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SAD DEMISE OF DR. SAMPURNANAND

महान्य शिक्षाविद्यु, गम्भीर विद्वान, दार्शनिक विचारक,
पद्म राजनीतिज्ञ, पर्याय शुद्ध प्रदाशक डाक्टर समपूणिन्द्रजी के
निधन से राष्ट्र ने एक महाकुश खो दिया।

डाक्टर समपूणिन्द्रजी की भारतीय संस्कृति और परम्परा में
महत्वी आधार थी। उनकी नगरी के विकास-विस्तार में उनका
योगदान विस्मयक रहेगा। संस्कृत भाषा के विकास और
भारतीय संस्कृति के संरक्षण के लिए उनके सत्ता प्रत्यक्ष अविस्मर-
णीय हैं। काशीराज से उनके पूर्वज संबंध हुए। सर्वभाषीय
काशीराजन्यास के न्यायिक संबंध के से आरम्भ से ही उत्तरप्रदेश-
सरकार द्वारा मनोनीत सदस्य थे और न्याय के कार्यों में सदैव
सक्रिय सहयोग और प्रेरणा देते थे।

उनके निधन से सर्वभाषीय काशीराजन्यास के समस्त सदस्य
दुःखी हैं और उनके प्रति अपनी श्रद्धांजलि अर्पित करते हैं। इस
विश्वगत आत्मा के दुःखी परिवार के प्रति अपनी समवेतना प्रकट
करते हैं और ईश्वर से प्रार्थना करते हैं कि वह विश्वगत आत्मा
को शान्ति प्राप्त करे।
हिमवदकृता पार्वती-स्तुतिः
( कृष्णेऽ०, पौराणिक, १.१२.२०८—२३९ )

हिमवानु वाच

[ अथ वे सप्तले जनम अथ वे सप्तले तपः।
याने साश्वात्म तत्त्वमयका पपना इत्यियोजचरः ॥ २०३ ]

तथा सुधे जगत्संस्कर्यान्त तत्वि स्थिताः।

तथ्येव छीरे पुजु केमेव परमेव गतिः ॥ २०८८
वदन्ति केकिद्वामेव प्रकृति प्रकहे: परामृ।।

अन्ये परमायेजः: विवेवि शिवसंस्कर्यात् ॥ २०९२

तथा प्राधान्ये पुरुषोऽद्वारा महान् अर्हिते ॥

अविष्का नियतिर्नै फलाया: शतशोऽभवत् ॥ २०१०१

स्वेते हि सा परमा शाक्तिरन्ता परमंतिनी।

पाठभेदः

[कविविद्ययागमस् पुराणविभाषे कृष्णपुराणशास्त्राय अधी तस्महलेखः
( ४ उत्तराखरीत्व संस्कारिकाः इव देवनागरीलिपिः ) संस्करेत्।

वर्ततिरिप्प श्रीयाम्: स्वर्य। पाठभेदाध्ययानायेकरी हृदी देवनागरी
लिपिहस्तलेखायापि ( एक हर्षयागानिस्वैर्यागाराय अभास्, अन्यः
हारस्वद्विभवविशालप्रश्नायाराय अभास् ) हृदयः। पाठभेदकौर्ये कोऽकृत
तत्त्वस्थायवात् हस्तलेखानां संस्कर्याये तत्त्वस्थाय। संस्कराण—ि= इत्यादि
हृदयः, वंगाया हृदयः, नारायणः हृदयः, वंगाया हृदयः; अ, ब, क, द
इत्यादि: हृदयः कभी प्रवाह: हृदयः, हृदयः, हृदयः, हृदयः]

1. ब पा। ( २ दे., २ वा )
2. परस्पर ( १ दे., १ वा., १ ना. )
3. शिव-संख्ये ( १ दे., १ वा., १ ना. )
4. लक्ष्यो ( २ दे., २ वा. )
5. सवार्थि निजबा ( ४ दे., २ वा. )
लामधिङ्गाय योगेशि महादेवो महेशरः।

पथनां जगतेऽव करोति विकरोति च || २१२

लधेघ्व सज्जतो देवः ुस्वामनन्दं समदृते।

लमधेघ्व परमानन्दस्वेवानन्दस्वायत्तो || २१३

लमधेघ्व पर व्योम महज्ज्वोतिनिन्द्रजनम्।

शिवं सर्वं सृष्टम् परं ग्राह्य सनातनम् || २१४

लं शाकः सर्वदेवानं देवा १० वन्धवदिस्मि।

रामदुवेलवता देवी योगिनां च कुमारः।|| २१५

कपोलां च वसिष्ठस्वं व्यासो वेदविदवामिषि।

सांख्यानां कपिलो देवी रुद्राणां चाप शाक्षरः || २१६

अदित्यानादपेन् दस्वं करुणा चैव यातः।

वेदानां सामवेदस्वं गायत्री १७ वर्णसारसम्पे || २१७

वधात्मवधिष्या विधानान्म गतीं न परमा भावः।

माया लं सर्वजातीयां कालं कल्यात्तमिषि || २१८

प्रेमार्धनेवादिनां च हिन्दौवमुः।

आद्रामार्गाङ्गुलस्वस्वीवाणां महेश्वरः || २१९

पुंशां लक्ष्मीं पुरुषं सर्वभूतहृदिः समर्थः।

सर्वोपलिपिद्रा देवी १४ गुहोपितं हरसैंसे।|| २२०

वेदतामिनाथः १६ कल्याणा युगानं क्षत्रमेव च।

आदिव्यं सर्वमार्गानं १७ बाणो देवी सरस्वती || २२१

लं लक्ष्मीं रहस्याणां विष्णुमार्गविनामिषि।

अथात्तं सतीं न लं वृषोऽविष्णुऽ मत्तामिषि || ९०२।

6. ुठस्म (२ ०, २ ०, १ ०, १)। 7. स्वामनं (१ ०, २ ०)। 8. वस्मार्ग (२ ०, २ ०, १ ०)। 9. १ तिरस्तरम् (२ ०), १ ०)। 10. वेदविद्या (१ ०)। ११. कुरातनं (२ ०)। १२. वार्ताला (२ ०)। १३. गृहराजनां च (२ ०, २ ०, १ ०)। १४. गुहोपितसुं (२ ०)। १५. धनुषपत्रेः (२ ०, २ ०, १ ०)। १६. चाति (४ ०, १ ०, १ ०)। १७. सर्वभागानं (२ ०)।
हिमवत्क्षतापार्वेती-स्तुति:

सूक्लाणं पौर्णम् सूक्ले १८सामज्येष्ठं च सामसु।
सावित्री १९चापि जात्याणां च जुकां शतहदियस् ॥ २ २ ३
पर्वतानां महामेररन्तो भोगिनामपि।
सर्वं तवं परं ब्रह्म लघनं सर्वं सदिव हि ॥ २ २ ४
रूपं तवाघोषविकारहीनः।
मयोचरं निमेघमेकरपस्।१०

अनादिमध्यानतमनत्तमां

नमामि सत्यं तमसः परस्तात द्वी ॥ २ २ ५
यदेव पश्चिनि बगामसुति
बेदान्तविज्ञानविनिधित्वाः।

आनन्दमात्रं प्रणावभिधानं
तत्तदेव रूपं शरणं प्रपचे ॥ २ २ ६
अदोषखुतान्तसाविधि ॥

२४प्राणायुगोगवियोगहेतुम्।

तेजोमयं २५बन्मविनाशहीनं

प्रणावभिधानं प्रणावा-निस्ति रूपम् ॥ २ २ ७
आयनवीणं अंगदासरूपम्।

विभिन्नसंस्क्षेत प्रकृते: परस्तात्।

कुटस्थमध्यकमपु स्तथैव ॥

२७नमामि रूपं पुरुषाभिधानम् ॥ २ २ ८

सर्वाथिरं सर्वं ग्रंविधिधानं

सर्वं रूपं जनमविनाशहीनम्।

---

18. ज्वेदसाम ( १ दे., १ व. १ न.). 19. चासि ज्ययानं ( १ दे.,
२ व., १ न.). 20. दक्षतविहीनः ( ४ दे., २ व., १ न.).
21. ननिष्क्रियात्मा [ ] ( २ दे., १ व.). 22. नतोरिस्म ( २ दे.),
गतोरिस्म ( १ व.). 23. सनिदिघिर्म ( १ दे.). 24. प्राणसंवर्गः
( २ दे., १ व.). 25. व्रह्विभि ( १ व., १ न.). जनमविनाशहीन ( १ दे.).
26. वस्तेव ( ३ दे., २ व., १ न.). 27. वस्तेव ( २ दे., २ व.,
१ न.). 28. चासि ज्ययानं नासि ( २ दे., १ व.).
पुराणम्—PURAṆA

सूक्ष्मं विचित्रं २९निगुणं प्राधानं
नतोऽसि ते रूपमप्रयोंद्वम्

आद् ३१महानं पुरुषाभिधाने
प्रकृतरेखेः निगुणात्मकीयम्।

ऐश्वर्येभिज्ञानविरोधयःः।

समन्वितं दैवि नतोऽसि रूपम्।

द्विजसालोककमम्बुझस्थं
चित्रसमेंि पुरुषोककनाधम्।

अनेकवेदवेदकर्मविवासितं ते
नतोऽसि रूपं बगदन्दस्यः।

अश्वेयवेदाद्मकमेकमाधिः

तत्वेतज्ञासि पूर्तितलवेदभद्रम्।

विकालेहः ३५ चित्रसमेंिन्तं
नमामि रूपं रविमण्डलस्थम्।

सहस्रसुखीनमनन्तशक्तिः

सहस्रवादुः पुरुषं वराणम्।

शायानमन्तः सखिः तबेव ३६।

नारायणस्य भण्तोऽसि रूपम्।

द्रश्यःकारलं रविद्वामिवन्द्

युगान्तकालानवेत्ररूपम् ३७।

29. निगुणभिधानं... 30. पुरुषप्रयोंद्वम् (१ दे.) 31. महानं पुरुषाभिधानूः (२ दे.), महानं पुरुषात्मकमु (१ दे.), महानं पुरुषात्मकमु (१ दे.), महानं पुरुषात्मकमु (१ दे.)

32. नविरोधयाः (१ दे., २ बे., १ ने.) 33. अनन्तपूर्वीर (१ दे., २ बे., १ ने.) 34. स्वतेज्ञासि (१ दे., २ बे., १ ने.) 35. अभिनव (१ दे.) 36. तबेव (१ दे., २ बे., १ ने.) 37. वल्लकपपु (१ दे., २ बे., १ ने.), वल्लकपपु (१ बे.)
हिमवतकुता पार्वती-स्तुति: 5

अशोपमूलाण्डविनाशादिः

नमामि रूपं तव कार्यसंज्ञाम् ॥ २३४

णासहस्रुष्ण विराजमानं

भोगीन्द्रशुश्यामपि पूज्यमानम् ॥ ३८

जनादेशाहुरदधिं प्रसुपतं

नतोःसिम्रूपं तव श्रेष्ठसंज्ञाम् ॥ २३५

अन्याहैतुष्थयंसुमनेि

ब्रह्मागृहानन्दरसंज्ञेकम् ॥

युगांतश्रेष्ठ दिविं नुस्मानं

नतोःसिम रूपं तव रुद्रसंज्ञाम् ॥ २३६

श्रीणश्रुकं प्रविशिीनहुपं

द्रुसरुपैरचितपापस्वः ॥ ४२

सुकोमलव देवी विभासं ॥ ४३ ज्वारं

नमामि ते रूपमिदं भवानि ॥ ४४

नमस्ते स्तु महादेवं नमस्ते परमेश्वर! ॥

नमो भगवतीशानि शिवाय ॥ ५८

लक्ष्मीें लक्ष्मीवर्षमेव च ॥ ५६ गतिःमेः

शानि यास्ये यास्ये प्रजीवं परमेश्वर! ॥ २३९

38. रुपमूल्यमान (२ दै., २ बै. ). 39. जनादेशाहुरुष्ण प्रसुपतं (१ दै.)  40. युगांतश्रेष्ठ (१ दै.)  41. विभासं परिवर्त (४ दै., २ बै., १ न ).  42. द्रुसरुपैरचित (१ दै., २ बै., १ न ).  43. ब्रह्मागृहानन्द (१ दै., १ बै.), विभासं (२ दै., २ बै.)  44. नमामि (३ दै., २ बै., १ न ), रूपमिदं परिवर्त (१ दै.).  45. शिवाय (१ न.).  46. शानि शानि (१ दै., २ बै., १ न.).  47. लक्ष्मी (३ दै., १ बै.).
NOTE ON THE PĀRVATĪ STUTI

[Context: Brahmā, while practising austerities, produced from his face (or forehead) God Rudra who was born as half male and half female (अश्वनारीश्रवण, I. 11.3). Brahmā then asked him to divide himself, and so Rudra divided himself into two forms, Male and Female. The Male form was further divided into eleven gods called the eleven Rudras, and the Female form was divided into various forms called the Śakti-s. Śaṃkarī, the original Śakti of Śaṃkara or Rudra, was born as Satī, the daughter of Dakṣa Prajāpati, who gave her to Śaṃkara as his wife. Śaṃkarī or Satī was again born as the daughter of Himavān and Menā, and was known as Pārvatī (the daughter of the Parvata or the Mountain-god Himavān). Pārvatī was thus the manifestation of the Original Śakti of Śaṃkara to whom she was finally united as his पार्वतीररिणी (i.e. sharing half of his body); hence she is also called as Māheśvarī, Śiva, Satī and Haimavatī.

—वैषा माहेश्वरी देवी उष्णाशिवरिणीा। लिजन रति हैमवती सुरासुरस्वस्वल (I. 11.13).

Pārvatī at the time of her birth had four faces, three eyes, eight arms, braided and knotted hair (कपिलिनी), and was adorned with a portion of the moon (I. 12.43 ff.). At Himavāns request Pārvatī showed him her supreme divine form (एवं वर्ण दिव्य रूपं) pervading the whole universe (सर्वबृहत्त्व तिक्ष्णी, Śl. 59). The account here is on the model of the Bhagavad-Gītā, Adh. 11. On seeing such a form of Pārvatī Himavān was struck with awe and praised her with her one thousand and eight names (I. 12.62-199); there he trembling with fear requested her to show him her gentle and mild form. The Goddess then showed him her pleasant form with two eyes, two arms and black locks of hair, and also with a Tilaka on her forehead and ornaments all over her body. Himavān, then out of joy, praised her with the Stuti as given in the above ślokas.]

Goddess Pārvatī is praised here both in her immanent as well as in her transcendent form. She creates the universe; Pradhāna (Prakṛiti or the Primordial Matter) exists in her, and the universe is again absorbed in her.—(208). She is the higher
Prakṛti, higher than the Pradhāna, and she is also called Śiva because of her relation with Śiva.—(209). In her exist the Pradhāna, the Puruṣa (Spirit.), the Mahān (or Buddhi Principle) and also the Iśvara or Śiva. In her exist the Avidyā (Ne-science), Niyati (Destiny), Māyā (the great creative divine power) and the Kalā (Arts & Sciences)—(210). She is the highest Śakti (Energy) which is infinite and remains in the highest abode. She is free from all distinctions, and still she is the substratum of all the distinctions and appearances.—(211). The great God Iśvara (Śiva) depends on her in creating and destroying the universe (Pradhāna etc.).—(212). United with her the God Śiva enjoys his inner bliss. She is the bliss, and bliss bestower.—(2.13). She is the imperishable (श्रवण) and the highest heaven (परं व्रोण), she is the stainless great Light, she is Śiva and she is also the all-pervading, eternal and the absolute Brahman.—(214). Thus, she in her immanent form, creates and pervades the material universe (तत्कृष्ण तद्वेदनप्रविशतिः--upaniṣad), but in her transcendent form she is beyond the universe, the pure and absolute Reality.

From ś. 215 to ś. 224 Dakṣa describes the various Vībhūti-ś (magnificences) of the Goddess as a part of her Stuti. This description is mainly on the model of the 10th Adh. (called the Vībhūti-yoga Adh.) of the Bhagavad-Gītā where Lord Kṛṣṇa relates his vībhūtis to Arjuna. This Pārvati-Stuti of the Kūrma-Purāṇa contains not only the similar ideas, but also the similar expressions as contained in the Vībhūti-yoga Adh. of the Gītā.

For example :—

Kūrma-P. (I. 12)

| तवं शक: सवर्द्वावानां | (215a) |
| योगिनां तवं कुमारक: | (215d) |
| व्यासो वेदविद्वामसिः | (216b) |
| सास्त्यानां कपिलो देव: | (216c) |
| स्मारणा चापि श्रवण: | (216d) |
| आदिविष्णुपुरुषेऽस्वः | (217a) |
| ब्रह्मणां चैव पावक: | (217b) |

Bhagavad-Gītā (Adh. 10)

| देवानामसिः वाचव: | (22b) |
| तेनानामसिः सक्तसदिः | (24c) |
| मुनीनामहेऽव्यः | (37c) |
| चिन्तामणि कपिलो मुनि: | (26d) |
| श्यामरवर्षासिः | (23a) |
| आदिविष्णुमहेऽविचु: | (21a) |
| ब्रह्मणां पावकस्वासिः | (23c) |
From ślokas 225 to 237 Satya (Truth), Praṇava (Omākāra), Prāṇa (Life-force), Puruṣa (Spirit) Pradhāna (Primal Matter), Jagad-ānā (Mundane Egg, the universe), Para vr̥śīhin (the supreme deity) residing in the sun, Narāyaṇa, Kāla (Time or Death), Śeṣa (thousand-headed serpent forming the couch of Viṣṇu), Rudra (Śiva in his terrible form who performs his tāṇḍava dance at the commencement of the Dissolution of the universe) and the mild and pleasant form which Parvatī showed to Dakṣa are all conceived as the forms of Goddess Pārvatī.

In ślokas 225 ff. the cosmic aspect of the Goddess is clearly brought out. The Satya (Truth) which is pure, changeless, beginningless and eternal and which is beyond the darkness, the Praṇava (the syllable Om) which the learned see as the cause of the universe and which is the pure bliss, the Prāṇa (Life-force) which has entered all the beings, which causes the union and the separation of the Pradhāna and the Puruṣa, which is lustrous and which is without birth and death, the Puruṣa (Spirit) which has no beginning and end, which is the soul of the universe, which is beyond the Prakṛti and which is changeless and unmanifest, the Pradhāna (Prakṛti) which is the substratum of all, which builds the whole universe, which is all-pervading, unborn and imperishable, subtle, varied, having the three Guṇa-s (Sattva, Rajas and Tamas) as its constituents and containing in its form all the forms in their unmani-
fest state, the Mahān Puruṣa (or the Mahat, the Buddhi Principle) which is nearest to the Prakṛti, being its first product, and which is the seed of the three Guṇas, the Jagad-āṇḍa (Mundane Egg out of which the universe was evolved) which contained the fourteen worlds (Seven below and seven above), which rested in the Primeval waters, which inheres in itself curious differences, and which is associated with the Puruṣa, Parmo-śīhin (the supreme being) residing in the sun, which is identified with the Veda, and which is the cause of the three divisions of Time, Narāyaṇa who has thousand heads and thousand arms, and who is the ancient Puruṣa or Spirit and who sleeps in the Primordial Waters, the Kāla (Death) who has terrible Jaws, who is worshipped by the gods, who produces the fire of destruction at the end of the creation and who causes the destruction of all the beings, Śeṣa the great Serpent with his thousand hoods, being worshipped by the chiefs of the serpents, and forming the couch of Viṣṇu, Rudra (the terrible form of God Śiva) who has three eyes, whose power and majesty is unhindered, who enjoys the highest and immortal bliss and who performs his tāṇḍava dance at the commencement of the Dissolution of the universe, and the gentle and pleasing form which Pārvatī showed to Dakṣa, are all conceived here as the forms of Pārvatī. Dakṣa even conceives himself as a part of Goddess Pārvatī (त्वमयोऽस्मि) whom he thinks as his best refuge (त्वमेव च गतिमय) and completely surrenders himself to her grace (त्वमेव शरण वास्ये प्रसीद्ध परमेत्वर).
METRES OF CLASSICAL POETRY IN THE PURĀNAS*
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At the first glance it might appear that the Purānas are composed throughout in the epic Śloka metre and contain very rarely a vedic Triṣṭubh or a Jagati. The Agnipurāṇa, above all, creates such an impression according to a statement at the end of this work, it contains 11457 verses (āditāḥ ślokaṁ samsātyaṁkāh 11457). There we find, apart from short prose-pieces, also a few solitary verses with 11 or 12 syllables. These verses are not based on the number of simple syllables as the vedic metres are, but here the order and quantity of each syllable is fixed according to certain rules as in the works of classical poetry. Indravajrā (115, 40), Upendaravajrā (192, 10, 196, 16), Upajāti (196, 15, 255, 35) and Varṇāsthā (270, 14, 15) are represented here. In a single verse the four metres Upendaravajrā, Indravajrā, Vātormī and Śalini occur one after the other:

Agastyā evaṁ khananād dharitrīṁ
Pujāṁ apatyaṁ bālam śivamānaṁ/
ubhau vārṇāv rśir ugraṁ pūpoṣa
satyā deveśv āśīgo vai jagāma// 206, 13.

* Reproduced in English from the WIENER ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE KUNDE SÜD-UND OSTASIENS (Journal of the Indological Institute, University of Vienna), Band IX, 1965, with the kind permission of its Editor.

The original German article 'Metren der Kunstdichtung in den Purāṇen' translated into English by Dr. S. R. Sharma.
Similarly, in the first part of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa classical metres make a rare exception. There are only three such verses among 432 ślokas. With regard to the number of syllables they correspond to a vedic Triṣṭubh. But a closer examination shows that they also are composed according to the rules of classical poetry. Of them one proves to be Upajāti (I, 1, 174) while the other two have a stamp of Śālinī on them (I, 5, 107, 108). In the third Pāda of the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, as against in the first, we find other metres also more frequently. The chapters 41, 50 offer eight different metres, viz., 1 each of Vasantatilaka and Mandakrānta, 2 each of Indravajra and Upendravajra, 4 Upajātis, 5 Mālinīs, 9 Śārdūlavikṛīḍitas and 10 Sragdharaś. The variety is still greater in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa VII, 8, where Upajāti, Śālinī, Vaṃśasthā, Vasantatilaka, Kanakaprabha, Bhujanga-Prayātā, Praharṣini, Śālinī and Mandakrānta occur in a colourful series.

A closer examination of the different works leads us to the astonishing conclusion that, with regard to the number of metres employed, the Purāṇas do not lag behind the many famous classical poems. Harṣadeva employs in the Ratnāvalī 14 more or less classical metres apart from the Śloka, whereas Kālidāsa uses 20 in the Mālavikāgnimitra and 21 in the Śakuntalā. These figures are surpassed in the Bhāgavata-, Matsya-, and Padmapurāṇas. Although the considerably greater volume of these works has to be taken into account, still we can not overlook the fact that the authors endeavoured to vie with the classical poets. In works this is already evident from the fact that they begin with a classical metre. The first or the second verse (as the case may be) in the Matsya-, Varāha-, and in the Śṛṣṭikhaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa are composed in the metre Sragdharā following the example of Kālidāsa’s Śakuntalā. The Bhāgavata-purāṇa and the Brahmapurāṇa exhibit the metre Śārdūla-vikṛīḍita in the first two verses. In this regard all the Purāṇas are surpassed by the Harivaṃśa. In a short introduction, which precedes the main work, each single verse is composed in a different metre with only one exception. There we find Śloka, Vasantatilaka, Ārya, Vasantatilaka, Upendravajra, Indravajra, Giti and Upajāti in this
order. The Bhaviṣyapurāṇa contains six different metres in the first eight verses.

This state of affairs is interesting from more than one point of view. It shows that the authors of the Purāṇas were acquainted with the rules of classical poetry. Although the ability of the individual poet might have varied from one to the other, yet from the variety of the metres employed clues may be obtained about the time of the composition. It is striking that the works of earlier time like the Vāyu- and the Viṣṇupurāṇa contain only nine or ten metres whereas their number in the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, which is generally considered to be younger, rises up to 31. The Agnipurāṇa is an exception here. The fact that only very few metres are employed in it cannot be considered as an evidences of its high antiquity because individual episodes, like the narration of the great flood, give the impression of a later composition. The question might remain undecided whether the authors of this work were less acquainted with classical poetry or they did not attach much importance to the presentation of the entire material in classical metres.

A register of all metres and the places of their occurrence in the great Purāṇas has, above all, a practical significance. I came upon the idea of such a compilation as I was attempting to verify all the quotations in Rāmānuja's Vedāntadīpa. Particularly a passage in Śālī metre could not be located for a long time. Rāmānuja quotes only the first line in his shorter interpretation of the Brahmasūtras (1, 2, 26). The full text is found in the corresponding place of his great Commentary, in the śīrbhāṣya, where it runs as follows:

"śmaranti ca munayaḥ:—
dyām mūrdhānāṁ yasya viprā vadanti
kham vai nābbhim candrasūryau ca netre/
dīṣaḥ śrotre viddhi pādau kṣitiṁ ca
so 'cintyātmā sarvabhattapraṇetā // iti.

It is followed by a passage, similar in content, from the Mahābhārata 12, 47, 68 which has parallel in the Matsyapurāṇa.
Also Matsyapurāṇa 154, 9, 10 and its parallel Padmapurāṇa V, 40, 12 correspond to the above quotation from the point of view of their content as well as the metre Śālī. But Rāmānuja could hardly have had this passage in view, because the last line of the quotation is missing here. Moreover the context is about a eulogy which the gods offer, not to Viṣṇu, but to Brahmā. Only after a long search, the full quotation was found in the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 1, 5, 107, and further, almost in similar wording, also in the Vāyupurāṇa 9, 120 and in the Śivapurāṇa VII, 1, 12, 76. But it is remarkable how less accurately the text is transmitted in the first two places. Of the obvious scribal errors only two may be mentioned: in the Vāyupurāṇa the Nominative dyaur next to the Accusative mūrḍhānam and in the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa the complete omission of dyaur and its subsequent replacement by vai. Rāmānuja has preserved not only in this case the wording more faithfully than the original texts. An example from the Vedic literature is Atharvaveda-samhitā 8, 9, 10 of the Paippalāda-school. In the Tübingen Manuscript and in the editions based on it the passage is transmitted full of mistakes and would have remained unintelligible, had not Rāmānuja recorded the wording correctly in his interpretation of Brahmaśūtra II, 3, 42.

The present work is divided into a table of the employed metres and a register of the places of their occurrence. In the table the consulted works are given in the Latin alphabetical order from top to bottom on the left hand side. It contains all the great Purāṇas whose number is given in the lists, mostly as 18, but which actually amounts to 19. In the Padmapurāṇa (IV, 111, 90-94) the Vāyu is omitted and in the Matsyapurāṇa (53, 11-59) the Śivapurāṇa is omitted. The Kūrma-Purāṇa (1, 1, 13-15) maintains the number 18, but mentions the Vāyupurāṇa as the 18th and the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa as the 19th. We may spare ourselves the justification of the number 18 through the argument that either the Śivapurāṇa or the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa is regarded as “a Purāṇa proclaimed by Vāyu”, because the editions of the texts of three works, and thus of all the 19 great Purāṇas, are
available to us. A Nārādīya-purāṇa is mentioned in the lists of the Mahāpurāṇas as well as of the Upapurāṇas. The Bṛhma-nārādīya-purāṇa, which has been consulted, should belong to the former group, because it enjoyed such a high respect that Rāmānuja quotes the verse 36, 17 in his Bhagavadgītābhaṣya (13, 4). Another quotation in his two interpretations of Brahmāsūtra IV, 1, 13 is found in the Brahmavaivarta-purāṇa (4, 130, 9) as well as in the Bṛhān-nārādīya-purāṇa (9, 79). Of the Skandapurāṇa, which according to Matsyapurāṇa 53, 43 should contain altogether 81100 verses, only an edition of the Sahyādri khaṇḍa apart from a few Māhātmyas was available. The Harivamśa, about which M. Winternitz commented long ago that this work is “in reality a Purāṇa”, indeed “absolutely and entirely a Purāṇa” (History of Indian Literature, Vol. I. pp. 443, 454) has also been consulted and the information about it has been given at the end.

The metre employed in the consulted works are given in the table from left to right at the top in the same order as was maintained by Albrecht Weber in his two monographs of Indian Prosody (Abhandlungen über die Metrik der Inder) in the eighth volume of the Indische Studien, Berlin 1863. About the names of the metres, it is explained there that not a few are based on epithets for women, some give at the same time a hint as to the way the corresponding metre is constructed, others imitate the voices or habits of animals and some are derived from flora or borrowed from the names of gods and demons (pp. 170-178). In the Purāṇas are to be found, among the Gaṇachandas with a specific number of feet, each consisting of four morae, the varieties of the Ārya (1-5); some Mātrāchandas with a specific number of morae, although not bound by any definite order of feet (6-10), in a greater number the akṣarachandas in which the number of syllables and the quantity as well as the order of each individual syllable (11-46) is fixed. From the latter variety, which are similar in the fact that the four lines of a verse are constructed in the same way, three groups can be formed; metres with 11 syllables (varieties of Triśṭubh 11-20), metres with 12 syllables (varieties of the Jagati 21-30) and metres with more than 12 syllables (31-46).
A reference may be made of some of the metres which were not described in detail in the above-mentioned monographs. In the Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa there are eight lines with 10 syllables each and two lines with 11 syllables each, all of which begin with the expression tvadbhitā. This metre is not given in the 13 varieties of the Pañkti (op. cit., pp. 369-371). In its construction it resembles the Śalinī with the following exception, viz., that at the beginning of each line there are three long syllables before caesura in stead of four tvadbhitā anudravanti janās, tvadbhitā bīmahācaryām caranti......

In the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa (III, 3, 20, 8) there is variety of the Triṣṭubh which resembles the metre Sumukhī in the first and in the fourth pāda, but contains in the second and in the third pāda Amphimacer in stead of Amphibrachys.

Jayati te vapur divyavigrāham
nayati sarvadā devatāgaṇān /
pibati mātriyaṁ dugdham uttamaṁ
vadhati sarvadā daitiyadānavaṇ //

A rather irregularly constructed variety of the Jagatī corresponds, to a great extent, to the metre Lalitā except in the first pāda (Bhaviṣyapurāṇa IV, 134, 46).

A verse from the Garuḍapurāṇa (110, 14) resembles in the second and in the fourth line the metre Drutavilambita, according to which also the second and the fourth lines of the metre Hariṇaplatā are constructed (op. cit., p. 360). The first and the third lines end like the Vaitāliya, but contain at the beginning a long syllable in stead of a short one, in other words, each line has one mora more:

Karnabhuṣaṇasarṇgrahocito
_yadi maṇis tu pade pratibadhyate /
kim maṇir nahi śobhate tataḥ
bhavatī yojayitur vacanīyatā //

The Padmapurāṇa (V, 43, 92) contains a verse, whose 14 syllables, with the exception of the penultimate one, are all short: bhavabhayahara hara parama udāra mama sukhakaraṇa nikhila-
surasāra......comparable are the metres Gaurī with two long syllables after 14 short ones. (op. cit., pp. 385, 390).

A verse in the Śivapurāṇa is a Mātrāsamaka (op. cit., pp. 314-319), but contains 19 in stead of 16 morae. Moreover the last words of each two lines rhyme with one another:

vaśībhayaṁkara saṁkara janaśaranaṁśya
vande tava padapadmam sukhakaraṇasya /
vijñaptim mama kaiñe skanda nīdhehi
nijabhaktim janacctasi sada vidhehi //

As examples for the employment of refrain, which A. Weber has traced to the vedic literature (op. cit., pp. 69-71) three cases may be cited. Three in a series of verses, the last syllable has the same sound, and that is in the metres Indravajrā: tvām āhur agryaṁ puruṣaṁ purāṇaṁ (Matsyap. 163, 99-103); Vasantarūlam: saṁcintayed bhagavataḥ caraṇaṇavindam (Brahmavaivartap. 1, 30, 1-6); Vibudhapriyā: Candrāśekharam āśraye mama kiṁ kariṣyati vai Yamāḥ (Padmap. VI, 236, 75-82).

The Gāthās, which are constructed irregularly, are omitted in the table and in the register (see Matsyap. 159, 40-43. of Padmap. V., 41, 181-184).

It is not always possible to delimit the individual verses exactly. Occasionally two lines are constructed as Upajāti and the other two as Vaṁśasthā or three lines belong to one metre and only the fourth line to another metre. There are isolated cases of combination between Indravajrā and Śālinī or Vaṁśasthā and Vasantarūlaka. In such special cases each half verse is noted down separately. Otherwise the whole verse is given under one metre or the other, because the enumeration of all the irregularities would have impaired the general view. In Indian Prosody such mixed constructions are considered as varieties of the Upajāti. While commenting upon the plural Upajātayaḥ, which occur in a sūtra of Pingala, A. Weber says that 14 different varieties of the Upajāti can be constructed from the two metres Indravajrā and Upendravajrā alone through various combinations of the individual lines. Moreover, he refers to the view
of the commentator Halāyudha and others. According to which it is possible to construct sub-varieties or varieties of the Upajāti from Vāmaśastha and Indravāmaśa, and Śālinī and Vātorini, as well other metres which differ slightly from each other (Op. cit., pp. 372, 373). A number of examples of such mixed varieties are to be found above all, in the Harivāmaśa II, 22, 28-60; in the Matsyapurāṇa 28-42; and in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa X, 63. 36; 64, 13, XI, 14, 24; 22, 30.

A register of all the metres of classical poetry, employed in the Purāṇas, makes it easier to trace the quotations to a great extent. In order to find out where a certain verse occurs and whether it is to be found at other places also, it is sufficient to refer to the places of occurrence of the corresponding metre in each work. The following two examples may illustrate this point.

(a) According to the Viṣṇupurāṇa, Yama says to his servant in the metre Puṣpitāgrā:

Paribhara Madhusūdanaprapannān
Prabhur abham asmi nṛṇāṁ na Vaishnavānāṁ //

The Vāmanapurāṇa (94, 31) substitutes prasannān for prapannān and anyanṛṇāṁ for asmi nṛṇām. The Garudapurāṇa (219, 16) has-prapannān as in the Viṣṇupurāṇa and anyanṛṇāṁ as in the Vāmanapurāṇa, but nā is intensified through the addition of kadāpi without any regard to the length of the verse. Finally the Padmapurāṇa (VI, 194, 102) changes Madhusūdan-prapannān or the prasannān into Bhāgavat Kathāsu Mattān. The order of the changes mentioned here might reflect, at the same time, the chronological order of the four works.

(b) The Bhāgavatapurāṇa has, after the end of the 12 books, a Bhāgavatamāhātmya in six chapters. The colophons begin with the words: iti śrīpadmapurāṇe uttarakhaṇḍe. The search after these six chapters in the voluminous Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa would be quite a time-consuming job, in so far as there is no table of contents. On the other hand a comparison of the metres, which are found in it, leads us to our goal faster. The corresponding metres are as follows:
The rest of the metres also, which occur in the Māhātmya, are to be found in these chapters, reduced in the above way. A comparison with the edition of the text shows an almost complete agreement between the Māhātmya and Padmapurāṇa VI, 189, 4-194, 106. Only a few additional verses, which are to be found in some manuscripts, are also taken in the edition of the Padmapurāṇa. It is evident from various passages that the Bhāgavata purāṇa in its present form was known to the authors of the Padmapurāṇa VI. It is expressly stated in the Padmapurāṇa VI that the Bhāgavatapurāṇa consists of 18000 verses and 12 books (grantho श्लोकोऽस्पदं द्वादशस्तन्यापदम् 191, 28. of 193, 52, 194, 105).

The table and the register of metres are presented in the following pages with the hope that these might help many a researcher in saving time and energy.

The following editions are used and quoted:

Agnipurāṇa Poona 1900
Bhāgavatapurāṇa Bombay 1800
Bhāviṣyapurāṇa Bombay 1952

I Brāhma-, II Madhya-, III Pratisarga-, IV Uttaraparva
Brahmapurāṇa Poona 1895
Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa Bombay 1935
Bṛhan-Nāradiyapurāṇa Calcutta 1891
Garuḍapurāṇa Calcutta 1890
Kūrmapurāṇa Calcutta 1800
Liṅgapurāṇa Bombay 1924
Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa Calcutta 1862
Matsyapurāṇa Poona 1907
Padmapurāṇa Poona 1893, 1894
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I Ādi-, II Bhūmi-, III Svarga-, IV Pātāla-, V Srṣṭi-, VI Uttarakhanda

Śivapurāṇa

Bombay 1933

I Vidyeśvarasamhitā,
II Rudrasamhitā 1 Srṣṭi-, 2 Satī, 3 Pārvatī, 4 Kumār-, 5 Yuddhakhaṇḍa
III Śatarudrasamhitā
IV Koṭirudrasamhitā
V Umāsamhitā,
VI Kailāsasamhitā,
VII Vāyavīsamhitā 1 Pūrva-, Uttarhaṇḍa

Skandapurāṇa Sahyāḍrikhaṇḍa

Bombay 1877

I Pūrvārdha, II Uttarārdha, III Reṇukā, IV Candracūḍa-,

V Nāgāhvaya-, VI Varuṇapurva-, VII Kāmākṣi-,
VIII Māṅgīśamahātmya

Vāmanapurāṇa

Bombay 1929

Varāhapurāṇa

Calcutta 1887-1893

Vāyupurāṇa

Poona 1905

Vigrahaṇu Purāṇa

Calcutta 1882

Harivamsa

Bombay 1891
### A Table of the metres employed in the Purāṇas

(The numbers below show how many verses in particular metre are to be found in the individual works.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Årya</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upagiti</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udāga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āryāgiti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaṭalīya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Årupachandāsika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åparāntika</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åparavakra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puṣṭāgra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnipurāṇa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgavata</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavīṣya</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brhmāṇḍa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brhmavajvarta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brha-Nāradīya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garuḍa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liṅga</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārkaṇḍeya</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsya</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padma I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmanā</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varāha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāyu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇupurāṇa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harivaṃśa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indravajra</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upendravajra</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upañjati</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodhaka</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śālinī</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vātornī</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhramara</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilasita</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svagatī</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumukha</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vañjasthā</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indravajna</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drutavilambita</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toptaka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>86</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Bhujangasa-prayata</td>
<td>Pramitakshara</td>
<td>Drutapada</td>
<td>Lalitapada</td>
<td>Vaijayanti</td>
<td>Prabarhsani</td>
<td>Rucira</td>
<td>Mattamayura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Agnipuranam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bhagavata</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bhavisya</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Brahma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Brahmananda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Brahmacaivarta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Brshana-Naradiya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Garuda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kurma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Liinga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Markandeya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Matsya</td>
<td>9 22 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Padma I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Siva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Skanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Vamanasa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Varaha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Vayu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Vignapurana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Harivamsa</td>
<td>2 2 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanakā - prabhā</td>
<td>Vasanta - tilakā</td>
<td>Mālinī</td>
<td>Pañcācāmara</td>
<td>Śikharīṇi</td>
<td>Pṛthvī</td>
<td>Hariṇī</td>
<td>Mandākrānta</td>
<td>Narkuṭaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 652</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. REGISTER OF THE PLACES OF OCCURRENCE

1. Ῥγ्या:

2 Lines with 8 feet each. Each foot consists of 4 short or 2 long or 2 short and 1 long syllables in various combinations.

Exceptions:

(a) The eighth foot in each line consists of only one long syllable.

(b) The sixth foot of the second line consists of only one short syllable.

1.

2. Similarly the second line, but in the sixth foot only.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
VI, 16, 39. 45, 46.

Bhavīṣyapurāṇa
I, E, 2 ; 4, 128 ; 73, 48.
IV, 61, 11-16. 18. 20-22 ; 68, 25 ; 137, 16-19 ;
140, 21. 72 ; 207, 15.

Garuḍapurāṇa
68, 9. 10. 27. 43 ; 69, 23 ; 70, 21 ; 71, 12-15. 17. 18 ; 72, 14-15 ;
73, 8-10 ; 76, 1-4. 7.8 Uttkh 1, 2 ; 2, 15.

Matsyapurāṇa
193, 34. 35. 38-44

Padmapurāṇa
II, 43, 41, 43. V, 43, 71. VI, 7, 23. 24 ; 12, 56 ; 13, 34 ; 14, 3.

Skandapurāṇa
II, 9, 73.

Vāyupurāṇa
1, 2.

Harivamśa
E, 3.

2. Gūḍi:

Like Ῥγ्या, but without the shortening of the sixth foot in the second line.
Bhāgavatapurāṇa

**VI, 16**, 36-38, 40-43, 47

Bhavisyapurāṇa

**III, 4, 14, 12. IV, 3, 96. 97; 10, 5, 61, 17, 19.**

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa

**III, 42, 28, 29.**

Garuḍapurāṇa

**71, 16. Uttkh 2, 14, 25, 42.**

Matsyaapurāṇa

**193, 37, 45.**

Padmapurāṇa

**VI, 8, 14, 224, 18-23, 255, 66.**

Vāmanapurāṇa

**95, 91.**

Harivamśa

**E, 7.**

3. **Upagīti:**

Like Āryā, but with only one short syllable in the 6th foot of both the lines.

Garuḍapurāṇa

(76, 6).

Padmapurāṇa

**VI, 8, 5.**

Vāmanapurāṇa

**95, 82**

4. **Udgīti:**

Reversal of Āryā; in the first line one short syllable only in the sixth foot.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa

**VI, 16, 34, 35.**

Garuḍapurāṇa

**76, 5.**

Matsyaapurāṇa

**193, 36.**
5. Āryāgīti:

Without any shortening; in both the lines the sixth and the eighth feet contain 4 morae.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
VI, 16, 44.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
III, 4, 25, 7. 8.

Padmapurāṇa
IV, 112, 1.2.

6. l'aitālīya:

1  3.  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
2  4.  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 32 ( arson, 90, 21.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
I, 5, 106. 107.

Liṅgapurāṇa
I, 72, 167; 107, 53.

Matsyapurāṇa
140, 40.

Padmapurāṇa
IV, 5, 2-5; 21, 20; 25, 1-3. VI, 112, 32.

7. Aurocchandanika

1  3.  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
2  4.  ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
IV, 84, 1. 2; 97, 31.

Garuḍapurāṇa
68, 26. 28. 34. 42; 69, 30. 31; 71, 4; 73, 14.15.

Kūrmapurāṇa
II, 26, 78.

Matsyapurāṇa
69, 62; 81, 1.2; 95, 36; (138, 51. 52. 56).
Padmapurāṇa
I, 57, 78; V, 21, 22. 23; 23, 70b. 71a. 73a.

Varāhapurāṇa
149, 3b

8. Aparāntikā

1. 3. 4

2.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
X, 31, 1-18

9. Aparavaktra

1. 2.

3. 4.

Brahmapurāṇa
33, 47; 237, 12.

Matsyapurāṇa
133, 68-70; 136, 63; 137, 29. 30. 35. 36.

Padmapurāṇa
VI, 6, 6a.

Harivamsa
Π, 62, 18; 85, 78; 123, 32. III, 6, 13.

10. Puspitāgrā

1. 3

2. 4.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
I, 9, 32-42. III, 4, 27 28; 33, 27. IV, 23, 39; 31, 20-22.
X, 7, 24. 25; 21, 2; 90, 22. XI, 2, 53-55. XII, 12, 65-67.

Bhāvishyapurāṇa
I, 121, 28; 145, 24. IV, 25, 43; 26, 41; 49, 18; 85, 54;
109, 35; 116, 17, 187, 12. 14; 190, 26-28; 206, 30.

Brahmapurāṇa
32, 108; 36, 124; 173, 36.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa
Π, 27, 60. 95. 100. 128, IV, 39, 24.

Garuḍapurāṇa
115, 31; 219, 26.
पुराणाः—पुराणा

Kūrmapurāṇa
I, 17, 68.

Liṅgapurāṇa
I, 33, 13, 18; 34, 23; 71, 37; 104, 28.

Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa
2, 63; 3, 85; 106, 65; 107, 11.

Matsyapurāṇa
54, 31; 55, 33; 57, 28; 60, 49; 61, 57; 62, 39; 69, 63, 64; 77, 17; 98, 15; 100, 37; 115, 19; 134, 31-33; 136, 64; 137, 31-34; (138, 48-50); 139, 45; 161, 88, 89; 276, 19; 281, 14, 16; 285, 21-23; 286, 15, 16.

Padmapurāṇa
IV, 99, 43-47; V, 20, 42; 21, 280; 22, 60, 104; 23, 71b. 72; 24, 96, 130, 278; 42, 82, 83; VI, 6, 6b; 77, 31; 194, 102; 195, 46; 197, 104; 199, 67, 68; 202, 61; 223, 60.

Śivapurāṇa
VII, 1, 11, 36; 15, 35; 2, 31, 2.

Skandapurāṇa

Vāmanapurāṇa
(I8, 27); 94, 31.

Varāhapurāṇa
151, 4.

Viṣṇupurāṇa
II, 16, 25. III, 7, 14-35; 17, 34. VI, 8, 62.

Harivamsa
II, 85, 79; 107, 31, 32. III, 6, 2-4, 9, 10; 42, 20, 21; 48, 29; 49, 31, 48; 50, 12; 51, 18, 29, 42, 49.

11. Indravajra
1-4. संस्करणाः—

Agnipurāṇa
115, 40.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
1, 18, 17; 19, II, 14, 22, 28. I I, 1, 29, 30, 32, 35; 2, 4, 6a, 29; 8, 22; 6, 42, 43. III, 1, 20, 26, 37; 2, 18, 19, 24; 5, 1, 9, 39, 49; 18, 35b; 21, 13. IV, 7, 41; 8, 18; 20, 15; 21,
10. 42. V, 5, 11. 13. 15. 20; 10, 11. 17. 22; 11, 11. 12; 12, 3. 6; 18, 13. VI, 3, 18; 8, 14. VII, 3, 33; 7, 21; 10, 47; 15, 75. VIII, 3, 20; 6, 9. 16a; 7, 25, 30; 19, 10; 23, 6. IX, 4, 53. X, 2, 26; 7, 31. 37; 12, 11. 40; 14, 8, 14-16; 46, 31. 33. 44; 64, 15; 81, 34. XI, 2, 33. 39. 49; 7, 42a; 11, 19. 20; 12, 19; 19, 8. 9; 22, 33; 28, 16. 18; 29, 38. XII, 4, 38.

Bhavisyapurāṇa

I, E, 8; 4, 123; 5, 105; 41, 8. 29. 30. 45. 47. 48; 53, 25; 112, 14. 15; 124, 3. 6-8. 11; 131, 42; 145, 23. II, 1, 9, 82. 85. 88. 90a; 2, 19, 1. 2, 4, 7. 9. III, 3, 32, 117. IV, 50, 11; 88, 46, 49; 85, 24, 25, 34; 116, 12. 15; 117, 22; 130, 68; 179, 11; 195, 18; 204, 35; 206, 11. 15. 17; 207, 11.

Brahmapurāṇa

19, 22. 23; 94, 28. 29; 104, 105. 108; 110, 26. 31. 33, 44, 104; 114, 14; 116, 14; 117, 8. 15, 17; 122, 74, 76, 90, 81; 126, 24; 128, 29, 30, 35; 129, 75, 76, 78; 130, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31; 140, 22, 24a; 143, 11, 12; 144, 19; 150, 22, 157, 19, 21; 167, 13; 174, 1. 5, 30; 175, 78b; 191, 27; 219, 170; 219, 35b; 220, 12; 226, 44, 68; 238, 75, 237, 39; 239, 105; 244, 36; 245, 37. 38.

Bṛhmapāṇḍapurāṇa

II, 21, 116; 23, 37, 38, 41; 29, 6; 35, 207, 210, 213. III, 27, 24b, 25b; 32, 32; 36, 51b; 37, 17, 18; 38, 42, 45; 39, 56b; 40, 33; 41, 10, 11. IV, 1, 205; 30, 12-14. 16. 17. 19. 22. 24, 29. 34, 40.

Bṛhan-Nāradiyapurāṇa

2, 25; 8, 86; 6, 24; 10, 54; 15, 206; 28, 69; 36, 30, 36.

Garudapurāṇa

68, 23, 36; 69, 3. 7, 9, 11, 27; 70, 2, 8, 24, 33; 73, 2; 75, 3; 77, 2bd. 3; 89, 31-33, 38, 39; 101, 20, 113, 51; 116, 19, 67; 159, 36; 160, 60; 226, 53.

Kūrmapurāṇa

I, 32, 26; 38, 40. II, 5, 19, 25, 27, 32, 33, 36; 38, 16, 17:
Liṅgapurāṇa
1, 5, 50; 29, 82, 53, 56; 54, 38a; 72, 65, 153, 159, 160; 85, 17; 106, 15. II, 19, 32.

Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa
26, 35, 39; 39, 63; 43, 83; 91, 4, 27, 28, 30, 31; 96, 31-33.
38, 39; 103, 7; 136, 8, 9.

Matsyapurāṇa
8, 6; 21, 9, 28; 23, 30, 39; 37, 9; 54, 9, 21; 55, 7, 9; 57,
11, 14, 15; 69, 59; 83, 17; 92, 32; 98, 13; 100, 6, 15; 119, 45;
126, 38, 39; 135, 76, 77; 138, 27, 35; 139, 33, 39, 40, 43;
142, 4; 151, 31, 32, 35; 165, 24; 203, 14; 204, 18; 220, 47;
221, 12; 222, 10; 237, 217; 228, 29; 232, 15; 240, 27; 245,
25, 27; 250, 17; 274, 30-32.

Padmapurāṇa
1, 34, 22, 23; 35, 39, 41. II, 17, 38, 39; 20, 16; 24, 2, 3;
30, 18; 33, 45; 34, 15a; 36, 58; 43, 34; 54, 14, 17; 55, 2, 6.
7, 16, 17, 21, 23; 57, 1; 73, 5, 6; 8, 10-15; 74, 1, 2; 98, 53, 61.
62, 64-66, 69, 71, 73; 99, 5, 7; 102, 38, 40, 41, 48; 108, 67.
108, 34; 109, 2; 116, 31, IV, 3, 32; 7, 21; 72, 74; 87, 22; 88.
56; 90, 50; 92, 27; 105, 50; 110, 180. V, 7, 73, 75; 10, 114.
11, 77; 12, 34, 43; 15, 381-385, 388, 390; 18, 468-470; 19, 99.
104, 320; 20, 10, 19; 21, 17, 18, 97; 22, 54; 28, 66, 67; 24, 70.
72, 111, 114, 115, 117; 27, 92, 93; 29, 109, 46, 131; 82, 34, VI.
6, 18; 12, 40; 23, 42; 33, 32; 78, 11, 111, 33; 126, 15, 17.
145, 39; 147, 14; 191, 16a. 68; 194, 91, 95; 217, 36; 223, 58.
228, 18; 233, 43; 234, 72; 235, 66; 254, 75.

Sivapurāṇa
I, 7, 31; 8, 10c; 20, 51. II, 2, 11, 11; 19, 75; 22, 32; 26,
16; 27, 19, 3, 5; 27, 29; 5, 42, 22, 35; 48, 17, 20, 26, 32; 44,
11, 16, 28, 37, 45, 61; 45, 18, 24, 28, 39, 54; 46, 10, 11; 47, 42.
48, 50; 48, 2, III, 11, 35a; 13, 50. V, 23, 23; 26, 9. VII, 1,
7, 23, 24; 10, 47; 20, 38, 39, 43; 22, 70; 2, 41, 39.

Skandapurāṇa
1, 16, 54a; 21, 6; 54, 6b-8a, 17b-18a; 58, 33b, 34a; 60.
68. 85; 61, 10. 12. 33; 63, 14-16. 35. 39. 47. 49. III, 32, 5-8; 40, 24. 30. VII, 2, 9. VIII, 7, 8; 10, 5.

Vāmanapurāṇa
2, 50. 52; 6, 44. 50. 56; 9, 43. 49, 10, 32; 12, 52; 14, 27. 35. 36. 48. 49; 16, 46, 18, 5, 13. 16, 29, 37, 19, 2. 3. 12. 17. 20, 26, 29, 31, 43; 20, 38, 45, 51, 21, 52, 61; 22, 50; 29, 23; 44, 39; 56, 34, 69, 58, 92; 59, 13, 14, 63, 86, 66, 15, 68, 40, 44; 69, 41. 42, 157; 70, 1. 52; 72, 12, 74, 42; 79, 5; 81, 28, 33; 83, 33; 85, 46; 88, 28, 89, 35; 90, 45, 46; 91, 3. 115; 92, 2, 12, 60; 93, 11; 94, 76; 95, 30, 33, 78, 85.

Varāhapurāṇa
7, 14, 19b; 13, 44; 14, 31; 21, 74; 33, 5, 6, 8, 14, 36, 17; 40, 11, 45, 10, 59, 9; 124, 39, 45; 128, 54, 182, 8, 16, 30, 183, 15, 17, 21; 184, 9; 185, 20; 186, 19, 192, 13; 196, 24; 207, 48.

Vāyuapurāṇa
3, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 21-23, 11, 63; 50, 169, 52, 37, 39; 57, 7, 58, 119; 61, 178, 181, 184, 79, 71; 100, 208; 103, 72b; 110, 55, 111, 37.

Viṣṇupurāṇa
I, 2, 23, 24; II, 3, 26; 8, 59; 12, 45, 46. III, 1, 46; 11, 48, 50; 14, 19. IV, 1, 27; 2, 48. V, 1, 45; 17, 31. VI, 5, 87.

Harivamśa
E, 6, I, 41, 174. II, 89, 3. 8, 26, 37. 51. 54, 57, 59, 63, 66, 80. 82, 83, 85; 95, 3, 16, 28, 34; 123, 47. III, 51, 79, 52, 20, 25. 39, 42; 53, 38, 39; 71, 6, 80, 39, 49, 51; 82, 31.

12. Upendravajrā

Agnipurāṇa
192, 10a; 196, 16.

Bhāgavata-purāṇa
I, 5, 6; 13, 28; 16, 24a; 18, 43; 19, 9. 12, II, 2, 17b; 3, 25. III, 1, 11, 18. 35; 8, 1; 4, 20; 7, 14; 8, 21, 13, 5. 25; 14, 47a; 21, 15. IV, 16, 27; 30, 38, V, 1, 17; 12, 1, 12; 13, 4, 5.
पुराणं—पुराण

VI, 11, 25. VII, 5, 30. VIII, 5, 26, 28; 6, 8; 12, 43; 16, 5.
IX, 5, 26; 6, 45. X, 1, 4; 7, 29; 13, 2; 38, 25. XI, 12, 18;
14, 14; 23, 44. XII, 9, 12.

Bhavisyapurāṇa

I, 41, 44; 123, 23, 24; 124, 4. III, 8, 32, 111. 122. 133–
135. 137. 146. 148. 153. 156. 157; 4, 25, 10, 23. IV, 4, 131;
101, 4; 109, 18; 126, 48; 128, 13; 180, 40.

Brahmapurāṇa

33, 22. 23, 34, 101, 36, 74, 116; 71, 10; 75, 13. 48b; 97,
21; 110, 46, 112, 6a; 123, 195–200. 204; 140, 8. 10. 15; 174,
3. 6; 181, 21; 213, 27. 141; 228, 45. 81; 230, 93; 236, 20;
244, 35.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa

II, 25, 91; 26, 32. 47–50. III, 26, 56; 27, 26a, 39, 44.
45a; 40, 16; 41, 9, 14; 53, 36a. IV, 1, 182; 4, 24; 18, 24–26;
30, 11.

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa

I, I, E, 1a.

Bṛhan-Nāradyapurāṇa

8, 85; 4, 84; 10, 11; 11, 71. 72. 74–78; 15, 61; 16, 96;
36, 20. 32. 38.

Guruḍapurāṇa

68, 35; 73, 11; 89, 20; 115, 14; 220, 10; 223, 24; 226,
54. Uṭṭkh. 31, 20; 35, 40a.

Kūrmapurāṇa

I, 12, 227. 233; 16, 175–179. 200, 201, 203; 17, 53; 25,
52; 33, 30. 31. II, 5, 34. 37; 7, 32; 38, 19. 20.

Lingapurāṇa

I, 40, 93; 53, 57. 58. 60, 64, 9; 70, 83; 71, 134; 72, 54.
56. 57. 59. 72. 73. 75. 96. 98. 100. 155; 81, 58; 94, 13. 15.

Mārkapṛdeyapurāṇa

28, 36; 98, 29; 99, 62, 69; 110, 43.
Matsyapurāṇa
25, 46; 36, 4; 40, 5; 55, 16; 135, 79, 81, 82; 138, 21, 22, 37; 140, 42, 68; 154, 261-264, 266, 267, 270; 159, 14-16; 205, 9; 211, 28; 212, 30; 279, 9.

Padmapurāṇa
I, 35, 30; II, 66, 158; IV, 12, 48; 84, 70; 99, 8; V, 1, 61; 12, 48; 14, 144, 146, 149; 16, 50; 19, 98, 102, 319; 20, 17b; 24, 79; 25, 59, 60, 75; 26, 69; 40, 256-260, 262, 263; 41, 155-157; VI, 103, 31.

Śivapurāṇa
II, 2, 11, 10; '27, 29; 42, 33; 3, 12, 14, 36; 23, 41; 41, 40a; 4, 5, 32; 7, 40; 12, 4; 5, 7, 10; 42, 17; 48, 15, 38, 41, 43; 44, 32, 34; 48, 3; III, 26, 42; V, 24, 35a; VII, 1, 7, 26; 22, 69; 35, 9; 2, 41, 40.

Skandapurāṇa
I, 16, 56-64; 60, 39, 87, 88; 61, 31, 36, 37, 41; 68, 42, VI, 1, 24.

Vāmanapurāṇa
4, 29; 10, 43, 44, 52, 53; 12, 54, 55; 14, 57; 18, 6, 51, 63; 58, 32; 66, 27, 61; 59, 35; 66, 33; 68, 39; 72, 11; 76, 81, 33; 84, 42; 89, 36; 91, 13, 17a; 95, 36.

Varahapurāṇa
3, 17, 19, 20; 7, 13, 15; 9, 28, 29, 32; 10, 6, 11, 86, 87, 89; 12, 13; 13, 41; 15, 10, 11; 13, 20; 17, 10; 21, 70, 72, 73; 23, 20, 31; 26, 14; 36, 13, 22; 45, 9b; 55, 34, 38, 39; 96, 11; 120, 10; 142, 9a; 186, 33.

Vāyu-purāṇa
5, 21; 14, 11; 30, 130; 54, 98, 101; 55, 31, 47, 50; 75, 48b; 708, 25.

Viṣṇupurāṇa
IV, 1, 26; 2, 31, 32; 49; V, 1, 54; 9, 27, 29.
Harivamśa

13. Upajāti

Agnipurāṇa
196, 15; (206, 13); 255, 35.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
6. 7; 2, 18, 19, 22, 27-30; 3, 31; 7, 2, 30; 8, 39, 40; 12, 15, 17; 18, 8, 30, 39; 14, 7, 9, 13, 19-21, 28-30, 58, 60; 16, 33, 35, 37, 38; 19, 8, 27, 4-6; 32, 20, 33, 17; 40, 1-3; 44, 36-38; 46, 32, 43; 48, 20-23; 50, 24; 63, 35-39, 44, 45; 64, 6-8, 13, 14; 68, 46; 80, 3, 4; 81, 33, 35, 36. XI, 2, 36, 37, 40-43; 4, 2, 3, 5, 11-13, 41, 42; 6, 7; 8, 30, 32; 9, 12; 10, 13; 11, 6, 7; 12, 10, 12, 17, 20-24; 14, 24-26; 16, 5; 17, 42; 19, 10; 22, 30-32; 23, 1, 42, 43, 45-58; 26, 25, 28, 17, 19-25; 29, 34-37; 30, 43. XII, 3, 15, 48; 4, 19, 20; 9, 11, 30, 31; 12, 47, 55, 56.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa

I, E, 6, 7; 28, 44; 35, 44; 36, 59; 40, 20, 21, 30, 31, 33, 35; 41, 24, 27, 28, 41, 42, 46, 58, 26, 28; 61, 28, 70, 4, 5, 73, 47; 77, 20b, 21; 78, 4, 103, 45, 112, 11-13, 16, 17, 122, 5, 123, 47; 124, 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 131, 26, 34, 41, 140, 46, 47a, 49; 143, 19; 145, 25; 195, 20. II, 1, 6, 6, 9, 37-40. 84; 10, 82, 2, 19, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-14, 17-19; 20, 8, 111, 114. 143. III, 2, 29, 64; 3, 32, 109, 110, 112-116, 118-121, 123-132, 136, 138-145, 147, 149-152, 154, 155. 158-162; 4, 25, 20-22, 24-28. IV, 3, 93; 19, 6, 25, 44; 51, 14; 52, 40; 69, 84; 75, 71, 82, 55, 56, 83, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50, 51, 85, 26, 33, 94, 33; 97, 30, 33; 107, 12, 13, 109, 31-34, 111, 62, 114, 50; 115, 16-18, 116, 13, 14, 16; 127, 91, 128, 11, 12, 130, 33; 148, 11, 149, 9; 128, 16, 17; 158, 14, 160, 15; 161, 73, 1: 175, 53-62; 179, 10; 186, 12; 187, 10, 11; 188, 21; 189, 9; 195, 15-17, 19-21a; 204, 34, 36, 37; 205, 116, 206, 18, 8-10, 12-14, 16; 207, 10, 12, 13.

Brahmapurāṇa

19, 25, 26; 25, 3; 35, 64; 86, 7-9, 11-24. 26, 77, 94, 96, 101-105; 38, 20, 40, 39, 33, 42-54a; 49, 67, 69-71; 71, 9, 72, 36; 74, 88; 75, 5-7; 11, 12, 14-18, 20, 21, 24, 78, 87, 58, 80, 83, 97, 20, 22, 23, 29, 100, 19-21, 103, 8, 108, 104, 105, 107, 110, 21, 22a, 25a, 27, 28a, 30-32, 34-40, 42, 43, 45, 50, 51, 54-57, 59, 62, 63, 66, 68, 70, 100-103. 105, 106. (155). 156, 158, 159, 164a. 229; 112, 4, 5; 118, 9, 16; 114, 6-9a, 10-13, 15-18; 117, 7, 9-14, 16; 119, 9b-11; 122, 75, 77-79, 82; 128, 201-203, 205.
पुराणम्—पुराङ्ग {[Vol. XI., No. 1

206; 124, 5-8; 126, 25-27; 128, 30; 129, 31. 32. 34a. 37. 68-74. 77-79. 90, 108; 130, 25. 27. 29; 138, 4-7; 140, 7. 9. 11-14. 16-21. 23; 143, 6-10. 13-17; 144, 18; 150, 15-18a. 19b-21; 157, 10-18. 20. 22-31; 167, 8-12. 14. 30; 173, 37-39; 174, 2. 4. 29; 175, 75; 177, 5. 24; 178, 114-116; 179, 27. 28; 181, 22-25; 182, 76; 191, 28-31. 33; 219, 31-33. 116; 222, 55. 56; 228, 37-43. 45-67. 69-80. 82-88; 233, 71-74; 238, 56-62; 239, 106-112; 244, 31. 34. 37-39. 41; 245, 11. 40.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa

1, 1, 174. II, 6, 64; 21, 151; 25, 77. 91. 96; 26, 46; 35, 41. 77. 206. 208. 209. 211. 212. 214. III, 4, 24; 11, 8f. '82. 84; 14, 70; 15, 11. 45. 68; 26, 58. 60b-62; 27, 12. 11-13. 86, 52-53; 37, 15, 21a. 24; 38, 41. 43. 44. 46-48; 39, 56-53. 51. 52; 40, 17. 19. 31b. 32. 34-53a; 41, 8. 12. 13. 15; 72, 22, 23. IV, 1, 183. 206. 207; 3, 110. 111; 4, 73; 5, 1; 18, 12; 30, 15, 18. 20. 21. 23. 25-28. 30-33. 35-39. 41. 42; 41, 75.

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa

I, 80, 7-14 (teilweise Vamśastha). IV, 19, 29-31; 22, 22, 25; 77, 37; 111. 48-50a.

Bṛhan-Nārādiyapurāṇa

1, 61. 66-71; 2, 11. 26-30. 54; 4, 85-87. 8, 38. 9, 21-22. 60. 8-10, 3. 11. 73; 15, 57-60. 62-64; 28, 118. 119; 31, 149; 85, 56. 57; 86, 3-10. 31. 33-35. 37; 37, 120.

Garuḍapurāṇa

68, 16. 29. 52; 69, 1, 2. 4-6. 8. 10. 12-22. 24-26. 28. 29. 92. 3; 70, 1. 3. 5-7. 9-13. 18. 19. 22, 23, 25. 28-32; 71, 6. 8; 72, 19; 73, 12. 13; 75, 1; 80, 2; 85, 23b; 89, 27-28. 30. 54-37; 108, 28; 109, 7. 38. 42. 43. 48. 51; 110, 2. 16. 20. 30; 111, 18; 112, 18; 113, 16, 20, 21, 31; 114, 18. 28. 29; 115, 16, 18. 20. 21. 52. 54; 157, 10. 11; 147, 9; 159, 34. 35. 37; 160, 31; 169, 34; 220, 13; 223, 25; 225, 11, 226, 52. 55. 56. Uttkh. 1, 5; 2, 8; 6, 20; 8, 42; 14, 19; 16, 67.
Kūrmapurāṇa


Liṅgapurāṇa

1, 20, 29; 29, 13. 16. 17; 35, 31; 36, 21; 58, 53. 54. 59. 61. 62; 58, 13; 64, 32. 67; 71, 56. 112. 114; 72, 49-53. 55. 58. 66-68. 71. 95. 97. 154. 156. 158. 161-163. 166. 168; 75, 37-39; 77, 4. 5; 80, 11. 18. 43; 81, 56. 57; 85, 125; 86, 42; 88, 38. 40. 41; 91, 32; 92, 34; 94, 14. 16; 106, 16. 17; 107, 26. II, 18, 26; 19, 31.36-38; 26, 19. 20.

Mārkandeyapurāṇa

24, 43; 25, 11-13. 15-18; 26, 37. 38; 37, 38-42; 43, 30. 82; 91, 1-3. 5. 29; 96, 27. 28. 30. 35-37; 99, 63; 102, 22; 103, 6; 107, 4; 109, 78; 116, 56. 57; 136, 7. 9-12.

Matsyapurāṇa

8, 2-5. 7-12; 17, 10. 43; 22, 94; 23, 29. 31-38. 40-47; 25, 43-45. 47-54. 56-62a. 64; 81, 16. 17; 36, 6. 8-11; 37, 1. 3-8. 10-12; 68, 1-3. 5. 7-11. 14-19. 22; 89, 1. 2. 4. 6-10. 12-17. 19. 20. 22-26; 40, 1-4. 6. 7; 41, 4-13; 42, 1-4. 6. 9. 12. 18. 20-22. 24. 25. 28. 29; (von 25, 47 an wiederholt wechselnd mit Śālī und Vātormi). 52, 26; 53, 74; 54, 10-20. 22. 23; 55, 8. 10-15. 17. 29-32; 57, 1. 8-10. 12. 13. 16; 58, 55. 56; 61, 46-49; 68, 42; 69, 58. 60. 61. 65; 70, 63. 64; 72, 23. 33-35. 44. 45; 78, 11; 80, 13. 14; 88, 13-16. 18-20a; 92, 31. 33. 34; 95, 35. 38; 97, 14-16; 98, 10-12. 14; 100, 7. 13. 14; 101, 85; 117, 21; 120, 41; 126, 36b. 37; 129, 35. 36; 131, 50; 135, 74. 75. 78. 80; 138, 23-26. 28-34. 36. 38-40; 139, 22-32. 34-38. 41. 42. 44; 140, 41. 69-75. 83. 84; 144, 107; 148, 36. 37; 150, 108. 160; 151, 33. 34. 36; 162, 27-35; 158, 169; 154, 260. 265. 268. 269. 271; 159, 15. 17. 18; 162, 12. 13. 33-35; 163, 95. 99-103; 171, 56; 178, 32; 179, 90; 195, 46; 196, 55; 197, 11; 198, 22; 199.
Padmapurana

I, 1, 1; 34, 24. 25; 35, 28. 29. 31-38. 40. 42. 43; 53, 90. II, 5. 104. 105; 17, 37. 40; 18, 35; 30, 16. 17; 31, 50; 86, 59a; 48, 78. 79; 44, 8-11; 54, 15. 16. 18-25; 55, 1. 3-5. 8-15. 18-20. 22. 24; 56, 36; 57, 2-7. 37; 58, 1-3. 12; 73, 2-4. 7. 9. 16. 17; 74, 3-5. 26-27; 98, 7. 51. 52. 54-60. 63. 67. 68. 70. 72; 99, 1-4. 6. 8. 9. 13. 14; 102, 31-37. 39. 42-17. 49-51; 107, 15; 109, 3; 111, 1; 112, 1; 115, 1-3; 117, 33. 111, 25, 16. 20. IV, 8, 31. 33; 5, 10; 7, 20. 22; 8, 37; 10, 73; 11, 3. 9. 69; 12, 79; 13, 64; 15, 9; 17, 75; 42, 2; 53, 12. 13; 54, 17; 72, 73; 73, 44. 50; 83, 114; 85, 3. 27-29. 33. 38; 86, 32. 33; 87, 29-32. 34; 88, 4-7. 20. 62. 68; 90, 51; 92, 30. 49. 58; 93, 40. 42; 94, 16. 94. 109; 96, 31; 98. 30. 31; 99, 2. 7. 55; 100, 133; 104, 16; 107, 38-46; 108, 132; 110, 178. 179; 181. 192. 193. 205. 383; 111, 38. 39; 113, 17-20. 23. 28-30. V, 2, 117; 8, 36b. 37. 39. 40; 7, 69-72. 74. 76-80; 9, 137. 172; 11, 79. 97; 12, 33. 35-42. 44-47. 49-51; 14, 140-143. 145. 147. 148. 57; 15, 386. 387. 389; 19, 81-84. 96. 97. 100. 101. 103. 105. 106. 151. 152. 162. 175. 176. 318. 340; 20, 9. 11-18. 19. 144; 21, 17-20. 93-100a. 291. 320. 321; 22, 52. 53. 55; 23, 68-70a. 73. 145. 146; 24, 39. 49-51. 62. 63. 71. 73-78. 80. 92-95. 101. 108-110. 112. 113. 116. 117. 189. 190; 25, 58. 73. 74. 76. 104; 26, 65-68; 27, 94. 95; 28, 194; 29, 102-105. 110-115; 34, 97; 37, 110. 198; 40, 255. 261. 264; 41, 154; 42, 95. 96. 115. 116. 187. 191-193; 43, 89. 127. 46, 132; 78, 93-99; 82, 35. 43. VI, 8, 48. 49; 7, 33; 8, 80; 16, 39; 17, 19; 19, 51. 57. 134; 23, 28-35; 26, 14; 83, 10; 75, 10. 11;
92, 31; 93, 29; 94, 32; 100, 29; 101, 36; 102, 31; 106, 28; 107, 29; 112, 29; 113, 31; 114, 30; 116, 28; 126, 16; 144, 83; 147, 46; 148, 30-32; 153, 4; 191, 67. 69-73; 192, 8-10; 193, 91; 194, 90. 92-94; 208, 36. 37; 217, 35. 37. 38; 219, 47; 222, 18. 32; 223, 57; 224, 9. 78; 225, 21. 38-40. 43-47; 228, 17; 229 83; 231, 49. 52; 232, 2. 10. 19. 44. 67; 233, 83; 234, 71; 235, 10. 15. 22-24. 65; 236, 65; 238, 78; 239, 81; 240, 103; 243, 97; 244, 18; 252, 68; 253, 58; 255, 7. 22. 65; 258, 31; 270, 53.

Śivapurāṇa

I, 2, 66; 7, 32; 8, 7; 18, 12. II, 1, 2. 3; 13, 4; 2, 6, 20; 11, 12-15; 22, 28. 30a. 33; 26, 18. 53; 27, 20, 28; 33, 6; 37, 22. 42; 38, 49. 50. 53; 3, 3, 36; 5, 26a; 13, 26; 21, 18; 23, 17; 24, 16b; 29, 38; 38, 5; 41, 15. 25, 50; 4, 1, 10; 6, 14-17; 9, 12-15. 36. 52; 12, 3; 5, 4, 24; 6, 25; 9, 28-30. 33. 41. 42; 14, 39. 40; 15, 66a; 20, 62; 42, 8-10. 12-16. 18-21. 23-30. 31bcd-34. 36-49; 43, 16. 18. 19; 21-25. 27-31. 33-37. 39. 40. 42; 44, 1-7. 9. 10. 12-15. 17-27. 29-31. 33. 35. 36. 38-44. 46-60. 62-71; 45, 1-17. 19-23. 25-27. 29-38. 40-53; 46, 1-9. 12; 47, 40, 41. 43-47. 49. 51-53; 48, 4. 5. 45. 46; III, 24, 37. 38; 26, 52. 64; 27, 47. 49. V, 18, 42; 14, 28-30; 18, 19-21; 23, 21, 22; 26, 10-12; 27, 32. 33; VI, 6, 39. 40; 23, 24-26; VII, 1, 6, 76; 7, 21. 22; 10, 45. 46. 48; 19, 67; 20, 36b. 37. 40-42; 22, 71. 72; 23, 20; 2, 2, 44; 6, 31; 41, 37. 38.

Skandapurāṇa

1, 8, 29b. 30a; 9, 8. 9; 21, 7a. 8; 53, 80. 82; 54, 8b. 9a. 15b-17a; 57, 60; 59, 40a. 41b; 60, 89. 90; 61, 1-5. 6b-9. 11. 13-30. 32. 34. 35. 38-40. 42-44a; 63, 1-11. 13. 17-34. 36-38. 40-46. 48. 50-59; 64, 63; II, 10, 50; III, 31, 33; 32, 4. 9; 40, 25-29. 31. 32a. 38. 39. IV, 5, 6; VI, 1, 25. VII, 1, 37b. 38a; 2, 12; 8, 30. VIII, 8, 41.

Vāmanapurāṇa

1, 20. 21. 24-27; 2, 3. 35. 36. 51. 53. 55. 56; 3, 11. 22. 23. 31-36. 51; 4, 49. 50; 5, 61; 6, 43. 45-49. 51-55; 7, 53-59. 61.
Varāhapurāṇa

1, 17, 18; 2, 7-9, 11; 3, 11-16, 18, 21; 5, 49-58; 7, 11, 12.
14, 16-18a. 20, 21; 9, 27, 30, 31, 33; 10, 5, 7, 11, 88, 90; 12, 11.
12, 14-19; 18, 40, 42, 43, 45-48, 58; 14, 30; 15, 9, 12, 14-19;
17, 9, 11-15, 20; 21, 71; 22, 47, 48; 23, 21-24, 28-30; 25, 37;
26, 10-13; 82, 32b, 83, 2-4, 7, 9-13a, 15; 36, 12, 14-16, 18-21; 40,
4-10; 51, 9-12; 55, 35-37, 41, 42; 73, 22-36; 98, 31; 96, 7-10;
107, 4; 112, 42; 120, 8, 12, 14, 16; 124, 6, 37; 127, 47, 55, 57;
62; 128, 8, 17, 56, 63, 66; 129, 3, 43; 142, 47; 149, 3a; 172,
36, 37; 181, 19; 182, 5, 20, 23, 25, 27, 31; 184, 4, 12; 185, 3.
8. 12, 13, 16; 186, 5; 188, 65; 190, 47; 191, 17b; 192, 17, 22.
27; 196, 23, 25-32, 34; 207, 45, 47, 49-51; 211, 78.

Vāyupurāṇa

1, 205; 8, 11-15, 18, 20, 24; 7, 67; 8, 188; 12, 33; 14,
7-10; 19, 30, 24, 32; 30, 116-119; 50, 202, 52, 38, 40; 54, 80.
95. 97. 99. 100; 61, 37. 68. 177. 179. 180. 182. 183. 185; 75, 45b. 46; 78, 59; 79, 95; 97, 23. 24; 100, 187. 209. 210; 103, 132. 133; 108, 73; 110, 54; 112, 68.

Viṣṇupurāṇa

1, 2, 67; 4, 28. 32-37; 15, 56-58; 17, 36, 40, 41. 44. 47. 90. 91; 19, 74. 75; 20, 13. II, 3, 24. 25; 8, 81; 12, 38-44; 16, 23. 24. III, 3, 31; 9, 30. 31; 11, 49. 51. 52. 91, 92; 14, 12-18. 20. 30; 15, 35. 36; 17, 31-33. IV, 1, 25. 28-38; 2, 23. 24. 30. 44-47. 50-52; 24, 61-63. 71-76. V, 1, 40-44. 55-58; 3, 12; 9, 26. 28. 30. 31; 17, 27-30. 32. VI, 5, 83-86.

Harivamśa

E, 8. I, 43. 31. II, 65, 52-55; 72, 29-60; 89, 1. 2. 4-7. 9-25. 27-36. 38-45. 47-50. 52. 53. 55. 56. 58. 60-62. 64. 67-79. 81. 84. 86-88; 95, 1. 2. 8. 12. 15. 17-20. 22. 25-27. 30. 31. 33. 35-39; 120, 41. 42; 124, 54-56. III, 4, 7; 6. 1. 12; 12, 18; 14, 67; 34, 18; 35, 50; 39, 23; 40, 27; 43, 15-17; 44, 22-24. 28; 47, 15. 27-33; 49, 1. 20. 41; 50, 7. 21. 28; 51, 7. 12. 22. 35. 60. 68. 72-76. 78-82. 84-87. 91. 92; 59, 11-19. 22-24. 26-38. 40. 43-56. 58. 60-63; 53. 1-4. 31. 35-37. 40. 41; 62. 36. 37; 83, 16; VII, 5; 72, 47; 80, 38. 40-48. 50; 82, 28. 33. 35; 126. 45-47.

14. Dūdhaka

Brahmapurāṇa

87. 29.

Matsyapurāṇa

.16, 23, 24; 154, 470-478.

15. Śatāra

Bhāgavatapurāṇa

1, 18. 27; 16, 19. 20. III, 19, 6; 25. 31; 33. 7. VIII, 7, 37. V, 5, 1. 2. VII, 8, 45. X, 3, 24-28; 69, 25-28.
Bhaviṣyapurāṇa

I, 119, 26. II, 1, 9, 35. 36. 83. 85c. 89. 90bc. 16, 3 ; 2, 18, 1. 2; 20, 146-151; 4, 159, 44.

Brahmapurāṇa

39, 45b; 105, 19 ; 110, 22b-24. 28b. 29. 47-49. 52. 53. 58. 60. 61. 64. 65. 67. 79. 164b. 166. 167. 225; 112, 6b; 114, 9b; 124, 4a; 128, 32-34. 36. 37; 129, 33. 34b-36; 140, 24b. 25; 150, 18b. 19a.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa


Garuḍapurāṇa

109, 54; 114, 75; 147, 11. Uttkh. 16, 60.

Kūrmapurāṇa

II, 8, 16. 17; 9, 13; 36, 21-26; 88, 162a.

Liṅgapurāṇa

I, 16, 35; 21, 85. 86; 53, 55; 54, 38b; 72, 164. 165. 177; 88, 39; 89, 27; 96, 35. II, 18, 34. 40; 26, 19a.

Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa

16, 63; 28, 46. 47; 25, 14; 41, 25.

Matsyapurāṇa

154, 7-15; 165, 24.

Padmapurāṇa

IV, 10, 13; 110, 93-99. 366-368. V, 26, 41-43; 36, 51; 40, 9-18; 43, 90. 91. VI, 93, 28; 208, 38-43.

Sīvapurāṇa

II, 2, 6, 12-16. 21bod; 3, 5, 24. 25. 26b; 24, 16a; 41, 40b; 48, 36. III, 11, 35b; 13, 42-49. VII, 1, 8, 31; 12, 76. 77; 2, 5, 36, 37; 41, 36.
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Skandapurāṇa

I, 53, 26. 28b-30a. 44; 61, 6a. VII, 2, 21b.

Vāmanapurāṇa

5, 43; 54, 8a; 58, 94; 59, 28; 72, 8. 9; 92, 39. 40. 66; 94, 75; 95, 46.

Varāhapurāṇa

2, 12; 7, 18b. 19a; 24, 28-30; 32, 30; 33, 1; 45, 9a; 98, 23-26; 118, 43; 185, 23; 186, 10. 16.

Vāyupurāṇa

6, 77; 9, 120. 121; 16, 22; 20, 29, 235; 57; 24, 163. 164; 75, 47. 48a; 79, 12; 83, 90; 103, 40a. 41b. 71. 72a.

Harivamśa

II, 74, 24-34; 79, 16. 17. III, 8, 26; 62, 35; 70, 2.

16. Vātormī

— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —

Bhāgavatapurāṇa

III, 18, 5. 6b; 25, 38. V, 5, 8a; 11, 11c. X, 93, 36b. 64, 13a. XI, 14, 24; 22, 30b.

Brahmapurāṇa

144, 17.

Kūrmapurāṇa

I, 17, 58. 59. 62. II, 8, 14. 15; 9, 12b. 14-16; 10, 13-16; 38, 161a.

Mārkandeyapurāṇa

50, 96.

Matsyapurāṇa

25, 62b. 63. 65; 38, 4. 6. 12. 13. 20. 21; 39, 3. 5. 11. 18. 21, 28; 42, 5. 7. 8. 18. 23. 26. (zuweilen wechselnd mit Śālinī).
Śivapurāṇa
II, 3, 12, 35.

Varāhāpurāṇa
2, 10; 32, 31b. 32a; 51, 13, 14; (127, 52)

Vāyupurāṇa
20, 28; 108, 40b. 41a.

Harivamsa
79, 11-15.

17. Bhramaravītasita

Matsyapurāṇa
180, 43.

18. Rathodāhadā

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
I, 122, 4; IV, 115, 21-23.

Brahmapurāṇa
237, 13, 14.

Garuḍapurāṇa
109, 26.

Kūrmapurāṇa
II, 14, 89.

Liṅgapurāṇa
I, 64, 56. 37, 62; 72, 64, 69; 95, 14.

Markandeyapurāṇa
107, 3.

Matsyapurāṇa
97, 17-20.
Padmapurāṇa

I, 22, 38-44. IV, 21, 21-28; 57, 36-38; 94, 110, 111; 95, 49. VI, 197, 3-6; 199, 60-63; 210, 102-105; 223, 24; 228, 48; 247, 48-54.

Skandapurāṇa

II, 3, 10b. 11a; III, 31, 89.

19. Svāgata

Bhāgavatapurāṇa

X, 35, 2-7.

Garuḍapurāṇa

147, 10.

20. Sumukhi

Mārkandeyapurāṇa

107, 6-10.

21. Varāha

Agnipurāṇa

270, 14, 15.

Bhāgavatapurāṇa

I, 3, 4; 4, 11. 12; 5, 10. 12-23. 25-28. 40; 6, 26; 8, 23, 24. 29. 36. 37; 9, 24. 30. 31; 10, 1-3. 21-30; 11, 2. 6-9. 27. 31-34; 14, 37. 38; 15, 33. 36. 37; 16, 1. 10. 11. 24b; 18, 44. 45; 19, 1. 2, 4. II, 2, 9. 11-13. 17a. 18. 19. 27. 28; 4, 12-14. 16-22; 6, 33-35; 9, 5-18. 29. III, 8, 31; 13, 34. 36. 39-45. 48-50; 14, 1. 25. 27. 47b. 48a; 17, 17. 18. 25-31; 18, 1-3. 6a. 7. 19-21; 19, 7, 14. 15. 26-28. 30-32. 37; 20, 8; 21, 18-20; 25, 12. 25. 26; 29, 5; 30, 22; 38, 5. 6. IV, 3, 8. 9. 11-14. 16-25; 4, 1-7. 9-15. 18-21. 23,
24. 26-30; 5, 1-3, 5. 6. 9-12; 6, 5. 8. 40. 44. 49; 7, 25. 38. 61; 8, 22. 23. 79. 80; 9, 1-5. 28. 30. 36; 10, 20-22; 11, 3-6. 20. 27. 29; 12, 1. 7. 8. 20-22. 25. 28. 36. 41-43. 52; 13, 1. 47-49; 14, 21. 16, 3; 17. 29-36; 19, 27. 28. 38; 20, 12. 13. 21-32; 21, 7. 8. 31-41; 22, 20-27; 23, 20-22; 24, 29. 52. 58. 59. 61-63. 66. 67. 79; 25, 28. 30. 31. 42; 27, 3. 4; 30, 21. 43; 31, 3. 16. 28. V, 1, 11. 14; 13, 1-3. 16-19. 21. 22; 15, 7. 8; 17, 18-21. 23. 24; 18, 3-6. 11-13. 19-23. 26-28. 32. 33. 36-39; 19, 4-8. 12-15. 21-28. VI, 1, 7, 8. 19; 2, 11. 12. 45. 46; 3, 16. 17; 4, 23. 26. 27. 29. 32-34; 7, 36; 11, 8-10. 20; 12, 3. 7; 13, 22. 23; 14, 47-55; 16, 30-33; 17, 32; 18, 22; 19, 24. 25. VII, 1, 10. 11; 2, 31-34. 39-43; 4, 12-14. 33. 42; 5, 5a. 13. 37. 49. 50; 7, 34b-40; 8, 10. 11. 15-18. 20-32. 34-36. 40. 50. 54; 9, 5. 6; 10, 49. 69; 11, 1; 15, 68. 77. VIII, 1, 16. 33; 2, 19. 22-32; 3, 4-8. 23; 4, 8. 9; 5, 21. 23. 27. 44; 6, 16b; 7, 8-11. 14. 15. 18. 19; 8, 17-23; 9, 12; 10, 35-39. 54. 55; 11, 1. 25. 26; 12, 18-21. 23. 46; 15, 3. 20. 21. 23; 16, 14; 17, 6. 7. 18; 18, 2-4. 11. 12. 20-23. 28. 31; 19, 2. 4; 20, 10, 11. 19-21. 32. 33; 21, 1. 3; 22, 2. 3. 8-11. 13-17; 23, 1. 2; 24, 30. 31. 46-52. IX, 2, 15; 9. 20. 21; 4, 18-22. 27. 61; 5, 6-9; 6, 46; 8, 13. 14. 22; 11, 30; 15, 29-34. X, 1, 5. 21. 22. 41-43; 2, 20. 21. 31-37. 39; 3, 9-12. 17-22. 48-52; 4, .38; 6, 5-9; 11-13; 7, 4. 6-8. 32; 8, 41. 42; 9, 5-11; 11, 50-52; 12, 1. 12-14. 16. 24. 26-28. 31. 34. 35. 38. 39; 13, 5. 22-24. 33. 64; 14, 5. 6. 26. 31; 15, 1-5; 16, 18. 34. 36. 49. 50; 17, 6. 7; 18, 5. 6; 19, 7; 22, 19. 22; 28, 7; 25, 29. 33; 27, 8. 9. 24. 25; 29, 2-4. 43; 30, 2-4; 32, 13-15. 21. 22; 33, 18. 25. 26; 34, 19; 36, 13. 14; 37, 1-9. 23. 24; 38, 7-11. 13. 15-23. 26; 59, 19-28. 31; 40, 12. 14. 15; 41, 20. 22-27; 42, 1. 3. 17; 43, 19. 20; 44, 39; 45, 37. 38; 46, 45. 46; 47, 1-3; 48, 3-6; 50, 21-23. 25-30; 51, 47-58; 58, 51-53. 56. 57; 54, 34. 35. 56; 55, 10; 58, 7. 36. 40; 59, 7-16. 22. 23. 29-31. 41. 43; 60, 22. 23. 54; 61, 40; 62, 31-34; 63, 52; 65, 13; 66, 17. 18. 39. 41; 68, 27. 53; 69, 6; 70, 5. 6. 18. 38. 39; 71, 26. 27; 78, 12-14; 75, 39; 77, 28. 29. 32. 34-36; 80, 38; 81, 37; 82, 15; 88, 3, 5, 17; 84, 12. 13. 16-18;
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85, 36-38; 86, 41-42, 48; 88, 19, 20, 40; 89, 51-59. XI, 2, 38; 3, 32; 5, 8-10; 7, 42b; 8, 31; 20, 17; 28, 26; 29, 3. 7. 39. 45-48; 30, 15-19. 42, 31, 13. XII, 3, 14. 43. 44; 4, 30-33; 6, 30-32; 8, 33. 34; 9, 13-16. 27-29; 12, 48-54.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa

I, 5, 108; 77, 20a; 122, 6; 123, 44-46. 51. 52. II, 2, 12, 163. III, 2, 24, 26; 29, 63.

Brahmapurāṇa

23, 44; 38, 48. 49; 34, 100; 36, 73. 75. 76; 40, 120; 85, 8; 110, 25b. 163; 119, 9a. 12; 124, 4b; 219, 35a; 235, 68; 244, 32. 33. 40.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa

II, 6, 63; 23, 42.43, 25, 40. 115-117. III, 7, 479; 11, 81a; 19, 63-65. 73; 26, 59.60a; 27, 14.15; 32, 34-36; 36. 54. 55; 37, 22b. 23; 38, 40.49. 50a; 53, 36b. 37. IV, 1, 182; 13, 27.28; 29, 148.

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa

I, 1, E, 1b; 25, 1-18. IV, 111, 50b. 51.

Bṛhan-Nāradiyapurāṇa

4, 89; 11, 181.

Garuḍapurāṇa

85, 23a; 109, 22.53; 112, 3.16; 113, 9; 114, 35. 37; 219, 38; 222, 40. Uttkh. 5, 85-88; 26, 37; 35, 40b.

Kūrmapurāṇa

I, 17, 52.56.57; II, 8, 18.

Liṅgapurāṇa

I, 64, 31: 72, 120; 80, 12; 89, 28.29; 90, 24; 92, 12-18.20.
Markandeya Purana
2, 64.65; 28, 115; 41, 24.26; 85, 35; 107, 5; 116, 58.

Matsyapurana
126, 41; 130, 27.28; 133, 67; 135, 68-73.83; 136, 66-68; 138, 57; 140, 42.43; 148, 100-102; 150, 108a; 153, 150-154; 154, 397-404; 162, 36. (37.38); 169, 18; 170, 30; 180, 24-30. 32; 185, 52; 190, 22; 251, 26.

Padmapurana
I, 17, 18; 27, 92.11, 24, 1.4; 34, 15b; 42, 17-22; 96, 52; 100, 10-12; IV, 5, 8; 6, 37; 10, 12; 11, 19. 78. 79; 12, 81; 13, 6-9; 15, 2.3; 16, 9.10; 17, 13; 25, 76; 26, 32; 38, 51; 58, 4; 95, 60; 73, 43.45; 77, 49; 112, 5; 118, 21b. 22-24-27. 31-33. V, 3, 34-36a. 38; 14, 156; 15, 355-357. 391. 392; 19, 177.317; 26, 70; 29, 97-101; 37, 18.49; 39, 99-102; 40, 360-364. 367-369. 413; 78, 90-92. VI, 5, 25; 6, 45; 8, 10-12.81; 9, 26.27; 12, 72; 14.45; 18, 3; 19, 54. 132; 28, 38; 75, 7-9; 79, 79; 90, 65; 98, 31; 99, 32; 104, 30; 105, 32; 106, 18-20; 109, 29; 110, 30; 117, 30; 147, 34; 191, 15; 192, 11; 194, 81. 82, 87; 195, 35-37; 201, 45-46; 203, 22-25; 222, 39; 231, 34.35; 238, 97; 247, 3-5. 14. 31. 32. 36; 248, 17.74; 252, 72; 260, 71; 282, 49.

Sivapurana
I, 6, 21; 7, 11. 26-28; 29; 8, 4-6; 10, 25.27; 24, 50. II, 2, 6, 21a; 22, 30b; 26, 14.15. 17; 27, 27; 42, 32; 3, 12, 13; 23, 16; 38, 37; 39, 43; 40, 56; 41, 14. 26; 47, 35. 55; 4, 7; 16. 17. 41; 8, 31; 9, 53; 10, 15; 5, 15, 66b; 18, 46; 28, 51; 24, 4; 26, 21-23; 44, 8; 57, 24. III, 27, 48. 53. V, 24, 35b; 48,3-43. VI, 10, 12; 12, 44. 45; 28, 34. 35. VII, 1, 6, 58.

Skandapurana
I, 8, 30b, 31a; 16, 54b. 55; 52, 22-28a. 29a; 60, 102. II, 11, 48. III, 3, 23; 21, 24. VIII, 11, 8.
Vāmanapurāṇa

I, 17-19. 22. 23. 31; 2, 2, 4. 54; 6, 107; 7, 65; 9, 45. 48, 51; 10, 38; 11, 58; 12, 44-46. 57; 14, 51-53; 17, 73; 18, 1-3. 7, 10-12. 24; 22, 60; 51, 64; 53, 35, 36; 54, 8b; 56, 18, 19. 58-60. 65. 68. 70; 58, 19, 83. 87, 88; 59, 47; 62, 29; 64, 79; 66, 30; 69, 1, 155; 70, 26, 45-47; 72, 15; 78, 80-84; 82, 30; 84, 43; 85, 47. 48; 86, 20, 21; 89, 59; 91, 6; 92, 58. 59. 64; 94, 41; 95, 67. 70-73. 88.

Varāhapurāṇa

7, 34-40; 8, 43-54; 10, 71, 72; 11, 53-64; 12, 5-10; 22, 46; 23, 25-27; 25, 17-28. 38; 32, 31a; 39, 8; 55, 33, 40; 73, 17-21; 96, 12; 148, 6; 151, 29.

Vāyupurāṇa

3, 1-8; 7, 66; 16, 23, 24; 17, 8; 18, 23; 30, 305; 52, 41, 42; 54, 44, 115-117; 55, 44-46. 48. 49; 69, 355; 75, 45a; 83, 96-98, 106; 100, 86.

Viṣṇupurāṇa

I, 1, 2; 4, 25, 27, 29-31; 17, 26. II, 7, 43.

Harivamsa

II, 53, 53-55; 65, 51; 66, 55; 68, 38-40; 69, 73; 70, 8. 9, 49, 50; 120, 43. III, 6, 5-8, 11; 18, 29; 37, 33; 38, 35, 44, 25-27; 49, 19, 36; 51, 83; 63, 10-15; 71, 7; 82, 30; 85, 9-16; 93, 25; 118, 2-10.

29. Indravamsa

Bhāgavata-purāṇa

I, 5, 11, 24; 6, 27. II, 2, 10; 4, 15, 23. III, 4, 16; 13, 35a, 37, 38; 18, 4; 19, 38. IV, 2, 20; 8, 10, 15; 4, 8, 22, 25; 5, 8, 13; 16, 2; 30, 2. V, 17, 22; 18, 10, 31. VI, 11, 14. VII,
8, 33. VIII, 4, 14; 21, 2. X, 2, 38. 41; 6, 10; 7, 5. 33; 11, 15.
49; 12, 2. 25. 32. 44; 14, 4. 23-25; 15, 19; 16, 50; 22, 20;
27, 7; 38, 12. 14; 40, 13; 41, 21; 42, 2; 60, 53; 62, 35; 70, 37;
77, 33; 81, 40; 82, 14; 85, 35; 90, 17. XI, 14, 17. XII, 9. 26.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa
III, 32, 33; 87, 19. 20. 21b. 22a.

Garuḍapurāṇa
Uttkh. 5, 89.

Mārkandeyapurāṇa
85, 36.

Matsyapurāṇa
135, 67.

Padmapurāṇa
I, 22, 21-27. 87. 88. 90; 23, 26-28. II, 24, 5; 86, 59b;
42, 23-25; 103, 90; 115, 45. IV, 13, 4. 5; 23, 75; 25, 32;
68, 23. 24; 99, 13; 102, 24; 103, 90; 112, 4; 113, 21a. V,
18, 471. VI, 19, 53; 95, 33; 118, 29; 191, 54; 192, 12-14;
198, 88-89; 194, 88; 246, 186. 187; 247, 6-13. 15. 33-35. 37;
248, 18.20. 71-73. 75. 76.

Śivapurāṇa
II, 2, 22, 29.

Vāmanapurāṇa
56, 67; 70, 94; 95, 69.

23. Drutavitambita

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
I, 1, 3
Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
I, 42, 2. IV, 182, 18.

Brahmapurāṇa
175, 80

Liṅgapurāṇa
I, 72, 90. 94. 99; 80, 8. II, 47, 2.

Matsyapurāṇa
158, 11-19; 286, 17; 287, 14, 15

Padmapurāṇa
III, 25, 10. IV, 5, 6. 7. 9; 112, 8. V, 41, 109-117. VI, 194, 83; 231, 55.

Śivapurāṇa
VII, 1, 23, 52-56; 35, 8; 2, 41, 42.

Skandapurāṇa
IV, 7, 14

24. Totoṣa

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
III, 4, 10, 27. 28

Matsyapurāṇa
154, 29-37; 188, 67-71

Padmapurāṇa

Skandapurāṇa
II, 9, 41-51.

25. Bhujangaprayāta

\[...\]
Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 35. VII, 8, 49.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
III, 2, 14, 43. 44; 25, 17. 41; 4, 10, 29. 30; 11, 4-6.

Kūrmapurāṇa
I, 17. 19-23.

Līngapurāṇa
I, 42, 16; 93, 8; 95, 20.

Matsyapurāṇa
153, 183-189; 154, 576. 577.

Padmapurāṇa
II, 43, 46-48. VI, 100, 2-4; 208, 35.

Śivapurāṇa
III, 6, 39.

26. Śrāvṇiṇī

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 36. 45-47.

Matsyapurāṇa
154, 554-575.

Padmapurāṇa
V, 40, 506-526.

27. Pramitākṣara

Matsyapurāṇa
100, 13a.
Skandapurāṇa
I. 54. 13b-15a.

28. Drutapada

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
X, 35, 8-25

29. Lalitapada

Vāmanapurāṇa
56, 66; 67, 58.

30. Vaiśvadevi

Harivaṃśa
II, 74, 22. (23).

31. Praharṣiṇī

Bhagavatapurāṇa

Bhavīṣyapurāṇa
I, 136, 80. IV, 3, 94; 204, 38.

Brahmapurāṇa
192, 55. 56; 196, 45.

Garuḍapurāṇa
68, 32.

Kūrmapurāṇa
I, 25, 60-62.
**Purāṇa**

**Līṅgapurāṇa**

I, 88, 64; 92, 25, 26; 97, 33-35.

**Markandeyapurāṇa**

99, 66-68; 104, 36-38.

**Matsyapurāṇa**

92, 35; 164, 28; 180, 37, 38.

**Padmapurāṇa**

IV, 99, 50; 110, 208. V, 21, 21; 36, 27. VI, 97, 31; 115, 37; 194, 106.

**Skandapurāṇa**

I, 52, 33, 34.

**Vārāhapurāṇa**

211, 70.

**Vāyuapurāṇa**

14, 33.

**Viṣṇupurāṇa**

II, 12, 47. V, 18, 55, 56.

**Harivamśa**


**32. Rucirā**


**Bhāgavatapurāṇa**

II, 2, 37. IV, 7, 34. VIII, 11, 31. 32. X, 18, 26-29; 71, 14-18; 88, 36.

**Bhaviṣyapurāṇa**

I, 122, 3; 128, 44a, 50.
Brahmapurāṇa
75, 48a.

Mārkandeyapurāṇa
99, 64. 65; 107, 2.

Matsyapurāṇa
118, 77; 153, 28; 154, 452-469. 497. 498; 166, 24; 167, 67; 168, 16; 247, 44; 248, 79; 250, 54; 251, 27-36.

Padmapurāṇa

Vāmanapurāṇa
56, 56. 57.

Varāhapurāṇa
7, 31-33.

Vāyupurāṇa

Harivamśa
II, 71, 54; 122, 93; 123, 35. III, 9, 23; 10, 69; 11, 17; 33, 47; 34, 48; 36, 60.

33. Māttamayūra

— — — — — — — — — —

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 43.

34. Mahābhārata

— — — — — — — — — — — — —

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 39.

36. Vasantatilaka

Bhāgavatapurāṇa

1, 2, 3, 23; 4, 5; 8, 31, 43; 11, 36; 15, 7, 21; 16, 16, 32, 35, II, 2, 5; 8, 12; 7, 1-49, III, 9, 1-25; 11, 15; 15, 17-50; 16, 6-12, 20-26, 36; 20, 36; 23, 6-11, 38, 39; 28, 21-38; 31, 12-21; 32, 9, 10; 33, 1, IV, 1, 27, 28, 56; 4, 16, 17; 7, 13-15, 20, 21, 26, 27, 30, 44; 9, 6-17; 10, 30; 11, 30, 12, 16-18, 22; 37-40, 47; 28, 11, 12; 26, 23-26; 29, 40, 53, 55, 84; 30, 6, 7, V, 1, 35; 2, 8-17; 6, 19, 20; 14, 43, 44; 26, 38. VI, 8, 24-30, 33, 34; 9, 45; 14, 56-58; 15, 28; 16, 48. VII, 6, 25-27, 8, 43, 44; 9, 8-50; 10, 46; 15, 45, 46. VIII, 3, 17, 18, 30-33; 4, 13, 7, 32-34; 8, 24, 25; 9, 17, 18, 28, 29; 10, 56, 57; 12, 7-11, 22; 17, 8-10; 21, 4; 22, 20, 23; 28, 7, 8, 29. IX, 6, 51, 52; 10, 6-23; 11, 20-21; 24, 65-67. X, 1, 14; 2, 40; 5, 11; 6, 22, 23; 8, 22-25; 10, 27, 28, 38; 13, 61, 62; 14, 1-3, 11, 22, 23, 34, 34, 40, 47, 15, 6-8, 42, 43; 16, 6-10, 19-21, 23-32; 21, 7-19, 28, 22, 23, 29, 30, 29, 29-41, 46; 30, 9-12; 31, 19; 38, 16, 22-24, 35, 40; 39, 29, 30; 40, 28; 41, 28; 42, 24; 44, 13-16, 47, 44, 59-63.
48, 7. 24-27, 49, 29; 52, 37-43; 53, 54. 55; 55, 40; 56, 28; 58, 37; 59, 44. 45; 60, 8. 9. 24. 34-46. 55-57; 61, 3-6; 64, 26; 66, 40; 68, 37; 69, 12-18. 44. 45; 70, 26-30. 44; 71, 9. 32-36; 72, 4-6. 37. 38; 74, 30; 75, 8. 16. 17. 24. 32. 33; 82, 29. 30. 38. 39. 48; 83, 4. 8-10. 12. 13. 28. 29. 40; 84, 1. 26. 33; 85, 19. 20. 45; 86, 20. 21; 90, 10. 11. 16. 18. 23. 49. 50. XI, 1, 2-4. 10. 11; 2, 23; 3, 35-40; 4, 4-11. 17-22; 5, 33. 34. 48; 6, 8-19, 7, 16-18; 9, 25-29; 18, 32-37; 19, 7, 29, 4-5; 30, 38; 31, 11. 12. 28. XII, 4, 39; 6, 1; 8, 40-49, 11, 25.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa

1. E, 5; 40, 32; 137, 2. IV, 1, 30; 2, 41; 3, 95; 4, 135; 5, 85; 6, 209, 7, 31, 8, 25, 9, 16; 10, 9; 11, 23; 12, 38; 13, 100; 14, 27; 15, 23; 16, 16; 17, 14; 18, 36; 19, 16; 20, 28; 21, 44; 22, 36; 23, 28; 24, 36; 27, 27; 28, 58; 29, 77; 30, 19; 31, 62; 32, 30; 33, 13; 34, 10; 35, 20; 86, 61; 37, 58; 38, 17; 39, 15, 40, 15; 41, 18; 42, 29; 43, 30; 44, 9; 45, 3-5; 46, 43; 47, 25; 48, 16; 54, 59; 55, 69; 56, 23; 57, 30, 58; 71; 59, 23; 60, 10; 61, 57; 62, 17; 63, 32; 64, 46; 65, 49; 66, 27; 67, 16; 69, 90; 70, 66; 71, 46; 72, 52; 73, 21; 74, 72; 76, 67; 77, 12; 78, 14; 79, 25; 80, 39; 81, 13; 82, 71; 88, 147; 85, 27-29; 86, 37; 87, 16; 88, 9; 89, 51; 90, 49; 91, 12; 92, 15; 93, 77; 94, 73; 96, 14; 98, 25. 26; 99, 67; 100, 22; 101, 32; 102, 91; 103, 46; 104, 26, 105, 23; 106, 67; 107, 69; 108, 42; 110, 35; 111, 62; 112, 1; 113, 43; 114, 50; 117, 46, 118, 83; 119, 10; 120, 15; 121, 187; 122, 35; 123, 33; 124, 32; 125, 20; 126, 43-46; 128, 37.38. 45; 129, 1-13; 130, 69; 131, 12; 132, 51; 133, 23.59; 134, 71; 135, 36; 137, 23; 138, 115; 139, 43; 140, 73; 141, 121; 142, 80; 143, 46; 151, 39; 152, 41; 153, 72; 154, 19; 155, 23; 156, 12.13.27; 157, 13; 158, 45; 160, 16; 162, 21; 163, 22; 164, 42; 165, 33; 166, 28-29; 167, 38; 168, 45; 169, 77; 170, 32; 171, 23; 172, 26; 173, 12; 174, 29; 175, 99; 176, 69; 177, 46; 179, 19; 180, 49; 181, 47; 182, 19; 183, 17; 184, 23; 185, 17; 186, 14; 187, 13; 189, 10.
12; 191, 68; 192; 39, 193, 66; 194, 22; 195, 21b-28. 48; 196, 11; 197, 25; 198, 9; 199, 26; 200, 10; 201, 13; 202, 13; 205, 153, 207, 14.

Brahmapurāṇa

175, 78a; 178, 177; 192, 57; 193, 88-90; 203, 72; 219, 36; 245, 36.

Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa

II, 23, 37b; III, 27, 3-10. 16-24a. 25a. 26b-45; 55, 27. IV, 6, 49; 18, 5-12a; 29, 147; 40, 124-129; 44, 48.

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa

I, 1, E 2; 36, 1-6.

Byḥan-Nāradiyapurāṇa

21, 72-79; 36, 49; 37, 121-123.

Garuḍapurāṇa

68, 22, 31; 69, 35-37; 71, 5-7; 72, 1-4; 73, 5; 75, 2-4-7; 77, 1, 2 ac. 4; 78, 2, 31 109, 6; 111, 10.25; 115, 33-35; 180, 8; 147, 82; 219, 36; 220, 5.20; 222, 34; Uttkh 6, 8; 9, 22.

Līṅgapurāṇa

I, 92, 21.22.27-29; 95, 19; 97, 17.

Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa

1, 1. 2; 84, 1-22; 91, 32; 103, 8-10.

Matsyapurāṇa

64, 28; 88, 20b-27; 96, 24. 25; 100, 8-12; 116, 25; 126, 36a; 139, 46. 47; 180, 33. 34. 39-41. 78. 79; 255, 24; 257, 22, 23; 270, 35. 36; 274, 77. 78; 276, 17. 18; 277, 22; 279, 11-13; 280, 15; 281, 15; 282, 13-15; 283, 17-19; 287, 12. 13; 288, 15. 16.
Padmāpurāṇa

1, 31, 109. II, 20, 17-21; 21, 20-27; 31, 51, 52. IV, 7, 37; 10, 53; 15, 21-26. 62. 63; 16, 42; 28, 5; 37, 35; 39, 17. 22. 23; 53, 14-17; 80, 67. 68; 84, 69; 85, 26; 88, 3. 59; 91, 22; 94, 106; 95, 57; 96, 33; 99, 26-42. 56. 57; 112, 29. V, 20, 12-17a; 21, 100b-108; 28, 157-175; 43, 54-70. VI, 7, 25; 19, 44-46; 23, 17-19. 27. 43, 91, 31; 96, 31, 108, 31; 118, 30; 124, 70. 98; 125, 82; 189, 4; 190, 77. 78; 191, 16b. 43. 44. 75; 192, 78-80; 194, 101, 220, 80; 222, 31. 41, 225, 22-28, 234, 73; 245, 35; 246, 176-178; 249, 112-116; 252, 69; 269, 368.

Śivapurāṇa

I, 1, 1; 2, 65. 67; 4, 2-5; 7, 7. 30; 8, 10d; 24, 51; 25, 45. II, 1, 1, 1; 2, 7, 18; 22, 31; 3, 3, 37. 38; 24, 6; 29, 21; 48, 9. 34; 4, 5, 26. 37; 5, 24, 27; 42, 31a; 50, 24-32. III, 15, 4. VI, 11, 33; 17, 49. VII, 1, 9, 24; 2, 41, 41.

Skandapurāṇa

1, 21, 70; 52, 29b. 30. 35. 36a. 67; 54, 9b-13a. II, 9, 33-40. III, 15, 7. 8; 17, 6-9; 31, 66. VII, 2, 32. VIII, 2, 18; 3, 32-34; 4, 23. 24.

Vāmanapurāṇa

18, 25. 26; 43, 89; 50, 55. 64; 58, 95. 111; 59, 2; 67, 59; 69, 31; 73, 46; 77, 54; 85, 40-43; 94, 30. 70-73.

Varāhapurāṇa

187, 96; 191, 17a; 218, 1.

Vāyupurāṇa

21, 81, 52, 36.

Viṣṇupurāṇa

III, 18, 104; V, 18, 57; 20, 89-91; 30, 77; VI, 8, 58-61.

Harivaṁśa

E, 2. 4; III, 114, 39-41.
37. Mālinī

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 29. VII, 8, 52. VIII, 12, 47; 24, 61. X, 47, 1, 21; 51, 59; 85, 59; 90, 15. 48. XI, 29, 49. XII, 11, 24; 12, 68.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
I, 1, 1; 34, 19a; 70, 22; 195, 25. II, 1, 1, 2. III, 2, 24, 6; 33, 21, 4, 10, 33, 34. IV, 26, 68, 53, 48; 84, 56; 117, 21; 157, 18; 186, 13; 189, 13.

Brahmapurāṇa
36, 79; 203, 73.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa
III, 43, 3-7.

Brahmavaivartapurāṇa
I, 1, 2. IV, 6, 21-23; 22, 24.

Guruḍapurāṇa
1, 1; 110, 18; 226, 50, 51. UttKh 15, 41; 35, 52.

Kūrmapurāṇa
II, 29, 49.

Liṅgapurāṇa
1, 80, 6. 7; 92, 19. 32.

Mārkandeyapurāṇa
1, 54; 104, 39; 136, 13. 14.

Matsyapurāṇa
63, 29; 82, 31; 93, 161; 180, 31. 44; 275, 28, 29; 278, 29; 280, 14; 282, 16; 284, 21; 288, 17; 289, 17.
Padmapurāṇa

I, 31, 208; 60, 42; 61, 102. II, 58, 26. IV, 9, 34; 9, 15. 24; 10, 28; 12, 15; 72, 153; 99, 39. V, 22, 135; 25, 55-57, 77; 82, 36. VI, 4, 11; 19, 133; 139, 88; 191, 74; 194, 105; 204, 68; 206, 70; 208, 54; 211, 54; 221, 85. 86; 223, 23; 238, 86; 245, 145; 250, 299, 300.

Śivapurāṇa

II, 2, 4, 34; 21, 47; 3, 8, 56; 25, 69; 4, 6, 15. VII, 1, 3, 63; 2, 40, 1.

Skandapurāṇa

I, 52, 28b, 37; 63, 60. III, 31, 46.

Vāmanapurāṇa

I, 28; 94, 29.

Varāhapurāṇa

169, 40.

Viṣṇupurāṇa

V, 80, 78

Harivamsa

II, 105, 84. III, 132, 100.

38. Pātācāmarā

Matsyapurāṇa

158, 137-145

Padmapurāṇa

II, 43, 31-33. 37. IV, 110, 194-196; 112, 12. V, 43, 93, 94.

39. Śīkhāraṇi
Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 42; X, 13, 57

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
IV, 1, 3.

Garuḍapurāṇa
113, 11

Padmapurāṇa

Śivapurāṇa
1, 25, 44. II, 5, 46; 13-41.

Vāmanapurāṇa
59, 29

40. Prthvī

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
III, 4, 10, 31, 32; 97, 32

Matsyapurāṇa
97, 37.

Padmapurāṇa
IV, 9, 21; 10, 17; 99, 21-25. VI, 12, 41, 42; 198, 58; 225, 48.

Śivapurāṇa
IV, 1, 2.

Vāmanapurāṇa
73, 45.

41. Hariṇī
Śivapurāṇa
VI, 11, 55

42. Mandākrāntā

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
IV, 7, 28. VII, 8, 42. VIII, 7, 17. X, 8, 29-31; 9, 3; 13, 11; 21, 5; 33, 8; 90, 20. XI, 30, 3.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
I, 34, 8; 137, 1. IV, 127, 90.

Brahmapurāṇa
36, 117.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa
III, 42, 20.

Līṅgapurāṇa
1, 92, 33. II, 47, 11.

Padmapurāṇa
III, 25, 23b. IV, 10, 56. VI, 212, 101; 219, 42.

Śivapurāṇa
V, 26, 13a b d.

43. Nārkaṭaka

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
X, 87, 14-41.

44. Viśuddhapriyā

Padmapurāṇa
VI, 236, 75-82.
45. Šārdūlavikridita

Bhāgavatapurāṇa
I, 1, 2. X, 13, 15. 19; 14, 18. 35; 26, 25; 43, 17; 87, 50; 90, 24; XII, 13, 1. 2. 18. 19.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa
I, E, 4; 34, 6; 44, 33; 137, 5. III, 2, 24, 5. IV, 1, 1. 2.

Brahmapurāṇa
I, 1. 2; 36, 88; 178, 193. 194; 245, 34. 35.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa
III, 41, 55; 43, 8-10; 48, 8. 24. 43; 50, 16. 17.

Garuḍapurāṇa
109, 9. 18; 113, 15; 114, 14; 115, 2. 81; 222, 44.

Liṅgapurāṇa
I, 72, 70.

Padmapurāṇa
II, 43, 11. 35. 36; 58, 28; 98, 74-77. III, 25, 9. 18. IV, 10, 11; 22, 3; 79, 66; 90, 47; 93, 26; 99, 48. 51; 110, 206. 207; 112, 10. 11. V, 18, 404; 75, 91. VI, 4, 35. 48; 5, 16; 12, 2. 9; 14, 46; 19, 135. 136. 156; 23, 15. 23. 24. 40. 41. 44-46. 48. 49; 56, 22; 194, 72. 84. 85; 195, 44; 202, 62.

Śivapurāṇa
I, 24, 43. 46. 47; 25, 46. II, 2, 38, 34; 4, 1, 1; 6, 11. 12. 16. IV, 1, 1. V, 1, 1. 15, 5. VI, 28, 33.

Skandapurāṇa
1, 64, 62. III, 27, 91; 31, 50.
Summary*

A nearer view of the Purāṇas reveals the interesting fact that these works contain many artificial metres, such as are applied by Kālidāsa and other famous poets. In his Śakuntalā we find 21, in the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa 24, and in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa 31 such metres. The investigation before us shows after an introduction: A. in a table of numbers how often each metre in the Mahāpurāṇas and in the Harivaṃśa occurs, and B. in a list of passages where each metre in the mentioned works is to be found.

* In the original German article this summary in English has been given at the end by the author himself. (—Editor).
HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF A PURĀNIC VERSE RELATING TO ŚUŃGA DYNASTY

By
S. N. Roy

[श्रीसमू लेखे गुप्तराजस्थानराय रिहात: इकोफ्क्षय ऐतिहासिक-पद्यम् तुलनात्मको विचारा: प्रस्तुतात्। इत्यस्य इलोकथा वात्युपारणीय: पाठः
“पुष्यमित्रसुतावाष्ट्रीभविष्यति समा: नुवा;” ब्रह्माण्डपुराणीयात् “ब्रह्मविनितो नुस्क्वाष्ट्रीभविष्यति समा: नुवा:” इत्यमात् पाठात् शक्तितृणस्वाभाविको निर्णये।
लेखमहोदयेन ब्रह्माण्डपुराणीयोः पाठ उचित इति मत्वा वात्युपारणीयपाठम् प्राप्तमिति कृताति प्रदतित। यत: कृतातस्यप्राकार: “पुष्यमित्रसुतावाष्ट्रीभविष्यति समा: नुवा;” इति पाठः इत्यवा आकर्षणारूपीय प्रस्तावत् तथा वास्तूत्य ऐतिहासिको तथ्यविषयांस्य गुरुपरंपरा पूर्वै पाठमयस्य इत्यवां।

अन्तर्भूर्भुविनियमस्य मार्गस्थिति लाहिरी हस्तलेखेपि वात्युपारणीयोः “तत्त्वातिश्वनियम्याष्ट्रीभविष्यति समा: नुवा;” इति पाठः सामुपपरित्यावन्त। एवं “पुष्यमित्रसुतावाष्ट्रीभविष्यति समा: नुवा;” इति पाठः सामुपपरित्यावन्त।

The Purānic verse which is being analysed here occurs in the dynastic section and has its reference to the account of the Śuṅga dynasty after Puṣyamitra. The cluster of verses of which it forms a part and which concerns with the description of the Śuṅga-dynasty is no doubt found in other early Purāna texts, but the particular details contained in the present verse seem to be found only in the Vāyu and Brahmacāṇḍa Purāṇas. In these two

1 Matsya-Purāṇa. Chapter CCLXXII
2 Vaiṣṇu-Purāṇa. maṇḍa IV. Chapter 24.
3 Bhāgavata, Skandha XII. Chapter 1.
4 Vāyu-Purāṇa. Uttara-bhāgā XXXVI. 332.
5 Brahmacāṇḍa Purāṇa, III, 74. 151

Thus late Dr. R. S. Tripathi remarks in ‘History of Ancient India’ that Puṣyamitra appears to have made virtually a feudal division of his extensive territories, for one version of the Vāyu Purāṇa states: "पुष्यमित्रसुतावाष्ट्रीभविष्यति समा नुवा;" i.e. all the eight sons of Puṣyamitra will rule simultaneously. This suggestion was originally made by K. P. Jaiswal, see J. B O. R. S.; 1924, Vol X, Pt. III, pp. 205-207.
texts, again, the details are not identical and the verse is not uniformly worded. Thus in the Vāyu-Purāṇa, the verse reads: ‘कुशमित्रानी-राज्यो भविष्यति समा नू{।}’ while the reading of the Brahmāṇḍa’s version is: ‘कुशिनित्रानी नवराज्यो भविष्यति समा नू{।}’. Relying on the version of the Vāyu Purāṇa, some scholars are inclined to suggest that Puṣyamitra made a feudal division of the empire among his eight sons; who ruled simultaneously over its different units. It is proposed here to examine the amount of originality contained in the Vāyu’s version and find out whether or not a distinct conclusion of the above nature, even in a surmisable manner can be formed on its basis.

The point which is of vital significance in the context of the present discussion is that the forms of the verse in the texts of Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa differ seriously not only in respect of their general wording but also in respect of the general historical information which is likely to be gathered from them. Thus exactly speaking the Vāyu Purāṇa’s verse conveys a fantastic account that the empire which was built up by the prowess of his arms could not remain a single whole after his death, as there were eight aspirants to it. These eight aspirants were Puṣyamitra’s own sons. In order to avoid the possibility of a war of succession among them, Puṣyamitra divided his empire into eight administrative units to be ruled over by his sons, whose number corresponded with the number of the territorial divisions. On the contrary, the text of Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa supplies altogether a different information. According to it Puṣyamitra left behind him only one successor, and he was Agnimitra; whose rule continued for eight years. In view of the conflicting nature of the statements of the two texts one may look into the question as to which of these can refer to the real state of affairs. In consonance with the methodology that can be pursued while taking into account the value of the Purānic records, the relevant form of the present query seems to be the investigation as to in which of the two texts the stamp of earliness is more faithfully
preserved. The traditional style which contributed to the make-up of the Purāṇa-texts has been addition and deletion of passages in them even after the latest stage of their reduction. It is, thus, very much difficult to become sure of the genuineness or otherwise status of a particular verse mainly on the basis of the source from which it comes. At such junctures, where the Purāṇas are not unanimous, the proper evaluation of their evidence is possible not so much by considering the period of the text containing it as by taking into account the period of the matter contained in it. In view of this, two broad facts come to the forefront: (1) The verse occurs in an early Purāṇa-text. But its earliness has not been effectively maintained. There are not only late chapters in it, but the original passages and verses are likewise either omitted or transformed in its early chapters at various places. (2) As a rule original passages and early verses of the Vāyu Purāṇa are mostly found in the text of Brahmāṇḍa, because both of them have sprung from the same parent-stock i.e. Vāyu Proktam Purāṇaṁ. It is, therefore, extremely doubtful if the present verse of Vāyu Purāṇa is the same as was composed in the original text.

The possibility of the above conclusion is made still more evident when it is observed that whereas the Brahmāṇḍa’s form of the verse accords uniformly well with the general style adopted in the dynastic section of the Purāṇa-texts, there is a

1. Early and late chapters are found in both the texts. Very often even early chapters have passages of spurious character in them. New verses are incorporated into them and the older ones do not seem to retain their early forms. The vast volumes of the Purāṇa-texts are largely due to this trend and it has played an important role at the various stages of the Purāṇa-compilation.

2. The original unity of the texts of Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa is too well-known for any special remark. Hazra feels that the separation of the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa from the original text of Vāyu took place sometime in 400 A.D. (Purāṇic Records, p. 134). Analysis of this point has also been done by the writer of the present article in his previous two articles entitled ‘On the Date of Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa’ (published in Purāṇam, Vol. V. No. 2, p. 305 ff) and ‘Some Late Chapters of Vāyu Purāṇa’ (Published in Purāṇam Vol. VI. No. 2, p. 366 ff).
distinct deviation from it in the version of Vāyu. Attention may
here specially be drawn to the words श्रेणी and समा which have
varied grammatical signification in the two versions. The usual
meaning of the word समा in the dynastic section is year and in
association with the numeral figure it brings out the regnal dura-
tion of a particular king. The Brahmāṇḍa’s version in which the
words समा and श्रेणी are employed in order to denote the regnal
duration of Puṣyamitra’s successor seems quite consistent with
this style. On the other hand, these words in the Vāyu’s version
present its make-up which has hardly any relevance in the set-up
of the verses of which it is expected to be an essential part. The
spurious character of Vāyu’s verse is fully exposed from the con-
sideration of the fact that the reference to Agnimitra is missing
in the entire list of the text and the only verse in which such
reference could be made is the present one. It is to be noted that
Agnimitra’s name either occurs or is at least indicated even in the
Purāṇas whose account with regard to the Śuṅga-dynasty is a bit
condensed in comparison to the texts of Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa.
This is a clear testimony to show that the verse has lost its original
form in the text of the Vāyu Purāṇa.

It may further be argued on the basis of the Vāyu’s verse
that the compiler who prepared the edition of the Purāṇa at some
late stage did not take into full account the precise order of
succession after Puṣyamitra due probably very much to lack of
historical sense in him. It appears that the original text which
formed the basis of the new recension read the line as follows :

1. The irregular arrangement of अष्टावू and सामी in the Vāyu’s version
   had already been pointed out by Mr. Pargiter (Ibid, p. 31. Fn. 10).
   The remark which he makes in his brief note on the present verse
   implies that the words सूतता: and नूयता: are erroneous conversions of
   their singular forms. Obviously in the converted forms of these
   words, श्रेणी and समा seem to be standing as adjectives in their
   relation; whereas the general arrangement of the verses of the group
   and the particular style followed in them suggest that श्रेणी is a
   qualifying term in relation the noun समा:
The reference of the verse was thus obviously to the regnal period of Agnimitra, son and successor of Puṣyamitra. As the name of Agnimitra is only indicated in this verse instead of being directly mentioned and as the number of kings of the dynasty, whose names are enumerated hereafter is eight, the numeral figure was mistaken for a reference to the number of kings enumerated in the verses subsequent to the present one. The verse was thus reconstructed in accordance with the exegetics of grammar by a compiler who had little knowledge of historical traditions, as a result of which he was not well competent to realize that the verse was already correct and consistent in its original form.

Even if we set aside the above consideration in view of its being too conjectural for the purpose of proper history there is, nevertheless, an evidence of positive nature to prove that the verse composed in the original text was in the same very form as it is found in the text of Brahmāṇḍa. Thus in a version of Vāyu the verse reads: तत्तत्रसुविधानांग्राही भविष्यति सम्मा नूपः. It would be seen that so far as its general connotation is concerned this verse is very much similar to that of the Brahmāṇḍa text. It is found in the manuscript of Vāyu, which is preserved in the India office library. According to the observation of Pargiter, this manuscript is very valuable, because it agrees with the Matsya-text where it differs from the printed text of Vāyu. The unity of the Matsya-text with that of the present text of Vāyu leads one to presume that the verses which are now missing in the Matsya had the same reading as the latter has got in it. From this it may also be adduced that the verse in the manuscript of Vāyu has got original elements in it, because the Purāṇa-text of the dynasties of the Kali Age is said to have its earliest form in the Matsya-Purāṇa. The

1. See also notes on this verse by Pargiter (Ibid, p. 31) who is in favour of the similar corrected form. He also cites the parallels of other Purāṇa texts which either refer to the name of Agnimitra or simply allude to his reign after the reign of Puṣyamitra. In all these texts there is reference to only one son of Puṣyamitra.
2. Ibid, p. XXXIII.
3. Ibid, p. XIV.
loss of the verse under discussion in the available texts of the Matsya is evidently due to the revisionary trend of the Purāṇa-kāras; consequent upon which, as Hazra¹ shows, the text of Matsya-Purāṇa has been subjected to repeated additions and losses.

The various possible angles from which we have analysed the Vāyu-Purāṇa's verse in our humble attempt are tendentious to the following general remarks on it:

(1) That the form of the verse which is found in the printed texts of Vāyu points to its revision at a later date. When this revision took place, an attempt was made by the compiler at the readjustment according to his fancy without taking note of the meaning originally contained in it.

(2) That the verse cannot be made the basis for the history of the Śuṅgas unless otherwise it is corrected in the light of Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa and that of the manuscript form of the Vāyu's text, cited above.

(3) That in its genuine form the verse simply refers to the duration of the reign of Puṣyamitra's son and successor, Agnimitra who ruled for eight years and not to the readjustment of the empire into eight feudal units.

¹ Purānic Records, pp. 46-43
PURĀNIC WISE SAYINGS IN THE LITERATURE OF "GREATER INDIA"

By

Ludwik Sternbach

[ Sanskrit text follows, containing various Sanskrit phrases and verses.]

ABreviations

ABay A. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. Kl.

AKM. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.


BhP. or BhPn. Le Bhāgavata Purāṇa......publié par M. Eugène Burnouf...Paris, 1884, 1898.

BhPr. Bhojarājabandha of Ballāla...Pāṇḍuraṅga jivājī...Bombay, śake 1854. Also: Bhojarājabandha of Ballaladeva of Banaras. Edited...by Jagdishlal Shastri...Motilal Banarsidass.....Patna, 1955.


C. Čaṇakya.

ChSS. Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series.

CNR. Čaṇakya-nīti-śāstra version (reconstructed). See Cr.

Cr. Čaṇakya-Nīti Text-Tradition (Čaṇakya-Nīti-śākhā Sampradāya) in two volumes—Volume I, part I: the Vṛddha-Čaṇakya, textus ornatus (CVR), the Vṛddha-Čaṇakya, textus simplicior (Cvr), the Čaṇakya-nīti-śāstra (CNR), and the Čaṇakya-sāra-sāṅgraha (CSR) versions; volume I, part II: the Laghu-Čaṇakya (CLR) and the Čaṇakya-rāja-nīti-śāstra (CRr) versions; Vol. II the Ur-text (in three parts). Six versions of collections of Čaṇakya maxims reconstructed and critically edited, for the first time, with introductions and variants from original manuscript, all available, printed editions and other
Purānic Wise Sayings


CSR. Cāṇakya-sāra-saṅgraha version (reconstructed). See Cr.

CVR. Vṛddha Cāṇakya, textus ornator version (reconstructed) See Cr.

Cvr. Vṛddha Cāṇakya, textus simplicior version (reconstructed) See Cr.

DhN (P) or DhN The Dhammanīti in PMB (Pāli).

GhN. Ghaṭakarpura’s Nītisāra. In KSH 504-506.


H. Hitopadeśa.


JRAS. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.


LN (P). The Lokanītī in PMB (Pāli) and in JASB 47, Part I, Calcutta, 1878 p. 239 sqq.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBh.</td>
<td>Mahābhārata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrch.</td>
<td>Mrčchakaṭika of Śūdraka, 8th ed. NSP. 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKy(B) or NKy.</td>
<td>Nīti Kyan. Translation of a Burmese Version of the Nīti Kyan, a Code of Ethics in Pāli (Burmese). JRAS 17 of 1860, p. 252 sqq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS or NS(OJ)</td>
<td>Nītiśāstra; Ond Javaansche tekst met Vertaling uitgegeven door R. Ng. Dr. Poerbatjara. Bibliotheca Javanica No. 4. Bandoeng 1933.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSP.</td>
<td>Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.</td>
<td>Pañcatantra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PdP.</td>
<td>Padma-purāṇa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PMB. J. Gray, Ancient Proverbs and Maxims from Burmese Sources. London 1886.

PN. Pañcatantra. Nepāli text, as quoted in PS. LXXXIX, PT. I. 153; 104-26 and PRE 2, 192 sqq.

PO. The Poona Orientalist, Poona.

PP. The Pañchatantra. A collection of Ancient Hindu Tales in the recension, called Pañcākhyānaka ... ... of Pṛṇabhadra. by J. Hertel. HOS. 11-2. Cambridge, Mas., 1908-12.


PRÉ. The Pañcatantra I-V. The text in its oldest form. Ed. ... by F. Edgerton. Poona, 1930. Also: The Panchatantra reconstructed ... ... by F. Edgerton I-II. AOS 2-3. New Haven, 1924.

PrŚ(C) Pratyayaśataka, Sannasahi tayi-Colombo 1867, also Pandure 1941. cf. footnote 25.


PT. Über das Tantrākhyāyikā, die Kāśmirische Rezension des Pañcatantra mit dem Texte


Pts. Pañchatantra (textus simplicior), Edited with notes by F. Kielhorn (I) and G. Bühler (II-V), Bombay Sanskrit Series 1, 3, 4. Bombay, 1891-6.

PtsK. Pantschatantrum, sive quinquepartitum de moribus exponens ... Edidit ... Io. Gedeoß. Ludov, Kosegarten ... Pars prima, textum sanscritum siripliciorem tenens. Bonae ad Rhenum 1848.


RN. or RN(P) The Rājanīti in PMB. (Pali).

ShD or ShD(T) She-rab Dong-bu, cd. and transl. by Maj. W. L. Campbell, Calcutta 1919 (Tibetan), (cf. footnote 15).

ŚIt (OJ) or ŚIt Ślokāntara, an Old Javanese didactic text. Edited and annotated by Sharada Rani, Dvīpāntara-piṭaka being the Indonesian Collection in the Series of Indo-Asian Literature forming the Śatapiṭaka. Vol. 2. International Academy of Indian Culture, Delhi, 1957, (Old Javanese).

SN (P); The Suttavaḍḍhānanīti in PMB. (Pali).

SRN (T) or SRN Sa-skya legs bcan. Subhāṣita-ratna-nidhi. W. L. Campbell, Ost-Asiatische Zeitung, Neue Folge 2 of 1925; pp. 31-65; 159-185. See also footnote 17.


SSJT. L. Sternbach, Sanskrit Subhāṣita-Samgraha-s in Old Javanese and Tibetan, ABORI 43; pp. 118-158.


ŚtsA. Der Textus Simplicior der Śukasaptati in der Recension der Handschrift A. Ed. by R. Schmidt. ZDMG 54. 515-547 and 55.1-44.


VC. Vikrama's Adventures, or the thirty-two tales of the throne ....... Edited in four ... recen-
sections: Southern (VCsr.), Metrical (VCmr.), Brief (VCbr.), Jainistic (VCjr); also sections from Vararuci's recension ... and translated into English ... ... by Franklin Edgerton ... ... 2 vols. HOS, 26, 27. Cambridge, Mass, 1926.


ZDMG. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

ZII. Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik.
Subhāṣita-s in the Literature of "Greater India"

1. The Sanskrit literature was very fond of wise sayings, sententious verses, adages, maxims, aphorisms, etc. and there exists a great number of anthologies, Subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s, containing such subhāṣita-s.

Even some of the literary works, particularly belonging to the kathā literature, are in reality works composed for the purpose of creating Subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s tied together by a story. These literary works were written in particular in order to teach princes through subhāṣita-s the way of life and their moral conduct. To such kathā works belong the Pañcatantra, the Hitopadesa and to a lesser extent the Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā, the Vikramaracita and the Śukasaptatī.

2. Subhāṣita-s were not only popular in India, but with the spreading of the Indian culture into "Greater India", they become also popular among the Tibetans, Mongolians, Manchurians, Nepalese, Ceylonese, Burmese, Siamese, Chams, Khmers, Javanese, Balinese, etc.

3. We find in the Tibetan Tanjur the wise sayings of Masūrākṣa and even the whole Cāṇakya-rāja-niti-śastra version, and such works as the She-rab Dong-bu and the Vimala-praśno-ntara-ratnamālā, as well as the Subhāṣita-ratna-nidhi (Sa-skya-legs-bcead); the latter contains several hundred subhāṣita-s, some of Indian origin, of such a high moral value that they were also translated into Mongolian and Manchurian and were included in the Mongolian literature.

4. In Nepāl, the whole Cāṇakya-sāra-saṃgraha version was well-known and many Subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s, e.g. the Subhāṣita-ratna-koṣa were prevalent.

5. In the kathā literature of the Simhalese we find also many subhāṣita-s of Sanskrit origin; the literature of Ceylon contains the whole collection of the Cāṇakya-niti-śastra version as well as two Sanskrit Subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s in Simhalese script known under the name of Vyāsakāraya and the Pratvayasatakaya.

The first one, despite the name Vyāsa in its title does not contain, as far as could be ascertained, any Mahābhārata verses.
However, about 70 per cent of the verses could have been identified. Some of them belong to the Cāṇakya's collections, some to Bhartṛhari's śataka-s and to other works containing sententious verses. The great number of verses included in the Vyāsakārāya are also found in the South Indian Subhāṣita-samgraha, the Sūktiratnahāra, in which they were ascribed to Vyāsakāra.

Over 50 per cent of the sententious verses included in the Pratyayaśatakaya could have been identified. Many of them belong to the collections of Cāṇakya's verses, many to Bhartṛhari's śataka-s, the Hitopadeśa, the Pañcatantra, etc. Many of the latter verses were also included in Cāṇakya's collections. Therefore, it is impossible to come to the conclusion whether they were taken from the collections of Cāṇakya's verses or from the Hitopadeśa, the Pañcatantra, etc.

Also proper Simhalese collections of wise sayings, such as the Subhāṣitaya of Alagiyavanna, the Lōkōpakārāya by Raṇasgalle Thera, the Anurāgamālāaya, and particularly the Attaragama-Baṇḍāra's Vadankavipota show borrowing from Sanskrit wise-sayings, either directly or through the Tamil Nālaṭiyār.

6. Through the Manipurian Puṇṇas wise sayings spread to Burma and were incorporated into the Pāli literature of Burma; they were included into the Pāli Lokanīti. It is worth noting that very few Buddhist teachings were included in the Lokanīti; there, most of the sententious verses are Brahmānistic. The Pāli literature of Burma included also Sanskrit wise sayings in the Dhammanīti and in the Suttavaḍḍhanīti and the Rājanīti. Particularly the second and third contain a greater amount of Buddhist sayings. There is also in Burma prevalent the Nīti Kyan which, in reality, is the translation of the Pāli Lokanīti into Burmese. Also the whole Cāṇākya-nīti-sāstra version could be found in Burmese, while in the Rājādhirāj, prevalent among the Mōns and Peguans, some subhāṣita-s of Sanskrit origin could be traced.

7. The Pāli Lokanīti spread also from Burma (or from India) into Thailand, Cham, Khmer and Xieng Mai cultures. The
T'ais knew also the maxims of King P'hrang Rüang (Baññat P'hra Rüang), but these as well as the Pû-sôn-Lân and the Lân-sôn-Pû (teachings of the grandfather to the grandson and of the grandson to the grandfather) contain wise sayings which could, however, in some cases only, be traced to Sanskrit sources.

In Thailand we also find several Siamese Sup'hāsit-s (subhāśīta-s) influenced by Sanskrit literature and in particular the Pip'hek-sôn-but and the Pâli-sôn-sôn, both of which are based on the Râmâyâna. Also the Câṇakya-nîti-śâstra version of Câṇakya's aphorisms was known in Thailand.

In Champa, Kambuja-deśa and Lâos and even in the Malay Peninsula the Lokañiti was well known. In Cambodia the Lokañiti-pakarana (for prakarana) is still well known; it was lately reissued in 1936 by Ven. Ouk Chea Vacirannanbhavongs in Pnom Penh. Also in Pnom Penh the Râjanîti (for Râjanîti) and the Sup'hāsit ebâp srî Bâky kâby, Anâk Okâa Suttant Prijâ. 'Téâ Índ were published in 1941 and 1951 respectively and contain subhāśīta-s in Pâli and Khmer respectively, based partly on the Sânskrit nîti-literature and subhāśīta-s influenced by Amaru.

Lâo proverbs, mainly collected in Xieng Mai, in the Pû-sôn-Lân and Lân-sôn-Pû, also show Sanskrit influences. We also know about the existence in Lâos of a Pâli Lokañiti of about 400 verses.

8. The maxims found in the Old Javanese literature are directly connected with the Sanskrit wise sayings. The Sârasamuccaya is, in reality, an anthology of sententious verses borrowed almost in its entirety from the Mahâbhârata.

The Old Javanese Šlokântara contains also a great number of maxims of Sanskrit origin characteristic by its wording which often differs from the Sanskrit wording of verses, but comprises the same thoughts. The two other Old Javanese works, the Nitikâmandaâki (Tantri-Kâmandaâki which despite its author Kâmandaâki has nothing to do with the author of a political work, but is an Old Javanese translation of the Pañcatantra) and the Nîtiśâstra of Nitisâra contain a number of Sanskrit maxims,
9. Even the Persians translated the Cāṇakya-nīti-śāstra, while Aṭ-Toṭūshī in Spain compiled in Arabic in the 12th or 13th century A. D. a collection of maxims “for an Indian King” under the name Siragu al-Mulūk. These maxims are based on Sanskrit subhāṣīta-s.¹

Wise sayings in the Purāṇa-s

10. The Purāṇa-s, in general do not contain a great number of wise sayings, but some are found scattered in almost all the Purāṇa-s. In addition to the wise sayings from the Purāṇa-s published up-to-date in the “Purāṇa” (III. 1; pp. 61-3; IV. 1; pp. 154-7; IV. 2; p. 408; V. 1. pp. 137-143; VII. 2; pp. 288-290; and VIII. 1; pp. 168-169) there exist two anthologies of Purānic wisdom, viz. the Astādānapurāṇa-intargata-nītiśāra-subhāṣīta-saṅgrahaḥ (Purānic Words of Wisdom) by Dr. A. P. Karmarkar (Bharatiya Vidyā VII), and the Purāṇa-kavya-stotra-suṇḍhā (The Purānic Anthology) edited by the same Dr. A. P. Karmarkar, Mira Publishing House, Thalakwadi, Belgaum 1955. As far as the Purānic subhāṣīta-s are concerned, the second collection contains almost the same subhāṣīta-s from the Purāṇa-s as the first one, as well as the same mistakes.

Scattered Purānic subhāṣīta-s also appeared in the Purāṇeti-hāsa-saṅgraha (An Anthology of the Epics and Purāṇa-s) ed. by S. K. De and R. C. Hazra in the Sāhitya Akademi Publications, Vol. II.

Purāṇa-s in Java, Bali and Kambuja-desa

11. Already R. Friedman in the middle of the nineteenth century in his Voorloopting Verslag von het Eiland Bali, published in the Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap (1849-50)² has shown that the Brahmadapuraṇa was well-known in Bali. It was also known in Old Java. Goris, in his Oudjavaansche en Bali-

¹ For more details about the spreading of Sanskrit wise-sayings over “Greater India”, see L. St rnbach, The Spreading of Cāṇakya's Aphorisms over ‘Greater India’ in Journal of the Greater India Society, Vol. XVIII, Nos. 1-2 and in Greater India Society Series. (Spr.)
² Translated in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (NS) 8; pp. 57-218; 9; pp. 59-120; and X; pp. 49-97 and republished as “The Civilization and Culture of Bali”; Susil Gupta, 1959,
neesche Theologie has also shown that the Śivaistic Bhuvanakośa, known in Java and the Agni-purāṇa show a similarity (e. g. chapter 121). Also the Viṣṇupurāṇa was known in Java and Bali and the Veṇa and Niśāda's birth, as given in the Viṣṇupurāṇa, is almost identical with that included in the kahauin Kalyavanāntaka; it must have been influenced by the Viṣṇu-purāṇa.  

12. R. C. Majumdar has also shown⁴ the thorough preponderance of the Purānic form of Hindu religion in the Tuk Mas in Java, as well as in Champa.⁵ It is also known from a Sanskrit inscription from the sixth century A. D. that in Kambuja-desta arrangements were made for the daily recitation of the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇa-s⁶ and it was considered a pious act to present copies of these texts to temples.⁷ The Sanskrit inscriptions in Kambujadeśa also show an intimate knowledge of the Purāṇa-s.⁸ The authors of these inscriptions derived undoubtedly their literary culture from the itihāsa-s and the Purāṇa-s.⁹

13. G. Coèdes concluded: “pendant toute la période hindoue, le Rāmāyaṇa et le Mahābhārata, le Harivāṁśa et les Purāṇa-s ont été les principales, sinon les uniques sources d’inspiration des littératures locales. Dans toute l’Indochine indienne, en Malaisie, à Java, toute cette littérature épique et légendaire constitue encore la trame du théâtre classique, des danses, du théâtre d’ombres et des marionettes…” and “L’hindouisation doit donc s’entendre essentiellement comme l’expansion d’une culture organisée, fondée sur la conception hindoue de la royauté caractérisée par les cultes hindouistes et bouddhiques, la

---

3. H. Bhushan Sarkar, Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali; Calcutta, 1934, p. 35.
6. But it is not known what Purāṇa-s.
7. R. C. Majumdar, op. cit., p. 208.
8. R. C. Majumdar, op. cit., p. 209.
Although the greatest authority on the spreading of Indian Culture in South East Asia knows that the Purāṇa-s were prevalent in South East Asia, it seems impossible, as it was impossible for G. Coèdes, with the exception of those given above\textsuperscript{11}, to determine which of the Purāṇa-s were prevalent in the hinduized kingdoms of South East Asia; it is however doubtless that the religion as incorporated in the Purāṇa-s influenced greatly the religious life of the hinduized kingdoms of South East Asia.

**Purānic Subhāṣita-s in the Literature of “Greater India”**

14. With the exception of the Brhaspati-saṁhitā of the Garuda-purāṇa, which is an abbreviated collection of maxims of the Cāṇakya-rāja-niti-śāstra version\textsuperscript{12} and forms an integral part of the Garuda-purāṇa, the subhāṣita-s found in the Purāṇa-s are scattered throughout all the Purāṇa-s and although some Purāṇa-s were known in “Greater India”, subhāṣita-s contained in the Purāṇa-s can only be traced in Subhāṣita-samgraha-s known in “Greater India”. They were mentioned in paragraphs 1-9 above.

(a) **Tibet**

15. Since the Brhaspati-saṁhitā of the Garuḍa-purāṇa in the form of the Tibetan Cāṇakya-rāja-niti-śāstra\textsuperscript{13} was included in the Tibetan Tanjur and, thus became prevalent in Tibet, we must assume that whenever the CRT text is identical with GP,

---

\textsuperscript{10} G. Coèdes, *Les États Hindous*, *op. cit.*, p. 422 and 36. The Old Javanese Sārasamuccaya (cf. para 23 below) mentions also the Purāṇa-s next to itihāsa-s and Vedas as it states in verse 45;

\textsuperscript{11} इतिहासपुराणां वेदे समुपप्रचेति ।

\textsuperscript{12} विशेषतः मृत्त्वादेहो साम्यं प्रचेष्यति ॥

(identical with MBh (Bh.) 1. 1. 204).

\textsuperscript{11} See para. 11.

\textsuperscript{12} See *Purāṇa* VI. 1; pp. 113-146; VII. 1; pp. 19-86; and VIII. 2; pp. 315-429.

\textsuperscript{13} Cāṇakya-rāja-niti-śāstra by *Suniti Kumar Pathak*, *Viṣṇu Bhāratī* Annals, VIII, Cf. Spr. paras. 5-14; also *L. Sternbach*, The Tibetan Cāṇakya-rāja-niti-śāstra, ABORI 42.99-122 and *L. Sternbach*, Sanskrit Subhāṣita-samgraha-s in Old Javanese and Tibetan, ABORI 43; pp. 118-158.
and that is the case of the greatest part of CRT, then the Bṛhaspati-saṁhitā of GP was known also in Tibet. Therefore, in Annex I which gives in tabular presentation the Purānic verses known in "Greater India" the first column gives the subhāṣita-s of GP. The second and third column shows the appropriate places in which the GP text appears in the CRT text (i.e. in the Tanjur) (3rd column).  

16 Other Tibetan texts, such as the She-rab dong-bu i.e. the Nītiśāstra Prajñādaṇḍa, the Nītiśāstra of Maṣūrākṣa and the Subhāṣita-ratna-nidhi appear in Column 3.

SRN(T) was also translated into Mongolian and West Mongolian (Kalmuk) and even Manchurian. These translations are included, whenever identical with a Purāṇa text, in the last column of Annex I.

However, I could not trace any Purānic subhāṣita-s to another Subhāṣita work in Tibetan, viz. the Vimala-praśnottara-ratnamālā.

17. Usually the CRT text was also included in the Cāṇakya-rāja-nīti-śāstra version and was edited by me in Cāṇakya-Nīti-Text Tradition, Vol. II, part II (Text reconstructed). The number of the verses is then included in column 3, while the adhyāya and the verse number of CRT. in column 2; wherever, however, the CRT. text did not appear in the reconstructed

14. See para. 17 below.
20. Vishveshvaranand Indological Series, No. 29A.
Cāṇakya-niti-śāstra version, it appears in Cr, vol. II, part III;\textsuperscript{21} in that case the Cr. number is given in column 2.

(b) Ceylon

18. Purānic verses of wisdom found in Ceylonese (Sinhalese) literature are shown in Anucx I in columns 4 and 5. Since some verse of the Cāṇakya-niti-śāstra version which was included in the literature of Ceylon\textsuperscript{22} are identical with GP. they are marked in column 4. They refer to my reconstruction of the Cāṇakya-niti-śāstra version CNr. in Cr.\textsuperscript{23}

19. Other texts of Sanskrit origin found in Ceylonese literature, either in Sanskrit (in Sinhalese script) or in Sinhalese translation are the Vyāsakārāya\textsuperscript{24} and the Pratyayaśatakāya;\textsuperscript{25} both these texts were primarily used in Ceylon by students for learning of Sanskrit. These two texts are mentioned in Annex I in column 5.

(c) Burma

20. The Purānic words of wisdom were also sometimes included in the literature of Burma, particularly the Pāli literature of Burma. The main work is, in particular, the Pāli Lokanīti\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{21} Vishveshwaranand Indological Series, No. 29\textsuperscript{11}.
\textsuperscript{22} Cf. Spr. paras. 39-40, 42-3.
\textsuperscript{23} Vishveshwaranand Indological Series, No. 27, part III.
\textsuperscript{24} Published by H. Bechert in "Sanskrit-texte aus Ceylon". I. Schultexte, Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft München 1962; also L. Sternbach On the Sanskrit Niti-Literature of Ceylon. I. The Vyāsakārāya and Cāṇakya's Aphorisms... in Brāhmaṇidyā 81-82; pp. 636-663. Cf. Spr. Addendum to Annex I.
\textsuperscript{25} Pratyayaśatakā(ya), sannasahi tayi, Colombo 1867 and Pandure 1941; also L. Sternbach On the Sanskrit Niti-Literature of Ceylon. 2. The Pratyayaśatakāya... in Brāhmaṇidyā.
and its Burmese equivalent (translation) the Niti-Kyan. Both these works are marked in Annex I in column 6. The first figure refers to the LN(P) verse and the second to the NKy(B), verse.

21. Since the Lokaniti was also known in Champa, Khmer, Kambuja-deśa and is still known in Thailand, Cambodia, Lào, among the Mœns, and all over South East Asia, whenever Purāṇic words of wisdom are found in LN(P) a cross is given for these countries in column 8.

22. Purāṇic words of wisdom in the Pāli literature of Burma are also found in the Dhammaniti, Rājaniti, Suttavādḍhannaṇiti. They are marked whenever they are identical with a Purāṇic subhāṣita in column 7.

(d) Java, Bali

23. In the Old Javanese literature we find quite a number of subhāṣita-s identical with the subhāṣita-s found in the Purāṇa-s. They are marked in column 8.

The following works, mostly Old Javanese Subhāṣita-samgraha-s, often tied together by a tale, were consulted; the Old Javanese Nitiśāstra of Nitiśāra, the Old Javanese Ślokāntara, the Tantri Kāmandaka and the Sārasamuccaya (or Sārasamuccaya

27. Burmese version of the Niti Kyan, a Code of Ethics in Pali, JRAS 17 of 1869, pp. 2 266. Cf. Spr. 59-60 and PLBN.
28. Published in English translation in PMB. Cf. Spr. paras 62-63, 56-59, 72-73 and PLBN.
Tutur), an Old Javanese *subhāṣita-sārvāgraḥa* mainly based on the Mahābhārata.\(^{32}\)

24. A great part of the Mahābhārata was also discovered in Java and Bali; it is in kālanvin.\(^{33}\) The Bhāṇḍārkar edition of the Mahābhārata contains a list of Sanskrit passages from the Javanese version of the Mahābhārata, in particular of the Ādiparvan (Vol. I, Appendix II), Udyogaparvan (Vol. 6, Appendix II), and Bhīṣmaparvan (Vol. 7, Appendix II, the old Javanese Bhagavadgītā). Some of the Mahābhārata *subhāṣita-s*, particularly of the Vidura-nīti in the Udyogaparvan also appear in the Purāṇa-s and through the Mahābhārata found their way in the literature of Java and Bali; however, these *subhāṣita-s* were not recorded in Annex I.

25. The *subhāṣita-s* found in the Purāṇa-s and in the literature of “Greater India” (under the literature of “Greater India”, I understand only the literature of the countries East, South and North of India and not West of India, e. g. Iran where we also find some Persian translations of the Purāṇa-s) are seldom translated and incorporated in these literatures word for word; they contain mostly the same idea but do not contain a literal translation of the Purāṇic words of wisdom. This is particularly evident in the Ślokāntara, the text of which is usually different from the original.

**Origins of Purāṇic subhāṣita-s in the literature of Greater India**

26. It is not certain, and even very doubtful, whether in the majority of cases the *subhāṣita-s* which appear in the Purāṇic texts were incorporated into the literature of “Greater India” directly from the Purāṇa-s or from other Sanskrit primary sources. In Annex II the Purāṇic texts (if they appear not only in the

---


33. See in particular H. B. Sarkar, Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali, Calcutta 1934, chapter XI.
literature of “Greater India” but also in other Sanskrit primary sources) are given, for the purpose of comparison, whenever a textual comparison would have to be made among the various texts.

27. The GP. text, in the majority of cases, was taken in the literature of “Greater India” from the collection of Cāṇakya’s aphorisms and not from the GP. The old Javanese Sārasamuccaya has more likely borrowed from the Mahābhārata text directly than from any Purāṇa text which happened to be identical with the Mahābhārata text, and in many other cases it is more likely that the Pañcatantra, or the Hitopadeśa, or the Mahābhārata, or the Bhartṛhari’s śatakā-s, or the Rāmacāṇa, where the primary sources for the literature of “Greater India”. It can be said that in the majority of cases when a subhāṣīta from the latter sources was identical with the subhāṣīta from a Purāṇa text, it came to be known in the literature of “Greater India” from these sources and not from the Purāṇa-s; however, that is not always the case.

Annexes

28. The following Annex I gives a better account of the subhāṣīta-s identical in the literature of “Greater India” and the Purāṇic subhāṣīta-s.

The analysis of the Annexes shows that most of the subhāṣīta-s of the Brhaspati-samhitā of the Garuḍa-purāṇa are found in Tibet, Ceylon, Burma and Java. Certainly (because of CRT.) they are mostly found in the Tibetan Tanjur, and from there probably in other Subhāṣīta-samgraha-s known to exist in Tibet. Many of these maxims spread also through the Cāṇakya-nīti-sāstra version to Ceylon and through the Lokanīti to Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, Lāos, etc. It is however very interesting to note that as many as 47 maxims of GP. became also prevalent in Java and Bali.

In addition to the Brhaspati-samhitā of the Garuḍa-purāṇa we find also scattered Purāṇic subhāṣīta-s of the Mārkandeya-purāṇa (4), Vāyu-purāṇa (5), Viṣṇu-purāṇa (3), Bhāgavata-purāṇa (5), Matsya-purāṇa (5), Padma-purāṇa (4), Skanda-purāṇa (9),
Brahma-vaivarta-purāṇa (2), Agni-purāṇa (1), Viṣṇudharmottara (1), Bhaviṣya-purāṇa (3), Śiva-purāṇa (2) and Vāmāna-purāṇa (1) mostly in the literature of Java and Bali, but also the literatures of Tibet, Burma (and through the Lokanāti of other South-East Asian countries), as well as Ceylon. Annex I illustrates these points clearly.

It must be noted that many more identical verses of the Purāṇa-s could be traced to the literature of "Greater India", but this study is confined to suhāgītas in the Purāṇa-s and not to Purānic verses in the literature of "Greater India."

Annex II shows where the Purānic texts mentioned in Annex I appear also in other primary sources of Sanskrit literature. It is arranged in the order of the first column of Annex I.
## ANNEX I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Tibet</th>
<th>Ceylon</th>
<th>Burma</th>
<th>Lokaniti (Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Xiengmai)</th>
<th>Java and Bali</th>
<th>Mongolia and Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjur (CRT)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CN(C)</td>
<td>Other (LN(P) &amp; NKy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Cr 915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Cr 260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Cr 169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Cr 641</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prś(C)84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.14</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Cr 649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.15</td>
<td>1.12-3</td>
<td>Cr 1043</td>
<td>CNr 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.16</td>
<td>1.12-3</td>
<td>Cr 607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.18</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Cr 1070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Cr 607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.20</td>
<td>Cr2020/1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.21</td>
<td>Cr1344/1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Cr 838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.23</td>
<td>Cr1850/1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.24</td>
<td>Cr1849/1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Cr 477</td>
<td>CNr 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.108.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 428</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vyās 64</td>
<td>126/154</td>
<td>DhN 179 ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Cr 142</td>
<td>CNr 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>42/59</td>
<td>DhN 408 ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NM 3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Lokaniti (Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Xiengmaï)</td>
<td>Java &amp; Bali</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjur (CRT)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CN(C) (CNR)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>LN(P) &amp; NKy (B)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.2</td>
<td>2.2 Cr 431</td>
<td>CNr 29</td>
<td>156/180 DhN 205</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.3</td>
<td>2.3 Cr 911</td>
<td>CNr 30</td>
<td>159/182 DhN 83</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.4</td>
<td>2.4 Cr 903</td>
<td>CNr</td>
<td>PrŚ(S) 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.5</td>
<td>2.5 Cr 365</td>
<td>CNr 31</td>
<td>78/108 DhN 98</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.6</td>
<td>2.6 Cr 92</td>
<td>NM 6.9</td>
<td>PrŚ(S) 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.7</td>
<td>2.7 Cr 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.8</td>
<td>2.8 Cr 140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.9</td>
<td>2.9 Cr 958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.10</td>
<td>2.10 Cr 890</td>
<td>CNr 31</td>
<td>78/108 DhN 98</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.11</td>
<td>Cr1104/2.11</td>
<td>NM 3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.12</td>
<td>2.12 Cr 166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.13</td>
<td>2.13 Cr 840</td>
<td>CNr 25</td>
<td>DhN 239</td>
<td>TK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.14</td>
<td>2.14 Cr 527</td>
<td>CNr 25</td>
<td>DhN 239</td>
<td>TK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.15</td>
<td>2.15 Cr 87</td>
<td>CNr 32</td>
<td>281- DhN 52</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.17</td>
<td>2.16 Cr 245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.18</td>
<td>2.17 Cr 305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>CNr</td>
<td>DhN</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>CF, SRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.19</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.20</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>CNr 35</td>
<td>114/142</td>
<td>DhN 79</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.21</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.23</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.24</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>NM 5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.25</td>
<td>738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.32</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>CNr 19</td>
<td>82/112</td>
<td>DhN 252</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.33</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>CNr 76</td>
<td>161/206</td>
<td>DhN 164</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.38</td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.40</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.41</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.42</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>PrŠ(C)49 (35)/- (DhN 352)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Šlt 62 (SRN 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.43</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.44</td>
<td>755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.46</td>
<td>980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.109.52</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>CNr 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jan, 1969
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP*</th>
<th>Tibet</th>
<th>Ceylon</th>
<th>Burma</th>
<th>Loka-nīti (Thailand, Java, Cambodia, Loos, Bali, Xiengmai)</th>
<th>Mangolia and Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjur (CRT)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CN(C) (CNr)</td>
<td>LN(P) &amp; NKy(B)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Cr 746</td>
<td>CNr 50</td>
<td>TK 50, BhP NŚ 39, 2.56,22 Shīt 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Cr 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Cr 914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Cr 1111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNr 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.9</td>
<td>Cr1608/3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.10</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Cr 1078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.11</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Cr 1097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Cr 293</td>
<td>Shīd 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.15</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Cr 896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.16</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Cr 230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.17</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Cr 568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.18</td>
<td>3.13-4</td>
<td>Cr 814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.19</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>Cr 1024</td>
<td>CNr 17</td>
<td>85/110</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.20</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Cr 978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.21</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Cr 182</td>
<td>CNr 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.22</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Cr 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.23</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Cr 49A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.24</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Cr 253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.25</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Cr 501</td>
<td>CNr 33</td>
<td>160/(205)</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.26</td>
<td>3.23-4</td>
<td>Cr 625</td>
<td>CNr 34</td>
<td>113/141</td>
<td>DhN 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1656/3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.110.30</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>Cr 569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Cr 660</td>
<td>(RN 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM 7.1</td>
<td>(RN 163)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Cr 872</td>
<td>(SRN 323)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SRN 163)</td>
<td>(RN 93)</td>
<td>DhN 182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Cr 675</td>
<td>ShD 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SRN 323)</td>
<td>(RN 93)</td>
<td>DhN 182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Cr 462</td>
<td>(Cr 191)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1660/4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Cr 413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.7</td>
<td>167/211</td>
<td>Cr 1029</td>
<td>Vyas 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.8</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>Cr 772</td>
<td>CNr 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 8.44</td>
<td>Vyas 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>NM 6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>SRN 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Footnotes]

SRN 49
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Tibet</th>
<th>Ceylon</th>
<th>Burma</th>
<th>Loka-nīti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjur (CRT)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CN(C) (CNr)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.18</td>
<td>Cr 429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.24</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Cr 522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.26</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Cr 335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.27</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.28</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1354/4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.29</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1461/4.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.30</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1899/4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.31</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1213/4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.32</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Cr 180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.111.33</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td></td>
<td>1272/4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.112.1</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>Cr 645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.112.2</td>
<td>Cr 805</td>
<td></td>
<td>PrŚ(C)34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.112.3</td>
<td>NM 4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.112.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Cr 290</td>
<td>CNr 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.112.5  5.6  Cr 785  
1.112.6  5.7  Cr 162  CNr 106  
(NM 7.14)  
1.112.7  5.4  Cr 790  
1.112.8  5.8  Cr 719  
1.112.9  NM 7.15  CNr 103  

1.112.10  5.9  Cr 665  CNr 105  
(NM 7.16)  
1.112.11  5.3  Cr 149  CNr 101  
(NM 7.13)  
1.112.12  5.2  Cr 963  CNr 99  
NM 7.9  
1.112.13  Cr 892  CNr 6  
1.112.14  5.15  Cr 498  
1.112.15  5.16  Cr 466  CNr 23  Vyās 34  
1.112.16  5.17  Cr 2  CNr 103  
1.112.17  Cr 420  
NM 6.16  
1.112.18  5.18  Cr 339  
NM 6.17  
1.112.19  5.19  Cr 609  
NM 6.18  
1.112.20  Cr 1404/5 20  
1.112.21  (5.1 adj)  Cr 359  
1.112.22  5.22  Cr 1011  
1.112.23  5.23  Cr 784  CNr 84  
1.112.24  5.25  Cr 799  

RN 12  
(RN 17)  
(RN 18)  
(RN 20)  
(DhN 254)  
(DhN 306-7)  
(RN 96-77)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Tibet (CRT)</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Ceylon (CN (C) (CNr))</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Burma (LN (P) &amp; NKy (B))</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Lokaniti (Thailand, Cambodi, Bali and Laos, Xiengmai)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.112.25</td>
<td>Cr1495/5.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.3</td>
<td>Cr 803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRN. 324)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SRN 323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShD 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM 4.2ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.10</td>
<td>Cr2025/6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.12</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.29</td>
<td>Cr1368/6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.33</td>
<td>Cr1863/6.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.35</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.36</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.37</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TK 42)
(SRN324)
(SRN323)
(DhN 182)
(SN. 62)
(SN 60)
SS 168
(SS 182)
SS 361, Šlt 31
(SS 259)
SS 271
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.113.41</th>
<th>6.14</th>
<th>Cr 551</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.113.42</td>
<td>Cr1519/6.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.43</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>Cr 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.46</td>
<td>6.17ef</td>
<td>Cr 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.52</td>
<td>Cr1813/6.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.53-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.55</td>
<td>Cr1820/6.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.56</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>Cr 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.60</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>Cr 1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.61</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>Cr 1081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.113.62</td>
<td>Cr1831/6.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Cr. 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Cr 1003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Cr 816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.8</td>
<td>Cr1136/7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.15</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>NM 5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.18</td>
<td>Cr2037/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.19</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>Cr 987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75/106</td>
<td>DhN 348</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS 312
Javanese
MBh. (cf. Juynböll
228

SS 288

SS 383
SS 359
SS 347
SS 487

Ślt 76

SS 448

PrŚ (C)42 125/153 ḌhN 209 x
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP.</th>
<th>Tibet</th>
<th>Ceylon</th>
<th>Burma</th>
<th>Lokaniti (Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Xiengmai)</th>
<th>Java and Bali</th>
<th>Mangolia and Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjur (CRT)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CN (C) (CNr)</td>
<td>LN (P) &amp; NKy (B)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.21</td>
<td>Cr1666/7.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>Cr 565</td>
<td>CNr 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.24</td>
<td>Cr1592/7.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>Cr 955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>Cr 702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.28</td>
<td>Cr1141/7.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>Cr 998</td>
<td>CNr 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>Cr 1039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 740</td>
<td>CNr 94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>Cr 278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>Cr 991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>Cr 830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>Cr 459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.46</td>
<td>Cr (SRN 167)</td>
<td>(NM 4.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2077/7.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.114.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>Cr 964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SRN 167
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Tibet</th>
<th>Ceylon</th>
<th>Burma</th>
<th>Lokaniti (Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Xiengmai)</th>
<th>Java and Bali</th>
<th>Mangolia &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjur (CRT)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CN(C)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>LN(P) &amp; NKy(B)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>Cr 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>Cr 741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PrŚ(C)3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.30</td>
<td>Cr1177/8.21</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>Cr 828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>Cr 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>Cr 831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>Cr 1084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNr 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.42</td>
<td>Cr1821/8.23</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>Cr 807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.44</td>
<td>Cr1904/8.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cr 581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NM 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.48</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>Cr 646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.49</td>
<td>Cr1535/8.27</td>
<td>Cr 407</td>
<td>(80/110) DhN 87 x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.51</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>Cr 570</td>
<td>NM 3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.52</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>Cr 409</td>
<td>NM 3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.54</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>Cr 409</td>
<td>Cr1858/8.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.55</td>
<td>Cr1858/8.31</td>
<td>Cr 1057</td>
<td>SS 471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.60</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>Cr 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.62</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>Cr 661</td>
<td>SS 435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.63</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>Cr 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.65</td>
<td>Cr1584/8.34</td>
<td>Cr 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.66</td>
<td>Cr1584/8.34</td>
<td>Cr 89</td>
<td>PrŚ(C) 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.67</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>Cr 130</td>
<td>Vyās 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.74</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>Cr 482</td>
<td>TK 49, NŚ 2.8, Ślt 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.76</td>
<td>Cr 285</td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.78</td>
<td>(Cr 499)</td>
<td>CNr 7</td>
<td>18/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.80</td>
<td>Cr 1935</td>
<td>PrŚ(C) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.115.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārkaṇḍeya-</td>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Lokanīti</td>
<td>Java and</td>
<td>Mongolia and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purāṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bali</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjur</td>
<td>CN(C)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>LN(P) &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>(CNr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NKy(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.18-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.39-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 236,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mahā-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bhārata,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Juynböll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.62-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.112-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113/141</td>
<td>DhN</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāyu-purāṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cf. Vyās 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu-purāṇa</td>
<td>4.10,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.10,10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.10,12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padma-purāṇa</td>
<td>7.2,40</td>
<td>SS 433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.19,13</td>
<td>SS 422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.19,14</td>
<td>SS 429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.19,16</td>
<td>SS 462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.19,17</td>
<td>SS 448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>SS 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>SS 450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>SS 107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.11</td>
<td>SS 126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>215.8-13</td>
<td>(NM 7.3-18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Padma-purāṇa</th>
<th>CNr 75</th>
<th>SS 439</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Srṣṭi-kh.</td>
<td>54.21</td>
<td>Ālt 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>224.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūmi-kh.</td>
<td>81.47</td>
<td>SS 359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttara-kh.</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skanda-purāṇa</th>
<th>NŚ 4.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māheśvara-kh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vyās 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tibet</th>
<th>Ceylon</th>
<th>Burma</th>
<th>Lokanitī (Thailand), Java (Cambodia, and Laos, and Bali Xiengmai)</th>
<th>Mongolia &amp; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Śrāddha-purāṇa</td>
<td>Tanjur (CRT)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CN(C) (CNr)</td>
<td>LN(P) &amp; NKy(B)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avantya-kh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115/143 DhN 261</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caturaśāti-kh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NŚ 5,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keśa-kh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāgara-kh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SS 470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhāsā-kh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kṣetra-mahā-tmya)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SS 470)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.56.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr 957/3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 TK 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NŚ 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NŚ 3.9,Slē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni-purāṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 TK 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20,1 sqq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NM 7.3-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purana</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Other References</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇudharmottara</td>
<td>2.24,4-6</td>
<td>(NM 7.3-18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavisya-purāṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SS 441, SS 448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmaparvan</td>
<td>4.182, 4.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttara-parvan</td>
<td>102.29</td>
<td>(120/148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śiva-purāṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NŚ 2.8, Ślt 81, TK 49,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śatarudra</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasamhitā</td>
<td>4.219,52</td>
<td></td>
<td>ShD 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmanapurāṇa in ŚKDr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DhN 397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Garuḍa-purāṇa

1.108.14 HJ 3.101, BhŚ 958
1.108.15 HJ 1.138, Vet 1.26, ŚTs 40.10; 63, 7-8
1.108.18 MBh 1.74.39, HJ 1.211
1.108.22 ŚTs 374.36.7
1.108.25 PtsK 1.235, HJ 2.120
1.108.26 HJ 324, BhŚ 519
1.109. 1 Mn 7.213, MBh 1.160.27 and 5.37.18, Pts 1.356 and 3.86, HJ 1.43, VCsr 12.1, VCjr 20.1, ŚTs 321.12-3, Vet 19.16, HDh 14, BhPr 198
1.109. 2 MBh 1.115, 36; 2.61, 11 and 5.36, 17, P (PT 1.118, PTem 1.107, PS 1.105, PN 2.83, Pts 1.355 and 3.84, PRE 1.117), HJ 1.159, ŚTs 21.4-5, VCjr 28.3, MK 76
1.109. 4 HJ 1.107, PP 1.77
1.109.10 PS 1.26, HJ 4.108
1.109.14 PP 1.52, HJ 1.18, VCsr VII 8, VCjr VII 1, ŚTs 20.9-10
1.109.15 HJ 1.138, Vet 1.26, ŚTs 40.10 and 63.7-8
1.109.20 HJ 1.109, ŚTs 332.22-8
1.109.28 MBh 5.38, 76-7, ŚTs 82.6-7, ŚTs 360.8-9
1.109.32 Vet 4.7
1.109.33 Paṇcarātra 1.14, 96, HJ 2.118 & 4.8, Brahmavaivarta-purāṇa 1.23,63
1.109.38 PtsK 1.227
1.109.52 Mn 8.26, P (PP 1.21, Pts 1.44) HJ 2.47, Vet 1.8
1.110. 1 P (PP 4.143, Pts 2.137, PtsK 2.144, PD 302,41, PM 2.55, HJ 1.227)
1.110. 4 MBh 2.5, 112 and 5.38, 66-7, PP 2.150, Pts 2.147, PtsK 2.154
1.110. 5 Vet 7.4
1.110.13 HJ 1.142, BhŚ 34
1.110.19 PP 2.27 and 4.13, Pts 2.32 and 4.14, PtsK 2.330 and 4.15, PT 2.29, PN 1.17, PS 2.19, PRE 4.19, HJ 2.147, MBh 1.142, 82 and 12 140, 30,
1.110.26  HJ 1.110.  Cf. Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa 34.112-3
1.111. 3  MBh 5.33,17, PM 1.82
1.111.18  PT 2.54, PP 2.106, PRE 2.33
1.112.15  HJ 2.91, BhŚ 27
1.112.17  Pts 1.248, PtsK 1.278
1.113.8  HJ 2.9
1.113.9  PS 4.6, PN 4.2, PRE 4.14, HJ 4.87
1.113.10  MBh 5.33, 38
1.113.29  MBh 12.181, 15 and 12.322.15
1.113.36  Mu 5.106, Vi 22.89 (and nibandha-s)
1.113.42  PT 2.55
1.113.48.  MBh 13,163, 11, HJ 2.15, (cf. Bhāgavata-purāṇa 7.2, 40, PT 2.113, PTem 2.102, PS 2.66, PN 1.62, PP 5.53, Pts 5.7 and 4.9, 105, PtsK 2.11 and 113, PRE 2.68, HJ Pr 29, and 4.9, VCSR VII 13 and 12.3-4, VCMr 12.38-9, VCR 12.6)
1.113.53-4  MBh 12.181, 16; 12, 332, 16 and 13.7, 22-3, PPT 2.106, PTem 2.95, PP 2.135, Pts 2.125, PtsK 2.134, PM 1.46, PdP, Bhūmi-Kh, 81.47
1.113.56  MBh 1.74, 81
1.113.58  HJ Pr 17
1.113.61  MBh 12.174, 20, Vet Hu1 MS 16.16 and ad 16.175
1.114.1  HJ 1.73
1.114.2  PT 2.170 and 4.7, PTem 2.152, PS 2.83 and 4.3, PN 1.79 and 4.3, PP 2.195, Pts 2.179, PtsK 2.194, cf. 2.59, PRE 2.95 and 4.7, PM 2.73, HJ 1.225
1.114.6  Bhāgavata-purāṇa 9.19,17, Bhaviṣya-purāṇa 4.184, HJ 1.126, Mn 1.215,
1.114.19  PT 1.153, PTem 1.140, PS 1.132, PN 2.106, PP 1.373, PRE 1.144, PM 1.59.
1.114.32  HJ 1.206
1.114.36  Aṣṭarātra 3 (KSH 7)
1.114.47  Pts 2.39 and 4.13, PtsK 2.43 and 4.14, PP 4.12,
          Śts 21.3, ŚtsA 23.2, Śts Pct 28b
1.114.49  MBh 12.140,66
1.114.59  BhPn. 10.114
1.114.66  IT 1.14, PTem 1.11, PP 1.334, Pts 1.335, PtsK
          1.376, PML 137; cf. HJ 1.35
1.114.69  MBh (Bh) ad 12.167,20; 449* lines 32-3, R 4.34.12,
          PP 1.248 and 4.10, Pts 4.10, PtsK 4.10
1.114.72  PT 3.142, PTa 3.147.
1.115.1   MBh 12.139,32, Harivarmśa 1160
1.115.4   MBh 1.139,93
1.115.18  Vet 4.15
1.115.23  PP 2.64, PtsK 2.82, PPY 73(68), HJ Pr 27, Vet 8.8
1.115.28  BhŚ 200, Vet 23.5
1.115.31  PT 1.12, PTem 1.9, PS 1.15, PN 2.11, PP 1.15,
          PRE 1.14, PM 1.14, HJ 2.42
1.115.36  PP 3.88, Pts 3.96, PtsK 3.97, PM 3.32; cf. HJ 1.169
1.115.45  PP 1.170, PD 307.102, HJ 4.17 and 1.58, Vet 11.7
1.115.46  PT 3.114, PS 3.69, PN 3.59, PP 3.219, Pts 3.178,
1.115.47  PP 5,64, Pts 5.84, PtsK 5.70, PM 5.47, Vet 25.1
          (p. 117), Śts 23.33
1.115.48  PP 1.284, PM 1.78, HJ 1.79
1.115.52  HJ 3.64
1.115.60  PT 2.165, PTem 2.147, Pts Göttingen Ges. Anz.
          1862, p. 1363, (HS ad 1.180)
1.115.63  HJ 1.128.
1.115.65  MBh 13.38,16, Pts 1.142, PtsK 1.158
1.115.76  VCSR 3.10, VCmr 3.91-2, Śto Intr 49.
1.115.78  Pts 2.88, PtsK 2.96
1.115.80  HJ Pr 38
1.115.81  VCSR 9.3, VCjr 21.1, Guṇaratna 3, HJ ad Intr. 48
Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa

14.18-9 MBh 12.322,3
29.39-40 MBh (Bh) 5.39,25
34.62-3 Mn 4.134
34.112-3 See above GP 1.110,26

Vāyu-purāṇa

93.95 MBh (Bh) ad 1.80,9; 84O* lines 1-2, Mn 2.94, Harivaṃśa 1639, Viṣṇu-purāṇa 4.10.9, Bhāgavata-purāṇa 9.19,14.

93.98 MBh (Bh) ad 1.80,9; 84O* lines 3-4; Harivaṃśa 1640, Kullūka ad Mn 2.94, Viṣṇu-purāṇa 4.10,10, Bhāgavata-purāṇa 9.19,13, KN (BI) after 1.36.

93.101 MBh (Bh) 12.168,45 and 12.268,12, Harivaṃśa 16.43, Viṣṇu-purāṇa 4.10,12, Bhāgavata-purāṇa 9.19,16, Skanda-purāṇa, Kaumāri Kh. 46.41.

93.102 Harivaṃśa 1644, PP 5.63, Pts 5.83, PtsK 5.15, BhŚ 504

93.103 MBh (Bh) 12.171,15 and 12.268,6, Saṅkara’s bhāṣya on Brhadāraṇyaka-upaniṣad 4.3,33, Yogasūtra bhāṣya on 2.42.

Viṣṇu-purāṇa

4.10.9 See above Vāyu-purāṇa 93.95
4.10.10 See above Vāyu-purāṇa 93.98
4.10.12 See above Vāyu-purāṇa 93.101

Bhāgavata-purāṇa

7.2,40 See above GP. 1.113,48
9.19,13 See above Vāyu-purāṇa 93.98
9.19,14 See above Vāyu-purāṇa 93.95
9.19,16 See above Vāyu-purāṇa 93.101
9.19,17 See above GP. 1.114,6
Matsya-purāṇa

215.8-13 Cf. MBh. 1.100, 12, 85, Agni-purāṇa 220.1 sqq., Viṣṇudharmottara 2.24, 4-6, KN 12.2, 18.27-43, Mn 7.63-4, K 1.16; 2.33, Mānollāṣa 2.2,90-2.

Padma-purāṇa

Srṣṭi-kh. 54.21 HJ 1.127, Vet, Intr. 1 (cf. 3.10), cf Mn 2.94, BhPņ 7.19,14
224.47 Vet 19.11, Cr. 1868
Bhūmi-Kh. 81.47 See above GP 1.113, 53-4
Uttara-Kh. 7.23 Cr 2068, BhŚ 801

Skanda-purāṇa

Māheśvara-Kh.
Kumārika 46.41 See above Vāyu-purāṇa 93,101
Āvantya-Kh.
Revā-Kh. 103.124 (Cf. PS 2.32, PN 1.29, PP 2.80, PRE 2.34, HJ 1.135, VČsr 21.1, VČm 21.19-20, Vet 3.2, Cr 72, Mṛcch. 1.8)
Nāgara-Kh. 26.18 MBh (R) 12.276, 13, MBh (Bh) 12.309, 72, Viḍḍhasātātapa-smṛti 61, Viṣṇudharmottara 1.117
185.15 HJ 1.196, Pts 1.401 and 2.116, Pts K 1.149 and 2.124)
196.6 PP 1.142, Pts 1.185, Ptsk 1.199, HJ 1.130
Prabhāsa 255.32 PT 2.79, PTeṃ 2.68, PP 2.97, PS 2.42, PN 1.38, PRE 2.47, HJ 1.152

Brahmavaivarta-purāṇa

1.23, 63 See above GP 1.109, 13
2.56, 22 See above GP 1.110, 8

Agni-purāṇa

2.20, sqq. See above Matsya-purāṇa 215.8-13

Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa

2.24, 4-6 See above Matsya-purāṇa 215.8-13
Bhaviṣya-purāṇa

Brahma-parvan
4.184 See above GP 1.114, 6

Uttara-parvan
102.29 CVr 4.11, Vet. 4.29, VCmr 2.70-1

Śiva-purāṇa

Śatarudra 38.18 See above GP 1.115,74

Rudrasamhitā
4.216,52 P (PT 1.62, PTem 1.55, PS 1.54, PN 2.39, PP 1.172, Pts 1.314, PtsK 1.245 and 3.68, PRE 1.63, PM 1.81, HJ 2.129, Što 40.1, CVr 10.16.
कृम्पुराण-सुभाषितानि
( पूर्वभागात् )

धर्म-महिमा—

परिस्मर्ज्जेदर्थकामी यो स्वातः धर्मवित्ती।
सर्वतः संहरेत् च धर्ममण्याचर्चन न। ( १. २५३ )
धर्मं संजाते दार्थिः धर्मात् कामोलिपिजाते।
धर्मं एवावंगर्य तस्मादेः समाः श्रेयेष्व। ( २. ५४ )
यद्यर्हर्मसमायुक्तोऽधर्मकामो व्यवस्थितो।
इह होके हुलों मूला प्रेयानन्तयाय कथ्यते। ( २. ५७ )
धर्मं संजाते सर्वभिमला हुः विवादिनः।
धर्मेण धार्यते सर्वं जगत्यावर्जगमस्म॥ ( २. ६१ )

काण-महिमा—

करोति कालः सकलं संहरेत् कालं पुत्र हि
कालः स्थापयते विद्धा कालाधीनमिदं जगत्। ( १२. २४ )
कालः रुज्जति भूलनिः कालः संहरेत् प्रजाः।
सर्वे कालस्य बश्या न कालः कस्पित्तः बहे। ( २. ३. १६ )

अपूर्वपूजने पूज्यपूजने च दोषः—

अपूर्वपूजने चैव पूज्यानां चाप्यपूजने।
नरः पापमान्यानोधिता महतु वै नात्र संविध:। ( १. १५. २६ )
असतां महाभो यत्र सतातेव विमानना।
दण्डे दैवेण्डस्त्रत्र सर्वं पतति दाहण:। ( १५. २७ )

इष्टदेवतावः

या यस्याभिमित्तम पुस्तः सा हि तस्येव देयता॥ ( २२. ४० च। )
अहिंसा-महिमा—
अहिंसाया: परो धर्मो नास्त्वहिंसायरं दुःखम् ∥ (२८६.१५४.)

सत्य-महिमा—
सत्येन सर्वभावनोति सत्यं सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितम् ∥ (१८.२६४.)
सत्येन लोकाज्ञयति सत्यं तत् परम् पदम् ∥ (१४.२४४.)

संतोष:—
प्रशस्तं गुरुः प्रायु: सन्तोषं कुलक्षणम् ∥ (१२.२७३.)

गुरु:—
गुरुनिनिजातीना मार्गः नानाना गुरुः।
पतिरेव गुरु: श्रीमान् सर्वभाषायानो गुरुः ∥ (१२.४५)

आत्महिंसाधारन—
न धर्मं स्थायते विद्वानम् न पारं गृह्येदपि।
कुर्मात्मायेहि नित्यं सर्वभूतनृक्षणम् ∥ (१४.१०)
मातापिनीहि ययौ गोभ्राज्ञणहि रतः।
दानो यज्ञ देवभक्तिमनोकथिनेकः महीयते ∥ (१५.२४)
भृतानां विमारंकौ स्यात्र पत्रेहृक्षमौः। (१५.४१५.)

गृहस्थक्षणण—
विभासः सत्तं क्षम्युत्परं प्रायः।
गृहस्थस्तु समाल्पयतो न गृह्यं गृही भवेत् ∥ (१६.२६)

क्राहणख्यणण—
क्रम्य द्या च विज्ञान सत्यं चैव दृष्ट: शरम:।
अध्यात्मिनित्तज्ञानमेतद्वाराज्ञणक्षणण। (१५.२७)

परांमप्यकर्मणो दृष्ट:—
हुन्दुक्तं हि मनुस्यस्य सर्वस्मे क्षविन्धम्।
यो वस्यानं समद्भावति स तस्मादनाति किलितम् ∥ (१६.१५)
अतिथिपूजनं—

पूजयेति तिथिं निःयं नमस्येदचंगेदिशेऽपरं ॥
मनोवाकृत्तमभि: शान्तः स्वागतं स्वगृहं गतः ॥ (१५.११०)

दानमहिमा—

यदृ ददाति विशिष्येत्: शिष्येत्: अद्वयः गुतः ॥
तदृ विचित्रमहं मन्ये देवं कस्यापि स्वरः ॥ (१६.२)
दानभरतं परे धर्मों भूतानं नेत्र विचित्रे ॥ (१९.५५५)

बद्राचरणं—

दशिपूतं स्मसेत् पादं ब्रह्मपूतं बलं पिसेत् ॥
शास्त्रपूतं बदेदू वानीं मनं पूर्तं सामाचरे ॥ (२०.१६)

तीर्थसेवाविधि:—

स्यं वाइमनसी शुद्धं हस्तपादीं च संस्थितौ ॥ (२०.१७.१८गत)
अलोचसियो ब्रह्मचारी तीर्थनां च चुल्लमापनुयात् ॥ (१७.१८)
य: स्वर्गार्थं च यस्मिन तीर्थसेवां करोति हि ॥
न तत्क फलते तीर्थमिह लोके परत्र च ॥ (२४.२०)
SOME LINGUISTIC PECULIARITIES IN THE PURĀNAS.

BY

R. A. PATHAK

[प्रश्नतुलेखे लेखकमहोदयो भाषाविज्ञानपद्धत्या पौराणिकभाषागतबौधत्याविवेचनमारा पुराणां परमप्राचीनत्वं, वेदान्तत्त्वादित्वमहाभारतसमकालिकत्व्यं च प्रतिपादवत्ती। पुराभौपूपलभ्यमाना नैकविधय प्राग्निष्ठाय: प्रयोगाः सर्वथा छन्दोज्योतिषमनिष्ठ्याः प्रयोग इति सते सुविद्यकं निराकरतो; बैंकट्य। शब्देशां सह ताहाणा प्रयोगाणां साम्यं प्रद्वव तेनां वैविकाव्यार्थं साधवत्त। मम्म्मके चारी यतृ पुराणसम्पादकः: एताद्वः: सन्या: पाणिनिन्यायांमनुवृत्त ययायकां संशोधिता भस्तुः, वेन तेनां मौलिकं स्वरूपं बद्धं विकृति जातम, वेन च कारणेन विविधं: पुराणां परमस्यमृत्तितम।

तथापि प्रवशिष्ठ: ताहसां बद्हं: प्रयोगाः पुराणाः इत्याचारिपि प्रायं तच्चवन्ते, वे तु संस्कृतभाषाविकाससयोजितसंहितायाः शब्दमेव महत्वपूर्णाः; उपयोगिन्यात्सहि॥

तथा धि पुराणां भाषाविकाससंहितायांवदिकस्यां प्रतिवर्तीते: अतः एताद्वः: पौराणिकः प्रयोगा: साधवान्त्या संस्कृतीया: वैविकाव्यार्थं सह शंगोजन्यायां। निविधशक्ता कान्तिकुञ्जहरणानि पुराणोत्सवं प्रस्तुतानि।]

Purāṇas, in general, are ancient works written in Sanskrit language representing the transitional stage between Vedic and classical periods. As such their language is often found interspersed with the old survivals of the Vedic language, which have become obsolete in the later classical language. The editors of the Purāṇas, at times, have emended the original texts in the lights of the usages prescribed in the classical portion of the Pāṇinian grammar. Thus a lot of old material of linguistic interest is almost getting lost for ever. However, the materials at our disposal which have any how escaped the sight of editors, sufficiently indicate the antiquity of their language. As the major portion of the Purāṇas, with all their interpolations and later additions, conforms with the classical Sanskrit, it was quite natural for scholars to assign a late period of origin. But the fact that some portions, even in the extant versions of the Purāṇas, are much older cannot be gainsaid. Of course, they
had their origin in hoary antiquity but in later times suffered so much from interpolations that they came to be regarded as pure classical compositions. Thus it is often alleged that the language of the Purāṇas does not, at places, follow the classical grammar and consists of a number of archaic forms. This allegation obviously presupposes the fact that Purāṇas are of pure classical origin as well as posterior to Pāṇini. In literary chronology, Purāṇas, as has often been done in old literature, must be placed immediately after the Vedic literature beside the epics whose language is almost identical with that of the Purāṇas. Thus for a true and just estimate Purānic language must be judged in relation to its prior source the Vedic.

The above-referred archaic forms in the Purāṇas, are in the main, explained as being due to metrical exegency, that is, the particular metre of the composition did not permit the author to use the form current in the classical Sanskrit. Indeed there are passages in the Purāṇas which can be explained on no other ground than the metrical requirements but this must be applied within certain limits. But this explanation of metrical exegency does not at length appear to be genuine as the Purānic authors could well have opted another suitable metre or even prose form of expression which they have in many Purāṇas actually done. A close examination of the language and metre points out that only those usages should be accounted for metrical needs which consist in an irregular lengthening or shortening of vowels or insertion of a vowel-part (svara-bhakti) to facilitate pronunciation, or a little more than that, which are at the same time required by the specific metre.

1. cp. Atharva Veda XI. 7. 24; XV. 6. 11-2; Purāṇavid in XI. 8. 7; Satapatha Brāhmaṇa XI. 5.6.8, 5.7.9; XIII. 4. 3. 12-3; XIV. 6. 10. 6; Gopatha Brāhmaṇa I. 1. 10, etc.
2. Atharvaveda XV. 6. 11-2; Gopatha Brāhmaṇa I.1.10; Satapatha Brāhmaṇa XIV. 6. 10. 6; along with Chāndogya Upanishad VII. 1. 2, 1. 4, 2. 1 and Sūtras where ‘Purāṇa’ has always been mentioned beside the epics (Itihāsa).
3. Saptadāśa (for sapta-dāsa) in Brahmāṇḍa II. 21. 84; Mahātmya (for māhātmya) in Skanda. Mahādeva, 1. 30. 51 tata stād akāraṣam (for akāraṣam), in Bṛhadāraṇyaka 1. 6. 5 kim akāraṣit tataḥ (for akāraṣit) ibid. i. 10. 1, etc.
The rare forms of an old language like Sanskrit must not be dispensed with merely with the remark that they are irregular because they often prove to be of immense value and link the chain of linguistic evolution. The following treatment of some important linguistic peculiarities will show how far Purāṇas are indispensable to the history of linguistic development of Sanskrit. These are arranged here according to the grammatical categories:

The Declension:

In the Purāṇas masculine stems in ī and u often insert an n before endings beginning with vowels. This insertion before the endings of the Instrumental singular and Genitive plural has been most current in ancient times, which led Pāṇini to frame sūtras like aṇo nā' striyān1 and kṛṣvanadīyāpo nuṭ2, the former substituting nā for the normal ending ā, to stems other than feminine and the latter prescribing an augment (insertion) of an n before genitive plural ending to the same stem. These two forms with inserted n have survived and come down to us in regular use. They do not strike our mind because we are much accustomed to them. But an attentive reader is naturally startled to note this insertion extended elsewhere also, i.e. in the accusative, dative, ablative, genitive and locative singular and nominative and genitive plural.

Thus the accusative singular form māricinam (against regular māricim as if it were māricīn-am occurs twice in the Brahmaṇda and once in a parallel passage of the Kūrma4.

In the dative singular occur ardhendumauline (against

1. Asādhyāyī VII, 3, 120.  
2. Ibid. VII, 1, 54.  
3. प्राणाद वक्तोड्युज्जद् वाच वच्चुम्भी च मरीचिनम् ।  
   इ. 5, 74ab.  
4. प्राणाद वक्तोड्युज्जद् वाच वच्चुम्भी च मरीचिनम् ।  
   इ. 7, 36ab.
the regular ardhendumaulayc) in the Brahmanḍa, ghrpine in the Kūrma and surahlique in the Skanda. In the ablative singular is found Kālaneminaḥ in the Skanda.

In the genitive singular are found salilayoninaḥ (twice) and avyaklayoninaḥ in the Brahmanḍa, Kālaneminaḥ (twice) and saimaulinaḥ in the Skanda and Candramaulinaḥ in the Matsya. The genitive plural form āmayoninām and māmūṣṇām occur in the Brahmanḍa and triḍārāṇām in the Matsya. Lastly the locative singular form bhāṇuni is found in the Bhaviṣya. The nominative plural candrārdhamaulinaḥ occurs in the Matsya (CLXXX. 21ab).

At first sight these forms appear quite abnormal to a classical student. But when we judge them along with their precursors in the earlier literature the fact becomes evident that from the

1. नमक्र्मित्स्मरणानासात्मांनासुज्जमिलिते II. 25. 11 ab
2. नमरो ह्रणिनेनुप्रृत सूयाय ब्रह्मपिरो II. 18. 28 ab
3. शर्वाय दितिसपाय सता सुरादियो नम: II. 48. 23 cd
4. एवं चक्रवर्त्य निशाय निध्यो: सत्वीरस्वाय रवं निमेयाद। निनाय हूरं किल कालनेमिति: भीतस्तदा वायविरोकनावाद। I. 2. 19. 82
5. भृगुप्तु ह्रदयायु जस श्रवृ: सतलिन्यनिति। I. 5. 74 cd
भृगुप्तु ह्रदयायु जस श्रवृ: सतलिन्यनिति। II. 9. 22 ab
संकलनाचैव संकल्पो जजो सोद्वक्षयनिति। I. 5. 73 cd
6. नवस्तय त्रिपिनिमेमी: क्सारे: कालनेमिति। I. 2. 1. 24 cd
सा पपाप तिरस्तुग्रहा तहहा कालनेमिति। I. 2. 6. 78 ab
dेयी च प्रविषेषाय भवनं शश्मोलिति। I. 2. 29. 77 cd
7. श्रीतिभमान्तरक्रिक सततं वस्त्रमिति। Matsya, CLV. 12 cd
8. ब्रह्मा वतात्स्कानां तु सर्वशास्त्रमित्यनिनाम। II. 9. 19 cd
कुटकाकुटकाक्रङ्गाल नवनां मुनयुधायु। II. 7. 87 cd
9. तेस्वा निःपुष्युक्तानां निःपुरे निभारिनाय।
जन्तिस्म सुखं कालं स्त्राण्विनानं यथा तथा। CXXXX. 11
10. तत्ति ववाणि सवसं हस्पातिरि चासुनिः।
बलानि तत्तमुखोऽवस्था सात्सीतपस्तको गुण। II Brāhma. CXV. 14
11. cp. the solitary occurrence of cārunaḥ in the Rgveda VIII. 5. 14 as well as that of rajjuni in the Atharva Veda XX. 133. 3,
earliest down to Purāṇa period masculine stems in i and u like neuter ones could freely insert n before endings beginning with vowels, beside the normal form prescribed in grammars. Pāṇini prescribes the aforesaid insertion to neuter stems only, which frequently appears here also in case of the masculines.

Another remarkable point in Purāṇic declension, though of rare occurrence, is that the nominative plural form of many stems appears in the accusative also. Thus, in the Mārkaṇḍeya are found forms like viḥūtayāḥ, paśaṇāḥ, avayaḥ and gāvah, etc. against the normal viḥūtīḥ, paśān, avīh and gāh, respectively. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa in a parallel passage, though partly emended, mentions avayaḥ for normal avīh. Similarly in the Brahmāṇḍa in an identical context is found gāvah used for regular gāh. The Bhāgavata too in a quite different context uses gāvah in the accusative. The epics also furnish similar usages.

This fact, though rare, is not absent in the earlier literature. Thus in the Rgveda occurs the nominative plural form aryaḥ used as accusative. Similar instances to this effect are vayaḥ, citrōtaryāḥ, āpah and in the Atharvaveda śucayaḥ, etc.

Thus from a comparative study of the above it is clear that Purāṇas maintain the chain of early evolution of language in which the nominative and accusative plurals were used indistinctly.

---

1. इकोडिच विभक्ती, Asādhyāyī VII. 1. 73
2. पश्यैता वृष मथेय विभक्तयो महिष्मृत्य: | XC. 4
   तत्: स्वदेहीत्यानिव वयासि पश्योस्सजः |
   मुखसोदः ससर्जय वक्षस्मार्योस्सजः |
   गाभाबौर्दराद ब्रह्म पात्रध्या च विनिमितमेऽऽ् | XLVIII. 25
3. द्वयो वक्षस्मके मुखसोदः: स सुन्धरान | I 5. 48 cd
4. द्वयो बोर्दराद ब्रह्म पात्रध्या च विनिमितमेऽऽ् | II. 8. 44 ab
5. सर्पिलथव विप्रवाहो गाबो बहुगुणा द्रु: | III. 3 26 cd
6. बत्तमाहशयक्षेपेण दिप्व झालम्बितः | Śrīmadbhagavadgitā X. 16ab
   हत्ते कथित्याभिम दिप्व झालम्बितः | ibid X. 19 ab
7. cf. Rgveda VII. 48. 3, etc. seven times.
8. Rgveda I. 104. 3 ; Atharvaveda V. 1. 3,
Similarly Purānic declension is often seen observing no distinction between strong and weak stems. Normally in graded declension the first five endings up to the accusative dual of masculines take the strong stem and the rest the weak. Purāṇas indistinctly use the weak stem with little modifications in other cases. Thus in the Bhaviṣya we find vidvadhiḥ used for the normal vidvadhī. The Vāmana Purāṇa uses senāye as a locative singular form, as if made from a stem in a. All these have their germs in the early language of the Vedas where also the weak stem sometimes appears in strong cases.

The use of bare stem in the locative singular of words ending in an is a common factor of the Vedic language. This also appears here in the Purāṇas not infrequently. Thus the Bhāgavata uses atman and bhūman as locatives against the normal ātmanī and bhūmanī.

The Verbal Inflexion:

Without going into subtle details it may be said that verbal inflexion in the Purāṇas exhibits considerable divergency in regard to voice (upgraha) and the class (gana). There is much effacement of distinction between active (parasmaipadum) and middle voices (ātmanepadum). Instances to this effect recur in all the Purāṇas. Thus for example व्रद्धी ‘to grow’, वा ‘to sit’, etc. are roots inflected, as a rule, in the middle voice alone but in the Purāṇas as well as in the epics their active inflexion is also met with.

1. सुदन्तस्य व्रद्धि | अग्निधाय! I. 1 48.
2. प्रयम्य सौभोज्य: पुराणविषय, सह | Brāhma LXX. 6. ab
3. सेनाय नित्ये तत्सदृश | XV. 22 a
4. Cp. व्रद्धिः (Rgveda I. 11. 5) used for प्रवासवावं, and चक्रवर्तम (Igveda X, 139. 1) for चक्रवर्तम, with veḍaviduṣṭि (Brahma Purāṇa LVI. 18) used as nominative plural etc.
5. आत्मु भावसं तानि न पराभवविद्यम् | II. 5. 5. ab
6. वर्षेन्द्र सहन्ति | Brāhma LXXII. 36
    प्रासातः (the genitive singular of the present participle from the active base of वा ‘to sit’ against the normal प्रासात्स्य) in Brāhma CX. 14,
A similar divergency subjects the system of verbal classes also. In classical grammar each verb has been assigned to a definite class or number of classes whereas in the Purāṇas it observes no hard and fast rule. Thus here a verb may belong to any number of classes.

**The Verbal Augment:**

The most conspicuous inflexional peculiarity in the Purāṇas lies in the treatment of verbal augment. Like the earlier language of the Vedas here also it is often dropped and the forms without augment are used in the augmented ones. Thus, for example *karot*, *vi-ni-vedayat*, *sam-ut-sārayan*, *pra-kalpayat*, *bravi*, *kṛthāh*, *chādayan*, *pra-kupyata*, *pūjyat*, *vy-ava-dhāt*, etc. etc. occur in various Purāṇas and express past sense. Sometimes such forms

---

वद्यम्, Bhāgavata III. 10. 2.  
अभेलत: निःस्रतः ग्यन्वमात्राः (normally प्रवेशमात्राः) in Bhāgavata III. 12. 51.  
वनेद: (normally लोमेद) in Brāhmanādyāya I. 17. 70, etc.  
1. चन्द्र in Brahma LXIII. 8 occurs beside चन्द्रिण्य the regular formation of the VII class.  
शोचिन्म in Skanda Māh. II. 33. 8 beside the normal शोचिन्म  
2. Prescribed by Pāṇini as लुढ़ वर्णयुक्तहुः:; Aṣṭādhyāyī. VI. 471.  
3. Cf. बहुः चन्द्रस्मर्यायोऽिपिः, id. VI. 4. 75  
4. सत्कृप्यो विनयुक्तं बहुलिन्ता मस्मतात करोद। ब्राह्मण II. 13. 61 cd  
सोभायस्यार्थपतिः सुविन्द्रायं सदा विभद्धवादायु तस्मै।  
ibid III. 27. 20  
ते सम्पुत्सरायव् शेनोः: युवरस्मर्यायिकात्।  
पुनः सोव्य प्रक्वतः। Vāyu I. 6. 32 d  
बाहो दोर्रमना ब्र्यैत्। Skanda Mah. II. 46. 15  
दिवास्तत्वः कृष्णार्: पादाकारस्तिरोहिष्ठा।  
सुलिप्त मुचिर वाते दिष्टो गर्भं मया तव।  
भद्धवेयः पुनः: प्राप्य ते च तत् स्थितात स्थवर्।  
नीहा राज्यवेत् दिसा।  
ibid II. 14. 42  
id. II. 13. 109 cd  
नीहा राज्यवेत् दिसा।  
पुनसंयोगमेच्छद्य स तद्विसवात प्रकुप्तत।  
ibid II. 46. 55  
पुज्यमात्रतिर्मुनियुतकः कृष्णो महामना।  
id. II. 54. 17  
न हेष्य व्यवस्थायः काल एष सर्वनिराकृतः।  
Bhāgavata I. 6. 4  
घण्टास्वनेन तातारंशात्मका चोपटः हृदद।  
Mārkaṇḍeyea LXXXVIII. 8  
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appear formally as an injunctive also. Use of unaugmented forms are much common in the Vedic language.

Gerunds:

Regarding the use of gerunds Purāṇas show some deviation. Against the general rule that simple roots take -tvā in forming gerund whereas the prefixed ones add -ya instead, the Purāṇas frequently use tvā to the prefixed and -ya to the simple ones. Pāṇini has noted this fact in regard to the Chandas or the Vedic language.

Infinitives:

Besides the single surviving form of the accusative infinitive in -tum the Bhāgavata Purāṇa twice uses dative infinitive form pratihartave (for normal pratihartum) and hantave (for hantum).

Particles:

Of the particles the Skanda Purāṇa frequently uses asmi and a few times asi, the former being equal to the pronoun of the first person and the latter to that of the second one. This usage is quite rare in the later literature.

Taking into cognizance the linguistic material treated above, the antiquity of the Purānic language is amply evident.

1. हय यो ग्रा यो म ् को य य भ ् धभसकिसुमनि:।
   बदनगरसने पुरय फल तत्स्रीमान्यात्॥ Bhavisya Prati. IV. 21.43

2. समसंज्ञाप्योऽक्तो ल्यः, अश्वद्धाय VII. 1. 37

3. ब्रजपुरयवा in Brahma VII. 3. 26. ब्रह्मपुरिवा in Vayu I. 4. 30, etc. etc
   गुहा in Brahmānda II. 22. 12. Matsya II. 10, CXXXIII. 57; पूजय
   in Vāmanīa II. 37, etc.

4. क्ल्यापी च्यंद्विस, अश्वद्धाय VII. 1. 38

5. सबेन निरुत्का: स्वविहारतत्र ् न शास्तसमावहतियते॥ III. 5. 47 ed

6. ब्राह्मणसंहार त वूयो हस्तवेवितर्वोदयत । IV. 19. 15 ab

7. विचरायसिः ( = विचरायसः ond so on) II. 5. 21, सन्तायसिः II. 7. 41
   प्रवचयसिः II 7. 57, प्रतिविषयायाः ओऽ पूजयायाः II. 8. 28, प्रवचयायसिः II. 27. 56
   अद्य वसायाः II. 32. 165, श्रवयायसिः II. 34. 76, प्रवचयायसिः II. 40. 9,
   यजायसिः II. 42. 178, प्रति तसमम II. 46. 129, etc.

8. पिक्षिः ( = पिक्षिः लोय) II. 40. 88.
THE DEVI-BHÄGAVATA AS THE REAL BHÄGAVATA*

BY

NIRMAL CHANDRA SANYAL

[ देवीभागवत-श्रीमद्भागवतपुराणयोः: महापुराणविषये प्राचीनकालतः एव विवादः: विज्ञानवादाः प्रचलत। वैष्णवाणां सते श्रीमद्भागवतमेव महापुराणम् सांस्कृतकालाः सते देवीभागवतं महापुराणम्। श्रीवाचर्यः, महावर्गः: रामायणाचार्ये श्रीमद्भागवतं प्रभाग्येन ब्रह्ममुख्यं। जैवनीलकण्ठान: नामक आचार्यः: देवीभागवतं महापुराणग्रंथान: भानकरोति। डॉ. हाजराप्रसूतर: केवल श्रीमद्विद्वंदोर्जणि विज्ञानवाचर्यान: महापुराणमानकरोति। अस्मिन्न लेखनी विद्वान् लेखकपने नाप्पामासाम सुविद्य वते देवीभागवतपुराणस्य महापुराणवं प्रतिभाविदितं प्रकट: अद्वैत-पुराणान्तरस्य सांस्कृतकालाः सती श्रीमद्विद्वंदः विद्वान्। ब्रह्मविद्वान्: वैष्णवान्तरस्य सांस्कृतकालाः सती, श्रीमद्विद्वंदः विद्वान्। ब्रह्मविद्वान्: वैष्णवान्तरस्य सांस्कृतकालाः सती, श्रीमद्विद्वंदः विद्वान्। ब्रह्मविद्वान्: वैष्णवान्तरस्य सांस्कृतकालाः सती, श्रीमद्विद्वंदः विद्वान्। ब्रह्मविद्वान्: वैष्णवान्तरस्य सांस्कृतकालाः सती, श्रीमद्विद्वंदः विद्वान्। ब्रह्मविद्वान्: वैष्णवान्तरस्य सांस्कृतकालाः सती, श्रीमद्विद्वंदः विद्वान्।

The controversy as to which of the two Bhāgavatas, viz. the Devi-Bhāgavata and the Vishnu-Bhāgavata (better known as the Śrīmad-bhāgavata) is a Mahāpurāṇa has been continuing for some centuries past. We get the earliest hint about it in the commentary on the Vishnu-Bhāgavata written by Śrī-Dharasvāmin (circa 1350-1450 A. D.). According to this commentator the Vishnu-Bhāgavata has got all the characteristics of the Bhāgavata (Mahāpurāṇa) described in Matsya-purāṇa and the Purāṇāntara, (i.e., the other Purāṇa). Then Narasimha Vājapeyin whom Dr. Kane has placed after 1400 A. D. has shown in his Nityāchārapradipa,

* The writer is indebted to Dr. Asoke Chatterji Sastri, Head of the Purāṇa, Ithāsa Department of the Varanaseya Sanskrit University for revising this article. According to his suggestions certain portions of the original article have been deleted.
some reasons for dismissing the views of those who connect the Bhāgavata with Bhagavatī.

Probably next comes the Bhāgavata-Vishaya-Svarūpa-Śaṅkā-Nirāsa-Trayodasa of Purushottama Tirtha, who, according to some Scholars, lived in the middle part of the 15 century. In it the writer has furnished thirteen grounds for accepting the Vishnu Bhāgavata as the true Bhāgavata.

In the 16th century Jīva Gosvāmin produced his Shāta-sandarbha (Six Essays). In its first essay, named the Tatvāsandarbha, he tried to prove the superiority of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata over all other Purāṇas and its existence in the days of Śaṅkarāchārya.

Early in the next century Mitra Miśra wrote the Viśramitrodaya, in which he supported the claim of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata and dismissed the claim of the Devi-Bhāgavata which he mentioned by the name Purāṇamitra.

After about fifty years Bhānuji Dīkshita alias Ramaśrama, son of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkshita, the celebrated grammarian of Vāraṇasī, wrote a pamphlet named the Durjanamukhachapetikā in which he denounced the Śaktas for their disregard of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata and tried to prove that work to be a Mahāpurāṇa composed by Vyāsa.

His views were first attacked by Kāsinātha Bhaṭṭa, a Śaṅka pañḍita of Vāraṇasī in another pamphlet named the Durjanamukhamahāchapetikā and then by an anonymous disputant in a third pamphlet named the Durjanamukhapadmapādukā. Both these pamphlets declared in favour of the Devī-Bhāgavata.

The Siddhāntadarpaṇa of Baladeva Vidyābhūshana, a Vaishnava Scholar belonging to Chaitanya’s sect and a contemporary of Maharaja Jaisingh II of Amber (1699-1725) probably comes next. It is a small metrical composition of fifty-one verses divided into seven prabhās of which the third, fourth, fifth and sixth prabhās have tried to establish the claim of the Vishnu Bhāgavata (for being regarded as a Mahāpurāṇa).
Then comes the Varivasyārahaśya, with commentary, from the pen of Bhāskara Rāya, the well-known Śākta scholar of Southern India, who flourished in the earlier half of the 18th century. This writer has mentioned the Devī-Bhāgavata by the name Bhāgavata in his original work and has justified his action in its commentary by furnishing a few arguments.

After this, we get the Devī-Bhāgavata-Sthiti of Śaiva Nīlakaṇṭha, which, after being revised by him, has been incorporated in his commentary on the Devī-Bhāgavata, as a preface. This writer states with a spirit of toleration, rare in his days, that some authorities support the claim of the Devī-Bhāgavata, while other authorities support the claim of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata and that the claim of both of them ought therefore to be admitted.

Last among the writings on this subject, which appeared in the mediaeval age, is perhaps another Devī-Bhāgavata-Sthiti written by Vidyāśānta. In it the writer has taken exception to the compromising attitude of Śaiva Nīlakaṇṭha, and has tried to prove the statements of authorities who have declared in favour of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata to be of late dates.

Again, some of the eminent Indologists of modern Europe and India have considered the question; and their opinions are also divided. Thus Colebrooke (Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I, p. 104) Burnouf (Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Preface pp. LXIIff.) and Wilson (Vishnu-Purāṇa, Preface pp. XLIV-LI) have given their verdicts in favour of the Devī-Bhāgavata while Macdonnell in his History of Sanskrit Literature has taken no notice of it and Winternitz in his History of Indian Literature Vol. I, pp. 554-556 has mentioned the Vishnu-Bhāgavata among the Mahāpurāṇas and has only taken a passing notice of its rival. Among Indian scholars, Raja Rajendra Lal Mitra has declared in favour of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata in the catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner, pp. 193-194; while M. M. Ganganath Jha and Prof. Śrīkantha Śastri in their articles published in the M. M. Kuppuswami Śastri commemoration Volume, pp. 1-2 and the ABORI, 1932-33, pp. 241-249 respectively.

Though the problem created by the rivalry between the two Bhāgavatas has thus been under the consideration of the scholars for a pretty long time, yet up till now certain points connected with it has not been considered at all while certain other points have not been considered fully.

Due consideration of these points has led us to support the claim of Devi-Bhāgavata. But one point we wish to explain at the outset. The Vishnu-purāṇa says that the epithet Bhagavān belongs to Vāsudeva (Krishṇa) and to no other person. Also, the word 'Bhāgavata' has been used in good many literary works and epigraphical records of the medizieval age as an appellation of the worshippers of Vishnu-Krishṇa. This has created an impression in the minds of some modern scholars that the name Bhāgavatapurāṇa is correctly applicable to the Vishnu Bhāgavata which describes the exploits of that deity and that the derivation of the word Bhāgavata as 'Bhagavatya idam' is an invention made by Śaktas after the Purānic age. But we have come across two instances in the Purānic literature of the use of the word Bhāgavata as an appellation of the worshippers of Bhagavati also. In chapter 13 of the first book of his *Chaturvargachintāmani*, Hemāḍri quotes a passage from the Bhavishyapurāṇa, which furnishes details of the Ubbayanavāṇi Vrata, a Vrata (vow) meant for propitiating Devi or Bhagavati. According to this passage the vow should last for one year and should consist, among other rites, of worship of Devi with certain special articles at the end of each month, which is to be followed by feeding of eight virgins and eight Bhāgavata

1. एष्येव महामुखवर्धी देवीश्य भगवानिति ।

परमस्थित्वस्य बालिकेवस्य नामग्य: ॥ (VI, 5, 76)
Brāhmaṇas. Just after quoting the passage Hemādri comments that the word Bhāgavata means (here) devoted to Bhagavatī. Then we find that the original Kālikāpurāṇa, which was written for glorifying Devī (or Bhagavatī), calls itself Bhāgavatasya mauleyam or fit for being kept on the head of a Bhāgavata. No doubt this phrase should be interpreted as fit for being kept on head of one devoted to Bhagavatī thus the derivation of the word Bhāgavata as ‘Bhagavatyā idam’ had at least some adherents even in the Purāṇic age.

Let us first examine the two verses which Śrīdharasvāmin has quoted from the Matsyapurāṇa and Purāṇāntara for supporting the claim of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata.

The Matsyapurāṇa verse states that the book in which the Dharma has been described in detail in the course of discussion about the Gāyatrī and which contains the story relating to the death of the Asura Vṛitra, is the Bhāgavata (Mahāpurāṇa). Of the contents of the Bhāgavata, mentioned in this verse, the story relating to the death of the Asura Vṛitra is found in the Vishnu-Bhāgavata as well as in the Devī-Bhāgavata. So it is not the distinguishing characteristic of either of them. The Dharma has also been described in detail in the Vishnu-Bhāgavata as well as in the Devī-Bhāgavata. But in the former it has no connection with the Gāyatrī, whereas, Skandhas XI and XII of the Devī-Bhāgavata are devoted to the exposition of the Gāyatrī and the Dharma. So the verse in question has mentioned the Devī-Bhāgavata as the Bhāgavata.

In order to prove that the above verse has mentioned the Vishnu-Bhāgavata as the Bhāgavata (Mahāpurāṇa) Śrīdharasvāmin has first tried to establish the identity of the opening verse of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata with the Gāyatrī by assuming —

10. मातलेको नमस्कर कस्तह भवद्यो च दुःखादित्या।
कस्तह भवद्यो नहं पुष्पाक्षित्व तरिको वहने।
नैवेद्य तत्कालस्व श्रीरस्तिडं निवेदयेत्।
कुमारिमेंद्रं जयवच्छों विस्तारे सागवतास्तथा।
11. मातलेको नमस्कर कस्तह भवद्यो च दुःखादित्या।
कस्तह भवद्यो महाबुधेस्तरं नहं पुष्पाक्षित्व तरिको वहने।
नैवेद्य तत्कालस्व श्रीरस्तिडं निवेदयेत्।
कुमारिमेंद्रं जयवच्छों विस्तारे सागवतास्तथा।
(1) That the revelation of the Vedas to Brahma by the Supreme Being, mentioned in one of the lines of that verse, being tantamount to the supply of intellect (to all beings) by Divine Light, mentioned in the Gayatri, the sense of that verse is the same as the sense of the Gayatri.

(2) That the word \textit{dhimahi} being present in that verse as well as in the Gayatri, the language of that verse is the same as the language of the Gayatri.

This interpretation of the clause which refers to the revelation of the Vedas to Brahma as having the same sense as the Gayatri, which refers to the supply of intellect to us (i.e., all living beings) is too far-fetched to be accepted by an impartial reader.

One point deserves special notice here. Just below the verse of the \textit{Matsyapurana}, discussed above, we get another verse which tells us that the Bhagavata deals with the accounts of men and gods who lived in the Sarsvata Kalpa.

In the \textit{Devi-Bhagavata} VI. 31 Vyasa is represented as saying that he wrote it in the Sarsvata Kalpa, whereas in the \textit{Vishnu-bhagavata} (II. 8) we find that it was recited to Brahma by Vishnu in the Brahma Kalpa. Some of the subsequent commentators of the \textit{Vishnu-Bhagavata} have tried to support the remark of Sridhara-svamin by arguments, which have got as little logic in them as that remark. Thus Vallabhacharya has stated that the Gayatri and the opening verse of the \textit{Vishnu-Bhagavata} have got the same

\textit{5. सारम्यकल्पव द्यो द्यो शून्यांश्चरि}।
तत्र तुत्तत्त्तोदवर्ष लोके तद्भावश्चतमिभवे}।

\textit{6. In the Vishnu-Bhagavata (II. 10) Suka is however represented as concluding the prefatory remarks and beginning the main topic of the book with a request to Partikshit for hearing the Padmakalpa. Thus there is a discrepancy between the statements of chapters 8 and 19 of Skandha II of the Vishnu-Bhagavata. Jiva Gosvamin has tried in his Tattvasandartha to connect the Vishnu-Bhagavata with the Sarsvata Kalpa. But for this he has reported to far-fetched interpretation and has kept silent about the statements reads in the above two chapters.}
meaning; and in order to prove this, he has attributed such meanings to certain words as are not found in the Sanskrit lexicons. Jīva Gosvāmin has stated that the Gāyatrī being the genesis of all the mantras, ought not to be put in writing in full and that the word dhīmahi ought therefore to be taken as its representative. But we are not aware of any Śāstric injunction to this effect. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī has stated that the use of the Vedic word dhīmahi instead of dhyāyema in the opening verse of the Vishṇu-Bhāgavata proves it to be a Gāyatrī. But a careful scrutiny of that work will bring out scores of instances of its use of Vedic words. (II. 7; VIII. 1 and 23 etc.)

The verse quoted by Śrīdhārasvāmin from Purāṇāntara tells us that the book which contains the stories relating to the Hayagrīva Brahmavidyā and the death of Vṛitra and which begins with the Gāyatrī is the Bhāgavata. Of the contents of the Bhāgavata mentioned here, the second is not helpful to us, for reasons already stated. As regards the first Jīva Gosvāmin reserves that the Nārāyaṇavarman, which is composed of verses no. 12 to 34 of chapter 8 of Skandha VI of the Vishṇu-Bhāgavata has, on account of its having been communicated to Tvāshṭrī by the horse-headed rishi Dadhīchi, been called Hayagrīva-Brahmavidyā.

Now, the verse, which mentions the Hayagrīva Brahmavidyā as one of the contents of the Bhāgavata, evidently wants to describe the Bhāgavata in a few words and thus mentions some of its stories which are comparatively important. So, if we accept the interpretation of Jīva Gosvāmin, then we must assume that the Nārāyaṇa-varma which consists of only twenty-three verses included in the chapter mentioned above, is more important than the chapters of the Vishṇu-Bhāgavata which describe the lives of Jaḍa-Bharata, Dhrūva, and Prahlāda and the exploits of Kṛṣṇa and that this has led the mention of the former and omission of

---

7. We are unable to say which Purāṇa has been meant by the word Purāṇāntara. According to Vījāyadhvaja it is the Skandapurāṇa and according to Vīra-Rāgghava it is the Uttarākhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa.

8. हृदयस्वीवविविध्वत् तत्र वृत्तत्वस्तवा। गावक्ष्व वै समार्थस्तदूर्व वै भागवतं विदुः।
the latter in that verse. But will not this assumption go against the rules of proportion and propriety? Kāśīnātha Bhaṭṭa has rightly observed:—

Why have the Purāṇas mentioned the stories relating to the death of Viśtīrāṣura etc. as characteristics of the Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavata and have left out the life of Krishṇa which has been described in detail in that work?  

Then another point arises. The Nārāyaṇavarma has been mentioned by the name Nārāyaṇaparam Varma in one place of the above chapter and by the name varma Nārāyaṇāttmakam in another. Any of these names could be conveniently used in place of its obscure synonym Hayagrīva-Brahmavidyā. Why was then neither of them used in the verse in question and why was that obscure synonym used instead? Until and unless these two points are satisfactorily explained it is not possible for an impartial reader to accept the interpretation of Jīva Gosvāmin.

But there is explicit reference to the story relating to the Hayagrīva Brahmavidyā in the Devī-Bhāgavata (I. 5) and in this study Devī has been twice mentioned by the name Brahmavidyā thus by mentioning the Hayagrīva Brahmavidyā as one of the contents of the Bhāgavata, the verse of the Purāṇāntara implies that the Bhāgavata is identical with the Devī Bhāgavata.

In interpreting the clause according to which the Bhāgavata begins with the Gāyatrī, Kāśīnātha Bhaṭṭa states that as the opening verse of the Devī-Bhāgavata is composed in Gāyatrī metre and the words dhīmahi and prachodayāt which occur in the Gāyatrī occur in it also, the above clauses refers to it alone.  

Indeed the metre and the wording of this verse and the substance of its third charaṇa are such as would remind anyone of the Gāyatrī as soon as he would read it. So, it may be given

9. वैष्णवभागवते शतिविस्तृते कृष्णचरिते घटिते तत्तत् चक्रवत्त्या दुःस्ववचारी
लक्षणसारस्त्रा कुतः: पुराणे लिखितमयः?

10. The opening verse of the Devī-Bhāgavata is:—

सर्वषेत्रयुथ्यां नामाद्वां विष्णू च धीमहि। बुद्धि या न प्रचोदयाद्।।
the name of ‘Gāyatrī’ with some justification; and the statement of Kaśīnātha Bhaṭṭa may be taken as correct.

Inapplicability to the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* of the clause which states that the *Bhāgavata* begins with the Gāyatrī has already been explained by what we have said about Śrīdharasvāmin’s interpretation of the verse of the *Matsyapurāṇa*. It may now be pointed out that the opening verse of the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* begins with the word Janmādyasya Yataḥ (जन्माद्यस्य यतः) which forms the second sūtra of the Vedānta. So, if the author of the Purāṇāntara regarded the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* as the *Bhāgavata* (Mahāpurāṇa) then it would have naturally struck him that the above clause could be substituted with greater propriety by another clause describing the beginning of the *Bhāgavata* with a sūtra of the Vedānta.

It is necessary now to find out the dates of composition of these verses. The first verse appears in a list of Purāṇas (Mahāpurāṇas) and Upapurāṇas, which we find in chapter 53 of the Matsyapurāṇa. Then it appears again in similar lists found in the *Agni purāṇa* and the *Prabhāsakhaṇḍa* of the *Skanda- purāṇa*. Now it has been shown already that this list of the *Matsyapurāṇa* seems to mention the *Devī-Bhāgavata* among the Mahāpurāṇas. So, it ought to have mentioned the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* among the Upapurāṇas. But it has not done so. In fact, it is silent about the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata*. We presume therefore that it was composed some years before the composition of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata or some years after its composition but before its admission to the rank of the Purāṇas.

Nothing can be said definitely about the date of composition of the verse quoted from the Purāṇāntara, so long as this work is not discovered. Only with reference to the period to which Śrīdharasvāmin belonged, we can presume that it was composed by the closing years of the Hindu rule.

Then we get two verses in the two lists of Purānic works furnished by the *Saura Purāṇa* and the *Revākhaṇḍa* of the *Skanda- purāṇa*. These verses tell us that the *Bhāgavata* is devided into
two parts.\textsuperscript{11} As the \textit{Devi Bhāgavata} is divided in two halves, each consisting of six \textit{Skandhas}, no doubt the above verses refer to it and not to the Vishṇu-Bhāgavata, which is not so divided.

Now, in his Dānasāgara, Ballālasena, the King of Bengal (circa 1101-1120) has mentioned the Revākhaṇḍa of the \textit{Skanda-purāṇa} among Purānic works composed by men of his own time. So, with reference to the date of his accession, we may perhaps fix 1050 A. D. as the date of composition of the Revākhaṇḍa (and its list). And the Revākhaṇḍa has mentioned the Saurapurāṇa among Upapurānas. So the \textit{Saura Purāṇa} (and its list) may be dated still earlier.

Next evidence is furnished by a passage quoted from the \textit{Kālikāpurāṇa} by Hemādri in the second book of his \textit{Chaturvarga-chintāmani}. According to it the Bhāgavata is the source of the Kālikāpurāṇa.\textsuperscript{12} And as the Kālikāpurāṇa is a Śākta Upapurāṇa, evidently it mentions Śākta Bhāgavata i.e., the Devi-Bhāgavata has been mentioned under the name ‘Bhāgavata’ as presumed by Śaiva Nilakantha.

Date of composition of the Kālikāpurāṇa (to which the above verses belong) has not yet been fixed. But as Nānyadeva, Lakshmiśīhara and Ballālasena, have drawn upon it, surely it existed in the 11th century.

\textsuperscript{11} ततो भागवतं प्रोत्ते भागवतविषूपितम् \hfill (Saurapūrāṇa 9-8)
\times \times \times
\textit{नवमं भगवासं भागवतविषूपितम्} \hfill (Revākhaṇḍa 1-37)
\times \times \times

\textsuperscript{12} श्रीविषयं श्रीवल्लभं वैश्वतं कृपाखं तथा;\hfill
\textsuperscript{12} मृदि वल्लभं तमसूलं भागवतं स्मृतसम्;\hfill
\textsuperscript{12} नौर वाक्रं नारदीयं नारायणं स्मृतसम्;\hfill
\textsuperscript{12} वामनं कथौ मालायं सतद्वं च गाहदम्;\hfill
\textsuperscript{12} ब्रह्मावत्रक्षद्वः स्त्रीं पुराणाः न स्रष्टय;\hfill

This passage is neither found in the recently discovered manuscripts of the original \textit{Kālikāpurāṇa} nor in the printed editions of the extant \textit{Kālikāpurāṇa}. There is reason however, for suspecting that several passages of the manuscript of the original \textit{Kālikāpurāṇa} are missing. Possibly this passage is to be grouped with them.
Besides these, Śaiva Nīlakanṭha has quoted two verses in his *Devi-Bhāgavata-Sthiti*. Of the two verses, one belongs according to him, to the *Sivapurāṇa*, and is found in the Uttarākhanda (23.92) of that Purāṇa. It states that the book in which the exploits of Bhagavatī Durgā have been described is called the *Bhāgavata* but that it is not to be identified with the *Devi-Purāṇa*. The other belongs according to him to the *Devi-Yāmala Tantra*. It states that the Purāṇa named *Śrīmadbhāgavata* was narrated to the son of Parīkṣhit by Vyāsa, the son of Satyavatī and that the deeds of the incarnations of Devī have been described in it in details.

Both these verses certify the *Devi-Bhāgavata* to be the *Bhāgavata* (*Mahāpurāṇa*). Of these, the verse of the Uttarākhanda of the *Sivapurāṇa* tells us that the *Bhāgavata* is not identical with the *Devīpurāṇa*.

As regards the verse of the *Devi-Yāmala Tantra*, we regret to say that this Tantra has not yet been discovered. Aufrecht has mentioned it in his catalogorum (pt. 1) p. 262 from a statement of Kshemarāja. As it has drawn upon by Kshemarāja, as well as by his Guru Abhinavagupta, surely it existed in the 10th century. But so long as it is not discovered and genuineness of the verse quoted from it by Śaiva Nīlakanṭha is not proved, nothing can be said about the value of the verse.

The claim of the *Vishnū-Bhāgavata* for being regarded as a *Mahāpurāṇa* has been supported by the *Nārādiyapurāṇa* in chapter 96 of its Pūrvabhāga (by way of describing the contents of the *Śrīmadbhāgavata* which agree with those of the *Vishnū Bhāgavata*) and by the Uttarākhanda of the *Padmapurāṇa* in its seven chapters 2, chapter 193 to 198 and 236 of Calcutta (Vangabasi), edition

---

13. भगवत्याश्रयु सुगमवश्रिः सत्व वप्यः ।
तत्रू भागवत्स प्रोक्ता न तु देवीपुराणकम् ॥

Śaiva Nīlakanṭha has interpreted it in a different way. As his interpretation is somewhat farfetched, we are unable to accept it.

14. श्रीमद्भागवतं नाम पूरा: इ रक्षसमितम ।
पारोक्तायोपविमुख सत्ववश्यवभवनता ॥

यत्र देवयवत्सरस बहुवं परिकौटिता: ॥
chapters 189 to 194 and 253 of Poona (Anandasrama) edition. Besides these, the Vishnuhridaya of the Skandapurana has stated in its certain chapters that the Bhagavata has been described by Suka and that Krishna has been glorified in it.

As regards the certificate given by the Naradiyapurana, we give below the substance of a passage which we have got in the Devi-Bhagavata-Sthiti of Vidyatirtha:

Of course, the contents of the eighteen Puranas are found in the manuscripts of the Naradiyapurana written in modern times. Contents of the Bhagavata found therein are applicable to the Vishnu-Bhagavata. In (some) other Puranas also the contents of the Bhagavata are found (and they are applicable to the Vishnu-Bhagavata). But they do not prove the authenticity of the Vishnu-Bhagavata. As similar compositions are not found in the old works, they have been composed by rogues (in modern times). It is for this reason that Sridharasvamin, who was determined to oust the Devi-Bhagavata took the help of weak evidences and not of such strong ones. Also, if those contents were composed by Vyasa then in the contents of the Kurmapurana and of some of the other Puranas, their last portions would have been mentioned in addition to their available portions.15

15. नेतु नारदपुराणांश्चपुराणां यथा यथा सुचिरायुनिकपुस्तकेः पुलमये। तत्र भागवतसुचिरिन्तवमर्मिनिः।
तत्र तु प्रथमे स्कन्धे सूर्य्याणां समागमे। यथास्तु च चरितं पुनः पान्धवाः तत्तविं च। पारंशितमुपाल्यान्तिः समुद्राः सहंभिता देवसाक्षांतसूचिरिन्तवमा। तथा भागवतमाहात्म्यमुद्रेदिविष्णुमाहात्म्यवेदुपिन्तवमर्मिनिः। तथात्म्यपुराणविधानः भागवतप्रतिपादकवचनानिः। उपत्माः। तत्रत्तत्तत्त्तान्नात्म्यमाहात्म्यायाः स्त्रियाः सर्वां प्राचीनपुस्तकेवभावेत। दुःखितत्वेन प्रामाण्याभावाः। अततेत यथेत द्विपरिव्रमणार्यमुपाल्यायाः नानांक्षीयेत वाक्यीयेत वेदीमाहात्म्यश्वरेण वापल्लकिरिः हृदत्रप्रमाणेृथवियृथविज्ञातामप्रमाणे। भागवतमुपाल्यायाः। श्रीमान्महाभागवतमाहात्म्यमुद्रेदिविष्णुमाहात्म्यायाः सर्वां महात्म्यायाः।

कि च यदि सा सुचिरिन्तवस्कन्धे स्यातां यथा भागवतस्य सबिपुराणाः। किताः। तथा सुमेधपुराणाः सम्पद्युपित्तिः ब्रह्मचार्यानां धर्मिकिंवद्येवै न इतर्वास्वानामान्तरं। सर्वाः सूचित शुरूयुतु न च तथात्तिः कित्तु वास्वास्वं सम्पद्युपाल्यः। यथा यथा तथात्तरं। तद्यथे द्विपरिव्रमणे। किताः किताः। च भागवतमाहात्म्यमुद्रेदिविष्णुमाहात्म्यायाः सर्वां महात्म्यायाः।
The statement made in this passage, is quite correct. To illustrate its correctness, we would add here that according to chapter 53 of the Matsyapurāṇa, which we have proved to be fairly old, the Brahmapurāṇa describes the exploits of the Boar Incarnation of Brahmā; whereas chapter 95 of the Pūrvabhāga of the Nārādiyapurāṇa which describes the contents of the Brahmapurāṇa is silent about the Boar Incarnation of that deity and states in its stead that the Brahmapurāṇa is divided into the Brahmakhaṇḍa, Prakritikhaṇḍa Gaṇeśakhaṇḍa and Kriṣṇakhaṇḍa. This statement is applicable to the extant Brahmapurāṇa, including the Prakritikhaṇḍa was composed in the Muslim period. We may assume therefore that all the chapters of Pūrvabhāga of the Nārādiyapurāṇa which describe the content of the Mahāpurāṇas (including chapter 96 already referred to) were written in a very late date did not see the original Brahmapurāṇa. Also, as implied by Vidyātīrtha, they were probably composed after the death of Śrīdharasvāmin.

Of the seven chapters of the Uttarakhāṇḍa of the Padmapurāṇa it can be remarked that Dr. Asoke Chatterjee has proved (see his book Padmapurāṇa—A study pp. 80ff.) that these chapters belong to a very late period. Thus these are of little value.

The Viṣṇukhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa has described in chapter 21 of the Venkatāchalamāhāmya included in it, the presence of Rāmaṇuja at Tirupati. So we may assume that it was written at least one hundred years after the death of that Saint which took place after 1125 A. D. when he was regarded as a man of the remote past.

Another support to the claim of the Viṣṇu-Bhāgavata comes from two verses found in the Bhāgavata-tātparya of Mahāvīcharīya. They certify that the book named the Śrīmadbhāgavata is a commentary on the Vedānta, Mahābhārata and Gāyatrī, has got the sense of the Vedas in it and occupies among the Purāṇas the
position which the Sāmaveda occupies among the Vedas.\textsuperscript{16}

These verses, although stated by Madhvaśāhrya to have been quoted from the Garudaṇḍapurāṇa, are not traceable in any of the printed editions of that Purāṇa. Moreover, Jīva Gosvāmin has quoted them in one place of his Tattvānanda-bha and has remarked a little later that in order to prove the correctness of his interpretation, he has quoted certain passages from the Vedic and Purānic works seen by him: but that in some cases he has quoted passages which belong to works not seen by him but which appear in the Bhāgavata-tātparya, Bhārata-tātparya and commentary on the Brahmasūtras, written by Madhavāchārya. Then, we learn from another remark made by him that some portions of the Garudaṇḍapurāṇa were not available in his days.\textsuperscript{17}

From this frank confession of Jīva Gosvāmin we are led to conclude that he could not find the above verses in the manuscript of the Garudaṇḍapurāṇa, which he consulted. Thus it can be safely presumed that these verses were composed by some unknown Vaishnava after the death of Śrīdhārasvāmin, and ascribed to the Garudaṇḍapurāṇa. But it is perhaps more correct to presume that they were composed by Madhvaśāhrya in the course of his composition of the Bhāgavata-tātparya (and ascribed to the Garudaṇḍapurāṇa Hari Dīkṣita in his Brahmasūtra-vṛtti and Appaya Dīkṣita in his Madhvamata-vidhvasana have brought out several cases of such statement made by Madhvaśāhrya and Prof. A. Venkata-svāmin in his article on the Māṇḍūkyopanishad and Gauḍapāda

\textsuperscript{16} यथीतः स्वतंत्रवादाय भारतार्थेश्चिनित्वायः।
गायत्रीमाथव्वश्वस्तः के वधार्थविशेषतः॥
पुराणानां सामस्यः शास्त्राय भगवतोज्जितः॥
द्वादशक्षम्भस्तुकः पारंतविच्छेदस्तुः॥
प्रकोष्ठवर्धीदस्तर्थ सादस्त्रीम्भवागवताभिषः॥

\textsuperscript{17} प्रत्येक एवं द्वीपस्थित्वप्रभाबाधिष्ठात्साधिष्ठात्।
published in the Indian Antiquary: 1933 (pp. 181-193) has added to their number.

As regards the silence of Śrīdharasvēmin about these two verses, we would point out that the period which intervened between the career of Madhvāchārya and the career of Śrīdharasvēmin was very short. So it is possible that these verses did not reach the latter.

Next we get a verse in the commentary of Śrīdharasvēmin, which states that the Bhāgavata has been described by Śuka. No doubt this verse implies that the Vishnu-Bhāgavata is the Bhāgavata (Mahāpurāṇa). However, according to Śrīdharasvēmin it belongs to a dialogue between Gautama ond Ambarīṣa, included in the Padmapurāṇa. But neither it nor the dialogue to which it belongs is found in the printed editions as well as in the principal manuscripts of that Purāṇa (see Dr. Asoke Chatterjee Padmapurāṇa—A study in this connection). So its value is open to questions.

Then Jīva Gosvēmin has quoted three verses in the Tattvasandarbha in addition to the one quoted by Śrīdharasvēmin and discussed above. Two of these connect the Bhāgavata with Hari or Vishnu and the third states that the Bhāgavata has been described by Śuka. According to Jīva Gosvēmin, the first verse belongs to a dialogue between Gautama and Ambarīṣa, the second to the Vanijulimāhātmya and the third to the Prahlādasamhītā. The dialogue between Gautama and Ambarīṣa, to which the first verse is stated to belong, is probably the same as the dialogue to which the verse quoted by Śrīdharasvēmin belongs. So its value is open to questions for reason already stated. The Vanijulimāhātmya and the Prahlādasamhītā have not yet been discovered. So the value of the second and the third verse cannot be finally described. Most of the pamphlets on Māhātmyas are however admittedly works of late date; so we will not perhaps be wrong if we group the Vanijulimāhātmya with them. The Prahlāda samhitā has, as far as we knew, been drawn upon only by Saṅtana Gosvēmin in his Bhaktirasamrītatasindhu and by his nephew Jīva Gosvēmin in his Tattvasandarbha. So, with reference
to the dates of Sanātana and Jīva Gosvāmin, we may perhaps assign this work to the latter half of the 13th century.

In short, we may say that majority of the verses and passages, which certify the Devī-Bhāgavata to be a Mahāpurāṇa, belongs to the early mediaeval age, whereas majority of the verses or passages, which certify the Vishnu-Bhāgavata to be a Mahāpurāṇa, belongs to the late mediaeval age and the rest though of indefinite date cannot reasonably be regarded as older than that age. Thus the claim of the Devī-Bhāgavata to the rank of the Mahāpurāṇa is stronger than the claim of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata.

The Vaishṇava writers of the mediaeval age, whom we have already mentioned, seem to have had knowledge of this. So, some of them have tried to turn the tide in favour of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata by making certain old Purāṇic verses applicable to it with the help of sophistic and far-fetched interpretaion.

As far as is known at present, the Vishnu-Bhāgavata received the earliest support to its claim for being regarded as a Mahāpurāṇa from the Tahqiq-ul-Hind of Alberuni. But long before it, the Devī-Bhāgavata received a similar support to its claim from the Matsyapurāṇa relevant verse of which has already been quoted.

In addition to these direct evidences, an indirect evidence also leads us to support the claim of the Devī-Bhāgavata. Though we are not yet in a position to say anything about the date when the Śākta sect came into existence, yet we can say definitely that when the age of the Mahāpurāṇas began, there were many Śāktas in the country. So when the Śaivas and the Vaishṇavas began to write Mahāpurāṇas for describing the glories and exploits of Siva and Vishnu respectively, those Śāktas naturally felt the need for writing at least one Mahāpurāṇa for describing the glories and exploits of Devī. Thus one of them wrote the Devī Bhāgavata. It is of course incorrect to say that they felt this need when it was too late-when the age of the Mahāpurāṇas was gone.

Among the advocates of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata Rajendra Lal Mitra and R.C. Hazra have tried to prove that the Devī-Bhāgavata was not regarded as an authentic and authoritative
work by the learned men of the mediaeval age. We should now discuss about the correctness of the arguments put forward by them.

The remark of Rajendra Lal is to the effect that the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* has been quoted by a host of Mediaeval writers as a Mahāpurāṇa and a large number of commentaries has explained its meaning*** whereas the Śākta work has neither the benefit of a commentary nor the authority derivable from quotations by respectable authors.

Then, Dr. Hazra has observed:—

"The verses quoted from the *Bhāgavata* by Ballālasena, Madhvāchārya, Hemādri, Govindānanda, Raghunandana, Gopālābhāṣṭa and others are very often found in the present Bhāgavata *** whereas the name of the *Devi-Bhāgavata* has not been mentioned in any of the numerous Nibandhas, we have examined."

Existence of a large number of commentaries of the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* need not, in our opinion, be taken into account in considering the question relating to the authenticity of either Bhāgavata. It only shows that the *Vishnu-Bhāgavata* is very popular among the Hindus. We may explain here that its popularity is due partly to the literary beauty possessed by it (and by no other Purāṇa) and partly to the gradual change in the psychology of the Hindus, caused by the Muslim conquest of India, which made them hopeless about worldly prosperity and bend towards the doctrine of Bhakti, ably expounded in it.

It may be added here that most of the Purāṇas have got no commentary at all and a few of them have got one or two commentaries each. It may also be added in contradiction to the statement made by Raja Rajendra Lal that the *Devi-Bhāgavata* belongs to the latter group, for it has three commentaries—vide Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum (Pt. i) p. 261.

However, references to and quotations from the *Devi-Bhāga-vata*, found in the works of the mediaeval age are indeed very few in number. A few verses quoted by Gangādhara in his commentary on the *Dharmasaṃhitā* of the Śivapurāṇa and by Śaiva Nilakanṭha
in his *Devi-Bhāgavata-Sthitī* from certain Purānic works mention it among Upapurāṇas. Among the Smrīti Nibandhas, only the *Durgāpradīpa* compiled in the 16th century, has quoted a verse which prescribes its reading during the Navarātra festival; and the *Sīvārchanadīpaka*, compiled in the 17th century has quoted a passage from it. The *Saubhāgīyabhāskara*, a commentary on the *Lalitāsahasranāma*, written by Bhāskara Rāya in the 18th century has also quoted passages from it. In the *Bhāskarabīṣa*, a biography of Bhāskara Rāya, written by one of his disciples, we find that he popularized it.

Besides these, certain quarrelling pamphlets, written in the 17th and 18th centuries, have referred to it. Then commentaries on it have been mentioned by Aufrecht in the *Catalogus Catalogorum*. Of these, the commentary written by Śaiva Nilakānta in the latter half of the 18th century has come down to us.

In no other work we find any reference to or quotations from the *Devi-Bhāgavata*. However, we have got reason to suspect that a big passage, which forms part of chapter 30 of Skandha VII of this work, has been assimilated by the *Matsyapurāṇa, Śrīśīkhaṇḍa* of the *Padmapurāṇa* and *Śrīvaśīkhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa*. This passage is a list of the names under which Devī is worshipped at places where her limbs fell on being severed by the arrow of Vishṇu, after she had committed suicide on account of her father’s objectionable conduct.

In the *Devi-Bhāgavata Vyāsa*, after narrating the story of Devī’s suicide and severance of Devī’s limbs, quotes a remark of Śiva, according to which, the persons who will worship Devī at the places where her limbs fell, will have their desires fulfilled; at this the king Janamejaya asks the names of those places as well as the names of Devī’s manifestations residing in those places; so Vyāsa recites the list. In the *Matsyapurāṇa* Devī determines to commit suicide; at this, her father asks her about the places at which she will be found and the names by which she will be worshipped (in those places); in reply, Devī recites the list. In the *Padmapurāṇa (Śrīppī Khaṇḍa)* Śāvitrī, displeased with
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Brahmā, prepares herself to leave his abode; in order to pacify her, Vishnu says to her that though she is everywhere, yet he is mentioning the names of the places where men, who want fulfilment of desire, will find her; and then recites the list. According to the Skandapurāṇa (Revaṅkhaṇḍa) the ṛishi Māṇḍavya, who has been placed on a stake by royal officers, propitiates Śiva, who soon appears before him with Devī. Then he requests Devī to name the places where she exists in the form in which she has appeared before him and Devī recites the list.

Now, if anyone examines the relevant chapters of all the four Purāṇas, mentioned above, from a literary point of view, he will have to admit that the question put by Janamejaya in the Devī-Bhāgavata is a justifiable one, whereas the questions put by Devī’s father in the Matsyapurāṇa and by Māṇḍavya in the Skandapurāṇa (Revaṅkhaṇḍa) as well as the remark made by Vishnu in the Pañcarātra (Śrīṅkhaṇḍa) are unjustifiable and unsuitable to the occasions. So, we think that originally the Devī-Bhāgavata had the list in question. Soon it became very popular and the other three Purāṇas then borrowed it from the Devī-Bhāgavata.  

Also, the stories relating to the severance of Vishnu’s head from his body and the adventure of the Haihaya Prince Ekavīra are found in the Devī-Bhāgavata (I. 5 and VI. 19-23) as well as in the recently discovered original Kālikapurāṇa (chapter 39 and 47 to 56); and according to a passage, which we have already quoted, the Devī-Bhāgavata is the source of the original Kālikapurāṇa. So, we may say that the former has lent and the latter has borrowed the above stories. Again the story relating to the

---

18. Another Smṛiti-Nibandha, named the Durgātarangini also prescribes its formal reading during the Navaratra festival, according to Śaiva Nilakaptha.

19. The story of the severance of Vishnu’s head from his body is found in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (XIV. 1. 1. 6 to 10) and the Panchavimśa Brāhmaṇa (VII. 5. 6) also. Some of our readers may presume, therefore, that the author of the original Kālikapurāṇa borrowed it from either of these Brāhmaṇas. But as that Kālikapurāṇa abounds in grammatical mistakes, its author was probably not a very learned man and did not handle any Vedic work. So, we presume that he borrowed the above story from the Devī Bhāgavata.
performance of the Durgāpūjā by Rāma is found in the Devi-
Bhāgavata (III. 30) as well as in the extant Kālikāpūrāṇa (chapter
60) with slight variations; and though this Kālikāpūrāṇa does not
mention the Devi-Bhāgavata as its source, a comparison of the dates
of their composition will prove that the Devi-Bhāgavata is older and
this Kālikāpūrāṇa is younger. So, the latter has borrowed the
above story from the former. One more instance of such borrow-
ing has been traced by Śaiva Nilakanṭha in a clause included in a
verse, which, according to him, belongs to the Adityapurāṇa.²⁰

In this clause Vṛitra's death caused by Devi has been alluded
to; and among all the Purānic works, it is only the Devi-Bhāgavata
(VI.6) that describes Vṛitra's death through Devi's instrumentality.
So, it must be admitted that Adityapurāṇa has borrowed the
substance of the clause relating to Vṛitra's death from the Devi-
Bhāgavata.

Although the remark made by Śrīdharasvāmin in his com-
mentary on the Vishnu-Bhāgavata, which we have referred to in
the beginning of this article, clearly implies the existence of the
Devi-Bhāgavata in his days (circa 1350-1450), it is strange to observe
that all Nibandhas relating to both Smriti and Tantra, composed
after those days, are peculiarly silent about it. Silence of the
Nibandhas like the Durgābhaktitararāṇi of Vidyāpati, Durgotsava-
viveka of Śūlapāṇi, Durgāpūjātattva of Raghunandana and Nava-
ratrapradipa of Nandapanḍita, which deal solely with the Durgā-
pūjā or Navarātra festival (described in the Devi-Bhāgavata III-
26, 27 and V.34), the Śrītattvaśintāmaṇi of Pūrṇānanda Giri,
which deals solely with the nature and attributes of Devi (descri-
based in the Devi-Bhāgavata VII.31 to 36) and the Śaktiṇandada-
tarāṇi of Brahmananda Giri and Tantrasāra of Krishṇananda
Āgamavāgīśa which deal inter alia with subjects which have been
discussed in detail in the Devi-Bhāgavata (e. g. rules for the use of

²⁰. Apparently Śaiva Nilakanṭha has meant the Saurapurāṇa, in
chapter 49 of which, we find the verse in question with slight
variation of reading. It runs as follows:—

या जड़ने महिष्य देशय कृरे दुभत्वरे तता ।
साध्य रत्नावरु हृत्वा स्वराज्यं ते प्रदास्यथि ॥
roary made of Rudrākshas, excellence of Śakti-worship, purification of the elements of the body, rules for the Japa or formal repetition of mantras) makes us astonished. Our astonishment increases, when we notice that most of these Nibandhas have abundantly quoted passages from other Purānic works.

Those who wish to fix the status of a Purānic work from the number of its passages quoted in the Nibandhas, will no doubt explain this silence of the above Nibandhas by saying that the Devī-Bhāgavata was disregarded by men of all sects, including the Sāktas. Before abiding by such a paradox, we should see whether this silence can be explained in any other way.

A remark made by Narasiṃha Vājapeyin, in his Nityāchārapradīpa, which also we have referred to in the beginning of this article informs us that certain persons regard the Kālīkāpurāṇa as the Bhāgavata and declares that as Lakshmīdhara has proved that purāṇa to be an Upapurāṇa, those persons are silenced.

Perhaps we should suspect from this remark that Narasiṃha, Vājapeyin as well as his contemporary pandits belonging to his native land Orissa were totally ignorant of the existence of the Devī-Bhāgavata.

A similar ignorance, of the pandits of Bengal came to light in the last century from a statement made by Babu Janamejaya Mitra, father of Raja Rajendra Lal Mitra, in his book entitled Mahāpurāṇa Śrīmadbhāgavatānukramāṇikā. We learn from it that Maharāja Nabakrishna (who was a contemporary of Robert Clive and Warren Hastings and founder of the Raj family of Sobhabazar, Calcutta) being desirous of collecting manuscripts of all the Purāṇas as well as of all the Parvans of the Mahābhārata sent three Bengali Pandits to Varanasi. These pandits, while engaged at Varanasi in doing the needful, wrote a letter to the Maharaja, which was to the following effect:—

One day the remark of Śrīdharasvāmin, made in his commentary on the Śrīmadbhāgavata, forbidding the acceptance, as the true Bhāgavata, of any book, other than that commented on by him, attracted the notice of Babu Durgaçhāran Mitra (who was
Maharaja's Dewan at Varanasi) and he requested the pandits of Varanasi to find out the second Bhāgavata, existence of which has been hinted at by Śrīdharsavāmin. Nobody agreed to comply with this request. At last one Ramachandra Ghulia, who was a great poet, agreed to comply. He then composed the Devī-Bhāgavata describing the exploits of Devī in it and divided it into Skandhas and chapters in imitation of the Śrīmadbhāgavata. Being pleased with it, Babu Durgacharan Mitra gave its author much reward and got that spurious Purāṇa circulated at Varanasi.

This letter makes not only two irreconcilable statements (according to one of which Babu Durgacharan Mitra came to know about the existence of the Devī-Bhāgavata from a remark of Śrīdharsavāmin, who had lived nearly four hundred years before him, while according to the other, that work was written by a poet of his own time), but also betrays an ignorance of the pandits of Bengal about the existence of the Devī-Bhāgavata up to the 18th century.

The only conclusion which we ought to arrive at from these facts is that some centuries ago all the manuscripts of the Devī-Bhāgavata, which Orissa and Bengal had, disappeared from those provinces and very few manuscripts of it remained in other parts of India.

Certainly such an event should be attributed to some special cause and not mere chance and facts detailed below lead us to think that it was religious fanaticism of certain Vaishnava kings of Orissa and Bengal.

1. Some oft-quoted lines of unknown authorship and date indicate that the Śāktas had to live outwardly like Vaishnavas and repeat mantras meant for propitiating Vishnu.21

2. Some verses of the Nilatāntra (which was probably composed, like many other Tantras, in Bengal or Mithila) indicate

\[\text{21(a) भन्त:शारसः बलिः: शैवः समाव: वैष्णवः स्वरूपःः।}
\text{नानानुपवतः: कोला विचारन्ति महोत्तते॥}
\text{21(b) श्रवयं विष्णुमन्नाया दुग्गविधानमेवता।} \]
that the Śāktas had to perform their religious rites secretly for fear of molestation by Vaishṇavas. 22

3. According to a story, which we find in the Bengali version of the Bhaktamāla (Garland of Saints), a king of Kuśa having been converted to Śāktism by Saṅkarāchārya, ordered that all manuscripts of the Bhāgavata (Vishṇu-Bhāgavata) should be thrown in the Ganges. His order was carried out. But the Ganges did not destroy the manuscripts and Vopadeva recovered them after some time. Then Saṅkarāchārya repented his action and wrote a commentary on the Vishṇu-Bhāgavata. By comparing the available number of manuscripts of the two Bhāgavatas as well as the number of Nibandhas which have drawn upon them, we are led to suspect that it was the Devī-Bhāgavata that suffered prescription, described above, under the orders of a king, who was necessarily a Vaishṇava by religion. Also, as the story is found in the Bengali version of the Bhaktamāla, and not in its Hindi original, we think that it narrates the deeds of a king of Bengal.

4. While some manuscripts of the Devī-Bhāgavata bearing pretty old dates, have been discovered in other provinces of India, no such manuscript has been discovered either in Orissa or in Bengal.

5. In his article ‘Ekānamśā and Subhadra’, published in the J.A.S.B. (Vol. II) 1936; (pp. 41-46). Mr. Jogendra Chandra Ghosh has presumed that the image of Subhadra, placed between the images of Jagannātha and Balarāma in the celebrated temple of Puri is really an image of Ekānamśā, the Mother Goddess of

22. निजेने चैत कर्तव्या न चैत जनसभिः ॥
× × × ×
कुलपुष्पं कुलद्रव्यं कुलपूजां कुलं जरं ॥
कुलचक्रं कुलं ध्यानं संबैयं न प्रकाशयेदु ॥
प्रकाशात् विद्विष्ठानि: स्यादः प्रकाशात्तित्वात्वाचितम् ॥
प्रकाशातो न्यासत्वात्: स्याद् प्रकाशात् कुलसंस्करणम् ॥
प्रकाशातो श्रुतिपुराणम: स्यात् प्रकाशात् कदाचन ॥
पूजाकाले च वेदेति यदि कोषयत गत्वभिः ॥
दशवेदेभावायै: मुद्रां विष्णुव्याख्यानं तथा स्तवम् ॥
the Śāktas, which, according to chapter 58 of the Brihadāraṇīhīta, should be placed between the images of Krishṇa and Balarāma. In support of this presumption Mr. Ghosh has pointed out that Subhadrā has been called Kātyāyanī in chapter 57 of the Brahma-purāṇa and recitation of the Devīsūkta at the time of her worship has been prescribed in chapter 29 of the Purushottamanāhātmya included in the Vishnukhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa. Moreover, ginger and molasses, which, according to the Śākta idea, form a substitute of wine, accompany her daily dishes, even now.

This change in the name of Ekānāmasī is certainly due to some conflict which took place in the past between the Śāktas and the Vaishnavaśas of Orissa and which led the latter to deny the fact of their worshipping the Mother Goddess of the former.

In addition to this a very old tradition tells us that a Śri-Yantra is lying hidden below the floor of the temple, in front of the Ratnavadī or jewel altar, on which the above images are seated. If this tradition is correct, then in it also we get trace of a conflict, which ended with the defeat of the Śāktas of Orissa.

6. The Pārāyaṇa or ceremonial according to the Devī-Bhāgavata is still in vogue in Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra etc. but not in Orissa and Bengal.

With regard to the date of this event the following observations are to be noted.

As the Somavamśi kings of Orissa were Śivaiteśes, this event did not take place in Orissa during their reigns; and as the Pala kings and the earlier Sena kings of Bengal were Buddhists and Śivaiteśes respectively, this event did not take place in Bengal during their reigns. In these circumstances, the second quarter of the 12th century, when Orissa was under the rule of Anantavarmā of the Ganga dynasty and Bengal was under the rule of Lakshmanaśena of the Sena dynasty (both of whom were Vaishnavaśas) should perhaps be taken as the period of occurrence of this event.

We would mention here that Rāmānuja, the Vaishnava saint of Southern India, was a senior contemporary of Ananta-
varman, and that according to the Prapannāmrita, he came to Puri in the course of his digvijaya (tour of propaganda) and brought the king of that place under his influence. So, it is quite possible that Anantavarman imbibed the agressive spirit of Rāmānuja, manifested by his conversion of the temples of Śiva and Harihara (Vishṇu-Śiva), situated at Srikur̥mam and Tirupati respectively, into temples of Vishṇu, his conflict with Adhirājendra, the contemporary Śaiva king of Chola country (which ended with the death of that king in suspicious circumstances) and his arrangement, with the help of his royal disciple Vishṇuvardhana for grinding the Jaina priests of Gangavādi in an oil-mill, for compelling them to embrace Vaishṇavism. Then, we learn by comparing the epigraphical records of the reign of Lakshmamānasena with those of the reigns of his father and grandfather that he forsook his ancestral Śaiva faith and embraced Vaishṇava faith. So, it is quite possible that, like most of the renegades, he was a zealous lover of his new faith.

Perhaps the combined efforts of Anantavarman and Lakshmamānasena led to the disappearance of the Devi-Bhāgavata from Orissa and Bengal.

Now, Dr. Hazra has satisfactorily proved in his article published in the Journal of Oriental Research : 1953 (p. p. 71-77) that the author of the Devi-Bhāgavata was a Bengali. So, in those days, when the printing machines were unknown, Bengal possessed the largest number of its manuscripts; and Orissa, being her immediate neighbour, possessed some manuscripts; and very few

23. Of the four events of the life of Rāmānuja, alluded to above, the first three have been described in the Prapannāmrita and other biographies of Rāmānuja. The fourth has been described in an article of captain Mackenzie, published in the Indian Antiquary, 1872, (p. p. 40-44) which is probably based on some Jaina work.


25. Dr. Hazra has also announced that the author of the Devi-Bhāgavata settled at Varanasi and wrote his book there. Such an assumption is altogether unnecessary in our opinion.
manuscripts reached other provinces. When, therefore, the manuscripts of Orissa and Bengal were destroyed, only those very few manuscripts remained. In all probability this is the reason why most of the Nibandhas have omitted to draw upon the Devi-Bhāgavata and this is the reason why Bhāskara Rāya felt the need of popularizing it.

Of course, the above presumption may not be correct to the letter. But certain violent actions taken by certain Vaishṇava kings of Orissa and Bengal seem to be at the root of the mystery relating to the Devi-Bhāgavata; and in the present state of our knowledge we must identify those kings with Anantavarman and Lakshmana Sena.

However, the omission of Ballalasena, the father of Lakshmana Sena to draw upon the Devi-Bhāgavata is yet to be explained.

Two books written by this king, named the Adbhutasāgara and the Dānasāgara have come to light uptill now. The former one deals with the omens and auguries and the latter one deals with the merits of gifts.

Now, the Adbhutasāgara states that Ballalasena having died before finishing it, his son Lakshmana Sena finished it. And we have shown grounds for suspecting Lakshmana Sena to be hostile towards the Devi-Bhāgavata. If we are correct, then the omission noticeable in the Adbhutasāgara, to draw upon the Devi-Bhāgavata, is not Ballalasena’s but Lakshmana Sena’s.

As regards the omission of the Dānasāgara to draw upon the Devi-Bhāgavata, we would invite the attention of our readers to a passage which appears in the preface of the Dānasāgara and which states that the Bhāgavata, Brahmāṇḍa and Nāradīya Purāṇas have not been taken into account (in writing the Dānasāgara) as they do not deal with the rules relating to gifts. It is to be noted in this connection that the Vishnū Bhāgavata contains no chapter on gift, the Devi-Bhāgavata, however contains only one chapter (chap. 29 or Skandha 9). From this Dr. Hazra has made a mistake in asserting that the Devi Bhāgavata is not the Bhāgavata meant by Ballalasena. For this would give rise to the fallacy of Argumentum ex silentio.
In the opinion of Dr. Hazra, expressed in his article published in the New Indian Antiquary (1938-39) pp. 522-528 the Bhāgavatapurāṇa mentioned in the above passage means the Vishnu-Bhāgavata, which contains no chapter on the merits of gifts. Moreover, the Devī-Bhāgavata contains one chapter (chapter 29 of Skandha IX) on that subject. Yet the Dānasūrya has not drawn upon it. From this Dr. Hazra infers that the Devī-Bhāgavata is not the Bhāgavata meant by Ballālasena.

Then, in his article published in the Journal of Oriental Research, 1953, (pp. 49-79) he states that almost all the chapters of Skandha IX of the Devī-Bhāgavata have been taken from the Prakṛtikhaṇḍa of the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa with certain additions and alterations.

By combining these two statements of Dr. Hazra we get the following facts:

1. The Brahmavaivartapurāṇa, as we see it, is an earlier work and the Devī-Bhāgavata, is a later work.

2. Skandha IX of the Devī-Bhāgavata, as we see it, was borrowed at the time of the composition of that work from the Prakṛtikhaṇḍa of the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa.

3. The Devī-Bhāgavata, with its Skandha IX borrowed from the Prakṛtikhaṇḍa, was in existence in the days of Ballālasena, but he did not regard it as an authentic and authoritative work.

Now, in his ‘Studies in the Purānic Records’ Dr. Hazra has stated in repetition of a statement made by Mr. Jogesh Chandra Roy that the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa, though composed in the 8th century, has been subjected to additions and alterations till the 16th century. Of this period, the latter part, i.e., the 14th, 15th or 16th century, which saw the subjugation of the greater part of India by Muslims, should be assigned to the Prakṛtikhaṇḍa, Chapter 7 of which refers to the adoption of Mlechchha customs and study of Mlechchha scriptures by the four castes in the Kali
age and Chapter 30 of which mentions the punishment to be awarded after death to a Brahman of India, who serves a Mlechchha. So, the 15th, 16th or 17th century should be assigned to the Devi-Bhägavata, which has borrowed from the Prakṛiti-khaṇḍa and chapters 8 and 33 of which are repetitions of the chapters of the Prakṛiti-khaṇḍa referred to above. Similarly the 16th, 17th or 18th century should be assigned to the Revākhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa, which has mentioned the Devi-Bhägavata in its list of the Mahāpurāṇas. And, as Ballālasena has mentioned the Revākhaṇḍa in his Dānasāgara, his reign should be brought down to the closing years of the above period.

Even then we cannot get rid of difficulties. Later in his article Dr. Hazra has, in view of the mention of the Devi-Bhägavata made by Śrīdharasvāmin and some subsequent writers arrived at the conclusion that it was probably composed in the 11th or 12th century. To accept this conclusion, we must either revise our dating based on Dr. Hazra’s statements referred to in the preceding paragraph and assume that the Prakṛiti-khaṇḍa from which the Devi-Bhägavata has borrowed, was, with its lines relating to the prevalence of Mlechchha customs and study of Mlechchha Scriptures, composed in the 10th century or antedate the Muslim conquest of India by two centuries’. Moreover, a question arises here. Why did not Ballālasena draw in his Dānasāgara upon the Prakṛiti-khaṇḍa, which was in existence in his days and chapter 26 of which deals with the merits of gifts?

We do not find a satisfactory reply to this question.

In these circumstances, is it not better to assume that the Devi-Bhägavata was in existence in the days of Ballālasena but its Skandha IX with its chapter 29 (copied from chapter 26 of the Prakṛiti-khaṇḍa) was not? This can easily explain why Ballālasena has not drawn upon the Devi-Bhägavata in his Dānasāgara.

The vicissitudes of fortune, to which the Devi-Bhägavata was subjected during the reigns of Anantavarman and Lakshmana-
sena probably led to the loss of the whole of Skandha IX as well as of the geographical chapters (chapters 5 to 13) of Skandha VIII which it originally had. This loss made the tradition relating to the composition of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa of 18000 verses inapplicable to the Devi-Bhāgavata. To settle this discrepancy, some adherent of that work, who lived in the 16th or 17th century, probably translated in poetical language the geographical chapters (chapters 16 to 20) of Skandha V of the Vishnu-Bhāgavata (written partly in prose and partly in poetry) and copied the Prakritikhaṇḍa of the Brahmavaivarta-purāṇa and inserted them in the Devi-Bhāgavata.

This presumption is confirmed by the following two facts:

1. In the above-mentioned chapters of Skandha VIII and in the whole of Skandha IX of the Devi-Bhāgavata Nārāyaṇa and Krishṇa has been paid the greatest respect.

2. Chapter 1, 2, 4 and 17 of Skandha IV of the Devi-Bhāgavata expressly attempt to lower Vishṇu, Rāma and Krishṇa. Yet nowhere in those chapters we find any reference to the story relating to the rape of Tulasī by Vishṇu which has been told in chapter 24 of Skandha IX (of the Devi-Bhāgavata).

Dr. Hazra also states that Ballālasena has not included the name of the Devi-Bhāgavata among those of the spurious or rejected Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas. Intention of this statement of his is not clear. However, the reason why the name of the Devi-Bhāgavata does not appear among those of the spurious Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas mentioned by Ballālasena is of course this that he had no reason for considering it spurious; and we have already explained that it appears among rejected Purāṇas.

Some more arguments have been put forward by Dr. Hazra for proving his point. We are dealing with them serially.

First of these arguments is this that the contents of the Bhāgavata (Vishnu-Bhāgavata) are more befitting a principal Purāṇa than those of the Devi-Bhāgavata. But the contents of some other Purāṇas (e.g. the Vāmanapurāṇa and the Varāhapuṣya) also are
not fully befitting principal Purāṇas. So, this argument is not a
strong one.

Next argument of Dr. Hazra is based on the mention of
the Vishnu-Bhāgavata (and not of the Devi-Bhāgavata) as one of
the principal Purāṇas by Alberuni. The following remark made
by Edward Sachau at the end of the preface to his English trans-
lation of Alberuni's work refutes this argument:

Lastly, India, as known to Alberuni, was, in matters of
religion, Vishnute (Vaishnava), not Śivate (Śaiva). Vishnū or
Nārāyaṇa is the first god in the Hindu pantheon of his Hindu
informants and literary authorities, whilst Śiva is only incidentally
mentioned and that too not in a favourable manner.

It appears that after the Vishnu-Bhāgavata came into exis-
tence, the Vaishnavaśas began to mention it by the name Bhāgavata.
As Alberuni’s informants were Vaishnavaśas, they informed him
that the Bhāgavata was a Vaishnava Purāṇa.

Next argument draws our attention to the contents of the
Śrimadbhāgavata, described by the Nāradīyapurāṇa in chapter 96
of its Pūrvaḥṣaṅga and agreement of the same with the contents of
the Vishnu-Bhāgavata. But as already seen by us, Vidyātīrtha has
conclusively proved that chapter of the Nāradīyapurāṇa to be an
interpolation of a very late date; and the views expressed by Dr.
Hazra about that chapter of his studies in the Purānic Records
(p. 132) are almost similar to those expressed by Vidyātīrtha. It
is therefore not clear to us why he has attached importance to
that chapter.

Then Dr. Hazra points out that in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa
(Vishnu-Bhāgavata) there is no mention of the Devi-Bhāgavata nor
there is any attempt to prove its own superior position but in the
Devi-Bhāgavata the Vishnu-Brāgavata has been included among the
Upapurāṇas, obviously with a view to establish its own claim
to the position of a Mahāpurāṇa. This shows that the Devi-
Bhāgavata is not a Mahāpurāṇa.

Evidently Dr. Hazra has overlooked an important point here.
He has made this remark with reference to the list of Mahāpurāṇas
and Upapurāṇas which is found in the Devī-Bhāgavata I. 3. But such lists are found in some other Mahāpurāṇas also, and we have reason to believe that they were compiled long after the composition of those Mahāpurāṇas, probably by persons who were entitled to handle them. The same thing may be said in respect of the list found in the Devī-Bhāgavata also. So, the Devī-Bhāga-
vata, (i.e., its original portion) cannot be suspected of attempting to prove its own superiority (and its rival’s inferiority).

Let us explain our intention fully with the help of examples.

The Vāyupurāṇa and the Matsyapurāṇa are two of the oldest Mahāpurāṇas; and each of them has got a list of Mahā-
purāṇas in it; in addition, the Matsyapurāṇa has got a list of Upapurāṇas also, as already told.

Now, if we take it for granted that these lists were compiled by the authors of those Purāṇas, then we should admit that the Vāyupurāṇa was composed after the composition of all Mahā-
purāṇas and the Matsyapurāṇa was composed still later,—after the composition of the Upapurāṇas, mentioned by it. Will it be correct?

Last argument of Dr. Hazra also falls flat. It deals with the difference of opinion among the Śāktas about the identity of their Bhāgavata in consequences of which some of them regard the Kalikāpurāṇa, some regard the Devīpurāṇa and some regard the Devī-Bhāgavata as this work. According to him this is due to the jealousy of the Śāktas of the position and influence of the Vishnu-
Bhāgavata, which led them to compose those Purāṇas and claim position and influence of the Purāṇa of their rivals. But will it not be more reasonable to assume that this difference of opinion among the Śāktas was due to speculations for a long-lost thing about the loss of which they had not kept any record, partly on account of the disorder created by the Muslim conquest of Northern India shortly after the destruction of manuscripts of the Devī-Bhāgavata by Lakshmanaśena and Anantavarman..
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A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE PURĀNAS ON THE KRŚṆA LĪLĀ

BY

BALDEVA UPADHYAYA

[ भारतीयवाद्येः श्रीकृष्णचरितं सर्वत्र आचार्यं वर्तते। पुराणोऽद्य वंशवर्णनां वर्णानुवर्णत्या वर्णशास्त्रः कुरुविविध व्यवस्थानां वा श्रीकृष्णचरितं वाणिज्यस्तिः। अत विद्वान लेखकेन समुक्षिक्षें प्रदर्शितं यत् न केवलमैतिष्ठानिक- घृणा एव श्रीकृष्णः तत्वात्त्विकसम्बन्धितां श्रमवृत्तिः साधनः अध्यात्मिक- घृणा अथवा विविधतिमहत्त्वां वर्तते। ॥

The Purāṇas hold a unique place in the history of the religious literature of the Hindus. They are an inexhaustible mine of pure gold in the shape of very useful and interesting information which they contain not only about the social and political history of this vast land but also about the ethical and philosophical problems of perennial interest. They are indeed a veritable encyclopaedia of Hindu Religion and Ethics. At a time when the language and the teachings of our oldest scriptures, the Vedas—the Fountain-head of all religions and philosophies—were, due to the prevailing ignorance of the age, liable to be misconstrued and misunderstood, the venerable Vedavyāsa, that great benefactor of humanity, took upon himself the onerous task of composing such works for the benefit of the erring mortals as will be suitable compendia for explaining in an easy way the subtle truths and the profound problems of the holy Śruti. These works are the present Purāṇas, which have got the obvious purpose of popularizing and propagating the ideas and ideals of the great Sanātana Dharma.

At present we are not concerned with the study of the age and authenticity of the Purāṇas. Suffice it to say that we hold
all the eighteen Purāṇas to be of equal importance for the study of our ancient culture and religion and do firmly believe that, inspired as they are by a highly noble ideal for their composition, they are undoubtedly characterized by an unmistakeable unity of purpose running through all them. As the classical definition1 of Purāṇas (पुराण पञ्चलक्षणम्) has it, they possess five well-known characteristics (लक्षण). They deal, as ideally conceived, with सर (creation), प्रतिसन्न (dissolution of the universe), वंश (royal genealogies), मन्वतर (different Manu-ages) and राजनुतविरित (detailed histories of some of the prominent royal dynasties of ancient India). This is only an ideal description, but all the Purāṇas do not conform to it. It is only in some of the major ones that all these characteristics attain their full scope and significance.

Śrī Kṛṣṇa was a noble scion of the deservedly reputed Yādava dynasty. His divine qualities apart, He was, even as a great historical figure, a noble embodiment of all the great qualities of head and heart. He was a towering genius of His age, who, endowed with a magnetic personality, outshone every rival, if any, and commanded profound respect and admiration from all, the high and the low, from everyone who happened to come into his contact. Viewed even in an historical perspective, Śrī Kṛṣṇa deserves ample treatment at the hands of the writer of the Purāṇas. But He was more than that. He is the highest incarnation of the great Viṣṇu descended for the destruction of the wicked and the protection of the righteous. Hence, it is but natural to suppose that the Purāṇas will accord Him ample scope for a detailed

1. The classical definition of the purāṇa, as found in most of the purāṇas, is given in the following well-known verse:—

सत्वम् प्रतिसन्न वंशो मन्वतराणि च।

वंशानुविरितं चेतु पुराणं पञ्चलक्षणम्॥

Agni I. 14; Kṛṣṇa I. 1. 12; Garuḍa I. 125. 14; Viṣṇu III. 6. 25;
Mārkaṇḍeya 134. 13.

A slightly different definition is given in the Kāvyas Mīmāṃsā in the following verse where Kalpa has been mentioned as one of the principal subjects of the purāṇas:—

सर्वं प्रतिसन्नः कल्पो मन्वतराणि वंशविधिः।

वचने यय निषिद्धे तद विषयं पुराणमिव।॥
description of a variety of His divinely sweet Lilás. And this they have done. Out of the complete list of the 18 Purāṇas, about two-third deal more or less with the life and deeds of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. The Purānic narration of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s Lilás has followed two different methods. In some they are treated only incidentally, along with the description of the kings of the ancient Kṣatriya dynasties; while in others special sections or books have been devoted to a lengthy and appropriate description of those important incidents. The Purāṇas of the first type are: Garuḍa (I 149), Kūrmā (I. 24-26), Vāyu (96), Nārada (II. 81), and Devī-Bhāgavata (IV. 20-26 and IX), which contain useful information about Rādhā along with the other manifestations of Śakti. The Purāṇas of the second type are about six, all of which have been analysed and described here. They are Agni, Brahma, Padma Brahmapādāvatī, Viṣṇu and Śrīmad Bhāgavata. Out of these, the Agni-Purāṇa has got only a short chapter, while the Brahma and Padma Purāṇas have devoted several Adhyāyas to this subject. The last three have devoted whole sections and books to the description of Kṛṣṇa-Carita and should be considered on that score to be the most important and comprehensive store-house of all the available informations collected in these ancient works touching upon the many-sided personality of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and upon His divine Lilás. We shall present below only a short account of those Adhyāyas and books of the above-mentioned Purāṇas in which Kṛṣṇa-Carita has been dealt with.

Agni-Purāṇa

As it stands, it presents an excellent epitome of all available and useful information about the different branches of learning and sciences. Hence its very nature forbids its attempting a lengthy treatment of Śrī Kṛṣṇa’s life. It has devoted a single adhyāya, viz. the 18th, consisting of only 56 short anuṣṭup verses, and thus catalogues only the important events connected with the life and work of Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

Brahma-Purāṇa

It contains 33 Adhyāyas (180-212) on the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Both the Lilás-those of Vṛndāvana and of Dvārkā-have been
presented here in a concise form. Here are to be found all the important Viṣṇavāna-Lilās which we have come to associate with the name of that Divine Cowherd. The 189th Adhyāya gives a fine description of Rāsa-Lilā, where we find veritable echoes of some of the charming verses of Śrimad Bhāgavata. The Gopīs' lament at the sudden departure of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Mathurā at the instance of Akrūra is profoundly touching and truly heart-rending. But a thorough comparison of these Adhyāyas with those in the fifth Ṭīṁśa (book) of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa reveals the fact that they contain a nicely made epitome of the latter. Here we find that two or three Adhyāyas have been condensed into one by the omission of a large number of verses not considered essential for following the thread of the narrative. For want of space we are compelled to omit a detailed comparison and analysis of these chapters here, but wish to stress the point that these chapters of the Brahma Purāṇa are totally based upon those of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa as is evident not only from the similarity of ideas but also from the identity of their construction and phraseology. In fact, they present a judicious selection of the verses of Viṣṇu-Purāṇa with the obvious purpose of giving, in a nutshell, the chief events of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's life.

Padma-Purāṇa

It is one of the most important among the major Purāṇas. In point of extent and volume it is second only to the great Skanda-Purāṇa, which is easily the most voluminous among the Purāṇas. The text of the Purāṇa as published from the Ānanda-śrama, Poona, contains six Khandaśas or books. They are Adi, Bhūmi, Brahma, Pātāla, Sṛṣṭi and Uttara Khandaśas. Out of these, two books devote special Adhyāyas to the elucidation of many important topics of Vaiṣṇava theology as well as a concise treatment of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's life. A critical study of this Purāṇa is essential for understanding the theological basis of the various schools of medieval Vaiṣṇavism, especially of the Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism. In fact, its greatest value lies in its being thoroughly imbued with the Vaiṣṇava spirit. In consonance with its true nature we find special items of purely Vaiṣṇava faith properly
handled and popularly treated therein. Thus in the 50th Adhyāya of the Uttara-Khaṇḍa is described the Māhātmya of Gopī-candana; the 83rd and 84th Adhyāyas give a popular description of a typical Vaiṣṇava; the 85th Adhyāya describes, with the proper mantras for recitation, the festival called Dolotsava, which is to be celebrated on the Ekādaśī day of the bright half of the Caitra month. It is the Padma-Purāṇa that contains that celebrate Māhātmya of Śrīmad Bhāgavata in Adhyāyas 189 to 194, illustrated with the aid of the well-known anecdot of Dhundhukārī, who attained his final liberation as a direct result of the hearing of Śrīmad Bhāgavata for seven days only.

So much for the Vaiṣṇava element in this Purāṇa. Now coming to the treatment of the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, we find it described twice, one in the Pāṭāla-Khaṇḍa and then in the Uttara-Khaṇḍa. In the second, there are eight chapters devoted to it from the 272nd to the 279th. Here the very first Adhyāya consists of a highly philosophical praise uttered by Indra to Śrī Kṛṣṇa in which the whole of the celebrated Hiranyagarbha-Sūkta has been incorporated, of course, with the necessary linguistic and metrical changes—due to its adoption in a Purānic text. The great value of this Stotra lies in presenting a Purānic interpretation of a Vedic Sūkta. Another peculiarity of this section lies in the fact that a large portion of the 277th and the 279th Adhyāyas is written in a clear and chaste prose of the well-known Purānic type.

The other section occurs in the Pāṭāla-Khaṇḍa of the Purāṇa and is of extreme value for properly understanding the theological and philosophical conceptions of the medieval Vaiṣṇava sects. This section consists of eight chapters and extends from the 69th Adhyāya to the 77th. The 69th Adhyāya furnishes a highly elaborate and allegorical conception of Vṛndāvana, which is taken to represent upon the surface of this earth that ideal Vṛndāvana—Nitya Vṛndāvana as it is termed—the highest abode of Bhagavān situated even above the far-elevated Vaikuṇṭha.*

* साल्वतां स्वामसुखवचव विष्णूद्वस्तुतुद्वमयम्।
नितयं वृंदावनं नाम ब्रह्माण्डोपपरि संस्कृतम्।॥
पूर्णं ब्रह्मामुखन्यं नित्यवृंदावनस्वरूपम्।
वृंदावनं तत्सविश्वं तदस्तवनं भविष्य।॥

—Padma, Pāṭāla section, 69 Adhyāya,
Mathurā is represented as a lotus of a thousand petals and with strict accuracy the complete circle is divided and sub-divided into, different parts each of which has been described with its presiding deity. The present Vṛndāvana has also been similarly represented in the Brahma-Saṁhitā, one of the famous scriptures of the Pāñcarātra school. The rest of the section has been devoted to the elucidation of the real nature of Rādhā and Her companions—their names, their mystical significance, their relative importance and relation with Śrī Kṛṣṇa in the Rāsa-Līlā, etc. Scholars know that Rādhā, who plays such an important role in the growth of the later Vaiṣṇavism, is conspicuous by Her absence from the pages of the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas, but it is in the Padma as well as in the Brahmavaivarta that we meet with the complete paraphernalia of the Rādhā-cult. Hence the extreme importance of the Padma-Purāṇa in the history and growth of Vaiṣṇavism is quite evident.

The Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa

It is one of the most celebrated Purāṇas containing a detailed description and popular presentation of the charming Līlās of Śrī Kṛṣṇacandra. The Purāṇa as it goes has 4 large sections or Khaṇḍas—viz., (1) Brahma-Khaṇḍa, (2) Prakṛti-Khaṇḍa, (3) Gaṇeśa-Khaṇḍa and (4) Kṛṣṇa-Janma-Khaṇḍa. The last book contains about 129 chapters and thus presents an elaborate and comprehensive account of the great deeds performed by Śrī Kṛṣṇa either at Vṛndāvana or at Mathurā and Dwārakā. But the great merit of this Purāṇa lies in its attaching greater importance to the Rādhā element in the Kṛṣṇa-worship. And hence naturally the Vṛndāvana-Līlās have received an elaborate treatment at the hands of the writer, and the figure of Rādhā as painted there emerges out of her hazy associations and vague surroundings into a living figure of great personal and supreme spiritual charm. In reality the Brahmavaivarta completes the divine picture of Rādhā as portrayed by the cognate Padma-Purāṇa and the two together stand out as the most authoritative texts upon the worship of Śrī Kṛṣṇa with a special leaning towards the Rādhā element therein. Suffice it to say that the later Vaiṣṇava theologians have amply drawn for their materials upon these sections of the Padma and the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa.
The Viṣṇu-Purāṇa

For the study of the philosophy of Vaiṣṇavism this Purāṇa along with Śrīmad Bhāgavata occupies an extremely important place. Though not much in extent and volume (it contains only 126 Adhyāyas, and is thus only one-third of the Bhāgavata), it has supplied the most important materials for the philosophical superstructure of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism. The fact is not unknown to scholars that the great Rāmānujācārya has drawn copiously upon this Purāṇa for the sake of making his philosophical theories tally with the Purāṇic conceptions. Hence the importance of this Purāṇa for a study of the Vaiṣṇava faith.

The Viṣṇu-Purāṇa has been divided into six sections or books styled as Aṃśas. The fifth book is entirely devoted to a description of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's life. All the important Līlās of Śrī Kṛṣṇa have been presented here in an excellent literary form. The same old and familiar Anuṣṭup is there; but it does not possess that looseness of construction frequently met with in the other Purāṇas, but has got a peculiarly chaste literary ring about it. The writer has done full justice to the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇacandra by his impartiality for all Līlās; he has followed the golden mean by allowing the important events of both the portions of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's life in equal scope for their presentation. Thus, the 38 Adhyāyas of this book are of paramount importance for presenting a complete picture of the life of a very busy individual. The mystical Rāsa-Līlā has been described in a particularly charming manner but it is important to note that like the Bhāgavata even here the name of Rādhā is conspicuous by its absence.

Śrīmadbhāgavata-Purāṇa.

On the life of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, and for a complete description of His divinely charming Līlās, there is no higher authority than the Bhāgavata. Though the other incarnations have also been treated here, Śrī Kṛṣṇa's Līlās are, in fact, the main theme of this Purāṇa. In print of literary charm and philosophical subtlety, it is indeed equalled by no other Purāṇa. The supreme importance of the Bhāgavata can also be gauged by the host of commentaries and glosses written by those learned scholars of ancient
times who are reckoned by later generations to be the highest authorities on such subjects. The language has got a supreme beauty of its own, and, though at times a bit archaic and hence somewhat difficult, it possesses a uniform dignity of expression, rarely to be met with in the other compositions of the same type. The old critical statement 'विद्यावता भागवते परीक्षा' has a large element of truth in it, since it is no exaggeration to say that the Bhāgavata-Pūrāṇa is a veritable touchstone of Shastric knowledge.

Out of the twelve books or Skandhas as they are called the tenth deals entirely with the Līlās of Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa. This Skandha is not only the longest of all, but covers about one-fourth of the whole of the Bhāgavata. It is divided into two parts, the first part, containing 49 Adhyāyas, taken up entirely with those Līlās of Śrī Kṛṣṇa which centred round Vṛndāvana and Mathurā; while the second part, consisting of 41 Adhyāyas, deals with the incidents of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's later life connected with Dvārkā and thus in these 90 Adhyāyas we possess information about Śrī Kṛṣṇa in greater detail than in any of the Pūrāṇas. Despite its possessing a few more Adhyāyas, the Brahmavaivarta cannot surpass the depth and that literary charm which are deservedly associated with the name of the latter Pūrāṇa. Space forbids us to enter into a detailed analysis of the tenth book; but we cannot close these notes without remarking that, as the tenth is considered to be the quintessence of the whole of the Bhāgavata, so the five Adhyāyas (29-33) descriptive of that divinely inspired Rāsa-Līlā of Śrī Kṛṣṇa are rightly reckoned as the very quintessence of the whole of the tenth Skandha. The fact is that the Rāsa-pañcā-dhyāyī of Śrīmad Bhāgavata is a literature by itself, so charming in expression, so deep and subtle in its philosophical contents, so mystical and divine in its entirety that the like of it cannot be found anywhere in the whole range of the vast Sanskrit literature. Another peculiar feature of this book is its abounding in a number of delicious songs mostly sung by the Gopīs in different occasions, the sweetest of the lot being the celebrated Gopī-gīta in the 31st Adhyāya and the most philosophical and the subtlest being the Śruti-Gītā in the 87th Adhyāya. The presentation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa's
Lilās on the whole is, at once simple and charming. Rightly is Samādhi-bhāṣā of Vyāsa considered the most important of the authorities in the Vaiṣṇava sects founded by Śrī Caitanya and VallabhaŚraya.∗

**Conclusion**

This humble attempt on the part of the writer will no doubt disclose the fact that there are, due to the emphasis laid upon these aspects, two lines of approach to the chequered history of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as found in those major Purāṇas that devote special books or sections to the proper delineation and subtle analysis of one of the most important, though highly complex, personalities of ancient times. One is in main theological, where the author has taken great pains to explain in a lucid way the spiritual meaning underlying incidents and the deep allegory concerning the life-history of Śrī Kṛṣṇa—His present environments, His companions and friends, etc., especially belonging to His earlier life at Vṛndāvana and Gokula. This is the main point in the Kṛṣṇa sections of the Padma and Brahmavarta Purāṇas, which have been naturally utilized in such Pañcarātra works as Brhad Brahma- sarīhitā and others and have also been extensively drawn upon for laying the theological foundations of the medieval Vaiṣṇava schools with a leaning towards the Rādhā element in Kṛṣṇa-worship. The other line of approach is chiefly philosophical, where the other elements have been subordinated to stress the philosophical aspects of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and His worship. This is virtually presented in the Viṣṇu and the Bhāgavata Purāṇas, where the divine aspects of Śrī Kṛṣṇa have been amply brought out in all their subtle beauty and sublime charm. But even here we realize a fine shade of difference in the indebtedness of the later Vaiṣṇava sects to these ancient store-houses of Vaiṣṇava faith and culture. Śrī-Vaiṣṇavism with its preference for the worship of Lakṣmi-Nārāyaṇa is more indebted to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa for its philosophic contents than to others and hence Ācārya Rāmānuja shows a considerable partiality for this Purāṇa in the copious extract he has made in

∗ वेद: श्रीकृष्णवाक्यानि व्याससूत्राणि चैव हि ।
समाविभाषा व्यासस्य प्रमाणे तत्तुद्वयम् ॥
support of his philosophical position. On the other hand, Śrīmad Bhāgavata is the mainstay and the supreme authority with those Vaiṣṇava cults which show a preference for the worship of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. And hence it is no wonder that it is the most important scripture of the Caitanya and Vallabha sects of Vaiṣṇavism and naturally it has been accorded there an equal, if not a greater, authority with the well-known Prasthānātṛaya represented by that spiritual trio, the Vedas, the Brahma-Sūtras and the Bhagavadgītā. If the one school extols the Bhāgavata to be the spotless authority, (वीमद्वर्गाच्या प्रमाणपत्रम्), the other is not far behind it in showering eulogies upon it and in claiming it to be the समाविभाषा of Vedavyāsa. In fact, these schools have their life and being in the supremely spiritual atmosphere created for the benefit and the amelioration of the teeming millions with its emphasis upon gaining the Divine Grace through devotion which the Purāṇa inculcates to be the only panacea for all human ills.*

*न वानं न तथो नेत्रम् न शौचं न प्रतानि च।
प्रीयतेमलयं सक्ष्या हृदरस्यं विप्रवेगम्॥

Śrīmad Bhāgagvata
Note—

KAPĀLA-MOCANA: AN ANCIENT HOLY PLACE

BY

V. RAGHAVAN

In the last issue of the Purāṇa (July, 1968), Sri Devendra Handa has presented the textual material, legend and religious significance, geographical location and the archaeological importance of the holy spot known as Kapāla-mocana.

On the textual side, he has mentioned mainly the Vāmanā Purāṇa and the Mahābhārata, and to some extent also Garuḍa, Matsya and Brhannāradiya Purāṇa which have some references to the place.

I wish to supplement the article with some more data. Stein notices in his Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Raghunath Temple Library, Jammu (1894) several manuscripts of parts of a text called Bhṛṅgābasāṁhitā also called Śrīsāṁhitā (pp. 210-11), describing the māhātmyas of several holy spots in Kashmir and its neighbourhood. Here, one of the manuscripts (no. 3882) deals with Kapālamocana.

In Kalhana’s Rājataraṅgiṇī, VII. 266, there is mention of an one-eyed Dāmara, inimical to king, belonging to the place called Degrāma. In his note on the identity of this Degrāma, Stein says in his English translation that it is the modern hamlet of Degrām, a few hundred yards to the north of “the well-known spring of Kapālamocana (marked as ‘Nagbal’ on the map). Stein has a paragraph on the Tīrtha of Kapālamocana in his Ancient Geography of Kashmir at the end of his translation of the Rājataraṅgiṇī. He says here that the Tīrtha marks “the spot where Śiva cleaned himself from the sin attaching to him after the cutting-off of Brahman’s head (Kapāla). The tīrtha is old because the Haracaritaacintāmaṇi mentions it twice.”
In the last mentioned poetic account of Kashmirian shrines and sacred places, (Kāvyamālā 61), Jayaratha mentions Kapālamocana twice, in X. 249 and XIV. iii; in the former context, it is mentioned among holy places on the Vitastā in the chapter on Śiva Vijayeśvara whose shrine also Kalhaṇa refers to often (I. 38 et. seq.). In the latter context, Kapālamocana is mentioned as being near Kapateśvara. Are there two holy places of the name Kapālamocana?
In Memoriam

Dr. SAMPURNANAND

Dr. Sampurnanand shed his mortal remains and passed away from our midst on 10th January, 1969.

Varanasi has lost a great citizen who always thought for the revival of its tradition. Among his notable services he restored the ancient name of Varanasi and arranged for the repair of Ghats. He revived the ancient seat of Samskrit learning by raising the Samskrit College to the Varanaseya Samskrit University.

He was a scholar and had chosen education as his profession but patriotism in his heredity drew him towards active politics. His ancestor Lala Dheya Ram was a minister of Raja Balwant Singh of Banaras, who carved out an important Hindu State during the decline of the Muslim rule of Oudh.

Dr. Sampurnanand’s great grand father Bakshi Sadanand was a Dewan of Raja Chet Singh and fought by his side with Warren Hastings. Dr. Sampurnanandji had great regard for Banaras Darbar and always tried to keep up the old tradition of his family.

Outspokeness and strict adherence to principles won him great regard from his friends and opponents alike, though at times he had to face great inconvenience and had to pay very high price for his principles.

He was one of the founder Trustees of the All India Kashi Raj Trust and always took keen and active interest in its affairs. It will be difficult for the Trust to fill the void created by this irreparable loss.

We all pray that may Lord Vishwanath grant him eternal peace (मोक्ष) about which he always spoke during his last days.

—RAMESH CHANDRA DĘ
ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

(JULY-DECEMBER, 1968)

Purāṇa Work


The publication of the Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa was completed during the first quarter of this year (1968), as has already been mentioned with details in the last review in 'Purāṇa' X, 2, pp. 192 ff. The two translation volumes—the English translation with the Sanskrit text and the Hindi translation with the Sanskrit text—were also published in October on the occasion of the 24th Session of the All India Oriental Conference held at Varanasi.

Both the translation volumes contain, besides the Sanskrit text and the translation, the following matter also.

1. Introduction containing a general study on the Purāṇas and specially on the Vāmana Purāṇa, and also discussion on the problems of translation of the Purāṇas and a review of the translations and adaptations of the Purāṇas in various regions and languages of India and abroad.


4. Appendices as follows:

1. Subject-concordance of the Vāmana Purāṇa with the other Purāṇas and the two Epics.

2. Lists of the episodes, stotras and vrata-upavāsas mentioned in the Vāmana Purāṇa.

काशिराज-न्यासस्य कार्यचिवरणम्
( जुलाई-दिसम्बर, १९६८ )
पुराणकार्यः

वामनपुराणस्य समीक्षितसंस्करणस्वानुवादसंस्करणगोष्ठ प्रकाशनम्
वामनपुराणस्य समीक्षितसंस्करणस्य प्रकाशनं, यथा निर्दिःश्विस्तरे
पूर्वांस्मतः पुराणसाहित्यकामः (१०. २, पृ. १९२ इत्यादि), १९६८ वर्षस्य
प्रथमचरणे एव पूर्विमगात्। ब्राह्मणपुराणस्य ( संस्कृतवाच्य संवादश्रेणी
हिंदीमात्र अनुवाद एवं अविनाशतीय-प्राच्यविद्यासम्मेलनस्य वाराणस्या सम्पन्ने
चुनितविशिष्टविवेचनान्वयनस्य प्रकाशितो

वामनपुराणस्यां संस्कृतवाच्य अनुवादभागी संस्कृतवाच्यांतरिकमात्मकोर्विनिष्ठा
विषयां आदेशः।

१. सूपकार्यसं सामान्यतः पुराणसाम्बन्धित विशेषत्व वामनपुराणविषयकः
मध्यमनस्य प्रत्ययते, तथा च पुराणस्यांनुवादस्य समस्या विचारिता,
विनिर्दिःश्विस्तरीयमात्र औढ़ेकी च अन्यत्र च पुराणानां
अनुवादान्वयनानन्वयनस्य प्रत्ययते।

२. समीक्षितपाठस्य वामनपुराणस्य वेदांतवाच्यसंस्करणं सह अध्याय-
संवादः।

३. विस्तृतविशिष्टविषयाविशिष्टविलोकनां आलावी-हिंदीभाषा:।

४. परिशिष्टावर्षति यथा—

१. वामनपुराणस्य विषयः सह पुराणान्तरां महाभारत-
रामायणस्य विषयः सह संवादः।

२. वामनपुराणस्य विनिर्दिःश्वां उपाख्याय-स्तोत्र-तत-उपवासानं
संवादः।

३. व्यक्तिवाच्याविष्टिकारणां-वामनपुराणस्य विनिर्दिः
श्रीमान्न-वैद्यमान-नायस्मृतिनां

२३
4. Lists of the geographical names in the Vāmana P. with their scientific Latin names and descriptive notes on the flora.

5. Verse-index.

The three Volumes of the Vāmana Purāṇa, Viz. the Critical Edition Volume, the English translation volume and the Hindi translation Volume, are of the demy quarto size, and contain \(i-i\text{i}x+1-778+1-114+1-97\) pages, \(i-\text{lii}+1-543+1-70+1-97\) pages and \(i-xl+1-465+1-55+1-97\) pages respectively. It is hoped that these volumes will prove useful for the study and research on this Purāṇa.

Release of the Vāmana Purāṇa Volumes

The above-mentioned three Volumes of the Vāmana Purāṇa were ceremonially released in an impressive function held for the purpose at the Shivala centre of the All India Kashiraj Trust in Varanasi on the 13th October 1968. The function was presided by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, General Secretary of the All India Oriental Conference. Besides the president of the function and H. H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh Ji (Chairman of the All India Kashiraj Trust) Dr. A. N. Upadhye (General President of the A. I. O. C.), Maharajakumar Dr. Raghubir Singh Ji, Pt. Giridharilal Ji Mehta, Shri Raghunath Singh Ji (Trustees of the All India Kashiraj Trust), Dr. A. D. Pusalker (Curator of the B. O. R. I. Poona), Acharya Hazari Prasad Ji Dvivedi (Rector of the Banaras Hindu University), Prof. Raja Ram Shastri, (V. C., Kashi Vidyapith), Pt. Rajeshvar Shastri Dravida (Principal of the Sanga-Veda-Vidyalaya, Varanasi), Rai Krishna Das Ji (Director, Kalabhavana, B H. U.) and other distinguished persons of the city, such as Shri Shyam Mohan Agrawala (Mayor of the Varanasi Corporation) and Shri Satyendra Kumar Gupta.
4. वामनपुराणे समागतानां भौगोलिकनामसूच्यं आद्यनिर्मकमात्र-वैज्ञानिककौशित्रियनामसूचिता; वनस्पतिनामसूच्य आक्रमणायां संकल्पणशीलीयुतात्रा।

5. शीतोष्णाष्ट्रौतिया।

वामनपुराणां वैद्य भागाः; समीक्षितसंस्करणभागाः; आक्रमणाचेतनावाच भागाः; हिन्दीभाषानुवादभागाः; कार्यालय साधन इत्येककारण मुद्रिताः सन्निया, येथा केमेनी i-lxx + 1 - 778 + 1 - 114 + 1 - 97 दृष्टा; i-lvi + 1 - 543 + 1 - 70 + 1 - 97 दृष्टा, तथा i-xl + 1 - 465 + 1 - 55 + 1 - 97 दृष्टा: भवनिं। आवश्यक बनेरे भागाः हें पुराणा माधिकाय श्रीमांद्रश्रीनोपनिर्माणों भवनिती।

वामनपुराणप्रथमप्रयोग्य प्रकाशः

उपरिनिदर्शं वामनपुराणस्य भागानं विच्छिन्नं क्रक्षकामण्डलनवतः। पत्रधर्मको भवनिर्मकमा: १२ अक्तूबर १९६८ दिवसस्य वाराणस्य सर्वभारतीय-काशीराजनामस्य सिवालयको आयोजित आशीर्ष। समायाः अध्यक्षमंडल-भारतीयपार्चविविधासमन्नरमस्य प्रधानस्थिति: डा. ओ. आर. पन. दाबेदकरमाहोदयाः-रहन्दुकृतमाः आशीर्ष। अन्ये न ये समायापशिताय भासन तेथु काशिनिर्माणः

श्रीमहाराज डा. ओ. विप्लविनामारणसि महोदयाः (सर्वभारतीयकाशीराजनामस्याध्यक्षाः)

डा. प. पन. उपाध्येयमहोदयाः (अधिकारसार्थतिकाचितविद्यामितरः), श्रीमहाराज-केमारः डा. ओ. रघुविनिर्महोदयाः; श्री पं. विरियालके महत्तमहोदयाः; श्री रघुविनिर्महोदयाः (काशीराजनामस्य सदस्याः), डा. प. सी. रघुविनिर्महोदयाः;

(पूनाया: भादरसारमार्गकाशीराजनामस्य क्षेत्रकारमहोदयाः), आचार्यश्रीहासिकातिसार-द्विये सिमहोदयाः (काशीविष्णुविज्ञानमर्गरूपकारमहोदयाः), श्री पं. राजेरकारशाखी

द्रविड़ ( वाराणसीसारासारविज्ञानविद्याध्यक्ष: ), श्रीविक्रमदासमहोदयाः ( कार्यमिहनसारासारकार: , का. हि. वि. वि. ) पं. राजारामवास्त्री

(उपकृतमाः काशीविज्ञानीपठय: )। अन्ये पि वाराणसीसारास्य विश्वविद्यालयमहावाणः; श्री इयामनोहन अभ्यासः ( वाराणसीसारासारविज्ञानविद्याध्यक्षा: महापौर: ) श्री सत्येन्द्र-
(Editor of the Hindi Daily 'Āj.) attended the function. A large number of the delegates' to the Varanasi Session of the All-India Oriental Conference also were present. The function started with the singing of the ślokas of the Vāmana stuti from the Vāmana Purāṇa, after which Maharajkumar Dr. Rughubir Singh in his speech welcomed the president Dr. Dandekar and other learned guests.

Dr. Dandekar in his speech greatly appreciated the three published Volumes of the Vāmana Purāṇa and thanked the Kashiraj Trust for its Valuable undertaking. His Highness in his speech traced the circumstances which led to the undertaking of the Purāṇa work by the Kashiraj Trust some 14 years ago and referred to a meeting between himself and Dr. Dandekar at that time when he (Dr. Dandekar) had also advised for taking up the Purāṇa work by the Kashiraj Trust. His Highness also expressed his appreciation of the hard labour which the staff of the Purāṇa Department of the Kashiraj Trust had put in for bringing out these three Volumes in time. His Highness then presented the copies of these Volumes to Dr. Dandekar. Copies of the three Volumes were also presented to the Editor, Shri Ananda Swarup Gupta, and to Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai who was in-charge of the printing and the proof-reading. In the end Shri Girdharilal Mehta thanked His Highness for taking so much interest in the Purāṇas and for steering the work of the Vāmana Purāṇa to successful and timely conclusion. He also thanked Dr. R. N. Dandekar for presiding the function in spite of his being so busy in the work of the Conference. The audience was also thanked for their participation and co-operation.

Resolution by the All-India Oriental Conference:

The All India Oriental Conference in its Varanasi Session has passed the following resolution on the publication of the Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa and the Translation Volumes by the All India Kashiraj Trust:

"The All India Oriental Conference, meeting in its twenty-fourth Session at Varanasi, conveys to the Kashiraj Trust its felicitations on the recent publica-
Shri Giridharilal Mehta, Trustee, All-India Kashiraj Trust, thanking the guests.
कुमार गुप्तः (‘आज’ दैनिकसमाचारपत्रस्य समापदकः) इत्यादः उल्लेखनीयः।
तथा अखिलभारतीयप्राच्यविवाहस्मतिः वाराणसी अधिवेशने आगातः बहुः प्रतिनिधियोऽौ उपस्थितः आसनः। महोत्सवस्य समारम्भः वामनपुराणस्य वामनस्तुते: इलोकानां समुद्राण्वारणेन अभुवः। तदनन्तरः डा। रघुवीरसिंहमहानुभावेन स्वीयभाषेऽ अध्यक्षमहाशयायानामन्येपामतिभिषुतानां विहुः च स्वागतं कृत्तम्।

डा। दाण्डेकरमहोदयः स्वभाषेऽ वामनपुराणस्य प्रकाशितं भाग्यवं भुवः। परंतः शिक्षाराजन्यास्यन्योदयिनी नारायणेऽ धनचार्ये धनवादारः व्याहतः। तत्र भविष्यः कृतान्तसम्मानवासौशी ब्रह्माण्यः च तत्वद्विष्णुपूर्वः कृतान्तराजस्वाधेशः पुराणकार्येऽवर्षब्रम्भः ये प्रेतजन् तथा विवरणं दर्शनं तथा च डा। दाण्डेकरमहोदये भविष्यं कृतान्तसम्मानवासौशीं नवः अन्वितम् तथा तद्भस्य अभिव्यक्तिः तदन्तरः तदन्त्र॥

बामनपुराणस्य भाग्यवं निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशिनां व्यस्तस्य कृतवर्णिनिन्दितार्थायां साधुः। तत्र भविष्यः कृतान्तसम्मानवासौशीं: वामनपुराणस्य भाग्यवं निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशिनां व्यस्तस्य कृतवर्णिनिन्दितार्थायां साधुः। प्रकाशितम्। इदं बागानसागरस्य श्रीमन्नवरुक्तस्मात्मवहिनिः स्वभाविणी डा। गंगासागरस्य प्रकाशितम्। तस्मात् बागानसागरस्य श्रीमन्नवरुक्तस्य विवरणायां निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशार्थः ब्रह्माण्यः संपरिष्ठत:। उपर्युक्तसम्मानवासौशीं दुराराज्येऽ उत्सवास्यायाय अन्तः धनवादाद्वारा। तत्र व्यस्तस्य अंगीरिष्यार्थः रघुवीरसिंहमहोदयः: तत्र विवरणायाम्यः च तत्वद्विष्णुपूर्वः। तत्वद्विष्णुपूर्वः। भाग्यवं निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशिनां श्रीमन्नवरुक्तस्य विवरणायां निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशिनां श्रीभाषेऽ निर्धारितम्। वामनपुराणस्य सम्मानवासौशीं दुराराज्येऽ उत्सवास्यायाम्यः स्वकृतः।

अखिलभारतीयप्राच्यविवाहस्मतिः प्रस्तावः

वामनपुराणस्य वामसमितास्य संस्कारस्य तस्मानवादीयोऽवर्णिनिः प्रकाशितम्। इदं बागानसागरस्य श्रीमन्नवरुक्तस्य विवरणायां निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशितम्। बागानसागरस्य श्रीमन्नवरुक्तस्य विवरणायां निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशितम्। स्वभाषेऽ वामनपुराणस्य सम्मानवासौशीं दुराराज्येऽ उत्सवास्यायाय अन्तः धनवादाद्वारा। डा। दाण्डेकर-महोदयफः तस्मात् बागानसागरस्य श्रीमन्नवरुक्तस्य विवरणायां निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशितम्। इदं बागानसागरस्य श्रीमन्नवरुक्तस्य विवरणायां निवन्तसम्ये प्रकाशितम्।
tion of the *Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa*. The Conference wishes to record its high appreciation for the competent manner in which the Editor, Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, has tackled the various text-critical problems which his work involved. Further it notes with satisfaction that the *Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa* is brought out with Hindi and English translation in separate Volumes. Altogether this Edition augurs well for the Critical Editions of other Purāṇas, which are under active preparation under the auspicious of the Trust.

The Conference is glad that the Government of India and Uttar Pradesh have been rendering financial help to the Trust for the important research project, and hope that the project will not have to languish for want of adequate funds."

The authorities of the Kashiraj Trust are grateful to the A. I. O. C. and specially to Dr. Dandekar for this encouraging and appreciative resolution, and hope that the Conference in future also will continue to co-operate in this useful Purānic undertaking of the Trust.

*Kurma-Purāṇa-Work.*

Now that the Vāmana Purāṇa work has been completed, we have taken up the work of the Kūrma-Purāṇa edition and translation. For the critical edition we have collated the following manuscripts of the Kūrma Purāṇa up till now:

1. No. 41 of 1881-1882 from the B. O. R. I., Poona. Devanāgarī Dated Saṁvat 1615 (A. D. 1558),
4. PM. 2418, I & II (two volumes) from the Adyar Library, Madras, Devanāgarī.
अभिनवन करोति । इसे समेतस्ते साधनप्राप्ति संपादकाय श्रीआनन्दस्वरूप-गुसाई अति लुयोयरीत्या पाठ-समीक्षासम्बन्धितसमस्तानां समाप्तानां सूर्यो धन्यवादायं समर्पितकरति । अभी संतोषस्वि विषयो यदु पाठ-समीक्षासंस्करणातिरिक्त हिंदी-आङ्गिकभाषानुवादाभ्यूं सह प्रथक्ष मन्त्रयोगिनि प्रकाशनं जातम । इद्य संस्करण न्यासान्तां नपायाध्यायानां अन्यपुराणानं पाठशालीसांस्करणानां प्रकाश्याने प्रेमकर भविष्यति ।

समेतस्ते स्वस्वकल्पनानुगतः यदृ उपर्युक्तप्रेति कायने प्रभाविते आयात्ते च अथेरकुच्छेण हेतुना कायं कदापि नवरुढ़ो भविष्यती ।

कानिराजन्यास्यस्याचिन्तकारिणः अबिखरतीयप्रच्छिन्दायासमेतस्ते विशेषः

डाँडकरस्थविद्यायं प्रति अत्य उत्साहवर्धकस्य प्राचीनसमकक्षु च भस्तवस्य

पारानां धन्यवाद प्रदेष्टः, आयात्ते च यदृ भविष्यः अति समेतस्ते न्यासस्यासिनः

उपयोग पुराणकर्मण सहयोगं दायः विद्वृती ।

कृम्पुराणकायम्

स्मर्ति वामनपुराणकायानें समाली कृम्पुराणस्य सम्पादनस्मुद्धारकायं च समार्थाम् । अथावच कृम्पुराणस्यायो निर्देशः हस्तिलेखः । संबंधितः —

१. सं. ४१ ऑफ १८८२-१८८२। गुप्तवत्स्यभाषकान्र-
न्यासविधाशीर्षोत्सस्यानां प्रकाशनं हस्तिलेखः । कालः संवतः १६१५ ( १५५८ ई० )

२. सं. ५५८९। होशियारपुरस्थात् विख्यातरान्तरबौद्धविद्वारोष
संस्थानात् हस्तिलेखः । कालः संवतः १६७९ ( १६७२ )

३. ई. १३४६। हांडनगरस्थ-इण्डिया-आफिस इत्यः हस्तिलेखः ।

४. अह्मदाबाद लाहारे मद्दासुंजः पी-एम. २४१८ ( भागवतस्मातः )

हस्तिलेखः ।
The Following manuscripts are being collated:

1. No. 2845 (Mycrofilm copy) from the Dacca Universitys Bengali script.
2. No. 398 from the Asiatic society, Calcutta, Bengali Script.
3. A Palm-leaf MS. from the Sringeri Math, Mysore (South India). Nandi Nāgarī script.
4. A Palm-leaf Granth MS. Purchased from Madras.

We have also the following MSS of the Kūrma Purāṇa with us, which have not yet been collated:

1. MS. No. 3390 (Microfilm) from the Dacca University, Bengali script. We are preparing here a photo-stat copy from this microfilm.

The lists of the geographical and personal Names from the Kūrma Purāṇa are also being prepared.

'Purāṇa' Bulletin

Index to the articles published in the last five Volumes (VI-X) is also being published as the supplement of Vol. X. 2. The articles and the topics of these Volumes have been arranged on the model of the Index to the first five Volumes (I-V) which was published as the supplement to Vol. V. 2. It also includes the author-Index arranged alphabetically.

We intend to publish the next July issue (Vol. XI, No. 2) as the 'Vāmana-Purāṇa Number'. It will mostly contain the studies on the Vāmana-Purāṇa and the Vāmana Avatāra. The critical notes on the constituted text of the Vāmana-Purāṇa will also be published in this July issue. Thus this issue will be a kind of supplement to the already published critical edition of the Vāmana-Purāṇa.
अगोनिनिदित्वां चतुर्वां हस्तेल्कां पाठसंबादः कियमाणो बरतते-

1. दाकाविवधाचालक् २८४५ संख्या: बंगालिहस्तेल्कः
( माइकोफिल्मपति: )।

2. पशियादिक सोसाईटी, कलकत्ता, इत्यादि संख्या ३९८, बंगालिहस्तेल्कः।

3. श्री रोमां, मेसूरः ताडवहस्तेल्कः; नन्दिनारायणविद्या।

4. मद्रासमेता राम: अन्त्यचित्त ताडवहस्तेल्कः।

अगोनिनिदित्वां बाधाविच्च असाधितां: हस्तेल्कः: अष्टि बरतते।

1. दाकाविवधाचालक् प्राप्त: ३२९० संख्या: बंगालिहस्तेल्कः
( माइकोफिल्मपति: )। चतुर्वां बंगालिहस्तेल्कः अन्त्य फोटोस्टैट प्रति कर्तुः महानाथ।

2. टार्बल युनिवर्सिटी पुस्तकालयः प्राप्त: १०३६ संख्या: हस्तेल्कः।
( फोटोस्टैटपति: ) देवनागरीविद्या।

3. इण्डिया आफिस-रचना: प्राप्त: ही २३४५ संख्या: देवनागरीहस्तेल्कः।
( भल्पकल्प: संख्या १८५६ ( ही १३९९ )।

4. अद्याप्रति रामेशर देवानागर: प्राप्त: उदया लिखियां ७५३१९ संख्या: हस्तेल्कः।

कृप्यापि यशस्वी पाठसंबादातिरिक्त भौगोलिकसाहित्य, व्यविनायिक, प्राचीनविद्याविद्याचार निर्माणते।

'युज्यार्छ' पत्रिका

गतवस्तवर्षं चकाशतां लेखां सूची अष्टि दशमभागस्य द्वितीयाङ्गस्य परिशिष्टप्रेषण प्रकाशयमाणा बरतते। एषा सूची पद्मभागस्य द्वितीयाङ्गस्य परिशिष्ट-प्रेषण प्रकाशितात: सूच्या: सज्जनमुनसरति। अस्थायशासकमेण संकल्पिता लेखकसूची अष्टि बरतते।

आगमी-जुलैं अर्धः ( XI : २ ) वर्ष वामनपुराणाङ्गप्रेषण प्रकाशयित्वमिच्छाम:। अर्थमिन्ने विशेषः वामनपुराणोपनिषद: वामनावतारसंबंधिनेव लेखः। वामनपुराणपाठसंबंधिन्येव: समीक्षामितिप्रणयके प्रकाशिता: भेदः। इत्तथमिदमः वामनपुराणस्य पाठसंबंधितसंस्करणस्य परिशिष्टम समाप्तः।
Help given by the Purāṇa Deptt. to Research Scholars

Research scholars occasionally seek help from the Purāṇa Department of the Kashiraj Trust for supplying them necessary data and bibliography for their Purānic dissertations. The following research scholars may be noted in this connection:

(1) Śrīmatī Usha Satyavrata, M. A., Ph. D., Lecturer in Sanskrit, Delhi University, who had been working on the Matsya-Purāṇa for her D. Litt. Degree, changed her subject as the study of the Vāmana Purāṇa, when the critical edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa was brought out by the Kashiraj Trust. She is a U. G. C. Senior Research fellow. She came to our Purāṇa Department in last September and worked on a Kashmirian MS. (कार् of our Critical Apparatus) of the Vāmana Purāṇa under the guidance of Shri Anand Swarup Gupta for more than a week.

(2) Shri J. L. Sharma of the Birla Public School, Pilani (Rajasthan), who is carrying on his research on Śrīmad-bhāgavata under the supervision of Dr. S. K. Gupta, Reader of the Sanskrit Department, Rajasthan University, Jaipur, has requested Shri Anand Swarup Gupta, under the instructions of his supervisor, to supply him information about the books and matter worth-knowing. The required information has been supplied to him.

(3) Shri Cornella Church, Bethesda, Maryland, U. S. A., wrote to Dr. V. Raghavan, Prof. of Sanskrit, Madras University, for suggestions on bibliographic material for a dissertation on the subject of the story of the Yugas, or four Cosmic Ages, as found in the Purāṇas. Dr. Raghavan has forwarded this letter to the Purāṇa Department here for sending the required suggestions, which have been directly sent to the above-mentioned scholar in U. S. A. from the Purāṇa Department.

(4) Shri Mata Prasad Tripathi, Research scholar, Gorakhpur University, working on the historical aspect of the Śākta-cult has requested in his letter of 22. 11. 68 to supply him the reprint of Shri Anand Swarup Gupta's
शोषितविषेणयः पुराणविभागञ्चारा क्रतु साहाय्यम्

समये समये शोषितविषः पुराणविभयकाठमण्डस्वलेखनाय काशिराजसत्यपुराणविभागात् अन्धसूची, तथ्यादि१११५ प्रदनात पुरुषन्ति विरगण च याचने।

अस्मिन्वर्गं अथोनिनिर्देशः छात्रा उलेखाहारः—

( १ ) श्रीमली उषा सत्यवन, प. प. पी-पी. डी., विद्यायाभ्यास संस्कृतविभागे अध्यापिका। एस. महानगरमा मस्तकपुराणविभिन्न शैवभाषीं कुर्वीति आसीत। किंतु न्यासद्वा वामनपुराणस्य पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंकल्पणाः प्रकाशनान्तरं सा पूर्व-विषयं त्यक्तवा वामनपुराणस्य विषयं स्त्रोण्तवी। सा विद्यायाभ्यास-अनुदानायोग्यस्य वरिष्ठा शोषितविषेण। गतागतम् श्रीयुतमार्गे सा पुराणविभागे आगता आसीतं सत्यवां यावत् श्रीमानोन्नतस्वरूपस्य निर्देशस्नातां कामीरीहत्तेख ( पाठसमीक्षात्मकसंकल्पणास्य ‘कारा’ हस्तेख ) विषये कार्यं कुर्वति।

( २ ) विद्यायाभ्यास-क्षेत्र विद्याादि, इत्यादि: श्री ने. एंड. श्रीमली-महोदयः राजस्थानविभागविभागम् संस्कृतविभागायकाय बा-० प. के. गुप्त-महोदयस्य निर्देशने श्रीमान्यगतिकविषयविभिन्नाकार्यं करोति। स: उपयोगी-अन्धसूची विरगणादियां याचितवान्। आवश्यकी सामीय तथी प्रेषिता।

( ३ ) बेंशास्त्रा, मेरिलेंड, यू. प. प. इत्यस्य: श्रीकारिनाचर्च मंहोदयः मद्रासविभागविभागम् संस्कृतविभागायकायः डा-० राष्ट्रया महोदयं पौराणिकभवन-वस्त्रविभयकायः श्रीमान्यनिमितत्वान्तरं अनथसूचीप्रदनाय आर्थितवान्। डा-० राष्ट्रया महोदयः तस्य पदे पुराणविभागे प्रेषितवान्, अमेरिका वेम्बास्तवाय तस्ये विरगणे प्रेषितस्।

( ४ ) गोरखपुर विश्वविद्यालये श्रीमानासादस्तिनाभिनामः शोषितविषः शास्त्रमंदास्य ऐतिहासिकविषये शोषं करोति। स: त्यौद्वे २३.२१.६८
article on 'Conception of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas' published in 'Purāṇa' Vol. IV, Part I (January, 1962) for the purpose.

Purāṇa Pāṭha and Pravacana

During the last week of the bright half of the month of Kārtika, from Oct. 30 to Nov. 5 the complete text of the Garuḍa Purāṇa was recited in the morning and the Pravacana on it was given in the evening by Pt. Visvanath Shastri Datar of the Sāṅga Veda Vidyālaya, Varanasi, in the Padmanabha temple of Ramnagar.

Purāṇa-Goṣṭhī

A Purāṇa-Goṣṭhī is arranged every year on the occasion of the Vyāsa Pūrṇimā. On the occasion of the last Vyāsa Pūrṇimā the Purāṇa-Goṣṭhī was arranged at the Shivala centre of the Trust, in the morning of the 9th July, 1968. It was presided by His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, and was attended by a number of Professors and Scholars of the Varanaseya Sanskrit University and the Banaras Hindu University and also by some local Sanskrit Pandits of Varanasi. After the Maṅgalā- carana a report of the work of the Purāṇa Department for the year (i.e. since the last Purāṇa-goṣṭhī in July, 1967) was read and discussed. The Volume of the critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa was, then, placed before the scholars present and they approved and appreciated it. A short discussion on the translation of the Vāmana Purāṇa, which was then in the Press, also followed. Dr. S. Bhattacharya, Head of the Sanskrit Department of the B. H. U., and Pt. Hariram Shukla, Professor of the Varanaseya Sanskrit University, took keen interest in the discussion. After the Goṣṭhī the Prasāda was distributed.

Veda-Pārayaṇa

In order to popularise the Vedic recitation H. H. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh Ji organised the Pārayaṇa (i.e. recitation of the complete text) of the Veda. The Pārayaṇa of the Kāṇva Śākha of the Śukla-Yajurveda by memory was done during the bright half of the last month of Āśāḍha by Pt. Ramchandra
विनायके प्रे श्रीआनन्दस्वरूपपुरस्य Conception of Sarasvatī नामकस्य
लेखस्य ( VI.1) प्रति याचितवान्। तस्मै मृदुगमात्: मेषिता।

पुराणपाठः प्रचनं च
कार्तिकमासस्य श्रुतिकक्षस्यान्तिमेकावादेः (अक्टूबर ३०-नवम्बर ५)
गहड़पुराणस्य पूर्णः पाठः पदानाम मन्दिरे जातः। अस्योपरिः साक्ष्याविद्वार-वी०: श्रीविभवानाथशाहालिदातारमहीदेवः प्रचनं कृतम्।

पुराणगोष्ठी
प्रतिवर्ष न्यासपूर्णिमाससरे पुराणगोष्ठी आयोजिता नवति। गतम्मात्स्मृणि-माससरे ९. जुलाई १९६८ विनायके प्रातः काले न्यासस्य शिवालाखेन्द्रे पुराणगोष्ठी आयोजिता आशीत। अस्यः गोष्ठया अथवास्तता तत्तत्वचिन्द्रः काशिनरेशः डा० विश्वरुतिन्यात्मकस्यहुमहीदेवः कृतः। अस्यां गोष्ठां वाराणसीस्य संस्कृतविध्वंशविध्व-विद्वानः महाकाव्यः मेवालः अथ्यायकः के० श्यामाविथियोऽविन्दस्य उपस्थिता आसन्। महात्मारामनन्तरं पुराणविभागस्य बार्तिक कार्यविवरणं (गत्पुराणगोष्ठी: आर्यवर्तमानपुराणगोष्ठी: आर्यवर्तमान) पठितं विचारितं च। तदनन्तरं वामनपुराणस्य प्रकाशितं पाठसमीक्षामकं संस्कृतं विद्या कृतं प्रलि ते: विवेचितं प्रवर्तितं च। वामनपुराणस्याविद्वारशः के० श्यामाविथियोऽविन्दस्य बार्तिक: महाकाव्यः संस्कृतविध्वंशविध्वाणीयोऽविन्दस्य श्रीहरिमाल्यकृतं विशेषंचं दर्शित्वत्रौ।

वेदपाराश्रमस्य
वेदपाठस्य प्रचारायं तत्तत्वतः काशिनरेशः डा० विश्वरुतिन्यात्मकसिद्ध-महीदेवः वेदानं पाराश्रमस्यायोजनं कुर्वित। स्सत्यापनेण श्रुतिकल्याणन्त साधारणकार्यः पाराश्रम गतार्थमासस्य श्रुतिकल्याणे पं. रामचन्द्रराजहंसमहीदेवः
Rajahamśa from 26 June to 10 July, 1968. On the successful conclusion of the Pārāyana the reciter was awarded a certificate of merit and the usual dakṣiṇā by His Highness.

Vedic Yajñas—Paurnamāsa and Darśa

The ancient institution of the Śrauta-Yajñas which had played so prominent a part in the life of our ancient forefathers, has now almost fallen into oblivion, but it deserves to be revived and preserved, as it is the most important and the oldest institution of the ancient culture of India. Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, who is a sincere devotee of the Vedic culture, deserves our congratulations for patronising the performance of the two important Śrauta-Yajñas, viz. the Paurnamāsa and the Darśa. The Paurnamāsa Yāga was preformed in the morning of 10th December and the Darśa-īṣṭī was performed on the 19th and 20 Dec. in the morning (i.e. on the Amāvasya and pratipadā of the month of Pauṣa) in the Ramnagar Fort.

Both the Yāgas were performed strictly according to the Vedic sacrificial rules prescribed by the Lātyāyana and the Kātyāyan Śrauta Sūtras. The Yajña-vedi and the five kuṇḍas for the five fires (Āhavaniya, Gārhapatyā, Dakṣiṇāgni, Sabhya, and the Āvasathyā) were prepared with accurate measurement as prescribed in the Sulba-sūtras. A chart showing the exact position of the vedi and the five Agnīs together with the detailed procedure containing 86 items was cyclostyled and the copies were supplied to the scholars present.

The following acted as the yajamāna and the priests of both these yāgas:—

Yajamāna — Shri Diksita Riśisankar Tripathi Somayājin with his wife.
Hotṛ — Pt. Visvanath Deva Ghanapāṭhī.
Adhiṣṭhāna — Pt. Sivaram Tripathi.
Agnīdh — Pt. Dinakar Phadake.
Bṛuhīma — Pt. Harirama Trivedi
२६ जून: १० जुलाई १९६८ यावद क्रमम्। पारायणसमाप्ति पाठकों
प्रशंसापूर्वक, दक्षिणा च तत्त्वविषय: काशिनरेश्वर: प्रदुष।

बैदिक यज़्य—पौर्णमासो दशैश

शौतोधानां प्राचीना परिपटी या प्राचीनकाले अस्मार्क पूर्ववाणां चीने
प्रभावशालिनी आसीत् सा सम्पति दृष्टान्य जाता। किन्तु अस्त्या: पुनरुज्जीवन-
माविष्कारम्। यत्स्वेपणां प्राचीना महत्त्वपूर्ण संस्थासौ। बैदिकसंस्कृतें:
पोषका: समर्थकाश्र काशिनरेश्वर: डा० ब्रम्हसूतराचार्यसिंहमहोदया: धन्यवादाही:
ये: दौ महत्त्वपूर्ण शौतोधानो-पौर्णमासवर्षों गतदिसम्बन्धमसे कारितो। पौर्णमासप्रमिषः
दिनान्तसमय १० दिनान्तस्य प्रातःकाले कृता। दशैशदिनांकृतिः १९, २०
दिनान्तायोः ( अभावस्य तिथिः प्रदिपिदि च ) सम्पन्न।

उभी यज्ञी पूर्णरूपेण सावधानतया च अष्टायण-कायणकौशलयुतायां
विहितया पद्मया पुव सम्पन्नो। शर्वसूत्रविहितमाणानुसारं बैदिकः, पद्मा
(अाहस्या-गार्भयु-दक्षिणा-सन्तु-आवास्ययु) आमनां कुण्डानि च निर्मितानि
आसंतृ। बैदिकः: पद्यान्तानां च स्थानसूत्रस्वसंहितं सह पद्यशीति विषयसंवीकृत
तस्य विवरणस्य साहित्यस्थल स्त्रिया: विरूपणस्य विवरणस्य विवरणस्य
प्रशस्तोऽव्यः दर्शकेश्वरस्य प्रदुषा आसीत।

उभयोऽवस्थायोः: अधूनिद्विच: सजना: यज्ञामन: पुरोहिताकाव्याम्।

यज्ञामन:—साप्तलीक: सोमावाजी श्रीदीक्षितांकिंशिकरसमाप्ति। होतापुण्डितविधानां
नाथेव: वनपाटी। अध्वरुच्छ:—पण्डितस्वरामत्रिपाठी। आनीघ—
पण्डितमनकरकर्षके। सदस्य:—पण्डितवालकुण्यभट्टाचार्येवो। ब्रज्या—
पण्डितहरिसम्रामविवेद्वी।
After some preliminary rites the sacrificial fire was produced by means of the friction of the two araniś (two pieces of the wood of a śamī tree) and with the chanting of the Vedic mantras. On the occasion of the Darśa-Yāga six cows were milked in the evening of the 19th Dec. (Amāvasyā) and again in the early morning of the next day (pratipāda) according to the Śrauta-rites. Both the Yāgas were performed under the supervision of Pt. Rajeshvar Sastri Dravid. His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh and the young Maharajakumar sat by the side of the Āhavaṇīya fire throughout the performance of the two Yāgas. The Dakṣiṇā was given to the yajamāna and the priests in kind (corn). At the conclusion of the Darśa-Yāga the yajña-vibhūti was distributed to the audience. It was really an inspiring and ennobling sight to watch these two sacrifices being performed according to the ancient Vedic injunctions. Even the minutest details were correctly performed with recitation of the Vedic formulas indicating the mode and the importance of their performance. The performance of these two yāgas also served as an education to the young Brahmacārins in the ancient Vedic yajña-vidyā. His Highness intends to perform occasionally these and the other Śrauta-yajñās not involving the animal-sacrifice, for preserving and propagating this important Vedic institution of the ancient Indian culture which is not merely of antiquarian interest but also of educational value to the present age.

Vasanta-Pūjā and Śastrārtha

During the 9th birth day ceremony of the young Maharaj-Kumar, Sri Anant Narain Singh, which was celebrated from 25 to 27 November 1968, the Vasanta-pūjā (i.e. the ceremonial recitation of the Vedas by the boys under 14 years of age on a birthday ceremony) and a Śastrārtha on the Nyāya was arranged by His Highness on the 27th November, in which the Mahārājākumar and the other Brahmacārins (students of the Vidyā- mandir Pāthaśāla of the Maharaja Banaras Vidyā- mandir Trust) took part. Both the function were held under the supervision of Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid and Pandit Hari Ram Shukla of the Varanaseya Sanskrit University. After the two functions the prizes were given to the Brahmacārins and the prasāda was also distributed to the audience.
ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST

Jan., 1969]

The activities extend over several months, involving the organisation of various events. The dates mentioned include

- 19th December: Dinashakshyam
- 20th December: Dinashakshyam
- 21st December: Dinashakshyam

Various activities were organised in different locations, including:

- Sahar Anandnagari
- Doohi, Thakurdwara
- Bhaba, Rohri

The activities were aimed at promoting the welfare of the community and fostering a sense of unity and spirit.

[Further details about the activities are provided in the text, including mentions of specific dates and locations.]

The activities concluded on a positive note, with participants expressing satisfaction and enthusiasm for future events.
Varanasi Session of A.I.O.C.

The twenty-fourth session of the All-India Oriental Conference was held at Varanasi in the Varanaseya Sanskrit University on Oct. 12-14, 1968. His Highness Maharaja, Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh was the chairman of the reception committee. In his address at the Plenary Session of the Conference the President, Acharya Visvabandhu (who could not attend the Session in person and so his address was read by Prof. Jagannath Agrawala) referred to the Purāṇa work of the All India Kashiraj Trust in an appreciative tone. In its concluding session the conference passed a resolution on the publication of the Critical Edition and the two translation Volumes of the Vāmana Purāṇa, which has already been noted above.

The Chairman of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh, gave a tea-party to the delegates of the Conference in the evening of the 12th October on the lawn of the Sanskrit University. Dr. Aditya Nath Jha, Lieutenant Governor of Delhi, who inaugurated the session, was presented by H. H. a copy of the Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa on this occasion.

Shri Ananda Swarup Gupta and Dr. Ganga Sagar Rai read their papers on ‘Textual Problems of the Vāmana Purāṇa’, and the ‘Evolution of the Vāmana-Legend’ respectively in the classical section of the Conference. On the advice of Dr. R. N. Dandekar the classical section also passed an appreciative resolution on the publication of the three Volumes of the Vāmana Purāṇa by the Kashiraj Trust.

On behalf of the Purāṇa Department of the Kashiraj Trust Shri Anand Swarup Gupta placed the following resolution in the Council of the Conference on the 13th October, which was seconded by Dr. P. N. Pushp, Director of Archives and Libraries, Kashmir, and was passed unanimously:—

“Indian Institutions and Manuscript-Libraries are requested to give to the Public Institutions which are well established and recognised by the Government of India, facilities to directly
अखिलभारतीय महानगर सम्मेलन स्वरूप वाराणसी-अखिलेश्वर

अखिलभारतीय महानगर सम्मेलन स्वरूप बुधवार के अन्दर १२-१४ दिनांक के सम्पन्न। तत्परता: काश्मीर डा० विमुखिनारायण सिंह महोदयः स्वागतिकतमः अय्यक्ष्मा आधीतः। सम्मेलनस्वरूप भारभिकाविवेचने अय्यक्ष्मा: डा० विमुखिनारायणसिंह महोदयः (व्यक्तिमुखः काश्मीर जनमोत्सव अमृतस्तरः तत्स्वरूप भाषणमयः) स्वागतिकतमः अय्यक्ष्मा आधीतः। काश्मीर, स्वरूप विवेचने अय्यक्ष्मा: डा० विमुखिनारायणसिंह महोदयः (व्यक्तिमुखः काश्मीर जनमोत्सव अमृतस्तरः तत्स्वरूप भाषणमयः) स्वागतिकतमः अय्यक्ष्मा आधीतः।

१२ दिनांक विमुखिनारायणसिंह महोदयः सर्वभारतीय काश्मीर जनमोत्सवः विवेचनस्वरूप अय्यक्ष्मा आधीतः। सम्मेलनस्वरूप विवेचने अय्यक्ष्मा: डा० विमुखिनारायण सिंह महोदयः स्वागतिकतमः अय्यक्ष्मा आधीतः सम्मेलनस्वरूप विवेचने अय्यक्ष्मा: डा० विमुखिनारायण सिंह महोदयः स्वागतिकतमः अय्यक्ष्मा आधीतः।

सम्मेलनस्वरूप 'काशिकल हर्ष श्री आनन्दकृष्ण' विषयमिश्रितवर्णन: Textual Problems of the Vāmana Purāṇa विषयमिश्रितवर्णन: डा० गंगासागराय अवारकोरीः विषयमिश्रितवर्णन: निर्देशन: डा० विमुखिनारायण सिंह महोदयः विषयमिश्रितवर्णन: डा० आदिवाख्याकृतिः महोदयः विषयमिश्रितवर्णन: डा० आदिवाख्याकृतिः महोदयः।

काश्मीर जनमोत्सवः विवेचनस्वरूप: श्री आनन्दकृष्णपुराणमहोदयः सम्मेलनस्वरूप महोदयः स्वागतिकताः अय्यक्ष्माः प्रस्तावः प्रस्तावः। पुष्पमहोदयः स्वागतिकताः स्वरूपमहोदयः

“भारतीय संस्कृत इतिहास पुराण प्रकाशन इंद्रियाध्यात्मक यथे प्रस्तावः यथे भारत-राज्य स्वीकृतेः। तथा प्रकाशन: सर्वजनीतिकार्यार्थ उपचितः व्यक्तिकार्यार्थ उपचितः।”
borrow manuscripts from them, except the rare ones, on furnishing adequate security and on duly executing the indemnity bond. In case of rare manuscripts microfilms or photo-stat copies as desired by the borrowers, be supplied to them at their cost. If the lending institutions or libraries do not possess necessary facilities for making microfilm and photo-stat copies, they should have it done by the National Archives or such allied Government Institutions at the cost of the borrower”.

Two Sanskrit Dramas Staged

Staging of Sanskrit dramas is a very good means of making the Sanskrit language popular among the masses besides giving them a healthy entertainment. It also displays the salient features of the Indian culture. With this point in view His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh arranged through the Maharaja Banaras Vidyamandir Trust the staging of the two Sanskrit dramas, Saint Tulasidasa and Mirabai, composed by Srimati Dr. Rama Rao of the Pracya Vani Institution of Calcutta. The two dramas were successfully staged under the guidance of the authoress Srimati Rao by her party on the 15th and 16th October respectively in the Ramnagar Fort. Besides Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh Ji, Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravida and other local scholars and distinguished persons witnessed the two plays and appreciated them. A dinner was given to Srimati Rao and her party on both the days.

Rāmalīlā

The famous Rāmalīlā organised every year at Ramnagar in Sept-Oct. by His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh Ji has a great religious and cultural importance and is visited by a large number of people. It lasts for a full month.

This year the Rāmalīlā was organised from Sept. 5 to Oct. 5. Apart from the huge congregation the following distinguished persons also visited the fair:—

1. Shri Balwant Garagi of the Punjab University, the well-known authority on folk-theatre visited the Rāmalīlā and stayed here in the Nadesar House of His Highness. He is writing a book on the Ramnagar-Rāmalīlā.
दुर्भाइस्तेल्यानां विहायनानां इस्तेल्यानां ददम्यत । दुर्भाइस्तेल्यानां माइडेरफिम्यांनी प्रतिस्थापन वा महत्त्वाची व्यथेच निर्माय ददम्यत । यदी तेथेच संकाच तस्मात माइडेरफिम्यांनी प्रतिस्थापन वा साप्तांत नीचे ते महत्त्वाची व्यथेच 'राष्ट्रीय आर्थिक' अथवा पातः केल्या जास्तीत संस्थयाची निर्माणक्षेत्र ददम्यत ।

ह्रयोः संस्कृतनाटकेऽरमिनयः

संस्कृतनाटकानाममिनयः दर्शना अन्नतोपायातर्विकृतं संस्कृतभाष्याः प्रवा- रस्थ सागवसण्यति । अथं भारतीयसंस्कृतं भुक्ताङ्गात्मापण्यति ।

एतौ दृष्टां महाराजकाशनरेशः महाराजसाहिबचालांगनेश्वरस्वास्तवाचा कल्पकी- 

tिवासिनी दाता रमाचौबरीहोत्याचवा तुवसीदास-मिराबाई विषयकृत्या निर्मितवीः।

ह्रयोः नाटकेऽरमिनयश्च प्रकार धारायमातुः। तेलिकाया: निदेशानी दृश्योऽन्योऽर- 

tिनयः १५, १६ अक्टूबर दिनांकः रामनगरमध्ये अभ्यूः आशील काशनरेशः,

पं राजेश्वराश्चिन्महिमाद्विद्धमहोः अनेके विद्वाने: अस्तिथिकाश्च नाटकेऽर- 
tिनयं ददवतः । नाटकपुरूषां निदेशाकाश्च समाने उभधुः साथ्य भोजनं ददम्यूः।

रामालीका

तत्र भवविद्यः काशनरेशः: दाता अभियुतिकाश्च सिंहमहोः रामनगरे खंड्रकार जिवयव्य चतुरार्थस्वारे आयोजितः तस्याचर्यां जांभिन्नां साक्षात्काराः महत्त्वपूर्णां वर्णिते। अभिमानः वर्षं ५ सितम्बरदिनांकत: आर्थ्यम् ५ अक्टूबर दिनांकः याबूः रामालीका आयोजिता आतोः। श्रृंखलामहत्त्वात्स्वारतमार्गितोऽन्मित्यां विशिष्याः: शुभरा रामालीकादार्शनार्थमयात जास्तोः——

१. श्रीबंभवन्तगारीमहोः: पञ्चाविविधविवाहायस्य-तौक्तुंकायिकेऽष्ट्रये अविकर्तिको विभानू वर्णिते। अथं महानारायणे काशनरेशः तन्द्रायज्ञमध्ये अतिथिरक्षितमूः। अथं महानारायणे: रामनगरस्य रामालीकायिके प्रस्थर्थर्थां कुरुः मेहः।
2. Mrs. Chester Bowles, wife of the U.S.A. Ambassador in India, Mr. Chester Bowles, came to see the Rāmalilā with her friends from the Embassy and stayed at the Nadesar House.

3. The V.C. of the Varanaseya Sanskrit University, Dr. Gauri Nath Shastri, came to see the Rāmalilā with his family and friends on the Bharata-mīlāpa day (Oct. 3).

4. The V.C. of the Calcutta University also visited the Rāmalilā on the same day.

5. Brigadier Rizvi of the Lucknow Command visited the Rāmalilā on the Bharata-mīlāpa day and was greatly impressed.

Šaṣṭyaṣṭī-Pūrti of Dr. V. Raghavan

The Šaṣṭyaṣṭī-Pūrti on the 61st birthday of Dr. V. Raghavan, Professor and Head of the Sanskrit Department of the Madras University and an eminent Sanskrit scholar of international fame, who is also a member of our Purāṇa-Committee, was celebrated in Madras with proper śāstric rites on the 21st and 22nd August, 1968. A public function was arranged on the 22nd August to felicitate Dr. Raghavan on this occasion. The function was presided by Dr. C. D. Deshmukh. Messages were received from various quarters of India and abroad. The All-India Kashiraj Trust also sent a message of felicitation in Sanskrit and Rs. 101/- as its contribution. We again congratulate him for completing his 60th year and pray God to grant him a long and happy life to serve the cause of Sanskrit learning.

Scholars who visited the Puṇeṇa-Department

The following scholars visited our Puṇeṇa-Department during the period under review:—

1. Mahāmahopādhyāya Svāmi Gangesvaranand Ji, Veda-mandir, Ahmedabad.—16.10.68.
2. Dr. L. Sternbach, U.N., New York.—9.11.68,
3. Prof. Dr. Sūrya Kānta, Head of Sanskrit Department, Kuruksetra University.—23.11.68.
4. Dr. B. N. Sharma, National Museum, New Delhi.—24.11.68.
2. अमेरिकादेशस्थ राज्‌दृष्ट्य नेस्टर बाउल्स महोदयस्य धर्मपल्ली
 प्रसिद्धिकालेन रामलीलाकचिन सिद्धांताभाषण स्थानावर वाहे
 काहिनेराग्र संशयोक्तिमयोऽरताा महोदयं परिवारस्यं
 स्मित्रेत्या सह भूतासलाखिपी (३ अक्टूबर
dिनांके) रामलीलां द्वारः

4. कलक्तियतिव्विहामाध्यमेन उपकुलीतिमहोदयः दिनेन
रामलीलां हस्तवान्

5. श्रीगिरियर रिजवीमहोदयः दिनेन रामलीलां हस्त्वा
प्रभावितो जाता:

ढावे रावचन महोदयस्य षष्ठमंदः पृवत्तः

विधवांशसंस्कृतस्वतिविधुतः मद्राससस्कृतविद्वाचार्यस्य संस्कृतविविषयिायक्षस्य असमात्पूरणस्मितिस्वद्वस्य ढावे रावचन् महोदयस्य षष्ठमंदः
कु त्तस्वः १८६५ तिष्ठायांगस्तमसय २१, २२ दिनांकीयः शाक्त्वत्तमया
सम्प्रदा:। असस्तिवरसे ढावे रावचन्महोदयस्य विविषयिायक्षस्य कु त्तस्वः एकः सार्वजनिकः
उत्सव आयोजित आसहीः। उत्सवरोत्तमः ढावे चिन्तामणिद्वारकासाहित्यदेणुकुः
महोदयेन कुः। देवीदेवी। श्रुतिभाषनसतिदशा आगता आसनाः।
असस्तिवरसे काव्यांत्रयां समस्तभाषाणां श्रुतिभाषाः १०१ उद्वा
च पेशिता। वर्ष तयां पद्मिनीतृतीयां तस्मैन् धनिष्ठावानुक्रममं व्याख्याम्: भगवत्य याचार्ये यत्
तस्मै दीर्घं शुद्धं च आयुष्यं च वित्तोत्तु येनां यथानुभागः संस्कृतसेवां कुःरीतीः।

पुराणविविषया व्वकम्बमात्वा विवर्शः
असस्तिवरसे काव्यांत्रयां अभोगविद्या विवर्शः: पुराणविविषये आगता आसनाः—

१. महामहोदयस्य: स्वामी गजेश्वरानन्दः, अहमदाबादां तेजदेवमनिराधारः
१९६१ १६ दिनांके।

२. ढावे भाषानिक: स्टॉनबाल महोदयः ९२१ १६ दिनांके।

३. कुःरीत्रविद्वान् विहारावत्मक विषयिायक्षस्य: प्रो. ढावे सर्वकालः
महोदयः २३१ १६ दिनांके।

४. ढावे बी.ए. न. शर्मा महोदयः, नेशनल म्यूजियम, दिल्ली।
२०१५ १६ दिनांके।
Distinguished Guests of His Highness

The following dignitaries were the guests of His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh at his Nadesar House during their visit to Varanasi:

1. Shri Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister of India. (6.7.68).
2. Shri Jagjivan Ram, Food Minister, Government of India. (21.7.68 and 29.9.68).
3. Justice Shashi Kant Varma of Allahabad High Court. (1.9.68).
4. Shri Satyendra Narain Sinha, Patna. (2.10.68).
6. Maharajkumar Dr. Raghubir Singh. (10.10.68)
7. Dr. R. K. Sharma, Ministry of Education, Govt. of India. (12.10.68)
8. Shri Raj Gopalan, Judicial Member Income-tax Tribunal, Patna. (24.11.68)
10. Smt. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India. (26.12.68)
विशिष्टा अतिथियः

अधी निर्दिष्टा: सजना: स्वीयकाशीयात्रायां तत्रभवतां छा. विभूतिनायकरण-सिंहमहोदयान्न नन्देशवरभवने अतिथियः आसन्न—

१. भारतस्यप्रधानमन्त्री श्रीमोरोजवेदिमहोदयः ६.७.६८ दिनाख़े।

२. भारतस्य लालमन्त्री श्रीजगवीवनराममहोदयः २९.७.६८, २९.६.८ दिनाख़े।

३. प्रथाग-उच्चनम्मेयालयस्य न्यायाधीशः श्रीशिक्षान्तर्महोदयः १९.६.८ दिनाख़े।

४. पटनायकवास्तुः श्रीसबेदनारायणसिंहमहोदयः २९.६.८ दिनाख़े।

५. भारतस्य अमेरिकी दूतावासः श्रीमती बेस्टवोल्समहोदयः।

६. महाराजकुमार छा. रघुवीरसिंहमहोदयः १०.१०.६८ दिनाख़े।

७. भारतस्य विक्षामन्त्रालयाधिकारी छा. रामकरणशर्ममहोदयः १२.१०.६८ दिनाख़े।

८. श्रीरामपालुमहोदयः।

९. श्रीमती खुशीला नायरमहोदयः २६.१२.६८ दिनाख़े।

१०. भारतदेशस्य प्रधानमन्त्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधीमहोदयः २६.१२.६८ दिनाख़े।
BOOKS RECEIVED

(With brief Note on their Contents)


[It presents a study of the new personality of early India as emerging from functional-historical integration of recent data on human ecology, archaeology, anthropology, linguistics and literature bearing on the Sarasvati, the lost river of the Indian History, and the mechanics of the human process.

The main headings are: I. Sarasvati Basin and its strategy to history; II. As Archaeology depicts, distorts and drops; III. The human process in India. These are divided into several sub-headings. Several illustrations, maps, charts, appendices and an index are also added.]


[The work contains the Sanskrit text of the Sūtras of Pāṇini, French Translation, and extracts from commentaries. Vol. I—Adh. 1 to 4, Vol. II—Adh. 5 to 8. At the end of Vol. II (pp. 435-490) a complete Index of the Pāṇini Sūtras is given.]


[It has been edited on the basis of the four MSS. The variants are given in footnotes. Text—pp. 1-124a; Critical notes—pp. 125-137; Appendix-A: An Alpha-
betical Index of the names of Sāmagānas, Grāmageya and Āraṇyaka. The verses on which these gānas are melodized as also the names of the Rṣis who composed the gānas are mentioned against each gāna. Appendix B: An alphabetical list of Rṣis of Sāmagānas with reference to page numbers. The Introduction given in the beginning in pp. xi-xvii discusses important characteristics of this work.]


[The editor has made use of eight MSS, four with commentary and four with the text only. Variants are given in footnotes. Critical notes are given in p. 269ff. Appendix contains the citations from other works referred to in the commentary. In the end two Indexes are given, the first contains the technical names of Sāmagānas, Grāmageya and Āraṇyaka, and the second Index has listed the Āraṇyaka-gānas in alphabetical order with their technical names and location numbers. Introduction in the beginning discusses important characteristics of the work and the various categories of the gānas.]


[The present edition of Ṣadviṃśa is based on one printed edition and eleven MSS. The Introduction deals with the important characteristics of the work, gives a brief summary of the topics dealt with in its six chapters, and discusses its textual and grammatical peculiarities. It also gives useful information about its
previous editions. The text covers pp. 1-225 with
variants in the form of footnotes. Critical notes follow
in pp. 226-234. Appendix A contains the explanation
of technical words having a special connotation
as found in the text or commentary. Appendix B
contains the list of the quotations from the Samhitās,
Brāhmaṇas, Āranyakas and Upaniṣads found in the
text or commentary. Appendix C has listed the
quotations from the non-Vedic texts found in the text
and commentary. In the end a word index is given.]

Malayamāruta (मलयमार्तु) Part one; A collection of minor works
in Sanskrit poems, plays, hymns, anthologies etc. from
MSS. not yet published. Edited by Dr. V. Raghavan.
Published by the Central Sanskrit Institute, Tirupati,

[In order to bring to light the large mass of minor
Sanskrit works lying in manuscripts the Kendriya
Sanskrit Vidyaapeetha, Tirupati, has planned to publish
a periodical, called the Malayamāruta, on the same plan
as that of the Kāyamalāgucochakas formerly published
in fourteen parts by the Nirmaya Sagar Press, Bombay.
The present issue of the Malayamāruta (मलयमार्तु) is the
inaugural number and is called the प्रथमः स्वतः. It
contains the collection of the following nine short and
minor Sanskrit works:

1. उत्त्वस्वागस्यपतिस्तम्भायुक्तकारस्तः: (Adyar Library Ms);

2. महाराजोज्ज्वलस्तः Composed by Pandita Kṛṣṇaka (Adyar
Library MS., B.O.R.I. Ms.; and National Museum,
Delhi, MS.);

3. क्षल्लोकस्य by Vidyācakravartin (Government Oriental
Manuscripts Library, Madras, MS.);

4. उपदेशस्विविधामिणि: by Tyāgarāja (Adyar Library MS.);

5. पूजुस्वालनम् a compilation (Sarasvati Mahal Library,
Tanjore, MS.)
6. कवितासृप्तिकृत compiled by Gauramohan (Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library MS.);

7. नराभरणम् a compilation (Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library MS.);

8. सीमानायंतकम् by Somanātha (from a transcript copy of a MS. of the Bhosla Sanskrit College, Nagpur); and

9. विदुषमोहन प्रहस्तण् by Harijivan Miśra (Anupa Library, Bikaner, MS.).

In the footnotes are given textual and explanatory notes and bibliographical and historical data. The Preface (in English) and आचरण (in Sanskrit) gives information about the earlier efforts in publishing such collections of minor Sanskrit works from calcutta, Bombay and Banaras.]


[The present work is a dissertation in Hindi—based on the four Purāṇas—Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu and Matsya. It discusses the religious, social and cultural material of these Purāṇas. In the beginning there is a long and informative Introduction called विषयप्रवेश (pp. 1-176) which discusses the origin, development, nature and chronology of the Purāṇas in general and of the four Purāṇas in particular. After this the following topics of interest are discussed under the Paurāṇika Dharma evam Samāja:—वैष्णववर्ग (Vaiṣṇavism), शैववर्ग (Saivism), सूर्य तथा सौरपूजा (Sun and the Sun-worship), शक्तिवर्ग (Sākta-cult), पुराणां में वर्णित रात्रि देवता (Other Paurāṇika Deities), वाद (Sacrifice), तीर्थ (Places of pilgrimage), वर्ण तथा जातियाँ (Varṇas and Castes), क्षात्रम् अवस्था (the Institution of the four Āśramas or stages of...
life), संस्कार (Purificatory ceremonies), शिक्षा (Education), खोबो (the condition of women), वस्त्र-प्रसंस्कार (clothes and ornaments), मनोरञ्जन के साधन (the means of entertainment), श्रवण (food and drinks), नगर-मापन (the building of cities), and अर्थविकल्प (economic condition of the people). The परिवंत (Appendix) deals with such topics as the Purānic story of the origin of the Liṅga, etc. In the end there is a list of the Bibliography utilised by the author, and also a word-Index.]
PUBLICATIONS OF THE PURĀNA DEPARTMENT OF
THE ALL INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST,
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI, U. P. INDIA

**Purāṇa**: Half yearly Purāṇa-Bulletin, started from 1959. Published in January and July each year. Contains articles in English and Sanskrit on Purānic studies and research. Annual Subscription Rs. 12 or £ 1. Supplements containing Indexes of articles and authors of every five Volumes also available separately.

**Vāmana-Purāṇa**: Critically edited for the first time by Prof. Anand Swarup Gupta on the basis of 21 manuscripts of different versions and scripts. The Introduction both in English and Sanskrit, besides giving the details of the critical Apparatus, discusses the various textual problems of the Vāmana Purāṇa and the principles adopted for constituting the text. Besides the Introduction, Constituted Text and the Critical Apparatus the edition contains also a detailed concordance of its Adhyāyas and Ślokas with the other printed editions of the Purāṇa, detailed Adhyāya-Contents, Appendices containing (i) a Subject-concordance with the other Purāṇas and the two Epics, (ii) Vāmana Purāṇa quotations found in the Dharmaśāstra-Nibandhas, both identified and unidentified, and (iii) a concordance of the Vāmana Purāṇa Ślokas with the critical edition of the Mahābhārata. In the end an Index of the Vāmana-Purāṇa Ślokārdhas (Half-Ślokas) is also given. Demy quarto size. pp. i-lxx+1-778+1-97 (Verse-Index). Price Rs. 125/-

**Vāmana-Purāṇa with English Translation**: English translation along with the constituted Sanskrit Text and with Introduction, Appendices, Adhyāya-concordance with the Veṅkaṭeśvara edn. and Verse-Index. The Appendices contain a subject-concordance and lists of the
personal names, geographical names, tīrthas, stotras, vrataś, flora and fauna mentioned in the Vāmana Purāṇa with references of Adhs. and Śls. Scientific Latin names of flora and fauna and descriptive notes on the flora are also given. Demy quarto size. pp. i-1+1-543+1-70 (App.) +1-97 (Verse-Index). Price Rs. 80.

Vāmana-Purāṇa with Hindi Translation: Hindi translation along with the constituted Sanskrit text. Introduction (Hindi), Appendices, Adhyāya-Concordance and Ślokārdha-Index same as in the English Translation Volume. Size also Same. pp. i-xl+1-465+1-55+1-97. Price Rs. 50.

Rāmacarita-mānasa: The great Hindi Poem of Gosvāmī Tulasidāsa. Critically edited on the basis of a number of old manuscripts both in India and abroad written within the hundred years of the poet's death. By Prof. Vishvanath Prasad Misra. Price Rs. 6.50, Library Edn. Rs. 15.


Matsya-Purāṇa—A Study: By Dr. V.S. Agrawala. The Author's point of view is mainly directed to an interpretation of this important Purāṇa in the Vedic background on the one hand and in the light of the cultural, geographical and historical material incorporated in the Purāṇas on the other. Price Rs. 30.

Vyāsa-Praśasti: Compiled and edited by Dr. V. Raghavan from the Mahābhārata, Purāṇas, Māhātmyas, etc. Price Rs. 1.

Niti-Section of the Purāṇārtha-Samgraha: Edited with Introduction and Notes by Dr. V. Raghavan. Price Rs. 2.

Viṣṇu-Purāṇa-Visayānukramaṇi (Subject-Index of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa in Sanskrit): By Pt. Madhvacharya Adya. Price Rs. 5.


Hindi Translation of the Report of the Calendar Reform Committee: Government of India. (For Private use and not for sale).

To be had from
General Secretary,
ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST,
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI (INDIA)
Vol. XI., No. 2  [29 July, 1969]
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व्यास-वन्दना

विज्ञानरोचि:परिपूर्वितान् वर्षार्णकोशं हस्तितोषणम् ॥
तर्कभियेतं विविधार्थ्यूपगीर्ववगविज्ञानद्वातान्तरस्मि ॥ ॥

नमामि नीलाम्बकान्तिकान्ते व्यासे निर्स्वायूलदेश्यानु ॥
शान्तिदन्ते विगुर्गविदिकेष्यं सच्चक्षुद्राभयुक्तमस्मि ॥ ॥

पूर्णोपकषरसिवितां सज्जनेष्ठमन्तसन्दृष्टमु ॥
वासवीहत्यन्तन्ते हरिः बादरायनमहे भजेन्निशाम ॥ ॥

व्यासे सर्वगुणावासं वासवीन्द्रन्ते प्रभुम् ॥
गुर्वशिष्यपादाङ्के बन्दे मधववहम् ॥ ॥

बन्दे सत्यवतीतृं सब्जिज्ञानंविद्धम् ॥
श्रीमधवशुनिन्तिसेवकांग्रामकर्मन्वहम् ॥ ॥

आनन्दादिगुणोदितं स्वाभिषेनन्दनावयक्मम् ॥
आनन्दायकसदर्शं भजेतं हं बादरायणम् ॥ ॥

(श्राध्योपाख्येत्यं पदमघचारणं संकलितम्)

1. आनन्दीवीच्यसे तत्त्वसारे ।
2. आनन्दीवीच्यार्थमहागजन्तत्वानिष्ठ्यात् ।
3. आनन्दीवीच्यक्तस्योपविवाधविविंत्यात् श्रीनिवासशीर्षकश्चिदं ॥
4. श्रीनिवासशीर्षक्तिर्मचारक्षणंत्यात् ॥
5. श्रीनिवासशीर्षक्तितस्यसंबंधयानिष्ठ्यात् ॥
6. श्रीनिवासशीर्षक्तितस्यतत्वज्ञवेक्षीमिष्ठ्यात् ॥
A NOTE ON THE VYĀSA-VANDANĀ

These verses of the Vyāsa-vandanā (adoration of Vyāsa) have been taken from some of the works of Madhva-Ācārya (also called Ānanda-tīrtha, b 1119—d 1199) who was the founder of the dvoṭa philosophy of Vaiṣṇavism, and also from the works of Śrī-nivāśācārya (or Śrīnivāsatīrtha) of the Mādhva-sect. Śrī Madhva-Ācārya and the Ācāryas and followers of his sect were the great devotees and admirers of Veda-Vyāsa and regarded him not only as an avatāra of Viṣṇu, but Viṣṇu himself who incarnated into various avatāras, from Matsya to Kālki, as is clear from the Karāvalan bana-stotra of Veda-Vyāsa composed by Yadupati or Yadavācārya (c. 1400 A.D).

These verses describe the physical form and some of the prominent virtues of Vyāsa and pray homage to him as follows:

"I bow to him (i.e. to Vyāsa) who has filled the whole internal and the external universe with the light of knowledge, who is dark like an emerald, who keeps his hands in the position of the tarka-mudrā and the abhaya-mudrā, and who has imparted knowledge to Brahmā, Śiva and other gods.—(1)

"I bow to Vyāsa whose body is lustrous like the lustre of dark blue clouds, who has cast away (or driven away) all the evils, who imparts knowledge to Brahmā, Śiva and others, and whose hands are in the sat-tarka-mudrā and abhaya-mudrā.—(2)

"I incessantly adore Hari in the form of Bādarāyana-Vyāsa who gladdens the heart of his mother Vāsavi (Satyavatī), who fulfills the desires of good persons, who has endless good virtues, and whose feet have been served by the hands of Ānanda-tīrtha endowed with full knowledge.—(3)

"I adore Vyāsa who is the abode of all the virtues, who is the son of Vāsavi (Satyavatī, the daughter of king Vasu Uparicara), whose lotus-like feet are worshipped by my teacher, and who is dear to Madhva.—(4)

"I daily adore the son of Satyavatī, who has the form of sat (existence), viś (consciousness), and ānanda (happiness) and whose lotus-like feet are worthy to be served by Śrī Madhva Muni.—(5)
“I adore Bādarāyaṇa (Vyāsa) who is prominent in the virtues like happiness, who gives happiness to his dependants, and whose body is made of happiness.”—(6).

Vyāsa is represented here as keeping his hands in the position of the *tarka* and the *abhaya-mudrā*-s. It has a great significance here. A *mudrā* is formed by keeping the fingers in a certain position according to the rules prescribed in the Tantra-s. The *tarka-mudrā* is also called the *jñāna-mudrā* and is formed by joining the index finger with the thumb and spreading out the other fingers jointly (see the footnote of the Hindi translation of VI. 6. 38 of the Bhāg-P., Gṛttā Press edn.) This *mudrā* is formed when expounding the philosophical and religious truths. By the mention of this *mudrā* Vyāsa is represented here as a great expounder of *dharma* through his works—Mahābhārata, Purāṇas and the Brahma-sūtra. Vyāsa’s *tarka-mudrā* symbolises *sat-tarka* (good and proper reasoning) and not *ku-tarka* (bad and fallacious reasoning). By his *abhaya-mudrā* Vyāsa assures security and freedom from fear through his exposition of *dharma* which protects one who protects or follows it (‘भर्मां रक्षति रक्षित्’).

The *tarka- (jñāna-)* *mudrā* is one of the nineteen *mudrā*-s sacred to Viṣṇu and the *abhaya-mudrā* is one of the ten *mudrā*-s sacred to Śiva (cf. Kālikā Purāṇa, Adh. 65, as quoted in the Śabda-Kalpa-drūma). The mention of these two *mudrā*-s together, therefore, may also be taken to signify a synthesis of Vaisnāvism and Śaivism in Vyāsa and his works.

Vyāsa is considered as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, cf. śloka 3 above in the *Vyāsa-vandanā* and also the following.—

द्वापरे द्वापरे विष्णुव्यासरूपी महापुत्रे ।  
वेदेऽमेकं सुब्रह्मण्यं कुर्ते वजयो हिंदुय ॥

(Viṣ.-P. III. 3. 5)

क्षणद्रौपिण्यनो व्यासो विष्णुर्त्तरायणे स्वयम् ।  
अपानतरमा: पूतः स्वेच्छया ह्यम्बलेद्वः ॥

(Kūr.-P I. 51. 48)
In the Śiva-Purāṇa (Ṣata-rudriya Samhitā, 37. 22f.) Vyāsa is mentioned as a great devotee of Śiva:

एतस्य्व समये व्यासो भस्मभूषितमस्य: ||
हर्षक्षाभरणुष्णायात् जटाजूतविश्रृंगित: ||
पञ्चाश्शरं जपनू मन्त्रं शिवप्रेमसमाकुल: ||
तेजसं च स्वयं राशि: साक्षाद्यथे हवापर: ||

In the Kūrma-Purāṇa Vyāsa is said to have seen and praised three-eyed Śiva before arranging the Vedas:

पराशरोऽहम्पिणी कृष्णद्वैपणाऽहरि: ।
आराध्य देवमीशानं दश्या स्तुत्वा त्रिलोचनम् ॥
तत्प्राप्तादसौ व्यासं वेदानामकरोजू प्रसः ।

(Kūrma-P. I. 52. 11f.).

His works, both Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, are permeated with a spirit of great tolerance and with the ideas of the unity of the two great gods—Viṣṇu and Śiva.

—ANAND SWARUP GUPTA
वासुदेवः स्तुतिः
(भागवतपुराणम्, ८. १६. २९-३७)

नमस्तुम्यं भगवते पुरुषाय महोदये ।
सर्वभूतिनिवासाय वासुदेवाय साक्षिणे ॥ २९ ॥

नमोद्वस्त्याय सूक्ष्माय प्रभागुरुरुपाय ।
चदुप्रवन्दवसुप्रणोदिन्याय गुणसंस्पर्शाय ॥ ३० ॥

नमो द्विशीर्षणं त्रिष्णेऽचरुःश्रृद्धयाय तन्तवे ।
सतहस्ताय यज्ञाय त्रिविविधाय नमः ॥ ३१ ॥

नमः शिवाय सदाय नमः शकिवराय ।
सर्वविविधाचित्वे भूतानां पते नमः ॥ ३२ ॥

नमो द्विरुपीयाय प्राणाय जगददामने ।
योगीश्वरजसरीराय नमस्ते योगहेतुवे ॥ ३३ ॥

नमस्त आदीदेवाय साक्षिमूत्य ते नमः ।
नारायणाय चहये नावाय हरिये नमः ॥ ३४ ॥

नमो सर्वकृतशयामवुपुरे भविगतस्मि ।
केशाय नमस्तुम्यं नमस्ते पीतवाससे ॥ ३५ ॥

तव सर्ववर्तः पुंसां चरेयाय वर्दर्षम ।
अतस्य क्रेयसे धीराः पादभूपुप्पासने ॥ ३६ ॥

अन्वयत्वेत यें देवा श्रीव तत्पदपचयोः ।
स्पृहयन्त इवामोदं भरणाम्ये प्रसीदताम् ॥ ३७ ॥
A NOTE ON THE VĀSUDEVĀ-STUTĪ

The above Vāsudeva-stuti is a part of the payo-vrata (a vow to live on milk only for twelve days in the bright half of the month of Fālguna) instructed by Sage Kaśyapa to his wife Aditi. By observation of this vow Viṣṇu is pleased and grants a boon to the worshipper. Aditi observed this vrata strictly according to the instructions of Kaśyapa, and thereby she was granted a boon by Viṣṇu that He would be born to her as a son in the form of Vāmanā. This payo-vrata is called sarva-yajña (essence of all the sacrifices), sarva-vrata (essence of all the vows) and tapah-sūra (essence of all the austerities) and satisfies God Viṣṇu—

अवः वै सर्वयज्ञाल्यः सर्वज्ञतिमिति स्वतंतम् ।

तपासारमिदं भद्रे दानं चेष्ठरत्पर्यम् ॥

(Bhāg. VIII. 16.60).

This Vāsudeva-stuti, being a part of this important vrata, has great importance from the religious point of view. The first two ślokas (29, 30) of this stuti are in general praise of Vāsudeva: He is the greatest of all the beings, he resides in all the beings, he is Puruṣa (the Supreme Being and the soul of the universe), Vāsudeva (the deity who resides in all and in whom reside all) and sākṣīn (the witness) of all—(29). He is avyakta (unmanifest), sūkṣma (subtle) and Pradhāna-puruṣa (the Primaeval Matter or Prakṛti). He knows the twenty-four guṇas (i. e. 24 tattvas as enumerated in the Sāṅkhya Philosophy), He is the founder of the Sāṃkhya-philosophy (called here guṇa-sāṅkhya, as guṇas or tattva-s are enumerated and expounded here)—(30).

The third śloka (31) describes symbolically the form of Yajña (Sacrifice) who is considered as Viṣṇu himself (‘यजो वै विष्णुः’ ) and also as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu (Cf. Bhāg.-P. II. 7.2). Yajña here is said as having two heads (prāyaṇīya, introductory libation, and udayantya, finishing ceremony), three feet (i.e. the three savana-s act of pressing out the soma-juice performed at the three periods of the day), four horns (i.e. the four Vedas), seven hands (i.e. the seven Vedic metres). He (God Yajña) is tantu (producer and
increaser of the results of the actions) and his soul resides in the \textit{Troyi-vidyā} (the science of the three Vedas). This śloka is in fact a repetition of the following Rgvedic mantra—

\begin{quote}
चत्वारि श्रुङ्गा त्रयो अस्य पादः द्वे शोषै सप्त हस्तासो अस्य ।

त्रिघा बद्धो दृष्टो रीसन्ति महोदेवो मर्याद्वेश ॥
\end{quote}

(Rgveda, IV. 58.3).

Śāyaṇa has interpreted this mantra as follows:—

श्रुङ्गो अस्य पादः सवनानि श्रीप्रस्थ पादः।

प्रृतिसाधनलघु पादः इत्युपने।

इन्द्रसोपध्रातान्वेद्युक्तम्।

सत हस्तास: सत छविः।

हस्ता: प्रातुरानर्स्य मुख्यस्नम्।

छविद्विषि देवताश्रीणनस्य मुख्यसाधनं भिन्न्।

व्यवहारः।

तिथा बद्: भद्राणार्गकल्यः

त्रिप्रकारं बद्:।

ब्रजनस्य तत्रस्त्रास्यम्।

व्यवहारः।

छविः: फलादी वनिता (cf. ‘तत्तद्वे’ in the above \textit{stuti}).......

The next ślokas further describe Lord Vāsudeva as follows:

He is Śiva, Rudra, Śakti-dhara (upholder of Śakti); He is the Lord of all the \textit{Vidyā}-s or branches of knowledge; He is the Lord of all the beings; He is the Hiranyakarbhā (Brahmā or the Golden Egg.); He is \textit{Prāṇa} (called also \textit{sūrṭāman} in the \textit{Vedānta}); He is the soul of the universe; He has the body of the powers of \textit{Yoga}; He is the founder of the \textit{Yoga}; He is the Primaeval Deity;

He is \textit{Sakti-bhūta} (the witness of the universe); He is Sage Narāyaṇa and Nara (these two are also considered as the \textit{avatāras} of Viṣṇu); His body is dark like an emerald; He possesses Śrī (or Goddess of wealth); He is also called \textit{Kesāvu} and \textit{Pitavāsas} (having Yellow garments); He is the bestower of all the boons; He is the best of the \textit{Puruṣas}; He is the best of those who bestow boons; the wise therefore worship the dust of his feet for their welfare. The gods and Śrī (Lakṣmī), therefore take shelter under his feet, desirous of obtaining fragrance from them Salutation to Him May He be propitiated.

—Anand Swarup Gupta
PRINCIPLES OF MAHĀBHĀRATA TEXTUAL CRITICISM:
THE NEED FOR RESTATEMENT

BY

V. M. Bedekar

[ 'पुराण' पत्रिकाया: १०. २ (जुलाई १९६५) श्री मेलिन बियार्प्लू (Madeleine Biardeau) इत्यादिया कान्तिदेशीय-मुद्रा पाठसंस्कृतकार्यस्थल प्रस्तुतानां महाभारतपुराणांप्रमाणित संस्करणांदत्तप्रज्ञाविलक्ष्यमाणित संस्करणांनुसारव्यवहारप्रमाणित विवेचनम्। लेखकामोहद्यया मतानुसारतः विवेचनपञ्चानीनां पाठसंस्कृतांक न कर्तीयम् अपि तु सर्वसाम्येऽवतदेशेऽप्रतिलिङ्ग पाठसंस्कृतमाणित पक्षगुप्तरत्ना सर्ववर्तवर्तानां समानान्तरं एकत्रित विश्लेषणात्मक संस्करण विवेचनम्। प्रस्तुततिथिनवन्वस्य लेखकः ओवेडेकर प्राणोदयः उत्तलेखिकायाः मतानांमानोत्तरं कथा देशविश्लेषणप्रमाणांतः कर्तीतिः। लेखकमोहद्यया मतानुसारतः पाठसंस्कृतप्रभावद्विकाशमाणितः प्राचीनप्रयाणां सम्प्रदायान्तः तु प्रायेण सर्वसाम्येऽवतिः सममितप्रमाणिः। सत्तविवेचनस्य प्राणुं विनिर्देशकमहादेवः महाभारतस्य पाठसंस्कृतसंस्करणस्यश्लेष्यक्ततः प्रविष्टततः प्रकाशनदेवेऽवर्तमानक केन्द्रिकमहाभारतश्लोकानां समस्तसंस्करण प्रकाशितम्। वदन्तन्तरं भाषाकर्तीयस्यस्यातः बहुभिः प्रकाशणप्रमेयः विवेचनपञ्चानी बर्णस्त्रावर्तमाणि सम्पूर्ण महाभारतम प्रकाशितम्। प्रस्तुततिथिनवन्वस्य लेखकः वदन्तयति यतः लेखिकायाः उत्तलेखिकायाः बहुख्यो विविधतिरः पवित्रयाः विवेचनालविविधद्विविधी विभागाः वासुन यासा समस्ताः मयोविनिर्देशकमहादेवः कर्तीम्। यथा लेखकामोहद्यया सर्वां पाठसंस्कृतां पक्षगुप्तरत्नां प्रकाशपुराणां सम्प्रदायान्तः स्त्रावर्तितं ततु महाभारतदुःस्त्रावर्तमाणां पवित्रयाः अभ्ययते। पुनः इत्यादिपिपुक्षसंस्करणसंस्कृतमोहद्ययेऽवगुप्तमेव भविष्यति। सर्वां पाठसंस्कृतां प्रकाशपुराणां पक्षसंस्कृतां स्त्रावर्तिताः प्राचीनपाठसंस्करणां निर्विवेचनमिष्टको यो धारायो भवेत। लेखकामोहद्यया विवेचनात्मकप्रज्ञाज्ञानततः तत्त्वसत्मकमिश्रिताः महाभारतमेव भविष्यति। व्यक्तिविवेचनाः सर्वसाम्येऽवर्तमाणि वैश्वानिक-पद्धतिविवेचनाः वासुदेवनामक प्रकाशितमेव भविष्यति। भविष्यितमेव विवेचनात्मकप्रज्ञाज्ञानततः तत्त्वसत्मकमिश्रिताः महाभारतमेव भविष्यति। व्यक्तिविवेचनाः सर्वसाम्येऽवर्तमाणि वैश्वानिक-पद्धतिविवेचनाः वासुदेवनामक प्रकाशितमेव भविष्यति। भविष्यितमेव विवेचनात्मकप्रज्ञाज्ञानततः तत्त्वसत्मकमिश्रिताः महाभारतमेव भविष्यति। व्यक्तिविवेचनाः सर्वसाम्येऽवर्तमाणि वैश्वानिक-
The need for a critical edition of the Mahābhārata (ṁb) was first voiced about seventy years ago by M. Winternitz (1897). In furtherance of the project initiated by Winternitz’s proposal, Prof. Luders prepared a ‘specimen’ of a critical edition of the first 67 stanzas of the Ādiparvan of the ṁb in 1908. The first great World War gave a quies to the ambitious project of the critical edition of the ṁb undertaken by Western Scholars. Subsequently, the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute enthusiastically undertook the work of the critical edition of the ṁb. Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, the first General Editor, brought out the critical edition of the Ādiparvan in 1933, with a Prolegomena appended to it in the beginning, in which he systematically formulated the principles of textual criticism underlying the critical edition of the ṁb. On the basis of these principles enunciated in the Prolegomena, the subsequent work of critically editing the rest of the ṁb was carried on, and the critical edition of the whole of the ṁb (without the Harivamsa) was completed in 1966. The principles formulated and applied to the critical edition of the ṁb have been acclaimed by almost all scholars and have generally served as a scientific norm in the preparation of the critical editions of old Indian texts. One would, indeed, think that, after the publication of the monumental critical edition of the ṁb on which so many eminent scholars worked, the principles of textual criticism underlying the edition had come to stay. It is, therefore, curious and intriguing, if not amusing, to read ‘some more considerations about Textual Criticism’ by Madeleine Biardeau (B) (‘PURĀNA’ July 1968, pp. 115-123) in which the writer has called in question the very principles of Textual Criticism underlying the critical edition of the ṁb.
B. while attacking the principles of \textit{mb} textual criticism has stated towards the end of her article that ‘I purposely remained at the level of generalities to make my point clearer’. With all deference to the writer’s candour in making this statement, it must be remarked that one’s overall impression after reading the article is that of a cluster of vague generalizations which hardly ‘make the writer’s point clearer’. The writer has not given or pinpointed specific texts or passages in the critical edition of the \textit{mb} or the Purāṇas to substantiate her contentions. A careful reader of Sukthankar’s Prolegomena to the Ādiparvan will be agreeably surprised to find that many of the difficulties or the objections which B. claims to have raised in her article had been already forestalled and satisfactorily met by him. We shall give such instances in the sequel of this article.

Fortunately for the reader, B. has come down from the plane of generalities towards the end of the article and has vouchsafed what appear to be her constructive suggestions, for the consideration of the editors of the critical editions. B says (p. 123\textsuperscript{1}):—

‘The main concern of the editors should be to publish not only the different recensions as they are, but also when necessary, the different versions of each recension. The different texts should be published in parallel. Each version could be “critically edited” (B’s own inverted commas) to a certain extent, though final certainty or completely satisfactory text is impossible. This detailed critical work should not be mechanically compiled just on the basis of known rules of critical editions. I would suggest that the \textit{ms} evidence be checked and strengthened through consultations with the people who even now have a firsthand knowledge of the Epic and the Purāṇas”.

The substance of the suggestion made by B. in the first sentence of the above quotation has been already dealt with by Sukthankar who says\textsuperscript{2}: “One scholar (Lesny, Archiv Orienalni, Vol. 5 (1933), p. 159) has suggested that to expedite and facilitate the work, we should, as a first step, before any attempt is made to constitute the final text of the \textit{mb}, critically edit all the different

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] The figures refer to the pages of B’s article in the \textit{PURĀṆA} already referred to.
\item[2.] Prolegomena pp. 82 ff. Quotations from Sukthankar further on in the article refer to the pages from the Prolegomena.
\end{itemize}
versions. That, it must be said, a tall order, as any one will admit, who has any practical experience of editing the *mb*, in any shape or form, critical or otherwise. But perhaps funds and workers—not to speak of patience—can be found to edit a dozen or more lakhs of stanzas comprising the dozen or more versions of the Great Epic. There remains, however, yet another and more fundamental difficulty which appears to have wholly escaped the attention of the learned critic. The difficulty is that it is practically impossible to edit even a single version of the *mb*—or for that matter, of any other text—wholly satisfactorily, without considering the entire evidence that is, without, at the same time, consulting the readings of all other versions.\(^1\). In fact, there is no way of finding out whether any of the mss of a particular version. And, if for the editing of each of the individual versions, we have to scrutinize and weigh the entire evidence, we might as well get busy with the work of preparing the final text, assuming of course that a final text has to be prepared. Even if we assume, for the sake of argument, that all the dozen or more versions lie before us in a critically edited shape, our task is not made easier on that account. One has to go through the same mental process in picking out or reconstructing the correct readings, whether, as at present, the *variae lectiones* are concentrated on a single page of the critical edition or have to be searched in a dozen or more different provincial editions, arranged round about in a semi-circle. Preparing all these different editions would not by itself give us the correct readings”.

We have given the above quotation in extenso in order to show that the suggestion of B. that the different recensions and their versions should be separately published is not a new one and that it has been given great thought and shown to be quite unfeasible by Sukthankar. The most important conclusion to which B’s suggestion inexorably leads, in spite of her, is, as has been shown by Sukthankar, the very necessary task of preparing the critical edition to which B. unfortunately demurs throughout her article. That the suggestion made by B has not been given

\(^1\) As this point, Sukthankar discusses a specific example of the difficulty of ascertaining the true character of the variants in Grantha mss without consulting other versions.
full thought or has not been thought out by her in all its implications or is even haphazard, vague and ill-conceived would appear from the rather intriguing statements made by her (following that suggestion made by her in the above quotation from her article) She says (p. 132): “The different texts of versions of recensions should be published in parallel. Each version could be ‘critically edited’ to a certain extent... This critical work should not be just on the basis of known rules of critical editions...... The ms evidence be checked through consultations with the people who have a first-hand knowledge of the Epics.” Now these vague statements raise a number of questions. On each of these statements, one would like to ask B. the following questions:

(i) If, in the proposed edition, the different texts are to be published in parallel, how would this procedure substantially differ from the present critical edition of the mb. in which the different varying texts are either given at the bottom of the page or in the Appendix?

(ii) What does a version ‘being critically edited’ mean? Does it not mean, as Sukthankar says, the consideration and consultation of the readings of all other versions? If that is what is meant, how does it differ from the present method of the textual criticism of the mb?

(iii) What rules has B. in view, ‘other than known rules of critical editions’?

(iv) What particular people has she in view, who according to her ‘have a firsthand knowledge of the texts’? Are they some local Pandits or Purānikas who read or recite the Epics and the Purāṇas?

What quality or standard has she in view, which the local Pandits should possess and by which their firsthand knowledge or accuracy of their particular transmission of the Epic or Purānic texts can be judged? While consulting the Pandits, the Pandits of what particular locality or localities should be given preference in deciding upon a variant in a ‘critically edited’ text?—These questions would logically confront the reader and befog him as to the exact and clear outlines of the new constructive method of textual criticism B. may have in view. Her statement that she has ‘purposely remained at the level of generalities’ would not
exonerate her from the charge of misleading the reader by making such vague general statements with a view to belittling, without adducing sufficient reasons, the canons of textual criticism on which the critical edition of the mb is based.

B. calls in question the textual criticism on which the critical edition of the mb is based, but nowhere does expressly state her own rules of textual criticism. If we try to gather, from the vague general statements which we have quoted above and subjected to a searching analysis, some canons of textual criticism which B. may have in view, we may say that one of her proposed canons of proper textual criticism would be to ‘check the ms evidence through consultation with the people who have a first-hand knowledge of the epics’ (p 123). That she has this criterion of textual criticism in view gets corroborated by another statement which she has made in the article (p. 121). She says: “Any Epic or Purānic story is true if the local Brahmins recognize it as part of their beliefs”. In support of this criterion of textual criticism which she has posited, she goes on to give a concrete illustration which she came across in her tour of Andhra. Her illustration throws an interesting light on what constitutes according to her own peculiar idea, a canon of textual criticism, namely, the recognition by local Brahmins. She says¹ (p. 121) “While talking with Shri Vaishnava Pandits of the Simhachalam Pathashala in Andhra, I found that they admitted that the local Purāṇa which relates the story of Narasiṁha and Prahlāda was quite different from the Skandapurāṇa version of the same story, though Skandapurāṇa version was the avowed source of it. In spite of this difference, the local Purāṇa was for them authoritative, since it expressed their beliefs, and was therefore considered superior to any local version. A non-Brahmin Hindu (who accompanied me) tried to propose another i.e. Śaivite version of the same story. The Shri Vaishnava Brahmins rejected that version saying that it was a Purāṇa ‘coming from the mouth’, while their own local Sthala-Purāṇa was attributed to Vyāsa. The Shri Vaishnava Brahmins found in themselves the real source of the authoritativeness of the story”.

---
¹ What follows is a summary of the anecdote of her meeting with the Brahmin Pandits.
The criterion, which B. has suggested for the checking of _ms_ evidence,—namely the consultation with the local pandits—is, as has been suggested in the questions raised previously above, is, to say the least, uncertain and arbitrary. The anecdote which she narrates of her meeting and talk with the Vaishnava Pandits of Simhachalam does not at all help to make the criterion clearer. The Pandits admit that the story of Narasimha and Prahlāda occurring in the Skandapurāṇa is the source of, or older than, that in the local Purāṇa. The admission of the pandits that the Skandapurāṇa version of the story is older than the one in their own local Purāṇa, implies on their part the tacit acceptance—may be, unawares—of the principles of scientific textual criticism according to which attempt is made to distinguish or separate an older version from its later modified version. That the local pandits show their preference for the version in the local Purāṇa is another matter and being subjective cannot be a criterion of objective textual criticism. There might be other pandits of other localities who would show their preference for the version in the Skandapurāṇa. The non-Brahmin Hindu who accompanied B. had his preference for the Śaivite version of the story. How can such differing likes and dislikes—such subjective preferences for particular versions—serve as a criterion of scientific textual criticism? Scientific textual criticism, in application to this particular case, should and would take into account all available _ms_ evidence and other testimonial bearing on all versions of the Narasimha and Prahlāda story and try to arrive at and constitute the oldest shape or version of the story on the basis of that evidence. While recording the oldest form or version of the story thus arrived at and constituted, proper scientific textual criticism would not ignore the differences or variations found in the versions; on the other hand, it would also record such differences and variations in the critical apparatus below the constituted version or in the Appendices attached to it thus making available in one edition to all readers a panorama of different versions, still leaving them free choice to enjoy their preference for their own particular version which they may be considering as authoritative.

Basing his stand on the principles of objective textual criticism, Sukthankar has naturally been critical of the Vulgate i.e.
the Devanāgarī version of Nilakaṇṭha which he takes as proof of the process of conflation through which the mb text has passed. B. disagreeing with Sukthankar’s principles of textual criticism and his criticism of Nilakaṇṭha, has the following to say in praise of the Vulgate and Nilakaṇṭha (p. 120): “N tried to collect all the available versions of the mb and on the basis of them all, to compose a more complete text. We have not much evidence of N’s kind of work. No doubt he had also sometimes to eliminate and choose and he did not retain stories or details of stories which were meaningless to him. He was probably even more conscious of the religious requirement than the modern pandits. We can at least tentatively express the traditional idea in these terms any epic or purāṇic story is true if the local Brahmans recognize it as part of their belief. These Brahmans are the Śruta, because they are well-versed in Śruti.”

Sukthankar has subjected to a fairly detailed critical analysis of the version of Nilakaṇṭha (see, pp. 65-69, 80-81, 103 of the Prolegomena). If one read Sukthankar’s analysis carefully, one would not agree with B’s remark made above that ‘we have not much evidence of N’s kind of work’. Rather, as Sukthankar has said, Nilakaṇṭha himself has vouchsafed some information as to how he has prepared his text (Prol. p. 81). That N’s text is of an inclusive type is proved by a remark of N. where he naively admits that he had put together the stanzas which had been commented on by the ancient Bhāṣyakāras and others he had found in modern manuscripts with the idea of making ‘a thesaurus of excellence’ (युक्तीपूर्वार्थाब्याय यज्ञक्षेत्र). He has borrowed, according to his fancy, passages short and long, from the southern recensions. Sukthankar has conclusively shown how N.’s conflated version contains a number of lines which are not found in any of the other versions (p. 78), how it contains mystifying, nonsensical repetitions (p 78), how at one place N has disfigured his text in his frantic attempt to squeeze into it a lengthy Southern passage containing some details which did not fit into his own text (p. 80), and how as a result of his additions, his text sometimes becomes wholly unintelligible and syntactically absurd.

B. while praising the Vulgate and Nīlakaṇṭha, does not care to answer Sukthankar’s criticism. She further says (in the, passage
quoted above) that 'No doubt he (i.e. Nilakantha) had also to eliminate and choose etc.' She does not explain why even Nilakantha who, according to her, tried to collect all available versions and to compose a more complete text, was required to eliminate and choose certain texts. Perhaps even Nilakantha had his own ideas of Textual Criticism, of which B. fights so shy. Therefore he was compelled by the logic of his own criterion to refer only to certain passages and eliminate them from his text. [e.g. he only refers (see his Adiparvan 196 Bombay edition) to the two adhyāyas of Nālāyanī and Bhaumāsvī episodes which are typical Southern interpolations and which he has dropped from his text] (See Prol. 67). Sukthankar (Prol. 67) has pointed out how Nilakantha has candidly confessed his inability to understand the confused textual tradition (on B. 1.22.1) which shows that this learned pandit of the 17th century was groping, in his own way, to arrive at certain canons of textual criticism of which B. appears to be so chary. B. agrees with S. Levi in her high cussate of the Vulgate and Nilakantha in spite of their obvious defect. The uncritical casual and ill-informed manner in which she has praised the Vulgate and Nilakantha reminds us of the remarks which Sukthankar has made with regard to S. Levi. Sukthankar says (p. 84) ‘...his theoretical misgivings are based on a rather hasty study of both the Vulgate and the critical text; for the text of the Vulgate is so corrupt and obviously contaminated.’ These remarks of Sukthankar can apply to the whole article of B.

Then B. in the passage quoted above goes on to formulate what according to her formed Nilakantha’s criterion of composing his text, namely, the religious requirement of the modern pandits, adding her own pet maxim referred to above that ‘any epic or purānic story is true if the local Brahmans recognize it as part of their beliefs’. This criterion, namely, consisting of religious requirements and the preference of the local Brahmin is a purely subjective matter, being vague and, in the ultimate analysis, indeterminate and falls outside the sphere of objective textual criticism.

B. has unjustly criticized Sukthankar and others in using the Western Scientific method of textual criticism which was not,
according to her, meant for that kind of Indian Epic and Purānic literature. She says in effect (pp. 116-117) "The oral tradition in the West was authorless and collective and is in opposition to written literature which was by individual authors and maintained by ms tradition. The rules of textual criticism were evolved for written literature and their main purpose was to reconstruct, out of the variation of mss, the original work of the author". About the oral tradition in India she says (p. 118): "The Epic and Purānas are Smṛti texts. We have not here a single text with negligible variant readings but different recensions of the same work. In the Epics and the Purānas the oral tradition has been maintained through ms tradition in which vast variations occur not only between two recensions but also between two versions of the same recension".

If one reads these two quotations together, one fails to understand what essential difference B has in view between Western and Indian traditionally written transmitted texts. Originally the Epics and the Purānas were orally transmitted. But when later on, they were committed to writing and transmitted through mss, they apparently stand on a par with Western written literature, as far as the essential rules of textual criticism are concerned. Only the proportion and the magnitude of the task of applying rules of textual criticism to mb differ in their vastness and arduousness from those of the Western written literature. Sukthankar was conscious of the difficulties and the limitations in applying the principles of textual criticism to the stupendous material of the mb. He also recognised the necessity of evolving for the critical edition of the mb canons of textual criticism different from those usually applied to Western texts. He says (p 77) "Indeed our ideal is the same as that of the classical philologist: restoration of the text, as far as possible, to its original form. In the mb, we have a text with about a dozen, more or less, independent versions where extreme types differ, in extent, by about 13000 stanzas or 26000 lines. The classical philologist has clearly no experience in dealing with a text of this description, an opus of such gigantic dimensions and complex character, with such a long and intricate history behind it". Undaunted by the stupendousness of the task, Sukthankar, therefore, tried to evolve, on the basis of Scientific Western textual criticism, canons of textual criticism in its application to the mb
problem which he called, to distinguish it from that of Western literary texts, a problem *su generis* (p. 86). Sukthankar applying himself to the task of evolving and formulating the Mahābhārata textual criticism, was actuated, like other Western savants (like Ludders) before him, by the scientific spirit—the raison d'être of Western textual criticism—which aimed at the restoration of the oldest text on the basis of the available *mss* evidence. B.'s criticism that Western scientific method of textual criticism is not meant for the Indian Epics and Purāṇas is therefore not only unjustified but unsound as it finally militates against the very essential core of the whole question—namely the scientific approach which is inherent in the science of textual criticism. The textual criticism as a science is universal and it is crass obscurantism to say that it is not meant for the Indian Epics and the Purāṇas.

Some vague confusing statements in B.'s article would lead a discriminating reader to conclude that as far as Indian Epics and Purāṇas are concerned, B. does not believe in a scientific approach inherent in textual criticism and holds some beliefs as criteria which are extraneous and irrelevant to the science of textual criticism. We are giving, as example, the following statements in her article, with our critical remarks at the end of each statement.

(i) "Sukthankar has created a new recension of the *mb*. But it is not clear why it should be either better from a scientific viewpoint or more authoritative from a traditional angle. Since the traditional Indian Pandits presently seem to share in this opinion, it would seem that the target has been missed." (p. 119).

In this statement, it is not clear what B. exactly means by the words 'more authoritative from the traditional angle'. She does not clarify what is exactly meant by 'the traditional angle' or point of view. Perhaps by authoritative she means 'approved by the traditional Indian Pandits'. But this militates against the scientific spirit of the *mb* critical edition. For, the use of the word 'authoritative' is subjective and depends upon the likes of the persons who call it authoritative. The critical edition claims that its text is better from a scientific viewpoint, as it represents the oldest text arrived at on the basis of available *mss* evidences. It may not be authoritative from the traditional angle of the traditional pandits who regard subjectively as authoritative their own pet versions.
irrespective of the fact that those versions vary from other versions which latter may be considered authoritative by another set of Pandits. Sukthankar never claimed that the critical edition would be authoritative from the traditional point of view.

(ii) "If we want to study scientifically some piece of Indian oral tradition, we should not begin by focussing our attention on the changes that took place in the process of transmitting the texts but determine for any given time whether a particular piece of oral literature had some relation to the actual beliefs of the people and how it was understood by them" (pp. 119-120)

With regard to the above statement, one may ask: what after all does scientific study of texts mean, if it does not take into account the changes that appear from recension to recension or from version to version? Again it goes without saying that every particular recension or version may have had some relation to the actual beliefs of the people. But how does this consideration help scientific textual criticism which, as has been already said, aims at the oldest text, irrespective of the beliefs of the people who may be having liking for a particular version. It is possible that the oldest text, thus arrived at on mis evidence, may have had some relation to the actual beliefs of the people. But this consideration is entirely extraneous to the canons of textual criticism which lead to the restoration of the oldest text.

(iii) Speaking in praise of Nilakantha and his text, B. remarks: "His main concern was to bring out as complete a collection as possible of the epic stories that were prevalent at the time and known by everybody in one form or another. But certainly he was concerned with the authoritativeness of the stories, as any good Brahmin should be. He was probably more conscious of this religious requirement than the modern pandits". (p. 121)

B. has not clarified or specified the criterion or the test by which Nilakantha, including the stories, was able to find the sense or consensus of 'everybody in one form or another'. It may have been probably his own subjective preference for particular stories from different recensions or versions which actuated him, to select his conflated text. If inclusion of as complete a collection as possible of stories prevalent during the growth of the epic were the main consideration in judging any edition of the Mb, one would
recommend to B, the critical edition of the mb initiated by Sukthankar and completed by the successive Editors because the latter within its vast compass of (i) the constituted text (ii) starred passages and various readings given below the constituted text and (iii) the passages given in the Appendix to every Parvan, contains all the stories prevalent at various times and known by everybody in one form or another. Even the story of Nālāyaṇī which Nīlakaṇṭha has not included in his text is found included in the Appendix in the critical edition.

In the eloquent words of Sukthankar (p. 4), in the preparation of the critical edition of the mb, “all important versions of the great Epic have been taken into consideration and all important mss collated, estimated, and tuned to account. Since all divergent readings of any importance will be given in the critical notes, printed at the foot of the page, this edition will, for the first time, render it possible for the reader to have before him the entire significant ms evidence for each individual passage..... Since not even the seemingly most irrelevant line or stanza actually found in the mb ms collated for the edition, is on any account, omitted this edition of the mb will be, in a sense more complete than any previous edition. It will be a veritable thesaurus of the Mb tradition”.

Further, B. says that Nīlakaṇṭha as a good Brahmin was concerned with the authoritativeness of the stories, as he was more conscious of this religious requirement. Now the question is: on what grounds is the authoritativeness of a story to be judged? Is it on the grounds of ‘religious requirements’? Again what does “religious requirements” imply? In that case, would not the authoritativeness of the story vary from sect to sect according to the beliefs of sectarian worshippers?

(iv) “The modern pandits are now in the name of science trying to decide what is old enough to possibly date back to Vyāsa and use this as the basis for determining the authoritative version. They have introduced the historical dimension into the realm of myth where it can not exist. For a long time, people have been aware of differences in local recensions or traditions but it has not occurred to them that these differences should be accounted for in terms of historical change. A criterion for decision could immediately be found in their own social group status.”
In the above statement in the first two sentences B. appears to have misunderstood and misstated the work of modern scholars who have worked in the field of mb textual criticism. They do not claim to have restored texts dating back to Vyāsa; their only claim is that they have tried to restore the oldest possible text on the basis of available mss evidence. It is also a sweeping travesty of truth and a gross perversion to say that modern scholars have 'introduced historical dimensions into the realm of myth'. Even myths are studied scientifically by anthropologists. But here the matter is quite otherwise. Are mss of different recensions and versions myths? Rather, the mss provide a sort of a historical material into which modern scholars like Sukthankar have probed and which they have surveyed in its historical dimensions. Modern scholars have made the material historically meaningful and significant to give us the oldest possible text based on principles of textual criticism. B. further says in the statement above that people have been aware of differences in local recensions or traditions, which differences (as she appears to suggest in the last sentence if we interpret it rightly), are accounted for by them as stemming from their own social group status. What does B. exactly imply by 'social-group status'? Is it their particular sectarian creed or belief which made them introduce changes which are responsible for the differences in local recensions?—But such criteria are, again, subjective, as they are swayed by people's likes and dislikes of particular texts and must be pronounced as irrelevant and extraneous to the objective, scientific principles of textual criticism.

(v) "Any locally accepted version is authoritative in its own right. Any scientific study should, first of all, preserve these variations and determine the kind of socio-religious ideas they conveyed to the people". The two sentences in this statement, the second following the first, are mutually contradictory in spirit. A locally accepted version is authoritative i.e. regarded as the only true one by the local pandits or the people. Scientific study involves the comparison of recensions and versions and may reveal variations from one recension or version to another. If such variations are revealed, the science of textual criticism would try to account for these variations on objective principles based on the study of mss evidence, arrange them in their text-critical sequence.
and place them as genuine or spurious, older or later, as the case may be. B. appears to insist in the second sentence that the variations in the particular version should be preserved that is, (if we interpret rightly), should be kept intact in their own original place, irrespective of what a scientific study may reveal or judge to the contrary; in that case her reference to scientific study is meaningless, because scientific study presupposes that there is nothing authoritative in its own right unless and until it is proved to be so by the scientific method. The critical edition attempts to arrive at an authentic—not authoritative-text.

The mb grew through centuries into a national epic, a traditional book of inspiration which has been the cherished heritage of a whole people throughout India from Kashmir to Kanyakumari and has been preserved in numerous recensions written in different scripts. To say therefore, (as B. has said) that ‘any locally accepted version (of the Epic) is authoritative’ is to detract from the universal character of this national Epic, and make it a parochial text. The scientific study of the mb, on the other hand, based on the principles of textual criticism, takes into account this universal character of the Epic and sets about to discriminate, with as much precision and certainty as the mss material would allow, between the data of the rival recensions, and to evaluate correctly and confidently the amazingly large mss of variants. The critical edition worked on such scientific principles, besides giving the constituted text, would also preserve the variations (found in recensions collated for this edition), (which B. wants to be preserved) only in their proper perspective and place in the framework of the critical apparatus. Thus the critical edition, while being scientific in its constitution of the oldest text, would also fulfil the desideratum of B. by providing, if only in a differently arranged form, the locally accepted version to the local pandits who should then be satisfied with their socio-religious ideas which the variations convey.

B.'s suggestion in the statement that 'any scientific study should determine the kind of socio-religious ideas which the variations conveyed to the people' belongs properly to the sphere of Higher criticism and not to sphere of lower criticism, namely, the textual criticism which restricts itself only to constituting the oldest text on the basis of available ms evidence and does not
occupy itself with probing into the socio-religious ideas of the people. This latter task belongs in the sphere of Higher Criticism which will study the constituted text, the variants in the critical apparatus, the passages in the Appendices and try to determine the different strata or stages through which the contents of the text appear to have passed and the kind of socio-religious ideas which the variations may have conveyed to the people.

B. has picked out certain statements, from the Prolegomena of Sukthankar, which appear to her, to be contradictory. In one of her statements she says: (p 116) “Sukthankar holds the idea of an old organic form which is the basis of all alterations, but he also says about this poem that, it, ‘practically never existed’. This contradiction was brought to light by S. Levi”. In another statement (p. 123) she says: “The editors up till now have concentrated on the reconstruction of a single text out of the several known recensions, but it is recognized by everybody including the editors themselves, that such a text never existed”.

The careful readers of the Prolegomena will be able to judge for themselves that B.’s above statements are based on quotations which are torn out of their context, and that they misrepresent the claims of the editors of the mb. We shall quote the relevant words of Sukthankar in their full context (p. 102-103).

“The essential fact in the mb textual criticism... that the mb is not and never was a fixed rigid text, but is fluctuating epic tradition... Our objective should consequently not be to arrive at an archetype (which practically never existed), but to represent, view and explain the epic tradition in all its variety, in all its ramifications. This is a problem in textual dynamics rather than in textual statics. To put in other words, the mb is the whole of the Epic tradition, the entire critical apparatus. Its separation into the constituted text and the critical notes is only a static representation of a constantly changing epic text ...”

The tenor of Sukthankar’s words that ‘an archetype practically never existed’ is to point out the fundamentally fluctuating, fluid nature of the epic text which, according to him, set limits, inherent in this peculiar task, on the critical edition’s attempt to arrive at the archetype. Sukthankar is quite clear in his further statement regarding the objective of the critical edition. He says (p. 102-103).
"To prevent misconception in the mind of the casual reader, it is best to state at first what the constituted text is not. The editor is firmly convinced that the text presented in this edition is not anything like the autograph copy of the work of its mythical author, Vyāsa. It is not, in any sense, a reconstruction of the Ur-mahābhārata or of the ur-Bhārata, that indeed but impossible desideratum. It is also not an exact replica of the poem recited by Vaiśampāyana before Janamejaya. It is further wholly uncertain how close it approaches the text of the poem said to be recited by the Sūta before Saunaka.

"It is but a modest attempt to present a version of the epic as old as the extant manuscript material will permit us to reach with some semblance of confidence. It only claims to be the most ancient one according to the direct line of transmission... It may be regarded as the ancestor of all extant manuscripts, or to be precise, of the manuscripts examined and collated for this edition..."

It will be clear from the above rather extensive quotation from the Prolegomena of Sukthankar what, according to him, was the objective of the critical edition of the mb. Sukthankar and other editors of the mb never claimed to have aimed at a restoration of the original archetype or the Ur-mahābhārata. It will be relevant here to refer our readers to the controversy between Sukthankar and S. Levi which has been alluded to by Sukthankar in a footnote on the page (p. 103) from which the above quotation has been taken. Sukthankar has quoted S. Levi who in a review of the critical edition of the Ādiparvan said in effect: "I advise the editor to renounce the reconstruction of the Ur-mahābhārata, as he is pleased to call it." Sukthankar has remarked on this statement that it is false, meaning thereby that the critical edition never claimed to have aimed at the reconstruction of the ur-Mahābhārata. It is certainly improper and unfair on the part of critics (e.g. S. Levi then and B. now) to foist on the editors of the critical edition a claim which they never made but which, on the other hand, they clearly disavowed, and to find fault with them for their not having been able to fulfil it.

We have selected some statements from B.'s article which is full of vague generalizations and have subjected them to critical
analysis in which we have quoted, to answer her vague contentions, passages from the Prolegomena of Sukthankar himself—pioneer of mb textual criticism. It will be clear to the readers that many of the objections of B have already been dealt with in one form or another by Sukthankar. We regret to say that B in her article appears to have made no contribution to the mb textual criticism. As we have pointed out in the beginning, B. has not given a single concrete illustration of a passage or passages from the critical edition of the mb in support of her vague contentions. When we consider that the critical edition of the mb after over forty years of labour which eminent scholars have put in in the field of textual criticism, stands before us as a fait accompli, vague statements made by B. in her article will no doubt appear on that background as not only full of antiquated or outdated ideas reminding one of Rip van Winkle but also of obscurantist ideas which militate against the very science of textual criticism.

B has concluded her article by inviting the expressions of opinions on the points she has raised. We have expressed our opinion in the foregoing part of this article. Rather than being content with a more expression of our opinion, we would like to go a step further and, in the interest of the science of textual criticism, would like to make a request to her in the form of a concrete proposal. From her remarks on page 123 of her article, it appears that she is not against the critical edition of ancient texts as such. She says (p. 123): “Each version could be ‘critically edited’ to a certain extent”. She wants that the ancient texts should be ‘critically edited’ to a certain extent. Now we would request her to come down from the level of generalities and try her hand at some practical task of ‘critically editing’ a text to the extent which she may have in view. She should publish a sort of fascicule of a critically edited text, of some epic or Purāṇa passage, embodying her own suggestions (made on page 123 of her article) namely: “Publishing not only the different recensions but when necessary, different versions of each recension, publishing the different texts in parallel, checking the manuscript evidence and strengthening it through consultations with the people who have a firsthand knowledge of the epics and the purāṇas”. The publication of such fascicule on her part would certainly be a practical demonstration of her thesis, thus rescuing her method.
from the fog of generality and consequent ambiguity and would set the stage for fruitful discussion among serious students of textual criticism.
THE PURANIC RECORDS ON THE SUN-WORSHIP

BY

V. C. SRIVASTAVA

[ वन लेखकमहोदये सौरसम्प्रदायविद्ये पौराणिकोक्षेत्रानावरे-कृत्य भारते वर्ण प्रचलितस्य सूर्योपासनोपाकाये: शोचपरो विचार ऐविठासिकास्त्राय कृत्यो वर्तिते। तापु-विष्णु-ज्वालाण्ड-मधुर-मर्क्क्वेह मन्त्रिवर्ष-द्रव्य-श्रुत-ण्ड-वराह-महिन-गहुः-विष्णु-मांतर-द्रव्य-षोत-कालिका-सामवु-रायोपकाल-साम्प्रदाय इत्यविषयकाः: प्रारम्भालये: प्रचलिताय: सूर्योपासनाया: स्वरूपविकायायो: पर्यायं जानं प्राप्तं। प्राचीनमतेऽदु पुराणेऽदु वैदिकरस्त्राय: सम्प्रदृश्य निरावहोरति। अवलोक्यन दुर्गवस्य स्वाति। संविदा-प्राच्यात्मकृत्तिनामभिः प्रियात्मरूप महत्वं 'बीमन': 'श्रुतस्ततुः' इर्व तथ्यायितमात्रिर्भीत। सूर्यसम्बन्धे बदुवितवथा विचार: सूर्यश्रुत-सूर्यकथा-सूर्यर्ग्य-सूर्यकथा-सूर्यविकालीनाः निर्देशपुरस्तरं प्रस्तुतं। अवर्तमानेऽदु च पुराणेऽदु व्यास सामवद्रव्यपुराणान्तः सूर्योपासनाप्रचलितिः प्रमाणम 'करायन' देशीय सूर्यमायानं प्रमाणवल्लादु साम्प्रदायिन्त्र शास्त्रार्थ्यात्मकृत्तिः साम्प्रदायिकाः प्रमाणवल्लादु सामवद्रव्यसम्बन्धमान्त्रितिप्रेषितिनिर्देशप्राप्तिः। वैदिकवस्तुपुराणार्थं प्रमाणीकृत्य तेन सौरसम्प्रदायस्य संकेत इतिहासप्राणेऽदु, विद्वान्यूद्विक्यायांतविविधु च प्रचार ब्रह्मदि निरस्त्रेण बिवेचितम्।]

The vast literature of the Purāṇas ranging from the 3rd century A.D. to the 12th century A.D. and even beyond supplies us with invaluable data for the study of religious history of the classical and the mediaeval Hindu periods of ancient India.

2. Pargiter, F.E., E.R.E., vol. X, p. 451 regards the Purāṇas as 'a popular encyclopaedia of ancient and mediaeval Hinduism'; Winternitz, M., A History of Indian Literature, vol I, p 521 emphasizes this point, 'At all events they are of inestimable value from the point of view of the history of religion... They afford us far greater insight into all aspects and phases of Hinduism—its mythology, its idolworship, its theism and pantheism, its love of god, its philosophy and its superstitions, its festivals and ceremonies and its ethics, than any other works'.

There are many Purāṇas and Upa-purāṇas-early as well as late which throw flood of light on different aspects of the growth and nature of the sun-worship as was found prevalent from the 1st century A.D. to the 12th or 13th century A.D. in ancient India. The sun-worship in some form or the other is mentioned in Vāyu, Viṣṇu, Brahmāṇḍa, Matsya, Mārkandeya, Bhaviṣya, Brahma, Skanda, Varāha, Agni, Gauḍa, Viṣṇudharmottara, Bhaviṣyottara, Kālika and Śāmba Purāṇas. No doubt, the question of the chronology of the Purāṇas and Purānic passages (because there have been changes, additions and interpolations many times in all Purāṇas) is a vexed problem, but efforts have been made by the scholars to settle the question with fair amount of probability and now the Purānic literature may be divided into early and late Purānic records. Of the various Purāṇas dealing with the sun and sun-worship, Viṣṇu, (the last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A.D.), Vāyu (3rd century A.D.) Mārkandeya (3rd or 4th century A.D.), Brahmāṇḍa (3rd-5th century A.D.) and Matsya (last quarter of the 3rd or the first quarter of the 4th century A.D. and later) may be assigned in the first group.

3. Though no extant Purāṇa can be dated earlier than the 3rd century A.D., yet it is probable that the picture of religion and society depicted in the earliest Purānic texts may be that of then contemporary India as well as of two three centuries before it.

4. Kane, P.V., op cit. opines that the chronology of the Purāṇas like that of the epics, is a subject full of perplexing problems.


8. Ibid., pp. 8-17.


The second group of late Purāṇas and Upa-purāṇas consists of Bhavisya (500 A.D.—1200 A.D.),11 Brahma12 (900-1200 A.D.), Skanda13 (700 A.D. and later), Varāha14 (800 A.D.—1400 A.D.), Agni15 (9th century A.D. and later), Garuḍa16 (10th century A.D. and later), Viṣṇudharmottara (400-500 A.D.)17, Bhaviṣyottara,18 Kālikā (between the 10th and the 11th century A.D.)19 and Sāmba (500-1500 A.D.).20

The earlier Purānic texts continue the older Vedic, Epic and Smṛti traditions of the sun-worship with minor changes and additions to suit the changed conditions. Āditya becomes a common name for Sūrya (the sun-god) with which he is identified.21 Thus in the Vāyu12 and the Brahmāṇḍa23 Purāṇas this term has been enumerated with various other names of Sūrya. The Matsya Purāṇa24 prescribes the worship of the sun under the name of Āditya in Avimukta-tīrtha ceremony. In the prayer of Vājaṇa-valkya addressed to the sun-god, Āditya figures as one of the names of the deity in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa.25 Regarding the origin of Ādityas

11, Ibid., pp. 167-173.
12, Ibid., pp 145-156.
13, Ibid., pp 151-105
14, Ibid., pp 96-106.
15, Ibid., pp 134-140, Choudhury S ḍ, J A H R S III, pp 127-134 places it between the middle of the 8th and the middle of 9th century A.D.
16, Ibid., pp 141-144, Sastrī, H P places it in third-fourth century A.D. but his view is disproved by Choudhury, S B, I H Q, VI, pp. 553-560 who places it in the 10th or the 11th century A.D.
17, Hazra, R C, J U G, III, pp 39-64
20, Hazra, R.C. studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol I, p 93.
21, Roy. S. N., Early Purānic Account of Sun and Solar Cult, University of Allahabad Studies, 1964 p 1-44
22, Vāyu P, XXXI-37
23, Brahmāṇḍa P, II-13-125
24, Matsya P, CLXXXIV-31 'Ādityopūsanāṁ kṛtvā'
25, Viṣṇu P, III-5-24 'Ādityādibhūtāya...nāma nāmaḥ'.
who are twelve in number it has been narrated\(^{26}\) that the gods called Tusitas of the Cākṣuṣamanvantara came to be known as Ādityas in the Vaivasvata manvantara. They were born out of the womb of Aditi which was the result of their pre-planned determination of enjoying the rank of gods in the next manvantara again. Ādityas along with other celestial beings occupy the orb of the sun and support his chariot in each month\(^{27}\) and lend their fiery lustre to the sun.\(^{28}\) It is said that in the beginning of creation the solar phenomenon came to be named Āditya not because he was son of Aditi but because he was first born.\(^{29}\) This semantic etymological derivation is a departure form old practice and is a Purānic device.\(^{30}\) These twelve Ādityas are Viṣṇu, Śakra, Aryaman, Dhṛti, Tvāstr, Pūsan, Vivasvat, Savitṛ, Mitra, Varuṇa, Amsa and Bhaga\(^{31}\) and have been assigned to different months.\(^{32}\) It is interesting to find that the solar nature of Viṣṇu, Pūsan, Savitṛ, Aryaman, Vivasvat and Bhaga is not lost. Pūsan has been compared with Āditya.\(^{33}\) Savitṛ is one of the different names applied to the sun in the prayer offered by Yājñavalkya\(^{34}\) Savitṛ along with Aryaman has again been applied to the sun in the description of the northern part of the solar sphere.\(^{35}\) According to Purāṇas\(^{36}\) a householder offers water to the sun saluting the deity by the names of Vivasvān and Savitṛ, the former being radiant and glory of Viṣṇu, the latter being granter of the fruits of acts. This is in conformity with Śūtra tradition of “arghya” to the Sun-god. In some early Purāṇas Savitṛ has been described as one of the epithets of Sūrya who is also called Āditya and Bhānu.\(^{37}\) It is stated that

---

29. Mārkaṇḍeya, P., Ch. 102-14.
33. Viṣṇu-P., I-9-63
34. Ibid., III-5-24
35. Ibid., II-8-92
36. Ibid., III-11-39, 40.
in Cāksusa manvantara Sūrya began to be called Vivasvān and Satrājīta worshipped sun god as Vivasvān, and Brahmā also adored him as Vivasvān in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa. Further it is enjoined in connection with Mandāra-Saptami vrata that a devotee should salute the sun in the name of Aryamā and Pūsan in the south-west and north-directions respectively and on the occasion of the Saṅkrānti-vrata it ordains that in south-west and north directions sun should be worshipped in the name of Savitr and Bhaga. No doubt, the Purāṇas were following the old Vedic tradition in this respect but there is one significant departure in the sense that Mārtaṇḍa—one of the Ādityas in Brāhmaṇas is conspicuous by his absence in this group though it always stands for the sun god in the Purāṇas. In connection with the Saṅkrānti-vrata it is prescribed that the sun should be worshipped in the name of Mārtaṇḍa in northern direction. The sun is known as Mārtaṇḍa because of its flashing out of the Brahmāṇḍa. Similar explanation is given in other early Purāṇas. The primeval egg was divided into two parts by Tvastā. The sun sprang from it which was apparently dead (Mrta) but was actually alive. Mārtaṇḍa is so known because it came out of the dead egg.

It is significant to point out that in the early Purāṇas the sun-god has been worshipped mainly in his benevolent role. He is a great benefactor of humanity. This feature is essentially Rgvedic in origin. It is stated in typical Purāṇic fashion that the gods, men and demons depend upon the sun-god mainly because this god extracts waters for eight months of the year from various sources and pours them on the earth during remaining four months. It is due to rain that corn grows and the world subsists. It is further said that sometimes the sun pours down water with his

38. Vāyu-P., LXXXIV-29; Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-59-30
40. 103-5 to 12.
42 Matsya-P., LXXIX-6, 7.
43 Matsya-P., XLVIII-6,
44. Ibid, II-36; Mārkaṇḍeya-P., Ch. 105-19
46. Roy. S. N., Early Purāṇic account of Sun and solar cult, p. 49
rays while he is still shining in the sky and there is no cloud. It is due to his benevolent quality that the sun-god is also called as 'Jīvana' and Brahma-satām (honoured by Brahmā whose creation is nourished by him). In the present context the title 'Brahma-satām' has no sectarian affiliation but may have given opportunity to later sectarian works to derive inspiration from such terms. All these beneficial qualities are described in connection with 'Saura-Vratas' described in Purāṇas and legend of Rājyavardhana. But from the above description inference should not be drawn that the malevolent aspect was not known at all. In Mārkandeya Purāṇa there are reference to the destructive role of the Sun-god. The main reason for emphasis upon the benevolent aspect of the Sun-worship in the early Purāṇas lies in the fact that the Purāṇic theology centres round "theism".

The early Purāṇas give elaborate description of the sun's chariot, its different parts, horses and celestial beings. The sun's chariot is nine thousand yojanas in length. It consists of a pole which is twice of that longitude. Its axle is fifteen millions and seven hundred thousand yojanas long. On this axle a wheel is fixed which has three naves, five spokes and six peripheries. On the whole the wheel constitutes the circle or wheel of time. The seven horses which carry the chariot has been identified with the seven Vedic metres. The chariot is presided over by Ādityas, Rṣīs, Gandharvas, Apsaras, Yakṣas, Sarītas and Rākṣasas. In every month these heavenly bodies occupy it in seven seats and perform their specific duties for enhancing the lustre and strength of the chariot. Other early Purāṇas give similar descriptions with the difference that the total length and breadth of the chariot in them is ten thousand yojanas and it is said to have been constructed by Brahmā. The association of the sun-god with a chariot drawn by horses

47. Viṣṇu-P., II-9-7., Mārkandeya P., 27-23
48. Vāyu-P., XXXI-37, Brahmāṇḍa-P., II-13-125. Such titles are also given to sun in the epics and this legend of giving rain is also mentioned in the epics cf. MBH., III-3-146.
49. Matsya P. Chs. 74-78, 85-89.
50. B. Mārkandeya-P., Ch 109-82-78, 110-1 to 5.
51. Ibid Ch. 108-2 to 12, 105-39
53. Viṣṇu-P., II-2-2 to 7; II-10-1 ff.
is Vedic in origin and thus the early Purāṇas continue the tradition with elaborate descriptions. The Sungod has been identified with "Time" in the early Purāṇas. This explains the number of 12 Ādityas and seven horses in chariot of sun.

The early Purāṇas are conscious of the existence of a family of the sun-god a tendency which is already prevalent in the epics. Samjña the daughter of Visva-karman is mentioned as a wife of the sun and three children of the sun-Yama, Yamī and Manu are also referred to. Some early Purāṇas narrate the story of Chhāyā-shadow of his queen and refer to attendants also. The story of the cutting of the rays of the sungod is referred to in the early Purāṇas.

In the early Purāṇas, Agni—the fire god is placed as inferior to Sūrya in marked contrast to the high position given to Agni in the Vedic literature. In some Purāṇas Agni in the form of Kāla is regarded as nothing else than the essence of Sūrya. At other place it is more explicitly referred to that Kālagni is Sūrya himself. The sun has been described as the cause of the regulation of day and night a conception which is Rgvedic in origin. It appears that the sun was regarded as remover of evil effects as it is said that if heretics are seen the wise men should look at the sun. His connection with eye is not forgotten and he is

55. Macdonell, A A , V M, pp 30-31
56. Viṣṇu P. XXXI-29, Viṣṇu P., II-VIII-12., Mārkandeya P Ch. 104-36.
60. Matsya-P., XI-32-36 , Vīṣṇu-P., III-2 ; Mārkandeya-P Ch. 78-32-34.
63. Viṣṇu-P., XXXI-29 ‘Ādityastvasau sāraḥ Kālagnih’.
64. Brahmanda-P., II-13-117 ‘Ādityastu asau Sūryaḥ Kālagnih’
66. Macdonell, A A , op. cit. pp. 30-31
regarded as presiding over eyes.\textsuperscript{68} He becomes seven-fold at the end of the world.\textsuperscript{69}

There are many legends in the early Purāṇas which may be specially associated with the sun-worship—firstly, the legend of Yājñavalkya, secondly, that of Satrājita, thirdly, worship of the Sungod by Brahmā,\textsuperscript{70} fourthly, worship of the Sungod by Adiṣṭa and fifthly, adoration of the Sungod by Rājyavardhana. According to Purāṇas Yājñavalkya invoked the sun to get the text of the Yajus. He worshipped him as the gate of liberation, the fountain of bright radiance, the triple source of splendour as the Rk, the Yajur and the Sāmavedas. He as fire and the moon is one with the cause of the universe—one with the notion of time and all its divisions of hours, minutes and seconds, He is to be meditated upon as the visible form of Viṣṇu, as the impersonation of the mystic ‘OM’, he nourishes troops of the gods, having filled the moon with his rays, who feeds Pītrs with his nectar and ambrosia and who nourishes mankind with rain. Brahmā is nothing but the sun in the form of the three seasons, he alone is the dispeller of darkness of this earth of which he is the sovereign lord. He is clad in the raiment of purity. Man is incapable of devout acts until his rising. Touched by his rays the world is filled with religious rites He is the centre and source of purification. He is the eye of the universe born in a golden car whose banners scatter ambrosia. The sun gave him Yajus in the form of a horse. In view of the fact that the story does not find mention in the Vedas, it has been suggested\textsuperscript{71} that it is a Purāṇic invention but this view is not acceptable as the legend is found in the epics\textsuperscript{72} and therefore it may be regarded as continuing the epic tradition. In the above descriptions certain well marked features of the sun-worship comes into prominent relief such as the identity of the sun with Time, Viṣṇu, Brahmā and OM etc., the description of the sun as nourisher and raingiver, as the visible symbol of invisible reality, as symbol

\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., III-V-24.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., VI-3-3.
\textsuperscript{71} Wilson, H H (Tr.) Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, p. 280.
\textsuperscript{72} MBH-Śāntu-Parvan-61-5
of purity and source of all Vedas. All these features are Vedic in origin. In view of the fact that the sun god has been described as cause of the universe, the gate of liberation, the sovereign lord and identical with ultimate reality, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Vedas and Time etc., his supremacy has been clearly stated and therefore may be regarded as containing germs of the sectarian sun-worship, if not an example of sectarianism itself. This description of the sun-worship tallies with the epic description\(^73\) of the sectarian solar worship and also with later Purānic passages\(^74\) on the sun-sect.

The second story of Satrājita is also significant from the point of view of the sun-worship. Satrājita worshipped the sun and received from him Syamantaka gem as boon. He repaired to Dwārakā where people welcomed him. Here Āditya appeared in the human form with reddish eye, dwarfish stature burnished as copper.\(^75\) The significance of the legend lies in the fact that it refers indirectly to the image of the sun when it is said that Āditya appeared in the human form. Secondly, the region of the story is Dwārakā which was associated with later sectarian sun-worship.\(^76\) Moreover, many sun temples and inscriptions referring to the sun worship in sectarian form have also come to light from this very region during the same period.\(^77\) All these definitely go to indicate that the early Purāṇas were conscious of the sectarian sun-worship as will be evident from their familiarity with the sun-worship in the human form—a fact indicative of image worship because the old Vedic tradition believed in the worship of the sun in the form of disc. or wheel or rayed orb\(^78\) though no doubt anthropomorphic\(^79\) descriptions of the sun-god are found in the Vedic literature. The story appears to be a faint echo of the story of Sāmba, found in the later Purāṇas.

73. Ibid, III-3-5
74. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. II.
76. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. III
78. R.V., I-175-4; IV-28-2, 30-4; V-29-10 S.B., VII-4-1-10.
The worship of the sungod by Brahma, Aditi and Rājya-varṇḍana are found in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa which show familiarity of this Purāṇa with sectarian form of the sun-worship.

There is one significant reference to the sun-worship in the Vāyu-Purāṇa. In description of Vāyupur there appears to be an allusion to the setting up of an image of Vādāditya by the god Vāyu. It has been suggested that this Vādāditya is none else but the sun-god or Sūrya. The suggestion appears to be probable in view of the following description found in the Vāyu Purāṇa. It is stated that the peoples of the place were called Vādavas whose customs were many and varied. Yājñavalkya and his pupils were inflicted with the sin of 'Brahmahatyā'. On the advice of Brahmā they worshipped the god Vālukēśvara of twelve beams (dvādaśārka i.e. the sun) in the city of Vāyupur and had their baths in the tanks at that place. One of the four was known as Sūrya-kuṇḍa. Then they adored Vādava, the lord of the north, and merged themselves into the world of Sūrya (Sūrya-maṇḍalam). Of Yājñavalkya, it is stated, that he returned what he had learnt about the Vedas to his teacher and concentrated his mind on the sun-god. As a result of these efforts the god in the form of a horse gave a new samhitā to Yājñavalkya. The Rākṣasas named Yātudhānas—ten in number—were the followers of Sūrya and wandered with the deity. Bhauvana who appears to be a demon offered a prayer to the sun-god with the Rathāntarasāman and was immediately turned into an elephant. In the Kimśuk forest the Siddhas pay homage to Āditya. Sūrya in the guise of a Brāhmaṇa begged of the king Arjuna the whole earth for alms. The above description from Vāyu Purāṇa may be regarded as containing many basic ideas of the sun-worship. Firstly, the familiarity of the Purāṇa with sun

80 Ch. 101-103.
81 Ch. 104-105.
82 Ch. 119-10
83 See Agrawala, V. S., Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, Eka Sānkritika Adhyayana
84. Patil, D.R., Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa, p. 67. cf. his appendix No. 1422.
86. Vāyu-P., 69-128, 'Sūrasyānusarā hyete Saha tena Bhramanti'.
87. Ibid., 69-209-10.
88. Ibid., 38-31-2.
been foreigners and therefore the need was specially felt to emphasise the varied nature of their customs. Secondly, the god Valuksēvara who was nothing else than the sun-god is specially mentioned as ‘Dvādaśārka’, of twelve beams. It is interesting to note that the Magas—the foreign priests also worshipped the sun god in his twelfth form. Thirdly, it is significant to note that Yajñavalkya returned the teachings of the Vedas and then worshipped the sun-god as if the worship of the sun god was something outside the sacred tradition of the Vedic worship. All these only hint that there may have been some foreign elements in the worship of the sun represented by the Vādavas, though it needs confirmation by other reliable sources.

The Vāyu Purāṇa expressly states that in the Gayātirtha there are installed four images of Sūrya which are expressions of four different yugas and if they are seen, touched and worshipped liberation of the ancestor is guaranteed. In śūtras also the sun worship is prescribed in śrāddha.

The Matsya Purāṇa gives detailed instructions regarding the construction of solar images thereby indicating that the practice of making image for the sun-god was already an established fact and therefore there was need for rules and regulations. According to this Purāṇa the image of the sun should be made with beautiful eyes, seated in a chariot and holding a lotus. There should be seven horses and one cakra in the chariot of the sun and a coronet beaming red should be placed on his head. He should be decorated with ornaments and the two hands as holding blue lotuses and the latter should also be placed on his shoulders as if in a sport. His body should be shown as covered with a bodice of two pieces of cloth. The feet should not be made, it should be brilliant, otherwise he would suffer leprosy. Dāṅga and Pingala should be placed as guards with swords in their hands. Aruṇa and snake etc. should also be there. The sun-god should be either seated on the chariot or on the lotus and holding a lotus.

95 Samba Upa-Purāṇa, 3.3 ‘Dvādaśa bhūṣena mitreṇa’.
97. S. G. S., IV-1-8, A. G. S., IV-6-18, H. G. S., II-5-14. 3.
98. Matsya-P., CCLXI-1-7; XCIV-1.
It has been suggested\(^9\) that these passages referring to the sun image are late and interpolations. It is significant to point out that in some earlier Purānas\(^{100}\) the legend of not depicting feet is found as the sun because of his dazzling heat became unbearable and Viśvakarman diminished the dazzling parts of the sun in order that the latter might become bearable to Śamīṭa. It is probable that the passages may be late interpolations but there is no mention of the northerner's dress (Udīcyavesa) which was a characteristic of the sun image from the Kusāna period onwards and is also found repeatedly referred to in the technical literature\(^{101}\) and later Purāṇas.\(^{102}\) It may be the Indian method of depicting sun images as found in the earlier sun images.\(^{103}\) Though the number of horses here is four generally while in this Purāṇa it is given as seven. Daṇḍa and Piṅgala are not seen in early sun-icons though they are mentioned in the Matsya Purāṇa.

The testimony of the Matsya Purāṇa is again revealing in the sense that it demonstrates the popularity of the sun god in various domestic vows.\(^{101}\)

The main ceremony of the Kalyāṇasaptami vrata also called Viśaṣṭi saptami to be celebrated on the sundays, 7th day of a bright fortnight, centres round the worship of the sun with flowers, sandals, white clothes, incense, eatables and raw sugar along with salt and fruits. Eight pictures of the sun-god should be drawn on eight petals of the lotus and following mantra should be recited

‘Tapanāya namaḥ, Mārtanda namaḥ, Bhāskarāya namaḥ,

Vikartanāya namaḥ, Ravaye namaḥ’

beginning with the pictures on eastern, south-eastern, southern, south-western, western, north-western, northern and north-eastern

\(^{9}\) Hazra, R. C., Purānic Records, p 48 places these passages at a date not earlier than 650 A. D (550-650 A. D.). Dr S. N Roy, thinks that it is not unjustified to regard these passages earlier than 550 A D., Purānic Dharma evaṃ Samīṭa. p 165

\(^{100}\) Viṣṇu-P., III-2-2 The story is repeated with elaboration in later Purāṇas as Śīmā Upa-p., chs. 12-15.

\(^{101}\) Varāhmihira, Bṛhat-Samhitā, ch. 57

\(^{102}\) Viṣṇudharmottara, III-67-2

\(^{103}\) Banerjea, J N, op cit, pp, 432-33

\(^{104}\) Roy, S N., Early Purānic account of sun and solar cult, p. 55-57.
sides. He is also called supreme self. The reward of this Kalyāna-
saptamī vrata is liberation from all sins, long life and prosperity.\textsuperscript{105}

In the Viśokāsaptamī vrata,\textsuperscript{106} to be observed on the sixth
and seventh days of the bright fortnight in Māgha month\textsuperscript{107} the
lotus is worshipped as the sun (Arkaṇa namaḥ) with red Kanera
flowers and a piece of red cloth with invocation—'O Āditya as this
world becomes free from all grief at thy rising, in the same way
let me also be free from sorrow in all my lives and may I have
always faith in thee'. This results in freedom from sorrow for a
period of ten Padmas and also from diseases and attainment of
bliss and unification with Brahmā. One reference in it is worth
mentioning. It is that the devotee prays for everlasting faith in
the divinity a features of the Bhakti cult\textsuperscript{108} which was responsible
for the later sectarianism.\textsuperscript{109}

Phalasaptamī-vrata\textsuperscript{110} is also a solar vow to be performed on
the seventh day of the bright fortnight of the month of mārgaśīrṣa.
Here the golden image is to be worshipped under various names
such as Bhānu, Arka, Ravi, Śūya and Viśhāvasu etc. for attain-
ment of endless fruits, prosperity and liberation from diseases and
the image is to be given to the Brāhmaṇas.

The Šarkarasaptamī-vrata\textsuperscript{111} is to be observed on the 7th day
of a bright fortnight in Vaiśākha in honour of the sun by drawing
lotus on an altar and reciting 'savitṛy y namaḥ'. This is done for
prosperity for sons and grandsons and ultimate emancipation.
One who reads or listens this obtains the region of the sun.

The Kamalasaptamī\textsuperscript{112} vrata is to be observed on the 7th
day of a bright fortnight in spring in which golden lotus in a golden
vessel as the sun should be worshipped under different names
'Kamalahastāyana namaḥ, Viśvadharmāya namaḥ, Divakarāya namaḥ,

\begin{itemize}
\item[105] Matsya-P, 74-5 to 9, 15-16 & 18
\item[106] Ibid., 75-4, 10, 12.
\item[107] Bhattacharya, N.K., Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmaical
Sculptures in the Dacca Museum, p. 148 The vrata of Māgha
manḍala is essentially a solar vrata.
\item[108] Gtū, XVIII-62-66 also envisages for absolute faith in the divinity.
\item[109] Macnicol, N., Indian Theism
\item[110] Matsya-P., ch. 76.
\item[111] Matsya-P., ch. 77.
\item[112] Ibid., Ch. 78, 85 to 89.
\end{itemize}
Prabhākarāya namah'. One who observes this ordinance becomes possessed of inexhaustible wealth and goes to the kingdom of the sun.

The Mandarasaptami\textsuperscript{113} vrata to be performed on the seventh day in the month of Māgha enjoins the worship of the golden image of the sun along with eight petalled lotus under the name of Bhāskara (god of East), Sūrya (god of South-East), Arka (god of South), Aryanā (god of South-West), Vedadharmiṇe (god of West), Caṇḍa-bhānu (god of North-West), Pūṣan (god of West) Ānand (god of North-East). This is meant for freedom from all sins.

In Śubhasaptami vrata golden ox and golden cow is to be worshipped as born of sun under the mantra ‘Aryamā priyatām’.\textsuperscript{11}

The Sūrya-sankrānti vrata\textsuperscript{115} to be performed on the day of equinoxes or solstices enjoins the worship of the sun by drawing eight petalled lotus under different names: Āditya (East), Savitr (South-West), Tapana (West), Bhaga (North-West), Mārtanda (North), Viṣṇu (North-East), Sūrya in pericap of the lotus. The arghya consisting of water, sandals and flowers should be placed on the floor as an oblation to the sun. One who observes it is honoured by devas in the realm of Indra.

Besides the worship of the sun on these occasions, the general worship of the sun on Sunday is prescribed\textsuperscript{118} by drawing 12 petalled lotus with red sandal. To the east of it he places after salutations Sūrya, to the south-east-Divākara, to the south Vivasvān, to the south-west Bhaga, to the west Varuṇa, to the north-east Mahendra, to the north Āditya and to the north-east Savitr. In the forepart of the lotus the horses of the sun should be inscribed, in the south Aryamān, in the west Mārtanda; on the northern petal Ravi and Bhāskara on the pericap of the lotus. He has been described as the soul of the universe, the basis of Rk, Yajus and Sāmavedas. One who observes this ritual is freed from all sins and goes to the solar region. It is stated that Sūrya-vrata is one of the sixty ordinances explained by Śiva\textsuperscript{117} and thus it gives a

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid, ch. 79.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid, ch. 80.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., ch. 98.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 97-5-9.
\textsuperscript{117} Matsya-P., CI-63.
divine origin to this. A perusal of all these Sūrya-vratas will reveal to us that there was development of a cult of the sun-worship in the sense that a procedure was already evolved for this worship. This included in the main arghya of water, flower and sandal etc., depiction of the sun pictures in lotus, salutation to the sun and recitation of mantras to the sun under different names. The seventh day in a bright fortnight was specially sacred for the sun-worship and red colour was also sacred to the sun god. The sun is specially prayed for deliverance from the sin—a feature which is very old. Besides the worship of the sun by the depiction of eight petalled lotus, it was also to be done by means of a golden image of the sun. But there is no provision for the public worship of the sun god as there is no mention of the worship in a temple. This worship was in the form of domestic 'pūjā'. In view of the fact that the sun has been called as the soul of the universe, and bases of all Vedas, the solar sectarianism is hinted at as three constituents-supremacy of the god, fixed procedure of worship and exclusiveness are found in these solar vows. It has been suggested that passages referring to Saura-vratas are later which appears to be quite probable. But as the worship of the sun by means of arghya, salutation and recitation of mantras is mentioned in the śūtras it may be regarded as continuing the earlier tradition of the sun-worship, of course, with detailed additions to the procedure. The sun-worship has been prescribed as one of the daily obligations to be performed by every house-holder. It has been said that he should raise his mouth and offer water to the sun. On this occasion he should touch his forehead with his hands. Then he should recite verses

‘Namo vivasvate brahma bhāsavate
Visnutejase jagatsavitre sucaye karmasākṣiṇe’

118 Hazra, R C., Purānic Records, p. 43. Chapters 74 to 80 of the Matsya-Purāṇa may be dated between 550-650 A.D. as they mention week days and the earliest mention of week days is found in Eran Inscription of 484 A.D. cf Fleet, J.F.C II, vol. VII, p. 88-89 and there are other internal evidences to this effect.
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It is interesting to note that Sūrya and Śiva have been identified in some early Pūrāṇas. Further in Karmayoga the worship of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya is prescribed where they are to be considered as 'abhinna' (not different from one another).

This tendency of religious syncretism is a characteristic of the ancient Indian religious development and is further amplified in the later sectarian literature of India and is vouchsafed by the iconography and epigraphy. A parallel development may be traced in the religious life of Hinduised south-east Asia where Sūrya and Śiva are not differentiated particularly in Java.

It has been suggested that the sun occupies a subordinate position in relation to Viṣṇu in early Pūrāṇas. But it is difficult to agree with the view mainly because the suggestion has been made purely on the basis of Viṣṇu-Purāṇa which is a sectarian Purāṇa specially associated with Vaiṣṇava sect. It would be no surprise if the sun is subordinated to Viṣṇu in a Vaiṣṇavite Purāṇa as in a Saura Purāṇa like Sāmba, Viṣṇu and others are subordinated to Sūrya. Moreover, in some early Pūrāṇas Brahmā, Śiva, Viṣṇu and Sūrya all four are regarded as indistinguishable.

121. Matsya-P., LV-3-5
122. Ibid., 52-23.
130. Matsya-P., 52-23
thus indicating equality of all four gods. The place of pride that is given to the sun god in connection with the legend of Yajñata-valkya\(^{111}\) and reference to “Sauradarśana\(^{112}\)” is a pointer in the direction that the sun was not occupying a subordinate position. Further in vows, Śaiva, Vaisnava and Saura have been given equal opportunity\(^{113}\) in early Purāṇas. In some early Purāṇas the sun-worship has been associated with the worship of nine Grahas.\(^{114}\) This association of the sun worship with nine Grahas finds expression in ancient Indian arts also.\(^{115}\)

The later Purāṇas and Upa-purāṇas of the second category mentioned in the beginning of this article may be taken to reveal the religious condition of India from the 6th-7th century A. D. to the 12th or 13th century A. D. The Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa and Sāmba Upa-purāṇa are the most comprehensive and complete documents of the sun-worship in its sectarian form influenced by the advent of the Magas in ancient India. It has rightly been argued that most of the verses of the first group\(^{116}\) of the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa are found to occur in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa which may have been the borrower.\(^{117}\) The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, therefore, does not provide us with any additional information regarding the sun-worship as compared to the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa. Moreover, the verses showing the sectarian form of the sun-worship found in Skanda,


\(^{112}\) Viṣṇu-P., 104-16. Jñānārṇavatàntra, 16-131-134 also refer to it Handiqui, K.K., Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture, p. 218.

\(^{113}\) Matsya-P., 92-101.

\(^{114}\) Ibid., Ch. 93.


\(^{116}\) Hazra, R. C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I, p. 57 divides the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa into two groups: Group I, Chapters 1-38, 44-46, 84, Group II, Chaps 39-43, 43-44. Hazra, R. C., op. cit., p. 93 after careful examination has settled the date of different chapters as follows:

Group I, Chapters (except verses 17-25), 2-15, 16, 18-21, 24-32, 34-38, 46 & 84 composed between 500 A.D. and 800 A.D. (probably towards the beginning of this period). Chs. 17, 22-23 added later than 950 A.D. Ch. 33 added between 700 A.D., 950 A.D. Chs. 44-45 inserted into the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa between 950 A.D.-1050 A.D.

Group II, Chs. 39-43, 47-83 added between 1250-1500 A.D.

\(^{117}\) Ibid., op. cit., p. 59.
Brahma, Varaha, Agni and Garuda must have been borrowed from the Samba Upa-puraṇa. Like other sects, the sun-sect also must have developed a vast Saura-literature as is evident by notices of such works in the literature of India but unfortunately the Samba Upa-puraṇa is the only extant Saura work D. R. Bhandarkar mentions a Surya Purāṇa as known to Śākadvipa Brähmanas known as Sevakas living round about Jodhpur but is quite ignorant of its contents and it is difficult to say whether it is the same as the Samba or not. Bhavisya Purāṇa mentions an ancient work dealing with the saura-dharma as declared by Nārada. It has been quoted in many literary works of later times. It was an early work dealing with the duties of the Sauras. It has been included into the class of upa-purāṇas and dated earlier than 800 A.D. It is lost. Most of the verses of Saura-dharma quoted in later literature relates to fasting on the ekādāśī tithi in the month of Māgha, one to the eatables in the Kāmya vrata and lastly a Surya-vrata to be performed every month from Mārgaśīra by placing a golden image of the sun in a silver chariot. It also enjoins that three leaves of a Tulasī plant are to be eaten up by the observers of Kāmya vrata and Surya vrata every month. There was another saura literature in Saura-dharmottara quoted by many works. It may be regarded as an upa-purāṇa and may be dated not later than 900 A.D. Its verses are generally related to Ekādāśī upavāsa. There is a reference to a Surya-Purāṇa.

141. I-4-39. ‘Saura dharmas Ca Rājendra na-radokto mahīpate’.
143. Caṇḍeśvara-Tīthi-nirṇaṇaya, II-11, pp. 552-7 deals with Surya vrata of Sauradharma.
145 Hazra, R.C., op cit, p. 340
146. Caṇḍeśvara in his tithinirṇaya, fol. 2a quotes the verse- ‘Samkṛantiyām ravi-varā Cā tathā......which he assigns to Surya-Purāṇa.'
describes a manuscript of the Kiṣapancami śraddhavidhi which he claims to have belonged to the Sūrya Purāṇa.\textsuperscript{147} In the Berlin manuscript\textsuperscript{148} of the Bhaviṣyottara there is a chapter on putrakāma-krṣṇa pāñcamī-vrata which in its colophon names Sūrya Purāṇa as its source. As these topics are not found in the Sāmīya upa-purāṇa, the Sūrya Purāṇa appears to be a distinct work, an early work but as no manuscript has come to light it cannot be dated in our present state of knowledge. Thus the Sāmīya Upa-purāṇa is the only source of information regarding the sectarian sun-worship as prevalent between the 6th century A.D. and 1500 A.D. The Bhāskara Purāṇa mentioned in the Skanda Purāṇa\textsuperscript{149} may be the same as the present Sāmīya Upa-purāṇa.\textsuperscript{150}

The later Purānic records throw flood of light on the sun worship particularly on its sectarian side. All the features of a sectarian form of the sun-worship may be seen in the Sāmīya Upa-purāṇa, Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, Varāha Purāṇa, Skanda Purāṇa and other late Purāṇas. Firstly, the unquestionable supremacy of the sun-god is well-established in these Purānic records. At the very beginning of the Sāmīya Upa-Purāṇa the sungod is described as the cause of creation, protection and destruction of the universe and is the soul of pitāmaha, Nārāyaṇa and Śaṅkara whose manifestations are the three Vedas and who pervades the universe in the form of Śakra, Vahni, Yama, Varuṇa, Samīraṇa (i.e. Vāyu), Dhanada and others who crowd the quarters. Here like other sects\textsuperscript{151} the sun god has been regarded as identical with the universe and the ultimate reality. The exclusiveness and supremacy of the sun god is further stressed in the praise of the sun by Vasiṣṭha. Here the sun-god is regarded as the only visible and eternal deity who is highest among gods and is the only source


\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., No. 468, p. 135 (Colophon of Ch. 50).

\textsuperscript{149} Skanda-P., V-III.

\textsuperscript{150} Sāmīya Upa-purāṇa, Ch. I, verse 13 calls itself as ‘Bhāskarīya Purāṇam and contains in Chs. 10-11 the story of the birth of Āśvins mentioned by Bhāskara Purāṇa.’

\textsuperscript{151} Bhandarkar, R.G., Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and minor religious systems, pp. 2-4.
of energy, who never moves from his fixed position, who manifests himself, at the time of destruction into whom the yogins and the sāmkhyavid-s enter after forsaking their bodies. who is the only god deserving devotion and worship

Again the sectarianism is stressed in the description of the Sūrya-loka by Nārada. The sun is attended by the gods, Yaksas, Gandharvas, Apsaras etc., by the three Vedas incarnate, by the sages reciting Vedic hymns of praise, by the three Samdhya-incarnate, Ādityas, Vasus, Maruts and Ásvins, by Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Rudra and by many others. This deity pervades the universe and is eulogised by Brahmā and other gods. It is to be noted that the sun god is described as being attended by the three prominent gods-Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā of Purānic religion and is thus placed above all. The sectarian nature of the sun worship is again brought forth when the sun's creation and various other kinds of creatures in the form and capacity of Brahmā is described. The supremacy of the sun-god is expressed in explicit words when the evolution of the universe according to the principles of the Sāṅkhya system and the appearance of the supreme being (Īśvaram Param) as a luminary (called Savitr) at the prayer of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Mahēśvara and others is mentioned. The making of Indra, Varuṇa, Rudra etc. as attendants of the sun is a proof of the supremacy of the sun. Rudra is said to have taken recourse to the sun and eulogised him which shows, the supremacy of the sun-god over Rudra. That the sun-worship was of a sectarian form is also confirmed by the mention of the Sūrya-bhaktas and their characteristics, special sun-worshipping priests known as the Magas and the Yājakas, Sūrya-siddhānta (also called Āditya-siddhānta as distinguished from Traivedyā-Siddhānta), existence of a sectarian Saura literature as discussed before, the reference to the flags of

152. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, II.
153. Ibid., 6.
154. Ibid., 4.
155. Ibid., 14.
156. Ibid., 16. 25-35 & 17.
157. Ibid., 16-1-24. See reference 120.
158. Ibid., 38.
159. Ibid., 27.
160. Ibid., 28.
Ravi,\textsuperscript{161} the reference to fixed methods and procedures for worshipping this highest deity\textsuperscript{162}, sadācāra for the sun-worshippers,\textsuperscript{164} the elaborate descriptions for making sun-images and temples\textsuperscript{164} and his identification with all gods such as Mahādeva, Iśvara, Brahmā, Bhava, Prajāpati, Puruṣa, Svayambhū, Hiranyagarbha and Nārāyaṇa\textsuperscript{165} and the praise of Sāmba upa-purāṇa by Śūta over the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. The sectarian mantra of the Sauras was “khakholkāya namah”.

Thus there cannot be any doubt to the fact that the later Purāṇas witnessed the growth of a full-fledged sun-sect with all the paraphernalia needed for the growth of a sect. No doubt in the epics there are references to the Sauras—the sectarian sun-worshippers and the early Purāṇic records might have contained solar sectarianism in a veiled form. It was mainly during the period of later Purāṇas that a full-fledged sect round the sun-god developed on a unprecedented scale most probably due to the influence of a new form of the sun-worship from Iran.

One of the most interesting features of the sun-worship in ancient India as evidenced by late Purāṇas had been the association of the foreign priest-hood with the cult of the ‘Sauras’\textsuperscript{166}. These foreign priests were known as ‘Magas’ in ancient India. There are numerous references in many late Purāṇas which go to prove the advent of the ‘Magas’ in India from ‘Sākadvipa’ to accept the priest-hood of the sun-temples which they constructed for the first time in the history of India. There is a legend concerning the advent of the Magas and their association with the sun-worship in the Bhaviśya Purāṇa.\textsuperscript{167} Sāmba, the son of Kṛṣṇa by Jāmbavatī, constructed a temple of the sun on the banks of Candrabhāgā (modern Chenab in the Punjab) and no Brāhmaṇa would accept the office of a regular priest of the temple. He,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 33.
\item \textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 47-83.
\item \textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 44.
\item \textsuperscript{164} Ibid., 30-31.
\item \textsuperscript{165} Ibid., 7 verses 16-21.
\item \textsuperscript{167} Bhaviśya-P., Ch. 139.
\end{itemize}
finds confirmation in various coins of Scythians and Kusānas and various seals. Their presence on Indian soil is again indicated by many Iranian iconographical features mentioned in the Brhad-Samhitā and other texts, as well as the depiction of these features in Śūrya-icons of Kusāna period and onwards. These features were 'avyanga', udācyavesa and upānatpinaddha. Even today there are Brāhmaṇas of that name in Rajputana and some other states of Northern India.

All these evidences conclusively prove that a certain class of priests devoted exclusively to the sun and fire-worship were brought into India from 'Śāka-dvīpa'. There are many problems connected with the advent of the Magas in ancient India. Firstly, the identity of 'Magas' and the location of 'Śāka-dvīpa' may be discussed. It has been held by most of the scholars that the Magas of the Purāṇas were no other than the sun-worshipping Magi priests of Persia or Iran and the idea of locating them on a continent called Śākadvīpa must have arisen from the fact that they were foreigners like the Śakas with whom the Indians had been familiar since the second or third century B.C. There is no doubt that the Magi priests became closely and indistinguishably associated with Iran after Cyrus extended his empire to Medea and


Lydia of which we find unimpeachable testimony in Persian texts and Greek writers but it may be pointed out that originally they were a priestly tribe—probably Non-Āryan in origin in Medea a section of which worked their way in Zoroastrianism after founder’s death probably in the fifth century B.C. Though originally there were fundamental differences between their way of life and that of Persians, there was ultimately a compromise and Mithraism was born not later than fourth century B.C. Before the Persian impact this cult was already influenced by the religions of Babylonia and Chaldea. The chief features of the Magi-cult were their worship of the sun god and fire-god under the name of Mithra with eastward position, the use of ‘baroma’ and belief in a dualist view of the world e.g. division of the world between good and evil powers represented by light and darkness—Ahuramazdā and Ahir-Man. They were famous for magic and occult power. From the above review the natural inference appears to be that the Magas who later came to India were originally the magic-expert indigenous non-Āryan fire and sun-worshipping Medean priests whose faith was very much mixed up with the Chaldean and the Babylonian elements and by the time they came to India it must have been Iranianised. Regarding the location of the ‘Śāka-dvīpa’, no definite opinion can be expressed since there is no detailed reference to its situation in any of the Purāṇas or other sources. The possibility appears to be that it must have been situated in

185. Avesta refers to them once. In Yasht there are signs of the presence of Magi. cf. Frank Cumont—The ‘Mysteries of Mithra’, p. 9
188. Ibid, p 9, 13. Xenophon, Cyropaedia, VIII-I-23
189. Herodotus was aware of these differences specially in matters connected with the disposal of the dead. They exposed the dead body while Persians burnt it. cf. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, p. 57.
190. Burns, E.M., Western Civilizations, p 70
192. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism, pp. 182-253
Iran most probably in Eastern Iran since the Śaka-occupation of the western portion of Northern India where the temple of the sun at Multan is supposed to have been built by the Magas, was principally the work of the Śakas of ‘Eastern Iran’. Another important aspect of the Maga-problem is the antiquity or date of the advent of the Magas in ancient India. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar gives the date of the third century A. D. for the introduction of this element from Persia. Mr. H. D. Bhattacharya gives the reign of Kaniska as the probable period for the introduction of the Magas from Persia. He, believing in 1st century A. D. theory of Kaniska’s date regards 1st century A. D as the time of their advent in India. Weber also came to the conclusion that this Mithraic element came from Persia at the time of the Indo-Scythian Kings. The basis for this theory lies in the fact that Kaniska struck his coins with the image of Mithra and the name of Miiro (Mihir) added. It may be pointed out that the presence of coins of 1st century A. D. having Mithra figure and name reveals that the cult might have been introduced some time before it. Let us examine the available materials chronologically.

(1) The inscription at Govindpur (Gaya District) dated 1137-1138 A. D. refers to the Magas.

(2) Alberuni (11th century A. D.) refers to the presence of Magi-priests in India.

(3) An inscription dated in 861 A.D. knows about the Magas of India.

(4) Varaha-Purana (800-1000 A. D.) refers to them.

(5) Varahmihira (6th A. D.) refers to the Magas.

193 Barth, A., op. cit., p 257-59
194 Sircar, D.C., Age of Imperial Unity, Ed. R C Majumdar, p. 121.
195 Bhandarkar, R.G., Collected Works, p. 220. He believed in 3rd century A.D., theory of Kaniska’s date
196 It is a matter of controversy but the most probable date accepted by many scholars is 78 A.D.—cf Political History of Ancient India—Roychoudhury, H C.
197 Barth, A., op. cit., p. 258, f 9.
199 Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Purana Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, p. 104.
(6) Sāmba Upa-purāṇa (dated between 500-800 A. D.\textsuperscript{200}) gives a full account of them.

(7) Bhavisya Purāṇa (500 A. D. and after\textsuperscript{202}) was also familiar with them.

(8) Several Gupta and Kusāna sun-icons are depicted in Iranian fashion thereby showing the influence of Magas of Iran.\textsuperscript{202}

(9) The seal No. 607 discovered by Spooner at Basarh\textsuperscript{203} contains a fire altar with probably a solar disc. The legend is in Gupta character 'Bhagavat Ādityasya'. It may be suggested that the association of fire and sun may be due to the Magi-influence.\textsuperscript{204} The seals from Bhit, Sunet and Rājghat belonging to the Gupta period show Magi-influence.

(10) The fire-altar occurs on much earlier coins—for instance on those of Wema Kadphises and others (1 century B.C.), on Panchāla-Bhānumitra\textsuperscript{205} coins (200 B.C.) the same device of fire on altar and sun on altar is found.

(11) On the Indo-Greek and the Kusāṇa coins there is representation of Helios and Mithra. The Indo-Greek invasion began as early as 3rd century B.C.\textsuperscript{206}

(12) In the Mahābhārata\textsuperscript{207} (400 B.C.-400 A.D.) there is reference to Magas of Śākadvīpa and there are many mitra-ending names\textsuperscript{208} indicative of Magian-influence.

(13) On an Avanti coin\textsuperscript{209} a human figure in association with a solar standard (3 B.C.-2 A.D.) is depicted which

\textsuperscript{200} Hazra, R.C., Studies in the Upa-purāṇas, vol. I., p. 91.
\textsuperscript{201} Ibid., Purānic Records, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{203} A.S.I.A.R 1913-14, pp 118-120, 140 pl. XLIX.
\textsuperscript{204} Banerjea, J N, op cit., p 199.
\textsuperscript{206} Tarn, W.W., The Greeks in Bactria and India.
\textsuperscript{207} MBA-VI-11:36-38.
\textsuperscript{208} Sorensen, Index, p. 1.
shows the sectarian form of the sun-worship in view of the fact that the Sāmba Upa-purāṇa\textsuperscript{210} describes about a flag staff of Ravi in connection with a Maginised sun worship and the region of Avantī may have been under the influence of a Magian form of the sun-worship as is hinted by Varāhamihira,\textsuperscript{211} the evidence of this coin may be taken for knowing the date for the advent of the Magas in India.

(14) Ptolemy\textsuperscript{212} (2 century A.D.) vouches, for the existence of the ‘Brahmanai Magoi’ in the south.

In view of these continuous and overwhelming evidences ranging from 3rd century B.C. to 12th century A.D. and beyond no one can deny the influence of Magi-priests of East Iran upon India. There are two possibilities regarding the period of the advent of Magas. First possibility is that of 6th-5th century B.C. when Darius and his successors came to India and made its western part as a satrapy of Iran\textsuperscript{211}. It is well known that the Magi-cult of Iran was very much popular among the masses and specially among the military class\textsuperscript{214}, and it is no surprise if it could have poured into western part of India in the wake of Persian invasion. Spooner half a century ago suggested that this particular form of the fire-altar at Basarh in Indian archaeology without attendant figure is not due to any modification of Sassanian coinage through Kusāṇa influence but rather due to the survival in India itself, of the older, more original Persian tradition in such matters which antedates the Sassanian themselves by many centuries\textsuperscript{215}. Further, it has been argued that in absence of any

\textsuperscript{210} Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch 33


\textsuperscript{212} McRindle, J. W. (Tr.), Ancient India as described by Ptolemy. p. 170.

\textsuperscript{213} Herodotus—III-94, Mookerjee, R.K., Age of Imperial Unity, ed. R.C. Majumdar, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{214} Frank Cumont—The Mysteries of Mithra, pp. 26 ff.

\textsuperscript{215} A.S.I.A.R., 1913-14, pp. 118-20, 140.
survival of old Persian tradition it is difficult to explain how Pusyamitra (185 B.C.) could have been influenced by the Persian example in adopting the name of Mitra. It has been suggested that Pusyamitra may have been an Iranian, a worshipper of the sun-Mithra. But as pointed out by a recent scholar it is difficult to come to any absolute conclusion that Pusyamitra was an Iranian or that he was under the influence of Magians or Iranians. There are a few names in the Mahābhārata even which end in Mitra but since the date of the Mahābhārata itself is controversial and there are much interpolations and later additions no reliance can be placed on this name-basis in matter of Magi-advent in India but there are other grounds for holding that the Magas might have come to India in 6th century B.C. There are references found in Pāli texts such as Bambhajāla-sutta that at a time of Buddha the magic priests (probably Magas) were held in disrepute. Against the theory of the survival of old Persian tradition it has been argued that there is little to support this claim in Pre-Buddhistic Brāhmaṇa literature and Megasthenes is silent about Magi-priests in India. In reply to these arguments it may be pointed out that this silence on the part of orthodox Brāhmaṇa literature before the Purāṇas might have been due to their hostility and contempt to the peculiar ways and manners of the Magas. In Ārṣeya Upanisad there is reference to a class of peoples-Puṇḍras, Suhmas, Udumbhas, Dardas and Barbaras who believed in the worship of the sun and were outcaste in the orthodox society. They were held in contempt by the Brahmanic Rṣis such as Gautama. Are we not to suppose that this group was composed of

220. Hopkins, Religions of India, p. 544.
221. See Majumdar, R.C., The Classical Accounts of India.
222. In Atharvaveda we find reference to Magadha. It is tempting to suggest that it was named after Magas but it is hypothetical with no positive data in its favour.
indigenous as well as foreign tribes as is clear from the word ‘Barbaras’? If so, there is every reason to believe that the Magas-the foreign sun-worshippers might have been meant by the term ‘Barbaras’ who were against Vedas and Vedic culture. They are mentioned in the Brahmanic literature only when they because of their immense popularity and also because of their adoption of Hindunised ways are accepted as Śāka-dvīpa Brāhmaṇas in the Hindu fold. Now as the matter stands it may be suggested that there is possibility of the advent of Magi-priests and along with them Iranian form of the sun-worship in the wake of Iranian invasion of 6th century B. C. which was responsible for the occupation of the north-western part of India over two centuries upto 330 B. C. There might have been continuous pouring of Magi-priests from Iran into India under the presence of other foreign invasions in that region. This becomes very plausible in view of the close proximity of the two regions and of immense popularity of Mithra-cult of Magis among the military classes of Iran and neighbouring regions. But the positive evidence of the fire-sun worshipping Magi priests of Iran starts coming from the Indo-Greek period (3rd century B. C.) and it continued with renewed vitality in the Indo-Parthain-Sassanian Kuśāna period when all over the ancient world Mithraism was spreading with phenomenal success. In its westward extension it became a formidable but unsuccessful rival to christianity in the Roman


225. Sankalia, H.D. in Archaeology of Gujarat, p. 212, supports this contention, ‘An early form of the sun-cult of the type we find later in Kathiawar might have reached that region as early as the 5th century B.C. through the Magas when North-western India formed a part of the empire of Darius’. It may be pointed out that as early Asokan time there is evidence of a Yavana Tushapa as the governor of Saurashtra which reveals that even in 3rd century B.C. foreign influence had been predominant in this region and it is more than probable that there had been foreigners in the Indian population of this region.


227. Frank, Cumont, op. cit., pp. 11-19, 33-34.
world under Constantine, while in its eastward extension it crossed Asia Minor, Iran and come to India but only to be absorbed in the ever-expanding heart of liberal but vital India.

Another aspect of the Maga-problem is concerned with the question as to how far these magi-priests could influence the indigenous tradition of the sun-worship in Ancient India. Certain Hindu names containing Mihira i.e. Mithra, the Magas e.g Magi priests, and recommendations of the sun-worship in the Purāṇas are the grounds on which Weber propounds a theory of the great influence of Magi-priests and cults upon indigenous sun-worship. He claims in fact, that the native sun-worship was quite replaced by this importation. It is difficult to agree with him in view of the fact that there are many Purāṇas which do not mention the role of Magian priests at all and continue the indigenous and national tradition of the sun-worship as found in the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Upanisads, the Sūtras, and the Epics. Some of the Purāṇas such as the Kūrma limit themselves to a description of the function of the sun as the heavenly body in regulating time and seasons, in maintaining the planets in their position and fostering the life of plants and animals and make only a passing reference to the solar family. This description is in conformity with the Vedic account of the sun-god. In the Viṣṇu, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and Matsya Purāṇas there is the sun-worship of the Vedic tradition. It has rightly been pointed out that the orthodox tradition developed on the lines of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa's prescription of a golden disc to represent the solar orb and the Upanisadic doctrine of the golden Purusa in the Sun and the philosophically inclined concerned less of the 'all-red' deity and more of Brahmaṇa as the ultimate being with which the sun was identified. There is testimony of this tradition in the Kurma Purāṇa and many other places in the Viṣṇu, the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇḍa and the Matsya

231. Roy, S N., Early Purāṇic account of Sun and solar cult, pp. 41-45.
233. S.B., VII-4.1.10.
234. B.A.U.-II-5-5.
235. See references 105, 111, 112 etc.
Purāṇas. Moreover, the name of the sect of which Magis became priests is named as ‘Saura’—a Sanskritized form which is sufficient to indicate that the Magian cult was thoroughly Indianised and only then it could become palatable to the Indians. Further the whole of the theology of this system is so much Indian—a reflex of the teachings of Vedas, Upaniṣads and Epics that the question of displacement does not arise.

The influence of the Magi-cult upon indigenous solar cult has been generally overestimated. The fundamentals of the Magi-cult could not make slightest headway in India most probably due to exemplary assimilative and absorbing capacity of the Indian culture. Further it might not have been possible for Magi-priests to advance their cause because most of the features of the Magi-cult (especially its Iranianised form which reached India) were already present here. For instance, the worship of the sun under the name of Mithra had already been prevalent in the native tradition of India is revealed by the Rgveda, the Atharvaveda, the Upaniṣads and the epics. The fire was also worshipped and was closely connected with the sun in India right from the Rgvedic times. The dualist view of the world i.e. division of the world into good and evil powers and consequently the struggle between them and ultimate victory of the good was also found in ancient Indian history. The fight between Indra and Vṛtra which forms an important theme of the Vedic lore may be regarded as a fight between powers of light and darkness. The whole epic story is taken by some scholars as symbolising this struggle. In view of these similarities there was

---

237. Ibid., He compares it with Śaiva theology and considers it as a reflex of the Gītā.
239. A.V., XIII-3-13, IX-3-18; III-8-1, V-12-1.
240. Tattvārtha-U., 1-1-1, 1-12-1.
242. Ibid., Maitreyya is one of the names of Sūrya in the Mahābhārata, III-146 to 157.
hardly anything new for Magi priests to propagate in India. There is one significant difference between Indian Mitra and Magi-Mitra. Magi-Mitra is credited with the slaying of the bull but we do not find any reference to this legend in the Purāṇas or other literature. No representation of this episode is found in the Indian art though it was frequently represented in the arts of Asia Minor and Rome. There are many rites of initiation etc. in the Magi cult of Mithraism but they are not to be traced in the Purāṇas. Thus it may be suggested that so far as the mythology, theology and philosophy of the sun-cult was concerned the Maga influence was negligible.

There are two connected spheres where they appear to have exerted powerful influence—iconography and temples. Though there might have been native tradition of image-making and temple-building for different sectarian gods yet it appears that the images and temples of the sun-god were either not known or popular in India before the advent of the Magas as evidenced by the Purāṇas. It might have been due to the fact that the solar deity itself was visible daily to every body and there was no need for its representation. Its orb was worshipped by the general masses. For the philosophically inclined its artificial representation was meaningless since they found in its visible form a symbol of ultimate reality. Even if the tradition of image making in case of Sūrya might have existed it must have been on a very

246. Frank, Cumont, op. cit., Figs. 4-7, 25, 26, 35, 37.
249. Śāmba Upa-purāṇa, 29-2-6. It is interesting to note that here the Maga priests are not described as responsible for image-making but Viśvakarman—the native architect was responsible. A few images of purely native tradition such as of Bodha-gayā, Bhal, Lala-bhagat etc. have to come to light. cf. Banerjea, J.N., op. cit., pp. 432-434.
251. B.A.K., II-I, Chāndogya U., 3-1-11.
small scale because as it is mentioned in the Purāṇas that the masses worshipped the solar deity not in its anthropomorphic but symbolic form by disc, wheel, lotus and svastika etc. On the other hand, there are many elements in the solar iconography of the Kusāna, the Gupta and the post-Gupta periods which are unmistakably Persian. These must have been brought by the Agni-priests in India. These are Udicyaveśa, avyanga and high boots. They are found referred to in the literary texts of India as well as depicted in the solar images from the Kusāna period onwards found at Mathurā, Bengal and Western India. That these features were imported from Persia becomes too evident when they are not found in the solar iconography of south India which remained uninfluenced by the east Iranian tradition. The existence of a large number of the sun-temple in the western part of India, where Magas first established the sun-temple at Mūlāsthāna (Modern Multan) is again a pointer in the direction that actually Maga priests were responsible for starting this new tradition in the solar religion. Is it natural to presume that these two traditions established by them were materially instrumental in propagating and diffusing the sectarian form of the sun-worship. They gave concrete and lithic representation to the imaginary

252. Sāṁba Upa-purāṇa, 29-2-6. Bhaviṣya Purāṇa (Brahma Parvan) refers to Maṇḍala form of the sun-worship. In commenting upon Āpastamba Dh. Sūtra, II-11-29-16 Haradatta says that the Draviḍas used to worship Āditya by drawing Maṇḍalas.


254. Bṛhat-Saṁhitā, Ch. 57 (45-8), Viṣṇudharmottara, III, 67-1 to 5 also refers to these elements.


257. Sankalia, H. D., Archaeology of Gujarat, pp. 84, 157, 158, 159, 163.


260. Sāṁba Upa-purāṇa, 29-2-6. Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, Ch. 139 too narrates the incident.
depiction of solar anthropomorphism as found in the Vedas, the epic and the Purāṇas.

There is another aspect of the Maga-problem e. g. absorption and acceptance of the Magas into the traditional Hindu fold. The Indian culture has always been famous for its immense capacity of mutual adjustment and assimilation and ultimately absorption and annihilation into the ever-widening cultural patterns of India. Many tribes, races and cultures were absorbed into the Indian culture. The same fate awaited the Magas. They were ultimately accepted as ‘Śākadvīpī-Brāhmaṇas’ on account of their priestly functions by Indians. Already in 520 A.D. a manuscript found in Nepal gives an equal status to the Magas and Brāhmaṇas in the Kaliyuga. The very fact that they were mentioned in the Purāṇas in association with native myths and legends is indicative of their acceptance by the Brāhmaṇas.

Another aspect of the problem is concerned with the factors responsible for the wide popularity which they commanded for two or three centuries and which were ultimately responsible for increased vitality of the solar-cult in the early centuries of the Christian era. The proselytising spirit of the Magas, the state support that they enjoyed at least under foreign rulers, i.e. of Indo-Greeks, Scythians and Kuśāṇas, the propogating of the benefits of the

266. Vasu, N.N., Castes and Sects of Bengal, IV, 56-57 suggests probable connection of the sun worship with Śuṅga, Kanva and Hūṇa dynasties.
267. Bloch, Z.D.M.G., 1910, p. 723 believes that the theory that sun god cures leprosy came from Persia. But as shown by the Rgveda and the Atharvaveda there was native tradition that the sun-god cures leprosy and other skin diseases. Śamba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 24, see Mayūra-śataka of Mayūra.
sun-worship, especially its creative properties.\textsuperscript{268} their contribution towards image-making and temple-building of Sūrya whose absence must have keenly felt—all these factors must have contributed towards their temporary success but ultimately they lost their individuality since there was nothing distinctive about them.

It has been suggested that the sun-worshipping Magas were divided in course of time into two groups of the Magas and the Bhojakas later on degraded as the Yājakas. Both are distinguished in the sense that the Magas used to meditate on the syllable ‘A’, while the Yājakas worshipped the sun by burning incense, offering garlands and various other articles and muttering mantras though the aim of both is the same—the attainment of final emancipation through Karmayoga to the sun who resides in the phenomenal sun and is both Sakala and niskala.\textsuperscript{269} It appears that the Bhojakas or the Yājakas or the Sevakas may have been indigenous priests of the sun-cult on the ground that they are described as chanting Vedic mantras etc.\textsuperscript{270} Later on they indulged into objectionable activities and practices and entered into matrimonial alliances with foreigners like the Magas. Then they came to be regarded as iow or apāṅkta\textsuperscript{271} or Devalaka-Brahmins\textsuperscript{272} (temple priests). There is a reference to a tribe known as Bhojakas in the time of Aśoka\textsuperscript{273}. It is difficult to suggest whether Bhojakas of Aśokan inscriptions and Bhojakas of the Purāṇas were identical. If they were identical, it is just probable that due to the extreme popularity of the Magas in northern India they might have migrated to south India but there is no evidence of migration of any such tribe. Whatever might be the truth they enjoyed respect upto the eighth century A. D.\textsuperscript{274}

Though the sun-god had various names\textsuperscript{275} such as Āditya, Savitṛ, Bhāskara, Arka, Ravi, Sūrya, Mihira, Prabhākara, Mārtanda, Bhānu, Citrabhānu and Divākara etc., he was specially
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worshipped in his twelfth form (Dvādaśārika) Mitra. The twelve Ādityas are Indra, Dhātṛ, Parjanya, Pūsan, Tvāṣṭṛ, Aryamā, Bhaga, Vivasvat, Viṣṇu, Amśu, Varuṇa and Mitra.

The development of a family and attendants of a deity is a common features of Hindu sects and cult. The later Purāṇas elaborately describe this feature of the sunworship. Rajani and Nikṣubhā are his two wives. Pingala the recorder of good and bad deeds of creatures, Daṇḍanāyaka, Rajña and Stosa, Kalmaśa (i.e. Yama) and Pakṣin (i.e. Garuḍa) attend on him and also Vyoman and naked Dīṇḍī. Rajani’s another name was Samjña or Sureṇu and the sun had two sons with her—Vaivasvata Manu and Yama Śrāddhadeva and a daughter named Yamī or Kālindī. The shadow of Samjña was Chāyā (called to be the same as Niksubhā identified with Prthvī). From Chāyā the sun got Śrutasravas and Śrutakarman and a daughter known as Tapaṭī. The other sons of the sun-god were two Āśvins named Nāsatya and Dasra (from Samjña in Kuru country) and Revanta with the body of a horse having a bow and arrows. There is mention of eighteen attendants of the sun—Indra under the name

276 Sūmba Upa-p., I-8b-14. 3.3  ‘pritya sāṃbasya, tatrārko Jagato’nugrahya ca / Sthitō dvādasa-bhūgena mitro maîtreṇa ca kṣuṣṭa //
In Sūmba Upa-purāṇa 4. 6 Mitra is mentioned as the last of the 12 Ādityas.

277. Sūmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 6.

278. Bhaviṣya-P. I-76-13 read ‘puṅgalo lekhati’ in place of ‘pingalo devakāh’ of Sūmba Upa-purāṇa but the text of the Bhaviṣya-P. appears to be the correct one. In Visnudh III-67. 5-7 Puṅgala is described as ant пуṅгала, Uddīptaveṣa (Udīcyaveṣa ?) Lekhāni patrākāra and carma Śūladhara.

279. Sūmba Upa-purāṇa, 6. 22a & 7. 3a., Bhaviṣya-P., I-76-13b & 18 (corresponding to above) to names are Rāja and Srosa but in Bhaviṣya P. I-124-13 and 22-24a they are Rajnā and Srauṣa Ch. I-148. 40a. Sūmba Upa-purāṇa 36.39 gives the names as Rājan and Tōsa. In Āвеста Rashnu (justice) and Śraoshka (obedience) are companions of Mithra.

280. Sūmba Upa-purāṇa, 6. 23. 7, 4 & 16. 25 but in Bhaviṣya P., I-76. 14 and 19 and I-124-1 the words tathā, agrataḥ and magnah are found in place of nagnaḥ and nagnakah.

281. Sūmba Upa-purāṇa, 10-17b, Bhaviṣya-P., I-79b; Skanda-P., VII-1-11-85b.
of Daṇḍanāyaka on the left side of the sun and was engaged by
latter to rule over the world with his daṇḍa and nītī, Agni known
as Piṅgala on the right side of the sun was engaged in checking
the good and bad deeds of all creatures, two Aśvins stood on two
sides of the sun, Kārttikeya and Hara stood at the eastern gate
under the name of Rajnā and Stosa respectively, Yama and
Guruḍa assumed the names of Kaṁśa and Pakṣin who stood with
two asses at the gate and on the south stood Citragupta and Kāla
under the names of Jandākāra and Māthara, on the west stood
Varuṇa and Sagara under the names of Prapnuyana and Kṣutapa
respectively, on the north stood Kubera and Vināyaka and on the
east stood Revanta and Rudra under the name of Diṇḍi and also Śrī, Mahāsvetā and Mātrṣ. Besides these chief eighteen
attendants, at one place Soma is included as an attendant deity
of the sun and there were fourteen other attendants. In the list
of attendants there are names which may be regarded as Iranian,
importation such as Rajna and Stosa, Māthara and Jandākāra, though there is effort to Indianise them by giving them
Indigenous origin as mentioned above.

The method of the sun worship is elaborately described in the
late Purāṇas. Many influences may be seen in the evolution of
the methodology of the sun worship in the late Purāṇas—such as
the Vedic tradition of the sun-worship, the indigenous tradition
of the sun-worship, the Iranian tradition of the sun-worship, the
Tantrik tradition of the worship and Śaiva tradition.

The first important feature in the worship of the sun was the
introduction of image and temple of the sungod in contrast to the
worship of sun in symbolic forms. This is expressly brought out

282. Ibid., 29-13b. Viṣṇudh-III-67-Daṇḍin (i.e. Daṇḍanāyaka)—
Dharma in the form of lion and the banner (dhvaja) on the left
of the sun, Piṅgala on the right, the sun's four sons (viz.
Revanta, Yama and two Manus) as well as his four wives (viz.
Rajani, Nikṣubhā, Chīyā and Suvarcasā) on both sides are
mentioned.

283. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, 10. 1 24.

284. Ibid., 36-41b.


in the later Purāṇas. The rules for the construction of the sun temple and images are also given. From the point of view of materials seven kinds of images and dresses etc such as avyanga, pada-bandha etc are mentioned. It has rightly been suggested that in the earlier chapters of the late Purāṇas the Vedic tradition has been given prominence though no doubt Iranian elements were already introduced in the sun-worship. There are references to six mediums of the sun-worship viz. fire, water, air, holy place, image and pedestal for the image of a deity. There is no reference to Tantric symbols like Yantra or Maṇḍala in these earlier chapters. The hymns in praise of the sun are called Vedokta or Veda-Vedāṅga-sammita, the three Vedas are said to attend upon the sun and the agnihotraghra (the house for the oblations to the fire) is an integral part of the sun-temple. The Vedic home forms an important part of the worship, the mantras to be used are either Vedic or Purānic or both.

But the Tantric cult was becoming quite popular particularly in eastern India from 7th-8th centuries onwards and the sun-worship could not remain aloof from this development. In the chapter of the second group of the Śāmba Upa-purāṇa there are many elements in the sun-worship which are essentially Tantric.

288. Śāmba Upa-p., 29-2-6.  
na pūrā pratīmaḥ hy āsit pūjyate maṇḍale raviḥ/  
yathaitau maṇḍalam vyomini śthiye śavaitus tad//  
evam eva pūrā bhaktaiḥ pūjyate maṇḍalākrtaḥ//  
yataḥ prabhṛtā cāpy esa nirmīto viśvakarmanā//  
sarva-loka-hitārthāya sūryasya puruṣākṛtiḥ/  
gṛheṣu pratīmyāḥs tu na tāsām niyamah kvacit//  
devyātana-vinīśe kāryam mūrtiparīkṣanam//  
Ibid., 1-17a 'Śāmbasya ca tadollāsam pratīmyāthāpanām tathā'.

289. Ibid., Ch. 29.

290. Ibid., Ch. 30. 31.
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294. Ibid., 6. 15.

295. Ibid., 29. 15.

296. Ibid., 30. 18, 32. 12 '......puruṣoktena mantreṇa......

The method of initiation is full of Tantric influence. It involves the selection and preparation of the ground, selection of spiritual preceptors and disciples, offer of argha to the sun with the mahā-mantra, drawing of a maṇḍala with the figure of a twelve-petalled lotus in its performance of home and of tattvanyāsa and mantra-nyāsa, worship of the quarter guardians to whom fish, meat etc are offered. It is interesting to learn that the mantras with Tantric symbolism are employed at every step. The drawing of maṇḍalas, the performance of various kinds of mudrās and nyāsas are in accordance with the Tantric philosophy. The word ‘Tantra’ has been used to mean not only procedure but also Tantric works. The methods of performing abhisāra rites and bijas in mantras and practice of yoga have also been given and six acts viz. vaśikarana, ākarana, māraṇa, uccātana, vidveśāna and stambhana etc. Thus the sun-worship in the later Purāṇas appears to have been influenced by Tantric symbolism. The sun-worship was done at sun-rise, at mid-day and at sunset.

The later Purāṇas also give an account of the method of performing the annual worship (samvatsarī pūjā) and the annual car-festival (rathayāstrā) of the sun with the use of Vedic and Purāṇic mantras, and methods about the use of incense and other materials, methods and results of observing the seven different saptamī tithis as well as the twelve śukla-saptamīs. The legends of Jāmadgini and Viśvakarman are given where an effort has been made to give a national version for covering the feet of the god sun. Other topics such as evolution of the universe according to the principles of Sāmkhya system are described.

The later Purāṇas refer to three centres of the sun-worship of Magian type. Firstly, it mentions Mūlasṭhāna also referred to

298. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 39 & 41.
301. Ibid., Ch. 29.
302. Ibid., Ch. 34.
303. Ibid., Ch. 46.
304. Ibid., Ch. 45 and Ch. 12-15 respectively.
305. Ibid., Ch. 14.
306. Skanda-Purāṇa, VI-76 refers to Mundūra, Kālapriya and Mūlasṭhāna, VII-139, 11 & 12a mentions that the sun is seen at
as Mitravana on the\textsuperscript{307} Candrabhāgā river and identified with Multan in Punjab.\textsuperscript{308} Besides Mitravana and Mūlasthāna there are other names of this place—Kaśyapa-pura, Hamsapur, Bhagapur, Sāmbapura (referred to by Abu-Rihan), Prahlādapur and Ādyasthana all terms connected with the sun-worship.\textsuperscript{309} Hsiu-en-Tsang who visited the place in the seventh century A. D. testifies to the great popularity of this place as a centre of the sun-worship.\textsuperscript{310} The other Muslim historians also give an account of this temple.\textsuperscript{311} Cunningham takes Mūla as an epithet of the sun

Munjīrāsvāmin at Gangāsāgara sangama, at midday at Kālapriya and in evening at Mūlasthāna near candrabhāgā. Śāmba Upa-purāṇa, 26. 14 refers to Kālapriya, sutīra and Mitravana cf. 42. 43. 'Sthāpayitvā ravīnā bhaktā tristhānasu surottamaḥ' cf. Śāmba-P., 43-36b, Bhāaviṣya-Purāṇa, I-72-4-6 refers to Munḍīra, Kālapriya and Mitravana, I-129. 16b-17a, Sutīra, Kālapriya and Mitravana, I-189-23 26, Munḍīrsvāmin, Kālapriya and Mūlasthāna, I-55-27, Sunḍīrsvāmin, Kālapriya and Mitravana, Varāha-Purāṇa, 177-55-77 narrates that Śāmba established three images at Udayācala, Kālapriya on the south of yamunā and Mūlasthāna on the Astamānācala.

307. Śāmba Upa-purāṇa, I-38.
310. Beal, A., Buddhist records of Western Countries, vol. II, p. 274, 'There is a temple dedicated to the sun very magnificent and profusely decorated. The image of the Sun-deva is cast in yellow gold and ornamented with rare gems. Its divine insight is mysteriously manifested and its spiritual power made plain to all. Women play their music, light their torches, offer their flowers and perfumes to honour it. This custom has been continued from the very first. The kings and high families of the five Indies never fail to make their offerings of gems and precious stones (to this deval). They have founded a house of mercy (happiness) in which they provide food and drink and medicines for the poor and sick, affording succour and sustenance. Men from all countries come here to offer up their prayers. There are always some thousands doing so on the four sides of the temple. There are tanks with flowering groves which one can wander about without restraint'.
311. Alberuni, Al. Edrisi, Abu Ishak al Ishtakhri etc. Quoted by Elliot, H. M. and Dowson, J., History of India as told by its own historians, Vol. I, p. 18-73.
as the God of rays and therefore Mūlasthānapura as the 'City of the Temple of the Sun'. But the interpretation is far-fetched and more probable view appears to be that it means the 'original place of the sun worship'. The internal evidence is in favour of this interpretation. In the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa as well as in the Sāmba Purāṇa the place is also referred to as Ādyasthāna which directly means 'original place' and there is no reason to take it as a corruption of Āditya. Secondly, the legend of Sāmba expressly states that for the first time a sun temple was established here. That western India where Multan is situated was a strong hold of the sun-worship, is also attested by epigraphy.

The second place of the sun-worship is referred to as Kālapriya identified with modern Kālpī on the southern bank of Yamunā. There is a controversy regarding the identification of Kālapriya temple of the sun at Kālpī with Kālapriyanātha at whose fairs all the three plays of Bhavabhūti were staged but others identify Kālapriya with Mahākāla of Ujjayini. It is reasonable to suspend judgment on this issue.

The third place is referred to as Sutīra, or Muṇḍīra or Udayācalā also known as Sūrya-kānana, Raviksētra, Sūrya-ksetra and Mitravana while the Brahma Purāṇa expressly calls it Koṇāḍītya or Koṇāraka in Utkala (or ordeśa). It is

314. Ibid., p. 105.
316. Sāmba Upa-purāṇa, Ch. 24-26.
generally and rightly identified with modern Konarak near Puri in Orissa. Dr. Kane objects to this identification and identifies Mundhira with the sun temple at Modhera in north Gujarat but his objections are not forceful. It seems that the name Konarak came to be applied to this place because of its position in the north-east corner (Kona) with respect to Puri. It is clear from the above description of the places of the sun-worship that the whole of northern India was witnessing the development of the Magian type of the sun-cult.

Thus the Puranas—early and late—contain valuable data for the study of the sun and solar cult from the beginning of the Christian era, if not earlier, to the end of the Hindu period of India. The early Puranic records continue the national tradition of simple, non-sectarian sun-worship by means of symbols though there are passages and occasions when solar sectarianism in a veiled form is seen. The old Vedic tradition of worshipping the sun under different names continued though Surya, Savitṛ and Āditya became very prominent names. The sun was worshipped mainly in his benevolent form. The early Puranas describe about the family of the sun-god and his chariot with elaborateness not seen before. There are indirect references to sun-images and temples, but the early Puranas do not mention the Magas—the foreign sun-worshipping priests. There is mention of the characteristics of the sun-images which are Indian as compared to the Iranian elements of the late Puranas. In various domestic rites the sun-worship played predominant part and twelve petalled lotus was particularly associated with the sun-god. The worship of the sun in the early Puranas mainly consisted of recitation of mantras, Vedic and Puranic in praise of the sun god under the names of Bhāskara, Ravi, Surya, Savitṛ, Bhaga and Arka etc.; argha consisting of water, sandal flowers, specially red, and salutation to

sanhitā A.S.B. Ms. No. 311, Ch. 6, Konarak has been called Maitreya-Jana and the Raviṅśetra.


325. Ganguly, M.M., Orissa and her remains, p. 437.
the sun-god. There is no reference to the Tāntric mode of the sun-worship in the early Purāṇas.

The most interesting feature in the late Purāṇic records is mention of the advent of the Magas and the popularisation, if not introduction, of the sun images and temples at three places. The sun images were to be dressed according to the Iranian fashion though there is an effort in these Purāṇas to nationalise this foreign element. The advent of the Magas gave a philip to the cause of the sun-worshippers and it spread throughout northern India. Ultimately the national and Iranian traditions of the sun-worship were mixed up and the solar sectarians developed a philosophy which was similar to the Sāṃkhya system. In earlier chapters of the late Purāṇas the Vedas and the Purāṇas are given prominence in the worship while in the later chapters of the later Purāṇas Tāntric symbolism gains popularity.
THE SYMBOLISM OF THE THIRD EYE OF ŚIVA
IN THE PURĀNAS.

BY

WENDY DONIGER O'FLAHERTY

Symbolism is essential to all mythology, but particularly to the mythology of the Hindu god Śiva. For the corpus of myths, preserved in its most important form in the Sanskrit Purāṇas, embodies a basic paradox: that Śiva is the god of ascetics and the god of the liṅga. The myths which explore this paradox do so by a combination of rational explanation and emotional perception; but the symbols of Śiva express in a static form the resolution of the mythological paradoxes. Symbolism is uniquely capable of resolving such ambivalences, for the symbol may be two things at once, the actual object and the implicit quality. This facility is particularly applicable in the Purāṇas, since all of Sanskrit poetry is based upon the concept of dhvam—emotional overtones or echoes, secondary implications of words. Thus where the myth, which functions in terms of action, must describe first one and then another aspect of the god, resorting to cyclic activity, the symbol juxtaposes the aspects so closely as to superimpose them, forming the moment of complete resolution which the episodes of the myth approach but never reach.

1. This has been discussed at length by the present writer in two articles entitled, "Asceticism and Sexuality in the Mythology of Śiva," in History of Religions (University of Chicago: May, 1969, and August, 1969).
I. The antierotic connotation of the third eye.

Śiva is the god of yogis and the greatest of all yogis; the third eye in the middle of his forehead is a symbol of his magic vision and an instrument of his ascetic power. With this eye he burns to ashes Kāma, the god of desire, when Kāma attempts to wound Śiva with one of his flower arrows. As R. C. Zähner describes this episode, "With a glance of his third eye—the eye of contemplative wisdom situated above the bridge of the nose—he [Śiva] reduced the impudent godlet [Kāma] to ashes." With this same divine eye, Śiva performed another antierotic act: at the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī, Brahmā, who was performing the ceremony in his capacity of Creator, became excited by the beauty of Pārvatī and shed his seed upon the ground. Brahmā created a screen of smoke to obscure his transgression, and Śiva's two eyes were blinded, but with his third eye he saw what had happened and punished Brahmā. Thus in terms of traditional symbolism, as well as by its application in Hindu mythology, the third eye is ascetic and antierotic, in keeping with Śiva's role of the divine yogī.

This connotation of the third eye appears throughout the myths of Śiva and his wife Pārvatī. In one story, Pārvatī beats Śiva by cheating in a game of dice:

When Pārvatī had won everything from Śiva, including his loincloth, Śiva looked at her in fury with his third eye, and the hosts were terrified and thought, "Now Śiva is angry with Pārvatī and will burn her as he burned Kāma. "But Pārvatī smiled and said to Śiva, "Why do you look at me with that eye? I am not Death, nor Kāma, nor the sacrifice of Dakṣa, nor the Triple City, nor Andhaka [all enemies of Śiva who had been destroyed by the third eye]. What good will it do you to look at me with that thing? You have become three-eyed in my presence in vain". Hearing this, Śiva decided to go alone to a deserted forest.

3. Śiva Purāṇa (Benares : Paṇḍita Pustakālaya, 1964) 2, 2. 19. 17-30 ; *Skanda Purāṇa* (Bombay: Venkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1887) 6. 77. 49.
4. *Skanda Purāṇa* 1. 1. 34. 130-139.
Even without these particular association, a third eye in the middle of the forehead produces a reaction of horror and aversion as a mere facial disfigurement, a physical monstrosity. This is brought out in the Purāṇa passages in which various people, trying to dissuade Pārvatī from her love of Śiva, contrast his three eyes with her lotus-petal eyes, his deformed eyes with her wide eyes, his monkey-eyes with her fawn-eyes. A Bengali poem is based upon this contrast together with a related reversal: the idea that Kāma burns Śiva instead of being burnt by him:

Why do you burn my body, Madana [Kāma]?
I am not Śaṅkara [Śiva], but a delicate girl.
A pearl tiara this and not the crescent moon [which Śiva bears];
Not an eye on my forehead but a vermillion spot...

The inappropriateness of the third eye in an erotic context is expressed in a verse describing Śiva as he wanders about begging, naked, enticing the wives of the sages living in a Pine Forest: “As the third eye saw the body of Śiva which, though the body of the enemy of Kāma, was arousing passion throughout the three worlds, the eye was ashamed of its former deed [the burning of Kāma], and it hid.”

II. The interaction of the Horrible and the Erotic.

Thus, on its explicit level, the third eye is horrible and therefore anti-erotic. Yet the two aspects are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although, in traditional Indian literary analysis, the loathsome, furious, heroic and frightening moods are opposed to the erotic, the Malati Mādhava is a notable exception to this rule, “a play that combines love and horror with a felicity

5. Śiva Purāṇa 2 3. 27. 25.
7. Skanda Purāṇa 1. 2. 25. 67.
9. Kāsemendra, Darpadalana (Bombay: Kāvyamāla Series 6 [pp. 66-117], (1890) 7. 35.
never again equaled in Sanskrit.” The presence of horror to enhance love may be seen in Indian miniature painting in the motif of the abhisārtkā, the woman who steals out to meet her lover at night in spite of the dangers of darkness, lightning, snakes ghosts, and jungle plants that tear her sārī and pluck off her golden ornaments.

The worship of the Goddess in India is particularly characterized by the combination of these elements, and there is even explicit reference to this phenomenon in the Purāṇas: in describing the glory of the Goddess in full armor, the messenger of the demon Mahiṣa says, “All the rasa-s [moods]—erotic and terrible, heroic and marvellous and comic—are combined in her.” Zaehner captures the logic of this juxtaposition when he writes, “[Kāli] is terrifying in her beauty, and her loveliness lies precisely in her frightfulness.”

The interaction of these rasa-s is still more significant in the character of Śiva himself, though its presence in the Goddess makes all the more comprehensible her ultimate approval of it in him. “Rudra [Śiva] inspires terror and most paradoxically, a fascinated tenderness for the terrible,” writes Zaehner. This emotion often takes the form of something approaching necrophilia, as in the episode in which Śiva embraces the corpse of his dead wife, Sati, but throughout the mythology the “fascinated tenderness” turns upon the ambiguity of the symbols themselves rather than upon a seemingly perverse reversal of an unambiguous symbol (such as a corpse). The third eye, in spite of its superficial connotations, is in fact just such an ambiguous symbol.

III. The Erotic function of the third eye.

The third eye is capable of inspiring love as well as fear or revulsion in Pārvatī precisely because, in the context of the Hindu

---

15. Brahmaśaivarta Purāṇa, ed. by Hariprasad Śastri, 4 vols. (Poona: Anandārama Sanskrit Series 102, 1935) 4. 48. 27-40,
attitude toward sexual love, the two emotions are entirely compatible and are in fact characteristic of Pārvatī’s feelings toward Śiva from the very first. Pārvatī fears and loves Śiva simultaneously; a Sanskrit poet notes that Śiva, who shares half of his body with Pārvatī in his androgynous form, is never left by her, “for though she draws away in fear, she is bound to the dexter part, which ever draws her back.” The poet Kālidāsa writes that the combination of love and fear in Pārvatī on the wedding night aroused Śiva’s desire, and in the Śiva-Purāṇa it is said that Śiva teased his wife by disappearing and then suddenly embracing her, frightening her.

In many of these episodes of love and fear, the third eye plays an important dual function. This is clearly illustrated by a poem in which desire masquerades as fear (reference is made to the snakes which adorn Śiva and the river Ganges which flows through his hair, as well as to the third eye):

“Whence comes this perspiration, love?”
“From the fire of your eye”
“Then why this trembling, fair-faced one?”
“I fear the serpent prince.”
“But still, the thrill that rise on your flesh?”
“Is from the Ganges’ spray, my lord.”
May Gaurī’s [Pārvatī’s] hiding thus her heart for long be your protection.

A similar juxtaposition is at the heart of a Tamil song in praise of Śiva; in it, “the mother is apparently perturbed that the daughter has lost her heart to a weird character like Śiva; yet her catalogue of his qualities bring [sic] out his unique greatness”

What mad you fall in love with him [Śiva]?
Was it for .. the moon in his locks and the blazing eye in his forehead?
Or for killing Kāma (god of love), or for swallowing poison?

18. Śiva Purāṇa 2. 2. 21. 19.
19. Subhāṣītaratnakośa 75, translated by Ingalls, op. cit.
... Or the deeds he wrought or his lovesports?
What made you fall in love?

As the poem implies, Parvati loves Śiva not in spite of his ascetic accoutrements and the ascetic eye in his forehead, but because of these qualities; she loves him because they make him unique among the gods, and because in his ascetic powers there is implicit great erotic power.

In Kālidāsa’s description of the wedding night of Śiva and Parvati, the third eye is put to striking erotic uses, arousing in Parvati the very desire that it had formerly destroyed incarnate:

> When her silken gowns were drawn away for love-making,
> Parvati covered with her hands
> the eyes of the trident-wielding god,
> but, to her dismay, her efforts were in vain,
> for Śiva gazed at her
> with the eye in his forehead...
> When Śiva’s forehead eye was blinded
> by the perfumed powder from her hair loosened by kisses,
> he would place it in
> the lotus-fragrant breezes from her mouth.

**IV. The Erotic Origin of the third eye.**

The erotic uses of the third eye are supported by its various erotic origins as described in several myths. The Vedic god Indra, from whom Śiva derives many of his myths and symbols, sprouted a thousand eyes in order to see more of Tilottamā, the beautiful apsaras, or celestial nymph; and at the same time, Śiva became four-faced in order to see her, just as he becomes three-eyed to see Parvati on the wedding night. In addition to this explicit connection, Śiva’s third eye is assimilated to the thousand eyes of

---

20. This song appears in the program of a performance by Balasarasvati at the New Empire Theatre in Calcutta, on February 5, 1964; the Tamil text is included in the program, and is probably from the 19th century, but I have not yet been able to trace it.


Indra by the *Bṛhadāraṇyak* reference to Indra’s third eye\(^{21}\) and by the Brāhmaṇa verse which describes Rudra (Śiva) as having a thousand eyes.\(^{24}\) One version of the Tilottamā story omits Indra but is still more closely related to the origin of Śiva’s third eye:

Brahmā created Tilottamā, an *apsara* so beautiful that she aroused even Brahmā himself. He sent her to Mount Kailāsa to bow to Śiva. Śiva saw her but did not dare to look carefully at her, for Pārvatī was there by his side and he was afraid of her. As Tilottamā walked around Śiva, in obeisance, Śiva made a head facing in each direction. Then the sage Nārada said to Pārvatī, “Look what a despicable thing your husband has done. You will be laughed at by all the wives of the gods when they know that Śiva is attracted to another woman.” Then Pārvatī was angry and covered up Śiva’s eyes. Darkness came over the world, and the mountains were shattered, and the oceans left their beds; it was like doomsday. Nārada was afraid, and he said, “Release Śiva’s eyes now or everything will be destroyed.” Yet Pārvatī did not uncover the eyes, and so, out of pity for the world and in order to protect it, Śiva made an eye in his forehead.\(^{25}\)

This myth combines two versions of the origin of the eye: one from the desire to see Tilottamā and one from the touch of Pārvatī’s hands. That the latter is also a direct cause of the creation of the eye—and that it is an erotic cause—is made clear by yet another myth:

Formerly on Mount Madana, in playful jest, Pārvatī covered Śiva’s (two) eyes with her lovely hands. When his (three) eyes were covered, great darkness arose [commentator: because Śiva’s three eyes are the moon, sun, and fire], and from the touch of her hand Śiva’s water of passion [madām-

---


bhak; commentator: sweat] was shed A drop of it fell into the fire [commentator: of Śiva’s third eye] on the forehead, and it became heated. From it an embryo appeared, laughing and dancing. Śiva asked Pārvatī to release his (three) eyes; she released his (two) eyes and the light shone forth again. But the child was blind, because of the darkness in which he had been conceived, and so he was called Andhaka, the blind one.26

The myth is imperfectly adapted from an earlier version in the Mahābhārata,27 and it retains certain inconsistencies. Pārvatī covers only two eyes, as in the first version, but where the latter describes Śiva’s creation of a third eye of fire to dispel the darkness, the Purāṇa omits to do so and yet refers to the third eye, by which it explains the birth of the child. This confusion is heightened by the natural tendency to refer to eyes in the dual, in spite of the fact that Śiva must be three-eyed by the end of the myth. The confusion extends to the blindness of Andhaka, who, in some versions, is said to be “blind” because of his own lust, rather than because of the lust associated with his birth.28

V. The Wedding Transformation of the third eye.

Many of the myths of the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī ignore these secondary connotations of the third eye and begin from the superficial premise of its anti-eroticism. In these myths, Śiva wishes to change from his ascetic to his erotic aspect in order to marry, and so he changes his ornaments into the conventional ones with which they are usually compared. Thus all the serpents that adorn his body become gold bracelets; his matted locks become an elaborate coiffure; his tiger skin becomes an embroi
dered silk garment, and the funeral ashes on his body turn into perfumed sandalwood paste; by Śiva’s wish, all his ascetic adornments become conventional ornaments (yathāyogyam).29 And, in

26. Śiva Purāṇa 2.5.42. 15-22; Śiva Purāṇa, ed. by Rājarāma Ganeśa Bođasa, with commentaries (Bomcay: Ganpat Krishnaji Press, 1884 [cited by Sañhītī name]), Dharmasamhitā 4. 4-10.
29. Śiva Purāṇa 2.2.18.28; Śiva Purāṇa, Jñānasamhitā, 16.4.
particular, he becomes two-eyed, or the third eye in his forehead becomes a fabulous gem or a tilaka (an auspicious mark painted in vermillion on the forehead).

This process is a transformation, not a replacement; when the Mothers laid out ornaments suitable for marriage Śiva rejected them, and his own apparel underwent a change, becoming suitable for a bridegroom:

The eye that blazed in the middle of his forehead, its pupil red and yellow from the fire within, performed the office of a tilaka made of golden pigment.

Śiva transforms himself in this way not for the sake of his bride, who would accept him anyway, but for the representative of the conventional world, his mother-in-law, Menā. First, in order to destroy her bride, he reveals himself in his three-eyed form: then, when she is suitably humbled, he reappears in glorious but conventional form, and Menā rejoices to see him. Brahma states the reason for this transformation when he approaches Śiva before the wedding and says:

"Śiva, this is your highest form, beloved of yogins, your form that is streaked with ashes, four-armed. You should reabsorb this form and assume a lovelier, gentler one, so that your father and mother-in-law will rejoice to see how handsome you are, and so that no woman will be frightened of you." Then Śiva assumed an anthropomorphic form, with two arms.

Similarly, the Mothers at the wedding urge him to behave like a handsome young lover in order to please Menā.

Often, Śiva appears with both traditional and ascetic garments in order to please the different levels of his worshipers. When he comes to visit Himālaya, the father of Pārvatī, he appears

31. Kumārasambhava 7.33; cf. Śiva Purāṇa, Jāṇasamhitā, 16. 5.
32. Śiva Purāṇa 2.3. 43-46; Śiva Purāṇa, Jāṇasamhitā, 18. 17-31.
34. Śiva Purāṇa 2.3. 50.35.
with three eyes; but when Menā enters, he appears to her with a pair of lotus eyes. In another text, Brahmā again convinces Śiva to change his form for the sake of the Goddess, and he changes him into a second Kāma.

When Brahmā saw the beauty of the Goddess he thought: "A woman should not reign alone. Only Śiva can be her husband, but he has three eyes. She who is so auspicious must somehow choose him even though he is inauspicious." Then Śiva appeared before Brahmā with a divine body and divine garments, with beauty great enough to enchant the universe. Brahmā thought him a suitable husband for the Goddess; she saw Śiva and thought him to be Kāma incarnate, and she was overcome with desire for him.

Yet, from the more devout viewpoint, ornaments of Śiva are considered superior rather than inferior to the conventional ones. Although Śiva must actually transform his horrible adornments into their beautiful counterparts before the ordinary worshipper will accept him, Pārvatī rejoices even at the first frightening description of him, for she sees him in his true form from the beginning. The Hindu view of eroticism and the ascetic tradition which Pārvatī herself embraces—for she lays aside her own royal jewels and wears the bark garments of the female ascetic in order to win the love of Śiva—combine to depict the ascetic costume as more erotic than the conventional one. She accepts the third eye of Śiva not because it is like a tilaka or a fabulous gem in a diadem, but because a god who has an eye in his forehead is far more wonderful than one who wears ordinary jewels, and in her eyes the eventual transformation is no more than a revelation of what she had seen all along.

VI. The third eye—untransformed.

In this way, several of the Purāṇas describe the "transformation" from her point of view; the objects are not changed into

37. Śiva Purāṇa 2.3.45. 3-7.
38. Śiva Purāṇa 2.3.8.13.
their conventional counterparts, but are rather considered to substitute for them as they are:

The Seven Mothers came to adorn Śiva in the conventional way (yāthāyogayam). But how can anything be done for one who is perfect? Śiva’s own natural garb [svabhāvaka vēlo] became a kind of adornment. The third eye was a lovely tilaka. By Śiva’s power, all his natural [prāktā] qualities were transformed. It is difficult to describe the beauty of such a form.39

The commentator on these verses (like the author of a second version40) sees—wrongly, I think—an actual and therefore far less marvellous transformation: “The third eye became a tilaka.” He reads “conventional” (lauktikam) for “natural,” and interprets the transformation as one from the common to the royal rather than from the royal to the magical, as the primary Purāṇa version itself describes it. Other texts substantiate the point of view that the ornaments remain unchanged: Śiva appears three-eyed, lovely in all his limbs;41 at the wedding, the sun, moon, and fire shine forth from his three eyes.42 Here, as in Kālidāsa’s description, Śiva rejects the conventional ornaments offered to him and adorns himself only with his ascetic qualities.

For Pārvatī, who loves him as he is, this is entirely sufficient. Similarly, the manner in which true love or insight “transforms” the horrible ornaments even while they remain unchanged is illustrated by two verses which describe the baby Skanda playing with his father, Śiva. Here the strangeness and terror of Śiva lend a striking contrast to the air of tenderness, playfulness, and humor which, though bordering on the grotesque in Western eyes, do not jar the Indian sense of affection or devotion:

May Guha [Skanda] save you from misfortune,
who rolls at will upon his father’s chest
until his limbs are whitened from the funeral ash;
who from the headdress then dives deep into the Ganges.

39. Śiva Purāṇa Jānasaṃph t2, 16. 3-8.
40. Śiva Purāṇa 2.3.39.36-42.
41. Śiva Purāṇa 2.2.17.4.
42. Padma Purāṇa (Ānandaśrama Sanskrit Series 131, 1893) 5.40.435,
Matsya Purāṇa (Ānandaśrama Sanskrit Series 54, 1907) 154.441.
at the coldness of whose stream he cries aloud,
till trembling and with chattering teeth
he holds his hands before the blazing eye.
. . . Thinking the forehead- eye a lotus flower,
he tries to pry it open
May Skanda thus intent on play
within his father's arms protect you.

The eye itself is ambiguous; the Śiva Purāṇa describes how, after burning Kāma to ashes with his fiery glance, Śiva then revived him by gazing upon him with his Soma glance, the glance made of the elixir of immortality. These and many other overtones of the third eye all play a part in the mythology of Śiva. The interrelationship of these aspects is beautifully expressed by a verse in the Skanda Purāṇa:

May the three eyes of Śiva protect you
when at the time of his meditation they are divided into three moods:

one is closed in yogic meditation;
the second, however, lusts greatly
while looking at the hips and breasts of Pārvatī;
and the third blazes with the fire of anger against Kāma,
who has thrown his bow far away

Summary

The third eye of Śiva is the emblem of his ascetic power; flames issue forth from it to destroy Kāma, the god of desire. Yet throughout the mythology of the purāṇas this eye appears in erotic contexts, serves erotic purposes, and has various erotic origins. At the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī it is described by certain texts as having been transformed into a tilaka; other versions of this myth state rather that, unchanged, it served as a tilaka. In this way, various connotations—some of them apparently contradictory—are seen to be symbolized by the third eye.

43. Subhūtitaratnakosā 91, translated by Ingalls, op. cit.
44. Subhūtitaratnakosā 92, translated by Ingalls, op. cit.
45. Śiva Purāṇa 2.3.51.14.
46. Skanda Purāṇa 5.3,150.18,
A PAURÄNIC ICONOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT OF
THE IMAGE OF SARASVATI

BY

MOHD. ISRAIL KHAN

[ लेखेदैलमू चर्चन्त्रा बैवळभेतायाः: प्रतिमानिम्नांविनिष्कांतप्रकृतियांकाळस्थः यदृ राजाँकं वर्णनमुपलयते तस्य सर्वैःकं वितेसनं इत्यं वर्ते तत्त्वा। छूक्षणवियांना नीः, ब्राह्मणाशेषो वाकः, पुराणाशे देवो, इत्यं सरस्वतीपदस्थेयकार्यपर्यथा। गुरुरोधेत्वेर तत्त्वांत्यायः स्वरूपकारादानं च वितेस्वर्गमनमुपलयते। यथा प्रतिष्ठा।

पुराणां (वि. ४६-५५)। महामेघां (भ. २५५-२६)। विष्णुमहात्मां पुराणां (भ. ३ ो ४) देवानां प्रतिमायाः निहृत्यं हंसतमित।

महामेघां (२६०-४६) ब्रह्मण: प्रतिमायाः पारं च सरस्वतीब्रह्मण: प्रतिमाम् रेखिविषु च च च। यथादि।

पुराणांत्यायांमनांस्यां: पारं शिल्पकारादानं वर्णितथेते इत्यादि सोवाहुरगतं निरङ्कत वर्तेत। प्रतिमानिनित्यविचारां तेनां प्रौढ़ग्रंवतः प्रतिमायां इति पुराणां: परिश्रममपर्यथ निष्ठित।

एवं चामुन्त्रविचं च नित्यप्रतिमायां यानमा प्रमाणितं निष्ठितप्रतिमायां सरस्वतीपदार्थां भूगोलविचाराः।

In the *Rgveda*, there are many references which beyond doubt of shadow, prove Sarasvati to be a river. In the *Brahmaṇas*,

1. Cf. RV. I. 3.12, II 41.16, III 23.4; V. 42.12, 43.11; VI. 52.8, VII. 36.6, 96. 1-2; VIII. 21. 17-18, 54.4; X. 17.7, 64.9, 75.5 etc.
we find her identified with speech completely ‘vāg vai sarasvatī’ But a landmark in development has been paved towards the iconographical character of the goddess in her entering the Purānic era. It is the Purāṇas which at first have anthropomorphised her to the fullest extent and offer to us several iconographical references to her. In the following, it is observed in detail.

1. The prescription for the Image of Sarasvatī:

Among the Purāṇas the Agni, Matsya and Viṣṇudharmottara in particular deal with this prominently. The Agni Purāṇa spares its chapters 49-55 on laying down the prescriptions for the images of the various gods and goddesses. In its chapter 49 while describing the image of Brahmā, it lays down that the image of Sarasvatī and Sāvitri should be respectively at the left and right sides of the Brahmā’s image ‘āhyasthālī Sarasvatī Sāvitri vāmadaksīpe.’

Like the Agni-Purāṇa, the Matsya-Purāṇa maintains the same formula; and for it, it devotes chapters 258-64. Like the Agni-Purāṇa, it prescribes how the image of Sarasvatī and Sāvitri should be made with Brahmā. It goes on saying that Brahmāṇī (Sarasvatī as either wife or daughter of Brahmā) should be made like Brahmā in all respects to his recognition of iconic features—‘brahmāṇī brahmasaḍṛṣṭā.’ As to the image of Brahmā, it says that it should be made of four heads and there should a water-vessel (kamaṇḍalu) in one of his hands. He should be made riding a swan or seated on a lotus. The image should have a site for oblations of ghee. It should have the four Vedas to its right. To

1. Cf. Śat. Br. II. 54.6; III. 14.9, 14, 9.1.7, 9; IV. 2.5.14, 6.33; V. 2.2.13, 14, 3.4.3, 5.4.16; VII. 5.1.31; IX. 3.4.17; XIII. 1.8.5; XIV. 2.1.12.
Taṇṭ. Br. I. 3.4.5, 8.5.6; III. 8.11.2.
Ait. Br. II. 24, 3.1-2, 37, 6.7.
Tāṇḍ. Br. XVI.5.16.
Goṇ. Br. II. 1.20
Śān. Br. V. 2, XII. 8; XIV 4.

2. AP. 49.15.

3. MP. 261 24.

4. MP. 260.40.
its left there should be the image of Sāvitrī and to right that of Sarasvatī.\(^1\)

Like the Agni and Matsya Purāṇas, the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa spares its Third Khaṇḍa exclusively for iconic description. In Adhyāya 44 of this Purāṇa, Brahmā has been pictured as sitting in the lotus-posture (Padmāsana) and has Sāvitrī placed on his left lap.\(^2\) The striking feature of this description is the absence of Sarasvatī who has been represented with Sāvitrī by the Agni as well as the Matsya-Purāṇa.

There remains not only a mere Purānic theory, but it has also taken econographical form. The dual image of Brahmā and Sarasvatī found in the Mathura Sculpture, shows partial acceptance of the formulas laid down by the Purāṇas\(^3\)—partial, because sometimes the Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa has been followed in depicting only Sāvitrī with Brahmā. But such distinction does not always prevail. An obvious attempt has been made at wiping out a distinction and the two goddesses are given their proper places by depicting both of them with Brahmā. This feature is available in some of the famous sculptures like "Mīrpur Khas in Sindha"\(^4\) and "the early Chola and late Hoysala Schools".\(^5\)

Besides, the Purāṇas themselves let us believe that in the Purānic age, the theory of image-making had already been put into practice. This is evident from the following instances. Once the king Ambuvīci, after having known the great powers of Sarasvatī, had a great regard in his heart for her and consequently, taking the clay out of the Sarasvatī river, made an earthen image (Pratimā) of her.\(^6\) Similarly in the Vāmana-Purāṇa, Sarasvatī has been said to

---

1. *MP.* 260.44.

"प्राज्यस्वाली ्त्र्येवत्वाश्चेव बेदाश्र चतुरः पुनः।

बांपत्वेक्ष्य सावित्री दक्षिणो च सरस्वतीम्॥


6. *SkP.* VI. 46. 16-17.
have been installed in the form of linga at the Sthāṇu-tīrtha by Śiva himself.¹ These instances will suffice to lead us to assume that in the Purāṇic age, we find not only allusions to the iconic features of various gods and goddesses, but we also witness that these were, by and by, translated into real iconography.

2. The Face

In iconography face attains very great importance. It is this alone through which the whole image is measured out. According to the Mānasāra, the image of Sarasvatī should be made in accordance with the daśatāla system — "sarasvatīm ca sāvitrīm daśatālen karyet".² The daśatāla system is taken to be the supreme one among tālamānas—Navatāla, Aṣṭatāla, Saptatāla, etc., and according to all these measurement systems, the whole image (Pratīmā) should be ten times the face. This daśatāla system is again divided into the three categories according to its height giving the measurement the various names such as Uttama, Madhyama and Adhama daśatālas. As per rule, the largest daśatāla system divides the whole length of the image into 124 proportionally equal parts, the Madhyama into 120 and Adhama into 116.³ The method of making the face is detailed in the same Śilpaśāstra.⁴ The three varieties of daśatāla system have fully been discussed by Śrī Kumāra in the Śilparatna⁵. As regards the measurement of aṅgulas, a detailed description is given in the Mānasāra-Śilpaśāstra by Prasanna kumar Acharya.⁶

---

¹ Vān. P. S. M. 194
² Mān. AS. 54. 19.
³ Prasanna Kumar Acharya, Indian Architecture according to Mānasāra-Śilpaśāstra, (New York, 1927), pp. 78, 123.
⁴ Ibid., p. 84.
⁵ Śil. R. 5.1–114. ¹; 6.1–11. ¹; 7.1–42. ¹.
⁶ Prasanna Kumar Acharya, A Summary of the Mānasara (A paper submitted to the Lieden University for Ph.D. Degree), p. 35. The paramāṇu or atom is the smallest unit of measurement.

8 Paramāṇu = 1 rathadhūli (lit. car-dust).
8 Rathadhūlīs = 1 bālāgra (lit. hair’s end).
This is the detailed description of the face which has a impressive recognition in iconography. But so far as the Purâṇas are concerned, they actually do not go such a farther extent in connection with the face of a deity. While describing the face of Goddess Sarasvatī, they vary to a great extent. Like her father Brahmā, she is often mentioned as having up to five faces. According to the Matyā-Purāṇa\(^1\), like Brahmā, Brahmāṇī should have four faces. Similarly in the Vāyu-Purāṇa, she is described as having four heads.\(^2\) According to the Viśnuḥdarmottara-Purāṇa, Sarasvatī has only one face.\(^3\)

Śrī Sūtradhāra Maṇḍana in his Rāpamaṇḍana, has described forms of Sarasvatī, namely Mahāvidyā and Sarasvatī. There Mahāvidyā is said to have one face (Ekavaktra)\(^4\). Moreover, like Brahma, Sarasvatī has also been depicted to have five faces. In this form she has been named “Śaradā”\(^5\).

Sarasvatī in Buddhism has some features similar and some dissimilar those of Brahmanic Sarasvatī while describing the farmer’s iconic character, it is emphasised that she may have either one or three faces.\(^6\) Like her, Vajrasarasvatī has also three faces ‘Vajrasarasvatīṃ Śrīmukhāṃ’\(^7\)

---

8 Bālāgras = 1 likṣā (lit. a nit).
8 Likṣās = 1 Yūkṣa (lit. a lause).
8 Yūkṣas = 1 Yava (lit. a barley corn).
8 Yavas = 1 aṅgulas (lit. finger’s breadth).

Three kinds of aṅgulas are distinguished by the largest of which is made of 8 Yavas, the intermediate of 7 Yavas, and the smallest one of 6 Yavas.”

---

1. MP. 261. 24.
2. VP. 23.50.
3. “‘शैशा भवली देवी तत्प्रूति: सत्यन्वेषः।
चतुर्मुखी जगद्योगिनः प्रकृतिपू: प्रकृतिलिङ्गः।’”
8. Śadh M. 163.
3. The Implication of the Faces.

Now the implication of one and four faces are to be seen. It is held that her face represents either Sāvitri or Gāyatrī. At one place in the Ṛgveda, Sarasvatī is called ‘Saptasvaśa’ having the seven metres as her sisters where Gāyatrī is chief among them. All these metres separately or jointly symbolize not only the metres of the Veda, but actually they may be taken as symbolizing the Veda as a whole. This sense of one face of Sarasvatī tally with the fact that Vāk is said to have been issued from Brahmā’s mouth. This Vāk may be said as symbolizing the Veda; and Sarasvatī, who is prominently described in the Purāṇas as Vāk or Vāgdevī or the presiding deity of speech, may be said as having embodied Veda herself. Similarly the four faces of hers may also be taken as symbolising the four Vedas in the same way as the four faces of Brahmā represent the four Vedas.

In the Purāṇas, it is widely held that Brahmā has created the whole universe. For this creation, he had a pre-planning through his mind or intellect. This mind or intellect is nothing but the Veda itself which bears the cosmic feature endowed with four-fold nature. This sense goes to the four Vedas and mind can be replaced by the four-fold nature or creation. So the four faces of Brahmā imply the four Vedas. Similarly the four faces of Sarasvatī undoubtedly stand for the same fact, for she also is said as creating the universe.

So far as the three faces are concerned, they may be taken as implying the three principal Vedas—Ṛgveda, Yajurveda and Śāmaaveda exclusive Atharvaveda which is supposed to be a later compendium. That is why she is called ‘Trayī Vidya’ representing these three Vedas. She in fact represents all the Vidya—namely

2. RV. VI. 61.10.
4. Dr. Priyabala Shah, op. cit., p. 140.
Yajñavidyā, Mahāvidyā, Guhyavidyā, Ātmavidyā, Ānvikṣikī, Trayī, Vārtā and Daṇḍanīti

The conception of the five faces of Sarasvatī may be extended to the five Vedas in which Nāyāśāstra is included according to the new conception of the fifth Veda. Perhaps it has been reckoned so, because it embraces all the branches of arts and sciences. So this fifth Veda may be said to represent one of the faces of Sarasvatī obviously with the fact that she (Sarasvatī) is also said to represent the various arts and sciences and, therefore, appropriately is called sarvasangītasthānātālaśākāraṇārūpini.

4. The number of her hands and the objects held by them.

The number of hands of Sarasvatī differs from place to place in the Purāṇas. It is really very interesting to take them all into account. In the Purāṇas, Sarasvatī is mostly alluded to as having four hands. But by some of her Purānic epithets like Viṇāpustakadhāriṇī, she seems to have two hands having a lute (Viṇā) and a book (Pustaka). The Matriya-Purāṇa, while prescribing certain rules for making the images of the various gods and goddesses states that Sarasvatī like Brahmā, should be made as having four hands. Like the Matriya, the Agni-Purāṇa also prescribes that the image of goddess Sarasvatī should be made as having a book (Pustaka), a rosary (Aṃśāmāla), a lute (Viṇā) and a water-vessel (Kumbhābja) in her respective hands.

In the Viśnudharmottara-Purāṇa, as in the other Purāṇas, a number of references puts forth her iconic character. At one place, she is described as having four hands. In her two right hands, she holds a book and a rosary, while in her two left hands she bears a water-vessel and a lute. Elsewhere also she is pictured

4. BVP. II. 1.84.
5. BVP. II. 1. 35, 2. 55.
6. MP. 261.24
7. AP. 50. 16.
8. Dr. Priyabala Shah, op. cit., p. 225
as having four hands, but the order of the emblems held in the right and the left hands differs. In the latter case, Sarasvatī is depicted as having a rosary and a trident in her two right hands and a book and a water-vessel in her left hands. Thus Trident has been given in the place of lute (Viṣṇa). At another place, she is mentioned as usual to have a book and a rosary in her right hands and ‘Vaiṣṇavi’ and a water-vessel in her left hands. The word ‘Vaiṣṇavi’ has been read by Dr. Kramrisch as ‘Vaiṣṇavī’ and by Dr. Priyabala Shah as the staff of Viṣṇa made of bamboo.

Besides, Sarasvatī has been reckoned one of the five Prakṛtis. The Vaiṣṇa-Purāṇa while describing her as the Prakṛti Gau, presents her as having four mouths, four horns, four teeth, four eyes and four hands. Since she herself is the prakṛti gau, all the animals are born under her impression as four-footed and four-breasted.

In the Skanda-Purāṇa, an earthen image is said to have been made by the king Ambuvici. That image is described to have four hands with a lotus, rosary, water-vessel and a book in the respective hands. This shows the fulfilment of the rules laid down by the Purāṇas, according to which the image of goddess Sarasvatī would have been made.

In Jainism, most of the Vidyādevīs are four-handed; while in Buddhism, the case differs. The Buddhistic Sarasvatī is said to have either two arms or six arms, and in case she is two armed,

1. Ibid., p. 327.
2. Ibid., p. 154.
3. Ibid., p. 154. f.n. 1.
4. Ibid., p. 154 c. “The word Vaiṣṇavi requires some classification. I have amended the reading Vaiṣṇavi into Viṣṇava because Sarasvatī is traditionally known to carry Viṣṇa and not a flute of bamboo which is the usual meaning of the word Vaiṣṇavi. On further, however, I find that it is not necessary to change the reading into Vaiṣṇava because, the word Vaiṣṇavi does not mean Viṣṇa. It indicates the staff of Viṣṇa which must have been made of bamboo as in the case of the present ‘Ekatira’
5. BVP. II. 1. 1 ff.
6. VP. 23. 44-45.
7. VP. 23. 88.
8. SKP. VI 46. 16-19,
she has her four forms under different names. She is also said to have eight and even ten arms.

5. The implication of the objects held in the hands

The four arms of Sarasvatī, like her four faces, represent the four Vedas, and Kāmaṇḍalu represents, the nector of all Śāstras. Since she symbolises the entire knowledge she symbolises all the Śāstras, too. She holds a book in one of her hands and this also conveys the same sense. The Skanda-Purāṇa VI. 46. 19, while defining the book in one of the hands of Sarasvatī says ‘pustakam ca tathā vāme sarvavidyāsamudbhavam.’ Since other concepts of Sarasvatī have developed from her watery form, e.g. Sarasvatī as a river, it is also maintained that Sarasvatī has created all the tanmātrās which are but essential for the creation of the Universe and of which water is one. As prakṛti, she is advocated to have created the Universe. The water is fundamentally necessary for this purpose. It is, perhaps, for this reason that she has water in her water-vessel and thus by it, she, perhaps, also denotes her earliest association with water. This water may not be thought of an ordinary type. It is divine (divya) and it is only in this capacity that it may be thought to have been kept in the water-vessel of Sarasvatī.

Similarly the lute (Vīnā) held by Sarasvatī is also not less important. It is held that the lute represents a kind of achievement or proficiency. This close relation of the lute and the book cannot be ignored. Sarasvatī, no doubt, represents the principles of speech and for this very reason, she has been identified with speech (vāg vai sarvasvatī) in the Brāhmaṇas. Now, this speech can

5. Ibid., p. 185.
6. Ibid., p. 186.
9. cf. BVP. II. 1. 1. ff.
10. SKP. VI. 46. 19.
reasonably be divided into sound (dhwani) and word (pada, vākya etc.,). The book in the hand of Sarasvatī may also be taken to represent besides what is said above, the second element while the lute in her hand represents the first element. Only the lute, and no other musical instrument has been described in the hand of the goddess. The lute is the most ancient musical instrument and finds mention in the Atāreya Ārānyaka. Melody helps mental concentration. The lute is the best instrument resorted to for this purpose, because it is highly useful for producing Soma song.¹ Moreover the goddess is said to have a rosary in one of her hands. This rosary in the hand of the goddess usually represents Time.²

Abbreviations

Ait. Br. Aitareya-Bṛāhmaṇa
A P. Agni-Purāṇa
Bṛ. P. Brahmavaivarta-Purāṇa
Bṛāh. P. Bhāgavata-Purāṇa
D. Bhā. Devī Bhāgavata-Purāṇa
Gop. Br. Gopatha-Bṛāhmaṇa
M P. Matsya-Purāṇa
Mān. Ā S. Mānasāra on Architecture and Sculpture
Nāt. Ś. Nātya-Śāstra
Pd. P. Padma-Purāṇa
R. V. Ṛgveda
Śat. Br. Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa
Śāń. Br. Śāńkhāyana-Bṛāhmaṇa
Sādh. M. Śādhana-Māla
Śil. R. Śilparatna
Sk P. Skanda-Purāṇa
Taitt. Br. Taittirīya-Bṛāhmaṇa
Tāṇḍ. Br. Tāṇḍya-Bṛāhmaṇa
V. P. Vāyu-Purāṇa
Vām. P. Vāmana-Purāṇa
Vāik. R. Vaikṛtā-Rahasya
Viś. P. Viśṇu-Purāṇa

¹ cf. D. Bhā. III. 30. 2.
² Dr. Priyabala Shah, op. cit., p. 185.
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Although the Padma-purāṇa in its entirety has been printed and published by five different scholars, yet the conclusion is irresistible that it has never been critically edited. It is a voluminous work consisting of extensive parts called Khāṇḍas which are five in number in the Bengal recension, i.e. Srīsī, Bhūmī, Svarga, Pātāla and Uttara and six in Devanāgarī recension which replaces the Svarga by Ādi (called Svarga in the Veṅkāṭēśvara Press edition) and Brahma. But although it has been published more than once, none represents the proper Bengal recension of it. There are reasons to believe that the Bengal recension of the Padma-purāṇa had perhaps a distinct text of its own which was in course of time not traceable on account of the overwhelming superiority of its Devanāgarī counterparts. At present there are some chapters of some Khāṇḍas which distinguish the two recensions of it. But the Svarga-Khāṇḍa in its entirety stands an exception to it. Remaining completely unrecognised in the Devanāgarī recension of it, this Khāṇḍa is a distinct text of varied interest. Its main importance lies in the fact that it may or may not possibly be regarded as the source of Kālidāsa’s famous drama Abhijñānaśākuntalā. It is Prof. Winternitz who has first created interest in the minds of scholars with regard to the position and
importance of the Svarga-Khaṇḍa. He has remarked, "It will not be possible to decide the question of the source of Śakuntalā drama finally, as long as we do not possess a reliable text of the Padma-purāṇa and as long as it is not possible to make a thorough comparison of the two texts."

The Svarga-Khaṇḍa has never been published and so far as our information goes eight complete manuscripts of it are traceable. Of these, two belong to the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, one to the National Library, Calcutta, one to the Sahitya Parist Library, Calcutta, one to the Samskṛta Siksā Parist, Calcutta, one to the Dacca University Library, East Pakistan one to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the last to the Staatsbibliothek, Marburg, West Germany.

We have had the opportunity to examine all these manuscripts in details. But quite recently we have been able to secure another manuscript of the Svarga-Khaṇḍa which we have reasons to believe, decidedly preserves the older text. This was found in the private collections of Pandit Shyamacharan Kaviratna, Howrah. This is complete in 107 folios. But on account of the fault in numbering of some of the pages the last page is numbered 105 instead of 107. The error is first seen in page 22 where there is double numbering 22 and 20. Of these the latter was originally written but afterwards corrected as 22. Similar is the case with page 23 which bears an old but erroneous number 21. From this page no attempt has whatsoever been made to correct the numbering of the pages. This false numbering has been allowed to continue. It is all the more curious to note that the numbering of 38 is 36 as usual but there was another numbering of this page also which was 35 instead of 38. This numbering of 35 has been wiped out. From pages 93 to 107, there are always the double numbering one is from 91 to 105 the other is curiously one higher, i.e., from 92-106.

It is written on country made paper in Bengali character with nine lines (3+3+3) in each page. The page 105a, however, contains ten lines (3+4+3). Pages 47 and 76a also contain ten

---

1 We are grateful to Sri Balai Chandra Banerjee, Govt. Pleader, Howrah, who has kindly lent it to me for examination from the private collection of his grandfather, pandit Kaviratna.
lines but that extra line denotes entirely later additions. Its size is 16 2 × 5 2. It is in good condition. It begins with Om śrī śrī hariḥ' and its post colophon is as follows.

Yatnena likhitam grantham yaś corayati mānavaḥ/ mātā ca śūkṛī tasya pitā tasya ca gardabhāḥ/ śrīr-astu lekhake pāṭhake ca

Following are the grounds for considering it as preserving an earlier text

In addition to the Khāṇḍas already mentioned above, there are innumerable treatises which though being originally independent claim to be parts of the Padma-pūraṇa. It is due to the huge mass of it, the Vāyu-pūraṇa, Matsya-pūraṇa and some other Pūrāṇas state that the Padma-pūraṇa consists of 55000 ślokas. But a careful examination of the present Padma-pūraṇa shows that originally it consisted neither of such a huge bulk nor of distinct parts called Khāṇḍas. At one place in the Padma-pūraṇa it is found that the whole of the Padma-pūraṇa was spoken out by Marici for Vyāsa’s sake in five parts called pārvans. Of these five pārvans, the first dealt with the origin of Viśvā, the second dealt with all the planets and the mountains, continents and seven oceans, the third contained the accounts of those Kings who paid large amount of money as priestly fees, and also treated of the creation by Rudra and the curse of Dākṣa, the fourth dealt with the origin of Kings and with the history of all the royal families and the fifth treated of the nature of final liberation and the way of attaining it

That the Padma-pūraṇa in its earlier form with the Pārva division and with Brahmā and Marici as interlocutors, was a much shorter work is shown not only by the above quoted rendering of the verses in which the Padma-pūraṇa is said to have been spoken out briefly in five pārvans but also by the Agni-pūraṇa and the Bhūmi-Khāṇḍa of the present Padma-pūraṇa. The Agni-pūraṇa says (272,2).

Vaiśākhayām paurṇamāsīyām ca svargaṛthi jaladhenumata/ padmam dvādaśa-sahārasam jyaiśthe dacyāc ca dhenumat//

It is clear that it knows a Padma-pūraṇa consisting of 12000 verses. The Bhūmi-Khāṇḍa says that the Padma-pūraṇa consisted of 12000 verses in the Kaliyuga, that the entire Pūraṇa of 12000
verses would perish in the Kali age and that this work would again come into being for the first time in that age (Bhūmi-Khaṇḍa, 125. 43-45).

This fact that the Padma-pūrṇa was probably not such voluminous as it appears to be is also corroborated by the evidence of the Bengal manuscripts of the Uttara-Khaṇḍa, the necessary passages of which are as follows:

dvādaśātha sahasrāṇi pāṇḍāpahṛtiṇī vai/
kalau nāśam prayāsyanti prathamam dvijasattamah//
vīna dvādaśa sahasra padmānyapi mahāphalam/
kalau yuge pathisyanti pūrṇam padmasamjñakam//

It is to be noted that though the writer of these verses made an attempt to give the present amplified text of the Pādma-pūrṇa a garb of greater antiquity, he has not denied the loss of the 12000 ślokas belonging to this work.

So it is evident that the Pādma-Pūrṇa in its earlier form was much shorter and had its division known as the Parvans. We become all the more interested when we read and carefully examine this newly discovered manuscript. On two occasions its colophon distinctly mentions its Parva division, reads ‘ityādi mahāpurāṇe pādme tṛtiye parvāṇi svargakhaṇḍe sākuntele prathamo’ dhyāyah, and ‘iti śrīpadmapurāṇe tṛtiye parvāṇi svargakhaṇḍe anukrama-varṇanam nāmāstītrīpaṃ sattam’ dhyāyah. Not any of the eight manuscripts of the Svarga khaṇḍa mentioned above refers or seem to refer to the earlier division, i.e., Parva division of it. They all along in each of their colophons testify to the presence only of the Khaṇḍa division of it. This seems that this newly discovered manuscript is an older one.

Secondly, we have carefully calculated the total number of the verses of the Svargakhaṇḍa. Taking into consideration nineteen verses of the 20th chapter the bulk of which is written in prose, the total number of it is 2875. The variant of number of these ślokas is not more than 20 in all the cases. But the number of the ślokas in this manuscript is much more than its counterpart. There is no numbering of ślokas in each chapter; it may be nearing 2600. The contents of two entire chapters are conspicuous by their absence in it. These are no. 28 and no. 38. Thus while all other have 40 chapters, it has 38 chapters only. Besides these quite a
number of verses from different chapters of it are missing in this manuscript. This tends to suggest that this belongs to the comparatively early recension of the Padma-purāṇa which, as we have noticed above, consists of lesser number of verses.

Thirdly, a careful examination of the Svargakhanda shows that it has derived quite a large number of chapters and isolated verses from the Mahābhārata. The following short analysis will show the indebtedness of the writer of the Svargakhanda to the compiler of the Mahābhārata.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 67, Verses 1-22 = Svargakhanda,
Chapter I, verse 44-64

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 67, Verses 23-33 = Svargakhanda,
Chapter II, verses 1-14.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 68, Verses 18-80 = Svargakhanda,
Chapter III, verses 42-103.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 69, Verses 1-27 = Svargakhanda,
Chapter IV, verses 1-23.

Mahābhārata (Ādi), Chapter 69, Verses 38-49 = Svargakhanda,
Chapter VI, verses 1-12.

Mahābhārata (Āraṇyaka) Chapter 192
Verses 6-29
- do- Chapter 194 Verser 2-25
- do- Chapter 195 Verser 1-33
- do- Chapter 130 Verses 17-20 = Svargakhanda, Chapter XVIII, verses 2-43
- do- Chapter 131 Verses 1-30

Mahābhārata (Drona),
Chapter 173 verses 20-33 = Svargakhanda, Chapter XX, verses 2-15 (after 79 lines of prose begins the verse)

Mahābhārata (Āśvamedhika),
Chapter 5 Verses 3-26 = Svargakhanda, Chapter XIX, verses 2-53
Chapter 6 Verses 2-33
Mahābhārata Chapters 7 and 8 correspond to Chapter XX (including its prose portion)

| do | Chapter 9 | corresponds to Chapter XXI |
| do | Chapter 10 | corresponds to Chapter XXI |

It may be mentioned, however, that our manuscript in question is comparatively free from the influence of the Mahābhārata. At least at some places it uses comparatively less terms and terminologies, words and phrases of the Mahābhārata as compared to its eight other counterparts. A difference of it with other eight manuscripts so far as the Śakuntalā episode is concerned may be shown. It is needless to mention that all other eight manuscripts show much more remarkable affinity with the Mahābhārata than this one. The following chart will classify it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This manuscript</th>
<th>Mahābhārata and other manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46c sarvarājyam</td>
<td>sarvam rājyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54a dharma</td>
<td>dharmya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter II</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b āgamat</td>
<td>āśrayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d anindite</td>
<td>śakuntale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter III</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44a gūhayante</td>
<td>guhamānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46c kalpanam</td>
<td>kalyānam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57d ātmāpakārinā</td>
<td>ātmāpakārinā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61a cāsya</td>
<td>tasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65b saṁprati</td>
<td>saṁsadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73d priyānvitāḥ</td>
<td>śriyānvitāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a saṁvasantam</td>
<td>saṁsaratam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76b viṣayēsv</td>
<td>viṣameśv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77a saṁhitā</td>
<td>saṁsthitā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80d prāpa sa</td>
<td>prāpy eva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81d gharmātmā</td>
<td>gharmārtāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84b dharant-reṇu-luṇṭhitāḥ</td>
<td>reṇu-guṇṭhitāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88d-sūtaḥ</td>
<td>putraḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93a ya</td>
<td>mām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b-anyam</td>
<td>anyān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b satyāc ca</td>
<td>satyam ca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The twenty-eighth chapter which bears some ideas and passages similar to those of the Mahābhārata is conspicuous by its absence in it. This may lead to conclusion that in all probability it belongs to the earlier recension of the Padma-purāṇa which may not have copiously used the identical words, parts of sentence, and verses of the Mahābhārata. Its latter redactors in order to increase the bulk of it more for propagating their views have freely copied from the Mahābhārata—the ever-eternal fountain of Indian thoughts.

Fourthly, the colophons of all these eight manuscripts are all the same while those of this manuscript differs a bit from them. While all other manuscripts mention 'iti śrī-padma-purāṇe,' the colophons of this one runs as follows 'ityadi-mahāpurāṇe pādme' suggesting its inclusion in different type of recensions.

Fifthly it may be pointed out that while dealing with the Marutta-episode, this manuscript is bereft of nineteen verses where king Marutta glorifies Śiva in order to fetch gold by which he can perform his sacrifice. It is needless to mention that all other manuscripts contain it and the passages similar to it can also be found in the Mahābhārata VII 173. This suggests its antiquity as we know the latter redactors of the Śaiva sects took up the whole of this Khanda, nay the whole of the Padma-purāṇa, tried to wipe out its Vaiṣṇava influence and administer from place to place certain passages glorifying Śiva.

Sixthly, it is interesting to note that the first six chapters (leaving aside the beginning portion of, chapter I i. e., verses 1-43) of the Svarga-Khaṇḍa deal with the Śakuntalā-episode. Here the colophon of this manuscript varies with that of others. While others run as 'iti śrī-padma-purāṇe śākuntale' (ity-ādi-mahāpurāṇe' of course runs over through all the colophons). This shows a distinction of it—however minor may it be—with its counterparts.

Last but not the least, this is the only dated manuscript of the Svarga khaṇḍa while all other lack, and it shows that the scribe sends this work after completion to a King or Zamīndar through the hands of one Laksminarayan Chattoraj. It bears the date Śaka 1763 (1861 A. D.) The scribe was aware that this one was not similar to its other counterparts.
THE PURĀNIC THEORY OF
THE YUGAS AND KALPAS--A STUDY

BY

ANAND SWARUP GUPTA

[ भ्रमित निबन्धे युग-मन्भतर-कल्पादीना प्रमाण-संख्या-स्वरुपाणां मनुस्मृति-महाभारत-पुराण-यौतिरिवृट्य विवेचनं क्रमम्। भ्रम
बिद्वास्तत्सय विचये याकृतिकहृदयाशि क्रियैदु विचारीलसन क्रमः। गुरुदीना देववेंद्र मानं यौतिरिवद्धात् प्रसंशेतु पुराणोपु जैवोपुत्रंत्ये
इत्यविषये प्रकृतितरं मानं मानुषविवेकवादीविनिर्देशिणि प्रदेशिलमः।
सहलचतुर्युयादामिकः कलः इत्यविषये प्रकृतितरं मानं संयोगं भावं।
युग-मन्भतरं कलं इत्यविषये मानं संयोगं गणना तु प्रायः पराशिको, सा चापि
यातिस-विद्वास्तत्सयावर्। पुराणादृस्तेश्वर युक्तिसंधात्तात्वस्तेश्वर च
बलुकं मन्भतर-कल्पमानस्य तुलनास्तकी विचारोपयो क्रमः।
यौतिरिव पुराणादित-प्राचीनमात्तात्सररे कलस्य मानं प्रदश्यं तदनुसारे युगित्रिय
उत्तत्त्वं वर्तमानं काल-मानं दस्त्तं, प्राकृतिक सुमां-विद्वासित्रियाशि
पुराणादृस्तेश्वर बलुकं मानस्य विचारोपयो क्रमानां तपातीको तालिकायथा प्रदेशाः।]

The Purāṇas have given the long computations of the Yugas and
the Kalpas, in which they have divided the duration of the
Universe (Brahmāṇḍa) both in its manifest and semi-manifest
forms. The Purāṇas have conceived the Time or Kāla as begin-
ningless and endless, and so there is no break in the order of the
creation, preservation and dissolution of the Universe, in other
words, there is no break in the continuity of the universe in some
form or the other; for, even in the Pralaya the universe is not totally
destroyed, but merges into its unmanifest cause from which it
emerged at the time of its creation, as says the Gītā—

अन्यकालोऽनि भूलानि व्यक्तमध्यानि भारत।
अन्यकालिष्टतयेव तत्र का परिवेशन। (2.28)

(Being are unmanifest in their origin, manifest in the interval,
and unmanifest in their end). The Visṇu Purāṇa puts this Purānic
truth of the continuity of the creation, preservation and dissolution of the universe in clear words:

अनादिकालाणां काले नान्दोदय द्वितिबिवते ||
अवयुक्तिःवास्तवस्य सम्प्रिष्ठितस्याध्ययः ||

(Vis.-P, I 2 26)

Thus the creation, preservation and dissolution (Srṣṭi, Sthiti and Pralaya) go on taking place after each other in the fixed order and after fixed intervals like the day and night.

The Purāṇas call the duration of the Universe in its manifest form (i.e. the time of its creation and preservation, or its Srṣṭi-kāla and Sthiti-kāla) as a Kalpa which is regarded as the Day of Brahmā, the Creator, on the analogy of the day of man when he is active.

A Kalpa has been divided into 14 Manvantaras, and each Manvantara into 71 Catur-Yugas (a term generally used in the Purāṇas) or Daiva-Yugas (a term used in the Manu-Smṛti) or Mahāyugas (a term generally found used in the astronomical works). Each Mahāyuga consists of four Yugas, viz. Kṛṣṭa-Yuga, (or Satya-Yuga), Tretā-Yuga, Dvāpara-Yuga and Kali-Yuga, of descending duration of the ratio of 4:3:2:1. Thus, the Kṛṣṭa-Yuga is of 4,000 divine years with a Sandhyā of 400 divine years in the beginning and a Sandhyā of the similar length at the end, the Tretā-Yuga is of 3,000 divine years with a Santhu and a Sandhyā of 300 divine years each, the Dvāpara-Yuga of 2,000 divine years with a Sandhyā and Sandhyā of 200 divine years each and the Kaliyuga of 1000 divine years with a Sandhyā and a Sandhyā of 100 divine years each. All these four Yugas (with their durations in the descending order, i.e. of 4000+400+400, 3000+300+300, 2000+200+200, 1000+100+100 divine years) make a Mahā-yuga of 12,000 divine years, each divine year being equal to 360 human years.

This computation of the length of the four Yugas has been considered by some modern scholars as ‘purely hypothetical’1, ‘extravagant’2 and ‘gigantic’3. But considering the eternity and

infinity of the Time (Kāla), no division of time, whatever may be its length, can properly be called as extravagant and gigantic. And according to the Indian philosophical conception, Time is one and indivisible and so any division of time by its very nature must be purely hypothetical and imaginary. It must be conceded, however, that this long computation of the Yugas as given in the Purāṇas may also be taken as representing the later Purāṇic view only, for the earlier view seems to favour a much smaller computation of the four Yugas.

The Manu Smṛti gives the length of the four Yugas as follows:

चतवार्षिक: सहस्राणि वर्षणां तु कुलं युगम्।
तस्य ताब्रचक्षी संध्या संध्यांशक्ष तथाविचः॥

इतरेषु सरसंध्येषु सरसंध्याशेषु च निमशु

एकापेन बर्षन्ते सहस्राणि शतानि च॥

यदेवत् परिसंध्यात्माश्च करुणामुखः॥

पत्त्दु द्वादशसाहसं देवानं युगाः पूर्वते॥ (1.69-71)

From these ślokas it appears that the Manu-smṛti gives the length of the four Yugas most probably in the human years and not in the divine years: for, firstly, it does not mention here these years as daiva (divine), and secondly, in the last śloka (71) quoted above, four human Yugas ('मानुष्य च तद्वृत्तम' कुशीत्तृत्तका) of the collective length of 12,000 years (पत्त्दु द्वादशाशेष) are said to make a devānām yugam (Divine Yuga) and if these four Yugas are mānuṣa (human), then the length of their duration might also have been intended as mānuṣa. But following the Purāṇic view the commentator Kullaka remarks here that the number of the years of the duration of the four Yugas mentioned here is divine (वर्षसंयम वैयं दिय्यमानिन तत्रैव सम्यक् पृष्ठाम्बुर्)

The Mahābhārata (Vana-Parva, 188.22-26, Nīlakanṭha's text) gives also the length of the four Yugas which is similar to that given by the Manu-Smṛti, but it (the Mbh.) does nowhere mention the years as divine. It does not even says that the four Yugas collectively make one divya Yuga; it simply mentions that the 12,000 years of the four Yugas are collectively called the yugākhyā—

पत्त्दु द्वादशाशेषं युगान्त्य विनिमित्त। (27 cd)
But the Purāṇas clearly mention the years of the duration of the four Yugas as dinya (divine); e.g.—

\[\text{Visṇu P., I. 3 12-14}\]

This Purānic computation of the length of the four Yugas in the divine years seems to be a later elaboration, the earlier computation as given in the Manu-smṛti and the Mahābhārata being much smaller. But even the earlier Purānic view as represented by the Vāyu-Purāṇa (32.58 ff.) seems to favour the smaller computation in the human years. According to this Purāṇa the Catur-yuga (four Yugas taken collectively) of the length of 12,000 years has four Pādas or quarters in the form of the four Yugas; thus—

1. Kṛta-yuga  4,800 years  Prakriyā-Pāda
2. Tretā-yuga  3,600 years  Anuṣṭaṅga-Pāda
3. Dvāpara-yuga  2,400 years  Upodghāta-Pāda
4. Kali-yuga  1,200 years  Samhāra-Pāda

The Purāṇa is said to be also of the 12,000 ślokas and to have the similar four Pādas:—

\[\text{Vāyu-P. 32, 65-67}\]
Here the 12,000 years of the *Catur-yuga* and its four *Padas* are said to be corresponding with the 12,000 ślokas and the four *Padas* of the Purāṇa, which indicates that the computation of the four Yugas according to the Vāyu Purāṇa here is in the human years and not in the divine years. The context preceding these ślokas also leads to the same conclusion.

But later on the Purāṇas elaborated the computation of the length of the four Yugas, perhaps under the influence of the *Siddhānta Jyotisa*, and so the computation of the four Yugas in the *human years* was replaced by that in the *divine years*, which made a lot of difference. According to the earlier computation in the human years the length of a *Catur-yuga* was 12,000 years, while according to the later Purāṇic computation in *divine* years, the length of the *Caturyuga* comes to $43,20,000 \ (12,000 \times 360)$ human years.

A Cunningham in his *'Book of the Indian Eras'* has suggested the source of this longer Purāṇic computation in divine years. According to him the present Purāṇic system of computation is the invention of the astronomers "which they based on their newly acquired knowledge of the precession". The precession of the equinoxes per year fixed by Parāśara was 46.5 seconds and that by Ārya-bhaṭa was 46.2 seconds. Shri K. D. Sethna in his article *'Megasthenes and Indian Chronology'* (Pub. in *'Purāṇa' X. 2*) on the basis of these facts analyses this problem as follows:

Given the precession, what would be the period of one revolution through the whole circle of the ecliptic of 360 degrees? As 60 minutes make 1 degree and 60 seconds 1 minute, to cover the full circle of the ecliptic takes $1,296,000 \ (360 \times 60 \times 60)$ seconds divided by 46.5 or 46.2. Then we get $12,960,000 \ \text{or} \ \frac{12,660,000}{462}$ years, which by dividing them by three become $\frac{43,20,000}{155}$ and $\frac{43,20,000}{154}$ years. The numerator is exactly the number of years which goes into a Mahāyuga (or Caturyuga). And 43,20,000 years is the period in which the ecliptic would be circled 155 or 154 times.

According to both the earlier view and the later Purāṇic view 1,000 Caturuyugas go to make the length of the duration of
a Kalpa, i.e. the duration of the existence of the universe, which is also called Brahmā’s Day (अष्टम); cf.—

दैविकानां युगानां तु सहस्रं परिसङ्गय्या धार्मिकमक्षेत्राय तावती रात्रिरेव ्।

(Manu Smṛti 1 72)

पण्डः द्वादशसहस्त्रीय युगापथ्य वर्षवीकृतिः।
पूतवः सहस्त्रपरस्त्रमवः राज्य सुदार्शनः॥

(Mbh., Vana-P., 188 28)

क्रृतं जेवा व्रमरश कलिध्वेष्व चतुर्युग्मम।
मलेख्ये तत्सहस्रं च नरांगो दिवसं घने ॥

(Viṣṇu-P., I. 3 15)

In the Nirukta and the Bhagavad-Gītā the Caturyuga or the Mahāyuga is simply called as the Yuga—

‘तदेवदहुयुगसहस्रं’ ······ युगसहस्रं रात्रिस्ताचेतावहोरात्रावबसं परिवर्तेत्’—

Nirukta, 14 4.

सहस्त्रयुगपरस्त्रभब्लवणो विदुः।
रात्रि युगसहस्रानां ते सहोरात्रविचारे जनना।॥

(Bhag.-Gītā, 8. 17; Nirukta 14. 4)

By the word ‘Yuga’ used by Yāska here Prof Mankad in his work *Purānic Chronology*, remarks that “the designation (Caturyuga or Kalpa or Divya-yuga) employed by the Purāṇas for units of extreme length are replaced by one (i.e. Yuga) which Purānically means a lesser duration”. But I think Yāska’s *yuga* is the same as the Daiva Yuga of the Manu-Smṛti or the Caturyuga of the Purāṇas, for the Manu-Smṛti uses the term ‘Yuga’ as a synonym for its ‘Daivika yuga’ also; cf.

दैविकानां युगानां तु सहस्रं परिसङ्गय्या धार्मिकमक्षेत्राय तावती रात्रिरेव ्।

(Manu-Smṛti, Adh. 1)

Compare also the Vāyu-Purāṇa, 32, 67, quoted above, where the word Yuga is used for the Chatur-yuga.
YUGAS ASSOCIATED WITH DHARMA

The four Yugas are associated with dharma or moral virtues, and the dharma gradually decreases by one pada (quarter) from Kṛta to Kali. Thus, the dharma in the kṛta-Yuga is of all the four padas (i.e. in its entirety), in the Treta it loses its one pada and becomes of three padas only, and so on up to Kali-Yuga when its one pada only remains; cf. the Manu-Smṛti 1. 81-82:

चतुष्पात सकलो धर्मः सत्यवैष्णव कृते युगे।
नाशमंगलम् कथमनुष्ठानूः प्रतिकृष्टः॥
इतिरङ्गमाधू धर्मः पादशस्तवरोजितः।
चौरिकृतमायामधिर्मंश्चापित पादशः॥

Thus, there is the gradual deterioration from Yuga to Yuga. The period of human age is also subject to this gradual deterioration. In the Kṛta yuga man lives for 400 years, in the Treta 300 years in the Dvāpara 200 years and in the Kali-Yuga 100 years only:

अरोगा: संर्वसिद्धार्थसङ्कृक्तेवेताव्याः।
कृते चेतादिद्वृ बोधामयुहसति पादशः॥

(Ibid., Śī. 83)

This theory of the gradual deterioration in life from Yuga to Yuga is opposed to the modern theory of evolution.

The dharma of each Yuga differs from the other. In the Kṛta tapas (austerity) in the Treta jñāna (knowledge of Self), in the Dvāpara Yajña (Sacrificial cult) and in the Kali dāna (charity) is the main dharma:

अन्ये कृतयुगे पद्मस्तेलीयां द्वापरे परे।
अन्ये कलियुगे नूणां युगहासानुरूपतः॥
तपः परे कृतयुगे जैवायां ज्ञानहुच्यते।
द्वापरे यद्भवाहुवादनमेक कली युगे॥

(Ibid., Śī. 85-86)

Human actions bear fruits according to the influence of a Yuga:

वेदोऽर्थस्त्रेणामायनाविष्ठस्मै कर्मणाम्।
फलस्तन्युगं ते के प्रभावं शरीरिणाम॥

(Ibid., Śī. 84)
The same view of the gradual deterioration from Yuga to Yuga and different characteristics and dharma of the Yugas is held by the Purāṇas and the Epics also. According to the Vāyu-Purāṇa even the different gods are worshipped in the different Yugas.—Brahmā in the Kṛta, Yajña in the Tretā, Viṣṇu in the Dvāpara and Mahādeva in the Kali:—

श्रवण  कृत्यान  पूज्यस्तेलायां  वज्ञ  उच्चते ।
ध्रुपे  पूज्यते  विश्वर्हां  पूज्यम्यात्मवेयि ॥

(Vāyu. P., 32. 21)

Even the mode of worship differs from Yuga to Yuga—in the Kṛta dhyāna (meditation) in the Tretā worshipping by means of Yajñas, in the Dvāpara arca or pūjā, and in the Kali the chanting and repetition of God’s name bear similar fruits:—

ध्यायन्तहे  वन्यम्यात्मेतायां  ध्रुपेरुपयन ।
यदान्तिनि  तदान्तिनि  कलैं  संकीर्य  केश्रवयु ॥

(Viṣṇu-P. VI. 2. 19.)

MANVANTARAS

Neither Yāska, nor the Gītā, nor the Mbh.-Vana-Parva and nor even the Manu-Smrṭi in the ślokas quoted above have inserted the computation of the fourteen Manvantaras within the frame of the scheme of computation of the Brāhma-ahār (the Day of Brahmā) or the Kalpa, although the Manu-smṛti mentions seven Manu-s and their antara-s or durations during which they created and protected the creatures:—

स्वाम्यस्यस्य  मनोऽपि  वहं  वंद्या  मनवोर्यरे ।
स्वरत्वं:  प्रवा:  स्वा:  स्वा  महात्मानो  महोवेयस: ॥ 61
स्वरोचिष्टश्रौचिंशा  तामसो  रैवत्तथा ।
नाधुष्ठ  महात्मजा  विवस्वततुत  पव  च ॥ 62
स्वाम्यस्यवाधा:  सप्तते  मनवो  भूरितेजस: ।
स्वे  स्वेत्वत्तरे  सर्वनिद्यवाधायङ्गराचरम् ॥ 63

(Manu, Adh. 1)

But in the Purāṇas as well as in the works of the Siddhānta-Jyotiṣa we have also the computation of the Manvantaras (the
periods of Manu-s), fourteen of which go to make the total period of a Kalpa or the Brahma-ahak (the Day of Brahma) inserted between Yuga (i. e. the Mahayuga) and Kalpa; cf.

एकरणो दिनसे एकरण मनवस्त्रु चन्द्रेश ।
भवनिर्माणं च तेषां काठकतुं शृङ्ग ॥ 16
चतुर्दशानं संक्षायता सानिका रक्षकस्तिनति ॥
मन्वन्तरं मनोऽचारः सुरादीनां च सचम ॥ 18
चतुर्दशाणयो श्रष्टु कालो ब्रा०महः स्मृतम् ॥
व्रती नैमित्तिको नाम तस्याते मलिस्नार: ॥ 22

(Visnu-P., I. 3)

चतुर्दशस्त्रां तु कथते एकरणो दिनसे ।
स कर्कस्तनं मनवशालुर्दश द्विचोचमाः ॥

(Brahma-P., 231.12)

So, according to the Visnu-Purana, a Manvantara (Manu’s Period) consists of something more than 71 Catur-yugas (सानिका रक्षकस्तिनति:) The commentator Srīdhara explains the word sādhika as follows:—“चतुर्दशशतापरामाणयः ब्राह्मिनं च चतुर्दशकान्तिविवधार्गानि सर्वतोः नवसत्तिर्यापां सायास्सभान्तिर्यामनवास्तिनि चतुर्दशाणयो श्रष्टु कालो ब्रा०महः स्मृतम् ॥ व्रती नैमित्तिको नाम तस्याते मलिस्नारः ॥.

Thus, as the Day of Brahma or Kalpa is equal to the 14 Manvantaras or 1000 Caturyugas, a Manvantara actually is equal to $71 \frac{6}{14}$ Caturyugas (for, $1000 \div 14 = 71 + \frac{6}{14}$).

The Sūrya-Siddhānta (the earliest available work on the Siddhānta-Śyotiśa) makes this point of ‘sādhika’ more clear. In its computation of Yugas and Kalpas it says that after every Manvantara there is a Sandhi equal to the period of a Kṛta-Yuga (i. e. of 4800 years) and this Sandhi after each Manvantara is characterised by jala-plava (water-immersion or deluge), and there is also a Sandhi in the beginning of a Kalpa, which (Sandhi) is the fifteenth and is also of the length of the Kṛta-Yuga:

युगानं सम्पन्तित: सैका मनवन्तरमिहोच्छते ।
कृतान्तस्या तस्यान्ते संधि: प्रत्यो जल्लेव ॥
सागरस्य मनव: कन्ये ज्ञायश्चतुर्दश ।
कृतान्तमाण: कर्क्यादौ संधि: पश्चिम: स्मृत: ॥

(Sūrya-Siddhānta, 1. 18-19)
Thus, the first Manvantara in a Kalpa has two *Sandhis*, one in the beginning and the other in the end, so there are 15 *Manvantara-sandhis* of 4800 years each in a Kalpa, besides the 14 Manvantaras of 71 Caturyugas each. These 15 *Sandhis* (\(= 4800 \times 15 = 72,000\) years or 6 Caturyugas) and the 14 *Manvantaras* (\(= 71 \times 14 = 994\) Caturyugas, together make the total of 1000 Caturyugas.

The conception of the 14 Manvantaras forming the duration of a Kalpa or the Day of Brahmā is mainly Purānic. According to the Purānas a Manvantara is a period of \(\frac{1000}{14}\) or \(71\frac{6}{14}\) *Caturyugas* and according to the *Sūrya-sindhāna*, as quoted above, it is a period of 71 *Mahāyugas*+4800 divine years as its *Sandhi* except the first Manvantara which is of the period of 71 *Mahāyugas*+9600 divine years (the two *Sandhis* one in the beginning and the other at the end). Both these computations come to the same thing. Thus, according to this computation a Manvantara is a period of 8,52,000 divine years and 30,67,20,000 (12000 × 360 × 71 + 17,28000) mortal years.

A Manvantara is named after its presiding deity called *Manu* who is in charge of the preservation and protection of the universe during his period. According to the *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* (III 1f.) out of the 14 Manvantaras of the present Kalpa six Manvantaras have already passed, viz.—


The seventh called the Vaiśvāvata (वैश्ववत) is the present Manvantara and the seven future Manvantaras are as follows :

8. Sāvarṇī (सावर्णी),
9. Dakṣa-sāvarṇī (दक्षः-सावर्णी),
10. Brahma-sāvarṇī (ब्रह्मः-सावर्णी),
or
Meru-sāvarṇī (मेरु-सावर्णी) (Devi Bhāg. X. 13. 26).
11. Dharmasāvarṇī (धर्मः-सावर्णी)
or
Sūrya-sāvarṇī (सूर्यः-सावर्णी) (D. Bhāg.)

---

12. Rudra-sāvarṇi (रुद्र-सावर्णी)  
   or  
   Candra-sāvarṇi (चन्द्र-सावर्णी) (I. Bhāg.)

13. Raucya (रौच्य) (=Ag. P., Adh. 150; Hariv. I. 7. 5)  
   or  
   Deva-sāvarṇi (देव-सावर्णी) (Bhāg.-P. VIII. 13. 27)

14. Bhautya (भौत्य) (=Ag.-P.; Hariv.)  
   or  
   Indra-sāvarṇi (इंद्र-सावर्णी) (Bhāg.-P.)
   or  
   Viṣṇu-sāvarṇi (विष्णु-सावर्णी) (I. Bhāg.)

Of these future Manus the 8th is the son of Vivasvan (Sun)  
from his wife Chāyā, and is therefore the step-brother of Vaivasvata-Manu and resembles him, whence he is called Sāvarṇi (of the same varna or form). The next four Manus (9-12) are the sons of Priyavrata and the grandsons of Svāyambhuva-Manu (the first Manu). According to the Harivamśa (I. 7. 6) these four Manus (9-12) are also called Meru-sāvarṇis, for they obtained the Manuhood by performing austerities on the Meru mountain (मेरुसावर्णिः-अत्यारो ब्रह्मसावर्णिः; रुद्रसावर्णिः; मेरुसावर्णिः; देवसावर्णिः).  
   पूजे मेरौ अस्ति  
   धृत्रा सिद्धि प्राप्त हिति सर्वेऽपि मेरुसावर्णिः हि जात्यते-नीलक्षणः).  
   Raucya is the son of Prajāpati Ruci and Bhautya is the son of Bhūti.

Each Manvantara has its own Saptarṣis (Seven Sages), gods,  
Indra, Manu and his royal sons who are in charge of the protection of the world and are simultaneously created in the beginning and destroyed at the end of their Manvantara :—

सप्तर्षिः सुरः शको मनुस्तत्तवी नुपः।  
एककले हि सुज्ञते संहितत्ते च पूर्वबित्त।

In each Manvantara the Sattvika Śakti of Viṣṇu is also incarnated in the form of his partial incarnation to help in the work of the protection of the universe.

Below are given gods (in their gaṇas), Indra, part-incarnation of Viṣṇu and principal Purāṇic episodes of each Manvantara according to the Viṣṇu.-P. (III. 1-2) and the Bhāg.-P. (VIII. 1-24):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manvantara or Manu</th>
<th>Gaya-s of Gods</th>
<th>Indra</th>
<th>Visnu’s incarnation</th>
<th>Episode relating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, Svayambhuva</td>
<td>Yama-s</td>
<td>.......?</td>
<td>Yajna</td>
<td>Kapila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Svárociṣa</td>
<td>1 Parva-vata-s</td>
<td>Vipahi</td>
<td>Vibhu</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Tusita-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uttama</td>
<td>1 Sudhāman-s</td>
<td>Susanti</td>
<td>Satyasena</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Satya-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Japa-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Pratar-dana-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Vaśa-vartīn-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tāmasa</td>
<td>1 Supāra-s</td>
<td>Śibi</td>
<td>Harim-e-dhasa</td>
<td>Gajendra-moksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Hari-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Satya-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sudhi-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Raivata</td>
<td>1 Amitabhā-s</td>
<td>Vibhu</td>
<td>Vaikuṇṭha</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Bhūta-ray-a-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Vaikuṇṭha-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Sume-dha-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cākṣuṣa</td>
<td>1 Āpya-s</td>
<td>Mano-Ajita</td>
<td>1. Samudra-</td>
<td>manthana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Prasūta-s</td>
<td>java</td>
<td></td>
<td>(churning of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Bhavya-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the ocean) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Prthu-ka-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kurma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Lekha-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Avatāra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. War between
Gods and
Asuras—Jambha Namuci
etc. killed

Bali-Vamana

8. Sāvarṇī
1. Sutapa-s
2. Amitābha-s
3. Mukhya-s

Bali Sārvabhāuma

9. Dakṣa-sāvarṇī
1. Pāra-s
2. Marci-garbha-s
3. Sudhaman-s

Adbhūta Rṣabha

10. Brahma-sāvarṇī
1. Sudhāman-s
2. Viṣuddha-s

Śānti Viṣvaksena (Vis-P)
Śambhu (Bhāg.)

11. Dharma-sāvarṇī
1. Vihaṇgama-s
2. Kāmagama-s
3. Nirvāṇaratā-s

Vṛṣa Dharmasetu (Viṣ. P.)
Vaidṛṣṭa

12. Rudra-sāvarṇī
1. Harita-s
2. Rohita-s
3. Sumanās-s

Ṛta Svadhāman
dhāman
As 1,000 Mahāyugas, each of 12,000 divine years or of 43,20,000 human years, make a Kalpa or cosmic period, the length or duration of a Kalpa comes to 1,20,00,000 divine years or 4,32,00,00,000 human years. Since a Kalpa is the Day of Brahmā (Creator), 30 such Kalpas make a Month of Brahmā. And as there are 30 tithis (lunar days) of different designations in a lunar month, on the same analogy the different names of the 30 Kalpas of Brahmā’s Month are given in the Matsya-Pūrṇa (Adh. 290) as follows:


Of these 30 Kalpas the 15th (Kaurma) is the Full-Moon Day (पौर्णमिति) and the 30th (Pitr-kalpa) the New-Moon Day (कृष्ण, अमावस्या) of Brahma's Month.

Out of the eighteen Mahāpurāṇas the following Purāṇas deal with the accounts of some of these Kalpas, as follows (see Matsya-P., Adh. 53):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purāṇa</th>
<th>Kalpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Padma-Purāṇa</td>
<td>Padma-Kalpa (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu-Purāṇa</td>
<td>Vārāha-Kalpa (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāyu-Purāṇa</td>
<td>Śveta-Kalpa (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgavata-P.</td>
<td>Sārasvata-Kalpa (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāradīya-P.</td>
<td>Bṛhat-Kalpa (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni-P.</td>
<td>Iśāna-Kalpa (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavisya-P.</td>
<td>Aghora-Kalpa (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahma-vaiiv.-P.</td>
<td>Rāthantara-Kalpa (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liṅga-P.</td>
<td>Āgneya-Kalpa (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vārāha-P.</td>
<td>Mānava-Kalpa (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanda-P.</td>
<td>Tat-purusā-Kalpa (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmana-P.</td>
<td>Kūrma-Kalpa (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūrma-P.</td>
<td>Lakṣmi-Kalpa (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garuḍa-P.</td>
<td>Garuḍa-Kalpa (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vāyu-Purāṇa (Adh 21) gives a different list of the 28 Kalpas (perhaps on the analogy of the 28 Nakṣatras or Constellations in a lunar month) as follows:


In addition to the twenty-eight Kalpas the Vāyu-P. (Adh. 22) gives 5 more Kalpas—1. चेतकल्प, 2. रक्ष, 3. पीतवाससु, 4. द्वार, 5. विश्राम—the names of which are derived from the forms which the Creator assumes in these Kalpas.
Each Kalpa (Cosmic Period) or the Day of Brahmā is followed by the Pralaya or the Ekārṇava state (Great Deluge) in which the whole of the universe up to the Svār-Loka is destroyed. This Pralaya is called naimittika as it is occasioned by the Night of Brahmā when he remains asleep (or inactive). At the end of Brahmā’s life of his 100 years (360 × 100 Kalpas) the entire universe including even Brahmā and all other Gods and all the fourteen Loka-s are destroyed and merge into their original cause or Prakṛti; hence this Pralaya is called the Prākṛtika Pralaya. (cf. Viṣṇu-P. VI. 1f.)

Brahmā’s full age of his 100 years is called Para, and half of this period is called Parārdha. One Parārdha of Brahmā’s life has passed, the last Kalpa of this Parārdha is also called the Pādma-Kalpa, for the Earth (or the world) in that Kalpa is produced in the form of a Lotus from the navel of Viṣṇu; the present Kalpa, which is also the first Kalpa of the second Parārdha of Brahmā’s life, is called the Śveta Vārāha-Kalpa. (Vis. P. I. 3. 26 ff.; Bhāg III. 11. 33 ff.; Mt.-P, 164. 5; 169. 2f).

As the scheme of the four Yugas is associated with the varying degrees of the dharma and adharma (i.e. the gradual deterioration of dharma, and gradual increase of adharma from the Kṛta-Yuga to the Kali-Yuga), this scheme is said to prevail in the Bhāratavarṣa only out of the nine Varṣa-s of the Jambu-dvīpa, and not in the remaining eight Varṣa-s where there is no dharma and adharma and no gradation of high and low in their social order (cf. Viṣṇu-P. II. 3. 19—चालायें तात्र साते वे युगां त्रां ग्धातुने | तृतीयं तृतीयं कतिपयायण स वुष्णिद्द्र्व |). In this respect these Yugas may be likened to the six Rūtas (seasons).

2. The jala-plāva (Deluge) after each Manvantara may not be universal, but this Naimittika Pralaya is universal. A jala-plāva is mentioned in the Matsya-Purāṇa, when the Matsya incarnation of Viṣṇu narrated the Matsya-Purāṇa to Vaivasvata Manu. So this jala-plāva might have occurred after the sixth (Cākṣuṣa) Manvantara or in the beginning of the seventh Manvantara.
3. Cf. also Viṣṇu-P. II. 1. 25-26

yalnā mantra krtvābhāvadiṁ bhūtvābhāvā bhāvān ||
śeṣa ścāmānāṁ ścīdaṁ bhūtvābhāvā śeṣeṣeṣeṣe ||
viṣṇo bhūtāni nābhāvite hi kṛtvābhāvāḥ n ca ||
prāṁbhāvāṁ n tathālāṁ nīrtāṁ kāmakāmyaḥ ||

also cf. ibid, II. 2 53-55.
The present Kalpa is the Vārāha-Kalpa, of which the following period has already elapsed:

6 Manvantaras = 1,85,14,28,574 human years

+ 27 Mahāyugas = 11,66,40,000 human years (of the present Vaiśnavata Manvantara).

+ 3 Yugas (Satya, Dvapara, Kali) = 38,88,000 human years

+ Past period of Kali (28th) = 5070 years (up to A.D. 1969).

Total Period elapsed = 1,97,19,61,544 years

This period may be taken, according to the Purāṇas, as the age of the present creation or sṛṣṭi. In the beginning the earth was only in the atomic form. It was in the womb of the cosmic water, and later on, it emerged from those waters as they gradually dried up by the Sun’s rays, (that is what the episode of the Prthivi-uddhāra by God Varāha may indicate). So the real age of the present solid earth may be less than the above calculation of the present age of the sṛṣṭi, which surprisingly comes close to the geological time scale calculation as given below:
### ORIGIN OF THE GEOLOGICAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eras</th>
<th>Periods and Systems</th>
<th>Derivation of Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUATERNARY</td>
<td>Recent or Holocene, Glacial or Pleistocene</td>
<td>Holos = complete, Pleiston = most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘cone’ from Kainos = recent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAINOZOIC</td>
<td>TERTIARY Pliocene, Miocene, Oligocene, Eocene</td>
<td>Pleion = more, Meion = less, Oligos = few, Eos = dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRETACEOUS</td>
<td>Creta = chalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JURASSIC</td>
<td>Jura mountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRIASSIC</td>
<td>Threefold division in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MesoZOIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERMIAN Carboniferous</td>
<td>Permia, anc. kingdom E. of Volga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devonian or Old Red Sandstone</td>
<td>Coal-bearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silurian</td>
<td>Devon (marine sediments) (Land sediments of same period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordovician</td>
<td>Silures anc. tribe of Welsh border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambrian</td>
<td>Ordovices, anc. tribe, N. Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambria = Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALÉOZOIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROTEROZOIC  Archæozoic</td>
<td>Proteros = Earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eozoic</td>
<td>Archæos = Primæval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eos = Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-CAMBRIAN ERAS</td>
<td>PROTEROZOIC</td>
<td>Archæozoic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRECORDED INTERVAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGIN OF THE EARTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE EARTH

TIME SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate dates in years</th>
<th>Distinctive Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Modern Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Stone-Age Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>Mammals and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000,000</td>
<td>Flowering Plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,000,000</td>
<td>Reptiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220,000,000</td>
<td>Amphibians and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280,000,000</td>
<td>Primitive Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320,000,000</td>
<td>Fishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000,000</td>
<td>Invertebrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000,000</td>
<td>First appearance of abundant fossils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 1,750,000,000</td>
<td>Scanty remains of Sponges and Seaweeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrecorded Interval</td>
<td>No direct fossil evidence of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 2,000,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This Geological Time Scale showing the date of the origin of the Earth has been taken from Arthur Holmes. *Principles of Physical Geology*, pp. 104-105. It has been kindly supplied by Dr Arup Deb, Department of Geology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.
कर्मयोगः

कार्यमिलेव यथः नियतं सक्षरविनितम्।
किसमे बिदुः कर्म तद्भवेदि प्रोक्ष्यतं॥
अथवा यदि कर्मणि कुर्मावग्यायमपि विन्यः।
अक्षुल्य फलसंयापसं बद्धेन्ते तत्पते रु॥
तस्मातृत्वसङ्कर्तनं व्यक्त्वा कर्मातिकं परम्।
अवद्धानापि कुर्वित कर्मणीति चिरागः पदम्॥
कर्मणा क्षोभेते पापमैति पौर्विकं तथा।
मनः प्रसादमनेति ब्रह्मविज्ञायते नरः॥
कर्मणा सहिताज्ञानात् सम्बोधोगोध्विज्ञायते।
झाँस च कर्मसहिते जायते दोषविनितम्॥
तस्मातृं संबंधसंरते यत्र तत्राशमे रते॥
कर्माणि धर्तुपर्यं कुर्मातिकम्प्राप्नुतात्॥
संप्राप्यः परम स्मानं नैक्रम्यं तत्परादत॥
एकाकी निर्यमः स्मानं जीवचेति विद्विचयते॥
वैक्ष्ण्डे दशमासने परं ब्रह्म महाधरम्।
नियान्त्री निराभासस्तरमेव लघु ब्रजेत्॥
तस्मातिसिद्धे संतते कर्मयोगं प्रसिद्धि॥
तुष्ये परमेश्वरं तत्परं याति शाश्वतम्॥

(कृष्णपुरं १०.३.१३-२३)
Note

A NOTE ON KAPĀLMOCĀNA

In the *Purāṇa*, X. 2 (July 1968), Devendra Handa has described a *tīrtha* called Kapālamocāna in the Kuruksetra region. In the same journal, XI, 1 (January 1969), V. Raghavan has referred to the existence of one or two *tīrthas* of this name in Kashmir.

It is certain that a homonymous *tīrtha* existed at Vārāṇasī as well. Thus one of the copper-plates of the Gāhaḍavāla ruler Govindacandra (c. A. D. 1114-55) found at Kamauli, District Vārāṇasī, says that the ruler bathed in Kapālamocana-ghatā on the Gaṅgā at Vārāṇasī before making the grant of a village to a Brāhmaṇa in samvat 1178, i.e. A. D 1122 (*Epigraphia Indica*, IV, pp. 109-11)

Prof. Anand Swarup Gupta, Editor-in-chief of this journal, has very kindly drawn my attention to a legend in the *Vāmana-Purāṇa* (ed Anand Swarup Gupta, All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1967), *adhyāya* 3, verses 47-51, about a pond called Kapālamocana at Vārāṇasī. Other references to this Vārāṇasī *tīrtha* in the Purāṇas are not lacking, see Moti Chandra, *Kāśi kā Ithāṣa* (Bombay, 1962), pp 172, 176 and 185.

It appears therefore that there were many *tīrthas* of this name at different places.

—A. GHOSH
ACTIVITIES OF THE ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
(JANUARY-JUNE, 1969)

PURĀṆA-WORK

KURMA-PURĀṆA-WORK

The Critical Edition of the Vāmana Purāṇa with its English and Hindi translations having been published last year, the work of the Critical Edn. of the Kūrma Purāṇa is now in hand. The following preliminary work is being done for this purpose:—

(A) Collation—The following MSS. of the Kūrma-Purāṇa have been collated—

(a) Devanāgarī Manuscripts


2. No. 5589, from the V.V.I. Hoshiarpur, dated Sāñvat 1679 (A. D. 1622).


4. PM. 2418. I. & II. (Two Volumes), from the Adyar Lib., Madras.

(b) Bengali Manuscripts

5. No. 2845 from the Dacca University; Microfilm.

6. No. 398 (G4492-5-F7), from the Asiatic Society, Calcutta.

(c) Oriya Manuscript

7. No. 75139, from the Adyar Library, Madras; containing only the Uttarārdha-text.

(d) Nandi-Nāgarī Manuscript

8. A Palm-leaf MS. from the Śrīnāgarī Maṭha, Mysore.
सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजन्यास्य काय्यचित्रक्रमः
( जनवरी—जून, १९६९)

पुराणकायः

cुम्पुराणस्य कायः

विगतवर्ष वामनपुराणस्य आंगङ-हिंदी-अंगोवादसंस्करणाश्च सहितस्य समीक्षितसंस्करणस्य प्रकाशने चाते सति वर्तमानास्मै ते कुम्पुराणस्य समीक्षित-संस्करणसम्बन्धे काय्यचार्यं प्रचारित। पूर्वसर्वस्य अष्टेकोलिहितानि पूर्वकायां पियः सम्पादनाते:

(अ) अष्टेकोलिह कुम्पुराणहस्तलेखः सम्पथः संपादितः:

(ब) द्विनागरीहस्तलेखः; यथा—

१. संख्या ४९ आफू १६८१, पूर्नस्थ मण्डारकर शोधसंस्थानः, काळः संवत् १६६५ ( १५५४ ई० )।

२. सं ५५८९, वी० वी० आड० होशियारपुरः, काळः संवत् १६९१ ( १६२२ ई० )।

३. ई० १६४६, नद्वनस्थ इण्डिया ब्राफिस्क लाइज़रीटः।

४. चौ० एमो २४१८, १ तथा २. ( भागमवर् ), मद्रास्सस्य-अड्ड्यालाइज़रीटः।

(ख) बंगला-हस्तलेखः; यथा—

५. संख्या २८४५ माइकोफिल्म; दक्षिणविचारालयः।

६. संख्या ३२८ (G 4492-5-F7), कलिकाताया: एसियाटिक-चौपाराइटः।

(ग) उड़िया-हस्तलेखः:

७. सं ० ३५६२९, मद्रासस्य-अड्ड्यालुस्तकाल्यातः (उत्तराखंडभाग: केवलम्)

(घ) नन्दनागरी-हस्तलेखः:

८. एकः ताडांगन-हस्तलेखः, मैमुनस्य श्रीगुरीमठातः।
(e) Grantha Manuscript

9. A Palm-leaf MS. purchased from Madras, containing only the Purvārtha-text.

The following Manuscripts are being collated:—

1. D. 10427 from the Sarasvati Mahal, Tanjore, Devanāgarī; microfilm copy procured, photo-copy prepared here by the Purāna Deptt.

2. No. C. 371 from the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore; Devanāgarī; microfilm copy procured; photo-copy prepared by the Purāna Deptt.

3. A Palm-leaf MS. No. 6036, from the V. V. I. Hoshiarpur, Grantha script; complete.

Efforts are also being made to procure a complete MS. of Oriya from the Raghunandan Library Puri, a Malayalam MS. from the Kerala University, Trivandrum, and a Kashmiri MS. from the Dharmārtha Trust, Jammu.

(B) Other Work

(a) A subject-concordance of the parallel topics of the Kurma Purāṇa with the Epics and the other Purāṇas is being prepared. The parallel topics from the Matsya, Vāmana, Vāyu and Brahmāṇda have been noted by this time.

(b) Name-index of persons, places, rivers, mountains, tirthas etc. from the Kurma-Purāṇa is under preparation.

(c) Kurma Purāṇa quotations from the Nibandhas and the Smṛti-tīkās are being collected.

'PURĀṆA' BULLETIN

The Vasanta-Pañcami Number of the Purāṇa Bulletin (XI. 1) was published on the Vasanta-Pañcami day, (January 22, 1969), consisting of pp. 202, and containing articles on Purānic topics, besides a Stuti with comment, Sūktis, notes and Book-Reviews.

We regret to inform that owing to some unavoidable circumstances the present July issue of the Purāṇa-Bulletin is not being published as the 'Vāmana-Purāṇa-Number' as had been proposed and stated in the last Vasanta-Pañcami issue (XI. 1). It is hoped that the next January issue (XII. 1) will be published as the 'Vāmana Purāṇa Number'.
(१०) उन्नत-हस्तलेखा :—

२. एक: तादफ्तरीहस्तलेख: पूर्णिमामय एव मद्राससनगत बीत। निम्नाख़्लानां हस्तलेखानां संबंधिकार्य प्रचलनत: —

२. बी: १०२७ सरस्वतीमहेंद्रज्ञोत्तर: देवनागरीलिप्त: माइक्रोफिल्म:, फोटोप्रित: पुराणविभागद्वारा निर्मिता।

२. संख्या सी. ३७६ ओरियोनल रिसर्च इंस्टीट्यूट माइक्रोग्राफ देवनागरी

३. एक: सम्पूर्ण: तादफ्तरीहस्तलेख: सं० ६०३६, बी: ०० आधौ हिंदी-यारुसारूत अनुच्छेदां लिखित: प्राप्त।

अन्यथा, प्रयत्न: क्रियात्मक उद्धवाचिकां एकत्र संयुक्त संस्कृति उन्नत-हस्तलेखा

संस्कृतियों पुरान्तात रक्षनन्दनपुत्रकालाकाल। अपरस्य मल्ल्याधि-हस्तलेखा केरलविविधविभाग्यात: विशेष-मुख्त रुपस्तम्भात, तथा अन्यश्रेष्ठ च काश्मीरहस्तलेखा च धर्मरूप ट्रांस कालों इतिहास न्यासात: प्राप्ते।

(आ) हिंदीतः

(अ) कृम्पुराणस्थान इतरपुराणां: इतिहासाद्रिक्षायां च नह साधः महत्तां

कृम्पुराणस्थानां सूची निर्मितमाणा बर्तते। अध्यापिं भाष्यवामनजात्वक्षानद-पुराणां समानविषयानां सूची प्रस्तुतवर्तते।

(आ) कृम्पुराणस्थानां व्यक्त-स्थान नानक-परव्यासीनां नामसूची अपि

निर्मितमाणा बर्तते।

(इ) निवन्नाध्रेष्ठेष्ठ: स्त्रीतीकायायथा कृम्पुराणश्लोकानांपुराणानि

संगृहितमाणा बर्तते।

'पुराणम्' पत्रिका

'पुराण' पत्रिकायां: वसन्तपञ्चमी (१२१) वसन्तपञ्चमीदिने (२२

जनवरी १९६९ दिनहें) प्रकाशितो जातः। तत्सम्बन्धं २०२ प्रमाण स्थित। तत्र

सुकित्वीषवुद्वायदीनामतिरिक्त पुराणबाध्यमोक्ष नानानिविधाथासनु। इति

संबंधने निवेदननां यदृच्छयायां: अयुक्त: वामनपुराणांभविष्यति वसन्तपञ्चमी

सुरुःतृष्ण अपरिहार्यकारणां: तथा न जातम्। आशामहें आर्यावी जनवरी-अन्धः

वामनपुराणांभविष्यतिः।
PURĀṆA PĀṬHA AND PRAVACANA

1. From Māgha, Śukla 1 to 9 (January 19 to 26, 1969) the whole of the Devī-bhāgavata was recited and discourses on it were given by Pt. Thakur Prasad Dwivedi of Ramnagar in the Sumeru Mandir.

2. From Pālguna, Kṛṣṇa 2 to 13 (February 5-16, 1969) the whole of the Vāmana Purāṇa was recited from its Critical Edition in the morning and discourses on it were given in the evening in the Śiva-temple by Pt. Thakur Prasad Dwivedi.

VEDA-PĀRĀYAṆA

From Māgha, Śukla 1 to 15 (January 19 to Feb. 2, 1969) the complete texts of the Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda, Taittirīya-Śākha with its Brāhmaṇa, Āraṇyaka and Upaniṣad were recited from memory by Pt. Bhaskara Vaiśampayana of Bilaspur (M. P.) in the Veda Vyāsa temple inside the Ramnagar Fort. Pt. Śrī Krishna Murti Ghana-pathi of Kashi was the Śrota. The reciter was awarded a certificate of merit and a ratna Kaṅkaṇa by His Highness.

JYOTIṢĀ-SAMMELANA

The All-India Kashiraj Trust held a Jyotīṣa-Sammelana in the Shivala Palace, Varanasi, on 26 March, 1969 under the chairmanship of His Highness Maharaja Dr. Vibhuti Narain Singh. The topic for the discussion was वाष्पुदिरस्वयं (i.e. an increase upto five ghaṭikās and a decrease upto six ghaṭikās in the duration of a tīthi or lunar day) versus सत्युदिरस्वयं (an increase upto seven ghaṭikās and a decrease upto ten ghaṭikās in a tīthi). Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid maintained and explained the principle of वाष्पुदिरस्वयं according to the Śakalya-Samhitā.

Jyotisa-scholars mainly belonging to the Banaras Hindu University and the Vārāṇaseya Sanskrit University and other local scholars took part in the discussion. The Vice-Chancellor of the Sanskrit University, Dr. Gauri Nath Shastri, was also present on this occasion. A Sub-Committee was formed for further consideration and discussion.
पुराणमार्गः प्रवचनं च

१. मायकुक्कलप्रतिष्ठानारस्य नवमी तिथिः यावत् (जनवरी १९-२६, १९६९ ) सम्पूर्णजीवाभूतत्त्व पाठः सुप्रसन्नदिरे क्रतः। तदिन्ये रामनगरा-
बासिना श्रीठाकुरप्रसादरुद्धेश्वरदिवोधये प्रवचनं कृतम्।

२. फाल्गुनकुक्कलप्रतिष्ठानारस्य क्रोददिरशी यावत् (फरवरी ५-१६, १९६९ ) संपूर्णजीवाभूतवार्षिक पाठः समीक्षक्षत्संस्करणः जिंवमिदिरे प्रातःकाले
जातः। पेटिविषयं प्रवचनं सारांसमये पक्षितकुरप्रसादरुद्धेश्वरदिविना कृतम्।

वेदवाराणस्य

माघ चुक्र १ तिथिः अर्धम १५ तिथिः यावत् (जनवरी १९-फरवरी
२, १९६९ ) क्रण्मण्डूतवरः श्रीरामरायणकोणिकश: सह सपूर्णमः वैविद्यो-
संहिताय: कण्ठस्य पाठः विख्यातमुर (सध्यपदेश) निवासिना पणिततमात्रक-
रैवंयज्ञमनोदयेन रामनगरुद्धेश्वरवार्षिकामनदिरे कृतः। काशीवास्तवः
पणितकुक्कलपुरीं घनपाठी श्रोता आसीत। तत्रतब्रजः काशीनरेशः पाठकां
सारांसपात्रं रत्नक्रणं च प्रदच्यम्।

यजोविषसम्मेलनम्

सर्वभारतीयकाशिराजव्यासस्य तत्त्वाद्याते वाराणसीस्वाक्षिपिवालामाराजदै २६
मार्च १९६९ दिनाङ्कः तत्त्वाद्याते काशिनरेशमहाराज डा। विभूतिनारायणसिद्ध-
महोदयानां साधाने यजोविषसम्मेलनं सन्तरम्। विवेचनीयो पक्षी
आस्ताम्—‘बाणपुद्दिस्रस्य’ अर्थात् चान्दृतियो पवधविका यावत् त्रिधः
षड्यिका यावत् हस्ताँ, तथा ‘सतत्र्वुद्धिस्रस्य’ अर्थात् सवधविका यावत् त्रिधः
दशान्तिका यावत् हस्तां। पणिततत्रेतरशास्त्रविद्वादिमहोदयः शाक्तसंहितां-
नुसारतः बाणपुद्धिस्रस्यसदान्त्वेव व्यायांम कृतवाच। हिंदुविधविधावायस्य
वाराणसेयसंस्तंतविधविधावायस्य च विधास: अन्ये बिधास्य अस्मिन् (विषये विवेचन
कृतवाच:) वाराणसेयसंस्तंतविधविधावायस्योष्कुलवातः। डा। गौरीनाथशाक्ती
अधि उपस्थित: आसीत। अभिमन्वितार्थं पक्षा उपस्वितनिर्मित।
As the Purāṇa Department is now doing the work on the Kūrma-Purāṇa, it celebrated the Kūrma-Jayantī on the Vaisākha-Pūrṇimā, May 1, 1969. His Highness also graced the occasion. Havana and Puja were performed and prasāda was distributed.

**SCIENTISTS WHO CONTACTED THE PURĀṆA DEPARTMENT**

The following scientists and research students contacted the Purāṇa Department either personally or by correspondence for obtaining them certain Purānic material and data:—

1. Mr. James Macdonald, International Hostel B. H. U., Varanasi required some data on the ghṛtas of Varanasi as recorded in the Kāśi-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda-Purāṇa or as known traditionally, and he personally visited the Purāṇa Department for this purpose.

2. Dr. Jagadish S. Sharma, Librarian of the Punjab University Library, was supplied the required information on the geographical names connected with the ancient Indian history.

3. A Professor of the Sanskrit and Philosophy Department, Gujarat Vidyapith has been supplied certain information on the Devī-Bhāgavata which he required for his Ph. D. students.

4. Miss Shashi Mathur, 6-E, Karol Bagh, New Delhi, Research Scholar, working on the cultural Study of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, wanted information about the available manuscripts of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, which was supplied to her.

5. Miss Santosh Bagai, 10-A/7, East Patel Nagar, Delhi-8, who is a lecturer in Sanskrit in a Women's College of the University of Delhi, and also doing research on the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, in her letter of 25. 4. 69 appreciates the 'Purāṇa' Bulletin and considers it as "indispensable for Research Scholars." She wanted to supply her a list of the articles on the Viṣṇu Purāṇa published in the various issues of the Purāṇa-Bulletin, which list has been supplied to her.
कृमजयन्ती

यतस्तु पुराणबिभागों संपन्न कृमपुराणकार्य परम्परता वित्त: अतिव विभागे
बैशाखपूर्णिमा दिने ( मई १, १९६९ ) कृमजयन्ती आयोजिता आयोजित। अतिव तात्त्विक तथ्यबन्ध: काश्यपरेषामहोदयाः अपि उपस्थिता आसन्। हमन-पूजनानान्तरं प्रसादवितरण जातये।

पुराणबिभागों सह संपर्क स्थापविभागों विषयासः

अध्योपनिषदिः विद्वानः अनुसंधितस्वतः वैयक्तिककङ्क्वेष पत्रेण वा सामर्थ्य-सामाजिकस्वास्थ्य पुराणबिभागों सह संपर्क स्थापितवतं—

१. इष्टरनेशनल होस्टल, का० हि० वि०, वाराणसी, इत्यत्त्वः दीक्षितम् मैकडानलसमहोदयाः—अयो महानुभाव: स्कन्दपुराणस्य काशिकादेवे काणितानामकव्या परम्परायां वर्णितानां काशिकाधानं विषये कवित्विन्दरवर्णधा प्रसादः पुराणबिभागों आयोजित।

२. पश्चात्विधविवाहार्यस्य पुस्तकालाख्यतः दा० जागि०श्रीरक्षमश्च महोदयाः मातोलितेन संवेदना मातोलितेन संवेदना कालिकी भौगोलिकविवरणानि प्रदचनानि।

३. गुजरात विधायीस्य संस्कृतसुलभानिविगच्छेऽर्मोऽस्मिन्य स्त्राणुपन्यसमहोदयाः देवीभागवतपुराणपुष्करः कवित्विन्दरवर्णधा प्रदचनानि। अयो महानुभाव: स्त्राणुपन्यसविशेषः विषयनिर्दित वाणिज्यितः सम।

४. ६—ई० करोऽवाग नयी दिल्ली वास्तवाय कुमारी शाशिमाधुरमहोदयाः, या विष्णुपुराणस्य सांस्कृतिकविवणविषयेष शोधं करोऽत्त्वः, विष्णुपुराणस्योपमन्न-हस्तलेखानां विषये विजाहिततत्वती। पर्या सूचना तस्मै प्रदचन।

५. १०-पृष्ठ पदेन्द्रनगर विली-८ इत्यत्व वास्तवाय विधविवाहादिककप्रेष महिलामहाविद्यालयं नामितित्ते विज्ञानिकाया कुमारी सन्नाद्वेगमहोदयाः, या विष्णुपुराणविषयं अनुसंधानं करोऽत्त्वः, २५४५६६ दिनाधिकेत् स्वप्नवेत् 'पुराण' पत्रिका प्रकाशितवती। सा इमां पत्रिकां शोधसाहित्यिनानां महत्त्वपूर्णां भवनार्थ। सा विष्णुपुराणविषयकानां लेखानां सुची वाणिज्यितः सम। एका सूची तस्यै भेदिता।
SCHOLARS WHO VISITED THE PURĀNA DEPARTMENT

1. Maharaja-Kumar Dr. Raghbir Singh, Sitakundu, Our Trustee.—4. 1. 69.

2. Dr. W. Norman Brown, Professor Emeritus of Sanskrit, University of Pennsylvania.—16. 1. 69.

He has remarked in our Visitors’ Book as follows—"The work of editing the texts of the Purāṇas, with English and Hindi translations, is one of the important project in the study of India’s tradition. The volume of work involved in collecting, selecting and collating manuscripts is enormous, but is only a beginning. The judgment required to unravel the relationship of the manuscripts, the fine discrimination needed to determine the correct readings, and now, as in the case of the works being edited here, the mastery of other languages than the original essential to the making of the translations, call for a rare combination of abilities. Indic scholarship in general is being put under a heavy and pleasant—obligation by the scholars who have planned and are executing this important labour."

3. Dr. Ainslie T’Embree, Department of Middle East Languages and Cultures, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.—16. 1. 69.

4. Dr. D. D. Karve, formerly Principal, Fergusson college, University of Poona.—16. 1. 69.

5. Shri V. R. Nambiar, Executive Officer, American Academy of Benares, Varanasi.—16-1-69.

6. Shri Vinod Dwivedi, National Museum, New Delhi.—1. 3. 69.

7. Dr. G. M. Bongard-Levin, Institute for Oriental Studies, Moscow, USSR.—14.3.69.

We are grateful to all these scholars for taking interest in our work.
पुराणविभागे आगता विद्वानः

१. सीतामऊ (माल्वा) वास्तवः न्यासस्वास्थ्य महाराजकुमार
declaring: ज्योति हिरासनहरेड़यः ४-१-६९, दिनांकः।

२. पेनसिल्वानिया विद्वानविभागे महास्वास्थ्य 'इमरिट्सपोफेसर' पवभाकः
declaring: डक्टर० नारमन व्हाइटमहेड़यः १६-१-६९, दिनांकः।

अथ यहाँ: पुराणविभागस्य दर्शनपुस्तिकाएँ संग्रहित-भारतीयस्थापत्यतः
अध्ययने हिन्दी-आंग्लभाषयो: अनुवादित सह पुराणानां संपादनं महत्त्वपूर्ण कार्यमयः।
हस्तलेखानां संपादन संवादस्य संवादस्य च कार्यं अति कठिनं व्यापकं च
वर्तते। इत्य एवं कार्योऽरमः च वर्तते। विशिष्टाः कार्यां हस्तलेखानां संवादस्य
दर्शिन्तां भोगताः, उचिताभिमानस्य विशेष: तथा च वादशः कार्या प्रचलित
तस्मात् अनुवादकार्यांच्छ अन्यायाभावालापः पाण्डित्यापेक्षते। इत्य एवं कार्यं विशिष्टाः
विज्ञानविभागस्यस्य विद्वानः। इत्य एवं कार्यां ये: विद्वानः: प्रस्तुती यथा कियते.५ के तथा
अतिक्रमवशः वर्तते भारतीयविद्या।

३. डा. ऐन्सली हे. एम्ब्रे (Dr. Ainslie T. Embre)
न्यूयॉर्केस्कोलिया विद्वानविभाग्ये पश्चिमाधीकीश्य मध्यपूर्वदेशीयभाषानां संस्कृतस्य
अध्यापक: १६-१-६९, दिनांकः।

४. डा. डीरे डीरे कर्वो महोदयः, पुराणपत्रस्यमहाविद्याध्याय-न्यायकाराद्याच्छ आचार्यः १६-१-६९, दिनांकः।

५. अमेरिकन अकादमी, वाराणसी इतिहासः श्री शो. आर. नामिके
यार महोदयः १६-१-६९, दिनांकः।

६. नेशनल भुविज्ञान, विद्वानः, इतिहासः श्रीभोद्रिविद्वानमहेड़यः
१-३०-६९, दिनांकः।

७. इंस्टीट्यूट ऑफ ऑरिलियल स्टॉडेज, मायॉरी, इतिहासः डा.
ला. जी. एम. बोनार्ड लेविन महोदयः १६-३-६९, दिनांकः।

वर्त्तमान स्थिरत्व: सर्वस्वाध्याय: तेषा अस्तिनकार्यः सिद्धांतनां स्नेहः
समः।
ACTIVITIES OF OUR SISTER-TRUSTS

1. MAHĀRAJĀ BANARAS VIDYĀ MANDIR TRUST

(1) YAVAGRĀYANESTI (सन्तानमायनेति)

The above Iṣṭi (Yajña or Sacrifice) is performed on the occasion when the barley (yava) harvest is reaped by cultivators. This Iṣṭi was performed in the Ramnagar Fort in the morning of the Pūrṇimā (full Moon day) of the month of Caitra, April 2, 1969, under the supervision of Panditaraj Shri Rajeshvara Shastri Dravid. The same persons who had acted as yajamāna and priests in the Paurṇamāsa and Darśa Yajñas mentioned in the last issue of the ‘Puraṇa’ Bulletin (XI. 1, p. 186) also acted as the Yajamāna and Priests in this Iṣṭi.

The members of the Sub-committee of the Executive Body of the Viśva Hindu Sammelana who returned from the Patna Session and halted at Varanasi to hold a meeting of the Committee under the chairmanship of His Highness, also attended the Iṣṭi and watched with interest its performance according to the Vedic sacrificial rules as prescribed in the Kalpa-sūtras. The daksinā was given to the priests in kind (i.e. in the form of bags of wheat).

(2) MAṅGALOTSAVA

Under the auspices of the Mahāraja Banaras Vidyā-Mandir Trust, the Mangalotsava was celebrated in the form of the classical music and dance in the evening of 11 March, 1969, in which the teachers and students of the Music College of the Banaras Hindu University took part. A number of prominent persons of Ramnagar and Varanasi attended. The performance was very successful and was much appreciated.

(3) CHANTING OF THE ŚĀMAVEDA MANTRAS ON THE VĪṆĀ

A Vedic scholar from Madras chanted some Śāmaveda mantras on the Viṇā in the Ramnagar fort in the evening of 20-5-69. Many learned scholars, such as Dr. Gaurinath Shastri, Vice-Chancellor of the Vārānaseya Sanskrit University, Pt. Rajeshwar Shastri Dravid, Prof. Lalmani Misra, Head of the Department of Music, Banaras Hindu University, Shri Jyotishthushan Gupta, attended this attractive and novel performance. An interesting discussion on śvaras and śrutis followed in which Dr. Gaurinath Shastri and Prof. Lalmani Misra were the main participants. Rupees hundred and one were given as daksinā by His Highness to the Vedic scholar who gave the performance:
बहुली गिन्यासानां कार्यविचारणम्
1. महाराजवनारस्विद्यामण्डल ट्रस्ट

(i) विवाहप्रेषितः

पुष्पा इश्वर: यवास्य लब्धकाले भवति। पुष्पा इश्वर रामनगरुद्वा पंडित-राजधरालेखशाखा उद्योगस्य निदर्शने कैवल्यश्रृणू तिमाना: प्रातःकाले अमृत २, १९६९ कार्ति। ते पुष्पा जनान: अस्तिमिक इश्वरां यवमान: पुरोहिताः आसन ये दश्यामृणसायन यवमाने रोहिता आसन, चेष्टा नामानि च पुराणं प्रविधिकाया: गताक्रे (१९-११, प्र० १८६) प्रकाशितानि। विष्णुभिन्न-सम्मेलनस्य कार्यसमिति: उपस्थितं: सदस्याः। ये पदार्थप्रेषित: कार्यां तत्र भवत: काशिने शास्त्रशास्त्रविद्यातुं समिति: समेचन कर्त्तुं आसन, महताः। देशोरं इश्वर: डूरवनां। पुष्पा इश्वर: कल्याणकृष्ण विष्णुविद्वत्ता शिक्षियनसाधनानुसारेण संपन्न। पुरोहितेनः अत्र शिक्षा प्रदचा।

(ii) महाराजवनारस्विद्यामण्डलस्य तत्त्ववाचारे ११ मार्च १९६९

दिनान्वय सार्थकाले शास्त्रीयसंगीतकेत्तुं नृत्यरूपेण च महाराज:स्वामीः संप्रवाचा जात:। अभिमानु शाश्वत्विष्णुविद्वत्ता विचारात्माने शास्त्रसंगीतमहाबिवाहवयस्य छाँगा अश्वालकाम प्रदर्शण कार्यालये आसन:। रामनगरस्य कार्यालये बहव: शिक्षा उपस्थितां आसन:। प्रदर्शण समकाले प्रशंसित: च जातम:।

(iii) वीणाया: साहाय्य तत्साधनस्य नाथां गणानुः

२० मई १९६९ दिनान्वय सार्थकाले रामनगरुद्वा महाराजनि दादागांव: एको विभागो वीणाया कैथासिकसामर्थ्यमन्त्रणानां गतार्थेऽति:। बहव: विद्वानोऽस्मिन्, तथा वाराणसुवस्यं विश्वविद्यालयेन विश्वविद्यालययोजकस्वप्नव: दृश्य: गौरीनाथशास्त्री, पंडितराज-राजेन्द्रशाखा विकादः; हिन्दुविद्वत्ता विश्वविद्यालयसंगीतसम्मानाध्यक्ष: दृश्य: शास्त्रशिक्षाः, तथा श्रीज्ञानसंप्रदायसमर्थ्यमहोदयस्य, उपस्थिताः। स्वर्यावेशे श्रुतिस्वरे च उपयोगी बिन्दासां साधारणत: यस्मिन् बाक्य: गौरीनाथशास्त्री तथा बाक्य: शास्त्रम्य मिश्र: प्रमुखविवेकचक्री आस्तिमाः। तत्र भवता काशिने शास्त्रविद्यालये गानक्रम विद्याः एकस्तुत्मुद्राय: विवेक प्रदचा।
2. MAHARAJA KASII NARESII DHARMAKARY-NIDII (TRUST)

(1) The Trustees of the Maharaja Kashi-naresh Dharma-Karya-Nidhi under the presidency of Maharaja Kashinaresh were pleased to approve a scheme of memorising the complete Samhita of the Sukla-Yajurveda with its bulky Satapatha-Brähmana and the related Upaniṣads and Āraṇyakas. It is estimated that it will take at least ten to twelve years to memorise the whole of the Satapatha-Brähmana.

Under this scheme the Vedic scholar, Pt. Sakha Ram Ji has been specially deputed to prepare students in this Śakha. The teacher would be getting a dakṣiṇā of Rs. 300/- p. m. The three students have been memorising the Satapatha Brähmana under the guidance of the learned scholar. A scholarship of Rs. 601/- p. m is given to each.

(2) As has been the practice, the above Trust gave a six monthly dakṣiṇā of Rs. 600/- to Pt. Krishna Murti Sroti Sāmavedin on the occasion of the annual function of the Sānga-Veda-Vidyalaya, Varanasi. He has been memorising the complete Samhita of the Sāmaveda and its Brähmaṇas and Upaniṣads.

DISTINGUISHED GUESTS AT THE NADESAR HOUSE

The following distinguished persons were the guests of His Highness Maharaja Vibhuti Narayan Singh, at his Nadesar House during the period:—

1. Shri Y.B. Chavan, Home Minister, Govt. of India.
2. Shri Shyam Dhar Mishra, M. P.
3. Shri Jagajivan Ram, Food Minister, Govt of India,
5. Shri C.B. Gupta, Chief Minister, Govt. of U.P.
6. Shri Mangala Prasad, Minister, Govt. of U.P.
7. Shri B.B. Lal, Chief Secretary, Govt. of U.P.
8. General Ne Bin, Burma.
9. Justice Shashi Kant Varma, Allahabad High Court.
(२) महाराजकाशिंबरले-यथर्मकार्यनिविष्टः (न्यासः)

(१) तत्त्वभवतः काशिनिरेणस्याय्यक्षतां महाराजकाशिंबरले-यथर्मकार्यनिविष्टः न्यासाधिरः शतयंत्रतत्त्वानुपालन उपविष्टविर आरण्यकें च वह वृक्षवन-वेदेश्य संपूर्णां सदियं कण्ठस्थलक्रणाय योजनां स्त्रीलक्षत्रतः। अनुमीयते समवेद्यावर्षाणां दक्षिणवृक्षवनाः वा कण्ठगतं भविष्यती। अस्या योजनाः पण्डितस्वराममहोऽदयः। अस्या शालाः सागरकन शिस्ततुं नियुक्तो जातः। प्राथमिकरकमहोऽदयः शतर्वलमुद्राणां मासिकी दृष्टि प्राप्तोऽतः। त्र्यो सागरकन अस्य निर्देशने शतयंत्रतत्त्वाणां कण्ठस्थलक्रमेण तेव्रोतिष्वः प्रत्येकः पदिः सुधाः श्रीसमस्यासामायतः।

(२) द्वादशं पूर्व्यः प्रवर्तितः, वाराणसीसवलीक्रेष्टवित्ताहार्यस्य वारिष्कोशबां-वशेरे अनेन न्यासिन मासिकक्रियाहितेपः पण्डितस्वरासुतिमितः; श्रीतृतीयस्मै सामवेद्विद्याः मासिकक्रियाहितेपः भवतु कण्ठस्थलः महाराजाः। अर्थं महानुभवम् वाराणसीसवलीक्रेष्टवित्ताः सह सामवेद्यां संपूर्णां सदियं कण्ठस्थल कहः प्रयत्नमाने वर्तते।

नन्देण्यारम्भने चिन्तिष्ट अतिथुः
अथस्मृतः काशिमिवः अयोगनिद्रिणः महानुभवः। वाराणसीवधे नन्देण्यारम्भने तत्त्वभवस्य काशिनिरेण महाराज बाहू चिन्तिष्टारणांसेवहितदेवायामातिथिय वासनः—

१. श्री यशवन्तराव बलबन्तराव चवर्णमहोऽदयः। कैट्रिय गुरुमन्त्री।
२. श्री श्रामप्रमिणामहोऽदयः। संसादुस्तः।
३. श्री वर्मावनराममहोऽदयः। कैट्रिय-खादमन्त्री।
४. महाराजकुमार बाहु राष्ट्रविशेषेन महोऽदयः।
५. श्री चन्द्रमानुरुपमहोऽदयः। उपर्ववेदस्य सुव्यमन्त्री।
६. श्री महाकालसदमहोऽदयः। उपर्ववेदस्य मन्त्री।
७. श्री बी. बी. बालमहोऽदयः। उपर्ववेदस्य मुखस्थचिवः।
८. जेनरल ने बिनमहोऽदयः। वर्माशासनपाद्यकः।
९. श्री श्रीकान्तमहमहोऽदयः। प्रयाग उपचार्याल्यस्य न्यायराजः।
१०. श्री के. बी. अस्वानमहोऽदयः। प्रयाग उपचार्याल्यस्य न्यायराजः।
12. Shri N.P. Sharma, Bar-at-Law; Guyana Swatantra Vidyat Parisad; Guyana Pandit's Council.
13. Prof. Ram Singh.
14. Shri Vishwanath Satyanarayan; Vizayavada.
15. Shri Subramanyam.
16. Shri A. T. Kande; Poona.
17. Pt. Brajeshji.
18. Prof. V. G. Deshpande; Patna.
20. Sri P. Gokhle; Poona.
११. श्री पं. पं. बैनर्जी महोदयः, विश्वविद्यालयपरिषद्:

१२. श्री पं. पी. शर्मा महोदयः, गायनशास्त्रसम्बन्धी विषयपरिषद्: अध्यक्षः

१३. प्रेरणा रामसिंह महोदयः:

१४. श्री विध्यनाथ सत्यनारायण महोदयः, विज्ञवादवास्तवः

१५. श्री सुभाष्यगम महोदयः:

१६. श्री पं. दी. काण्डे महोदयः:

१७. पं. ब्रजेश बाबू महोदयः:

१८. प्रेरणा वी. जी. देशपाण्डित महोदयः:

१९. श्री गंगाशरण सिंह महोदयः:

२०. श्री पी. गोविलेमहोदयः; पूनावास्तवः