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\textbf{व्यास-वन्दना}

व्यासं वसिथनारं चक्ते: पौशमक्तमपसः
परशारालम्बं वन्दे शुक्तातं तपोविषिम्

व्यासाय विमुक्तपाय व्यासरङ्गपाय विषष्ये
नमो वै वधानिं वासिष्याय नमो नमः

( महामारो, ऋ.ई. भीमपर्वी, पृ.३, डिच. )

वशामुत्रहते तस्मे वेदवाचाय वेध्यते
जानशक्तिवतताय नमो भगवतो हरे:

( शारीरक भाव, भामती, मंगलाकरणोक )

वन्याससूचवयथितायसोधीसारभयमथितयपावसालग।
प्रसादवटम्यावमातवं ते व्यासानं गुहमान्तोधिम।

( वेदान्तकप्तते, मंगलाकरणोक )
क्यास-वर्णनम्

तत्त्व कृपास्य कपिलः जटां दीप्ते च छोचने ।
कम्भूणि चैव इष्टार्णि छल्ल देवीं न्यमीहः ॥

( महाभारत, ११०६१५ )

वासे कमण्डलुः विष्णुः दक्षिणेऽन्न्दस्यतन्म् ।
विष्णुपर्यंताभिषवं राजितो महसां चरः ॥

( शिवपुरी, उपासना, ४४२६ )

पतासिमास समये क्यासो महस्मुपदतिमस्तकः ।
हन्दासमरणेऽचायात् जटाजुटिरुंगितः ॥
वश्चाकरं जणुः सत्रेऽ शिवभेममसाकृतः ॥

( शिवपुरी, श्रवणदत्त, ४७२२, २३ )

( रामराङ्कर भट्टाचार्य )
अगस्त्यप्रकां पापशामन्न नाम हरिश्चन्द्रस्तोत्रम्

( बामनु ०, कंठेश्वरस्तोत्रम्, च ० तन, श्लोक २-१६ )

मस्त्यं नास्यं देवस्या कुमारं देवतानामं १।
हरिश्चन्द्र नामस्यें भवं विनु जयिंकमाम्म ॥ २ ॥
नमस्ये मात्रेशातीता हरिश्चन्द्रापारमितां ॥ ३ ॥
नारायणं नस्येः नस्यं ुरडवास्यं ॥ ४ ॥
स्वयं नस्यं च रूपारं ुकोलायम् ।
कामशालकण्ड त्र नमस्ये ब्रह्मण्यायम् ॥ ५ ॥
अन्निर्विनस्या गुणदर्किं चिवायम् ।
हरिः सत्तुं नमस्ये च ब्रह्मण सत्तायांधिम् ॥ ६ ॥
नमस्ये दुर्बलवातुं च देवं चक्रपरं तथा ।
श्रवणं विनु त्रुणांकोऽगोऽपि पीतवाससः ॥ ७ ॥
नमस्ये च गंगायांनं नमस्ये च कुशोहयुः ।
अश्वारिः च देवं नमस्ये पापशामन्न ॥ ८ ॥
गोपा च सातकोकुण्ड नमस्ये चायारिः ।
नमस्ये विषुपथं च चर्वेश्वरं पापमं तथा ॥ १० ॥
उवादायं नमस्येः साकार्यारं साकार्यारं।
नमस्ये पदाकिरणां नमस्ये वदवासुः ॥ ११ ॥
कारिकर्वं नमस्येः वांडः ॥ १२ ॥
नमस्ये पदाकिरणां नमस्ये च कुशोहयुः ॥ १३ ॥

अतः कायोराज्यायं पुरूषोमिभो संवदितमें (Collated) बामगुणरा-कोषम्: केवलो उपयोगी: पाठम् निविषयते । पाठप्रवृत्तां वेदाणीस्विनिकनोलाप्ता संत्वासहस्त्र कोलेप्रे महर्षये, शर्यालिंकोलार्यसां शास्त्रं हेतं युक्तेन निविषयार्यसां निम्नः । वामगुणरा वेदस्तिकोलार्यसां विवरणं पुरूषोमिभो पतिकर्यार्य: भाग ३, चतु १, श्लोक १३५-१३६ श्लोके प्रदत्तम् ।

१. गोपिनवेश ( ५, श्लोक १० )। २. कुमारिणी ( ५, श्लोक १० )।
३. नामस्ये ( २, श्लोक १० ) । ४. ज्ञेयेर्वे नृसिम्हं ( ४, श्लोक १० )।
५. रूपाचार्यकुंठो ( ५, श्लोक १० )। ६. हस्ते ( ५, श्लोक १० ) ।
७. सुपार्शिकर्ष ( ५, श्लोक १० )। ८. बैर वैद्यकुण्ड ( ५, श्लोक १० )।
९. थापराविषय ( ५, श्लोक १० )। १०. ध्वस्तिन्तं विवेचनं ( ५, श्लोक १० )।
११. वास्तिन्तं पाथमं विवेचनं ( ५, श्लोक १० )।
१२. भारात्रिवीर्येष्व प्राणं-स्वाघविक्षं संवदितमें: नमस्ये पुक्कोलारं च प्राप्ती ( प्राप्ती, श्लोक १० ) । योगिनिः म श्लोकम् । आशिर्वादं च लोकों च ज्ञेयेर्वें मयां मयां चतुरं ( ५, श्लोक १० )। १३. वा (भाग ३, श्लोक १० )। १४. वा (भाग ३, श्लोक १० )। १५. उत्तरायं नासिक ( ५, कोकोण)।
नमस्ये स्थागुणवन् नमस्ये बचनामविनम्।
नमस्ये लाहोराङ्ग च नमस्यवह धिम्स र्रितम् ॥ १७॥
नमस्ये च त्रिनरवति नमस्ये हंडवाहनम्।
नमस्ये च तोरोवक्ति ॥ १८॥
नमस्ये शाक्तमयुक्तम्।
कयदिन् नमस्ये च सर्वाधिवसथायम् ॥ १९॥
"नमस्ये शिवाय सूर्यः पुराव जैसः महाजसम्।
परानाम दीर्घपात्रे नमस्ये स्तून्द्रमिनयम् ॥ २०॥
नमस्यथ ॥ २१॥
सदावति ॥ २२॥
नमस्ये च नमस्ये आणावचणम् ॥ २३॥
नमस्ये सर्वाधिवसथायम्।
नमस्ये श्रीविवाम् च नमस्ये रुष्योमनम् ॥ २४॥
नमस्ये च चरतातुः नमस्ये च सुआधिम् ॥ २५॥
वस्तावति ॥ २६॥
नमस्ये सनुमवयम् ॥ २७॥
श्रीकौट्ट वाकुते ॥ २८॥
नमस्ये शर्मानवः ॥ २९॥
गारो स्मर्येतरूः ॥ ३०॥
नमस्ये च नमस्ये च चक्षुधिनम्।
बद्रीचे ॥ ३१॥
मनीहरे च छ्रुङ्गोऽत्र नमस्ये च चक्षुधिनम्।
होकोल्यम् ॥ ३२॥
महावाहु नमस्ये च कुश्यं भूषम् ॥ ३३॥
भूषर हृदिताद् ॥ ३४॥
बद्राक्ष बीरमहरे च नमस्ये च शंकुणिनम् ॥ ३५॥
दुर्मत्वम् च विधास्थित्वे शादिस्माद्।
उपेन्द्रे च समगुने नमस्ये पञ्चविवषम् ॥ २६॥

२६. विनोगर (२, शाखा)। २७. वाहोरा (७, शाखा)। २८. शाणानुमान (२, शाखा)।
२९. वर्तविवाम दूर्वसः (१)। ३०. रावत (८, शाखा)। ३१. महाकृष्ण (२)। ३२. वैश्वतिक (३, शाखा)। ३३. नमस्यथ (४, शाखा)। ३४. नमस्यथ (५, शाखा)।
३५. महावाहु (४, शाखा)। ३६. सदीर्घनम् (६)। ३७. शाक्ति (४, शाखा)।
३८. ल (२, २, १)। ३९. शाखा (१)। ४०. वैश्वतिक (४, शाखा)।
४१. विनोगर (३, शाखा)। ४२. नमस्यथ (२, शाखा)। बुधवार (२)।
४३-६४. छाँतातुः जिनेन्द्र शूलाखिनी (२, शाखा)। ६५. शूलाखिनी (२)। ६६. शालक्षिमम् (३, शाखा)। ६७. शूलाखिनी (२)। ६८. शालक्षिमम् (३, शाखा)। ६९. शूलाखिनी (२)।
26. कालाधिकोष्ठ देवेशु (४, शा०)। २७. निर्माण (२, शा०); निर्माण (१);
28 स्मरणादृ संवलावाच (१); संसरणादृ शुभाच (१); स्मरणादृ संवलावाच (१, शा०); अवरणादृ स्मरणादृ (१)। २९. अयोक्त्रों न विच्छिन्ते (१ कोलेक्ट)।

(विकुप, फुलु संताप ग्राहित --
नरो नारायणश्री संरक्ष: संवलावाच।
देवा विकुप इवाव, वेदा विंजुपारिति अरुद्ध।
(सहा०, च. ए., भीष्मपर्व, ६. २१)

'विकुप (म. VI. ९. २१c; ६. २१-१५b) is a personal name and not a place name, as it became in later literature.'
(Mbh., C. E., Bhishma Parvan, Appendix)

(आनन्दोक्त्र गुप्त)
[It has been generally held by Indologists that the five characteristics of the Purāṇas (sarg, pratisarg, etc.), which have been mentioned in the Amarakośa (c. 5th century A.C.), as well as in some of the Purāṇas, had originally formed the main subject-matter of the Purāṇas, and that the religious topics were added to them afterwards. But in this article the author brings to light an altogether different pāṇḍalakṣayu-definition of the Purāṇas, quoted in the Jayamaṅgalā commentary of Kautilya's Arthaśāstra. This definition mentions dharma as one of the five characteristics of the Purāṇas, and so it differs from the well-known classical pāṇḍalakṣayu-definition. It has not yet been traced in any of the Purāṇas, and so it may be said to represent a different tradition of the Purāṇa-pāṇḍalakṣayu, which might have been contained in some old works of the Paurāṇika-school. The quotation of this pāṇḍalakṣayu-definition, which had probably sunk into oblivion, may be said to be a valuable contribution of the Jayamaṅgalā, the famous work on ancient Indian politics, to the Purāṇic thoughts.

On the strength of this definition of the Purāṇa, the learned writer has shown here that the dharma-śāstra-material, though forming a secondary topic in the Purāṇas was, nevertheless, originally included in them, and not interpolated later on.

The writer has also examined the views of some of the modern Indologists on the pāṇḍalakṣayu-defini-
tion of the Purāṇas. In his opinion the sense of the Amarakaśa-definition must conform to the sense of the Jayamangala-definition, and so the word 'Manvantara' in the Amarakaśa-definition should be explained as to include in it the topic of dharma also, as the Bhāgavata Purāṇa has already explained it by the words 'सच्चास्त्राडाकः' सदम्: (2.1.3)

In the end the author has stressed the need of studying the works on the Rājaśāti for properly editing and interpreting the Purāṇas.

“पुराणस्याल्पमंसा धर्मशास्त्राङ्कितिः। वेदः स्वातन्त्र विद्वानं परमाश्च च चतुर्दशम्॥” (वा. सू. भा. १)

इति याज्ञवल्क्यस्यपुराणसः पुराणानि धर्मसाधारणां प्रस्तुतः। न केवलम् याज्ञवल्क्यसम्प्रदायाः प्रस्तुतात्पुराणं यथा वैद्यपञ्चाभिनवदेव अपने। भास्त्रितो भवति। तथापि तत्कथा अन्यः—

“कः पुनर्विद्वांस इत्याह पुराणात्मि। सृष्टविद्वांस नात्मि। तथा चोक्कम्—

“सृष्टिपूर्वाहास्यम्योजनाम्। ख्रिस्माचिनित्वम्। भास्त्राचिनित्वम्। पौराणः पवित्रकृतम्।” इति।

(तौ. व. १-५ व्यास्यम् कणमाणस्क)
इति श्रीभागवतेश्वरी पुराणस्य पश्चिमकृष्णान्तर्गती सन्तवतर्भागः सद्वर्म इत्युतः पुराणान्ति भर्मज्ञतपादाद्वयं ब्रह्मस्यायते। अतोदस्येव पुराणपथपि भर्मश्रीकृष्णान्तर्मौन इति सिद्धां च।

वचनं भवति वायुवस्ववने भर्मश्रीकृष्णान्ति पुराणम्। प्रामाण्यमानिति प्रश्नवचनाविचित्रधितिः। प्रथमान्तर्गतां पुराणां विषयवाचार्यामय प्राधान्यानि भर्मश्रीकृष्णान्ति। "तत्रत्वस्ती" तत्र वायुवस्ववने प्रश्नवचनानि ब्रह्मश्रीकृष्णान्ति, तत्रश्रीकृष्णान्ति प्रश्नवचनानि भर्मश्रीकृष्णान्ति। प्रामाण्यमानिति प्रश्ननिषिद्धवचनानि वायुवस्ववने प्रामाण्यमानिति वायुवस्ववने भर्मश्रीकृष्णान्ति।

"भवति वायुवस्ववने वायुवस्ववने प्रामाण्यमानिति वायुवस्ववने प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति वायुवस्ववने प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति। अन्तर्गतां प्रामाण्यमानिति।

इति श्रीभागवतेश्वरी पुराणस्य पश्चिमकृष्णान्तर्गती सन्तवतर्भागः सद्वर्म इत्युतः पुराणानि विषयायां भर्मज्ञतपादाद्वयं ब्रह्मस्यायते। अतोदस्येव पुराणपथपि भर्मश्रीकृष्णान्तर्मौन इति सिद्धां च।
पुराणोप सर्वं, प्रति सर्वं, वंशं, मन्त्रतर्कः। वंशानुचरितं केति श्रविषया आवश्यकः। एतेऽपः पश्चातारमपि रूढः रामायणं मूलम् आश्वानम्, उपास्यानम्, गाथा, सत्योपन्नवतं चतुर्यमेव। ब्राह्मणं। २-३४-२१, वाचं। ६०-२१, विष्णुं। ३-६-१६, एतेऽपं चतुर्यानां मुख्यस्तेर्यां च श्रविषयावेष्ट च रूढायमेवति सिद्धविषयति। अतः पुराणं स्वार्थानवस्थापि सर्वाधिस्वविषयानेव मायामेव वर्णं कियो भवेत् सत्यम् नाति सन्देहः। परस्तु वर्तमानेऽपि पुराणायापेक्षा एतेऽपं विषयानां कालवर्षाबद्धया कालवर्षाबद्धयोक्तमा कर्ता वत्ते। धार्मिकं प्रस्तुतं नातिविवेचनेठावाय, सत्यम् तद्दहं दुःस्वयं विष्णुमयं। येः पुराणोपकृतवक्षणान्म पूर्वतं पाख्यसतं व वर्णं हृदयात्, तत्रथर्यां धार्मिकां स्मराति न च विषयानां वर्णसममिति।

(हाजरा, शुचिपिन्दि रिकार्यत ५० ४-५)

“इति धार्मिकेन स्मराति च विषयेऽपि पुराणानां प्राचार्योपकृतयुक्तम् तदा पुराणानां सृंख्यविषयेऽपि पद्धसरकः प्रक्ष्णो भौत्तिकां धारणा एवाष्टो सत्यम्, यत्-परलं पद्ध रूढः रामायणि केवलस्य पुराणानेव प्राचार्योपकृतयुक्तम्, महापुराणानां वह दश्राध्वस्तिकस्व धार्मिकां स्मराति च विषयानां प्राचार्यों स्थाविति। अतो राजां न धार्मिकां च वंशं वंशानुचरितं च प्रति विशेषेऽवस्त्रादानं न करतः। एवं, वंशं वंशानुचरितं च युद्धया ऐतिहासिकवक्षणं न विस्तात् प्रायः कथावाचितिति।

(हाजरा, ५० रिथ, ५. ७)

“अस्मलकोशोपकृतेऽपि पुराणानां चानुसारेऽण स्मरायतं पृष्ठैव पुराणानां विषयं।। “वंशानुचरितं” …दितम् “भूमिः संस्थानं” मन्त्रं धारार्थ, सत्यार्थं। “वीराष्ट्रको सुन्दरकोश” हि। परस्तु वर्तमानेऽपि पुराणेऽपि वश्विष्णु, पुराणमेवस्य: पद्धर्षक्षणयुक्तम्: परिश्रमाय: अनुसरण पूर्णतं न करतिः। केवलचूर्णानूणसरक्षणप्रकृतिकाः एव विषयं: उपक्रमेत्वं। केवलचूर्णानूणसरक्षणप्रकृतिकाः एव विषयं: उपक्रमेत्वं। परस्तु एवतं प्रकृतिः नयेनायापेक्षाः विषयानां विस्तारे हृदयात्। किं च, वर्तमानार्थं उपरुप्वेषे पुराणेऽपि चतुर्वार्तववाचितयाः ।१४० परवर्षक्षणप्रतिपादकः। एतेऽपं स्वरूपस्य, वर्णं—प्राचीनपुराणानां सृंख्यं प्रतिष्ठाना विषयो भर्मोक्षेत्रो
नायिनः तानि च मुद्देश्वरूपे साम्यशास्त्रिकभावनाय न चित्रतायासारिति।
बंद्वानपुराणेण हि दुनि-ब्रह्म-ब्राह्मणग्रहितायाः पृथ्वीपुराणेण च वर्तते, ये तत्त्वातिकभावनान्नति न भवति, पुराणानां वाक्यसंग्रहपरिभाषां
चावाः संस्कृतान्तः केवलः सैद्धांतिकः कुलितः। अतः इति पुराणस्मथानोऽपि
पुराणेवेव अति-पञ्चवाक्यानि केवलः पुराणानां, पञ्चपुराणपरिभाषां तु दशशब्दसाराणि, यथा-पञ्चशब्दसाराणि, तथा-पञ्चशब्दसाराणि अल्पवाक्यसंग्रहानि
चावाः संस्कृतान्तः केवलः सैद्धांतिकः कुलितः। अतः इति पुराणस्मथानोऽपि
पुराणेवेव अति-पञ्चशब्दसाराणि नात्त्वाण्वतिति। मत्त्वपुराणायां इति
ब्रह्म-विष्णु-गृह-सुब्रह्मण्यानां माहात्म्याणि, धार्मिकामोक्षप्रतिभावसिद्धः चावाः
संस्कृतान्तः केवलः सैद्धांतिकः पुराणानां इति

( पुराणानां इति वि-पवित्र एक श्री पुराण, भूमिका, पृ० ४५-४६ )

"प्रविष्टदस्माश्चत्तकाशायास्तः अमरकोशः, अनेकमुख पुराणोऽपि पुराणानां
पञ्चशब्दसाराणि। परसुः "किरिज़हः" स्रीहरणेनमहाविजय च, यथा-पञ्चशब्दसाराणि
तु पुराणानां चावाः संस्कृता अन्यस्वतित्रूपाणियां भवति। अलद-विद्याधिनोऽपि च चावाः
संस्कृता अन्यस्वतित्रूपाणियां भवति। मत्त्वपुराणायां इति पुराणानां चावाः
संस्कृतान्तः केवलः सैद्धांतिकः पुराणानां इति

( पुराणायां इति वि-पवित्र एक श्री पुराण, भूमिका, पृ० ४५-४६ )

श्रीमद्भागवते पुराणानां दश व्याख्यान्युक्तः। किल्लुपान्निपुराणस्माचर्यायां पुराणानां सम्पूर्णतः व्याख्यानि न भवति। मत्त्व-
पुराणस्माचर्यायां पुराणपरिभाषां तु वृद्धिसब्दाः व्याख्यानि न भवति। तदनुसारे इति इति
पुराणोऽपि सम्पूर्णविद्याशास्त्रितानि, व्याख्यान्युक्तानि माहात्म्याणि, चावाः संस्कृतान्तः केवलः सैद्धांतिकः पुराणानां
चावाः संस्कृतान्तः केवलः सैद्धांतिकः पुराणानां

( हर्माक्षरात्म्यानि, एशियाटिक सोसाइटी संस्कृत केल्ट्लै, भाग ५, भूमिका )
“बर्तमानपुराणानि पुराणानामृयोणानि प्राचीनपुराणानि न सम्मतीतों तथव
बर्तमानपुराणेपुराणं पुराणोत्तरत्वं पश्चालक्षणपरिभाषाया
अनुसरणं न करोति। प्राचीनपरिभाषामुक्तय
प्रत्येकर्षिनं पुराणं सङ्गं, प्रति:सं: वंशं: समर्थतान्त्रि, वंशावलीचरितं,
अथवा—पर्यवेक्षणां वा राज्यों चरितं चेति पश्चालक्षणायावलयकालि।
बर्तमानकाले शासन प्रुरणानुपववधानि, तर्कपश्चालक्षणात्मकस्तवांशिक पर
विषयं वर्ते। केपुरुसतुस्वरूपेश्वरासिद्धि एव विषयं: स्वर्णि।
कालिन्च पुराणान्तोऽयो सत्यविषयं न करवततति। संवेद्यां शिष्या एव विषयाः
निरूपततया। शाय: संवेद्यां बर्तमानपुराणां विषये विशेषस्वत्वो"णोलेकर्षोदयः
विषयों वृद्धेत्यां सामांताविश्वस्वाध्यायः, अथवा—विभिन्नविवादभेदेषु केन-
चित्रम्भवेत, यस्य: प्राचीनपश्चालक्षणपरिभाषाया पूण्यतोपोऽहा कृता वर्तते।

चेहु पुराणेव प्राचीनस्वभवं केनिन्द्रयेत दर्शितस्मि, तेहु
सुधिपरचचायाः, आकाशरीनितिहास्य च प्रकरणायम्बलयतः। एवं
पश्चालक्षणपरिभाषासूत्रम् सूक्खमुखः: नुर्चन्तिवृद्धोबीशीमानं महाभारताकालीन-
वीरसर्वे नातां प्राचीनानि राज्यं वंशावल्लिप्तं तत्वयुतम्।
(बिक्रियतन्त्र, हिदृशी राय इंद्रवन लिटरेटर, द० ५२२-२३)

अनेकरेषु पुराणेषु प्रसिद्धेषु क्रोरेषु चोपश्वायाः: परिभाषाया अनुसारेण
पुराणानां पश्चालक्षणानि भवति, सङ्गः प्रति:सं:समर्थतान्त्रि प्राचीनराजवृद्धावली
तथा वंशावलीस्वरूपो जनिन्त चेति। यवपि—बर्तमानकाले उपलब्धेषु
पुराणेषु विनिमयों पुराणोत्तरत्वं परिभाषाया अक्षरोंङ्गूसूरणं न करेति,
तथापि अनेकरेषु पुराणेषु सत्यविषयं सत्यतानि सत्यीति—
(चोराल, स्टोरिज इत्य लिपिवर्ण हिदृशी परंद कल्प, द० ५९)

अनु ब्रूमः

“सुधिपरचचिंहर्मौक्ष्योपकालयाः।
श्रव्यविविचित्रः मोक्षु पुराणं पश्चालक्षणम् ।।” (कौटिको १-४, व्याकरण)
पुराणम्—PURĀNA

इत्यादिवाचयमयस्यकुटुम्बप्य पूर्वाँचतवचनस्यामर्कस्यकविकस्यकृतिः समकालिककौशिकीति—
व्यक्तंतार्थशब्दोऽस्मापनपदर्श्यां विवाक्षारुपमहाराजस्वतिष्ठचक्रस्य—
मानवनेतार्थस्यौत्पत्तिकार्यस्यप्रकाश्यत सार्वभूतानि तारधार्मिकवर्त्ते नास्ये व श्रद्धावकाशः ।

"सर्वथा प्रतिसमेः व ज्ञान मन्त्रतर्कणं च ।"

इति वाचस्यापि "मन्त्रतर्कणं सद्यम्" इति वचनस्यापेन तारधार्मिकः प्रतिवादविस्मिति स्फुटे प्रतिपक्षः । स्फ्रोक्तीवर्षयमयेः उपकरे पुष्पामाभि: ।

एवं सति भावृक्षरूपाणितमात्रोऽधिकौः राजनीतिशास्त्रार्थमनोचनेनास्यवेव
क्ररा पते सच्चीवात्रेपम् अधद्भेद्या पचः ।

तथाहि:—वदुवचयं—वायव्यतः प्रपाध्यानम्, उपाध्यानम्, गाथा, कर्त्तोत्पलितेऽति
हतुधर्मार्थस्य विकारः सुमूच्छिति, तव पुराणस्याधारामाद्यानादीनां सुखवम-पेक्षितम् वा चेतार्थिद्यार्थामाद्यावानादीनां मध्यमः
परम्परां आदपि आद्यक्षरस्य आद्यक्षरस्य । अधपने
स्फुटे पराधाव्यतश्रीवः । द्वितीयविश्लेषस्य इच्छयं पचः ।

"वहरावणानीतिभासानु पुराणानि कथा गाथानारासांसी"विषि

(वैभव दूर्दम २६ ३०)

केदाराक्षर भाष्यकला परं व्याख्यातः।

"इतिहासं सहास्माजात्यः पुराणानि अभाज्यार्धीनि, यद्य "इवालुराव, संयोजच असो"जिखयादित्तिहासं, "आलाम वा इदमैक प्राचार्य आदश्चाल्यशिवायन
मिश"विशति सहद्वाराधिपतिप्रभावेण पुराणानि। कथा, कित्युराणी प्रयोग-
प्रतिवादकाली, गाथा:—गायतिशिवेशिविभिन्निविभिन्नि मन्त्रनिवेशः: "योद्धकोविषे"त्यादयः,
यमगाथाभि: परिरामावर्तिविचारात्। नारायणयाद्यानेति नारायणेः: "हीताव- 
यकुञ्जरासांस"मिलात्या: मन्त्रभागानातःमिलनामथि पुनःकि: पराधाव्यत-
चौतनाथंतिनीति।

अन्त हि पुराणानित्यमान्यानां सच्चिदिवशतिपादकान्तनीतिः वद्या 
भाष्यकला "यविश्वसनायं"तिं पूर्वेकृतिवयमस्योकतवचनमेव समर्थः राजनीतित्य-
लवण। "सर्वशेष" त्यादिव्यचनस्त्र स्थऽण शानि स्वद्यादिव्यतियार्ज्जुनान्येव चैति विशेष: स्वः।

कौटिल्यार्थशास्त्रांद्वितीयं—"परंतपममितिरागसक्रमणाः पुरागमितिः ज्ञानव्यान-निःसूतां विकोन्दार्णां सर्वश्चार्ज्जुभेचितहिसाः" इति।

अः भारतीयसमवाचलितेः वेदीयां कौटिल्यीये आयुर्विकोन्दार्णम्—

"असतुतातरावस्त्रलक्ष्मयुज्यतान्तिमुः
निःसार्वार्ज्जुभेचितहिसाः इति।"

यथा तत्त्वज्ञानार्थ । इति वाचीनाविन्दितामुरुः दृढः।

नवमहाकुलवीच आयुर्विकोन्दार्ण "वर्जनसेवनकृतं तत्त्वाविकोन्दार्थ।" ।

इत्यादि बद्रता उक्तिप्रणमेवैतृं सन्तुमिताः।

एवे विश्लेषामानायुक्तैना पुरागमुखविकोन्दितामुखर्यसूतिः चौद्धार्णपथवेनेव भवतीति स्पष्टकृः। पुरोपकारणालक्ष्ममितिपात्रे "सुहितमुखरी" त्यादिवचने स्थितिपर्यायायः। विद्वेषविधि स्तुतिपात्राय: विद्वेषविधि स्तुतिपात्राय: विद्वेषविधि स्तुतिपात्राय: विद्वेषविधि स्तुतिपात्राय: विद्वेषविधि स्तुतिपात्राय: विद्वेषविधि स्तुतिपात्राय: विद्वेषविधि स्तुतिपात्राय: ।

पतेन "वंचातुचिति" विषय "स्मृताः संख्याः"मिति पादांतरं वर्णमित्वम् वात्स्योद्वादिनमयमुक्तमेव । लोकोपकारणस्त्र स्वद्यादिव्यस्त्र पूर्वकरे व्याजन बुधुगणेश्वरे सिद्धे ज्ञानकोशाद्वेय पुराणां सास्त्रेऽवाचस्यालक्ष्मका सत्यां भोगेऽपि पाठौः: शास्त्रां साहित्यां पाठौः। भावतोत्तराद्विकोन्दार्णमानि पूर्वकोन्दार्णकृतार्ज्जुभेचितार्ज्जुभेचित: ||

न बालकिनिन्द्र वधाने स्ंचितेऽन्नाति वधानानि न सम्भवतीति क्षणम् नियमः। न्यायशास्त्रे—

"वर्णः शुक्रोऽसर्वस्याशः च सङ्कुचिताः।" (भाषा २९६)

इत्यादिना बहुनां गहनानां वर्णमालाक्ष्यः दृष्टान्त।
प्रयोजन यह चूहान दक्ष्णानां, सर्वव्रत सर्ववर्णं दक्ष्णानामप्राप्तावं जेन्ध्र- ब्रजेन्द्र्यापि दक्ष्णिनिर्मयः। तथा पशुलक्षमणिर्देशलक्षणारुः का नामानुपालितः निम्प्योजनता वेति नेव वर्षु शक्तमम्। दक्ष्णालक्षणार्जुञ्जनामणि पुराणालक्ष्यायाप्य पशुलक्षणस्वादिक्षत्वान्।

अन्तर्द्वचनयेवः—राजनिष्ठार्कं प्रत्यक्षान्तिरामाण्यान्तिरांतिरांप्रतिपाद- कामिति पृवमेव (‘पुराणम्’ पत्रिका, भाग 9, अंक १, पृष्ठ ७२-७३ स्थः) प्रतिपादितम्। राजप्रतिरूपमेवं कार्यकलाप्रमेयां अनुप्रेषणमेव तद्विद्यं दक्षिणिणयेन तस्मा शक्तेत। एवं सति न्यायाधिनिर्ज्ञेतर्नलोकेयेर्थमेव राजनिष्ठार्कमेव सत्तवे निष्ठितोर्भतेषु परिगुहितेषु सत्तु तत्तः इतिहाससंयोजनं विद्येत: प्राचीनवाचेर्व पुराणाविद्या शक्तिनिर्मकरं बेताथायेव सहदशानां भवति इति।
THE GEOGRAPHICAL TEXT OF THE PURÁNAS. 
A FURTHER CRITICAL STUDY.

BY 

C. A. LEWIS.

(Continued from Vol. II., No. 1)

[ अर्थ लेख: ‘पुराण’ पत्रिकावां: पूर्वसिंहास्त्री (भाग ४, अंक १) प्रकाशित थी तैयिस सहायकों सिलितस्य पुराणाभ्यान- 
कौशलान्तिकिमणो लेखस्यावश्यामानिः । पुराणां मुख्यकोणयुक्तेऽथो 
मय्यदेश-उत्तराध्य-भाग्य-विनिमय-प्रारम्भ-विन्य-मिलालय-विन्यान 
सहान्य जनपदान वर्णनमुहस्वतेः । तनौ पूर्वसिंहास्त्री प्रकाशितेऽष्ठे लेखाधे 
आदानां चरणान यम्यदेश-उत्तराध्य-भाग्य-विन्यान - जनपदान मुराण- 
कुर्त्वा वर्णान समालोचितमुः । पुर्ववंशदृढ्युनेन्द्रियानं च वेषाण अद्यान 
दिष्टवापथ-अपराध-विन्य-मिलालय-विन्यान - जनपदान वर्णान समी- 
लितमुः । पुर्ववंशदेव भागानि किर्यिन्यस्मादेवनन्त विन्यासस्य परिश्रम 
लिन्यालीक्षराक्षसमहृदये च स्त्रीकृतस्य परिश्रम समालोचना नियम 
षां जनपदान रिष्कालानिष्क्रिये सम्भविलुभ्यन परिश्रम च विविधे युक्तपर- 
सरं स्वस्माचर्य अद्वैतमुः ]

DAKŚINĀFATHA

Kirfel's text.

athaśpare janapadā Dakśiṇāpathavāsīnāḥ
Pāṇḍyaś ca Keralāś caiva Colāḥ Kulyās tathaiva ca
Setukā Muśikāś caiva Kumānā Vanavāsīkāḥ
Mahāśūṭā Mahiśikāś Kaliṅgāś caiva sarvaśāḥ
Abhīrāś ca Sahāśīkā Āṭavyāḥ Śabarāś tatha
Pulindā Vindhyamauliya Vaidarbhā Daṇḍakāliḥ saha
Pauriṅga Muliṅgaś caiva Aśmakā Bhogavardhanāḥ
Nairṅkāḥ Kuntalāś Andhā Udbhīdā Nalakālikāḥ
dakśiṇātyāś ca vai deśāḥ.............

Sircar's text.

athaśpare janapadā dakśiṇāpathavāsīnāḥ
Pāṇḍyaś ca Keralāś caiva Colāḥ Kulyās tathaiva ca
Setukā Mūṣikaś caiva Kumārā Vanavāsakāh
Mahārastra Māahiṣakāḥ Kaliṅgāś caiva sarvasāh
Kāverāḥ saha Caiṣikā Āṇiṇyāḥ Śabarāś ca ye
Pulindā Vindhyamūlikā (ya) Vidarbha Daṇḍakāḥ saha
Paurīka Maulikā (Maulakāḥ)-ś caiva Aśmakā Bhogavardhānāḥ
Nai (ṛ-) śikāḥ Kuntalā Andhra Udbhida Navalakālikāḥ
(-lūpāḥ)
dākṣiṇātyāś ca vai deśā...............

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations.

(1) K. Kumana S. Kumāra; (2) K. Vanavāsika. S. Vanavāsaka; (3) K. Ābhīra S. Kāvera; (4) K. Sahaiṣika S. Caiṣīka; (5) K. Vindhyamanliya S. Vindhyamūlikā (ya); (6) K. Maulika S. ? Maulaka; (7) K. Nairṇika S. Naiṣika (?) Rṣika; (8) K. Navalakālikā S. ? Navalakālūpa. Of these nos. 2, and 5, are obviously variants of the same name and accordingly do not require further discussion. Kirfel’s forms seem preferable in both cases.

(1) Kumana / Kumāra. Sircar’s text is almost certainly correct, for the Kumāras may be easily identified with the inhabitants of Cape Comorin at the extreme southernmost tip of India. Such an identification would exactly suit the area required by the two preceding names, Setuka (Adam’s Bridge) and Mūṣika (the southern part of the Malabar coast). Kirfel in his Bhāratavarṣa originally also adopted the form, Kumāra.

(3) Ābhīra / Kāvera. The problem here in determining the original name is rather an unusual one; in this instance both names are well established by numerous other texts, so that the usual bogey of textual corruption does not arise. Moreover as both the Abhīras and the Kāveras are definitely to be included in the Southern Region, a choice between the two is extremely difficult to make. The former were originally a N-W tribe between the Indus and the Sarasvatī, and were closely associated with the Śudras. By the first century A. D. however,
they had migrated further south to the area of Gujarat around the mouth of the Narmadā. Ptolemy and the Periplus refer to this region by the name of Abertia. The Brhat Śāṁhitā clearly indicates that the Ābhīras had two branches, one in the S-W and one in the South, which is associated with the Konkaṇas. The Kāsyapa Śāṁhitā also confirms their location in the South. The Kāveras must of course be identified with the inhabitants of the banks of the Kāverī River, whose location in the South is obvious. There is accordingly abundant evidence for the location of both in Daksīnāpatha. The only way therefore of determining the question is to consider the position of the other tribes mentioned in the same line. These are the Māhārāṣṭras (mod. Māṇḍhata country between the upper Godāvari and Kṛṣṇā rivers), the Māhiṣikas, the inhabitants of the area around Māhiṣmati (mod. Māṇḍhāta on the Narmadā), Kaliṅgas (mod. Puri and Ganjam Dists. of Orissa), Āṭavyas and Śabarases (mod. Saurs of Ganjam Dist.). Among these tribes it is far easier to place the Ābhīras of Southern Gujarat than the Kāveras of the extreme south. It is evident that the extreme south has already been described in the opening slokas from Pāṇḍya to Vanavāsa; now it is the northern areas of Daksīnāpatha which are being described. Accordingly, Ābhīra seems the preferable reading.

(4) Sahaisīka/Caśiśika. Both Kirfel’s and Sircars’s readings, though different in form, refer to a tribe called the Eśika, the former compounding it with saha and the latter with ca. The most valuable evidence in helping one to determine the original text at this point is supplied by the Vaijayanāti, which mentions the Iṣikas as a tribe of Daksīnāpatha along with the Śabarāraṭṭas. That this section is a direct quotation from a Purānic source may be proved from its striking similarity with the actual texts now under discussion. Compare:

Vaij. 37·34. Iṣikāḥ Śabarāraṭṭāḥ
Vāyu. 45·126. Caśiśiṅa Āṭavyāḥ Śabara
Mats. 114·48. Sahaisīka Āṭavyāḥ Śabara
Mārk. 57·17. Vaiśikya Āṭhakyaḥ Śabara
The question now arises as to the identity of these Ṛṣikas. This has been explained by Moti Chandra (J.U.P.H.S. Dec. 1943 p. 24) as a Prakrit form of Sanskrit Ṛṣīka. According to the same authority, both these forms are given as alternatives at MB. 2-24-23-4, where the northern digvijaya of Arjuna is being described. If this association is accepted, the next question that arises is whether the Ṛṣikas are ever to be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. Independent evidence of such a location can be derived from the Kūrma-vibhāga\(^{30}\) sections of the Bṛhat-saṁhitā and the Mārkandēya-purāṇa and also from the Kīśkin-dhā-kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa. There is thus decisive evidence for two separate branches of Ṛṣikas, one in the North as indicated by the Mahā-bhārata and Rāmāyaṇa, and the other in the South, as proved by the Purānic texts, the Kūrma-vibhāga list and the Rāmāyaṇa. Accordingly the form Ṛṣīka (i.e. the Prakrit form of Ṛṣīka) is the reading to be adopted here.

(6) Maulika / ? Maulaka. Sircar’s emendation to Maulaka is almost certainly correct. The mūlakas are well known for their close association with the Aśmakas who later absorbed them. In the Nasik record of queen Gautami Balaśri (EI. VIII. 61), mention is made of Asaka (i.e. Aśmaka) immediately before Mālaka, while Purānic traditions attribute the foundation of these two kingdoms to Ikṣvāku chiefs.

(7) Nairṇika / Naśīka ? Ṛṣīka. The original reading here is very uncertain. The corresponding texts of the geographical section of the Mahā-bhārata includes the variants Jhillika, Nillika, Kuḍaya and Karṇika, while the Brahmiṇḍa and\(^{31}\) Brahma-purāṇas read Nestika and Kaulika respectively. None of these forms provides any immediate solution to the difficulty however. At first sight the most plausible reading is Naśīka, which one is at once tempted to identify with modern Nasik. As long as we limit our investigation to the peoples of Dakṣiṇāpatha, this appears to be a probable solution, for Nasik is located in the south by both Rājaśekhara and the

\(^{30}\) BS. XIV. 15, Märk, 53.27; R. Kīś (B). 41.10. (N.W.) 33.12.

\(^{31}\) Bh. 1. 16. 59, Br. 27. 57.
Kūrma-vibhāga texts. There is one major obstacle to such an identification however. If we examine, as we shortly will, the Purānic lists of Aparānta peoples, we find among them the Nāsikyas, who are associated with the Antara-or Uttara-Navaras, the Bharukacchas (i.e. the inhabitants of mod. Barozh), and the Māheyas (the peoples along the banks of the Mahi). As all these places are not far from Nasik, it would seem preferable to include Nāsikya in Aparānta-Desa rather than in Dakṣiṇapatha, though in actual fact the position of Nasik is so ambiguous geographically that it may easily be incorporated into either region by a slight change of the boundary line separating them. This uncertainty is reflected in the Kūrma-vibhāga texts. While the Brāhatasmithā and the Māikaṇḍeya-purāṇa locate Nāsikya in the South, the Parisiṣṭa to the Atharva-veda (LVI. 6) places it in the South-west. The environment in which it is placed by the latter text is of considerable significance as it corresponds to a great degree with the position assigned to Nāsikya in Aparānta-Desa by the Purānic texts. Compare:

Purāṇa—
Nāsikya-ācāya ye cānye ye cāivottaranarmadāḥ
Bharukacchāḥ sa-Māheyaḥ...

Parīṣṭa—
Nāsikya-Karmanoyaṇi-Mahi-Narmadā...

Except for the interpolation of the unknown Karmanoyani in the Parisiṣṭa text, the environment in both cases is identical. Accordingly, the location of Nāsikya in the western division is much more probable. Furthermore its inclusion in Dakṣiṇapatha by Rājaśekhara29 and the Kūrma-vibhāga lists can be easily explained by an analysis of the structure of these texts. Rājaśekhara distinctly specifies that Māhiṃmati (mod. Māndhāta on an island in the Narmadā) is to be regarded as the southern boundary of Madhya-Desa. As Nasik is south of the Narmadā, it must automatically be included in the southern region. Bharukaccha (mod. Barozh) is not, and accordingly has been assigned by Rājaśekhara to the western division. Similarly

32. KMB p. 98, BS. XIV. 13, Mark. 58. 14
the Dakṣiṇāpatha of the astronomical texts includes not only the entire area south of the Narmadā, but even some districts north of it like Bhārakačcha and Girinagara. Accordingly both Bhārakačcha and Nāsikya are by their classification to be included in the southern division. In view of all the preceding evidence therefore, it is not possible to identify the Naiguṇḍa of the Markaṇḍeya-purāṇa with Nāsik, for the latter will be correctly included later on in the list of western peoples. It accordingly remains to discover some other alternative. Sircar, who is also evidently not satisfied with Naiguṇḍa, suggests Išika as a possible reading, but if we accept the Vaijayantī’s text, Išika, as correct, this alternative is no longer possible. A very hypothetical solution of this problem may be found in regarding Ihillika and Kaulika as corruptions of Śūlika. A people of this name has already been mentioned among the tribes of Uttarāpatha by these puranic texts, and the Brahmanda-purāṇa has actually listed Ihillika as a variant. As the Kārma-vibhāga texts actually refer to a second branch of Śūlikas in the South-east, and several manuscripts of the geographical catalogue of the Mahā-bhārata cite a form Vindhyā-cūlika, evidence from independent sources does exist for assuming the existence of a second branch of Śūlikas in this division.

(8) Nalakālikā / Nalakālūpa. The reading once again is uncertain as none of the purānic variants contributes anything of value. The parallel passage of the Mahā-bhārata (6.10.58.) includes the variants, Nalakālaka, Nalakānana and Nabakaṇana, none of which occurs elsewhere. The Vaijayantī includes in its text of Southern peoples a tribe called the Kulakālakas. This name must be parallel to the Nalakālikas etc. of the purāṇas. Moreover in the Kārma-vibhāga section of the Markaṇḍeya-purāṇa we find a people called the Kakulakās who are associated with the Niśadas and the Pṛṇa-sābaras. Its form at once suggests that it is identical with the Kulakālakas of the Vaijayantī, which, as has already been indicated, corresponds to the Nalakālikā etc. of the Epic and Purānic texts.

Sircar's suggestion that the reading Nalahālūpa i.e. the Nalas and Alūpas, two dynasties of the Deccan should be adopted, though plausible, is not supported by any direct evidence.

Before we complete our analysis of the list of Daksīṇāpatha tribes, one further textual point remains to be discussed. Both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading Kūlya after Cola in the opening line of these texts. While the Colas are well known however, the Kūlyas are very obscure and perhaps only owe their place in the text to textual corruption. Law (A. B. O. R. I. 1936 pp. 217ff.) connects them with the Kolas of the Mahābhārata, who in turn may be connected with Kollagiri whose location in the south is established by the Mahābhārata34 and the Kūrma-vibhāga texts. Some support for preferring Kola to the unknown Kūlya is supplied by the latter which place Kollagiri and Cola next to one another. The Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa variant, Golāṅgula, is very interesting; it can scarcely be a corruption, as Pargiter maintained, as the same name occurs in the Brhatanāhita (XVI. 3.) along with the Puṇḍras, Śṛtparvatas, and Vardhamānas. As this list is an astronomical and not a geographical one however, no conclusion can be derived from it regarding the location of the Golāṅgulas.

Our survey of Daksīṇāpatha tribes now being complete, we may summarise our results in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sircar's texts.

Paṇḍyaś ca Keralāś caiva Colāḥ Kolās tathaiva ca
Setukā Muṣikāś caiva Kumārā Vanaṃśikāh

Mahārāṣṭra Mahiṣikāḥ Kaliṅgāś caiva sarvaśaḥ
Abhirāś ca sahaEśikā Aṭavyāḥ Śabarās tatha

Pulinda Vindhyamāliyā Vidarbha Daṇḍakaiḥ saha
Paurikā Maulakāś caiva Aśmakā Bhogavardhanāḥ

Śūlika Kuntalāś Āndhra Udbhīdā Nalahālikāḥ

34. MB. 2.28.43, BS. XIV. Markp. 58,23.
It now remains to identify briefly the above and so confirm their location in Daksināpatha.


3. Cola. Mod. Tanjore and Trichinopoly Dists. Capital Uraiyur (Skt. Uragapura) which corresponds to mod. Old Trichinopoly. They are the Sora of Ptolemy.

4. Kola. If this reading is accepted, the Kolas may be regarded as the inhabitants of Kollagiri, According to the Mahā-bhārata (2.28.45) it was conquered by Sahadeva along with Mūracaṇṭanam (i.e. the Mouziris of the Greeks and mod. Muyirikkodu). In both the Kūrma-vibhāga texts it is placed next to the Colas, but Rājaśekhara's Kāvyamānāhā locate it several places away between Kauṅkaṇa and Vallara. Its identification is accordingly somewhat uncertain. Dey identifies it with Kodagu i.e. Coorg on the Malabar coast, while Law locates it at Kolhapur on the basis of epigraphic evidence (E. I. III. 207; XXIII. 30), which refers to a town of Kollapura. Kollagiri and Kollapura however need not necessarily be the same, and if Mūracaṇṭanam is mod. Muyirikkodu, Coorg, judging from the evidence of Sahadeva's digvijaya, is a rather more probable location than Kolhapur.

5. Setuka. The inhabitants of the Setu-bandha, i.e. Adam's Bridge, a chain of islets linking India with Ceylon.

6. Mūṣika. There appears to have been two tribes of this or similar name. One may be located in the extreme south on the Malabar coast between Quilon and Cape Comorin, and a second further north, which is referred to in the Kūrma-vibhāga section of the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa as Mūṣika and placed in the South-east division. Pargiter locates the latter on the river Musi on which stands mod. Hyderabad. The geographical section of the Mahā-bhārata refers to them both. The mention of the Setukas and the Kumāras shows that it
is the Mūṣikas of the far south to whom reference is being made in the present context.

7. Kūmāra. The inhabitants of Cape Comorin, the southernmost tip of India.

8. Vanavāsika. The inhabitants of the Kannada speaking areas between the Ghats, the Tuṅgabhadra and the Wardhā rivers. The ancient name of this region is preserved by the modern town of Banavasi situated on the left bank of the Wardhā.

9. Mahārāṣṭra. The mod. Maratha region. The extent of this well known territory varied from time to time, but its heart may be located in the area between the Upper Godāvari and the Kṛṣṇa.

10. Māhiṣaka. The inhabitants of the Narmadā valley around Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māndhātā on an island in that river).

11. Kaliṅga. The extent of this large and important kingdom varied from time to time according to different political conditions. In Epic times it is most frequently associated with the Aṅgas and Vaṅgas, and this has led to suggestions that at this period it did not extend south-west of Orissa. Abundant epigraphic evidence however shows that the Kaliṅga country extended along the east coast from the Mahānadi to the Godāvari rivers.

12. Ābhīra. As mentioned previously, the Ābhīras were originally a North-west people, who by the second century A. D. occupied the areas of mod. Gujarat near the mouth of the Narmadā.

13. Iṣṭika. The region occupied by this people cannot be determined with certainty. In the geographical catalogue of the Mahā-bhārata they are associated with the Vidarbhas, and in the Rāmāyaṇa with the Vidarbhas and the Māhiṣakas. They may thus be located in the upper section of the Narmada valley.

35. For full details of the epigraphic evidence see Chaudhuri, pp. 71-80.
14. Āśavya. According to epigraphic evidence (C.I.I. III. 114; E. I. VIII. 28:4-7) they are to be closely associated with the Ḍabālas or Ĉedis and so may be located in the Jubbulpur Dist.

15. Śabarā. The Śabarai of Ptolemy and the descendants of the mod. Sāurs who occupy the Ganjam Dist. of Orissa. The Dhārṣṭaṁbhīṭā divided them into two groups, the Nagna-śabaras and the Parṇa-śabaras. The former must refer to those Śabaras, who did not wear any type of clothing, while for the latter, two possibilities have been put forward; firstly the Parṇa-śabaras may be interpreted as denoting those Śabaras, who used leaves as their food as Pargiter maintains, or alternatively those members of the tribe who used leaves as clothing. The latter suggestion is much more suited to the context, for then the sense of the whole passage becomes “the Śabaras who wear clothes and those who do not.” This distinction has doubtless been specifically made in the Karma-vibhāga texts to indicate differences in the stages of civilisation and culture among the various branches of Śabara. The Parṇa-śabaras are probably the Phullitai of Ptolemy (Gk. phullon leaf). and may be identified with the modern Juangs of Keonjhar Dist. of Orissa, who even now wear leaves.

16. Pulinda. The Poulindoi Agriophagoi of Ptolemy. Their antiquity is proved by the fact that they are associated in the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa (VII. 18. 2.) with the Śabaras and the Āndhras. According to Raychaudhuri (PHAI. p. 258.) their capital, Pulinda-nagara, is to be located at Rupnath to the East of Bhilsa.


18. Daṇḍaka. The inhabitants of the forest tracts between Bundelkhand and the Kṛṣṇā. Raychaudhuri (PHAI. 5th ed. p. 91.) would locate their capital at Kumbhāvatī.

19. Paurika. The inhabitants of the city of Purikā, which according to the evidence of the Hari-vaṁśa (2.38. 20-22) was situated not far from Māhiṣmatī (mod. Māṇḍhāṭā) in the Rkṣa mountains.

20. Manšaka. The extremely close association of the Mūlakas with the more powerful Aśmakas causes some difficulty in determining their geographical location. According to Buddhist Sanskrit tradition the Godāvari formed the original boundary between the two peoples, the Mūlakas occupying the northern bank, and the Aśmakas the south.

21. Aśmaka. At the time of the composition of these purāṇic texts the Aśmakas must have occupied the southern bank of the Godāvari immediately below Pratiṣṭhāna (mod. Paithan). Such a location is indicated by the separate mention of Mūlaka and Aśmaka. Later on however, they extended northwards across the river and, absorbing their neighbours, the Mūlakas, occupied the modern Nasik and Aurangabad districts.

22. Bhogavardhana. Epigraphic evidence (EI. IX. 299) indicates that Bhogavardhana is to be identified with mod. Bhokardhan, the north-eastern taluk of Aurangabad district.

23. Śulika. If this reading is accepted, these Śulikas may be identified with the tribe of the same name mentioned in the Harāha inscription of Īśānavarman (A. D. 554). In this inscription the Śulikas are mentioned between the Āndhras and the Gaudas, and so are evidently to be located in Orissa, as the names are set in geographical order from south to north. Other records of the Śulikas have also been found in the same area. Law would identify them with the Solaki of Gujarat or the Cālukyās, but both these suggestions which rest on similarity of form seem somewhat dubious.

37. Law, Geography of Early Buddhism p. 21. The text of the Sutta-Nipāta (V. 977) implies that the Brahmin priest reached the Mūlaka country proceeding northwards from Assaka (Aśmaka) which lay along the southern bank of the Godāvari in Daksīnāpatha.
24. Kuntala. Epigraphic evidence indicates that the Kuntalas occupied a considerable area between the Bhīma and Vedavati rivers, and so included most of the modern Kannada speaking regions. Capital Kalyāṇapura (mod. Kalyana 35 miles west of Bidar).

25. Āndhra. The inhabitants of the modern Telugu speaking area on the east coast of India between the Godāvari and the Kṛṣṇā rivers. Whether the Āndhras originally inhabited this region or migrated there from an earlier abode in the Vindhyas is uncertain. Some evidence in favour of the latter contention is supplied by the connection of the Āndhras with the Aśmakas in Buddhist texts and their association with the Pulindas at the time of the composition of the Aitareya-brāhmaṇa. Also in the present day in the Amraoti district lives a tribe of Andhs, who may well be the descendants of the ancient Āndhras. Their importance at the time of Alexander is attested by Pliny who, following Megasthenes, states that they possessed thirty fortified towns and a vast army. (N.H. 6. 22).

26. Udbhida. This name so far remains unidentified.

27. Nalakālika. The location of this tribe is quite uncertain. Dey would connect them with the Nelcynda of Ptolemy (mod Kottayam in Travancore). Shafer (E.A.I. p 75), on account of their proximity with the Andhrs, locates them along the Kistnā river and Nallamalai mountains. Both identifications are only conjectures, though the latter is certainly much more in conformity with the available data than the former.

Aparānta-Deśa

Kirkel’s text.

Śūrpārakāḥ Kalivanā Durgāḥ Kālitakaiḥ saha
Puleyāś ca Sirālaś ca Rūpasāś Tāpadaiḥ saha
tathā Taittirikāś caiva sarve caiva Kātṛaskarāḥ
Nāśikyāś caiva ye cānye ye caiva Āntarānārmadāḥ

39. Scansion here requires an obligatory short syllable,

Bhārukacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sāraśvatair api
Kacchīyās ca Sūraṣṭrās ca Anartās cĀrbudaiḥ saha

Sircar's text.

Śūrpārakāḥ Kolavanā Durgās Tālikātaḥ saha
Puleyās ca Sūrā (Mūrā ?) laś ca Kūpasās Tāmasaiḥ saha
tathā tu Raminās caiva surve caiva Kāśasākāraḥ
Nāśikyadyās ca ye cāṇye ye caiva Tātaranarmadāḥ
Bhāru (Bhṛgu)-kacchāḥ sa-Māheyāḥ saha Sāraśvatair api
Kacchīyās ca Sūraṣṭrās ca Anartās cĀrbudaiḥ saha

An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations. (1) K. Kalivanā. S. Kolavanā; (2) K. Kālitaka. S. Tāli-
kaṭa; (3) K. Sīrāla. S. Surāla. ? Mūrāla; (4) K. Tāpasa. S. Tāmasa; (5) K. Taittirika. S. tu Raminās; (6) K. Antranar-
madā. S. Uttaranarmadā; (7) K. Bhārukaccha. S. Bhāru (Bhṛgu) kaccha. Of these no. 7. is merely a question of whether one
should adopt the Prakrit or Sanskrit form for Baraoch and accordingly does not require further discussion.

(1) Kalivanā / Kolavanā. Epigraphic evidence supplies the clue to the correct reading in this case. In two grants of
Pṛthivicandra Bhogaśakti, a member of the Hariścandra dynasty, who ruled in the seventh and early eighth centuries A.D. an
area roughly comprising modern Nasik district as the feudatory vassal of the Western Calukyas (EI. XXV. 230), we find a
reference to the town of Kallivana, which corresponds exactly to Kiefel's reading, Kalivanā. This may easily be identified
with mod. Kalvan in the north-west region of Nasik district.

(2) Kālitaka / Tālikāta. The accuracy of Sircar's form,
Tālikāta, is proved by the Kūrma-vibhāga texts which locate it in the South. The apparent difference of direction however
need cause no difficulty for, as previously mentioned, the boundaries adopted by the compilers of the various texts are
useful for that one system of classification only, so that, what one source might include in the West, another would place in
the South. Kiefel's form, Kālitaka, can easily be explained
as a confusion of the original name due to carelessness in transcription. Tālīkaṭa is also mentioned as a variant reading in the digvijaya of Sahadeva, where the Poona Critical Edition reads Copakṛta which however must be almost certainly wrong. In this passage also Tālīkaṭa is mentioned close to Śūrparaka and so the accuracy of the puranic lists is confirmed by an independent source.

(3) Sirāla/ Surāla? Murāla. The text here is very doubtful, as none of the variants listed by the different Purāṇas can be traced in other sources. This has led Sircar to conjecture that the form, Surāla, is an error for Murāla. Such an hypothesis at first sight has much to recommend it; Devanāgarī and m by reason of their close similarity are constantly confused in orthography, while the existence of a tribe called the Murālas who lived on the banks of a river of the same name, is proved by at least two independent sources, Rāja- śekhara’s Kāvyamāmā and Kālidāsa’s Raghuvamśa. The former locates it in Dakṣināpatha and places it between Kāvera and Vanavāsaka and accordingly implies that it is to be located in the far south, a position that is confirmed by the Raghuvamśa (IV. 55), which implies that the Murāla river was situated in or near Kerala. Sircar, following Dey, identifies the Murala with the Mūlamuthā which rises near Poona and is a tributary of the Bhīmā, but this appears to be too far north to be correct in view of the location implied by the Kāvyamāmā and Raghuvamśa. For the same reason therefore it is doubtful whether Surāla should be regarded as corrupt for Murāla. Shafer (EAI, p. 78) identifies the Sirālas with Sirīl near Miraj in the Kolhapur district of Bombay. Such an identification can only depend on the similarity between the ancient and modern names, but the location would suit the requirements of the purānic texts.

(4) Tāpasa/Tāmasa. Kirsch’s reading is the more probable. The Kūrmaśaṅkha mention in their lists of southern peoples

40. MB. 2 28 43: MSS. V₁ B₂ D₁ Tālīkaṭa; B₃ D₂ D₃ Tālīkaṭa.
a name, Tāpasārāma, with which Tāpasa may at once be connected. As we have seen before, the apparent difference in direction is no obstacle in associating the two names with each other. According to Dey, Tāpasārāma may be identified as with mod. Panderpur or Pantharpur on the southern bank of the Bīmā in Sholapur district. Sircar’s reading. Tāmasa, appears very doubtful. It cannot refer to the Tāmasavana which must be located in the Panjab, not to the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tāmasā, i.e. mod. Tones, a branch of the Sarayū in Oudh, as neither of these places can possibly be located in the western division. Dey also lists two other Tāmasā rivers, one in Rewa and the other in Garhwal, but both of these would also be quite out of place.

(5) Taittirika/tu Ramina. The text at this point is very difficult to determine. In addition to the forms adopted by Kirlé and Sircar, the Mārkandeya-purāṇa reads Kurumina (which Chaudhuri follows) and the Vāyu-purāṇa, Turasita. The most probable reading at a superficial glance would be Turasita, which at once suggests some connection with the Tārakṣiti of the Kārma-vibhāga texts, where it is located in the tail of the “tortoise”, i.e. in the West. Unfortunately this is a far too easy solution, for a detailed analysis of the Kārma-vibhāga texts at once shows that the ‘West’ of these texts does not correspond with our modern ideas of what would constitute western India, nor with those of the compiler of the Bhuvana-kosa texts, who clearly identifies it with the coastal portion of Bombay State on both sides of the Narbada. As the Tārakṣiti are associated with peoples like the Rāmaṭhas, Pāradas, Jriṅgas, Vaiśyas etc. it is obvious that they have no place in the western region of the Bhuvana-kosa texts. For the same reason it is impossible to accept Chaudhuri’s reading of Kurumina, which he tentatively identifies with Karmania or Kerman in Persia. In stressing that the Pāradas etc. have been included in the West, he shows that he has fundamentally failed to appreciate the completely different systems of classification employed by the compilers of the Bhuvana-kosa lists and the Kārma-vibhāga texts.
Kirfel’s reading, Taittirika, however seems rather more likely. A people called the Tittiras is mentioned in the Mahābhārata (6.46.50.) along with the Colas, Pāṇḍyas and Śabarās. Their association with these tribes would suggest that they are to be located in Dakṣiṇāpatha. In the Mahābhārata however, this term is often used loosely of the entire area south of the Narmada, and so would necessarily include that part of purānic Aparānta-dēsa which lay south of that river. This can be proved by using the next name in the text, Kāraskara, as an example. The purānic lists locate it with the Māhiṣakas, Kaliṅgas and Keralas, all of whom are placed by these same lists in the south. Accordingly, the association of the Taittirias with the Colas etc. is no serious obstacle to adopting Kirfel’s text, which is based on the Matsya-puṭa. The difficulty arises from the fact that the portion of Aparānta-dēsa, which is south of the Narmada in the purānic texts, is included by the Mahābhārata in Dakṣiṇāpatha; in other words the two areas overlap one another to some degree.

(6) Antaranarmada/Uttaranarmada. The difficulty here rests entirely with the meaning. Antaranarmada has been interpreted as referring to those tribes, who live within the basin of the Narmadā, while Uttaranarmada has been taken to denote those peoples who live on the northern bank of that river. Such is the translation suggested by Pargiter (Markp. (trans.) p. 339). It also however seems possible to interpret the compound Uttaranarmada as Bahuvrihi “those having the Narmadā to their north” i. e. those tribes living to the south of the Narmadā, whose northern boundary is determined by that river. It is significant that all the names previously listed, where identification is possible, are to the south of the Narmadā:

Śūrpāraka (Sopara), Tālikāta (associated with Śūrpāraka and therefore south of the Narmadā), Kalivana (Kalvan), Tāpasa (Pandharpur), Taittirika and Kāraskara (in South according to Mahā-bhārata and therefore below Narmadā), Nāsikya (Nasik).

Accordingly, if Uttaranarmada is interpreted in this sense, it is a distinctly preferable reading to Antaranarmada, which would
refer to the tribes living near the sources of the Narmadā, an area which would properly belong to the Vindhyā division. Moreover further support is given to the reading, Uttaranarmada, by the fact that all the names in the next śloka are to be located north of the Narmadā. The Aparānta-deśa is accordingly extremely well defined; it consists of an area on both sides of the Narmadā, which perhaps bisects it. In the first part of the text, only tribes to its south are enumerated, and in the second section, which starts with Bhārukaccha, only tribes to its north.

Before we complete our analysis of the list of western tribes, one further textual point is perhaps worthy of consideration. Both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading Puleya, while the Mārkandeyapuraṇa reads Pulinda and the Matsya-puraṇa Kuliya. The Pulindas are of course very well known and are usually associated with the śabaras and located in the south. As it is not possible to confirm from any independent text that they should be included within the boundaries of Aparānta-deśa, the Mārkandeya text is accordingly very doubtful and probably is the result of a copyist's "effort" to "correct the passage" by substituting a well known name for what was to him at least an unknown one. The Matsya form, Kuliya, at once suggests that it may be connected with the Kūlyas, who have been mentioned already among the tribes of Madhya-deśa and Daksipāpatha. As nothing however is known about these Kūlyas from independent sources, their name may not be authentic but one which owes its existence to textual corruption. The one advantage in reading Puleya is that it is free from the difficulties present in Pulinda and Kuliya, namely that they have already been located in these texts in divisions other than Aparānta-deśa. Even so Puleya is a very doubtful form, for there is no evidence for its existence in any independent source which would confirm the accuracy of its form. The depth of corruption at this point of the text and the resulting confusion is clearly indicated by the corresponding section of the Mahā-bhārata (6.10.62), where a vast number of variants are found, none of which contributes anything to the solution of the problem. The Critical Edition adopts the form आदिदाय, but the whole crux goes so deep that
this reading can reflect nothing more than the subjective choice of the editor.

The following comments are made purely by way of suggestion only. Devanagari 1 and t are very similar in orthography. By changing 1 to t in Puleya we obtain a form Puteya, which is perhaps a metathesis of Tāpeya, i.e. the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tāpi (mod. Tapti). The context makes it clear that a location south of the Narmadā is essential to any reading.

A second serious difficulty in both Kirfel's and Sircar's texts, is the reading, Rūpasa. As Chaudhuri rightly says (p. 149 n17), “For the Rupasas there is hardly any reliable notice.” It is therefore probable that the Rūpasas owe their existence to textual corruption. The corresponding text of the Mahābhārata (6. 10. 62.), where the editor of the Poona Critical Edition reads Stubika, has a host of variants, of which the most interesting, Sūnapas, may well provide the key to the solution of this problem. It is clear that Sūpana and Rūpasa are jumbled forms of what must have originally been the same name, as both have every letter in common except r and n. The confusion here is doubtless due to the orthographical similarity between Devanagri r and n. Most significantly however the Mahābhārata form, Sūpana, can be re-arranged by metathesis as Anūpas, which is the name of a very well known tribe in Sanskrit Literature. If we substitute Anūpas for Rūpasa in the purānic texts, it is accordingly necessary to locate them south of the Narmadā in Aparāntadeśa. The most definite passage for the Anūpas is to be found in the Raghuvamśa (VI. 37-13.), which states that Māhiśmati, on the Revā, was the capital of Anūpas. In the Nasik record of queen Gautamī Bālāsri they are placed between Aparānta and Vidarbha. The general conclusion to be drawn from these passages is that the Anūpas are to be located south of the Narmadā in Dūṣipāpatha rather than in Aparāntadeśa. This however would overlook the basic meaning of Anūpa
which is explained in the Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi as a tract of land near water, an example being Kaccha. In the Mahābhārata, Anūpas is mentioned as a coastal portion of the sea (sāgarānapavāśinaḥ). Accordingly, if we locate the Anūpas on the southern bank of the Narmadā between Māndhātā and the sea, they may easily be included in Aparānta-deśa. Possibly at the time of the epics and purāṇas they occupied the coastal area to the south of the mouth of the Narmadā and later extended inland eastwards to Māhiṣmati.

Our survey of the tribes of Aparānta-deśa now being complete, we may summarise our results in the form of a new text. As before, all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel's and Sirca's texts.

South of Narmadā:

Šūrpārakāḥ Kalivanā Durgās Tālikatāḥ saha

…………

Tāpeyaḥ ca Sirālaḥ ca Anūpas Tāpasaiḥ saha

………………

tathā Tuittirikaḥ caiva sarve caiva Karaskaraḥ

………………

Nāsikyādyāḥ ca ye cānye ye caiva Ottaranarmadaḥ

…………………

North of Narmadā:

Bhārukacchaḥ sa-Māheyaḥ saha Sārasvatār api
Kacchīyaḥ ca Surāstraḥ ca Anartāḥ cārbudaiḥ saha

It now remains to identify the above briefly and so confirm their location in Aparānta-deśa.


3. Durga. Their identity is uncertain. Dey lists a river Durgā as a tributary of the Sabarmatī in Gujarat, which would correspond roughly to the area required, but which is unfortunately to the north of the Narmadā, whereas all the names in this śloka must be located to its south. However it is nevertheless probable that the Durgas of this passage may be identified with the inhabitants of the banks of the Durgā river, for Dey’s identification is probably wrong. According to the paurānic texts, the Durgā issued from the Rkṣa range, which may be identified with the modern Satpuras. Accordingly, the Durgā is to be placed to the south of the Narmadā.

4. Tālikata. The generally accepted identification of this name with Talakāḍa or Talkaḍ, the capital or the Gaṅgas on the Kāveri 30 miles east of Mysore is very improbable, for Talkaḍ is so far south that it can only be located in Dakṣipā patha. The evidence of the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas makes it clear that the Tālikātas must be located somewhere near Bombay.

5. Tāpeya. If this suggestion is accepted, the Tāpeyas are obviously to be identified with the inhabitants along the banks of the river Tapti.

6. Sirāla. Perhaps Shirol near Miraj (Kolhapur district)

7. Anūpa. If this reading is accepted, the Anūpas are to be located on the coast immediately to the south of the mouth of the Narmadā. Later they extended their influence inland as far as Māndhātā.

8. Tāpasa. Mod. Pandharpur on the Bhīmā.

9. Taitiririka. South of the Narmadā, but it is not possible to suggest a more precise location.

10. Karoskara. Dey would locate them at Karakal in South Kanara district.


12. Uttarānarmada. The tribes living on the south bank of the Narmadā whose northern boundary is formed by that river.
(13) Bharukaccha. Mod. Baroach, 30 miles from the sea on the north side of the Narmadā. A town of great commercial importance, it was known to the Greeks as Barygaza.

(14) Māheya. The inhabitants of the bank of the river Māhī, which flows through Malwa into the Gulf of Cambay north of the Narmadā.

(15) Sārasvata. The inhabitants of the bank of the river Sarasvatī, which, rising in Mt. Abu, flows into the sea near Prabhāsa (mod. Somanath). Śircar erroneously connects it with the river Sarsuti, which must be located in the north.

(16) Kacchiya. The water-logged portions of the sea-coast from the Gulf of Cambay to Baroach.

(17) Suśāstra. The Syrastiene of the Periplus and Ptolemy. The Suśāstras occupied the lower half of the peninsula of Kathiawar around Junagadh, Their name survives in modern Surat.

(18) Ānarta. The Halar division of Kathiawar. Capitals Kūśasthāli (mod. Dvārā) and Ānarttapura, later called Ānandapura (mod. Vadnagar).

(19) Arbuda. The inhabitants of Mt. Abu in the Aravalli range in the Sirohi State of Rajputana, a hill of great religious sanctity to the Jains.

VINDHYAN REGION

Kirfel’s text

Mālavāś ca Karuṣāś ca Mekalāś cOtkalaiḥ saha
Uttamārṇā Daśārṇaś ca Bhojaḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha
Tośalaiḥ Kośalaiś caiva Traipurā Vaidiśās tathā
Tumurāś Tumbaraiś caiva Śaṭpurā Naiṣadhaiḥ saha
Anūpāś Tuṇḍikerāś ca Vitihotrā hy Avantayaḥ

Śircar’s text

Maladāś ca Karuṣāś ca Mekalāś cOtkalaiḥ saha
Uttamārṇā Daśārṇaś ca Bhojaḥ Kiṣkindhakaiḥ saha
Tośalaiḥ Kośalaiś caiva Traipurā Vaidiśās tathā
An analysis of the above texts shows the following variations.

(1) K. Malava. S. Malada; (2) K. Tumura Tumbara. S. Tumbana Tumbavana; (3) K. Satpura. S. Patu.

(1) Mala/Malada. The Mala/Malas are a very well known tribe in ancient Indian history. Originally they lived in the north-west and are identified by most scholars with the Malloi of the Greeks, who made such a tenacious resistance to Alexander. The Mala/Malas in the present text are generally located in modern Malwa, a view however which ignores several important considerations. Firstly there is a serious chronological difficulty, as the Malas did not occupy the area of western Malwa until at least the sixth century A.D. Until that date Avanti was known by its own name; only from the sixth century A.D. did it become known as Mala, the earliest reference to the arrival of the Malas in the vicinity of Ujjaini, the Avanti capital, being made in Bana’s Kadambari (ed. Ridding p. 221). As the Bhavana-kośa lists must have been composed before that date, the Malas could not have been anywhere near Malwa. Numismatic evidence indicates that from the second to the fourth century A.D., they lived in the area of Jaipur, where large numbers of their coins have been found. Later they appear to have migrated further south to the areas of Mewar and Kota.

Apart from chronological factors, there are sound textual reasons for doubting the authenticity of Mala as the original reading. If we accept Mala as an integral part of the text, there would be no reason for the inclusion of Avanti as according to the lexicographers the two names are synonymous. Even more decisive is the evidence of the Vaijayanti, which includes the Maladas at the head of its Vindhy section—‘natheme Maladadyākhya Vindhyaparyantavāsinaḥ.’ The same

41. For the latest detailed study see IHQ. 24. p. 171 ff.
work continues by identifying the Maladas with the Sthauras and the Karuṣas with the Brhadgrhaṇas. For these considerations also Malava is an unlikely reading.

Finally a comparison of the environment in which the Maladas or Mālavas are to be located brings one to the same conclusion. The other tribes mentioned in the same line are the Karuṣas, Mekalas and Utkalas. Of these the Mekalas may be identified with the inhabitants of the modern Maikal range, and the Utkalas with those of the interior of Orissa. Even more important however is the location of the Karuṣas. A tradition recorded in the Rāmāyana (I. 14) groups the Karuṣas and the Maladas together, and traces the origin of the two names to a common mythology. The Karuṣas may be located on epigraphic evidence (A. S. R. III. 67-71) in the Shahabad district of Bihar. In such an environment Malada would be a vastly superior reading to Mālava.

(2) K. Tumura Tumbara / S. ? Tumbāna Tumbavana. This pair of names, which have been taken together for the sake of convenience, involves considerable difficulty both as regards their actual form and their location. Sircar’s suggestion of Tumbavana is supported by the Brhatāṃhitā, which locates them in the south and also by the evidence of the Tumain Inscription of Kumāragupta. (E. I. XXVI. pt. 3). A name, Tumbupa, occurs in the Mahābhārata (6.46.51) among the list of tribes on the wings of Yudhīṣṭhira’s army, but, as there are numerous variants, it is far from certain that Tumbupa is the correct reading at that point. The Tumbaras are however mentioned in the Harivamśa (5.310-1), where together with the Niṣādas they are described as the descendants of a king Niṣāda, while Buddhānāṭṭa’s42 Ratna-parikṣa and other texts describe their territory as a source of rubies. Accordingly we may accept Sircar’s suggestion for this part of the text with the slight emendation of Tumbara for Tumbāna as both

Tumbara and Tumbavana are established by independent literary and epigraphic sources.

(3) K. śatpura / Paṭu. The diversity of readings both on the part of the original texts and of the critical editors indicates that the degree of corruption is considerable at this point. In his earlier edition of these texts published in his Bhāratavarṣa (p. 62), Kirfel originally adopted the Vāmana-purāṇa form, Vāhela, which Dey identified with Baghelkhand. The Vāyu-purāṇa reads Satsura and the Matsya-purāṇa Padgama or Satsgama, but none of these forms can be traced elsewhere. If śatpura is accepted as the reading here, it is evidently to be identified with the modern Satpura range. Such an assumption however seems extremely improbable for there is no evidence that śatpura was in current usage at the time of the composition of the Purāṇas. Sircar’s variant, Paṭu, seems the best reading in the present state of knowledge. While it cannot be traced elsewhere, at the same time it does not involve one in the difficulties that surround the adoption of śatpura. For the present however there is insufficient evidence to attempt any solution of the problem.

Our survey of the textual problems now being completed, our results may accordingly be tabulated in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names denote new readings; a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between Kirfel’s and Sircar’s texts.

Maladāś ca Karūṣāś ca Mekalāś cOtkalaiḥ saha
………………
Uttamārṇa Daśārṇaś ca Bhojaḥ Kiśkindhakaiḥ saha
Toṣalāḥ Kośalāś civa Traipurā Vaidiśās tatha
Tumbārās Tumbavanāś caiva Paṭavo Naṇḍadhaiḥ saha
………………………………………

Anūpās Tūṇḍikerāś ca Viṭhitotrā Avantayaḥ

It now remains to identify the above briefly and so confirm their location in Vindhya-deśa.
(1) Malada. Mod. Baghelkhand region.
(2) Karuša. Mod. Shahabad district.
(3) Mekala. The inhabitants of the Maikal range.
(4) Utkala. Originally the Utkalas occupied the interior districts of Orissa near the Maikal hills. Later they extended eastwards towards the sea down the Mahanadi valley. Their capital may be placed at Chaulnar opposite Katak.
(5) Uttamārṇa. If we follow Wilson's interpretation of Daśārṇa as "ten forts", and translate Uttamārṇa as the "highest forts", it would be reasonable to locate them on the highest parts of the Vindhyā, i.e. on the Mahadeo Hills.
(6) Daśārṇa. This people may be located on the banks of the river Daśārṇa (mod. Dhasan, which, rising near Sangor, flows through Bundelkhand into the Betwa). According to Jain sources its capital was Mṛttikavatī, which the Hūrī-vamaśa (1.36.15) places on the Narmadā.
(7) Bhoja. According to purānic tradition, the Bhojas were a branch of the Yadavas, who founded the kingdom of Vidarbha. Similarly in the Raghu-vamaśa (V. 39.) the king of Vidarbha was a Bhoja. The mention of Bhojakaṭa in the Chammak Copper-plate Inscription of Pravarasena III (C.I.I. III, p. 236) proves that the territory occupied by the Bhojas in Berar included the areas of mod. Elichpur and Chammak.
(8) Kiṣkindhaka. Dey would connect this name with the famous Kiṣkindhāya Mt. of the Rāmāyaṇa, and locate it near a small hamlet, which still retains the same name, in Dharwar district on the south bank of the Tuṅghabhadrā near Anagondi, three miles from Vijaynagar and close to Bellary. The purānic texts however imply a more northern location and this is supported by the Kūrma-vibhāga lists, which include the Kiṣkindhakas in the South-east (i.e. Vindhyā) region.
(9) Toṣala. Its extremely close association with the Dakṣiṇa Kośalas is attested by at least three other texts, Rājaśekhara's Kavyamīmāṃsā, Bharata's Nāya-śāstra and the Pari-
śiṣṭa to the Atharva-veda. It is also mentioned in Asoka’s Rock Edict found at Dhauli, while other inscriptions refer to a Uttara Tośala and a Daksīṇa Tośala (EI. IX. 286; XV. 3.). The Gaṇḍa-vyūha, a Sanskrit Buddhist text, refers to a town of Tosala in Amita-Tosala. According to the epigraphic evidence, the Tośala-viṣaya covered a large area from the Suvarṇarekha down to the Rṣikulyā. At the time of the composition of the purānic lists however it probably occupied a smaller area centred on the Dhauli and Balasor districts.

(10) Kosalas. Epigraphic43 evidence proves that the Daksīṇa-Kosalas occupied a large area of the Chatīgarh region, extending eastwards to Sambalpur district and the South Mahānadi Valley.

(11) Tripurī. The inhabitants of the town of Tripurī (mod. Teer on the Narbādā, seven miles west of Jubbulpur. The Vaijayantī makes them synonymous with the Hāhālas (i.e. a corruption of Ḫahāla) and the Cedis.


(13) Tumbāra. Sircar tentatively identifies it with Tūrān, 45 miles north of Ratanpur.

(14) Tumbavana. Mod. Tumain, 50 miles N-W of Eran in Gwalior State.

(15) Paṭu. Not identifiable.

(16) Naiṣadha. This people are generally located on the Satpura Hills, N-W of Berar.


(18) Tuṇḍikera. Perhaps mod. Tendukhara near the Narmadā in Narsinghpur District.

(19) Vitihotra. A branch of the Haihayas. Their location within the Vindhya division is uncertain.


43. For detailed analysis of epigraphic evidence see Chaudhuri, p. 74ff.
HIMALAYAN DIVISION

Kerfel's text.

Nīharā Haṁsāmārgāḥ ca Kupathās Taṅgaṇāḥ Khaṣāḥ
Kuthaprāvaraṇāḥ caiva Ěṛṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Hūhukāḥ
Trigartā Maṇḍalāḥ caiva Kiratās Tāmaraih saha

Sircar's text.

Nirāhārā Haṁsāmārgāḥ Kuravas Taṅgaṇāḥ Khasāḥ
Karṇaprāvaraṇāḥ caiva Hūṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Hūhukāḥ
Trigartā Mālavāḥ caiva Kiratās Tāmasaih
(Tomaraḥ ṭa) saha

An analysis of the above texts show the following variations.

(1) K. Nīhāra. S. Nirāhāra; (2) K. Kupatha. S. Kuru;
(3) K. Kuthaprāvaraṇa. S. Karṇaprāvaraṇa; (4) K. Ěṛṇa. S.
Hūṇa; (5) K. Maṇḍala. S. Mālava; (6) K. Tāmara. S. Tāmasa.
(Tomara).

(1) Nīhāra / Nirāhāra. The Vāyu-purāṇa variant, Nigar-
hāra, is interesting as it may be regarded as a colloquial form
of Nagarabāra, which is mentioned in an inscription as a town
of Uttarāpatha. The Parāsara⁴⁴ likewise locates it in the same
division, while Hiuan Tsang refers to it as Na-kie-lo-ho.
Alberuni locates the Nirāhāras as living behind Mārīgāla i.e.
Takṣāsilā (mod. Taxila). The consensus of this evidence would
place the Nirāhāra in the vicinity of Jalalabad.

(2) Kupatha/Kuru. If the latter name is adopted as the
reading, it must refer to the Uttara-kurus, a semi-mythical
people living to the north of the Himalayas. Kupatha on the
other hand may be connected with the Kārāpatha of the Raghu-
vaṃśa and the Kārupatha of the Rāmāyaṇa. It has been
identified with Kārābagh or Baghan on the west bank of the
Indus at the foot of the Salt Range in Bannu District. Though
both Kuru and Kupatha may be located without difficulty in
the Himalayas, the latter seems preferable, as they may be placed

⁴⁴ J. A. S. B. XVII p. 492; Parāsara (Text in Brāhatsaṅhita, Viniyoga-
gram S. S. p. 293).
in the area suggested by their neighbours, Nirāhāra (Jalalabad), Hāmsamārga (? Hunza and Nagar districts), and Taṅgaṇa (the region extending from the Rāmgaṅgā to the Upper Sarayū) much more easily than the Uttarā-kurus, who must be located in Tibet.

(3) Kūtaprāvaraṇa/Karpaprāvaraṇa. The Karpaprāvaraṇas are mentioned in the Rāmāyana in the eastern division along with the Kirātas. Accordingly they may be located in the eastern Himalayas. Another tribe of the same name are placed by two passages of the Mahābhārata in the Vindhyas. The Karpaprāveyas of the Kūrma-vibhāga texts, which are located in the S–W (i.e. N–W.) along with the Śūdras and Pāraśavas, are probably identical with the Karṇa-prāvaraṇas and the Rāmāyana.

(4) Üṛṇa/Hūṇa. These names have been discussed in the Uttarāpatha section, paragraph 22.

(5) Maḍḍala/Mālava. Sircar's text is almost certainly correct. At the time of the composition of the epic and purānic lists the Mālavas lived in the N–W and did not migrate to the Vindhyas until some time later. Their close association with the Trigartas is attested by several passages of the Mahābhārata. Kirfel's variant, Maḍḍala, cannot be traced elsewhere.

(6) Tāmara? Tāmasa? Tomara. The people mentioned here must be identical with those mentioned immediately before the Kirātas in the Uttarāpatha section, where Kirfel and Sircar both agree on the name, Tomara. At the same time it must be stressed that there is nothing to prevent the choice of Tāmasa (the inhabitants of the banks of the river Tons) here, for such a location can easily be included within the Uttarāpatha and Himalayan divisions.

Though both Kirfel and Sircar adopt the reading, Hūṅka, as one of the names of this division, it is important to compare this name which occurs before Hūṅa and Dārva with that occurring before the same two names in the Uttarāpatha division where Kirfel reads Cāṅka and Sircar suggests its emendation
to Bāhika. For a discussion of this problem and the conclusions reached, see the Uttarāpatha section paragraph 21.

In accordance with our usual procedure, the result of our analysis can be tabulated in the form of a new text. As before all underlined names will denote new readings different from those of Kirfel and Sircar, while a dotted underlining will show where a choice has been made between the two.

Nirāhārā Haṁsamārgāḥ Kupathās Taṅgaṇāḥ Khasāḥ
.............

Karṇaprāvaraṇās caiva Huṇā Dārvāḥ sa-Kūhukāḥ
.............

Trigartā Mālavās caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha
.............

It now remains to identify the above mentioned names briefly and so confirm their location in the Himalayan region. Unfortunately it is not possible to locate most of them with any precise degree of accuracy, as in mountainous areas such as this, many tribes would tend to be nomadic in their habits.

(1) Nirāhāra. The inhabitants of mod. Nanghenhar or Nangnihar, 4 miles west of Jalalabad.

(2) Haṁsamārga. Possibly mod. Hunza and Nagar districts.

(3) Kupatha. If, as is probable, this is regarded as identical with the Kārāpatha of the Rāghuvaṁśa, it may be identified with Karabagh at the foot of the Salt Range in Bannū district. Upadhyaya has located it at Chandpur east of Saharanpur in the land of the Northern Mallas.

(4) Taṅgaṇā. The Ganganoi of Ptolemy, being an orthographical error for t. They may be located in the central Himalayas in the area stretching from the river Rāmagāṅgā to the Upper Sarayū.

(5) Khasā. Mod. Khakkhas to the west of Nepal.

45. India in Kalidasa, p. 68.
(6) Karnaprabhava. As mentioned previously the evidence of the Kishkindha-kanda of the Ramayana would place them in the Eastern Himalayas.

(7-9) Huna Darva Kuhuka. For their location see the Uttarapatha section.

(10) Trigarta. Mod. Jalandhar region.

(11) Malava. They are generally identified with the Mallai of the Greeks and located in the area of Multan, which is rather too far south to be included in the Himalayas. This identification of Skt. Malava and Gk. Malloi is by no means certain. In the first place it is reasonable to assume that the Greeks would transcribe Sanskrit place-names as accurately as the phonemes of their native language would permit. Accordingly Malloi is a more accurate transcription of Skt. Malla than of Malava. Moreover the Mallas are well-known in Sanskrit Literature as the name of a tribe, being mentioned in the Epics, Puranas, the Parashara-tantra, the Bhat-samhita and the geographical section of the Mahamayuri etc. The objection to the identification of Greek Malloi with Skt. Malla however does not depend on any linguistic argument, but on grounds of geographical location. The Mallas mentioned in the Epics and Puranas are located by these texts in the East; the Malloi of the Greeks must necessarily be in the N-W. In view of this discrepancy of direction Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malla cannot be associated together; therefore one must search for a name that overcomes this obstacle. This is to be found in Sanskrit Malava, which is conveniently listed in the North by passages in the Epics and Puranas. On the basis of these arguments Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malavas are considered to refer to one and the same people. This conclusion however fails to take into account one important piece of evidence, that of the Parashara-tantra, which locates the Mallas in the north-West along with the Tusaras and Talas. This evidence overcomes the objection to equating Greek Malloi and Sanskrit Malla, as one may now assume the existence of two branches of Mallas, one in the East and the other in the
North-West. Moreover the Purāñara-tantra specifically mentions the Mālavas as distinct from the Mallas, and locates them in the North. Accordingly, this information makes the problem of the location of the Mālavas easier to solve. One is no longer troubled by the difficulty of having to assume that they migrated from the area between the Jhelum and the Chenab (where Greek sources place the Malloi) at some date soon after Alexander's invasion to Nagarchal in mod. Jaipur district where large hordes of their coins have been found. The former area was occupied by the Mallas and the latter by the Mālavas who may have migrated there from the Himalayas, if their inclusion in the list of "mountainous" countries is correct.

(12) Kirāta and (13) Tāmara. For location see Uttarā-patha section, nos 37 and 38.

In conclusion a peculiar feature of the Himalayan list requires a brief comment. It will be noticed that of the 13 tribes enumerated, no fewer than 7 have already been located in Uttarā-patha, viz. Haṁsamārga, Taṅgapa, Hūna Dārva, Hāhuka (? Kūhuka), Kirāta, and Tāmara. Furthermore all these names have been taken from the last two ślokas of the Uttarā-patha section only. The reason that at once suggests itself as an explanation of this repetition is that the Himalayan portion may be a later addition to the whole text, perhaps with the purpose of giving a more detailed description of that particular area to the reader, the Vañjayantī appears to supply some evidence in support of this view. While as regards the other six divisions it follows the Purāñas exactly, it yet omits the Himalayan region which, if its mention of the Trigartas is any criterion, it must have included in Uttarā-patha. It is quite clear therefore that the Uttarā-patha and Himalayan regions must overlap one another to some extent in the Purāñas; had they each represented a distinctly separate area, no such repetitions would have been possible. In this respect it is worth comparing them with the Vindhya section, where every single name (with the possible exception of Anūpa) is a new one. In view of these considerations therefore we may conclude that the Himalayan portion was not originally part of
this geographical list, but may later have been added as an amplification of the last part of the Uttarāpatha section. Compare:

Uttarāpatha—

Aupagāś cĀlimadrāś ca Kirālaṁāḥ ca jātayaḥ
Tāmarā Haṁsaṁārgāś ca Kāśmirās Taṅganaḥ
Kulutāḥ Kuhukāś caiva Hūnā Darvās tathaiva ca

Himālayas—

Nigarhāra Haṁsaṁārgah Kupathās Taṅgaṁāḥ Khasāḥ
Karnāprāvaranāś caiva Hūnā Dārvaḥ sa-Kūhukāḥ
Trigartā Mālavāś caiva Kirātās Tāmaraiḥ saha

With the investigation of the Himalayan list completed, all the geographical names of the Bhuvanakośa texts have been examined. Of the large number of names included in this list about three-quarters of them have been now identified with some degree of accuracy. No one is more aware than the author that a number of suggested readings and identifications are extremely tentative, but if they only serve to arouse interest and even controversy in this important subject, he feels they will have achieved their purpose.
[Almost in every Purāṇa there are found a number of non-Pāṇinian uses which generally pertain to hiatus, re-sandhi (or double sandhi), remodelling of the basic forms of some words on the lines of Prākṛta-forms, inflectional and conjugational forms influenced by Prākṛta, and also actual Prākṛta forms found incidentally written by scribes in some of the old manuscripts of the Purāṇas. These non-Pāṇinian uses are often held as ār̥ga prayogas. But in the present article it is shown that they are mostly due to the exigencies of metre, or to the influence of Prākṛta or to both. For this purpose, the article has divided non-Pāṇinian uses of the Purāṇas into five main heads with several sub-heads. Each head and sub-head is, then, discussed with appropriate illustrations from the printed editions and manuscripts of several important Purāṇas. Editors and scribes have often tried to emend these non-Pāṇinian uses. Such emendations have also been illustrated here.

On account of some Prākṛta or Prākṛta-influenced forms met with in the Purāṇas, Pargiter held that the Purāṇas, and specially their genealogical chapters, were originally composed in Prākṛta, and later on sanskritized by the Purānic redactors. The present article has also briefly discussed this point. According to the view expressed in this article, there might have been parallel genealogical literature composed in Prākṛta by some Sūtas and Magadhas attached to royal courts, and the Purānic redactors might have also incorporated a few of these Prākṛta ślokas into the genealogical Sanskrit accounts of the Purāṇas, and hence some stray Prākṛta uses in the Purāṇas. A.S.G.]
अथ पुराणेऽऽ वर्णमालानाम् अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां विचारः प्रस्तूतेऽऽ।
प्रायः सर्वेऽऽ नलोऽऽ अपाणिनीयप्रयोगा विचारः। आरोपस्य प्रयोगः इति
मला तेऽऽ साधुऽऽ प्रतिपाद्यः। कामस्य सदृऽऽ तेऽऽ मध्ये करिविवृत्त प्रयोगः
आर्याः अच्छः, परस्य तेऽऽ सर्वेऽऽ अपाणिनीयप्रयोगः आर्या प्रवेशित मात्र तु न समीचीनः
प्रतिपाद्यः, अनेकसंख्या अपाणिनीयप्रयोगाणां तत् ्ज्ञातोऽऽ स्मृताम्
प्राणिनीयप्रयोगाणाः नेत्रेऽऽ नुग्गे नागस्यायनाय नेककारणसृज्यतवः।
अर्थः, भारतसारणिनां 'आर्याः' इति शब्दोऽऽ येदे
प्रयोगमित्यतः ततः 'सन्दुऽऽ शाक्ष्यस्यस्वायान्तरः' (२० वि. १.१.६)
प्रस्तुतिधिः सूक्ते शार्यतः। येदेतथाव्रे च तेऽऽ 'अनन्यः' इति शब्दोऽऽ सु
प्रयोगः इति तु सम्पूर्वः।
वेदसंहिताः, ब्राह्मणिः, आर्याखान्तः, उपनिषदः वेदाः
साध्यमेव वेदे (चांदसि) अन्तर्नवितः। कालात्मकवर्तिः सन्दुऽऽ विपर्ययः
कारणोपर्याणाः च असाध्यः वैदिकवर्त्तायः उज्ज्वलः प्रश्चालिः।
अर्थः पुराणेऽऽ प्राणिनीयमाणे यथा वैदिकवर्त्तायः शास्त्राणीयो वा अयोगाः
तेऽऽ प्रयोगस्य इति ततः वेदे संगृहः 'भस्मवऽऽ रुद्दसम्' (२१.५.५.२१),
'प्रतिहत्वः' इत्यतः 'स्थाने 'प्रतिहत्वः' (२१.५.३५),
थथा धीमहि (२१.१), 'अभिमूहिः' (८.१२.२)
इत्यतः प्रयोगः।

वेदे 'सन्दुऽऽ' विभवः अर्कानस्कर्तानाः 'पुराणिनाः' · · · · · · 'मूलाः' (२०.५.०
१.१.२), थथा 'कालसि' · · · · · · 'अधिकः' (२०.५.०.१.७.६.४)
इत्यतः उपाध्युय प्रयोगः एकाग्रापि प्राणिते। अर्कानस्कर्तानाः तूतीया
वहुऽऽ च 'मिलनः' प्रयोगाः तु पाणिनितेः छन्दस्येव भवन्ति बहुऽऽ, न
तु लीत्तके संस्कृते। लीत्तकसंस्कृते तु केवल 'क्रूरः' 'माणसि' इत्यदृऽऽ
प्रस्तुतः प्रयोगः श्रीतः, प्रश्चीते तु पुनः 'क्रूरः', 'माणसेहि' इत्यदृऽऽ
मिलनः एव प्रयोगः हस्तमः। पुनः, वेदे यथा — 'अर्कानस्कर्तानाः शाश्वस्य
प्राणिनात्मकानाः संस्कृते च 'विधात्तुलः' (२०.५.०.१.१५.१.२),
थथा सुवालनाः (२०.५.०.१.१५.४.२.), 'विधानः दुर्लितानाः' (२०.५.०
५.८.२.२.), इत्यतः उपाध्युय प्रयोगः प्राणिते, थथा पाणिनितेः एव 'फलः',
'फलिनः' इत्यदृऽऽ द्विवधाः प्रयोगः चिन्तये। पुनः, वेदे असाध्यं इतः

१. प० ७१.१५, १०
अनन्य अनुवाद समासेशिवि (अर्थात् उपसमासीवि कादातोपिवि) ‘क्ला’ प्रत्ययस्य ‘लघु’ आदेश: कविचित्र भवति, पवित्र च यथा असमासी लघुत्वा (ऋ। वै १०.१.४8), लघुत्वाः (१०.१.४९) इत्यद्य: प्रयोगः, तथा समासेशिवि ‘परिघाभिवला’
‘अन्यवेदनिवला’ प्रयोगः प्रयोगः वेदे वर्तन्ते । एन्सेव पाठिभवाधायमपि
‘पूलिवला’ ‘उपपिनिवला’ इत्यद्यः प्रयोगः प्राप्तन्ते । वेदे च समासी लघु
आदेशस्विपि कविचित्र ‘क्ला’ प्रत्ययस्य ‘लघु’ आदेशः सातुः, यथा ‘निग्रह’
(ऋ। वै १०.१.५५), ‘उद्धृत्व’ इत्यद्यः प्रयोगः, एवम् ‘अन्यथः’,
‘अन्यथ’ इत्यद्यः प्रयोगः वेदे कल्पितेन च उपलब्ध्यते । प्राकृतः दुः
पुनः ‘क्ला’ सातुः समासेशिवसमासे सर्वोष्ट ‘लघु’ आदेशः इत्यतः, यथा
‘उपपिनिवला’ (संस्कृते-उपपिनिवला), ‘उपपिनिवला’ (संस्कृते-उपपिनिवला), ‘परिघाभिवला’
(संस्कृते-परिघाभिवला), ‘भविवला’ (संस्कृते-भविवला), ‘भविवला’ (संस्कृते-भविवला),
‘पाणिवला’ (संस्कृते-पाणिवला), ‘गाइश’ (संस्कृते-गाइश) इत्यादिपु वर्णोपिवयु ।
एवं स्मरते, यद्य पुराणः च ‘पेठिः’ (जे० मः), ‘चाय’ (जे० मः), ‘उद्धृत्व’
(उद्धृत्व), ‘चार्विनिवला’ (चार्विनिवला), ‘पाणिवला’ (पाणिवला), ‘पूर्व’
(पूर्विवला) प्रमुखणित् प्राणिवला: प्रयोगः अपि प्राप्तन्ते, तद्धिं किमः प्रयोगः
आपिः उत प्राकृतप्रतिलक्षणः माहात्मनुकरिणो वा, छन्दोजुरोवचन्या च इत्यतः
प्रकृतिः समाचेयः ।

इतिमथ्यावेष्य यद्य पुराणानि खल परमिविन् व्यासेन लोकहितार्थाय
संपूर्वितानि रचितानि या। अतो वर्णालिकिप्रकारे कादातिप्रवेशः सर्वसंपूर्वे जनानां
पुराणानि पधने अपने नान्तिकारोधसुकुपम्यते। अतएव पुराणवाचकः सुला
व्यासाथ जनसंसाद पुराणानि वाच्यतिः सम। जनानामान्यस्य च भासा सादृष्टि

2. ‘हेम् तासी यमामान परिघाभिवला’ (पाठ ७३.१३५, काशि)
3. ‘प्रत्यावर्तम परिघाभिवला’ (तत्रेक)
4. ‘उद्धृत्व जुरोत्ति’ (तत्रेक)
5. ‘अन्यथ’ तास देवानम गतः (तत्रेक)
6. कल्पितेन चार्विनिवला प्राय चार्विनिवला अवज्य इति। (पाठ ७३.१३५, चतूर शः,
मुनोचनिप्रतापः)
7. उदाहरणानि तूरस्त्राहिबपिदिबद्धः ।
8. ‘इत्य लोकहितार्थाय संसूदान परमिविन’ (लघु, ५३.१५६ पृ)

July 1962] पुराणार्थविनौपायावलोकि: 279
प्रायोण प्राक्तम् आलीत। बेदेके 'तत्त्व' स्मृतम्। दानव्यमेत्रः भगवता। पापिनिना संसूतमेऽ 'भापायम्' इति बन्ध्ययोगस्तु विष्यकविषयाणां मायां श्रवणमात्रानं ये न तु जनसामान्यम् भापामधिक्ष्य।

लोकालां ललितकस्तृत उपजिन्न्द्रः सुखोकालास्फलस्य सुखा च कोके भव्यार्थमाणे पूरणावाचैः लोकभाष्या प्राक्तेन दानवरमूलविन्यत सम्बन्धवा तु नापलावा।

पुनः पुराणानि कधः कधः प्रतिभास्यः सूक्ष्रः ब्यासः अन्वैयः वा पुराणविशेषः कचिंभः परिवर्तिनिश्व संविश्वासनिश्व प्रयत्नित्विनिश्व वा—इति प्राचीनः पुराणकोशाणां सत्यः अत्यन्तनेन सप्तस्त्री प्रतियोग्यते। तस्माद रचनाकर्तानां प्रति-संस्करणकर्तानां वा पौराणिकोऽभायां प्राक्ताभावेण अपठित्या नासीद्विप्पिः निष्कित-प्रयोगां। प्राचीन-पुराणपुस्तकानां इत्याश्रम प्राक्तत्रैः देख्येतरं पुराणानि कालिषिनं संस्कारपदार्थं ज्ञातौज्ञानां ताा नानांतिरक्षणकारणं इततः, परवर्तिनिश्व दिशिकारैः तत्र तथा प्रतिरियोज्यानि च।

पुनः पुराणे पुस्तकमानां राजवंशावलीनां केवल शब्दः सुतमागवशास्त्रीमिः मूलमः प्राक्ते एवं रचिताः स्वः पाथाचः तत्सः शेषः। पुराणप्रतिसंस्करणं संस्कर्ते परिवर्त्यं पुराणे एवं विषयाणि स्वः इत्यादि संबन्धवा बलते।\(^{१०}\) अतः एवं पुराणेः कचिंदु हितोपदेशानि प्रथमा विनिष्कतः प्रधानः सदाः।\(^{११}\) परस्तु संस्कर्तवाच्यम्नानां एततः प्राक्ताः विषयाणि साधने तत्वदः प्रयोगः। पुराणेः केवल शब्दः संस्कर्ते स्वः प्रकृतीमनोन्निधिस्यं विशेषमनोन्निधिस्यं वही प्राप्ते, परस्तु यदि ते शक्याः पुनः प्राक्ते परिवर्त्यं, तद्भवं तदं त्वमदेव स्त्री-भावो ज्ञाते, साधुः संवधिना साधुः सम्बन्धे।\(^{१२}\)

\(^{१०}\) इश्वराचार्य—\(१२०\) वेण० १०१३। उपाख्यानोऽद्या स्वाति तत्त्वश्च शृङ्खलायः।

\(^{११}\) अथ च इश्वरयाचार्य: पापिनि, पुराण-देवक्ष्य आङ्ग वि आलीश्वरिहः अष्टिः वि कलिः एवः, परिष्ठलम्।\

\(^{१२}\) ब्रह्मचारिणी राजवंशावलीमानानि केवलस्वरूपः सुतमागवशास्त्रीमिः मूलमः प्राक्ते एवः रचिताः एव विषयाणि पाथाचः तत्र तथा संस्कर्ते परिवर्त्तिनां योजानि—इति पापिनिश्व विषयाणि मध्ये। पुराणोऽद्या स्वाति राजवंशावलीमानानि केवलस्वरूपः सुतमागवशास्त्रीमिः मूलमः प्राक्ते एव विषयाणि—इति प्राप्त इति र्नतु वै शर्येखिनि प्रतिपादते।
पुराणम् प्राकृतमूलकम् अंशलय प्राकृतच्यायापूर्वे संस्कृते विपरितरूपायेपि केःप्रूति स्थले छद्योमहाद्वियो विचारे।

निधिप्रस्तु—पुराणम् केंचिद् अपाणिनीयम्योगा: प्राकृतप्रखंडकाला: प्राकृतच्यायारूपे अने छन्दर्घोयंकाले अपाणिनीया: संया:। तत्र केंचिद् आयथा अथ अणां फंस्ते दर्शाने, पर्वता ते विरखा एव। पुराणप्राणिनीयम्योगाः संस्कृते छौ बहुत छन्दोमहामहाप्रकाशि एव महोदेहति इति तुपूर्वत्यादिः स्पष्टीकिते।

प्लादस्युः प्राकृतच्यायारूपाः कौंचित्तू अपाणिनीयम्योगाः द्यूवैव प्रतिभुपुराणातिषु: पारंतरस्यप्रकाश्यत्स मतं स्यंबाधयं छन्दो मतस्याभावमाणायत्रीनि पुराणानि मूलति: प्राकृतमायागेव रचितमात्यतातुः, पथाच तानि प्राकृतच्यायापूर्वे संस्कृते परिवर्तितानि। भारतीयप्राणिनीयमतरा पारंतरस्य श्रुतिप्रकाश्यपारंपारिविवकः सिद्धान्त एवाया मतस्याभावमाणायत्रीनि। भारतीयप्राणिनीयमताः हेः पस्यरे आलामुः—

भाषणपरपरा, श्रुतिपरपरा नौ; भाषणपरपराया वेदांज्ञानार्थकम्भूतियो अर्थम्

संस्कृते एव रचिता आसन्न, श्रुतिपरपराया: ( समस्तपरपराया: ) पुराणाद्वैयो

अन्यायं प्राकृते रचिताः, पथाच ते भाषणबातीले: प्रतिसृतेऽविवाति: संस्कृते विपरित

वर्तनितम्:—इति पारंतरस्यप्रकाश्य सिद्धान्तः। ॥४॥ पारंतरस्यप्रकाश्य मतदविं

कौंचित्तू" नाम महामहाप्रकाशिः। तथा

छु पुसाल्क्षमहाद्वियो निसर्कः किते। ॥६॥ तत्समाश्च पारंतरस्य छु

विवादायमेव लितिर्ति। अस्तु। प्राकृतमहान्नुसारम्।

१३. प्राकृतकोकस्य संस्कृते विपरिविवाति, अथवा प्राकृतच्यायार्थकोकस्य निम्नां मण्यानुपचारः कारणां मन्तविः। अतएव राजयुक्तमहामहालस्य ( निर्यय-सागरसे-संस्करण, १६२५ ) हितोपदिशार्थ प्राकृतकोकस्य विप्रथम् अर्थार्थोऽव्यः, अतएवक्षंयोमहास्तिः। इति सिद्धिष्ठम्।

१४. पारंतर, ‘परिषेषिततिरिष्टिरिष्टिरिष्टिरिष्टिरिष्टितिरिष्टिरिष्टितिरिष्टितिरिष्टिरिष्टितिरिष्टितिरिष्टितिरिष्टि’ दशौ ५-१४।

१५. व०—‘जराल भाषाराय पाण्डिशक रासायनी’ १६१४, व० १०२९-१०।

१६. व०—पुसाल्क, ‘घोष्ट्रीय इत एपिक्स एंड दि पुराणज’, व० २६-३०।
पुराणम्—PURAṆA

पुराणेण भावा अपाणिनिययमयोगः अघोगिनिदिष्टेषु विभंगोऽवि विभव्य

चिन्हान्ते—

१. स्वसंस्थिसम्बंधितोपाणिनीययमयोगः:
   (अ) विन्दुः (hiatus)
   (आ) हि:संधि: (double sandhi)

२. प्रातिपदिकसम्बंधितोपाणिनीययमयोगः:

३. शुचन्तपदसम्बंधितोपाणिनीययमयोगः:
   (अ) कारकविविधसंबंधितोपाणिनीययमयोगः:
     (१) सम्बद्वाणे सत्त्वे
     (२) ‘नम्’ योगे सत्त्वे
     (३) माहात्म्याः प्रतिपक्षाणि विभक्तिरुपाणि
   (आ) विक्रत्ययथः:

४. लक्षन्तपदसम्बंधितोपाणिनीययमयोगः:
   (अ) लक्षि ‘अद’ ‘आद’ आगमयोरभावः
   (आ) आगमयोद्विद्यम स्थाने परस्परिद्यमयोगः:
     (१) कत्रवाच्ये, (२) कच्चवाच्ये

५. ‘क्ला’स्तसम्बंधितोपाणिनीययमयोगः:
   (अ) समासेद्विप ‘क्ला’ प्रतिवस्य ‘स्यू’-आदेशाभावः
   (आ) अस्मासेद्विप ‘क्ला’ प्रतिवस्य ‘स्यू’

पुराणानि युक्तस्तमसमूहे स्वरूपे अपाणिनिययमयोगः: सम्पादकः संस्करिता:

पुराणानि युक्तस्तमसमूहे स्वरूपे अपाणिनिययमयोगः: सम्पादकः संस्करिता:

परस्तु मात्राविवरणम् मैत्रिका एव ते प्रयोगः

प्रायश्चित्ते। कच्चिय तेजस्वि हिर्बिर: केण्युः अपाणिनिययमयोगः स्वःसमस्याय

संस्करिता:। अतो येषु हस्तन्त्रेषु इद्दा: संस्करिता: मौयोगः

प्रायश्चित्ते, ते मात्रो अर्थविवेचनात्मक एव मन्तव्यः; तत्वादि इद्द्वारोऽकाशानं तन्त्रम् प्रयोगानं अन्तरा प्रामाण्यं नामयुपेयः।
पुराणश्रवणितिनियमयोगाः:

अत्र केवलः पुराणानां सुदृढ़तुतकेस्यः ॥ तथा मस्त्यपुराणस्य प्राचीनकोदर्मयास्यसंग्रहानां पुरुषोक्तिभाषापूर्वोऽविनेकानां अपाणिनीयययोगानां कतिपयं उदाहरणानि स्थापितुऽलक्षणयेन प्रदर्शन्ते ॥

१. संबिष्टसम्बन्धिनो अपाणिनीयययोगाः:

(अ) वित्तिनु (hiatus)

[संस्कृतभाषायाम् केवलः पुरुषोक्तिभाषायः संग्रहानां प्रकृतिभाषायः, तथा ‘केशाय शाक्तस्य’ (पाण १५५१५९) इति ‘सुधूरसप्रेयोग अवर्गुः’ प्रदानकारकार्यस्य केशाय एव पुरुषज्ञानं अवधार्यस्य द्वरः स्वरस्य पुरुष प्रथयं: पाणिनिसम्मतः। पुराणे वु पुरस्य अन्त्रापि द्वयोऽवधार्यस्य स्वरस्य: प्रयोगेन वित्तिनु वर्त्ते सा च वित्तिनु: केशाय चर्म वस्तुपुरुष जितिक्रियः सम्पादकैर् व इति, ‘च’, ‘तु’ ‘हि’ प्रथममितिसत्याणां प्रयोगेन पाठ्यदेवन व संवृतिलिखितः हस्तयते। पुरस्य सर्वमेव उदाहरणे: स्वश्रेष्ठिते।]

उदाहरणानि

(१) दलालः वाचमानस्य इति मेव अत्रापिस्थितम्। (मस्त्य १०००कोषाच्)

” ०् ् ् वीतिनु, ” ् ् (मस्त्य ११३२त्र०)

(२) विन्यासकारे वत्तुः। (N₁कोषाच्)

०हीत चातुः। (D₅, D₆)

०तिं विवाम्बुः। (मस्त्य १३०४उ)

(३) पूर्वकृत् गुरुमलिखितः... (मस्त्य ६०१६उ; कोषाध्यापिनि)

१७. श्रीसमृद्धे शास्त्रदिनेशिष्ठेऽस्मि मस्त्य-१०००-अजृह-अभिन्न-प्राप्तपुराणायाम् आलोकार्ययास्त्य, सिद्धान्तावल्लोऽवेद रीतिमेतयाः, अन्यत्राः च पुराणानां चेत्तेक्ष्मिनिष्ठ संस्करणानि भ्रुताणि।

१८. मस्त्यपुराणस्य चित्त तामः काशिरामन्यायाः-पुराणविन्यासं संबंधितः: (collated), वेदां परिचयो तथा ‘पुराणस्य’ प्रवेदायाः: प्राचीनस्य १०२१५१५ श्रीसमृद्धे भ्रुताः। श्रीसमृद्धे शास्त्रदिनेशिष्ठेऽस्मि मस्त्यपुराणकृति-संकेतानां च स्पष्टीकरणं त्याग वर्तिति।
[ तन समासे निबंधनेतरी परिधारण विवरणा केवलं छन्दोंनुरोधानेत्रे।
संधीं हूँ ते, अनुध्यानेतरी समासारणेत्रे म्हणे। ]

(४) मूळं क्रत्योपस्थानांतर अक्षरा पाद्याच्यानं। (मल्ल्य्र०-कोशपु)

"

" नति चाक्षरा " ते। (मल्ल्य्र०, १३६१॥४ पृ)

(५) आसुः च अशाम्ने। (D७-७)

" तद्दासाम्ने। (D१०, ११)

" तद्विरामने। (मल्ल्य्र०, २०४१॥ उ)

(६) सांस्कृतिकशील्य उपायणपिष् (D१३)

सांस्कृतिकशील्यपायणपिष् (D१०, १०, १०, १०, १४)

सांस्कृतिकशील्य भवावाची (मल्ल्य्र०, २४६१॥ उ)

(७) नारा हस्तुस्ते अथा अञ्जनिसिद्धि " "। (N१, D६-६, १९)

"

" ते बापी बृहनिसिद्धि " "। (मल्ल्य्र०, २४६४॥ उ)

[ कथिते 'अयो अञ्जनिसिद्धि' अथ अञ्जने रूपस्तवतः मत्त्या कोशोऽपि तथैव
संधीं क्रमं, अन्यथा 'अयो कणाणिसिद्धि' इति संधीं क्रमं आसोऽपि, अतपूर्व
कोशोऽपि विवर्णस्त्रादि न मन्यते। परतु मल्ल्यपुराणस्त्रादि आदेशाक्रमसम्पदाकैराजापि
विवर्ण सम्भव 'हि' निपत्त्य प्रयोगस्त्रादि न निवारिता। ]

(८) पुरो वदुधारं अमोघस्य। (वानमण्-केपुजित कोशोऽपि)

" अयो शास्त्रमोघस्य। (वानमण्, ६५४॥ उ)

(९) कुणिद्वाण न प्रतेश्वरायमपि अहवाच्य " "। (वास्त्रा, १६६॥ पृ)

(१०) पुत्रके तु अजं धाश " "। (पशुपद, ४१२॥) २३४ उ)

अत्र प्रदेशानुवादायोऽस्मै प्रमेयतः शत्रु छन्देऽंदेशपरिसारायैव विविधत्रत्र
समाकृतिता आसोऽपि। साचे केपुजित कोशोऽपि युग्मणलुकेत्य च निपत्त्यप्रयोगादि
संशोधिता व्यक्ते।
यत्र पूर्वनिर्दिष्टः (पद ८१३.१९) सत्रानुसारिण विन्दुः पाणिनी-सम्मतापि कहते सम, तत्रापि विविधतिः अवयवोन्नीहिंदिकारः सप्ताधेकः नियालतान् प्रयोगः कृतः पाठमेवं वा समाधितः; यथा—

अन्याया अर्थोकांशः ३ दशैश्वरकोषः

०या बालोकांशः ३ (मत्य १५६.१६ पु ४ कोशेष्ठु च)

शक्तिविन्य स्वामिप्रा (मत्य १२.८)

विश्वुकावालिप्रा (वी ६ कोशे)

(आ) द्वि: संधि: (Double Sandhi)

[भगवत: पाणिनेिरं मते ८१३.१९ प्रमूहितम: सृजृतञ्ज अवर्ज्ञूपावियोः पदान्त्यन्त्यकार-बकारायोर्कोभे क्ततेश्वी ८१.२१। सत्रानुसारिण तन्थ कोषाश्चित्तवात्त पुरेरत्योः

स्वरयोः पुनः संपर्ण स्व भस्ति। परतु पुराणेष्टु तादोष्णिवि लेपः खुलेखु

पुनः संपर्ण (द्वि: संधि:) हस्तये संधि: संधिकारः सप्ताधेकः नियालतान् प्रयोगः कृतं

अन्याया अर्थोकांशाः।]

उदाहरणाणि

(१) सर्वनास्फलः प्रोक्तः (मत्य ५.५६.१४ कोशेष्ठु च)

[सर्वनास्फलः, <सर्व: अन्तत्त्वः, <सर्व: (०मूः ०यूः) अन्तत्त्वः।

अत्रीः पुत्रदायिने नवायमसक्षिप्तपरायां द्वि: संधि: ]

(२) तत्त्वात् नुप: श्लायत् (वमी १.३.१.७)

[तत्त्वायतः, <तस्ता: (=देया:) अभमतः, <तस्ता: (०मूः ०यूः) अभमतः]

(३) विरोधेकः च सुरभिमायाः (मत्य १४.६.१५)

[सुरभिमायाः, <सुरा अभिमायाः, <सुरा: (०मूः ०यूः) अभिमायाः]

(४) सुभोक्ष राजा स पुरुषवामात् (बाण ७६.५.ॷ द)

[पुरुषवामात्, <पुरुषव अभमतः, <पुरुषवा: (०मूः ०यूः) अभमतः]

।
(६) कपालिकनेत्रोरय। (७ कोषें)

कपालिके च वीरा०। (मल्लयो, ४७१, ३६ ०)

[ कपालिकनेत्रोरय, कपालिक एकजोरय, कपालिक एकजोरय ]

(७) तथावस्थागति नैस्तिती (५ कोषें)

"0ने च नैस्तिती (मल्लयो, ७६१, ३६ ०)

[ अवर्गगति, अवर्गण इति, <अवर्गण्य इति ]

2. प्राचीनपिकसम्बन्धीतपाणिनोपरप्रथमयोगः:

[पुराणेण प्राचीनमभावेत छन्देऽद्वीरोधेण च कविता 'तेजस्', 'वशस्', 'शिरस्', 'अवस्', 'सरस्' । प्रभृतीनाम 'असु-अन्तलालाभार्य' सकारार्येन कुला तेमासु अकारार्यं (खियामू-आकारार्यं) क्रतम् । पुरवं, अन्वेषपि प्राचीनमभावति: प्राचीनिपिकसम्बन्धीतपाणिनीययिकारणा: पुराणेण प्रथम।]

उदाहरणाति—

(१) अधूतेजन: खियो झाला: (मल्लयो, १८५, १० ।)

[ अन्त 'असु-अन्तलालाभार्य' इति शाब्दिक स्वरुपात्मक 'अधूतेजन' इत्याकारार्यं कुला तस्य जसि रूपं प्रथमकम्। अधूतेजन: इति युद्धपाछाण्यस्थले 'अधूतेजन' इत्यपाणिनीययिकेत पठेष्ट अन्त नवाकर्षकसंप्रथिरोधिपि क्रतं। प्राचीनमभावस्वरूप स्थङ्ग एव।]

(२) नवलवरंभसुतासे वीर्य्यत्तो महायाता:। (बालुङ्गो, ६४ ।)

[ अन्त 'महायाता: इति प्राचीनप्रतिलहफः पाठ: बालुङ्गारणण्य इंपिया आफिसपुस्तकायस्य ५५६१५५कें कोषः वतेतादिति। अस्य कोषायस्य]
(3) भासि मार्गिशिरे नरः (भागम् ६५५१२, तकोशेः च)

[ अत्र ‘मार्गिशिरे’ इति श्रुत्वपथस्य स्थाने ‘मार्गिशिरे’ इति प्रयोगस्य नवाभ्रस्तपरिधारय न्यियोगते। कोणते ते ‘मार्गिशिरे’ नरोऽसे इति पाठो न्यियोगते।]

(4) जगतः श्रेयकारणम् (भागम् ६५५१२)

[ अत्र ‘श्रेयकारणम्’ इति श्रुत्वपथस्य स्थाने ‘श्रेयकारणम्’ इति पाठस्य अनुस्पुद्धि पाठे पक्षमवर्णस्य घुर्तकिरणार्थम्।]

(5) तथेत सर्माहालयं ब्रूहि (भागम् ६५५१२)

(6) पञ्चस सर्माहालयं (६५५१२)

(7) ब्रूहि में सर्माहालयं (६५५१२)

[ अत्र तिथ्वविति स्थः ‘सर्’ इति श्रुत्वपथस्य स्थाने ‘सर्’ इति प्रयोगस्य अनुस्पुद्धि पाठे पक्षमवर्णस्य घुर्तकिरणार्थम्। अत्र तत्त्ववेश्या न न्यियोगते तव ‘सरस्’ (‘सहसरस्त्रेत्य पूर्ण्’ भागम् ६३१२८), ‘सरसी’ (‘प्रमण रसी ब्रूहि’ २२५१८५), ‘सरसी’ (‘स्रद्धा च स्त्रोतयेऽविपणने’ २२५१८५)

भूमिकः प्रयोगः एव स्त्रयते।]

(8) दुहितलात्र प्रशाश्च च (भागम् ६५५१२६, कोशेः च)

[ अत्र ‘दुहितलात्र’ इति पाठस्य स्थाने ‘दुहितला’ इति पाठो नवाभ्रस्तपरिधारय। अस्मिन् स्थः शास्त्रविद्याधिकारेऽ ‘प्राचार्य दुहितला’ इति संबोधित: पाठो विचित्रते। अन्तरागमविचारे तकोशेः च विवाच दुहितला’ इति पाठेत्य न्यियोगते।]

(9) विभाषातात्म संहातात्म (भागम् ४७११५१; तकोशेः च)

१५. दूर—पाञ्जिक, दूर दूर, दूर दूर, दूर दूर।
[ अथ ‘विशालाय’ हस्यस्व पत्रस्य सतिकृत सत्वद्विनसामयिः ‘महते’ हस्यस्य स्थाने ‘महानालाय’ इति पाठे चुत। अनेन पाठेन चात्र छन्दः-पादपूरीमिच्छि भवति; अन्यथा ‘महते’ इति पाठे सपाटसर्वप्रेम स्वः। पुनः हस्य ‘महानालाय’ इति पाठे पाल्प्राकृत्रत्रभावोऽपि हस्यते, पाल्प्राय:ते ‘सहते’ हस्यस्य ‘महत’ इति प्रातिपादिकरूः भवति। ]

(१०) स्वाहाय च स्वादाय च ( मल्ल्यो, ४७१५७ प्र.)

[ अथ विशव्वते महास्वा ‘स्वाहा’ ‘स्वाच्छि’ हस्यवच्छस्ववत्सौर्ज्ञां हस्यप्रकाशनम् च च: तत्स्वाकारणोऽपि पदे शिल्पस्य द्विषोषणतेनाभिलाभतवेन वा प्रयुक्ते स्वः। अथे व्युष्टे पदे ‘वस्तुकारात्मने चैव’ इति पदस्य वस्तुकारात्मकात्। ‘स्वाहा’ ‘स्वाच्छि’, ‘वस्तु’ इति ग्रामण्यां पदानि स्वाकारणग्नि पाठवति।

३. सुचिनादर्भन्धिनयोगच हथायनायेव योगीः

(अ) कारकविन्यासपरिवर्तनः

[ पुराणेऽजः कथितः सप्रदानोऽपि चतुर्दश्यामाने सत्सम्बन्धिनै विमिश्रित: प्रयुक्ते द्वयस्ते, कथित ‘नमः’-शव्वंशेऽपि चतुर्दश्याने सत्सम्बन्धिते, कथित प्राकृतस्यभार्तेनेकथो विद्भूत्यायमपि प्राकृतस्य प्रयोगात् पाठवते। अन्यायार्थो विमिश्रित्याय: पुराणेऽज, यत्र तत्र प्रायः। ]

(१) सम्प्रदाने सत्सम्बन्धितः

मधुराच्छुने वद्याय ( D₁₀-₁₄ )
मधुरांश्च कुजऽ वद्याय ( D₉-₁₆ )
अस्त्य स्थाने—

गृहदीवनं च मैयाय ( N₁—नेवारीकोर्चे )
अज्ञाताय संस्कारं ( मल्ल्यो, ६३१५५, कृपुचित तत्कारणं च )

(२) ‘नमः’ योगात सत्सम्बन्धी—

प्रणवेच्छस्य सान्ते... तुस्मं मन्त्रालम्बने नमः।

( मल्ल्यो, ४७१५७ )
(३) प्राकृतप्रतिज्ञानीय विभिन्नरूपावरण

"भारतां प्रभुविन्यासं विभिन्नभिन्नरूपावरणति।
उत्सद्य पारस्वानं सर्वम् सोजयानं करणं करणपूणति॥
कैलासनं पवकालेन पुलिन्त्रानं ब्रह्मभयांसति।
स्थापितं करतो राजानं नानादेशापूं ते जनान।
विभिन्नरूपावरणमहासवो युक्ते विद्युसमो चोिः॥३०

(बाहुऽ, ४६६.१६७-१६७)

[विभिन्नरूपावरण नानादेशापूं ते जना (ऽ लात् जनानं, कैलासनं) राजानं (ऽ राज्, द्वितीयावहनम्) स्थापितं-हवम्बयां। अत: वधपि ब्रह्माण्ड (३१४२१९२) 'स्थापितं हवम्ब वहवचनपाठो न्यायते, तथा वायुपुराणस्य बैधेदेशंसंस्करणेऽविवरणिर्दिष्ट (उत्तरार्क, अ:२, स्थान: ३३३ पु:२) 'स्थापितं करतो राजानं नानादेशापूं तेजसं हवम्ब पाठः विभिन्नरूपावरणमहासवो युक्ते विद्युसमो चोिः।

[ब्रह्माण्डावरण महासवो युक्ते विद्युसमो चोिः]
अथ मध्यप्राचीनो मन्त्रितारो वदायौ ते। (भगवतो, ६३२३४५ ॥)

[अथ तु स्थितेव पार्श्वभक्तिस्य प्रभावो लक्ष्यते। पार्श्वभक्तो द्वितीयां बहुचने ‘राज्ञिः’ शब्दस्य ‘राज्ञानो’, ‘भवितो’ शब्दस्य च ‘मन्त्रितारो’ इति रूपं भवति। एततस्तः प्रयोगसू तत्तैव सातुः। संस्कृते त्वेऽक्षरो वाक्यविन्यास: सब्वेदैवपाणिनीः।]

राजा कोपस्तथापि वर्णणी मन्त्रिता स्वयः। (वक्रत्वो, ३२६०६५ ॥)

[अथ प्रकरणे वायुपुराणेपि (६६३४५७) ‘वर्णणी मन्त्रिता स्वयः’ इत्येव पाठो वर्तते। ‘त्रिः’ संस्कृतशब्दस्य प्राक्ते प्रथमान्तित्वो विशेष विभेष तत्वो इति बहुवचनरूपं भवति। अथ ‘त्रिः’ इति रूपं ‘तत्वो’ इति प्राक्तत्वप्रस्ताविकाः संस्कृतच्छायैः। अन्यथा ‘वर्णणी’ इत्यस्य योगे त्रिव्यं इत्येव शुद्धसंक्षेपादः स्वयः। वायुपुराणेपे कोरो (Jones Ms; Web, T. ४८) अथा पाठं एवं संपीडितः—‘व्रीणि वर्णणी मन्त्रिता राजा कोपस्तथापि’।]

मृगेन्द्र: स्वाभिकिन्तु मन्त्रित्वं समाख्यः। (मत्स्य, २७२ । ३ पृ।)

[अथावस्त ‘त्रिः’ शब्दः ‘तत्वो’ इति प्राक्तत्वप्रस्ताविकाः संस्कृतच्छायैः। शुद्धसंक्षेपभये तु ‘चावो’ इति श्रवणयोगे तत्वं संस्कृताविशेषां रूपेण संस्कृतच्छायैः। इत्येव शुद्ध: पाठः स्वयः।]

अन्तःचविश्वति तथा चर्या पार्श्वी मन्त्रिता नुपः। (मत्स्य, कोरो) २३

२१. द्रौ—पांचितर, ‘पु: ३०’ पु: ५२, विन्यासः ३३-४२।
'आयाबिशिष्टि तथा बर्षि (= वर्षण)’ इति पाठनात्रानुसारा पाठिका नवासारणी म्हणत. पाठूने तु असळ भारे ‘अन्यायसंग स्वतः बर्षि’ इति पाठो भरवति, अनेन माहात्पदेन च पादे.सत्त्वनुः अन्यायसिद्धेन भरवति. अतो मूलाभासून पाठी हुय निवाद आसोद्रिति पाठिकास्थूलाध्यक्षित् मलदु. ३२ संस्कारवाचकसूत्र ‘बर्षि’ शब्दसूत्र ‘बर्षि’ इति द्वितीयांहुवचनांपूर्वे तु ‘बर्षि’ इति पाठानुसार त्यतिरिक्तपेक्षा. पाठिकाप्रायांपि ‘फल’ प्रमुखात्मानुः अकारांतनुसरः शब्दान्त्यां प्रथमाः त्यतिरिक्ते वेदान्तां पाठानुसार ‘फल’ ‘फलानि’ इति द्विविधानिर्धारी रूपाणि म्हणति. मलदुसराणात्मकानुसारसंस्करणे (२७२ १ ३ २) अथ पाठ: इत्यं संशोधितेः पाठाने-‘आयाबिशिष्टि वर्षणि पाठी म्हणता तुः’.

परन्तुप्राप्तिर्वायुंशिष्टि इति उद्धारतः स्वाते ‘आयाबिशिष्टि’ इत्यादिप्रणाली: पाठांतु खंडर्षुदंत्योपेक्षेषां पाठालंशत्रीयार्यज्ञकुलार्यथात्वः स्वीकृत:।

आयाबिशिष्टि मैथिलिः: (सबांसकः, २३५२१२३; वास्तु, ६५६६३२४)

[ अनापि ‘आयाबिशिष्टि’ इति पाठ: पाठानुसारी; पाठीते विस्मर्याभावात्। पाठमण्डित्यं खुदुःत्वकस्वारे अथ पाठोत्तर गृहहोः।]

वृद्धावाक्यप्रभा नूतन कुर्यंति किल निनिविष्णु। (वामनः, ५ कोशिः) ३४

[ अनापि ‘प्राण्य’ इत्यकारांनुसारकार्यद्वृत्त ‘प्राण्या’ इति पथमा बहुवचनांपूर्वे पाठिकांसत्त्वकस्वारे प्रतीक्षेते।३६ लेकिके संगुते तु ‘प्राण्यानि’ ह्याये साधु। अतः वेंकटेश्वरसंस्करणे (वामनः, ९५६६८ ग) ‘वृद्ध-वाक्यप्रभावेन’ इति संशोधितेः पाठ उपलब्धयते।]

२४. रब-पाषित, पु: देश, २० ५६।

२५. काशिराजावली-पुराणिविलोगान वैवेदिकसुतं पालसु कोशिः। वामामुराणात् वैवेदिकसुतोऽवाहिनी विवरणं पुराणार्यभागः तारा, वामुः, २० १३५२१ ३६ स्वले इत्यादिः।

२६. पाठिकाप्रायाञ्च ‘फल’, ‘फलानि’, इत्यादिनि द्विविधानि रूपाणि प्रथमा द्वितीयोरुः बहुवचने म्हणति; बेदेवेदेथाम, यथा ‘विष्णु’, ‘विष्णानि’, ‘या’, ‘यानि’ इत्यादिने रूपाणि—इति पूर्ववेदादिः। अतोभास ‘प्राण्या’, इत्यादिनि रूपाणि भारे (थैविक) प्रयोगः—इति पवित्र व्यक्ते।
वहिं संस्थाप्ते क्षणेमैदानाकुम्भस्मृति (सत्वे, कोशे) २३

[ अत्र 'यहिं' (सं ५४ 'येमि.') इति तत्त्वावलुबचने प्राकृतप्रयम।
बेदि इव पारिभाषायं प्राकृते न अक्षरान्तरश्च तु तत्त्वावलुबचने सिद्धान्त रूपं
द्वस्ते। इतिकक्षरस्त्रेतु 'तृतीयाः' अन्तमेव—इति तु पूर्वभेदोक्तम्। अस्य
पालसस्य स्थाने मल्लपुराणस्य आनन्दायसमस्तर्कये (५.०१३७ घ) 'तेषु संस्थाप-
ते तच ऐतिहासिक स्मृति इति पाठ उपलब्ध्ये।]

विन्यासकालों कुलानाते नुपा वैविभिन्निकालयस्। (बहुवाचौ, ३२६५४१६६ दू)

[ अत्र 'कुलान+अन्ते' इति विचित्रते युक्तः। 'कुलान' इति 'कुल' शब्दस्य
प्राकृते यथि बहुवचनस्य। २६ वचनपि बहुवचनपुराणस्य बैकेटेकारसमस्तर्कये ग्रंथादेहस्:
'विन्यासकालों कुलानाते नुपा वैविभिन्निकालयस्' इति संकेतितः पाठो वद्यते।
परस्तु बायुपुराणान्ति 'विन्यासकालों कुलाणाते नुपा वै वैविभिन्निकालयस्' इति पाठो
वद्यते। अत्र कहाच्छेदपि 'कुलानाते' (कुलान+अन्ते) तथा 'ते वै वैविभिन्निकालयस्
(=वैविभिन्निकालयस्) इति पाठ पञ्च वैविभिन्निकालयस्।]

(आ) विविधायस्ंज्ञायः:
वेद चायने एक्षेंच्छाजातः (बाघे, ६६४३६३ ?; बैंक}"६४१६५ ख)।

[ अत्र 'वाल्यः' इत्यस्य विशेषणपद्वेण 'वाल्याम्ब्र' इति शुद्धः पाठो युक्तः। बायुपुराणान्ति काले प्रायोपितः (५४ 'वाल्याम्ब्र' इति संकेतितः पाठो बद्यते।
मल्लपुराणस्य सामस्तायसमस्तर्क्षाति 'तेषु चायने एक्षेंच्छासम्बतः' (५.०१३७ घ) इति संकेतितः पाठो बद्यते।

'पुण्यमस पुष्पांकुर्वेन पवशोतः सरस्वती। (पञ्च, ५२०५२१६६ पू)

[ अत्र 'सरस्वती' इत्यस्य विशेषणपद्वेण (विशेषणपद्वेण) कुर्वेन' इति 'शातु'
प्रत्ययातु पुन्निष्कर्षु ववशेषास्तः। अस्य स्थाने 'कुर्वेन' इत्येव प्रयोगः.

२६. मल्लपुराणस्य दाहिन्याभासिनायुमूलताक्षरे B. ३२५५ संस्कर्थे काले।
२०—पाठ्यकन्त, ५००७३, ४३२, ३०१६।
२६. पाठ्यकन्त, ५००७३, ४३२, ३०१६।
२६. पाठ्यकन्त (Jones Ms., W 6b, T. 38); पाठ्यकन्त, ४३२, ४३२, ३०१६।
4. विक्रमपुरस्वरूपीयिनीयिनियमयोगा:

(अ) लड़ ‘अट्’, ‘आट्’ आयमयोरभावः

कुमारं जनयत् निमुः (सत्स०, २०४४ ख, कोशेयोप)

dोषेयो जनयत् सुतमुः (तब०८, ३०१६ ख, कोशेयोप)

पुष्कराणं जनयनर्चतमुः (तब०८, ३०१६ ख, कोशेयोप)

[ अत्र त्रिग्नि स्थायेः चन्द्रन्तियोपपरिहाराय अवजनयत् इति पाठस्य स्थाने 'जनयत्' इति पाठो बतते। शास्त्राकोशं तद्युगारिणि देवनामगरोकोशं च 'पुष्कराणनयनर्चतमु्' इति संशोधितः पाठो बतते।]

पूर्वः य तालिनी भवत्। (सत्स०, „..."

[ अत्र स्वरविवृत्तिपरिहाराय चन्द्रन्तियोपपरिहाराय च 'तालिनी अभवत्' इत्यस्य स्थाने 'तालिनी भवत्' इति पाठो बतते। रूपः कोशे तु 'तालिनी अभवत्' इति पाठो विचरते, रूपः कोशे च 'तालिनी हस्तु्' इति स्वरविवृद्धिचित्रितः पाठो बतते।]

स्तोत्रस्वैरिष्ट्यः (बामपुराणस्य प्रायः सवेषो कोशेयो)

[ अत्र ‘आट्’ आयमयोरभावः। चक्षेष्ट्यक्रस्रसर्नेण (८४०१६ श) 'आट् आयमययुत्: 'स्तोत्रस्वैरिष्ट्यः' इति संशोधितः पाठो दशये। अयम् आयमयमयुत्त: पाठोपि चन्द्रन्तियोपपरिहारते। चन्द्रन्त बामपुराणस्य प्रायः। सवेषे कोशेषो (शास्त्राकोशेयो) चन्द्रन्तियोपपरिहाराय च 'उदीयमय' इत्येव पाठः प्रयत्ते। अत्य प्रायवेश प्राचीनः पाठः।]

(अ) आयमनेपदस्य स्थाने परस्परपदमः

(१) कर्त्तवाचः—

तेन चन्द्रयाक्ष्य लु निशाय मैत्याः

श्रीरूपस्य विनिर्देशित लोकस्यः। (बामन०, ७३१२० पृ०)
[ अत्र 'इन्द्रजा' इत्यत्र प्रथमी दृष्ट यहि 'स्वातिन्द्रव्या यदि तै बनि गः' इति रक्षणात् सारेण इत्यत्रस्य सामान्यः अक्षरः ( जगण्यस्य प्रथमस्य अक्षरः ) लघु भवति। अतएव छन्दोधनुरोथोऽज 'निवेदये' इत्यत्र स्थाने 'विधिति' इत्यपाणिनीः पाठः सत्मान्यस्य लघुत्वकरणाय समाधितः।]

(२) कर्मवाच्ये—

या च सदा विविषिष्ठ सेवयति देवैर्—

या च सदा सुचि सेवयति विषे।

(मत्स्य कोशेऽ)

[ आनान्दशममुद्धितमलस्यपुराणस्य ११६।२२ स्थाने S₁, D₁, D₂, D₆, कोषेऽवर्ध पाठ उपक्षमः। अत्र एकादशशास्त्रकी दोषकृत्वापादी। दोषकृत्वापाद च वृतवाकृध्—'दोषकृतुचिं मिवे भमभादुः गी' इति लक्षणमः। दोषकृत्वापादः नाय्य भावः भगवान लघु भवति भगवान वृतवाकृध्। अतः, छन्दोधनुरोथोऽज दोषकृत्वापादोऽवस्थयोऽवस्योऽवस्य पादोऽस्य: 'संख्यः' इति इत्यद्वाठस्य स्थाने कर्मवाच्येऽपि सिद्धिः' इत्यपाणिनीः पाठो वर्तते, नवमान्यस्य लघुत्वकरणाय।]

विन्ध्य सववानां दृष्यति तेहे जनमिः प्रकटमः।

(मात्र, १६१३६७)

[ अत्र 'पार्थ' छन्दः तृतीयचतुर्थः। आर्यायासु तृतीये पादे द्वादशां मार्गः भवति। चतुर्थां पादे च पञ्चदसां मार्गः। इदं रक्षणस्यनुसूत्राय चतुर्थां पादे 'द्वितेत्' इति इत्यद्वाठस्य स्थाने कर्मणां पि 'दृष्यति' इति पाठः प्रयुक्तः।]

५०. 'क्वचा' इत्यस्मान्यमनोदिवशिकायपाणिनीयंयोगः।

(अ) समासेऽपि 'क्वचा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यूप्' आदेशाभावः।

[ 'समासे' इत्यस्मात् क्वचा ल्यूपः ( पा ७१।३४ ) इति यूपः भावता पाणिनिना भाप्याय ( जैकिनस्मृत्ते ) उपसर्गपूर्वाकारः धातुः: 'क्वचा' प्रत्ययस्य निर्मयं 'ल्यूप्' (२) आदेशो विहितः। परस्तु पुराणः कचिद् उपसर्गपूर्वाकारः धातौरूपिणी 'ल्यूप्' स्थाने 'क्वचा' प्रति हयथः। तत्र प्राप्ते छन्दोधनुरोथ एवं हेतुः।]
ढिलूहरिणि। पाकृतप्रभावोधि पत्र हेतुसूक्ष्मितेषि, पाशिमात्तो वास्तवान
प्रयोगानां साक्षात। अथवा, वेदिक्षाप्राचारिप्रतिलकासु वाचतः: प्रयोगः
पुराणेशु वर्तन्ते—हि तथापि वहन्तु हुक्लसम। तथापि, पुराणेशु विवरणान ल्यवादेशा
रहिता चत्र प्रयोगाः अपारिन्यीयाः पर्व, यत्: वाणिज्यिना छन्दस्त्रेव समसेुपि
क्तो बाहुल्येऽन ल्यवादेशायाम उत्कः, न तु भावायामिति पूर्बेऽव प्रस्तावनायां
स्पष्टेऽक्तम्। ]

उदाहरणाति

(१) प्रकरणिता तै सर्वघुरित्रां चाकासेऽक्तम्।

(२) प्रेक्षास्त्रं वचनं विभै। (वामनो, ९३३७)

(३) श्रीपिरम देशवर्त्र विनंत्र संपूर्णविष्णू सहितः युक्तसभा।

(४) आमिन्याविली यो मोहादानवः ग्रांग्रा...। (चूमनी, १२२१५)

(५) सर्व वचनं प्रेक्षाविली एकादशिरेंद्रनिर्णायकः। (वहरो, २५१२५ प्र)

(६) उदाहरणिता चेत्र तु चक्रमन्यकारिरितिः। (वापो, ६८६१९०)

[ बायुपुराणेत्र अनुसार 'प्रकरणेश्वर' (२२९३७) 'उसायु पारिवानाः
शर्पां हि त्रिविष्णू-इति साहु: पाठ एव ऊनः, न तु 'उसायुविलिता'
इत्यपारिवाना: पाठः, तत् छन्दोदौरपम्याभावात्। 'उसायुविलिता' इति पाठ एव प्रभावोधितः व्याख्या। अतः एव बायुपुराणस्य
कौन्तेय (पारिवर—११७) अन्य स्थाने 'उसायुविलिता' इति पाठ एव प्रभावोधिता चिन्तितम्युपपम्यः। ३० विष्णुपुराणेन
'उसायुविलिताः त्रिविष्णू' इति शुद्धः पाठ एव क्त्वते (२२२१६७)। ]

(अ) असमासेत्पि 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यपः' आदेशः

[ लेखानिक्षेत्रते 'क्त्वा' प्रत्ययस्य 'ल्यपः' आदेशाः अनन्तर्वः समासे

३०. हृद्—पारिवर, यूश्च हृद्, हृद् ४२, हृद् ५२। (४२३ = Jones MS.; W ६ b, T ३८।)
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उदाहरणानि

(१) तत: शुद्धांभ्रे: शूपो वेष्क्य संपूर्णेनेनैः ( मात्यः, ८११४४ पू.)
   " " " वेश्याल्पाचेनेनैः ( D₁, D₃० )

(२) तद्विकारसंग्रह गुःश्य ततोऽद्***। (मात्यः, १३३१७ ष कोशेषु च)
   तत्त्रः तथा संग्रह वंशोऽद्***। (S — शास्त्रालिपिकोशे)

(३) शिरसा हु ततो वन्य गतारः***। (मात्यः, १५८१० पू नोशेषु च)

(४) यूज्य देवं चतुर्विन्यः। (वामनः, ४६१३७)
   पूज्यानिष्ठाः सरस्वतीः। (तावै, ४०२४)
   संपूर्णु देववेषेः। (तावै, १३३६६)

(५) तत्रतोऽविकारसंग्रहगुःस्थिरः कालः। (वामनः, ७६१८६)
   उपोष्य *** *** ***। (तावै, ५०२६)
   उपिल्व *** *** ***। (मात्यः, १५२६६)

(६) सेव्यः पाण्डुः प्रवलानेन। (वामनः, ४२१२)

(७) तत्र स्थाय्यः हरिनेनैः। (वामनः, ४६१२०)

[पुष्य उदाहरणः वेष्क्यः, ‘गुःश्यः’, ‘वन्यः’, ‘पूज्यः’, ‘उपोष्यः’, ‘सेव्यः’ 'स्थायः'
   इति पदानि छन्दोऽस्तुराधिपदिव प्रशुकानि। यति हू छन्दोभजन्ति न विचारः तत्र
   ‘पूज्यानिष्ठाः’, ‘संग्रहः’, ‘उपोष्यः’, ‘उपिल्वः’ इत्यादिनि द्वाराधीन पदानेव प्रशुकानि।
   वेष्क्यः ‘गुःश्यः’ इत्यत्र च कोशेषु, वेष्क्यानिष्ठाः ‘संग्रहः’ इति संशोधनमपि
   विचारः।]

(८) संतोषः नारायणमचीः भक्तः। (वामनः, ७६१५)
   तमच्चित्वः विवेषेः। (तावै, ८४१६)
पुराणेश्वरणाथ अपाणीयप्रयोगानां पंताचित्र निर्माणम स्त्रयामीर्द्र प्रतिम्यते यदृ पंतादशानां प्रयोगानां सत्याते हु छन्दोऽसृद्धे एव प्रस्तानो हेतुः।

पुराणेश्वर प्रायः प्रवर्धिणे अपाणीयप्रयोगानां वर्त्तेन, प्रवर्धिणे हु तथा स्थाने पाणिनीप्रयोगां एव प्रस्तुता, यथा ‘उत्साधिक्षरं खं’ (वायूः ३.२.८२)

इति वेप्रयाक्षर ‘उत्साधिक्षरं’ पद्मस्त न्याने ‘उत्साधिक्षरं खं’ (विज्ञप्तम् १.१२.६.२) इति गवार्ती ‘उलाच्य’ इति पाणिनीय: प्रयोग पूव वर्ते। केवलत्व प्रयोगानु च प्रामाण्यकृतिः प्रभावंप्रस्तर एव। वहुनाम् अपाणीयप्रयोगानां संशीते च विविधारीः संवादकृत्य स्व: प्रवल: कृतः, तत्ततेयां प्रयोगानाः अश्रुतं वाचितं भवति; यता, असाधुमेभ प्रयोगानां संशोधनं जियते, न त्वार्णाः। अतः संशोधकानां विचारेऽपि तेन्तपाणिनीप्रयोगां

असाधु एवायतन न लघः।
THE SANKHYIZATION OF THE EMANATION DOCTRINE
SHOWN IN A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF TEXTS*

By
P. Hacker

[ Mitsubishi-šaṅkṣiptavākyā: (C. E.) 224 अथवा, मनुष्टमं: प्रचेष्टत यथा, पुराणम् च भृतस्विद्रेयत्वायम्: समानं कर्णन्दुपलम्बे।

[वर्षभिसर्वालिका: पुराणांशा: किरकलमोहोवेन स्वति गुरुनां गुरुपुराणां पक्षितवन् यथा — TG I
(प्रवचनो अवधायम्:—भवान्, राजां रिखरीभी, स्वति नरेणसहिन्ता, विधिः—
पुराणम् च ), TG II श्री (द्रवीरो व्रान्यस्वरूपः:—रूपम्, पपा, नारायणं, विष्णुं, भगवंते, कृष्णं, ब्रह्मचारी, विश्वम्, वायुनारं
च), TG III (सत्यपुराणम्) च। प्रस्तुतादेवत्व विचयम् वेदक्षेत्रं लेखकेन श्री वालेन्द्रसहियोऽस्मिन्दृशुमये भक्तिप्रकरणम्: TG I
पुराणां च भृतस्विद्रेयत्वायां प्रस्तुतां किल्मिनिन्तु पूर्वकेः यथा। भयं न कस्ये च चतुर्दशा महानां—शाल्यवार्त (C. E.)—224
वायस्यस्य 11.3-24 श्लोकेषु, TG II पुराणम् च प्रवचना भृतस्विद्रेयत्वायां पाठसमीतिपूर्वं विलेख्यते चक्तन्तस्तथा च तुलपानीयि यथास्यां ब्रह्मे।

अत्य लेखकं प्रथमं भागं क्षतिपाक (C. E.), व० 224,
शरणं: 11.3-24 समालेखणां: श्रीती। एदं श्लोकेषु 12-31.940
(पूर्द्धि) शरणं: कालविशयं युगमण्डोकीयन्त्यति, श्रीतां 11,
39.9 (तत्त्वादं) —35 शरणं: पूर्णं छोटं (=भृतस्विद्रु) वस्यप्रयतं।
पूर्णं शरणां मध्ये 32-34 शरणं: प्रकरणम्:। तत्थ, 11, 31 उ, 14-36 शरणेऽश्रवीया
क्रमादं प्रवर्तततः मूर्तितत्वादं क्षतिपाक एव क्रमादं (स् यो—
सवंकलाभः) महं भृतस्विद्रेयत्वाय भयं कस्यां प्रकरणां मूर्तितत्वाय: वर्षोत्तरः।
एवम् कर्णां च साधकसिद्धांतमुन्नितिः। भृताः स्वाभाविकी स्वतः
एव वस्यप्रयति, न लोकस्वरुपः प्रेमविन्यासं नान्तर शाल्यपारत्वप्रविचारे
मन्दिते। तथायत TG I पुराणेऽश्रवीया प्रतियागित्वं हृदयं, ईश्वरकृत्यन्तः
सिद्धांत्ये प्रभावोऽपमत्यते; यत्; एदं शाल्यपारत्वश्लोकेऽश्रवीया

* Reprinted from the WZKSO (Journal of the Indological Institute, University of Vienna), Band V, 1982, by kind permission.—Ed.
The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

BJ = Brahmiṇḍapurāṇa (Viṣṇuṭaṁśvara Press).
Ku = Karṇāpurāṇa (Bibliotheca Indica and Viṣṇuṭaṁśvara Press, sāmpvata 1983).
L = Liṅgapurāṇa (Calcutta, sākṣhīpāla 1911 and 1885 A. D.).
M = Manusmṛti, Chapter I (Nṛṇayayāgāra edition with Kuṭṭakar’s commentary).
Mbh = Mahābhārata (quotations according to CE).
Mr = Markapāṇḍapurāṇa (Bibliotheca Indica and Viṣṇuṭaṁśvara Press, sāmpvata 1967).
Pd = Padmapurāṇa (Ānandaṭhara Edition).
PP = W. Kirfel, Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa, Bonn, 1927 (References are to pages and verse-numbers, e.g.: PP. 6, 4, means verse 4 of page 6 of the Purāṇa texts in Kirfel’s edition).
Sp = Sāntipurāṇa of Mbh (quotations according to CE).
TG = Text Group (Textgruppe) of the Sarga-Pratisarga texts in PP.

Adhyāya 224 of Sp and some passages of M were thoroughly scrutinized from the point of view of the historian of philosophy by Erich Frauwallner as early as 1925, in an article in JAOS, vol. 45, pp. 51—67. A remarkable result of these investigations,
which was later incorporated in Frauwallner’s *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (vol. I, Salzburg, 1953, pp. 97ff.), is the discovery that there are pre-Sāṅkhyaic texts in Śp. This result has greatly enhanced the importance of the Great Epic as a source, or as the reflection of sources, providing materials for the knowledge of the history of philosophy. The opposition of “philosophy of syncretism or of transition” (Mischphilosophie or Übergangsphilosophie), which had dominated the discussion about the nature of “the Philosophy of the Epic” among scholars of an earlier generation, has been replaced by fresh points of view, and it is no longer justified now to speak of the philosophy of Mbh as of a body of doctrines exhibiting anything like intrinsic unity. The didactic pieces of the epic reflect several currents of thought belonging to different periods of time, from which no other documents are available, and to some extent developments can be traced within the texts themselves.

In the meantime, however, the Critical Edition of the relevant Mbh passages (*Sāntiparvan*, fasc. 22 and 23, Poona, 1951—1952) and W. Kirfel’s *Purāṇa Pañćalakṣaṇa* (Bonn, 1927) have appeared. This makes a fresh study of the subject desirable. It may be stated beforehand that this investigation will not cancel Frauwallner’s results, but render their significance even more conspicuous by tracing the line of development farther in both directions, towards the past as well as towards later periods, and by analysing more elaborately some aspects of the texts treated by Frauwallner.

For the texts of Śp 224 and M are in a direct genetic line connected with those purānic texts the historical development of which, as far as it is traceable in the purāṇas themselves, has been shown by Kirfel in his *Purāṇa Pañćalakṣaṇa*. In the direction of the past, there is a genetic connection to TG I, as I tried to show in a brief analysis of the cosmogony of the

Manuṣṭhī in comparison with TG I a few years ago. In the present article, it is proposed to trace the line of development to a later stage, viz. to TG IIA and TG IIb, after first attempting a fresh critical analysis of the Cosmogony Text of Ṣp 224, utilizing the Critical Edition. The study is limited to the account of the elemental emanation as given in Ṣp 224 and the exposition of the emanation of the elements and senses as set forth in TG IIA/IIb, all matter after Ṣp 224, 38 and after PP 50, 45b (or PP 9, 20, respectively) being reserved for future investigations.

I. The Account of Emanation of Ṣp 224

Ṣp 224, 11 (quoted below, p. 303) describes the nature of the primeval entity. Immediately afterwards, the subject changes. The following verses, 12—31, b, have no direct bearing on the contents of 11, treating as they do of Divisions of Time (12—21 and 28—30) and of the Dhārmas of the Yugas (22—27). After 30, the subject of Cosmogony is resumed.

Up to Ṣp 224, 38 there are parallel passages in M:
12—21 correspond to M 64—70 (Divisions of Time);
22—27 correspond to M 81—86 (Yugadharmāḥ);
28—38 correspond to M 71—78 (conclusion of the tract on Divisions of Time and Cosmogony).

The different arrangement of the several subjects in Mbh and M already suggests that neither M nor Mbh has used the other text, but both have drawn upon a common source, now, several sources, viz, a short text on Divisions of Time, another one on Yugadharmāḥ, and a third one on Cosmogony—and that the

2. Two Accounts of Cosmogony, in: Jñānamuktāvāli, Commemoration Volume in Honour of Johannes Nobel (New Delhi, 1959), pp. 77ff. For lack of space, this article had to be very brief, and the comparison of M with Mbh 12, 231—232 could be given only in a very summary way. Besides, I eventually forgot, though I originally intended, to refer to Frauwaller's article in JAOS, vol. 45, a reference which would have been especially useful for the explanation of the verses M 16—19 (see pp. 80f. of my article in Jñānamuktāvāli and pp. 57f. of Frauwaller's article in JAOS, vol. 45).

3. CE 12, 224, 11—12 is Bombay Edn. 12, 231, 11—12; CE 12, 224, 13 is B.E. 13—14; CE 12, 224, 14—31 is B.E. 15—32; CE 13, 224, 32—38 is B.E. 12, 232, 1—7,
redactors of Śp and M have pieced them together in different ways. The observation of two interruptions in the course of exposition raises this supposition almost to certainty: (1) The verse Śp 224, 11, which gives a description of the primeval being or the primeval state of the world, is evidently meant as an introduction to the narration of the cosmogonic process, but the subject is resumed only with 31; (2) the tract on Divisions of Time is cut short with 21, but abruptly resumed in 28, an interruption which is absent in M. These breaks in the continuity of the narration as well as the difference of arrangement in Mbh and in M are incompatible with the assumption that the text had from the outset formed a coherent whole. In placing the introductory verse of the cosmogonic narration (11) at the beginning of the whole passage, i.e. by indicating the third subject before treating the first and second ones, the redactor of Śp 224 evidently meant to bind together more closely the three subjects which he wanted to connect into a whole, and to do this by using the very words of his sources, without adding links of his own invention.

The sources used by the redactor were small tracts which had had an independent existence and had presumably been used for purposes of instruction even before they were incorporated into the epic. Such tracts can be traced in other texts of the anonymous Sanskrit literature also. We will call them Short Instructional Tracts (German: Kleine Lehrstücke) or simply Short Tracts. One text of this kind is e.g. preserved, with enlargements, in TG I (see my Two Accounts of Cosmogony); another one is the account of Viṣṇu’s prādurbhāva in Mbh 3, 272 (see my book Prahlāda [Mainz, 1959], p. 25—26 with footnote on p. 26; a third instance—the Sāṅkhyā Text of TG IIA/IIB—will be dealt with in section II of this article.

Thus we may say that three Short Tracts—on Divisions of Time, on Yujādhiṃnāḥ, and on Cosmogony—are united in Śp 224. In this article we will consider only the text Emanation of the Elements, on what is called pūrvā sṛṣṭīḥ in Śp 224, 38d, leaving over for future treatment other texts of Śp 224.
Textual criticism affords some precious data regarding the history of the initial verses of this Short Tract. These verses, including Ṣp 224, 11, run as follows:

11. anādy-anitaṁ ajāṁ diryam ajaram dhruvam avayam apratātāṁvam avijñāṁ brahmāyog samavartata.
   (v. 1. : sanpravartate)

31. pratibuddho vikurute brahmādayanakṣapā-khyāye svijate ca mahad bhūtam tismād vyaktātmaṁ manah.
   (v. 1. vyaktāvyaktātmaṁ manah).

32. brahma tajñayaṁ sukraṁ gasya sarvam idam jagat
   (v. 1. : rasah)
   ekasya bhūtaṁ bhūtasya drayam sthāvara-saṅgamam

33. ahar-mukhe vibuddhaḥ san svijatevidyā jāgat
   agra eva mahābhūtaṁ āśu vyaktātmaṁ manah.

34. abhijñayiha cāreṣmaṁ vyasijat sapta mānasāṁ
   dirayaṁ bahudāgāmi prārthanaṁ-saṁśayātmaṁ.
   (Variant readings have been noted, here as elsewhere, only if they are of importance for the discussions of this article).

33–34 are lacking in one manuscript (of the Devanāgarī Composite Version)\(^3a\), and in 3 southern manuscripts as well as in the Kumbhakonam edition the verses 35–38 (quoted below, p. 309) appear after 31 CE for the first time and are then repeated after 34 CE. Moreover the awakening of the Creator and the creation of the manas are mentioned twice (in 31 and 33). These facts safely indicate that in manuscripts or oral traditions different attempts had been made to commence the cosmogonic narration and that the initial verses of different traditions were more or less mechanically juxtaposed by the redactors of the Ṣp. text. One of these traditions made the account of cosmogony, after the introductory verse 11 and the intervening tracts, begin with 31; this must have been the oldest way of beginning the account after it had been combined.

---

\(^3a\). One MS of the Northern recension (Kāṣmīrī version) omits 32a–33b, but this seems to be a case of haplography due to the fact that both 32b and 33b end with jāgat in that MS.
with the two preceding tracts, since 31 occurs in all manuscripts. The 3 southern manuscripts and the Kumbhakonam edition testify to that old tradition in which 32–34 were lacking, but the compiler of that version knew also the younger tradition which included those verses, and in order to do justice to both, he mechanically juxtaposed their readings, first omitting 32–34, but then, after 38, giving the whole account once again, with the inclusion of 32–34. The one manuscript of the Devanāgarī Composite Version, however, which omits 33–34, seems to point to a tradition in which 32 had already been inserted, while 33–34 were still lacking. The text of the majority of the manuscripts, however, juxtaposes four different beginnings of the account: one is 11, a verse which is here used as an introduction to the whole tract in which three Short Texts (on Divisions of Time, on Yugasārman, and on Cosmogony) are united; the second one is 31 a—b, a half verse which tries to connect the preceding tract on Divisions of Time with the following on Cosmogony; the third one is 32; the fourth one is 33 (—34).

This practice of juxtaposition, which is a primitive method of redaction, caused by the desire of doing equal justice to different traditions, is not traceable in the Cosmogony of Śp 224 only, but can be observed in other texts of the epics and purāṇas also. In the Rāmāyaṇa, e.g., one and the same subject is sometimes treated several times in slightly different ways in successive sargas. Another instance is the initial part of PP, TGI, in which at least two different beginnings, PP 2, 3 and 3, 10, can be distinguished (cp. my Two Accounts of Cosmogony). In the beginnings of short texts that had originally had an independent existence, this practice has sometimes led to a state which may at first sight be figuratively and approximately depicted as frayed. There are, as it were, various loose threads at the fore-edge of the fabric of the text. The textual condition which we have described as juxtaposition of different traditions, may of course as well be characterized as interpolation or addition of parts of later versions or traditions to the original,
i.e., to use the figurative expression: not all of the loose threads originally belonged to the tissue. The critic has to examine which one of them has a continuous connexion with the tissue and which have been secondarily attached to it. Thus it will be our task to analyse in detail the four different beginnings of the Short Tract on Cosmogony contained in Sp 224.

We have also to bear in mind that in the case of ancient Short Tracts the affixing of additional beginnings may be due to the intention of modernizing the texts. Thus in TG I the insertion of the verse PP 2, 3 was evidently caused by the desire of adapting the ancient account to cosmogonic ideas of the Sāṅkhya system. It may even be stated as a law governing the transmission of instructional texts, that the bulk of an old Short Tract is handed down unaltered or with minor changes only, but the introduction to it is at times remodelled to adapt the whole text to later views or to a new context. This is sometimes, as in the case of the cosmogony of Sp 224, done by the insertion of additional initial verses (which perhaps belonged originally to other, later texts), sometimes by other means as we shall see in the case of TG IIA/11B.

Let us now examine the first introductory verse (11) of the account of elemental emanation:

\[ \text{anādy-antam ajam dīvam ajaram dhruvam avyayam} \]
\[(v. 1.: avyaktam ajaram dhruvam)]
\[ \text{aprātarkyaṃ avijñeyam, brahmāgre samavartata} \]
\[(v. 1.: sampravartate).] \]

This verse conceives of the entity that existed before the origin of the constituents of the world, as an impersonal being, which is called brahman as in early upaniṣads. The attributes by which it is here characterized give no indication as to whether the brahman is a spiritual being or something like primary matter. Its most prominent quality is its permanence, which is described by no less than five adjectives anādyanta, ajā, ajara, dhruva, avyaya). Besides, its supermundane nature (dīva) and unknowability (aprātarkya, avijñeya) are mentioned.
A variant, attested by 11 manuscripts, replaces *avyayam* by *avyaktam* and changes the arrangement of the words for the sake of the metre. This alteration is of course due to the tendency, so often observable in the anonymous literature, of modernizing an ancient text by the introduction of ideas or terms that had become fashionable at a later time, and it makes the *brahman* similar to the primary matter which is denoted by the term *avyaktam* in Sāṅkhya.

An approximate parallel is found at M 5:

अिदं तदं तमो-भुतं अप्रर्द्धतं अलक्षयां
अप्रर्द्धर्ययं अविष्ठयां प्रसुप्तम् इव सर्वताः

In this verse the designation of the primeval entity or primeval state as *brahman* is eliminated, and the attribute *pramṛta*, which originally, of course, referred to the personal Creator immersed in his cosmic sleep, is assigned to the pre-creational state of the world, whereas, on the other hand, the attribute *avyakta*, which originally denoted primary matter or the world in the state of dissolution, is in the following verse (M 6) assigned to the personal Creator—two interesting cases of exchange between impersonalism and personalism.—Two words of the Śp text, viz. *apratarśyam* and *avartyam*, are confirmed by M 5.

The whole verse, Śp 224, 11, recurs, with significant variants, in Bṛ, Kṛ, L, Mr, and Vā (PP 46, 10), cp. below, pp. 317 ff. The imperfect tense *samavartata* is seemingly confirmed by

---

4 The reading *samavartata* (with ə) found in PP is an error, all Purāṇa editions would consult having *samavartata*. By the way, it may be noted here that the sentence *brahmātṛ brahmagāṛ sampraramānta* had a long history starting from one of the later hymns of the Rgveda and extending at least to the time of the great Vedānta teacher Śaṅkara (7th–8th century A.D.). Rgveda 10, 121, 1 begins with the words *Hiranyagarbhaḥ samavartatārthaḥ*. Here the imperfect tense is used, and the subject of the verb is a personal being, not an impersonal entity. Whether *samavartata* means *began to move*, or *existed* or *arose*, is not quite clear. Śaṅkara (Brahmāstraḥbhāṣya 1.2.23) took it in the latter sense (*samavartataḥ ajayātāḥ* aṣṭhaḥ). The pāda Śp 224, 11 d was obviously modelled on the pattern of that Rgveda sentence, but the verb was taken in the sense *began to work*, which was rendered clearer by the addition of the second prefix *-pra*; at the same time, the tense was changed into the present (to suggest the idea of cyclic recurrence) and what was the most important change, the subject of the verb was no longer
four of these purāṇa texts, but is certainly not original. For the whole of the following account, at least those of its verses which are incontestably original, are in the present tense. Therefore, sampravartata, which is attested by 11 manuscript texts and one marginal note, has to be preferred. Moreover, this form makes better sense. For samavartata may suggest the idea of origination, which, however, is excluded by the preceding attributes "without beginning or end" and "unborn." sampravartata, on the other hand, can more easily be understood to mean begins to work. The substitution of the imperfect for the present tense, in Śp as well as in the purāṇas, is easily explainable from the fact that the text treats of an event which, though imagined as cyclically recurring, is also conceived of as having happened in the past.

After the introductory verse 11 and after the intervening verses that treat of other subjects than cosmogony, the exposition of the process of emanation starts with 31 (quotation above). The verses 31—34 are in a curious state of confusion. We have already seen that there are strong grounds—manuscript testimony as well as repetitions in the contents—for rejecting 32—34 as unoriginal. We will consider these verses below. As for 31, I am inclined to regard its first half as an attempt to connect the account of emanation with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time and at the same time to mention a personal Creator; so this half verse did not possibly form part of the original Short Tract on Cosmogony either. The continuation of this tract, which began with 11, might fittingly have been the second half of 31 (arjate ca mahād bātām ...), and the personal Hiranyagarbha but the impersonal brahman. The MSS of Śp and the purāṇas that changed sampravartata into samavartata did so probably under the influence of the old Ṛgveda verse. The subject of the verb, in PP 56, 10 remained the impersonal brahman. But afterwards, in the same purānic tract, the sentence once more occurs (PP 51, 58), and at that place the context makes it clear that here the personal Brahmā, not brahma, is meant: adikārī ca bhūtanā, Brahmāgṛ e samavartata, and under the influence of this passage, the redactor of Va-Bṛ understood Brahmā at PP 46, 10 also, cp. below, p. 312. So the history, extending over more than a thousand years, of the old Ṛgvedic sentence reflects continual fluctuations between a personalistic and an impersonalistic conception of the Highest Being.
after this, 35 might have followed (quotation below, p. 309). I think there are strong reasons for the assumption that the beginning as well as the continuation of the account of emanation (11 and 31 c—d, respectively) must have been of an impersonalistic tendency. For the continuation of the emanation is an evolutionary process, in which every entity evolves from the preceding one more or less mechanically, without the intervention of a directing person; this suggests that the first stage also happened without the activity of a person. The idea of discharging or emitting out of one's self (ṣṛṣṭe, 31 c) need not necessarily refer to the conception of a personal Creator. The ātmāṇepada is doubtless significant. It stresses the impersonal, mechanical character of the process, whereas in the originally theistic cosmogony of TG I the paraṃśuṣeṣa (sasurja, asṣrja: PP 3, 10.14; 4, 15.18) is used to express real action of a person. The ātmāṇepadaḥ of vi-kr, vikuruṭe and vikuruṇa, which occur in the sequel (cp. the quotation of 35—38 below, p. 309), suggest the same idea of a mechanical process. In 35, maṇaḥ sṛṣṭim vikuruṭe does not mean that the Mind “differentiates” a “creation” already in existence, but the idea is that the Mind differentiates itself, i.e., gets into a process of differentiation, as the result of which the emanation (sṛṣṭi) arises; so sṛṣṭim is an effected, not an affected, object. On the other hand, in 31 the ātmāṇepada form vikuruṭe is construed with an affected object (akṣayam), and this difference from 35 in the use of the ātmāṇepada form vikuruṭe also tells against the originality of the first half of 31. The ātmāṇepada participle vikuruṇa, which occurs three times in 36—38, again expresses the idea of differentiating oneself or falling into a process of differentiation.—The notion of the “desire to create” (sṛṣṭikītā), which is attributed to the Manas in 35, implies partial personification only. It is certainly a reminiscence of the ancient theistic cosmogony of TG I, in which the Creator begins his work because he is “desirous to create” (sṛṣṭiṣe, PP 3, 10). But this influence has not substantially altered the essentially mechanical character of the emanation process as described in Śp 224, for as the ether “is born” or
"arises" from the *manas*, so each of the following elements "arises" from the preceding one. If the process had in the original account started with an action of a personal Creator, one would expect that afterwards the Creator should personally create the products of creation or at least arrange for their being created, as he does in the purely theistic tract of *TG I* (cp. my *Two Accounts of Cosmogony*). Moreover, as we have seen above (p. 306) in examining a verse of the Manusmṛti, impersonalistc or mechanistic attributes were interchangeable with personalistic or theistic ones. It is the general tenor of an account of cosmogony that allows to determine it as theistic or impersonalistic, and this tenor is clearly impersonalistic in the case of the cosmogony of *Sp 224* once the interpolations are eliminated. The original form of this Short Tract belongs to a current of thought different from that of which the tract of *TG I* is representative, but concordant with the thought of some impersonalistic texts of the early upanisads.

So there is some probability of the whole account of emanation having originally run approximately like this:

\[ \text{anādy-antam ajyaṃ divyaṃ ajaraṃ dhruvam avyayam} \]
\[ \text{apratarkyaṃ avijñeyaṃ brahmāyore sampravartate (11)} \]
\[ \text{srjate ca mahād bhūtān tasmād vyaktātmakam manah} \]
\[ \text{(31c—d).} \]
\[ \text{(v. 1.; vyaktāvyaktātmakam manah)} \]
\[ \text{manah srjiṃ vikurute cediyamānam sitrikṣayā} \]
\[ \text{ākāśaṃ jāyate tasmāt tasya sabalo guṇo matalḥ} \]
\[ \text{(35)} \]
\[ \text{ākāśat tu vikurvāṇāt sarva-gandha-rakah śucih} \]
\[ \text{balavāḥ jāyate vyayus tasya sparṣo guṇo matalḥ} \]
\[ \text{(36)} \]
\[ \text{vāyor api vikurvāṇāḥ jyotir bhūtān tamo-nudam} \]
\[ \text{reśināḥ jāyate tatra tad ri-pa-guṇam ucyate} \]
\[ \text{(37)} \]
\[ \text{jyotiṣo 'pi vikurvāṇād bhavanty āpo ratāmiṃkūḥ} \]
\[ \text{adbhavyo gandha-guṇā bhūmiḥ pārvatśa srjir ucyate} \]
\[ \text{(38)} \]

The whole account is in the present tense, probably because the process of cosmogony is imagined as repeating itself at the beginning of every aeon, not as happening once only. 35—38 almost literally agree with M 75—78,
In 31d there is an important variatio lectio, attested by 3 manuscripts, viz. vyaktāvyaktātmakaṇḍ manah instead of tasmād vyaktātmakaṇḍ manah. This reading would suggest that the manas is the mahaḍ bhūtam and is not evolved from another entity called mahaḍ bhūtam. The manas would thus be the first product of evolution, which would correspond to an earlier stage of development of the doctrine and also accord with the cosmogony of M 74—78. The epithet vyaktāvyaktātmakaṇḍ, which is contained in the variant, means more or less the same as sad-asad-ātmakaṇḍ, which characterizes the manas in M 74:

tasya so ’har-niśasyaṃte praṇuptaḥ pratibudhyate
pratibuddhas eva tati manah sad-asad-ātmakam⁵.

I am inclined to regard the reading vyaktāvyaktātmakaṇḍ as original. Later, the manas was certainly considered to belong to the evolved state of things, a view which is attested in our text by 33: abhvyaktātmakaṇḍ manah. But at an earlier stage, it would not be so well intelligible why the manas should have been called vyaktātmakaṇḍ, especially if it is probable that the text of 11 had not originally contained the word vyaktātmakaṇḍ. The attribute vyaktāvyaktātmakaṇḍ—as well as sad-asad-ātmakaṇḍ in M,—on the other hand, is easily explainable from the fact that the manas is intermediate between the inconceivable brahmāṇ and the products of creation, which are “made asunder” (i.e. rendered vyaktā) by the manas.

In the remaining verses of the original Short Tract. 35–38 there are several variants, some of which, while at the same time concordant with M, are attested by numerous Mbh

---

⁵ This Manu verse is another attempt, besides those traceable in Śp 224, of giving a new introduction to the ancient Short Tract (which had once had an independent existence). It was obviously composed with the intention (1) of connecting the subsequent account of Cosmogony with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time, and (2) of replacing the original beginning, with the impersonal brahmāṇ, by a mention of a personal Creator. Its ideas point to an early period, when the Sāṅkhya had not yet become popular and manas still was the first product of cosmogony. The impersonalistic initial verse of the ancient Short Tract has been placed in M at the beginning of the first account of Cosmogony (M 5), but has been thoroughly modified, only one pada having been retained from the ancient verse (cp. above, p. 306).
manuscripts, but none of them implies a notable change of ideas; it is therefore not necessary to discuss them here.

As for the philosophical contents of the verses, the reader is referred to Frauwallner's article in JAOS, 1925.

There is a second impersonalistic beginning in our text, viz. verse 32. The verse is difficult. As it stands it seems to mean:

"Brahman is the fiery seed, the one being of which (yana... ekanya bhūtasya) the whole of this world, consisting of immobile (inanimate) and mobile (animate) beings, is (or: has become) a double."

But there is a remarkable variant, viz. rasah (rasam in one MS) instead of jagat. This reading is attested by 14 manuscripts of the Northern and Southern recensions and is evidently the lectio difficilior; so it deserves special notice. The verse recurs at Sp 232, 9 (Bombay edition: 240, 97), and the reading rasah is attested by all manuscripts of that passage. The verse may have had a sort of independent existence, at least it must have been felt to be very impressive as it was quoted in various contexts—like other impressive verses, as e.g. PP (TG I), 2, 3a—b, which recurs at TG II B, PP 45, 7c—d, right side; and PP 3, 11, which recurs several times in the anonymous literature. Textual criticism has to find out the original context of such verses—which is a difficult task as long as we do not have word indexes or at least pada or verse indexes to all works of the anonymous literature. As regards the verse in question, neither Sp 224 nor Sp 232 seems to be its original context. It may or may not originally have formed the initial verse of a cosmogonic account.—If in this verse rasah is substituted for jagat, the meaning seems to be that "the universe (sarvam idam) is the essence of brahman". But the idea of this sentence is hard to understand. It would

---

6 Of these MSS, 3 additional MSS, and the commentary of Vidyāśāgara have brahma-bhūlasya instead of bhūtasya bhūlasya, but this seems negligible.

7 The recurrence was not noticed by the editor of Sp in CE, so he did not utilize it in establishing the text of 224, 32.

8 The idea is also suggested by the editors of the new edition of Apte's Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v. rasa, meaning 15.
amount to an excess of pantheism or even materialistic monism: the essence of the Absolute is the World. Anyhow, we have at least to reckon with the possibility that there was such a philosophy in ancient India, and to wait until other contexts afford further elucidation. The idea must have been unintelligible or offensive to an early redactor; so he replaced rasa by jagat 9. It is tempting to translate rasa by discharge or secretion, a meaning which would be easily derivable from the original sense juice; the passage would then mean that the universe was a discharge of the seed which is brahman, but I cannot vouch for the existence or possibility of this meaning.

So the verse would mean: “Brahman is the fiery seed of which the universe, inanimate and animate, is the essence (or: of which the universe is the discharge—?); (the universe) is a double of (that) one being.”

In translating dvayaṃ by “a double”, I have in mind the meaning of dvaita, which, as long observation of many texts has taught me, rarely means duality or dualism, but mostly the state of there being a second one (a double). This signification presupposes a noun which, if it has several meanings, must at least in one of them signify a double, something which appears as a second one beside an original or essential unity, and if there is such a noun it can only be dvayaṃ.

Instead of taking brahma tejomayaṃ sukraṃ to be a nominal sentence (with bhava to be supplied), it would also be possible, in the context of Śp 224, to construe it as in the preceding half verse as a predicate of which brahma, with tejomayaṃ sukraṃ as an apposition, would be the subject: “Brahman, the fiery seed, creates (i.e. discharges out of itself) the Great Being, the Manas, which is evolved and unevolved…” But this construction would be secondary, as it is rendered possible only through the juxtaposition method of the Śp redactor.

9 Deussen’s translation of the verse (Vier philosophische Texte, 249, 9c—10d=CB 222, 9) offers no acceptable solution. He makes brahmatejomayaṃ a compound. reads śukla instead of sukra, and translates yasva sarvam idam rasaḥ by dessen Geschmack dieses Wörtlich an sich hat, i.e., he takes rasa to mean something like taste-bearer, a meaning which does not seem to be attested anywhere,
If the cosmogonic account which is preserved in Ṣp 224, originally started from an impersonal Absolute, the personalistic, i.e. theistic conception which is represented by TG I (and the roots of which can also be traced to some texts of the brāhmaṇaś and early upaniṣads) must have soon influenced the impersonalistic text. The influence began, as we have seen p. 308, by taking over the notion of śīryā. But then, several other attempts were made to introduce theism into the text by making the cosmogony start from a masculine being. One of them is represented by Ṣp 224, 31 a—b (a half verse with which 31 c—d, which probably belonged to the original, impersonalistic text, was combined into a sentence), a second one by 33 (with which 34 c—d is to be connected), and a third one by M 74 (which is very similar to Ṣp 224, 31; see the quotation above, p. 310 with footnote). All the three beginnings include the idea that the Creator awakes from his cosmic sleep, and this idea at the same time establishes connexion with the preceding tract on Divisions of Time, which concludes with mentioning the cosmic day and night.

In 31 b, brahmākavyam is only understandable if it is dissolved into brahmā akāvyam (for otherwise there would be no masculine noun to which pratibuddho would refer and which could be made the subject of srjate), and akāvyam (the same word which was introduced by later versions into the verse of Ṣp 224, 11 as an attribute of brahman which is a sort of primary matter; cp. below, p. 319). must mean something like primary matter, so that the sentence would mean: “Having awoken at the end of the night, Brahmā differentiates (makes asunder) the Imperishable.”

In 33 it is once more stated that the Creator, having awoken, created the Manas, “the quick one, of evolved nature”. The manas is here evidently identical with the mahābhūtam. So this verse testifies to the existence of the view of the manas as a mahābhūtam or mahād bhūtam (this reading is in 21 MSS of several versions); accordingly, if the same view, which is certainly ancient, was originally expressed by 31 also, the reading tasmād vyaktitmakam manah (which implies that the mahād bhūtam is the origin of, not identical with, the manas) has to be rejected in 31, and the only
alternative afforded by the manuscript material is vyaktavyaktatmakam. 33 would thus agree with the original text of 31 in the view that the manas is the Great Being, the first product of creation, but differ from it in so far as the manas is described as evolved, no longer as evolved-and-unevolved.

The text of 33b is ambiguous in the word vidya, which may stand for avidya, according to sandhi rules. The commentaries quoted by the editor of CE all understand avidya, and this seems in fact to be the probable reading, though the editor of CE preferred vidya. vidya, in this context would mean something like by a spell, or the word would refer to the Creator's knowledge of the karman of the several beings, in accordance with which their new existence is shaped (cp. pratijnam karmanapakam vidita in the cosmogony of Praṣastapāda's Padarthaḥharmaśaṅgaraḥ). But I would prefer to read avidya, which is well in concord with texts of purānic Sāukhya as well as later Vedānta, cp. e.g. the abuddhi-purvakāś surāgah of PP 20, 1. So the idea is that the Creator utilized Nescience, a dull, gloomy, de-spiritualizing force, in creating the material world.

Verse 34 is puzzling. Its second half evidently gives a characterization of the manas, which was mentioned at the end of 33, describing it as "far-going, moving in manifold ways, consisting of desire and doubt"; this half verse seems to be a late accretion. But to this addition, a second interpolation was added by another redactor, who was induced by that harmonizing tendency which has been so effective in the history of purānic texts, to insert a reminiscence of the ancient cosmogony of TG I: Śp 224, 34b (vyasarjat sapta mānasān; v. l. aeṣarat...) is almost identical with PP 4, 16d (so aṣarat sapta mānasān). In accordance with the text of TG I, the subject of vyasarjat should be the Creator himself, so that 34a—b would mean: "Having here overpowered the Flaming One (i.e. the Great

---

10. The aśādhyāna or cintona practised by the Creator in the act of creation (two instances, out of many, are PP 20, 1 and M 8) is of course quite a different thing from vidya.

11. In the parallel passage, PP 62, 26, the reading should also be abuddhi-; not buddhi-.
Being, the manas), he created seven Mānasas." It is interesting that the manas is conceived of as a bright substance. The overpowering of this substance is probably to be understood to mean that the Creator forced the manas to discharge the Mānasas as its offspring. The whole idea is entirely foreign to the rest of the cosmogonic account of Śp 224, nay, it is understandable only if the parallel of PP 4, 16 (to which parallels from M can be added) is utilized for explanation.

To recapitulate, we may state that the cosmogony of Śp 224 has four juxtaposed introductions, two of which are mechanistic (11 and 32), the two others being theistic (31a—b and 33, to which 34c—d and 34a—b are two successive additions).

The first mechanistic introduction, verse 11, is most probably the original one. It describes the premundane states as the brahman, which is "without beginning or end, unborn, supermundane, undecaying, stable, imperishable, inconceivable, unknowable", and which "starts moving in the beginning".

The second mechanistic introduction (32) also speaks of the brahman, but it is here conceived of as "a fiery seed, of which the universe is the essence (or: the discharge—?): the one being of which the world, animate and inanimate, is a double."

The first theistic introduction (31a—b) calls the Creator Brahman and says that, "having awoken at the end of the (cosmic) night, he differentiates the Imperishable", by which word primary matter is signified here.

The second theistic introduction (33—34) says that (the Creator), "having awoken at the beginning of the (cosmic) day, creates the world through Nescience: first (he creates) the Great Being, the quick Manas, which is of an evolved nature, which is far-going, moves in manifold ways, and consists of desire and doubt; then having here overpowering the flaming (being), he created the seven Mānasas."

The one account of emanation of Śp 224 thus reflects, as a result of the juxtaposition method of the compiler, two different currents of thought and various stages of development of cosmogonic ideas.
II. The Emanation of the Elements and Senses according to TG II

We will deal here with the 1st Chapter of TG IIA (PP 6ff.) and the 1st Chapter of TG IIB (PP 44ff.). The nucleus of the 1st Chapter of TG II is a cosmogony on Sāṅkhya lines. But it has been enlarged by numerous additions and interpolations; further, in a few cases original verses or lines have been dropped, and there have been a great deal of alterations in the several versions. The texts of the 7 purāṇas which form the basis of TG II, may be divided into 3, and ultimately 2, main groups:

1. Mr 45, 27 ff. (=42, 27ff. in the Veṅkaṭeśvara edition of saṁvat 1967);

2. Va 4, 5ff., almost identical with Bṛ 1, 3, 1ff. (since the nucleus of both works originally was one purāṇa, cp. Kirfel, PP, Introduction, p. Xff.; but there are many corrupt readings in Bṛ, and a few additions, in Va); Kū 4, 5ff. and L 70, 2ff. which are both dependent on the ancient nucleus of Va-Bṛ; Kū, however, has utilized the text of Vi also);

3. Pd 5, 2, 82ff. and Vi 1, 2, 1ff. (both are largely identical, but Vi presents some characteristic innovations. In the beginning of the account, and at a few later places, there are lacunae in Pd, so that for some portions we have to depend on Vi alone).

The version of (Pd-)Vi shows clear traces of having been composed on the model of Mr, a dependence which we shall afterwards often have occasion to observe. Ultimately, therefore, there were only two versions: Mr and Va-Bṛ. Pd-Vi was modelled after Mr, but with such characteristic changes that it must be reckoned as an independent, though secondary, version. At a later time, Kū was composed, and the latest to arise was perhaps the text of L.

12. When both TG IIA and TG IIB are meant, I will henceforward use the symbol TG II.
In giving the numbers of the initial verses of the versions, I have included introductory material (which is reproduced in PP only when it is more or less identical in at least two purāṇas). Now these prefaces display great variety. Though the bulk of the cosmogony is largely identical in all the seven purāṇas, there are six different prefaces: in Vā-Bṛ, Kū, L, Mr, Pṛ, and Vi. This entails the conclusion that none of the introductions originally belonged to the account of cosmogony. The same result is arrived at when the contents of the cosmogony are compared with those of the introductions. For the cosmogony is, as we shall see, purely mechanistic; the prefaces, on the other hand, are all theistic: Mr and Vā-Bṛ are Brahmāite, Kū and L Śivaite, Pṛ shows a state of transition from Brahmāism to Viṣṇuism, Vi is as markedly Viṣṇuīte as L is Śivaite. We will not discuss the prefaces in detail. The account proper begins with PP 45, 8, left side, or 45, 7c, right side.

Text of PP 45, 8, left side (45, 7c, right side)—46, 10:

Mr:

pradāhānaṃ kāraṇaṃ yat tad
avyaktam kāraṇaṃ yat tan
avyaktākhyam maharṣayaḥ
nityam sad-asad-ātmakam (7)
yad āhuḥ prakṛtiṃ sūkṣmaṃ
pradāhānaṃ prakṛtiṃ cidva,
nityam sad-asad-ātmakām (8)
yam āhūs tattva-cintakāḥ
dhrvam ākṣayam ajaram
gandha-varṣa-rasair hīnaṃ
ameyam nūnya-samsrayam
viveṣa-parṣa-vivarjitaṃ (8)
gandha-rūpa-rasair hīnaṃ
viveṣa-parṣa-vivarjitaṃ (9)

Vā, lṛḍ, Kū, L:

avyaktam kāraṇaṃ yat tan
nityam sad-asad-ātmakam (7)
pradāhānaṃ prakṛtiṃ cidva,
yam āhūs tattva-cintakāḥ
gandha-varṣa-rasair hīnaṃ
viveṣa-parṣa-vivarjitaṃ (8)

Mr, Vā, Bṛ, Kū, L:

anādy-antam ajam sūkṣmaṃ trīgaṇam prabhavadyaṃ
(v. 1. : jagad-yanīṃ, Mr)

(10).

13. The reading samāvatāta in Kirṭeps text is a misprint.
These verses present a puzzling picture. There are words and lines and ideas identical in both versions, but it is impossible to arrange this material in such a way that one of the versions would be reduced to the other or both derived from a common source. Dilapidation of manuscripts surely cannot account for the divergencies of the texts. For then it would be unexplainable why most of the ideas recur in each of the old versions. The only way out of the impasse is to search in the verses for such material as can be regarded as ancient and to assume that this material was later increased by the redactor of either version.

Now it is in fact possible to find out such ancient material. It consists of three lines. The first of these, which indubitably was the initial line of the whole tract, is the following:

\[ \text{aryaktam kāraṇam yat tan nityam sad-asad-ātmabam.} \]

In Vā, Bd, and Kā this line follows immediately after the preface (PP 45, 7 right side). Its two pādas, separated by other words, occur also at Vi 1, 2, 19: and 19d\(^{14}\) (PP 7, 4\(_{b}\)). It was even inserted into the beginning of TG I (PP 2, 3a—b) by a redactor who wanted to adapt that old cosmogony to views current at his time (cp. my Two Accounts of Cosmogony), and the cosmogony of the Manuṣmṛti also contains it, with a slightly different arrangement of the words (M 11 a—b). In Mr, the line is not completely preserved, but the redactor betrays that he knew it by adapting to his new version (with which we will deal below).

Then, after a passage in which the versions diverge, there comes a verse which is largely identical in Mr and Vā-Bd:

\[ \text{anādy-antam ajayā sikṣman trigunam prabhavaprayayam} \]

\[ \text{(v 1.: jagad-yonin, Mr)} \]

\[ \text{asāmypratam avijñeyam brahmāguru samavartata (PP 46, 10).} \]

It is evident that this verse has been taken over from the cosmogony of Śp 224, where it is verse 11 (cp. above, p. 305).

\(^{14}\) In Pd, this part of the tract is not preserved, either by deliberate omission or on account of a lacuna in a MS,
However, if we are right in assuming that this verse in the original form of the tract followed immediately after the line *avyaktaṃ kūrayam...*, we must, in explaining this verse and those preceding it in PP, start from that form which it had originally and which is preserved at Śp 24, 11:

\[
anādy-antam ajaṃ divyam ajaram dhruvac aruyayam 
apratarkyam avijñeyam brahmaigre sampravartate.
\]

As for the change of *sampravartate* into *samavartata*, cp. above pp. 306 f. with footnote 4. The change of *apratarkyam* into *asāṃpratam* may be due to the consideration that the former word is to some extent synonymous with *avijñeyam*, whereas *asāṃpratam* ("not of the present time") brings in a new idea.

In the first line, *divyam* was eliminated in all versions, presumably because the redactor did not want to attribute a celestial or supermundane character to the *brahman* which in this context is completely identified with primary matter. But the substitutes for the word are different in the old versions. Vā-Bṛ has replaced it by *sūkṣmam*, an adjective which characterizes the primary matter of the Sāṅkhya system; Mr has deleted both *ajaṃ* and *divyam*, filling their place with *jagad-yoniṃ*. However, neither, did Mr dispense with *sūkṣma*, nor would Vā-Bṛ do without *jagad-yoni*, Mr relegating *sūkṣma* to PP 45, 8 (left side), where it figures as an attribute of *prakṛti*, and Vā-Bṛ transporting *jagad-yoni* to PP 45, 9 (right side) as an apposition to *avyaktaṃ kūrayam*. So it is probable that the two words were taken by either version from the same source, but inserted into the text of the Sāṅkhya tract in different ways.

The same theory holds good for the change we have to consider next. In the second pāda, *avyaya* was—on grounds I cannot account for—replaced by *akṣayya*, and the three words were in both versions shifted to the preceding verse, but to different places and in different arrangement (Mr: *dhruvac akuśayam ajaram*; Vā-Bṛ: *ajaṃ* [v. 1: *ajātaṃ*] *dhruvac akuśayam*). The pāda was then filled up by the insertion of the words *triguṇaṃ prabhavāpyayam* in both versions—obviously
with the intention of mentioning Sāṅkhya notions, which had been absent in the Śp cosmogony to which the verse originally belonged. So if the two versions agree in inserting in 46, 10 the words trigunam prabhavāpyayam (which they took from a common source) and in relegating the original words of that pāda to a preceding verse, they differ in the way they have modelled these preceding verses.

These verses in both versions include the idea that anyakta, pradhāna, and prakṛti are synonymous, though the synonymity is expressed more pronouncedly in Vā-Bṛā than in Mr; besides, they give further characterization of the Un-evolved Cause. That the wording of 45, 8 is not original in the form it has in Mr, is also borne out by the fact that, after three feminine adjectives qualifying prakṛti in the yad-āhuk clause, the text continues with neuter adjectives to be construed with kāraṇam (45, 8) or with brahma (46, 10), which is a somewhat awkward construction and a safe indication of an alteration. Again, the fact that in the sequel (46, 12, left side) pradhāna is said to have originated, also strongly tells against the assumption that the text had originally stated anyakta, prakṛti, and pradhāna to be so synonymous as Vā-Bṛā asserts them to be. In fact, anyakta seems to have been not only the most current term to denote primary matter\(^{15}\), but perhaps the oldest one too. In the perface of the cosmogonic tract in Vi (PP 7, 4\(_g\)), three words of the Mr version of 46, 10 are incorporated, which again shows that Mr was used by Vi.

The two pādas

gandha-rūpa-rasaśair hīnāṁ śādo śarṣa-vivarjitam

may have belonged to the original tract since they are attested by Mr, (Vā-) Bṛā and, partly, by Vi (PP, 7, 4\(_g\)).

Now if we attempt to restore the original wording of the initial verses of the tract, the only possible hypothesis is to assume that in their most ancient form they consisted only of the three lines we have considered above, i. e. PP 45, 7c–d,

right side, and Śp 224, 11, with the addition perhaps of PP 45,9c—d, left side = 45,8c—d, right side. If we admit one of the changes introduced into 46, 10 by either Mr or Vā-Bṛḍ, it will entail the other changes in the preceding verses of either Mr or Vā-Bṛḍ so that the two versions will fall asunder. Therefore, we have to assume that the compiler of the tract took the verse which is Śp 224, 11 as it was and prefixed to it a line declaring the brahman of the following verse to be the Unevolved Cause. Subsequently, the redactor of Mr introduced some changes and additions. In the first verse, he did not entirely identify the three terms avyakta, pradhāna and prakṛti, but retained avyakta as the main term, only adding that it was the “Main Cause” (pradhānam kāryam) and that the Great Rṣis called it “Subtle Primary Matter” (prakṛtim sūkṣmām). After this, Vā-Bṛḍ was redacted. Its redactor knew the ancient tract and Mr. He thought it fit to restore the initial line to its original form, to which he added two pādas which completely identify the three terms (PP 45, 8a—b, right side). This change then entailed others. sūkṣma could no longer get a place as an attribute of prakṛti; so the redactor placed it in 46, 10, restoring at the same time the ancient ajam, but relegating jagadyonim to the preceding verse. Why he replaced the pāda ameyam nīyamāpyaṃ śrayam by nīyaṃ svātmāy avasītitaṃ and changed the place of the half verse gandhārāparasair hīnāṃ sabdasparśavāvartitaṃ, is not clear. He changed the arrangement of the words dhruvam akyayam ajaram to render the metre more correct. At the end of 9, he anticipated the description of the avyakta as brahman because he wanted to take brahmāgre in 46, 10 as Brahmā agre (cp. below, p. 324). He added the description of the brahman as a Great Being and as the Body of all beings (9c, e). So the wording of Vā-Bṛḍ can be explained on the assumption that the redactor of this version utilized the ancient tract as well as the version of Mr. On the other hand, it is not conceivable that, conversely, Mr should have been redacted under the influence of Vā-Bṛḍ. It is, e.g., highly improbable that the redactor of Mr, in altering the four initial pādas of Vā-Bṛḍ, should have taken sūkṣma from 46, 10 and at the same time shifted jagadyonim from
and it is quite impossible that he should have omitted the mention of brahma in 46, 9d (right side) if he also, as the redactor of Vā-Bṛ did, had taken brahmāgre in 46, 10 as Brahmā agree.

So the result of our investigation is that Mr is anterior to Vā-Bṛ. This is corroborated by a scrutiny of the subsequent verses.

The possibility, which has also to be considered, that 46, 10 might have been added to the text later (with a view to adapting it to the earlier tract of Śp 224) can safely be denied. For there are more facts than one to indicate that the verse formed an integral part of the tract ab initio:

(a) Parts of the cosmogonic account of Śp 224 occur elsewhere in the 1st chapter of TG II also, and it is impossible to omit them without removing essential parts of the cosmogony; so the author must have deliberately shaped his cosmogony on the model of the account which is preserved in Śp 224;

(b) The verse is attested by all the three versions, Mr and Vā-Bṛ quoting it in full, and Vi using parts of it;

(c) The ancient pāda ajaram dhruvam akṣayam (for avyayam), though removed from its original place, is also attested by all the three versions;

(d) Parts of the new material of both Mr and Vā-Bṛ are inserted in the verse differently in both versions.

To summarize the contents, we may state:

The Unevolved Cause [which is also called prakṛti and pradhāna], which is everlasting (nitya) and neither being nor non-being; which is devoid of smell, colour, taste, sound, and tangibility (i.e., not perceptible by any of the senses); which is ageless, stable, and imperishable; [which is unknowable and not dependent on anything else (Mr, Vi)—or: which constantly rests in its own self (Vā-Bṛ)]; which is the origin of the world [which is a Great Being, the eternal, highest Brahman, and the body of all that has become (Vā-Bṛ)];—is the Brahman without
beginning or end, unborn, subtle, consisting of the three Qualities, the origin and the (place of) reabsorption (of all things), not of the present time, incognizable: (this Brahman) existed in the beginning.

It is of importance to note that the text of this tract retains the description of the primeval state as brahman. Whether this term was original in the genuine Sāṁkhya or grafted upon the system secondarily by harmonizers, is a question which cannot be decided on the basis of the texts dealt with in this article. Anyhow, the data of the two texts, Śp 224 and TG II, in combination with the history of the Vedānta, suggest the interpretation that there was a bifurcation of the brahman monism of the early upaniṣads: one line leading to the spiritualistic monism of later Vedānta philosophy, which was preformed in the early texts, and a second one, also foreshadowed in some early upaniṣad texts, leading eventually to the identification of brahman with primary matter in PP 45, 8 (7)—46, 10. The existence of the latter view is also attested by Gauḍapāda, who mentions brahman as a synonym of prakṛti, pradhāna and aryakta in his commentary on Sāṁkhya-kārikā 22.

**Text of PP 46, 11—12:**

Mr (45, 35—36):

pralayasyānāṃ tenādāṃ
vyāptam āśiṣa abeṣataḥ /
guṇa-rāmyāḥ tatas tasmāt

Vā (4, 22c—24):

tasyaṭmāḥ sarvam idam
vyāptam āśiṣ tamomayam /
guṇa-rāmyaḥ tadda tasmān

sarga-kāle pradhānasya

kṣetrajñādhiśiṣṭān mūna (11)
guṇa-bhāvāḥ sṛṣṭiyāmānāt
sarga-kāle tataḥ puraḥ /
pradhānaṁ tatvarm vadhātaḥ
mahāntam tat samāvṛtāḥ (12)

Parallels of Vi:

Vi 1, 2, 21c—d (PP 7, 4,c—d!):

tendgre sarvam evāside vyāptah vai pralayād anu
Vi 1, 2, 33—34b (PP 8,6—7b):

\[ \text{gupa-samyat tata tasmat kestrajyadhihitam mune} \]

\[ \text{pradhana-tattvam udbhutan mahantas tat samavysot.} \]

The readings of Vā may represent those of the Vā-Bḍ nucleus. They produce the impression of an attempt, though not a very skilful one, to reinterpret some statements of Mr which the redactor found puzzling. He understood all the words of 46, 10, up to avijñeyam, as qualifying the avyakta (45, 9f., right side), but took brahmāgre as Brahmā agre, i.e. he found here a reference to the personal Creator, probably because the masculine Brahmā is signified at another place of the same text (PP 51, 58) by the same words in an unmistakable context (ādikartā ca bhūtānāṃ Brahmāgre samavartatā), even in Mr. Therefore, in order to maintain the identification of the avyakta with the brahman, he inserted a mention of the neuter brahman in the preceding verse (parant brahma sanātanaṃ 45, 9d, right side). In 46, 11a also, he deemed a change necessary. The demonstrative pronoun of this pāda can only refer to the word brahma or Brahmā of the preceding pāda. The redactor, who thought that Brahmā was meant there, saw the idea of the Puruṣasūkta and of such passages as PP 5, 25c—d of TG I (divam ca prthivim cdava mahimnā vyāpya tis śhati) expressed in the vyāptam of 46, 11; but it seemed to him too indistinct an expression to say that the universe was pervaded “by him”. So he changed the tena of Mr into tasyātmanā—i.e., “by his self” the universe was pervaded—, an expression which unmistakably refers to a person. So here again Vā-Bḍ is clearly secondary as compared with Mr.

In the next pādās, there is a slight unevenness in the text of Mr. For not only is the state of equipoise of the guṇas expressed in two different words, guṇasamāyat and guṇabhāvat, but, the sense of “then” is also expressed twice, by tataḥ in 11c and tataḥ punah in 12b. It is hard to conceive that this is original. I think that the half-verse guṇasamāyat tata tasmāt kestrajyadhi-

\[ \text{ṣhihitam mune} \]

is an interpolation and that it was the redactor of
Mr who inserted it into the old Sāṅkhya tract. The purpose of the insertion was, firstly, to explain the somewhat obscure gunahāvat of 12a—which was altogether dropped by Vi—by the unambiguous gunasāmyāt. Secondly, the interpolator thought it fit also to mention the personal Creator's activity at the beginning of the creation (the redactor of Vā-Bḍ had found a reference to the Creator in 101 as we have seen); so he added kṣetrajñādāhīśhitam. But if the original account had made any mention of the Creator, it would be rather surprising that it should have done so only in one member of a compound word, after the lengthy description that was given of the primeval state of the world. Hindu cosmogonic tracts that are originally theistic start by more or less elaborate characterizations of the Creator and sometimes even with words of adoration addressed to him. Moreover, all the seven purāṇas which have incorporated the Sāṅkhyic account of cosmogony follow this practice, but, as we have seen, these prefaces were added by the redactors of the several purāṇas and none of them formed part of the Sāṅkhya tract. Therefore, the brief mention of the kṣetrajña makes the pāda in which it occurs suspicious, and the following vocative (muna) only adds to the suspicion, though the compiler of Vi thought it fit to retain it. For it is hardly conceivable that there was any vocative in the original Sāṅkhya tract.

In 11c—12b, the twisted syntax of the verses of Vā-Bḍ is a clear indication of the secondary origin of this version. It is of importance to note that in Vā-Bḍ the Mahān is the first product of the emanation process, whereas in Mr.—and, after it, in Vi—the pradhānapatsavam arises first. Vā-Bḍ has combined pradhāna with sargakāle in a genitive which most probably is meant to say, not that the pradhāna was emitted from the brahman or avyakta (genitivus objectivus), but that it emitted the products of creation (genitivus subjectivus), avyakta and pradhāna were absolutely synonymous to the redactor of Vā-Bḍ, but not to the author of the ancient tract as becomes clear from Mr 45, 36

15a. kṣetrajña is here to be understood as a synonym of Brahmā; cp. PP. 51, 57: kṣetrajña Brahma-sāuyūtāḥ (Mr, Vā-Bṛ, Kū, L).
(PP. 46, 12, left side), where it is said that from the State of Guṇas (of the Un-evolved Cause) the Main Principle (pradhānam tattvam) arose. Vi has retained this old view, and a number of variant readings in the whole tract also indicate that avyaktam (kāraṇam) and pradhānam (tattvam) were not originally synonymous, though identified later. Nor was prakṛti originally a synonym of avyaktu and pradhāna; as 53, 64d shows, the old tract knew of eight prakṛtis, but nowhere, except in the initial verse, which is a product of later remodelling, was one prakṛti mentioned. I think it is important to bear in mind the difference that was observed by the ancient Sākhya tract in the use of the three terms.

According to Mr, the text of which may here represent that of the original Short Tract, “at the time of emanation the Main Principle arose from the State of Guṇas, while this was being sent forth”, i.e. while the Three Qualities were losing their undifferentiated state of equipoise and becoming manifest as characterizers of things. In Mr, as in Pd-Vi, the mahān is not expressly stated to have become manifest. The text mentions it only as having been covered or enveloped by the Main Principle, and this envelopment is further described in the following verse (PP 46, 13; see below). In the sequel of the account, each following tannātra element is stated to have been “enveloped” by, after it had been manifested by emanation from, the tannātra preceding it in the series.

Mr (45, 37):

Vi (1, 2, 34c—d) :

Pd (5, 88c—89 b):

yathā bijam tvaca tadvad
avyaktendurto mahān
sattviko rājasas ediva
tāmasa ca tridhā mahān

sattviko rājasas ediva
pradhāna-tattvona saman

tāmasa ca tridhādītaḥ

tvaca bijam ivurtam

(The corresponding text of Vā-Bṛ is negligible).

In this case, I would give preference to the text of Pd-Vi, firstly because it has the advantage of being the lectio difficilior, secondly because it retains the word pradhānatattva, not replacing
it by avyakta (which was not originally synonymous with pradhânatattva).

Translation of PP 8, 7c—f:

“The Mahân is threefold: consisting of goodness, passion, and darkness. As a seed is enveloped by its rind, in the same way (the Mahân is enveloped) by the Main Principle”.

After the mention of the Mahân, Vā-Bd has a long interpolation (46, 14—48, 30) in which the Great One is deified and identified with Brahmā and many other entities. We will pass over that passage.

Text of PP 48, 31—49, 38/ 8,—9, 15:

For the following verses, a fairly good text can be constituted on the basis of Mr and Pd-Vi, with utilization of Vā (-Bd) at some passages. After each line, I note the purāṇas on which my text is mainly based.

$tatā tasmād ahaṅkāraḥ trividhā vai vyajyata$ (Mr)
vaṅkariṇa tajjasā ca bhūtādīś ca sa tāmasaḥ (Mr)
yathā pradhānena$¹ mahān mahatā sa tathāvṛtah (Vi)
bhūtādīś tu vikuruṇaḥ sabda-tanmātrakaṁ tātaḥ (Mr, Vi)
sasarja sabda-tanmātṛdaḥ ākāśam sabda-lakṣaṇam (Mr, Vi)
ākāśaṁ sabda-mātraṁ tu bhūtādīś ca āväṇaṁ tātaḥ (Mr)
ākāśas tu vikuruṇaḥ sparsa-mātraṁ sasarja ha² (Vā, Pd-Vi)
balavān jāyate vāyus tasya sparsa guṇo mātāḥ³ (Mr)
ākāśaṁ sabda-mātraṁ tu sparsa-mātraṁ samāvṛṇaḥ⁴ (Vā, Vi)
vāyus cāpi vikuruṇo rūpa-mātraṁ sasarja ha (Mr, Vā):
$jyotir utpadyate vāyos tad rūpa-guṇam ucyate$ (Mr, Vā, Vi)
sparsa-mātraṁ⁵ tu vai vāyus rūpa-mātraṁ samāvṛṇo (Vi)
jyotis cāpi vikuruṇaṁ rasa-mātraṁ sasarja ha (Mr, Pd-Vi)
sambhavanti tato hy āpas odan vai tā rasātimikāḥ⁶ (Mr)
rasa-mātraṁ tu tā hy āpo⁷ rūpa-mātraṁ samāvṛṇo (Mr)
āpas cāpi vikuruṇyo⁸ gandhu mātraṁ sasarjīre (Mr)
saṅghāto jāyate tasmāt tasya gandho guṇo mātāḥ (Mr, Vi).

Notes:

¹) The text of Mr has here again avyaktena instead of pradhānena, but after what preceded I think that only pradhānena
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is possible if we want to restore the original terminology of the tract. The redactor of Vi must have taken the word from the original independent tract. Cp. note 4.

*) In this line, Mr is not original; possibly the MS used by the redactor of Mr had been corrupt here. The nātra sandhyāḥ of Mr is a clear sign of the secondary origin of the line.

*) This line is identical with Ṣp 224, 36c—d.

*) This line is lacking in Mr and in Pd. Vi has restored it; so the redactor of that version must have utilized more than one MS or version: not only Pd and Mr, but probably Vā(Rḍ) also, if he did not take the line from the original independent tract.

*) The last pāda is identical with Ṣp 224, 37d.

*) Mr: sparśa-mātras tu vai vāyaḥ; Vā: sparśa-mātram tu vai vāyoḥ; Vi (1, 2, 41c Gorakhpur ed.; 1, 2, 39g Calcutta ed. of 1882): sparśa-mātram tu vai vāyāḥ. The latter reading (lectio difficilior) seems to be the original one, which was replaced in Mr and Vā by constructions that are grammatically clearer but have no parallels in the rest of the tract. vāyuḥ (vāyāḥ) is an apposition to sparśa-mātram. All the mātra-compounds of the tract are nouns, not adjectives.

*) rasātmikāḥ also at Ṣp 224, 38 b.

*) It is not necessary to see in āpo a grammatical mistake (a nominative employed as an accusative) as Pargiter (in his translation of Mr, Calcutta, 1904, Bibl. Ind.) and Kirfel (who puts the mark [ ] after āpo) had done. If we adopt the reading of Mr, rasamātram (instead of -āḥḥ), tā hy āpo may be construed as a short independent sentence: “for this is water”. Pd-Vi has removed the difficulty by substituting ambhāṃśi for āpaḥ.

*) The parasmai pada participle is surprising. May we replace it by vikurvaṇā on the authority of Pd-Vi (which have vikurvaṇāmi, ombhāṃśi, PP 9, 15) and Kā (which has āpaḥ

9)
\textit{cāpi viśvavyā}, but is perhaps the latest of the extant versions of the tract?

Translation:

From this (Mahan) then arose the threefold Egoity: that one which is Subject to Modifications, the Glowing (or: Passionate) One, and the Origin of the Elements which consists of darkness. It was enveloped by the Mahān as the Mahān was by the Main (Principle). Then the Origin of the Elements, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Sound, and from this the Ether, which is characterized by sound, (arose). The Origin of the Elements, however, then enveloped the ether, (which had the form of) the subtle matter of sound. The ether, while differentiating itself, produced the Subtle Matter of Palpability, (thus) the strong Wind is born; palpability is known to be its property. But the ether, (which had the form of the) subtle matter of sound, enveloped the subtle matter of palpability. Then the wind, while differentiating itself, produced the Subtle Matter of Visibility. Light arises from the wind; its property is called visibility. The wind, however, (which had the form of the) subtle matter of palpability, enveloped the subtle matter of visibility. Light, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Taste. From that, Water arises; its essence is taste. The subtle matter of visibility enveloped the subtle matter of taste, which is water. Water, while differentiating itself, emitted the Subtle Matter of Smell. From that, the Aggregate is born; smell is known to be its property."

After this account of elemental emanation, Vā has the line \textit{rasamātram tu tat toyam gindha-mātram samāvyan} (PP 49, 39). But this line occurs in none of the other versions, not even in L, which is throughout dependent on Vā. We have therefore to assume that the original tract did not mention the "envelopment" of the subtle matter of smell by that of taste and that the line was interpolated in Vā after the redaction of L.—As the last product of the emanation process one would expect to find earth. Instead, the text has \textit{sanghītā}, "the Aggregate". This term suggests the view of the \textit{accumulation theory} that earth includes subtle particles of all the elements preceding it in the series of
emanation. But it is not this idea which is brought out by the mention of "envelopment". For the accumulation theory does not, as the environment theory does, teach the reabsorption of a following tanmātra by the preceding one but, conversely, the admixture of particles of all preceding elements to each item of the emanation series.

A comparison with Šp 224.

Here it becomes evident that the whole tract on cosmogonic emanation has been composed on the pattern of the cosmogony of Šp 224. In fact, it is nothing but a remodelling of the old account with the inclusion of the more developed views of a later time. The Manas, which "differentiates from itself the creation" (ṣṛṣṭiḥ vikurute), has been dropped, but the Mahān is here intermediate between the Main Principle and the Āhāryākāra; in the process of emanation Tanmātras are interposed between each preceding and each following element; there is the idea that, after a gross element had evolved from its Subtle Particles, these are "enveloped" by the element preceding in the series; and there is, at the beginning of the tract, the idea of the subtle, imperceptible Primary matter, consisting of Three Qualities. All this corresponds to a form of the Sāṅkhya system, though not of that of the Kārikā.

Much material of the ancient tract of Šp 224 has been incorporated into the later one. Not only has the old introductory verse (Šp 224, 11) been preserved, with some modifications, but the terms vikurvāna has been retained, and even the word gopa, though in the same tract occurring in the later sense of "Quality of the Unevolved Cause", has at the same time been used in the old technical sense of "Property of an Element" (later Šp texts16 replaced it by viṣeṣa in this sense). Further, one line, one pāda and one expression have been preserved. And, though the whole account was conceived in past tenses, the present tense jāyate of the line taken from Šp

16 E.g. Šp (CE) 298, 14 and 299, 11 = Bombay ed. (Poona reprint of 1932) 810, 14 and 811, 12.
224, 36 drew after it even a few further cases of use of the present tense (tus'adhyate, sambhavanti, jayate).

Frauwaller observes in his Geschicht der indischen Philosophie (vol. 1, p. 303) that the evolution theory of the Sāṅkhya was probably shaped on the model of the Śukinupraśna cosmogony (i.e., Śp 224). This statement is now corroborated by textual history. Nay, the purāṇas even contain an ancient tract—earlier than the 4th century A.D.—which describes the whole process of cosmogony on the lines of a form of the Sāṅkhya system. I am convinced that this text is another instance of a Short Instructional Tract, which had once existed independently, but was then incorporated into works of the anonymous literature and has thus come down to us.

Text of PP 49, 39—50, 45b (cp. 9, 15, 18):

[tusmin tu tusmin tu tan-mātraṁ tena tannāṭrataṁ smṛtā

(v. 1.: tan-mātra Vā, Vi)

aviśega-vāca-kśavād avisegās tatās ca te (39)

na sāntā nāpi ghorās te na mūchhās eva viśegaṁ

bhūta-tanmātra-sargo 'yam ahamkārāt tu tāmasāt (40)

vaikārikāt ahamkārāt sattvādirotat tu sattvāt

vaikārikāḥ sa sargas tu yugapat sampravarte (41)

buddhāndriyāṇi pañcaiva paiśa karunāndriyāṇi ca[1])

tajjasāndriyāṇy āhur devā vaikārikā daśa (42)
[ekādāśanā manās tatra devā vaikārikāḥ smṛtābh]

śrotram tvak okṣugu jihvā nāsikā odhā pañcamā (43)

śabdādīnām avāpty-arthaṇa buddhi-yuktāni anokṣate)

pādaś pāyur upasthaś ca hastau vāk pañcamā bhavet (44)

gatir visargaḥ hy ānandaḥ śīpaṁ vākyam ca karma tat (45a—b)

This text has throughout been given according to Mr.

NOTES:

1) 39—42b are missing in Pā. As there are a number of

17. The cosmogony of TG II belongs to nucleus of Vā-Bd, which was redescribed shortly after 335 A. D. (cp. PP, Introduction, p. XVIII f., and my monograph Prahlāda [Māly, 1959] p. 24; consequently it must be considerably older.
apparent lacunae in the cosmogonic account of that purāṇa, the absence of the seven lines is not by itself an indication of their being unoriginal. But there are some features of the contents of these lines which are apt to rouse doubts as to their having belonged to the original form of the independent Short Tract.

(1) The preceding account had not only, as 40c—d states, described the emanation of the tanmātras but had mentioned the origination of the gross elements also. Therefore, neither is 40c—d exact nor does the form of the preceding account, which does not specially treat of tanmātras, suggest a necessity for an explanation of this term at this place. On the other hand, 39c—40b are so similar to Sākhyakārikā 38 (tanmātrāṁ aviseṣas tebhyo bhūtāṁ pañca pañcodbhavah | etc śṛtāṁ viśeṣaṁ sāntā ghorāṁ ca nāḍhāṁ ca) that the idea suggests itself that they were composed and inserted to adapt the doctrine of the tract to that of the Kārikā.

(2) The same idea is suggested by 40c—42b, which remind of the Kārikās 24—25. According to these two Kārikās there are two sorts of emanation: the tanmātrāḥ sargah, which is tāmāsa, and the ekādaśakāḥ sargah of the senses, which is sāttvika and proceeds from the vaikārika or vaikrāta form of the ahamkāra, and it is this idea which is expressed in 40c—42b. However, to reproduce the contents of Kārikā 25 completely, it would have been necessary also to state that the taitasa form of the ahamkāra was operative in both the tāmāsa and sāttvika (or vaikārika) emanations. This would have created a glaring contradiction to 42c, which reserves the attribute taitasa to the senses. But while this was avoided, an inconsistency arose all the same, for in 42c—d the senses were called taitasa, whereas in the (interpolated) lines 41—42b they were derived from the vaikārika form of the ahamkāra, (42c—d will be discussed in the following note).
Vi has 39 and 40 (with a few variants) but omits 41—42a. Perhaps the redactor of Vi felt that 41—42a, besides being absent in the old independent tract, were not in harmony with 42c—d; so he omitted these lines though he took 39—40 from Mr.

Apparently the intention of harmonizing the tract with the doctrine of a text (the Sāṅkhya-kārikā) which (in the meantime ?) had become recognized as authoritative, could not fully succeed, since it was combined with the traditionalist tendency of preserving the old text. There is one line (40c—d) which is not in harmony with the preceding account and there are others (41a—42b) which are not in keeping with the following (42c—d). As for the rest, there are two lines (39c—40b) which, though not inconsistent with the context, have also evidently been composed under the influence of the Kārikā, whereas the line 39a—b produces the impression of having been added by a redactor who found that a definition of the term tanmātra was necessary as an introduction to 39c—40d; it is improbable that the original tract, which left unexplained other obscure terms (e. g. vaikārika), should have given a definition of tanmātra at the end of what was not an account of bhūta-tanmātra-sarga but a description of the emanation of the (gross) elements with each tanmātra emanating from the gross element preceding it in the series and each tanmātra immediately producing the corresponding gross element.

Therefore it is probable that the original Short Tract did not contain the lines 39a—42b and that Pd, in omitting them, has preserved a feature of the original tract.

42c—d must be regarded as original. For while the statement of 41—42b that the senses are a product of the vaikārika-sarga is easily traceable to the influence of another text, the description of the senses as taijasa seems to be peculiar to the Short Tract of Emanation. It must therefore be assumed that the original Tract, after describing the emanation from
"the bhūtādi, which is tāmasa", continued by stating: "The senses are called tājasa", thus suggesting only implicitly that they proceeded from the tājasa form of the ahamkāra. A similar implicit statement we met with at the beginning of the account where the origination of the mahān was not expressly stated (cp. above).

42d presents a problem. Two interpretations are possible: the deities mentioned here are either identical with the senses or they preside over them. The first alternative was adopted by Pargiter in his translation of Mr (Bibl. Ind.), and it may be supported by passages like Śp (CE) 203, 31 (Bombay ed.: 210, 33); the second possibility would be in keeping with the view of Brahmaśūtra 2, 4, 14—16. It seems to me that the second possibility is the more probable one. For if the gods were identical with the senses, these would be tājasa and vaiśārika at the same time according to 42c—d. It would however be more logical if the tāmasa, vaiśārika and tājasa forms of the ahamkāra each had its own function or products, and it is well understandable that the vaiśārika, in which sattva is predominant, should produce the gods presiding over the senses while the senses themselves emanated from the tājasa. I would therefore suggest to take 42d to mean: "The ten gods (who control the senses) are vaiśārika." The redactor, however, who interpolated 41a—42b, certainly did not understand 42d in this sense.

The fact that the deva vaiśārikāh are once more mentioned in 43a—b rouses suspicion as to the originality of this line. Moreover, the line breaks the connexion of 42c—d, which mentions the (ten) senses and the ten deities presiding over them, with 43c—45b, which name these senses and their functions. I think, therefore, that the line has to be rejected and that the original Tract did not mention the manas at all—possibly because the manas was understood to be included in the mahān, which had taken its place in the emanation series. The insertion of a mention of the common
idea of the manas as the eleventh sense is easily explainable from that harmonizing fence by which, along with the other tendency of preserving what had been handed down, is one of the forces that dominated the development of texts of the anonymous literature.

The mention of the manas was expanded to a full line by a repetition of the statement that the senses were devā vaikārikāḥ (43b). 43a—b might perhaps be understood to mean that the mind is the (ten) vaikārika gods. The grammatical difficulty involved in this interpretation might be tolerable in a purānic text. The resumption of the words devā vaikārikāḥ would thus not be a mere repetition but serve a special purpose. The doctrine would be similar to that of Śāṅkhyasūtra 2, 17—19 (cp. Aniruddha’s commentary: antarā manah iti ekādaśakam indriyam; Garbe [Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie, 2nd ed., pp. 299f.] erroneously states this to be general Śāṅkhya teaching). But the view of the manas as the special outcome of the vaikārika-sūrya seems to have arisen at a very late date, whereas the interpolation of 43a—b belongs to an early time since the line occurs in Mr, Pd, and Vi (Vā has remodelled it, and L, here as elsewhere, has followed Vā). Therefore it is not very probable that the interpolator should have intended to express that view.

9) In 42 and 43, Pd and Vi have a number of unimportant variants.

4) vaikārate is a conjecture, first proposed by Pargiter in his translation of Mr. The text has vakṣyate, which does not make sense. The emendations of L, Pd and Vi are negligible.

Translation:

"[In each of them there is only that (Vā, Vi: In each of them there is a particle [mātrā] of it); this is why tradition speaks (of them) as being Tanmātras. And hence they are without differences, for (the word tanmātra) is not expressive of difference. They are neither calm, nor terrible, nor dull, being without differences. This emanation of the tanmātras of the elements"

14
(proceeds) from the ahâykaru characterized by darkness. From the ahâykaru subject to modifications, however which is of the nature of goodness (and) possesses goodness in excess, the vaikārika emanation begins at the same time: the five knowledge-senses and the five action-senses]. The senses are called glowing (i. e., luminous and vigorous); the ten deities are vaikārika. [The mind is among them the eleventh. They are traditionally called the vaikārika deities.] The ear, the skin, the eyes, the tongue, and the nose as the fifth are called (organs) connected with knowledge for perceiving sounds and other (sense-objects). The feet, the anus, the organ of generation, the hands, (among which) the voice is the fifth; walking, evacuation, (sexual) delight, manual work, and speech: that is the work (for each of the action-senses)

III. Results

(of this study, combined with some results of my paper Two Accounts of Cosmogony and my monograph Prahlāda)

1. For the history of texts of the anonymous literature:

(a) The oldest version of those parts of the purāṇas which deal with cosmogony on Saṅkhya lines, is that of Mr. The other original parts of Mr19 were evidently redacted at the same time, and this redaction preceded that of the Vā-Bṛ nucleus. The investigation of the cosmogony of Mr leads to the same result at which F. E. Pargiter arrived from quite different considerations20, viz. the nucleus of Mr was compiled about 300 A.D. The redaction of Vā-Bṛ is plainly later, and it took place shortly after 335 A. D.21. After the nucleus of Vā-Bṛ, the cosmogony of Pd was redacted; then, perhaps about 500 A. D., Vi22; then,

18. The rest of the account of cosmogony of TG II I will leave over for later studies.


perhaps in the 7th or 8th century, Kū. L is later than Vā-Bd, but its chronology in relation to Pd, Vi and Kū cannot yet be determined. Likewise, the question of the time when the single redactions of Vā and Bd arose is still unsettled.

(b) Some tracts incorporated in Sp are considerably older than the third century A. D., probably dating from pre-Christian times.

(c) The first adhyāya of the Manusmṛti was composed later than the independent tracts that were incorporated into Sp 224, but earlier than, or approximately at the same time as, the final redaction of Sp 224, presumably in the first centuries A. D.

(d) There are Short Instructional Tracts, which once had an independent existence and were preserved because they were incorporated into the anonymous literature. There are certain laws governing their textual development (modernizations, harmonizations of different traditions, adaptations to the context, juxtaposition of different beginnings).

2. For the history of philosophy:

(a) There was an Instructional Tract, composed in the third century A. D. at the latest, which expounded the evolution of the world according to a form of the Sākhya system and is largely preserved in different versions in seven purāṇas.

The Sākhya of the original form of this tract, which can be reconstructed with some amount of probability, is to some extent identical with that of the Sānkhyakārikā but deviates from it in some points: (A) avyāktā, the unevolved cause or primary matter, is distinguished from pradhāna(tātvar), which is the first product of its evolution; (B) there is no special tannātrā-sarga, but the emanation of the tannātras is combined with that of the gross elements, each following tannātra emanating from the gross element preceding it in the series; (C) after a gross

23. Op. my Prohlāda, pp. 193 f. The investigation of the history of the legend of Prahlāda, led to the same results for the relative chronology of Vā-Bd, Vi and Kū as the study of the cosmogonical texts of these purāṇas.
element has originated, the t<sub>n</sub>mātra that was its source is “enveloped” (a-r, sau-a-r) by the t<sub>n</sub>mātra preceding it in the series; (D) the ten senses are products of tājāna emanation, whereas the results of vaikārika emanation seem to be the deities presiding over the senses; (E) the manas does not seem to have been mentioned in the oldest form of the tract.—Later harmonization or modernization has attempted to blur some of these deviations (A, D) and to introduce some ideas from the Kārikā (B, E). In view of the fact, detectable by textual criticism, that the old Short Tract was later on interpolated under the influence of the Sānkhyakārika, in combination with the dates suggested above, the hypothesis may be ventured that the Sānkhyakārika was regarded as an authoritative text as early as 300 A. D. The old Short Tract, however, was composed at a time when the Kārikā either was not yet in existence or had not yet received general recognition.

(b) This Sānkhya tract has been modelled on the pattern of an earlier exposition of the evolution of the world which is preserved in Śp 224. This latter text, which is pre-Sāṅkhyaic, probably dates from pre-Christian times.

3. For the history of religion:

(a) There are clear traces of a constant antagonism between theism and impersonalism in the anonymous literature from pre-Christian times to about the 4th or 5th century A. D.

(b) The data of the anonymous literature point to the existence, in the first centuries B. C. and the first centuries A. D., of an influential Hindu sect that adored Brahmā as the highest deity.

(c) About the 4th or 5th century A.D. the glory of Brahmā faded away and Viṣṇu and Śiva took his place, some texts substituting the one, some the other god for Brahmā.

(d) From that time, the old opposition between theism and impersonalism was largely replaced by the new antagonism between Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism.
[The Mudgala-Purāṇa is counted among the eighteen Aupa-Purāṇas. It is still unpublished, and is available in manuscripts only. The present article is based on the two manuscripts of the Mudgala-Purāṇa, deposited in the Kāśirāja-Sarasvatī-Bhaṇḍāra of Rannagar. It is the summary of a discourse given by the learned author according to the Purāṇa-pravacana-scheme of H. H. the Kāśinareśa (for which see 'Purāṇa' Vol. III, pp. 401 f.).

The Mudgala-Purāṇa mainly deals with God Gaṇapati, his worship and his glorification. He is conceived here as the supreme brahman, all other gods being considered as subordinate to him. Buddhi and Siddhi are said to be the two forms of his Māyā. This Purāṇa presents various conceptions of Gaṇapati. In one place he is conceived as the universe-qualified brahman—his head being the brahman, and his remaining body the universe. In another place he is conceived as yoga, the head being the nirvikalpa-samādhi and the body the sa-vikalpa-samādhi. Each of the several khaṇḍas of the Mudgala Purāṇa explains a particular name of God Gaṇapati. The superiority of Gaṇeśa over the other principal gods—Sūrya, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra-Śiva and Kārtikeya—has been established by means of various episodes or ākhyānas. The symbolism underlying the conception of his protruding belly and the four hands—holding paśa, ankusha, modaka and kamala, his elephant-face, and his vāhana, mouse, is also explained here. Besides, the stories of the birth of Moha and Kārtikeya from the seed of Rudra-Śiva are also narrated, and the
चतुर्मात्माणां युधिष्ठिरं गणितयं। काचित् उपपृष्ठोपोषं-
वर्क्षकैक्योपमुराणं गणने। औपपूर्णाणि चालिपुरं नानापि केनिदाहुः।

dependent genealogies of the Solar and Lunar dynasties given,
where-in Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Yudhīṣṭhira and others are
also said to have worshipped Gagapati.

एवं नामानि च बृहद्वितीये स्मर्यन्ते—
आयं सन्तुमारं च नारदीभवं वृहद्वं बहु
आदिच्य मानवं गोक्तं नमोहकरसेन च।
कौमं मागवतं श्रीं वालिण्यं मागवतं तथा।
सुदर्शनं कलिकं देवों च महामायवं तथा।
बृहद्रमं परापणं च श्रीं पुष्पंतं तथा।
हरिवंशं ततो श्रेयसमीपसुपुराणकम्।

अतः पठिन्ति सन्तुमारादीनि कानिचिदुपुराणेष्वपि पद्धन्ते—
आयं सन्तुमारोकं नारायंसिद्धमथापसम्।
वृहद्वं स्वान्तुलवं जुमारें तु भाषिती।
श्रीवर्मी प्रसादमित्रं साधारणोद्याधीसमि।
वृहदमुसोलमानं नारदोंक्षमतं परम्।
कपिलं वामनं चैव तद्वेतिनन्देति।
हरिवंशं वाहणं च अस्तित्रक्षेत्रमी।
महेश्वरं तथा सार्थं सीतं सर्वसंर्कंचयं।
सुपारिशोकसमं मारोचं माक्षाराह्यम्।

पैतृकमालेख्यं विविधः। प्रतीयत चतु यानि कैलिचिदुपुराणेनोत्तरानि
तान्त्रिक्य कैलिचिदुपुराणेन हस्तम् पणीतानि। वस्तुतः सर्वभिमायमपुराणेन
गणनं उपकं प्रतिभाति।

उपपूरणेषु प्राणं कैलिचिदुपुराणेन तन्माहात्म्यमेव विविधं दश्यते।
श्रीवर्मी महापुराणेष्वी श्रवियोगसम्यवे, तत्तत्त्वं श्रीपूरणेषु भवत: शिवस्य,
यथावेशु पुराणेषु च भक्तस्य विष्णूमहादत्त्वतिशयं: ह्यं भवत: इति, तत्तवां।
उपराणपुरुष नु श्रीकृष्णमलिपियें निरूपितमा निरोक्तये। आद्र च परसर
निरोधे नावाकालव। यतो हि सर्वप्राप्ति चराचरामकोपु श्रूङ्ख्लयें चर स्थलयें
वेदमार्गकोप वितिशिल्रू। न ततु न स्वरूपमोपासिनु श्रवयथ्—“यतो
वाचो निवेदने अञ्चलय सन्ता सह” “अतिवादं विचारात विज्ञातमविचाराताम्”
“चन्द्रमा न मन्त्रये येनाहुंसी मनं, तदेव व्रत वने विद्वदं नेतरं विद्वदुपासी”
इत्यदिवभि: श्रुतिमि: तस्य वाचानसारायणायाम्: सप्तमुद्धुस्वत्त्वात्। तस्मिन्
मनोविनीतो हि तदुपासारं भवति, वच मनोविनीतामकेव नावणयेहं तत् मनो-
विकेश: कथं कर्त्रं श्रवयं: स्यात्। न वा स्सुतिं: तस्य संभवतिः, वायुवीकावात्।
तथा च तदुपासारं न संभवतोदेव वाणिज्यम्। उपासनयें नवुचन्द्रिया
साध्यम्, उपासना च न संभवताशि चोवनास्तेव नित्यस्वस्तम:भवति, तदेवार्थ
सम्बन्धान्यान्यान्यायारोक्त्वम तस्मिन्मनो निवेदययतमि श्रुतिमस्तुयादिरू भागः
उपविद्या। ताति च सम्बन्धार्न्याणि अधिकारिमेतेव पञ्चाः निरिद्ययिन-
यथा विद्या, शिव: शाक्ति गणेशं, सुर्याणि। तेहि देवा: स्त्रस्थापिको
निलुक्ता: स्तुस्त्वाकारं निर्विद्यतभि। पुं प्रार्थितेतस्त्वस्त्र, स्त्रस्वस्तुस्त्वः
ब्रह्मविद्वानस्कम वर्त्त्या, तदृष्टं तेनोपसकम परज्ञातवा भाविन्य, अन्यानि
तु रूपाणि धग्यथार्थस्त्रस्तिक्षायनेव भाविन्यानि।

तदेवं येन वर्त्तं पर्यावरत्या भावितं तदेव तदुपासी कर्त्ये प्राप्तं स्यात्। अन्यानि
tु रूपाणि धग्यथायताति तदनुपासारामेव स्यात्। अनेकेवं रूपाणि पर्यावरत्या
भावितेषु तदुपासे न स्यायोति। विचित्रवद्यामाला हि उपासनाया: फलम्, अनेकेवं
उप्योगात्मा भावितेषु तु इतिसाद: प्रभवचितं कथेकायम् भवेत्। तस्माद् ब्रह्मविद्वानस्के
कस्मिनित्वेपुरज्ञात्वम्। इतरेषु तु न बिद्यम्: कर्त्ये। अतिशु समिन्यः
अधिकारे ते तस्याति: नारदाणिकारिविश्वेदमेव तेषा मन्त्यम्। तथा च
पर्यावरत्या भावितेषु रूपां रूपाणि पर्यावरत्यामेव तेनेवे देवा भवेत्। पर्यावरत्या
भावितेषु तु रूपं सर्वं: प्राप्तान्यस्तेव पुराणस्पृहेऱेषु च कस्मिकादेशय गर्गण्यां
तत्र तत्र स्यापिलम। रूपाणि धग्यथार्थस्त्रस्तिक्षायनेव प्रवास निदानस्, न तु परसरं
कोषपि बिरोधः।
धिकारणः स्मायाद्रः यत्र सचि:। तदेव रूपं तेन ध्यात्स्यामिति तदार्थः। तदेव रूपं धारीकृत्वा निर्विकल्पकसमापिनः तस्य ब्रह्मणः प्रवेशः स्याद्रितः योगसूत्रायः।

तदर्थे निर्भिततया मनोनिवेशार्थे स्वीकार्ते रूपेऽः भगवान् गणयतीर्थवाच पुराणः परमाकृत्वा प्रवेशोपि सङ्कारसीदले ब्रह्मणेऽऽ संभवति। निर्भितः तु ब्रह्म केवलप्रकाशनः निपेश्युद्धेऽऽ इवः भेदतु। तदर्थेच निर्विकल्पे एव समाधिश्च यथास्यानः स्याद्रितः न ततृत वाचा याज्ञवल्क्यः कथमपि शाक्यमुः, तत्थः मायाश्रवः व्रतेन गणयतिर्थि पुराणसूत्राधिराजः।

माया च ततः बुद्धिसिद्धिरिति विविधा व्यापितः। तत्र बुद्धः चिन्त-श्रद्धन्दे पथ्यतिष्ठता च, पश्चात्त्वा सा चोका। पश्चात्वतचः च शिरे, मूं, विष्णुसः, पुराणः, निर्विकल्प चिन्तयायाम व्यायामसः। केवल संसारिणाः, मूं आत्मानाः, विकृतिः मुक्तस्वाः, विद्याप्रेय श्रुतिः श्रवणेऽऽ एकायः श्रोत्रो ज्ञातवनाः, निर्भितः च योगिनामिति। एते मेदः: प्राप्ये योगद्वारानवेद गुणीः: खः। चिन्तयत् चेदेः श्रवन्ते बहु प्रक्ष्यायायाते। साञ्ज्यवस्त्रि मनो-बुद्धिरहस्य इति विबिधभेदानः कलयुक्तसः। योगद्वारः तु चिन्तयात्रानैक्यवेद एव व्यवहारे दयते। परं तदन्तः करणविवेदोऽऽ वेदात्म विद्याम्बिति ततोऽऽ वेदायायामः वेदात्म वेदार्थसः भवेत् तेषामभिद्वाति। अधागमाः तु “चिन्तेत् चेतनपदात्रव्रहः चेतासङ्कोचिनिचिन्तम्” (प्रत्यभिज्ञात्वते सूर्य पि) इति चिन्तं व्यवहारसः। तथा च चिन्तेत्: प्रथमः संग्रामो बुद्धवेयत्स्यावि सर्वायात्स्यात्मिति प्रतीति। इति तु बुद्धिमायात्वे चिन्तेत् चाद्यायाद उपायः। प्रत्यभिज्ञात्वे बुद्धिमायात्वे च तः व्यवहारः तस्य सिद्धियोऽत्तत्ते। अतः बुद्धिमायात्मिति चेतासः महायोगस्य प्रवेश तस्य गणयतिर्थि मायायोगस्य निर्विकल्पः। चेतायः विस्मृते चेतने प्राक्षयो मोक्षो न मायायु-भवत्मिति यज्ञवार्तयो हुः। चेतायः सामग्रिकस्य च चेतायः चेतायः अथायः विस्मृते मोक्षस्य मायायोगस्य निर्विकल्पः। बुद्धिमायः स्वर्गाय: अथायः मायास्यूः: सन्त्योगेति बुद्धि: सिद्धिरिति भवेतो गणयस्य द्वे माये अन्त्र व्यायामः। गणयतिर्थि रूपं बुद्धिमायात्मिति निर्विकल्पः। चिन्तेत्
बहु तदवनमण्डलु ब्याप्तिस्वैयक्तः। अपरत्र तु योगस्वेत्वा गणपतिःक्रम
इति कायः सत्विकर्षकामसाधिक्रियः, निराध निर्दिष्टक्षमसाधिक्रियः निर्दिष्टः। यद्य
गतः उपदाते सुविसंवेश्या निरस्त्रीत्या निपास्तात्र भवति तद्वा मण्डलःकारः तथा
मुख्योपकेतृपेत्रेषु विद्यया, न च तदाध्ययः गतेः प्रतिपेदः इति निष्क्षेपकसारः तत्रानी-
संहिताः। केवलेकाढ्यः कारः तस्त्र इत्वत्तत्त्त्वेऽकटकः स्वतः यूर्यितम्।
कारः तु विनिष्ठा अवयवः प्रत्येकः इति तस्म संसारारुपः प्रस्तुतः। चुरुचिभिः
मोक्षाद्वृत्तीस्वतः। सृष्टिः। करेकु निष्ठां च चुरुचिभिः पुरसांतः दृढःकारः। तत्र
पाठोपथ्यं, अर्थः मोक्षः परोपरः बोधां निर्देशः। कमलः नामकः सः इति
कारः अर्थः मोक्षसः उपश्रवणः धश्यूर्वस्वरुपः। अथः कस्मसैं बालसिकः स्मरणः नामगणि
न स्वयं इति मोक्षवर्यः न्यायः। इति इति इति। एततः इति इति इति। एततः इति
सत्यतिः सत्या नाया भवायुः गणपतः। संसारम्यो ददातिति त पते तद्ध्वससस्य
निर्दिष्टः।

आराध्यत अर्थः प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः गणपतः। प्रथीक्षेण वस्थितः न्यायः गणपतः।
इति अर्थः विठ्ठितः, यथा प्रथमलः सः प्रस्तुतः। न्यायः विठ्ठितः, यथा प्रथमवः
अर्थः विठ्ठितः, यथा प्रथमवः बोधवायुः। एतस्यानि न्यायः विठ्ठितः। तत्र
तुौः कारः अर्थः विठ्ठितः। तत्राया कारः अर्थः विठ्ठितः। विठ्ठितः। तत्राया
कारः अर्थः विठ्ठितः। तत्राया कारः अर्थः विठ्ठितः। तत्राया कारः अर्थः
विठ्ठितः। तत्राया कारः अर्थः विठ्ठितः। तत्राया कारः अर्थः विठ्ठितः। तत्राया
कारः अर्थः विठ्ठितः।

आहै दृष्टान्तः भूत्वा भाष्यः प्राणिः देहमाधिबिष्टः।
प्राणायामतः प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः।

इति भगवद्विद्धाः गणपतिः प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात्
परेशाद्वित्वः प्रविधः भोगविद्धाः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
स्वाप्तः। प्रथीक्षेण सः प्रश्वः। तस्मात् महदुः
युध युद्धमन से "युध यासन चक्तसरुक्त्" "नृत्य जना: सूर्यं प्रमुखः"
इत्यादि: स्त्रितम्भयेव सर्वमनस्तुर्वर्ण सर्वव्यायत्वा चाश्रयावसे।
भवन्तम्पि च ध्यानिनिर्वत् पदयामः।
तद्वरानृ कमलभित्वायतीति नौ मनसि: विज्ञाप्ता सम्बुद्धि तत्
क्रिया समयै इति।

तदा सूर्य: "गणपतिस्वरुपः सर्वपामिभिष्यता" स एव च चरं यशोऽवेच
वर्य सर्वे: तत्कर्ममइ प्रकल्पितेः।
समेवाहै सत्तमभिव्यायसि्" इति ताना
प्रवृत्तिवादाः।
निद्रिष्टव्यां: गणपतितल्बं प्राप्यक्षम्।
मूर्त्यः तन्महाश्च युस्मपूर्व
व्याच्छिन्न क्रियस्य दृः: सर्वा तिथिः कथाः कथितमात्रा यत् कथयोः मनमनः च जनमः
मां सुतिरमारातिचित्वाम्।
तत्त्वसा युगसत्तावहै चरा वर्य प्रदाहू तस्मिने गत:।
तदा स मां कहुतरं स्वत्वा "स्वमेव मत्तुतता याहि” इति वर्य प्रार्थितचारव्।
हार्ष्य प्रसेवसमै: वान्धवयेव वर्य वनमायः।
एवभियायसि कहुतरं वस्मन्या
स एव बरो मत्तकालाभ:।
विधिकरणं च मद्यनी संज्ञानान्मं तपसा समाराज्य
"स्वं मे पुणी भूषा:” इति वर्य प्रार्थितचारव्।
तथा:।
कर्षणादर्शिणाः
न्यायान्वीयाः:।
मद्यनी संज्ञा च विधिकरणं: पुणीतमगावत्।
तथा:।
विधिकरणा सा मद्य प्रदेशति बधायोः:
सम्भवोऽन्त:।
तथा विद्याप्रवत्ताः श्रुतिवाक्षे:
स्वमेव सर्वभेदलया मन्वतो गणपति व्यस्माध्यं।
तदा गणपतिना विष्ण: सबुद्धित:।
स च चेतनेऽस्मात्मासी सुमाति चेति द्वारा आतरी: देशकुलोऽस्मुतस्योऽपि।
तत्त्वमा च तपसा: शिवमाराज्या मरोहाधिकप्रकाशे चिन्मानेन प्राप्त:।
प्राकाशः
यतो तै: राजस्वेव व्याप्तवताः।
विव्या मत्तकासा: राजी च तत्रीयविविदायः
प्रकाश:। इति सत्तेनविविधप्रकाशस्वादध्वारा।
रणति: केनानि न भाषायत।

तदा स प्रासादम्बिवादिकाल्कार्यायुर्ज्ञानहतुकालिविहितानि: यवादिकालिजी
कर्मा: च विकोपमेव गतानि।
अद्वैते: च यवादिविश्लेष्यायितेऽभवाचीति
मद्यकालमनीपर्यवीत: चिन्तित:।
एवंविच्छ: व्यास्कालोवः
मया स्वतेचासा तिनलेन सह्ष्ठो तो देहानि दृष्टिः।
तदा से व्ययमानः
दाहाणप्रतिते शिवेन निर्देशः सदस्य शिष्टिस्वच्छम्।
तदा सर्वात्वेव वैदिकानं
कर्माणि: लोके जातः।
सर्वं अद्वैते: स प्रवा मतस्वव्रता इति तालाम्बी: विनाश
आयति।।
तदा स सर्वे:प्रमिति: संभूत्य सम्बन्ध: शिवः प्रार्थिती यत्: किमिदं
भवता कृतम्। सूर्य विना कर्भ रजस्तान मित्रति: समरेव। न चाय रथयाकाल
इगकाण्ड एवं सत्प्रथा: कर्भ भवता प्रबः क्ति। तद्दा च शिखन शिकारेष्कु-गणपतिना सम्यकार्तिते स्रवः इति गणपतिमेहार्ष्यायाः सूर्याः जीवितप्राप्तिम्।
अन्तर्गत भागवतं गणपति त्रासायो शिवेदोक्त:—“कस्यूँ जीवितः” अन्यायाभिषोप
स्वकीय विशिष्टकार्यात्मिको, दूर्य बिन्दिनित्य श्रीगणपतिना स्वयं विचन्तुसंरक्तयाः
धीरं भर: पुनः जायेन योचितत। पूर्वः छों धीरेः शिरश्र
कार्यां लोकोऽर्थ निपरितमेत्। ्तात्र चाय जीवित:।
पुनर्विचित्रिते च मया चिन्तिते यदि श्रुतिम् सर्यस्यप्रभाषामाह आत्मस्य कर्भ सूर्यः समरेव। तस्मादाहारः
सर्यस्यप्रभाषाभावानुविदयते। न च मया सर्येः जनाः प्रकृत:।
तस्मादवृष्टयथः प्रायोजितमर्यमेन गत्वा तत्प्रकाशितमिति।
अर्थं गतं जगते च मधि नक्षा
समेत्य मां प्रभुःभाषाकारः।

वच्चुति: सर्यस्यप्रभाषाष्ट्रयं मयान् सर्यस्य बन्धन: आयमा भवतेव च सर्यः
अपि प्रजाः पाल्यते। परसुरामपर्वत कर्भ ब्रह्मण: शासने तिष्ठाम:।
तत्त्वक्यः च सर्वं यथं तत्त्वक्यात्;। स ब्रह्माः पर्वतान्तर्गतः गणपति: सर्वस्माभ्य: समुपासः
शेषनीयः।
भवता गणपतिकृतस्य विस्मृतमिति तत् एवाः विष्णु: समुपासः।
दृश्यनि स्वाभाविकां सम्बद्धनिवहितान्तर्गता भवता सर्वाभासितेः
मयाः समानीयः। तत्त्वक्यः

अस्यं कथायामिर्न रहस्यं यत् कर्भप्रयो नाम अधिरेष्टः, अन्तर्गत
मौलिकः: प्रजाः, सर्वविशुद्धाः इति श्रुतिपुरूषाः।
तदुक्तं श्च श्चायकाण्डः—
“अस्त इत्यम आऽनौ, तदाहुः। फः तद्वस्त्राऽत्त्वायणीपि नाव तेलेसायु
स्वशोच्य दृष्टिं ते इति प्राण वात्य कर्भः।" इति।
तेम्भ एव चार्ये
स्वश्रुतिः अर्थात: समान्तात। भवता मनुः चायदृस्यः—

अधिरेष्टः: पितरो जाताः: पितुभय: देवदानावाः।
देवस्थाधा जातंस्य चर्मः स्थायनपूर्वाः।। इति।

तत्परः अधिरेष्टः एव पितरो जाताः जयता इति फलितम। तत परं च
“कार्याः: सकलाः: प्रजा:।" इति कर्भप्रयो सर्वायनित्वाय गुणादिनिपु
विभागः।
कर्भप्रयोः “कर्भम: पद्धतो भवति।” इति वाक्यमेषु निभतः।
क्रमेण च वितिषित विशेषः। स च यथाभाष्याय ध्विनितिभाष्याय विकासविधि च। तथावस्था कर्मभागरूपम् स्वाभाविकः। प्राच. बल्हिनिद्वारे प्राच. निर्विवचित। समयं संकेतप्रदत्तं वेदिते। तत्त्वस्था सहायता भविष्यस्ते। अभ्यासीयस्ते क्रियाविधिः। तत्त्वस्था महासन्दर्भायेको भागः। सुरतिसिद्धिः भविष्यस्तेन अपराधं सूचित विद्वानास्मात्। क्रियान्।

तद्वितक्षरमालोच्चायोपमोऽवधा च विक्रमस्वाधिुधिविविधः। अस्वाधिकायारथस्वाधिकायोऽविविधः। अनुभावार्थोऽविविधः। तत्त्वस्थानं च विविधः। चक्रितस्य विकर्षणस्य सत्यस्य द्वारश्रुतिः। एव च द्वारश्रुतिः विचारस्य तद्वितक्षरमालोऽवधा। विचारस्य अस्वाधिकारस्य द्वारश्रुतिः। एव च विचारस्य अस्वाधिकारस्य द्वारश्रुतिः।

अव्ययमाणे विस्ताकालस्य कर्मस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि। यथाविधिः स्वाधिकारस्य आि।
तात्तु। सर्वे चेतु रुद्रप्येन बालुना क्रियाती इति रुद्रप्यविवरेकत्व प्रकटे-दस्तीकृत। एवेविशेषानें किरणेशी चन्द्रपदो तीसितायते, स च रात्रिको प्रक्षेतने इति रात्रिको प्रक्षेत: कथायुक्त:। सूर्यस्य शिवमयापि च गणप्य-रार्यनेन हेतुतुष्टू पुष्ठेन च गणप्य-रार्यस्य गणप्य-सेवकरं प्रक्षेतने विक्षेपण-सिद्धि सर्वे वत्थादेह वैस्मयः। काश्चन शिरपतनादितु शोकाङ्तिरः-महिमलयापनाखिमे दुश्यिनभिमति। अवेच च मोहस्त्रोतत्ववृत्तान्ते वाल-सिद्धे: प्रश्नं दूरस्तनां बोध्यांमासं यद्येकत्व निवो भववासु वने एव तपस्तानाते सम। तदेव तारापुराणे स्त्रस्तस्थानेम्य: परिमितता देवा: शिवस्य वीर्योत्तुलः कुमारेशां हृत्य एव तारापुर इति विजय केतायों पार्वतीसचिवे गतात्। सर्वेः वृथान्ते तत्स्य स्वयेदेवस्य। तद्भवि पार्वतीं भिल्ली-रूपं विनायक स्वेतविनायिया गता। अतिप्रवणे च हृदयेन तत्रैव वने पुष्प-बच्चनाधि कुर्हितो विचारित सम। समाप्येएङ्ग्यानाशाले च शिवस्यदूर्धः दुर्योगिनास्तुलास्तुल: निवरति-मनवावम्। एवमुष्ट्यवेश महिमाविवेशमी: कालु तारामणयानदूरस्तस्य प्रक्षेत: मनवावम्। तदेव च वृथा मोहरूपवानापि तद्यथा पार्वतेः गिेव श्रवणामवादीदिति प्रक्षेतनानु। तत्तथा स पार्वतीसचिवो गतात्वा देवानां च भाषणों चुर्या तथा तदुपरान्तमे। सम्म पुरुषां कामस्यानाकुटाकुटणिविता। एवं भिल्लयं कामवर्गों गिेव नोहात्कारों महानाह:। पश्चात्तव यदा स पार्वतीस्मन्तरे गणपतिः, तद्या कालमस्मार “मथुरां यहि यथव मथुराप्रहारं” इति तत्तत्त्वं देवीकृती गणपतिः दुर्योगिनास्तुल: गणपतिः दुर्योगिनास्तुल: “गणप्यमनाराध्य स एव दुर्योगिनास्तुल:” इत्युपर्वेदेपि गणपते-रेकास्तु सन्त्र तत्स्य वृही तैत:। तत्तर्मणेन कामस्यानानादितत्वान निरविश्वासानु। एवेविशेषु वृही सन्त्र स्वस्येव गणपते-रेकास्तु वृही निरविश्वासानु। अभुतं तव विवेकनागरुज्ञेन ज्ञेयेन दार्शने। स एव होनमयों त्यामुथ्यप्रविष्टिः। तथापि च तदेवं रितेवभावं अविश्वासायदिप्रक्षेत। इत्यादिः कामकाला सम्म-पुरुषविविषा। तदुदु कार्तिकेयजनमक्षापि प्रक्षेतना बहुव्रक्तं पार्वतेऽपि बहुमुखां श्रवण्यो यदा न प्रतिपादति तद्या देवं। प्रवर्तिते वाहिकिषुवक-
वेषण रसमाण्योस्यत्मः प्रदेशं गत्वा दुर्गमित्र एवं भिषामवाचल तद्वा कथितं पुरुष आयात इति विजाव्य पावतंपरस्यस्यराख्यातिब्रह्मण्यं। उद्विद्मात्रस्य च शर्मोऽपि भूत्योऽत्र चक्रंतः।

तदन्नयं च पार्बती भिषाक्षेपणं भिषुक्क्रमं वहुः प्रदेशः। चढ़ितस्तरेश्वरि दुर्गमवाचल तदसहमानाभ गवः गवः तत्रोष्ट्रोणं तविष्णुः। तत्र स्नानथमागताः क्रुद्दिका कोणे सह तत्सः। ता अध्यसहमानाभं शरस्त्रमेव तदन्नयं गवः। तरं वास्यां जातं। क्रुद्दिकान्यं चातवायुरः कार्तिकेयं उच्चयते। शरस्त्रमेव च जातवास्यांसमवता। तं नारदः दुर्द्रः सं कैलासं गया पार्बतीं प्रति कुमारनमावर्तावताः। पार्बतीं त्वांस्यायं तं पध्यायासाः।

क्रुद्दिकान्यं सो वनविवृत्ता देवेः सह तारकं हनुः चामगाः। चहुः पुच्छिष्टं हनुः न शरकः। तता कब्रं हनुः शक्यमुनिमति शमसुं पपर्चः। शमसुप्निद्धोग्यं गणपतिमाराध्यांको। ‘अराध्यतेः गणपति। प्रस्तास्रेवाः। कार्तिकेयेण सह बहुः स्तुतः। अभीष्टः शुज्वति स्मृतवाहनस्मायि रहस्यमुक्तम्—थथा समकः प्रथविव्या प्रचण्ड्या प्रचण्ड्या एव निवास्यति, प्रचण्ड्या एव च बन्धनानि छिन्तति, तदा तत्वाय च सर्ववचनानि कुलो निवास्यति। अविवाच्यात एव भक्तानि बन्धनानि छिन्तति’ इति समकः रहस्यमुक्तच्याते इत्यादि। गणपतिता दृष्टवर्धं सो गुणदेशां नेपालितमुः दुधाय वातां ताराकाब्रह्म ज्ञातां चेति मध्येदुर्गामुरुस्ते पुराणात्सरसंवादिनी कथिता। केवलं गणपतितवर्धरणेमेवात् चोऽविशेष उक्तः। अथामेव पुनमोहचिरसुपकालस्य, श्रीकृष्णदुर्गदको मोहः देयत्वमुः हुः शरणं गतं। ते नारदः तस्य संधःस्याः इत्याः, सुर्याधृतोपदेशध्यं वस्तु॥ तेनाराध्यत्तु सूर्यस्त्रमेव वरः दुर्गः, सूर्यामाोवरधसं दैवतामाधिपतिष्कृतमुः। प्रमादस्य सुतां मनिराबोमेमे। तस्यं तस्य उमः क्रुः। मेघाको श्रीकृष्णो हरणेष्टती प्रकरणं वस्तुः। इत्यावस्यः नारखे भुहुःस्य दुधायुः। केवलां सर्वेन्द्रे दैवतामाधिपिनां भूत्या स्वसुतानूतनं तत्तनाशिष्यं दैवतामाधिपिनां प्रतिष्ठाप्यामाः। देवाथं देवनितिकृष्णो विवास्य सज्जितायेष्वं स्त्रियामाधिवृक्षवृक्षवृक्षवृक्ष। अथ देवः परिज्ञातः समस्वमिमपि विज्ञागमिमपि च गता। सर्वेचेति सम्मुख्यमणितिविशव्यस्यां शरणं वातां। तत: प्रारंभित्य गणपतिष्कर्त्योद्दशं चक्षितः। नारादः
पुराय वैदेशन तत्कालिनी प्रस्थायमानम्। सम्मिलनां नारदमसी संत्यारीण जगाय।
“तथा सर्वमं प्रविष्टम्। रोजन्नर वाती ब्रह्म”, ‘इति’ तनकुष्ठ नारदः। “गणपतिप्रत्यायो
पूजनभवति, वधानां किमचुन्ने अभिमुक्तः। तत्रस्वत्वविना गणपतिनम् सह
तत्र योग्यनि परितः। तथा तथा श्रयु फहारी” इत्यादिः कामौ। तन पूनाक
गणपतिमहिमां तत्र प्रतिवामातायान। एवं प्रस्तोतिप्राप्तम् मोहाकुष्रो गणपतियम् यमोः,
तनात्संध द्वेषैः! स्थानानि दुःखा नैवेः। सह पातालं विवेधा इति मोहकथासंपत्यः।

आयासा: कथाया: निगृहाधियाः प्रकटीकिष्यते। अन्तरस्यांस्यां देहः
द्वाय बुधाः व्याख्यातः। ‘तस्य द्वे तन्त्राय धरास्यां च विवाह्यां च’ तत शिवन
तनुर्मक्यायानां सर्वोपदेशाः, भोजनं भूषणं भूषणं पर्यथात्। पत्थर गम्यन् तत
तत्र प्रार्थिते। तत्रेदेः चारित्र धरास्यांमांगादेः रूड्ष्ट्रेव। अतपाट तथा
वने विचारणमेवान निर्दिष्टम्। अनेकां स्वाधिकारिणि च ब्रह्मणा। यदा क्रोऽन
द्वे उत्पादितः, प्रभा: स्वतंत्र चारित्रः। यदा तेन स्वस्त्यी भयंकरी प्रजा चक्षुः
मार्गाय, तद्वा ब्रह्मणा स्वविभावादिविनिर्दिष्टम्: इति तत्रहास्यायाते। एवं
द्विप्रेम करण करण विविध सर्वां मोहपरिवर्त विषयः। मोहस्य च द्वस्त अयुगुरस्येव
द्वृष्ण्य भल्लति, इति अयुगुरावस्थं समीपे तथा गमनसमृतिम्। तस्य कालः
परियोऽविषयः: तेन स्वविभावानां मोहाधिक्यस्याम् मोहस्येव रुपाकथाया
कल्पना: ज्ञेषुविषयं स्पर्श भाषिते। तथाहि प्रमाणसिद्ध ध्यातर्व उक्तः। तत्कथा: च
प्रवाहां मोहस्य पत्थापैतः। मोहरूप: मोहां प्रवेदः। मोहेन च
मदिरामणे प्रकृतिविशेषणसाधनायां पत्थर्यातायाचारिणी: उक्तमेव। द्वायः
तस्य येन उक्ता ते मोहप्रतिकारविवेचनं परे-उपरे द्वृष्ण्य मोहेन मदिरामणे
च जागेः। ‘मेधाविः’ इति पाठयः मोहुप्रेतु भ्रमणिनोऽक्षतुः प्रतिभायेन, टीकाक्षः
सुत्रा तु नामातिरितिसन्नद्धमाधिक्यविशेष इति व्याख्यातः। अस्मात: तु
“अमोक्षायाम्” इति मोहुप्रेतु गण्यं यथा प्रतिभायेन। मोहेनैव अमोक्षायां
प्रकृतिविशेषण। अनेके च शोकमेव होत्याजन्यत् मोहः, शोकार्थं च तत्वार्थायेन
हर्षार्थं चाँगियमूढः पापासिद्धािने चपेते मोहप्रेतु: स्थाने व्याख्यातः।

तस्य नगरं च विषयासाधनम् विविधिः क्षुद्रप्रचित्मेव, मोहागाँवनां
विषये वाणिज्यकर्मम्बृतानां। प्रकृतिः मोहोद्वृत्तं: करणे देवेथि:विद्याधिनंभिः परोपकारः
पुराणम्—पुराणम्

उत्तराद्वातिति देवान् सस्थाद् प्रभात्य देवानां तत्र निवेश सम्प्रेष प्रतिपावितः। कामकोषोहसनानीं वृड्यागचों समहन्ते। एवं बिधानां देवीनामामुखियाणां वृषीणां संधर्य पुष्य देवातुरुखुढ़लेण श्रीशाहराचार्यवाच्यायात उपकिलिते। एवं बिरोहाये पुष्ये सत्क्रम परिप्रावक्षशतुरुपाति देवीनां वृषीणां कुरुचिङ्चुदृढ़यो भवलेव। देवे: प्राधित्थ्र ज्ञानश्रो गणपतिवृद्धा मोहमाकमियुं प्रवचनः तत्रा मोहं स्यभासु इति कुमात्र प्रतिपावितः। पालायगमनम् परदुरागाममोऽधिकृतम्, वर्तमानोत्तरत्वाः, अठिन्यं हि देवानां त्रिलोकायावासः

‘अतुणां व पाले इत्यावृत्ति व्रजस्व नवल्ल्ला भजलोकं प्रवर्त्ता देवायु उच्रुः—

‘त्रिलोकायान्त्रो कल्पते देवा: सत्य विष्कृमं।

युधं प्रयत गातालं यत्र जीवितमिच्छष।

इति मोहकथया आध्यात्मिकं रहस्यम्।

मद्धे कार्तिक्यमनस्करं च यात्रीका तरया अपींद्व ताल्प्रमवसेतुम्—

युधं वहद्रो रुद्ररोणनवेन तत्र तव स्वायते। शशास्वरोति इति रुद्रमात्र कौरोपापी प्रति धवले। अतरिक्षः विकुलो वर्तुरे विहिस्वारवर्ति।

‘अमोपायास्मकं जग्यवर्त॥ वजनविद्वेदेन परिभाषितोवर्मीणोंमध्ये गुण-पदार्थानामिनविन आज्ञा च सेविते परिमार्यां इत्यद्यम्।

तदेवाम् विद्येरूरोऽन्नम्। युधं—‘आविसकन्तन’ नामम् परिभाषते पादश्च रूपेण वैज्ञानिकः। लोको वृह प्राप्त्तका जलिणां च यायामायायाते। जलेपां च तस्मात्त्वावेव द्रव्यमणुयक्ते इति। जलेपां तस्मात्त्वाभिष्करण प्रविध्यं

भवतीति विद्या जलिणां तत्त्वसन्मोहवर्ध्यते। तारायुं च क्रिकायां, तस्मात्; अतिरेक क्रिकाया अत्यन्ते वृष्टिवर्ध्यते।

अथे च सुविद्यद्वेश्वद्वेश्वद्वाध्याय श्रीरूपुराणवतुं संक्षेपोऽकाल:।

तत्त्र च रामकथायुष्मिद्धरायानामपि गणपतुपासन प्रस्तुत निदर्शनः।

पत्रमामिः: कृतविक्तचयन्त: तुतिर्मामाय: सारोग्यातिसंस्करणं विषु:।

अथ च मायया नाधारविधु सुखापृमं युक्त:। विदितमेव प्रस्तुतकृत्तित्वेन पत्रमामिः: श्रीकर्मिण्यंयुज्वतकाल्यायाय्यः।

अविनिष्ठस्तु पुराणे गोगविश्व आगमश्रुतविषयः चूँकत क्रिया इत्यद्ये दृष्टियाः।
THE DEVI-PURĀNA, A WORK OF BENGAL

BY

R. C. Hazra

[ “देवीपुराण” नामोगुराण शास्त्राङ्ग प्राचीनम् परं सम्मानितम् प्रयः। शर्ये पुराणार्थां ब्रह्मच ग्रंथर्णां रचित आसीति लेखितम् ब्राह्मणपरिषिद्ध्रव्याः। एवं शर्ये च इम्हे हेमशोभापन्नस्तवम्।—१। देवीपुराणस्य प्रायम् सर्वे कोषाः। (MSS.) ब्रह्मचरितम् लिखितम् स्तितं, व्रजस्वरे एव च प्राप्यन्ते; (२) उक्तशेषायणस्य ‘युक्तस्वरूपायण-वर्णपुराणम्’, तथा ब्रह्म- शेषायणस्य च ‘शख्तस्वरूपायण-वर्णपुराणम्’ नामं वर्णितं, नामयम्। (३) देवीपुराणे ब्रह्मशेषायणां नामं उल्लेखो विवेचां, नामयम्। (४) देवीपुराणे ब्रह्मशेषायणां कामस्वरूपायण-राजस्वरूपायण-पृथ्वीस्वरूपायण च देवीपुराणस्य नामं उल्लेखो विवेचां, नामयम्। (५) देवीपुराणे नामकरणस्य च वर्णमालकन्तकस्य ‘उज्जैती’ नामकरणस्य च विवेचाम्।—६। देवीपुराणे शाश्वतस्वरूपायणां मध्ये वर्णमालकन्तक-स्वितस्य च विवेचाम्।—७। देवीपुराणे ब्रह्मशेषायणां नामं उल्लेखो विवेचां, नामयम्।–८। देवीपुराणे ब्रह्मशेषायणां नामं उल्लेखो विवेचां, नामयम्।

Among the extant Purānic works professing Śaktism, it is the Devi-Purāṇa¹ which is decidedly the most ancient as well as valuable and interesting from various points of view. Although this work came to attain an all-India character many centuries ago, being recognised as an authority in religious and social matters by many of the early Smṛti-writers of different parts of


16
India, and the conception of Devī, as found in this work, is in many respects different from that now prevalent in Bengal, there is little scope for doubt that it had its origin in this province. Besides the mention of the names of countries, rivers, holy places etc., mostly belonging to Northern India and showing the relation of this Purāṇa with that part of the country, there are other evidences which point to Bengal as the place of its origin. These evidences may be stated as follows:

(1) Most of the extant manuscripts of the Devī-p. are found in Bengal and are written in Bengali script, and those which are now available at or near about Benares, might have been copied from their originals taken there from Bengal. In other parts of India, Mss. of this Purāṇa are very rare.

(2) Of the numerous lists of Upapurāṇas contained in different works it is only those given in the Ekāṃra-purāṇa (a work of Orissa) and Raghunandana's Malamāsa-tattva (of Bengal) which include the name of the Devī-p.3

(3) The Devī-p. names, in some cases more than once, Kāmarūpa, Kāmākhya, and the different parts of Bengal, viz., Vāṅga, Rādhā, Varendra, Samata, and Vardhamāna, and thus shows its familiarity with and partiality for this part of Eastern India.

(4) Among the few chief holy places sacred to Devī this Purāṇa recognises and names Ujjayinī (a Śākta holy place in the district of Vardhamāna in West Bengal) and its presiding deity Ujjainī (popularly known as Ujjainī),11 which, being of local impo-

---

2. See Devī-p., chaps. 38, 39, 42, 46 (verses 63 ff.), 63, 74-76, and so on.
3. For these lists see my Studies in the Upanīṣads, Vol. I, pp. 4-5 and 13.
4. Devī-p. 42. 8 ; 46. 71.
5. Ibid., 39. 6 and 144.
6. Ibid., 46. 69.
7. Ibid., 39. 144.
8. Ibid., 39. 144 ; 42. 9.
9-10. Ibid., 46. 70.
11. See Ibid., 36. 8-उज्जैनी से उज्जैनी जस्ते जस्ते तथा स्थिता।
tance, are found mentioned only in the works of Bengal.\footnote{13}

(5) The Devī-p. mentions ‘Satru-bali’ in Durgā-pūjā in the following verse:

\begin{align*}
\text{“सत्रुभीतो नन्द सैन्यच्छुदु हृद्य ते पित्थसम्।”} \\
\text{सह्योगन तालिका तु वामालकनविशालयो! ||} \quad (22.16)
\end{align*}

Curiously enough, this custom survives in Bengal even to the present day.

‘Satru-bali’ as a malevolent rite is very ancient. In early days it was performed after pacificatory rites (sānti) by a King’s priest with the use of abhicāra-mantras for the good of his royal patron. Varāhamihira mentions it in the following verse of his Brhat-samhitā (44. 21):

\begin{align*}
\text{“शान्ति राज्यविकुट्यै कुत्या प्रयोगिष्ठाक्रमं ||} \\
\text{भूमयमार विभवछायचूढ़ेलोकेः निम्प! ||”}
\end{align*}

“After performing the propitiatory rite for the growth (and prosperity) of the kingdom the (learned) Brahmīn (priest) should, by citing Abhicāra-mantras again, thoroughly pierce with a lance at its chest (the effigy of) an enemy made of clay.”

\cite{12}

12. ‘Ujjayini’, mentioned in Devī-p. 33, 8 (quoted in the immediately preceding footnote), is the same as the ancient city, popularly known as ‘Ujāni’, which comprised the modern villages of Kogram, Maigalkoṭ (Sanskrit—मूगाकोट) and Ārāḷ situated on the bank of the river Ajaya in Katwa subdivision in the district of Burdwan (Varahamāṇa) in West Bengal. It has been mentioned, sometimes under its popular name ‘Ujāni’, in the works of Bengal as one of the Mahāpiṭhās created by the fall of the different parts of Satu’s body severed by Viśū, and Devī is said to reside here under the name of ‘Ujāni.’

For mention of this sacred city see Brhad-dharma-p. I. 14. 14, in which Devī says:

\begin{align*}
\text{“उज्जयीन्यं तथा पुर्णम पीढ़ मंगलकोणम।”} \\
\text{युग्म मंगलमहस्तायन्यं यन्तां वरदायिना! ||”}
\end{align*}

See also Trikandesvara, Tanttra-sūḍāna, Pīṭha-nirāṇiya (alias Mahāpiṭha-nirāṇi), Bhārata-candra’s Annadā-māṅgala (Pīṭha-māḷā, verse 21), and so on.

For an excellent account of the Šākta Pīṭhas (including the said ‘Ujjayini’ or ‘Ujāni’ of Bengal) see JASB, XIV, 1948, pp. 1-103.
But the association of 'śatru-bali' with Durgā-pōja is of comparatively late date. So far as we have been able to find, it is our Devī-p., which is the earliest extant work to mention this rite in connection with Durgā-pūjā. The other comparatively early Purānic works to prescribe it are the present Agni.13 and Garuḍa-purāṇa, the Mahābhārata, and the Kālika-p. Of these, the Agni-p. (185. 13-14) says in connection with the worship of sixteen- or eighteen-handed Durgā annually on the Māhānavami Tithi:

"तत्याच्छ तु नृपः स्नायाच्छवः पिष्मयध्र हरेः ।
दुर्गासन्दिविशदायम् ... ... ... **॥**

"In her (i.e. Devī’s) presence the king should take his bath, destroy (the figure of) an enemy made of powdered rice, and give (it) to Skanda and Viṣākha ... ... ... ." In much the same words (especially as those of Devī p. 22.15) the Garuḍa-p. also says in the same connection:

"तत्याच्छ तु नृपः स्नायाच्छवः श्रवण च पैदक्षम् ।
क्षत्रिय धार्मिके नृप दुर्गासन्दिविशदायोः **॥**14

It is to be noted that these two verses of the Agni and the Garuḍa-p. (and more particularly that of the latter) agree very much with Devī-p. 22.10 quoted above, and have even the incorrect Saṁdhi in 'तत्याच्छात' (tor 'तत्याच्छात अन्वतः') like the Devī-p. Moreover, chap. 1.4 of Garuḍa-p. I, which also deals with Durgā-pōja on the Māhānavami Tithi, has one line (6b) tallying completely with Devī-p. 22, 10a and two more (6a and 7a), agreeing remarkably with Devī-p. 22, 9a and 10b respectively. So, there is little doubt about the fact that both the Agni and

13. This is a spurious work available in more printed editions than one and quite different from the genuine Āgneya-p. still surviving in Mss. under the title Vāgni-p. For information about this genuine Āgneya-p. (alias Vāgni-p.) see my article published in Our Her. ages, I, 1953, pp. 209-245 and II, 1954, pp. 77-110, and Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, V, 1955-56, pp. 411-416.

the Garuda-p. modelled their verses on ‘śatru-bali’ on that of the Devi-p.

Now, the Agni-p. was compiled either in the eastern part of Orissa or in the western part of West Bengal (and most probably in the latter)\(^{15}\), and the Garuda-p. originated in Mithilā, but most likely in that part of Bengal which was adjacent to Mithilā.\(^ {16}\)

Of the Mahābhāgavata and the Kālīka-p. the former, which mentions the rite of ‘śatru-bali’ in the verse

\[ \text{“तत: राजः बाँध द्वाराकल्या विषयं गम।} \\
\text{नवम्यं पूर्वितां तु विषयिनिविशिष्ठित।”} \quad (15.33) \]

was written in Bengal (most probably in its eastern part) some time during the tenth or eleventh century A.D., and the latter, which gives a description of the rite in chap. 71, verses 177 ff., was compiled in the tenth or the first half of the eleventh century A.D. either in Kāmarūpa or in that part of Bengal which was very near to it.

Again, the earliest Smṛti work to mention the said rite of ‘śatru-bali’ in Durgā-pūja is Lakṣmīdhara’s Kṛtya-kalpataru but its only authority is the Devi-p., from which it quotes, in its Rājadharmā-Kānda, pp. 192–195, verses 3-24 of chap. 22 (including the verse on ‘śatru-bali’). In his Durgotsava pāddhati Udayasimha Rūpanārayana also quotes many verses from the Devi-p. and says:

अनन्तः राजयुक्त्वां दिशमयं कुर्वा सम्मेलनलोकोधिविट्या ‘भृगु लक्ष्मण सम।’ \\
इति लक्ष्मण हिरो देवन्त भृगु विशाखाय सम।’ इति विशाखाय कवन्तं द्वादश। \(^ {17}\)

Although Udayasimha Rūpanārayana does not quote Devi-p. p. 22, 16 (on ‘śatru-bali’), his wordings show definitely that his authority for this rite was the Devi-p. In his Vidhāna-pāryāyata (II, p. 651) Ananta-bhaṭṭa also quotes the said verse of the

\(^ {15}\) We shall discuss the questions of provenance of the present Agni- and Garuda-p. on another occasion.

\(^ {16}\) See Asiatic Society (Calcutta) Ms. No. 6445 (Indian Museum Collection), fol. 15b.
Devi-p. (and no other authority); in connection with ‘śatru-bali’ in Durgā-pujā.

In Eastern India it is the Sanvāteara-pradēpa which is the earliest Smṛti work to include this rite in the annual worship of Durgā. It was written in the twelfth century A. D. by Halā-yuddha, a high state-officer in charge of religious affairs under king Lakṣmanāsena of Bengal; and its relevant lines (given without quoting authority) run as follows:

“ततो………धिक्लिपिकाःक Dealers like the Prayer of the Sāṃskāra of the Ṛṣi Śrīya, तिथि तीसिंहस्तियम् आदाय अमुकशक्ति मारंजया-मीति चछ्वा स्तब्धिविशालायं नम हि निवेददेवत्।”

There is also another Smṛti work of Bengal, viz., the Durgā puja-paddhati of Vidyābhūṣaṇa Bhaṭṭācārya, in which there is mention of ‘śatru-bali.’ Of the Smṛti-writers of Mithilā it is Cāndēśvara and Vidyāpati who mention ‘śatru-bali’ in their Kṛtya-ratnākara (pp. 353, 360) and Durgā-bhakti-tarangini (pp. 35, 197) respectively, the authority cited by them on this rite being the Devī-p. only. The influence of the Bengal Nibandhas on the sections on Durgā-puja in Cāndēśvara’s Kṛtya-ratnākara and Vidyāpati’s Durgā-bhakti-tarangini is obvious. It is specially remarkable that in all cases the non-Bengal Nibandhas use the Devī-p. as their only authority on ‘śatru-bali’, that all the Purāṇas, except the Devī, which mention this rite, connecting it with Durgā-puja, belong either to Bengal or to places very near to it, and that this rite is found to be followed in some form or other in Bengal even at the present day. From all this it appears that both the rite of ‘śatru-bali’ in Durgā-pujā and the Devī-p. recording it originated in Eastern India and very likely in Bengal.

(6) Although the Devī-p. mentions ‘Kāmarūpa’ and ‘Kāmākhyā’ as places of Devī-worship, it does not add any importance to these, nor does it betray any influence of the method of Devī-worship followed in these places. On the other hand, it concerns itself with the praise and worship of Vindhyavāsini (of whom,

18. See Dacca University Ms. No. 4632, fol. 23b.
19. See Dacca University Ms. No. 2238 (dated Śaka 1658), fols. 46b.-47b.
as the *Ishakumāra-carita* tells us, there was a famous temple at 'Dānuśāhu' or Tamuluk, and the importance of Kāmarūpa as a place of Śakti-worship and its influence on Bengal became more and more prominent in the later Purānic works such as the *Kālidāsa-p.*, *Mahābhārata* and *Bhārat-dharma-p.*

(7) Unlike all other works of the Purānic literature, the *Devī-p.* is written in highly incorrect Sanskrit which compares very favourably with the language of the *Mahāvīru*, *Lalita-vistara* and other Buddhist Sanskrit works of East Indian origin. So, there can be little doubt about the fact that the *Devī-p.* also had its origin in Eastern India.

(8) In the *Devī-p.* there are many words and expressions which are clearly based on those in popular use in Bengal. As instances, only a few are noted below.

(a) The inflected form 'devyā' of 'devī' has been used in a large number of places as a basic word and declined like 'lātā' and other feminine words ending in 'ā'. (It should be mentioned here that in rural Bengal the word 'devyā' for 'devī' is popularly used as a surname of Brahmin words even at the present day). Similarly, 'mātā', 'duhitā', 'trātā', 'lotā' etc. have been used on several occasions as basic words respectively for 'mātrā', 'duhitṛ', 'trātṛ', 'hotṛ' etc.

(b) As in Bengali, the word 'sammatā' has been used to mean 'the person who has agreed or given his consent' (and not 'the matter agreed upon or consented to') in *Devī-p.* 7. 96—एवं ता: संमतीकत्वा********ै निबुक्ष: रेंजुना********ै (Cf. Bengali—'सम्मत करियो').

(c) Like the word 'Ki' used for 'Kīṃ vā' in Bengali, the *Devī-p.* uses 'Kīm' in 8. 12—********्तः चारे********ै नार्तलिहङ्गे देव स्पष्टवां कि प्रवेशस्तात्********ै

90. See *Date-Kumāra-Carita* (ed. M. R. Kale, Bombay), p. 149—

**********सुखार्दु शास्त्रविद्वाल्यवस्य साधुस्य बालोद्धारे**********नाताने

विनियनहिन्दुरानां वातो विनियनहिन्दुस्ववः ********

21. The results of my studies in the language of the *Devī-p.* are going to be published very soon.
Cf. Bengali—দেয়, "দ্বারে ... নারে গ্রহণ করিয়েছেন, [তাহকে লেখাইহে] রাখিয়ে হবে কি প্রবেশ করাইতে হবে? (Note the word 'স্থানান্তর' for Bengali 'রাখিতে হবে')

(d) The verbal forms 'uttha' (for 'uttishtha') in Devī-p. 8.17 (অক্ষ রাজন মহাভারত) and 'karanti' (for 'kurvanti') in Devī-p. 35.27 (..... বার্ষিক করিতে চ) are very similar to their Bengali equivalents 'ঝড়' (rise) and 'করে' (present tense, third person, plural number of the Bengali root 'কর্ত' for Sanskrit 'कर').

(e) As in Bengali, the Sanskrit root 'bhu' (meaning 'to enjoy') has been used in the form 'bhuṣ' in many places of the Devī-p. see, for instance, Devī-p. 2.42 (স্বর্গস্থানালাই বুঝ ব্য), 2.49, 5.16 (সুখ ত্বারী), 4.10 (সুখতালালিনী শৃঙ্খল), 9.12 (গৃহেণ গৃহীত), 9.36 (চালা চুক্তির), 9.39 (গৃহঃ গৃহীত), and so on.

(f) On numerous occasions nouns derived from verbal roots by means of Kṛt affixes denoting action have been allowed to govern objects having the second case-ending. For instances of such use we may refer to Devī-p. 1.57 (স্বর্গস্থানালাই বুঝ ত এবারে শিল্পাকামিত্ত, in which the word 'অক্ষ' governs the Accusative Case in 'প্রথম'), 8.57 (কন্যামূহারনোপরি—about marrying the girl), 9.42 (সত্যাধিকমল্কু—eager to marry her), 9.50 (বিধান মোহভীলা যা সন্তানাকামিত্ত), 11.2 (সম্প্রসারণে তথ্য), 13.22 (স্তন্তি তর্কম), and so on. Similar use of Kṛdanta nouns denoting action is very common in Bengali and has its root in the Vedic literature, in which there are a few instances, viz., Rg-veda viii. 11.7—অধি লামারায়া লিঙ্গ (which Sāyaṇacārya explains as 'লামারায়া লামা ব্রাহ্মণায়া লিঙ্গ স্তব্ধ'), Atharva-veda vi. 139.2, 4—মোট কথায় সত্য—by loving me (Whitney), Satapatha-brāhmaṇa ii. 3, 1.16—বদনে শোরে কীবলে পালেম্যাখেল।—if it should happen to him to have to drink pure milk (Eggeling), and so on.

(g) 'অশ্লিষ্ট' (for 'অশ্লিষ্ট') has been used as a basic word in Devī-p. 14.27—অশ্লিষ্টকোপ। Cf. Bengali—অশ্লিষ্ট ভার্মণ—blazing fire, 'অল্পন গাড়ী'—moving car, 'অশ্লিষ্ট রিঃ'—sleeping child, and so on.
(h) As in Bengali, the word पूर्वे (with the seventh case-ending) has been used in Devi-p. 6, ii. 1 (माग पूर्वे च तवं इद्र उक्तमासीत""") in the sense of ‘formerly’.

(i) In several places of the Devi-p. the seventh case-ending has been used in place of the fourth in the Dative Case. See for instance, Devi-p. 11. 7-11 (सप्तहनापि या दत्ता """); छुँजल्ला-लेजे दत्ती, ‘ताहले’ being used for ‘ताध् राहले’; and so on), 106. 5 (देव्या भवे प्रयत्वत्थप).

Cf. Bengali — ""वाप दिता ते त्रेत — (my) father gave me to such a bridegroom...... ; सलाणे दान करा उचित — (one) should make gifts to a good recipient; and so on.

(j) As in Bengali, words have sometimes been used in different cases without any case-ending at all. See, for instance, Devi-p 3, 12, 21 (सहालाभार बलिरे), 14. 20 (सात लूळ पुरीत्वा ""यावलि कुड कोपाचू), 14. 25 (तवापि कालो गव्वा तो मुथोच), 14. 27 (एवं ध कालो हत श्रेष्ठबिश """") and so on.

From the evidences adduced above it is clear that the Devi-p. was an East Indian work originating in Bengal. The use of the simile of ships (पोत) in more places than one in this Purāṇa tends to show that it was written somewhere about Tamluk, where, as we have already seen from the Daśa-kumāra-carita, there was a famous temple of Vindhyavāsinī and whence ships were sent to distant countries outside India.

22. Devi-p. 72-73 (‘पोती पोतस्य वा वया’ used in connection with the maintenance of a fort by its owner); 77. 8 (‘शिक्षपीत्ते तु तेन पारं महारावत;)
83.112 (देवीभ्रमण मनोलगं रं जोता भव शूकिनी).
[The learned writer has here discussed the relation of the Varāha-Purāṇa and the Rāmānuja-Sect of Vaiṣṇavism. The Varāha-Purāṇa has been the principal Purāṇa of the Rāmānuja-Sect, and so it has been profusely drawn upon in the works of this Sect.

The writer has shown that many of the important religious and philosophical tenets of the Rāmānuja-Sect are contained in the Varāha-Purāṇa. He traces in the present Varāha-Purāṇa a number of the Ślokas quoted by Rāmānuja and Vedāntadeśika in their works. Still, there are many ślokas found in the works of the Rāmānuja-Sect, which are mentioned as quoted from the Varāha-Purāṇa, but which are not actually traceable in the available editions of this Purāṇa. Such ślokas, in the opinion of the writer, either might have been lost from the Varāha-Purāṇa or might be traced in the Southern Mss. of this Purāṇa, which have not yet been utilised for preparing its editions.

The learned writer has also discussed the question whether the Varāha-Purāṇa was ever composed or redacted by the followers of the Rāmānuja-Sect. He says that the Sanskrit-works of the Rāmānuja-Sect (which are called the Sadasya-granthas) are meant to propagate the doctrines of this sect among the scholars of the opposite fold also, and so they mainly draw upon the works which are recognised by both the parties. And as these Sadasya-granthas have mainly drawn upon the Varāha-Purāṇa, this Purāṇa, therefore, could not be
confined to the Rāmānuja-Sect only. Again, this Purāṇa contains several statements and doctrines which are opposed to those of the Rāmānuja-Sect; e.g., the doctrines of unity or identity of the three Gods of the Trinity and performance of sakāma karmas, both preached by the Varāha-Purāṇa, are opposed to the main doctrines of the Rāmānuja-Sect which preaches the doctrine of superiority of God Viṣṇu over Brahmā and Rudra both, and abhors the performance of sakāma karmas. All this shows that the Varāha-Purāṇa was not composed or even redacted by the followers of the Rāmānuja-Sect, but had been composed by sages like Vyāsa long before the inception of this Sect.

अध्यादशेषु पुराणेऽऽ्र श्रीवाराहुपुराण द्वादशे गणयेत्। तथा च श्रीविष्णुपुराणे तृतीये दस्यो फलेचरणाये वचनम् “वाराहं द्वादशं चैव” इति। इत्यं सात्विकनुपुराणेणवन्नतम्। तथा च पश्चपुराणवचनम्—

“वैष्णवं नारदीयं च तथा भगवतं श्रुमस्।
गार्हें च तथा पावं बाराहं श्रुतवदने।
सात्विकानि पुराणानि विष्णवानि श्रुमानि वै॥” इति।

नारदीये बराहपुराणविषये गणयेत्

“श्रुणु पुत्र महाकालवाणि बाराहं वै पुराणकम्।
भागवतपुरं शास्त्रदिध्यमहात्मपुरुषकम्॥”

“भानवस्य दुः कल्पस्य प्रस्तश मक्तते पुरा।
नित्वचन्य पुराणंप्रसिन् चतुर्विषयात्तलके॥” इति।

पत्त्रवेदस्तीतिः भागवतपुरंप्रियपुराणकमप्पूचतमांवनकस्मप्रसिद्धवृत्तिनानि-विकालवृत्तिपाणि बराहपुराणस्य कक्ष्मणि पत्त्रवेदे आकाेरदशेनादि परिपुर्वते कल्पतासंस्कृतकालवृष्णायपेने श्रीविष्णुविष्णवारणिणा संस्कृतव्य प्रकाशिते उपस्मन॥

वराहपुराणम् संवत्तते। परं तु अनेन वचनेन श्रीमद्भागवते द्वादशस्त्रपदः-विनिमेतःविधाये विचयानेन “चतुर्विषयाति बाराहं” इति वचनेन च ज्ञापिता
चतुर्भिकलितकालाक्षम कालसंकल्प सांतितकेसरिमत्रा वराहपुराणे नीपुमयेि, किंतु द्रवधशतहााँशक अन्त्यसंपोषणसूत्रेि, तेनान्विते पाणिनस्य वराह-पुराणसाधारणाम एव सांप्रमुगुलयेि, अर्थभागे हुस् इति। अथवा यत् इहि वराहपुराणे श्रीवीरचरीकलितसमुक्तानुसारेि उत्सर्जनसीवकलितपुस्तकक्रम-मेवयेि संयोज्यः वधका सीता नीतम्,् दशकिस्तिरिदेशीयविलितपुस्तकानि संयोजन-कर्मीि न वचुहिरे अति एव पूर्णसरीि वराहपुराणे न संशोधयेि। दशकिस्तिरिदेशीयविलितप्राचीनवस्तनसेिीमाथकलितविश्लेषणक्रममयसर्वप्रतियोगि संमावयेि।

दशकिस्तिरिदेश्रेयस्: श्रीवीरचरीसंस्कृतव्याख्यानिरंतरविन्दुप्रकुंजसााृिाँ श्रीवीरहरुपुराण-चनानााि इति अस्तिममि। वराहपुराणः वेदनुपनिोिाँ हिनीन्द्राधिपििा निम्नीकरणेि एव वराहपुराणे सुसर्गेति तदि हि वराहपुराणस् प्राचार्यविश्लेषणसंसक्रमयस्तततिमयसप्रतियोगि संमावयेि।

किंतु वराहपुराणे पुराणप्रकुंजसमवेति निम्नीकरणेि एव वराहपुराणे निम्नीकरणेति सम्बन्धित वदुि वराहपुराणसबेि वेदनुपनिोिाँ हिनीन्द्राधिपििा निम्नीकरणेि एव वराहपुराणे सुसर्गेति तदि हि वराहपुराणस् प्राचार्यविश्लेषणसंसक्रमयस्तततिमयसप्रतियोगि संमावयेि।

वराहपुराणे स्वंचकार: श्रीरमसंस्कृतव्याख्यानिरंतरविन्दुप्रकुंजसााृिाँ श्रीवीरहरुपुराण-चनानााि इति अस्तिममि। वराहपुराणः वेदनुपनिोिाँ हिनीन्द्राधिपििा निम्नीकरणेि एव वराहपुराणे सुसर्गेति तदि हि वराहपुराणस् प्राचार्यविश्लेषणसंसक्रमयस्तततिमयसप्रतियोगि संमावयेि।
(१) नारायणस्य भगवान्कारणप्रतिपादननमस्ते “एको हे ते मातारण आसीत न श्रीराम नेशनी नायो नायकोपाध्याये ने ध्यानाध्याया न नारायणरणानि न च चंद्रमा, स प्रकाश स रेिस” इत्यादिकाया महापरितिबहितं भगवानुपालितं श्रीवराहपुराणस्ये।

“पूर्वः नारायणस्य्ये नारायणस्य्ये नारायणस्य्ये नारायणस्य्ये नारायणस्य्ये नारायणस्य्ये नारायणस्य्ये
सेठ पुत्र रत्न भसे नेव वर्षहर्न्तारम्िठाक् || (अो ९, छो २)
“सारस सारस सारस सारस सारस सारस सारस
कथ्यामाय धर्ष तद्नार्थे भिन्ते भ्रुगु || (अो २, छो २)
“अायो मार्जो इति श्रीका अायो वे नलमयी।
अर्थं तथा: पूर्वः तेन नारायण: समृतः || (अो २, छो ३६)
“सरः देवः साप्तरो ब्रह्माभ्यांकमयामायः।
विपर: साकाशानुकता इत्याद्र बैदिकको श्रुति: || (अो १७, छो २३)
“यदनंपरम श्रीराम भेदार्थें पत्त्वे।
स देव: पुनःरक्षकः स्वर्य नारायणो हरि: || (अो २९, छो १५)
“नारायणार्थो देवो न मूतो न भविष्यति।
पतारस्यैं वेदाना पुराणां न सर्वं: || (अो ३३, छो ५०)
इतिेभिष्मसरस्युपश्रम्माणार नारायणस्य भगवान्कारणप्रतिपादनस्य परेक्त्युपत्वेव च श्रीरामानुजप्रदाये सतिष्यते। अत्र श्वामानिकानवधिकारिणियेक्षेितुषे नारायण लघु न मृष्यति बैदिककः का।” इति स्तोत्रावर्ग यो श्रीमानुजमोत्सरामाया- विति नारायण: “परश्रा पुरुषोऽमो नारायण: इति व्यवस्थण निदर्शिनमु। अवोदाहसमु केियो नारा इति वैदिकः” इति वचनं श्रीमानुजप्रदायाचार्य्यम् श्रीब्रह्मान्यमकिं विरिति रहस्यमथारे सूलमन्नाधिकारिमेष श्रीरूपावसूतीकाश्विे इति वचनं मनुष्यवृत्तमयां भवेनुसारे।
“सरः देवः साप्तरो” इति वातावरणस्य श्रीभवान्यमकिं विरिति स्तोत्रसम्भाये “श्वामानिकानवधिकारिणियेक्षेितुषे” इति परस्य व्यासवासायं श्रीमानुजप्रदाये इति वचनं मनुष्यवृत्तमयां सहस्यसु दद्ययाते।
“यदनंपरम श्रीराम जसन्म” इति वातावरणस्य सन्ताने वर्त्मयायें “राजस यः” इति परस्य व्यासवासायं सहस्यसु दद्ययाते।
“नारायण: परेदेवः” इति वातावरणस्य स्तोत्रसम्भाये “कुशीदारे” इति श्वामानिकानवधिकारिणियेक्षेितुषे।
(२) श्रीरामपुराण—

"सृष्टः नारस्य वधो तन चाहं अनेव स्थायम् नारायणेति।
कल्ये कल्ये तत्र शायामि सुयः सुस्तः मे नामिनः स्यावायाम॥
"एवंसतः सः देविः नामिष्ठेः चतुर्वेदः।
उच्चं स मया ग्रंथं प्रजः सृष्टः महामति॥" (अ २, चौक १२, १३)

इति वचनमयोऽत्र प्रतिपादिता नारायणातः चतुर्वेदस्य अङ्काण मूलितः श्रीरामानुजसंप्रदायेऽस्म्युपमान्यन्ते। अतः "परो श्राप पृथवोत्स्मो नारायणो ब्रह्मादिः
स्थायरात्तः ब्रह्मसुष्ठः" इति श्रीरामानुजविज्ञाताभ्यासितास्य वाक्यं निर्देशनव्।
श्रीरामानुजविज्ञाताः श्रीमातामिवे ब्रह्मसुष्टमाये इदं वचनद्वयं "तथासुःदि
सर्गमहं बक्षेेः" इत्यार्थमोऽच्येत—

"सृष्टः नारस्य तिथमस्तस्य कृतमध्ये येन स्यामे स्त्र स्यारायणेति।
कल्ये कल्ये तत्र शायामि सुयः सुस्तः मे नामिनेः स्यावायामस्॥"
"एवं भूतस्य मे देवि नामिष्ठेऽऽऽ चतुर्वेदः।
उच्छेः स मया चोकः प्रजः सृष्टः महामति॥"

इत्यक्रमः पंक्तीं एकश्चतुमदेव समस्तृतं संबोधते। श्रीमान्योदयः
पादः संस्कृतमेऽऽ इति पराशों निष्ठावमाणो विज्ञाते। अस्यां पंक्तिः उद्द्वत्सु
"आदिसर्गमहं बक्षेेः" इति वचनं वराहपुराणे "आदिसर्गमहं तावतकथायामि
वरान्ते" (अ २, चौक ५) इत्येवमविषयक्ते। श्रीमान्यो देववाचिकन् तथा
"परो नारायणो देवस्तमादात्तथुगुःः" इत्यस्मिन् वाक्ये उद्द्वतिदेवं वचनमपि
वराहपुराणावतान्त्रिमेव। इदं वचनं वराहपुराणे—

"परो नारायणो देवस्तमाजात्तथुगुःः।
तस्मातृद्रोहवचीवि स च सवैः सः गतः॥" (अ ९०, चौक २)

इत्येवं संबोधते॥

(३) श्रीवराहपुराण—

"परो नारायणो देवस्तमाजात्तथुगुःः।
तस्मातृद्रोहवचीवि स च सवैः सः गतः॥" (अ ९०, चौक २)

"आयो नारायणो देवस्तमादु ब्रह्मा ततो भवः।
अतः स्वर्यामः यो मरीच्याचार्कसंबन्धः॥" (अ २५, चौक ६)
इत्यादिकृत वचनस्यां प्रतिपादिता ्श्रवणोऽहानि ्श्रवादिपुरुषः। श्रीरामालंकारसंप्रदाये स्वीकरिते ।

तव "परे नारायणोऽदेवः" इति वचनः स्तोत्रस्तवभाषे "कस्योऽदेवे"।

इति श्रीकुमारस्वामी साधृऽतमङ्कोऽन्यभौ ।

"आहो नारायणोऽदेवः" इति वचनः रहस्यव्यसाधी परदे करारामायणः।

उद्भूतः संस्कृताः ॥

(२) श्रीवाराहे सत्तिमेषुधायेः प्रत्यत्वरक्तस्वामारूढः ॥

"क परं प्रस्याऽयोऽविस्थिता नूपोवतमः। प्रत्येकमेऽन्यरथ्य द्रष्टं मां लुससौर्धमः" ॥ १९ ॥

रङ उवाच——

श्रवणः चिलवंतः स्वेतं तथां देवं गोरा ्मः ।

रङ र्यायं विलोकनाः स्वयं श्रवणः में वचः ॥

तत् चाम्बिकः महादुल्हः श्रुणः में गद्वती वचः ॥ १२ ॥

यो ब्रजेिर्थयते देवो वस्मालाब्धिमिदं जगत्।

उत्पवं सर्वौ यस्मनः लीनं महति सामर्थमः।

नारायणः परोऽदेवः सर्वसङ्गा वचारः ॥ १३, १४ ॥

विषाणूसः तरं स भावानं सतर्य परमेश्वरः।

रजस्तम्भोऽभां वुक्तोभुवुद्धजस्त्वथायिं विषुः। ॥ १५ ॥

सत्त स्तम्भः नामभिकः ब्रह्मण नरभासानम्।

रजसा तस्मां तुकः सोऽपि मासस्तहस्तिनः। ॥ १६ ॥

यत् सतं स हरिदं मो हरिस्तवः परं पदमः।

वेन सत्तवजीसि सोऽपि ब्रह्मा क्षमसभवः। ॥ १७ ॥

यो ब्रह्मा शैव देवस्तु यो देवः स चुऽपेंचः।

ब्रह्मजस्तम्भोऽपि सोऽपि नास्त्वत्र संशयः। ॥ १८ ॥

सतं रजस्तम्भवेद्विन्यते ज्ञातुरूपे चैतुरूपे।

सत्त्व नुभज्ञे जन्मः सतः नारायणात्मक्षः। ॥ १९ ॥

रजसा सत्त्वज्ञोऽर्थः ब्रह्मणः श्रीरामः।

तत् पैतामह कथानं सर्वशाश्वेषु पत्त्वा ॥ २० ॥
यदृ वैद्यकार्त्तं कर्म स्थाच्छायाः कृद्रद्र्ये सेवयस्ते ॥
तद्विद्वेगान्तं विविहारं समन्यं गाविलं नुणास् ॥ २१ ॥
यद्य न रजस्य कर्म कैवर्यं तासं पु वस्तु ॥
तद्विद्वेगान्तं नुणासिन्हलोकं परस्य च ॥ २२ ॥
सर्वसं मुच्छ्टे बनुः सर्वं नारायणात्मकसं ॥ २३ ॥

tvāmśeṣeṣeṣaḥ: 

प्रतिपाद्यमानं ब्रह्माचिच्छुद्राणां राजसाध्विक्षतामस्यं
नारायणस्य सर्वदेवशेषक्षेन नारायणोपासनस्यं
मोक्षहेतुधर्म्म्यं ब्रह्माचिच्छुद्राणस्यं सारारकेनी
फलवनसाधिक्षेन च श्रीरामानुजस्यप्रदाये स्थुपुमस्य
श्रीरामहुपुराणस्य च चालकोऽर्थे बहुत चननिल
चननिल च श्रीरामानुजस्य अर्थस्वद्वर्त्त्वेणि
फलवनसाधिक्षेन च श्रीरामानुजस्य अर्थस्वद्वर्त्त्वेणि

tvāṃṣeṣeṣaḥ:

कः श्री श्रीव: इति पद्याल्पयां
पुराणं च वाराहे अगस्थस्वस्वदेशार्थं रुद: —

यत् सर्वं स हरिद्वदन् यो हरिस्तिः परं पद्मं ॥
सर्वं रजस्तामस्त्रं त्रितयं चैवतुच्चः तत्वकारणम् ॥
सर्वेन सुच्चितं भवनु: सर्वं नारायणात्मकस्य ॥
रजस्य सर्वविच्छेदः भवेछ्वामाम्बोमस्थितिः ॥
तच पैतासः स्थानं सर्वश्राद्धेभुः पवित्र्याः ॥
ब्रह्माचिच्छुः कर्मं स्यामाविक्षुद्धियोगस्यस्याः ॥
तद्विद्यान्तं विविहारं कनिष्ठान्तं नुणास्य ॥
ब्रह्माचिच्छुः कर्मं स्यामाम्बोमस्याः ॥

tvāṃṣeṣeṣaḥ:

इत्यथा पंढरी "बतुं सर्वसं" हियादीनि कर्त्तानि साप्तावतानि।
तथेष्मानि कर्त्तानि पापुपात्तिकाम्यां ब्रह्मचारिकाम्यायमुद्दतानि।
एवं स्तोत्रावर्त्ये "कस्योदेरे
इति पद्याल्पयां "श्रीरामेहे चार्गत्त्वं प्रति रुदः —

नारायण: परो देव: सर्ववही जगान्ते: ॥
विनातामाणं सं भावानु: सर्वं थर्मेश्वरं: ॥
रजससम्योऽयो: सृष्टिवस्मात्त्वायांकित्वमु: ॥
सर्वं नामाचारं श्रवणं क्षर्यातस्यादस्य ॥
रजस्य तमसायुक्तं सोईप शामुकज्ञात्त्वः ॥" इति ।
(५) श्रीवाहारे दसमेद्याये—
"सत्यादित्यो वस्तो ये च साध्या विशेष्यन्ति मल्लश्रोष्याधः।
सर्व सत्यं शरणं गतं: समुक्त्यं पूज्यानिः विध्यामूः।"

(६) श्रीवाहरे जयसतातिमेवः—
"चतुर्वृक्षो वा यदि कृतित्वको भवेचर: कृत्यित्व: विद्युद्वेता:।
स मे गुणानायुक्तेन्नैवेद्युः: स्वा देवचर प्रसीद।"

(७) श्रीवाहारे श्रीमणोयन्तरध्यायेभुवस्मिः—
"बहुधसाधवाच वांचितावनो भवेचर: कृत्यित्व: विद्युद्वेता:।
स ते गुणानायुक्तेन्नैवेद्युः: कृत्यित्व: वा देवचर प्रसीद।"

(८) श्रीवाहारेष्वे पवमेद्याये—
"बहुधान्यो कर्माणि किं प्राप्यंते स्वनिनिवयः।
मोक्ष एवं ममाक्षव पृष्ठत: संहारं प्रभो।"

(९) श्रीवाहारेष्वे श्रीमणोयन्तरध्यायेभुवस्मिः—
"यदू तिनिचित्तमेते कर्मं पुलक: साध्यसात्तुः।
सर्वं नारायणं न्यस्तं कुर्वं प्रियं न हिष्ठे।"
परमात्मा स्वर्येभूतः कीड़िः भगवान् स्वर्यः ॥ २३ ॥
आह्मस्य सदा व्रतविवेचिः सुपुज्ञः ॥ २४ ॥
एवं श्याने भेवलर्मि कृत्यं विदिषाकिम् ।
भेयस्य किरीटिनिग्रहः रूपं राजवसो शुभम् ॥ २५ ॥

इत्येवः कर्मेन्द्रपरिवर्तने: श्रीनारायणे चतुर्विध्याये “कथमाराध्येवेदवे हरि नारायण परम्” ॥ १७ ॥ इति राजाधिवर्तसा पुराणं चौचिकिर्मिकलाभ्याः लक्षादेशोऽन्तः

“कितु सन्त्विरीरस्यः परमात्मा जग्यति: ।
स्वेदेऽहं द्विते पात्मा नैकस्थ्यानगतात् सः ॥ २७ ॥
एवं सर्वभोगी विद्यायतव बैश्रेण जनेकरः
मन्निर्या भूतसंवर्तम भुराय ये प्रदद्वितः ॥ २९ ॥
पश्चातः कीर्तिसंवाक्ष ते उपी विद्याया नूष ।
भावान्तू द्वां कृत्याय: सर्वभोगी हरि: ॥ ४० ॥
नान्यतः तत्सदो भृत्तितिभ्रातने स्वेद्याताम् ।
पूजः ते ज्ञानस्वरूपस्तव राजन् प्रकृतिलिङ्गः ॥ ४१ ॥
परिवर्तः भानुन समर नारायण गुप्तम्
पूजोपस्थार्थास्पद व्रताभ्यासाः च लघुः ॥
व्यातनेन सुत्थितेनात्मु सुमायः: परस्परः ॥ ४२ ॥

इत्येविवर्तने: साहित्योपन्यासे—
“भावास्थयो जात्यं देवि न विचारं चैपरहं” ॥ २१ ॥ इति,

पश्चान्तिकालिकाशतस्ते भ्रातायाम्
“नामः दानवहले नामः श्रवश्वरे: ।
तुष्यामि न तु प्रस्थेते: नयं स्वर्यवेच्ययः ॥ ३ ॥
एक्षणं समाधय स्ये मा ज्ञाति माये: ।
निति तुष्यामि तस्याहं पुरुषं भूपदेशान्तः” ॥ ५ ॥ इति,
“तथा चतुरां समाद्र य च रत्नस्तर्प य च करिति भवतामीप्राप्ति।”

इति समावेश वराहपुरुष बचनेन प्रतिपदामानी। कर्माधारणानां भोजसाधनश्-
प्रकारी गीतामश्य रचत्तत्त्वतः नृत्तत्त्वानि सारसत्त्वमतायायायासायास।”

(९) रहस्यत्त्रवारसौर्यारांश्चकालिकारे भगवदगङ्गाभाष्यकात्वप्रतिपदात्रात-चारे सच्चगुरूंस्तृति “न तथा भ्राता सुरिन्दसेवदेवो दृश्यसंभव।।” 

(१०) रहस्यत्त्रवारसौर्यारांश्चकालिकारे सच्चगुरूंस्तृति—

“सत्य चक्रवर्तश्च विषोशिलोस्तृति।”

इति वचनं श्रीवाहुपुर्णे पर्ययसतितमेव चतुरार्यां स्थायरात्मकां च प्रकटः। दृश्यसंभव।।
(१११) रहस्यवसारे साध्योपासनस्योपसनाथिकारे "नमो नारायणेष्युक्तवा
श्याकः पुनरागमवर्" इति सामी समुद्ध्वरं व्याप्याद्वृतिः——

"ततः प्रभाते बिमते बिनवृश्चे च जागरे।
नमो नारायणेष्युक्तवा श्याकः पुनरागमवर्।।"

इति काल्योगोद्वारतः श्रीवाराहस्यवर्चनं श्रीवाराहुरणं १२० तमेश्वर्याये

"अथ प्रभाते बिमते गोते तुल्ये च जागरे।
नमोनारायणावेति श्याकः परिवते।।१२१॥

इथे व पादचन्द्र संस्कृतः।

(१२२) श्रीवाराहुरणं द्वारिकायथिकशतलमेघवाहे विधानमानं——

"अहं श्रीप्रण क दासी क सक्ष्मा क लयं मायाय ं।।१२२॥

इथे व श्याखोत्तरणीवाचः श्रीमेधतेष्यदेशिकं बिनवचिते रहस्यशिलामाणी समुद्ध्वरतं
प्रेक्षये।

(१२३) श्रीवाराहुरणं सत्तितमेघवाये वर्षमानं

"तथं च श्रद् महावाहो मोहश्राक्षणं कारय।
अध्यायारं दर्शि नित्या महावहु महेश्वरे।।१२३॥

इति वचनं श्रीवाराहस्यसारे वास्तवलवाप्रायथिकिकारे

"तथं दि श्रद् महावाहो मोहश्राक्षणं कारय।
दर्शिचार्यमायारं फलं शीवं भवद्यनं।।"

इति पादमेवेकोद्वृततं संस्कृतः।

(१२४) श्रीमाण्यादकवाचिकनां पठयुपस्यथिकरणे "तथायक्षुफ्यतमेघवाये—

"पौरण शुक्लमालायथे वचनीति द्विवासु मायु।
सहितमालास्यायथे य मां प्राप्यन्ति ब्राहण:।।
अामे वेदस्त्रायणं पवतात्त्वितेति हि।
स्माणं मां प्रतप्वते ते मां प्राप्यप्लित सालवः।।
ब्राह्मणानित्यनितिमाणं पवतात्र बिनवचिते।
श्रुताचार्यं न तत्र भोगवदक्षीप्यथित।।"
इति पञ्चदशमयः वेदवल्लभस्वरामज्जागुरुपरमः प्रामाण्यमभिदितम्। तथा पञ्चपत्रिविभागं तत्त्रान्तरविन्यासानिमित्व भगवत्चालकपरासुखत्वं तासुभुगानुविवेकं च तत्रोजनम्—

"इति राजसैवित्सामसैद्ध समाहृतः। भविष्यति द्रविष्णु माचारसनप्रभुः। इति अतदकारं च सुगम तीणि नारद। सत्यार्था मां समेक्ष्णित कृतं राजस्तमोपिका॥"

इत्याद्यं पंक्तिः समूद्रशुरानि वचनाचि श्रीवराहदुराणे पद्मप्रितमेदावेये

"भीमर्य सुभाष्ट्रय ये वचनिति द्रविष्णु माम्। ते मा भविष्यति सततं संहिताध्यायनेन च || १.०|| अखंिे वेधमन्त्राणं पञ्चदशमाणं हि। मां धंरणे ये ते मा भविष्यन्ति मानवा: || १.१|| ब्रह्मन्दशिकालिनां पञ्चदशमां विचःयते। शुद्धार्थों तु मे क्षेत्रविभिन्नों द्रविष्णु। मां मां विभन्ति तेनां नाम्पूरजानिध्रुमचेते। || १.२|| एवं सहायकं संपन्नं पुरुषं पञ्चदशं पुराणणम्। पञ्चदशमां सहस्राणं यदि कृष्णडूष्टीयति || १.३|| कर्मकर्मसंपर्वं च मा कृष्णि यदि मत्तो भविष्यति। तस्य नेवं पञ्चदशमां निविं छ्वदिव वसिष्यति || १.४|| इति राजसैवित्सामसैद्ध समाहृतः। भविष्यति द्रविष्णु माचारसनपराहुः || १.५||
(१५) श्रीरामायण प्राचीनकाशी काशीकाशी “किमु च तत्र रुद्रच—
देवदेव जनसत्रीमु कुक्कुलचर्मचर्मः
कथं सुधिः प्रभविता नरकेशु च को वेदेत्
एवधुकस्त्वा देवश्रेष्ठावः जनावरः
युगलो श्रीरण सहसा मातुप्रेयतनं मानवः
अन्त्ये युगोऽपि नववरस्त्रक्षत महाश्रयः
एष मोहं च महायोगु श्री कर्ता मोहविष्णुति
त्वं च रुद्र महायोगु मोहविष्णुणि कार्यः
अल्पवासो द्विंशितवा फलं शीर्षं प्रदश्यं
कुर्वकानिन्द्रायामि विरुद्धावरणानि च
दशंशितवा जनं सर्वं मोहयां महेश्वर
eवधुकस्त्वा लेन देववं परमेश्वरा
आयसा तु गायिताः स्थः प्रकाशोऽदं क्षत्ततः
तस्मादरस्य कालात् महास्वयंतृप्तं सत्तम
शास्त्रप्रभवितती जीविका वायुविन्यसः न वेदेत तस्मि”

इत्यमः वाचाये वाराहपुराणस्मैतेनोद्वृत्तानि वचनानि श्रीरामपुराणे साधितमेवध्याये—

“देवदेव जनं सर्वं मुक्किर्मर्गम् व्यवस्थिताः।
कथं लक्ष्मी नवविता नरकेशु च को वचेत्।”
एक्षुचकस्तो देवो मायुयाच जनानं।
युगानि श्रीणि बह्वो मायुयणि भान्ति मालवः। ||६४||
अन्त्ये युगे प्रविष्टं भविष्यति मदाधिवः।
पप्प मोह सुब्रह्मण्यो यो जनं मोहिष्यति ||६५||
त्वं च रूप महाभाहो मोहशाक्षाणि कारः।
अल्पायासं दशिष्यता मोहिष्यु महेशः ||६६||
एक्षुचकस्तदा तेन देवेन परमेश्वरः।
आतमा तु गोपिनास्वः। प्रकाशोज्दहकस्तदा ||६७||
तस्मादर्मणं कालातु मत्रणीतिमु सतम्।
शाश्वेतस्वर्थरः लेको नाहस्येन भेददत॥६८॥

इत्येवपहुँचने
(६६) पाङ्गुपताकन्यक्रणश्रुतकाशिकायां — "यथाविद्धसततमेण
" "मां विषणवीतितिं वे ब्रह्माणं च द्वियोचमः।
बन्धनं पापकर्मणि याति नरकं नरवः। ||६६||
वे वादार्पणिन्ध्रदार्शनः मोह्यर्मेव च।
नवसिद्धान्तसंहि दि मया शाब्दसु तु दशिष्यम।
पाठोर्थम पशुभावस्तु स यदा पतितो भलेतु।
तदो पायपतं शाब्दं जायते वेदसंहितम्" ॥ इति

इत्येव वाराहपुराणस्थलेन वर्णितानि वचनानि वराहपुराणो सप्ततिमेवैवास्ये—
"मां विषणवीतितिं वे ब्रह्माणं च द्वियोचमः।
भवन्ते पापकर्मणि याति नरकं नरवः। ||६८||
वे वादार्पणिन्ध्रदार्शनः मोह्यर्मेव च।
नवसिद्धान्तसंहि शाब्दसु तु दशिष्यम। ||६९||
पाठोर्थम पशुभावस्तु स यदा पतितो भलेतु।
तदो पायपतं शाब्दं जायते वेदसंहितम्" ॥७०॥
(१७) तस्यमेव पाषाणताकिरणुश्रुतकाशिकायां—“थथा निष्टानामीह\
 मोहनार्थे तु मुद्दताम् तत्त्व शासन धुसकृ क्रतम्।
तत् कदवः हेतुमा केन क्रतं देव वदस्य नागः।”

(१८) तस्यमेव श्रुतप्रकाशिकायां तदन्तत्त्वं “दुभिकाहु गौतमेष्य रक्षतेर्न्तु-
भैरविगमित्वमहत्सनिम्नित्वमातितिसंरचित्वतुत्व।”

“पवितवक्षतश्च तैततु गौतमः क्रिमिदं विविद।
गीतब्धारणं भवस्तावत्सन्तयति योगविद्।
कर्त्त्वा मायेः सर्वस्मिनं जातं विचित्रं वे।
शाशाप तालसत्वा भस्मिष्ट्वः मुख्यपरीस्थिष्ठा।
भविष्यथ नयीवद्या वेदज्ञश्रद्धान्बवथिताः।
तत्र श्रवणं श्रुतवपण्यं गौतमस्य महानेः।
आः सर्वस्मिनं भावं सर्वकालं द्विजोत्थमः।
भवन्तु किं तु ते वायुमोनं नात्र संसारः।
तद्विवस्थविनिन्दिष्टा: सदा काऺ्ये द्विजः।
भविष्यति किमाह्यनाससवेदविहिष्कृतः।”

इति गौतमशापां तर्कूक्षकारणं कहो जन तदनुष्ठाय तद्।
रोकपरं तैतततैमेः-श्रुतवाच्यवर्णों चोक्ता।” इति स्याऽपः पद्नकी वराहपुराणीतेहोद्युताकर्मानि वचनानि
श्रीवराहपुराणे एकस्पष्टितिर्यथायेः——

“एवर्कसतदा तैततु गौतमः क्रिमिदं विविद।
गीतब्धारणं सुदं तावदं पश्यति गौतमः।”

कर्त्त्वा मायेः सर्वस्मिनं जातं विचित्रं वे।
शाशाप तालुक | जटास्मिष्ट्वः मुख्यपरीस्थिष्ठा।
भविष्यथ नयीवद्यावेदसमवं विहिष्कृतः।”
तत्स्वत्व अवस्थनं गौतमस्य महादुर्गे।
कस्तुः सर्वध्याये भानं सर्वकालं द्विजोजयम्॥४०॥

एवं लिङ्गं ते वाक्यं मीरं नास्त्यकं संस्करः।
यदि नाम करो सर्वं भविष्यति द्विजोजयम्॥४१॥

उपकारिणि एते हि अपकारं एव लिङ्गः।
हि उस्मृति अथि कलो मतिमाती भवनु ते॥४२॥

त्वदाक्षरविविधतेः सदा करिष्योगे हिन्दुः।
भविष्यति किमाहीना वेदांगशिर्कृतूः॥४३॥

इत्यादि संहिताः।

(५९) पाण्डुपातीविधिकल्पत्रप्रकाशिकायां तत्र यथा महेश्वरवचः—

"पदमयधितितस्तैलु पुराजः द्विजस्वतः।
बेद्यायास्मात्त्वं कुत्वानसिं सहिताः॥

निघासायां तस्विस्सं त्रिना वाचव्ययापिणिला।
अवापरा इत्येव शोभा वेदाभिकारवन्॥

भवेव मोहितात्त्व हि भविष्ययज्ञत्व हिन्दुः॥" इति तत्—

"निघासांसिद्धं हि कुस्मात्रा प्रमाणतः।
शेष पाण्डुपति दीक्षा योगः पाण्डुपतथ सः॥

पत्मादुदार्मगार्गः यदवतिषी जयोऽऽम्।
तस्यो द्राक्षम विके तद्व शौचविकार्भिः॥

बे रसमुपस्वतः कलो श्रवणक्ति नरः।
उच्छज्जह्यांसे जोया नाह तेषु व्यवस्थितः॥"

इति, तथा "तेनां गौतमशापादकं भविष्यस्यनवये हिन्दुः।" इति प्रकरणः

"तेनां मध्ये सदाचारास्त्रे तेषु मच्छासने रतः।
तेते सर्वमपव्याः च यास्त्रेषु लण्डै निश्चयः॥"
वैदालिका ये यास्यम् मम सन्ततिमुखः।
प्रामूलोत्सविनिनिद्रणः पुरुषद्वाचार्यः द्विबाः।
नरकं ते गमिन्यस्ति नात्र काययो विचारणा।।

इत्येकं पद्माकुंतद्वारानि वचनानि वराहपुराणे एकपापलितसमूहाये—
“एवमयथितसैतु सरसृं हिलससम्। वेदलिकासायनः ।
ञुवनासिम संहिताम्।।५.१।।

निधासांस्कर्त्तं ततस्तस्या जीना ब्राह्मणवाहिनः।
अतःपरं श्रुतेव मतात्त्वे दामित्सः सचः।।५.३।।
भैवेत्त भेदितसीते तु भविष्यज्ञातां द्विबाः।
जीवाधिनः स्वशास्कणं कार्यस्वत् कलो मरः।।५.४।।

निधासांस्कितः हि ज्ञातां भ्रमणाः।
सैव पायुपती दीपः तोऽः पशुपतस्य धरमः।।५.५।।
एतस्माद्विदमेवगद्ध अवन्द्विद्ध जावन्ते।
तद् क्रियाभवः विज्ञेयः रीते हृदाविचिन्तितम्।।५.६।।

वे श्रद्धाश्राविनित कलो वैदालिका नरः।
जीवाधिनः स्वशास्कणं कार्यस्वत् कलो मरः।।
उष्णा पम्रस्त्रतते जीवः नाहं लेवु व्यवस्थित:।।५.७।।
“तेषां गौतमशास्कणः भविष्यव्यवस्थे हृद्वाः।।५.८।।
“तेषां मच्छास्तरः सदागारः हृद्वाः।
स्वगच्छेवविभवः च इत्यतः संशोध्या पुरः।
वैदालिकाः यास्यति सम सन्ततिमुखः।।५.९।।

भगु गौतमशास्त्राः द्रुप्या पुराणचनन्तः हृद्वाः।।
नरकं तु गमिन्यस्ति नात्र काययो विचारणा।।५.१०।।

हृदयेवदीक्षितमेवेदेऽवस्थते।
(२०) पान्याःग्रामसामृतः “अत्र च चाक्रमण्यविवेदीक्षितपरायामास्माह्म समवान्—
“श्रुणु गुणदर्शते देवस्य विनिश्चयं” हृदयांशःपाणा हृदयेवाः सत्त्रिन्याः।
वराहपुराणे सातदशाशिकांतमें। इत्यादि पाठमेंदेवोपरिप्रयोगः। ॥
हेतु॥ श्रीरामाजुजमंदिरवर्मेयं तत्र तत्र प्राणविनेद्रदृश्यतां सम्बन्धितमसे निर्भरतां वराहपुराणे आकर्षितमयां वर्षाकृष्णमुदाहरानि।

अथ श्रीरामाजुजमंदिरवर्मेयं तत्र तत्र वराहपुराणीद्वारे प्राणविनेद्र-दृश्यतां यथा वचनानि सांप्रदायिके वराहपुराणे नौजवनने, तात्मादायिन्ये।

(१) पाठप्रतात्त्विकसिताध्यायकाणि तत्रावधायिनीसे—
"विषयवर्गा चाल्योंद्र सर्वदेवश्रीलोकम।
सादिकी स च समायत मृत्युमं युनियुगः॥
वंदभक्तिः च नागपते: समावतः।
सिद्धान्तमार्गस्तैहः शृद्धति प्रौढः।
राजसीं मे तु तत्त्व कान्ती हिमश्चाचम॥"

इसस्यां प्रकृति वराहपुराणीयेवेदनोद्वाहारानि च कथानि सांप्रदायिके वराहपुराणे यौधापि नौजवनने।

(२) तत्रैव श्रुतमार्गकाणि समानतरसर्वनृत्ते—
"तथाऐश्वेतविध्वं मैत्रासहितिनिर्माणः।
ततोंवतिरितिस्तिथ्यस्तोतिस्तुमध्ये पालये॥"

इति समृद्धतेषु वराहपुराणाचारमपि अस्मिन् वराहपुराणे न वचनेते।

(३) श्रुतिपादव्यासांमिभि: संवरस्मायमने श्रीदातार्थबिषैः सरस्वतिशासन-सक्षमिनान्ति रहस्यस्माये। श्रीवराहपुराणचर्मश्चेष्टेनेवदृश्यायामान्य-रहस्यमथः बहु उद्वर्तकत्वातः—
"स्वति सनसि नृस्वायं शरीरे सति यो नरः।।
भादुसाये स्वति सतां विध्वंस च सामजन्मः।।
तत्त्वं विनिष्ठं तु कष्ट्यापाणस्वतेषु।
अहं समापति महिमं नवायमिः परमां गतिः।।"

इत्यतः इत्योऽक्रमे कल्पकालात्युत्तिं रसिन्य वराहपुराणे न दृष्टियोगिर्मितकः।
(५) शीतेदुःधनेरस्मिनिन्दित्संम सचिन्तिकाम यथमेव श्रीवाहिनि—
“बालुदंश्चरित्म कुर्याधासनो बाहुमूलः।  
सोमाश्रेष्ठाः प्राप्य विशुद्धसः महायते ॥  
इतिः,
तत्रैव क्षेत्रासाहायः—
“सचकाहितेवाहो यो मद्धको सुवि दुधः।  
सामेवैवन्ति धर्माला मदेकातेन चेतसः ॥  
चकाहितस्तु: केवचतुर कुल वसन्ति चे।  
शोकनाति तथा सीणं सम क्षेत्रं वसुपरे ॥  
ये केवचतुर पुरुषा विशुद्धकाद्रूद्धता:।  
तेवा दुर्वेष्टनाथेण महापालकनाथाद् ॥  
सूचने तिर्थशाचार्य वाक्रत्वः वसुपरे।  
तत्र सवः प्रशनं यथिति वत्र चकाहितो वसेत्”॥

इत्यथा पद्य: वराहचुराणो लोहेको अमिन्य वराहचुराणुपस्तके  
कृत्वा न्यायः।

(६) सचिन्तिकाम द्वितीयाशिकी तत्रैव क्षेत्रमहाश्रवणमांनाणो—
“कुछोऽन्त ब्रह्मणे चिदान्त: भस्मादारी भवेचादिः।  
वचेत्याचार्यां देवि मदोच्छिष्ठेष्ठर्थ यथा ॥”

इत्यथा पद्य: वराहचुराणो लोहेको अस्मिन्य वराहचुराणे न दस्यते।

(६) सचिन्तिकाम द्वितीयाशिकी सन्ति च पुराणाविश्वाय तथाते  
वचांसि।  
तथाति श्रीवाहिनि—
“पुजकन्तों महाभागा मत्तपुरुषः देवार्थमः।  
तान्तराणान्त: प्रकृतिर्तुन्तु पुराणान्त: मम पदार्थान्त: ॥  
रावणं महालाभं च पवित्राय वराहने।  
मत्तपुरुषं विपधभायस्तु: पुरुषः”॥
एत्यन्तर्दृश्वेन स्वोको वराहपुराणे न ज्ञातेते ।

(७) श्रीवराहपुराणे साधुकथाएँ पद्मपत्रोकार ललितेषु शिक्षारिणीप्रीति स्मृतिप्राप्तिकारे “भगव-मन्दिरे तत्तत्त्वज्ञानवीकरणस्मारकनाइयोऽपि पिरिषित । एवं तु श्रीवराहपुराणे द्वारिकादशनाम-धारावा: पद्धार:” इत्यद्वा घरणीवोहिरस्वामिदलये सुतूनविशल्लितकल्लुकायमेक-मथ्याय विभिन्निर्भिन्न, “इति श्रीवराहपुराणे घरणीपरे द्वारिकादशनामार्य नाम पञ्च-कल्लुकायमेक”। इत्यित्विशल्लितम्। परंतुयमभावाये वराहपुराणे सूतोऽवर-धाराये: कुजापि नोपकष्यते किं तु वराहपुराणे अनातितस्वप्नविकारकत्त्वमेकामोक्षरेषु पुराणे: इति जीवनेिवेभूतेष्वर्गविकारकत्त्वमेकामोक्षरेषु पुराणे: पद्धार:। संस्कृतवर्गसम्बन्धिते ।

(८) तत्वेति वराहपुराणायं समानन्तरदृश्वे रहस्तस्वप्नार्ये प्रभावविकारके चौदृश्वे—

प्रभावविकारके चौदृश्वे: स्वरूपविशेषायो नार:।
उपचारश्चतानाचरि न क्षमामि कोलमे नृत्ये्।”

इति व्यायामार्थिनि नामग्राहमेकि वराहपुराणे कुजापि नोपकष्यते।

(९) स्तोत्रमभावायेच “जनकनासेह बंशे” इति इलोकवाहणे—

“जनकनासेह बंशे प्रभावविकारके नार:।
सामभेव न प्रभावते सति दुःखवत्ते ततो किंग ॥”

इति वराहपुराणायं प्रभावविकारके इलोके वराहपुराणे नोपकष्यते। अनेन इलोके वराहपुराणे द्वारिकादशनामकादयामेकामागार्थवान्तरथ्याये माल्यत्व तर तथिविः घरणीयनः बहुमतार्थतान्तरथ्याये माल्यत्व। परंतु तत्वार्थं नोपकष्यते। इत्यथावर्गायेच श्रीवराह-पुराणे श्रीराममुखरामेकादयामेकामागार्थवान्तरथ्याये संस्कृतविश्लेषणस्वरूपिः इलोके वराहपुराणे संस्कृतविश्लेषणस्वरूपिः बहुमतार्थवान्तरथ्याये रामकादयामेकामागार्थवान्तरथ्याये। परंतु अनेन विद्माहानं निरुक्त।

अत्रार्थ प्रसन विवाहातिः प्रभावविकारके सम्बन्धस्मारकनाइयोऽपि पिरिषित:। अनेन अनेन विद्माहानं निरुक्त। कल्लुकायमेकामागार्थवान्तरथ्याये ज्ञातिस्वप्नानां सुन्तायेिवेशप्राप्तह, न तु द्वारिकादशनामानां नामानामुखरामेकात्मक्यान्तरथ्याये। द्वारिकादशनामेकामागार्थवान् इलोकानां पाठः संस्कृतवान:। किं च,
अन्यायपुराणेशु चतुर्विंशतिसहस्रसंख्यकसम्बन्धितलेन वराहपुराणेव वर्णितमाले सार्वज्ञतिकाःस्वयमभास्तिकाः तदादासहस्रसंख्यकसम्बन्धितस्य वराहपुराणस्य दशनिन अवशिष्ट दससहस्रसंख्यायोऽपि नुसरायते। यदि विभिन्नब्राह्मणानां विभिन्दं वराहपुराणं अर्थान्तरम् सर्बपरमार्गार्थम् यदि वराहपुराणं संस्कृतं प्रकाशयेत, तद्राहू वहनामवेदानांतररस्य स्रुवं फलेदिश्वरये स न समेतः।

अथ विचाराते श्रीवराहपुराणस्य रामायंजसंस्करं चाचार्यविकायां विषयाविद्यामुखन्तके किं चोजू? इति तत्तेंद परिमुखति यत्——

“वैष्णवं नानदोऽव च तथा भागवतं शुभम।
गार्द च तथा पापं वारहं शुभदर्शने।
साम्यकालिनु पुराणानि विच्यायानि शुभानि चे।”

इति पाँचवचननारुरोथेन वराहपुराणस्य विष्णुपुराणतु विष्णुपुराणान्ति विश्ववर्धनानदियारिवने वैष्णवकर्मणांमितयावक्तवच च वराहपुराणं श्रीवैष्णवस्य राजसामस्तपुराणेश्वरदित्वेनान्तिवैद्याश्रयिति। वराहपुराणायां श्रीवैष्णवसंहन्ते विष्णुपुराणस्य वैद्याश्रयान्तिवैद्याश्रयानुदीत इति। वराहपुराणपेश्चा श्रीवैष्णवसंहन्ते अङ्गादेशेन विष्णुपुराणायां वैद्याश्रयान्तिवैद्याश्रयानुदीत इति। वराहपुराणायां संहन्ते विष्णुपुराणायां वैद्याश्रयान्तिवैद्याश्रयानुदीत इति। वराहपुराणायां संहन्ते विष्णुपुराणायां वैद्याश्रयान्तिवैद्याश्रयानुदीत इति। वराहपुराणायां संहन्ते विष्णुपुराणायां वैद्याश्रयान्तिवैद्याश्रयानुदीत इति। वराहपुराणायां संहन्ते विष्णुपुराणायां वैद्याश्रयान्तिवैद्याश्रयानुदीत इति।

अथ विचाराते श्रीवराहपुराणकौन्ते श्रीरामानुसारंसंस्कारं अविभिन्तमेति तत् बहुः उदाहरणं दित्तं पुराणं श्रीरामानुसारं संस्कारं अविभिन्तमेति। प्राचीनसारा चार्योंतिरें परिवर्तिणं ब्रह्मचार्यं शक्तिसारं नेति। तत्रेत भगवानं श्रीरामानुसारं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऽपि सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः शेषौ परवाच्यं प्राणं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः। शेषौ परवाच्यं ब्रह्मचार्यं संहन्ते द्विविधं ब्रह्मः पूर्वचार्योंतिरेऍ निर्मिताः सततं श्रवणाध्यायेऽपि तत्र रहस्यमः शिष्याणामुपेश्चार्यं निरमिताः।
विषवचनशत्तहिततय श्रीरामानुजसंस्कृतदाचार्य: प्रणीततब परिवर्धितसू वा न शक्यवहारुप।
तत्तत्त्व दिस परिवारिकितेनकृतनवानेः अन्येऽं पराविरिक्षितवभयानेः नामधेयं त्वचनानाः प्रभृत्यालोकहृणाः न युज्यते।
किं च श्रीरामानुजसंस्कृतदाचार्य: श्रीरामानुजसंस्कृतदाचार्य: श्रीरामानुजसंस्कृतदाचार्य: श्रीरामानुजसंस्कृतदाचार्य:

(१) श्रीरामानुजसंस्कृतदाचार्य: विषयाः सर्ववक्ष्यते ब्रह्माभद्योगस्तीविधतनें चाम्बुपालयाः इति प्रथितम्।
अतः

“सामाविकारविकारविस्विस्तुः नारायण त्वथि न सृष्ट्यति वैदिकः।
भवता शिवः शतमकः परमज्ञानितेनवः वस्य महिमारणविविधुतसू।”

इत्यादिः स्तोत्रसहस्रोऽवश्ये।

“सत्यकं च हरिः पूर्व रूढः बांधवायु महा।
वादाः सा भिराः। प्रोक्ता यो हरिः स त्रिलोचनः।
एवं सर्वं शास्त्रं श्रुतं शुचं च गच्छति।
पत्तमाप्तमथा बस्तु ब्रह्मेपहु शास्त्रं प्रथक्तया।
हेदी जनानाः मयानाः काल्य शास्त्रं न तद्भवेत्।
विष्णु रूढ़कतं ब्रह्मान्त श्रीमृगितति निगच्छति।
पत्तमाप्तमथा यथा सोपमेत्यथे बुधः।”

इति सर्वततमेते भवे।

“यो विष्णुः स स्वर्यं ब्रह्माः यो ब्रह्मास्ती महेश्वरः।
वेत्तब्रह्मे च कृतं द्विजेन्द्रनू जिद्वकथाः।
यो भवें द्वितेः स्तम्भवत्रया विनिर्भव।
स पापकारी दुयात्मा दुर्गतिः समवानुवात्।

मां विष्णुस्तिमितिमकरं ते श्रवणे च द्विजोम।
भवते पापकारीं यान्तिः नरकेः नराः।”
हृति, एकपरिपूर्णे।  

“प्राणमय शिरसा देवेऽ यात्रवस्यस्मि हे नृपः।  
तावत् तस्येव सदस्यं देवस्यं क्रमाधिकारम्।  
॥ २॥  
नारायणं च हृदये अतर्कं प्राप्तवणासनं।  
॥ ३॥ इति  
क्षेत्रस्य भूद्वृत्ते हृदयं मात्रुद्रिष्ठम् महायेः।  
ते आयोपि वर्यं भागं सुहोमः कृत्विसतमा।  
॥ ६॥  
नास्माकं विविषयो भावो वर्तने सुनिर्वचनः।  
॥ ७॥ इति,  
हिसात्ततिमेवध्याये।”

“विषयेश वर्यं श्रवं त्रिमंददिनं पञ्चते।  
वेदंसिद्धान्तमार्गं तत्व जानन्ति मोहिषः।  
॥ १॥  
आहं विषयविषयं वेदं भ्रामर्णं चादित्य च।  
॥ २॥  
पद्मं वर्यं तेषकेतुं न पूर्वमार्येऽवं सुधी।  
॥ ३॥  
योग्यस्त्वं मात्रे वेदेवितरं पक्षाति सुक्तं।  
॥ ४॥ इति,  
तवःसततिमेवध्याये।“विषयुःक्षेत्रं  
वर्यं वर्यं भद्रोऽस्तु देववेव उपायेः।  
न वेदवाहकोऽहेऽदं एकावाचामुवापि।”  
॥ ५॥ इति,  
सताशीतिप्रकाशततः ध्याये।”

“एकमुंत्तितिन्यार्थं चातो श्रवविषयक्षेत्रमकः।  
॥ ६॥  
कौष्ठेतेऽवंस्यं सुधु ईष्टोऽहेऽरत्नासनः।  
॥ ७॥  
सक्ता नायामभवपकः पथवर्यं मितायिनं।  
॥ ८॥  
एवं वर्यं श्रियं वेंवं कः चल्ल करणां सहीमः।  
॥ ९॥  
विष्णुः परस्परत्वं मायं चल्ल तु चैवणवोः।”  
॥ १०॥ इति,  
इस्मेमहेऽचनं रामानुजसंवद्याशस्यतं तिमिर्यक्षं तिमिर्तिसायं वा प्रत्यपादते।  
किच् स्तोत्रत्तमाये।“कस्योद्रे।”  
इति ईष्टोऽहेऽरत्नासनं वारह्ये एकपरिपूर्णेः  
ध्याये विद्वानाति।“त्रिभमानं सं भगवानं, सर्वं परस्मिधरः।”  
इत्यादिन वचनं।
न्युनतंत्र "विधायसत्त्वानं" इत्यतः लेण क्रेन क्षेत्रस्तुतिविशिष्टमष्ठपेन चेति बहुप्रमाणाणुसारेण प्रत्ययमुः। इति किंतु वीणणा वोच्चने निस्तीवते यद्य श्रीरामाजुनसंप्रदायाय मुनायुः "एकं सृष्टि विभक्तम्" इति तत्त्वस्तुसत्त्वाय निस्तीवणापूर्वकेवलेन परिवर्णनेन पश्चता प्रतिपादितः ॥ ॥

(२) शरणागतेन दीक्षितेन वैणणेन वर्णाश्रमं यावजीवं कैौंक्यतमनानुस्तृते इति रामानुजसिद्धान्तस्य विवेको दीक्षितत्वश्च शरणागतस्य वर्णाश्रमं त्यागस्य प्रतिपादितानि वचनानि वर्हुपुराणेऽवस्तुत्यक्षणात्मकसुङ्गमाः सन्तः--लक्षणी विषयोऽरुपयाणि त्यसः सवः वित्तिः इति सवः लक्षणी देवश्रेणि विषयं प्रकृतिः संसारं जन्मां तारामुः ॥ ॥ नन्तः—अहं वैणणो भक्तत्वमुपात भूमण्यं कमण्यं च वैणण्यम् । दीयां च रुप्ता भक्तवसादात्मसीवः में भवन्ति-मोहाणां ॥ ॥ ॥

श्रूकोः श्रूकरयम्य युक्त्य भर्तर्य च सवःः। भक्तन्वयमर्य तत्त्ववक्तज्ञ च श्रूकर्यम् च' ॥ ॥

इत्यतः इत्यतः ॥ एवं धर्मसंयुप्यायने एवं स्वास्त्यम्। धर्मस्वरस्वायनो रामाजुनसंप्रदायायति।

(३) रामाजुनसंप्रदाये सकामकमणी सुमुखलक्ष्यपद्याविशिष्टाम "न सुकृत सुकृतम्, सर्वोपमानोर्ति निर्वैद्वेदः" इतिदिवृत्तुरूपमहाप्रेयोगी-निबेध्यात्मकत् वाच्यत्वः निर्देशानी। परंतु वर्हुपुरणे अध्यादेशायायारस्य चतुर्भिधमाचायायारस्य चादाद्वैतिकविशिष्टतमाचायारस्य अध्यायेनुः अयमेव च सकामकमणी क्रयवेदतानाशुशुष्णने। अयमेवः भविष्यात्त्वमितिविशिष्टपत्यर्थ नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायायसम्भवितस्यसम्यः।

सम्म स्वरूपेण नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायार्थिक्षणा नौरामाजुनसंप्रदाया वर्णनिश्चयार्थः विशिष्टार्थः परस्यादित्वमितिविशिष्टपत्यर्थः । प्रति नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः । नौरामाजुनसंप्रदायः ।
TELUGU VERSIONS OF THE PURĀNAS

By

K. V. Ramakoti Sastry

[‘Purāṇ’ परिकाया: दोहीये भागे २२५-२४२ छँधू बा० ‘वौ राष्ट्रन’ महोदेयन तामिलपुराणानामपुराणानाम च संख्यर वर्णं प्रस्तुतम्। तामिल सर्णिमसुखव वर्तमानलेखस्य वेलकमहोदेवभाषे तेलुगुपुराणानामपुराणानाम फुदितस्यायुदितस्य च परिचय: प्रस्तुतम्। तेलुगु-साहित्य वास्तवपुराणानामपुराणानाम प्रमाण: लघुं दल्वते। तथोदयो महाभरतमो वर्तमानकाल यात्रा तेलुगुभाषायं संस्कृतपुराणानामपुराणानां रचना-दलितत्वम् व्याख्या बलभद्र स्वामिनारायणानां सङ्केतितत्त्र महोदेयम् चोलेश्वर वृत्तिं सङ्केतितत्त्र सेवापद्धतिः।]

The Purānic literature of our country is an eternal treasure, enriching our culture and ennobling our national character from times immemorial. Our Indian culture withstood the hostile onslaughts of several currents throughout the ages. To day we find the noble features of our heritage passed on firm and intact with all the necessary vitality firm the ancients. As an important component of national literature, the influence and impact of the purānas on Telugu literature needs no special emphasis. It struck deep roots in the life of the Telugu-speaking people.

Purānas had their heyday when in good olden days native princes and their subordinates patronised the poets and scholars who with zeal and devotion rendered Purānas into Telugu. The people evinced keen interest and great regard which led to the promotion and flourishing of the Purānic Literature in Telugu for the last so many centuries. NANNAYA, the first and the foremost of our Telugu poets of the 11th
century, referred to himself as a well-versed scholar in all the Purāṇas. He further referred to the court of his patron king Rajaraja as it was studied with a good number of Purānic Scholars i.e. Paurānikas. His testimony bears ample evidence to the fact that the Purāṇas had a great reputation and influence and had their pride of place in this land. It is significant to find that even the present-day scholars and poets carry on with their ever-growing literary activity of rendering the Sanskrit originals into Telugu, and thus add to the wealth of our literature. This Purānic consciousness indeed bridges our past, present and future and thus contributes to the enrichment of our culture.

The mass appeal of the Purāṇas was due to the impressive presentation with necessary explanation by the specialised scholars on the public platforms. This was the media of propagating the ethical values of the Purāṇas throughout this country. Even today we find such practice, especially on religious occasions. There are families completely devoted to this mission; and with the passage of time they came to be known as Purāṇam varu, and their succeeding generations bear the surname Purāṇam. Another peculiar point of interest is that some of the families take after the surname of that particular Purāṇa they are associated with, e.g. Bhāgavatula, Bhratula etc.

We can safely say that the Purāṇas started appearing in Telugu versions by the end of 13th century. This rendering continued all through and even to this day. A striking paradox in the course of our Telugu literature is that the dawn of the 20th century saw on one hand the rendering of the Purāṇas into Telugu, and on the other had the upheaval of the recent western literary trends.

My endeavour in this paper is to present a detailed chronological order of the Telugu versions of the Purāṇas with the necessary data of the re-renderings. First of all, I would like to give the main characteristics of the Telugu versions as follows:
1. All the Telugu versions contain both prose and verse.

2. A few of them give the number of Ādhyāyas and Ślokas of their original Sanskrit texts.

3. All of them unanimously acknowledge the 'Venerable sage of uncommon wisdom' Veda-vyāsa (Kṛishṇa-Dvāipaṇyana) as the author of their originals.

4. Word to word translation is something foreign to many of the Telugu versions.

5. Generally versification in the Telugu versions speaks of a very easy flow of style and at times easier than the prose passages they contain.

6. There are cases where the authors exhibit a free and flexible handling of the material in their Telugu renderings and at the same time they are faithful to the spirit and meaning, i.e., tātparyārtha of their originals.

At present some of the Telugu versions of the Purāṇas are not traceable, and some are in the neglected state. This causes concern and compels for a thorough undertaking and vigorous efforts to trace and to bring to light. Expecially the Telengana area deserves special attention for a complete and a thorough survey. No doubt it is heartening to find that the present day scholars are doing their best in this connection, but it needs much more research to 'save' the soul of our literature. However, we have ample Purānic literature in Telugu on hand to-day.

MĀRKANDEYA-PURĀṇA

A. Among the Purāṇas this is the first that has been translated into Telugu. The name of the poet is MARANA. He belongs to the 14th century A. D. Scholars are of the opinion that this Purāṇa might have been written at about 1320 A. D. Even though this is a translation of the Sanskrit original, there are places where the Telugu poet dealt independently. We do not know why this poet did not touch in the end of his work the stories of NARISHYANTA and DAMANA, the son and grandson respectively of the great MARUTH. This Telugu
version which is in eight Āsvasas with 2477 gadya-padyas concludes with the glorified story of Maruth.

B. Narasimha Kavi is another person, whose name we hear as the author of a Telugu version of this Purāṇa. 3

C. Oubala Kavi (1540 A. D.) has also rendered Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa into Telugu, the whereabouts of which are not known.

D. Another poet who translated Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa completely is Manda Kāmeśvara Kavi who belongs to the last quarter of the 19th century. It is strange that this Kavi did not even mention at least any one of the above poets. If we compare both the texts of Marana and this Kavi, it will be clear that this Kavi has gone through the text of Marana. This version ends with the war of Damana with Vapuṣmanta the South Indian King. It seems that Kāmeśvara Kavi’s translation is more close to the original than that of Marana. 4

Padma-Purāṇa

A. We are told by Srinadh, a very well established Master poet of the latter half of the 14th century that Kama-Lana-Nabhamatya, his grandfather, had written Padmapurāṇa-sangrahā in Telugu. But that book has not yet come to us.

B. Madiki Singana of the 14th century has given a Telugu version of the Padma purāṇa Uttarā Khaṇḍa. 5 There is a stray verse which is not included in the printed text in which the poet said that he has rendered Padmapurāṇa into Telugu, by which one can infer that he has translated the whole of the Padmapurāṇa. But we are aware of the Uttarā Khaṇḍa only.

C. Kamineni Malla Reddy’s Telugu version of this is available in print. He belongs to the second half of the 16th century. He did not translate the purāṇa completely. He has concentrated on Siva Rāghavanulapakadha only which forms part of Pātāla Khaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa. This work begins with the arrival of Lord Śiva in the guise of a Rishi to
the court of Sri Rama and extends to be an exposition of the Lord on various subjects to Sri Rama in five Asvasas with 1412 gadya-padyas.

D. We are having Pasupati Subbaraja Kavi’s Mahapurana, the Telugu version of Maghamahatmya which is a part of the uttara-khanda of the Padmapurana. Subbaraja Kavi has referred to Ramagiri Singana as having rendered a part of Maghamahatmya. Subbaraja Kavi of this century has published his work in 1924 A.D.

E. Pillalamarri Pinna Veerana who belongs to the 15th century, has translated the Magha-mahatmya into Telugu. But nothing is available to us.

F. There is one more Telugu version of the Maghamahatmya, which forms part of the Padma Purana, by Vedatam Seshacharya of this century. This work, in six Asvasas and 2307 gadya-padyas, has been published by the author himself in the year 1932 A.D.

G. Ramavamedha, which is a part and parcel of the Patala Khanda of the Padmapurana is said to have been rendered into Telugu by Tripurana Venkata Surya Prasada Raya Kavi (1889-1945 A.D.)

H. The complete translation of the Padma Purana we are having now is of Pasupati Chidambaram Sastry who is known even in the court of Maharaja of Kasi. This in four volumes is now available in print. Svarga Khanda is not referred in this Telugu version. And there is no such reference to Svarga Khanda in Patala Khanda of this Telugu version as shown by Asoka Chatterjee (Purana, Volume No. 2 Page 175-183). Scholars are of the opinion that this Telugu version is very close to the Sanskrit original. This scholar poet Chidambaram Sastry passed away on the eleventh day of Dec. 1951.

Narasimha-Purana

A. Verrana (1280-1345 A.D.)¹⁰, one among the celebrated Kavitranyam, gave Narasimhapurana also to Telugu people.
But this is neither a translation nor an adaptation. He has taken the story from the Brahmāṇḍa and Viṣṇu Purāṇas and developed it into a grand literary piece with his descriptive talent. Veiluri Sivarama Sastry who edited this book for Vavilla Ramaswamy Sasturulu and Sons, Madras, has expressed his opinion that this Telugu Purāṇa is quite different from that of Gopala Narayana & Co., Bombay Sanskrit edition of the Narasimha-purāṇa.

B. There is reference\textsuperscript{11} to the effect that one Proluganti Chennasauri of the 15th century also has translated this purāṇa into Telugu. But unfortunately this Telugu version is not available.

C. We possess Narasimhāpurāṇa Uttarabāga which belongs to Hari Bhattu of the 15th century. This Telugu version, in five Āñvasas with 1000 gadya-padyas, deals with the later life story of Prahlāda i.e. his war with Viṣṇu and Indra etc.

D.Ārigadpula Dharmayamatya is another poet with whose name there is one Narasimhapurāṇa in manuscript. Dr. B. Rama Raju\textsuperscript{12} writing about this poet, placed him in the first quarter of the 18th century. Though the name of this work is Narasimhapurāṇa, actually the text is very peculiar in six cantos. The first ends with the story of Jaya and Vijaya. The second one contains the stories of Nārada-Suparna-Ambaṛiṣa-Kārtyavibhūjana and Parasurāma etc., The third and fourth cantos deal with Hiraṇyākaśipu, Hiraṇyakṣa and Prahlāda. The fifth one is nothing but an abridged story of Rāmāyana, whereas the sixth deals with the story of Śrīkrishṇa.

E. Kotikalapudi Kōdana Rama Kavi's (1807-1883) Telugu version of this purāṇa is available only in manuscript.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Viṣṇu-Purāṇa}

A. Paśupati Naganādha of the 14th century is said to have translated Viṣṇupurāṇa.\textsuperscript{14} We have only one verse from that Purāṇa describing \textit{vasantarū} today in the Telugu Academy at Kakināda.
B. There is one translation of this purāṇa belonging to the 16th century. The name of the author is Vennelakanti Sūrana. It is distinct in the preface of the Telugu version that this work is a translation of Pārāśarasmhitā i.e. Viṣṇupurāṇa a part of the Brhmaṇḍapurāṇa. This is some what confusing but we can find the same in the original Sanskrit Viṣṇupurāṇa printed in Telugu script by Srikanchi.pra. Annangaracharya (iti Sarvapurāṇanāmadibhūte Brhmaṇḍākhyē Mahāpurānē Vudhrutāyām Pārāśarasmhitāyām Sri Viṣṇu Puranē).) Seshadri Ramana Kavulu, the editors of Telugu version are of opinion that Surana did not actually follow the original Sanskrit and even this is not a complete translation of the Viṣṇupurāṇa. Surana has limited himself to the first part of the purāṇa which is full of stories glorifying Viṣṇu and Śrīkrṣṇa leaving the second part that describes various Dharmas, Vratas and Philosophy etc., This in eight Āśvasas with 3010 gadya-padyas.

C. Kalidindi Bhāvanārayāṇa of the 16th century is another poet to translate the Viṣṇupurāṇa into Telugu. This has been edited and published by the University of Madras in the year 1930 A.D. This version contains only four Aṁśas and 1806 gadya-padyas. It is doubtful whether Bhāvanārayāṇa has completely rendered the purāṇa including the last two Aṁśas of the original or not. The editors, late K. Ramakrishnaiiah, Reader of the Madras University, and P. Lakshmikantam, the present professor in Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupathi, after comparing the Telugu version with the original, expressed sincerely in their introduction that Bhāvanārayāṇa has followed the Sanskrit original more closely than any other translator of any other purāṇa. Of course they have clearly stated where the poet introduced his original ideas too though they are negligible in character.

D. Dittakavi Venkatāmātya (17th century) is also, said to have given a Telugu rendering of this purāṇa of which the other particulars are not known.

E. Mudumrai Deekshitulu of the 19th century is another poet to translate this Viṣṇupurāṇa.16

16
F. Chakrapuri Raghavāchari¹⁶ is one more name with which we can find a Telugu Viṣṇupurāṇa. But this not at all a translation of any Sanskrit original. It is an independent work by itself giving information about yamaloka and Rāmānuja’s religious and philosophic activities.

G. Two prose versions of this Viṣṇupurāṇa, one by Tupakula Ananta Bhupati¹⁷ of the 18th century and the other one by Nori Gurulinga Sastry, are also in Telugu. The second one has been published in August 1904 A.D.

H. There is one Seetaramasiddanti¹⁸ with whose name we are informed that there is a Telugu version of Viṣṇupurāṇa.

SKANDA–PURĀṆA.

Except a reference¹⁹ to one Nalla Reddy (1667-1696 A.D.) as the author of the Telugu Skandapurāṇa by Kundurti Venkatachala Kavi of the 18th century, we know nothing more either of the poet of his purāṇa. So we can say that no poet up to now has translated the whole of the Skanda Purāṇa into Telugu. But there are poets who have given Telugu versions to the many parts of the Purāṇa. They are in nutshell as follows:—

1. Godāvarī Khanda:—This Telugu version of this Khanda is the work of Srinadha, the most famous among the Telugu poets, belonging to the 14th century. He has re-named it Bhīmesvarapurāṇa. The reason that he gives to justify his title is that there is nothing but the glorification of the God Dakṣarāṇa Bhīmesvara in Godāvarikhanda and hence it can be called Bhīmesvarapurāṇa as well. This work is in six cantos with 1035 gadya-padyas.

2. Kāśi Khanda:—This is also the work of the above poet Srinaḍha in seven cantos and nearly 1750 gadya-padyas. We have one more translation of this Kāśikhanda in Telugu prose by Nanja Raju belonging to the latter half of the 18th century. This is a true translation of the original following of the Adhyāya Krama.²⁰
3. Kedara Kanda:—Pedapati Somaiah (1500 A. D.) is the first man to translate this Kanda. But his Telugu version is lost. There is another unpublished translation of this Kanda by Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma of this century.

4. Arunachala Kanda:—The above-referred Somaiah is said to have rendered this Kanda also into Telugu as Arunachalapurana.

5. KaumariKA KANDA:—This is the work of the above-mentioned Seshadri Sarma in three Ashvas with 4847 gadya-padyas. According to the author, the Sanskrit original that he has followed is in 66 adhyayas.

6. Nagara Kanda:—We are having a Telugu version of this by Turaga Rajakavi and Ayyaanki Balasarasvati of the 16th century. A recent translation of this in 10 Ashvas and 8952 gadya-padyas by Janapati Pattabhi Ramasastry (1900) in Telugu is available in 4 volumes having been published in 1923, 25, 28, and 34 respectively.

7. Brahmatara Kanda:—Pitupanti Basavana’s (1470-1500 A. D.) is the first translation of this kanda in Telugu in Dwipada metre. Another Telugu version of this Kanda in five Ashvas by Linganaradhyya is in manuscript. Pochiraju Veeraya Kavi alias Kolakaluri Verrana also has rendered into Telugu Vibhuti Rudraksha Mahatmya, a part of the Brahmatarakanda. There are three other poets who have rendered this into Telugu. They are Sridharamalla Venkata Rama Kavi, Mutturaju Venkata Krishna Kavi and Pratakota Mallaiah Kavi, Venkata Rama Kavi’s Telugu version is now available in print. He belongs to the 18th century. Pattamatta Soma Nadha Somayaji (1520-1630), a great scholar poet has also translated this Brahmatarakanda, into Telugu.

8. Sivarahasya Kanda:—The Telugu version of this is the work of Kodoor Venkatachala Kavi belonging to the second half of the 17th century. This Telugu version is complete in seven khandas namely, Sambhava, Asura, Veeramahanda, Yuddha, Deva, Daksha and Upadesha and has been published. Another Telugu version of this ñin Dwipada metre by
Oubalakavi can be found in manuscript. Venkayalapati Veerbhadra Kavi and Revuri Anantayaja (18th century) are referred to be the authors of the Telugu versions of this Khaṇḍa. One Mulugu Ayyavarlu is also said to have rendered this khaṇḍa into Telugu.

9. Dharma Khaṇḍa:—We have only one Telugu version of this by Edulapalle Bhavanisa Kavi of the 18th century. This, in nine Āśvasas with 3165 gadya-padyas, deals mainly with the life story of Vālmiki.

10. Śreesalla Khaṇḍa:—Seshanaradhyya (1500 A. D.) rendered this into Telugu in six cantos and named it Sri Parvata Purāṇa. This has been published in 1888 A. D. by Padurti Akkyyadevara of Madras. Another poet who translated this into Telugu is Attaluri Papakavi of the 18th century. This is in manuscript.

11. Setu Khaṇḍa:—Papayamatya’s Telugu version of this Khaṇḍa is in manuscript. One more version in five cantos by Damera Venkata Raya Kavi also can be seen in manuscript.

12. Maheśvara Khaṇḍa:—We have a prose translation of this which includes Kedāra, Kaumārika and Aruṇāhala Khaṇḍas by Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu of this age. This has been published as Āṇḍhraskhaṇḍa first part in the year 1959.

13. Prabhāsa Khaṇḍa:—The Telugu version of this belongs to Chaganti Bhakuralinga Sastry of these times. It is learnt that he has neither completed nor published it.

14. Sūta Samhitā:—Pattamatta Somanadha Somayaji who has been referred to above in this paper, is the author of the Telugu version of this Saṃhitā. He has translated this even without leaving ‘Tu and Cha’, to quote his own words, following Tātparyā-dīpikā the commentary of Vidyārāṇya, in seven Āśvasas with approximately 2000 gadya-padyas. It is supposed that this version might have come out in 1578 A. D.

15. Śankara Saṃhitā:—There are two Telugu versions of this Saṃhitā in manuscript both of which are very
much worn out and are of unknown authorship. Sivaramalinga Kavi\textsuperscript{37} in the year 1733 A.D. translated this in three Āśvasas and named it Vīra Śavīcāra Sangraha. Two other writers Nanja Raja\textsuperscript{38} of the 18th century and Mallamapalle Buchikavi (19th century ?) whose date is not exactly known, have rendered Halasyamāhātmya which forms part of this Śankara Saṁhitā into Telugu. Nanja Raja’s version is in prose whereas Buchikavi’s is in Campū in six Āśvasas and 3458 gadyapadyas. This Halasyamāhātmya has again been translated by Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma in six Āśvasas with 2296 gadyapadyas. The Two Telugu versions of Buchi Kavi and Seshadri Sarma are available in print, being published in 1943 and 1906. There is one Skandapurāṇetihāsmānjari, a prose translation in Telugu. The name of the author, as the catalogue says, is Nori Gurlinga Sastry. One more prose version of Sivarahasya Khanda (Sambhava Khanda) in Telugu is the work of Mudigonda Veeresalinga Sastry. This has been published with the original in Telugu script in 1926 A.D.

Here I would like to draw the attention of the learned scholars to some of the important points that concern the Skanda Purāṇa basing on the Telugu versions mentioned above. Srinadhā, the first Telugu poet to place his hand on the Skanda purāṇa, has described in his Bhimesarapurāṇa, as it is fulfilling the five lakṣaṇas and having sapādālakṣaṇagrandhas. Again he refers to it in his Kāśi Khaṇḍa as having six Saṁhitās, i.e. Sanatkumāra-Sūta-Śaṅkara-Vaiṣṇava-Brahma and Saura and Paṇcaśatakhanda like Paṇcha Nagara, Kāmalālaya, Revā, Ekaśīra, Mailara, Godāvari Khaṇḍas etc., According to his reading the samhītās contain paṇcasaḥsahasrika, Śatasaḥsirasika, Trīṁsataḥsahasrika, Paṇcasahasrika, Trisahasrika and ekaśahsirasika respectively. He further points out that some are of the opinion that Kāśikhaṇḍa is Vedavyāsa Śūtasamvādātmakam. Srinadhā’s reading of the slokas of the saṁhitās is quite similar to that of the number given in the Sanskrit original. According to Pattamatta Somanadhā Somayāji Śivamāhātmya, Jānayoga, Muktī, and Yajñavaiṣhava Khaṇḍas form Sūta Saṁhitā. Nanja Raja has referred Śaṅkara Saṁhitā as Agastyasaṁhitā.
Halāsyamāhātmya gives us an explanation that because Agastya is the person that narrated the Saṅkara Samhitā it is called Agastyasaṁhitā also. Buchi Kavi further says that there are 50 khaṇḍas altogether in the six saṁhitās of the Skanda purāṇa. Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu speaks of this Purāṇa as there are two versions in Sanskrit, one with saṁhitās and the other with khaṇḍas and upakhaṇḍas. And again he refers to the second version as having seven main khaṇḍas, Mahēśvara etc.

The seven khaṇḍas of Saṅkara Samhitā (Tamil Kanda Purana) as Dr. V. Raghavan gives, are one and the same in order too, in Śivarahasya Khaṇḍa as has been given by the Telugu poet Venkatachalakavi with a slight change regarding the first and the third. The Telugu poet gives sambhava in the place of Utpatti and adds Veera to Mahendra which makes no difference at all. The point to be noted here is whether Saṅkara Saṁhitā and Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa are one with two names, or are they separate books? As Dr. Raghavan admits, the Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa forms part of Saṅkara Saṁhitā. Then how is it possible that the whole of Saṅkara Saṁhitā to have seven kandas only that makes Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa?

If Śivarahasya Khaṇḍa is a part of Saṅkara Saṁhitā, then what about the other parts of it? Because the Tamil translation of the Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa, as Dr. Raghavan puts it, is in two kāṇḍas we have to request him to give the names of those two kāṇḍas which will solve the problem. According to the Telugu poet Venkatachalakavi, there are Twelve khaṇḍas in Saṅkara Samhitā of which the Śivarahasya khaṇḍa is the first having seven kāṇḍas in itself. This is all because to say that the Tamil Kanda purana must be a translation of Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa only and that it cannot be of the Saṅkara Saṁhitā as a whole as has been opined by Dr. V. Raghavan.* Another point to be noted is in the original text of Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa printed in Telugu script we are told of Saṅkara Saṁhitā as

---

* Tamil versions of the purāṇas by Dr. V. Raghavan, (Purāṇa Vol. II No. I and 2, pages 225-246).
having two parts and the first in seven kāṇḍas with 10,000 ślokas is known as Śivarahasayakhaṇḍa. Again we are supplied with foot notes “Vistareṇa Suviṣṭrutā” for “Dvibhāgaiṣṣayutacat tat” and “Tatgrandhāi Trayodasa Sāhasraśca” for “Tamgrandhāi Dasasāhasraśc” (Sambhava Kāṇḍa Dvitiyodhyāya, 60, 61). The Sanskrit original Śivarahasayakhaṇḍa is not referring to the twelve khaṇḍas of the Śaṅkara Saṁhitā and the Telugu translation of it by Venkatachal Kavi is giving a different independent version of the khaṇḍas of Śaṅkara Saṁhitā on one hand, and on the other taking the footnote reading of the ślokas. Some sincere enquiry is needed to be definite of the parts or khaṇḍas of Śaṅkarasaṁhitā and of the Ślokas of Śivarahasya khaṇḍa.

Nāradīya-Purāṇa

Pillamari Pinaveeraṇa of the latter half of the 15th century has mentioned Nāradīya purāṇa as his previous work in Telugu of which the whereabouts are not known. There are two other poets, namely Vasiraju Ramaiah (1500 A.D.?) and Kottalanka Mrutyunjaya Kavi who are said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu. A complete palm-leaf manuscript of this purāṇa belonging to Allada Narasimha Kavi is available. The above mentioned Mrutyunjaya Kavi’s Telugu version in six cantos called Bruhannaradeeya is also available in manuscript.

Varāha-Purāṇa

The Telugu version of this Purāṇa in twelve Āśvasas and 1709 gadya-padyas is the work of Nandi Malliah and Ghanta singaiah who belong to the 15th century. This has been edited and published in 1904 A.D. by Kandukuri Veeresalingam Pantulu. Another poet Hari Bhattu who has been referred to above in this paper, also gave a Telugu rendering to the Ādikāṇḍa of this purāṇa. This is available in manuscript.

Bhāgavata-Purāṇa

A. The famous Bhakta Kavi Potana (1450-1500 A.D.) is the author of this purāṇa in Telugu. Unfortunately the present
available text is not completely Potana's. 1 to 4, 7th and 10th of the twelve skandhas are from the pen of Potana. The fifth skandha is by Gangaih, sixth by Singaih and the last two i.e. 11th and 12th by Veligandala Naraiah. These three poets are said to be Potana's disciples. Any how this Telugu Bhágavatapuráṇa enjoys a great reputation in this region even today.

B. Madikisingana (14th century) has rendered only the Dasamaskandha of the Bhágavata Puráṇa which is even now in manuscript.44

C. Sixth, eleventh, and twelfth skandhas of this puráṇa have been rendered into Telugu by Hari Bhattu (15th century).45

D. A Telugu version of this puráṇa in Dvipāda metre by Tekumalla Rangasai can be seen in manuscript.46

E. Sripada Krishna Moorthy, Sastry, the late poet-laureate of Andhra Pradesh, has one Telugu Bhágavatapuráṇa to his credit.

F. Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma, a great scholar poet of this century, seems to have rendered the Dasamaskandha of the puráṇa into Telugu as Tandavakrishna Bhágavatam.

G. Kokkireni Narasimha Raya Kavi has translated the eleventh Skandha of this puráṇa. The author quotes the original Sanskrit slokas and gives his translation in verse and writes Tātparya and explains it in detail. This peculiar translation has been published in 1914 (Madras).

H. 11th and 12th Skandhas of the Bhágavata Puráṇa have been recently translated into Telugu by Minikanti Gurunadha Sarma of Guntur. This true translation with the title Sri Madguru Bhagavatham has been published in 1952. In his introduction to this work Durbha Subrahmanyam Sarma, a scholar-poet of Nellore, has referred to two poets who translated this Puráṇa into Telugu, Kovuri Pathabhiramaiah (11th Skandha only) and Sri man Sampanmudhumba Singaracharya (1, 2, 5, 10, 11 and 12th Skandhas only) Subrahmanyam Sarma is doubtful whether Singaracharya has rendered the remaining Skandha of the Puráṇa or not.
We have a complete true translation of the Bhāgavata purāṇa by Gandham Srirama Murthy and Irrinki Narsimha Murthy who are known as Sri Rama Nrusimha Murthy Kavulu belonging to the present day. This version is published in five volumes in 1955 A. D.

MATSYA—PURĀṆA.

A. Haribhattu's Telugu version of this purāṇa is the first of its kind. The late Manvalli Ramakrishna kavi has brought this into light from Gadwal. This has been first published by Oletivenkata Rama Sastry of Pittapuram in his magazine KAVITA. It is believed to be an incomplete translation limiting itself to the Viṣṇudharmottara khaṇḍa.\(^{47}\)

B. Lingamaganta Ramakavi (1650 AD) is one that is said to have translated this purāṇa.\(^{48}\)

C. Kanadam Peddana of the 18th century the poet of surapura (Gadwal ?) Samstan has also translated this purāṇa.\(^{49}\)

D. Manda Kamesvara Kavi is another name that is associated with a Telugu version of this.\(^{60}\)

VĀYU—PURĀṆA.

We hear of only one Oddepadi Peddana (1500 A. D.) as having rendered Māghamāhātmya\(^{41}\) which is a part of this purāṇa into Telugu.

GARUDA—PURĀṆA.

Pingali Surana of the 16th century said that he had translated this purāṇa.\(^{44}\) But not even a single manuscript of this is to be found.

ŚIVADHARMOTTARA

The Telugu composition of this by Raja Malla Reddy of the 16th century is in 8 cantos with 1167 gāḍya-padyas. This has been published in 1913 A.D.

VAMANA—PURĀṆA.

A. Yelakuchi Bala Sarsavathi and Lingamagunta Rama Kavi (1550 A. D.) are said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu.\(^{65}\)
B. A Telugu version of this purāṇa in ten cantos by Oubalakavi (1540 A.D.) is available in manuscript.54

C. The present available Telugu version of this in print is the work of Ramavajhala Kondaiah Sastry of this century. This version is in twelve Skandhas with 4443 gadya-padyas.55

Kūrma—Purāṇa.

A. Rajalingakavi of the 17th century has given a complete translation of this purāṇa in Telugu which is still in manuscript.56

B. Manda Kamesvara Kavi of the 19th century,57 who has been referred to above, is also said to have rendered this purāṇa into Telugu of which we know nothing more.

Līṅga—Purāṇa.

A. Without any concrete evidence, we are being told58 that there is a Telugu version of this purāṇa by Tenali Ramakrishna Kavi of the 16th century.

B. Of this Līṅga Purāṇa we have a recent translation in Telugu by Mulugu Chandramouli Sastry which has been published in two parts (pūrvārdha and uttarārdha or Bhāga) in 1929. We have a preface in prose by the author himself published in the first part from which we can know something new about the Sanskrit original. According to that there are 109 Adhyāyas in pūrvārdha and 55 Adhyāyas in Uttarārdha.59 One more important point we have to note, as the author says, is that the editors of the Līṅga Purāṇa Bombay edition have dropped some ślokas in the uttarārdha which tell us about Śivalīṅga Dīkṣā, Līṅga Dharma and Līṅga pūjā. Those ślokas are from Nandeesvara (Sailadi), Sanatkumara Sarvāda. Actually they may have their place just after the exposition of the Guru-Śiṣya Lakṣaṇas i.e. in the Śiva pūjā Krama.

Kalki-Purāṇa

Chilakapati Ramanuj Sarma60 is said to have given a Telugu version of this purāṇa in 1898 A.D. We have a prose translation of this in Telugu by Puvvada Balakrishna Rao
which is published for second time in 1925 A. D. This Telugu version gives the number of the Adhyāyas of the Sanskrit original as 35, and ślokas as 1600. ‘Anubhāgavatam’ is the additional title of this purāṇa.

BRAHMĀNDAPURĀṆA

A. We are furnished with a palm leaf manuscript63 of the Telugu version of this purāṇa by Kavuri Yalliaiah of the 16th century. This version has been described by Chaganti Seshaiyah64 as having the stories of Paraśurāma, Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa in six Āśvāsas. In the words of the author, his Telugu version of this purāṇa is ‘Ardhapanchakavi jñāna.’

B. Devāṅgapurāṇa63 in Dwipada metre by Bhadrakavi Lingakavi of the 16th Century is based on the above purāṇa in Sanskrit.

C. Mallupurāṇa63, the Telugu version of Mallukulakrama of the above purāṇa, is the work of Nudurupati Venkana belonging to the 18th century.

D. The present Telugu version of the Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa we are having on hand is the work of Janamanchi Seshadri Sarma. This version consists of Prakriyā—Anuṣanga—Upodghāta and Upasāṁhāra padas and 6118 gadya-padyas. The author himself said of his translation that he had left some adjectives here and there and added some wherever he felt necessary. He pointed out further that he had completely the sixty first and sixty second adhyāyas of the upodghatapada which are on gandharva (Music). The reason, as he says, is that those two adhyāyas are beyond his capacity of understanding.

BRAHMA-PURĀṆA

The author of this Telugu version is also the above poet Seshadri Sarma. In accordance with the Sanskrit text, this Telugu version is also in 137 adhyāyas (6111 gadya-padyas).

ŚIVA-PURĀṆA

This is the last of all the purāṇas to be translated into Telugu. This is the work of Mudigonda Nāgaveerēsvara Kavi
of this century, and has been published in the year 1947. There are Śrīsti—Satī—Pārvatī—Kumāra—Yuddha—Leelā—Liṅgavaibhava—Umā—Kailāśa—Vāyaviya and Vidyeśvara Khaṇḍas in this Telugu version. The author tells us that the Sanskrit original of this purāṇa is divided into saṁhitās and sub-divided into khaṇḍas, but he has dropped the word saṁhitā and used only the word khaṇḍa. The parts known as Śatarudra Saṁhitā and Koṭirudra saṁhitā in the original are named Lilākhaṇḍa and Liṅgavaibhava khaṇḍa in this Telugu version. Vidyeśvara Saṁhitā which is found in the beginning of the original has been shifted to the end as Vidyeśvara khaṇḍa. The author admits that he has enlarged the Pārvatī, Kumāra and Liṅgavaibhava khaṇḍas and has abridged Lilā, Umā, Kailāśa, Vāyaviya and Vidyeśvara Khaṇḍas to some extent, while rendering the Śrīsti, Satī and Yuddha khaṇḍas following the original very closely. Further he makes clear that he has dropped all sorts of repetitions in his Telugu version except the story of Brahmā’s Panchama Śīraḥ Khaṇḍana which appears both in Lilākhaṇḍa and Liṅgavaibhava Khaṇḍa. One major change that the author has introduced in his version is, as he says, instead of writing the story of Upamanyu for a second time in Vāyaviya Khaṇḍa following the original, he has replaced it by inserting the story of Mārkandeya taking from Padmapurāṇa. The author has followed the Bombay edition of the Śivapurāṇa for his translation. Any how, if we want to make a comparative study of this Telugu version with the original, now and then we have to search Skanda, Bhāgavata, Mahābhārata, and Jābala, Kālāgniudrapanishats too as has been suggested by the author in his prose preface.

We have a Telugu translation of Jānasaṁhitā only from Śivapurāṇa by Mantri Pregada Bhujanga Raya Kavi in in three asvasas and 441 gāḍya-padyas. I am unable to quote the date of its publication as the title page of the copy I have gone through is worn out.

**Devībhāgavata—Purāṇa**

A. Mulugu Papayawardhya of the 18th century is the
first poet to translate this purāṇa into Telugu. This has been published and widely read.

B. Tripurana Tammaya belonging to the 19th century is referred by his son Venkata Surya Prasada Raya Kavi as the author of the Devībhāgavata purāṇa. Except this much we know nothing of this Telugu version.

C. Dasu Sreerama Kavi (1864-1908) has also translated this purāṇa. It is said that he could finish the whole translation (1100 granthas) in only four (six?) months. This is available in print.

D. Tirupati, Venkata Kavulu, the epoch makers of this century, have also a Telugu version of the Devībhāgavata to their credit. Though the whole Telugu version goes by their name, but actually some of the skandhas have been written by their disciples. It is stated in the printed text.

E. We are having prose translations too of this purāṇa by S. Visvanadha Sastry and Stanapati Rukminamma of this century.

Janamanchi Venkata Subrahmanya Sarma has also recently translated and published this Devībhāgavata purāṇa.

**Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa**

We have only some prose translations of this purāṇa in Telugu in this century. Brahmaparva of this purāṇa has been published along with the original (216 adhyayas) in 1939 without giving the name of the prose translator by Vavilla Ramaswamny Sastrulu of Madras.

We have one great puranic scholar Kalluri Venkata Subrahmanya Deekshitulu, who has been referred to above in this paper, by whom we may say that all of the purāṇas have been rendered into Telugu prose. There are of course others too who gave prose renderings of all the purāṇas in this century. Because they were meant for laymen, it is but natural with them to be concise. Astadasapurānam by Oleti Venkata Lakshmi Narsimha Sarma may be mentioned in this respect. As
a matter of fact the attempt to give the purāṇas in Telugu prose in this region goes back to Nineteentwenties when the Purāṇa Grantha Mālikā was started under the editorship of Nadakuduti Veeraraju Pantulu at Pitapuram Śiva, Brahma, Vāmana etc., have come out through that Granthamālikā.

DATTABHĀGAVATA

The author of this work is Tadepalli Raghavanarayana Sastry of this century. This Bhāgavata glorifies Dattadeva as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu and contains some other stories like Alarka, Kārtavīrya, Kanchanamalini, Parasurama, Vena and Nahuṣa etc. in twelve parts known as Guchas with 2865 verse. This has been published in the year 1955.

GARGA—SAMHITĀ.


BHĀRGAVA—PURĀṆA.

We have a Telugu version of this purāṇa which bears an additional title Nityasūricharitra dealing with the surprising stories of Butamuni, Mahamuni etc. in seven Āśvāsas by Kanduri Venkata Daśa kavi (19th century ?) In the year 1922 A. D. this purāṇa has been edited and published by Chelkani. Lacharao of Chitrada. There is one manuscript with the name by Rajabahiri Pamanayaka Bhupal (1751-1773 A. D.) of Surpura Samstan. This is in eight āśvāsas comprising the stories of Alwars. As the author himself says, the first canto of this Telugu Bhārgavapurāṇa contains the matter of the fifth adhyāya of the uttarakhaṇḍa of the original. Like this the author has taken the necessary subject matter from so many adhyāyas here and there that constitutes the uttar-
khaṇḍa of the Sanskrit Bhārgavapurāṇa. So we cannot consider this version as a complete translation of the original.

GANEŚA—PURĀṆA

This Telugu purāṇa is the work of Sripada Krishnamurthy Sastry⁶⁶ referred to above in this paper. As this is not available now, we can speak nothing more of it.

VAIŚYA—PURĀṆA

Bhaskarāchārya (16th century)⁶⁸ is the author of this Telugu purāṇa which is in eight Āśvāsas only of which the first four deal with the story of the descending of the Vaiśyas from Kailāsa and the second four with that story of Vāsavikanyā

ĀDI—PURĀṆA.

Sarvadeva⁶⁹ is said to be the author of this Telugu Purāṇa. The author may be placed at any time before 1500 A.D. We have only two stanzas from this purāṇa in the Telugu Academy at Kakinda.

ĀDITYA—PURĀṆA.

This is to be the work of Elakuchi Pinayaḍītya⁷¹ who is supposed to be in the first quarter of the 17th century.

VĀSAVARANYAKA—PURĀṆA

We have a prose version of this Purāṇa in Telugu. This has been published along with the Sanskrit original in Telugu script by Arya Vaisya Yuva Jana Sangham of Penugonda in 1951 A.D. According to the original this Purāṇa in 60 Adhyāyas and 3798 ślokas is a part of Sanatsujāta Saṃhitā of Uttara Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa (Iti Sri Skande Uttara Khaṇḍe Sanatsujāta Saṃhitāyām.............). This Sanatsujāta Saṃhitā may be another name to Santkumara Saṃhitā.

VIŚVAKARMA—PURĀṆA.

We have a palm-leaf manuscript of this Telugu purāṇa by one Venkatacharyudu.⁷² There is another paper manuscript⁷³ of unknown authorship which goes by the Viśvabrahmapurāṇa.
Besides all this, there are still some more texts in Telugu which pass under the name of purāṇa—Manuvarṣapurāṇa, Gauḍapurāṇa, Sagara purāṇa etc., and Māhātmya-granthas i.e., Sthalapurāṇas based simply on some purānic stories enjoying considerable reputation for their literary values, but the premises of my attempt in this paper concerns only the main purāṇas and Upapurāṇas and some of their major sections for which we have Telugu versions of the purāṇas one by one and discuss in detail comparing with their originals which may add something to the purānic studies.

NOTES

1. If we are furnished with the Narasimhapurāṇa of Vemulavada Bhimakavi (1100-1180 A.D.) that must have been the first Telugu version among the purāṇas.

2. AKT. Volume 3 page 167.

3. ALP. Serial No. 2319.

4. AKT. Volume 9 page 124.

5. We can take for example the Padminividyā. This has been rendered in detail completely by Kameshwara Kavi whereas it has been condensed into one stanza by Marana. I have compared this with the originals given by Dr. V. S. Agrawala (Purāṇa Volume I, No. 2, page 183-197). But one interesting point may be said of Kameswara Kavi here. His translation of the (VII. 3) corresponds exactly with those of N. N. Dutta and Charuchandra Mukerjee as pointed out by Chintaharan Chakravarti (Purāṇa Volume 3 No. 1 page 44).

6. AKT. Volume 4 page 175.

7. Ramagirisangana and Madikasingana are one only. AKT. Volume 4 page 162.

8. AKT. Volume 6 page 33. As there is one Māghamāhātmya in Vāyu- purāṇa also, we cannot without doubt, say, that this Pillamarri Pinaveerana’s Māghamāhātmya is from Padmapurāṇa.

9. ARC. page 271.

10. Though Harivaṅsa is called purāṇa now and then, as it is not found in the authentic list of purāṇas, either Yerrana’s Harivaṅsa or Nachana Somana’s Uttara Harivaṅsa is not mentioned in this paper.

11. NPU, first canto stanza 33.

12. MPM. Page 1-5.

13. ALP. serial No. 1359.

14. AKT. volume 4 page 147. one Vaishnavapurāṇa by Dasakavi by available in manuscript in the Telugu academy, Kakinada.

15. TVS. volume 3 page 1172.


17. SST page 479.
18. IVS. page 11.
19. SST. page 370.
20. SST. page 482.
21. AKT. volume 8, page 225.
22. ARC. page 255.
23. AKT. volume 8, page 225.
24. AKT. volume 11, page 57.
25. VSL. page 103.
26. DCT. No. 197.
27. VSL. page 115.
28. ALP. serial No. 1738. This catalogue reads the author's name as Pullaiah.
29. ALP. serial No. 3281.
30. VSL. page 193.
31. SST. page 379.
32. PKV. page 1.
33. VSL. page 189.
34. ALP. serial No. 3749.
35. TCM. R. No. 543.
36. DCT. No. 357 and 358.
37. VSL. page 155.
38. SST. page 481 and 527.
39. AKT. volume 6, page 33.
40. AKT. volume 8, page 223.
41. ALP. serial No. 1910.
42. TCM. R. No. 86.
43. AKT. volume 8, page 170.
44. DCT. No. 307.
45. AKT. volume 8, page 173.
46. AKT. volume 12, page 75.
47. AKT. volume 2, page 176.
48. AKT. volume 9, page 175.
49. KKS. page 283.
50. TVS. page 1197.
51. AKT. volume 9 page 63. Andhramaghapuranam by Ramadasapradhan is in manuscript in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
52. AKT. volume 10 page 97. We have one more manuscript of this Telugu purana by Varadaraja kavi in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
53. AKT. volume 9 page 175.
54. ALP. page 265.
55. This Telugu version is not divided into two parts, and the author has not given any hint to infer that the original as having purvottarakāgas according to the description given in the Naradiya purana, chapter 105 (Purāṇa volume IV No. 1 page 187). The original sanskrit followed by author is the edition of Venkateswara Press, Bombey.
56. ALP. serial No. 635, 636, 637,
57. TVS. volume 3 page 1172.
58. AKT. volume 8 page 26.
59. According to Dr. V. S. Agrawala and Dr. V. Raghavan the purvādha of this Liṅgapuṇa contains only 108 adhyāyas (Purāṇa volume I No. 2 page 286 and volume II No. 1 and 2 page 229).
60. PSL. page 24.
61. ALP. serial No. 1732.
62. AKT. volume 9 page 240.
63. VSL. page 199–201. A manuscript of Devanga Charitra (No. 931) of unknown authorship is in the Telugu Academy, Kakinada.
64. SST. page 430.
65. NKS. first canto, stanza 7.
66. ARC. page 91 and 196.
67. MPM. page 89–93.
68. ARC. page 214.
69. AKT. volume 9, page 296.
70. AKT. volume 9, page 123.
71. AKT. volume 12, page 110.
72. ALP. serial No. 2919.
73. ALP. serial No. 2923.

ABBREVIATIONS USED.

AKT. Andhra Kavi Tarangini by Chaganti Seshalaha.
ARC. Andhra Rachaitalu by M. Satyanarayana Sastry.
NPS. Narsingapurana-Uttarabhaga by Hari Bhattu.
MPM. Marugunapadina Manikyalu, By Dr. B. Ramaraju.
TVS. Telugu Vijayana Sarvasvam.
IVS. Introduction to Vishupurana (1939) of Surana by Seshadri Ramana Kavulu.
VSL. Veerasiva Literature. By S. Ramakrishna Sastry.
DCT. A descriptive catalogue of the Telugu Manuscripts in the Tanjore Maharaja Serfojis Saraswati Mahal Library (Andhra University publication 1938).
KKŚ. Kakāṭeyyasanchitā edited by Dr. M. Rama Rao.
PSL. Purana Samalochaṇa of the Telugu Yamana-Purana by Janamānchi Venkata Subrahmanya Sarina.
NKS. Nirvachana Kumara Sambhavam.
पुराणसूक्तयः

सतसहः परमे भ्रमण अनेकात्मातामानः।
यदि कम्भेत विशेषं पुर्णं जनामात्तरा रितिः॥
( सर्वदेव भुवोऽः, वेक्षयोः, १२१२४ )

रविविषि रशिमवलोकि दिवस हि वहिस्तम्॥
सन्तः सुचिमरीच्योवेदात्मात्मां हि सर्वदा॥ ( १२१२५ )

दुर्गमा: पुरुषा लोकेकं भगवंद्र्दिकालसः।
तेषां सत्तो भवेचायस्मतं तत्त्वा शाश्वार्थे शाश्वती॥ ( १२१२६ )

समादिः संयुता वापिः विपद्विधापि सजनः।
सर्वात्मानं न भाग्ये स्वनेवसि सुरसत्मा॥ ( १२१२७ )

नासि शाश्वतिगतो वच्चुयवसित सत्यात्मां तत्॥
नासि मोहस्तरोऽः भ्रामो नासि गाजास्म नदी॥ ( १२१२८ )

यौवनं धनवंशचि: पृष्ठवमस्पोषकिताः।
एकमन्त्रमविधाय नित्यं वद्वतुमयः॥ ( १२१२९ )

असुयान्वतं मनसि यदि सप्तवं श्रवते।
तुषांपि वायुसंयोगवित ज्ञानीहि सुकङ्क॥ ( १२१३० )

तावतलोकश्च पौत्रश्च परतान्त्रायुहः।
यावदैवविशेषत्वम: क्रमावश्च नारद॥ ( १२१३१ )

विवेकं हस्यक्षारसबनावेक्षाः जीविनायः।
आपदः सम्बन्धोपेशस्वारं स्मायतः॥ ( १२१३२ )

नास्यकक्षितसमो पुर्वन्तीति कोषसमो रूपः।
नासि निन्दासाम पापं नासि मोहसमासः॥ ( १२१३३ )

पश्चिरो वापिः सून्येऽवं दर्शिद्रेऽवं श्रीयायनिते।
तुष्टि वा सार्वं वा मूल्योऽवं सर्वं तुल्यता॥ ( १२१३४ )

* मोहसमासः = मोहसम [१]: प्राथमः ( सर्व )। अभावी: क्रिष्णिः।
(Double Sandhi) छन्दोस्त्रिप्रारंभः।
A SAMPLE EDITION OF THE MATSYA PURĀNA TEXT

BY DR. V. RAGHAVAN

[ deducted in the text: सम्भाव्यन्य मत्त्युराणम् कार्यार्जण्यासंस्कृतम् प्राधमेंग्यायोजन्य श्राद्धकेश्रण प्रकाशे। नाणिनिर्देश्य पाठमेंद्वेश्यार्च्यं संवादितान्त मत्त्युराणम्कोशानं शुद्धितसंस्कृतम् च ये संकेतं: प्राचार्येन प्रारम्भे व्याख्या:। कोशानं साधनसरे विन्यासं तु 'पुराणम्' पत्रिकाय: प्राचार्यम्यथ प्रथमेंकृ। इत्यं। तच्च च पाठमें-लोक-वाचिकय-संहारितसंयमविभिन्क कोशानं परस्यसम्भव्योपिनी निबिडः तजनुष्ठाविन्तेन तेषां श्रेष्ठ व्यवम्यापितः।]

Abbreviations used:

(A) Printed Editions.

श्र. = श्रान्तदायक edition of the Matsya Purāṇa

वे. = वेल्सक़ेचर

पृ. = पृष्ठ

पृष्ठ. = पृष्ठफुट

पृष्ठ. = पृष्ठ

श्रद्ध. = श्रद्धालुक्रम कोश

(पु. = पुढ़त्रिन, printed)

(B) Manuscripts.

श्र. = Oriyā (ओरिया) MS., Utkal University, Cuttack.

ने. = Nevaī (नेवारी) MS., No. 41/182 of Sarasvatī Bhandāra Library, Fort Ramnagar (Varanasi).


श्र. = Śāradā (सारदा) MS., No. 4481 of Scindhia Oriental Institute, Ujjain.

थ १ = Devanāgarī (D. देवनागरी), MS., No. 4646 of Scindhia Oriental Institute, Ujjain.

थ २ = D. MS., No. 4146 of University Library, Bombay.

थ ३ = D. MS., No. 124 of Chunnialal Gandhi Vidyā Bhavana, Surat.


थ ६ = D. MS., No. 226 of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

थ ७ = D. MS., No. 28 of 1871-72, New No. 2, BORI, Poona.

थ ८ = D. MS., No. 119 of 1884-87, New No. 9 of BORI, Poona.