. Varuṇa Purāṇa
3. Vindhya-māhātmya and
4. Mānasakhaṇḍa

Works on these MSS is in progress.

### VEDA-PĀRĀYAṆA-

The Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda, Taittirīya Śākhā was recited in the Vyāsa Temple of Fort Ramnagar from Māgha Śukla pratipad to Māgha Purṇimā (from 31st January 1995 to 15th February 1995). The Śākhā was recited by Pt. R.S. Gurunath Sharma of Madras. Śrotā was Pt. Sri Ram Ghanapathi. Dakṣiṇā and travelling expenses were paid to the reciter and the śrotā on the conclusion of the Pārāyaṇa.

### VISITORS TO THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT.

During the period following distinguished scholars visited the Purāṇa Department—



1. Prof. Ramjee Singh, Director Gandhian Institute of Studies, Varanasi, on 4.1.95. He writes in the Visitors' Book': Kashi Naresh is not a person but a living Institution and Kashiraj Trust is more than a University. I feel that a proposal may be sent before the U.G.C./ Govt. of India to establish a deemed University of Purāṇas for which here is appropriate infra structure.

2. Prof. Dhan Raj Sharma, Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit. Punjab University, Chandigarh on 7.1.95. He writes:

अखिल भारतीय काशीराज न्यास के पुराण विभाग का अवलोकन करने का सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ। पुराण विभाग के पुराणों की आलोचनात्मक सम्पादन प्रक्रिया को देखकर अपार प्रसन्नता हुई। इस प्रकार के वैज्ञानिक सम्पादन से शास्त्रीय ग्रन्थों के तत्व को समझने में बड़ी सहायता प्राप्त हो सकती है। संस्था के भारत-भारती अध्ययन विषयक कार्यक्रम प्रशंसनीय है।

3. Dr. Tafianna Blagoda, Mosco, Russia: I am very impressed by Purāṇa Department and the Museum. I am very thankful for explanations, I was given by Dr. G.S. Rai.

4. Dr. Prabhakar Apte, Ex-editor, Sanskrit Kosh, Deccan College, Poona on 30.3.95. He writes:

आ. इ. काशीराज ट्रस्ट का प्रकाशन विभाग देखकर बड़ी खुशी हो गयी। यहाँ पर जो काम हो रहा है उसका सांस्कृतिक मूल्य बहुत है जिसका मूल्यांकन पैसे-रुपये में नहीं हो सकता। आपकी संस्था को नये वर्ष की शुभेच्छाएँ।

5. Dr. Shrikant Bahulkar-Kendriya Higher Tibbati Siksha Samsthan Sarnath. 30.3.95.

6. Sri Sadanand, Research Scholar, Indira Gandhi Rastriya kala Kendra, Varanasi 26.6.95

## ACTIVITIES OF THE SISTER TRUSTS

### 1. Maharaja Benaras Vidya Mandir Trust.

#### (A) DHRUPAD MELA.

This year the 21st Dhrupad Mela organised by the Maharaja Benaras Vidya Mandir Trust was held on 25,26, 27 February 1995. The Mela was inaugurated by Yuvaraja Sri Anant Narain Singh. In his inaugural Speech Yuvaraja Sri Anant Narain Singh emphasised the

importance of Dhrupad Mela and its impact on the Dhrupad Melas in the nation. Yuvaraja Bahadur declared the names of recipients of Swati Tirunal award of this year. This year the award was given to Dr. Ritwik Sanyal, Sri Sukhdeva Pawar and Sri Kailash Pawar in vocal music and to Sri Ramakant Pathak in Pakhawaj. Yuvaraj Bahadur lit the lamp as the mark of the inauguration. A large number of Dhrupad artistes participated in the Mela. Some of the artistes participated are Sri Siya Ram Tiwari, Dr. Ritwik Sanyal, Sri Abhaya Narain Mallik, Pawar Brothers, Sri Pagal Dasji and Raja Chhatrapati Singhji. This year volume X of the Dhrupad Annual was published.

### (B) MANGALOTSAVA.

This year Mangalotsava was organised on 21st March, 1995. The Function was held in Diwan Khana of the Ramanagar Fort in the evening. Artistes from Benaras Hindu University performed vocal as well as instrumental music. Katthak dance, Chaity and Holi songs were specialities of this Mangalotsava. Officers of Varanasi, important citizens and some foreigners were present in the performance.

#### 2. Maharaja Udit Narain Singh Mānasa Prachār Nidhi.

Under the auspices of this Trust Navāha Pārāyaṇa (a nine-day Pārāyaṇa) and Pravacana of Rāmacaritamānasa was organised in the Kali Temple of Chakia. The Pārāyaṇa and Pravacana were performed from Vaiśākha Śukla Dvitiyā to Vaiśākha Śukla Daśamī of 2052 Vikrama era (1st May-1995 to 9 May 1995).

Famous Vyasas of Varanasi, namely Sri Ram Narain Shukla and Sri Kokil Ji gave discourses on Rāmāyaṇa. A Large number of public listened to the Pravacana. The Pravacanas were also attended by His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. On conclusion a Bhaṇḍārā was organised.

## कर्माविवक्षायां प्रयोगसाधुत्वविमर्शः

रमेशचन्द्र पण्डा

[The use of *ṣaṣṭhī* (the sixth case-ending) for the object (*karman*) in active voice is a feature often found in *Itihāsa-Purāṇa* works. Following questions may be raised in this connection :-

(1) Can *ṣaṣṭhī* be retained in the passive voice (*karma-vācya*) making it *bhāva-vācya* ? The author has here argued for the validity of such constructions. The point is of great relevance to the Epic-Puranic textual criticism. At some places in *Karmavācya-prayogas*, we find plural objects in plural nominative but the critical apparatus gives a large number of examples showing passive verb in singular number. Opting for the vulgate reading ignoring the strong manuscriptal tendency is no Text Critical solution. Mss suggest some archaic singular construction in the original text asking for restoration by emendation. The construction discussed here has opened a new option for such emendations.

In fact such absolute (*Bhāva*) constructions were first discussed in a Seminar called for discussing simple styles of Sanskrit language under the chairmanship of the eminent Sanskritist Pt. Ram Prasad Tripathi (reported in the *Purana*, XXXV. 1) and was attested by a galaxy of local scholars. There Prof. Shashidhar Mishra, a member of the fast vanishing tribe of classical *Kāśika* grammarians, has pleaded for it, inviting objections if any. None except me came up and was answered. The speaker being a nonagenarian scholar and being not in good health we are unable to give his exposition here.

This absolute usage is of great practical utility also as it provides Sanskrit a style which must be probably simplest in the world. The whole complex of ten-lakāra system concerning Sanskrit verbs can be comprehended in a couple of hours using this device.

The author in this article has explained the signification of the *sūtra* '*Ṣaṣṭhī śeṣe*' and goes to explain the difference between '*anukta karman*' and '*avivakṣita karman*'. According to this if once *Karman* becomes *Abhihita* a regular *karmavācya* must be used and it can never be



converted into *bhāva-vācya*. Never-the-less in the absense of Karmic *Vivakṣā* from the very beginning the verb remains intransitive resulting in the *bhāva*-construction. The question of *karma-vācya* does not come into picture then.

Thus, the question of validity of such usage calls for a close look by the Sanskritist all over the world in view of its practical utility and its application in editing ancient texts-**Editor**].

### (I) उपक्रमः

व्याकरणशास्त्रेण जनानाम् 'अयं साधुशब्दः अयञ्च असाधुशब्दः' इति ज्ञानं जायते, इति विदन्ति एव विपश्चितः ।<sup>1</sup> 'अयं प्रयोगः साधुः, असाधुः वा' इति सन्देहे वयं व्याकरणशास्त्रेण तस्य निराकरणं कुर्मः ।

'षष्ठी शेषे' (पा. सू. २.३.५०) इति सूत्रस्य व्याख्यानावसरे भट्टोजिरदीक्षितः 'भजे शम्भोः चरणयोः' 'मातुः स्मरति' इत्यादीनि उदाहरणानि समुल्लिखति ।<sup>2</sup> अत्र सूत्रे शेषशब्दस्य व्याख्याद्वयं क्रियते । तत्र प्रथमा व्याख्या-'उक्ताद् अन्यः शेषः' इति । अस्या अयमभिप्रायः-अष्टाध्यायीग्रन्थे 'षष्ठी शेषे' इत्यतः प्राक् निम्नलिखितानि सूत्राणि सन्ति, यैः यथाक्रमं द्वितीया-चतुर्थी-तृतीया-पञ्चमी-सप्तमी-प्रथमा-विभक्तीनां विधानं तत्तत्सूत्र-निर्दिष्टेषु अर्थेषु क्रियते ।

1. कर्मणि द्वितीया (पा. सू. २.३.२)
2. चतुर्थी सम्प्रदाने (पा. सू. २.३.१३)
3. कर्तृकरणयोस्तृतीया (पा. सू. २.३.१८)
4. अपादाने पञ्चमी (पा. सू. २.३.२८)
5. सप्तम्यधिकरणे च (पा. सू. २.३.३६)
6. प्रातिपदिकार्थलिङ्गपरिमाणवचनमात्रे प्रथमा (पा. सू. २.३.४६)

एतेन इदं ज्ञायते यद् एतेषु सूत्रेषु ये अर्थाः उक्ताः, तेभ्यः कर्म-सम्प्रदान-कर्तृ-करण-अपादान-अधिकरणकारकेभ्यः प्रातिपदिकार्थेभ्यः च अन्यः यः स्वस्वामिभावादिसम्बन्धः सः शेषः इति बोध्यते ।<sup>3</sup> प्रथमव्याख्यानुसारेण राज्ञः पुरुषः इत्यादि प्रयोगेषु 'राजन्' इति प्रातिपदिकात् षष्ठी विधीयते ।

अथ द्वितीया व्याख्या केति चेद् उच्यते-'कर्मादीनाम् अविवक्षा शेषः'<sup>4</sup> इति । अस्याः अयम् आशयः-यदा वाक्येषु कर्मादीनां विवक्षा भवति, तदा द्वितीयादि-विभक्तयः विधीयन्ते, यदा तु तत्र कर्मादीनाम् अविवक्षा भवति, तदा षष्ठी विधीयते । विवक्षा नाम वक्तुः, वक्तुम् इच्छा । एवञ्च यदा वक्ता वाक्येषु कर्मादीन् (कर्मादिरूपेण) वक्तुं

नेच्छति, तदा कर्मादिभ्यः न द्वितीयादिविभक्तयः भवन्ति, अपि तु षष्ठी एव भवति । एतदिद्वितीयव्याख्यानुसारेण 'शम्भोः चरणयोः भजे' इति वाक्ये चरणशब्दात् षष्ठी विधीयते । अत्र हि 'चरणौ' इति कर्म भवति । परन्तु अत्र वक्ता कर्मदं कर्मरूपेण वक्तुं नेच्छति । अतः 'षष्ठी शेषे' इति सूत्रेण चरणशब्दात् षष्ठी भवति, 'चरणयोः' इति पदस्य च साधुता स्वीक्रियते ।

## (II) शङ्का तत्समाधानञ्च

'चरणयोः भजे' इत्येतादृशानां वाक्यानां विचारप्रसङ्गे काश्चित् शङ्काः मनसि जायन्ते । ताः च इत्थम्—

- (i) यदा वाक्ये कर्मणः अविवक्षा भवति, तदा सकर्मकधातूनाम् अकर्मकरूपेण व्यवहारः भवति, आहोस्वित् सकर्मकरूपेण, आहोस्विद् उभयरूपेण ?
- (ii) कर्मणः अविवक्षायां सकर्मकधातुभ्यः कर्मणि लकारो भवति, आहोस्विद् भावे ?
- (iii) कर्मणि प्रत्यये कर्मणः अदिवक्षायां कर्मसंज्ञककप्रतिपरिकात् षष्ठी भवति वा न वा ?

पाणिनीयव्याकरणाधारेण आसां शङ्कानां समाधानं कर्तुकामः अयं जनः लेखेऽस्मिन् प्रवर्त्तते ।

तत्रादौ प्रथमशङ्कायाः समाधानं क्रियते । अत्र 'कर्मणः अविवक्षा' इत्यनेन अर्थद्वयम् अवगम्यते । प्रथमः अर्थः तावत्—वाक्ये कर्मणः अनुच्चारणम् । यथा 'अहं भजे' इति वाक्ये कस्यापि कर्मणः उच्चारणं न क्रियते । द्वितीयः अर्थः तावत्— वाक्ये कर्मपदम् उच्चार्य तस्य कर्मरूपेण प्रतिपादनाभावः । यथा 'अहं चरणयोः भजे' इति वाक्ये "चरणौ" इति कर्मपदम् उच्चार्यते, परन्तु तत् कर्मरूपेण प्रतिपादयितुं नेष्यते । प्रथमपक्षे द्वितीयपक्षे च उभयत्रापि धातोः अकर्मकत्वमेव स्वीक्रियते । अविवक्षिते कर्मणि हि धातुः अकर्मकः भवतीति सिद्धान्तः वैयाकरणानाम् । <sup>5</sup>

अत्रेदं बोध्यम्—यथा लोके 'अनुदरा कन्या' 'अलोमिका एडका' इत्यादौ सत्यपि उदरे 'अनुदरा' इति, सत्यपि लोमिनि 'अलोमिका' इति सतः अपि अविवक्षा भवति, तथा अत्रापि सत्यपि कर्मपदे कर्मणः अविवक्षा भवितुम् अर्हतीति ।<sup>6</sup>

एतेन इदं ज्ञायते यत् यदा कर्मणः अविवक्षा भवति तदा धातुः अकर्मकः भवतीति । अत एव 'चरणयोः भजे' इति वाक्ये धातुः अयम् अकर्मकः सिद्धयति । तथैव 'अहं भजे' इत्यादिवाक्येषु धातूनाम् अकर्मकता बोध्या ।

एतेन इदं सिद्धयति यद् एतादृशस्थलेषु सकर्मकधातुः अपि अकर्मकः भवतीति कृत्वा तस्मात् भावे लकारः विधीयते । अन्यथा सकर्मकधातुभ्यः भावे लकारः पाणिनेः असम्मतः एव । अस्ति हि पाणिनीयं सूत्रम् 'लः कर्मणि च भावे चा कर्मकेभ्यः (पा. सू. 3.4.69) इति । अस्य सूत्रस्य अर्थः तावत् "लकाराः सकर्मकेभ्यो धातुभ्यः कर्त्तरि कर्मणि च स्युरकर्मकेभ्यो भावे कर्त्तरि च" 7 इति ।

एवञ्च कर्मणः अविवक्षायां सकर्मकधातुभ्यः अपि भावे लकारः विधीयते इति 'चरणयोः भज्यते' प्रयोगः अपि पाणिनेः सम्मतः इत्यत्र नास्ति सन्देहप्रति । 8 एतेन द्वितीयशङ्कायाः अपि समाधानं जातम् ।

सम्प्रति तृतीयशङ्कायाः समाधानं चिकीर्ष्यते । कर्मणि प्रत्यये कर्मणः अविवक्षायां कर्मसंज्ञकात् प्रातिपदिकात् 'षष्ठी शेषे' इति सूत्रेण षष्ठी भवति वा न वेति शङ्कायां समाधानरूपेण इत्थं वक्तुं शक्यते यत् तत्र षष्ठी न भवतीति । यतो हि अनभिहितकर्मण एव अविवक्षायां 'षष्ठी शेषे' इति सूत्रं प्रवर्तते । अभिहितकर्मणः अविवक्षायां तु तस्य सूत्रस्य अप्रवृत्त्या षष्ठी न विधीयते । 9 अत्र किं मानमिति चेद् उच्यते—'अनभिहिते' इत्यधिकारे 'कर्मणि द्वितीया' इत्यादीमि पूर्वोक्तानि द्वितीयादिविभक्तिविधायकानि सूत्राणि विद्यन्ते । तेन अनभिहितकर्मादिषु द्वितीयादयो विधीयन्ते । ततः 'षष्ठी शेषे' इति सूत्रम् उच्यते । एवञ्च अनभिहितकर्मादीनाम् अविवक्षया एव 'षष्ठी शेषे' इति सूत्रं प्रवर्तते इति पाणिनीयानभिहिताधिकाराद् एव ज्ञातुं शक्यते ।

एतेन इदम् अवसीयते यत् कर्मणः अविवक्षायां कर्तृलकारस्थले भावलकारस्थले च कर्मसंज्ञक-प्रातिपदिकात् 'षष्ठी विधीयते । तेन 'चरणयोः भजे' 'चरणयोः भज्यते' इति प्रयोगद्वयमपि पाणिनेः सम्मतमेव । कर्मणि लकारे तु 'कर्म अभिहितं भवतीति कर्मसंज्ञकप्रातिपदिकात् प्रथमा एव भवति, न तु षष्ठी । तेन 'मया चरणौ भज्येते' इति प्रयोग एव पाणिनेरभिप्रेतः न तु 'मया चरणयोः भज्येते' इति ।

### (III) उपलब्धिः

अत्र इयम् उपलब्धिः—

- (i) 'चरणयोः भजे' 'चरणयोः भज्यते' इत्यादिवाक्यानि पाणिनिस्मृतानि ।
- (ii) कर्मणि प्रत्यये 'मया चरणयोः भज्येते' 'मया मातुः स्मर्यते' 'मया ओदनस्य खाद्यते' इत्यादिप्रयोगाः पाणिनेः असम्मताः । भावे प्रत्यये तु उपर्युक्तरीत्या 'मया ओदनस्य खाद्यते' इत्यादिप्रयोगाः साधव एव ।



## पादटिप्पणी

1. द्रष्टव्यम्: तस्मान्निबध्यते शिष्टैः साधुत्वविषया स्मृतिः (वा. प. 1.29) ।
2. सिद्धान्तकौमुदी (प्र. भा.) चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरीज आफिस, वाराणसी, 1969
3. शेष इत्युच्यते कः शेषो नाम । कर्मादिभ्यो येऽन्येऽर्थाः स शेषः (भ. भा. I 4.63-9-10) ।
4. एवं तर्हि कर्मादीनामविवक्षा शेषः । (म. भा. I .463.13)
5. द्रष्टव्यम्: धातोरर्थान्तरे वृत्तेर्धात्वर्थेनोपसंग्रहात् ।  
प्रसिद्धे **रविवक्षातः कर्मणोऽकर्मिका क्रिया ॥**  
(वा. प. 3. 7.88)
6. कथं पुनः सतो नामाविवक्षा स्यात् । सतोऽप्यविवक्षा भवति । तद्यथा ।  
अलोमिकैडका । अनुदरा कन्येति (म. भा. I. 463.13-15) ।
7. सिद्धान्तकौमुदी (तृ. भा.), चौखम्बा संस्कृतसंस्थान, वाराणसी, पृ. 3
8. दृश्यतां धातुपाठटीका क्षीरतर्ङ्गिणी— प्रयोक्तुरविवक्षितत्वात्—कर्मणः सकर्मकादपि भावे आख्यातम्,  
यथा— नेह पच्यते, नेह भुज्यते (पृ. ७) (सम्पादकः)
9. द्रष्टव्यम्: (क) कर्मदिष्वकर्मकवद्भवन् ॥ कर्मादिष्वकर्मकवद्भावो  
वक्तव्यः । किं प्रयोजनम् । अकर्मकाणां भावे लो भवति  
भावे लो यथा स्यात् । मातुः स्मर्यते । पितुः स्मर्यते । अथ  
वत्करणं किमर्थम् । स्वाश्रयमपि यथा स्यात् । माता स्मर्यते ।  
पिता स्मर्यते इति (म. भा. I. 465.3-5) ।  
(ख) यदा भावे लस्तदैवाऽनभिहितत्वात्षष्ठी । यदा कर्मणि तदाऽ  
भिहितत्वात्प्रथमैव । **उद्योतः, पातञ्जलं महाभाष्यम्**  
(द्वितीयोऽध्यायः), सं. डॉ बालशास्त्री, वाणी-  
विलास प्रकाशन, वाराणसी, 1987, पृ. 316  
(ग) तेन 'मातुः स्मर्यते' इति भावे लकृत्यत्तखलर्था भवन्ति,  
कर्मणि तु लादिषु विधीमानेषु तैरभिहितत्वात् कर्मणः षष्ठ्या  
न भाव्यमिति प्रथमैव भवति—'माता स्मर्यते' इति ।  
**प्रदीप** तत्रैव, पृ. 316

# श्रीमदास्करपूजोलस्य प्रबन्धस्य समीक्षणम्

डॉ. उमाकान्त चतुर्वेदी

'पुराणम्' VOL-XXXV, NO 1 जनवरी 1993 अङ्के श्रीमतः आस्कर-पूजोलमहोदस्यांग्लभाषया रचितो लेखः प्रकाशितः । तत्र 'पुराणम्' VOL-XXX III, NO 2 जुलाई 1991 अयोध्याविशेषाङ्के प्रकाशितस्य 'अयोध्यातीर्थप्रशंसा' नाम्नो लेखस्य समीक्षणं विहितमतस्तत्कृते धन्यवादार्हः सभवान् ।

श्रीपूजोलमहोदयेन प्रबन्धस्य प्रथमभागे संस्कृत-भाषाया इतिहासम्प्रति प्रचलितभाषा-विज्ञानमाश्रित्य किञ्चिद्विचारितम्, द्वितीयभागेऽस्माभिरुत्क्षिप्तासु बह्वीषु समस्यासु काश्चिद्विचारिताः । अतोऽस्माभिरपि अत्र स्वप्रबन्धं भागद्वये विभज्य पूजोलमहोदयस्य समीक्षणम्प्रति समीक्ष्यते ।

## प्रथमो भागः

108 पृष्ठे, समीक्षकेणास्माभिः प्रतिपादिता 'सारस्वततन्त्रस्यानुस्वारव्यवस्थायाः सत्यता स्वीकृता । कातन्त्रव्याकरणे त्ववसाने एवानुस्वारो न तु पञ्चमाक्षरस्य स्थाने इत्यपि अस्मत्कथनं स्वयमेव समीक्षकेण सप्रमाणं प्रतिपादितम् । स्वस्य च बंगीयहस्त-लेखानामध्ययनेन परिपोषितञ्च । कायस्था अल्पज्ञा अज्ञानिन इति कृत्वा तेषां लिपिर्नोपेक्षणीयेत्यपि तेनोरीकृतं, किन्तु ह्यत्र समीक्षकस्य विप्रतिपत्तिर्दृश्यते ।

यादृशं पुस्तकं दृष्टं तादृशं लिखितं मया ।

यदि शुद्धमशुद्धं वा मम दोषो न दीयताम् (पुराणम्-VOL-XXXV, No 1 जनवरी 1993, पृ. 109) इति प्रचलितं श्लोकमुद्धृत्य तेन कायस्थानां व्याकरणाभिज्ञताम्प्रति सन्दिह्यते । मन्ये, समीक्षकेणास्य श्लोकस्य सम्यगर्थो नाकलितः । वस्तुतस्तु अस्मन्मतेऽत्र कायस्थैः स्वव्याकरणविज्ञानमनुलिपिकार्यम्प्रति निष्ठाञ्चोद्धाटितम् । ते वदन्ति-" हस्तलेखेषु दृष्टं लिपिविकारमपि स्वीयव्याकरणविज्ञानेन मया न संशोधितमक्षरशः अनुलिपिकार्यम्प्रति प्रतिश्रुतत्वात् । नात्र लिपिकाराणामतो हेतोर्व्याकरणम्प्रत्यज्ञानं प्रतीयते । 109 पृष्ठे, पूजोलमहोदयेन पाणिनेरनन्तरं व्याकरणस्य द्वे भिन्ने परम्परे आस्तां, न तु द्वौ सम्प्रदायाविति यदालोचितन्तस्य नास्ति कश्चन ममाग्रहः यतो हि परम्परा-सम्प्रदायेत्युभावपि शब्दावेकार्थवाचिनावेव । अतोऽत्र न हि केनापि विचारवैपरीत्येन भवितव्यम् । चिन्त्यं त्विदं यन्मम प्रबन्धे पाणिनेः पूर्वदिव संस्कृतभाषायाः द्वैविध्यं स्वीकृतमित्यत्र वाल्मीकेः प्रमाणमपि दर्शितम् (द्र. पु. VOL-XXXIII,, No-2

पृ.26 संस्कृतखण्डः) । परमत्र पूजोलमहोदयेन संस्कृतभाषाया द्वैविध्यं पाणिनेः परञ्जातमिति भणितमित्यत्र अस्ति कश्चन तर्कश्चेद्विशदीकरणीयः सः ।

समीक्षकेण मन्यते यद्रामायणमहाभारतादिमहाकाव्येषु पूर्वपाणिनीयाः प्रयोगाः न दृश्यन्ते । किन्त्वयं हि विचारो रामायणस्य पाणिनेः परत्वं पूर्वत्वं वेत्यस्य निर्धारणे न निर्णायकः । अतोऽत्रायं न विचार्यते । विषयोऽयं विवादग्रस्तः । रामायणस्य पाठोऽपि नाद्यावधि निर्णीतः । अपाणिनीयाः प्रयोगाः रामायणमहाभारतयोर्लभ्यन्त एव, ते पूर्वपाणिनीयाः न वेति विमर्शाधिक्यमपेक्ष्यते । प्रकृते चानुपयोगित्वाद्नैव वितन्यते । एवमेव सारस्वतव्याकरणस्यापि पाणिनेर्भिन्नाया इन्द्रचन्द्रपरम्पराया अनुश्रयणम्बोधितव्यम् ।

अनुस्वारस्य प्रयोगविषये तु तेषां पाणिनेर्भिन्नं मतं तु सर्वैर्विज्ञातम् । अवसाने पञ्चमाक्षरस्य स्थाने चानुस्वारप्रयोगस्य परम्परा पूर्वपाणिनीयाथवार्वीचीनेति विचारणीयम् । काशिराजन्यासस्थ-रामायणाध्ययनशालायाऽपि मतेनैषा परम्परा पूर्वपाणिनीया, रामायणे पुराणे च-तस्यां पुर्यां अनेकानि (द्र. पुराणम् VOL—XXX III No 2 जुलाई 1991 पृ. 33 सं. खण्डः) इतीदृशानां प्रयोगाणां दर्शनात् ।

पाणिनीयपरम्पराम्प्रति पाश्चात्यविदुषां पक्षपातः इत्यस्माकं मतम् । तत्र पूजोलमहोदयेन प्रदर्शितं यत्प्रथमं पाश्चात्याः सारस्वतादिपरम्पराम्प्रत्येवाकृष्टा इति प्रायेण स्वीकार्यम्, परं तेनोच्यते पाणिनेः कौमुदीकारेण पुनः प्रवर्तनं प्रचारञ्च कृतमतो हेतोः सारस्वतादीनामप्रचलनं जातमिति तन्न, सत्यामपि सिद्धान्तकौमुद्यां सारस्वतमुग्धबोधका-तन्त्रादीनामध्ययनं विंशतिशताब्देः पूर्वाद्धं यावदाधिक्येन दृश्यते, किन्तु परवर्तिकाले पाश्चात्यवैयाकरणानां पाणिनिम्प्रति पक्षपातेन सा सारस्वतादीनां परम्परा विनष्टा । एवमेव सत्यामपि सिद्धान्तकौमुद्यां हस्तलेखेष्वनुस्वारपरम्परैव प्रवर्त्यते स्म । आंग्लयुगे मुद्रणयन्त्रालयैरेव सारस्वतादीनामनुस्वार-परम्परा परित्यक्तेति ।

111 पृष्ठे, पूजोलमहोदयेन संस्कृतभाषायाश्शैलीद्वयमङ्गीकृतम् । लौकिकसंस्कृतमेव रामायणेतिहासपुराणादिषु इत्यादि तेनाङ्गीकृतम् । एतदस्माभिरपि स्वीक्रियते । परं रामायणेतिहासादीनां भाषापरम्परा ब्राह्मणीयसंस्कृतात् परवर्तिनीतितत्कथनन्तु चिन्त्यमेव । समीक्षकस्य मतेन ब्राह्मणीयसंस्कृतस्योपरि मध्यभारतीयार्यभाषायाः (Middle Indo-Aryan) प्रभावः, यस्माद्ब्राह्मणीयसंस्कृतस्य विकृतिः तस्माच्च पुनः लौकिकसंस्कृतस्योत्पत्तिरिति । समर्थनेऽस्यानेन बरो (Burrow) महोदयस्य मतमप्युद्धृतम् । किन्त्वस्ति अत्रास्माकं विप्रतिपत्तिः । यतो हि— रामायणे वैदिकसाहित्ये वा इतिहासपुराणयोरुल्लेखः प्राचुर्येणावलोक्यते, येनेतिहास-पुराणयोर्वैदिकसाहित्येन सह समकक्षता तुल्यता वा सुसिद्धा ।

पाश्चात्यभाषावैज्ञानिकैर्मध्यभारतीयार्यभाषायाः (Middle Indo-Aryan) कालो मौर्यकालः (अशोककालः) स्वीक्रियते, समीक्षकेणापीदं स्वीकृतम् । अतो रामायणात्पाणिनेश्च मध्यभारतीयार्यभाषाणामतिशयेनार्वीचीनत्वं सुसिद्धम् । परं



पाणिनिर्मौर्यकालादवश्यमेव पूर्ववर्तीत । रामायणञ्च भारतीयपरम्परानुसारेण पाणिनेरप्यतितरां प्राचीनमिति ।

समीक्षकस्य मतेनाशोककालिकाशिलालेखाः पालिप्राकृतभाषयोरेवेत्यनुमितम् अतस्तत्कालिकशासनव्यवस्थाया अपि ते एव भाषे आस्ताम् । पुनश्च 114 पृष्ठे, 'बरो' महोदयस्य मतमुद्धृतं यत् ख्रीष्टापूर्वं लोकभाषैव शिलालेखेषु प्रयुज्यते स्म । अत इदं सिद्धयति यद्ब्रह्मपारशासनतन्त्रयोरभिलेखा अपि अस्यामेव भाषायामासन् कालान्तरे- गैतत्स्थानं संस्कृतेन गृहीतम् । किन्तु समीक्षकस्यैतदुपर्युक्तं वचः सन्देहास्पदम् । यतो हि- अशोकस्य शिलालेखाः विभिन्नेषु प्रान्तेषु, जनसामान्येषु च धर्मोपदेशार्थमुद्घुष्टिता आसन् । अत आवश्यक एव शिलालेखेषु स्थानीयभाषाणाम्प्रयोगाः । एतेनैतावन्मात्रमेव सिद्धयति यत्प्राकृतपालिभाषे तदानीमास्तांलोकसम्पर्कभाषे, न पुनस्तत्कालिकस्य धर्माधिकरणस्य, राज्यशासनस्य वा भाषे । यथा परवर्तिहिन्दूकाले लोकसम्पर्काय लोकभाषैव प्रयुज्यतेस्म, किन्तु धर्माधिकरणस्य शासनतन्त्रस्य च भाषा फारसी एव, परं जनसम्पर्कभाषा तु लोकभाषैव । किं बहुना, आंग्लशासनकाले, दुर्भाग्येन साम्प्रतमपि आंग्लभाषैव शासनभाषा, जनसम्पर्कभाषा पुनर्लोकभाषैव । अत एवाशोकशासनकाले प्राकृतजनानां कृते धर्मोपदेशेषु पालिप्राकृतभाषयोर्दर्शनेन तयोरेव शासनभाषास्वरूपेणानुमानं न समीचीनम् ।

अत्रेदमपि स्मर्तव्यं यन्नौर्यशासनकाले न केवलमशोक एव सम्राट्, न वा स मौर्यवंशे प्रथमः । एतत्पूर्वञ्चन्द्रगुप्तस्य शासनम्, तच्च ब्राह्मणेन विदुषा चाणक्येन स्थापितम्परिवर्धितञ्च । तदर्थशास्त्रं संस्कृतभाषायामेवोपनिबद्धम् । तदनुसारेणैव शासनादिकार्यं सञ्चालितमासीत् । अतोऽवश्यमेव तदानीन्धर्माधिकरणराज्यशासनतन्त्रादिकं संस्कृतस्यैव माध्यमेन सञ्चालितमित्यञ्जसाऽनुमेयम् । एवञ्च पूर्वकालादागताया व्यवस्थायाः अशोककाले परिवर्तनञ्जातमिति न कुत्रापि लिखितं न वा किमपि प्रमाणं दृष्टं श्रुतंवेति

114 पृष्ठे, पूजोलमहोदयेन- 'लौकिकसंस्कृतेनास्माकं किमभिप्रेतमित्याक्षिप्तम् तद्विशदीक्रियते-लौकिकसंस्कृतं न प्राकृतं, न च मिश्रितं, न वा भ्रष्टं संस्कृतमपितु ब्राह्मणीयसंस्कृतमिवेदं शुद्धं व्याकरणसम्मतञ्च । ब्राह्मणीयसंस्कृतापेक्षया सारल्यमेवात्र विशेषः । अवसानेऽनुस्वारप्रयोगाश्च नाशुद्धाः, न वा प्राकृतप्रभावेणागताः । इयमितिहासपुराणादीनां भाषेव सरला । यतो हि व्याकरणं न केवलं पाणिनीयमेवापितु कातन्त्रादिकमपि । तेषामनुसारेण सरलं संस्कृतं लिखितुं शक्यम् । किमधिकं पाणिनीयतन्त्रेणापि संस्कृतभाषालेखनस्य विविधाः शैल्यः सम्भवाः, यथा- केवलं कृदन्तप्रयोगाः, केवलं तिङन्तप्रयोगाः, भाववाच्यप्रयोगादयश्चेति । एतासां विविधानां शैलीनां प्रभावो विभिन्नासु देशीयभाषासु दृश्यत एवेति । भवतु नामैतेन पूजोलमहोदयस्य जिज्ञासायाः परितोषः । एते विषयाः पुराणम्- XXX III, 130 पृष्ठे विचारिताः ।

## द्वितीयो भागः

118 पृष्ठे, पूजोलमहोदयेन यतिस्थलेषु सन्धिविषये विचारितम् । तेषां किञ्चित्समाधीयते — श्लोकस्य प्रथम-द्वितीययोः पादयोर्मध्ये, तृतीयचतुर्थयोश्च मध्ये सन्धिर्भवितुमर्हति न वेति विचारविषयः । साम्प्रतं प्रायेण ग्रन्थेषु श्लोकानां प्रथम-द्वितीयचरणयोर्मध्ये तृतीयचतुर्थयोर्मध्येऽपि बाहुल्येन सन्धिरवलोक्यते । अस्माकं मते तु यतेर्हेतोरेतादृशाः सन्धयो व्याकरणविरुद्धाः । पूजोलमहोदयेन—यतिः सर्वत्र पादान्ते श्लोकार्धे तु विशेषतः इति श्लोकार्धं तस्य टीकाञ्चाश्रित्यैतादृशानां सन्धीनां शुद्धता प्रतिपादिता । तेनेत्थं व्याख्यातम्—यतिः सर्वेषु चतुर्षु पादेषु भवति । किन्तु श्लोकार्धे 'विशेषतः' अर्थात् विशेषरूपेण भवति । एतस्येदं तात्पर्यम् यच्छ्लोकार्धे तु यतिर्नित्यैव, न तत्रापवादः सम्भवः किन्तु प्रथमद्वितीययोः पादयोर्मध्ये तु यतिः क्वचिद्वैकल्पिक्यपि सम्भवति । किन्तु समीक्षकस्योपर्युक्तं व्याख्यानं न रमणीयम् । यतो हि 'विशेषतः' पदे काकुमाक्षिप्य अन्येषु पादेषु क्वाचित्कं यतेरभावं विधातुं न शक्यते, यतो हीत्थं व्याख्याने 'सर्वत्र' पदेन निरूपितं सार्वत्रिकत्वमनपवादित्वञ्च खण्ड्यते । तद्यथा—आम्रः, कदली पनसं, दाडिमश्चेति सर्वाणि चत्वारि फलानि मम प्रियाणि, आम्रस्तु विशेषतः । प्रयोगेऽस्मिन् 'विशेषतः' पदेन क्वाचित्कं कदलीपनसदाडिमानामप्रियत्वं नानुमातव्यम् 'विशेषतः' पदेनाम्रस्याधिकतरं प्रियत्वमेवोद्घोषितम् । एवमेव विचारणीये श्लोकार्धेऽपि द्वितीयचरणस्यान्ते (श्लोकार्धे) यतेरधिकत्वं निरूपितम् । अर्थात् प्रथमतृतीयचरणयोर्यतेर्यन्मात्राकालस्तस्मादधिको मात्राकालःश्लोकार्धे भवति । अत्र प्रथम-तृतीयचरणयोरन्ते यते : क्वाचित्कोऽभावो न हि कथमपि विवक्षितमिति ।

पूजोलमहोदयेन दण्डिनमाश्रित्य सन्धियत्योर्मध्ये सन्धेरेव बलवत्त्वं प्रतिपादितमर्थात् तन्मतेन सन्धिकरणार्थं यतिं निरसितुं शक्यते । किन्त्वसाध्वेवेदं मतम् । वस्तुतस्तु दण्डिमतेनापि सन्धियत्योर्मध्ये यतेरेव प्रबलत्वं स्वीकृतम् । कृतेऽपि सन्धौ यतिस्तु रणणीयैव । तद्यथा 'सा दृष्ट्वा तदा राममासीत् कामातुरा मुदा ।' अत्र कृतेऽपि सन्धौ यतिरक्षणार्थं पादान्तमकारः प्रथमचरणतो विच्छिद्य द्वितीयचरणे स्थितस्याकारस्याङ्गीभूतः 'मासीदिति' । एवमेव —'सूर्यप्रकाशआभात्यत्यर्थं रजनीक्षये ।' अत्र सन्धिविकारान्तम् 'आभात्ये'ति सन्धिवशाद्विकृतं पदं पदत्वं नार्हति सामान्येन । किन्तु यते रक्षणार्थं छन्दःशास्त्रे तत्पदमेव मन्यते छन्दः शुद्धचर्थमि' ति । लुप्ते पदान्ते शिष्टस्य पदत्वं निश्चितं यथा । तथा सन्धिविकारान्तपदमेवेति वर्ण्यते (काव्यादर्श 3.154) ।

'श्लोकेऽस्मिन् दण्डिनाऽपि वस्तुत इदमेव विज्ञापितम् । अत्र वक्तव्यं यद्दण्डिना सन्धौ कृतेऽपि यते रक्षणं प्रतिपादितं, किन्तु तेनापि सत्यां यतौ सन्धेः प्रवर्तनं, तस्य शुद्धत्वन्तु नैव विचारितम् ।

119 पृष्ठे, समीक्षकेण यत्किमपि विचारितं तन्नास्माभिः सम्यग् मन्यते, समुचितोदाहरणाभावात्, प्रतिपाद्यविषयं विशदीकर्तुं समीक्षकः प्रार्थ्यते । एवं 'यतिः सर्वत्र पादान्ते श्लोकार्धे तु विशेषतः इति श्लोकार्धमाश्रित्य यल्लिखितन्तदधिकृत्य विचारा उपस्थापिताः । अग्रिमाश्च श्लोका एवं पठ्यन्ते—

समुद्रादिपदान्ते च व्यक्ताव्यक्तविभक्तके ॥  
 क्वचित्तु पदमध्येऽपि समुद्रादौ यतिर्भवेत् ।  
 यदि पूर्वापरौ भागौ न स्यातामेकवर्णकौ ॥  
 पूर्वान्तवत्स्वरः सन्धौ क्वचिदेव परादिवत् ।  
 द्रष्टव्यो यतिचिन्तायां यणादेशः परादिवत् ॥  
 नित्यं प्राक्पदसम्बद्धाश्चादयः प्राक्पदान्तवत् ।  
 परेण नित्यसम्बद्धाः प्रादयश्च परादिवत् ॥ इति ॥



# सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम् (जनवरी-जून १९९५) गरुडपुराणकार्यम्

अस्मिन् कार्यावधौ पाठसमीक्षोपकरणस्य पुनरीक्षणं प्रचलति स् । मुद्रणकार्यं प्रारब्धम् । आदितः विंशतिरध्याया मुद्रणालये सन्ति । संपादकः विशिष्टपाठानुद्दिश्य पाठसमीक्षिकां टिप्पणीं लिखति । धर्मशास्त्रनिबन्धग्रन्थेभ्यः उद्धरणलेखनकार्यमपि प्रचलति ।

## तीर्थसम्बन्धिकार्यम्

अयोध्यामाहात्म्यस्य अड्यार-लाइब्रेरीतः प्राप्तस्य तेलगुलिपिहस्तलेखस्य देवनागरीलिप्यन्तरीकरणं संजातम् । अस्य पाठसंवादकार्यं भविष्यति । एशियाटिक सोसाइटी बम्बई, इत्यतः प्राप्तस्य हस्तलेखस्य पाठसंवादकार्यमपि प्रारब्धम् ।

## अप्रकाशितपुराणानां कार्यम्

पुराणविभागेन अधोनिर्दिष्टानामप्रकाशितपुराणहस्तलेखानां कार्यं प्रारब्धम्—

१. वासिष्ठलिङ्गपुराणम्,
२. वरुणपुराणम्
३. विन्ध्यमाहात्म्यम् तथा
४. मानसखण्डं च । एषां पुराणानां हस्तलेखानां सम्पादनं प्रचलति ।

## वेदपारायणम्

२०५१ विक्रमाब्दस्य माघमासे शुक्लपक्षे रामनगरदुर्गस्थिते व्यासेश्वरमदिरे कृष्णयजुर्वेदस्य तैत्तिरीयशाखायाःपारायणं संपन्नम् । पारायणकर्ता मद्रासवास्तव्यः पं. आर. एस. गुरुनाथ शर्मा आसीत्, श्रोता च पं. श्रीरामघनपाठी वाराणसेयः । पारायणसमाप्तौ पारायणस्यक त्रे श्रोत्रे च दक्षिणा मार्गव्यायादिकं च प्रदत्तम् ।

## पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वांसः

१. प्रो. रामजी सिंहः—राजघाट, वाराणसी स्थितस्य गान्धीसंस्थानस्य निदेशकः—
- ४.१.९५ दिनाङ्के—एष महानुभावः लिखति- काशिराजः न एकः पुरुषः अपितु एका

सजीवा संस्था । काशिराजन्यासश्च विश्वविद्यालयादपि अधिको वर्तते । अहमनुमवामि यद् एकः प्रस्तावः विश्वविद्यालयानुदानसमक्षं भारतसरकारसमक्षं प्रेषितो भवेद् यद् एषा संस्था पुराणानां एकः विश्वविद्यालयकल्पो (deemed) भवेत्, एतदर्थं अत्र आन्तरिका सुविधा उपलब्धा वर्तते ।

२. प्रो. धनराज शर्मा प्राचार्यः अध्यक्षश्च चण्डीगढ़पंजाबविश्वविद्यालयस्य संस्कृतविभागस्य ७.१.९५ दिनांके-सः लिखति-सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागास्यावलोकनस्य सौभाग्यं प्राप्तम् । पुराणविभागे पुराणानां संपादनस्य वैज्ञानिकीं प्रक्रियां दृष्ट्वा अतीव मुदितोऽहम् एतादृशेन वैज्ञानिकसंपादनेन शास्त्रीयग्रन्थानां तत्त्वार्थज्ञाने महत्साहाय्यं भविष्यति । संस्थायाः भारतभारत्याः अध्ययनविषयको कार्यक्रमः प्रशंसनीयोऽस्ति ।

३. डा. टाफियाना ब्लागोडा, मास्को, रूसदेशीया- अनया लिख्यते-अहं पुराणविभागेन, सग्रहालयेन च अतीव प्रभाविताऽस्मि । डा. गंगासगाररायेन या व्याख्या (मार्गदर्शनं) कृता तदर्थं अनुगृहीतास्मि ।

४. डा. प्रभाकर आटे, पूर्वसंपादकः, डेकनकालेज पूना, संस्थायाः संस्कृतकोशस्य- ३०.३.९५ दिनाङ्के । एष महानुभावः आगतपुस्तिकायां लिखति-सर्वभारतीय काशिराजन्यासस्य पुराणविभागं दृष्ट्वा अतीव प्रसन्नता संजाता । अत्र यत् सांस्कृतिकं कार्यं क्रियते तस्य महन्मूल्यमस्ति यस्य मूल्याङ्कनं द्रव्येण भवितुं न शक्यते । भवत्संस्थानिमित्तं नववर्षस्य शुभाशंसनानि ।

५. डा श्रीकान्तबाहुलकर महोदयः - सारनाथस्थितस्य तिब्बती शोध संस्थानस्थः ३०.३.९५ दिनाङ्के ।

६. श्रीसदानन्दः - इंदिरागांधीराष्ट्रीयकलाकेन्द्र वाराणसी संस्थाया शोधछात्रः - २६.६.९५ दिनके एष छात्रः पुराणसंवधिकार्यार्थं पुराणविभागे समये-समये आगच्छति ।

## सहयोगिन्यासानां कार्यविवरणम्

महाराराज बनारस विद्यामन्दिर न्यासः

### (अ) ध्रुपदमेला

अस्मिन् वर्षे महाराज बनारस विद्यामन्दिरन्यासेन आयोजितः ध्रुपदमेलापकः फरवरी मासस्य २५, २६, २७ दिनाङ्केषु संपन्नः । अस्य उद्घाटनं युवराजश्रीअनन्तनारायणसिंह महोदयेन कृतम् । स्वीयोद्घाटनभाषणे युवराजेन अस्य मेलापकस्य महत्त्वं प्रदर्शितम् । देशे सम्पन्नेषु अन्यध्रुपदमेलापकेषु अस्य मेलापकस्य प्रभावोऽपि युवराजेन प्रदर्शितः । युवराजेन अस्मिन् वर्षे स्वातितिरुनालपुरष्कारेण पुरस्कृतानां कलाकाराणां घोषणाऽपि

कृता । अस्मिन् वर्षे डा. ऋत्विक् सन्याल महोदयः, सुखदेवपवारमहोदयः श्री कैलास पवार महोदयश्च गायनविद्यायां पुरस्कृताः श्रीरमाकान्त पाठक महोदयः वाद्य (पखावज) विद्यायां पुरस्कृतः । मेलापके बहवः कलाकाराः सम्मिलिताः येषु श्री सियाराम तिवारी , डा. ऋत्विक् सन्यालः , श्री अभयनारायणमल्लिकः, पवारबन्धवः, श्रीपागलदासः श्री छत्रपति सिंहश्च प्रमुखा आसन् । अस्मिन् वर्षे ध्रुपदवार्षिकी पत्रिकायाः दशमोऽङ्कः प्रकाशितः जातः ।

### ( ब ) मङ्गलोत्सवः

अस्मिन् वर्षे अनेन न्यासेनायोजितः मङ्गलोत्सवः २१ मार्च १९९५ दिनाङ्के रामनगरदुर्गस्थिते दीवानखाना प्राङ्गणे सायंकाले सम्पन्नः । काशीहिन्दूविश्वविद्यालय कलाकाराः स्वरसंगीतस्य वाद्यसंगीतस्य च प्रदर्शनं कृतवन्तः । कथकनृत्यं, चैतीगायनं होली गायनं च अस्योत्सवस्य वैशिष्ट्यम् । वाराणस्या अधिकांशः विशिष्टा नागरिकाश्च उपस्थिता आसन् ।

### महाराज उदितनारायण सिंह मानस प्रचारनिधिः

#### नवाहपारायणम्

अस्य न्यासस्य तत्वावधाने चकिया नगर स्थिते कालीमन्दिरे रामचरितमानस्य नवाहपारायणं प्रवचनं च सम्पादितम् । पारायणं वैशाखशुक्लद्वितीयातिथिमारस्य दशमीतिथिपर्यन्तं ( १ मई १९९५ तः ९ मई १९९५ यावत् ) संपन्नम् । श्रीरामनारायणुक्लः श्रीकोकिल जी च वाराणस्याः प्रमुखौ व्यासौ रामचरितमानसविषये प्रवचनं कृतवन्तौ । प्रवचने श्रोतॄणां संख्या विपुला आसीत् । तत्रभवन्तः काशिनरेशा डा. विभूतिनारायण सिंहशर्मदेवाः प्रवचनेषु उपस्थिता आसन् । पारायणसमाप्तौ भण्डारा आयोजिता आसीत् ।



THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
OF  
THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

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

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

2. Vacant.

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

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

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

5. Dr. R.N. Dandekar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
6. Pt. Giridhari Lal Mehta, Varanasi; Managing Director; Jardine Handerson Ltd.; Scindia Steam Navigation Ltd.; Trustee : Vallabhram-Saligram Trust, Calcutta.
7. Padmabhushan Pt. Baladeva Upadhyaya, M.A. Sahityacharya, Vachaspati; Formerly Director, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University; Ravindrapuri, Varanasi.

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

Statement of ownership and other particulars about

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

1. Place of Publication ...Fort Ramnagar, Varanasi
2. Periodicity of Publication ...Half-yearly
3. Printer's Name ...Vinaya Shankar  
Nationality ...Indian  
Address ...Ratna Printing Works,  
B 21/42 A, Kamachha, Varanasi
4. Publisher's Name ...Yogendra Narain Thakur  
General Secretary, All-India  
Kashiraj Trust  
Nationality ...Indian  
Address ...All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort  
Ramnagar, Varanasi.
5. Editor's Name ...R.K. Sharma (New Delhi),  
Dr. R.N. Dandekar (Pune),  
R.S. Bhattacharya (*Editor*)  
(Puraṇa Deptt., Fort Ramnagar  
Varanasi)  
Nationality ...Indian
6. Name of the owner ...All-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort  
Ramnagar, Varanasi.

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

**Yogendra Narain Thakur**  
Publisher.

Printed at the Ratna Printing Works, Kamachha, Varanasi.