___

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 = ṛ; च् =c; छ् = ch; ट = t: ठ =Th; ड = ḍ; ढ् = ḍh; श् = ś; ष् = ṣ; म् = ṁ.]

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

पुराणम् - PURĀṆA

Contents-विषयसूची

Contents – विषय-सूची

UNITY OF ALL

एक तत्त्व

एकं सद् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति ।

<div align="right">(ऋग्वेद)</div>

बहुधाऽप्यागमैर्भिन्नाः पन्थानः सिद्धिहेतवः ।
त्वय्येव निपतन्त्योघा जाह्नवीया इवार्णवे ।।

<div align="right">(कालिदास)</div>

रुचीनां वैचित्र्यादृजुकुटिलनानापथजुषां
नृणामेको गम्यस्त्वमसि पयसामर्णव इव ।

<div align="right">(पुष्पदन्त)</div>

उदधाविव सर्वसिन्धवः समुदीर्णास्त्वयि नाथ! दृष्टयः ।
न च तासु भवान् प्रदृश्यते प्रविभक्तासु सरित्स्वोदधिः ।

<div align="right">(सिद्धसेन दिवाकर)</div>

तीर्थक्रियाव्यसनिनः स्वमनीषिकाभि-
रुत्प्रेक्ष्य तत्त्वमिति यद् यदमी वदन्ति ।
तत् तत्त्वमेव भवतोऽस्ति न किञ्चिदन्यत्
संज्ञासु केवलमयं विदुषां विवादः ।।

<div align="right">(अभिनवगुप्ताचार्य)</div>

देवीकृता देवीस्तुतिः

(देवीमाहात्म्य अ. ४)

[ऋषिरुवाच—

शक्रादयः सुरगणा निहतेऽतिवीर्ये
    तस्मिन्दुरात्मनि सुरारिबले च देव्या ।
तां तुष्टुवुः प्रणतिनम्रशिरोधरांसा
    वाग्भिः प्रहर्षपुलकोद्गमचारुदेहाः ।। १ ।।]
देव्या यया ततमिदं जगदात्मशक्त्या
    निश्शेषदेवगणशक्तिसमूहमूर्त्या   ।
ताम्बिकामखिलदेवमहर्षिपूज्यां
    भक्त्या नताः स्म विदधातु शुभानि सा नः ।। २ ।।
यस्याः प्रभावमतुलं भगवानन्तो
    ब्रह्मा हरश्च न हि वक्तुमलं बलं च ।
सा चण्डिकाखिलजगत्परिपालनाय
    नाशाय चाशुभभयस्य मतिं करोतु ।। ३ ।।

[The Rishi said :-

4.1. 'When that most valorous but evil natured Asura toget with the demon army was vanquished by the Goddes Indra and the hosts of other gods began to praise with their words, bending in humility their necks, I shoulders, while their bodies looked beautiful by hair harripilated with ecstasy.'

4.2. 'The Goddess, who stretched out this world by power, whose body comprises the entire powers of the hosts of gods, Her, Ambikā, worthy of worship by all gods and g Risshis, We bow before in faith; may She ordain blessi for us!

4.3. May She, whose peerless majesty and power Ana Adorable, Brahmā and Hara cannot in sooth dech May She, Chaṇḍikā, to protect the entire world And to destroy the fear of evil turn her mind.

या श्रीः स्वयं सुकृतिनां भवनेष्वलक्ष्मीः

पापात्मनां कृतधियां हृदयेषु बुद्धिः ।

श्रद्धा सतां कुलजनप्रभवस्य लज्जा

तां त्वां नताः स्म परिपालय देवि विश्वम् ।। ४ ।।

किं वर्णयाम तव रूपमचिन्त्यमेतत्

किं चातिवीर्यमसुरक्षयकारि भूरि ।

किं चाहवेषु चरितानि तवाद्भुतानि

सर्वेषु देव्यसुरदेवगणादिकेषु ।। ५ ।।]

हेतुः समस्तजगतां त्रिगुणापि दोषै-

र्न ज्ञायसे हरिहरादिभिरप्यपारा ।

सर्वाश्रयाखिलमिदं जगदंशभूत-

मव्याकृता हि परमा प्रकृतिस्त्वमाद्या ।। ६ ।।

यस्याः समस्तसुरता समुदीरणेन

तृप्तिं प्रयाति सकलेषु मखेषु देवि ।

स्वाहासि वै पितृगणस्य च तृप्तिहेतु-

रुच्चार्यसे त्वमत एव जनैः स्वधा च ।। ७ ।।

4.4. Her, who is Good-Fortune herself in the dwellings of good deeds,
III-Fortune.

In those of men of sinful sculs; who is Intelligence the hearts of
the prudent,

Who is Faith in those of the goods, and Modesty in of the high-
born men;

Her, even thee, we bow before; protect the unive O Goddess!
Can we describe this they thought-transcending form?

4.5. Or thy abundant surpassing valour that destroyed Asuras?
Or thy surpassing feats which were displayed in ba Among all
the hosts of Asuras, gods and others Goddess?

4.6. Thou art the cause of all the worlds; Thou characterized by three
qualities, by faults

Thou art not known; Even by Hari, Hara and the other gods thou
art incomprehensible.

Thou art the resort of all; thou art the entire world which is
composed of parts.

Thou verily art sublime original Nature untransformed.

4.7. Thou, whose complete divinity by means of utterance Finds
satisfaction in all sacrifices, O Goddess,

Art verily Svāhā, and givest satisfaction to the Pitṛihosts.

Hence thou art in truth declared by men to be Svadhā also.

या मुक्तिहेतुरविचिन्त्यमहाप्रभावा-
            दभ्यर्च्यसे   सुनियतेन्द्रियतत्त्वसारैः ।
मोक्षार्थिभिर्मुनिभिरस्तसमस्तदोषै-
            र्विद्यासि सा   भगवती परमा हि देवि ।। ८ ।।

शब्दात्मिका सुविमलग्र्यजुषां निधान-
            मुद् गीथरग्यपदपाठवतां च साम्नाम् ।
देवी त्रयी भगवती भवभावनाय
            वार्त्ता च   सर्वजगतां   परमार्तिहन्त्री ।। ९ ।।

मेधासी देवि विदिताखिलशास्त्रसारा
            दुर्गासि   दुर्गभवसागरनौरसङ्गा ।
श्रीः कैटभारिहृदयैककृताधिवासा
            गौरी त्वमेव   शशिमौलिकृतप्रतिष्ठा ।। १० ।।

[The Rishi said :-

4.8. Thou art she who effects final emancipation, and performs great
      thought-transcending penances.
      Thou studiest with thy organs, which are the essence of strength,
      well-restrained.
      With *munis*, who seek final emancipation and who have shed all
      their faults.
      Thou art the Knowledge, adorable sublime in sooth O Goddess!

4.9. Sound is thy soul, thou art the repository of the most spotless Rik
      and Yajus hymns.
      And of the Sāmanas, which have the charming-worded texts of
      the Udgītha.
      Thou as Goddess art the triple Veda, the adorable, and for the
      existence and production.
      Of all/the worlds art active; thou art the supreme destroyer of
      their pains.

4.10. Thou art Mental Vigour, O Goddess ! Thou has comprehended
      the essence of all the Scriptures.
      Thou art Śrī, who has planted her dominion alone it the heart of
      Kaiṭabha's foe.
      Thou indeed art Gaurī, who has fixed her dwelling in the moon-
      crested god.

ईषत्सहासममलं परिपूर्णचन्द्र-

बिम्बानुकारि कनकोत्तमकान्तिकान्तम् ।

अत्यद्भुतं प्रहृतमात्तरुषा तथापि

वक्त्रं विलोक्य सहसा महिषासुरेण ।। ११ ।।

दृष्ट्वा तु देवि कुपितं भ्रुकुटीकराल-

मुद्यच्छशाङ्कसदृशच्छवि यन्न सद्यः ।

प्राणान्मुमोच महिषं तदतीव चित्रं

कैर्जीव्यते हि कुपितान्तकदर्शनेन ।। १२ ।।

देवि प्रसीद परमा भवती भवाय

सद्यो विनाशयसि कोपवती कुलानि ।

विज्ञातमेतदधुनैव यदस्तमेत-

न्नीतं बलं सुविपुलं महिषासुरस्य ।। १३ ।।

ते सम्मता जनपदेषु धनानि तेषां

तेषां यशांसि न च सीदति धर्मवर्गः ।

धन्यास्त एव निभृतात्मजभृत्यदारा

येषां सदाभ्युदयदा भवती प्रसन्ना ।। १४ ।।

4.11. Sightly-smiling, spotless, resembling the full moon's beautiful as the choicest gold, and lovely was thy Yet't was very marvellous that, being swayed by a The Asura Mahisha suddenly smote thy face when saw it.

4.12. But after seeing thy wrathful face, O Goddess, ter with its frowns, And sheeny in hue like the rising moon, that pa wonderful. For who can live after beholding the of Death enraged?

4.13. Be gracious, O Goddess, as supreme lady, to life. When enraged thou dost forthwith destroy whole fan Known at this very moment in this, that here is bro to its end. The Asura Mahisha's most extensive might.

4.14. Esteemed are they among the nations, theirs are ri Theirs are glories, and their sum of righteous; perishes not. Happy are they indeed, and they possess devoted of ren, servants and wives, On whom thou, well-pleased, dost always bestow perity, O lady!

धर्म्याणि देवि सकलानि सदैव कर्मा-

     ण्यत्यादृतः प्रतिदिनं सुकृती करोति ।

स्वर्गं प्रयाति च ततो भवतीप्रसादा-

     ल्लोकत्रयेऽपि फलदा ननु देवि तेन ।। १५ ।।

दुर्गे स्मृता हरसि भीतिमशेषजन्तोः

     स्वस्थैः स्मृता मतिमतीव शुभां ददासि ।

दारिद्र्यदुःखभयहारिणि का त्वदन्या

     सर्वोपकारकरणाय सदाऽऽर्द्रचित्ता ।। १६ ।।

एभिर्हतैर्जगदुपैति सुखं तथैते

     कुर्वन्तु नरकाय चिराय पापम् ।

संग्राममृत्युमधिगम्य दिवं प्रयान्तु

     मत्वेति नूनमहितान् विनिहंसि देवि ।। १७ ।।

दृष्टैव किं न भवती प्रकरोति भस्म

     सर्वासुरानरिषु यत्प्रहिणोषि शस्त्रम् ।

लोकान् प्रयान्तु रिपवोऽपि हि शस्त्रपूता

     इत्थं मतिर्भवति तेष्वपि तेऽतिसाध्वी ।। १८ ।।

4.15. All righteous actions ever indeed, O Goddess,

With utmost respect the man of good deeds performs,

And gains heaven thereafter by thy favour, O lady Dost thou not by him bestow rewards even on the worlds, O Goddess?

4.16. Thou, O Durga, when called to mind, dost reterror from every creature.

Thous, when called to mind bythose in health, bestow a mind extremely bright.

What goddess but thou, O dispeller of poverty, and fear,

Has ever benevolent thoughts in order to work be to all?4.17.

By these slain foes the world attains to happy let these

Forsooth practise sin so as to descend to hell for 'Meeting death in battlelet them proceed to he Thinking thus, thou dost assuredly destroy the O Goddess!

4.18. Having indeed seen them, why dost thous no reduce to ashes.

All the Asuras, since thou directest thy seap the foes ?

'Let even enemies, purified by dying in arms sooth to the bright worlds'—

Such is thy most kindly intention towards ever.

खड्गप्रभानिकरविस्फुरणैस्तथोग्रै:

शूलाग्रकान्तिनिवहेन दृशोऽसुराणाम् ।

यन्नागता विलयमंशुमदिन्दुखण्ड-

योग्याननं तव विलोकयतां तदेतत् ।। १९ ।।

दुर्वृत्तवृत्तशमनं तव देवि शीलं

रूपं तथैतदविचिन्त्यमतुल्यमन्यैः ।

वीर्यं च हन्तु हृतदेवपराक्रमाणां

वैरिष्वपि प्रकटितैव दया त्वयेत्थम् ।। २० ।।

केनोपमा भवतु तेऽस्य पराक्रमस्य

रूपं च शत्रुभयकार्यतिहारि कुत्र ।

चित्ते कृपा समरनिष्ठुरता च दृष्टा

त्वय्येव देवि वरदे भुवनत्रयेऽपि ।। २१ ।।

त्रैलोक्यमेतदखिलं रिपुनाशनेन

त्रातं त्वया समरमूर्धनि तेऽपि हत्वा ।

नीता दिवं रिपुगणा त्रयमप्यपास्त-

मस्माकमुन्मदसुरारिभवं नमस्ते ।। २२ ।।

4.19. And though, neither by the sharp flashes of light from thy scimitar,

Nor by the copious lustre of the spear-point, the Asuras

Were destroyed; yet, as they gazed upon the c which bore a portion of teh radiant moon, this happened.

4.20. Thy disposition, O Goddess, subdues the cond of evil conduct;

Thou hast as it were manifested pity thu enemies.

4.21. To what may this thy prowess be compared?

And where to thy form most charming, which among foes?

In thee, O Goddess, who bestowest boons e three worlds.

4.22. Through the destruction of the foes, these to entire.

Have been saved by thee. Having slain the battle-front.

Thou hast led even those hosts of foes to he dispelled the fear.

Which beset us from the frenzied foes of the to Reverence to thee.

शूलेन पाहि नो देवि पाहि खड्गेन चाम्बिके ।
घण्टास्वनेन न: पाहि चापज्यानि:स्वनेन च ।। २३ ।।
प्राच्यां रक्ष प्रतीच्यां च चण्डिके रक्ष दक्षिणे ।
भ्रामणेनात्मशूलस्य उत्तरस्यां तथेश्वरि ।। २४ ।।
सौम्यानि यानि रूपाणि त्रैलोक्ये विचरन्ति ते ।
यानि चात्यर्थघोराणि तै रक्षास्मांस्तथा भुवम् ।। २५ ।।
खड्गशूलगदादीनि यानि चास्त्राणि तेऽम्बिके ।
करपल्लवसङ्गीनि तैरस्मान् रक्ष   सर्वत: ।। २६ ।।

4.23. With thy spear protect us, O Goddess.
       Protect us with thy sword also, O Ambikā
       By the clanging of thy bell protect us,
       And by the twanging of the thong of thy bow.

4.24. In the east guard us, and in the west;
       O Chaṇḍikā, guard us in the south
       By te brandishing of thy spear,
       And also in the northy, O goddess.

4.25. Whatever gentle forms of thee wander about in the it worlds,
       And whatever exceedingly terrible forms wander, mean of them
       guard us and the earth.

4.26. Thy sword and spear and club, and whatever to weapons, O
       Ambika,
       Rest in thy pliant hand, with them guard us on event side.

—Translation by the Late Dr. V.S. Agrawala

THE GENTIC AND RECEPTIVE HISTORIES OF THE
SUNDARAKĀṆḌA OF THE *VĀLMĪKI RĀMĀYAṆA*

BY

R. P. Goldman

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे विदुषा लेखकेन सुन्दरकाण्डस्थ विवेचनं प्रस्तुतम् । इदं लोकप्रसिद्धं यत् सुन्दरकाण्डे सर्वमेय सुन्दरमस्ति। इदं भारतीयमनीषाया: प्राचीनतमं भणितं अस्ति यत् सुन्दरकाण्डं वाल्मीकीये रामायणे अन्य काण्डानाम् अपेक्षया भाषाभावदृष्ट्या सुन्दरतमं अस्ति। तदेव अत्र विदुषा लेखकेन सप्रमाणं प्रदर्शितम् ।]

Scholarly controversy about intergity of the great Sanskrit epics, the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, dates back to the dawn of scientific interest in these two monumental documents of Indian culture and society on the part of European savants of the 19th century.

There is no need to rehearse once again in detail the various arguments put forward by scholars in Europe and India on the various aspects of this important question. Suffice it to say that, despite a few dissenting voices such as those of Dahlmann, later Sukthankar, and most recently Ramanujan and Pollock, the prevailing opinion of western scholars from the 19th century down to the present day is that thses poemis as we know them differ substantially from the forms in which these were originally composed. These alleged differences are fundamentally of two kinds, both of which are of fundamental significance to our understading and appreccciation of these greats works.

The first of these has to do with the size and structure of the works as literary texts. The basic premise that has animated scholars at least since the time of Jacobi is that both monumental poems grew haphazardly as a results of an endless process of accretion, expansion, and interpolation on the part of redactors and diaskeuasts, less skillful in poetic composition than the original bards. Thus there has been much discussion of epic "cores" and "kernels" as if these poems were some kind of food grain in need of threshing, polishing, and milling to bring its nutritive heart to light after centuries of occlusion by massive accertions of -to continue the metaphor-poetic chaff.

The second of these alleged differences-which is in fact closely related to the first-has to do more with substance than form; and is most closely associated with the status of both epics as works profoundly imbued with the spirit of Vaisnava devotionalism. The prevailing theory of European epic scholarship and the one still handed down as the received wisdom is that the two central Vaisnava *avatāras* who drive trhe action of the epic narratives, Śrī Rāma and Śrī Krṣṇa were originally- that is to say in the oldest narrative cores of the texts, merely human heroes who were somehow raised to the status of the supreme divinity by later Vaisnava redactors.

According to the most redical statements of this position, a notion put forward by Jacobi in 1891 and strongly defended by Brockington in 1984, 1998 and. With Mary Brockington, 2006[1] the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* consisted originally only of what are now the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* through *Yuddhakāṇḍa* and those Books of the poem were originally utterly unaware of the divinity of the epic hero.

This idea of the history of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* is radically at variance with the traditional Indian understanding and appreciation of the poem as a work of art and a religious text and finds no significant support in the prodigious work of critical editing done the Oriental Institute of Baroda.[2] Thus many of the things that most delight and move the Indian audience have been declared to be extraneous and inferior by some Western critics; while the best scientific reconstruction of the text, although it shows that some popular episode are indeed relatively late, in no way points to a *Rāmāyaṇa* devoids of the *Bāla* and *Uttara Kāṇḍas* or one that does not throughout recognize the divinity of Rāma.

The differnces is, natuarally, not restricted to the poem as a whole but has been extended to each of its sections. It is my belief that the Western critique, whatever may be its philological claims, has erred in failring to evaluate the poem in terms of its own aesthetic and the

---

1. Brockington, John, *Righteous Rāma,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 1984. The Sanskrit Epics, Brill. Leiden, 1998. *Rāma the Steadfast,* Penguin Classics, London, 2006.

2. The *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* : Critical Edition, 7 Vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute. General editiors: G.H. Bhatt and U.P Shah. 1960-1975. All referneces to the Rāmāyana, unless otherwise specified, are to the Critical Edition.

social, cultural, and religious norms of its intended audiances and in imposing upon it alien critical standards that it was not created to satisfy. As a result, we have, despite the long and often distingushed history of scholarship on the Indian epics, little in the way of careful, but sympathetic criticism of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in terms of its authorial intention and its audience expectation. In short we need to develope an informed receptive history of the *Rāmāyaṇa* to balance and serve as a corrective to what may well be ethocentric biases of the inherited genetic history of the great poem.

Perhaps no clearer example of the difference in the two kinds of critique of the text can be found than in the comparison of the western or "etic" analysis of the *Sundarakāṇḍā* of the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* with the traditonal Indian or " emic" response to the work. For it is there, as we shall see, that the gulf between the two seems widest. Nonetheless, taking some courage from the central theme of the Book, Māruti's successful leaping of just such a seemingly unbridgeable gulf, I shall venture to approach the topic in the hopes that in so doing I may shed some small light on a problem that lies at the heart of both traditional epic scholarship and contemporary cultural studies.

ullaṅghaya sindhoḥ salilaṃ salīlaṃ

yaḥ śokavahniṃ janakātmajāyāḥ |

ādāya tenaiva dadāha laṅkāṃ

namāmi taṃ prāñjalir āñjaneyam ||

In his well known work *Das Rāmāyaṇa*[3] the great German philologist and epic scholar, Hermann Jacobi singled out the *Sundarakāṇḍā* for special treatment as a clear example of how what he saw as the smooth linear flow and uniformity of tone of the poem's original stage had been ruined by the repetitiveness and inexpert interpolation on the part of later redactors and by the sometimes undignified behavior of some of its characters.

Dr. Sutherland Goldman and I have put forward, in our introduction to the translation of the Sundarakāṇḍā ,[4] our detailed arguments

3. Jacobi, Herman. Das *Rāmāyaṇa : Geschichte and Inhalt, nebst Concordanz der gedrukten Recensionen.* Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1893.

4. Goldman, Robert and Sutherland Goldman, Sally. The *Rāmāyaṇa* of *Vālmīki* : An Epic of Ancient India, Vol. V: *Sundarakāṇḍa,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

for regarding the Book as largely integral both in its structure and its thematic content. I cannot repeat those arguements here but suffice it to say that we are convinced that a careful and dispassionate reading of the work in its own narrative and aesthetic context must lead to a sense of its unity and integrity as it has been transmitted in the southern and vulgate versions of the poem. First of all it possessess a unity of time and place that is all but unique among the *kāṇḍas*. Moreover its characteristically symmetrical placement of repeated-through repetition and prophecy-to both earlier and later portions of the epic clearly establish it as belonging to the most central elements in the design of the monumental poem.

This view of the centrality of the *Sundarakāṇḍā* is in general supportive of such traditionalist critique of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as is available to us. According to the *Agastyasaṃhitā,* the Book constitute the *bīja,* the nucleus or kernel of the whole poetic edifice and this idea, derived no doubt from a widely shared sense of the meeting of Sītā and Hanumān as the narrative and emotional core of the epic, has found an eager resonance in the writings of some Indian scholars and admirers of the poem. Thus K.R Srinivasan Iyengar speculates, albeit fancifully, that the Book may have been "composed and consecrated first as the nucleus of the whole epic architecture." He even hazards the somewhat questionable speculation-almost mirroring Jacobi in his enthusiam- that if the mounmental poem in seven *Kāṇḍas* as we know it can be seen " as the planned enlargement if an intial core narrative into the present much more extended recital, it is not improbable that originally the *Sundara Kāṇḍa* was the nucleus, the seminal epic, and the rest were later, if puposeful, additions."[5]

Iyengar's evaluation of the place in the *Sundarakāṇḍa* in the growth of the *Rāmāyaṇa* from an epic kernal is in harmony with the special esteem in which the Book is held by millions of contemproray Indians. By the same token, however, it is radically at odds with analyses of the epic and Book that have been put forword by a number of influential western scholars.

Jacobi felt that the *Sundarakāṇḍa*- more than any other Book-was

---

5.   Iyenger, K.R. Srinivasa, trans. The Epic Beautiful: Anm English Verse Rendering of the Sundara kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyna of Vāmīki. Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1983. Pp. 23-28

characterized by substantial passages that were spurious interpolations and that the most noteworthy of these passages constitute the entire lenghty account of Hanumān's adventures from the time that he first takes his leave of Sītā in *sarga* thirty-eight until his departure from Laṅkā *in sarga* fifty-five and the episode of the monkey's drunken revelry in the Madhuvana which occupies *sargas* fifty-nine through sixty-two. In addition, Jacobi argues for the spuriousness of the major repetitions in the Book, particularlyHanuman's accounts of his adventures and of his conversation with Sītā preciesly because they are repetiitve and therefore, he reasons, superfluous to the poem's audiance.[6]

As for the differing judgments of the Book's literary merit we see once radically differing views ranging from Iyenger's fulsome praise of the Book as "The Epic Beautiful," the very essence of beauty, to Griffith's bleak assessment,"To a European taste it is the most intolerably tedious of the whole poem, abounding in repetition, overloaded description, and long and useless speeches which impede the action of the poem."[7]

Jacobi's "genetic" textual history of the epics is, of course, radically at odds with the traditional Indian understanding that the *Rāmāyaṇa,* like the *Mahābhārta* is fundamentally unitary composition of a single post-seer who was a contemporary of the epic protagonists. This understanding is of course based upon a number of factors that are in need of careful re-evaluation in the light of the develpment of philological tools- such as the critical edition-that were not available o early scholars and of the kinds of culturally informed evalutions that are charcteristic of modern, post-Orientalist literary scholarship.

Jacobi's critique of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* and particularly his claim that the " *Hanumat Episode*" and the interlude of the *madhuvana* are clumsy and spurious interpolations rests on a number of specific arguments that need to be carefully re-examined in the light of a reading of the critical edition of the text, a study of the relevant commentaries, and a carefully consideration of the book in the light of the narrative, emotional, and aesthetic expectations of its intended audiance.

Despite his zeal to determine the " *Echtheit and Unechtheit*" of the various parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa,* Jacobi was forced to acknowledge

6. Jacobi, 1893, pp.31-35.

7. Griffith. Ralph T.H. The *Ramayan of Vāmīki,* translated into English Verse, 5 vols. London: Trübner. 1873. P. 279.

that he could arrive at no generally applicable external criteria for doing so.[8] His comparison of the various recensions available to him proved inconclusive and in fact, the later monumental textual scholarship undertaken by the research staff of the *Rāmāyaṇa* Department of the Oriental Institute of Baroda clearly refutes Jacobi's claims: for both of the major passages he regards as late and spurious have been clearly shown to belong to the best possible reconstruction of the text. He proposes, instead, that we must examine the "interanal evidence" by which he means contradictions with preceding or subsequent passages, "deviations" or "peculiarities" in the whole representation, and striking irregularities of outward form.

In the context of this methodological framework, so heavily laden with value judgments, Jacobi offers two major pieces of "indirect" evidence in support of his contention that the *"Hanumat-Episode"* was "alien to the original poem."[9] The first of these is that Hanumān fails to mention any of the adventures he experiences in the passage— his battles with the *rākṣasas*, his interview the Rāvaṇa, the burning of Laṅkā, etc. —when he makes his report to Rāma in *sargas* sixty-trhee through sixty-six.

In addition, Jacobi argues that when Hanumān is asked later, in *sarga* three of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, to provide intelligence about Laṅkā, its garrison and its defenses, he describes it a rich and well defended, a description Jacobi finds to be in glaring contrast with the "clumsily imitative" verse (6.3.28) in which the monkey refers to his destruction of the defensive works and his burning of the citadel. As additional evidence Jacobi offers the fact that while two *rākṣasas* named Yupākṣa and Virupākṣa are said to have been killed by Hanumān in *sarga* forty-four, rākṣasas of the same names are slain—the former by Sugrīva and the latter by Mainda—in *sargas* seventy-six and ninety-six of the vulgate respectively.

---

8. Jacobi, 1893, P. 31. One should not, however think that the traditional scholars of the epic, that is to say the commentators, uncritically accepted all sections of the poem as genuine. Indeed the contrary is true as can be seen from the debates that engage some of the southern commentators, most particularly Mādhava Yogīndra, as to which verse and even which chapters are to be regarded as either authentic (pāṅkta) or interpolated *(prakṣipta)*. Still no pre-modern Indian scholar ever proposed regarding so large a unit as a whole *kāṇḍa* or even as extended a passage as the one Jacobi calls the *"Hanumat-Episode"* as spurious.

9. Jacobi, 1893, p. 34.

In pressing his argument about the spuriousness of this passage, Jacobi considers and rejects two countervailing points, first that Hanumān does indeed speak at length of his adventures in Laṅkā when he reports to the search party at *sarga* fifty-six, and second, that the relatively petty contradictions can be accounted for as minor lapses on the part of Vālmīki under the principle, *interdum dormit Homerus*.[10]

Jacobi's analysis of the *"Hanumat-Episode"* has so considerable a bearing on our conception of the structure of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* and has become so ingrained a part of Rāmāyaṇa scholarship that it is important for us to carefully examine it and the grounds upon which it has been based.

Jacobi's observation that Hanumān fails to report on his adventures when he meets Rāma seems to have a disingenuous quality when placed alongside his critique of the monkey's detailed report to Aṅgada's search party in *sarga* fifty-six. For in the first instance the absence of reference of Hanumān's adventures is taken as evidence of their spuriousness while in the second the presence of such reference is denounced as unnecessary for those who hear or read the passage since the events have already been narrated in great detail. In other words both the report of these events and the failure to report them signify their spuriousness! Jacobi then, circularly it appears to us, insists that Hanumān's entire report to the monkeys is shown to be a late addition because of his reference to his second leave-taking from Sītā (5.56.38). Once again the reference to an event is taken as evidence that the event could not have happened.

Finally, Jacobi comments that the few references to Hanumān's martial exploits found in *sargas* fifty-nine and sixty of the vulgate are so confused and repetitive that they can hardly be taken as old. He concludes that the placement of these references in these *sargas* does nothing to establish the establish the genuineness of the episode but instead only speaks against their own authenticity.

But let us first examine Jacobi's smaller and more textually grounded points. In fairness it is important to keep in mind that he, like all scholars writing on the *Rāmāyaṇa* prior to the completion of the Baroda critical edition in 1975, were operating with no clear or objective means for evaluating the textual history of any passage in the poem. Most early scholarship—and Jacobi's is no exception—was based upon one

---

10. Jacobi, 1893, pp. 34-36.

or another of the major recensions, north or south, as they were repre-
sented in the various published versions. In practice that meant that
scholars took as their basis either the Bengal recension (e.g., Gorresio)
or —by far the majority — one or another of the published versions of
the so called vulgate, versions that, as in the case of some of the pas-
sages cited by Jacobi, may vary considerably among themselves.

So let us consider the case of the *rakṣasa* warriors Virūpākṣa and
Yūpākṣa who appear to be killed by Hanumān in *sarga* forty-four of
the *Sundarakāṇḍa* only to be slain once again by other heroes in the
Yuddhakāṇḍa.

The second killing of Yūpākṣa occurs in a passage belonging
basically to the sourthern recension, which, although it finds some
support in the north, is absent from the important northwest
subrecension. It has therefore, with some justification, been relegated
by the critical editiors to an appendix (*Yūddhakāṇḍa* App. I. No. 43,
pp. 1000-1004) following 6.63.3. Thus, in this case, the same scien-
tific textual analysis that shows the *"Hanumat-Episode"* to belong to
the best reconstruction of the poem eliminates the apparent contradic-
tion through the excision of the second passage, which Jacobi assumed
to be genuine. In the second case, that of Virūpākṣa, the critical
edition does support the passage at 6.84 in which a *rakṣasa* warrior
named Virūpākṣa is slain by Sugrīva after a fierce battle. But it is not
completely clear that this is actually a contradiction. The Virūpākṣa of
the *Sudarakāṇḍa* is closley connected with Yūpākṣa. They are two of
Rāvaṇa's five field marshals *(senāgranāyaka)*; they fight together and
are slain together. Yet even the Vulgate of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa,* which
describes the death of Yūpākṣa at the hands of the monkey-warrior
Mainda, does not associate him with Virūpākṣa. The former fights
here in conjunction with a *rakṣasa* named Śoṇitākṣa and the story of
his death comes some twenty *sargas* before that of Virūpākṣa, who
dies at the hands of Surgrīva. Neither *rakṣa* is identified in the
Yuddhakāṇḍa as a field marshal. Moreover, it is not at all unlikely that
the name Virūpākṣa, "Squint-eyes", could be applied to more than
one *rakṣasa* by way of an epithet or nickname. Indeed this is
suggested by several other clues in the text. For one thing several of
the *rakṣasa* men and women are said at various points to have this
deformity.[11] Such an idea is, we believe, further supported by the fact

11. Thus, for example, Rāvaṇa's eyes are said to be *virūpa* at 5.20.18 while
    Śūrpaṇakhā is described as virūpākṣī at 3.16.8.

that the *rākṣasa* in question is referred to by synonymous epithets such as *virūpanetra*, a type of variation that is common for epithets but less so for actual proper names.[12] This is also suggested by specific play on the epithet as at 6.84.30.

> *vivṛttanayanam krodhāt saphenarudhirāplutam |*
> *dadṛśus te virupākṣaṃ virupākṣataraṃ kṛtam ||*

"With his eyes filled with foaming blood and rolling with rage, Squint-eyes was made to appear even more squint-eyed."

In any case, even if one were to insist that this is a proper name, there are numrous instances in both epics in which the same name or epithet is used for more than one character. Consider for example the case of such prominent epic and purāṇic names such as Kṛṣṇa (Vāsudeva, Dvaipāyana, Arjuna) and Rāma (Dāśarathi, Jāmadagnya, Rauhiṇeya). The same phenomenon is true of lesser figures. Thus several of the Nāga lords named in the Mahābhārata have the same names as figures from the epic story. If we are to follow Jacobi in thinking that a name or epithet can be used for only one character must we then to suppose, for example, that the servant Śūrpaṇakhā, Sītā's *rākṣasī* wardress, mentioned by the poet at 5.22.40, is the same as Mahārāja Rāvaṇa's high-born sister whose disfigurement leads to the abduction of Sītā in the *Araṇyakāṇḍa?*

Thus we see that there are a number of plausible explanations for the recurrence of the name *Virūpākṣa* without having to brand the very core of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* as spurious. Then too, even if one were to admit that the same character is intended, it seems tendentious, if not churlish, on Jacobi's part to deny Vālmīki the privilege—so indulgently accorded Homer— of so minor a nod during the composition of an epic poem nearly twice the length of the Iliad and *Odyssey* together.

A more substantive and in many ways more interesting point is Jacobi's mention of Hanumān's silence concerning his martial exploits in Laṅkā when he reports to Rāma at the end of the book. The point is of some significance as its analysis has considerable bearing on our

---

12. Compare, for example, the synonymous epithets used for Rāvaṇa such as *daśagrīva, daśakandhara, daśakaṇṭha, daśāya, daśānana* etc., all meaning "ten-necked" or "ten-headed". No such variation is found, on the other hand, for the name Daśaratha ("having ten chariots").

evaluation of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* amd indeed the entire *Rāmāyaṇa* as a piece of cultural production and a work of literary art. It also provides us with a useful instrument to contrast the emic and etic approaches to the poem that have led to such radically divergent assessments of its merit by, on the one hand, western scholars such as Jacobi and Griffith and, on the other, by Indian audiences, both general and scholarly, exemplified by K.R. Srinivasa Iyengar.

Jacobi's critique proceeds from the assumption that, if the episodes in which Hanumān annihilates the *rākṣasa* warriors, confronts Rāvaṇa, and sets fire to Laṅkā were part of the original *Sundarakāṇḍa*, the monkey would naturally have reported all of his feats of strength, skill and courage to Rāma. Perhaps, this would be the appropriate expectation of a warrior sent out on a mission in a western martial epic. But this is not a western epic, and Hanumān is not a western hero. Hanumān has, *pace* Jacobi, already given an elaborate, highly colored, and even boastful account of his accomplishments to his immediate superior Aṅgada.[13] Would he have repeated such an account before Rāma and Sugrīva? We believe that there are cultural and contextual reasons for suggesting that he would not.

Jacobi was not the first scholar to note the apparent discrepancy in the two reports of Hanumān. The first recorded notice of it was, as far as we have been able to determine, made by the important and influential sixteenth century *Rāmāyaṇa* commentator, Govindarāja. Govindarāja calls our attention to the abbrevaiated nature of Hanumān's report to Rāma in *sarga* sixty three, which omits all of his adventures in crossing the ocean, burning the city, etc. He explains this by saying that although it was proper for him to have boasted of these adventures before his own peers, the monkeys; he does not do so here in order to avoid praising himself in his master's presence. Govindarāja further counters the objection that it would be appropriate generally for someone like Hanumān to give a full acount of his adventures by saying that it was more appropriate for a detailed report to be presented to Aṅgada in order to conceal from Rāma those things, which would not have been appropriate for him to hear. Govindarāja's

---

13. Goldman and Sutherland Goldman, 1996, pp. 513, 517 notes to 5.56.11 and 5.56.65. The text of the epic makes this clear at 5.56.4-5 where Aṅgada reqiests that Hanumān tell him and the search party everything he has seen and done in great detail and then tell them which of these things they should not repeat [in the presence of Sugrīva and Rāma].

explanation, unlike Jacobi's, takes into account the important principle of "context sensitivity," which, as Ramanujan has argued, is especially characteristic of traditional India.

A widely articulated Indian cultural norm prohibits self-praise (*ātmastuti*) most particularly in the presence of one's elders, masters, or gurus. Thus the acount of his own accomplishments that is perhaps permissible in the company of Hanumān's comrades-in-arms, becomes unseemly in the presence of his superiors Sugrīva, Rāma, and Lakṣmaṇa.

But there is yet another reason that might be put forward for Hanumṇ reticence in the presence of Rāma and Sugrīva. Rāma, who has been overwhelmed by an all consuming grief since the abduction of his beloved Sītā and an agonizing period of uncertainry, not knowing what has become of her or even if she is alive, is not interested at this moment in hearing about the exploits of his messenger. Indeed as soon as he hears from Aṅgada and the monkeys of the search party that Sītā is alive he begins to question them intensively about Sītā and Sītā alone.

kva sītā vartate devī katham ca mayi vartate I

etan me sarvam ākhyāta vaidehīm prati vānarāḥ II

"Where is Queen Sītā? How is the disposed toward me? Tell me everything concerning Vaidehī, monkeys." (5.63.5)

It is clear from this and the context as it develops that Rāma's only concern at this moment is for Sītā, her condition and finding out whether she has remained faithful to him. It is not until the third *sarga* of the text that the grief stricken husband becomes once more the resolute military commander and asks Hanumān about Rāvaṇa's troop-strength and defensive works.

In this context it would be highly inappropriate for Hanumān, the perfectly devoted servant, to prattle on about his exploits, which were, in any case, well beyond the mandate given him by his masters. He had been told to find Sītā and report back; no more, no less. The martial feats he undertook on his own initiative not only delayed the completion of his mission, they might—had he been killed or captured—have led to its failure. Then too, it is generally agreed upon by the monkeys and even expressed several times by Sītā herself, that Rāma would not took kindly on unauthorized efforts to engage the *rākṣasas*.

Given all of this and the powefully emotional tenor of Rāma's

grasping at every detail of Sītā's condition and speech that dominates
the closing sargas of the Book, one can hardly expect the poet to have
Hanumān launch once again into an account of his leap and his de-
struction of Laṅkā. Jacobi's critique, although based on the best
textual analysis possible given the materials from which he had to
work, is utterly insensitive to the aesthetic, emotional, and culture-
specific realities of the text. Rather than appreciate the skill and subtlety
of the poet in crafting a poem true to those realities, he seeks to dis-
mantle the fruit of that craft in the name of protecting Vālmīki's repu-
tation from the damage brought to it by the clumsy rhapsodists and
diaskeuasts of his—Jacobi's—imagination.

Also worthy of re-examination are Jacobi's views on the tone of
the *Sundarakāṇḍa*. Wherever the poem foregrounds the simian nature
of Hanumān and his monkey-companions, Jacobi sees a "burlesque
tone," which, fitting poorly with "Hanumān's character," leads him to
suspect the genuineness of the passage. The passages in which this
tone is most pronounced are, of course, the very same *"Hanumat-
Episode"* and the interlude in which the monkeys of the search party,
intoxicated with their success and the king's sweet honey-wine, dev-
astate the Madhuvana. Jacobi found the latter episode to be both su-
perfluous and disturbing and pointed out that if the offending passage
were deleted, the end of the sixtieth *sarga* (of the vulgate) could with-
out difficulty be joined to the beginning of the sixty-fifth *sarga* (of the
vulgate).[15]

On the technical level of text criticism, Jacobi is once agin wield-
ing his philologist's scalpel in the absence of a scientifically valid diag-
nostic of the text. It is true that the juxtaposition of two verses brought
about by Jacobi's excision would be in no way jarring. That, however,
is hardly proof that they were ever, in any version, so juxtaposed; and
indeed, now that we have the benefit of the critical edition, we can
easily see that such a juxtaposition cannot be shown to have existed in
any recoverable reconstruction of the text. In the first place the verse
Jacobi cites as ending the sixtieth *sarga* does not actually do so in any
known version of the poem. More importantly, if ironically, the criti-
cal edition shows clearly that the passage that ends that *sarga* in the
vulgate actually concludes a passage of twenty lines that —as we now
know on text-critical grounds—could not have been part of an Ur-

---

15. Jacobi, 1893, pp. 36-37.

Rāmāyaṇa. It has thus been relegated to the critical apparatus.

Jacobi's sense that what he sees as the "burlesque tone" of these passages accords poorly with that of the remainder of the Book and denigrates the character of its hero by displaying his simian nature must, on careful consideration, be seen as deriving more from the author's preconceptions about the tone of epic poetry and a Homeric sense of heroic dignity than from an informed and sympathetic appreciation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* that is sensitive to the aesthetic norms of the culture that produced and consumed it.

If Hanumān and his companions are portrayed, sometimes humorously, as monkeys, it is because the poet wishes to keep clearly before the eyes of his audience the fact that is precisely what they are. The simian nature of the *vānaras* is no comic interpolation into the body of the epic. It is constitutive of the Rāma legend, for it is tied up inextricably with the theological and mythic forces that drive the narrative and lend it its, unparalleled power, pervasiveness, and influence in the religious, intellectual, and cultural life of South Asia.

To understand this it is necessary to reflect on the culturally central role of Rāma as a principal avatāra of the great Lord Viṣṇu and upon the powerful ironies that animate this central and characteristic element of Vaiṣṇva theology. This irony, which is most elaborately developed in the cases of the two great human *avatāras,* Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, requires that for the omnipotent Lord to carry through his eschatological missions in the phenomenal world, his *līlās*, it is necessary for him to take birth as some creature that is at once less than a god but more than a human. The irony derives from the fact that the *avatāra* is both aware and unaware of his divine nature, thus carrying out the divine plan through his superhuman and miraculous feats while at the same time remaining subject to the anguish and the indignities of the human condition.

The necessity—inseparable from the very essence of the Vaiṣṇva avatāra—for Rāma to be born in the liminal category of superhuman human and to suffer the unbearable anguish of the loss of his beloved Sītā has been elaborately and persuasively discussed by Pollock in his learned introduction to the third volume of our translation and requires

---

16. Pollocak, Sheldon, The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki : An Epic of Ancient India, Vol. III : The *Aranyakānda*. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1991, pp. 15—54.

no further elaboration on our part.[16] But if the reasons for Viṣṇu's having to take bith as a human are made clear by the terms in which Rāvaṇa couches his well-known request to Brahmā, why is it that his companions and allies must be monkeys? As recounted in the framing mythological narrative of the *Bālakāṇḍa*, no sooner has Viṣṇu departed from the divine assembly in preparation for his birth as the son of the human king Daśaratha then Brahmā instructs the gods to sire powerful simian allies for him on the various classes of sauperhuman women.[17]

Although Brahmā's instructions are explicit that the children of the gods generated for this purpose must have the form of monkeys, the text offers no explantion for this condition at this point. A mythological explanation of why Rāma's allies have to be monkeys is, however, put forward in the section of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* that relates the early history of the *rākṣasa* king. There it is said that during the course of his efforts to conquer the universe, Rāvaṇa comes to Mt. Kailāsa, the abode of the mighty Lord Śiva. He is accosted by the great god's attendant Nandīśvara who is described as monkey-faced. In his foolishness Rāvaṇa ridicules him, laughing loudly. Enraged, Lord Nandin curses Rāvaṇa for holding his simian form in contempt and prophesies that beings resembling him, Nandin, both in form and power, will be born to encompass the destruction of the *rākṣasa's* family.[18]

---

17. *Bālakāṇḍa* 16. Note especially 1.16.6, *srjadhvaṃ harirūpeṇa putrān* and 1.16.7, *janayāmāsa evaṃ te putrān vānararūpiṇaḥ*.

18. *Uttarakāṇḍa* 16.12—17. In seeking a variety of "explanations" of the role of monkeys in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, we should be cognizant of the variety of approaches to such a problem that would be found among the traditional *Rāmāyaṇa* community, western-style literary-historical scholars, and those who attempt to combine elements of both. For each of these groups would entertain very different notions of what sort of explanation is required. Traditional scholarship, although it is often explicitly critical of certain passages, which, it is argued, strain credibility (e.g., Govindarāja's and Mādhava Yogīndra's comments on 5.1.141, see note on this in Goldman and Sutherland Goldman 1996, pp. 320—321), nonetheless accepts the *Rāmāyaṇa* as factual. Therefore, if a question such as, "Why monkeys?" is posed, traditionalists will generally fall back on mythical explanations such as the curse of Nandin to explain the fact of divinely poweful monkeys assisting Rāma in his cosmic task of destroying Rāvaṇa. Western-style scholarship assumes that the poem is for the most part a work of the imagination and seeks to explain a phenomenon such as the role of talking, flying monkeys in terms of folkloric, comparative mythological, psychoanalytic or other modes of literary theoretical analysis. A third approach, and one found in the writings of a number

If we must speculate as to why the Rāma legend has monkeys as the hero's allies, we can consider a number of possible factors. One such would be the popular folkloric motif, widely distributed in India and elsewhere, of the animal companion who helps a troubled hero gain or regain his lost love or stolen kingdom.[19] From the point of view of the particular context of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, its narrative logic and its theological presuppositions, however, it should be recalled that the first major narrative element in the grand scheme that will culminate with the confrontation of Rāma and Rāvaṇa is that which will drive the hero out of the human world, the city and the cultivated country-side, and into the dark recesses of the wilderness, the fearsome if some-times idyllic realm of demons and wild beasts. Thus the force of the narrative removes the hero from human society and places him where, in his hour of need, he is beyond human help.

Related to an supportive of this narrative logic is a kind of psychological imperative peculiar to the *Rāmāyaṇa* according to which forces associated with an ego and a sensuality unmoderated by the poweful strictures of *dharma*, social ordination, and renunciation are generally projected outward from human to non human societies. Thus when the poet needs or wishes to represent non-normative patterns of social relations, his tendency is, if at all possible, to place them in the social universes of the *vānaras* and the *rākṣasas*. In this way the mon-

---

of scholars, is to attempt to do combine both types of analysis by accepting the story as historical but rationalizing or interpreting elements that appear to be at odds with everyday reality. This school is best represented by authors who argue that the *vānaras* were actually not monkeys but were either tribal groups who either took the monkey for their totem or actually had tails. In one extreme case, Mehta, C.N. *Sundara Kāṇḍam or The Flight of Hanuman [The Vanara (Superman) Chief]*, Nadiad, the Universal Steam Press 1941, p. 335, they are identified as the Chinese! See also Goldman, R.P., *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki : An Epic of Ancient India. Vol. I, Bālakāṇḍa*. Introduction by Robert P. Goldman. Annotation by Robert P. Goldman and Sally J. Sutherland. Princeton : Princeton University Pess. 1984, p. 27; Bhatt, G.K. 1960, pp. 446-47; Mankad, D.R. ed. The *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* 1965, pp. xxxiii-xxxiv, Cf Lefeber, R. *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki : An Epic of Ancient India IV Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa* 1994 pp. 37-44, and Masson, J. L (J. Moussaieff Masson) "Fratricide among the Monkeys : Psychoanalytic Observations on an Episode in the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*" The *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (JAOS) 95, No. 4 1975. pp. 672-78.

19. Masson, Jeffrey. L. "Hanumān as an Imaginary Companion" *JAOS* 101 No. 3, 1981. pp. 355-60.

key polity of Kiṣkindhā serves not only to equip Rāma with allies and troops unavailable from their expected source, Ayodhyā, it also provides, in the conflict between Vālin and Sugrīva and Lakṣmaṇa's excoriation of Sugrīva's sloth and sensual indulgence, an additional opportunity for the poet to render in high relief the self-discipline and moral purity of Rāma and his brother.[20]

If the divine *avatāras* who are to play so vital a role in the discovery of Sītā and the defeat of Rāvaṇa must be monkeys, then it is only to be expected that, like Rāma they should exhibit to the fullest the defining characteristics of their dual nature. If Rāma as *avatāra* of Viṣṇu is both more godlike than any god and more human than any man, then the *vānaras* as animal *avatāras* of the gods of the Vedic pantheon should exhibit both the power, valor and wisdom of their divine fathers and to a very marked degree the bestial behavior humans most associate with primates.

Understood in this way, that is in the full narrative, mythic, folkloric, and theological context of the poem, it becomes clear that the vulgar and exaggerated simian antics of the monkeys in the *madhuvana*[21] or of Hanumān when he mistakes the sleeping Mandodarī for Sītā[22] are far from comic interpolations clumsily worked into the Sundarakāṇḍa by crude rhapsodists eager to amuse their uncultivated audiences. On the contrary, they are absolutely integral to the Book and to the poem as a whole and appear to us to be entirely in keeping with the narrative and aesthetic expectations of both educated and uneducated traditional audiences.

The specific points raised by Jacobi have been discussed here at

---

20. Even Vālmīki must on at least one occasion, situate social disharmony and antisocial egoism in the heroic household. This is the sociopathic behavior of Kaikeyī in defying her husband's wishes to exalt her own son over Rāma. Without this there would not have been enough conflict to advance the narrative. What is remarkable is that this is the only such instance in the entire epic. See Sutherland, Sally S.J., "Seduction and Counter-Seduction : Bedroom Politics in the Ancient Epics," The Journal of Indian Philosophy 20, 1992, pp. pp. 243-51.

21. As described in comic detail at 5.59 and 60.

22. Hanuman's antics here (5.8.50) are quite amusing.
    āsphotayām āsa cucumba puccham
    nananda cikrīḍa jagau jagāma I
    stambhān arohan nipapāta bhumau
    nidarśayan svāṃ prakṛtiṃ kapīnām II

length because they raise the larger issue of inter cultural aesthetic criticism with respect to a national epic such as the *Rāmāyaṇa*. This problem has been discussed earlier in the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* Translation Project in connection with the poem as a whole and with several of its constituent Books; and on one level, it can be seen as Pollock has suggested, as a product of western and western-style scholarship's focus on the poem's "genetic history" as opposed to the more traditionally focused concern with its "receptive history."[23]

This issue need not be taken up again here other than to not that although both approaches are valid and can contribute to our store of knowledge about the *Rāmāyaṇa*,much if not most of the "genetic" history of the text that has been provided to us is, as the preceding discussion attempts to show, in fact, inaccurate. Its inaccuracy derives not from any lack of scholarly rigor or philological skill on the part of Jacobi and his successors but from two significant facotrs. These are first, the unavailability of the requisite philological tools for a scientific study of the poem until very recently and second an attitude amounting to antipathy for much of the received text of the poem on the part of many early western scholars, which led them to judgments that appear to be less than objective. These problems have been compounded by the curious fact that even after the publication of the critical editions of both great Sanskrit epics and well into an era in which culturally sensitive "participant-observation" has significantly displaced the old "Orientalist" biases about Asian cultural production, western and western-style scholarship has largely continued to regard the theories and criticism of the *Rāmāyaṇa* put forward by Jacobi, Keith, Griffith and others in the heyday of Orientalism as axiomatic.

In his denunciation of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* as "intolerably tedious" Griffith had at least the decency to limit his judgment to the scope of "European taste," and the wisdom to represent Vālmīki as he found him rather than, "as European taste might prefer him to be." In so doing he suggests, although he does not embrace, the existence of other domains of literary and aesthetic sensibility. In the works of Jacobi and other Victorian students of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and Sanskrit literature

---

23. Pollock, Sheldon I. (1991). *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki : An Epic of Ancient India. Vol. III Araṇyakāṇḍa.* Princeton : Princeton University Press. 1991, pp. 3-6.

and in the works of many of their influential predecessors and successors like Hall, Macdonell, Keith, and so forth such pejorative terms are not similarly restricted and are given the status of universals. This is not the place to discuss in detail the fundamental impropriety of judging the aesthetic production of one culture by the standards of another. We have attempted this before in the case of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, while for Sanskrit poetry, in general, it has been done by others with far greater eloquence than we might achieve.[24]

Despite the harsh appraisal of the *Sundarakāṇḍa* by its western critics, the fact remains that the judgment of the Book among its intended audiences in India has been and continues to be utterly different. For the long and distinguished tradition of Indian literary criticism the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* has always stood unshakable in its claim to the title of Ādikāvya, the first and foremost of poems and the inspiration and model for all others. By the same token, as suggested above, the *Sundarakāṇḍa* appears to be widely acknowledged as the very heart of the poem. With this in mind let us turn once more briefly to the western critique.

The Book, as Griffith notes and Jacobi frets, does abound in repetition. It is true that has many long speeches, which, whether or not they be—in Griffith's words—"useless", do impede the poem's action. Why then is it so highly regarded? There are basically two answers to this question. The first has to do with the contrast between norms of aurally and visually consumed poetry and the second—and perhaps more fundamental—with culturally conditioned responses to repetitiveness and what western authors negatively characterize as "excessive" description or long-windedness. Indian cultural productions, from the ancient epics and drams to folk plays, music recitals, feature films and even group and public meetings tend to be longer and slower-paced than their counterparts in the cultures of Europe. This is perhaps because where western poetry and dramatic representation have tended to emphasize action and narrative movement, as codified in Aristotle's "unities" and western cinematic critics' frequent complaints that a film is too long or that its action

---

24. See, for example, Ingalls, Daniel H.H. An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry : Vidyākara's Subhāṣitaratnakośa. Cambridge : Harvard University Press. Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 44. (1965).

"drags," Indian emphasis has always—from the time of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*—been on sentiment, or rasa. Rather than compress sentiment in the interests of speeding the narrative flow, Indian poets traditionally tended to expand their works to accommodate he fullest possible exposition of the fundamental aesthetic-emotional states. For in traditional India it is the development of these sentiments, the suggestion *(dhvani)* of these *rasas*, and not the narrative plot that is, as Ānandavardhana famously put it, the very "soul of poetry."

The *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa*, then, as the exemplar of poetry, must therefore, as stated in its own preamble, be replete with the exposition of all the rasas. From the point of view of criticism, then, it is a serious error to fault the *Rāmāyaṇa* for elements that impede its narrative flow, for those are precisely the elements that the poet sought to develop and which is audience most relished. For in its essence the *Rāmāyaṇa* is not a mere narrative, it is a *kāvya* composed around a narative tale. It is traditionally the first example of a new genre that springs from and has as its very raison d'ître the profoundest expression of sublimated senti-ment. The narrative of the Rāma story can be and often is quickly told. Indeed the epic as we have it opens with just such a rapid telling when the divine seer Nārada relates the whole epic story to Vālmīki in fewer than one-third of the verses it will take the latter to describe Hanumān's jump alone.

Vālmīki had neither the need nor the desire simply to retell the story, nor would he have required divine inspiration to do so had he so wished. To say otherwise would be like saying that Wagner's purpose in composing the Ring of the Niebelungen was simply to retell a Norse legend.

Not only must sentiment or rasa in general must lie at the heart of an Indian poem; each poem must be suffused with and inspired by one sentiment in particular, its *pradhānarasa*. For the *Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* in particular that rasa is unquestionably the *karuṇarasa*, "the piteous sentiment," rooted in an sublimating the universal human emotion of *śoka*, "grief". For it is Vālmīki's compassion for the grief stricken hen-crane, crying out for her lost mate, that gives rise to the whole genre of poetic expression, (śloka), a notion so powerful that the great medieval playwright-poet of the *Rāmāyaṇa* theme, Bhavabhūti has one of his characters articulate a theory that *karuṇa* is the only true emotion, a kind of emotive substrate of which the others are mere

epiphenomena.[25]

If the karuṇarasa is the defining sentiment of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, it is expressed in the poem nowhere more effectively and feelingly than in the *Sundarakāṇḍa*. In the passages in which we see the forlorn Sītā alone in a strange and hostile land, imprisoned, cajoled and threatened by Rāvaṇa, harried by the *rākṣasīs*, living under the sentence of a hideous death, despairing of her life, driven to thoughts of suicide and yet through it all consumed with thought of her lost love, the poet has risen to the height of his art. It would be difficult to read the passages in *sargas* fourteen through seventeen where the poet heaps up a splendid structure of simile to convey the desolation of the queen or her heart-rending soliloquies in *sargas* twenty-three and twenty four and not be both deeply affected by her plight and profoundly impressed with the poet's skill. These passages and the others leading up to her sudden joy at the sight of Rāma's signet ring are indeed the heart of the Book and the epic, and it is they that no doubt account for the enormous esteem in which the former is held.

Central through the *karuṇarasa* is to the epic and the Book it cannot, in keeping with the cannons of the *alaṅkāraśastra*, be unrelieved; and it is, in aesthetic terms, no doubt in order to provide such relief that the poet has placed this gem of the piteous in a larger setting crafted of an amalgam of the *adbhuta, śṛṅgāra, bhayānaka, vīra*, and *hāsya rasas*—that is the sentiments of wonder, eroticism, terror, valor, and comedy—as expressed in Hanumān's leap, the description of Rāvaṇa's harem, the threats of the grotesque women, Hanumān's martial exploits, and the comical drunkenness of the monkeys in the *madhuvana* respectively. These elements and passages are not clumsy, jarring, or spurious additions to the *Sundarakāṇḍa*, but rather integral narrative, structural, and poetic elements essential to the architecture of this fascinating epic within and epic.

In conclusion we may observe that although early European scholars on the *Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata* laid the groundwork for the philological study of these great texts they were hampered in their understanding of these poems by two factors. The first was the absence of a scientifically reconstructed texts based on a comparison of the existing manuscript traditions. The second was a Eurocentric

25. *Uttararāmacaritam of Bhavabhuti.* S.K. Belvalkar, ed. Combridge : Harverd University Press. Harvard Oriental Series, NO. 22, 1918, 3.47.

bias, which took the literary aesthetic of ancient Greece and Rome to be universals against which to judge the literary and religious texts of India.

The first of these deficiencies has been largely remedied by the monumental efforts of the scholars of the Oriental Institute of Baroda and the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute respecively. The second, although it has been exposed and undermined by contemporary cultural studies, continues nonetheless to make itself felt even in contemporary study of these central documents of Indian culture and society.

While we must continue to honor these early western scholars for their pioneering work we must nonetheless continue to subject their theories to rigorous re-examination in the light of the new scholarly tools that have been placed in our hands.

ON THE TECHNICAL TERMINOLOGIES RELATED TO GOLD AS DESCRIED IN THE NĪLAMATA PURĀṆA

BY

R. K. DUBE

[अस्मिन् निबन्धे नीलमतपुराणे वर्णितस्य मृत्सा तथा मृजा धातुशास्त्रीय शब्दद्वयानाम् विवेचनं अस्ति। अत्र विदुषा लेखकेन मृत्सा शब्दस्यार्थः स्वर्णकममुक्तकंकणं मृत्तिका च कृतम्। मृजायाः अर्थश्च स्वर्णकणानाम् कंकणेन मृत्तिकया च पृथक्करणं कृतम्]

Introduction

The Nīlamata Purāṇa is an important text dealing with the cultural history of Kashmir. It is widely believed that the lower limit of the date of its composition is approximately eighth century A.D.[1]

The confluence of the rivers of Sindhu and Vitastā, flowing through Kashmir, has been described in detail in the Nīlamata Purāṇa. The writer has explained the importance of this confluence by means of a series of similes. The following stanzas are worth noting in this context—

वैतस्तमम्भस्सह   सैन्धवेन
युक्तं यथा   क्षीरमिवामृतेन।
लावण्ययुक्तं च यथैव   रूपं
शीलेन युक्तं च यथा श्रुतं स्यात् ॥ ३०२ ॥
शौर्यं यथा स्याद् विनयेन   युक्तं
धर्मं यथा स्याद् द्रविणेन युक्तम्।
मृत्सा युता वा मृजयैव राजन्
कामं यथा स्यान् मनसोपपन्नम् ॥ ३०३ ॥

[English translation : The water of the river Vitastā mixed with that of the river Sindhu is excellent like milk mixed with nectar, beauty associated with elegance, and knowledge associated with good conduct. O king, it is excellent like bravery associated with modesty, moral virtues associated with wealth, *mṛtsā* associated with *mṛjā*, and Kāma associated with mind.]

1. The Nīlamata Purāṇa, Vol. 2 (text with English translation), (ed.) Ved Kumari, 1973, Srinagar.

It is interesting to note that the writer wanted to convey the fact that the water of Vitastā the mixed with water of Sindhu enhances the holyquality (holiness) of the water of Vitastā after mixing. The writer has illustrated this fact through a simile, in which a number of sets of two good things or good virtues present in a human being have been used as upamāna. A combination of these two things produces a much more superior product, such as milk mixed with nectar. Similarly, a combination of the cited two good virtues makes a person having a much more superior virtue, such as beauty associated with elegance, knowledge associated with good conduct, bravery associated with modesty, and Kāma associated with mind. It is important to explain as to what is the meaning of *mrtsā* and *mrtsnā* in the present context.

The words mrtsā and mrjā

Amarakoṣa (2.1.4) stated the *mrtsā* and *mrtsnā* are the two words used for "good quality earth".

प्रशस्ता तु मृत्सा मृत्स्ना च मृत्तिका ।

Thus, according to the Amarakoṣa, *mrtsā* and *mrtsnā* are synonyms. Apte[2] defined *mrtsā* and *mrtsnā* as earth or clay. He also defined it as "good earth or clay." Monier Williams[3] defined *mrtsā* as good earth, soil or aluminous slate. He also listed the word *mrtsnā*, meaning clay, loam, good earth or clay, excellent soil or aluminous slate. *Mrjā* is a noun and corresponds to feminine gender. *Mrjā* would be the "process of washing". Thus the literal meaning of the stanza under discussion is that the water of Vitastā mixed with the water of Sindhu is like the *mrtsā* associated with the process of washing. Obviously, the process of washing makes the original *mrtsā* even much more superior, and the resulting product has excellent qualities than the original *mrtsā*.

A pertinent question which arises is as to what is the exact meaning of *mrtsā* and *mrjā* in the present context. An attempt has been made to define the meaning of *mrtsā* and *mrjā*. as described in the Nīlamata Purāṇā.

2. V.S. Apte, The Sanskrit-English Dictionary, First published, 1890, Revised edition, 1987, Delhi, p. 425.

3. Monier Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 1809, OUP, London, Indian Reprint ed., 1990, Delhi, p. 830.

The meaning of *mrtsā* given as good quality earth in the Amarakoṣa appears to be the most appropriate meaning in the present context. A good quality earth is not an ordinary earth, but it is an earth having some special features. What could be the features, which make earth very special? Can a very fertile earth be termed as *mrtsā*. Amarakoṣa itself has given an answer to this question. After defining *mrtsā* as good quality earth, Amarakoṣa has quoted another type of earth as *urvarā*. It defined *urvarā* as the earth having high fertility :

उर्वरा सर्वसस्याढ्या

Moreover, the washing of a highly fertile earth does not make it superior any further. The washing of such an earth does not make any sense. Can an earth having good moulding or shaping property for pottery making, be termed as *mrtsā*. There are some references, in which *mrtsnā*, a synonym of *mrtsā*, has been used in the sense of earth or soil used for making pitcher, as seen from the following reference from the Śrīmadbhāgavata (8.6.10) -

त्वय्यग्र आसीत् त्वयि मध्य आसीत्
त्वय्यन्त   आसीदिदमात्मतन्त्रे
त्वमादिरन्तो जगतोऽस्य   मध्यं
घटस्य मृत्स्नेव परः   परस्मात् ॥

Again, washing of such an earth does not increase its quality. Thus, it is reasonable to believe that the word *mrtsā* has not been used in the sense of earth having high fertility or good moulding property in the reference under discussion from the Nīlamata Purāṇa.

It is to be noted that many valuable high density minerals, such as cassiterite (an ore of tin, density=7.0 g/c.c.), and naturally occurring high density metals such as gold (density 19.3 g/c.c.) and platinum (density=21.4 g/c.c.) are found in the earth and gravel present on the banks and bed of rivers. Such deposits are called "alluvial placer deposits" or "stream placer deposits". Thus, the deposit consists of valuable high density minerals or metals, together with low density gangue materials such as silica (density = 2.65 g/c.c.), magnetite (density=5.2 g/c.c.) etc. These low density gangue materials are separated from the valuable high density minerals or metals present in the mined deposit by gravity concentration process. One such commonly used separation process since time immemorial is the "panning process". In principle, the process consists of placing the earth containing high

density valuable material into a wooden bowl, called pan, where it is subjected to frequent ablutions by a circular motion until the low density gangue material is washed away. A concentrate rich in high density valuable particles is collected at the bottom of the pan.

It must also he noted that alluvial placer deposits are derived from vein or reef deposits present in mountain rocks. The rocks become fragile after weathering. Such weathered rock pieces are subjected to dispersal by various natural agents, such as moving water, air or ice. Flowing water is the most common agent for its transport. The size of the rock pieces decreases continuously during its transport ever since its transport from its original place. In this manner, earth and gravel containing high density mineral particles are formed from the original rock during the transport. Eventually this mixture of earth, gravel and valuable high density minerals or naturally occuring metals present in the original rock become a part of the water flow of rivers or streams. It is to be noted that the water not only transports the earth and gravel together with the valuable high density mineral or metal particles, but also helps in sorting the sediments. The materials present in the water stream move in different fashion, depending upon the density and size of the material, and the gradient present during the flow. The valuable mineral or metal particles are selectively deposited on the banks or bed of the rivers. This aspect has been discussed in detail elsewhere by the author.[4]

As described above, earth containing high density valuable minerals or metals can be obtained from the banks and bed of rivers. However, there could be another source of such an earth. Rocks containing high density minerals/metals such as cassiterite or gold are are mined, crushed and subsequently ground. The valuable high density mineral/metal is separated from the ground earth by panning process as described earlier.

In view of the fact that high density valuable minerals/metals are found in the earth and gravel of rivers, and that these are separated from the low density gangue materials present along with it by pan-ning process, it is reasonable to assume that the word *mrtsā* can be regarded as a general word used in the context of earth containing

4.   R.K. Dube, Sources of Gold in India as Described by Thakkara Pheru-An Assessment, Indian J. of History of Science, Vol. 42, (1) 2007, pp. 1-11.

high density valuable minerals metals. This hypothesis gets credence
from the fact that the washing of such an earth produces a much more
superior product than the original starting earth before washing, and
this feature agrees very well with the central theme of the simile. In the
present context, the word *mrjā* has been used for the process of wash-
ing in the sense that high density valuable mineral/metal is separated
from the low density gangue material by the action of water using a
pan. Ved Kumari[5] translated *mrtsā* as clay of high quality, and *mrjā* as
prurification process. These meanings do not convey the real sense in
which these words were used by the writer of the Nīlamata Purāṇa.

A pertinent question is as to which valuable mineral or metal
is probably mixed with the earth, in the context of the word *mrtsā*
used in the Nīlamata Purāṇa. Before we answer this question, it is
necessary to review the references for the association of valuable
minerals or metals in the earth and gravel. Gold and tin were known to
Indians since the Vedic period. However, there is no reference to
platinum metal in any ancient Indian text. Although there were a few
places where tin was found and mined in ancient times, India was not
so well known for the availability of tin as much as gold. Sanskrit,
Prākṛta and Pāli literature, and other texts such as traveler's records
and books on geology have widely referred to the earth and gravel of
Indian rivers, containing gold particles in different ways. Before we
discuss the exact meaning of *mrtsā* in the present context, it is neces-
sary to review the references of earth and gravel of Indian rivers and
streams containing gold particles.

Earth and Gravel of Indian Rives containing Gold Particles : A Brief Description

Gold has been known to occur as alluvial placer deposits
throughout the world since time, immemorial. India has a very
fascinating tradition of alluvial placer gold deposits, i.e. earth and gravel
of rivers containing gold particles. The earth containing gold particles
is also called as "auriferous sand". In India, the earliest deposit is found
to be in the Ṛgveda, in which the river Sindhu (Indus) has been
associated with the adjective *hiraṇyayī* (Ṛgveda, 10.75.8) and

---

5.   The Nīlamata Purāṇa, Vol. 2 (text with English translation), (ed.) Ved Kumari,
      1973, Srinagar, p. 78.

hiraṇyavartiniḥ (Ṛgveda, 8.26.18). The famous commentator Sāyaṇa translated "*hiraṇyavartini*" as "*hiraṇmayobhayakūlā*", i.e. both banks containing gold. The lexicon Amarakoṣa (2.1.15) stated that "vartani" is one of the twelve words used to denote the word "path". The above references are the indirect references of the alluvial placer gold.

In classical Sanskrit literature as well as in references of later period, many rivers were described as gold producers. It has been described elsewhere in a detail by the author.[6] The Mahābhārata (Gita Press edition, Sabhā Parva, Dākṣiṇātya recension, after 28.6) stated that the mud, earth and water of the river Jambu is full of gold :

मेरुं प्रदक्षिणं कृत्वा पर्वतप्रवरं प्रभुः ।
ययौ जम्बूनदीतीरे नदीं श्रेष्ठां विलोकयन् ।।
स तां मनोरमां दिव्यां जाम्बूस्वादुरसावहम् ।
हैमपक्षिगणैर्जुष्टां सौवर्णजलजाकुलाम् ।।
हैमपङ्कां हैमजलां शुभां सौवर्णवालुकाम् ।

The Mahābhārata (Vana Parva, 90.26) further stated that the earth of the river Gaṅgā contains gold :

ऊष्णतोयवहा गङ्गा शीततोयवहा पुरा ।
सुवर्णसिकता राजन् विशालां बदरीमनु ।।

Kālidāsa stated in the Meghaduta (Uttarakhaṇḍa, 6) that the earth of the river Mandākinī contains gold :

मन्दाकिन्याःसलिलशिशिरैःसेव्यमाना मरुद्भि-
र्मन्दिराणामनुतटरुहां छायया वारितोष्णा ।
अनेवेष्टव्यैः कनकसिकतामुष्टिनिक्षेपगूढैः
संक्रीडन्ते मणिभिरमरप्रार्थिता यत्र कन्याः ।।

The Vāyu Purāṇa (47.23-25) has given information about Bindu Lake, the earth of which is auriferous. It has given the physical location of this lake as the foot-step of the Gaura Mountain situated in the north of the Kailāsa Mountain :

6.   R.K. Dube, Ancient Metallurgy of Gold in Indic, Iranic Semitic and Hellenic Civilizations, In : "A Golden Chain of Civilizations : Indic, Iranic, Semitic and Hellenic", (ed.) Dr. Govind Chandra Pande, 2007, New Delhi, pp. 356-416.

अस्त्युत्तरेण कैलासाच्छिवसत्त्वौषधौ गिरि: ।
गौरो नाम गिरिस्तत्र हरितालमय: शुभ: ।
हिरण्यशृङ्ग: सुमहान्दिव्यो मणिमयो गिरि: ॥
तस्य पादे महदिव्यं शुभं काञ्चनबालुकम् ।
रम्यं विन्दुसरो नाम यत्र यातो भगीरथ: ॥

The Mahābhārata (Bhīṣma, 6.43-44) also referred to the Bindu
Lake, and stated that its earth is auriferous. The Mānasa Khaṇḍa (18.70)
of the Skanda Purāṇa stated that the Sunandā River was full of gold,
meaning that the earth and gravel of the river contained gold :

तत्रोत्तीर्णा सरिच्छ्रेष्ठा सुनन्दा हंससेविता ।
स्वर्णाभा हिमसम्भूता पूरिता स्वर्णधातुभि: ॥

The noted Prākṛta writer Thakkara Pheru (Fourteenth century
A.D.) stated in the very first gāthā of his book Dhātutpatti[7] that gold is
obtained from the earth and gravel of rivers :

रुप्यं च मट्टियाओ नइ-पव्वयरेणयाउ कणओ य ।
धाउव्वाओ य पुणो हवन्ति दुन्नि वि महाधाऊ ॥

Ain-i-Akabari[8] mentioned the availability of gold in Pakli river,
near Kashgar area of Jammu and Kashmir state. Ralph Fitch[9] described
the recovery of alluvial placer gold from the river Gangā near Patna in
Bihar state.

In 1816, Moorcroft[10] traveled to Lake Manasarovara. Beyond
Dābā, there was a hill near the head-waters of the river Sataluja, which
was rich in gold. The rocks were heavily weathered out. Gold was
recovered from the weathered rocks by washing process. Moorcroft
also noticed a plain about half a mile in breadth and length, and bounded
partly by hills, and partly by the Sataluja River. This area was full
of shallow pits. These pits were dug by miners to recover placer
gold from the auriferous soil by washing process. An interesting
observation was that the heavy stones present over the auriferous

7.   Thakkara Pheru, Dravya Parīkṣa aur Dhātutapatti, (ed.) B.L. Nahta, 1976,
     Vaishali, p. 51.

8.   The Ain-i-Akabari, Abul-Fazl Allami, Vol. II, (tr.) H.S. Jarrett, First published,
     1927-1949, Indian Reprint, 1989, Delhi, p. 385.

9.   Ralph Fitch, in : "Early Travels in India, 1583-1619", (ed.) William Foster,
     First ed., 1921, London, Indian Reprint ed., 1999, Delhi, p. 23.

10. Willaim Moorcroft, A Journey to Lake Manasarovara in Un-des, a Province of
     Little Tibet, Asiatic Researches, Vol. 12, 1818, pp. 380-536.

soil were re-located by the side of the pits. Moorcroft also noticed caves of gold mines in the mountain rocks, as well as gold mines with tunnels under the surface. This observation indirectly suggests that the streams passing through the auriferous area and ultimately joining the river Sataluja, were bringing auriferous sand and gravel to the river.

In 1881, Ball[11] presented a detailed account of the rivers from which Indians were recovering gold particles by washing its earth and gravel. This has been discussed in detail elsewhere by the author.[12] An important information that can be drawn from this account is that gold was recovered from the earth and gravel of rivers throughout India, stretching from Himalayas in the extreme north to Madurai, Calicut and Mysore in the south, and from Assam and Manipur in the north-east and Orissa state in the east to Belgaum in the west. In 1843 A.D. Jammesson[13] witnessed the gold recovery from the earth and gravel of the river Indus, in between Attock and Kalabag by approximately three hundred people. Burnes[14] also reported the gold-washing activity on the banks of the river Indus near Attock. In 1922, Rahul Sankrtyayana[15] reported the recovery of stream placer gold in the lower portion of Himalayas, now in the present Uttarkhanda state of India, from the rivers such as Ganga, Alakananda, Prindara and Ramaganga.

Even today, local villagers recover gold from the earth and gravel of rivers like Ib, Seni and Sonagiri flowing through Chattisgarh state, on a very small scale.[16]

In short, it can be said that the practice of recovering gold by washing the auriferous earth of rivers in different parts of India is a very old one, starting from the Vedic age. The tradition is still continuing, but on a very small scale.

11. V. Ball, A Manual of the Geology of India, Part III-Economic Geology, 1881, London.

12. R.K. Dube, Nadi aur Svarṇa kā Sambandh : Sanskrit Sāhitya ke Paripreksya me, In : 'Śemuṣī (Acharya Baladeva Upadhyaya Birth Centenary Volume), (ed.) Dr. Vidya Niwas Mishra, 2005, Varanasi, pp. 482-487.

13. Jameson, quoted in : V. Ball, op. cit., p. 210.

14. Alexander Burnes, Travels in Bokhara together with a Narrative of a Voyage on the Indus, Vol. 1, 1834, London, Reprint ed., 1973, London, p. 80.

15. Rahul Sankrtyayana, Gaḍhavāla, Allahabad, p. 24.

16. Sanjiv Sharma, Māyā, September 15, 1992, p. 55.

The information regarding the earth containing gold particles was also described in Sanskrit and other texts in a different way. For example, Bāna used the word *cāmīkaratata* for the banks of rivers containing gold particles (Harsa Carita, 1.7)-

चामीकरतटताडनरणितरदने रदति सुरस्रवन्तीरोधांसि स्वैरमैरावते

Amarkoṣa (1.10.34) stated that Ṣoṇa and Hiṛṇyabāhu are the two names of the river Sona. Another recension of Hiṛṇyabāhuḥ has been stated as Hiṛṇyavāhaḥ.[17] According to the Rāmāśrami commentary, the meaning of Hiṛṇyabāhuḥ is that river in whose water gold particles flow —

हिरण्यं वहति

One of the synonyms of gold stated in the Vaijayantīkoṣa (3.2.21) is *venutataja*, i.e. the gold recovered from the earth of the river Veṇu.

The Pāli text Aṅguttara Nikāya (3.10.10) in the Pāṁsudhāvaka Sutta narrated the process of the recovery of gold dust or particles from the alluvial placer gold deposits. The description of this process was used beautifully as an allegory in explaining the removal of various evil thoughts from the mind in order to retain only the thoughts related to Dahrma. The reference under discussion is as follows :

सन्ति, भिक्खवे, जातरूपस्य ओळारिका उपक्किलेसा पंसुवालुका सक्खरकठला। तमेनं पंसुधोवको वा पंसुधोवकन्तेवासी वा दोणियं आकिरित्वा धोवति सन्धोवति निद्धोवति। तस्मिं पहीने तस्मिं ब्यन्तीकते सन्ति जातरूपस्य मज्झिमसहगता उपक्किलेसा सुखुमसक्खरा थूलवालुका। तमेनं पंसुधोवको वा पंसुधोवकन्तेवासी वा धोवति सन्धोवति निद्धोवति। तस्मिं पहीने तस्मिं ब्यन्तीकते सन्ति जातरूपस्य सुखुमसहगता उपक्किलेसा सुखुमवालुका काळजल्लिका। तमेन पंसुधोवको वा पंसुधोवकन्तेवासी वा धोवति सन्धोवति निद्धोवति। तस्मिं पहीने तस्मिं ब्यन्तीकते अथापरं सुवण्णसिकतावसिस्सन्ति।

Discussion

A point which is important in the present context is whether *mṛtsā* or its synonym *mṛtsnā* has been referred to in any other Sanskrit text in the sense of an earth containing valuable mineral or metal particles. If so, what is the context in which it has been used. Śrī Harṣa used the word *mṛtsnā* in the sense of valuable earth of the river Jambū (Naiṣadha, 11.86)-

17. Amara Koṣa of Amarasiṁha with Rāmśrami commentary of Bhānujī Dīksita, (ed.) Haragovinda Shashtri, 1970, Varanasi, p. 135, f.n.

जाम्बूनदं जगतिविश्रुतिमेतिमृत्स्नाकृत्स्नाऽपिसातवरुचाविजितश्रियस्या: ।
तज्जाम्बवद्रवभवाऽस्यसुधाविधाम्बुर्जम्बु:सरिद्रहति सीमनिकम्बुकण्ठि ।।

It is well documented that the earth of the river Jambū was very rich in gold. The gold recovered from the earth and gravel of the river Jambū was called *jambūnada*. Mallinath in his commentary on the above stanza has defined *mṛtsnā* according to that given in the Amarakoṣa, as discussed earlier. Thus, Śrī Harṣa used the word *mṛtsnā* in the sense of the earth containing gold particles.

On the basis of the widespread references for auriferous earth (i.e. earth containing gold) present on the banks and bed of Indian rivers discussed earlier, and also the usage of he word *mṛtsnā* (a synonym of *mṛtsā*) in the sense of auriferous earth in other Sanskrit texts, it is reasonable to define the word *mṛtsā* used in the Nīlamata Purāṇa, as auriferrous earth.

This theory also gets credence from the fact that the earth and gravel of the rivers flowing through Kashmir and adjoining areas were known for gold since time immemorial. As a result, gold-washing was also practised in these areas. It is also important to note that the Sindhu (Indus) River and Vitastā (Jhelum) River, which are mentioned in the stanzas of the Nīlamata Purāṇa under discussion, were known to be important sources of alluvial placer gold. It has been discussed earlier that the river Sindhu (Indus) was known for gold in the Vedic period. There are other such references of the later period. Hiuen Tsiang visited the river valley of Ta-li-lo. He wrote that "the country produces much gold".[18] Cunningham was the first to identify Ta-li-lo with Darel. which was situated on the bank of Indus.[19] In 1913, Stein reached Darel valley from Srinagar. He stated that "gold is still washed in Darel river and along the adjoining course of the Indus, though, as elsewhere in the Indus valley, the output is now very limited".[20] It is apparent that the tradition of gold-washing from the auriferous sand of the river Indus at Darel was a very old one: Tucci[21] quoted the work of

18. Si-Yu-Ki. Buddhist records of the Western World (English translation from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang), Vol. I, (ed.) Samuel Beal, 1884, London, p. 134.

19. Alexander Cunningham, Ladakh : Physical, Statistical, and Historical; with notices of the surrounding countries, 1854, London, p. 2.

20. M.A. Stein, Innermost Asia, Vol. 1, 1928, Oxford, p. 2.

21. G. Tucci, On Swat : The Dards and Connected Problems, East and West, 27, (1-4), 1977. p. 19, f.n 17.

Bailey[22], in which it is stated that in the itinerary in Khotanese Saka from Gilgit to Chilas and Kashmir (written between 958-972 A.D.) the Indus River is called - *Ysamiji ttāji*, i.e. "the Golden River", which is not a mere poetic attribute, but a reality.

Tibet was known for gold deposits for a very long time. In 1869, Mongomerie[23] reported the presence of a vast size of gold-field at Thok-Jalung in Tibet. At the time of the visit of the British explorers together with local Pandits to the area, the excavations were carried out on a field approximately one mile long, 10 to 200 paces in width and 25 feet in depth. This place was near Giachuruff camp situated on the banks of the river Indus. He described the gold-washing process used by Tibetans, which was essentially washing by flowing water manually through a channel. From the description, it appears that the gold deposits were of placer type. It is reasonable to assume that the smaller streams flowing through the auriferous region of the area ultimately joined the river Indus at various places. In this way the auriferous soil of the area also got mixed with the river Indus.

The tradition of gold-washing from the earth and gravel of the Sindu (Indus) and other rivers of the area has been known even in pre-modern times. A few such references with respect to the river Indus have been discussed earlier. Cunnigham[24] stated in 1854 that the Indian Muslims from Balti were recovering gold from the sand and gravel of the rivers Indus and Shayok in Ladakh by washing process. It is important to note that the river Indus is joined by its important tributary Shayok on the right bank at a place approximately 150 miles from Leh in Ladhakh.[25] He further stated that "the sands of the Indus have long been celebrated for the production of gold". In 1878, Wynne[26] reported that gold was recovered from the auriferous sand of

22. H.W. Bailey, An Itinerary in Khotanese Saka, Acta Orientalia, 14, 4, 1936, pp. 258-267.

23. T.G. Montgomerie, Report on the Trans-Himalayan Explorations during 1867, J. of the Royal Geographical Society of London, Vol. 39, 1869, pp. 146-187.

24. Alexander Cunningham, Ladakh : Physical, Statistical and Historical, with notices of the surrounding countries, 1854, London, p. 235.

25. Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 14, 15th edition, 2002, Chicago, p. 229.

26. A.B. Wynne, Memoirs of the Geological Survey of India, Vol. 14, 1878, p. 303.

the river Indus at Kalabagh. In 1881 A.D., Ball[27] stated that gold-washing was carried out on the banks of the Indus River in Bannu (Bunnoo), Peshawar, Hazara, Rawlpindi and Jhilam (Jhelum) districts of the United Punjab Province. It was reported in the Imperial Gazetteer of India,[28] published in 1908, that gold was washed from the sand and gravel of the river Indus, Sohān and some other rivers in Attock district. Ball[29] also stated that "all the rivers of the Punjab (United Punjab Province), the Ravi alone excepted, contain auriferous sands." Abbott[30] described the process of recovering gold from the sand of the river Beyass (Vyāsa), which is one of the five rivers flowing through Punjab.

Thus it is clear from the above discussion that the washing of auriferous soil and gravel was practiced in Kashmir and surrounding areas. It is intesesting to note that the writer of the Nīlamata Purāṇa has given a very interesting local colouring to the simile. He used the words *mṛtsā* and *mṛjā* as *upamāna*, which were related to Kashmir and adjoining areas. It is not the purpose of theis paper of identify the river Sindhu and its confluence with the river Vitastā, as mentioned in the Nīlamata Purāṇa. However, a brief comment on it would not be out of order.

It is to be noted tha tthe famous Sindhu (Indus) river described in the Vedas emanates from Southwestern Tibet, flows through Ladakh, Skardu and Chilas (Gilgit) and then passes through Pakistan. All the five famous rivers of Punjab, viz. Beas (Vyāsa), Satluj, Ravi, Chenab and Jhelum (Vitastā) merge with one another at different places. Finally it takes the shape of a single river, which is known as Panjnada (Pañcanada). The Panjnada then meets the river Sindhu (Indus) in the present day Pakistan. It seems unlikely that the river Sindhu mentioned

27. V. Ball, A Manual of the Geology of India, Part III-Economic Geology, 1881, London, p. 210.

28. The Imperial Gazetteer of India, Vol. 6, 1908, His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, p. 135.

29. V. Ball, A Manual of the Geology of India, Part III-Economic Geology, 1881, London, p. 209.

30. J. Abbott, Account of the Process employed for obtaining Gold from the sand of the river Beyass; with a short account of the gold mines of Siberia, J. of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. 16, (March), 1847, pp. 266-272.

int he Nīlamata Purāṇa is the same famous Sindhu (Indus) as mentioned in the Vedas.

There is a stream flowing throug the Kashmir valley, which is called Sindh/Sind Nallah or river in modern times. Sindh or Sind is a corrupt form of the word Sindhu. The source of this Sindh Nallah lies in the inner Himalayas at Dras. It meets the river Jhelum (Vitastā) at Shadipur near Sumbai in Jammu and Kashmir. Sindh Nallah is the largest tributary of the river Vitastā in the Kashmir valley.[31] It is approximately 96 km in length. There are a number of hydroelectric power projects which use its water. Even in modern times, the confluence of the river Vitastā and Sindh is considered a holy place, and is known a Prayāga of Kashmir. Hindus used to immerse the ashes of the deceased members of their family at this confluence.[32] In all probability, the river Sindhu of the Nīlamata Purāṇa is the Sindh Nallah or river of the modern times. It would be interesting to investigate as to why this Sindh Nallah has been named after the famous Vedic river Sindhu (Indus).

Concluding Remarks

In conclusion, it can be said that mṛtsā and mṛjā, as stated in the Nīlamata Purāṇa, are two important technical terminologies related to the mining and metallurgy of gold, and their meanings are "auriferous earth and gravel" and "process of washing (by water)" respectively. The usage of the combination of these two words would mean washing of auriferous earth and gravel by the action of water. Such a washing of auriferous earth by water is known as "panning process". As a result of such a washing process, a concentrate of gold aprticles having very little earth or gangue material is obtained, which is much more valuable than the original earth containing gold particles before washing. An important and widely known source of auriferous earth and gravel was the banks and bed of rivers. Kashmir and the surrounding areas were well known for gold-washing. The smile under discussion has a very interesting element of local colouring.

31. A.N. Raina, Geography of Jammu and Kashmir State, 1971, Delhi. Excerpts available from www.koausa.org/Geography/index.html.
32. P.N. Lidhoo, Home Land Pilgrim Centres of Kashmiri Pandits, Vitastā Annual Number, Vol. 35, 200-02, 91-97.

SOME MORE REFERENCES TO KAUṬILYA IN LATER LITERATURE

BY

VASUDEVA S. AGRAWAL*

Dr. R. Shamasasty in his introduction to the English Arthaśāstra has brought together a list of very important references to Kauṭilya and his Arthaśāstra as scattered in various Sanskrit and Prākrita works. I give below some more references which I came across during the course of my studies.

On pp. xii-xiv, Dr. Shamasastry bring out inferentially that Kālidāsa must have been indebted to Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra for some political terms, the explanation of which Mallināthasuri could find in no other political work other political work other than that of Kauṭilya. I believe this is a very valid inference, but I wish to point out that in the 1st Act of his Mākavikāgnimitra Kālidāsa more explicitly refers to a teacher under the designation of *Tantrakāra* :

राजा:– अथवा किं भवान्मन्यते ?
अमात्य:– शास्त्रदृष्टमाह देव: ।
अचिराधिष्ठितराज्य: शत्रु: प्रकृतिष्मवरूढमूलत्वात् ।
नवसरोपणाशिथिलस्तरुरिव   सुकर: समुद्धर्तुम् ॥ ८ ॥
राजा :– तेन ह्यवितथं तन्त्रकारवचनम् । इदमेव वचनम् निमित्तमुपादाय समुद्योज्यतां सेनाधिपति: ।

Now the verse Acirādhiṣhṭhita etc. seems to be a poetical rendering by Kālidāsa of the opinion of a political teacher whom the king refers to as the Tantrakāra. The famous commentator Kāṭayave-mabhupa, author of the commentaries called *Kumāragiri rājīya* on the plays of Kālidāsa, who was at the helm of administration during the

reign of the king Kumāragiri (1381-1403 A.D.) the Reddi king of Koṇḍavidu, explains *Tantrakāra* as the author of the Arthaśāstra :

तेनारूढमूल्लत्वेन हेतुना तन्त्रकारवचनमर्थशास्त्रकारवचनमवितथं हि सत्यमेव

I am unable just at present to point out the particular passage from the *Arthaśāstra* of which Kālidāsa has given us a version in *śloka* form, but the idea agrees wonderfully with the political technique ad-umbrated generally in the *Arthaśāstra*. In case it is possible to trace out the passage in question the identity of Tantrakāra with the author of the *Arthaśāstra* viz. Kauṭilya, as pointed out by Kaṭayavema bhupa, will be established on firm grounds; and we shall then be able to infer a direst reference to the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya by the greatest poet of Sanskrit literature.

2. The next reference is in the form of an unnamed quotation in the *Kāśikā*, a grammatical commentary on the Aṣṭādhyāyī. In explanation of Pāṇini's sutra V. 2.10 (परोवरपरम्परपुत्रपौत्रमनुभवहित), the Kāśikā says :

परम्परशब्दो विनापि प्रत्ययेन दृश्यते । मन्त्रिपरम्परा मन्त्रं भिनत्तीति । तच्छब्दान्तरमेव द्रष्टव्यम्।

Here the author of the *Kāśikā* is definitely quoting from the Arthaśāstra, I. 15 [p. 27 of Sanskrit text]:—

सैषा मन्त्रिपरम्परा मन्त्रं भिनत्ति ।

The stop in the Kāśikā is a distinct sign of quotation. The Kāśikā is generally regarded as a work of the seventh century A.D., but recently Mr. I.S. Pawate in his book, Structure of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, has pleaded for ascribing to it an earlier date.

3. Next in point of time their is a reference by ardhamāna (1140 A.D.) in his *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi*. At the end of verse 252, he gives sixteen ślokas illustrating the Gārgādi group. In the 12th śloka mention is made of one who has traversed his way across the ocean of Cāṇakya's treatise :

Obviously Vardhamāna writing in the 12th century had in his mind the comprehensive treatise of Cāṇakya which could have been

---

1. त्सप्तनवत्यधिकेष्वेकादशसु शतेष्वतीतेषु ।
   वर्षाणां विक्रमेर्त गणरत्नमहोदधिर्विहितः ॥
   Colophon to the Gaṇaratnamahodadhi.

nothing else but the Arthaśāstra.

4. Dr. Shamasastri has already shown that Bāṇabhaṭṭa refers to Kauṭilyaśāstra in the Kāuṭlyaśāstra in the Kādambarī. Here I want to point out that Saṅketa, a commentary on the *Harṣacarita* by Śaṅkara (seventeenth century), refers twice to Kauṭilya, both these references occurring in the II Ucchavāsa of the Harṣacarita. Explaining उच्चकुम्भकूटाहालकीवकंट संचारि गिरीदुर्ग राज्यस्य, Śaṅkara writes :

सञ्चारी जंगमः । यदाह कौटिल्यः – 'हस्तिनो हि जंगमं दुर्गम् ' इति।

Immediately after this there is another phrase : कृतानेकबाणा विवरसहस्रं लोहप्रकारं पृथिव्याः on which the Saṅketa says :

कृतान्यनेकानि बाणैर्विवरसहस्त्राणि यस्य तम्। प्राकारेषु बाणानुत्स्रष्टु विवरसहस्त्राणि क्रियन्ते, य इन्तकोशा इति चाणाक्यादिषु प्रसिद्धाः ।

<div align="right">(Harṣacharita, N.S. 5th edition, p. 68)</div>

The first reference viz. हस्तिनो हि जंगमं दुर्गम् is not traceable in the Arthaśāstra, while the rference to is found in teh second adhikaraṇa, adhyāya 3 on p. 52 of the Text by Dr. Shamasastri. From the tone of Śaṅkara's quotation it appears that he had seen the reference to the *indrakośas*, (openings in the battlements for the bowmen to discharge arrows from behind a shelter) not only in the book of Cāṇakya but also in the works of other political writers.

SOME CURIOUS MYTHICAL AND ICONOLOGICAL
MOTIFS IN THE VĀMANA PURĀṆA

BY

P.K. Agrawala

[वामनामहापुराणे कतिपयाः कौतूहलजन्यवचनाः प्राप्यन्ते। तेषां बहवः सन्दर्भाः
स्व. डॉ. वासुदेवशरण अग्रवाल महाभागैः "वामनपुराण-ए-स्टडी" नामके ग्रन्थे वैदिक-
पौराणिक तत्त्वदृष्ट्या व्याख्याताः विवृताश्च। प्रस्तुत निबन्धे लेखकमहोदयेन एतत्पुराणस्य
यत्किञ्चित्-पूरक-ग्रंथसमस्यानि समीक्षितानि कलाविमर्शवचनानि च उद्धृतानि।]

In his *Vāmana Purāṇa A Study*[1], the late Prof. Vasudeva S. Agrawala
brought out a significant exposition of the ancient Purāṇa-Vidyā as
based on its various dinstinguishing features regarding the data as rep-
resented in this Purāṇa in its religious glorification of the Kurukshetra
region, Pāśupata-Śaiva cult, wide-range spirit of contemporaneous[2]
tolarance amongst religious movements documented through the
legend of Vāmana-Trivikrama lore of Vedic origins, and the art-cul-
tural materials preserved in their Purāṇic mould, side by side the rich
geographical evidence available herein through several maps
high-lighting the historical nature of such documentations in the Purāṇic
toadition. However, many a curious aspect of mythico-iconographical
background as found in this Purāṇa appear to invite oru specific
attention further.

Lion faced Vīrabhadra As observed by V.S. Agrawala,
"Vīrabhadra is described as Gaṇeśvara or Gaṇeśa, leader of the Gaṇas.
He is several times described as having the face of a lion." It is
specifically stated that the members of his host are all featured as
lion-headed. It would be remarkable that in art representations of the
Gaṇa retinue of Śiva during the early medieval period onwards one or

---

1. Vāmana Purāṇa-A study, Varanasi 1964 2nd ed. 1983 [VP study]. Here, refer-
   ences made to it are to pages of the second edition. Vide Gītā Press edition,
   4.18;4.22;4.40.
2. For instance refer, C. Sivaramamurti, Naṭarāja in Art, Thought and Literature,
   Delhi, 1994 (reprint), figs. 8. (p. 29); 4 (p. 147); 238 (p. 331); 239 (p. 332); 36
   (p. 361); etc. R.D. Banerji, Basreliefs of Badami, Delhi 1998 (reprint) pls. III,
   IV, VII; Aschwin Lippe. Early Chālukyan Icons, in Artibus Asiae, Vol. XXXIV,
   4; etc.

more lionfaced members came to be shown quite regularly, e.g. at Badami, Ellora and also in later Rajasthani paintings, and Nepalese sculpture.

In passing, it can be remarked here that in the Māheśvara-khaṇḍa of the Skanda Mahāpurāṇa, we are told of the myth of lion as produced from the wrath of the Goddess whom she took to her vehicle (ya esha simhaḥ prodbhuto devyāḥ krodhād varānane/sa te' astuhvājno devi ketau chāstu mahābalaḥ//39.48, Mor edition, p. 348. An important reference has been, by way of just a similie, made to the rare legend of the Fish incarnation of Vishṇu devouring the demon Madhu.[1] Such a depiction of this avatāra and the scene of his adversary being swallowed by the lord is nowhere found in Indian art tradtiion known to us so far.

Kubera's son Pāñchālika

It is in acurious version of the Vāmana Purāṇa (ch. 6) story about Śiva and his adversary Kāmadeva, that one finds mention of Pāñchālika Yaksha who is stated to be a son of Kubera, the lord of the Yakshas. As explained by V.S. Agrawala in his detailed comments here, "It seems that there existed the idea of Pāñchika and Pāñchālika as a Bhāgavata version of the Buddhist deity whose worship seems to have been popular in Madhyadeśa."[2] However, the Buddhist Yaksha deity of this designation was known as Pañchika, Pāñchā-lika, Jambhala or Bhallāṭa and associated regularly with his consort named Hārītī both of whom enjoyed popularity in Buddhist mythology and art widely in India and outside throughout as the tutelary pair presiding over welfare of children and their representations have been regularly found in the art of Mathura, Gandhara the Deccan, and elsewhere right from

---

1.   .... यथा मधुं मीनवपुः सुरेन्द्रः ।. चक्रे निगीर्णे गणनायकेन .... However, there is discovered the Matsya avatāra and Śankhāsura legend in painting : V.S. Agrawala, *The Heritage of Indian Art*, Delhi, 1964, Rajasthani School, VI, fig. 26. But the above legend showing the Lord's tryst with the demon Madhu is not found anywhere else. For another painting of the Matsya incarnation and demon Śankha, Malwa, C. 17th cent. (now in New York Museum), *Der Indische Raum*, by H. Munsterberg, Baden-Baden, p. 155.

2.   V. P. Study, pp. 24.-5.

3.   See A.K. Coomaraswamy, *Yakṣas*. Washington 1928, pl. 15, fig. 1; Part-2, pl. 5, fig. 1; A. Foucher, *The Beginnings of Buddhist Art*, London 1917, pp. 139 ff. V.S. Agrawala, *Ancient Indian Folk cults*, Varanasi, 1970, pp. 181 ff.

the 3rd-4th century A.D. onwards.

But the peculiar idea of Śiva's transferring the influence of the five tormenting arrows of Kāmadeva to this Yaksha needs further scrutiny. It seems, the Purāṇa writers were inspired to connect five (pañcha) with the name (Pañchika or Pāñchālika and thus evolved the specific legend given in the context of freeing Śiva of the inflicting influence of the five arrows of the love-god with which the latter had struck the Mighty Lord even at the cost of his own discomfiture. From another viewpoint, the name Pāñchālika can be well connected with the Pāñchāla region.

In an interesting manner the Purāṇa writer states that the bow of Kāmadeva, on his own punishment of getting consumed by Śiva's wrath, was broken into five pieces which turned into his five flowery arrows, known as Champaka, Bakula, Pāṭala, Jātī and Mallikā.[1] This mythical concept is not known elsewhere.

There is mention of the 'Lotus car' (padmavimāna)[2] of Brahmā which he mounted while searching the upper end of the great fiery Liṅga of Rudra. It may be further remarked that the representation of Brahmā's padma vehicle first appers in art of the Gupta period[3] and during later times one finds it regularly shown in the legends of Brahmā besides his other well-known bird vāhana of Haṁsa, although lotus seat forms also an essential feature of Brahmā's iconography (his epithet, kamalāsana, padmāsanas).

We are informed that the demon-king Prahlāda had a chariot yoked with eight white horses :

प्रह्लादस्य रथो दिव्यश्चन्द्रवर्णैर्हयोत्तमैः ।
उद्वामानस्तथाष्टाभिः श्वेतरुक्ममयः शुभः ॥ 9.27. ॥[4]

In the glorification legend (māhātmya) of Auśanasa Tīrtha

1. VP., 6.97 ff.
2. VP., 6.75; VP Study, p. 27.
3. N. P. Joshi, Prāchīna Bhāratiya Murti-vijñana, Patna, 1977, pl. 81 (upper register, Narav Nārāyaṇa relief, Deogarh Temple, c. 475-500 A.D.)
4. Also 9.46; etc.
5. See V.S. Agrawala, VP. Study, pp. 97-8, for an exposition of this symbolical legend. [Read knee for neck in the work]
6. Somewhat similar mythical background of a head (kapāla, or skull) stuck to the left hand of Śiva is found in the Vāmana Purāṇa itself (see VP Study, pp. 16 ff.), and elsewhere in its various versions.

sanctified by the penance of sage Uśanas (ch. 39), we are informed that "the head of a demon, once cut off by Rāma in the Daṇḍaka forest" got stuck to the thigh (or knee) of sage Rahodara which made his movement quite difficult. when this sage came to the Auśanasa tīrtha and took his holy bath there he got rid of this attached extra head from his body as it got separated from his thigh *(jaṅghā)* fell into the waters of the tank. This miracle was then the reason to give that tīrtha a, name as *Kapāla-mochana.*[5] However, for an iconographic marvel of such a being with additional head on his thinh or knee, one has also to find out its rpresentation in art if any.[6]

For the etymology of the term *āditya,* it is almost in a Vedic tone that we hear of its derivation as given in the Purāṇa[1] :

यद् आद्यं निःसृतं तेजस्तस्माद् आदित्य उच्यते ॥[2]

(VP. 43.35)

One of the three daughters of the wife of Himavān is mentioned as Kuṭilā who was turned into a river of that name[3], otherwise identified with Gaṅgā, who is later on in the story is said to receive the virile power of Śiva through the agency of Agni and that was cast off by her on the Udayāchala at the behest of God Brahmā. The babe born out of that energy of Śiva was Skanda, also known as Mahāsena, Umāputra, Shaṇmukha of Kārttikeya, etc., in additon to the epithet *Kautilya,* being the son of mother Kuṭilā.[4] Further on in the story of Skanda's

1. *VP Study,* p. 110.
2. This peculiar imagination in unique of its kind and there is no such concept traceable in Yāska and Brāhmaṇa sources.
3. *VP.,* ch. 51.
4. Ch. 57. 84.
5. तमिन्द्रः प्राह कौटिल्यं मया पूर्वं प्रदक्षिणः ।
   कृतोऽस्य न त्वया पूर्वं कुमारः शक्रमब्रवीत् ॥
                              58.104.
   एवं ब्रुवंतं क्रौञ्चं स क्रोधात्प्रस्फुरिताधरः ।
   बिभेद शत्त्या कौटिल्यो महिषेण समं तदा ॥
                              58.109.
6. Probably, the Purāṇ author had in his mind the equation of Kuṭilā with Kuṭilī, for explanation of *Kautilya* as acceptable here.
7. Other views on this name, see R.P. Kangle, *The Kautilīya Athaśāstra,* III, Bombay, 1965. Ch. 4.

birth and his great exploits, this particular name *Kauṭilya* has been freely used by the Purāṇa writer for Skanda. Thsi etymological deriva- tion for "the son of Kuṭilā" as being called *Kauṭilya* is indeed of great significance.[5] According to the usual grammatical rules, Kuṭilya's son is to be *Kauṭileya*.[6] Here however, we have an explanation for the name Kauṭtilya of the famous author of the Arthaśāstra and this was perhaps to indicate the connection with his origin somewhere on the banks of the holy river Gaṅgā; it at least indicates him close associa- tion with the Gangetic region echoed in his nickname Kauṭilya.[7]

In an exceptional description, the vāhana of the river Sarasvatī is said to be elephant (*sarasvatī.... gajārudhā*, 53.12), which does not appear to have confirmation elsewhere in the Purāṇic icoography or mythical accounts (e.g., see VDh. P.I. 215, *mayura* as *vāhana* of Sarasvatī).

Likewise, we are told that Agni entered the cave-mansion of Śiva while he was with Pārvatī as assuming the form of *haṁsa* (*haṁsa-rupo hutāśanaḥ*, 54.41) to get secretly mixed up with the series of geese moving freely therein. This is quite a rare version as in the Kumārasambhava (9.1) of Kālidāsa and elsewhere in Purāṇic accounts, Agni is said to have taken the form of a pigeon (*pārāvata*) for the purpose.[1] *Haṁsa* is usually associated with Brahmā and his consort Brahmāṇi (see VP. 56.3).

Elsewhere, the vehicle of Vārāhī is mentioned to be serpent Śeṣa (*śeṣanāgopari stithā*, 56.7). This iconological myth is also of a rare occurrence in the Purāṇic lore as well as art representations.

We are told that the goddess Chaṇḍamārī emanated from a lock of the hair of Mahādevī and rode on the *vāhana* of a donkey (55.65-70).[2]

In an incongruous statement we hear of the god Kubera as presiding over the intermediary direction southerst of Nairṛitya (*kubero dakshiṇāparām*, 58.23) although he is regarded normally as the regent of northern direction (*uttarā*).

In a lengthy account of Daṇḍaka, Arajā, Chitrāṅgadā and others

1. Agni's *Vāhana* is *śuka*, parrot, in Purāṇic iconography, e.g. see VDh. P. II. 104.44; III.56.2,9; I. 215.15; etc.

2. Comparison can be made with the Buddhist goddess Ekajaṭā by name; vide B. Bhattacharya, *Buddhist Iconography*, Calcutta reprint 1987, pp. 193 ff.

3. Also see *VP Study*, p. 160.

(Ch. 63 onwards) there occur several curious myths and legendary anecdotes replete with interesting observations and imaginary as well as tortuous turns. For the present, attention may be drawn to the story of divine archited Viśvakarmā, whot turned into the form of an aper (kapi) from a curse of sage Ritadhuaja (viśvakarmāpi muninā śapto vānaratāṁ gataḥ, 64.2). From incono-mythical point of view, this mention is of exceptional value.

In ch. 68.35, the dhvaja-symbol of god Gaṇeśa is said to be kalaśa (pitcher, or purṇa ghaṭa) which is exceptional.

It is further stated that there appeared a host of Five Gaṇeśvaras for fighting with the demon army, namely Vināyaka, Kuṇḍodara, Mahodara, Kumbhadhvaja and Gaṭodara (VP. 68. 37-39). Attention may be drawn to this concept of Five Gaṇapatis who are, though named differently, are found to be mentioned elsewhere and appear in medieval sculpture studied by us earlier.[1]

In a very rare occurrence in the Purāṇa, Śiva-Mahādeva is mentioned as saptamurtimān, i.e. having seven murtis or aspects. Usually his well-known epithet is Ashṭamurti, "eight-bodied," metaphysically symbolising his cosmic aspect fully defined in the mythical tradition handed down from Vedic antiquity and ubiquitiously present in the Purāṇic and Āgamic expositions, as well as represented in its several versions of art depictions.[2] However, the famous Parel (Bombay) colossal, though referred to ashṭamurti by several scholars, shows a great imagery of Śiva's epiphany comprising of seven busts composed in to one body of unique illustration.[3] We are perhaps presented here in the form of this unique example, an exact illustration of the saptamurtimān definition of lord Śiva.

---

1. *Studies in Indian Iconography*, Jaipur, 1994, pp. 137-150 [earlier published; *JOI*, Baroda, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, 1975; *Artibus Asiae*, New York University, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, 1977].

2. For example, V.S. Agrawala, *Sparks from the Vedic Fire*, Varanasi, 1962, pp. 177-122; *Studies in Indian Art*, Varanasi, 1965, pp. 229-231; *Śiva-Madādeva, the Great God*, Varanasi, 1966, pp. 23-27.

3. See *Śiva-Mahādeva*, pl. XVI, and its description on p. 62. Further see the theory of *saptasvara-maya* Śiva, forwarded by C. Sivaramamurti, for explaining the Parel relief, *Naṭarāja in Art*, etc., pp. 6, 164, and fig. 13 (p. 164).

In 74.41, the demon Kālanemi is described to have a hundred heads (*dānavendram śatavadanam*; also *śataśīrsham udyatagadam sailendra-śriṅgākritim*, VP. 74.42).

There is a remarkable description given of the divine car sent by the gods and Gandharvas for the help of Indra which is said to be of the form of *svastika*, bearing a monkey figure on its banner and drawn by horses, etc. (69.124-126). The *svastika* shape of a chariot appears indeed of its own kind and would require explanation as to its specific designing in case of a horse-drawn carriage.

THREE KINDS OF VARTANĀ AS KNOWN IN CH. 41 OF VISHNUDHARMOTTARA PURĀNA

BY

P.K. Agrawala

[विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणस्य तृतीयखण्डे संग्रहितं लघुकायप्रकरणं चित्रसूत्रनामकम् । तत्रत्य 'वर्तना-त्रय' विषयक श्लोकाः तत्कालीनचित्रकलानुशीलनं प्रकाशयन्ति। तत्संबम्धिकतिपयशब्दानि अस्मिन् पत्रे शोधदृष्ट्या व्याख्यातानि। विशेषतः "हीर-हीरक-हैरिक" शब्दसरणिः विद्वत्समीक्षकेण यथासंदर्भं विवेचिता एवं तद्वर्ती लुप्तप्राया अर्थपरम्परा उद्घाटिता।]

Under the most important Section called Chitrasutra, "The Aphorisms of Painting," in the third khaṇḍa of the Vishnudharmottara Purāṇa (=VDh.P.) we find an outstanding treatment on the classification of "painting styles" into four major categories, namely (1) *Satya*, (2) *Vainika*, (3) *Nāgara* and (4) *Miśra* (Adh. 41, verses 1 to 5 ab). In spite of the fact that these four different styles, or probably representational types, of art ideologies of pictorial expression prevalent during ancient times in Indian Painting Aesthetics were codified under the precepts of art-criticism keeping in view only specific characteristics and defining features of each of them, their exact nature are not expressly evident to modern schoalrs.

It is significant to remark that the chapter fortyone of the Chitrasutra treatise contains only fifteen stanzas as summarising in a nutshell of bewildering composition of formulaic dicta *(sutras)* on painting aesthetics. Thus, in verses 5 *cd* to 7 *ab*, just comprising a space of two *anushṭubh ślokas*, another doctrine of appreciation for painting merits of piclorial technique has been put forth by the Purāna writer here.

Next, we find in stanzas 7 *cd* to 15 *cd* other aspects of painter's art cogently stated that were required to be judged with respect to certain embellishing qualities, types of comoisseur, painter's devotion towards work and intensive concentration on theme, and several other kinds of topics indicated to serve the cause of aesthetic as wel as ideological qualities of artistic composition.

Each of the above listed aspects presumably had a long history of śāstric development before any of them came to be so codified in the extant Purāṇic summary, even though in such a brief form of *sutra*

style fortunatley indeed in the present treatise, which requires a sort of running commentary for our present understanding even partially of the contents thereof. The meaning and theoritical concern of each and every word employed in such context of Painting aesthetics has to be studied with utmost care.

On such phrase is *hīraka* that has ever baffled modern scholars, since the date of the discovery of the Chitrasutra, with regards to the actual reading as well as the meaning accruing thereof in finding an explanation of its theoritical background and specific technical aspect in ancient Indian Chitrasutra vocabulary and exact practical concern of aesthetic value. We give the text as follows :

त्रिस्त्रश्च वर्तना: प्रोक्ता: ¹पत्रा(?त्र)हैरिकबिन्दुजा: ॥ 5 ॥
पत्राकृतिभी   रेखाभि: ²कथिता पत्रवर्तना ।
अतीवकथिता   सूक्ष्मा तथा   हैरिकवर्तना ॥ 6 ॥
तथा च स्तम्भनायुक्ता कथिता   बिन्दुवर्तना ॥ 7(ab) ॥

As it has been given by stella Kramrisch in her translation of the Chitrasutra Chapters :

"Methods of producing light and shade are said to be three :-

(1) Crossing lines (lit. lines inthe form of leaves *(patraja)*, (2) by stumping *(aririka)*, and (3) by dots *(vinduja)*. The first method (of shading) is called (patraja) on account of lines in the shape of leaves. The *airika* method is called so because it is said to be very fine. The *vinduja* method is called so from the restrained (*i.e.*, not flowing) handling of the brush."[3]

In the Introduction of her work she cogently remarked as to the great significace of this passage, "Togeather with *pramāṇa* and *kṣaya* and *vrddhi*, the knowledge of modelling and shading *(vartanā)* was fully known to the Indian masters of old. It is stated to be three-fold : (1) patraja (पत्रज) – cross lines, (2) airika (ऐरिक) — stumping and vinduja (विन्दुज) — dots (Ch. 41)."[4]

As she analysed in the above remark, the three *vartanā* varieties

---

1.   BCV. पत्राहैविकाबन्दुजा: ।
2.   V. कथितात्र च वर्तना।
         [After Shah, *Text*, p. 145.]
3.   *The Viṣṇudharmottara (Part III) : A treatise on Indian Painting and Image-making*, 2nd editions Calcutta 1928, p. 52.
4.   *Ibid.*, p. 15.

were known by their three names respectively, and each variety was based and so named on its specific mode of expression through the specific use brush-strokes and showing patra, irika (airika? obscure words) and *bindu* formations of stippling or shading on being imparted to the painted surface.

Apart from the three modes of shading, for which the great authorities like Kramrisch, Coomaraswamy, and others recognised the technical phrase *vartanā*. the words such as *patra, hairika* (or its variants suggested from textual evidence of manuscript material at hand) and bindu came to be well interpreted in the context of brush handling by a painter for effecting light and shade in his work.

Coomaraswamy thus observed on the three modes of Vartanā defined in the VDh. P. stanzas under study : "The leaf shading *(patrā vartanā)* is done with lines *(rekhā)* like those ofa leaf; that which is very faint *(sukṣmā)* is *āhairikā-vartanā* while that done with an upright *(stambhanā yukta)* brush is dot shading *(bindu-vartanā)*."

Last great scholar to have given attention to the Chitrasutra material is Dr. C. Sivaramamurti who not only translated its chapters into English with exceptional clarity of understanding but also added a long introduction to his work as discussing all significant themes treated by the Purāṇa in the context of art-technical vocabulary of old as well as the historical background of Indian art-relics and the traditional knowledge iherited by artist-experts of various regions. He has discussed and closely analysed the Purāṇic material on *Vartanā* and the practical aspects of artist's methods of "shading" in a painting. As far as the text under study is concerned, he amends the phrase *hairika* to *raikhika*.

However, as noted by P.B. Shah, "The reading of our text is *Patrāhairika* which would give *āhairika* as a second variety. Mss. B.C.V. give the reading *āhairika*. Dr. Stella Kramrisch, however, seems to amend the reading *Hairika* into *airika*. But this amendation makes the line of a verse short by one syllable. I have amended the reading as *Patrāhairika*. I derive the word *hairika* from *Hira(m)*. or *Hirā* meaning a band, a strip or a fillet or a vein or artery. So *hairikavartanā* would mean applying paint with thin bands."[1]

In a review of Shah's work, Prof. V.S. Agrawala[2] had occasion to observe as the following : "We however wish to draw attention to the

---

1.   Vol. II (Study), pp. 127-8.
2.   J. of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, Vol. XI, No. 3, March 1962, pp. 292-94.

passage regarding *vartanā*, of which three varieties are mentioned, viz. *patrā, hairika* and *binduja* (41.5). It does not seem to be necessary to take the second one as *āhairika* as Coomaraswamy had done, or as *airika* as Dr. Stella Kramrisch had done, or to amend the reading of patrā to *patra* as Dr. Shah has done. There has also been difference of opinion about the meanings... Dr. Coomaraswamy explains the three varieties as follows : 'The leaf shading *(patrā-vartanā)* is done with lines *(rekhā)* like those on a leaf; that which is very faint *(sukshma)* is *āhairika-vartanā*, while that done with an upright *(stambhanā-yukta)* brush is dot-shading *(Bindu-vartanā)*.' I wish to draw attention to the technique followed by the Mughal painters for deepening the shades of colours to produce an effect of roundness or relief. Dr. Moti Chandra recorded the technical methods of Mughal miniatures from a living painter of that shcool, perhaps the last straggling example surviving into our own times. In his book 'The Technique of Mughal Painting"he has noted several kinds of *pardāz* work (corresponding to ancient *vartanā*) : 'Stippling or shading with minute parallel lines is *khat paradāz*, and with dots *dānā pardāz*. Other method of stippling are *ghuhā pardāz* in which the dots or lines are placed so close that they are in-distinguishable from one another; *dhuvādhār pardāz* (धूवाँधार परदाज़) in which shading is so minute that one stippling cannot be distinguished from another, *jālidār pardz*, shading with crossed lines; *gudz pardz*, 'shading that melts', in which the parallel lines are so closely drawn that the lines melt into one another; and ek *bāl parddāz*, in which every hair is shown separately.' In the footnotes to this he discusses the Chitrasutra passage and rightly takes to identify *patra-vartanā* with *khat pardāz* and *bindu-vartanā* with *dānā pardāz*. He identifies *hairika vartanā* with *jālidār pardāz*, but I would agree with Dr. Shah in deriving *hairika* from *hirā*, vein or artery, and not with Moti Chandra in taking it from *hīraka*, a diamond. The other varieties like *gudāz* and *dhuvāndhār* seem to come under *hairika*."

The topic of *Vartanā* in painting is indeed a highly technical aspect of artistic creativity and of aesthetic appreciation by the critics and art-lovers. The specific chapter has been called by the Purāṇa writer as *Raṅga-vartanā* in its colophon. He even summarises in a beautiful verse several aspects of painting criticism done by different sections of the society in their own way of looking at things of their individual

---

1.   P.K. Agrawala, On the *Ṣaḍaṅga Canons of Painting*, Varanasi 1981, p. 82 (The translation as given above).

attraction :

रेखा च वर्तना चैव भूषणं वर्णमेव च ।
विज्ञेया मनुजश्रेष्ठ चित्रकर्मसु भूषणम् ॥ 10 ॥

"O the best of men, meritorious features in painting work highly estimated include line, shading, decoration and colouring."[1]

Each of these four aspects to be looked for in a painting by art-lovers is further specified as regards their social likings :

रेखां प्रशंसन्त्याचार्या वर्तनां च विचक्षणाः ।
स्त्रियो भूषणमिच्छन्ति वर्णाढ्यमितरे जनाः ॥ 11 ॥

"The excelling work of line is lauded especially by art-masters while of shading by connoisseurs; women prefer ornamentation while other folks in general like rich colours."[1]

In facts, all praisewaorthy effects in the work of painting derive their distinctive composition from "shading" (vartanā) that in essence is the basis of colour combination and arrangement, graceful and distinct play of light and shade, depth, highlights and charming contrasts of figural identity and emotions. C. Sivaramamurti has brought out a critical discussion regarding inter-dependence and effective representing of these aspects in pictorial creativity and their allied art expressions.[2]

All the above features that have direct concern with the work factor and the expertise of Vartanā in painting are indicated in the chitrasutra treatment, as preserved in the Purāṇa in such a brief gist, throughout its contents.[3]

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Chitrasutra of the Vishṇudharmottara*, Delhi, 1978, pp. 125 ff. We can further refer to the material of the Purāṇa itself.
3. For example, see 43.19 :
    (1) *Madhuratvam*, (2) *Vibhaktatā*
    (3) *Kshaya-vṛiddhi* (also see 29.38-51)
    43.17-18 :
    (1) *A-vibhaktatā*, (2) *Varṇānām saṅkara*
    43.22 :
    sa-śvāsa iva chitram
    43.28 : An expert painter is said to bring out even the movement of flowing wind in the picture by indicating its effect through the fluttering directions of banners or waves or even smoke.
    43.29 : "He is an adept in painting who can depict the difference between a sleeping pig that is alive and breathing, and a dead one bereft of life, and similarly the variation in heights and depths determining light and shade or chiaroscuro." (trans. : Sivaramamurti).

From the above cited observatons, there seems to be no contro-versy amongst competent authorities, regarding the two types if *vartanā*, and as to their interpretation of the terms *patrā* or *patra-vartanā* and *bindujā* or *bindu-vartanā* there is also no divergence of opinion—although the procedure undertaken by an expert painter for these *vartanā* has been irrterpreted differently by these scholars as regards the use of artist's brush effecting *vartanā*, — on one kind or the other. For the third kind of *vartanā* technique, there appear to be several readings recognised (or even in amendation suggested) by them:

(1) *Airika* (Kramrisch)

(2) *Āhairika* (Coomaraswamy)

(3) *Hairika* (all other scholars)

(4) amendation to *raikhika* (Sivaramamurti)

The first one is unacceptable as it has no basis of textual material available and as a word it is hard to be explained. The last reference also is useful only when the correction in readings extant is accepted. The phraserecognised by Coomaraswamy in the text of both the verses under study has also to be given no further value as it is based on a wrong assumption of *samdhi*, which may have been arrived at in both the places of the text :

(1) पत्राहैरिक-बिन्दुजाः (verse 5);

(2) तथाहैरिक-वर्तना (verse 6).

Morever, any consideration for the amendation at both the occasions to *raikhika*, as made by Dr. C. Sivaramamurti, unless some supporting evidence of additional source-material comes to light in the context, appears unwarranted.

Now, the phrase *hairika* seems acceptable from the extant textual material and has been given approval by several distinguished scholars, namely, P.B. Shah, Moti Chandra, V.S. Agrawala and oth-ers.[1] Having the reading *Hairika* as authentic there remains the point as to how interpret the phrase either from *hiram, hirā, hīra* or *hīraka*,[2] or from *hīra* as giving a sense such as "diamond". However we pro-pose to derive the term from this last word *hīra* of a definitive nature and contextual significance belonging to the core section to be seen in a wood or a stone. The Prakrit dictionary *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇao* by

---

1. See citations as above. And, P.K. Agrawala, *On the Ṣaḍaṅga Canons of Painting*, Varanasi 1981, pp. 80-81.

2. See the attempts of earlier authors as regards their respective derivation of the term *hairika* from such Sanskrit words.

Pt. Harishchandra Seth gives the following entry for *hīra* :

हीर (पुं.) = १ विषमभंग असमान छेद; (पण्ण १-पत्र ३७)। १२. बारीक कुत्सित तृण, कन्द आदि में होता बारीक रेसा; (जीव ३,४, जी १२)। ३. पुंन. हीरा मणि-विशेष; (स २०२; सिरि ११८६; कप्पू)। ४. छन्द-विशेष; (पिंग)। ५. दाढा का अग्र भागः ९से ४, १४)। हीर पुं नं (दे) १ सूई की तरह तीक्ष्ण मुँह वाला काष्ठ आदि पदार्थ: (दे. ८, ७०; कस)। २. भस्म; (दे ८, ७०)। ३. प्रान्त, अन्त भाग; (गउड)।

This meaning of *hīra* has been well attested to by several scholars recording its currecny in the Hindi vernaculars or Hindustani. For example,

— S.W. FAllon, *A New Hindustani English Dictionary, with illustrations*, etc. Banaras-London, 1879, p. 1212: "हीर *hīra* 1. Essence; pith. (2) Vigour; energy. 3. The inner portions just under the bark; ..."

— John T. Platts, *A Dictionary of Urdu, Classical Hindi & English*, Oxford University Press, 1930, p. 1244.

In the Hindi *Śabdasāgara* of the Kashi Nāgarī Pracārini sambhā, we find the following instructive entry : —

हीर-संज्ञा पुं. सं. (१) हीरा नामक रत्न। (२) वज्र। बिजली। ...
संज्ञा पुं. हिं. हीरा (१) किसी वस्तु के भीतर का भाग। गूदा या सत। जैसे जौ का हीर, गेहूँ का हीर, सौंफ का हीर। (२) लकड़ी के भीतर का सार भाग जो छाल के नीचे होता है। जैसे – इसके हीर की लकड़ी मजबूत होती है। (३) शरीर की सार वस्तु। धातु। वीर्य। ......
—[Vol. IV, Varanasi 1928, p. 3827.][1]

The use of Prakrit word *hīra* has been well attested to by the great polymat Hemachandra (11th-12th century) in his *Deśīnāmamāla* 8.70:

हिरिमंथा चणएसुं हीरो सूईणिहे हुडो मेसे ।

In his autocommentray, the same has been thus explained : *hīro suchīmukhābham dārvādivastu vajravāchakastu hīraśabdah samskritasamah*.

Thus, the Glossary by R. Pischel at the end of his edition gives its English rendering : "हीरो VIII. 70 मूचीमुखाभं दार्वादिवस्तु, anything sharpened into a point, such as a piece of wood....."[Vizianagaram Series, 1938.]

---

1. This meaning of the word *hīra* is well recorded in the particular context of expression in Hindi. Further see, "हीर [संज्ञा पुं.] (हिं.) १- किसी वस्तु के अन्दर का मूल तत्त्व या सार भाग । २-इमारती लकड़ी के अंदर का भाग" *Nalanda Vishal Śabdasagar*, Delhi, VS. 2007, p. 1544.

   "**Core n**. central or innermost part, केन्द्र, अंतरतम भाग, हीरा।" p. 124, Bhargava's Concise Dictionary of the English Language, Banaras 1938 (edn. 1972).

This specific sense of the word *hira* can be traced back, in the present state of our limited information, to the famous Jaina scripture in its Bṛihatkalpasutra-Bhāshya commentary by Saṅghadāsa-gaṇi :

जस्स मूलस्स भगगस्स, हीरो भंगे पदिस्सए ।
परित्तजीवे उ स मूले, जे याऽवऽन्ने तहाविहे ।।

(II. 970.)

यस्य मूलस्य भगनस्य 'हीर' तन्तुकविशेषो भङ्गे
वंशस्येव यद्दृश्यते परित्तजीवं तु तत् मूलम् । यश्च 'अन्योऽपि' स्कन्धादिकतथाविधो
भङ्गे दृश्यमानहीरः सोऽपि प्रत्येकजीव इति ।। 970 ।।[1]

There can, however, be readily discerned that the word *hira* implied the inner section seen of a wooden piece or log on being cut through as 'one is seen in the bamboo stick'. In particular, the core formation in tree consists of a series of concentric circles the innermost pith being the oldest and the harolest part of such formation originating right from the beginning of life in plant growth.

The "spiral design" or concentric circles seen of a wooden formation (or, as also recognised in the core section of a stone formation) were known by the technical phrase *hira*, which appears to be of wide range understanding of experts and common people alike and also has preseumably a high antiquity traceable to Vedic language. An obscure usage of the word *hirah* occurs in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa : *hiro vai rāsnā* (1.3.1.15). This *rāsnā*, according to the *Vedic Index* (vol. II, p. 223)" denotes 'girdle' or 'band' like *Raśanā* and *Raśmi*".[2] Obviously, if *hirā* were ever taken to mean *girdle, band or zone or circular cord*, it also would have had indicated in a general connotation presumably a "ring round three as seen by removal of bark."[3]

It is amply clear from the above citations made from the *Deśīnāmamāla* of Hemachandra and the modern Prakrit dictionary of Seth as well as Hindi Śabda sāgar that the meanings current in the Indian tradition specified this word *hira* to mean[4] the needle-like point

---

1. *Bṛihatkalpasutra-bhāshya*, edited by Chatura vijaya and Punyavijaya ji, Shri Ātmānanda Jaina Sabhā, Bhavnagar, 1936, pt. II, p.306.

2. Further see, Suryakanta, *Vaidika Koṣa*, Banaras Hindu University 1963, s..v. *rāsnā*.

3. Compare such a sense implied by 'girdle', vide *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, 5th edition 1964, p. 518; "a ring shaped cut around a tree", *Chamber's Twentieth Century Dictionary*, Indian Edition reprinted 1969, p. 447.

4. Shah, Text, p. 256.

of a sharpened wood-piece" and (2) "the ring-like formation to be seen in the section of tree stump" or girdle-like concentrine pattern in the crore of wood or stone. As it can be guessed presently, this last specification defined the hairika-vartanā practised by a painter as applying paint by using the brush point slightly bent in a circular movement to impart fine stippling on the select area for shading or effecting light and shade.

Now, this appears fully confirmed from the evidence available in the VDh. P. itself as we find the phrase freely employed by the Purāṇa-writer in Ch. 90 of the III part while describing several types of stones and their inner formation (śilānāṁ garbhavijñānam, II. 90.30).[1] For ready reference, the relevant verses are cited below :

कृष्णवर्णा शिला या तु शुक्ला हीरक-संयुता ॥ 22 ॥
सा शिला श्रीकरी ज्ञेया पुत्रपौत्रविवर्धिनी ।
सितवर्णा तु या कृष्णैः हीरकैः शबलीकृता ॥ 23 ॥
बहुदोषकरी सातु कृष्णा वा रक्तहीरकैः ।
सर्ववर्णेषु शुक्लेषु प्रशस्तं हीरकं स्मृतम् ॥ 24 ॥[2]

The matter giving instructions for the architect searching for appropriate stone was dictated from several considerations. P.B. Shah makes in her study of this chapter the following observation for the above cited verses. "The stone which has black colour and which is white like the diamond is specially auspicious."[3] However, no other scholar has given any attention to these significant verses. It is quite difficult to see how the Purāṇic author is explaining here the presence of diamond in the constitution of various śilas as giving rise to their altogether varying nature or texture, namely, (1) the black-coloured slab of stone containing that colour due to its white hīraka; (2) the white-coloured stone due to its black hīrakas getting variegated or mixed colour; and (3) the black śilā containing red-coloured hīraka (rakta-hīrakaih).

Thus, we feel the only meaning of hīraka in each of the above

---

1. Shah, *Text,* p. 256.
2. There are no significant variants for three stanzas as edited by Shah. She has noted here in this place, for example, the variant such as, "V.C.D. हीरकं विदुः" This does not change in any way the sense of the technical term *hīraka* of the present context appertaining to geological analysis which concerned study of rock, as to the structure and quality of stones to be used for different purposes.
3. *Study,* p. 195.

contexts refers to its technical aspect of denoting the core-rings present
in the formation of rock-fabric, or also seen in the inner portion of tree
under the bark. From this sepcific understanding of the technical mean-
ing of the terms *hīra*, *hīraka* and *hairika* it seems proper that a kind of
vartanā, stippling procedure of the artist-painter had come to be de-
fined by this word-group. To impart this shading effect in a painting,
the painter used his brush by moving its tip in a specific manner to
draw fine lines as applying fine colour touches in spirals or concentric
rings. Most prabably, it meant the same as was in later times[1] under-
stood by the expression" 'gudaz pardāz', shading that melts". This seems
acceptable in its quite restricted context with regards to the *hairika-
vartanā* definition which had presumably a wider application.

Dr. K.M. Varma, writing on the *Indian Technique of Clay
Modelling*, has shown that the aspect of *Varṇa-lepana*, denoting ap-
plying of colours to the surface of clay images, or elsewhere in allied
expressions of painting, was seen to have a close connection with the
subject of *Vartanā*. In search of his valuable textual source-materials
he was able to retrieve a fragmentary passage of the printed edition of
the Āgamic text named *Kāśyapa-Śilpa* to its somewhat fuller readings
that he availed of as supplied by its several new MSS. treating the
varṇa-lepana (or *varṇālepana*) procedure which is mentioned therein
to have six varieties of which the names appear quite interesting and
instructive in the present discussion about *vartanā*. Significant lines
run as follows :

पत्र हीरं च बिन्दु च सूपमुदवर्तनं तथा ।
प्रवर्त च षडैतानि वर्णं लेपनकं विदुः ॥
दीर्घं पत्रमिति ख्यातं रहितं वै तिर्यग्गतम् ।
सर्षपास्तरणं यद्वत् तद्वद् बिन्दुमुदाहृतम् ॥
सूक्ष्मबिन्दुस्तु धूपं स्यात् तस्माद् वै सूक्ष्मबिन्दु वा ।
तद् उर्वक्त्रमाख्यातं ततोच्चं तद्विभाजितम् ॥

Still, the text so recovered is quite defective and needs guess work
to arrive at the original readings in several places to get some logical
meaning out of the expressions. We, however, propose a few
amendations to improve upon the available version :

1. Moti Chandra, *The Technique of Mughal Paintings*, Lucknow, 1949, pp. 45-
    46.

2. Varma, *The Indian Technique of Clay Modelling*, Proddue, Santiniketan,
    1970, pp. 92-3.

(1) Read पत्रहीरं; (2) वर्णालेपनकं (3) तद्धीरं (i.e. तद्धीरं) वै तिर्यग्गतम् or हीरं तु वै or हीरमिति तिर्यग्गतम्

It is remarkable that the first three names of the *Varṇa-lepana* varieties are the same as the VDh. P. list of three *vartanā* varieties have been known. Evidently, the *bindu* kind seems clearly defined : "If the colour is applied in points in which case the surface looks as if covered with mustard seeds *(sarshapāstaraṇa)*, then it is called *bindu*".[1] For the *patra* and *hīra* types the text does not appear quite intelligieble even from the rendering attempted by Varma thoughwith great care and critical analysis.[2] How can we define *hīra varṇalepana* or *hīra-vartanā* as *tiryag-gatam*, it is difficult to guess. Varma explains, "If the colour is horizontally applied, i.e. by moving the brush from left to right and *vice versa,* then it is called *hīra.*" This exposition of the text under scrutin here seems off the mark.

As it has been pointed out above several times, all scholars agree that the different kind of *varlana* varites were accomplished by vary-ing and distintive movement of the brush in each of the cases. Thus, the *hīra* type was most probably done with by moving the tip of the brush in a winding or meandering manner. This specific sense of *tiryak* has been well recorded in the dictionaries of Apte and Monier-Will-iams[2]. In this light, the definition as supposedly found in the *Kāśyapa-Śilpa* is to be accepted quite justifyingly : *hīraṁ tu vai tiryag-gatam* (text as suggested in its amended form):—"That is indeed of *hīra* kind which makes (the brushs stroke) apply colour in winding or meander-ing movement." This very nature of the *hīra vartan*ā of VDh. P. has been remarked by us in our enquiry appearing in the preceding discussion.[3]

As the Chitrasutra itself has explained, "*the Patra-vartanā* is said to be done with the times shaped like leaves :" *patrākṛitibhī rekhābhiḥ kathitā binduvartanā* (41.6). This, however, seems to refer to the spe-cific using of the tip of the brush as flat or as resting flat against the surface, which would apparently afford to give an allusion to a leaf-shape for the brush-point and also for its shading of stippling pattern. Most probably, we get its briefest definition in the *Kāśyapa Śilpa* passage which refers to the using of the tip of brush as *dīrgha* being

1.   As translated by K.M. Varma, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

2.   *Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

3.   Apte, *The Student's SE Dict.*, Reprint p. 235 Monnier Williams, *SED*. p. 447 (who cites the authority of H.H. Wilson in particular).

bent flat on the surface. Presumably, in the chitrasutra statement as regards the *Binduvartanī*, viz., *tathā cha stambhanā-yuktā kathitā binduvartanā*, we have a similar style of literary expression and have seen above that the phrase *stambhanā* refers strictly to the position of brush-point as held "upright" against the surface for dot shading, as Coomaraswamy rightly explained the same. This, the following translation of the *Binduvartanā* definition of the Chitrasutra was given by us earlier : "The *Binduvartanā* is so styled from its being effected by the straightness *(stambhanā),* of the brush-point."[1]

In passing, a few more contexts that refer to the merits of *Vartanā* in painting can be of further interest and are briefly noted here.

(1) सूक्ष्मं वर्तनया यत् तु चित्रं तन्मध्यमं स्मृतम् ।

[Note that for *yat tu*, MSS. ABV. as collated by P.B. Shah read वस्तु which seems the best, as denoting "pictorial theme or substance", cp. in poetics, *vastu* denoting "poetic substance" (Apte)].

(2) वर्तनच्छाया – a phrase used in a verse cited by medieval authors on Sanskrit poetics.[2]

(3) Telugu poet of old named Nannachoda paraphrasing, as discussed by Sivaramamurti, the *Varṇā* vocabulary of the VDh. theory.[3]

(4) वर्तनाक्रम or वर्तनाकर्म as given in the list of "Eight Limbs of Painting" mentioned by Bhoja in his *Samarāṅgaṇasutradhāra*, ch. 71. 13-15.[4]

(5) A chapter of the *Aparājītaprichchhā* of Bhuvanadeva is entitled. *Paṭṭa-patra-vartanānirṇayo nāmaikatrimśaduttara dvisatatamam* appears to have contained some allied material; unfortunately, the passage after stanza 6 is missing at present.[5]

---

1. *Ṣaḍaṅga Conons of Painting*, p. 81.
2. See sivaramamurti, *Chitrasutra*, etc., p. 126; also p. 5.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 5; 23; 57-58.
4. See our comments on the above verses, *Ṣaḍaṅga*, pp. 78-81.
5. P.A. Mankad, editor, Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1950, Sutra 231, p-591.

THE HUNDRED-AND-ONE TEMPLE-NAMES IN THE VISHNU-DHARMOTTARA PURĀNA

BY

P.K. Agrawala

[विष्णुधर्मोत्तरोपपुराणस्य तृतीयखण्डे देवालय-स्थापत्य संबन्धिन: विशिष्टाध्याया: (८६-८८ संख्यका:)। तत्रत्य एकोत्तरशतप्रासादभेदा: निर्दिष्टाश्च नाम्ना तथैव तेषां परिभाषात्मकानि लक्षणानि संक्षेपेण सङ्केतितानि। 'हिमवान्' नामक प्रासादस्य विशिष्टमट वर्णनं विवृतं पुराणकारेण। तस्यैव मूल-परिभाषाया: आधारे विविधानि मन्दिरभेदलक्षणानि विकसितानि। सप्ताशीत्यध्याये 'सर्वतोभद्र' नामको प्रासाद: विस्तरेण वर्णित: तथापि 'सामान्यप्रासाद' शीर्षक-वर्णना अष्टाशीत्यध्याये वर्तते। विद्वत्तापूर्णे अस्मिन् निबन्धे उपर्युक्त पौराणिक-स्थापत्यविषयिणी विवेचना सूक्ष्मेक्षिका-सिद्धट्या शोधदृष्ट्या प्रस्तुता इति न कोऽपि संशय:।]

The *Vishnudharmottara Purāna* (VDh. P.), as is now well known, represents a unique compilation of miscellaneous Purānic themes belonging to many a *śāstric* tradition of technical knowledge as developed in ancient Indian culture up to roughly the Gupta period. the material contents available in this Purāna are often not properly traceable in their earlier antecedants, for example the textual evidence regarding various branches of arts and architecture as we have them treated in this Purāna with respect to sculpture, iconography, painting or temple-building activities. Temple architecture though well known for is later development and ramifications during post-Gupta ages, is only survived in its priliminary building movement that seemingly began not much before the fifth century A.D. Therefore the literary evidence summarised in chapters 86 to 88 (Khanda III of VDh.) on temple architecture as giving hundered-and-one Prāsādas, their individual names, distinctive details of constructions, etc. are of great importance and deserve our close scrutiny and analytical study as to their vocabulary and relevant understanding regarding actual structural forms

---

1. Professor stella Kramrisch was the pioneer of studying the subject in her great work, entitled, *The Hindu Temple*, Calcutta 1946. Subsequently, general attempts of handling the *Vishnudharmottara Purāna* evidence of temple architecture have been made by the following scholars : P.B. Shah, *Vishnudharmottara Purāna, Third Khanda*, vols. I and II, Baroda, 1958 and 1961—Vol. I, pp. 230-248; II, pp. 193-214, 238-239. T.P. Bhattacharya, *The Canons of Indian Art or A Study on Vāstuvidyā*, Calcutta 1963, pp. 467-469.

and definitions.[1]

According to Prof. Kramrisch, "The Viṣṇu-dharmottara", II, Chapters LXXXVI-VIII, gives a genealogical survey of the shapes of the temples at the time of its compilation, after the seventh century, at an age when the fully compacted Hindu temple emerged."[1] However, the date ascribed by her to the evidence available in the VDh. P. as regards the temple architecture[2] appears somewhat late and has now to be reviewed and indeed revised by two centuries in the light of the material available from several epigraphical records which date from the fifth-sixth centuries A.D. and have been analysed by us elsewhere. Moreover, the VDh. P. evidence on painting has also been ascribed to the age of fifth-sixth centuries at the latest by some other authorities on Indian art, for example V.S. Agrawala,[3] C. Sivaramamurti,[4] Moti Chandra, and even A.K. Coomaraswamy.[5] In a general estimate of the contents of the VDh. P., Prof. R.C. Hazra[6] datef the text as preceding the age of Varāhamihira, Bhāmaha and Daṇḍin or 'any other works written later than 500 A.D.' On the basis of the Jyotish evidence, David Pingree[7] also ascribes the VDh. P. to c. 5th-6th century A.D.

However, it must be remarked that the stanzas 2-12 of chapter 86 record a description of the first temple form called Himavān of which basic features are stated as follows :

1. *The Hindu Temple*, p. 411.
2. P.K. Agrawala, *Gupta-kālina Kalā evaṁ Vāstu*, Varanasi 1994, p. 11; the same, *Gupta Temple Architecture*, 2nd edn, Varanasi 1981, pp. 136-140; the same, "The Temple-Śikhara as mentioned in the Gupta Period Records," *Abhinanda Bhāratī, Prof. K.K. Handiqui Felicitation Volume*, Gauhati, 1982, pp. 133-138; the same, in *Indian Art of the Gupta Age*, ed. S.R. Goyal, Jodhpur, 2000, pp. 56-58; etc.
3. V.S. Agrawala, *Gupta Art*, 2nd edition, Varanasi, 1977, p. 91; also his views on Gupta age as quoted by P.B. Shah in her *VDh.P.* Introduction, p. xxvii. Further see V.S. Agrawala's paper, "Sanskrit Literature dealing with Art, Architecture and Sculpture," *J. of the U.P. Historical Society*, Vol. XVII, pt. 1, p. 10 : "the chitrasutra (Part III of the Vishnudharmottara Purāṇa) which was already current in the 7th century, and therefore contemporary with the later phase of the art of Ajanta." And his review of Shah's work, *J. of the Oriental Institute*, Baroda, p. 292.
4. Sivaramamurti, *The Chirasutra of the Vishnudharmottara*, New Delhi, 1978, p. 42
5. *HIIA.*, pp. 80, 90.
6. *Studies in the Upapurāṇas*, Calcutta, 1958, Vol. I, p. 201.
7. "The Paitāmahasiddhānta of the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa." *Adyar Library Bulletin*, Vol. 31-32, 1967-68, p. 472.

हस्तप्रमाणतः प्रोक्तं प्रासादानां तु लक्षणम् ।
संस्थानतो विनिर्दिष्टं हस्तमानानुकीर्तनम् ॥ २ ॥

(In general) the characteristic traits of temples are said to be specified in terms (*hasta*-measure (of 24 *angulas*). An account appertains as to such features according to the planning (*samsthana*=design, in plan and elevation) following a description in view of the (preliminary) hasta-units.

तदहं ते प्रवक्ष्यामि तन्मे निगदतः शृणु ।
प्रासादलक्षणं श्रेष्ठं विजयारोग्यवर्धनम् ॥ 3 ॥

That (specific *samthāna* proportions) I would tell which you listen as I speak them. The foremost of Prāsāda traits cause the growth of victory and health.

भागं तु जगती कार्या प्रासादो भागमेव च ।
कर्तव्या जगतीमात्रतुल्योच्छ्रायत्रिभूमिका ॥ 4 ॥

Jagatī (terrace) has to be made one part, and also the *prasāda* (actual shrine portion) is of one (equal) part. The triple *bhumi* (stepped upper storey) is also to be made equal to the measure of the *jagatī* itself.[1]

उच्छ्रयार्धेन कर्तव्या ह्येकैका भूमिकायतिः ।

(v.l. भूमिकागतिः)

भद्रपीठाकृतिः कार्या भूमिका भूमिका पुनः ॥ 5 ॥

The extent (in length) of each and every *bhumikā* (storey) is to be made a half of its (own) height. Thus, *bhumikā* after *bhumīkā* is rendered to be of *bhadrapītha* shape (stepped formation). There seems implied the injuction that of three *bhumī* (or *tribhubhikā*) one above the other each is reduced both in length and elevation successively in a stepped manner; thus the second is a half in dimension to the lowest one as recessed inside it and the third takes further recession in its length as well as height according to the one coming immediately below it, in each case of the three *bhumikās* constructed on the *prasāda* (middle body of the fane).]

प्रासादार्धं कटिः कार्या कूटमेव तथैव च ।
कटिमूलाष्टभागेन सोपानविस्तरो भवेत् ॥ 6 ॥

One half (of the dimension) of *prasāda* is to be made its *kuta* (*janghā* or wall portion) and of the same (dimension) has to be of its *kati* (i.e. *kutachchhādya* of later vocabulary). Now at the base of the *kati* there should be made the flight of steps *(sopāna)* having width as

---

1.   Here the text has been given by us with slight amendations is presenting its contents clearly.

measuring one-eighth part of its (i.e. of *kaṭi* in dimension).

समसंख्यं तु कर्तव्यं सोपानं भूमिकां प्रति ।

कूटः कार्यं स्त्रिधोच्छेदः शुभामलसारकः ।। 7 ।।

Sopāna should be made of equal numbers according to each of the storey. *Kuṭa* is to be made as consisting of triple elevation (*uccheda-section*), marked with ornamental *āmala-sārakas* on each of its sides.

चतुरस्रस्तथा राजन्   क्रमोपचयसंयुतः ।

विच्छेदाश्चात्र कर्तव्याः सिंहमालाविभूषिताः ।। 8 ।।

Each *kuṭa* is of square shape, o king, with successive accumulation elevation *upacaya*). having its break-ups marked by rows of lion-figures (i.e. dentils of lion heads).

द्वारोच्छायाश्च   कर्तव्याः[1]   देवाश्चाष्टांशसंयुताः ।[2]

विस्तारं (? र) द्विगुणं चात्र द्वारोच्छ्रायं तु (? यास्तु) कारयेत् ।। 9 ।।[3]

The height of doors should have to be made as increased by one-eighth part of the height of the image (installed within the sanctum). A door has to be in height just double its width.

द्वार-शोभावती कार्या चन्द्रशाला समुच्छ्रिता ।

कूटप्रथमविच्छेदे   शुभामलकसारकैः ।। 10 ।।

There the ornamental lintel of the door should be made while the candraśālā portion set up on the first elevational sections of the *kuṭa* be marked by auspicious *āmala-sāraka*-designs.

द्वारैश्चतुर्भिर्भिर्मग्नैस्तु   न   भग्नैर्वा महीपते ।

प्रासादमेतत्कर्तव्यं   कूटच्छेदद्वये[4]   तथा ।। 11 ।।

विच्छिन्ने चन्द्रशालाभिश्चतसृभिरेवावृत्तम् ।

हिमवानाम विख्यातः प्रसादोऽयं   मनोहरः ।। 12 ।।[5]

---

1. As it is given in Veṅkaṭeśvara Press edition. Shah's amendation here is unnecessary.

2. Shah amends it to वोच्चाष्टांश. However, correct reading seems to be देवार्चाष्टांश

3. Amendation suggested by Shah here appears, again, to be unwanted.

4. Shah amends it to कूटच्छेदे द्वये although the MSS read as above.

5. Dr. P.B. Shah has commented in her "Critical Notes" on Adh. 86, Śloka 11-12, as folows : "The description of माल्यवान् and हिमवान् Prāsādas seem. to be mixed up. So we can rearrange these two ślokas in order to separate the descriptions as follows :

द्वारैश्चतुर्भिर्भिर्मग्नैस्तु   न भग्नैर्वा   महीपते ।

हिमवानाम विख्यातः प्रसादोऽयं   मनोहरः ।।

प्रासादमेतत्कर्तव्यं   कूटच्छेदद्वये   तथा ।

विच्छिन्न   चन्द्रशालाभिश्चतसृभिरेवावृतम् ।।

कूटच्छेदद्वयोपेतो   माल्यवानभिधीयते ।"

This temple should be made as having four doors, which are pierced through or may not be so open (in all the four entrances but the main one). Even in its two (other elevational) sections of the *kuṭa* the same is marked (in an alternative example) with four *chandraśālā*-designs all around its sides. By name *Himavān* this temple of attractive features is well known.

We have attempted above to translate the stanzas as available in this chapter 86 of the VDh. P. (Khaṛḍa Third) regarding the basic type of the temple description called. Himavān which forms the primary treatment of Group one in a list of hundred-and-one Prāsādas. As observed by Kramrisch, "The last of these chapters[1] treats of the proportions of the general type (Sāmānya Prāsāda) of which 100 different shapes are described in chapter LXXXVI while one temple only,

---

For comparison the following note by Shah (*Study*, pp. 2001) may be given here :

"(1) Himavat—The description given in first twelve verses of this type apply to other temples in a general way. The modifications in each case are given in the description of the particular temple.

The temples are defined on basis of the Hasta1 measure.

The measurement in terms of Hasta is in relation to the Saṁsthāna i.e. the measurement of the whole.

The portion of the temple is the same as that of the Jagatī. The meaning seems to be that the height of the temple should be equal to the area of the Jagatī (platform). The Jagatī should consist of three stages (bhumikās) of equal height. mThe length of each stage should be half of its height. The shape of each bhumikā is that of a Bhadrapīṭha. The Katī should be half of the temple in measurement similarly the Kuṭa. The width of the flight of the steps should be one-eighth of the measurement of the bottom of the Katī. For each bhumikā (stage) steps should be of equal number. The portion above the Katī (i.e. Kuṭā) should be divided in three parts of compartments. Over each compartment there should be made a beautful āmalasā raka The Kuṭa should be quadrilateral and should grdually elevated. The three compartments should be decorated with a row of lions. The height of the door) should be one-eighth above the deity installed. The height of the door should be twice its width. On it (the door should be made an elevated Candraśālā which beautified the door or a candraśālā consisting of a gatehouse (Dvāraśobhā) should be made (one of the meanings of Dvāraśobhā being a gatehouse something like Gopuram). Over the first compartment of the Kuṭa beautified by an āmalasāraka, the temple should be made with four bent (bhagna) or unbent (na bhagna) doors. Similarly it should be made in the two ther compartments of the Kuṭa. The temple would be surrounded by four separate Candraśālā (naturally) on the four doors. This beautiful temple is known as *Himavat*."

1.   Namely 86 to 88, of Section III.

the Sarvatobhadra, forms the subject of chapter LXXXII."[1] Unless the above cited verses are correctly understood with respect to the technical vocabulary of temple-building definitions used in this context here, no visual picture can be made out of the description given therein of several structures concerning the plan, elevation, sections and ornamentations of the building which is presented in the text only in proportionate measurements referring to the several zones of the plan as well as vertical divisions. More than a dozen terms are of great relevance as regards their definitive explanations, for example, *jagatī, bhumīkā, bhadrapīṭha, kaṭi, Kuṭa, sopāna, āmalasāraka, uchchheda smihamālā, dvāraśobhāvatī, chandraśālā, bhagna-dvāra*, etc. It is indeed only a priliminary attempt of a general kind that we have made above to render the terms in their proper perspective of temple Vāstu. A few of the above terms that have not been translated in fulter terms in the English rendering made so far can be explained here in a general comment as follows.

Chandraśālā : dormer window[2]; enclosed opening within a cusped framework.

Jagatī : terrace or socle[3] (of a shine); *adhishṭhāna, pīṭha* (sometimes, fuller expression is *Jagatī-pīṭha*)."

Siṁhamālā *:* a garland of lions (Kramrisch, *op. cit.*, p. 412). It however, refers to the series of seated lions on side of the *bhumī*.

Āmala-sārka : the cogged ring-stone (Kramrisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 242, 348 ff.); a roundish top-stone with corrugations; or, a smaller design after this shape.

Prof. Kramrisch has made an extensive study of the two temple forms as based on the details furnished by the VDh. P. in its two separate chapters; namely the *Sarvatobhadra Prāsāda* (Adh. 87)[4] and the *Sāmānya Prāsāda* (Adh. 88).[5] For other shrine names we have, however, very limited treatment in the Purāṇa itself which begins its discussion of the first Prāsāda called *Himavān* as covering a space of twelve stanzas—mentioned and translated above. We have only a summary statement in the Purāṇa regarding other *ninety-eight temple names* of which very fine distinctive features in each case are afforded from stanza 13 onwards. A list of these interesting shrine-names can be given

---

1. *The Hindu Temple*, p. 411.
2. P.K. Acharya, *An Encyclopaedia of Hindu Architecture*, London 1946,   p. 172.
3. Kramrisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 145 ff.
4. *The Hindu Temple*, pp. 418 ff.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 411-12.

below would be found slightly to differ in several cases, as well as the order of arrangement recognised earlier, from those of the names that were read by previous authorities, such as Stella Kramrisch and T.P. Bhattacharya (to both of them only the Venkatesvara Press edition was available) and also by P.B. Shah who prepared her critical edition based on several MSS. We have evidently made use of both the editions.

1. Himavān
2. Mālyavān
3. Śrihgavān
4. Āgāra
5. Bhavanākhya (or Bhavana)
6. Grihākhya (or Griha)
7. Nishadha
8. Nīla
9. Śveta[1]
10. Vindhya
11. Valabhī
12. Vriddhida
13. Triguna
14. Śikhara[2]
15. Kāmada
16. Nrigriha
17. Turaga
18. Kuñjara
19. Yatheshta
20. Viśāla[3]
21. Bhadra
22. Dvāraśālā[4]
23. Subhadra[5]
24. Saumya (?)
25. Gandhamādana
26. Kamala

---

1. Bhattacharya mis-represent it as Cheta.
2. Bhattacharya here duplicates *Valabhī* after *Śikhara* and skips the two subsequent names.
3. Our list of names tallies in most cases with that of Shah, except that she adds *Vrittida* after *Kāmada*.
4. Bhattacharya reads it as *Dwārapāla*.
5. Bhattacharya reads *Samudra* here and follows it by *Śveta*, which latter is now redundant (see No. 9 above).

27. Aruṇodaya
28. Guha
29. Gauḍa
30. Śarva
31. Trailokya
32. Liṅga
33. Sarvakīṭa (read Śarvakuṭa)
34. Brahmāṇḍa
35. Shāra
36. Caturasra
37. Sumekhala
38. Dvimekhala[1]
39. Mekhalādhya
40. Dhishṇya
41. Śalya
42. Budha
43. Indu
44. Chandra[2]
45. Megha
46. Ambuda
47. Ākāśa
48. Gṛiha
49. Bahubhumika
50. Meru
51. Śuktimān
52. Mandara
53. Pāriyātra
54. Alaka
55. Vimāna
56. Pañchabhauma
57. Chaturbhauma[3]
58. Tribhumi
59. Dvibhumi
60. Ekabhauma
61. Samudga
62. Bhadrapīṭhākṛiti (?)[4]

---

1. Bhattacharya : *Vimekhala*.
2. Bhattacharya : *Grha (?)*; he leaves two or three names here.
3. Shah : *Pañchakaj Chatushkala*.
4. Bhattacharya has *Nandana* in place of the above name, and mis-represents : Nos. 56-57.

63. Nandī
64. Guhārāja (or, Gṛiharāja)
65. Ekaśṛiṅga[1]
66. Vṛisha
67. Haṁsa
68. Ghaṭa
69. Siṁha
70. Maṇḍapa
71. Dvādaśāsri
72. Shaḍasri
73. Ashṭāsri
74. Kailāsa
75. Trikuṭa
76. Sumanohara (?)[3]
77. Rājarāja
78. Dharaṇīdhara
79. Vimāna[4]
80. Surarāṭ
81. Ānanda
82. Sarvatomukha
83. Susama
84. Prabhañjana
85. Viśvakarma
86. Mahāsumana
87. Chhatra
88. Mṛidaṅga
89. Vajra
90. Lokapāla[5]
91. *Sāmānya*
92. Suguha
93. Triguha[6]

---

1. Not in Bhattacharya's list. Shah : *Bhadrapīṭha*.
2. Not given by Shah.
3. Bhattacharya : *Saumya*. But see No. 24 abvoe.
4. Duplicate here, see No. 55 above.
5. *Digvandha* (in Bhattacharya's *list*).
6. As per contextual sequence the line should read :
   त्रिगुहोपेतः त्रिगुहः परिकीर्तितः ॥ verse 122.

94. Nandaka
95. Ākāśanī (? Ākāśanāsā)
96. Shoḍaśāsri
97. Śaṅkha
98. Vaijayanta
99. Ambuda
100. Maṅgala.[1]
101. Sarvatobhadra.[2]

---

1. प्रासादानां शतं चैतत् समासात् कथितं मया । VDh. 86.129.
   At No. 91, the *Sāmānya* has been included in the list which finds detailed treatment in chapter 88.
2. Ch. 87 describes its details.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE PLACE OF
NAKULIŚA'S VISIT TO MAHAKĀLA UJJAYINI

BY

P.K. Agrawala

[कौण्डिन्यकृते पाशुपतसूत्रभाष्ये शैवावतार-लकलीशभगवतः सौराष्ट्रगतकायावरोहणे तीर्थे प्राकट्यं च तत: उज्जयिनीस्थ महाकालतीर्थगमनं वर्णितम् । अस्मिन्नेव शोधपत्रे लेखकमहोदयेन भगवल्लकुलीशस्य उज्जयिन्यां निवासस्थलीं उपदेशस्थलीं च पौराणिकसामग्र्याः विशेषतः निर्दिष्ट्रा यत् तेषां वर्तमानसमये परिज्ञानसहायो भवति स्थानीय-शोधप्रयासे ।]

In the great scripture of ancient Śaivism, ascribed to the Nakuliśa-Pāśupata sect. now extant with its Panchārtha-bhāshya of Kaundinya, that has been presently known by the title of *Pāśupata* Sutras, we are told of the sacred myth mentioning the appearance of Lord Lakuliśa at the Kāyāvarohaṇa Tīrtha, which latter is usually thought as identified with modern Kāravaṇa, in the Dabhoi Taluka of Baroda, in Gujarat. In the Bhāshya we are informed that the Āchārya Lakuliśa was an incarnation of the lord Śiva who had descended in the bodily form on the corpse floating in the river at the place and as such the village was called Kāyāvarohaṇa, and he assumed the particular name of Lakuliśa, the-lord-of *laguḍa* or staff and thus characterised as bearing a staff (or *danḍa*) in his left hand and a citron in the right.[1]

As the Bhāshya on Sutra 1 gives a summary of the main principles of the Pāśupata system and the events relating to the life of the founder-teacher Lakuliśa himself, we are told of the following :—

तथा शिष्टप्रामाण्यात् कामितत्वात्
अजाततत्वाच्च मनुष्यरूपी भगवान् ब्राह्मणकाय-
मास्थाय कायावतरणे[2] अवतीर्ण इति। तथा पद्भ्या-
मुज्जयिनीं[3] प्राप्तः । कस्मात् ? शिष्टप्रामाण्यात्
चिह्नदर्शनश्रवणाच्च। अत्याश्रमप्रसिद्धं लिङ्गमास्थाय ।
प्रवचनमुक्तवान्,[4] etc.

---

1. See *Ganakārikā of Āchārya Bhāsarvasva*, ed. C.D. Dalal, Baroda, 2nd edn. 1966, Introduction, p. V, appendix IV : *Kāravaṇa-māhātmya*; etc. V.S. Pathaka, *Śaiva Cults in Northern India*, B.H.U., 1960, p. 7. And *Pāśupata Sutras*, cited below.
2. *Pāśupata Sutras, with Panchārthabhāshya of Kaundinya*, ed. R. Ananthakrishna Sastri, Trivandrum, 1940, pp. 3-4.
3. R.A. Sastri notes : See कायावतरण (कारवण) माहात्म्य in गणकारिका।
4. Here Sastri observes : Not traceable. [Further, refer to his. Introduction, p. 11. etc.]

"Again, as the good are accepted as authority, for being actuated by (special) desires to asusme forms at will (I. 24) and because of his not being born (ch. 1.40) God in the shape of man, took the form of a Brāhmaṇa and became incarnated in Kāyāvarohaṇa. And he walked on foot to Ujjainī. How known? By the authority of the Śiṣṭas (good and learned persons) and by the sight or hearing of symbols. He assumed the mark, remarkable for the highest stage (āśrama) and pronounced the institutions; ...."[1]

The Purāṇic version of the above legend regarding the origin of the Kāyāvarohaṇa Tīrtha, the lord's (i.e. Śiva's) descending to the level of a dead body (kāyā) floating on the river surface (or a corpse thrown in a cementery) to assume his incarnation of Lakulīśa is, found in the Vāyupurāṇa,[2] Liṅgapurāṇa,[3] Śiva Mahāpurāṇa[4], Skanda Mahāpurāṇa,[5] etc. We find frequent mention of the doctrines preached by Nakulīśa in the Purāṇas and the philosophy of Pañchārtha Yoga or Vidyā (or Jñāna) associated with the Pāśupata sect originating with the great Āchārya.[6]

The most important information recorded by the teacher Kauṇḍinya (identified by scholars with the epithet Rāśikara on the authority of later scholars citing his words that are found in the Bhāṣya as published by R.A. Sastri) on Pāśupata Sutra commentary concern the early life of the founder of the sect. He is stated to have "walked on foot" to the great pilgrimage-centre of Mahākāla at Ujjayinī. Already in the time of Kauṇḍinya himself, that was regarded to be an event known to the worthies, well-conversant in the sectarian history based on traditional evidence (prāmāṇya) and the signs or traces (chihnas) if any of that visit of the lord as preserved at Ujjain actually 'seen' or 'heard' (darśanāt; śravaṇāt). Exact location of this association of Lakulīśa with the Mahākāla premises has not been mentioned here or elsewhere. As remarked by Ananthakrishna Sastri in his Introduction[7]

1. Translation as quoted above in after Chakraborti, op. cit, p. 49.
2. 23.222-24 (Mor edn., pp. 92-3).
3. (I) 24.129-134.
4. Vāyavīya Saṁhitā, II. Ch. 9; Ch. 11; etc.
5. Avanti-Khaṇḍa, see below, cited in its relevant passages.
6. For example, Śiva Mahāpurāṇa, ed. Ramtej Pandey, Varanasi, 1986 (reprint), pp. 1037, 1065; Liṅga Purāṇa I 86.46;50; Kurma Purāṇa, II. Ch. 42 (=Gita Press end., Ch. 44).
7. Sastri, Introduction, pp. 5, 15. We may refer to the discussion by the great teacher as found in his commentary on II. 2.7. 37. Cp. Kaṇḍinya-bhāṣya p. 6 on Pāśupata Sutra.

of the Pāśupata Sutra edition, he great Śaṅkarāchārya (c. 780-820 A.D.) has made mention of the Pañchārtha-Bhāshya of Kauṇḍinya whom he places in a period between 400 and 600 A.D.

The memory as regards the Āchārya's association with the great Śaivite seat of Mahākāla Jyotir-liṅga at Ujjayinī was preserved amongst knowledgeable persons up to the time of the Bhāshyakāra although he does not indicate the exact location details of the First Sermon by the lord Lakulīśa given to his direct disciple Kuśika at the holy city. The popular memory, it appears, about the spot had already become faint and only a few learned men knew about it. However, in this context, modern scholars pay their attention only to the remark of R.A. Sastri as given in a footnote : "None now in Ujjain knows the symbol or mark."

Since the great work of R.G. Bhadarkar's Vaishnavism, *Śaivism and Mirnor Religious Systems*, much has been written on the Pāśupata sect and Lakulīśa-Pasupatism as regards their history, founders and tenets. Epigraphical evidence has been avilable to a great extent. In art representations the figure of Lakulīśa has been well documented from the late fourth century at Mathura, shown with the pillar-inscription of Chandragupta II, dated A.D. 380, which also presents outstanding evidence for the early teachers of Pāśupata religion. All sources known up to now tell that the lord Lakulīśa incarnated at a place called Kāyāvarohaṇa after his descent in a human body. This holy place is well identified with Kārohana-Kārvana of the Dabhoi Taluka, Gujarat. But, the lord chose Ujjarin to be the centre of his first preachings. This fact does not seems to have alternative version.

Our Purāṇic tradition, however, appears to be a repetitive process of recording mythico-historical events, preserved and re-modelled, as well as expanded as to their orbit of absorbing newer information in revised perspective and glorifying statements. Thus, in the present context of study, we are afforded by the Kurma Purāṇa, II, Ch. 42[1] a summary, statement on the *māhātmya* of various Śaiva holy-centres, including Kāyāvarohaṇa and Mahākāla side by side as associated with the illustrious Bhagavān Nakuṭīśvara. The relevant stanzas may be quoted here.

कायावरोहणं नाम महादेवालयं शुभम् ।
यत्र माहेश्वरा धर्मा मुनिभिः संप्रवर्तिताः ॥ ७ ॥

There is Kāyāvarohaṇa by name the auspicious seat of Mahādeva, where the doctrines of Māheśvara following were promulgated by the sages.

---

1.   Gita Press edn., 1997 (=Mor edn. Ch. 44)

Then after mentioning two more religious centres of Kanyā-tīrtha and Jamadagnya-tīrtha, we are told of the Mahākāla-tīrtha evidently at Ujjayinī.

महाकालमिति ख्यातं तीर्थं त्रैलोक्यविश्रुतम् ।

गत्वा प्राणान् परित्यज्य गाणपत्यमवाप्नुयात् ॥ ११ ॥

गुह्याद् गुह्यतमं तीर्थं नकुलीश्वरमुत्तमम् ।

तत्र संनिहितः श्रीमान् भगवान् नकुलीश्वरः ॥ १२ ॥

Though, the Purāna-writer does not categorically indicate close connection between the two holy spots of Mahākāla and Nakuleśvara, we may easily guess that the reference is presumably of them both existing writhin the greater circuit of the same holy city. Thus, the legend as told in the Bhāshya regarding the visit of Lakulīśa to Ujjain and his stay there as preaching the Paśupata tenets before being finally merged into Śiva whose Linga (in a shrine) after his name being called Nakulīśvara, was raised there, somewhere in the precincts of the great Mahākāla *kshetra*. This very event appears to be well echoed in the statement. "there the illustrious lord Nakulīśvara is *sannihita* in the best (of Śivalingas called) Nakulīśvara which marks the most secret of the secret pilgrim's centres." The expression is *saṁhita*, i.e. "got merged," "took his presence fixed into" it. The phrases *sannidhi* and *sannihita* are technical in their ritual context of image installation, properly defined signifying as *prāna-pratishthā* of a deity into his/her concrete image or symbol, that in turn stands for the consecrated body of divine presence.[1]

Thus, it does not seem strange when we find in the Avanti-khanda of the Skanda Mahāpurana a detailed *māhātmya* of the Eighty-four (*chaturaśti-lingas*) of Ujjayinī, including the one called *Kāyāvarohaneśvara* as marking the southern portal of the religious city in its main nucleus area.[2] The other three guardian Lingas are

---

1.   We can refer to this "doctrine of *sannidhi*" as discussed and commented in detail by the great Śankarāchārya in his Brahmasutra Bhāshya (I. 3.5.14) : *"athavā jīvapura evāsmin brahma sannihitam upalakshyate / yathā sālagrāme vishnuh sannihita iti tadvat//*

       Also see the Purānic account of the *Deva-pratishthā-vidhi* in the Vishnudharmotara Purāna, III. chs. 95 to 100 (also the entire section of these chapters are called *Pratishthā-kalpa*, or *pratishthādhyāya*, etc.). As it is concluded (110. 1-3) : *Oṁ pratishthito'si bhagavan supratishthā bhavatviyam, sānnidhyaṁ pratipadyasva yajamānābhivridhye.* etc.

2.   Adhyāya 29.5-8; 19; etc. Adh. 81-84-89, etc. Adh. 81 to 84; etc.

named as *Pingaleśa* in the east, *Bilveśa*[1] in the west and *Uttareśvara*[2] in the north These four doorkeepers with the central shrine of Mahākāla make a list of Pañcha-Iśānas. This *pañcheśānī-yātra*, elsewhere called *Deva-yātrā-antargrihī-sarvatīrtha-yātrānukrama-ṇikādi*, has been described in the *Avanti-kshetra-māhātmya* quite a few times which fact attests to its exceptional merit as it was accepted in the tradition.

The particular chapter entitled *"Kāyāvarohaṇeśvara-Māhātmya"* (No. 82) of the fifth part of the Skanda Mahāpurāṇa begins with the oft-repeated story of the holocast of Daksha's Yajña by Śaivite hosts headed by Bhadrakālīm, Vīrabhadra, etc. fighting against diverse classes of gods *(devanikāyas)* to their utter defeat and surrender before them. Many of the divine classes are said to have been rendered "bodiless" *(vi-deha)*, such as the Tushita gods *(ādyā ye tushitā devā videhāśchaiva te kṛitāḥ*, stanzas 41, 46; also 40). Now, justifying the meaning of *kāyā-avarohaṇa*, "ascending the body", in a fresh context of the myth, the great god is approached who in turn tells the Tushita-gods to visit Kāyāvarohaṇa Liṅga sited in the southern area of the Mahākāla Tīrtha. Only its relevant portion for the present scrutiny is reproduced below in original wordings.

कायावरोहरणं देव ! तुषितानां कथं भवेत् ।
ब्रह्मणो वचनं श्रुत्वां मया प्रोक्तं वरानने ॥ ४८ ॥
महाकालवने   क्षेत्रे गच्छन्तु तुषितास्त्वमी ।
लकुटीशो गतो यत्र कायावरोहणाद् गृहम् ॥ ४९ ॥
ब्राह्मणाश्च ममादेशाच् चतुःशिष्यैः समन्विताः ।
द्वापरे समतिक्रान्ते प्राप्ते कलियुगे   तथा ॥ ५० ॥
तत्र कायमनुप्राप्ता मम शिष्या ममोपमाः ।
अवसन्त क्षितौ धन्या रक्षणार्थं द्विजन्मनाम् ॥ ५१ ॥
क्षेत्रस्य दक्षिणे तस्य विद्यते लिङ्गमुत्तमम् ।

1. In places, the name is given in v.l. or corrupt reading.
2. The Liṅga is also known (ch. 84) as *Dardureśvara* being connected with the demon Dardura. The name Uttareśvara-liṅga implies its position with reference to the Mahākala-liṅga as the tutelary gate-keeper of the North. Thus, Kāyāvarohaṇeśvara can be qualified to be called as Dakshiṇeśvara and Piṅgaleśvara as Purveśvara.

सर्वसम्पत्करं दिव्यं सिद्धानां कायदायकम् ॥ ५२ ॥

प्रसादात्तस्य लिङ्गस्य कायान्प्राप्स्यन्त्यमी सुराः ।

मदीयं वचनं श्रुत्व गतास्ते तुषिताः प्रिये ॥ ५३ ॥

मुदिता ब्रह्मणा सार्द्धं यत्र तल्लिङ्गमुत्तमम् ।

प्रसादात्तस्य लिङ्गस्य प्राप्तं कायमनुत्तमम् ॥ ५४ ॥

पुनस्ते तादृशा जातास्तुषिता यादृशाऽभवन् ।

अतो देवैः कृतं नाम कायावरोहणेश्वरः ॥

समीहितप्रदो नित्यं ख्यातो देवो भविष्यति ॥ ५५ ॥

ये गत्वा दक्षिणामाशां देवं कायावरोहणम् ।

पश्यन्ति परया भक्त्या.............. ॥ ५६ ॥

ये पश्यन्ति प्रसङ्गेन देवं कायावरोहणम् ।

न तेषां पुनरावृत्तिः कल्पकोटिशतैरपि ॥ ५९ ॥

[अवन्ति 82.48-59; also to the end of chapter]

It appears quite clear from the above collected evidence that the Purāṇic writers had never been oblivious as regards the holy spot of Lakulīśa's visit and stay in the city of Ujjayinī. As we have the account recorded in the Kurma Purāṇa (II. 42.11-12, quoed above), the lord Lakulīśa got sannihita at the place in region of the Mahākāla tīrtha itself and that was named owing to that event as Nakulīśvara, i.e. the Śivaliṅga dedicated after Nakulīśa.

That very spot as well as the memorial Śivaliṅga set up there appear, thus, to have been indicated categorically by the Skanda Mahāpurāṇa passage which suggests that the name Kāyāvarohaṇeśvara came to be given to mark the south portal in the sacred zone of the Mahākāla complex. Specific statement of this traditional belief as presented in this context may be repeated here as the following :

महाकालवने क्षेत्रे ..... लकुटीशो गतो यत्र कायावरोहणाद् गृहम् ।

Presumably, we find in this interesting statement that the eminent Teacher, who made a journey from his place of incarnation at Karvan (Kāyāvarohaṇa) to the Mahākāla kshetra for preaching his sermon, made his home (griham) there itself. The place sanctified by his stay at Ujjayinī got later on marked and consecrated through a Śivaliṅga named Kāyāvarohaṇeśva, that came up in memory of his eventual merger into the divine presence.

As already noted above, this Śivaliṅga named after the sage of Kāyāvarohaṇa, forms essential part of the *antargṛihī pañcha-Iśānī-yātrā* with three other door-keeper Śivaliṅgas and the great central Deity of Mahākāla, as the Fifth Lord.

According to the present situation, we are informed that the South Door-guardian of the Kāyāvarohaṇeśvara Śivaliṅga by name is traditionally recognised as sited near the Kokalakhedi village within the holy zone of the Mahākāla Tīrtha-kshetra.[1]

---

1. Shyam Sundar Nigam, Mālava kī Hṛidayasthatī Avantikā, Ujjain, 1968, pp. 9-11; Shobha Kanoongo, *Ujjayinī kā Sāṃskṛilika Itihāsa*, *Indor*, 1972, p. 34; Hamsa Vyas, Prāchīna *Mālavā men Śaiva Dharma (prārambha se 1305 Isavī tak)*, Ujjain, 1994, pp. 49, 72.80, 84; etc. As remarked by Hansa Vyas, there is a section of conversant men in modern-day Ujjain who believe that this Kāyāvarohaṇa in the city most probably represents the birth-place of Lakulīśa. (p. 49). But this view can hardly be acceptable as such from the evidence available to us now.

PURĀNAS : REFLECTION OF VEDIC CULTURE

BY

Gauri Mahulikar

Purāṇas have an encyclopaedic nature, including wisdom from various branches of knowledge like religion, Philosophy, history, Geography, Politics, Sociology, Cosmology, Eschatology etc. This literature is interesting, fascinating and informative from toddlers to elders. The name Purāṇa means ancient *(Purā bhavam)*.[1] The written texts of Purāṇas are available from the second/third century A.D. Much of the historical material can be dated to the Gupta period and the succeeding centuries; yet they existed in oral tradition before they were written, modified and updated from time to time.

Traditionally, Purāṇas have five distinguishing constituents, *viz.* *Sarga* - creation of the universe, *Pratisarga* - secondary creation or recreation after dissolution, *Vaṁśa* — the geneology of gods and sages, *manvantara* - creation of human race, 14 *Manus* and *Vanśānucaritam* वंशानुचरितम् ? biographies and histories of kings of solar and lunar race. As the interpolations increased, the Puranic redactors adopted *daśalakṣaṇa* definition.[2] This speaks of the assimilative and absorbing nature of the Purāṇas.

In fact, Purāṇas as a class, represents different phases and aspects of life throwing light on the history and cultural legacy, the society inherited from the Vedas. Purāṇas restate the meaning of the Vedas in their own style. A scholar, therefore, should substantiate Vedic meaning with the help of Itihās and Purāṇa.[3] Restatement doesn't involve disregard to the Vedic tradition, Purāṇas sometimes modify and simplify the Vedic concepts, but never bypass them totally. In the minutest detail of the Puranic daily chore, some Vedic glimpses can be

---

1. *Matsya* P. 53-65.
2. *Bhāgavata* P. XI. 7.9-10.
3. *Mbh. I* इतिहासपुराणाभ्यां वेदं समुपबृंहयेत् । बिभेत्यल्पश्रुताद्वेदो मामयं प्रहरिष्यति/ प्रतिरिष्यति ॥

seen. That the Purāṇas are reflections of the Vedic cutlure is brought
out in this paper in two parts; Myths and Rituals.

I. Myths : Myths get reflected in the Purāṇas in two ways, either an
existing Vedic myth is restated with some variations and additions, or
a new myth is created to justify some Vedic *mantras*.

1. For the first variety, let us examine the Vedic myth of Saraṇyu, the
    daughter of Tvaṣṭr, who was married to Vivasvān. She bore a twin
    Yama-Yamī and taking the form of a mare, disappeared. She cre-
    ated her replica *(sarvarṇām)* and placed her with Surya, before
    leaving his abode. Then she gave birth to two Aśvinā.[1] This myth
    contaied in just two verses of the RV is described elaborately in the
    Purāṇas.[2] Here Saraṇyu is called queen Sañjñā. She could not tol-
    erate the fiery lustre of her husaband and placed Chāyā, her shadow
    or replica in her place and went to her father, Tvaṣṭr. Oblivious of
    this exchange, Sun begot Sāvarṇi Manu, Śani and Tapati from
    Chāyā. Once Yama and Śani had a fight and went to Chāyā. He
    then went to Tvaṣṭr, who pared off Sun's lustre and made
    weapons of gods like the disc of Vīṣṇu, trident of Śiva, *Vajra* of
    Indra etc. Sun, then went after Sañjñā who was wandering in the
    Uttara-Kura region in the form of a mare, and mated with her as-
    suming the form of a stallion. From their union Aśvinā and Revanta
    Manu were born.[3] A detail in the *Matsya P.* elevates this simple
    narration to the status of a ritualistic myth. The Purāṇas states that
    while minimizing the lustre of Sun, the latter's feet got cut off. As
    such one should not prepare an idol of Sun having feet. One who
    does so becomes a leper.[4] The variation found in the *Matsya* P.
    aims at atleast two things viz. one-the tendency of worshipping the
    sun in the from of solar orb *(surya-bimba).* The temples dedicated
    to the sun-god were very few and hence the idols of the sun were
    fast diminishing so that was to be justified and second thing is
    Sun's association with leprosy. In the ritual aspect it is seen that
    solar worship is mainly prescribed for the removal of leprosy. The

---

1. *RV* X-17.12, also see *Nirukta* XII.1.
2. *Mārkaṇḍeya P.* Ch. 74,75,103-105. *Viṣṇu P.* III. 2.8 ff, *Matsya P.* 10-20 ff
3. Loc-Cit.
4. Matsya *P.* 10.30-32.

Purāṇa - composer made a fine combination of these two prevalent practices and connected it with the myth of sun's lustre being pared off by Tvaṣṭṛ. Threatened that he might incur sun's wrath and would suffer from leprosy, the god-fearing man never made feet of the idol of the sun thence forward and thus the existing practice of worshipping the solar orb instead of an idol was cleverly justified. Ghurye comments on the Ṛgvedic story as, horse is the symbol of sun[1] and the horse sacrifice is a solar festival. Sañjñā, for him is solar energy, the consciousness.[2] In the RV Aśvinā have a unique epithet, Nāsatyā meaning never-failing, truthful. The *Vāyu P.* connects this word with *nāsa*, nose and refers to the unusual birth of Aśvinā. Sañjñā regarded Sun in the form of a stallion to be a stranger and discarded his semen through nostrils, which caused the birth of Aśvinā[3]. Interestingly, Nirukta explains the word Nāsatyā as either truthful, propagators of truth or those born of nose.[4]

2. The RV refers to various miraculous deeds, sometimes medicinal activities of Aśvinā. The most important one in rejuvenation of sage cyavana. Aśvinā changed the sagging and disfiguring skin of the sage by removing it from his body like an armour.[5] The Purāṇas, especially the Bhāgavata gives a detailed account of Sukanyā, daughter of king Śaryāti, who got wedded to old sage Cyavana as an atonement of her misdeed, pricking the eyes of the sage unknowingly. Sukanyā served her husband loyally and laid down the norms of chastity and servitude, Once when Aśvinā came to their hermitage, sage Cyavana requested them to grant him youth and beauty. The celestial physicians asked the sage to take a dip in the nearby pond. After that reviving dip, Cyavana became young.[6] As a gesture of gratitude, he made them Somapā, entitled for a

---

1. *RV.* VII.3.

2. Ghurye, G.S., Vedic India, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1979, P. 331.

3. *Vāyu P.* 84. 76.77. मैथुनाय विचेष्टन्तीं परपुंसोपशकया। सा तस्मिन्नरधमच्छुकं नासिकाभ्यां

4. *Nirukta. VI 52.* सत्यावेव नासत्याविर्त्यौर्णवाभः, सत्यस्य प्रणेतायविर्त्याग्रायणः, नासिकाप्रभवौ बभू वतुरिति वा।

5. *RV/I 16-10* जजुरुनो नासत्योत वात्रिं प्रामुञ्चतं द्रापिमिव च्यवानात्।

6. *Bhāgavata P.* IX. 3.7., *Skanda P.* VII. 1. 280-84 Speaks about *Sukanyāsaras* at Prabhāsa.

share of Soma offering.[1] The Vedic texts narrated the myth to jus-
tify the share of Soma, whereas in the Purāṇas, it is developed to
illustrate the fidelity of Śukanyā to her old husband. Ritual of Soma
being outdated during the Purāṇic age, the values, morality be-
came more important.[2]

3. Let us see an example where the Vedic myth gets transferred to
    another deity. *Śat. Br.* states that prior to creation, when the entire
    earth was submerged into waters, Prajāpati assumed the form of a
    boar and lifted the earth on his tusk.[3] *Taitt. Sam.* also narrates the
    same account. *Taitt. Br.* says that Prajāpati saw a lotus leaf floating
    in the primeval waters. He assumed the boar form, entered deep
    waters, brought some wet mud and spread it on the lotus leaf. Earth
    got the name *pṛthivī* as she was spread. Earth being lifted by *Varāha*
    is referred to in the *AV* also.[4] Prajāpati's boar form is thus an earli-
    est reference which was later transferred to Vīṣṇu, in the post Vedic
    literature. Rāmāyaṇa has a clear reference to the boar form of
    Brahmā;[5] but Mahābhārata, however, refers to Vīṣṇu as *Varāha*.
    Incarnations of Vīṣṇu, Popularly 10 in number, sometimes 24, form
    an inevitable part of Vīṣṇu's mythology in the Purāṇas; its founda-
    tion, however, is seen in the Vedic literature as the of Prajāpati-
    Brahmā.

    A similar case of transferred epithet is found in the Indra - Śiva
    myths. Indra in the Vedas, is known as Purandara or Purabhid,
    Gotrabhid as he shattered the cities of his enemies because of his
    valour and physical strength.[6] The Śat. Br. mentions three castles
    built by the Asuras, of iron, silver and gold, in the three worlds.
    In the post Vedic tradition, Indra's popularity began to fade and
    lesser gods like Rudra-Śiva attained prominence. Then this func-
    tion of breaking the cities got transferred to Śiva, who got an eiithet,

1. *Bhāgavata P.* IX-3.24.
2. *Sat. Br.* XIV. 1.2.11 इयती ह वा इयमग्र पृथिव्यास प्रादेशमात्री तामेमूष इति वराट उज्जघान।
3. *Taitt. Sam.* VII.1.5.
4. *Taitt-Br.* 1-1.3, also *Kāthaka Sam-VIII.2.4*
5. AV-XII.1.48.
6. *Rām.* II 110-3-4 ततःसमभवद् ब्रह्मा स्वयंभूर्दैवतैः सह। स वराहस्ततो भूर्वा प्रोज्जहार वसुन्धराम्।

Tripurāri.[1] This is not the only instance of similarity between Indra and Śiva, O" Flaherty points out some more commonalities between them. Both have extra eyes, thousands or there and both are associated with the bull and an erect phallus, under lining the fertility aspect. Indra got *brahmahatyā* by killing Vṛtra, similarly, Śiva incured this sin by beheading Brahmāś fifth head.

II. Second part is that of Rituals of *Mantras* chanted during rituals. Let us at the outset examine the famous Mahāmṛtyuñjaya *mantra* from the RV. Arthavāda of this can be found in the Purāṇas. *Agni P.* says, if one mutters this and burns guggula, he sees Śiva in dream.[2] One gets a long and healthy life by merely muttering this *mantra*.[3] This chant removes not only one's fear of death; but also helps him conquer death in a way. Once sage Dadhīca was hit by king kṣuva with Vajra and lay dead. Śukrācārya restored his life with this *mantra*.[4] So one who chants this *mantra* and drinks the water consecrated there by, gets freed from death.

To justify the epithet *Sugandhi in the mantra Skanda P.* narrates a story. A demon, named Pulaka, took the form of a deer, propitiated Śiva and got from him the boon of fragrance. Blessed thus, he started attracting celestial ladies. Gods were disturbed and asked Śiva's help, Śiva asked his devotee Pulaka to discard his body, Pulaka did so on a condition that Śiva would apply the scent extracted from the body of Pulaka to his own body. Śiva agreed and applied *mṛgamada* to his body as well as to Pārvatī, thereby getting the adjective *Sugandhi*.

Before we explain the word *tryambaka* in the *mantra*, it will be interesting to see the close association, rather identification of the Vedic Rudra and Agni, two distinct gods of Vedic pantheon. The Śat. Br. gives names of Agni which include Śarva, Bhava, Paśupati, that are the synonyms of Śiva. The point of similarity is their fiery nature. In the Purāṇas, Śiva's third eye is said to be equivalent to Agni, Kāma,

---

1. *RV.* VI. 16-14, VIII. 61.10 Sāyaṇa comments on पुरन्दर as शत्रुपुराणां दारयिता।

2. *Liṅga P.* I. 70, also *Padma P.* Ch-130-137 and *Matsya P.* सृष्टिखण्ड Ch-130-137.

3. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Eliade Hircea, New York, 1987, Vol. VII. P. 215.

4. *RV.* VII. 62.12 त्र्यम्बकं यजामहे सुगन्धिं पुष्टिवर्धनम् । उर्वारुकमिव बन्धनान्मृत्योर्मुक्षीय मामृतात् ॥

Madana being burut to ashes when Śiva opened his thrid eye, is a common story in the Purāṇas. During the Vedic times sacrifices were performed and oblations were offered in the fire for a particular deity. As times changed and the abstract phenomenal gods got transformed into more concrete forms, the ways and means of worship also underwent a drastic change. Elaborate rituals were replaced by simple vows (Vratas) and idols were worshipped in various modes. This included *Kāyīka Pujā*, bathing the idol, offering *arghya, Pādya, naivedya* etc. to the concrete image. It could be verbal mode consisting of chanting of the *mantras* and *stotras* to glorify the respective deity. Third mode was mental worship, *mānasapujā*, including *japa, dhyāna* etc. When the Vedic sacrifices became less prevalent, the cult of image worship arose. It become more elaborate and common in the medieval and modern times according to Kane. Though idol worship is not found during the Vedic period, installation, worship and even the immersion of the idol is done chanting the Vedic *mantras* from the Purāṇic times. The Purāṇas are thus seen to always echo the doctrines preached by the Vedas. They have tried to revive and relive the elements of the Vedic tradition.

Following table gives a list of various details of wroship of Viṣṇu along with the Vedic *mantras* :

S. No.	Detail of worship	*mantra*	Vedic Source
1.	Water of washing feet (*Pādya*)	*Hiraṇmaya*	Taitt. Br. III. I. 1.9.
2.	Oblation of the god (*arghya*)	*ato devā*	RV. I.90.6.
3.	Special Offering (*madhuparka*)	*madhu vātā*	RV. I. 90.6.
4.	Sipping warter (*ācmet*)	*mayi grhāmi*	Vāj.Sam. XX.32
5.	*durvā* and *akṣatā*	*akṣannami madanta*	RV. I.82.2

6.	kindle fire	kāṇḍāt	Vāj. Sam. XIII. 20.
7.	Sandalwood paste	gandhavati	-
8.	Garland	unnayāmi	-
9.	Sacred thread	idaṃ Viṣṇuḥ	RV. I. 22.17.
10.	Pair of clothes	bṛhaspate	RV. IV. 5.2.
11.	Upper garment	vedāham	RV. II. 14.10.
12.	Incense burning	dhurasi	Tatt. Sam. III. 2.102.
13.	Collyrium	vibrāṭsukta	RV. X. 170.2.
14.	Umbrella	Indracchatra	-
15.	Mirror	virājataḥ	RV. I. 188.6.
16.	Ornaments	rathantareṇa	Vāj. Sam. XXI. 23.
17.	Chowrie	vikarṇena	-
18.	Fan	Vāsu-devādyaiḥ	Taitt. Ar. X. 1.6.
19.	Flowers	muñcāmi	RV. X. 161. 1.

It is interesting to see that here some of the *mantras* occur on the ground of mere similarity of sound. For example, the special offering (*madhuparka*) is offered, to the deity with the mantra *"madhu vātā ṛtayate"* on the basis of the word *madhu*. Still interesting is the offering of *akṣatā* with the *mantra 'akṣannami'*. This Rgvedic *mantra* is in fact addressed to Indra, where the seer says, "O Indra, these hosts (*yajamānāḥ*) are happy after eating (*akṣan*-root *aś*) the food given by you". Here the word *akṣan* has no connection at all with the word *akṣatā* and yet, while offering *akṣatā* (unbroken grains of rice), the *mantra* with the word similar in sound (*dhvani*) is employed. Another such example is that of offering the incense with the *mantra "dhurasi"*. Actually the *mantra* has reference to *dhur* i.e. the yoke of the car : but because of the similarity of the sound *dhur* with *dhupa* (incense) it is employed here. Interesting enough are the words in the vernacular languages for the smoke when incense is burnt. (Cf. *dhuvā* in Hindi, *dhur* in Marathi).

While going through the details of this ritual, we come across many Vedic passages, though out of place, at times. In fact, this seems to be the trend, practically of all the Purāṇas. The Purāṇa writers, always

had this Vedic antiquity in their minds and by incorporating the Vedic *mantras* in the ritual context, they tried to strengthen the link between the Vedas and the Purāṇas and express their indebtedness to the Vedic tradition.

Conclusion : Purāṇas show an interesting mixture of the Vedic religion, *āgamic (tantrik)* practices and folk-beliefs. Viṣṇu, one of the minor gods of the *Rgveda* attained the highest position in the Purāṇas. Brāhmaṇas had their share in equating Viṣṇu with sacrifice and glorifying him. Though the anthropomorphic description of the Vedic Viṣṇu is incomplete and vague, Purāṇas gave a complete picture of the Supreme God, taking help of the Cosmic Being described in the *RV* X. 90. Vedic *mantras, tantric* practices and geometric designers *(Yantra)* all had their share along with various myths, number of incaranations etc. of Viṣṇu. Similar is the case of Śiva, the proto type of the Vedic Rudra. These two gods have dominated the post Vedic Culture. Both Gods had their own devotees who adhered to certain precepts and concepts. Eventually there emerged superiority complex for the followers. The disputes and struggles had to be pacified. Purāṇas again took help of the Vedas to condemn diversity and propound identity.[8] With their encyclopedic nature, the Purāṇas have tried to bridge the gap between the ancient and the modern. They have retained the Vedic heritage, while doing so, they modified, simplified Vedic rituals and introduced a few innovative concepts like Vratsa and pilgrimages. Purāṇas are the literature of growth; as such they adopted and assimilated number of legends, mythical narrations to make them more comprehensive and appealing to persons of varied tastes. The synthesizing nature of the Purāṇas, thus depict that they are reflection of the Vedic culture.

---

1. *Agni P*. 260-18.
2. *Ibid.* 259. 63, 64.
3. *Śiva P. Rudrasaṁhitā. Satīkhaṇḍa*, 38.9 ff.
4. *Skanda. P*. I. 3-13.8 ff. मदङ्गसम्भवं दिव्यं सौरभं विश्वमोहनम। धार्यतां देवदेवेश सदा सादरचेतसा।। *(Ibid.* 17)
5. *Śat. Br.* I-7-3.8.
6. *Śiva P*. Rudrasamhitā II.9. 14.ff.
7. Kane, P.V., History of Dharmaśāstra, Vol. II, Pt. II, Pune, 1941, P. 712.
8. *RV* I. 164.46 एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति।

श्रद्धांजलि : डा० गंगा सागर राय (संपादक : पुराणम्)

देहावसान : 15 अक्टूबर 2014

डॉ. गंगा सागर राय का जन्म 1937 ई. में गाजीपुर जनपद के शेरपुर (कलाँ) गाँव में हुआ था। इनके तीन अग्रज थे। इन्होंने 1954 ई. में हाईस्कूल परीक्षा तथा 1956 ई. में इण्टर परीक्षा उत्तीर्ण की। तदुपरान्त इन्होंने 1958 ई. में बी.ए. तथा 1960 ई. में एम.ए. परीक्षा काशी हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय से उत्तीर्ण की। 1962 ई. में इन्होंने काशी हिन्दू विश्वविद्यालय से पी-एच.डी. उपाधि "वैदिक शाखाओं का अध्ययन" विषय पर प्राप्त की। इनके तीनों परीक्षक डा0 सी. कुन्हन् राजा, डा0 मंगल देव शास्त्री तथा डा0 सूर्यकान्त आक्सफोर्ड के डॉक्टरेट थे। यह संयोग शायद ही किसी-किसी को प्राप्त होता है। पढ़ने में ये कक्षा में सदैव प्रथम व द्वितीय स्थान प्राप्त करते रहे और छात्रवृति प्राप्त करते रहे। अपनी प्रतिभा और ज्ञान के कारण ये सदैव गुरुओं के स्नेह के पात्र रहे और गुरुजन इनकी प्रतिभा पर पूर्ण विश्वास कर इन्हें कोई कार्य सौंप देते थे। अध्ययन के बाद सर्वभारतीय काशिराज न्यास के पुराण विभाग में नियुक्त हो गये और स्वतन्त्र कार्य करने लगे।

इनके जीवन का एकमात्र कार्य वेद, पुराण, धर्मशास्त्र, साहित्यशास्त्र इत्यादि विषयों का अहर्निश पठन-पाठन और शोध रहा है और ब्राह्मण वृत्ति का आश्रय लेकर अर्थ से पृथक रहे हैं। इनके द्वारा प्रणीत ग्रन्थों की संख्या 50 से अधिक रही जिनमें कुछ मौलिक, कुछ संपादित, कुछ हिन्दी संस्कृत अथवा अंग्रेजी व्याख्या युक्त हैं। इनके अनेकों अनुसंधान पत्र डा0 दाण्डेकर की वैदिक बिब्लियोग्राफी के कई भागों में तथा जर्मनी से प्रकाशित इतिहास तथा पुराण संबंधी शतवार्षिकी अनुसंधान संग्रह ग्रन्थ में संग्रहीत तथा निर्देशित है। इनके कई ग्रन्थों अनेकों संस्करण मुद्रित हो चुके हैं। इनके ग्रन्थों की समीक्षा और प्रशंसा डा0 के.वी. शर्मा, डा0 काण्टा वाला, डा0 वी. राघवन, डा0 आर. के. शर्मा, पं. पट्टाभिराम शास्त्री, पं. बलदेव उपाध्याय आदि अनेकों विद्वानों ने की है। इनके द्वारा प्रकाशित नीति शतक, काव्य मीमांसा, चन्द्रालोक आदि ग्रन्थों के अनेकों संस्करण प्रकाशित हुये हैं।

इनके कई ग्रन्थों का उल्लेख मद्रास विश्वविद्यालय से प्रकाशित न्यू कैटोलोगस में हुआ है तथा कई ग्रन्थों की प्रशंसा परक समीक्षा अड्यार बुलेटिन, बड़ौदा इन्स्टीट्यूट की पत्रिका, विश्वेश्वरानन्द की पत्रिका, पुराणम् पत्रिका आदि में प्रकाशित है।

डा0 गंगासागर राय की कृतियाँ

मौखिक ग्रन्थ –

(1) महाकवि भवभूति [स्व. डा0 वासुदेवशरण अग्रवाल, म. म. मिराशी, पं.

बलदेव उपाध्याय, पं. रामकुबेर मालवीय, डा0 सिद्धेश्वर भट्टाचार्य प्रभृति विद्वानों से प्रशंसित तथा तदुत्तर (1965) एतद्विषयक समस्त ग्रन्थों द्वारा उद्धृत] (2) वैदिक आख्यान, (3) पौराणिक आख्यान, (4) अलङ्कारपीयूष, (5) Vedic Shakhas (6) संस्कृत के प्रमुख नाटककार।

हिन्दी अनुवाद सहित –

(1) काव्यमीमांसा, (2) बालरामायण (डा0 रामकरण शर्मा, पं. बलदेव उपाध्याय, पं. बदरीनाथ शुक्ल, पं. पट्टाभिरामशास्त्री प्रभृति विद्वानों द्वारा प्रशंसित व उत्तरप्रदेश सरकार द्वारा पुरस्कृत), (3) शाङ्खायन ब्राह्मण (डा0 आर. एन. दाण्डेकर, पं. बलदेव उपाध्याय, पं. पट्टाभिराम शास्त्री प्रभृति विद्वानों से प्रशंसित तथा उत्तरप्रदेश सरकार द्वारा पुरस्कृत), (4) वामनपुराण (संयुक्त रूप से), (5) शाङ्खायन गृह्य सूत्र (नारायण भाष्य सहित-उत्तर प्रदेश संस्कृत संस्थान द्वारा विशिष्ट पुरस्कार से पुरस्कृत), (6) शाङ्खायन श्रौतसूत्र (भाष्य सहित), (7) याज्ञवल्क्यस्मृति मिताक्षरा टीका सहित (उत्तरप्रदेश संस्कृत संस्थान से पुरस्कृत)।

संस्कृत तथा हिन्दी टीका सहित –

(1) नीति शतक (अंग्रेजी अनुवाद भी), (2) चन्द्रालोक, (3) अविमारक नाटक, (4) अभिषेकनाटक, (5) बालचरित, (6) प्रतिज्ञायोगन्धरायण, (7) प्रतिभा, (8) स्वप्नवासवदत्ता, (9) वेणीसंहार, (10) मुद्राराक्षस, (11) कर्पूरमञ्जरी, (12) बाल-भारत, (13) हरिविजय (प्रथम सर्ग), (14) पञ्चतन्त्र (अपरीक्षित कारक), (15) रघुवंश (त्रयोदश-चतुर्दश सर्ग), (16) मृच्छकटिक, (17) चारुदत्तः (18) मध्यभव्यायोग, (19) अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल, (20) मालतीमाधव, (21) दूतवाक्य, (22) पञ्चरात्र, (23) ऊरूभङ्ग, (24) दूतघटोत्कच, (25) कर्णभार, (26) सुबन्धुकृतवासवदत्ता।

अंग्रेजी अनुवाद –

(1) कूर्म पुराण (संयुक्त रूप से), (2) नीतिशतक।

संपादन –

(1) बालरामायण, (2) स्कन्दपुराणीयमानसखण्ड, (3) अष्टाविंशत्युपनिषद, (4) वसिष्ठलिङ्गपुराण, (5) श्लोकवार्तिक।

पत्रिकाओं का संपादन –

(1) पुराणम् (सह-संपादक), (2) हिन्दुत्व (सहायक संपादक), (3) विद्यामंदिर पत्रिका, (4) ध्रुपद वार्षिकी (सह संपादक)।

शोध पत्र –

एक सौ के लगभग (हिन्दी तथा अंग्रेजी में)।