

A HISTORY  
OF INDIAN LITERATURE

---

LUDO ROCHER

THE PURĀṆAS

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

# A HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE

---

EDITED BY JAN GONDA

VOLUME II

Fasc. 3

1986

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

LUDO ROCHER

THE PURĀṆAS

1986

OTTO HARRASSOWITZ · WIESBADEN

# A HISTORY OF INDIAN LITERATURE

## Contents of Vol. II

### *Vol. II: Epics and Sanskrit Religious Literature*

Fasc. 1:	J. Gonda	Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit
Fasc. 2:	T. Goudriaan / S. Gupta	Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature
Fasc. 3:	L. Rocher	The Purāṇas

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

**A history of Indian literature** / ed. by Jan Gonda. – Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz

NE: Gonda, Jan [Hrsg.]

Vol. 2. Epics and Sanskrit religious literature. Fasc. 3. Rocher, Ludo: The purāṇas. – 1986

#### **Rocher, Ludo:**

The purāṇas / Ludo Rocher. – Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz, 1986.

(A history of Indian literature ; Vol. 2. Epics and Sanskrit religious literature, Fasc. 3)

ISBN 3-447-02522-0

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface . . . . .	VII
Part I Puranic literature . . . . .	1
1 Purāṇa studies . . . . .	1
1.1 Introduction . . . . .	1
1.2 Importance of the purāṇas . . . . .	8
1.2.1 The purāṇas and the Veda . . . . .	13
1.3 "Extant" versus "earlier" purāṇas . . . . .	18
1.3.1 Sectarian character of the purāṇas . . . . .	18
1.3.2 Purāṇaṃ pañcalakṣaṇam . . . . .	24
1.3.3 Eighteen purāṇas . . . . .	30
1.3.4 Descriptions of purāṇas in purāṇas . . . . .	34
1.3.5 Quotations from purāṇas in the dharma literature . . . . .	37
1.3.6 Gradual deterioration of purāṇas . . . . .	38
1.4 The original purāṇa . . . . .	41
1.4.1 The "Ur-purāṇa" . . . . .	41
1.4.2 Traditional origin of the purāṇas . . . . .	45
2 The place of the purāṇas in Indian literature . . . . .	49
2.1 Nature of the purāṇas . . . . .	49
2.1.1 Puranic textual tradition . . . . .	49
2.1.2 The sūta . . . . .	53
2.1.3 Different recensions of purāṇas . . . . .	59
2.1.4 Diversity of puranic literature . . . . .	67
2.1.5 The purāṇas and other branches of Sanskrit literature . . . . .	80
2.2 Consequences . . . . .	95
2.2.1 "Mini-purāṇas" . . . . .	95
2.2.2 Dating the purāṇas . . . . .	100
2.2.3 The purāṇas as religious documents . . . . .	104
2.2.4 The purāṇas as historical documents . . . . .	115

Part II Individual purāṇas (in alphabetical order) . . . . .	133
Abbreviations . . . . .	255
General bibliography . . . . .	259
Index . . . . .	265

## PREFACE

To avoid repeating the term “purāṇa” is it replaced by the symbol ° in compounds. E. g., Viṣṇu° = Viṣṇupurāṇa.

Abbreviated bibliographical references are of two types:

(1) An author's name, followed by a date, a colon, and a page number (e. g., HAZRA 1940:52), refers to an entry in the General Bibliography at the end of the volume. When the General Bibliography contains more than one publication by the same author in the same year, they are distinguished by adding a and b after the publication date (e. g., HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a:lxxxv and HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928b:324). Notice that the publication dates, in chronological order for each author, are indicated at the end of the entries.

(2) An author's name, followed by a purāṇa title, a date, a colon, and a page number (e. g., HAZRA Siva° 1953:47), refers to an entry in the bibliography prefixed to each purāṇa in Part Two. All lists of editions, translations, etc. are arranged in chronological order, with the publication years at the end of the entries.

## PART I

# PURANIC LITERATURE

## 1. PURĀṆA STUDIES

In the first of the two sub-sections of Part I I will present a survey of purāṇa studies and purāṇa scholarship from their inception, more than one century and a half ago, down to the present day. I will refer to various scholarly opinions concerning the purāṇas, and show the trends and tendencies which have dominated purāṇa research over the years. While writing this book I gradually became aware that I could no longer support some of these opinions and trends. I will, therefore, occasionally also add my own, personal observations on a number of aspects of purāṇa studies as they are reflected in the earlier scholarly literature.

### *1.1 Introduction*

One characteristic of the purāṇas stands out above all others: their volume. Says Haraprasad Shastri:

“The Purāṇa literature is very extensive. The 18 Mahāpurāṇas are said to contain 400,000 verses. Over and above these, there are 18 Upa-purāṇas, and 18 more Purāṇas unsuccessfully claiming position among the 36 Mahā and Upa-purāṇas. Besides these 54, there is a miscellaneous lot of Purāṇas bringing up the number nearly to one hundred. If, on the average 20,000 verses are given to each of these 100 works, the number of ślokaś or verses would be 2,000,000. On an average of 4,000 verses per volume, they would fill 500 volumes, a respectable library in itself. To speak of this enormous literature with any authority, requires a life’s study; but nobody has as yet given his life to it.”<sup>1</sup>

In reality, Haraprasad’s calculations vastly underestimated the mass of literature which this volume of *A History of Indian Literature* is supposed to deal with. One might hesitate, without further evidence, to subscribe to V.S. Agrawala’s

<sup>1</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928b: 324.

opinion that “this single branch of Sanskrit literature . . . exceeds anything of its kind in the literature of the world.”<sup>2</sup> But we are on safe ground, if we agree with V. Raghavan, that “the Purāṇas form the largest part of the writings in Sanskrit, a most voluminous and bewildering mass.”<sup>3</sup> When briefly discussing the various types of purāṇas: mahāpurāṇas, upapurāṇas, and local purāṇas, both in Sanskrit and the vernaculars, Raghavan concluded the paragraph with the disheartening sentence: “To take stock of them is an impossible task.”<sup>4</sup>

It is easy to find claims that this enormous body of puranic literature has been unduly neglected. For instance, the president of the Classical Sanskrit section at the 1953 All-India Oriental Conference, R. D. Karmarkar, complained: “As regards the Purāṇas, not much is being done and we are not yet prone to pay as much attention to the Purāṇas as they deserve. Barring the work of Prof. Hajra, I do not find any scholar definitely devoting himself to this literature.”<sup>5</sup> Professor Rajendra Chandra Hazra’s name will be omnipresent in the following pages, and there is no doubt that, without his work, this volume would be far less comprehensive. Yet, the problem of the neglect of the Purāṇas in earlier days is more complex than the mere absence of someone like Professor Hazra.

In reality, the purāṇas were not always neglected. In 1784 Pandit Rādhākānta Śarmā wrote, at Warren Hastings’ request, a summary of the purāṇas, the Purāṇārthaprakāśa (see Part II), in which William Jones showed a deep interest. Also, among the “desiderata” found in Jones’ papers after his death, there is “The Ancient Geography of India, etc., from the Puranas,” and even “A Translation of the Puranas.”<sup>6</sup> The importance of the purāṇas in India was fully recognized by early Western writers. The catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the National Library in Paris (1807) contains many purāṇa titles, with extensive content analyses by Alexander Hamilton. A note on purāṇas in his own handwritten version of the catalogue begins with the statement that “after the Vedas, the Puranas are considered the most sacred of the Indian Books.”<sup>7</sup>

In the second quarter of the nineteenth century purāṇas and their place in Sanskrit literature became the object of a heated controversy between Vans Kennedy and Horace Hayman Wilson. The controversy will be discussed else-

<sup>2</sup> Editorial, Pur 1, 1959–60, 115–119 at 115.

<sup>3</sup> 1953: 270.

<sup>4</sup> 1961: 36.

<sup>5</sup> Presidential Address – Classical Sanskrit, AIOC 17 (1953), 86–92 at 87.

<sup>6</sup> S. K. CHATTERJI: Sir William Jones: 1746–1794, in: Sir William Jones: Bicentenary of His Birth, Calcutta: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1948, pp. 81–96 at 94. Cf. Juan Roger RIVIERE: European Translations of Purāṇa Texts, Pur 5, 1963, 243–250 at 244–245.

<sup>7</sup> ROSANE ROCHER: Alexander Hamilton (1762–1824). A Chapter in the Early History of Sanskrit Philology, New Haven Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1968, p. 41. The same sentence was repeated, in French, by Hamilton’s friend and collaborator, Louis Mathieu LAGLÈS: Sur la littérature des Hindous, Recherches asiatiques 1, 1805, 382–432 at 393.

where in this volume. The point I want to stress here is that Kennedy, an Englishman in the military service, read, in the 1830's, all major purāṇas, with only a few exceptions.<sup>8,9</sup> Wilson's approach to the purāṇas was even far more ambitious than Kennedy's. In his desire to obtain a survey of the entire purāṇa literature, "he engaged in the kind of work that would be hard to believe if he had not left written evidence for it."<sup>10</sup>

Wilson himself described his grand scheme as follows:

"I adopted, several years ago, a plan for the particular examination of the contents of all the Purānas, which was carried into execution during the latter years of my residence in India. Engaging the services of several able Pandits, I employed them to prepare a minute index of each of the Purānas. This was not a mere catalogue of chapters, or sections, or heads of subjects, but a recapitulation of the subjects of every page and almost every stanza in each page; being, in fact, a copious abstract in the safer form of an index. It is necessary to call attention to this part of my task, the more particularly that it has been misconceived, and has been supposed to mean nothing more than such a summary as sometimes accompanies a Purāna in the form of a list of the divisions of the work, and a brief notice of the topic of each. The indices prepared for me were of a very different description, as the inspection of them will at once exhibit. These indices were drawn up in Sanscrit. To convert them into English I employed several native young men, educated in the Hindū college, and well conversant with our language, and to them the Pandits explained the Summary which they had compiled. The original and translation were examined by myself, and corrected wherever necessary. When any particular article appeared to promise interest or information, I had that translated in detail, or translated it myself; in the former case, revising the translation with the original. In this manner I collected a series of indices, abstracts, and translations of all the Purānas with one or two unimportant exceptions, and of the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana, from which, if I am not mistaken, a correct notion of the substance and character of these works may now be safely formed."<sup>11</sup>

The originals of these manuscripts are now preserved, mainly at the Bodleian Library, in part also at the India Office Library;<sup>12</sup> copies were deposited at the Asiatic Society of Bengal.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8, 9</sup> KENNEDY (1831: 153): "I have most carefully examined sixteen of the Purans, and a great portion of the Skanda Puran," with a note: "I have not been able to procure the Bhavishya Puran, nor even to obtain any account of its contents."

<sup>10</sup> Jules MOHL, *JA* sér. 5, vol. 16, 1860, 19.

<sup>11</sup> *JRAS* 5, 1839, 63–64. RAJENDRALALA MITRA (ed. Agni°, pp. v–vi) adds that Wilson "was most favourably situated to carry out this research. He was at the head of a committee appointed by the Government of India to prepare abstracts of all the leading works in the Sanskrit language, and several paṇḍits and translators worked under him for upwards of twelve years." HARAPRASAD SHASTRI (1928a: lxiii) specifies that Wilson "trained four promising Indian youths in the art of translating the Purānas from Sanskrit into English. These were, Rāma-kamala Sena, his son Hari-mohana Sena, Tārā-chānd Cakravartī, a favourite of Rāja Rāma-mohana Rāya and Siva-kr̥ṣṇa Tagore."

<sup>12</sup> MORIZ WINTERNITZ and A. B. KEITH: *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905, pp. 157–164, nos. 1196–1220 (= MSS. Wilson 541–571). – George Rusby KAYE and Edward Hamilton JOHNSTON:

One other name has to be mentioned, before the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1840, the same year in which Wilson published his translation of the Viṣṇu°, Eugène Burnouf completed, in Paris, the first volume of his edition and translation of the Bhāgavata°, with a long and important introduction.<sup>14</sup>

To be sure, a handful of scholars studied purāṇas after 1840; their names will be cited at the appropriate places. Yet, it is characteristic that Winternitz, at the beginning of the twentieth century, introduced the chapter on the purāṇas with a footnote quoting, besides Aufrecht and Eggeling – for their catalogues of manuscripts at the Bodleian and the India Office libraries, respectively –, only three names: Wilson, Kennedy, and Burnouf.<sup>15</sup>

One can, therefore, rightly speak of a comparative neglect of the purāṇas vis-à-vis other branches of Sanskrit literature, in the second half of the nineteenth century. There may be several reasons for this neglect. In fact, it may very well have been the European scholar who did most for the early study of purāṇas – Wilson –, who also became responsible for their being neglected. Having collected and studied his indices to several purāṇas, Wilson was convinced that his translation of the Viṣṇu° ought not to be repeated for other purāṇas. Hence the nature of his annotations:

“In the notes which I have added to the translation, I have been desirous chiefly of comparing the statements of the text with those of other Purāṇas, and pointing out the circumstances in which they differ or agree; so as to render the present publication a sort of concordance to the whole, as it is not very probable that many of them will be published or translated.”<sup>16</sup>

The principal reason for Wilson’s lack of enthusiasm was his opinion that the purāṇas are basically late documents. The impact of this opinion on more recent purāṇa studies will be discussed later. At this point it will be enough to refer to Wilson’s statement of principle:

“From the sketch thus offered of the subjects of the Purāṇas, and which, although admitting of correction, is believed to be in the main a candid and accurate summary, it

---

India Office Library, Catalogue of Manuscripts in European Languages, Vol. II, Pt. II, MSS. Eur. D. 380–415, 1.2, pp. 1188–1208.

<sup>13</sup> Theodore GOLDSTÜCKER: *Literary Remains*, London: Allen, 1879, 2.94. Cf. WILSON, *JRAS* 5, 1839, 63 n. 1; HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928b: 324.

<sup>14</sup> The influence which Burnouf and, even more so, Wilson had on later purāṇa research will be discussed at various places in this volume. At this stage I want to draw attention to the fact that, for instance, LASSEN’s passage on the purāṇas (1847: 479–482 = 1867: 576–580) is totally and exclusively based on the Prefaces of Wilson and Burnouf: “In diesen zwei Vorreden hat man alles beisammen, welches für die Kenntnis der Purāna als wirkliche Ausbeute der Forschung gelten kann, wenn man dazu die besonderen Analysen einiger Purāna fügt, die wir Wilson verdanken” (p. 479 n. 2). In turn, WEBER’s *Vorlesungen* (1852: 179–180 = 1876: 206–208 = 1878: 190–191) is totally based on Lassen.

<sup>15</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 450 n. 1.

<sup>16</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: lxxii.

will be evident that in their present condition they must be received with caution as authorities for the mythological religion of the Hindus at any remote period. They preserve, no doubt, many ancient notions and traditions; but these have been so mixed up with foreign matter, intended to favour the popularity of particular forms of worship or articles of faith, that they cannot be unreservedly recognised as genuine representations of what we have reason to believe the Purāṇas originally were."<sup>17</sup>

Assigning the purāṇas a late date and labeling them "not very original," was bound to deter European indologists who, in an atmosphere of Romanticism, could only be interested in things ancient and original.<sup>18</sup>

Even though, one decade after Winternitz, it was still possible to say that "very little can as yet be added to his perspicacious survey of the Purāṇas,"<sup>19</sup> the situation had changed dramatically by the time the English translation of the first volume of the *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur* came along, in 1927. Contrary to Wilson's expectations several purāṇas had been edited and some translated; also, the initial footnote to the purāṇa chapter in Winternitz' English version clearly shows that the number of scholars taking interest in these texts generally had grown to a considerable extent.

One reason, in addition to the purāṇas being "late" texts, for the lack of interest in these books during the earlier period may have been the inability of scholars to deal with the overwhelming mass of materials contained in them.<sup>20</sup> It is characteristic of twentieth century purāṇa research that it starts looking for ways and methods to control this mass of materials. Even the title of Jahn's 1916 article: "Aufgaben der Purāṇaforschung," was programmatic. The most important names in this period, from a methodological point of view, are Frederick Eden Pargiter – whose historical evaluation of purāṇas has been admired and criticized, but never ignored – and Willibald Kirfel – whose strictly philological approach created a true school of purāṇa scholars, especially in Germany.<sup>21</sup> Their contributions, as well as the reactions they provoked, will be analyzed elsewhere in this volume.

The most recent important contribution to purāṇa studies was the creation, in 1955 in Varanasi, of the Purāṇa Department (Purāṇa Prakāśana Samiti) of the

---

<sup>17</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: lvi.

<sup>18</sup> HACKER 1960: 342.

<sup>19</sup> JAHN 1916: 305. About the same time K. NĀRĀYAṆASWĀMI AIYAR (1914: xv–xvi = 1916: xiii–xiv) admits that "the title of this work ... has been adopted more to attract the public to the much neglected study of the Purāṇas than to make an exposition of them."

<sup>20</sup> Cf. HACKER 1960: 342.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Hermann BERGER (rev. of Losch's Rājadharmā, ZDMG 113, 1963, 390): "Seit die in der Indologie etwas tiefmütterlich behandelten Purāṇas durch W. Kirfels bahnbrechende Arbeiten erstmals eine systematische Behandlung erfahren haben, beginnen immer mehr Indologen diesen für die indische Geistesgeschichte so grundlegenden Texten ihr Interesse zuzuwenden."

All-India Kashiraj Trust, and the publication, since 1959, of a journal solely devoted to purāṇa research: *Puranam*.<sup>22</sup>

After all this, and from a look at the bibliographical materials incorporated in this volume, it will be clear that, today, the purāṇas can no longer be considered neglected.<sup>23</sup> And yet, one continues to encounter references to “this hitherto totally neglected genre,”<sup>24</sup> and to read the traditional complaint that “material regarding Indian culture embodied in the Purāṇa texts remains untapped.”<sup>25</sup> A reviewer of the book in which the latter statement was made rightly questioned its validity, “when, now, studies on individual Purāṇas and Purāṇas in general from varied points of view are available in print and/or unpublished research-theses in various universities in India.”<sup>26</sup>

The most often quoted indicator of the general neglect of the purāṇas as compared with other branches of Sanskrit literature, is the state of the purāṇa editions. To be sure, just before and after the beginning of this century there was a serious effort by publishing houses in various parts of India, to make the text of many purāṇas available in print. The first issue of *Puranam* could refer to the fact that “complete Vulgate editions of the Purāṇas have been published in Bengali, Telugu and Nāgarī characters.”<sup>27</sup> Yet, quantity did not imply quality. On the contrary, all those who had occasion to use these editions of the purāṇas are unanimous: most editions are extremely poor. They are generally based on a limited number of manuscripts, the origin and variant readings of which are rarely indicated, if they are mentioned at all. The editions often appear to be no more than literal reproductions of one or more manuscripts, without the slightest effort at improving their shortcomings, and probably adding a few misprints of their own.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Rev. by W. KIRFEL: *ZDMG* 113, 1963, 388–390.

<sup>23</sup> I want to draw the reader’s special attention to recent purāṇa research in Italy, mostly written in Italian and, therefore, less widely known. For a survey, see Stefano PIANO and Giuseppe SPERA: *Puranic Studies in Italy*, *Pur* 22, 1980, 122–156.

<sup>24</sup> Aryendra SHARMA, in his Foreword to *LALYE Devībhāgavata*° 1973.

<sup>25</sup> PAI Kūrma° 1975: Preface p. i.

<sup>26</sup> S. G. KANTAWALA: *JOIB* 28, 1978–79, 103.

<sup>27</sup> S. K. CHATTERJI: *The Purāṇas – Projected Critical Editions by the Kāśīrāja Trust of Varanasi*, *Pur* 1, 1959–60, 12–15 at 15.

<sup>28</sup> “They are more full of errors than even the worst manuscripts” (HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: 327). Cf. John BROUGH (*The Early Brahmanical Tradition of Gotra and Pravara*, Cambridge UP, 1922, p. 48) on the state of the *pravara* lists in the *Matsya*°; Chintaharan CHAKRAVARTI (*Pur* 3, 1961, 40 n. 1) on the absence of a reliable *Mārkaṇḍeya*° ed.; especially, the anonymous review (*IA* 7, 1878, 208) of Gerson da Cunha’s *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* ed. A word of warning may be added here against using so-called revised and, therefore, expectedly improved editions. E. g., the *Bhaviṣya*° was printed in 1897 at the Venkaṭeśvara Press. The ed. was thoroughly revised in 1910, and published again, with minor improvements, in 1959. A scholar who used the three editions agrees that many mistakes have been cor-

Isolated voices claimed that a renewed effort to produce complete and better editions – and translations – of purāṇas is less useful than compiling good subject-indices.<sup>29</sup> Others felt that subject-indices, to be reliable and useful, ought to be preceded by critical editions.<sup>30</sup> Others again, and they were probably the majority, insisted on critical editions as a prior and necessary condition for further study of purāṇas generally.<sup>31</sup>

Meanwhile, the critical editions of the Mahābhārata at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune, and of the Rāmāyaṇa at the Oriental Institute in Baroda, provided models which sooner or later were to be imitated for the purāṇas. Speaking as the president of the fifth All-India Oriental Conference, Haraprasad Shastri referred to the Poona edition, and continued: “After the success of this edition of the Mahābhārata, the 18 Mahā-purāṇas should be subjected to the same critical method of examination.”<sup>32</sup> Critical editions of purāṇas along these lines were started in earnest<sup>33</sup> at the All-India Kashiraj Trust in Varanasi. The first purāṇa to be taken up for a critical edition was the Matsya°; the editor was to be V. Raghavan.<sup>34</sup> Several preparatory studies appeared in rapid succession in Puranam, including “A Sample Edition of the Matsya Purāṇa Text,”<sup>35</sup> but the critical edition itself has not yet appeared. The first critical edition to be published in Varanasi was that of the Vāmana°, by Anand Swarup Gupta, in 1967.<sup>36</sup> It was followed, in 1972, by the Kūrma°,<sup>37</sup> by the Varāha° in 1981, and work is under way for other purāṇas.

---

rected and totally ununderstandable passages made more legible, but he has good reasons to believe that the overall “emendation” in many cases actually led to less justifiable texts (STIETENCRON Sām̐ba° 1966: 15–16).

<sup>29</sup> I have already referred to Wilson’s lack of interest in editions and translations. Cf. also JAHN 1916: 307; KIRFEL: rev. of Puranam 1, ZDMG 113, 1963, 388–390 at 389.

<sup>30</sup> RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1951–55: 1.vii.

<sup>31</sup> Madan Mohan MALAVIYA: Presidential Address, AIOC 10 (1940) 1941, lxxii–lxxx at lxxvi; R. D. KARMARKAR: Presidential Address – Classical Sanskrit, AIOC 17 (1953), 86–92 at 87; HAZRA 1962: 266.

<sup>32</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI: Sanskrit Culture in Modern India, Pres. Addr., AIOC 5 (1928), 62–110 at 105.

<sup>33</sup> There are unconfirmed references to the beginning of a critical edition of the Bhāgavata°, by “the University of Gujerat” (S.K. CHATTERJI: Pur 1, 1959–60, 15), the “Gujarat Vidyā Sabhā” (MANKAD: Pur 4, 1962, 6), the “B.J. Institute of Learning, Ahmedabad” (PUSALKAR 1968: 692).

<sup>34</sup> S.K. CHATTERJI: The Purāṇas, Pur 1, 1959–60, 15; V. RAGHAVAN: General President’s Address, AIOC 21 (1961) 1964, 1.1–57 at 17–18.

<sup>35</sup> See bibliography sub Matsya°.

<sup>36</sup> The Acknowledgment and Appreciation states: “We had sent our scholars to the Bhandarkar Research Institute, Poona, to study the methods of critical edition followed there.”

<sup>37</sup> For the scholarly discussions on the validity of critical editions for purāṇas generally, see 2.2.1.

## 1.2 Importance of the Purāṇas

The purāṇas have not uniformly found recognition as an important branch of Sanskrit literature. Their relevance and status have been questioned mainly from three quarters, for three different reasons.

First, there were those who raised – often highly emotionally – objections against the very contents of the purāṇas, particularly against religion as it appears in these texts. An anonymous contributor to the Calcutta Review accuses the purāṇas of having “woven out a system of mythology, which has, perhaps, nowhere been surpassed either in extent, richness, or obscenity.” According to the same author, “of all false religions, that of the Purans is perhaps the most monstrous in its absurdities – a stupendous memorial to the easy credulity of an imbecile race.”<sup>1</sup> Theodore Goldstücker’s *Inspired Writings of Hinduism* contains a regular tirade against the contents of the purāṇas, and their destructive impact on the Hindu religion.

“When, by priestcraft and ignorance, a nation has lost itself so far as to look upon writings like these as divinely inspired, there is but one conclusion to be drawn: it has arrived at the turning-point of its destinies. Hinduism stands at this point, and we anxiously pause to see which way it will direct its steps. For several centuries, it is true, its position has seemed stationary; but the power of present circumstances, social and political, is such that it can no longer continue so. All barriers to religious imposition having broken down since the modern Puranas were received by the masses as the source of their faith, sects have sprung up which not merely endanger religion, but society itself; tenets have been propounded, which are an insult to the human mind; practices have been introduced, which must fill every true Hindu with confusion and shame. There is no necessity for examining them in detail, by unveiling, for instance, the secrets of the Tantra literature; nor need we be at pains of convincing the intelligent portion of the Hindu community; for, the excellent works which it sent forth from Calcutta, Benares, and Bombay, and the enlightened views which it propagates through its periodical press, fully prove that, equal in mental accomplishments to the advanced European mind, it requires no evidence of the gulf which separates the present state from its remote past.

But what we do hold is, that all the activity of the learned portion will not avert the danger which threatens the future destiny of Hinduism, unless it boldly grapples with the very root of the disease. The causes of the gradual degeneracy of Hinduism, are, indeed, not different from those to which other religions are subject, when allowed to grow in the dark. In Europe, religious depravity received its check when the art of printing allowed the light of publicity to enter into the book whence her nations derive their faith; and no other means will check it in India than the admission of the masses to that original book which is always on their lips, but which is now the monopoly of that infinitesimal fraction of the Brahminical caste able to understand its sense; and admission, also, to that other and important literature which has at all periods of Hinduism

---

<sup>1</sup> Puranism; or the popular religion of India, CR 24:48, 1855, 189–233 at 190 and 223. [Anonymous; attributed to Shoshee Chundar DATTA, in *Classified Subject Index to Calcutta Review 1844–1920*, Calcutta: India Book Exchange, 1974.]

striven to prove to the people that their real faith is neither founded on the Brahmana portion of the Vedas, nor on the Puranas, but on the Rigveda hymns.”<sup>2</sup>

Similar objections have been expressed, not only by Europeans, but also by Indians. According to V. Venkatachalla Iyer,

“Some of the major Puranas appear to have been re-written with the set purpose of promoting ignorance and superstition: of enslaving the minds of the people: of preventing them from thinking for themselves: and of giving currency to a religion, which, while pretending in theory to maintain within itself the principles of emancipation, is calculated in practice to sink one deeper and deeper in the quagmire.”<sup>3</sup>

Second, the purāṇas and their role as religious and cultural documents failed to find favor with a number of modern Hindu thinkers and reformers. Devendranath Tagore called on his compatriots to turn away from the purāṇas which were divisive, toward the Vedas, i. e. the upaniṣads, in order again to unite all Hindus into one religion. Such appeals at the same time show how important the purāṇas really were, and how few were familiar with the upaniṣads – not to mention the earlier stages of *śruti* literature.

“All our theologians revere the Upanishads as the Vedanta, the crowning point and essence of all the Vedas. If I could preach the Brāhma Dharma as based upon the Vedanta, then all India would have one religion, all dissensions would come to an end, all would be united in a common brotherhood, her former valour and power would be revived, and finally she would regain her freedom. Such were the lofty aspirations which my mind then entertained. Idolatry with all its pomp and circumstance was to be found chiefly in the Tantras and Puranas, and had no place in the Vedanta. If every one were to turn from the Tantras and Puranas to the Upanishads, if they sought to acquire the knowledge of Brahma as taught in the Upanishads and devoted themselves to His worship, then it would result in the utmost good of India. . . . But . . . the Vedas, whose crowning point were the Upanishads, . . . had become virtually extinct in Bengal. . . . With the exception of one or two Brāhmaṇa pundits, they did not even know the meaning of their daily prayers.”<sup>4</sup>

We are told that, when Dayānanda Sarasvatī offered the traditional parting *dakṣiṇā* to his guru Virajananda, the latter told him: “I want from you a new kind of *dakṣiṇā*. Promise me that you will, as long as you live, devote everything, even give up your life, to the propagation of the books of the *rishis* and the Vedic

<sup>2</sup> Calcutta: Susil Gupta, 1952, pp. 105–109 at 108–109. This text appeared originally in “an English Journal,” 1859–63; also reprinted in *Literary Remains*, 2 vols., London: Allen, 1879, 2.77–78.

<sup>3</sup> The Puranas, QJMS 13, 1922–23, 702–713 at 703–704.

<sup>4</sup> The Autobiography of Maharshi Devendranath Tagore, London: Macmillan, 1914, pp. 102–103. Cf. PAYNE 1933: 17. Wilhelm HALBFASS (*Indien und Europa*, Basel and Stuttgart: Schwabe, 1981, p. 492 n. 55) notes that, as far as Rammohan Roy is concerned, “gelegentliche abwertende Bemerkungen über Purāṇas usw. scheinen vor allem für europäische Leser bestimmt.”

religion. I will accept from you the fulfilment of that promise as my *dakshinā*.”<sup>5</sup> Virajananda, indeed, divided all Hindu scriptures into two categories. The *ārṣa* texts, the true works of the *ṛṣis*, i.e. the Vedas, were the sole authoritative sources of teaching and practice. All other texts were non-*ārṣa* and, therefore, devoid of all authority.<sup>6</sup> One of the texts explicitly mentioned by him as untruthful and worthless, was the Bhāgavata°.<sup>7</sup> Dayānanda himself soon published a Bhāgavatakhaṇḍana.<sup>8</sup> Even though, at that time, he still taught and defended the Devībhāgavata° as the true Bhāgavata°, and even though he still recommended reading the Kūrma° and the Liṅga°, he gradually eliminated all purāṇas as “books rejected for study.”<sup>9</sup> Members of the Arya Samaj have repeatedly disclaimed the purāṇas as authoritative texts, and denied the traditional authorship of Vyāsa.<sup>10</sup>

The Theosophists chose to walk the middle of the road, following neither those who reject the authority of the purāṇas on principle, nor those “who swallow them wholesale, without offering or finding explanations for those parts that seem not to be reasonable.” According to the author of these words, K. Narayanaswami Aiyar,

“In taking the Purāṇas as authorities, Madame Blavatsky wants us to avoid both extremes. She appeals to our reason; she throws out the explanation where it is necessary and gives us rational interpretation of the teachings therein. It is in the light of the hints upon the Purāṇas given by her in the two volumes of *The Secret Doctrine* that I write this little work on the Purāṇas. In those two monumental volumes of hers, it is the Vishṇu Purāṇa that has been mostly quoted, since it is perhaps a work that has not been much tampered with.”<sup>11</sup>

Finally, negative opinions about purāṇas also have been voiced by scholars, subsequent to and in consequence of their close association with one or more of these texts. I have already referred to Wilson’s opinion that “it is not very probable that many of them will be published or translated.” Others deplore the repetitiousness of the Vāmana°,<sup>12</sup> or the fact that “everything is welcome” in the

<sup>5</sup> J. T. F. JORDENS: *Dayānanda Sarasvatī. His Life and Ideas*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1978, pp. 38–39. Cf. the Earl of RONALDSHAY: *The Heart of Āryāvarta*, London: Constable, 1925, p. 70.

<sup>6</sup> Kenneth W. JONES: *Arya Dharm. Hindu Consciousness in 19th-Century Punjab*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976, p. 31.

<sup>7</sup> In a document called *Sārvabhauma Sabhā*; see JORDENS, op. cit., pp. 37–38.

<sup>8</sup> Agra, ca. 1865. Published, with notes, by Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṃsaka, Sonipat, 1971.

<sup>9</sup> *Light of Truth. An English Translation of Satyarthaprakash*, by Durga Prasad, New Delhi: Jan Gyan Prakashan, 1972, p. 70; cf. also “Falsehood of Puranas,” pp. 327ff.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., “Who wrote the Puranas?” (1891), by DURGA PRASAD, the manager of the Virajananda Press in Lahore: the purāṇas are all very recent – the Bhāgavata°, for instance, was written 184 years ago –, and their authors were followers of the Buddha. Cf. also Chinmanlal VAISHYA: *Purāṇatattvaprakāśa* (in Hindi, Agra 1910).

<sup>11</sup> 1914: 4 = 1916: 4.

<sup>12</sup> Adam HOHENBERGER: *IJ* 8, 1963, 1.

Svayambhū<sup>o</sup>.<sup>13</sup> The editor of the Kūrma<sup>o</sup> was surprised that eight manuscripts were preserved of a text which does not deserve that much attention.<sup>14</sup> One recent student of the Padma<sup>o</sup> notes that the growing size of the Uttarakhaṇḍa did not entail an increase in importance.

“There is not even a single chapter which may be considered as full of historic interest. Its importance being less, it is really very difficult to hold patience in carefully searching the whole of it and no blame can be given if one really becomes impatient in going over this long and dull book.”<sup>15</sup>

Notwithstanding all this, more often than not the purāṇas have been acclaimed as important documents, in a variety of ways, by Indians and foreigners as well. Al-Bīrūnī, for one, made extensive use of the purāṇas, and recognized that “by these books people are guided in fulfilling the rites of their religion.”<sup>16</sup> As indicated earlier, the first generations of Europeans in India were exposed to the purāṇas; it is clear that they also realized the importance of these texts. As early as 1609 Giacomo Fenicio (+. Goa 1632) composed, in Portuguese, a volume describing the Indian tradition as represented in the purāṇas. Although the term “purāṇa” is absent from the original title: *Livro da Seita dos Indios Orientais*, it does appear in the title of its Latin translation, by Ildephonsus a Praesentatione (+. 1789/1790): *Collectio omnium dogmatum & arcanorum ex Purānis seu libris Canonicis paganorum Indianorum, seu tractatus de falsa secta paganorum Indianorum Asiae maioris seu Indiae Orientalis, & praesertim de superstitionibus Gentilium Malabarum*.<sup>17</sup> Also, when the Jesuit missionaries, in the eighteenth century, composed a number of treatises to convert Hindus to Christianity, they gave these books such titles as *Ezourvedam*, etc., but they wrote them entirely in the style of the purāṇas.<sup>18</sup> William Ward, in turn, noted that the purāṇas “are the

<sup>13</sup> Louis de LA VALLÉE POUSSIN: *JRAS* 1894, 300.

<sup>14</sup> Nīlmaṇi MUKHOPĀDHYĀYA (ed. Kūrma<sup>o</sup>, p. v): “Considering that it contains very little that is new and that whatever it contains can be found elsewhere in a more attractive and elaborate form, and considering also that the book is seldom read and cited as an authority for any religious practices that obtain now-a-days, it is a wonder that so many well-written MSS. in a well-preserved state should have been received from different quarters for the purpose of collation.”

<sup>15</sup> Asoke CHATTERJEE: *Pur* 3, 1961, 48.

<sup>16</sup> SACHAU 1888: 1.265.

<sup>17</sup> Jarl CHARPENTIER: Preliminary Report on the “*Livro da Seita dos Indios Orientais*” (Brit. Mus. MS Sloane, 1820), *BSOAS* 2, 1921–23, 731–754; cf. id.: *A Treatise on Hindu Cosmography from the Seventeenth Century* (Brit. Mus. MS Sloane, 2748A), *BSOAS* 3, 1923–25, 317–342. The text was edited, with introduction and notes, by CHARPENTIER, Uppsala: *Arbeten utgivna med understöd av Wilhelm Ekmans Universitetsfond* no. 40, 1933.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Ludo ROCHER: *Ezourvedam. A French Veda of the Eighteenth Century*, [University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia 1,] Amsterdam–Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1984.

most popular of all Hindu writings, and have to this day an amazing influence upon the public manners throughout Hindoost'han."<sup>19</sup> Nearly one half century later Anton Edmund Wollheim da Fonseca's *Mythologie des alten Indien* was based on purāṇas, "the most important sources for the real mythology" of the Hindus.<sup>20</sup> More recently Winternitz, without being enthusiastic about the purāṇas as literary compositions, nevertheless realized their importance for Hindus, past and present.

"So langweilig und unerquicklich auch diese ganze grosse Purāṇa-Litteratur für uns sein mag, kann sie doch der Litteraturhistoriker ebensowenig wie der Religionsforscher mit Stillschweigen übergehen. Denn diese Schriften waren jahrhundertlang und sind noch heutigen Tages die geistige Nahrung von Millionen von Indern."<sup>21</sup>

The importance of the purāṇas has been stressed even more eloquently by Indians, often in conjunction with complaints about the way in which these texts have been neglected. The purāṇas are important because they preserve, in an encyclopedic fashion, every possible aspect of Hindu culture and civilization.

"The Purāṇas constitute the great store-house of ancient Indian knowledge. They are the records of every thing that in ancient times interested the people from the highest to the lowest. They treat alike of philosophy and theology, cosmogony and chronology, history and fables, science and art. Nothing comes amiss to them; and every subject is treated in an easy colloquial style suited to the lowest capacity."<sup>22</sup>

The purāṇas are, first, important documents for the study and reconstruction of the history of Hindu India.<sup>23</sup> In a more practical way, they have contributed to the continuity of Hinduism through the ages, and are indispensable for a correct

<sup>19</sup> WARD 1811: 2.37.

<sup>20</sup> Berlin: Hempel, 1856, p. 176.

<sup>21</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 483. Cf. Walter RUBEN, who insists on the importance of investigating local cults as a salutary supplement to the study of the purāṇas: "Sie und nicht die theologischen Systeme sind das Lebendige. Eine Interpretation der Purāṇen aus der Kenntnis der heiligen Stätten und Lokaltraditionen Indiens heraus, das ist eine wesentliche Aufgabe der Indologen, die das große Glück haben, im Lande selber arbeiten zu können" (*Eisenschmiede und Dämonen in Indien*, Leiden: Brill, 1939, p. 189).

<sup>22</sup> Rajendralal MITRA: ed. *Agni°*, Introduction p. 1. Cf. V. R.[AGHAVAN]: Editorial to Pur 1.1, 1959; V. S. A.[GRAWALA]: Editorial, Pur 1, 1959–60, 115–119 at 116. See also Giridhar Sharma CHATURVEDI: *Purāṇeṣu purāṇamahattvam*, Pur 1, 1959–60, 125–126, and Anand Swarup GUPTA: *Purāṇa-mahattvam*, Pur 3, 1961, 46.

<sup>23</sup> V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: *The Purāṇas, Their Historical Value*, PO 2, 1937–38, 77–83: "In what way does the Purāṇa help us to reconstruct the history of ancient India? The Purāṇas are altogether an encyclopaedia of information and therefore very useful in writing a history of Indian culture and civilisation. By culture and civilisation we mean a history of Indian polity, of Indian society, a history of religion and philosophy, legal history, a history of arts and crafts, architecture and iconography" (p. 80). Cf. HAZRA 1962: 270; S. K. DE and R. C. HAZRA: *Purāṇetiḥāsasamgrahaḥ, An Anthology of the Epics and Purāṇas*, Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1959, p. vi.

understanding of Hinduism today.<sup>24</sup> As a matter of fact, every Hindu is influenced by the purāṇas, and his activities are guided by them. “We all know that a Hindu is really born in the atmosphere of the Purāṇas, and he lives and breathes and has his being in the bosom of the Purāṇas, so to say, during the formative period of his mind and personality.”<sup>25</sup>

### 1.2.1 The Purāṇas and the Veda

A significant component of the importance of the purāṇas in the development of Hindu culture concerns their relationship with the Vedas. Some scholars denied any connection or resemblance between the two. Says Max Müller:

“... if it be unsafe to use the epic poems as authorities for the Vedic age, it will be readily admitted that the same objection applies with still greater force to the Purāṇas. Although only one of the eighteen Purāṇas has as yet been completely published, enough is known of their character, partly by Professor Burnouf’s edition of the Bhagavat-purāṇa, partly by extracts given from other Purāṇas by Professor Wilson, to justify our discarding their evidence with reference to the primitive period of Vedic literature.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>24</sup> M. M. MALAVIYA, who calls himself “a Paurāṇika by heredity,” Presidential Address, AIOC 10 (1940) 1941, lxxvi: “The Purāṇas are encyclopaedias of ancient and medieval Hindu culture and religion, and we can hardly get the proper perspective for solving the problems of present-day Hinduism without their proper study.” Cf. K. M. MUNSHI: The Classical Age (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, <sup>3</sup>1970), Foreword p. XX: “The Paurāṇikas were the missionaries of the new age; an agency of social uplift, which brought an ever-expanding circle of adherents into the fold of Āryan culture.”

<sup>25</sup> S. K. CHATTERJI: The Purāṇas, Pur 1, 1959–60, 15. Cf. Nīlmaṇi MUKHOPĀDHYĀYA (ed. Kūrma<sup>2</sup>, Pref. p. xv): “The Vedas are studied by the antiquarian, the Upanishads by the philosopher; but every orthodox Hindu must have some knowledge of the Purāṇas, directly or vicariously, to shape his conduct and to perform the duties essential to his worldly and spiritual welfare”; – RAGHAVAN (1953: 271): “They have become an encyclopaedia of Hinduism, a popular handbook of knowledge, the source of as complete a liberal education as is possible for the busy member of society to get”; – KANE (1968: 416): “the popular religion of modern Hindus is pre-eminently *paurāṇic*.”

<sup>1</sup> A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, London: Williams and Norgate, 1859, p. 61. Cf. Th. GOLDSTÜCKER (Sanskrit and Culture, Calcutta: Susil Gupta, 155; written in 1862): “... even a superficial comparison of the contents of the present Puranas with the ancient lore of Hindu religion, philosophy and science, must convince every one that the picture of religion and life unfolded by them is a caricature of that afforded by the Vedic works, and that it was drawn by priestcraft, interested in submitting to its sway the popular mind, and unscrupulous in the use of the means which had to serve its ends” (p. 61). More specifically, K. K. KURUKKAL (The Vedic Yajña and the Purāṇic Tapas, Wijesekara vol. 1970, 83–87) presumes that “the pre-Vedic non-Aryan practice of *tapas* was temporarily suppressed in the Vedic period but that it again assumed great importance when the Brāhmanism of the Veda was superseded by popular Hinduism of the epics and the Purāṇas ... While in the Epics, one still comes across references to *yajña*, the Purāṇas do not seem to give any prominence to it” (p. 84).

There are even some verses, attributed to Vyāsa, which seem to confirm that opinion:

dharmasuddhim abhīpsadbhir na vedād anyad iṣyate /  
 dharmasya kāraṇaṃ śuddhaṃ miśram anyat prakīrtitam /  
 ataḥ sa paramo dharmo yo vedād adhiḡyamate /  
 avaraḥ sa tu vijñeyo yaḥ purāṇādiṣu sthitaḥ //<sup>2</sup>

Others do recognize that the purāṇas have some connection with the Veda, but they describe this connection as a purely mechanical one, amounting to no more than meaningless lip service.<sup>3</sup>

According to the general opinion, however, the purāṇas cannot be divorced from the Vedas.<sup>4</sup> One way of interpreting the connection between the – earlier – Vedas and the – more recent – purāṇas is to consider the latter as the logical continuation and development of the former.<sup>5</sup> Others conceive the connection to be even closer, and interpret the purāṇas as the necessary companions for a correct understanding and interpretation of the Veda.<sup>6</sup> The purāṇas “manifest and demonstrate the Vedic truths;”<sup>7</sup> “they must be fully utilized by us if we are to

<sup>2</sup> Cf. HAZRA 1962: 250–251.

<sup>3</sup> JAHN (Saura° 1908: XV): “Im Veda-Kanon erblickt das Sauram offiziell die oberste Norm sowohl für menschliches wie für göttliches Denken und Handeln ... Es ist aber deutlich zu merken, daß die Weisheit des Veda nicht mehr sehr tief erfaßt und fruchtbar verwertet wird, sondern als willkommene autoritative Handhabe eher stereotype und mechanische Anwendung findet.” According to Govinda DAS (1924: 115), “The Vedas, while accorded lip-reverence, are absolutely put aside, and a wholly different and even antagonistic set of ideas and practices are in full swing.” To the same effect, KANE: Paurāṇa-dharma, Gode vol. (1960), 3.70–82 at 72.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ganga Sagar RAI: Śākhās of the Ṛgveda as Mentioned in the Purāṇas, Pur 6, 1964, 97–112; Śākhās of the Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda in the Purāṇas, Pur 7, 1965, 235–253; Śākhās of the Sāmaveda as Mentioned in the Purāṇas, Pur 8, 1966, 115–134; Śākhās of the Atharvaveda, Pur 14, 1972, 58–69; Vedic Śākhās, Pur 15, 1973, 133–140. On Viṣṇu° 3.3.11 (*eka āsīd yajurvedaḥ*), see Viman Chandra BHATTACHARYA: On the Import of a Paurāṇic Verse, JGJRI 16, 1958–59, 423–432.

<sup>5</sup> According to Viman Chandra BHATTACHARYA (Paurāṇic Tradition, Is it Vedic?, JGJRI 15, 1957–58, 109–133), “the set of traditions propagated by the Purāṇas is basically founded on the Vedic heritage” (pp. 132–133). P. V. KANE (Vedic Mantras and Legends in the Purāṇas, C. Kunhan Raja vol. 1946, 5–8) says that “the Purāṇas try hard to build on the foundations of the Vedic tradition” (p. 5), which he illustrates with examples from the Brahma°.

<sup>6</sup> Sudhakar MALAVIYA (The Purāṇic Interpretation of the Ṛgvedic Mantra IV.58.3, Pur 17, 1975, 75–83) shows that explanations for the vague terms *vṛṣabha* and *maho devaḥ* in the ṛc are found in the Skanda°, Agni°, and Bhāgavata°. V. G. RAHURKAR (The Role of Agastya in the Vedic and Post-Vedic Literature, PO 22.1–2, 1957, 40–50) used the purāṇas to attempt dating the Vedic hymn of Agastya and Lopamudrā (RV 1.179). Also, id.: Devāpi and Śāntanu in the Ṛgveda, Gode vol. (1960), 3.175–180, and A. D. PUSALKER: Ṛgveda and Harappa Culture, Renou vol. (1968), 581–594. For criticism of these attempts, see GONDA 1975: 28.

<sup>7</sup> ARORA Bhaviṣya° 1972: 1.

realize the truths of the Vedas.”<sup>8</sup> More specifically, the Bhāgavata° has been described as an interpretation of the Vedic Gāyatrī mantra.<sup>9</sup>

The idea that the purāṇas complement – in fact, are a necessary complement of – the Vedas, is supported by two often quoted verses:

yo vidyāc caturo vedān sāṅgopaniśado dvijaḥ /  
na cet purāṇaṃ saṃvidyān naiva sa syād vicakṣaṇaḥ /  
itihāsapurāṇābhyāṃ vedaṃ samupabr̥mḥayet /  
bibhety alpaśrutād vedo mām ayaṃ prahariṣyati //<sup>10</sup>

This interpretation of the connection between the Vedas and purāṇas entails a number of interesting consequences. First, if one accepts that the purāṇas “developed as a reinforcement and amplification of the Vedic teachings,” it is but one step to conclude that this reinforcement and amplification was meant for those who were unable to understand the Vedas without such complementary

<sup>8</sup> K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI: *The Purāṇas and Their Contribution to Indian Thought, The Cultural Heritage of India* (1937) 1.169–182 at 182. According to the same author, the purāṇas “enable us to know the true import of the ethos and philosophy and religion of the Vedas. They clothe with flesh and blood the bony framework of the Dharma-sūtras and the Dharma-śāstras. Without such a tabernacle of flesh and bone, the mere life-force of the Vedas cannot function with effect” (ibid., <sup>2</sup>1978, 5.64–71 at 64). For KANTAWALA (Matsya° 1964: vii), above everything else, “they are important as aids to Vedic interpretation.” Manilal N. DVIVEDI (The Purāṇas, Int. Congr. Orient. 8, 1893, 3.199–216 at 204) holds that “the Vedas are the historical record of a past humanity, containing many useful hints and lessons for our use; that the Upaniśads are the key to the understanding of these records; and the Purāṇas the broad clear light by which to read and decipher them.” Cf. also A. S. A[GRAWALA]: *Purāṇa Vidyā*, Pur 1, 1959–60, 89–100.

<sup>9</sup> RUKMANI Bhāgavata° 1970: 172–173. As far as the Bhāgavata° is concerned, there is also A. C. BHAKTIVEDANTA SWAMI PRABHUPADA’s opinion, that it “surpasses all other Vedic scriptures,” and that it is “the ripened fruit of all Vedic literatures. In other words, it is the cream of all Vedic knowledge” (Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam, First Canto, New York etc.: The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, 1972, pp. 55, 56).

<sup>10</sup> Besides being quoted in several purāṇas both *ślokas* also appear in the Mahābhārata (CE 1.2.235; 1.1.204, the former with a variant reading in *pāda c*: *na cākhyānam idaṃ vidyān*; MUIR: OST <sup>23</sup>3.28, 29 and HOLTZMANN 1895: 40 believe that the verse was taken from Vāyu° 1.200). The second *śloka* is identical with Vasiṣṭhadharmaśāstra 27.6; its first half is often quoted separately, e. g. in Aparārka’s comm. on Yājñavalkya 1.7, as Manu-*vacana*, showing its popularity and authority. For the entire *śloka*, and a commentary on the term *upabr̥mḥaṇa*, see also Rāmānuja’s Śrībhāṣya (Bombay S.S. 68, p. 72; tr. THIBAUT, SBE 48, pp. 91–92); cf. K. V. NĪLAMEGHĀCĀRYA: *Dharmaśāstretihāsapurāṇānāṃ vedopabr̥mḥaṇatvam*, Pur 4, 1962, 34–54. Similar verses also appear elsewhere in the purāṇas, e. g. Skanda° Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 1.90: *vedavan niścalaṃ manye purāṇaṃ vai dvijot-tamāḥ / vedāḥ pratīṣṭhitāḥ sarve purāṇe nātra saṃśayaḥ*. For several expressions such as *ātmā purāṇaṃ vedānām*, from the Revāmāhātmya, see AUFRECHT 1864: 65. K. A. NĪLAKANTA SASTRI (On the Origin of the Veda, IHC 4, 1940, 77–79) drew attention to two passages from the Vāyu°, showing that “the Vedic hymns and texts like other compositions were the product of human effort” (59.56–61), and that the Vedic *saṃhitās* suffered from mistakes introduced by successive generations of *ṛṣis* (58.10–13).

information. The puranic story tellers “kept the teachings and legends of the Vedas before the common people;” even more than the epics the purāṇas are “the scriptures of popular Hinduism.”<sup>11</sup> A variant on the concept of the purāṇas as substitutes for the benefit of those who were intellectually incapable of understanding the Veda, is the theory that they were meant for those who were socially excluded from Vedic recitation. Sāyaṇa, for one, makes it clear that the purāṇas are the Veda of women and śūdras:

striśūdrayoḥ tu satyām api jñānāpekṣāyām upanayanābhāvenādhyayanarāhityād vede 'dhikāraḥ pratibaddhaḥ; dharmabrahmajñānaṃ tu purāṇādīmukhenotpadyate.<sup>12</sup>

Another natural conclusion derived from the belief that the purāṇas were necessary companions of the Vedas, is that this companion literature was essential and, therefore, in existence from Vedic times onward. This was the view, for instance, of Vans Kennedy, for whom the purāṇas “were evidently intended to serve as a complement to the Vedas.”<sup>13</sup>

Consistent with this belief, in a number of passages<sup>14</sup> the purāṇas claim for themselves the status of a fifth Veda.<sup>15</sup> The Bhāgavata° (1.4.19–22), for example, relates how Vyāsa, for the sake of the continuity of the sacrifice (*yajñasamtatyai*), divided the single Veda into four: Ṛg, Yajus, Sāman, and Atharvan. Without

<sup>11</sup> RAGHAVAN 1953: 270–271. Cf. also NARAYANASWAMI AIYAR 1914: 7; Rajendralal MITRA: ed. Agni°, Intro. p. I–II; N. N. LAW: Prefatory Dissertation to Mukta-phalam, Calcutta Or. Ser. 5, 1920–21, p. xx; C. P. RAMASWAMI AIYAR: Purāṇas as Illustrative of Our National Psychology and Evolution, JOR 22, 1952–53, 76–80; Surabhi SETH: The Puranic World View, Indo-As. Cult. 20, 1971, 39–47 at 40; A. S. GUPTA: Purāṇic Heritage, Pur 18, 1976, 39–55 at 40.

<sup>12</sup> Ṛgveda comm., 1966 ed., 1, p. 18. GOLDSTÜCKER (Sanskrit and Culture, pp. 94–95) calls Sāyaṇa’s “but a poor justification of the origin of the [purāṇas],” and adds that Sāyaṇa and other authorities proposed it “probably because they did not feel equal to the task of destroying a system already deeply rooted in the national mind, or because they apprehended that the nation at large would remain without any religion at all, if, without possessing the Vedic creed, it likewise became deprived of that based on the Puranas.” HAZRA (1953: 221) considers the belief to be of comparatively late date only. Cf. also Devībhāgavata° 1.3.21: *striśūdradvijabandhūnām na vedaśravaṇam matam / teṣām eva hitārthāya purāṇāni kṛtāni ca*. Notice, on the other hand, that, according to the Kūrma° (CE 1.1.11), the purāṇa should only be communicated *śraddadhānāya śāntāya dhārmikāya dvijātaye*.

<sup>13</sup> KENNEDY 1831: 130. Even BURNOUF (Bhāgavata° ed., 1.viii–ix), who otherwise shares Wilson’s belief that the extant purāṇas are recent products, subscribes to Kennedy’s thesis, to the extent that, simultaneously with the Vedas, there must have been texts dealing with legends to which the Vedas make allusions, and containing “une bonne partie des matériaux qui entrent dans la composition des Pourāṇas actuels.” Cf. Sashi Bhusan CHAUDHURI: Antiquity of the Purāṇic Story Traditions, JIH 8, 1929, 1–17.

<sup>14</sup> See J. DAHLMANN: Das Mahābhārata als Epos und Rechtsbuch, Berlin: Dames, 1895, pp. 281–282; also RADHAKANTA DEVA: Śabdakalpadruma, p. 2194, col. 1.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Chāndogyopaniṣad 7.1.2, 4; 2.1; 7.1. See also Giridhara Sharma CHATURVEDI: Vedeṣu purāṇamahattvam, Pur 1, 1959–60, 21–30.

transition the text adds that *itihāsapurāṇam* is said to be the fifth Veda. The five Vedas were handed to Paila, Vaiśampāyana, Jaimini, Sumantu, and Romahaṛṣaṇa, respectively. Elsewhere the Bhāgavata° (3.12.37–39) singles out the fifth Veda, to claim superior status for it alone. Indeed, whereas each other Veda was created from one of Brahmā’s four mouths, the fifth Veda – here called *itihāsapurāṇāni* – originated from all mouths together (*sarvebhya eva vaktrebhyaḥ*).

The claim of the purāṇas to the rank of a fifth Veda found support in the occurrence, in the literature, of the term *purāṇaveda*. The Vāyu<sup>16</sup> even calls itself by that name. The Matsya°, in connection with the *mahābhūtaghaṭapradāna*,<sup>17</sup> prescribes the preparation of a vase, and of images of Brahmā, Śiva, Viṣṇu, etc., and continues:

vinyasya ghaṭamadhya tān vedapañcakasamyutān /  
 ṛgvedasyākṣasūtram syād yajurvedasya pañkajam /  
 sāmavedasya viṇā syād veṇuṃ dakṣiṇato nyaset /  
 atharvavedasya punaḥ sruksruvau kamalaṃ kare  
 purāṇavedaḥ varadaḥ sākṣasūtrakamaṇḍaluḥ //

Many modern scholars too, believe in the existence, at one time, of a Purāṇaveda, and indeed regret that this “most precious” document has been lost.<sup>18</sup> Some insist that the Purāṇaveda was a specific book;<sup>19</sup> others are inclined to think of it in more general terms, as “that branch of learning which consists of legends, stories, etc.”<sup>20</sup> In any case, much of the Purāṇaveda has been preserved in later epic and puranic literature.<sup>21</sup> Conversely, to use Geldner’s words, it was the Purāṇaveda which was “der ursprüngliche Platz” of the Purūravas-Urvaśī and other such stories.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>16</sup> 1.18ab (ĀnSS), 1.17ef (Vaṅga): *purāṇavedo hy akhilas tasmin samyak pratiṣṭhitaḥ*.

<sup>17</sup> A part of *mahādānānukīrtana* (ch. 274–289). For a description, see HOHENBERGER 1930: 156–157.

<sup>18</sup> GELDNER: *Vedische Studien* 1 (1889), 259. Cf. Johannes HERTEL: *Die Weisheit der Upanischaden*, Munich: Beck, <sup>2</sup>1922, p. 3.

<sup>19</sup> HOHENBERGER 1930: 38–39.

<sup>20</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 275 n. 3. ERNST LEUMANN (*Die Bharata Sage*, ZDMG 48, 1894, 65–83 at 67) is of the opinion that Saṃvartaka, one of the Parivrājakas mentioned in the Jābālopaniṣad, “wird ... der *vedischen Purāṇa-Literatur* [emphasis added] bekannt gewesen sein.”

<sup>21</sup> Emil SIEG: *Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda und die indische Itihāsaträdition*, Stuttgart, 1902, p. 35. According to Ananta ŚARMĀ (*Purāṇam vedāḥ*, Pur 19, 1977, 183–213) the purāṇas are the interpreters of the Purāṇaveda.

<sup>22</sup> The issue of the so-called *ākhyāna* hymns of the Rgveda has been discussed at GONDA 1975: 206–210.

### 1.3 “Extant” versus “Earlier” Purāṇas

The scholarly literature did not have to wait for the discussions on the existence at an early date of a Purāṇaveda which served as a precursor for the purāṇas as we have them today. As I mentioned above, Wilson already believed in the existence of a class of purāṇas which were much earlier than the ones he found preserved in his manuscripts. This belief was based on a variety of arguments and has led to a number of persistent trends in more recent purāṇa research. I will now examine these arguments and the resulting trends in detail.

#### 1.3.1 Sectarian Character of the Purāṇas

In the preface to the translation of the Viṣṇu° Wilson distinguished two stages in the development of the Hindu religion: the Vedic period<sup>1</sup> characterized by the worship of personified elements and a more simple and primitive form of adoration, and the mytho-epic period. The latter can again be subdivided into two phases: the older one which is represented by the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, and the younger one which corresponds to the time of the purāṇas, the main exponents of sectarian Hinduism.

“Śiva and Viṣṇu, under one or other form, are almost the sole objects that claim the homage of the Hindus in the Purāṇas; departing from the domestic and elemental ritual of the Vedas, and exhibiting a sectarian flavour and exclusiveness not traceable in the Rāmāyaṇa, and only to a qualified extent in the Mahābhārata. They are no longer authorities for Hindu belief as a whole: they are special guides for separate and sometimes conflicting branches of it, compiled for the evident purpose of promoting the preferential, or in some cases the sole, worship of Viṣṇu or Śiva.”<sup>2</sup>

The statement following immediately after the preceding one is important for our present purpose.

„That the Purāṇas always bore the character here given of them, may admit of reasonable doubt; that it correctly applies to them as they now are met with, the following pages will irrefragably substantiate. It is possible, however, that there may have been an earlier class of Purāṇas, of which those we now have are but the partial and adulterated representatives.”<sup>3</sup>

In other words, on the ground that the present, “extant” purāṇas are primarily sectarian, Wilson poses the existence of older purāṇas, which are lost, but which were more original, more authentic, and more valuable, than their “partial and

<sup>1</sup> Notice that Wilson’s characterization of the Veda was based on Colebrooke’s article at Asiatic Researches 8, Ellis’s *ibid.* 14, Rosen’s translation of the first book of the Ṛgveda, and Rammohan Roy on the Upaniṣads.

<sup>2</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: iii–iv.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. iv.

adulterated representatives,” which have been preserved. The latter are mere “pious frauds for temporary purposes.”<sup>4</sup>

Here, as for other aspects of purāṇa interpretation,<sup>5</sup> Wilson’s opinion was soon quoted – and supported – by Burnouf, in the preface to his edition and translation of the Bhāgavata°: even though some portions of the purāṇas may be of considerable antiquity, the texts obviously bear the imprint of substantial changes “the principal cause of which was the influence exercised on them by modern sects.”<sup>6</sup> With Lassen, who relies heavily on Wilson and Burnouf, the view that the extant purāṇas are recent sectarian recasts of older non-sectarian precursors enters the encyclopedic surveys of Indian history and civilization. Generation after generation of Indic scholars were told that the purāṇas, as we have them, “sind im Interesse und zur Empfehlung dieser Secten geschrieben.”<sup>7</sup>

Numerous examples could be quoted in which the same opinion is not only repeated but also expressed in nearly identical terms. Goldstücker, for example, concluded his discussion of the sectarian character of the purāṇas as follows:

“... probably *the* principal [object] of the Puranas, was to establish as the case might be, the supremacy of Vishnu or Śiva; and it may be likewise assumed of the female energy of Śiva, though the worship of the latter belongs more exclusively to the class of works known as Tantras.”<sup>8</sup>

In 1922 Rapson wrote in the Cambridge History of India:

“The chief object of the Purāṇas is to glorify Īva, or Vishnu, the great divinities who, in their manifold forms, share the allegiance of India. They have become sectarian and propagandist, exalting their own particular deity at the expense of all others. In a word, they have become the scriptures of various forms of the later Hinduism, and bear to these the same relation that the Vedas and Brāhmaṇas bore to the older Brāhmanism.”<sup>9</sup>

Half a century later, The History and Culture of the Indian People still reiterated the same idea at great length;<sup>10</sup> more succinctly, in Sukumari Bhattacharji’s words written around the same time, “the Purāṇas are sectarian scriptures, each of which magnified the cult and character of Śiva, Brahman or one or other of the incarnations of Viṣṇu.”<sup>11</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. vi. Cf. already Francis WILFORD (As. Res. 5, 1798, 244): “The Purāns are certainly a modern compilation from valuable materials, which, I am afraid no longer exist.”

<sup>5</sup> WINDISCH 1917–20: 42: “Die jetzt herrschenden allgemeinen Anschauungen über den Charakter der Purāṇan gehen in wesentlichen Punkten auf Wilson zurück.”

<sup>6</sup> BURNOUF Bhāgavata° 1.xxxiv.

<sup>7</sup> LASSEN 1847: 479 = 1867: 576.

<sup>8</sup> Sanskrit and Culture, Calcutta: Susil Gupta, 1955, p. 96 [written in 1862].

<sup>9</sup> RAPSON 1922 = 1962: 266.

<sup>10</sup> MEHENDALE 1970: 297–298.

<sup>11</sup> BHATTACHARJI 1970: 19.

Once the principle had been established that the extant purāṇas are late, sectarian representatives of earlier, non-sectarian originals, it lent itself to a variety of conclusions with far-reaching consequences for purāṇa interpretation. It means that more strongly sectarian treatments of particular myths or legends are more recent than their less sectarian counterparts. More generally, it means that the non-sectarian sections of a particular purāṇa have to be older than its sectarian parts. It also means that all purāṇas, as we have them, are of recent origin, but those purāṇas that contain more sectarian material are even more recent than the ones that contain fewer sectarian sections.

To be sure, the sectarian character of the purāṇas is supported by the tradition. First, the purāṇas are projected against the background of the three *guṇas*. The Matsya° (53.68–69) formulates the principle, as follows:

sāttvikeṣu purāṇeṣu mähātmyam adhikaṃ hareḥ /  
rājaseṣu ca mähātmyam adhikaṃ brahmaṇo viduḥ /  
tadvad agneś ca mähātmyaṃ tāmaseṣu śivasya ca /  
saṃkirneṣu sarasvatyāḥ pitṛñām ca nigadyate //

The Padma° (Uttarakhaṇḍa 263.81–84) provides the detailed threefold classification. Are *sāttvika*: Viṣṇu°, Nārada°, Bhāgavata°, Garuḍa°, Padma°, and Varāha°; are *tāmasa*: Matsya°, Kūrma°, Liṅga°, Śiva°, Skanda°, and Agni°; are *rājasa*: Brahmāṇḍa°, Brahmavaivarta°, Mārkaṇḍeya°, Bhaviṣya°, Vāmana°, and Brahma°. The Vaiṣṇava *sāttvika* purāṇas lead to salvation (*mukti*). The *rājasa* purāṇas, which are devoted to Brahmā, secure heaven (*svarga*). The *tāmasa* purāṇas are śaiva; “it is surprising to note that these latter are regarded as leading to hell.”<sup>12</sup>

In the second place, the sectarian character of the purāṇas seems to be supported by a number of – sometimes strong – sectarian statements in the texts themselves. As early as 1828 Wilson noted: “the Purāṇas and Tantras . . . not only aught their followers to assert the unapproachable superiority of the gods they worshipped, but inspired them with feelings of animosity towards those who resumed to dispute their supremacy.”<sup>13</sup> And, in a long footnote, he displayed several eloquent examples from different purāṇas.<sup>14</sup> A classical example of uranic “fanaticism” with reference to a relatively recent event is the Śaiva attack on Madhva in the Saura° (ch. 38–40).<sup>15</sup> Madhva – or Madhu, as he is called in the text – is described as a *cārvāka*, a most malignant, disguised promulgator of

<sup>12</sup> MEHENDALE 1970: 292.

<sup>13</sup> 1828–1832 = 1976: 1.3–4.

<sup>14</sup> See also Jos ABS: Beiträage zur Kritik heterodoxer Philosophie-Systeme in der Purā-Literatur, Jacobi vol. (1926), 386–392, for some extreme Vaiṣṇava quotes in which even the *vaidikadharmā* is called heterodox. E. g., *avaṣṇavas tu yo viprah sa pāṣaṇḍaḥ akīrtitaḥ* (Padma° Veṅkaṭ. 6.234.27).

<sup>15</sup> For details and bibliography, see sub Saura°.

the defamation of Śiva.<sup>16</sup> His Vaiṣṇava followers are wicked creatures; they are *mlecchas*, *sūdras*, and to be excluded from the herd.<sup>17</sup>

Notwithstanding all this, and even though the sectarian character of the purāṇas has rarely been questioned, one may wonder whether the sectarian divides between the purāṇas – and within Hinduism generally – have not been exaggerated.

First, the fact that, besides *sāttvika*, *tāmasa*, and *rājasa* purāṇas, the Matsya° (53.69) also recognizes purāṇas that are “mixed” (*saṃkīrṇa*), nearly passed unnoticed. And so did an alternative, fivefold subdivision, with purāṇas dedicated to five different gods:

1. Brahmā: Brahma°, Padma°
2. Sūrya: Brahmavaivarta°
3. Agni: Agni°
4. Śiva: Śiva°, Skanda°, Liṅga°, Kūrma°, Vāmana°, Varāha°, Bhaviṣya°, Matsya°, Mārkaṇḍeya°, Vāyaviya° (Brahmāṇḍa°)
5. Viṣṇu: Nārada°, Bhāgavata°, Garuḍa°, Viṣṇu°.<sup>18</sup>

Vans Kennedy<sup>19</sup> was one of the few who considered the division of purāṇas according to the *guṇas* as “entirely fanciful; for there is nothing contained in the Purans which at all justifies it; as the subjects treated in all those works are of precisely a similar nature, and in all of them are the same tenets and doctrines inculcated.” Kirfel also called it mere “spātere Spekulation”: the Vāyu° and Brahmāṇḍa°, which originally must have been a single purāṇa, are labeled Śaiva and mixed, respectively.<sup>20</sup>

Second, the fact that a purāṇa is classified as belonging to a particular sect does not prevent it from also paying attention to other gods.<sup>21</sup> Conversely, even the aggressively sectarian statements, such as those collected by Wilson, may, within the same purāṇa, be directed at different deities. Thus, in the Padma°, on the one

<sup>16</sup> *pracchanno 'sau mahāduṣṭaḥ cārvāko madhusaṃjñakaḥ / bhaviṣyati kalau viprah śivanindāpravartakaḥ* (40.61).

<sup>17</sup> *madhudarśitamārgeṇa pāpiṣṭhā vaiṣṇavāḥ kalau / bhaviṣyanti tato mlecchāḥ sūdrā yūthabahiṣkṛtāḥ* (39.77).

<sup>18</sup> Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa of the Śāṅkarīsaṃhitā of the Skanda°, 1 (Sambhavakāṇḍa). 2.30–35ab, quoted at EGGELING 1899: 1363.

<sup>19</sup> Asiatic Journal 1837, p. 242.

<sup>20</sup> KIRFEL 1927: X–XI. Cf. Appayya Dīkṣita's Śivapurāṇatāmasatva-nirākaraṇa or -khaṇḍana, Madras: Ādisarasvatīnilaya Press, 1871.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR (1951–55: 1.xiv–xv): “Whatever classification any Purāṇa may come under, the fact is that every Purāṇa speaks of almost all deities.” ELIOT (1921: 2.192–193), while discussing that the first clear indication of sects is in the epics: “But there is also a tendency to find a place for both, a tendency which culminates in the composite deity Śāṅkara-/Nārāyaṇa . . . Many of the Purāṇas reflect this view and praise the two deities impartially,” and he refers to the Mārkaṇḍeya°, Vāmana°, and Varāha°.

hand: “He who abandons Vāsudeva and worships any other god, is like a fool, who being thirsty, sinks a well in the bank of the Ganges.” But, on the other hand, in the same Padma°: “From even looking at Vishnu, the wrath of Śiva is kindled, and from his wrath, we fall assuredly into a horrible hell; let not, therefore, the name of Vishnu ever be pronounced.”<sup>22</sup>

The result is that, for many puranic texts, it is far more difficult to assign them to a particular sect than the tradition – and modern scholarship – would have it.

Farquhar<sup>23</sup> described the Agni°, not as a purely *smārta* document, but a *smārta* document composed for the use of the Bhāgavatas; it does contain a list of the Pāñcarātrasaṃhitās, but there are clear indications – the Bhāgavata mantra, etc. – which make it a Bhāgavata work. Hazra<sup>24</sup> disagreed: the Agni° was originally a work of the Pāñcarātras, for Farquhar’s arguments were based on chapters which are spurious. Prior to this discussion Rājendralāla Mitra had decided that the Agni° “has no sectarian leaning. It treats of Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva and Śākta forms of worship with impartiality.”<sup>25</sup>

Hohenberger<sup>26</sup> noticed that his presumption that the Vāmana° was a purely Vaiṣṇava document had not been confirmed: Śaiva legends are well represented in the text, alongside Vaiṣṇava legends. According to Hazra’s interpretation, the extant Vāmana° is a Śaiva recast of a Vaiṣṇava work – presumably a first sectarian version of the originally non-sectarian Vāmana°.

“The Śaiva materials in the present Vāmana as contrasted with the title and contents given in the Matsya and Skanda, shows that the Purāṇa in its earlier form was a Vaiṣṇava work, and that it was later recast by the Śiva-worshippers who changed the work with additions and alterations in such a way that very little of its earlier contents was retained.”<sup>27</sup>

The introduction to the critical edition, on the other hand, quotes Wilson: “It is of a more tolerant character than the Purāṇas and divides its homage between Śiva and Viṣṇu with tolerable impartiality. It is not connected, therefore, with any sectarian principles, and may have preceded their introduction,”<sup>28</sup> and agrees that “the Vāmana Purāṇa does not contain the narrow sectarian views, nor does it prescribe the bearing of various sectarian marks;”<sup>29</sup> indeed, “it is permeated with a spirit of religious tolerance and catholicism, and contains a happy synthesis of the Pāsupata Śaivism and Bhāgavata Vaiṣṇavism.”<sup>30</sup>

<sup>22</sup> WILSON 1828–32 = 1976: 1.3 n.

<sup>23</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 179.

<sup>24</sup> HAZRA 1940: 139.

<sup>25</sup> Ed. Agni°, Intro. p. xxxvi.

<sup>26</sup> HOHENBERGER Vāmana° 1963: 11.

<sup>27</sup> HAZRA 1940: 77.

<sup>28</sup> VĀMANA° CE + Engl. tr., p. xxvi.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. xxiv.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., pp. xxv–xxvi.

Sylvain Lévi expressed surprise about the Nepālamāhātmya. Māhātmyas, and purāṇas, generally, he says, “exhibit some kind of sectarian fanaticism.” The Nepālamāhātmya, “on the contrary,” puts Śiva, Viṣṇu, and even the Buddha, all at the same level.

„Les divinités concurrentes ne rivalisent que de politesse aimable: Çiva-Paṇupati félicite Nemi qui l’a reconnu identique à Viṣṇu; l’épouse de Çiva offre au Bouddha une faveur à choisir et consent à lui laisser partager avec Çiva les honneurs du culte. Et ‘le Compatissant’, qui ne veut pas être en reste de courtoisie, dédie à Çiva le linga de la Compassion (Kāruṇikeçvara).”<sup>31</sup>

We also know that the selection of quotations from purāṇas in the dharmanibandhas was in no way determined by the sectarian affiliation of the *nibandhakāras*. For instance, Lakṣmīdhara, the author of the Kṛtyakalpataru, who was a devotee of Viṣṇu, mainly quoted from four upapurāṇas: Nandī°, Devī°, Kālīkā°, and Nṛsiṃha°.<sup>32</sup>

In short, even though the purāṇas contain sectarian materials – and even though they therefore constitute excellent sources for the study of the Hindu sects –,<sup>33</sup> their sectarianism should not be interpreted as exclusivism in favor of one god to the detriment of all others. It has been stressed far too rarely that notwithstanding their sectarian character, in the purāṇas “generally a certain measure of respect is shown to all gods of the Pantheon.”<sup>34</sup> In fact, the purāṇas are fully in line with a general characteristic of Hinduism which was already noticed by the abbé Dubois. After discussing the Hindu sects and their disagreements, he concluded:

“That these religious dissensions do not set the whole country ablaze, or occasion those crimes of all kinds which were for centuries the result of religious fanaticism in Europe and elsewhere, is due no doubt to the naturally mild and timid character of the Hindus, and especially to the fact that the greater number compound with their consciences and pay equal honour to Vishnu and Siva. Being thus free from any bias towards either party, the latter serve as arbitrators in these religious combats, and often check incipient quarrels.”<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> LEVI 1905: 204.

<sup>32</sup> RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR Nandī° 1941–42: 158.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. JAHN (1916: 312): “Der größte Gewinn, welchen eine ergiebige Ausbeute der Purāṇa verspricht, besteht in den Grundlagen für eine Geschichte der indischen Sekten, welche von besonderer religionsgeschichtlicher Bedeutung wäre.”

<sup>34</sup> WILKINS 1882: 77–78 = <sup>2</sup>1900: 90.

<sup>35</sup> J. A. DUBOIS: Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies. Tr. Henry K. Beauchamp, OUP <sup>3</sup>1906, p. 120. Cf. HACKER (1957: 175): “Aber es gibt auch Hindus, und sie sind wohl zu allen Zeiten die Mehrheit gewesen, die nicht fast monotheistisch einer einzelnen Figur des Hindu-Pantheons dienen und infolgedessen keiner Seite angehören, in deren Glaube vielmehr ein Polytheismus mehr oder weniger überlagert, durchdrungen und temperiert ist von pantheistischen, monistischen Tendenzen. Aus der Atmosphäre solchen Glaubens stammt ein großer Teil der mythologischen, populärtheologischen und religionsgesetz-

Finally, it should be pointed out that Wilson's idea that the extant purāṇas are late texts because of their sectarian component, entirely rests on his assumption that sects and sectarianism themselves are late characteristics of and additions to Hinduism. This thesis has, however, not found general acceptance. It was already one of the points on which Wilson and Kennedy disagreed.

"It cannot . . . be reasonably doubted, but that the same system of religion prevailed in India at least one thousand years before the birth of Christ, as prevails in it at the present day; and if, therefore, the Purans exhibit a correct view of that religion, there seems to be no just or adequate grounds for considering them to be mere modern compilations."<sup>36</sup>

Based on a passage in the *Harṣacarita* (see 2.1.5) Bühler also raised the question of the origin of the Hindu sects and, in that context, hesitated to accept that the extant purāṇas cannot be older than the tenth or eleventh century.

"The earlier history of the Purāṇas, which as yet is a mystery, will only be cleared up when a real history of the orthodox Hindu sects, especially of the Śivites and Viṣṇuites, has been written. It will then probably become apparent that the origin of these sects reaches back far beyond the rise of Buddhism and Jainism. It will also be proved that the orthodox sects used Purāṇas as textbooks for popular readings, the Purāṇapāṭhana of our days, and that some, at least, of the now existing Purāṇas are the latest recensions of those mentioned in Vedic books."<sup>37</sup>

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of the origin of sects in Hinduism. It had to be mentioned, though, that the recent trend to claim high antiquity for them<sup>38</sup> disarms to a large extent Wilson's – and his followers' – argument that the sectarian purāṇas must necessarily be recent productions. It is, then, also no longer necessary to assume the existence, for each extant purāṇa, of a lost, non-sectarian predecessor.

### 1.3.2 Purāṇaṃ Pañcalakṣaṇam

Besides the sectarian character of the extant purāṇas, the main argument against their originality is that none of them answers the definition of a purāṇa as laid down by the author of the *Amarakośa*: *purāṇaṃ pañcalakṣaṇam*. This argu-

---

lichen Hindu-Literatur." Also B. N. SHARMA: *Purāṇic Message of Religious Tolerance and its Limitations*, Pur 13, 1970–71, 4–25.

<sup>36</sup> Asiatic Journal 1837, p. 244.

<sup>37</sup> SBE 2 (1879), pp. xxvii–xxix, n. 4.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. A. B. KEITH's review of FARQUHAR 1920, *The International Review of Missions* 9, 1920, 607–610 at 609. Also PAYNE 1933: 18; Swami TAPASYANANDA: *The Puranas, a Bird's-Eye View of their History, Features and Contents*, Ved. Kes. 60, 1973–74, 377–379 at 378; etc.

ment too, goes back to Wilson – with a reference to Colebrooke –;<sup>1</sup> he describes the *pañcalakṣaṇa*, and adds:

“Such, at any rate, were the constituent and characteristic portions of a Purāṇa in the days of Amara Siṃha, fifty-six years before the Christian era; and if the Purāṇas had undergone no change since his time, such we should expect to find them still. Do they conform to this description? Not exactly in any instance; to some of them it is utterly inapplicable; to others it only partially applies.”<sup>2</sup>

Here again Wilson’s theory has never been questioned. Burnouf<sup>3</sup> made a similar statement on Wilson’s authority, Lassen<sup>4</sup> repeated it on the authority of Wilson and Burnouf, etc.<sup>5</sup> One century after Wilson, in Ramachandra Dikshitar’s treatment of *pañcalakṣaṇa*, little has changed:

“One must aver that these rules are not strictly followed in these Purāṇas. The explanation is simple. The Purāṇas which now exist are not the old versions of Purāṇas. Much of the older version has been lost and to the preserved portions additions have been made from time to time.”<sup>6</sup>

Another, even more recent example is Mehendale’s:

“That the present texts hardly represent the original Purāṇas can be inferred from the disparity between the old definition of the Purāṇas and their present contents. On the one hand, some of the Purāṇas largely ignore the five subjects mentioned in the definition, while on the other, the definition altogether ignores the common factor in all the existing Purāṇas, viz. their glorification of Śiva or Vishnu and places sacred to them, description of the duties of the castes and *āśramas*, and so on.”<sup>7</sup>

It should be made clear, first of all, that Amarasimha himself does not enumerate the five constituent parts of the *pañcalakṣaṇa*.<sup>8</sup> Colebrooke must have known

<sup>1</sup> At Asiatick Researches 7, 1801, 202, the future (1808) editor and translator of the Amarakośa mentions “the Purāṇas, or Indian Theogonies.” And he adds in a note: “Every Purāṇa treats of five subjects: the creation of the universe; its progress, and the renovation of worlds; the genealogy of gods and heroes; chronology, according to a fabulous system; and heroick history, containing the achievements of demi-gods and heroes. Since each Purāṇa contains a cosmogony, with mythical and heroick history, the works which bear that title may not unaptly be compared to the Grecian Theogonies.”

<sup>2</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: v.

<sup>3</sup> BURNOUF *Bhāgavata*° 1.xliv.

<sup>4</sup> LASSEN 1847: 479.

<sup>5</sup> Others turn the argument around: “The antiquity of the definition is vouched for by the fact that it applies very imperfectly to any of the existing purāṇas” (JACKSON 1905: 68).

<sup>6</sup> The Purāṇas, their Historical Value, PO 2, 1937–38, 77–83 at 80.

<sup>7</sup> MEHENDALE 1970: 297.

<sup>8</sup> Some statements might easily be misread to say that the Amarakośa itself contains the fivefold list. For instance, BURNOUF (*Bhāgavata*° 1.xlv): “Ce résumé des éléments constitutifs de tout Purāṇa peut donc prétendre à une assez haute antiquité, puisqu’on le rencontre déjà formellement indiqué dans le plus ancien vocabulaire sanscrit.” Equally ambiguous are RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR (1951–55: 1.vii): “Ancient lexicographers like Amarasimha attribute the five characteristics to a Purāṇa treatise. These five characteris-

them from the commentaries on the Amarakośa, many of which quote the following *śloka*, from the purāṇas:<sup>9</sup>

sargaś ca pratisargaś ca vaṃśo manvantarāṇi ca /  
vaṃś(y)ānucaritaṃ caiva purāṇaṃ pañcalakṣaṇam //

According to Wilson's translation<sup>10</sup> the original five components of a purāṇa are: (1) primary creation, or cosmogony; (2) secondary creation, or the destruction and renovation of worlds, including chronology;<sup>11</sup> (3) genealogy of gods and patriarchs; (4) reigns of the Manus, or periods called Manvantaras; (5) history, or such particulars as have been preserved of the princes of the solar and lunar races, and of their descendants to modern times. There is only one noteworthy variant to this text. Wilson<sup>12</sup> already mentioned Rāmāśrama's reading *bhūmyādisamsthānam* for *vaṃśānucaritam*: "Destruction of the earth and the rest, or final dissolution;" in which case the genealogies of heroes and princes are comprised in those of the patriarchs."<sup>13</sup>

One other definition of *pañcalakṣaṇa* is quoted, anonymously, in the Jayamaṅgalā, a commentary on the Kauṭīlyārthaśāstra (1.5.12–14):

sṛṣṭipravṛttisaṃhāradharmamokṣaprayojanam /  
brahmabhir vividhaiḥ proktaṃ purāṇaṃ pañcalakṣaṇam //<sup>14</sup>

tics are: ..."; PUSALKER (Pres. Addr., Hist. sect., AIOC 18, 1955, 58–72 at 61): "According to the Amarakośa ... Purāṇa has five characteristics (*pañcalakṣaṇa*), viz. *sarga* ..."; DIMMITT-VAN BUITENEN (1978: 9): "Here [= in the Amarakośa] Purāṇas are said to treat of five topics, namely: world creation ...". Some statements are simply misleading. For instance, Swami TAPASYANANDA (The Puranas, a Bird's-Eye View of their History, Features and Contents, Ved. Kes. 60, 1973–74, 377–379 at 378): "a Purāṇa is expected to deal with the following five subjects according to Amarasimha: ..."; H.L. HARIYAPPA (Vedic Legends Through the Ages, Poona: Deccan College, 1953, p. 136 n. 56): "The *śloka* is found in the more important Purāṇas, in Amarakośa and other lexicons"; A.S. GUPTA (CE Kūrma°. Intro. p. iii n. 5): "These Pañca-lakṣaṇa-s of the Purāṇas are well-known. Amarakośa also mentions them ..."

<sup>9</sup> For reff., see TANDON 1952: 3.

<sup>10</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: iv–v.

<sup>11</sup> On the problem whether *pratisarga* is identical with *pralaya*, or whether, on the contrary, it means "Weiterschöpfung," see KIRFEL 1927: XLVII–XLVIII.

<sup>12</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: v n. 9.

<sup>13</sup> Amarakośa with Rāmāśramī, ed. Haragovinda Śāstrī, KSS 198, 1970, p. 84: *bhūmyādeś caiva samsthānam ... kvacid iha 'vaṃśānucaritam caiva' iti tṛṭiyapāde pāthāntaram*. JACKSON (1905: 68–69) prefers this reading, since *vaṃśānucaritam* "is tautologous, inasmuch as the doings of the great houses are mentioned separately from their genealogies." *Bhūmyādisamsthānam* "may roughly be translated by the word 'cosmology.' This fifth topic would include those geographical and astronomical sections which bear as primitive a stamp as any part of the extant purāṇas, and will fall under none of the other heads of the definition."

<sup>14</sup> Arthaśāstravyākhyā-Jayamaṅgalā, ed. Harihara Sastri, Madras: Kuppaswami Sastri Res. Inst., 1958, p. 16: *vinayaṃ jñānakriyāvaicakṣyaṃ gacchet / paścimam aharbhāgaṃ*

A different picture emerges from the Bhāgavata°. This text exhibits two lists enumerating not five but ten characteristics of purāṇas. The two lists can be juxtaposed as follows:

	2.10.1		12.7.9
1.		SARGA	
2.		VISARGA	
3.	<i>sthāna</i>		<i>vṛtti</i>
4.	<i>poṣaṇa</i>		<i>rakṣā</i>
5.		(MANV)ANTARA	
6.	<i>ūti</i>		VAMŚA
7.	<i>iśānukathā</i>		VAMŚYĀNUCARITA
8.	<i>nirodha</i>		<i>saṁsthā</i>
9.	<i>mukti</i>		<i>hetu</i>
10.		(ap)āśraya <sup>15</sup>	

Bhāgavata° 12.7.10 adds that “some” (*kecit*) recognize only five characteristics of purāṇas, according to the distinction between “major” (*mahat*) and “minor” (*alpa*) ones. The Brahṃavaivarta° (4.131/133.6–9) makes a similar distinction. It quotes the traditional *pañcalakṣaṇa* stanza, and explicitly assigns it to the upapurāṇas; the mahāpurāṇas have different characteristics, which it then enumerates:

sṛṣṭiś cāpi viśṛṣṭiś ca sthitis teṣāṃ ca pālanam /  
 karmaṇāṃ vāsanā vārtā manūnāṃ cākrameṇa ca /  
 varṇaṇaṃ pralayānāṃ ca mokṣasya ca nirūpaṇam /  
 utkīrtanaṃ harer eva vedānāṃ ca pṛthak pṛthak /  
 daśādhikaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ ca mahatāṃ parikīrtitam //

Nothing was more natural for scholars than trying to find a historical explanation for the appearance of the longer lists. Burnouf<sup>16</sup> interpreted the fivefold and tenfold lists as evidence for two distinct “but as yet undefinable” periods in the development of the purāṇas: from being merely cosmogonic and genealogical compositions, they developed into compilations of moral legends and sectarian treatises. Others attributed the transition from five to ten to “the influence of

*sukhāsīno vinodadharmajijñāsārtham itihāsaśravaṇe vinayaṃ gacchet / kaḥ punar itihāsa ity āha – purāṇam iti / sṛṣṭyādijñānaphalam / tathā cōktam – ... iti /*. Paṇḍita Rājeśvara Śāstrī DRAVIḌA (Bhāratīyārājanītau purāṇapañcalakṣaṇam, Pur 4, 1962, 236–244) uses this definition to show that the *dharma* materials in the purāṇas are original to them, rather than having been added at a later stage. From this he in turn infers that the term *manvantara* in the vulgate definition must have included *dharma*. Cf. also UPADHYAYA 1978: 127.

<sup>15</sup> The Bhāgavata° itself offers definitions for most of these terms: 2.10.2–7 and 12.7.11–20.

<sup>16</sup> BURNOUF Bhāgavata° 1.1–li.

Vaiṣṇava theologies.”<sup>17</sup> More specifically, it was suggested that the ten characteristics may be due to the influence of the Pāñcarātra which also recognizes “ten topics (*saṃhitā*).”<sup>18</sup> Baladeva Upādhyāya is probably right when he says that, when one compares the items in the two lists carefully, the *daśalakṣaṇī* of the Bhāgavata° is nothing more than an “expanded and enlarged” version of the *pañcalakṣaṇī*.<sup>19</sup>

Vans Kennedy was first to question *pañcalakṣaṇa* as the necessary component parts of the purāṇas. After referring to Colebrooke’s statement quoted earlier, he continues:

“But, though these topics are certainly treated of at greater or less length in most of the Purans, they still by no means form the principal subject of those works; for this Mr. Colebrooke has unaccountably overlooked, and yet it is the only reason which has conferred on them a sacred character, – I mean the moral and religious instruction which is inculcated in them, and to which all the legends that they contain are rendered subservient. In fact, the description of the earth and of the planetary system, and the lists of royal races that occur in them, are evidently extraneous, and not essential circumstances, as they are omitted in some Purans, some or other of the leading principles, rites, and observances of the Hindu religion are fully dwelled upon, and illustrated either by suitable legends, or by prescribing the ceremonies to be practised and the prayers and invocations to be employed in the worship of different deities.”<sup>20</sup>

Wilson<sup>21</sup> agreed that “many of the Purāṇas, as they are now,” have no other object than that of religious instruction. But that was for him the very reason why the extant purāṇas are different from the earlier ones.

“In the knowledge of Amara Siṃha the lists of princes were not extraneous and unessential, and their being now so considered by a writer so well acquainted with the contents of the Purāṇas as Vans Kennedy is a decisive proof that since the days of the lexicographer they have undergone some material alteration, and that we have not at present the same works in all respects that were current under the denomination of Purāṇas in the century prior to Christianity.”<sup>22</sup>

<sup>17</sup> TAGARE Bhāgavata° tr., 1.211 n.

<sup>18</sup> GAIL Bhāgavata° 1969: 16 n. 72. For the ten *saṃhitās*: *bhagavat*, *karman*, *vidyā*, *kāla*, *kartavya*, *vaiśeṣikī kriyā*, *samyama*, *cintā*, *mārga*, and *mokṣa*, see F. Otto SCHRADER: Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā, Adyar 1916, p. 112, <sup>2</sup>1973, p. 128; cf. Ahirbudhnya saṃhitā 12.45–48 (ed. Rāmānujācārya, Adyar 1916, 1.112).

<sup>19</sup> UPADHYAYA 1978: 138. Similarly Giridhar Śarmā CHATURVEDI: Purāṇalakṣaṇāni, Pur 1, 1959–60, 130–138. For other speculations on *pañcalakṣaṇa*, see Giridhar Śarmā CHATURVEDI: Purāṇalakṣaṇāni, Pur 2, 1960, 107–111 [each of the five topics is again fivefold]; Badarīnātha SUKLA: Purāṇānām pratipādyam, Pur 2, 1960, 43–51 [in the ultimate analysis the five and ten topics can be resolved into the one supreme principle, i. e. Brahmā or Hari, as the ultimate cause of creation and dissolution of the world].

<sup>20</sup> KENNEDY 1831: 153 n.

<sup>21</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: v.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. vi.

Wilson then went one step further. If, on the one hand, *pañcalakṣaṇa* made up the content of the original purāṇas; if, on the other hand, the extant purāṇas contain *pañcalakṣaṇa* to a larger or lesser degree, – those purāṇas that contain more *pañcalakṣaṇa* are closer to the original ones, and therefore, older than the others. This may have been one of the reasons why, of all purāṇas, Wilson chose to translate the Viṣṇu°.

“There is not one to which it [= *pañcalakṣaṇa*] belongs so entirely as to the Vishnu Purāṇa and it is one of the circumstances which gives to this work a more authentic character than most of its fellows can pretend to. Yet even in this instance we have a book upon the institutes of society and obsequial rites interposed between the Manvantaras and the genealogies of princes, and a life of Kṛṣṇa separating the latter from an account of the end of the world, besides the insertion of various legends of a manifestly popular and sectarian character.”<sup>23</sup>

The fact that the purāṇas contain relatively little *pañcalakṣaṇa* materials has been noticed repeatedly in the scholarly literature.<sup>24</sup> It has been stressed for the Vāmana°,<sup>25</sup> the Skanda°,<sup>26</sup> etc. In fact, according to Kane’s calculation, “the five topics occupy less than three percent of the extent of the extant Mahāpurāṇas.”<sup>27</sup> There are also puranic passages which clearly suggest that a purāṇa is supposed to contain far more than *pañcalakṣaṇa*. For instance, in the Matsya° Manu requests Matsya to be instructed, not only in the five topics, but also in the geography of the earth, the laws of *dāna* and *śrāddha*, the several *varṇas* and *āśramas*, ritual, consecration of images, and, lastly, “anything else that exists on earth” (*yac cānyad vidyate bhuvī*).<sup>28</sup>

Explanations why, notwithstanding all this, the terms purāṇa and *pañcalakṣaṇa* continue to be considered nearly synonymous, vary. Either the five topics, without ever being the sole concern of the purāṇas, nevertheless distinguished them from other branches of literature; or they were, at a certain point in time, posited

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. v. Cf. MEHENDALE (1970: 293): “Of all the Purāṇas the Vishnu Purāṇa appears to have preserved the original text more faithfully since it more or less satisfies the classical definition of a Purāṇa.”

<sup>24</sup> According to HARAPRASAD SASTRI (1928b: 329), the *pañcalakṣaṇa* view ought to be rejected. Rather, “anything old may be the subject of a Purāṇa, and it covers all aspects of life.” Whereas HAZRA (Smṛti-chapters of the Purāṇas, IHQ 11, 1935, 108–130 at 108) believes that *pañcalakṣaṇa* “has really become obsolete with reference to the extant Purāṇas,” BONAZZOLI (Prayāga and Its Kumbha Melā, Pu° 19, 1977, 81–179 at 105) is of the opinion that topics other than the *pañcalakṣaṇa* were represented in the purāṇas from the very beginning.

<sup>25</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 477, 1963: 502; HAZRA 1940: 76; HOHENBERGER Vāmana° 1963: 11.

<sup>26</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 476, 1963: 500 [not even in *the* Skanda°, written before A. D. 659]; MEHENDALE 1970: 294.

<sup>27</sup> KANE 1962: 841.

<sup>28</sup> Matsya° 2.22–24. For a good example of the variety of purāṇa contents, see Suresh Chandra BANERJI: Popular Life and Beliefs as Reflected in the Purāṇa-s, Pur 22, 1980, 23–26.

as the ideal to which every purāṇa, from then onward, ought to conform.<sup>29</sup> Others resort to calling the fivefold purāṇa “a literary myth,”<sup>30</sup> or to demonstrating that the term *pañcalakṣaṇa* in the Amarakośa has been misunderstood.<sup>31</sup>

Finally, Hazra developed a theory that a *purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa* was composed, by Vyāsa according to the tradition, for the use of the *hotṛ* priest in the *pāriplava ākhyānas* of the *aśvamedha*. Verses were recited and stories narrated, by the *hotṛ*, at the end of the third *iṣṭi*, every day for a full year while the horse was roaming about. In thirty-six cycles of ten days each, the recitations were drawn from different Vedic sources. On each eighth day, according to the Aśvalāyana-śrautasūtra, or on each ninth day, according to Śāṅkhāyana, the source was Purāṇavidyā, or Purāṇaveda, respectively.<sup>32</sup>

### 1.3.3 Eighteen Purāṇas

A third argument which has been used repeatedly to show that the present purāṇas are different from the original ones is the fact that they all refer to the existence of eighteen purāṇas. Here again the argument was formulated, in 1840, by Wilson.

“With regard to the eighteen Purāṇas, there is a peculiarity in their specification, which is proof of an interference with the integrity of the text, in some of them at least; for each of them specifies the names of the whole eighteen. Now the list could not have been complete whilst the work that gives it was unfinished, and in one only therefore, the last of the series, have we a right to look for it. As however there are not more last works than one, it is evident that the names must have been inserted in all except one after the whole were completed: which of the eighteen is the exception, and truly the last, there is no clue to discover, and the specification is probably an interpolation in most, if not in all.”<sup>1</sup>

Over sixty years later the argument still appears unaltered in Winternitz' *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur*.

<sup>29</sup> KANE 1962: 84. Cf. also W. RUBEN (The Puranic Line of Heroes, JRAS 1941, 247–256; 337–358 at 358): “The five topics are an ideal of later times, but not the germ of the Purāṇas.”

<sup>30</sup> E. W. HOPKINS: PrAOS, Oct. 31, 1888, JAOS 14, 1890, vi.

<sup>31</sup> Stephan H. LEVITT: A Note on the Compound *Pañcalakṣaṇa* in Amarasimha's Nāmaliṅgānūsāsa, Pur 18, 1976, 5–38 [*purāṇam pañcalakṣaṇam* means that the *purāṇa* “is fivefold,” including *itihāsa*, *ānvikṣikī*, *daṇḍanīti*, *ākhyāyikā*, and *purāṇa* itself].

<sup>32</sup> HAZRA: The Aśvamedha, the Common Source of Origin of the Purāṇa Pañca-lakṣaṇa and the Mahābhārata, ABORI 36, 1955, 190–203. On the *pāriplava ākhyānas*, see P.-E. DUMONT: L'aśvamedha, Paris: Geuthner, 1927, pp. 44–49; R. D. KARMARKAR: The Pāriplava (Revolving Cycle of Legends) at the Aśvamedha, ABORI 33, 1952, 26–40. If Hazra is right that during the *aśvamedha* there were 36 different recitations, it is tempting to connect this figure with the traditional number of purāṇas.

<sup>1</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xiii–xvi.

“It is peculiar that this list of ‘eighteen Purāṇas’ is given in each one of them, as though none were the first and none the last, but all had already existed when each separate one was composed . . . this is additional confirmation of the fact that none of the Purāṇas has come down to us in its original form.”<sup>2</sup>

Eighteen purāṇas are referred to twice in the Svargārohaṇaparvan of the Mahābhārata.<sup>3</sup> Rather than using these passages to claim an early date for the eighteen purāṇas,<sup>4</sup> Hazra<sup>5</sup> argues at length that one reference is absent from many manuscripts, and that the other occurs in a spurious chapter, which was transferred there from the Harivaṃśa. The reference to eighteen purāṇas at Harivaṃśa 3.135.3<sup>6</sup> is equally labeled a later addition, since it is missing in a number of manuscripts. On the ground that Matsya° chapter 53, in which the eighteen purāṇas are enumerated, can be dated between. A. D. 550 and 650, Hazra concludes that “the canon originated not later than the first quarter of the seventh century A. D.”<sup>7</sup>

In reality only one thing is beyond doubt: a list – rather, more than one list – of eighteen purāṇas existed in the time of al-Bīrūnī (A. D. 973–1048). He quotes a list “which has been read to me from the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa,” which indeed corresponds to the list in the Viṣṇu° as we have it.

1. Brahma.
2. Padma, i. e. the red lotus.
3. Viṣṇu.
4. Śiva, i. e. Mahādeva.
5. Bhāgavata, i. e. Vāsudeva.
6. Nārada, i. e. the son of Brahma.
7. Mārkaṇḍeya.
8. Agni, i. e. the fire.
9. Bhaviṣya, i. e. the future.
10. Brahmavaivarta, i. e. the wind.
11. Liṅga, i. e. an image of the αἰδοῦα of Mahādeva.
12. Varāha.

<sup>2</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 450. The quote is from the English tr. (1963: 466–467), which is more explicit than the original. For other examples of the persistence of the argument, see, e. g., PARGITER 1919: 450; RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1932: 756; PUSALKER: JUBO 10.2, 1941, 148, quoting HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: lxxxv.

<sup>3</sup> 18.5.46 (Bombay ed., also Calcutta ed., not ASB° ed.; CE footnote to 18.5.36); 18.6.97 (Bombay and ASB ed., not CE).

<sup>4</sup> Thus MACDONELL 1900: 290 = <sup>2</sup>1962: 251; PARGITER 1922: 22; RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1932: 761.

<sup>5</sup> HAZRA 1940: 3. Cf. HOLTZMANN 1895: 30–31, with a reference to E. W. HOPKINS: Quantitative Variations in the Calcutta and Bombay Texts of the Mahābhārata, PrAOS Oct. 31, 1888, JAOS 14, 1890, iv–vi.

<sup>6</sup> CE Appendix I, No. 45.6.

<sup>7</sup> HAZRA 1940: 4; cf. HAZRA 1962: 246.

<sup>8</sup> SACHAU 1888: 1.131; cf. Viṣṇu° 3.6.21–24.

13. Skanda.
14. Vāmana.
15. Kūrma.
16. Matsya, i. e. the fish.
17. Garuḍa, i. e. the bird on which Viṣṇu rides.
18. Brahmāṇḍa.

This list is, however, preceded by another “list of their names, as I have heard them, and committed them to writing from dictation.”<sup>9</sup> This list is different from all other lists preserved elsewhere, and contains a number of titles which are normally classed among the upapurāṇas.

1. Ādi-purāṇa, i. e. the first.
2. Matsya-purāṇa, i. e. the fish.
3. Kūrma-purāṇa, i. e. the tortoise.
4. Varāha-purāṇa, i. e. the boar.
5. Narasiṃha-purāṇa, i. e. a human being with a lion’s head.
6. Vāmana-purāṇa, i. e. the dwarf.
7. Vāyu-purāṇa, i. e. the wind.
8. Nanda-purāṇa, i. e. a servant of Mahādeva.
9. Skanda-purāṇa, i. e. a son of Mahādeva.
10. Āditya-purāṇa, i. e. the sun.
11. Soma-purāṇa, i. e. the moon.
12. Sāmba-purāṇa, i. e. the son of Viṣṇu.
13. Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa, i. e. heaven.
14. Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa, i. e. a great Rishi.
15. Tārکشya-purāṇa, i. e. the bird Garuḍa.
16. Viṣṇu-purāṇa, i. e. Nārāyaṇa.
17. Brahma-purāṇa, i. e. the nature charged with the preservation of the world.
18. Bhaviṣya-purāṇa, i. e. future kings.

Although, generally speaking, the list of eighteen mahāpurāṇas in the Indian sources is well established, there are a few discrepancies and problems. The Vāyu° (104.3–10 = 2.42.3–10) begins a list of eighteen purāṇas, but enumerates only sixteen: it introduces Ādi°, but omits Liṅga°, Viṣṇu°, and Agni°. <sup>10</sup> The Bṛhaddharma° (1.25.20–22ab) announces eighteen, but lists seventeen only; also, the Nārada° and Vāmana°, which normally appear in the lists of mahāpurāṇas, are inserted among the eighteen upapurāṇas (1.25.22cd–26).

Except for the Padma° which in one passage claims the first place for itself, the Brahma° figures first in all lists.<sup>11</sup> Commentators also normally interpret the

<sup>9</sup> SACHAU 1888: 1.130.

<sup>10</sup> Unless *ādikam* in the text stands for *āgnikam*. It has been suggested that the verses referring to the three missing titles were lost when the Vāyu° was being rewritten or recopied (e. g., GANGADHARAN Liṅga° 1973: 19).

<sup>11</sup> WILSON: JRAS 5, 1839, 65; BURNOUF *Bhāgavata*° 1.xviii; RADHAKANTA DEVA: Śabdakalpadruma (1967 ed.), 3.180.1.

terms *purāṇam/purāṇāni* in their basic texts as *brahmādi/brahmādīni*,<sup>12</sup> or they refer to Brahma° as Ādi°.<sup>13</sup> In addition to placing itself first, the Padma° also removes the Bhāgavata° from its usual fifth place to the eighteenth, “as the extracted substance of all the rest.”<sup>14</sup>

A more serious problem in the list of eighteen mahāpurāṇas results from the fact that the Śiva°/Śaiva°, which appears in the list of the Viṣṇu° and elsewhere, in a number of texts is replaced by the Vāyu°/Vāyaviya°. The Skanda° (5.3.1.33–34) solves the problem by saying that the same book is called by two names: Vāyaviya° because it is proclaimed by Vāyu, Śaiva° because of its connection with Śivabhakti.<sup>15</sup> The Bālabhaṭṭi,<sup>16</sup> a commentary on Vijñāneśvara’s Mitākṣarā, mentions the same solution, but adds „the opinion of others,” according to which the Śiva° is different from the Vāyu°, and nothing more than an upapurāṇa. This latter opinion has found favor with most modern Indian scholars.<sup>17</sup> For obvious reasons the Śiva° itself<sup>18</sup> as well as the introduction to its recent translation<sup>19</sup> defend the minority view that the Śiva° can rightfully claim the status of a mahāpurāṇa.

The omission of the Vāyu° in several lists is often explained by the fact that the Vāyu° and Brahmāṇḍa° are, to a large extent, identical; hence, in the lists in which the Vāyu° is absent the Brahmāṇḍa° is supposed to stand for both. Also, some texts like the Kūrma° (CE 1.1.15) use the term “Vāyaviya called Brahmāṇḍa°” (*vāyaviyam . . . brahmāṇḍam iti samjñitam*). It seems to be generally accepted that the Vāyu° and Brahmāṇḍa° were originally one and the same, and that only at a later date they went, to some degree, their own ways.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Mitākṣarā on Yājñavalkya 1.3; Kullūkabhaṭṭa on Manu 3.232; Śrīmūla on Kauṭilya (TSS 79, p. 35). Cases such as *purāṇāni brahmāṇḍādīni* (Sāyaṇa on TĀ 2.39) probably result from misprints.

<sup>13</sup> E.g., Kullūka on Manu 5.66, 72; BURNOUF Bhāgavata° 1.xvii.

<sup>14</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxiv: *sāram ākṛṣya sarvataḥ*.

<sup>15</sup> *caturtham vāyunā proktaṃ vāyaviyam iti smṛtam / śivabhaktisamāyogāc chaivam tac cāparākhyaḥ*. Cf. the same verse in the Revāmāhātmya, claiming to belong to the Vāyu° (AUFRECHT 1864: 65).

<sup>16</sup> BI work 162, 1904–07, pp. 12–13.

<sup>17</sup> Sashibhusan CHAUDHURI (On the Siva and Vayu Puranas, JBORS 15, 1929, 183–194) presents a highly emotional defense of the Vāyu° against the Śiva° (“never a Purāṇa – an extremely disconnected and frivolous book without any system and sequence . . .”). He was followed by HAZRA 1940: 14–15, and Śiva° 1953: 47–51; A. D. PUSALKER: Vāyu Purāṇa versus Śiva Purāṇa, JUBO n.s. 10.2, 1941, 148–155, and PUSALKER 1955: 31–41, <sup>2</sup>1963: 68–77; KANE 1962: 830; etc.

<sup>18</sup> Śiva°, Vāyaviyasamhitā 1.1.43 sqq.

<sup>19</sup> 1.xii–xiii, suggesting that the extant Vāyu° is “a recension of the proto-Vāyaviya and thus a part of the Śivapurāṇa itself.” Notice that the Śiva° was the very first purāṇa selected for translation in Ancient Indian Tradition and Mythology.

<sup>20</sup> PARGITER 1919: 448, adding: “Altogether, then, there are really nineteen”; also PARGITER 1922: 23, 77. KIRFEL discusses the problem at length (1927: XX–XIX), including

In reality we know little if anything about the origin of the list – or lists – of eighteen mahāpurāṇas.<sup>21</sup> A number of scholars have, indeed, reacted against the tendency to attach too much importance to the fact that the purāṇas – and the upapurāṇas, be it in a far less systematic way – are said to be eighteen in number. After all, the Mahābhārata is composed of eighteen parvans, its battle lasted for eighteen days, and it was fought by eighteen *akṣauhīṇīs*; the Bhagavadgītā consists of eighteen chapters, etc.<sup>22</sup> The number eighteen, and variants thereon, appear everywhere in Indian civilization, Hindu, Buddhist, and Jaina alike.<sup>23</sup>

### 1.3.4 Descriptions of Purāṇas in Purāṇas

A further argument to show that the extant purāṇas are apocryphal, and that there must have been a different class of original purāṇas, is based on the fact that a few purāṇas go beyond providing lists of eighteen titles. In varying degrees they also exhibit descriptions of the scope and contents of the individual purāṇas. The argument is that, if and when these descriptions do not tally with the purāṇas as we have them, they must refer to different works which originally went under these titles. The purāṇas that provide us with these descriptions are: Agni° ch.272, Matsya° ch.53, Skanda° 7.1.ch.2, and, especially, Nārada° 1.ch.92–109.

Wilson only used the descriptions in the Matsya°, but once again he laid the foundation for an argument that is still universally used today.

“In general the enumeration of the Purāṇas is a simple nomenclature, with the addition in some cases of the number of verses; but to these the Matsya Purāṇa joins the mention of one or two circumstances peculiar to each, which, although scanty, are of

concordances between the two texts; he refuses to date the separation except that it was later than A.D. 335, i.e. the date at which the compiler prepared the Vāyu-Brahmāṇḍa° nucleus. Cf. also HAZRA 1940: 17 n. 23, and 18, for hypotheses on when and why the two texts separated; and GAIL 1977: 194–197.

<sup>21</sup> I can, therefore, not subscribe to a suggestion made, tentatively, by GAIL (1977: 196), that the fact that the Brahmāṇḍa° consistently appears at the last place, “könnte aber auch ein Hinweis zumindest auf die späte Entstehungszeit des Textes innerhalb der Purāṇa-Literatur sein.” – Some wondered why certain potentially obvious titles are consistently absent from the list(s). E.g., ELIOT (1921: 2.151–152), on the absence of a Rāma°, “showing that his worship did not possess precisely those features of priestly sectarianism which mark the Purāṇas.”

<sup>22</sup> LASSEN 1861: 598; KANE 1962: 842. According to KIRFEL (1927: XI) the list of eighteen has nothing to do with the basic features of the purāṇas; it is “vielmehr spätere Spekulation.” S.K. CHATTERJI (Purāṇa Apocrypha: A “Maṇipura-Purāṇa,” W. Norman Brown vol., 1962, 29) suggests that the favorite number eighteen was created near the beginning of the first millennium A.D., in “a desire to prevent this unchecked or unfettered expansion of Purāṇa literature [from ca. 1000 B.C.] through every generation incorporating fresh materials.”

<sup>23</sup> I. SCHEFTELOWITZ: “Die bedeutungsvolle Zahl 108 im Hinduismus und Buddhismus,” W. Geiger vol. (1931), 75–88; O. STEIN: The Numeral 18, PO 1.3, 1936, 1–27; 2, 1937, 164–165.

value, as offering means of identifying the copies of the Purāṇas now found with those to which the Matsya refers, or of discovering a difference between the present and the past.”<sup>1</sup>

The following are two recent applications of this principle, exactly one century after Wilson. First, about the Agni°:

“The Matsya and the Skanda-p. notice the Agni-purāṇa as follows: ‘That Purāṇa which describes the occurrences of the Īśānakalpa, and was related by Agni to Vaśiṣṭha is called the Āgneya.’ But in the present Agni-p., though Agni is found to speak to Vaśiṣṭha, there is no mention of the Īśānakalpa. On the other hand, the Vārāha Kalpa has been mentioned in connection with the Tortoise incarnation of Viṣṇu (see Ag. 2,17). This disagreement between the description in the Matsya and the Skanda-p. and the contents of the present Agni shows that the latter is not the earlier Agni-p. which was noticed by these two Purāṇas.”<sup>2</sup>

Similarly, and even more clearly, in connection with the description of the Bhāgavata° at Matsya° 53.20–22:

“This description does not agree fully with the contents of the present Bhāgavata which begins with the Gāyatrī and contains the story of the killing of Vṛtra but does not refer to the Sārasvata Kalpa. On the other hand, it is said in Bhāg. II.8,28 that the Bhagavat declared the Bhāgavata to Brahma in the Brahma-kalpa. So, it seems that there was an earlier Bhāgavata which was the prototype of the present Bhāgavata and from which chapters have been retained in the latter.”<sup>3</sup>

The descriptions of purāṇas in purāṇas have also been used to claim eventual changes in the sectarian affiliations of specific texts, from the original to the extant purāṇas. I have indicated earlier (see 1.3.1) that Hazra used the descriptions in the Matsya° and Skanda°: “That purāṇa in which Brahmā addresses the three goals of life with reference to the greatness of Viṣṇu, is called Vāmana,” to posit the existence of a Vaiṣṇava precursor of the present, strongly Śaiva, Vāmana°.

It should be pointed out though that, with the exception of the Nārada° which devotes an entire chapter to each individual purāṇa, the other descriptions, besides being very brief, are also schematized in the extreme.<sup>4</sup> The Matsya°, for example, lists for each purāṇa: the name, the number of verses, the speakers, the *kalpa* to which it refers, and the right moment to donate it together with the

<sup>1</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xv. Cf. already at JRAS 5, 1839, 65–66, to show, for the Brahma°, “a different reading in the copy consulted by the compiler of [the Matsya°], and in those which are here followed.” Also KRISHNAMACHARYA 1906: 31.

<sup>2</sup> HAZRA 1940: 134.

<sup>3</sup> HAZRA 1940: 57 n. 97. A good example illustrating the extent to which some scholars rely on the descriptions of purāṇas in purāṇas, over and above other forms of evidence, is offered by Amarnath Roy (Bhāgavata° 1932). Śrīdhara comments on 335 chapters of the Bhāgavata°; the Padma° says that there are 332. Roy therefore looks for, and finds, three chapters that are spurious: 1.3, 6.8, and 12.1.

<sup>4</sup> HAZRA (1940: 134 n. 123) considers Agni° 272 as an abridgment of Matsya° 53.

benefits thereof. Wilson himself, in connection with the *Garuḍa*°, raised doubts about the reliability of its “description” in the *Matsya*°:

„The description given in the *Matsya* is less particular than even the brief notices of the other Purāṇas, and might have easily been written without any knowledge of the book itself, being, with the exception of the number of stanzas, confined to circumstances that the title alone indicates.”<sup>5</sup>

Abegg in turn came to the conclusion that the description of the *Garuḍa*° in the *Matsya*° was either based on a totally different text, or simply made up from the title. From here he went on to state, more generally, that “throughout, the brief references to the contents of the purāṇas in the *Matsya*° – and the *Agni*° – are very general and unrevealing [nichtsagend].”<sup>6</sup> If this is indeed the case, there is no justification for assuming that, in each instance, the “description” refers to “the earlier purāṇa,” as opposed to the extant one or ones.

One item in particular: the number of verses attributed to each purāṇa, is exhibited in many more puranic sources than those that also add shorter or longer descriptions. These numbers of verses have been used repeatedly to prove the apocryphal character of the extant texts, the length of which rarely corresponds to – or even comes close to – the figures given for them. For example:

“The extent of the *Brahma-vaivarta-purāṇa* is<sup>7</sup> 18,000 ślokas, but the *Vaṅga-vāsi* edition of the *Purāṇa* with 36 ślokas per page has 618 pages and therefore 22248 ślokas in all. Therefore at least 4248 ślokas are later additions. The *Veṅkaṭeśvara* edition with 50 ślokas in a leaf has nearly 25,000. The additional ślokas there are more numerous than in the *Vaṅgavāsi*.”<sup>8</sup>

Few scholars could resist interpreting the numerical data of these lists as true evidence for the existence, in the past, of purāṇas with specific different lengths than those of the existing ones.<sup>9</sup> I would like to suggest that this was not the intention of the composers of these lists. To be sure, the lists display a remarkable degree of uniformity – which is always the case once such systems have been set up.<sup>10</sup> The main concern in this particular case seems to have been to come close to a total of four hundred thousand verses, even though the exact figure was not always reached.<sup>11</sup> This is due in part to varying lengths being assigned to the

<sup>5</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: lii.

<sup>6</sup> *Der Pretakalpa* [ref. sub *Garuḍa*°], p. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Notice the use of the word “is” to say “as described in the purāṇas.”

<sup>8</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: clvi–clvii.

<sup>9</sup> One such scholar was ABEGG (*Der Pretakalpa*, p. 3), in connection with the *Garuḍa*°: “Aus solchen Zahlen braucht durchaus nicht auf das Vorhandensein eines weit umfangreicheren Textes als des uns bekannten geschlossen zu werden; gehen doch auch die für die andern Purāṇa’s gegebenen Zahlen weit über deren Umfang hinaus.”

<sup>10</sup> Cf. L. ROCHER: *The Sūtras and Śāstras on the Eight Types of Marriage*, Sternbach vol. (1979), 207–214.

<sup>11</sup> *Prapañcahṛdaya* (TSS 45, p. 46) gives the number of verses for each purāṇa, and

same purāṇas in different lists,<sup>12</sup> in part also to variant readings within individual lists.<sup>13</sup> It is clear that, as far as the details were concerned, the composers were allowed a considerable degree of latitude which they may have resorted to either intentionally, e. g. for metrical reasons or to add a personal touch, or unintentionally because *quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*.<sup>14</sup>

### 1.3.5 Quotations from Purāṇas in the Dharma Literature

One final argument to show that the extant purāṇas are different from their earlier predecessors was elaborated and used extensively by R. C. Hazra. From the time when the purāṇas included “records on Hindu rites and customs,” they have been quoted profusely by authors on *dharma*, both commentators and *nibandhakāras* (authors of systematic treatises). If such quotations are found in the extant purāṇa texts, they belonged to the purāṇa at least from the time of the particular author on *dharma* who cites them. A large majority of these quotations do not, however, appear in our extant purāṇas. Hence the conclusion that these verses must have belonged to the earlier version of the purāṇa, which was different from the extant one.

For example, a number of quotations in the *nibandhas* suggest that, in the *Agni*°, Vasiṣṭha speaks to king Ambariṣa on *dharma*. Another quotation mentions Sūrya as the speaker, and still another has Viṣṇu° speak to Gaṅgā.

“In the present *Agni*-p., however, there is no interlocution between Vasiṣṭha and king Ambariṣa, or between Viṣṇu and Gaṅgā, and there is also no chapter in which Sūrya is the speaker. The above facts, considered together, prove definitely that the present *Agni*-p. is not the earlier one.”<sup>1</sup>

Yet, this does not mean that the extant *Agni*° is totally different from the earlier one. Indeed, a passage quoted in Ballālasena’s *Dānasāgara*, in which Vasiṣṭha instructs Ambariṣa on *guḍadhenudāna* (gift of a sugar-cow), contains a number of verses which tally with verses in *Agni*° ch.210, though in the latter “all the marks

---

concludes: *samuccitam lakṣacatuṣṭayam*. In reality the figures add up to 411,000, or, if one takes the variant readings into consideration, 439,000.

<sup>12</sup> In the various lists which I collected, only the *Bhāgavata*° appears consistently with 18,000, and the *Liṅga*° with 11,000 (but it is omitted at *Vāyu*° ch. 104).

<sup>13</sup> E. g., Matsya° 53.13a (*ĀnSS*): *brāhmaṇam tridaśasāhasram*, with variant reading *brāhmaṇam taddaśasāhasram*. Also, at *Agni*° ch. 272, different editions give, for the *Agni*° itself, 12,000 and 16,000, for the *Varāha*°, 14,000 and 24,000, for the *Skanda*°, 81,000 and 84,000.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. M. N. DUTT’s translation of *lakṣārdhārdham*, which is already exceptional for the length of the *Brahma*° – it is normally said to have 10,000 verses –, at *Agni*° 272.1: “which contains 50,000 verses.”

<sup>1</sup> HAZRA 1940: 134–135.

proving the interlocution between Vaśiṣṭha and the king have been eliminated.” This comparison

“shows that the present Agni-p. is not a new work from beginning to end but has retained fragments of chapters and isolated verses from the earlier Purāṇa. It is for this reason that a few of the numerous quoted verses are found in the present Agni with variations in readings and arrangements of lines.”<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, most of the quotations from the Agni° in Govindānanda’s Dānakriyākaumudī are found in the extant Agni°. The verses on *guḍadhenudāna* in this *nibandha*, which are different from those in the Dānasāgara, agree remarkably with our present Agni° text. “It is, therefore, sure that at least the verses on Guḍadhenu-dāna, from which Vaśiṣṭha and Ambariṣa have been eliminated, were taken by Govindānanda from the present Agni.”<sup>3</sup>

One interesting aspect of the quotation-argument is that it also has to take into account losses in the extant purāṇas. The general idea that purāṇas have constantly grown by the insertion of new materials (see 2.2.2), is here countervailed by the necessity to assume that certain verses did occur in the earlier purāṇa but do not appear in the present one, and have therefore been lost. For instance, “the fact that many of the quoted verses, especially on *śrāddha*, are not found in the present Vāyu, proves that the Purāṇa has undergone serious losses also.”<sup>4</sup>

### 1.3.6 Gradual Deterioration of Purāṇas

The preceding five paragraphs discussed the main reasons why scholars were led to posit the existence of an older, more original class of purāṇas than those preserved in our manuscripts and editions. Occasionally one meets with other arguments to the same effect, some of them of a rather unexpected nature. A case in point is the argument put forth in favor of the existence of an earlier version of the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Padma°: the editor’s total disillusionment with the contents of the extant text.

“The fact cannot be denied that the present-day Uttara-khaṇḍa of the Padma-p. was not so voluminous in its origin. The Purāṇa-writers knew the psychology of the common people and were aware of the fact that their works would be the main channels for propagating their views. It does not seem plausible that the Purāṇa-writers who were very much self-conscious would put forward such an uninteresting, dull work which any man would be unwilling to read, causing great hamper to their interest thereby.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> HAZRA 1940: 135.

<sup>3</sup> HAZRA 1940: 139.

<sup>4</sup> HAZRA 1940: 17. Similarly, the quotations in the *dharmanibandhas* show that in the extant Brāhmaparvan of the Bhaviṣya°, vis-à-vis “its prototype,” “many chapters were discarded” (ibid., p. 171).

<sup>1</sup> CHATTERJEE Padma° Uttarakhaṇḍa 1961: 48–49.

Disappointment with the state of the present text is also behind the following statement with regard to the Garuḍa°.

“That the Garuḍa-Purāṇa was one of the eighteen Mahā-purāṇas need not be doubted. All the Purāṇas unanimously testify to it, and in the available list of the Upa-purāṇas, the Gaḍ [Garuḍa°] is nowhere mentioned as such. But, what is clear is that the Purāṇa, as it is at present, has got hardly any claim to be regarded as a Mahā-Purāṇa, far from being an ancient one. It has essentially been degraded and tampered with – an extremely disconnected priestly compilation without any system and sequence –.”<sup>2</sup>

Whatever additional arguments may appear in the scholarly literature, the result of all this has been the assumption that, for each and every purāṇa, there existed, some time in the past, a single original text. As indicated earlier, the idea goes back to the time of Wilson, and has been taken for granted ever since. The fact that all those “originals,” without exception, have disappeared, to be replaced by the extant versions, does not seem to have been a reason for concern among puranic scholars.<sup>3</sup>

This situation is all the more remarkable, since right from the time of Wilson at least one fellow-worker in the field again and again argued against the modernity of the extant purāṇas. For some reason Vans Kennedy’s voice went unheeded.

“I am . . . well aware that the recent composition of Sanscrit works, and particularly of the Purans, is a prevalent opinion; but as I have never met with it (except in the writings of Mr. Bentley) under any other shape than that of bare assertion unsupported by the slightest argument or proof, I am completely at a loss to understand on what grounds it could have been formed. It seems, indeed, to rest on a supposition that the Purans were intended to be geographical, chronological, and historical treatises; and, because it is impossible to give them this character, it is hence concluded that they must be incomplete, and that they merely contain badly arranged fragments of some larger works. But I have most carefully examined sixteen [*n*. I have not been able to procure the Bhavishya Puran, nor even to obtain any account of its contents.] of the Purans, and a great portion of the Skanda Puran, and I cannot discover in them any other object than that of religious instruction. Nor do I perceive in them any lacunae, or indications of failure or imperfectness in executing the design of their composition; from which it might justly be inferred that they were not original works, but were compilations from other books; for they appear to me to be precisely such compositions as would be produced by a first attempt to commit to writing the mythological legends and religious lessons which had no doubt been previously communicated by oral instruction. Hence have proceeded that total want of arrangement, that humility of style, and those constant repetitions, which are so observable in the Purans; and also their having been written in the form of dialogues, in which the speaker acts the part of preceptor, and the hearer that of pupil. But it is these very circumstances, that seem to have induced some writers to suppose that the Purans were merely modern compilations, which induce me to ascribe them to a remote antiquity: because the ability of the Brahmans to produce

<sup>2</sup> CHAUDHURI and BANNERJEE Garuḍa° 1930: 553.

<sup>3</sup> HAZRA (1962: 241) admits: “Extreme paucity of information leaves us in absolute darkness as to the character and contents of the ancient Purāṇic works, none of which has come down to us in its original form.”

much more perfect works cannot be disputed; and had they therefore determined, at some modern period, to recompose the Purans, it is quite incredible that they would have allowed them to appear in their present state; for, besides the faults of style and composition which they contain, they exhibit a remarkable diversity in a number of important particulars, which the Brahmans would most assuredly have then so corrected, as to reduce the contents of the Purans to one uniform system. This diversity, however, is exactly what must have resulted from eighteen different persons having, probably at different times and places, collected together and committed to writing the mythological and religious opinions and legends which had been previously formed and preserved merely by tradition. The present state, therefore, of the Purans, in which the most important legends, and even the origin of the deities, are related in a discordant manner, though not in such a manner as in the least affects the perfect homogeneity of the Hindu religion, must alone be a strong presumption that they exist at the present day in precisely the same state in which they were originally composed; and that, as the Brahmans have preferred to reconcile by explanation the discordances that occur in them (which they do not deny), rather than to correct them, they must have been prevented by religious scruples from giving uniformity to their religious system; and, consequently, that there can be no grounds whatever for supposing that these works are mere modern compilations.”<sup>4</sup>

The most striking facet in all comparisons between the lost originals and the extant purāṇas is the persistence of the idea of gradual deterioration. This concept, which one easily accepts in the writings of nineteenth century European scholars, not only has survived into the twentieth century, but it appears in the works of Indian scholars as well. Wilson already spoke of “an earlier class of Purāṇas, of which those we now have are but the partial and adulterated representatives.”<sup>5</sup> In Rapson’s opinion the text of the purāṇas “has been perverted by generations of editors and transcribers.”<sup>6</sup> Krishnamacharya, who disagrees with Wilson’s late dating of the purāṇas and his insistence on their recent sectarian character, concludes nevertheless: “Of course it must be admitted that their present form is an adulterated one, occasioned by causes incidental to the mode of preservation and the voluminousness of the works themselves.”<sup>7</sup> In most cases it is sectarianism that has “muddled them to a great extent.”<sup>8</sup> Because of the prominence of Tantric materials in the Agni° S. B. Chaudhuri came to the inevitable conclusion that “the Purana has been unblushingly tampered with” by preachers of the Tantric cult.<sup>9</sup> As far as the Bhaviṣya° is concerned, it “has been unscrupulously tampered with in order to keep its prophecies up to date.”<sup>10</sup>

<sup>4</sup> KENNEDY 1831: 153–155.

<sup>5</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: IV.

<sup>6</sup> RAPSON 1922: 266.

<sup>7</sup> KRISHNAMACHARYA 1906: 31–32.

<sup>8</sup> Bisheshwar Nath REU: *Hindu Purāṇas, Their Age and Value*, NIA 2, 1939–40, 302–306 at 304.

<sup>9</sup> CHAUDHURI Agni° 1928–29: 130.

<sup>10</sup> PARGITER 1913: xxviii.

Hazra hesitates to propose a date for the Matsya°; “no date is sufficient for it, because it has suffered through repeated additions and losses.”<sup>11</sup> And he describes the Liṅga° as “most probably the result of a destructive recast to which the earlier Purāṇa was subjected.”<sup>12</sup>

The idea that every individual purāṇa, as we have it, consists of two distinct parts: remainders of the original purāṇa on the one hand, and less or more recent additions on the other, leads to interesting differences of opinion among puranic scholars. From the religious point of view I have already drawn attention to the fact that many extant purāṇas exhibit allegiance to more than one sect. Depending on which sections of the text one chooses to be the later additions, one comes to different conclusions on the religious affiliation of the purāṇa at an earlier stage.<sup>13</sup> Differing opinions on whether a particular section of a purāṇa is original or spurious may also lead to opposite conclusions on the place of composition of the text. Haraprasad Shastri<sup>14</sup> assigned the Agni° to Bihar or Bengal, based on the descriptions of holy places in the text. According to Hazra, however, “it is difficult to say where the present Agni was first compiled. The view of Haraprasad Shastri that it was compiled in Bengal or Behar is based on evidences contained in those chapters of the Purāṇa which appear to be spurious.”<sup>15</sup>

#### 1.4 The Original Purāṇa

Puranic scholarship went beyond the belief in the existence of more ancient, original texts for each individual purāṇa; they also posited the existence, at an even earlier date, of one single, undivided purāṇa from which all individual purāṇas ultimately derived their origin. In so doing they happened to confirm an idea which is also present in the Indian tradition. Both the scholarly and traditional theories of a single, original purāṇa will be discussed in the next two sections.

##### 1.4.1 The “Ur-Purāṇa”

On the basis of the indices which Wilson prepared from various purāṇas, he could not fail being struck by the fact that individual purāṇas have numerous topics in common. When comparing the parallel passages in the Brahma° and the Viṣṇu°, he proposed, cautiously: “they appear to have been taken from some older work or works, from which the present Purāṇas are, probably, in part at

<sup>11</sup> HAZRA 1940: 26.

<sup>12</sup> HAZRA 1940: 93–94.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. HAZRA’s disagreement with FARQUHAR on whether the Agni° originally was a work of the Pāñcarātras or the Bhāgavatas (see 1.3.1).

<sup>14</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cxlvii.

<sup>15</sup> HAZRA 1940: 139.

least derived.”<sup>1</sup> One year later, the Preface to the translation of the Viṣṇu°, subsequent to the discussion of the sectarian character of the purāṇas, states more boldly:

“The identity of the legends in many of them, and still more the identity of the words – for in several of them long passages are literally the same – is a sufficient proof that in all such cases they must be copied either from some other similar work, or from a common and prior original.”<sup>2</sup>

Lassen, as always, echoed Wilson, but he referred unequivocally to the fact that, as far as the corresponding passages in individual purāṇas are concerned, the texts “have made use of a common prior source.”<sup>3</sup> In 1905<sup>4</sup> A. A. Macdonell stressed the same idea more specifically with regard to what is supposed to be the main topic of the purāṇas, *pañcalakṣaṇa*: “In that part of their contents which is peculiar to them, the Purāṇas agree so closely, being often verbally identical for pages, that they must be derived from some older collection as a common source.”<sup>5</sup>

By that time the idea of a common origin of all purāṇas had obviously fully taken root, for in the same year A. M. T. Jackson<sup>6</sup> wrote an article “to enquire whether we can fix approximately the scope and date of composition of this original.” He came to the conclusion that “the original purāṇa may be regarded with some probability as a work of the 4th century B. C.” He even decided that it was a Śaiva work, and continued:

“It is quite possible that the genealogies and the lists of rivers and tribes were originally drawn up in prose. At some date, which is at present unknown, the original purāṇa was re-written in verse, while the original chronology gave place to the system of Kalpas, and the history subsequent to the great war was thrown into prophetic form. This second version was the common source of the extant purāṇas.”

Three years later Blau applied the comparative method to the legend of Saranyū – and spoke, for the first time, explicitly of an “Ur-Purāṇa” as the common source of the extant purāṇas “in ihren echtsten Partien.”<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> JRAS 5, 1839, 66.

<sup>2</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: IV.

<sup>3</sup> LASSEN 1847: 480.

<sup>4</sup> In 1897 LÜDERS applied a similar method to the legend of Rṣyaśṛṅga; see references sub Padma° Pātālakhaṇḍa.

<sup>5</sup> 1900: 299.

<sup>6</sup> 1905: 67–77.

<sup>7</sup> August BLAU: Puranische Streifen. I. Der Itihāsa von Saranyū in seiner Fortbildung durch die Purāṇa, ZDMG 62, 1908, 337–357 at 337. Blau also saw another reason why it is important to determine the oldest parts of the purāṇas: “Denn so wenig die Massenhaftigkeit der puranischen Produktion und der z. T. höchst unerfreuliche Inhalt dieser Literatur zu näherer Beschäftigung mit ihr einladen mögen, so ist es gerade darum um so wünschenswerter, daß das Ursprüngliche und Alte in den einzelnen Purāṇa herausgehoben und miteinander verglichen werde.“

The first application of the principle on a large scale came from Frederick Eden Pargiter. In an article, in 1913, on “Visvamitra and Vasistha,” he defined his methodology as follows: “The texts for each story are cited. They are all obviously based on a common original metrical tradition, and by collating them a revised text may be framed. This I have done, and I give the collated version here with such variant readings only as are material.”<sup>8</sup> Far more important was the publication, in the same year, of *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*. In it Pargiter reconstructed the original puranic account of the dynasties that reigned in India during the Kali era, based on editions and manuscripts of the Matsya°, Vāyu°, Brahmāṇḍa°, Viṣṇu°, Bhāgavata°, Garuḍa°, and Bhaviṣya°. A more general volume on Indian history, based on the same principles, appeared in 1922: *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*. Once again Pargiter clearly stated his methodology:

“In examining the genealogies it is of little profit and is likely to be misleading to deal with the accounts of the several Puranas separately. The only trustworthy course is first to collate the texts that generally agree and ascertain as far as possible what original text they indicate, and then construct the genealogy therefrom. By this method individual corruptions and errors can be corrected, losses and omissions remedied, and interpolations and alterations detected with reasonable confidence; and thus a text may be framed which approaches as nearly as is possible to the common original on which all those texts were based.”<sup>9</sup>

The merits of Pargiter’s methodology in reconstructing the early history of India on the basis of the purāṇas will be examined later in this volume (see 2.2.4). At this point I merely want to stress the emergence of the concept of reducing parallel accounts in various purāṇas to one single original. In Pargiter’s case this concept was so successful that, from then onward, many historians of India were to base their research and their writings directly on Pargiter’s reconstructed text rather than on the more cumbersome editions of individual purāṇas.<sup>10</sup>

Pargiter’s efforts were followed, in 1927, by Willibald Kirfel’s *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa. Versuch einer Textgeschichte*. Notwithstanding the fact that, in an earlier publication, Kirfel expressed the hope soon to be able to present his “*Versuch der Rekonstruktion des Urpurāṇa*,”<sup>11</sup> there is no doubt that he pro-

<sup>8</sup> JRAS 1913, 885–904 at 885.

<sup>9</sup> PARGITER 1922: 82.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., K. G. SANKAR (Some Problems of Indian Chronology, ABORI 12, 1931, 301–361) uses PARGITER 1913 “throughout this article.” According to Ferdinand Bock (Die Purāṇas als Geschichtsquelle, WZKM 29, 1931, 97–133), “Die neue PARGITERSche *Ausgabe der Purāṇas* [emphasis added], die ich allen Zitaten zugrunde lege, zeigt dem Philologen auf den ersten Blick so viel Auffallendes, daß eine genaue Prüfung des Ganzen unerläßlich erscheint” (p. 98). Occasionally, the puranic lists of dynasties have been emended, starting from Pargiter’s text. E.g., V. V. MIRASHI (The Purāṇas on the Successors of the Sātavāhanas in Vidarbha, Pur 18, 1976, 88–92) proposes to correct the unknown *Maunāḥ* (at PARGITER 1913: 46) into *Maunḍāḥ*.

<sup>11</sup> Kṛṣṇa’s Jugendgeschichte in den Purāṇa, Jacobi vol. (1926), 298–316 at 299 n. 1.

ceeded cautiously, and that he was aware of the limitations involved in working out his reconstruction.

“The assumption that behind the oldest layer of our Pañcalakṣaṇa text there might yet be another unpreserved ur-purāṇa displaying an ideally complete and perfectly arranged treatment of the traditional five themes – an assumption in which Pargiter obviously believes (p. 36) –, is nothing more than arbitrary. Except for a few secondary verses (p. 22f.), nothing points to that possibility. Also, to solve the real mystery of the purāṇas, we cannot go beyond the textual tradition, which is the one and only reliable point of departure.”<sup>12</sup>

Elsewhere in his preface Kirfel comes even closer to equating his purāṇa research with textual criticism; in his case the existing purāṇas play the role of as many manuscript copies of *the* original text. Hence, for instance, the following remark on the relation between the Brahmāṇḍa° and the Vāyu°: “if we remove from both purāṇas the pieces which are peculiar to only one of them, we shall be left with two corresponding versions, which more or less relate to one another like two different manuscripts of the same text.”<sup>13</sup>

Even though the immediately following sentences again caution against too high an expectation of reconstructing the original of the Brahmāṇḍa° and Vāyu°,<sup>14</sup> it is clear that the idea of using the existing purāṇas as as many manuscripts of the same original text was well received among philologists. Speaking of Kirfel’s Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa, J.D.L. de Vries noted: “Those portions which obviously must derive from a common source are treated here as different manuscripts of one and the same text, so as to correct and complete each other.”<sup>15</sup> De Vries himself states that, as far as the purāṇa sections dealing with *śrāddha* rites are concerned, he has “attempted to reconstruct the original.”

The impact of Kirfel’s methodological approach on purāṇa studies has been tremendous.<sup>16</sup> In addition to de Vries’ work on *śrāddha*,<sup>17</sup> numerous publica-

<sup>12</sup> KIRFEL 1927: XLVIII. Translations from Kirfel’s introduction are my own; P.V. RAMANUJASVAMI’s translation (Journal of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute 7, 1946, 81–101; 8, 1947, 9–330) should be used with extreme caution.

<sup>13</sup> KIRFEL 1927: XIV. Even more strongly, twenty years later: “Die Version des Bḍ ist im ganzen etwas umfangreicher, und in ihr sind die verschiedenen Handlungen meist besser motiviert. ... Entweder ist die Stelle im Bḍ absichtlich erweitert ..., oder es liegt schon in dem Manuskript des gemeinsamen Textkerns des Bḍ und Vā, auf das das Vā letzthin zurückgeht, eine Lücke vor, die durch Verlust eines Blattes oder einer Manuskriptseite entstanden war” [emphasis added] (Rāmāyaṇa Kāṇḍa und Purāṇa, Die Welt des Orients 1947, 113–128 at 124–125).

<sup>14</sup> KIRFEL 1927: XIV–XV.

<sup>15</sup> Purāṇa Studies, Pavry vol. (1933), 482–487 at 483. Recently Y. MATSUNAMI (A Preliminary Essay in Systematic Arrangement of the Purāṇas – with Special Reference to the Legend of Yama’s Birth, Pur 19, 1977, 214–232) again stated that Pargiter and Kirfel have shown “that the whole Purāṇic system derives from one original Purāṇa.”

<sup>16</sup> S. P. L. NARASIMHASWAMI, who reconstructed his own, lost *purāṇasamhitā* – “written in 1936 B.C., just after the great Bhārata battle” –, was critical of the work of both

tions, for about half a century, have been directly inspired by Kirfel or have at least been dedicated to him. In his *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* Hans Losch follows the guidelines laid down by his “revered teacher” in the introduction to *Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa*.<sup>18</sup> Luise Hilgenberg’s comparative study of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Padma*<sup>o</sup> was written at his suggestion.<sup>19</sup> Carlo della Casa’s work on *Sāvitrī* in the *Matsya*<sup>o</sup> and *Viṣṇudharmottara*<sup>o</sup> owes much to his guidance.<sup>20</sup> Paul Hacker’s *Prahlāda* is dedicated to Kirfel “who, through his texthistorical work has shown the way to the scholarly exegesis of the purāṇas.”<sup>21</sup> Even after Kirfel’s death his advice and assistance are gratefully acknowledged by Franz László.<sup>22</sup>

### 1.4.2 Traditional Origin of the Purāṇas

The Western concept of a single, original purāṇa, from which all existing purāṇas ultimately derive their origin, resulted from a strict application of the rules of textual criticism, which were the backbone of European, especially German, classical philology. Scholars extended to purāṇas the same rules and principles they would have applied had they been editing Greek or Latin texts. Others, however, came to the same conclusion via a totally different route: the Indian tradition itself suggests that originally there was but one purāṇa.

The texts of the purāṇas which deal with this topic are far from clear, at least in the available editions. The *Viṣṇu*<sup>o</sup> (3.6.15ff.) tells us that Vyāsa composed a *Purāṇasaṃhitā*. He transmitted it to his famous disciple Romaharṣaṇa (or Lomaharṣaṇa), who in turn had six disciples: Sumati, Agnivarcaśa, Mitrāyu, Śāṃśāpāyana, Akṛtavraṇa, and Sāvarni. The latter three each composed a *Samhitā*; Romaharṣaṇa’s was the fourth, and the source of the other three. The *Viṣṇu*<sup>o</sup>

---

Pargiter and Kirfel: “That the results of their labours are unsatisfactory is a natural corollary from the fact that *sampradāya* or tradition is beyond their reach. The Purāṇic literature is specially dependent on a thorough knowledge of its tradition rather than on independent investigation. Hence the investigations of both the foreign scholars, unaided by tradition, strayed from the right path and became unserviceable for the purpose for which they were intended” (*Purana Samhita, Journal of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute* 6, 1945, 54–71 at 54). Cf., by the same author: *Aikṣvāku Dynasty, BhV* 4, 1942–43, 217–220.

<sup>17</sup> J. D. L. DE VRIES: *Der Śrāddhakalpa im Harivaṃśa und in fünf anderen Purāṇen*, Bonn: Schroeder, 1928.

<sup>18</sup> HANS LOSCH: *Die Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des indischen Rechts*, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1927.

<sup>19</sup> See sub *Padma*<sup>o</sup> *Svargakhaṇḍa*.

<sup>20</sup> CARLO DELLA CASA: *L’episodio di Sāvitrī ricostruito sulle versioni del Matsya- e del Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa*, *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie, Serie 8*, vol. 5, 1952, 1–36.

<sup>21</sup> HACKER 1959. Cf. HACKER (1960: 343): “Jede philologisch-historische Beschäftigung mit den Purāṇen muß nun zunächst Kirefels Methode befolgen.”

<sup>22</sup> See sub *Bhaviṣya*<sup>o</sup>.

then seems to indicate that it itself incorporated the substance of these four Saṃhitās, and, without transition, goes on to say that the Brahma° is the first of eighteen purāṇas which it then enumerates.<sup>1</sup>

The Agni° (271.11ff.) has a similar account, and so do the corresponding passages in the Vāyu° (61.55ff.) and Brahmāṇḍa° (2.35.63ff.). The latter two provide more details on the six disciples: they are Sumati Ātreya, Akṛtavraṇa Kāśyapa, Agnivarcaś Bhāradvāja, Mitrāyu Vāsiṣṭha, Sāvārṇi Saumadatti, and Suśarman Śāṃśapāyana. These two texts also add the interesting detail that the four *mūlasaṃhitās* have identical contents, and only differ in the way of expressing them, “even as the branches of the Veda.”<sup>2</sup>

The Bhāgavata° (12.7.5ff.) is more confused.<sup>3</sup> The *sūta* first states that six *paurāṇikas*: Trayyāruṇi, Kaśyapa, Sāvārṇi, Akṛtavraṇa, Vaiśampāyana, and Hārīta, each learned a Saṃhitā from “my father”, the disciple of Vyāsa. The *sūta*, their disciple, studied all these Saṃhitās. The *sūta* then adds that Kaśyapa, he himself, Sāvārṇi, and Akṛtavraṇa, learned, from Vyāsa’s disciple, four *mūlasaṃhitās*.<sup>4</sup> The text goes on to describe the ten characteristics of a purāṇa.

All these versions, however imperfectly they may have been transmitted, have at least one element in common. They all represent a tradition in which the number of purāṇas develops as follows: 1 → 6 → 4 → 18.<sup>5</sup> The Matsya° (53.4–10), on the other hand, has a different story. Originally there was only one

<sup>1</sup> WILSON (1840 = 1961: XI–XII) was confused by all this: “The substance of the four is said to be collected in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, which is also, in another place (Bk. I, ch. 1) itself called a Saṃhitā: but such compilations have not, as far as inquiry has yet proceeded, been discovered. The specification may be accepted as an indication of the Purāṇas having existed in some other form, in which they are no longer met with; although it does not appear that the arrangement was incompatible with their existence as separate works, for the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, which is our authority for the four Saṃhitās, gives us also the usual enumeration of the several Purāṇas.”

<sup>2</sup> Cf. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR’S (1932: 755) conclusion: “Collating the versions of different kinds we are led to the conclusion that the *mūla-saṃhitā* consisted of four versions, meaning thereby at the outset there were four Purāṇas, and the other grew later on out of these four.”

<sup>3</sup> PARGITER (1919: 448; 1922: 21) calls the account of the Bhāgavata° “late and untrustworthy.”

<sup>4</sup> BURNOUF (Bhāgavata° 1.xlii) was as confused as Wilson about the six purāṇas being reduced to four: “Cette partie de l’exposition est obscure, et rien ne détermine le rapport de ces quatre collections avec les six qui résultaient déjà de la distribution opérée par Rōmaharṇa entre ses disciples.” He elaborates at length on the accounts of the Viṣṇu° and Bhāgavata° (1.xlii–xliiv), and concludes, not unlike Wilson: “Quoi qu’il en soit, la tradition qui constate l’existence de quatre ou de six collections primitives de récits anciens, suffit à elle pour montrer quelles modifications cette partie de la littérature indienne a dû subir avant d’arriver à l’état de développement où nous la trouvons aujourd’hui.”

<sup>5</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI (1928a: lxxxix) refers to the Narmadāmāhātmya of the Vāyu° (no. 3570) according to which the purāṇas were ten in number, adding immediately that there are now eighteen. Hence Haraprasad assumes this evolution: 1 → 4 → 10 → 18.

purāṇa, of one hundred crores (ten million) of verses; it still exists in the world of the gods. To obviate the inability of humans to comprehend it, “I – the Fish, i.e. Viṣṇu, is speaking – assume the form of Vyāsa and proclaim it in a shorter version, of four hundred thousand verses, in every *dvāparayuga*. I reveal it in this world in an eighteenfold way (*aṣṭādaśadhā kṛtvā*).” The Matsya°, therefore, passes directly from one to eighteen.<sup>6</sup>

One argument that has repeatedly been used to show that, according to the tradition, there was originally only one single purāṇa, is the occurrence, in a number of ancient works, of the term *purāṇam*, in the singular. *Purāṇam*, in the singular, and with reference to a literary genre, appears for the first time in the Atharvaveda: *ṛcaḥ sāmāni chandāmsi purāṇaṃ yajuṣā saha*.<sup>7</sup> Also, the enumeration of the four Vedas is followed by: *itihāsās ca purāṇaṃ ca gāthās ca nārāśamsīs ca*.<sup>8</sup>

The reactions, in the scholarly literature, to the tradition that there was originally only one purāṇa vary greatly. A number of scholars explicitly or implicitly accepted the data from the tradition,<sup>9</sup> while others refused to give these data any weight whatever.<sup>10</sup> Others again acknowledged that we really do not know,<sup>11</sup> or

<sup>6</sup> According to PARGITER (1919: 448) the tradition of the Matsya° is a spurious one. “The reason for it seems to have been rivalry between the advocates of the Vedas and those of the Purāṇas, the eighteen Purāṇas being thus made coeval with the four Vedas.”

<sup>7</sup> Atharvaveda 11.7.24. Cf. a similar enumeration at Ṛgveda 10.90.9, however without *purāṇam*. For earlier uses of *purāṇa*, in the Ṛgveda, see LUDO ROCHER: The Meaning of *Purāṇa* in the Ṛgveda, WZKSOA 21, 1977, 5–24. For traditional etymologies of the term *purāṇa*, see S. G. KANTAWALA: Purāṇic Etymologies (On the Vocabular *purāṇa*), Indological Studies 2.1, 1973, 13–16. E. g., *purātanasya kalpasya purāṇāni vidur budhāḥ* (Matsya° 53.63); *yasmāt purā hy anatīdam purāṇaṃ tena tat smṛtam / niruktam asya yo veda sarva-pāpaiḥ pramucyate* (Vāyu° 1.1.183); *purāparamparāṃ vaṣṭi purāṇaṃ tena tat smṛtam* (Padma° ĀnSS 5.2.53); *yasmāt purā hy abhūc caitat purāṇaṃ tena tat smṛtam* (Brahmaṇḍa° 1.1.173). Cf. also RAGHAVAN (1961: 35): “*Purana* means old; a *Purana* is therefore an account of an old myth. It is also explained as old but always new *punar api nava*; it deals with the eternal verities and the eternal Truth, namely God.”

<sup>8</sup> Atharvaveda 15.6.4. On these and other similar terms, see HORSCH 1966: 5–71. Also U. N. GHOSHAL: The Gāthās and Nārāśamsīs, the Itihāsas and Purāṇas of the Vedic Literature, IHQ 18, 1942, 93–100.

<sup>9</sup> JACKSON 1905: 68. Approvingly, HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928b: 328; August BLAU: ZDMG 62, 1908, 337; PARGITER 1919:448 and 1922:49; Shivadatta GYANI: Pur 1, 1959–60, 219 and Indian History Congress 21 (1958/59), 221; DAS 1924: 117–118 (there was only one purāṇa up to the time of the Mahābhāṣya, ca. 200 B. C.).

<sup>10</sup> B. C. MAZUMDAR: The Origin and Character of the Purāṇa Literature, Asutosh Mookerji vol. 3.2 (1925), 7–30 at 14. According to WINTERNITZ (1963: 458, not 1907): “There was never *one* original Purāṇa, any more than there was *one* original Brāhmaṇa from which all the Brāhmaṇas sprang, or *one* original Upaniṣad whence all the Upaniṣads sprang. When ... ancient works here and there mention ‘the Purāṇa,’ they only mean ‘the old tradition’ or ‘Purāṇa literature,’ in the same way as the expression ‘Veda,’ ‘Śruti,’ and ‘Smṛti’ are used in the singular.”

<sup>11</sup> HAZRA, in WILSON 1840 = 1961, p. (a).

they expressed contradictory opinions from one publication to the other.<sup>12</sup> One explanation, with minor variants, for the division of the single original purāṇa into eighteen, is that the original kernel was subsequently taken to eighteen different localities and, in each place, supplemented with local traditions and events.<sup>13</sup>

The tradition that it was Vyāsa who composed the Purāṇasamhitā and “divided, arranged” it into several parts,<sup>14</sup> may well represent another attempt at establishing an analogy between the purāṇas and the Vedas (see *I.2.I*), which were equally *vyasta* by Vyāsa.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> KANE (1962: 829): “all this about the original existence of a single Purāṇa was purely imaginary”; (1968: 409): “it is not unlikely that originally there was only a single work called Purāṇa.”

<sup>13</sup> S. BHIMASANKARARAO (Historical Importance of the Puranas, QJAHRS 2, 1927–28, 81–90 at 84): “That there was a common tradition underlying all the puranas is certain and it is also certain that 18 versions of a common tradition have developed at different centres of religious activity where local events were inserted subsequently. Thus the Brahma purana represents the Orissa version, Padma purana that of Pushkara, the Agni purana that of Gaya, the Varaha purana that of Mathura, the Vamana purana of Thanesar, the Kurma purana of Benares, the Matsya of the Narbada Brahmins.” According to P.L. BHARGAVA (India in the Vedic Age, Lucknow: Upper India Publishing House, <sup>2</sup>1971, p. 20) the original purāṇa was transformed into the present purāṇas in “the hands of an *inferior* class of priesthood.” Walter RUBEN (Einführung in die Indienkunde, Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1954) suggests that the purāṇas “gehören ursprünglich vermutlich jedes zu einem Tempel” (p. 192).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Mahābhārata 1.57.73cd–74.

<sup>15</sup> K. M. SHEMBAVANEKAR (The Veda-Vyāsa Myth, ABORI 27, 1946, 114–123), who denies that Vyāsa had anything to do with the eternal Veda, accuses the *paurāṇikas*: “A careful investigation into the origin and development of this Veda-Vyāsa myth will furnish, perhaps, the best example of the way in which Purāṇic writers, as a class, have superseded, defied, twisted or perverted, old and carefully preserved Vedic traditions in order to glorify a particular personage or religious creed” (p. 114). For an attempt to coordinate the traditions, see R. MORTON SMITH: The Spread of the Vyāsa-Vedas, Pur 7, 1965, 221–234 [with a textcritical treatment of Vāyu° 61.36–43]. According to S. K. CHATTERJI (W. Norman Brown vol. 1962, 28–29) Vyāsa was “a unique personality, who unquestionably has a historical background.” Buddha PRAKASH (Vyāsa, A Study in Indo-Babylonian Cultural Contact, JBRS 37, 1951, 32–42) held that Vyāsa owed his origin, name and even his main activities to Berosus who, after Alexander conquered Babylonia, compiled a comprehensive history of Babylonia for the benefit of the new rulers. This thesis was rejected by HAZRA (Did Vyāsa owe his Origin to Berosus?, Pur 2, 1960, 17–22). Cf. also A. S. GUPTA: Vyāsa-vandanā, with a Note on the Vyāsa-vandanā, Pur 11, 1969, 203–206, and Vyāsastutiḥ, with a Note on Vyāsa, Pur 22, 1980, 119–121 [against Buddha Prakash].

## 2. THE PLACE OF THE PURĀṆAS IN INDIAN LITERATURE

The preceding survey of general trends in the history of purāṇa studies will now be followed, first (2.1), by a number of considerations on the nature of puranic texts, the transmission of puranic materials, and the place of the purāṇas within Sanskrit literature generally. In the second place (2.2), I will draw some conclusions from these considerations, with special emphasis on their impact on the interpretation of the purāṇas and the use of data provided by puranic texts.

### 2.1 Nature of the Purāṇas

#### 2.1.1 Puranic Textual Tradition

Modern scholarship has marveled at the textual tradition of the Vedic texts. For centuries these texts have been transmitted orally, without a single syllable or accent having been lost or changed.<sup>1</sup> It soon became evident that those who preserved the puranic tradition had a very different attitude toward it than those who were in charge of the Vedic tradition.<sup>2</sup> Western scholars were surprised, and accused the *paurāṇikas* of forgery and dishonesty.

One of the early “victims” of puranic textual tradition was Captain Francis Wilford, who set out to prove “that the Hindu religion had its origin in the British Isles, which constitute, in his opinion, the Sweta Dwipa, or white island, of the Indian mythologists.”<sup>3</sup> Wilford’s experience is worth quoting, for it clearly illustrates the nature of the puranic textual tradition.

“I consequently directed my pandit to make extracts from all the Purāṇas and other books relative to my inquiries, and to arrange them under proper heads. . . . I have since learned that, as the money for his establishment passed through his hands, his avaricious disposition led him to embezzle the whole, and to attempt to perform the task alone, which was impracticable. In order to avoid the trouble of consulting books, he conceived the idea of framing legends from what he recollected from the Purāṇas, and from what he picked up in conversation with me. As he was exceedingly well read in the Purāṇas, and other similar books, in consequence of his situation with a Marhatta chief of the first rank in his younger days, it was an easy task for him; and he studied to introduce as much truth as he could, to obviate the danger of immediate detection.

<sup>1</sup> E. g., Heinrich LÜDERS: *Geschichte, Philologie und Archäologie in Indien*, ZDMG 83, 1929, 1–20 at 3–6.

<sup>2</sup> E. g., C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR: *Some Thoughts on the Puranas, Prabuddha Bharata* 58, 1953, 86–91 at 87–88; P. L. VAIDYA: *Harivaṃśa CE 1* (1969), xxxix–xl.

<sup>3</sup> Alexander HAMILTON: *Edinburgh Review* 15:29, 1809, 1709.

... His forgeries were of three kinds; in the first, there was only a word or two altered. In the second, were such legends, as had undergone a more material alteration; and in the third, all those which he had written from memory.

With regard to those of the first class, when he found that I was resolved to make a collation of the manuscript, he began to adulterate and disfigure his own manuscript, mine, and the manuscripts of the College [at Benares], by erasing the original name of the country, and putting that of Egypt or of Śwétam in its place.

To prevent my detecting those of the second class, which were not numerous, but of the greatest importance in their nature, and as books in India are not bound as in Europe, and every leaf is loose, he took out one or two leaves, and substituted others with an adulterous legend. In books of some antiquity it is not uncommon to see a few new leaves inserted in the room of others that are wanting.

To conceal his impositions of the third class, which is the most numerous, he had the patience to write two voluminous sections, supposed to belong, one to the Scaṇḍa-purāṇa, and the other to the Brahmāṇḍa, in which he connected all the legends together, in the usual style of the Purāṇas. These two sections, as he wrote them, consist of no less than 12,000 ślócas or lines, the title of which he borrowed. The real sections, are so very scarce, that they are generally supposed to be lost and probably are so; unless they are found in the library of the Rajah of Jayanāgar. Other impostors have had recourse to the Scaṇḍa, Brahmāṇḍa, and Padma-purāṇas, a great part of which is not at present to be found, and for that reason are called the Purāṇas of thieves or impostors: though the genuineness of such parts, as are in common use, has never been questioned."<sup>4</sup>

More specifically with regard to the way in which the puranic lists of kings were treated Wilford reports the following experience.

"I was acquainted lately, at Benares, with a chronicler of that sort, and, in several conversations I had with him, he candidly acknowledged that he filled up the immediate spaces between the reigns of famous kings, with names at a venture; that he shortened or lengthened their reigns at pleasure; and that it was understood, that his predecessors had taken the same liberties . . . This is, however, the case with the sections on futurity in the Bhāgavat, Vāyu, Vishnu, and Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇas."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> An Essay on the Sacred Isles in the West, with other Essays connected with that Work, As.Res. 8, 1805, 245–367; 9, 1809, 32–243; 11, 1810, 11–152 at 8, 1805, 249–252. Wilford's ms. is now IOL 2765 (EGGELING 1899: 1412–1413, no. 3735). It is worth noticing, in connection with the impact of the purāṇas generally, that the result of Wilford's ("a learned and laborious, but injudicious writer," Wilson) earlier purāṇa studies – On Egypt and other Countries Adjacent to the CA'LI' River, or Nile of Ethopia, from the Ancient Books of the Hindus, As.Res. 3, 1792, 295–468 – were gratefully acknowledged and used by such authors as John Hanning SPEKE (Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile, Edinburgh–London: Blackwood, 1863, p. 13); according to Speke, they "show clearly that the ancient Hindūs must have had some kind of communication with both the northern and southern ends of the Victoria N'yanza." However, this paragraph – and Wilford's map – no longer appear in Speke's second edition (1864).

<sup>5</sup> As.Res. 9, 1807, 133. Cf. also Ernst WALDSCHMIDT (Geschichte des indischen Altertums, in Geschichte Asiens, Munich: Bruckmann, 1950, pp. 18–19) on Indian historiography and the *sūtas*' contribution to it: "Ihre Werke umschloß als weltliche Erzeugnisse aber nicht der Nimbus der Offenbarung und Heiligkeit, weshalb sie ständig ergänzt und

Wilson, who was aware of Wilford's experience, fully realized the risks involved in asking his pandits to supply puranic information on specific points: "Not to describe what was sought for, left the Pandit at a loss what to supply; to indicate a desire to find any particular information was to tempt him to supply it, even if he fabricated it for the purpose."<sup>6</sup>

Another well known case of "forgery" in the puranic textual tradition is connected with the *Nilamata*<sup>o</sup>. In 1877 Bühler reported as follows:

"In that case the Mahârâja of Kaśmîr was the innocent cause of the forgery. He ordered Pandit Sâhebrâm to prepare a trustworthy copy of the *Nilamata* for edition. As the Pandit found that all the MSS. were defective in the beginning, and as he knew from the fragments, as well as from the Râjataranginî, what the lost portions did contain, he restored the whole work according to his best ability. If I had not come to Kaśmîr soon after his death, it is probable that the genuine text would have disappeared altogether. For the Pandits thought, until I convinced them of the contrary, Sâhebrâm's copy greatly superior to all others. From these facts it will appear that complete Kaśmîri MSS. have to be used with great care, especially if they are new and the older MSS. are mutilated."<sup>7</sup>

One of the editors of the *Nilamata*<sup>o</sup>, K. de Vreese, was far more bitter about the procedures applied in Kashmir.

"In the written tradition of Kashmir textual criticism, being together with linguistic and historical research the indispensable means to the reconstruction of texts, meets, in a higher degree than elsewhere, with special difficulties. In this country to a greater extent than in India proper, the Paṇḍit has little respect for the sacredness of the ancient records and does not scruple to alter them, for some purpose or other, in an unsparing manner. Nowhere in India this practice of restoring or 'cooking' Sanskrit texts, as has been pointed out by Professor Bühler in his well-known Report, is so commonly used as in that country. The manuscript tradition of the *Nilamata*, too, has been deteriorated and corrupted in consequence of this uncritical and unscientific system."<sup>8</sup>

The freedom with which puranic materials can be and are treated is equally obvious from translations produced by Indian authors. The translation of the *Matsya*<sup>o</sup> in *The Sacred Books of the Hindus* series is a case in point. First, the translation is anonymous. The editor of the series, B.D. Basu, refers to the translator as "an esteemed Talukdâr of Oudh – well known for his scholarly attainments in Sanskrit and English."<sup>9</sup> Second, the editor makes it clear that the *Matsya*<sup>o</sup> translation – and the transmission of purâṇas generally – has a character of its own, and justifiably so.

umgeformt werden konnten, und dabei wirkte sich die starke Neigung des Inders zur Spekulation aus, die ... ihm den Sinn für kritische und nüchterne Wirklichkeitsbeobachtung ... nahm."

<sup>6</sup> JRAS 5, 1839, 62.

<sup>7</sup> Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS. made in Kaśmîr, Rajputana, and Central India, JBBRAS, Extra No., 1877, pp. 33–34.

<sup>8</sup> *Nilamata*<sup>o</sup> ed. 1936, p. X.

<sup>9</sup> *Matsya*<sup>o</sup> tr. 1916–17, Part 1, p. vii.

“The translation of the Matsya Purāṇa by the learned Taluqdar of Oudh is not quite literal but close to the original. While it is necessary to have literal translations of the Vedas, Smṛitis, Upaniṣads and Darśanas, it is not so of the Purāṇas. The present translation is readable and will enable to understand the contents of this important Purāṇa.”<sup>10</sup>

Manmatha Nath Dutt’s translation of the Garuḍa° gives no indication as to the edition on which it is based, but at the same time announces that it will be different from it.

“We have attempted to expunge all spurious portions, or passages of questionable authenticity from the text . . . and tried to restore it to its original form as far as possible after the progress of so many centuries since it first saw the light.”<sup>11</sup>

More recently, in the series Ancient Indian Tradition and Mythology some of the purāṇa translations are attributed to an anonymous “board of scholars”. In the Śiva° translation we had to wait until the fourth volume before we were told on which edition the English version is based. Finally, all those who have used editions of purāṇas accompanied by translations into one or other modern Indian language, are aware of the extent to which these translations either expand on the Sanskrit text, or, on other occasions, appear like mere summaries of it. A most revealing situation was pointed out by van Kooij, with regard to the Vaṅgavāsi edition of the Kālikā°:

“The translation in Bengali was apparently not based on the text printed over it, but on manuscript(s) not further known; this is proved by the considerable differences in the Bengali translation from the Sanskrit text; the version of the Bengali translation frequently corresponds to the readings of the manuscripts I was able to consult.”<sup>12</sup>

One possible reaction to this situation is to label these translations incorrect and unreliable. With regard to the Matsya° translation Hohenberger remarks that, on several occasions, he will have to point out that “it does not do justice to the text.”<sup>13</sup> Gail puts it more strongly, and says that Sanyal’s translation of the Bhāgavata° is “rather a hodgepodge of excerpts from Śrīdhara’s commentary on the Bhāgavata°, fanciful conceits, and little respect for the text, and that it can

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., Part 2, p. iii.

<sup>11</sup> Garuḍa° tr. 1908, pp. iv–v. Yet, comparing Dutt’s translation with the printed editions, Surabhi SETH came to the conclusion that “it is interesting to note that the chapters 168–191 in the translation of the Garuḍa-Purāṇa by Dutt have no corresponding text in the printed editions of the Garuḍa-Purāṇa available now” (Garuḍa° 1972–73: 484).

<sup>12</sup> Kālikā° tr. 1972, p. 37. Cf. also S.N. SARMA’s remark, on Assamese purāṇa translations: “One of the favourite methods adopted by the translators to make their stories more lively and interesting was to introduce into the texture of one story the descriptions and incidents of the same story narrated in some other purāṇa” (Epics and Purāṇas in Early Assamese Literature, Gauhati: Pratima Devi, 1972, p. 154).

<sup>13</sup> HOHENBERGER 1930: 31.

therefore only be used as a paraphrase of the text.”<sup>14</sup> Underlying these reactions is the ubiquitous idea that the editions of the purāṇas are the standards of reference, and that the translations ought to be faithful to them. Those who voice them overlook the important fact that liberties in the transmission of purāṇas are normal and accepted at every level, and that the translators in no way act differently than the editors of the printed editions, nor, ultimately, than the copyists of the manuscripts who aroused the suspicion of Wilford, Wilson, Bühler, de Vreese, and others.

### 2.1.2 The Sūta

The principal reason why puranic – and epic – stories can be treated with such a high degree of freedom is that, fundamentally, they do not belong in books. This was most clearly recognized by Milton Singer.

“Before I went to India, I knew these stories as occurring in printed books called the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, parts of which I had read in translation. This knowledge gave me a welcome sense of recognition when I heard some of the stories, but it did not prepare me for the rich variety of ways in which they are told and retold. Seldom did I come across an Indian who had read these stories as I did, simply in a book. This is not how they learn them and it is not how they think of them. There is a sense of intimate familiarity with the characters and incidents in the references made to Hariścandra, Rāma and Sitā, Krishna, Arjuna, and Prahlāda, as if the world of the stories were also the everyday world. Many children are told these stories from an early age by parents and grandparents, but this is by no means the only way in which they learn them. The very tissue of the culture is made from purāṇic themes. Practically every cultural performance includes one – in song, dance, play, recitation, and exposition. Characters and scenes are ever present on the colored lithographs used in homes and public halls (as well as in the brilliantly colored figures on temple towers, for example, on the modern Śrī Kapālīśvara temple in Mylapore, Madras). The cultural and physical landscapes are literally and imaginatively printed with them.”<sup>1</sup>

Or, to quote Giorgio Bonazzoli, “the purāṇa-s are still a living and developing tradition.”<sup>2</sup>

The purāṇas, indeed, belong to the *sūta*, as is clear from two parallel passages, in the Vāyu<sup>3</sup> and Padma<sup>4</sup>:

<sup>14</sup> GAIL Bhāgavata° 1969: 2.

<sup>1</sup> MILTON SINGER: When a Great Tradition Modernizes. An Anthropological Approach to Indian Civilization, New York: Praeger, 1972, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> Bhaviṣya° 1979: 28.

<sup>3</sup> BI 1.26–27; ĀnSS 1.31–32.

<sup>4</sup> ĀnSS 5 (Sṛṣṭi). 1.27–28. PARGITER 1922: 15–16 considers the Vāyu° “the older and ... the more trustworthy version,” the Padma° “a later and inferior version.”

Vāyu°	Padma°
svadharmā eṣa sūtasya sadbhir dr̥ṣṭaḥ purātanaih	eṣa dharmas tu sūtasya sadbhir dr̥ṣṭaḥ sanātanaḥ
devatānām ṛṣiṇām ca	
rājñām cāmitatejasām vaṃśānām dhāraṇam kāryam śrutānām(śrutena?) ca mahātmanām	rājñām amitatejasām tadvaṃśadhāraṇam kāryam stutīnām ca mahātmanām
itihāsapurāṇeṣu	
dr̥ṣṭā(diṣṭā?) ye brahmavādibhiḥ	dr̥ṣṭā ye brahmavādibhiḥ

Some details in the readings of these texts are open to discussion. I will therefore restrict myself to quoting Pargiter's translations:

(Vāyu°) The sūta's special duty as perceived by good men of old was to preserve the genealogies of gods, rishis and most glorious kings, and the traditions of great men, which are displayed by those who declare sacred lore in the Itihāsas and Puranas;

(Padma°) This is the sūta's duty from primaevial time as perceived by good men, to compose the genealogies of gods, rishis and most glorious kings and the eulogies of great men, who are seen as declarers of sacred lore in the Itihāsa and Puranas.

In any case, both texts "tell us how ancient genealogies, tales and ballads were preserved, namely by the *sūtas*, and they describe the *sūta*'s duty."<sup>5</sup>

The term *sūta* has created a number of problems – and not a little speculation – on the part of modern scholars. In the oldest texts – but not in the Ṛgveda – the *sūta* is often mentioned in conjunction with the *grāmaṇī*. He belongs to the king's eight *vīras* and eleven *ratnins*, and he is ranked among the *rājakṛts*. He was, therefore, clearly a high ranking officer.<sup>6</sup> It has been held that one of the duties of the *sūta* was to act as the king's charioteer;<sup>7</sup> charioteers were among the most highly regarded officials of the Vedic kingdoms. In the epic period the *sūta* not only piloted the royal chariot, but he also acted as the king's messenger and confidant.<sup>8</sup> It is this *sūta*, the king's charioteer and mediator in times of war, who was – or became –<sup>9</sup> in peace time the master of ceremonies at court and the "court-bard and chronicler."<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> PARGITER 1922: 15.

<sup>6</sup> References in Wilhelm RAU: Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien, nach den Brāhmaṇa-Texten dargestellt, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967, pp. 108–109, and in HORSCH 1966: 422–424.

<sup>7</sup> A. WEBER (Indische Studien 17, 1885, 199) → A. B. KEITH (Vedic Index 2. 462–463) → W. RUBEN (Studien zur Textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇa, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936, p. 254). RAU (op. cit., pp. 108–109), on the other hand, holds that Weber's identification as the royal "Stallmeister" is based merely on the commentaries, and that it does not prove anything for the Brāhmaṇa period: the Vedic texts do not point to a charioteer or to a bard.

<sup>8</sup> RUBEN: Rāmāyaṇa, p. 254. Cf. king Paēsi's brother who was his charioteer and his trusted councillor in all royal business (E. LEUMANN: Beziehungen der Jaina-Literatur zu andern Literaturkreisen Indiens, 6th Int. Congr. of Or. 1883, 3.503).

<sup>9</sup> RUBEN (Einführung in die Indienkunde, Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaft-

As to the intellectual and social status of the *sūta*, opinions vary. He was obviously a scholarly person,<sup>11</sup> and a Sanskrit scholar at that.<sup>12</sup> When he arrives in an assembly, even an assembly of *ṛṣis*, he is given a special seat, he is duly honored by the sages, and addressed as *medhāvin*, *vaṁśakuśala*, *kalpajña*, and *mahābhāga*.<sup>13</sup> In the Mahābhāṣya the *sūta* is a victorious participant in a grammatical discussion.<sup>14</sup> In short, the *sūta* seems to know everything, with one exception: he is not entitled to know the Veda.<sup>15</sup>

To complicate matters further, *sūta* is also the term for a member of one of the mixed castes, the son of a *pratiloma* marriage between a *kṣatriya* father and a brahman mother.<sup>16</sup> Whether this is also the case with the puranic *sūta*, has both been confirmed and denied by the tradition. After describing the various *pratiloma* castes, including *sūta* and *māgadha*, Kauṭilya (3.7.29) seems to draw a neat distinction: *paurāṇikas tv anyah sūto māgadhaś ca brahmakṣatrād viśeṣah* (or *viśeṣataḥ*). Unfortunately, the sentence is hard to construe, and may well be a marginal note which was only accidentally inserted into the text.<sup>17</sup>

Some scholars did not neglect to point out indications in the texts that the puranic *sūta* was indeed a brahman. For instance, Balarāma was accused of

---

ten, 1954, pp. 143–144): “Irgendwann einmal also haben die Brahmanen diese Wagenlenkerliteratur an sich gerissen, vermutlich, als die Wagenlenker ihre Bedeutung mit dem Kriegswagen verloren.”

<sup>10</sup> J. EGGELING: tr. Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, SBE 41, p. 62 n. 1; he however translates “herald,” with which RAU (op. cit., p. 109) agrees. Cf. John W. SPELLMAN (Political Theory of Ancient India, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964, p. 69): “The Sūta as well as being a messenger was apparently also an official who looked after the State horses and was responsible for the maintenance of dynastic tradition.”

<sup>11</sup> Yet, in connection with the unwieldy exaggerations in the purāṇas, says WINTERNITZ (1963: 465): “This, too, indicates that it was an inferior class of literary men, belonging to the lower, uneducated priesthood, which was engaged in the transmission of the Purāṇas.”

<sup>12</sup> RUBEN: Rāmāyaṇa, p. 256. Ruben also points out that Duṣyanta’s charioteer in Śākuntala speaks Sanskrit.

<sup>13</sup> A. D. PUSALKER: The Brāhmaṇa Tradition and the Kṣatriya Tradition, Hiriyanna vol. (1952), 151–155 at 155, quoting RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1932: 760. Cf. also PUSALKER: Conception of History in Ancient Indian Literature, OH 12, 1964, 33–52 at 46–47.

<sup>14</sup> Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini 2.4.56. Cf. J. WACKERNAGEL: Altindische Grammatik, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896, 1.xxxviii (tr. REṆOU, 1957, p. 19); RUBEN: Rāmāyaṇa, p. 257; L. RENOU: Histoire de la langue sanskrite, Lyon: IAC, 1956, pp. 78–80; Joseph MANSION: Quelques passages de Patañjali au point de vue de l’histoire de la langue sanscrite, Schrijnen vol. (1929), 381–384 at 384.

<sup>15</sup> Vāyu° 1.33ab (ĀnSS) = Padma° 5 (Sṛṣṭi). 1.29ab (ĀnSS): *na hi vedeṣv adhikārah kaścit sūtasya dṛśyate*; Bhāgavata° 1.4.13cd: *manye tvām viśaye vācām snātam anyatra chāndasāt*.

<sup>16</sup> E.g., Manusmṛti 10.11, 17. Cf. Kauṭilya 2.30 (*aśvādhyakṣa*). 42. Manu (10.47) states clearly: *sūtānām aśvasārathyam māgadhānām vaṅikpathah*.

<sup>17</sup> R. P. KANGLE: The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra, Bombay: University of Bombay, vol. 2, 1963, p. 248 n.

brahmanicide for killing the *sūta*.<sup>18</sup> Other sources, on the contrary, seem to indicate that the puranic *sūta* was not a brahman. Besides the argument that the *sūta* was not entitled to know the Veda,<sup>19</sup> there are also allusions to mixture of castes in the stories about the origin of the *sūta*: according to the tradition the *sūta* – and the *māgadha* – came into existence during the sacrifice for the birth of king Pṛthu, son of Vena.<sup>20</sup> Also, the *sūta* of the Bhāgavata° (1.18.18) seems to confirm his own mixed origin:

aho vyaṃ janmabhṛto 'dya hāsma  
vṛddhānuvṛtīyāpi vilomajātāh /  
dauṣkalyam ādhiṃ vidhunoti śighraṃ  
mahattamānām abhidhānayaḡah //

“Oh, what a happy surprise – that we who are born in a (lower) mixed caste, by our service of the seniors (in age and knowledge, e. g. of Śuka), have achieved our object in life. The association, even in conversation, with the greatest removes the agony (inferiority complex) of being born in a lower family.”<sup>21</sup>

Finally, the *sūta* is constantly connected with the *māgadha*, not only as performers, but also as members of mixed castes.<sup>22</sup>

Under these circumstances one can only speculate. Either one tries the synchronic approach: the mixed caste element explains how the *sūta* could simultaneously fulfil a kṣatriya function, that of charioteer and equerry, and a purely brahmanic role, that of bard and singer.<sup>23</sup> Or one looks for a diachronic explanation: the *sūta* as the son of a kṣatriya father and a brahman mother is a later application of the term only, and it was not that of the Vāyu° and Padma° texts quoted above.<sup>24</sup> One thing at least is certain, and surprising at the same time. Although the practice of reciting puranic stories continues up to the present day, the term *sūta* disappeared at an early date. The term is totally absent from the

<sup>18</sup> Bhāgavata° 10.78–79; Mārkaṇḍeya° 6.23–37. Cf. PUSALKER: Hiriyanṇa vol. (1952), 155.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. supra. Thus, P. L. BHARGAVA: India in the Vedic Age, Lucknow: Upper India Publishing House, <sup>2</sup>1971, p. 17 n. 1. Unless the texts want to say that he is not entitled to recite the Veda.

<sup>20</sup> Viṣṇu° 1.13.51–64; Vāyu° 1.33–38 (ĀnSS) = 1.28–32 (BI) and 62.137–148 (ĀnSS) = 2.1.135–146 (BI); Padma° 5 (Śrṣṭi). 1.29–35 (ĀnSS).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. HOPKINS Bhāgavata° 1966: 20.

<sup>22</sup> On the connection of the *māgadha* with the *vṛātyastoma*, see J. W. HAUER: Der Vṛātya, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1927, pp. 142–147, with references to Lāt.Śr.S. and Kāty.Śr.S.

<sup>23</sup> E. g., BURNOUF Bhāgavata° 1.xxxiii.

<sup>24</sup> PARGITER 1919: 448 and 1922: 16. Cf. B. C. MAZUMDAR (The Origin and Character of the Purāṇa Literature, Asutosh Mookerji vol. 3.2, 1925, 7–30 at 29): from being recited by brahmins in Vedic times, the purāṇas gradually became the monopoly of the lower classes, either because the brahmins began to ask money for their recitations, or at the time when the Magadhas became supreme.

Gupta inscriptions, even in contexts in which one would normally expect it.<sup>25</sup> Also, as we shall see later, the person who, in the Harṣacarita, *gītyā pavamāna-proktaṃ purāṇaṃ papāṭha*, is called *pustakavācakah sudrṣṭih*; his recitation is accompanied, with two *āryā ślokaḥ*, by *vandī sūcībāṇaḥ*.<sup>26</sup>

Nineteenth and twentieth century writings on India provide ample descriptive material on modern puranic bards and purāṇa recitals.<sup>27</sup> The picture that emerges from these descriptions is one of extreme complexity and diversity. If it is true that the modern bard “fulfils the same office as his prototype,”<sup>28</sup> the complexity of today may be indicative of at least some degree of complexity in ancient times.<sup>29</sup> This in turn may explain the often contradictory data about the *sūta* that survive in the classical sources discussed earlier.

The term normally used for the performer is Hindi *bhāt*, or its equivalent in other modern Indian languages. Yet it is clear that *bhāt* is a generic term, and that there are different sub-classes, not only in various parts of India,<sup>30</sup> but also locally.<sup>31</sup> Even one single recital may involve the simultaneous participation of different sorts of performers.<sup>32</sup> The idea that the *bhāṭṣ* originate from a mixture

<sup>25</sup> D. R. PATIL (Gupta Inscriptions and the Purāṇic Tradition, BDCRI 2, 1940–41, 148–165 at 165) expresses surprise about this. Cf. Nilmani MUKHOPADHYAYA (ed. *Kūrma*, p. X), more specifically on the disappearance of the *sūta* caste, and the replacement of *sūtas* by brahmins.

<sup>26</sup> For ref., see 2.1.5. Cf. V. S. AGRAWALA: References to Sects in Bāṇa’s Harṣacarita, IHQ 39, 1963, 151–159 at 159: the list, in ch. 5, includes, no. 21, *Paurāṇikas*.

<sup>27</sup> In addition to the sources quoted in the following notes, see also R. K. NARAYAN’S *The World of the Storyteller*, in: *Gods, Demons and Others*, New York: Viking Press, 1964, pp. 1–10.

<sup>28</sup> WILSON: *Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms*, London: Allen, 1855, pp. 78–79.

<sup>29</sup> For hints at diversity in classical times, see A. HILLEBRANDT: *Über die Anfänge des indischen Dramas*, SBAW 1914, 4. Abt., p. 9 (*svastikas, sūtas, māgadhas*, etc.); H. JACOBI: *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1893, p. 62 + n. 1 and p. 67 + n. 1 (difference between *sūta* and *kuśilava*); PUSALKER: *Hiriyanna* vol. (1952), 155 (three types of *sūtas*: the priest, the military man, the professional court minstrel).

<sup>30</sup> Athelstane BAINES: *Ethnography (Castes and Tribes)*, [GIAPA II.5.] Strassburg: Trübner, 1912, pp. 85–98: *Bards and Genealogists*. Cf. James WISE: *Notes on the Races, Castes, and Trades of Eastern Bengal*, London: Harrison, 1883, p. 246 (on the distinctive characteristics of the Bengali *bhāt* of Sylhet and Tripura).

<sup>31</sup> Henry Miers ELLIOT: *Supplement to the Glossary of Indian Terms*, Agra: Secundra Orphan Press, 1845, p. 59; – R. C. TEMPLE: *The Legends of the Panjāb*, Bombay: Education Society, 1884–1900, 1, p. viii; – W. CROOKE: *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, 1896, 2, pp. 20–33; – Robert Vane RUSSELL: *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*, London: Macmillan, 1916, 2, pp. 251–270; – A. M. SHAH and R. G. SCHROFF: *The Vahivancā Bāroṭṣ of Gujarat, A Caste of Genealogists and Mythographers*, in M. SINGER: *Traditional India*, Philadelphia: American Folklore Society, 1959, pp. 40–70 (p. 42, a reference to “eighteen or more bardic castes in Gujarat”).

<sup>32</sup> WARD 1811: 2.284–286, mentions a *pāṭhaka*, the actual reader of the purāṇa, assisted by two *dhārakas* who supervise him for correctness, and two *sadasyas* who decide in case of

of *varṇas* is still very much alive,<sup>33</sup> and so are stories about their origin.<sup>34</sup> In many places they form a caste – or castes – of their own.<sup>35</sup> Socially the *bhāṭ* occupies a very strong position. According to one report, he stands “higher in public estimation than the Brahmins.”<sup>36</sup> On the other hand we hear that he is less dignified and distinguished than his predecessors in ancient times,<sup>37</sup> that he is no longer conspicuous for his knowledge of the purāṇas,<sup>38</sup> even that he is “too proud to work, but not too proud to beg.”<sup>39</sup> Clearly people are in awe of the *bhāṭ*. He carries an aura of sacredness and immunity that makes himself and anything around him invulnerable and inalienable: he is called upon to conduct caravans safely through the wildest and most desolate regions.<sup>40</sup> His personal security is held sufficient for the payment of a debt or the fulfilment of an engagement.<sup>41</sup> *Bhāṭs* are also reputed for abusing their great powers. They sing the praise of those who are generous to them, but they freely treat those who neglect them with satires “in which they usually reproach them with spurious birth and inherent meanness.”<sup>42</sup> In extreme cases they fix effigies of their victims on a large pole and carry it around until they receive adequate remuneration.<sup>43</sup>

Another element in the modern descriptions is even more important for a correct understanding of purāṇa transmission through the centuries: the total freedom with which individual reciters treat their materials. Most bards recite from memory, “with the inevitable result that their individuality comes into play and no two reciters narrate alike.”<sup>44</sup> Moreover, each individual bard recites

---

disagreement between the former three; a *kāṭhaka*, finally, explains to the people, in the vernacular, what earlier has been read in Sanskrit.

<sup>33</sup> ELLIOT: op. cit., pp. 57–58. Cf. WILSON: Glossary, p. 78.

<sup>34</sup> John MALCOLM: *Memoir of Central India*, London: Kingsbury, Parbury & Allen, 1823, 2, p. 132. Cf. ELLIOT: op. cit., p. 58; CROOKE: op. cit., 2, pp. 20–33.

<sup>35</sup> Arthur STEELE: *Summary of the Law and Custom of Hindoo Castes within the De-khun Provinces Subject to the Presidency of Bombay, chiefly affecting Civil Suits*, Bombay: Courier Press, 1827, p. 108; – M. A. SHERRING: *Hindu Tribes and Castes*, Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1872–1881, 1, p. 271; – Edgar THURSTON: *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, Madras: Government Press, 1909, 1, pp. 223–230 (Bhatrāzu).

<sup>36</sup> Devendra N. DAS: *Sketches of Hindu Life*, London: Chapman and Hall, 1887, p. 179.

<sup>37</sup> WILSON: Glossary, p. 78; SHERRING: op. cit., 1, p. 271.

<sup>38</sup> ELLIOT: op. cit., p. 59; TEMPLE: op. cit., 1, p. xi.

<sup>39</sup> John C. NESFIELD: *Brief View of the Caste System of the Northwestern Provinces and Oudh*, Allahabad: NW Provinces and Oudh Gov. Press, 1885, p. 46.

<sup>40</sup> James TOD: *Annals and Antiquities of Rajast'han, or the Central and Western Rajpoot States of India*, London 1829–32, Madras: Higginbotham, 1873, 1, p. 602, calls the *bhāṭs* and *cāraṇs* “poets by birth, carriers by profession.” Cf. D. N. DAS: op. cit., p. 181.

<sup>41</sup> WILSON: Glossary, p. 79; DAS: op. cit., p. 180; H. H. RISLEY: *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, *Ethnographic Glossary*, Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Press, 1891, 1, p. 101.

<sup>42</sup> MALCOLM: op. cit., pp. 137–138.

<sup>43</sup> MALCOLM, *ibid.*; ELLIOT: op. cit., p. 58.

<sup>44</sup> TEMPLE: op. cit., 1, p. v.

differently under different circumstances; K. M. Munshi's description of the *gāgariyā bhaṭ* in Gujarat illustrates this situation most clearly.

“Wherever he happens to be, he opens his session at night on some temple-door or verandah before a public square. With his nimble fingers loaded with brass rings, he starts playing upon the *gāgar* as on a hand-drum, and makes the pot resound with his skillful raps. The neighbourhood flocks to hear the *kathā*, as the Purāṇic recital is called; the public square in front and the windows of the surrounding houses are turned into an auditorium for the occasion. The *bhaṭ* recites an *ākhyān*; explains many parts of it; adds a flourish here, a touch there, to move or tickle the audience; improvises new stories and introduces lively anecdotes. The audience sits, hour after hour, absorbed in the recital. The description of a Purāṇic incident or character, in the mouth of a competent *bhaṭ*, assumes a fresh form and contemporary colour. At an interesting point in the recital the *bhaṭ* stops, and wants to know who among his listeners will provide his next days' dinner; and, unless he is ignorant of the rudiments of his art, he is sure to receive invitations from more than one hospitable townsman. Having made sure of the morrow, he proceeds with the *kathā* till after midnight, sometimes till the early hours of the morning. The session continues for a month, sometimes longer; its length, as a rule, depends on the *bhaṭ*'s ability to attract a good audience, and upon the hospitable nature of the locality. After the session is over, the *bhaṭ* is feasted, carried in a procession through the town, and presented with a purse as a send-off.”<sup>45</sup>

The reason why I insisted on the role of the *sūta* – and his successor, the *bhāt* – is that, ever since Wilson and the development of purāṇa studies in modern days, the purāṇas have been looked upon, not as materials which were transmitted orally – with all the consequences thereof – by living individuals, but as texts consigned to and to be studied from manuscripts and, at a later stage, printed editions. It is a fact worth being kept in mind by anyone interested in purāṇas and purāṇa studies.

### 2.1.3 Different Recensions of Purāṇas

The existing editions of individual purāṇas exhibit a wide range of discrepancies, from minor variant readings to the inclusion or exclusion of entire chapters or sections. The latter situation applies, for instance, in the case of the Padma<sup>o</sup>: “The present Padma, which is the result of several recasts, has come down to us in two distinct recensions – North Indian (Bengal) and South Indian.”<sup>1</sup> This

<sup>45</sup> Gujarāt and Its Literature, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, <sup>3</sup>1967, pp. 166–167. Cf. Albert B. LORD: The Singer of Tales, Harvard UP, 1960; a number of statements in this volume apply perfectly to the purāṇas and their reciters. E. g., “Leaving out of consideration for a moment the question of the talent of the singer, one can say that the length of the song depends upon the audience” (p. 17).

<sup>1</sup> HAZRA 1940: 107. In the case of the Padma<sup>o</sup> this distinction was already made by Lüders (Sage von R̥ṣyaśṛṅga, 1897, ref. sub Padma<sup>o</sup>), including the statement that the Bengali version is the older one (p. 94 n. 1). Cf. WINTERNITZ 1907: 452.

statement by Hazra reflects the traditional interpretation of the major discrepancies, especially those between the Vaṅgavāsī editions<sup>1a</sup> on the one hand and the Veṅkaṭeśvara and/or Ānandāśrama editions on the other. Haraprasad Shastri formulated the general principle as follows:

“They represent the different provincial recensions and that means collation of different classes of manuscripts . . . By a cursory view of the two sets, one can at once come to know . . . that some khaṇḍas of the Purāṇas are popular in one province and unknown in another and so forth.”<sup>2</sup>

Elsewhere the editions are much closer to one another, as in the case of the Brahma°: “The AnSS ed. is chapter by chapter the same as the Vaṅga ed. There are occasional variations in readings and number of verses in the corresponding chapters, but these variations are not many and important.”<sup>3</sup> We might be tempted to conclude from statements such as this that there are also purāṇas without major, regional differences, were it not that we know that the Vaṅgavāsī editions and the Veṅkaṭeśvara and/or Ānandāśrama editions are not always as independent of one another as the geographic distance between Calcutta and Bombay or Pune might make us believe. Thus, in the preface to the Vaṅga edition of the Skanda° the editor explains that he took the Veṅkaṭeśvara edition as his basis, and merely added to it chapters and verses he found in the Bengal manuscripts.<sup>4</sup> And with regard to the Vāmana° editions Hazra surmised with good reasons: “The Vaṅga ed. is the same as the Veṅk. ed. Both consist of 95 chapters. The variations in readings in these two editions are so small in number that one seems to be a reprint of the other.”<sup>5</sup>

A good example to show that corresponding chapters in different regional editions of a particular purāṇa do not warrant any conclusion as to the original organization of the text, is provided by the Agni°. Hazra adds the usual note: “The Vaṅga. ed. is chapter by chapter the same as the AnSS ed. There are, of course, occasional variations in readings and number of verses in the corresponding chapters.” Gyani agrees, and further specifies: “These editions do not much differ from one another. All the editions contain 382 chapters but the Veṅkaṭeśvar edition has got one chapter in excess. The Chapter 135 entitled Atha Saṅgrāma Vijaya Vidyā cannot be traced in other editions.”<sup>7</sup> Not only has the additional chapter unostentatiously been inserted in more recent Ānandāśrama editions, but, more importantly, the apparently uniform division of the Agni° in 382 is, in reality, not a very ancient one. It was the work of its first editor, Rājendralāla Mitra,

<sup>1a</sup> Even though, in the particular case of the Padma° (see there) the Vaṅgavāsī ed. too, reproduces the “Western” Padma°.

<sup>2</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI: 1928b: 327–328.

<sup>3</sup> HAZRA 1940: 145 n. 163.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 10–11, quoted at HAZRA 1940: 157 n. 176.

<sup>5</sup> HAZRA 1940: 76 n. 1. Cf. PADOUX (Agni° 1978: 58) on the Agni°: “each new edition seems to make it a point to reproduce faithfully even the most obvious errors of the previous ones.”

<sup>6</sup> HAZRA 1940: 134 n. 122.

<sup>7</sup> GYANI Agni° 1964: 3 n. 1.

who used eleven manuscripts, and described their relationship and arrangement as follows: “Of these, eight codices correspond very closely, and give the same number of chapters; two Nos. I and VII are incomplete, wanting several chapters at the end; and one, No. III, has several chapters at the end, and 4 chapters on pilgrimage in the middle the counterparts of which are not to be met with elsewhere. The chapters are not regularly numbered in any of the MSS., and in several no number is to be met with. For the sake of convenience of reference the serial number has been introduced by me, and the total I arrived at from the eight MSS. which correspond is 382”.<sup>8</sup>

What I would like to suggest is that, even when different editions of a particular purāṇa correspond in their general arrangement, this does not mean that we are in the fortunate position of possessing *the* text of that purāṇa. On the contrary, there are reasons to believe that, irrespective of whether or not the printed editions exhibit major differences, all titles of purāṇas have been – and are – used to cover a variety of materials which do not appear in our editions. Some of these materials may still be available in – numerous – manuscripts which have never been consulted by purāṇa editors; others may have existed in manuscripts which are now lost; others again may have been included in the recitations of individual *sūtas* without ever having been committed to writing.

As early as 1890 Bühler showed that al-Bīrūnī’s quotations from “the Viṣṇudharma” are, in fact, from two different versions of the Viṣṇudharmottara°. One of his conclusions was that “it is evident that in the beginning of the eleventh century two works with the title Vishṇudharmōttara or Vishṇu-Dharma existed, and that both were considered to be canonical by Bērūnī’s Paṇḍits who, one and all, were Vaiṣṇavas.”<sup>9</sup>

On numerous occasions scholars have taken notice of the existence of manuscripts the contents of which did not correspond to those of any of the published versions. According to Burnell, “eighteen Purāṇas are mentioned everywhere; but they are often by no means the same works, though under one name.”<sup>10</sup> In Haraprasad’s catalogue of the purāṇa manuscripts at the Asiatic Society in Calcutta one comes across several statements, similar to the one on a Bhaviṣya° manuscript: “it does not agree with any of the recensions of the purāṇa known.”<sup>11</sup> R. N. Mehta came to the conclusion that “under the title of Nāgarakhaṇḍa several works exist.”<sup>12</sup> Bonazzoli refers to the existence of five different Bhaviṣya°s.<sup>13</sup> Even for a purāṇa for which most editions correspond, such as the Devībhāgavata°, Lalye saw a manuscript which is totally different.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Agni° ed., 1873–79, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii.

<sup>9</sup> Book-notice on Sachau’s Alberuni, IA 19, 1890, 381–410 at 407.

<sup>10</sup> 1880: 187. Cf. p. 189, on Brahma°, etc.

<sup>11</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: 424. Cf. p. (Varāha°), p. 647 (Vāmana°), p. 784 (Nīlamata°), etc.

<sup>12</sup> Nāgarakhaṇḍa – A Study, JUBar 17, 1968, 106.

<sup>13</sup> BONAZZOLI Bhaviṣya° 1979: 26–27.

<sup>14</sup> LALYE Devībhāgavata° 1973: viii.

Equally revealing for the existence of different texts with identical titles are certain statements in the dharmanibandhas. Besides the purāṇas with these names which he did consult (pp. 2–3) Ballālasena refers in the Dānasāgara to “another” (*apara*) Brahma°, Agni°, Viṣṇu°, and Liṅga° which he did not use (p. 7). Inasmuch as the contents of these “other” purāṇas, as indicated in the Dānasāgara, do not correspond to those of the extant purāṇas, the conclusion was drawn that in addition to the latter – which are spurious by definition (see 1.3) – there was for each of them at least one other spurious text.<sup>15</sup> Similarly, Narasiṃha Vājapeyin’s Nityācārapradīpa distinguishes between two different Brahma°s, one of which is quoted in Lakṣmīdhara’s Kṛtyakalpataru, the other in the works of Hemādri; the text labels the latter an upapurāṇa.<sup>16</sup> Ballālasena (p. 7) also refers to a few purāṇas which were useless for his purpose, since they do not contain rules on gifts (*dānavidhiśūnya*); one of these is the Brahmāṇḍa°. Not only does the extant Brahmāṇḍa° contain such rules; Hemādri’s Caturvar-gacintāmaṇi attributes to it many other verses on the subject which do not appear in our editions. This shows “that the text of the ‘Brahmāṇḍa’, used by Hemādri, was in many ways different from that of our present edition as well as from that of the Brahmāṇḍa known to Ballālasena.”<sup>17</sup>

The Kālikā° is a title which has created problems for several scholars. Raghavan was the first one to suggest the existence of at least three versions: the one represented by most manuscripts and editions, comprising from 90 to 93 chapters; L. 370 of Aufrecht’s Catalogus Catalogorum, which Rājendralāla Mitra himself calls Caṇḍī°; and the India Office manuscript, a later and different text.<sup>18</sup> The editor of Lakṣmīdhara’s Kṛtyakalpataru, K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar, came to the conclusion that “it has been . . . difficult to find any of the quotations from Kālikāpurāṇa in any of the printed editions of it. The existence of Kālikāpurāṇa in more than one recension, and the radical differences between rival versions of it, might justify the suspicion that we do not now possess it in the form in which it existed in the 11th and 12th centuries.”<sup>19</sup> On the basis of the India Office catalogue<sup>19a</sup> Hazra accepts the existence of another Kālikā°, also called Kālī° and Saṭī°, which is quite different from “the present” Kālikā°. <sup>20</sup> Elsewhere Hazra mentions that Raghunandana’s Durgapūjātattva (pp. 8–9) quotes ten verses which are introduced as *duṣprāpakālikāpurāṇāntare* ‘pi. It shows “that Raghunandana knew another Kālikāp. which was different from the present one profusely drawn upon by him in his Tat-tvas.”<sup>21</sup> Notice also that Nīlakaṇṭha’s Vyavahāramayūkha, after quoting three stanzas from the Kālikā°, says that they do not deserve absolute confidence, “for they are absent from two or three manuscripts of the text.”<sup>22</sup>

<sup>15</sup> E. g., HAZRA 1940: 95 n. 40 (Liṅga°), 151 n. 168 (Brahma°).

<sup>16</sup> BI work 160, 1903–28, 1.19.

<sup>17</sup> HAZRA 1940: 19.

<sup>18</sup> RAGHAVAN Kālikā° 1938: 331.

<sup>19</sup> RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR Nandī° 1941–42: 159.

<sup>19a</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1193–1198, no. 3344.

<sup>20</sup> HAZRA 1963: 259.

<sup>21</sup> HAZRA 1963: 236.

<sup>22</sup> Ed. P. V. KANE, Bombay: NSP, 1926, p. 114.

A most interesting case is presented by the Agni°. Gyani<sup>23</sup> lists five editions which “do not much differ from one another,” and he therefore restricts himself to using one edition: Veṅkaṭeśvara. Yet, ever since the publication of the catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts of the India Office Library<sup>23a</sup> the existence of a Vahni° – “different from the work usually designated by that title” – was known.<sup>24</sup> Only at the end of his treatment of the Agni° Hazra<sup>25</sup> briefly refers to this manuscript: “Besides the extant Agni-p., Mss. have been found of another work called ‘Vahni-purāṇa.’” A little over ten years later Hazra had an opportunity to study the manuscripts of the Vahni°; he concluded: “With the spread of Tantricism this spurious work [= the present AgniP] attained great popularity, and the genuine Āgneya-purāṇa [= the earlier Agni-p.] had to save itself from extinction by assuming a different title, viz., ‘Vahni-purāṇa.’”<sup>26</sup> He rightly points out that what makes a *mahāpurāṇa* is its being well known; that what is less well known becomes an *upapurāṇa*. “As modern scholars did not know the real nature of this ‘Vahni-purāṇa’ occurring in Manuscripts, they took it to be an Upapurāṇa of minor importance.” Although Hazra twice uses the expression that it is the Vahni° rather than the Agni° that “is identical with” the genuine Āgneya°, the absence in it of the Īśānakalpa – here too, even as in the extant Agni°! – and various other arguments make him admit that, once again, this Vahni° has lost many chapters of the original Āgneya°; they have been replaced by passages drawn from other sources, and the whole assumed a “Vaiṣṇava form.” In short, this is a unique case in which one “extant” purāṇa has actually been replaced with another, at least by one scholar. Yet, in 1964 Gyani continued to analyze the Veṅkaṭeśvara edition; his sole reference to Hazra’s article appears in six lines of the conclusions.

Modern scholarship noticed all these facts. It recognized “that the extent of the genuine Āgneya-purāṇa was not the same at all times and in all places and that it varied with the difference in time and locality.”<sup>27</sup> It realized that of the hundreds of verses attributed to the Devī°, which are not traceable in our text, some were quoted by certain *nibandhakāras*, some by others. “This shows that the text of the Devī-p. was not the same everywhere but differed considerably in different provinces.”<sup>28</sup> Yet, one failed to draw the logical conclusion: besides the version or versions of purāṇas that appear in our manuscripts, and fewer still in our editions, there have been numerous other versions, under the same titles, but which either have remained unnoticed or have been irreparably lost.

<sup>23</sup> GYANI Agni° 1964: 1 n. 1.

<sup>23a</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1294–1298, no. 3582.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. WINTERNITZ 1907: 473 n. 2; at 1963: 496 n. 2 it is called an upapurāṇa. In fact, Bühler’s Report for 1872–73 to the Director of Public Instruction mentions: “Among the Purāṇas the Vahnipurāṇa is new to me. It is not identical with the Agnipurāṇa” (extract at IA 2, 1873, 304). Cf. WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxviii.

<sup>25</sup> HAZRA 1940: 139–140.

<sup>26</sup> Discovery of the Genuine Āgneya-purāṇa, JOIB 5, 1956, 411–416 at 411; also, Studies in the Genuine Āgneya-purāṇa *alias* Vahni-purāṇa, OH 1, 1953, 209–245 [contents at 218–224]; 2, 1954, 77–110.

<sup>27</sup> HAZRA, JOIB 5, 1956, 414–415.

<sup>28</sup> HAZRA 1963: 193–194.

The danger I want to point out here is that those readings and arrangements of a particular purāṇa which happen to have been included in the printed edition or editions, have automatically been considered as representing “the” purāṇa – be it only the less valuable extant one –, whereas all variant readings and arrangements exhibited in manuscripts which were not used by the editors, have been generally overlooked or neglected. These latter materials never – or very rarely – come to the notice of those doing research on the purāṇas; and if they do, they are invariably treated as less valuable or negligible deviations from the standard text.

One scholarly publication in which, besides editions of purāṇas, manuscripts have been used quite extensively, is Pargiter’s *Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*. The author made a conscious search for as many manuscripts as he could possibly find (see his account, pp. xxix–xxxiv), and the variant readings found in them are carefully noted in the critical apparatus. Occasionally, however, even Pargiter cannot help giving more weight to the printed editions than to handwritten materials. For instance, in the *Bhaviṣya*<sup>o</sup> the text on the dynasties of the Kali age occurs in the *Veṅkaṭeśvara* edition, whereas “I have examined the following MSS, but none of them contain anything about these dynasties” (p. xxx); these manuscripts are ten in number, and Pargiter therefore concludes that the passage in the edition is “not genuine.” A similar situation presents itself in the *Brahmāṇḍa*<sup>o</sup>: none of the five manuscripts which Pargiter consulted contains the passage as it occurs in the *Veṅkaṭeśvara* edition which “professes to be based on several MSS, yet gives variant readings only rarely, and leaves on my mind the impression that it has been silently emended at times” (p. xxx). Yet, in this case Pargiter failed to draw the same conclusion he drew in connection with the *Bhaviṣya*<sup>o</sup>.

No one has probably consulted as many purāṇa manuscripts as R. C. Hazra; no one was more acutely aware of the problems they raise than he was. Yet, although he points to the existence of a manuscript of the *Vāmana*<sup>o</sup> which “seems to differ much from our printed editions,” he too, cannot help basing his discussion of the nature and contents of “the extant *Purāṇa*” on the printed editions only.

Other scholars did not use manuscripts to the extent Pargiter or Hazra did. The manuscripts were, in most cases, inaccessible to them, or too voluminous to handle. In fact, most scholars who wrote on purāṇas did not even have access to all existing editions.<sup>30</sup> Their conclusions are based on those editions which hap-

<sup>29</sup> HAZRA 1940: 76–77.

<sup>30</sup> The editions in Telugu script are, in many cases, the earliest ones; yet they have remained practically unknown and unused. The editions in Bengali script, especially those of the *Vaṅgavāsi* Press, have been used more often, but in general only by Bengalis. Most purāṇa studies, by Indians all over the subcontinent and by non-Indians, are based on the

pened to be available to them; in many cases this just meant one single edition. Kirfel's Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa, for example, uses a single manuscript of the Brahmāṇḍa°, in addition to its Venkaṭeśvara edition; for the Viṣṇu° it uses one edition from Calcutta and one from Bombay; for the Padma° it uses two editions from – at that time – Bombay Presidency; and for all other purāṇas it relies on single editions. Kirfel was aware of the problem; he confessed facing the alternative of making purāṇa studies progress with incomplete materials, or postponing publication of his research indefinitely, and he decided in favor of the former.<sup>31</sup> Abegg's Pretakalpa is based solely on Jibananda's edition of the Garuḍa – the editions of which are very different indeed.<sup>32</sup> A study such as Hohenberger's "Das Vāmanapurāṇa"<sup>33</sup> which uses the Venkaṭeśvara edition of the text only, cannot claim to be more than a study of that particular version of the Vāmana°; it is not an analysis of the Vāmana° as a whole. Surabhi H. Trivedi<sup>34</sup> lists four editions of the Brahma° (p. 75), but uses nothing else than the Ānandāśrama edition. V.S. Agrawala based his study of the Mārkaṇḍeya°, in Hindi, on Jibananda's edition and Pargiter's English translation.

In short, the existing editions, useful as they may have been in making the purāṇas available in print, have done a definite disservice to scholarly research, in that they have accidentally raised one or two versions of each purāṇa to the rank of *the* purāṇa. By doing so they have obliterated all other versions which

---

*devanāgarī* editions, especially the Venkaṭeśvara and Ānandāśrama editions, the latter being even more widely available than the former. E. g., "Reference is made here only to the texts that have appeared in Devanāgarī" (PUSALKAR 1968: 692); "Unless otherwise indicated, the texts are those of the Ānandāśrama Series" (W. JAHN: Über die kosmogonischen Grundanschauungen im Mānava-Dharma-Śāstram, Leipzig: Drugulin, 1904, p. 20).

<sup>31</sup> "Wenn im Vorwort zum Purāṇalakṣaṇa gesagt wurde, daß zur Aufhellung mancher textlicher Verderbnis oder Abweichungen noch eine Anzahl alter und guter Handschriften hätte herangezogen werden müssen, so gilt dieses auch für den vorliegenden Band. Es besteht aber auf absehbare Zeit nicht die geringste Aussicht, an jene heranzukommen. Aber selbst wenn dies der Fall wäre, würden sich doch nicht alle Textverderbnisse berichtigen lassen, wie die in Poona erscheinende kritische Ausgabe des Mahābhārata beweist. Zudem würde es sich bei den vielen hier in Betracht kommenden Purāṇa's um eine so große Anzahl von Handschriften handeln, daß die Drucklegung des durch so umfangreiche Kollationierungsarbeiten übermäßig angeschwellenen kritischen Apparates schon aus praktischen Gründen scheitern würde. Dies hieße zugleich, die mit der riesigen Purāṇa-Literatur verknüpften Probleme auf unabsehbare Zeit zurückzustellen; dies wäre ein Verfahren, das mit den Prinzipien von Forschung und Wissenschaft nicht mehr recht vereinbar ist" (KIRFEL 1954: XI–XII).

<sup>32</sup> "Neben dieser in der Einleitung S. 2 allein angeführten Ausgabe ist noch eine von Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta 1891 erschienen, sowie eine in Bombay; beide waren mir nicht zugänglich" (Pretakalpa des Garuḍa-Purāṇa, 1921, p. VIII n. 1).

<sup>33</sup> HOHENBERGER Vāmana° 1963.

<sup>34</sup> TRIVEDI Brahma° 1968–69.

<sup>35</sup> AGRAWALA Mārkaṇḍeya° 1961.

might be equally or, eventually, more important than the published ones.<sup>36</sup> As a result they have made purāṇa research based on them one-sided and, therefore, inaccurate.<sup>37</sup>

These facts have been recognized. Kane discusses the unfortunate situation that most editions of purāṇas are based on one manuscript or on a few manuscripts selected at random. “Many conclusions, therefore, drawn from the current printed editions of the Purāṇas or from mss. of the Purāṇas, must be regarded as merely tentative and as likely to turn out to be wrong.”<sup>38</sup> Haraprasad Shastri used a presidential address at the All-India Oriental Conference to stress the fact that “in the matter of the Purāṇas every manuscript has a peculiar feature, and so, all manuscripts are important from the point of view of a collector and a scholar.”<sup>39</sup>

Yet, scholars continue to quote and draw conclusions from *the Viṣṇu*<sup>o</sup>, *the Matsya*<sup>o</sup>, etc. Sten Konow,<sup>40</sup> for example, while discussing the name of the last but one Āndhra king, relies heavily on the purāṇas to defend the form Caṇḍa rather than Vincent Smith’s Candra.

“The forms of the name given in the Purāṇas are not at all in favour of this supposition. Candra, it is true, occurs in THE Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇa, but THE Matsya has Caṇḍa and THE Vāyu Daṇḍa, and this last form cannot well be explained as a corruption of Candra. I therefore think that Caṇḍa is the correct form of the word.”<sup>41</sup>

In connection with the different versions of purāṇas reference should also be made to titles of purāṇas to which adjectives such as Bṛhad-, Laghu-, Vṛddha-,

<sup>36</sup> E.g., Sylvain LEVI (1905: 210) noted the existence of not less than five versions of the Svayambhū<sup>o</sup>: Svayambhūmahā<sup>o</sup> (12 chapters), Svayambhū-utpattikathā or Madhyamasvayambhū<sup>o</sup> (10 ch.), Bṛhatsvayambhū<sup>o</sup> (printed in the BI, 3000 lines in ms.), Mahatsvayambhū<sup>o</sup> (2000 lines), and Svayambhucaityabhaṭṭāarakodeśa (250 lines). He considered the first one to be the best, as opposed to the printed one with its “style barbare et métrique abominable.” “Il est regrettable que la Bibliotheca Indica ait imprimé de préférence cette dernière recension, et que l’éditeur du texte ait cru devoir farcir à plaisir de barbarismes et de solécismes le sanscrit macaronique de son auteur; il n’est pas conforme au ‘fair play’ même entre brahmanes et bouddhistes, de choisir, comme de parti pris, les leçons les plus incorrectes et d’éliminer les autres” (p. 212 n. 1).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Albert B. LORD (The Singer of Tales, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1960, pp. 124–125): even though one or more versions of oral poetry become eventually fixed, this does not in any way affect the singer or his audience. The singer “continued, as did his confrères, to compose and sing as he always had and they always had”; the audience “thought in his terms, in the terms of multiplicity.”

<sup>38</sup> KANE 1962: 838.

<sup>39</sup> AIOC 5 (1928), 80. Cf. DAS (1924: 119): “One might almost say that no two manuscripts of any Purana are exactly the same.”

<sup>40</sup> Note on the Āndhra King Caṇḍasāta, ZDMG 62, 1908, 591–592.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 591 (emphasis added). Konow’s argument is even less convincing, since he draws these forms, second hand, from R. G. Bhandarkar’s Early History of the Dekkan (2nd ed., 1895, p. 164), where the sources used for the purāṇas are not even specified.

etc., have been prefixed. They have laid to confusion and misinterpretation.<sup>42</sup> Winternitz,<sup>43</sup> for example, confused the Nārada° and Bṛhannārada° in the original, German Geschichte; the confusion has only been partly eliminated in its English translation.<sup>44</sup> Both in the German and English editions the Bṛhannārada° is called “the great Purāṇa of Nārada,” whereas the much longer Nārada°, the edition of which is not even mentioned, is called an upapurāṇa. Similarly, when Winternitz<sup>45</sup> assigns an early date to the Viṣṇu° because few mātmyas claim to be part of it, he adds the following note: “Nevertheless it is noteworthy that Matsya- and Bhāgavata-Purāṇa give the number of ślokaś of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa as 23,000, while in reality it has not quite 7,000 verses, and that also a ‘Great Viṣṇu-Purāṇa’ (Bṛhadviṣṇupurāṇa, Aufrecht CC I, 591) is quoted.” He thus seems to equate the larger version of 23,000 verses with the Bṛhadviṣṇu°. In reality, here as elsewhere in Sanskrit literature<sup>46</sup> we should expect Bṛhad-, Laghu-, Vṛddha-, etc., to refer to compositions which are secondary as compared to the corresponding titles to which these adjectives have not been prefixed.

#### 2.1.4 Diversity of Puranic Literature

Modern scholarship draws a sharp distinction between *mahāpurāṇas* and *upapurāṇas*. The latter are reputed to be later compositions, more sectarian, of local interest only, and, for all these reasons, less important.<sup>1</sup> Comparatively speaking they received far less attention,<sup>2</sup> or they were disregarded completely. Even Winternitz<sup>3</sup> originally referred only to two upapurāṇas – Nīlamata° and Kālikā°;

<sup>42</sup> The confusion existed already in the Sanskrit texts. For instance, the Ekāmra° distinguishes between a principal Nārasimha° and an upapurāṇa called Bṛhannārasimha°. Gopālabhaṭṭa’s Haribhaktivilāsa also quotes verses separately from Narashimha° (ca. 100) and Bṛhannārasimha° (63). The Caturvargacintāmaṇi, on the other hand, ascribes the latter to Nārasimha°. HAZRA (1958: 356) concludes that either Hemādri considered the two works to be identical, or the verses occurred in both. They do not, however, appear in our printed Nṛsimha°.

<sup>43</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 466–467.

<sup>44</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 489–490.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. 478; cf. HAZRA 1958: 353–356.

<sup>46</sup> Compare the many *smṛtis* to which the same adjectives have been prefixed. On the status of such texts, see J. D. M. DERRETT: *Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature*, [part of vol. IV in this series,] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1973, p. 40.

<sup>1</sup> RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR (1951–55: 1.xiv): “The Upapurāṇas are very late productions and are much more of a sectarian character while they are of purely local interest. Their value to the student of history and even religion, is very little, and therefore we dismiss them for the time being.” Also RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1932: 755. On the inferior role of upapurāṇas, see KANE 1962: 834–837.

<sup>2</sup> HAZRA 1958: 1 n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 480–481.

he mentioned that only few upapurāṇas had been edited, and wondered whether it was worthwhile trying to become better acquainted with them. The latter statement has been deleted in the English translation, and a somewhat larger number of upapurāṇas were discussed there. Hazra excluded the upapurāṇas from his *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*, but later he devoted several articles to the subject, as well as two volumes, a third one having been announced at one time.

To be sure, even though the upapurāṇas too are said to be eighteen in number, their list is far less canonized than that of the eighteen mahāpurāṇas.<sup>4</sup> Hazra<sup>5</sup> collected thirty-three such lists, involving a large variety of titles. He also refers to a verse from the Bṛhaddharma<sup>o</sup>,<sup>6</sup> which, immediately after the enumeration of eighteen upapurāṇas, adds that many other such compositions exist and that they can claim the same authority.

It might be argued, nevertheless, that the distinction between mahāpurāṇas and upapurāṇas is not as historically important as it is generally made to be.

First, the term *mahāpurāṇa* occurs only rarely in purāṇa literature;<sup>7</sup> it is “probably of late origin.”<sup>8</sup>

Second, the mahāpurāṇas were not, as a group, better known in India than the upapurāṇas. We have reports to the effect that pandits knew one or two mahāpurāṇas only;<sup>9</sup> also, it is characteristic that the texts drawn upon to compile the Purāṇārthaprakāśa seem to be very limited in number. On the other hand, the popularity of a text did not necessarily depend on its belonging either to the mahāpurāṇas or the upapurāṇas. Al-Bīrūnī (1.130), for example, reports that “of all this literature I have only seen portions of the Matsya, Āditya, and Vāyu Purāṇas.”

<sup>4</sup> HAZRA 1962: 271. Cf. WINTERNITZ (1907 = 1963: 467): “Obviously there was a definite tradition about the existence of eighteen Purāṇas, while any modern religious text could assume the title of an ‘Upapurāṇa.’”

<sup>5</sup> HAZRA 1958: 4–13. Notice that a list of upapurāṇas became known in Europe as early as 1805, from a Persian source, in *Recherches asiatiques* 1, 393–394. It is close to the list of the Ekāmra<sup>o</sup>, but in different order.

<sup>6</sup> *anyās ca saṃhitāḥ sarvā mārīcikāpilādayaḥ / sarvatra dharmakathane tulyasāmarthyam ucyate* (1.25.27). Cf. HAZRA (1954: 38), after discussing 46 lost upapurāṇas: “there must have been others which have perished altogether, leaving no trace of their existence. So, the number of the extinct Upapurāṇas must be much higher than it now appears to be.”

<sup>7</sup> Bhāgavata<sup>o</sup> 12.7.10, 22; Brahmavaivarta<sup>o</sup> 4.131.7, 10 (Jibananda ed.). Kūrma<sup>o</sup> 1.1.16 (CE) opposes *aṣṭādaśa purāṇāni* and *anyāny upapurāṇāni*, but there is a variant reading: *api purāṇāni*. Clearest is Bṛhaddharma<sup>o</sup> 1.25.18: *satyavākyaṇi sarvāṇi purāṇāni dvidhāni ca / upapūrvam mahatpūrvam purāṇam dvidvidham matam*.

<sup>8</sup> HAZRA 1940: 2 n. 19. Cf. also HAZRA 1958: 2 n. 2; HAZRA 1962: 240 n. 1; KANE 1930: 161.

<sup>9</sup> WILSON (JRAS 5, 1839, 62): “The Pandits themselves are but imperfectly acquainted with the Purāṇas; they rarely read more than one or two, as the Bhāgavata and Vishnu.”

Third, as noticed earlier (see 1.3.3), the lists of eighteen mahāpurāṇas are not absolutely uniform in including or excluding certain titles. Conversely, some lists of eighteen upapurāṇas include titles which normally appear among the mahāpurāṇas: Kūrma° 1.1.17–20 includes the Skanda°, Brahmāṇḍa°, and Nāradya° among the upapurāṇas. Also, al-Bīrūnī's first list offers an unusual combination of titles which, elsewhere, are either mahāpurāṇas or upapurāṇas. Including the Śiva° or the Vāyu° among the mahāpurāṇas means, in fact, that one denies the other that privileged position. One case in particular has led to serious discussions, both in Sanskrit and in the secondary literature: which text has a right to claim to be a mahāpurāṇa, the Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavata°, or the Devībhāgavata° – eventually the Kālikā? Since this problem is linked to the question whether or not Vopadeva was the composer of the Bhāgavata°, it will be treated there.

For all these reasons it is clear that there is no basic difference between the mahāpurāṇas on the one hand and the upapurāṇas on the other. Even Winternitz, immediately before stating that the upapurāṇas may not be worth studying, says: “As regards the Upapurāṇas, they do not in general differ essentially from the Purāṇas, except inasmuch as (‘höchstens dass’) they are even more exclusively adapted to suit the purposes of local cult and the religious needs of separate sects.”<sup>10</sup> Not only are the upapurāṇas not basically different from the mahāpurāṇas; they are also equally important, a fact which was recognized as early as 1856 by Wollheim da Fonseca.<sup>11</sup>

The person who most strongly insisted on the necessity also to study the upapurāṇas was, of course, R. C. Hazra.

“In these days when all Indologists are feeling the want of a true history of Indian life and thought of the past and our able antiquarians are directing their attention and energy towards its reconstruction, it is a matter of great surprise and disappointment that very little is known and still less has yet been said about those valuable records of Indian life and thought which are known as Upapurāṇas (or secondary Purāṇas). The whole responsibility for such apathy of scholars towards these valued treasures must be laid on the high importance which has been attached, deservedly or undeservedly, for hundreds of years to the eighteen ‘great’ (Mahat) Purāṇas as well as on the disparaging prefix ‘upa’ attached to the common title (Purāṇa) to characterise those Purāṇic works which are different from the ‘great eighteen’. Whatever the reason may be, we should not, with our critical outlook befitting the present age and its culture, be swayed by mere

<sup>10</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 480 = 1963: 508. Cf. KRISHNAMACHARYA (1906: 34): “The Upapuranas have the same characteristics as the Puranas. One of them contains the episode of Adhyatma Ramayana, supposed to be a spiritual version of Valmiki’s poem.” But that is all he says about upapurāṇas!

<sup>11</sup> Mythologie des alten Indien, Berlin: Hempel, 1856, p. 177: “Die Upapurāna’s oder Nebenpurānas gelten als Beilagen zu den Purāna’s, obgleich sie größtenteils selbständig sind. Sie sind meistentheils noch späteren Ursprungs als die Purāna’s, aber für die Kunde des alten Indiens von nicht geringerer Wichtigkeit.”

tradition and baseless impression but be ready to give due consideration to this long neglected branch of Sanskrit literature.”<sup>12</sup>

Besides the mahāpurāṇas and upapurāṇas puranic literature also encompasses a large number of mähātmyas. The term *mähātmya* applies to those texts which are composed with the specific purpose of proclaiming the “greatness” of a variety of things: a place, an auspicious time, a deity, a ritual activity such as *tīrthayātrā* (pilgrimage) or *dāna* (donation), etc.<sup>13</sup> There has been a general tendency to rate this class of texts even lower than the upapurāṇas.

“The majority of the Mähātmyas which are connected with or included in the Purāṇas and the Upapurāṇas, is, on the whole, inferior literature. They arose as hand-books for the Purohitas of the Tīrthas praised in them, and tell legends which in part belong to the tradition, and in part are inventions, with the purpose of proving the holiness of these places of pilgrimage.”<sup>14</sup>

Notwithstanding this introductory statement Winternitz at least recognizes the importance of the mähātmyas as sources for our knowledge of local topography.<sup>15</sup> Others stress the need to study the mähātmyas for their religious content.<sup>16</sup>

Opinions differ on whether mähātmyas are independent compositions, or whether they are integral parts of the purāṇas to which they claim to belong. Those who adhere to the latter theory have, quite logically, used the mähātmyas to determine the places of origin of the purāṇas themselves. Ramachandra Dikshitar, for instance, uses the mähātmyas to refute the thesis that all purāṇas originated in the Naimiṣa forest.

“The chief places of pilgrimage where often thronged a large number of people from all parts of India was the best fitted avenue for the propagation of this kind of literature. From the glorification of certain places, we may venture to conjecture that the particular version of the Purāṇa sprang up in that centre. A Purāṇa that deals with the Gayā-mähātmya in extenso may be reasonably taken to have been compiled in the city of Gayā. Therefore to some such centre we must look for this version or that. To hazard a conjecture the Padma Purāṇa was compiled originally at Puṣkara, the Vāyu Purāṇa was

<sup>12</sup> HAZRA 1958: 1–2. Cf. also HAZRA 1962: 271–282.

<sup>13</sup> DIANA L. ECK: A Survey of Sanskrit Sources for the Study of Vārāṇasī, Pur 22, 1980, 81–101 at 81–82.

<sup>14</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 511.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.: “They describe, too, the ceremonies which the pilgrims are to perform and the route they are to follow. For this reason they are not unimportant from the point of view of the topography of India.” He then goes on to describe the Nīlamata°, “the Kāśmīra-mähātmya.” Cf. ASOKE CHATTERJEE: A Treatise of the Kārtikamähātmya, Its Character and Importance, Pur 5, 1963, 320–325 at 320.

<sup>16</sup> E.g., Wilhelm JAHN (Die Legende vom Devadāruvana, ZDMG 69, 1915, 529) presents versions of the Devadāruvanamähātmya “um zu zeigen, daß die *mähātmya* mehr Aufmerksamkeit verdienen als ihnen bisher zuteil wurde. Die zu behandelnden Texte bieten nicht nur literar-historische Probleme, sondern haben auch den Wert religionsgeschichtlicher Urkunden.”

compiled at Gayā, the Brahma Vaivarta in Orissa, the Mārkaṇḍeya in the valleys of the Narmadā and the Tapti etc.”<sup>17</sup>

The argument obviously loses all its weight if one considers the mähātmyas to be originally independent works which only secondarily have been attached to one of the major purāṇas.<sup>18</sup>

The mähātmyas are, again, not basically different from the purāṇas.<sup>19</sup> The Nepālamähātmya, for example, starts with the end of the famous sacrifice of king Janamejaya, at which a number of sages have gathered. One of them, Jaimini, in their name questions Mārkaṇḍeya on the sacred places of Nepal; Mārkaṇḍeya answers him at great length, in thirty chapters.<sup>20</sup> The Cidambaramähātmya begins with a visit of the *sūta* to the sages gathered in the Naimiṣa forest.<sup>21</sup> The printed, independent Prayāgamähātmya differs from the Prayāgamähātmya incorporated in the Matsya° in only two respects: first, each *adhyāya* of the Matsya° “has been increased, expanded, adapted to serve a pilgrim actually going to Prayāga;” second, in order to establish its independent character, the mähātmya has been provided with a “puranic” introduction, and, at the end, with its own *paramparā* (tradition).<sup>22</sup> Conversely, a number of books that go under the name purāṇa, are in fact mähātmyas. “The Brāhma Purāna, as we have it, is, for the most part, the Mähātmya or legend of the sanctity of Utkala or Orissa.”<sup>23</sup> The Nīlamata° is really a mähātmya of Kashmir,<sup>24</sup> even as the Svayambhū° is nothing else than “a Nepālamähātmya, for the use of the Buddhists.”<sup>25</sup> Other purāṇas are, for all practical purposes, nothing more than collections of mähātmyas, the best example being the Skanda°.

The mähātmyas are, in turn, only the more obvious and better known specimens of a much broader category of local puranic texts: the *sthalapurāṇas*. Many

<sup>17</sup> RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1932: 756–757. Similarly A. M. T. JACKSON 1905: 73.

<sup>18</sup> E. g., ASOKE CHATTERJEE: Kārtikamähātmya, Pur 5, 1963, 320.

<sup>19</sup> Madeleine BIARDEAU (La décapitation de Reṇukā dans le mythe de Paraśurāma, Kuiper vol. 1968, 563–572 at 565) suggests that *mähātmyas* often help better to understand passages of the purāṇas which by themselves remain more or less obscure. “En gros, on pourrait avancer d’idée que le purāṇa met en forme mythique des structures religieuses et sociales purement idéales, tandis que les mähātmya . . . sont plus proches de la religion concrète et de ses tensions vécues.”

<sup>20</sup> For the Nepālamähātmya, see sub Skanda°.

<sup>21</sup> H. KULKE: Cidambaramähātmya. Eine Untersuchung der religionsgeschichtlichen und historischen Hintergründe für die Entstehung einer altindischen Tempelstadt, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970, p. 1.

<sup>22</sup> Giorgio BONAZZOLI: Prayāga and Its Kumbha Melā, Pur 19, 1977, 81–179 at 85 [Matsya° ch. 102–111 = 257 *ślokas*; Prayāgamähātmya 12 ch. = 697 *ślokas*]. On the Prayāgamähātmya generally, see Giuseppe SPERA: Some Notes on Prayāga-Mähātmya, Ind.Taur. 5, 1977, 179–197.

<sup>23</sup> WILSON: JRAS 5, 1839, 70.

<sup>24</sup> See also sub Nīlamata°.

<sup>25</sup> LÉVI 1905: 209–210.

more areas and localities in India than we know may have had – and/or still have – their own purāṇas, most of which have been lost or never reached the stage of being written down.<sup>26</sup> In this context the term purāṇa assumes a very broad connotation, even to include Raja Rao's Kanthapura.

“There is no village in India, however mean, that has not a rich *sthala-purana*, or legendary history, of its own. Some god or godlike hero has passed by the village – Rama might have rested under this pipal-tree, Sita might have dried her clothes, after her bath, on this yellow stone, or the Mahatma himself, on one of his many pilgrimages through the country, might have slept in this hut, the low one, near the village gate. In this way the past mingles with the present, and the gods mingle with men to make the repertory of your grandmother always bright. One such story from the contemporary annals of a village I have tried to tell.”<sup>27</sup>

Yet another class of purāṇas, which is apparently far more important than our present, limited knowledge of them allows us to judge, are the so-called caste-purāṇas. One of these, the Malla° (see there), has been edited, with a useful introduction. It cites the following examples of caste-purāṇas in Gujarat: Dharmāranya (for Moḍh brahmans and baniyās), Śrīmāla° (for Śrīmāli brahmans and baniyās), Nāgarakhaṇḍa (for the Nāgars), Anāvīl° (for Anāvīl brahmans), Vāyu° (for Vāyaḍā brahmans and baniyās), Kālikā° (for the coppersmiths), Nāpita° (for the caste of barbers).<sup>28</sup> Even though this type of texts relate to single castes in limited areas of the subcontinent, they are again not fundamentally different from puranic literature generally.

“[The caste-purāṇas] may be considered to be the extension of Vamśānucarita, in the sense that they devote themselves to the history of some Vamśa, in a broad sense, and in this variety would be included the whole literature of the bards, and histories of different castes.

In spite of the fact that these Caste-Purāṇas claim to give the story of the castes, there are much religious data which have nothing to do with pure history. Some historical material is occasionally seen through this mesh of semi religious and semi fictitious account of the origin of the castes.”<sup>29</sup>

One last class of purāṇas remains to be mentioned: the puranic texts in the vernacular languages. Ward fully recognized their importance.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. François GROS and R. NAGASWAMY: Uttaramērūr (ref. sub Bhaviṣyottara°), p. 1. Verrier ELWIN calls his Myths of Middle India (OUP, 1949) – a part of “Specimens of the oral literature of Middle India” – a book which “may, in fact, be regarded as a sort of Aboriginal Purana” (p. xi).

<sup>27</sup> 1938 = New York: New Directions, 1967, Author's Foreword, p. vii.

<sup>28</sup> Malla° ed., p. 2 n. 3. See also, for other titles, Suresh Kanaiyalal DAVE: The Minor Purāṇas of Gujarat, Pur 17, 1975, 149–157. † have not been able to consult A. N. JANI's ed. (+ Gujarati tr.) of the Kālikā° of the Kaṅsārā caste, 1973.

<sup>29</sup> Malla° ed., p. 2. For an interesting analysis of the Malla° and Kālikā° as justifications of caste mobility, see Veena DAS: A Sociological Approach to the Caste Puranas. A Case Study, Sociological Bulletin 17, 1968, 141–164.

“These poetic versions of the pooranūs into the popular languages of India have greatly contributed to disseminate a knowledge of their contents amongst all classes of Hindoos; who read or hear them with the greatest avidity. The rich preserve embellished copies, and, as an act of great merit, the fruits of which they hope to reap in another world, they cause parts of them to be read in public assemblies, at their houses. Multitudes of well-dressed natives, of both sexes, assemble on these occasions, and listen with rapture to the exploits of gods, kings, moonees, bramhūns, etc. as recorded in these works.”<sup>30</sup>

There are basically two types of vernacular purāṇas: those that may be considered “translations” of purāṇas which first existed in Sanskrit versions, and those that came into being in the vernaculars without having been modeled after Sanskrit “originals.” However voluminous and important this literature may be,<sup>31</sup> it is not possible to deal with it in detail in this volume; the reader may be referred to the volumes in this series devoted to the various vernacular literatures. I shall restrict myself to a few general comments.

Old Assamese literature consists mainly of translations, abridged or not, and adaptations, of the Sanskrit epics and purāṇas; most Assamese purāṇas tend to be Vaiṣṇava. The Bhāgavata° is especially important, but others, including the Viṣṇu°, Padma°, Brahmavaivarta°, Mārkaṇḍeya°, Vāmana°, Bṛhannārada°, Dharma°, and Kalki°, are also represented.<sup>32</sup>

Bengal has made important contributions to puranic literature.<sup>33</sup> D. C. Sen devotes an entire chapter to “The Pauranic Renaissance” in Bengali literature, from the fifteenth century onward.<sup>34</sup> The importance of local purāṇa translations – which never follow the Sanskrit texts too closely – is underscored by the fact that they “reached the humblest cottage in Bengal.” Occasionally they were recited by those villagers who were able to read, but “a far greater popularising of Pauranic stories was carried out by the performances of professional singers . . . the Mangal Gayaks.”<sup>35</sup> Most prominent are the translations of the Bhāgavata°, and the Caṇḍī of the Mārkaṇḍeya°.

<sup>30</sup> WARD 1811: 2.39.

<sup>31</sup> For a general survey of vernacular purāṇas, see S. K. CHATTERJI (ed.): *The Cultural Heritage of India*, 2nd ed., vol. V, part III: Major Languages and Literatures of Modern India (pp. 417–655), Calcutta: Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, 1978.

<sup>32</sup> Satyendra Nath SARMA: *Assamese Literature* [vol. IX.2 in this series], Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1976, pp. 51–52, 68–69, with a reference to his own *Epics and Purāṇas in Early Assamese Literature*, Gauhati: Pratima Devi, 1972 [Part III: Purāṇas, pp. 143–221].

<sup>33</sup> On Bengal’s contribution to Sanskrit purāṇa literature, see Sureśacandra VANDYOPADHYĀYA: *Saṃskṛta sāhitye Vāṅgālira dāna*, Calcutta: Saṃskṛta Pustaka Bhāṇḍāra, B. S. 1369, pp. 209–237.

<sup>34</sup> Dinesh Chandra SEN: *History of Bengali Language and Literature*, Calcutta University, 1954, pp. 147–332.

<sup>35</sup> P. 157. On the Mangal Gayaks, including the Gayen as soloist and a chorus of ten or eleven, see pp. 157–158.

The Bengali Śūnya°,<sup>36</sup> attributed to Rāmāi Paṇḍita, a text in verse and prose in fifty-six chapters, has received a certain amount of attention. Its title, and the fact that it explains the creation of the universe from the void (*śūnya*), led to the assumption that it represented a late remnant of Buddhism in Bengal.<sup>37</sup> In reality it belongs to the type of literature known as Dharma°, Anila°, or Dharmamaṅgal, which is connected with the cult of Dharma of Dharmarāja, i. e. Yama, of whom Rāmāi Paṇḍita was the priest.<sup>38</sup> A very different kind of text claiming the title of purāṇa is the Mahārāṣṭa°.<sup>39</sup> In 716 lines it tells the story of the Maratha invasions in Bengal by the middle of the eighteenth century. “Despite its Puranic lip-service, it is basically a text of pure secular history.”

As far as Gujarat is concerned, I have already referred to its caste-purāṇas, mainly in Sanskrit, but mixed with Gujarati. Puranic revival in Gujarat (fifteenth-sixteenth centuries) has been explained as a reaction, by the brahmins, against “the fanatical foreigner – *mleccha* as they called him – devastating their land, demolishing the sacred shrines of their faith, destroying their *dharma* and the social structure which they believed to be eternal.”<sup>40</sup> Whereas the purāṇiks, who knew Sanskrit, continued to recite purāṇas at their own houses or at the houses of their patrons, the *gāgariā bhaṭ* or *māṇ bhaṭ* went from village to village, telling puranic stories in Gujarati verse. His performance has been described above (see 2.1.2).

In Marathi/Konkani literature attention may be drawn to two “purāṇas,” composed by Jesuit missionaries. Thomas Stephens’ (ca. 1549–1619 Goa) *Discursos sobre a vida de Jesu Christo nosso salvador ao mundo, dividido em dous tratados*, first published in Goa in 1616, assumed the title purāṇa from its 1649 edition onward. The book presents an abridgment of the Bible, from the creation up to Christ’s ascension, in more than ten thousand *ślokas* in *Ovi* meter.<sup>41</sup> Whereas

<sup>36</sup> Ed. Nāgendranātha VASU, Calcutta: Vāṅgīya Sāhitya-Pariṣad, 1314 (1908).

<sup>37</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI: *Discovery of the Remnants of Buddhism in Bengal*, Proc. ASB 1884, 135–138; – Yogeśacandra RĀYA: *Śūnyapurāṇa*, Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā 16, 1909–1910, 203–220; – Nāgendranātha VASU: “Śūnyapurāṇa” sambandhe mantavya, *ibid.* 221–224; Nagendra Nath VASU: *The Modern Buddhism and Its Followers in Orissa*, Calcutta: the author, ca. 1911; – Kumar Gangananda SINHA: *Is Dhāmat Religion, Buddhism?*, AIOC 3 (1924), 537–543 at 540–542.

<sup>38</sup> Sukumar SEN: *History of Bengali Literature*, New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, <sup>2</sup>1971, pp. 50–51.

<sup>39</sup> Edward C. DIMOCK and Pratul Chandra GUPTA: *The Maharashta Purana. An Eighteenth-Century Bengali Historical Text*, Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1965.

<sup>40</sup> Kanaiyalal M. MUNSHI: *Gujarāt and Its Literature*, <sup>3</sup>1967, Ch. III: A New Gujarāt and the Purāṇic Movement, pp. 161–173 at 163. In Gujarati, see also Durgashankar K. SHASTRI: *Purāṇa-vivecana*, Ahmedabad: Gujarat Vernacular Society, 1931; – D. P. DERĀSĀRĪ: *Paurāṇika kathā-kośa*, Ahmedabad: Hiralal Tribhuvanadas Parekh, 1927–32.

<sup>41</sup> The text was edited by J. L. SALDANHA: *The Christian Purana*, Mangalore: Cadialbail Press, 1907, and by Shantaram BANDELU: *Krista Purāṇa of Father Stephens*, Poona 1967. See also DE BACKER-SOMMERVOGEL: *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. 2 (1891),

Stephens mainly tried “to present the doctrine of the new religion in an attractive manner,” it was left to the French Jesuit Etienne de La Croix (1579–1633 Goa) to produce “a literary work for the purpose of refuting the errors of Hinduism,” in his *Discursos sobre a vida do Apostolo Sam Pedro. En que se refutam os principais erros do gentilismo deste Oriente; . . . Compostos em versos em lingua bramana marasta* (Goa 1629, 1634, 2 vols. in-folio). The introduction, in prose, explains the structure and purpose of the book: it is written in *Ovi* meter, in the form of a dialogue between “Kokane Gentiles” and the apostle Peter, who refutes their Hindu doctrines and replaces them by those of his own religion. The text is subdivided into three “purāṇas,” on the life of St. Peter, the Hindu religion and its gods, and Christianity.<sup>42</sup>

Puranic literature also flourished in South India, via the medium of the Dravidian languages.<sup>43</sup> One scholar goes as far as to claim that “several of the Purāṇas appear to be the summary in Sanskrit of a traditional lore which may have originated in some ancient, possibly Dravidian, tongue and of which much can still be found in the form of oral tradition and in the sacred literature of several Śaivite sects.”<sup>44</sup>

Reading Kannada purāṇas, “stories of the miracles of saints and deities,” is very popular both publicly, in *Vīraśaiva mathas* (monasteries, ‘colleges’), and

---

col. 468–469; – J. GERSON DA CUNHA: *The Origin of Bombay*, JBBRAS Extra No. 1900, pp. 162–168; – J. A. SALDANHA: *The First Englishman in India and His Works*, especially *His Christian Puran*, JBBRAS 22, 1908, 209–221; – Justin E. ABBOTT: *The Discovery of the Original Devanāgarī Text of the Christian Purāṇa of Thomas Stevens*, BSOAS 2, 1921–23, 679–683 (the ms. is now at SOAS); – A. K. PRIOLKAR: *Two Recently Discovered Letters of Fr. Thomas Stephens*, JUBO n. s. 25.2, 1956, 114–123; – Shankar Gopal TULPULE: *Classical Marāṭhī Literature* [vol. IX.4 in this series], pp. 380–382.

<sup>42</sup> J. MARUCCI’s *Relation de ce qui s’est passé dans les Indes Orientales* (tr. J. de Machault, Paris 1651, p. 34) refers to “les Chansons Spirituelles du P. Estienne de la Croix François, qu’ils appellent Puranes en leur langue, qui sont en deux grands tomes.” See also DE BACKER-SOMMERVOGEL: *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. 2 (1891), col. 1687–1688; – A. K. PRIOLKAR: *French Author of a Marathi Purana*, Fr. Etienne de La Croix, JUBO n. s. 29.2, 1959, 122–149; – TULPULE: *op. cit.*, p. 382.

<sup>43</sup> JAHN (1916: 309–310) called for a careful examination of the materials in South Indian vernaculars: “In die Gebirge des Südens kann sich manches alte Sagengut gerettet haben, dessen Dubletten im Norden vielleicht den zahlreicheren Invasionen zum Opfer gefallen sind.”

<sup>44</sup> Alain DANIELLOU: *Hindu Polytheism*, Bollingen Series 73, New York: Bollingen Foundation, Pantheon Book, 1964, p. 189. Daniélou holds that the Sanskrit purāṇas are abbreviated versions of Dravidian oral or written originals. “This is obvious from the style of the Śiva Purāṇa, for example, which relates the mere skeletons of stories the detail of which is supposed to be known by all.” According to S. K. CHATTERJI (*Purāṇa Apocrypha: A “Maṇipura-Purāṇa,”* W. Norman Brown vol. 1962, 28–41 = Pur 6, 1964, 285–306) “it is to be always remembered that in their nature the Purāṇas are largely of folk origin, and a mass of heterogeneous pre-Aryan or non-Aryan material has found a place within the hospitable bosom of Hinduism” (p. 41).

privately, in Viraśaiva households.<sup>45</sup> Today one of the more popular texts is the Devī°, in 796 stanzas, which is itself regarded as a form of Devī, and is therefore given more ritual attention than any other purāṇa. Devotion to the goddess leads to union (*aikya*) with her; Śiva, Viṣṇu, and Brahmā are all Devī's sons, and hence also and equally worthy of devotion.

Scholars of an earlier generation were led to study – and translate – mainly the Basava°,<sup>46</sup> so called after the founder – or, according to others, the reviver – of Viraśaivism. It was adapted into Kannada, from the original Telugu Basava°, in the fourteenth century, by Sumatibhīma, alias Bhīmacandra Kavi. The story of Basava's nephew was told in the Cannabasava°,<sup>47</sup> said to have been composed by Virūpākṣapaṇḍita, in 1585. It contains, according to the introduction, “the superior and excellent story of the initiation which the high priest Cannabasava gave to Siddharāma, explaining to him the superior Śivatattva.”<sup>48</sup>

Besides Viraśaiva purāṇas, there are also Kannada purāṇas composed by Viṣṇu worshipers: the Bhāgavata° was translated into Kannada in the sixteenth century.<sup>49</sup> From then onward, and down to the present day, most of the mahāpurāṇas and upapurāṇas have appeared in Kannada translation, some or at least parts of some on several occasions.

Among Jaina purāṇas, in Kannada prose, there is Hastimalla's Ādi°,<sup>50</sup> in ten *parvans*, each of which begins with a Sanskrit verse identical with the opening *maṅgala* of Jinasena's Ādi°.

<sup>45</sup> William McCORMACK: The Forms of Communication in Viraśaiva Religion, in SINGER: Traditional India (1959), pp. 119–129 at 123–124. On Kannada purāṇas, see also [G. WÜRTH:] Canarese Poetical Anthology, Bangalore: Director of Public Instruction Madras, 1868, pp. 251–293; – Paul WURM: Geschichte der indischen Religion im Umriß dargestellt, Basel: Bahnmaier, 1874, pp. 249–260; – F. KITTEL: Ueber den Ursprung des Lingakultus in Indien, Mangalore: Basel Mission Book and Tract Depository, 1876, pp. 27–30; – Edward P. RICE: Kanarese Literature, Calcutta: Association Press, <sup>2</sup>1921, pp. 64–69; – GONDA 1963: 245; – M. K. SATYANARAYANA RAO: Kannada Versions of the Purāṇas, Pur 6, 1964, 147–173.

<sup>46</sup> Ed. Mallikārjuna ŚĀSTRĪ, [Viraśaivaliṅgibrāhmaṇadharmagranthamālā 17,] Poona: Jagaddhitecchu Press, 1905–1906, 2 parts; – tr. G. WÜRTH: The Basava Purāna of the Lingaits, JBBRAS 8, 1863–66, 65–98. – See also WILSON 1828–32 = 1976: 225–230; – G. WÜRTH: Ueber das Religionssystem der Lingaiten. A. Basawa, der weltliche Begründer des modernen Lingaitismus, Baseler Missions-Magazin 1, 1853, 86–149; – R. G. BHANDARKAR: Early History of the Dekkan, Calcutta: Chuckervarty, <sup>3</sup>1928, pp. 161–165; – S. C. NANDINATH: A Handbook of Viraśaivism, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, <sup>2</sup>1979, pp. 23–24.

<sup>47</sup> Tr. G. WÜRTH: Channa-Basava Purāna of the Lingaits, JBBRAS 8, 1863–66, 98–221. See also NANDINATH: op. cit., pp. 28–29.

<sup>48</sup> WÜRTH: Channa-Basava, p. 98.

<sup>49</sup> WÜRTH: Canarese Poetical Anthology, p. ix.

<sup>50</sup> A. N. UPADHYE: Hastimalla and his Ādipurāṇa, Kane vol. (1941), 526–529.

Tamil literature is particularly rich in works called purāṇas,<sup>51</sup> some of which are, in comparison with the Sanskrit purāṇas, so “complex and highly sophisticated” that the term becomes misleading.<sup>52</sup> One Tamil purāṇa deserves to be mentioned in particular, the Śaiva Periya°, “a work that has acquired the high authority and popularity of the Sanskrit Purāṇas.”<sup>53</sup> It was composed in the eleventh century by Śekkiḷār, the minister of the Cola king, and it describes the lives of the sixty-three Śaiva Nāyanmārs (approximately from A. D. 300 to 900). The text is important both for the history of Śaivism and of South Indian culture generally.<sup>54</sup> For a Tamil Bagavadam, which became known in Europe in a French translation at an early date, see sub Bhāgavata°.

Telugu versions of the purāṇas go back as far as the end of the thirteenth century, and they continue to be composed even today. Ramakoti Sastry<sup>55</sup> lists thirty different titles, the most popular being the Padma° and the Bhāgavata°, each with eight entries, the Bhāgavata° entries including a translation by Bhakta Kavi Potana (1450–1500). Pāḷkurika Soma’s Telugu Basava° (A. D. 1195) served as a model for Bhīmakavi’s popular Kannada work of the same name.<sup>56</sup>

Sanskrit purāṇas, or at least parts of them, were translated into Persian. Translations have been noticed of the Bhāgavata° – one of them at the instance of Akbar –, Śiva°, Viṣṇu°, Skanda°, Padma°, Brahmavaivarta°, and Matsya°.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>51</sup> RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1932: 764–767; – V. RAGHAVAN: Tamil Versions of the Purāṇas, Pur 2, 1960, 225–242; – Kamil Veith ZVELEBIL: Tamil Literature [vol. X.1 of this series], 1974, pp. 170–192; – ZVELEBIL: Tamil Literature, Leiden: Brill, 1975, pp. 218–229 (earlier purāṇas), 243–248 (later purāṇas); – David Dean SHULMAN: Tamil Temple Myths, Princeton UP, 1980, pp. 29–39. – See also V. VENKATACHALLAM IYER: The Adventures of the God of Madura, IA 42, 1913, 65–72; 44, 1915, 206–212, 229–232 [tr. of selections from Thiruvilayadal° and Halasyamāhātmyam]; – R. DESSIGANE and P. Z. PATTABIRAMIN: La légende de Skanda; selon le Kandapurāṇam tamoul et l’iconographie, Pondicherry: IFI, 1967; – Rama Kant JAIN: Tamil Puranas, Sri Puranam and Meru Mandara Puranam, Jain Journal 11, 1976–77, 89–90.

<sup>52</sup> George LUZERNE HART: The Relation between Tamil and Classical Sanskrit Literature [vol. X.2 of this series], 1976, p. 343.

<sup>53</sup> S. K. CHATTERJI: W. Norman Brown vol. (1962), 33.

<sup>54</sup> P. V. JAGADISA AYYAR: Periyapurana (or the Lives of the Great Saiva Devotees), QJMS 12, 1921–22, 194–202; 13, 1922–23, 644–664; – K. R. SUBRAMANIAM: Some Interesting Constitutional Points from ‘Periyapuranam,’ JIH 6, 1927–28, 258–263; – M. RAJAMANIKAM PILLAI: Cultural History from the Periyapurāṇam, JOR 16, 1946–47, 50–57; – J. R. MARR: The Pēriya purāṇam frieze at Tārācuram: Episodes in the Lives of the Tamil Śaiva Saints, BSOAS 42, 1979, 268–289. – See also GONDA 1963: 229, and ZVELEBIL: Tamil Literature (1975), pp. 178–181.

<sup>55</sup> K. V. RAMAKOTI SASTRY: Telugu Versions of the Purāṇas, Pur 4, 1962, 384–407.

<sup>56</sup> S. C. NANDINATH: A Handbook of Vīraśaivism, Dharwar: L. E. Association, 1942, pp. 37–38 and 39.

<sup>57</sup> N. S. GOREKAR: Persian Language and Sanskrit Lore, Indica 2, 1965, 107–119 at 115–116; – N. S. SHUKLA: Persian Translations of Sanskrit Works, Indological Studies 3, 1974, 175–191 at 181–186. – See also sub Matsya°: BAUSANI 1956, DE 1964.

Purāṇas also found their way toward the East, into Greater India. For instance, a Cambodian inscription of the beginning of the seventh century A.D. mentions that a certain Śrīsoṃaśarman presented to a temple “the complete Bhārata, together with the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇa,” and he arranged for these texts to be recited every day, without interruption.<sup>58</sup> Another Cambodian inscription, of A.D. 1157, contains a quotation from a Sanskrit text called Purāṇārtha or Arthapurāṇasāstra, probably a chronicle of Champa.<sup>59</sup>

In Indonesia we meet with full-fledged puranic texts. The Old Javanese Agastyaparvan (shortly after A.D. 1000), a dialogue of the puranic variety but in prose, between Agastya and his son and disciple Dṛḍhasyu, has so far remained without a Sanskrit “original.”<sup>60</sup> The Old Javanese Brahmāṇḍa° was communicated to R. Friederich, even before the middle of the nineteenth century, “on the condition of my not making any uninitiated person acquainted with it.”<sup>61</sup>

Whereas the differences between the various classes of puranic literature – mahāpurāṇas, upapurāṇas, etc. – should not be overestimated, it cannot be denied that real differences do exist within the classes between individual texts. Kane<sup>62</sup> proposed a fourfold subdivision: (1) encyclopedic purāṇas such as Agni°, Garuḍa°, and Nārada°; (2) purāṇas dealing mainly with *tīrthas* such as Padma°, Skanda°, and Bhaviṣya°; (3) sectarian purāṇas such as Liṅga°, Vāmana°, and

<sup>58</sup> Auguste BARTH: *Inscriptions du Cambodge = Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Tome 27 (1ère partie), 1er fascicule*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1885, pp. 28–31, Veal Kantel: *rāmāyaṇapurāṇābhyaṃ aśeṣaṃ bhāratam dadat / akṛtānvaham acchedyāṃ sa ca tadvācanāsthītim*.

<sup>59</sup> Louis FINOT: *Notes d' épigraphie. XI Les inscriptions de Mi-so'n, BEFEO 4, 1904, 897–977 at 957–958/961 and 963/964.*

<sup>60</sup> Ed. J. GONDA: *Agastyaparva, een Oud-Javaansch proza-geschrift, Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië 90, 1933, 329–419; tr., ibid. 93, 1936, 223–285. Cf. also, by GONDA: Enkele beschouwingen over de inhoud, compositie, aard en herkomst van het Agastyaparva, ibid. 92, 1934–35, 337–458; – The Old-Javanese Agastyaparvan, Pur 4, 1962, 158–175.*

<sup>61</sup> FRIEDERICH's report in the *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap 1849–50*, was translated, by J. R. LOGAN, in *The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia 3, 1849, 117–137. Cf. also A. WEBER: Indische Studien 2, 1853, 131–132; – R. FRIEDERICH: An Account of the Island of Bali, JRAS 1876, 157–218 at 170–171; – H. H. JUYNBOLL: Het Oud-Javaansche Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa, Bijdragen etc. 51, 1900, 272–283; – GONDA: Het Oud-Javaansche Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa. Proza-Text en Kakawin, uitgegeven en van aanteekeningen voorzien, [Bibliotheca Javanica 5,] Weltevreden 1932; GONDA: id., vertaald, [Bibl. Jav. 6,] ibid. 1933; – GONDA: Einige Mitteilungen über das altjavanische Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa, AO 11, 1933, 218–259; – GONDA: The Old-Javanese Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, Pur 2, 1960, 252–267; A. TEEUW: *Prose and Poetry. A Contribution to the Study of Versification in Old Javanese*, Gonda vol. (1972), 208–221; – GONDA: *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, <sup>2</sup>1973, p. 194.*

<sup>62</sup> KANE 1962: 842.

Mārkaṇḍeya°; (4) historical purāṇas such as Vāyu° and Brahmāṇḍa°. Haraprasad Shastri<sup>63</sup> divided the purāṇas into six categories.

The principal difference between individual purāṇas lies in the varying degree to which they appear as unified texts on the one hand, or as aggregates of disconnected parts on the other. The Bhāgavata° has been described as “the one Purāṇa which, more than any of the others, bears the stamp of a unified composition, and deserves to be appreciated as a literary production on account of its language, style and metre.”<sup>64</sup> At the other end of the spectrum are those purāṇas that answer the definition given in the Skanda°:

yan na dr̥ṣṭam hi vedeṣu na dr̥ṣṭam smṛtiṣu dvijāḥ  
ubhayaḥ yan na dr̥ṣṭam ca tat purāṇeṣu gīyate.<sup>65</sup>

These are the true encyclopedic purāṇas, in which detached chapters or sections, dealing with any imaginable subject, follow one another, without connection or transition. Three purāṇas especially belong to this category: Matsya°,<sup>66</sup> Garuḍa°, and, above all, Agni°.

Modern scholarship, educated in the belief that a purāṇa deals with *pañcalakṣaṇa*, has not judged this type of purāṇas kindly. Wilson was categorical: “The cyclopaedical character of the Agni Purāṇa, as it is now described, excludes it from any legitimate claims to be regarded as a Purāṇa, and proves that its origin cannot be very remote.”<sup>67</sup> According to S. B. Chaudhuri, “The book is above all therefore not a purāṇa, but an encyclopaedic work open to every sort of popular information; it has deliberately departed from the ideal definition of a purāṇa.”<sup>68</sup> In addition to their not answering the ideal of a purāṇa, there was another reason why these texts became looked upon as unimportant – and recent: the assumption that the encyclopedic sections are always secondary to and derived from other texts, that they often “plagiarize verses, or even entire chapters from other standard works.”<sup>69</sup>

This derivative nature had only one advantage, which was recognized by Wilson,<sup>70</sup> and clearly formulated by Hazra: “by turning themselves into something like encyclopaedias, the above three Purāṇas have attained additional interest

<sup>63</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928b: 330–337.

<sup>64</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 488. Cf. HACKER 1960: 345.

<sup>65</sup> Prabhāsakhaṇḍa, ch. 2.92. Cf. A. P. KARMARKAR: Puranic Culture and Tradition. 1. Literature and Education, BhV 7, 1946, 93–100.

<sup>66</sup> See sub Matsya°, for a survey of the contents of an encyclopedic purāṇa.

<sup>67</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxvii.

<sup>68</sup> Agni° 1928–29: 131.

<sup>69</sup> MEYER'S (1929: IX) principal objection to Losch was that texts such as the Agni° and Garuḍa°, both being mere “omnium-gatherums of excerpts” were least appropriate to establish his thesis (see 2.1.5).

<sup>70</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxvii.

and importance in that they have preserved summaries and fragments of ancient works, some of which have been lost forever.”<sup>71</sup> In the mean time, following Kirfel’s advice,<sup>72</sup> several sections of the encyclopedic purāṇas have received due attention. They have been compared with other texts in the same fields, to answer the question whether they are indeed mere summaries of independent works, or whether they actually constitute original compositions which at one time had an existence of their own. The results of these researches will be discussed at the appropriate places.

### 2.1.5 The Purāṇas and Other Branches of Sanskrit Literature

The quantity and variety of puranic literature should not lead us to think of the purāṇas as a unique and isolated phenomenon. In reality the purāṇas share a number of characteristics with other branches of ancient Indian literature.<sup>1</sup> Their relation to the Vedas is a problem *sui generis*, which has been discussed elsewhere in this volume (see 1.2.1). The following pages will survey those branches of Sanskrit literature with which the purāṇas not only share their approach to the subject-matter, but in many cases the subject-matter itself as well.

The first branch of literature that has to be considered in this respect are the epics. As early as 1811 William Ward realized that the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa “may be ranked among the Purāṇas.”<sup>2</sup> Also, there is little difference between the epics and the purāṇas in the way in which they have been handed

<sup>71</sup> HAZRA 1962: 267.

<sup>72</sup> KIRFEL (Das Nidānasthāna im Garuḍapurāṇa, Garbe vol., 1927, 102–108 at 102): “Es bildet eine der nächsten und wichtigsten Aufgaben der Purāṇa-Forschung, diese fraglichen Abschnitte und Kapitel – soweit dies noch nicht geschehen ist – daraufhin zu untersuchen, wie sie sich zu den uns überkommenen Werken der verschiedenen indischen Wissensgebiete verhalten.”

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the parallel passages in the purāṇas, and the problems they raise, are echoed in OLDENBERG’S remark (SBE 30: xxvii) on the gṛhyasūtras: “It often happens that single Sūtras or whole rows of Sūtras agree so exactly in different texts that this agreement cannot be ascribed to chance; but this does not – so far at least – enable us to tell which text is to be looked upon as the source of the other, or whether they have a common source which has been lost.”

<sup>2</sup> WARD 1811: 2.43, after enumerating the eighteen purāṇas and the eighteen upapurāṇas: “These thirty-six pooranūs and oopūpooranūs, are not much read at present, in Bengal, two chapters of the Skündū Pooranū, called Kashēe-khündū and Ootkūl-khündū, excepted. These two works relate to the sacred places, Benares, and the temple of Jū-gūnnathū in Orissa. There are, however, three other works, which may be ranked among the pooranūs, which are very much read by the Hindoos, and are frequently rehearsed in public before vast multitudes of spectators, viz. the Shrēebhagūvūtū, the Ramayūnū, and the Mūhābharūtū.”

down, and the role they have played, for many centuries, in the religious and moral education of the Indian masses.<sup>3</sup>

For obvious reasons much has been written about the close relationship of the purāṇas with the Mahābhārata.<sup>4</sup> The Harivaṃśa, in particular, is both a genuine supplement to the Mahābhārata, and a purāṇa.<sup>5</sup>

The Mahābhārata begins like most purāṇas, with the arrival of the *sūta* in the Naimiṣa forest:<sup>5a</sup>

“The Bard Ugraśravas, the son of Lomahaṣṭha, singer of the ancient Lore [*sūtaḥ paurāṇikah*], once came to the Naimiṣa Forest where the seers of strict vows were sitting together at the Twelve-year Session of family chieftain Śaunaka.”<sup>6</sup>

And the seers ask Ugraśravas:

“Tell us that ancient Lore [*purāṇam*] that was related by the eminent sage Dvaipāyana which the Gods and brahmin seers honored when they heard it.”<sup>7</sup>

I mentioned elsewhere (see 1.2.1) the often used compound *itihāsapurāṇam*,<sup>7a</sup> in which the term *itihāsa* is generally taken to refer to the great epic. In fact, it may well be that there was no essential difference at all between the two terms,<sup>8</sup> and that both, together with *atīta*, *ākhyāna*, *kathā*, etc., “mean ordinarily an old tale, legend or incident.”<sup>9</sup> Also, the Mahābhārata displays the same encyclopedic character as the purāṇas; Sukthankar rightly referred to it as “the Encyclopaedia Brahmanica.”<sup>10</sup>

<sup>3</sup> V. RAGHAVAN: Methods of Popular Religious Instruction in South India, in M. Singer: Traditional India, Philadelphia: The American Folklore Society, 1959, pp. 130–138; RAGHAVAN 1953: 275–276.

<sup>4</sup> HOLTSMANN 1895: 29–58; HOPKINS 1901: 47–54; WINTERNITZ 1907: 442–443, 1963: 456–457.

<sup>5</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 378 “in Wirklichkeit ein Purāṇa”; 388 “ganz und gar ein Purāṇa”; FARQUHAR (1920: 139): “One of the earliest and greatest of the Purāṇas, and must be reckoned as such.”

<sup>5a</sup> According to information gathered by WARD (1811: 3.483), the Naimiṣa forest was located “near Lucknow.” Also, the tree under which the *sūta* sat while reciting to the sages, as well as his seat under the tree “are still shown in this place.” More specifically, Naimiṣa has been identified with Nimsār, some forty-five miles northwest of Lucknow (NARAYANASWAMI AṬṬAR 1914: xv = 1916: xiii), but this identification has also been rejected in favor of a place “situated on the Gomati somewhere in the Sultanpur district of Uttar Pradesh” (V. V. MIRASHI: Location of the Naimiṣa Forest, Pur 10, 1968, 27–34).

<sup>6</sup> 1.1.1–2. The translations quoted here are J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN’S.

<sup>7</sup> 1.1.15.

<sup>7a</sup> For textual references, see HORSCH 1966: 12–13.

<sup>8</sup> KEITH-MACDONELL (Vedic Index 1.540), notwithstanding Sāyaṇa’s statement in the introduction to his commentary on the Aitareyabrāhmaṇa: *devāsūrāḥ samyattā āsann ity ādaya itihāśāḥ; idam vā agre naiva kimcinn āsīn na dyaūr āsīd ity ādikam jagataḥ prāgavasthānam upakramya sargapratipādakam vākyajātam purāṇam.* (ĀnSS 32, 1, p. 4)

<sup>9</sup> HOPKINS 1901: 50.

<sup>10</sup> Epic Studies VI, ABORI 18, 1936–37, 1–76 at 68: *yad ihāsti tad anyatra yan nehāsti*

On one occasion the Mahābhārata seems to claim that it encompasses all purāṇas:

“Just as the four kingdoms of creatures range in the realm of space, so, ye twiceborn, all Lore ranges in the realm of this epic.”<sup>11</sup>

The Mahābhārata often refers to *purāṇam* as its source.<sup>12</sup> For instance, Vaiśampāyana concludes his description of the origin of the gods and asuras by saying:

“This is the origin of the generations, as told in the ancient Lore [*purāṇe*], of the puissant Gods and the Asuras; and so I have heard it.”<sup>13</sup>

A few stanzas later Vaiśampāyana declares:

“This Elixir, the brahmins, the cows, Gandharvas, and Apsarās were the progeny of Kapilā as declared in the ancient Lore [*purāṇe*].”<sup>14</sup>

Elsewhere, again, Yudhiṣṭhira is made to say:

“We hear in the ancient Lore [*purāṇe*] that a Gautamī by the name of Jaṭilā lay with the Seven Seers.”<sup>15</sup>

More specifically, at the end of the story of Manu Vaivasvata, Mārkaṇḍeya refers to *mātsyakam nāma purāṇam* as his source:

“Thus I have related to you the Lore that is famous as the Purāṇa of the Fish, which cleanses all evil.”<sup>16</sup>

The Matsya° itself claims that Vyāsa first compiled the eighteen purāṇas, and subsequently used their materials to compose the Mahābhārata.<sup>17</sup> Elsewhere in the Mahābhārata Mārkaṇḍeya refers to a *vāyuproktam purāṇam*; after having spoken of the four *yugas*, he concludes:

---

*na tat kvacit* (1.56.33cd). Cf. J. DAHLMANN (Mahābhārata-Studien, Berlin: Dames, 1899–1902, 1, pp. 72–73): “Wir sehen, wie das Mahābhārata mit den Eigenschaften eines Heldendichtes diejenigen eines Purāṇa im vollen Umfange verbindet.” According to M. V. VAIDYA (Padma° Svargakhaṇḍa 1941: 530) the only difference is that “the epic may be said to be on a slightly higher level of dignity.”

<sup>11</sup> *asyākhyānasya viṣaye purāṇam variate* (1.2.238). HOLTSMANN (1895: 31) interprets this as evidence for the fact that the Mahābhārata is older than the purāṇas, since it claims that they rest on it. According to HOPKINS (1901: 48 n. 2), on the contrary, the statement “presupposes a goodly number already in existence,” but he considered it to be a late addition.

<sup>12</sup> For more examples, see HOLTSMANN 1895: 29–30.

<sup>13</sup> 1.59.37.

<sup>14</sup> 1.59.50.

<sup>15</sup> 1.188.14.

<sup>16</sup> 3.185.53. According to HOLTSMANN (1895: 56) this refers to an older version of the Matsya°, for the Mahābhārata story represents an older and simpler version. Cf. WILSON 1840 = 1961: 1, and BURNOUF: Bhāgavata° 3, Intro. pp. 23, 28.

<sup>17</sup> 53.70. Cf. BURNOUF: Bhāgavata° 1, Intro. p. 83, and HOLTSMANN 1895: 58.

“I have declared to you all that is past and future, as I remember the Lore, lauded by the seers, that was promulgated by the Wind God.”<sup>18</sup>

Finally, the eighteen purāṇas are enumerated twice in the Mahābhārata (see 1.3.3).

On the other hand, the story of the Mahābhārata, including the Harivaṃśa, has been told repeatedly in the purāṇas.<sup>19</sup> Also, Jaimini’s questions at the beginning of the Mārkaṇḍeya° (1.2–17) clearly refer to the Mahābhārata.<sup>20</sup>

A number of verses from the Bhagavadgītā appear in the Bhāgavata°, showing that “the author of the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa was familiar with the Bhagavadgītā, and used it freely in the composition of his work.”<sup>21</sup> Far more important, in a survey of purāṇa literature, is the impressive number of *gītās* occurring in various purāṇas, most of them being directly modeled after the Bhagavadgītā of the Mahābhārata. A good survey of these *gītās* has been provided in another volume of this series.<sup>22</sup>

It is normal, under these circumstances, that there was much speculation on the relative chronology of the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas. As indicated earlier (see 1.3.1), Wilson considered the purāṇas generally to represent a later step in the development of Hinduism than the epics, including the Mahābhārata. To a large extent this opinion has been perpetuated in later scholarly literature. Holtzmann, for example, held that, “in ihrem wesentlichen Inhalt”, the purāṇas are later than the Mahābhārata and largely dependent on it. He adds two qualifications, though: on the one hand, “the purāṇa” in the Mahābhārata refers to more ancient collections of stories than the extant purāṇas; on the other hand, the purāṇas, as we have them, do contain passages and materials of considerable antiquity.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> 3.189.14. According to HOLTZMANN (1895: 40) the Mahābhārata quotes the Vāyu°. HOPKINS (1901: 48) considers the entire Mārkaṇḍeya episode a long interpolation, which “is itself virtually a purāṇa.” Cf. also: maharṣayas ... vāyuproktāḥ (Harivaṃśa 7.11); tāmasasya manor ete daśa putrā ... vāyuproktāḥ (ibid. 7.21).

<sup>19</sup> E.g., Agni° (ĀnSS) ch. 12: Harivaṃśa, ch. 13–15: Mahābhārata; Garuḍa° (Veṅkaṭeśvara) ch. 144: Harivaṃśa, ch. 145: Mahābhārata, ch. 237–238: Bhagavadgītā; Padma° (ĀnSS) 5, ch. 177–188: Bhagavadgītā; Mārkaṇḍeya° (Veṅkaṭeśvara) ch. 1–7: Mahābhārata.

<sup>20</sup> HOLTZMANN 1895: 50.

<sup>21</sup> J. E. ABBOTT: Similar Passages in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa and the Bhagavadgītā, IA 21, 1892, 14. Cf. RUKMANI Bhāgavata° 1970: 4–5.

<sup>22</sup> GONDA 1977: 271–276. In addition to the bibliography provided there, see Hirāmaṇi MĪŚRA: Purāṇoktā gītāḥ, Pur 20, 1978, 136–138. See also, in this volume, under the several purāṇas in which *gītās* are included.

<sup>23</sup> HOLTZMANN 1895: 29. Yet, Holtzmann too, accepted the most simplistic arguments to show that “the epic” was earlier than “the purāṇa.” For instance, in the epic the city of Dvārakā is totally engulfed in water, whereas in the Viṣṇu° Kṛṣṇa’s temple is saved. That means that the temple existed at the time when the Viṣṇu° was composed, but it did not yet

Once scholars started making more subtle distinctions between older and younger materials in the purāṇas – and the Mahābhārata –, sweeping comparisons between “the epic” and “the purāṇas” became far more hazardous. Whereas Hopkins still maintained, without qualification, that the puranic literature was “directly traceable to the latest additions made to the Epic,”<sup>24</sup> Lüders showed that, as far as the R̥ṣyaśṛṅga episode is concerned, the story as presented in the Padma° is to be placed in between an older version of the Mahābhārata and the text as it has come down to us.<sup>25</sup>

Other comparisons between the Mahābhārata and the purāṇas will be referred to under the relevant purāṇas in the second part of this volume. A few examples: DIXIT Matsya° (1928) 1930; on the subject of Yayāti, see also Asim Kumar CHATTERJEE: King Yayāti in the Epics and the Purāṇas, VIJ 9, 1971, 58–61; – Ferdinando BELLONI-FILIPPI (La leggenda mahābhāratiana di Śakuntalā nell’edizione critica di Poona, GSAI n. s. 2, 1932, 135–140) used Padma° Svargakhaṇḍa ch. 1–5 to show that the Mahābhārata CE episode is well founded; – HILGENBERG Padma° Svargakhaṇḍa 1934; contra Hilgenberg, BELVALKAR Padma° Svargakhaṇḍa 1939; – VAIDYA Padma° Svargakhaṇḍa 1941; see also by the same author: The Palace of Hiraṇyakaśipu, ABORI 23, 1942, 609–620 (compares Mahābhārata, Harivaṃśa, Vāyu°, Brahmāṇḍa°, Matsya°, Padma°); – BEDEKAR Skanda° Kumārikakhaṇḍa 1962; Nārada° 1963; Skanda° Setumāhātmya 1968; Vāmana° 1970; also, by the same author: The Legend of the Churning of the Ocean in the Epics and the Purāṇas, Pur 9, 1967, 7–61; The Legend of Trita in the Vedas, the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. A Comparative Study, Pur 17, 1975, 6–14.

There have been fewer occasions to compare the Rāmāyaṇa with the purāṇas than was the case with the Mahābhārata. But comparative studies have been made, and some conclusions have been drawn from these. The Rāmāyaṇa story itself occurs in various purāṇas, among others, the Agni°, Bhāgavata°, Padma°, and Viṣṇu°. <sup>26</sup>

“Each has adopted its own way of introducing the subject and of narrating the story. Differences are also visible in the narration, sometimes in details. The account of the Agnipurāṇa is unique in that it follows the same division as the Rāmāyaṇa of seven sections.”<sup>27</sup>

exist at the time when the Mahābhārata received its present shape. “Also ist das Epos älter als das Purāṇa” (p. 36, with a reference to Wilson 1840).

<sup>24</sup> Proc. AOS, 31 Oct. 1888, p. vi.

<sup>25</sup> See LÜDERS, sub Padma° Pātālakhaṇḍa. According to HOPKINS (1901: 50), in this particular case, “it is at least certain that the present epic form is subsequent to the present Puranic form, and that the tale is drawn from popular sources that antedate in all probability all the literary versions in Sanskrit.” For more evidence “that the Mahābhārata in its present form seems influenced by the Purāṇas,” see S. N. TADAPATRIKAR: The Kṛṣṇa Problem, ABORI 10, 1929, 260–344 at 328–329.

<sup>26</sup> Agni° (ĀnSS) ch. 5–11, Garuḍa° (Veṅkaṭeśvara) 1. ch. 143, Padma° (ĀnSS) 4. ch. 112, Viṣṇu° 4. ch. 4.

<sup>27</sup> A. N. KRISHNA AIYANGAR: Agnipurāṇa and the Rāmāyaṇa, BhV 25, 1965, 9–17 at 10. He concludes that the Agni° does not follow the Southern recension, but rather the N. W. version of the VVR edition. The latter, therefore, is earlier than the Agni°, which summarizes it.

Puranic references have also been used to show that the Southern version of the Rāmāyaṇa is more authentic than the Northern version.<sup>28</sup>

The thesis that the Bālakāṇḍa and the Uttarakāṇḍa are later additions<sup>29</sup> found support through comparison with puranic passages. For instance, the story of Asamañja cannot be the source of the corresponding stories in the Viṣṇu° and the Harivaṃśa, for it is not an integral part of the former whereas it is in the latter two.<sup>30/31</sup> Kirfel concluded, more generally, that the Bālakāṇḍa is probably more recent than the Vāyu° in its present form; and he used his Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa to suggest that the first *kāṇḍa* of the Rāmāyaṇa was composed in the fourth century A. D., or later.<sup>32</sup>

Other comparisons have been made to demonstrate that the Kūrma° reflects different religious concepts than the Rāmāyaṇa: Sītā who, in the latter, “is a perfect wife, but still a human being,” becomes, in the former, Lakṣmī, even as Rāma becomes Viṣṇu.<sup>33</sup>

The purāṇas are also closely related to the dharmasāstras. In fact, the purāṇas are said to be dharmasāstras.<sup>34</sup> The latter, like the former, have been subdivided into three groups of six each, granting *mukti*, *svarga*, and *niraya*, respectively. Are *sātvika*: Vasiṣṭha, Hārīta, Vyāsa, Parāśara, Bharadvāja, and Kaśyapa; are *rājasa*: Yājñavalkya, Atri, Tittiri, Dakṣa, Kātyāyana, and Viṣṇu; are *tāmasa*: Gautama, Bṛhaspati, Saṃvarta, Yama, Śaṅkha, and Uśanas.<sup>35</sup>

From the time of the early dharmasūtras purāṇas are referred to among the sources of *dharma*. Gautama (11.19) requires the king to administer justice in accordance with the Veda, the Dharmasāstra, the Aṅgas, the Upavedas, and “the Purāṇa.”<sup>36</sup> Āpastamba quotes a few passages as occurring *purāṇe*,<sup>37</sup> but

<sup>28</sup> Asoke CHATTERJEE: Śāntā’s Parentage, IHQ 33, 1957, 146–151, against S. K. BELVALKAR: Uttarakāṇḍa, HOS 21, 1915, Intro. pp. lvii–lviii.

<sup>29</sup> JACOBI: Das Rāmāyaṇa, Bonn: Cohen, 1893, pp. 64–65.

<sup>30,31</sup> V. LESNÝ: Über das purāṇartige Gepräge des Bālakāṇḍa, ZDMG 67, 1913, 497–500. Cf. H. LOSCH, Totenwiedererweckungsgeschichten in Indien, Kahle vol. (1935), 173–180; one of the stories appears in a shorter form in the Uttarakāṇḍa, in a longer form in the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Padma°. Part of another story is identical in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Bhāgavata°.

<sup>32</sup> Rāmāyaṇa Kāṇḍa und Purāṇa. Ein Beitrag zur chronologischen Fixierung des ersten Buches, Die Welt des Orients 1947, 113–128.

<sup>33</sup> P.-E. DUMONT: The Legend of Sītā in the Kūrma-purāṇa, Siddhesvar Varma vol. (1950), 1.236–238.

<sup>34</sup> P. V. KANE: The Tantravārtika and the Dharmasāstra Literature, JBBRAS n. s. 1, 1925, 95–102. Cf. A. S. GUPTA: Purāṇic Heritage, Pur 18, 1976, 39–55 at 41, with a reference to Bhaviṣya° 1.1.65: *etāni [= purāṇāni] kuruśārdūla dharmasāstrāṇi paṇḍitaiḥ / sādharmaṇāni proktāni varṇānām śreyase sadā*.

<sup>35</sup> Padma°, Uttarakhaṇḍa 263.86–89.

<sup>36</sup> In the singular, but so is the Veda! Cf. Gautama 8.6; Baudhāyana 2.10.14, 4.3.4; Vasiṣṭha 27.6; etc.

<sup>37</sup> 1.19.13, 1.29.7, 2.23.3. For the latter BÜHLER (Āpastamba’s Quotations from the

most attention has been paid to one particular passage from the same text, the sole example of a quotation being attributed to a specific purāṇa: *iti bhaviṣyat-purāṇe*.<sup>38</sup> This passage has been used, first, to show that, already in the time of the Āpastambadharmasūtra, the term *purāṇa*, irrespective of its original meaning, was used to indicate a distinct literary genre – the expression *bhaviṣyatpurāṇa* being a contradiction in terms –, and, second, to conclude to the existence, at that time, of several purāṇas of which the Bhaviṣyat° was one.<sup>39</sup>

There are indeed, in the purāṇas, extensive chapters dealing with various topics of *dharma*: *vrata*, *tīrtha*, *dāna*, *ācāra*, *varṇadharmā*, *āśramadharmā*, *vyavahāra*, *nīti*, etc.<sup>40</sup> These *smṛti* chapters in the purāṇas have been called “valuable records of the changes of customs and usages that took place during the long period ranging from Yājñavalkya to the Nibandhas.”<sup>41</sup>

Quotations from the purāṇas in the commentaries on the dharmasūtras and dharmaśāstras, as well as in the dharmanibandhas, are relatively few in the early stages, with such authors as Aparārka<sup>42</sup> and Medhātithi; but this attitude soon changes, and from Lakṣmīdhara’s Kṛtyakalpataru onward we find purāṇas cited, along with the sūtras and śāstras, on every aspect of dharma.<sup>43</sup> At a later stage the purāṇas were even held responsible for the appearance of certain Tantric influences in the nibandhas.<sup>44</sup> On at least one occasion purāṇa texts have been

Puranas, IA 25, 1896, 323–328) quotes passages from the Vāyu°, Matsya°, and Viṣṇu°, which “appear to go back to one and the same enlarged version of the *śloka*s quoted by Āpastamba” (p. 325).

<sup>38</sup> 2.24.5–6 (or 3–6). BÜHLER first (SBE 2, 1879, xxviii–xxix) admitted not to find the quotation in the extant Bhaviṣya°: “it seems to me not unlikely that Āpastamba’s authority was the original on which the existing Upa-purāṇa is based”; later (IA 25, 1896, 326) he compared similar passages in the Vāyu°, Matsya°, and Viṣṇu°.

<sup>39</sup> PARGITER 1913: xvii n. 2; 1922: 50–51; HAZRA 1962: 245; A. D. PUSALKAR: Conception of History in Ancient Indian Literature, OH 12, 1964, 33–52 at 43.

<sup>40</sup> For a representative list, see KANE 1968: 417–421.

<sup>41</sup> HAZRA: The Smṛti-chapters of the Purāṇas, IHQ 11, 1935, 108–130 at 108. Cf. HAZRA: The Smṛti-chapters in the Kūrma-Purāṇa, IHQ 11, 1935, 265–286.

<sup>42</sup> Cf., nevertheless, P. K. GODE: Some Purāṇic Extracts Quoted by Aparārka (c. A. D. 1125) and Their Bearing on the History of Indian Palaeography and Education, PO 13.3–4, 1948, 10–14.

<sup>43</sup> KANE 1968: 410–411; J. D. M. DERRETT: The Purāṇas in Vyavahāra Portions of Mediaeval Smṛti Works, Pur 5, 1963, 11–30; Bhabatosh BHATTACHARYA: The Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa: Its Dharmāśāstra Contents and Their Utilization in Mediaeval Digests, JBBRAS n. s. 28, 1953, 6–18; id.: Studies in Dharmāśāstra. I Ancient Period. III The Purāṇas, ISPP 5, 1963–64, 275–281 [partly overlapping with the preceding, plus the use of the Matsya° in the Dānasāgara]; S. C. BANERJI: Purāṇic Basis of the Bengal Smārta Vratas, Siddhesvar Varma vol. (1950), 1.218–224 [purāṇas in Śūlapāṇi’s Vratakālaviveka and Raghunandana’s Vratatattva]. On the use, by the *nibandhakāras*, of *mīmāṃsā* rules to interpret puranic texts, see S. G. MOGHE: Pūrva-mīmāṃsā and Paurāṇic Interpretation, Pur 19, 1977, 283–291.

<sup>44</sup> HAZRA: Influence of Tantra on the Smṛti-nibandhas, ABORI 15, 1933–34, 220–235; 16, 1934–35, 202–211.

quoted, via the nibandhas, to argue, in a modern law case, the practice of adopting a daughter, like a son, in the absence of a natural daughter.<sup>45</sup>

The fact that the purāṇas are quoted so often in the commentaries and nibandhas is, of course, the logical consequence of their containing materials very similar to, if not identical with, the primary sources of these texts, the dharmasūtras and dharmasāstras. Caland noticed that, in the *śrāddha* sections, the Mārkaṇḍeya° corresponds, often literally, with the Gautamasmṛti, and that the same is true for the Viṣṇudharmottara° and the Viṣṇusmṛti, for the Kūrma° and the Uśanasmṛti, etc. He suggested, merely in a footnote, that further research on the relationship between the purāṇas and the smṛtis might lead to some interesting conclusions.<sup>46</sup> His suggestion has been taken up by a number of scholars. In some cases the comparisons have been used simply to stress that the purāṇas and the dharmasāstras are in agreement.<sup>47</sup> In other cases, however, comparison was only a preliminary step, to be followed by conclusions on which kind of text preserved the more original version, and which the less original one.

For example, Hans Losch, a student of Kirfel's, examined the Yājñavalkyasmṛti against the background of the purāṇas, and came to some daring conclusions. Yājñavalkya, as we have it as it was canonized through the commentaries, is not the original smṛti; the latter has been enlarged with considerable additions. The older version of chapters one and three can be found in the Garuḍa° (ch. 93–101 and 102–196), and since the materials of chapter two are absent from the Garuḍa°, it is a later addition in its entirety. An older version of this chapter appears in the Agni° (ch. 253–258).<sup>48</sup> Losch's thesis was rejected by J. J. Meyer, who returns to the opinion that the puranic passages are later elaborations of the smṛti text. According to him, accepting Losch's findings would be "a castrophy for Indology."<sup>49</sup>

<sup>45</sup> K. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR: The Adoption of a Daughter and the Sagotra Marriage, PO 11.3–4, 1946, 42–53.

<sup>46</sup> Altindischer Ahnencult, Leiden: Brill, 1893, p. 112.

<sup>47</sup> E. g., A. B. L. AWASTHI: Numismatic Evidence from the Purāṇas, Pur 6, 1964, 347–353 [the names of coins in the purāṇas are the same as those in the *smṛtis*]; N. K. DUTT: Some Unorthodox Marriages in the Family of Yadu, IHQ 21, 1945, 86–90 [both the *śāstras* and the purāṇas lay down strict rules of marriage, which are, however, not always adhered to in practice]; F. E. PARGITER: Verses Relating to Gifts of Land in Indian Land Grants, JRAS 1912, 248–254 [verses quoted in land grants agree substantially with verses from the purāṇas].

<sup>48</sup> Die Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des indischen Rechts, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1927. In arithmetical terms, out of 1009 stanzas of Yājñavalkya, Losch considers 451 as primary, 558 as secondary. Typically, Losch's effort was meant "um durch sorgfältige Kritik, alte, ursprüngliche Texte zu gewinnen, die erst den notwendigen Unterbau für eine systematische Darstellung des gesamten Rechtsgebietes unter historischen Gesichtspunkten sichern" (p. VII).

<sup>49</sup> Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa. Ein Beitrag zur Frage von der Entstehungsart der altindischen Rechtsschriften und der Purāṇa, Breslau: Marcus, 1929, at p. VIII. In his review Batakrishna GHOSH (IHQ 5, 1929, 367–375) agrees with Meyer rather than with Losch, but he thinks that the Garuḍa° borrowed from Yājñavalkya at a time when the latter did

Books and articles on dharma and artha topics in specific purāṇas will be referred to at the appropriate places in Part Two. A few other, more general studies may be mentioned here, in chronological order. Mario VALLAURI: *Contributi puranici alla conoscenza della "Nīti"*, *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 64, 1928–29, 314–332 [Matsya° ch. 215 ... 243; Agni° ch. 220–230]; – V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR; *The Polity in the Puranas*, *Indian Review* 36, 1935, 365–368 [very general]; – Jagdish Lal SHASTRI: *Political Thought in the Purāṇas with an Appendix Containing Complete Extracts of Verses on Polity*, Lahore 1944; – Carlo DELLA CASA: *Un testo di dottrina politica indiana ricostruito sulle recensioni del Matsya- e del Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa*, *Atti del' Accademia Toscana di scienze e lettere "La Colombaria"* 18, 1953, 1–70 [Matsya° ch. 215–219; Viṣṇudharmottara° 2. ch. 24–28; Agni° ch. 220 ... 225: reconstructed text, transl.]; – U. N. GHOSHAL: *The Purāṇa Stories of Veṇa and Prthu and their Philosophical Significance*, *IHQ* 32, 1956, 406–411 [Vāyu°; Viṣṇu°; Bhāgavata°]; – Hans LOSCH: *Rājadharmā. Einsetzung und Aufgabenkreis des Königs im Lichte des Purāṇa's*. [Bonner Orientalistische Studien N. S. 8.] Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalistischen Seminars, 1959 [Matsya°; Viṣṇudharmottara°; Agni°: concordance]; – D. C. STR-CAR: *Dharmādhikaraṇa and Dharmādhikārin*, *Pur* 6, 1964, 445–450; – Ludwik STERN-BACH: *Cāṇakya's Aphorisms in Purāṇas*, *Pur* 6, 1964, 113–146; – id.: *The Kathā Literature and the Purāṇas*, *Pur* 7, 1965, 19–86; – id.: *Purāṇic Wise Sayings in the Literature of "Greater India"*, *Pur* 11, 1969, 73–115; – id.: *Purāṇic Texts in Subhāṣita-saṃgraha-s*, *Pur* 13, 1970–71, 102–132; – Om PRAKASH: *Divinity of the King and the Right of Revolution in the Purāṇas*, *Pur* 13, 1970–71, 167–169; – V. V. DESHPANDE: *A Comment on "Divinity ..."*, *Pur* 13, 1970–71, 170–174; – Om PRAKASH: *A Rejoinder to the Comment of Prof. V. V. Deshpande on the Divinity of the King and the Right of Revolution*, *Pur* 14, 1972, 30–39.

It should also be noted that a number of dharmanibandhas and commentaries, besides quoting puranic passages, exhibit theoretical discussions of the purāṇas as such, and their role as authorities of *dharma*.<sup>50</sup> They eventually discuss the composition of the list of eighteen purāṇas and upapurāṇas, and their number of verses.<sup>51</sup> Or they discuss particular points, such as whether or not śūdras have a right to listen to and/or read purāṇas.<sup>52</sup> The nibandha which probably deals most exhaustively with problems connected with purāṇas is Ballālasena's *Dānasāgara*.<sup>53</sup> On the occasion of two lists of books, one of books – including purāṇas – which he used in his treatise, and one of books which he did not use, Ballālasena provides some interesting details on a number of purāṇas and their composition (see 2.1.3).

not contain the second *adhyāya*. Cf. also S. C. BANERJĪ: *Vyavahāra Portion of the Agni-Purāṇa*, *Pur* 20, 1978, 38–56.

<sup>50</sup> E. g., Mitramiśra's *Vīramitrodaya*, *Paribhāṣāprakāśa*, ChSS 30.1, 1906, pp. 11–15; Narasiṃha Vāṇajeyin's *Nityācāraprādīpa*, BI work 160, 1903–28, 1, pp. 17–19.

<sup>51</sup> E. g., *Nityācāraprādīpa*, p. 18, after a quote from the *Matsya*° that the *Nṛsiṃha*° has 18,000 verses: *prasiddhanārasimhasyaṣṭādaśasahasrasaṃkhyā yady api nopalabhyate kim-cit kālakramāl luptam iti pratibhāti*. See also 1.3.3 and 1.3.4.

<sup>52</sup> E. g., Śeṣakṛṣṇa's *Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi*, [Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Texts 44,] 1933, pp. 45 sqq.

<sup>53</sup> BI work 274, 1953–56 (ed. Bhabatosh BHATTACHARYA). Cf. KANE 1962: 867–871; HAZRA: *Purāṇa Literature as Known to Ballālasena*, *JOR* 12, 1938, 129–146.

Interesting comparisons can be made between the purāṇas and the works of some of the best known authors of classical Sanskrit literature.<sup>54</sup> Some research has been done on the relationship between the purāṇas and the works of Kālidāsa.<sup>55</sup> For instance, a study of cosmography in Kālidāsa's works reveals that they incorporate the data which appear only in the more recent cosmological purāṇa versions of the Brahmāṇḍa°, Vāyu°, and Matsya° group, with the implication that the compilation of this group must be dated earlier than A. D. 450.<sup>56</sup> For the plot of the Kumārasambhava the author has been said to be "most probably indebted to an earlier recension of the Śiva°,"<sup>57</sup> a more detailed comparison showed parallels with the story as it appears in the Matsya°, the difference being "between a first rank poet and a writer or compiler of a Purāṇa" probably using a common source.<sup>58</sup> On the other hand, the Kumārasambhava story in the Kālikā° shows repeatedly that "the Purāṇa is unable to escape the influence of the poet which goes to the extent of not only borrowing the same details, same ideas and figures, but also of using the same words."<sup>59</sup>

Alois Anton Führer drew attention to the fact that, among the sources which Bāṇa used for his Harṣacarita, there were, in addition to the epics, also the Agni°, Bhāgavata°, and Mārkaṇḍeya°.<sup>60</sup> Among those who came to see Harṣa, in chapter five, are *śokāpanayananiṣūṇās ca paurāṇikāḥ*.<sup>61</sup> More important, Bāṇa

<sup>54</sup> Purāṇas have occasionally been used to emend readings in classical texts. E. g., Ajay MITRA SHASTRI: The Reading and Interpretation of a Verse in the Kuṭṣānimata in the Light of Epigraphic and Purāṇic Evidence, Pur 13, 1970–71, 160–166 [read Kalaśeśvara, one of the important *liṅgas* at Vārāṇasī, for Kamaleśvara, verse 735 ed. Kaul, 736 ed. Tripathi].

<sup>55</sup> C. KUNHAN RAJA: Kālidāsa's Knowledge of the Purāṇas, AIO 13 (1946) 1951, 2.115–122, deals mainly with the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, hardly with purāṇas.

<sup>56</sup> Hans HENSGEN: Bemerkungen zum kosmologischen Abschnitt des Brahmāṇḍa-, Vāyu- und Matsya-Purāṇa, ZDMG 108, 1958, 161–163. On the Raghuvamśa, see also Bhagīratha Prasāda TRIPĀTHĪ: Raghuvamśamahākāvyaśya dvitīyaḥ sargaḥ Padmapurāṇam ca – tatra prathamāślokaśya tulanātmakam anuśīlanam, Pur 22, 1980, 157–163 [Ragh. 2.1 improves on Padma° 6.203.1].

<sup>57</sup> M. R. KALE: Kālidāsa's Kumārasambhava, Cantos I–VIII, Bombay: Gopal Narayan, 1923, p. xxvii.

<sup>58</sup> R. S. BETAI: Matsya Purāṇa and Kumārasambhava, JUBo n.s. 30.2, 1961–62, 39–48.

<sup>59</sup> V. RAGHAVAN: The Kālikā-purāṇa, Kālidāsa and Māgha, Woolner vol. (1940), 191–195. According to Raghavan chapter 44 – the Tārakāsura episode – is based not only on Kumārasambhava II, but also on the first canto of Māgha's Śiśupālavadha; this gives a *terminus post quem* of the end of the 7th or beginning of the 8th century for the Kālikā°.

<sup>60</sup> Bāṇabhaṭṭa's Biography of Śrī-harshavardhana of Sthāneśvara, Int.Cong.Or. 6 (1883) 1885, 3.199–243. Cf. V. A. SMITH: Andhra History and Coinage, ZDMG 56, 1902, 654 n. 3.

<sup>61</sup> Tr. E. B. COWELL and F. W. THOMAS (London, 1897, p. 162): "mythologists expert in allaying sorrow." Cf. V. S. AGRAWALA: The Deeds of Harsha, Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan, 1969, p. 140. The *paurāṇikas* appear again, in chapter 8, immediately after the *dharmaśāstrins*, in a list of all those assembled at Divākaramitra's hermitage, on the occasion of Harṣa's visit; see AGRAWALA: Deeds, p. 226; tr. COWELL–THOMAS, p. 236.

tells us that, when he visited his native village, there was a *pustakavācakaḥ sudrṣṭīh*, who *gīyā pavamānaproktam purāṇam papāṭha*. There have been discussions about the correct reading of this passage,<sup>63</sup> but it has been used to demonstrate the existence of a Vāyu° in Bāṇa's time.<sup>64</sup>

Besides using passages from classical texts to determine their relationship to similar versions in the purāṇas, and in addition to claiming the existence of at least some version of a purāṇa at the time when a particular classical text was composed, modern scholarly literature did not fail to notice that, in some cases, the dividing line between classical *mahākāvya* and puranic texts is not as clear as one would expect it to be. For instance, Jayadratha's Haracaritacintāmaṇi, which is normally treated as a *kāvya*,<sup>65</sup> "is not really a Mahākāvya but a work of Māhātmya type, which retains in the Śloka metre old and new Śaiva legends, some of which are distinctly connected with places of pilgrimage in Kashmir."<sup>66</sup>

The purāṇas also have a number of points in common with Buddhist literature. The Pali Jātakas often treat materials very similar to those of the purāṇas.<sup>67</sup> The Lalitavistara calls itself a purāṇa, "a term which is fitting in so far as the style of the work is not unlike that of the Purāṇas."<sup>68</sup> Prophetic history, similar to that of the purāṇas, also occurs in the Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa. It is placed here in the mouth of the Buddha, "who undertakes to narrate the future vicissitudes of his Doctrine and Church, and in that connexion royal history is dealt with."<sup>69</sup> The

<sup>62</sup> 3.3. Ed. A. A. FÜHRER, BSS 66, 1909, pp. 131–132; tr. COWELL–THOMAS, pp. 72–73. Both are friends of Bāṇa, in the first chapter (ed. p. 67; tr. p. 33).

<sup>63</sup> Subandhu's Vāsavadattā, ed. Fitzedward HALL, BI work 30, 1859, Preface p. 12: *yavana-prayukta-purāṇam*. Rejected by BÜHLER, SBE 2, 1879, p. xxix n., in favor of *pavanaprokta-purāṇam*.

<sup>64</sup> BÜHLER: SBE 2, 1879, p. xxix n.; HAZRA 1940: 13; AGRAWALA: Deeds, pp. 73–75, but he agrees that, written on birch bark, the Vāyu° of 24,000 verses must have been "quite a ponderous volume." Cf. KIRFEL (1927: XIX): "ob darunter aber, wie man angenommen hat, das Vā. in seiner uns heute vorliegenden Gestalt oder nur der Textkern Bḍ-Vā. oder ein zwischen beiden liegendes Mittelglied in der Entwicklung nach Vā. hin oder endlich gar ein ganz anderer Text gemeint ist, läßt sich nicht entscheiden."

<sup>65</sup> WINTERNITZ: History 3.66; A. B. KEITH: History of Sanskrit Literature, OUP 1920, p. 137.

<sup>66</sup> S. N. DASGUPTA and S. K. DE: History of Sanskrit Literature, Calcutta University, 1962, pp. 323, 324. Cf. Kanta GUPTA: The Haracaritacintāmaṇi – Its Śaiva Legends as Compared with Those of the Purāṇas, Pur 18, 1976, 75–83. For the use of *kāvya* meters in the purāṇas, see 2.2.4.

<sup>67</sup> S. K. CHATTERJI (Itihāsa, Purāṇa and Jātaka, Woolner vol., 1940, 34–40, slightly altered in Selected Papers 1, 1972, 39–49 at 49): "The Jātaka has . . . to be recognised as a repository of Purāṇa references, and to be taken seriously along with the Brahmanical Purāṇas and Epics as a complementary source of information."

<sup>68</sup> WINTERNITZ: History 2.248 n. 3 (= Geschichte 2.194 n. 3); also GYANI Agni° 1964: 31 n. 6. Compare WINTERNITZ: History 2.244–245 (on the Mahāvastu), 2.301–302 (on the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka), 2.306 (on the Kāraṇḍavyūha).

<sup>69</sup> K. P. JAYASWAL (An Imperial History of India in a Sanskrit Text [c. 700 B. C. – c. 770

historical section covers the period between A. D. 78 down to the end of the eight century.<sup>70</sup>

There is only one major work with the term *purāṇa* in the title in Buddhist literature: the *Svayambhū°*, which, as indicated earlier (see 2.1.4), is really a *māhātmya* of the sacred places in Nepal, primarily of the *Svayambhūcaitya* near Kathmandu. It is a dialogue between two *Bodhisattvas*, *Jayaśrī* and *Jinaśrī*, in which the former tells the latter about a conversation between *Aśoka* and *Upagupta*, who in turn reports to the king a dialogue between *Śākyamuni* and *Maitreya*.

ED.: HARAPRASĀD ŚĀSTRĪ: *The Vṛihat Svayambhū Purāṇam. Containing the Traditions of the Svayambhū Kshetra in Nepal*, BI work 133, 1894–1900; – Louis de LA VALLÉE POUSSIN: *Svayambhūpurāna*, dixième chapitre, [Travaux de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, Université de Gand 9,] Ghent: Engelcks, Louvain: Ista, 1893; – id.: *Mañicūdāvadāna*, as Related in the Fourth Chapter of the *Svayambhūpurāna* [Paris, dev. 78], JRAS 1894, 297–319. – Cf. Ratna HANDURUKANDE: ed. tr. *Mañicūdāvadāna*, PTS [SBB 24,] London: Luzac, 1967 [pp. xxxiii–xlv discuss the place of the legend in the *purāna* and its connection with *avadāna* literature].

LIT.: HARAPRASĀD ČĀSTRĪ: Notes on the *Svayambhū Puranam*, Journal of the Buddhist Text Society of India 2.2, 1894, 33–37; – Sylvain LEVI 1905: 207–213; WINTERNITZ: *Geschichte* 2.267; *History* 2.375–376.

The situation is completely different in Jaina literature, which has produced numerous puranic texts, either with the term *purāṇa* in the title, or with other terms such as *carita*, etc. I will restrict myself to a few observations on the former category only.<sup>71</sup>

Among the many Jaina versions of the *Harivamśa*<sup>72</sup> reference should be made to the work with that title, by *Jinasena* (A. D. 783–784). It is “one of the most important books of the secondary canon of the *Digambaras*,” containing more than nine thousand *ślokas*, divided into sixty-six *sargas*.<sup>73</sup> By means of a number

---

A. D.], Lahore: Motilal Banarsi Das, 1934, p. 4) adds that the language and style have a striking resemblance with those of the *Yuga°* of the *Gargasamhitā*.

<sup>70</sup> The text has been edited in TSS 70, 76, 84. JAYASWAL edited *paṭalavistara* 53 (1003 verses: 6–344 the biography of the Buddha up to his *nirvāna*; 345–980 the prophecy). For other *Mahāyāna* prophecies, see E. OBERMILLER (tr.): *History of Buddhism* by Bu-ston, *Materialien zur Kunde des Buddhismus* 18–19, Heidelberg 1931–32. Cf. KANE 1962: 1140.

<sup>71</sup> Several *purāṇas* and *caritas* are listed in Ernst LEUMANN: *A List of the Strassburg Collection of Digambara Manuscripts*, VOJ [WZKM] 11, 1897, 297–312.

<sup>72</sup> L. ALSDORF (*Harivamśapurāna*, p. 13 n. 7) refers to 27 different versions.

<sup>73</sup> ALSDORF: *ibid.*, p. 14; for the contents of the text, see there pp. 15–28; cf. WINTERNITZ: *History* 2.495. ED.: Darbārī Lāl, [Māṇikacandra *Digambara Jaina Granthamālā* 32, 33,] Bombay: MDJG Samiti, 1930, with a useful preface, in Hindi, by N. Premi; – Pannalāla Jain, [Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī *Jaina Granthamālā*, *Samskṛta Granthāṅka* 27,] Varanasi: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1962. Cf. also M. Govinde PAI: *A Date-passage in the Jaina Harivamśa Purana*, *Diwakar* vol. (1955), 65–67.

of introductory chapters and several digressions throughout, Jinasena expands the brahmanic Harivaṃśa into a complete world history and a compendium of Jaina doctrine, cosmography, mythology, etc.

Another important book in the secondary canon of the Digambaras is the Triṣaṣṭilakṣaṇamahā°. The text itself says that it comprises twenty thousand *ślokas*, which is approximately correct. It is divided into two parts, called Ādi° and Uttara°, with forty-seven and thirty *parvans*, respectively. *Parvans* 1–42 were composed by Jinasena,<sup>74</sup> the *paramaguru* of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarṣa I. *Parvans* 43–77 are attributed to Jinasena's disciple, Guṇabhadra. According to the *praśasti* the work was completed in A.D. 897. Both in content and organization the Triṣaṣṭilakṣaṇamahā° is a precursor of Hemacandra's Triṣaṣṭīśālākāpuruṣacarita, a favorite book of the Śvetāmbaras. The Ādi° tells the history of Bharatavarṣa during the first three ages of the present *avasarpinī* (descending period); the Uttara° proceeds through the remaining ages, and ends with a prophetic look at the future *utsarpinī* (ascending period). The text clearly aims, first, at providing the Jainas with a book comparable to the purāṇas of the Hindus,<sup>75</sup> and, second, at showing that Hindu religion and customs are nothing more than a deviation from Jainism.

ED.: Pt. PANNĀLĀLA JAINA, [Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Saṃskṛta Granthāṅka 8,9,] Kāśī: Bhāratiya Jñānapīṭha, 1951; – Ādi°: Jaina Law [containing selections from the ... Ādipurāṇa, + Hindi and Engl. tr.,] Delhi: Satar Press, 2449 (1923); Uttara°: + Hindi tr., Pt. LĀLĀRĀMA JAIN, [Syādvāda-granthamālā 8,] Indore: Jainagrantha Prakāśaka Kāryālaya, 1918; – E. HULTZSCH: The Story of Jivandhara. Tr. from the Uttara°, QJMS 12, 1921–22, 317–348.

LIT.: H. VON GLASENAPP: Das Triṣaṣṭilakṣaṇamahāpurāṇa der Digambaras, Jacobi vol. (1926), 331–345; WINTERNITZ: History 2.497–503; – Ādi°: A. VENKATASUBBIAH: The Ādipurāṇa and Brhatkathā, IHQ 5, 1929, 31–35; – Kamta Prasad JAIN: The Ādipurāṇa and Brhatkathā, IHQ 5, 1929, 547–548; – R.M. DAS: Ādi Purāṇa and the Origin of Varṇas, Magadh Univ. Journal 1, 1964, 90–92; – S.N. JHA: Ornaments in the Ādipurāṇa of Jinasena, Bhārati 9.2, 1965–66, 206–214.

A separate chapter in Jaina world history is treated in Puṣpadanta's Tisaṭṭhimahāpurisaguṇālaṃkāramahā°, an Apabhraṃśa text. It is composed of an Ādi° in thirty-seven and an Uttara° in sixty-five chapters, and was completed in A.D. 965. The text deals with the twenty-second Tīrthaṃkara, Nemi, and the ninth and last triad of heroes: Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, Baladeva Balarāma, and Prativāsudeva Jarāsandha.

ED.: Ludwig ALSDORF: Harivaṃśapurāṇa. Ein Abschnitt aus der Apabhraṃśa-Welt-historie "Mahāpurāṇa Tisaṭṭhimahāpurisaguṇālaṃkāra" von Puṣpadanta. Als Beitrag zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṃśa und der Universalgeschichte der Jainas, [Alt- und Neu-

<sup>74</sup> This Jinasena is not identical with the author of the Harivaṃśa, above. Cf. ALSDORF: Harivaṃśapurāṇa, p. 15 n. 1.

<sup>75</sup> On the treatment of Hindu deities in Jaina purāṇas, see Shaktidar JHA: Hindu Deities in Jaina Purāṇas, Satkari Mookerji vol. (ChSSt 69, 1969), 458–465.

Indische Studien 5.] Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, 1936; – + Engl. tr., P. L. VAIDYA, [Manikchand Digambara Jaina Granthamala 27, 40, 41,] Bombay 1937–41.

LIT.: Kali Pada MITRA: Dramaturgy in the Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta, IHQ 26, 1950, 232–240; – Ratna Nagesha SHRIYAN: A Critical Study of Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta. A Critical Study of the Deśya and Rare Words from Puṣpadanta's Mahāpurāṇa and His Other Apabhraṁśa Works, [Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 26,] Ahmedabad: LDII, 1962; id.: A Study of Deshya Words from the Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta, JUBo n. s. 31.2, 1962, 94–120; 32.2, 1963, 177–206; 33.2, 1964, 168–188.

More than one text bears the title Pāṇḍava°. One of these, which is also referred to as Jaina Mahābhārata, is attributed to Śubhacandra.<sup>76</sup> It contains more than five thousand ślokas, divided into twenty-five *parvans*, and has been dated *vikrama samvat* 1608 (A. D. 1551–1552). Another Pāṇḍava°, in eighteen *sargas*, is attributed to Vādicandra (A. D. 1600).<sup>77</sup>

One book with *carita* rather than *purāṇa* in the title has to be mentioned here: Vimalasūri's Paūmacariya, first, because, notwithstanding its title, it calls itself a *purāṇa*,<sup>78</sup> and, second, because of its relation to Raviṣeṇa's Padma°.

ED.: Paūmacariya: Hermann JACOBI, Bombay: NSP, 1914; revised Muni Shri PUNYAVI-JAYAJI, + Intro. V. M. KULKARNI + Hindi tr. Shantilal M. VORA, [PTS Series 6,] Varanasi: PTS, 1962; – ch. 27–28, + free Engl. tr., S. C. UPADHYAY, + critical foreword K. V. ABHYANKAR, Ahmedabad: R. P. Kothari, 1934; – Padma°: Darbārī LĀL, [Mānikacandra Digambara Jaina Granthamālā 29–31,] Bombay: Native Opinion Press, 1928; – + Hindi *prastāvanā* and tr., Pannālāl JAIN, [Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Sanskrit Grantha 20, 24, 26,] Kāśī: Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha, 1958–59.

LIT.: WINTERNITZ: Geschichte 2.333, History 2.489–494; – Batakrishna GHOSH: review of Chintaharan Chakravarti's Jaina Padmapurāṇa (in Bengali), IHQ 5, 1929, 157–161; – B. A. CHAUGULE: Paumachariya and Padmapurāṇa, JUBo n. s. 14.2, 1945–46, 43–44; – P. M. UPADHYE: Relation of Vimalasuri's Paumacariya to Ravisena's Padmapurāṇa, JUBo n. s. 31.2, 1962, 88–93; – K. R. CHANDRA: New Light on the Date of Paūmacariyaṃ, JOIB 13, 1963–64, 378–386; – P. M. UPADHYE: Geography Known to the Paumacariya, JOIB 14, 1964–65, 46–51; – K. R. CHANDRA: Sources of the Rāma-Story of Paumacariyaṃ, JOIB 14, 1964–65, 134–147; – id.: Extent of the Influence of the Rāma-Story of Paumacariyaṃ, JOIB 15, 1965–66, 341–349; – id.: Literary Evaluation of Paumacariyaṃ, [Sanmati Publications 17,] Varanasi: Jain Cultural Research Society, 1966; – id.: Intervening Stories of Paumacariyaṃ and Their Sources, JOIB 16, 1966–67, 364–370; – id.: A Critical Study of Paumacariyaṃ, [Prakrit Jain Institute Research Publications Series 4,] Vaishali (Muzaffarpur): Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa, 1970; – Asim Kumar CHATTERJEE: Vimalasūri's Paūmacariyaṃ, JAIH 6, 1972–73, 105–115.

The Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī Paūmacariya consists of 118 chapters (called *uddeśa* or *samuddeśaka*, and *parvan*), with a total of 8651 stanzas, mainly in *āryā* meter. It is a Jaina version of the Rāma story. The question whether it is based on the

<sup>76</sup> Ed., with a free Hindi tr., by Jinadas Parshwanatha Shastri, [Jivaraj Jain Granthamala 3,] Sholapur: Jain Samskriti Samraksaka Sangha, 1954. With a Hindi *prastāvanā*, by Bālacandra Siddhāntaśāstri. Cf. WINTERNITZ: Geschichte 2.333 n. 2; History 2.496–497.

<sup>77</sup> WINTERNITZ: History 2.496 n. 3. The text is being edited by Padmanabh S. JAINI.

<sup>78</sup> Both at the beginning (1.32) and the end (118.111).

Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa has both been confirmed<sup>79</sup> and denied in favor of its taking its origin within the Jaina tradition.<sup>80</sup> It does, indeed, treat all the topics which are common to Jaina puranic literature: the lives of a number of *tīrthaṅkaras* and other great figures of Jainism; the duties of the Jaina monk and the Jaina householder; condemnation of the Vedic sacrifice and the brahmins; etc. Although the Paūmacariya is, therefore, definitely a purāṇa, on the other hand it displays a number of characteristics also to rank as a mahākāvya.<sup>81</sup>

It is not clear whether Vimalasūri was a Śvetāmbara or a Digambara. Some believe that he was a Śvetāmbara, admitting at the same time that “there are some instances which are simply contradictions.”<sup>82</sup> An alternate solution stresses the fact that the text displays elements of both the Śvetāmbara and the Digambara traditions and that, therefore, the author cannot have belonged to either; the book must, then, have originated before the division of the Jaina community into two sects.<sup>83</sup>

There is no agreement on the date of Vimala. Opinions range from the first century A. D.<sup>84</sup> to the end of the third century A. D.,<sup>85</sup> the fifth or perhaps the sixth century,<sup>86</sup> or even between the middle of the seventh and eighth centuries.<sup>87</sup> Since Vimala is more familiar with the geography of North India than with that of the South, he probably belonged to Northern India.<sup>88</sup>

Raviṣeṇa's Sanskrit — and Digambara — Padma° was composed in A. D. 677–678, in 123 *parvans*. Although the author does not state that his Padma° is based on the Paūmacariya, a comparison of both texts seems to indicate that he was “heavily indebted to Vimala.”<sup>89</sup>

The Śatruṅjayamāhātmya, attributed to Dhaneśvara, besides glorifying mount Śatruṅjaya, contains a number of Jaina and Brahmanic legends, in fourteen *sargas* and 8695 verses. Fragments of it were edited, on the basis of a single Oxford manuscript, by Albrecht Weber.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>79</sup> GROSH Paūmacariya 1929; UPADHYAY Paūmacariya 1934: 3–4, allowing that the Jainas “effected changes which would serve as a means of propagation of their own religion;” V. M. KULKARNI: The Origin and Development of the Rāma-Story in Jaina Literature, JOIB 9, 1959–60, 189–204 at 204.

<sup>80</sup> CHANDRA Paūmacariya 1964–65.

<sup>81</sup> JACOBI Paūmacariya 1962: 27–28.

<sup>82</sup> ABHYANKAR Paūmacariya 1934: 23–27.

<sup>83</sup> KULKARNI Paūmacariya 1962: 18–22.

<sup>84</sup> LEUMANN: op. cit.; WINTERNITZ.

<sup>85</sup> JACOBI; PUNYAVIJAYAJI; KULKARNI.

<sup>86</sup> CHANDRA Paūmacariya 1963–64: 386. See there for a general survey of the various points of view; also KULKARNI Paūmacariya 1962: 8–11.

<sup>87</sup> ABHYANKAR Paūmacariya 1934: 18, following a general discussion pp. 4–18.

<sup>88</sup> UPADHYE Paūmacariya 1964–65: 51.

<sup>89</sup> KULKARNI Paūmacariya 1962: 3. Cf. WINTERNITZ: History 2.494; CHAUGULE Paūmacariya 1945–46; CHANDRA Paūmacariya 1963–64.

<sup>90</sup> Ueber das Čatrunjaya Māhātmyam. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Jaina, AKM 1.4,

A Sanskrit Malliṣeṇamahā°, completed in śaka 969 (A.D. 1047) was discovered in a Jaina *maṭha* at Kolhapur.<sup>91</sup> A short Uttamaśikhara°, attributed to Siddhasūri, is referred to elsewhere in this volume (see 2.2.1).<sup>92</sup>

## 2.2 Consequences

### 2.2.1 “Mini-Purāṇas”

Vans Kennedy stands as good as alone with his opinion that the purāṇas were monolithic from the beginning, and that “they afford no grounds for supposing that in them either omissions or interpolations have taken place.”<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, everyone agrees that, to a large extent, purāṇas are made up of originally independent pieces.<sup>2</sup> It has been pointed out that the majority of Indians know little about purāṇas as integrated texts, whereas most of them are familiar with extracts compiled for specific purposes.<sup>3</sup> Also, when Kirfel examined puranic passages for his *Purāṇa vom Weltgebäude*, he noticed that the purāṇas in which these passages occur fall into different groups than those he used for his *Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa*: “Dies dürfte mithin schon ein klares Argument für die Annahme sein, daß ursprünglich selbständige Texte von nur geringerem Umfang von den Redaktoren der Purāṇa’s zu einem Ganzen verschmolzen worden sind.”<sup>4</sup> Finally, scholars did not fail to notice the fact that manuscripts of one purāṇa occasionally exhibit sections which are closer to the printed editions of other purāṇas than they are to the editions of their own purāṇa. E. g., two manuscripts of the Matsya°, one at the Bodleian and one at the India Office, when they differ from the Ānandāśrama edition of the Matsya°, often agree with the Ānandāśra-

---

1858. [Pp. 15–49 contain an analysis of the text, chapter by chapter; pp. 50–117 give extracts, in *devanāgarī*.] Weber’s monograph was translated, with additions, by James BURGESS: *The Satrunjaya Māhātmya* (A Contribution to the History of the Jainas by Professor Albert Weber), IA 30, 1901, 239–251. Cf. WINTERNITZ: *Geschichte* 2.333–334; *History* 2.503–504.

<sup>91</sup> K. B. PATHAK: *Mallishena-Mahapurana*, IA 40, 1911, 46–49.

<sup>92</sup> WINTERNITZ: *Geschichte* 2.333 n. 2; *History* 2.497 n. 5.

<sup>1</sup> [To the Editor,] *Asiatic Journal* n.s. 22, 1837, 240–246 at 246.

<sup>2</sup> See, e. g., J. J. MEYER’s (*Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa*, 1929, p. VI) graphic description – to be judged in the context of his objections to Losch, see 2.1.5 –: “Vom Einzelverfasser eines Purāṇa zu reden, schiene ein toller Einfall – wir erblicken ein Flickengewand mit einem Fetzen von da, einem Fetzen von dort, dabei meist arg schlecht zusammengeschnitten.”

<sup>3</sup> V. VENKATACHALLA IYER: *The Puranas*, QJMS 13, 1922–23, 702–713 at 702.

<sup>4</sup> KIRFEL 1959: XI. Cf. also KIRFEL: *Indische Parallelen zum Alten Testament*, *Saeculum* 7, 1956, 369–384 at 371.

ma edition of the Vāyu°. <sup>5</sup> Even when Naunidhirāma sets out to “summarize” the Pretakalpa of the Garuḍa°, he explicitly incorporates into his text data which do not belong to the purāṇa he claims to summarize: he refers to an earlier summary of the Garuḍa°, as well as to “other texts,” by which he probably means other purāṇas dealing with the same subject. <sup>6</sup>

There is also general agreement that these pieces as such ought to be studied comparatively, rather than as integral chapters of the individual purāṇas in which they appear. <sup>7</sup> Kirfel stated categorically that the purāṇas “sind ... NIE als Ganzes, sondern stets nach den in ihnen vereinigten Einzeltexten zu werten.” <sup>8</sup> Not only should the corresponding sections be studied throughout the purāṇas; wherever possible they should also be compared with corresponding materials in non-puranic literature. <sup>9</sup>

Yet, the general idea is that not everything in the purāṇas constituted originally independent pieces. We are constantly told that the “pieces” have been added, at different times in history, to an original puranic “kernel,” <sup>10</sup> which became, to a larger or lesser extent, “zur Unkenntlichkeit überwuchert” – the recurring idea of gradual deterioration (see 1.3.6) – by “Textstücke des heterogensten Inhalts.” The kernel, of course, explicitly or implicitly, is the *pañcalakṣaṇa*. I would like to submit that, rather than being a kernel, the *pañcalakṣaṇa*, like most other parts of the purāṇas – as we understand them today – was a purāṇa in its own right. In other words, I believe that the term *purāṇa* originally applied, not to groups of stories, legends, etc., but to each story, legend, etc., separately. <sup>11</sup> It is possible

<sup>5</sup> PARGITER 1913: xxxi. Similarly, STIETENCRON (Sāmba° 1966: 16) noticed that, wherever the India Office ms. of the Sāmba° deviates from the printed Sāmba°, it corresponds to the printed Bhaviṣya° or, at least, is closer to it than to the former.

<sup>6</sup> ABEGG Garuḍa° Pretakalpa: 29–30.

<sup>7</sup> Although, according to Kees BOLLE (Reflections on a Puranic Passage, Journal of Religion 2, 1962–63, 286–291 at 286), “there is no doubt ... that for some time to come the central problem will be the understanding of the ‘spirit’ which made the creation of these vast, often encyclopedic, works possible.” HACKER (1959: 12) is also conscious of the fact that studying puranic sections in isolation may lead to overlooking and missing important links. On the other hand, W. RUBEN’s review (ZDMG 113, 1963, 395–399) of HACKER 1959 calls for studies of several similar characters; only then will we be able “Prahāda in größerem, möglichst in alseitigem Zusammenhang [zu] sehen.”

<sup>8</sup> Kṛṣṇa’s Jugendgeschichte in den Purāṇa, Jacobi vol. (1926), 298–316 at 299. Cf. also his Ein medizinisches Kapitel des Garuḍa-purāṇas, Weller vol. (1954), 333–356 at 333, and his review of Pur 1, ZDMG 113, 1963, 388–390 at 388.

<sup>9</sup> GAIL (1969: 917) posits these two approaches as the primary goals of purāṇa research. A model for the first is Hacker’s Prahāda, for the second S. Dasgupta’s (The Philosophy of the Bhāgavata°) comparison of the *sāṃkhya* sections of the Bhāgavata° with classical *sāṃkhya*.

<sup>10</sup> KIRFEL (Kṛṣṇa’s Jugendgeschichte, 299): “Allgemein gesprochen gehen die Purāṇa zum großen Teil auf einen noch nachweisbaren Grundkern zurück.”

<sup>11</sup> Cf. WINDISCH 1917–20: 45, who points to a similar development for the term *brāhmaṇa*.

that there was, at one time, a clear distinction between *purāṇa* on the one hand, and *ākhyāna*, *upākhyānā*, *gāthā*, *kalpajokti* – even *itihāsa* –, etc., on the other;<sup>12</sup> but, if so, the distinction soon got blurred, and even those closely connected with these productions failed to preserve it.<sup>13</sup>

These short *purāṇas* – “mini-purāṇas,” as I would like to call them – are referred to in the literature. For instance, in the *Mahābhārata*, when Mārkaṇḍeya is requested to tell the story of Manu Vaivasvata (3.185.1), he concludes, fifty-two *ślokas* later (3.185.53): *ity etan mātṣyakaṃ nāma purāṇaṃ parikīrtitam*.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, the expression *vāyuproktam anusmṛtya purāṇam* (3.189.14) concludes a passage on the *yugas* which started at 3.186.

The *Matsya*° calls the story of the origin of the world from a lotus (*pauṣkara-prādurbhava*, chapters 164–171) an *agryaṃ purāṇam* (171.66a), Also the two chapters (247–248) on Viṣṇu’s incarnation as Varāha are introduced as *purāṇaṃ brahmasaṃmitam* (247.5b) and as *purāṇaṃ paramaṃ puṇyaṃ vedaiś ca saṃmitam* (247.8ab).

A Jaina poem in five *svargas* (*sic*) and with a total of 294 verses, composed by Siddhasūri and inscribed on a rock some fifty miles N. E. of Chitorgarh in *vikrama* year 1232 (A. D. 1176), bears the title *Uttamaśikhara*°.<sup>15</sup>

I have discussed elsewhere in this volume some of the work that has been done, comparing corresponding sections, either in different *purāṇas*, or in puranic and non-puranic sources. Such work is valuable, and ought to be encouraged. Comparing several versions of the mini-purāṇas will allow us to improve and correct many details which have been poorly transmitted in the written sources of any one particular text.<sup>16</sup>

Yet, one should also be aware of the limitations of these comparisons and, above all, clearly circumscribe the goals for which they are undertaken. In connection with the work of Kirfel and those who followed his example – and often went farther than Kirfel himself – I have raised objections to the intent, by means of comparisons of different versions, to reconstruct an ideal Ur-text of any puranic passage. I also have serious doubts about the expectation that comparison will, ultimately, allow us “to arrange all versions in a definitive chronological

<sup>12</sup> For all these terms, see HORSCH 1966: 9–42. Also V. S. PATHAK: *Ancient Historians of India. A Study in Historical Biographies*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1966, ch. I.

<sup>13</sup> A. P. KARMARKAR (*The Earliest Extant Purāṇa in Indian Literature*, Prin. Karmarkar vol., 1948, 77–81) speculated that the legend of Manu and the Flood was the earliest *purāṇa*.

<sup>14</sup> The variant reading *purāṇe* was obviously introduced to give the term its conventional meaning.

<sup>15</sup> A. B. KEITH: *Bijoli Rock Inscription: The Uttama-śikhara-purāṇa*, *JRAS* 1906, 700–701. The NCC lists no mss. of it.

<sup>16</sup> August BLAU: *Puranische Streifen. I. Der Itihāsa von Saraṇyū in seiner Fortbildung durch die Purāṇa*, *ZDMG* 62, 1908, 337–357 at 337–338.

order,"<sup>17</sup> "to contribute to a better understanding of the historical relations between various texts,"<sup>18</sup> or "to establish mythological developments and literary influences, and to solve problems of dates."<sup>19</sup>

The point is that a particular written version of a mini-purāṇa is not necessarily based on any other written version. Even as Jacobi<sup>20</sup> pointed out that the Rāmopākhyāna in the Mahābhārata (3. ch. 261–275) is not necessarily based on any manuscript of the Rāmāyaṇa but can very well be derived from an oral version, in the same way the written versions of puranic stories represent only an infinitesimal part of the versions that have existed over the centuries, in different parts of India.<sup>21</sup> Comparing puranic stories is useful because it gives us at least some idea of the vast richness with which certain themes have been treated;<sup>22</sup> drawing other, unwarranted conclusions may be hazardous and misleading.

As indicated earlier the poor condition of most purāṇa editions on the one hand, and the examples set for the Mahābhārata in Pune and the Rāmāyaṇa in Baroda on the other, made scholars feel the need for critical editions of the purāṇas, an enterprise which was started and still continues at the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust, in Varanasi. If we are correct, however, in assuming that the mini-purāṇas are more basic than their conglomerations into large purāṇas in the traditional sense, one has to agree with V. Raghavan that "so far as the Purāṇas are concerned a new method of editing them has to be adopted." More specifically, "the edition of these above-mentioned common portions cannot be based only on the mss. collation of one Purāṇa but has to be guided by the identical material in all the Purāṇas and it comes to this that the edition of one Purāṇa means virtually the edition of all of them."<sup>23</sup>

The problem manifests itself most clearly in the technical sections mainly of the encyclopedic purāṇas, but also of other purāṇas. Many chapters of the printed Agni° remain understandable without the help of puranic but also non-puranic sources.<sup>24</sup> For obvious reasons, what is true for the Agni° also holds for the Garuḍa°. For instance, "while bringing out a critical edition of the [Garuḍa°], one should bear in mind the importance of the AH [Aṣṭāṅghṛdaya], the composition

<sup>17</sup> JAHN Skanda° Revākhaṇḍa 1916: 316.

<sup>18</sup> HACKER 1959: 12. Also HACKER 1960: 343–344.

<sup>19</sup> GAIL 1969: 917.

<sup>20</sup> Das Rāmāyaṇa, Bonn: Cohen, 1893, p. 72. Approved by V. S. SUKTHANKAR: Epic Studies. VIII The Rāma Episode (Rāmopākhyāna) and the Rāmāyaṇa, Kane vol. (1941), 472–487 at 487.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. J. F. STAAL's review of Hacker's Prahlāda, JAOS 84, 1964, 466.

<sup>22</sup> N. B. UṬGIKAR (The Story of Rṣi Anī-māṇḍavya in its Sanskrit and Buddhist Sources, AIOC 2, 1922, 221–238 at 235) draws attention to an important element: the use of key-words and catch phrases around which the several versions develop.

<sup>23</sup> General President's Address, AIOC 21, 1964, 1.1–57 at 18.

<sup>24</sup> MEYER 1929: X. Cf. R. G. F. MÜLLER: Ärztliche Lehren im Agnipurāṇa 180, RO 28.1, 1964, 131.

of which will throw fresh light in determining the exact reading.”<sup>25</sup> In fact, in some cases the situation is so bad that even after comparison of puranic sections with the corresponding passages in the technical literature – comparisons made by experts in the field! –, “certains *śloka* ont dû, et doivent encore, rester inexpliqués.”<sup>26</sup>

At a certain moment emotions ran high on the value and even suitability of critical editions of the purāṇas. It goes without saying that, once one looks at purāṇas as a purely oral tradition, as a tradition that is solely carried forward by individual story-tellers, and which is, therefore, authorless and anonymous, as a tradition only parts of which have accidentally been committed to writing, – it goes without saying that in that case critical editions based on the standard rules of textual criticism make little sense. The discussion bears not only on the purāṇas; in fact, the discussion as far as the purāṇas are concerned is an offshoot of similar differences of opinion expressed in connection with Sukthankar’s edition of the Mahābhārata.<sup>27</sup> Madeleine Biardeau’s disappointment after a visit to the Purāṇa Department in Varanasi, in December 1967,<sup>28</sup> led to a passionate debate with participants in the ongoing critical editions who defended the position that “the science of textual criticism” is universally applicable, including the epics and the purāṇas.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Surabhi TRIVEDI: Garuḍa-Purāṇa and Aṣṭāṅghṛdaya, JOIB 15, 1965–66, 488.

<sup>26</sup> M.-Th. DE MALLMANN: Enseignements iconographiques de l’Agni°, 1975, p. xi. Cf. PINGREE (Viṣṇudharmottara° ed. 1967–68: 472–473), who remarks on his inability to provide a critical text for Viṣṇudharmottara° 2.166–174 generally and 2.166–167 in particular, a puranic version of the Paitāmahasiddhānta.

<sup>27</sup> This discussion is beyond the scope of the present volume. Authorities quoted in the purāṇa controversy include Sylvain LEVI’s review of the Ādiparvan, JA 225.2, 1934, 281–283, and Georges DUMEZIL’s Mythe et épopée I, Paris: Gallimard, 1968, p. 34.

<sup>28</sup> Some More Considerations about Textual Criticism, Pur 10, 1968, 115–123.

<sup>29</sup> V. M. BEDEKAR: Principles of Mahābhārata Textual Criticism. The Need for Restatement, Pur 11, 1969, 210–228. This was followed by BIARDEAU’s Letter to the Editor, Pur 12, 1970, 180–181, and a specimen – from the Mahābhārata – of her approach of parallel publication of different versions: The Story of Arjuna Kārtavīrya Without Reconstruction, Pur 12, 1970, 286–303. Finally, A. S. GUPTA provided a dignified defense of purāṇa critical editions: A Problem of Purāṇic Reconstruction, Pur 12, 1970, 304–321. It should be noted that objections to mixing various versions together into a single reconstituted text, in connection with the Vāmana°, were raised earlier by Viśvanāthaśāstrī DĀTARA: Purāṇapāthanirḍhārāritiṣayako vimarśaḥ [Consideration on the Settlement of Purāṇa Text], Pur 10, 1968, 6–16. A later article (G. C. TRIPATHI: The Significance of Contents-Analysis for Reconstruction of a Purāṇic Text, Shown by means of the Contents of Analysis of the Dwarf-Legend of the Padma-purāṇa, Pur 17, 1975, 38–51 at 39), without alluding to the Biardeau episode, proposed “to analyse a particular text or legend as regard its contents, set it against the similar passages in other Purāṇas and try to get a logical sequence of the development of the given text mainly on the basis of the different motifs used in the legend.” For a survey and critique of the controversy, see Thomas B. COBURN: The Study of the Purāṇas and the Study of Religion, Rel.Stud. 16, 1980, 341–352.

### 2.2.2 Dating the Purāṇas

It should come as no surprise that, as soon as Westerners came in contact with the purāṇas, they raised the question of the dates of these texts. The initial reaction was to assign late dates to the purāṇas generally. Bentley, for example, held that “many of the Purans” are more recent than Varāhamihira,<sup>1</sup> and, more specifically, that the Viṣṇudharmottara° borrowed from Brahmagupta.<sup>2</sup> Far more influential, of course, was Wilson’s opinion. I have already referred to the place which he assigns the purāṇas in the general development of the Hindu religion (see *I.3.I*). He felt that none of the present manifestations of popular Hinduism can be older than Śaṅkara, “the great Śaiva reformer,” and, on the Vaiṣṇava side, than Rāmānuja, Madhva, and Vallabha.

“The Purāṇas seem to have accompanied or followed their innovations, being obviously intended to advocate the doctrines they taught. This is to assign to some of them a very modern date, it is true; but I cannot think that a higher can with justice be ascribed to them.”<sup>3</sup>

Notwithstanding Kennedy’s claim that “the eighteen Purans must have been committed to writing in times considerably remoter than the era of Vicramaditya, or 56 A.C.,”<sup>4</sup> Wilson’s late dating was followed by Burnouf,<sup>5</sup> Lassen,<sup>6</sup> Macdonell,<sup>7</sup> etc.

Bentley was aware though, in 1799, that his late dating contradicted the traditional belief about purāṇas, “which through the artifices of the Brahminical tribe, have been hitherto deemed the most ancient [books] in existence.”<sup>8</sup> Leaving aside isolated voices claiming that the purāṇas were in existence in the pre-historic period,<sup>9</sup> or that they came into existence more than five thousand years ago,<sup>10</sup> there are indeed those who believe that the purāṇas go back as far as the Vedic period. The concept of a Purāṇaveda, and arguments in favor of the existence of purāṇas as a literary genre, from the time of the Atharvaveda on-

<sup>1</sup> JOHN BENTLEY: On the Antiquity of the Śūrya Siddhānta, and the Formation of the Astronomical Cycles therein Contained, As. Res. 7, 1799, 537–588 at 574.

<sup>2</sup> A Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy, from the Earliest Dawn of the Science in India, down to the Present Time, Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1823, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: ix–x.

<sup>4</sup> Asiatic Journal 1837, 246. Yet, since India has no real historiography, “it must be obvious that there are no means available, by which the date or probable period when each of the Purans was composed can be determined” (ibid., p. 243).

<sup>5</sup> Bhāgavata° 1, p. CI, especially the Bhāgavata°, on account of Vopadeva’s authorship.

<sup>6</sup> LASSEN (1861: 599): between the middle of the 8th cent. (Mārkaṇḍeya°) and the 13th cent. (Bhāgavata°).

<sup>7</sup> India’s Past, 1927, p. 90: “Deriving their subject matter from the epics, the earliest of them cannot be older than the sixth century A.D.”

<sup>8</sup> As. Res. 7, 1799, 574.

<sup>9</sup> B. N. REU: Hindu Purāṇas, their age and value, NIA 2, 1939–40, 302–306 at 303.

<sup>10</sup> NARAYANASWAMI AIYAR 1914: 22.

ward, have been discussed earlier in this volume (see *I.2.I*). There seems to be a widespread agreement that the original purāṇas existed “long before the beginning of the Christian era.”<sup>11</sup>

To be sure, nearly everyone agrees that the composite nature of the purāṇas implies that “there is a good deal in the purāṇas that . . . must be admitted to be very ancient; while undoubtedly also there is a great deal in them that is very modern.”<sup>12</sup> Most of the secondary literature starts from the idea that there was first “the old purāṇa” (see *I.3*) which, from a certain time in history onward, began to be re-modeled.<sup>13</sup> On the time when the re-modeling began, and on the question whether the re-modeling went on indefinitely or came to an end at a certain moment, opinions vary. For instance, the transition from the purāṇas as pure chronicles to the purāṇas as veritable encyclopedias began about 500 B. C., for Āpastamba could quote them as sources for *ācāra*.<sup>14</sup> Or, the re-modeled purāṇas are described as “part of the machinery devised by orthodox Brahminism in [its] onslaught against Buddhism,”<sup>15</sup> or, more broadly, as a reaction against both religious – Buddhism, Jainism, etc. – and political – the invasions of the Śakas, Hūṇas, etc. – dangers, implying thereby that some of the extant purāṇas were composed in the first centuries A. D.<sup>16</sup> According to others, for some of the purāṇas at least, the recasting period came to a close – they “received their final form” as part of the textbooks of Smārta Hinduism – during the Gupta period.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, even though Bhandarkar assigns a specific terminus a quo – the time of Wema Kadphises, ca. A. D. 250 – to the recasting process, he adds that the process went on uninterruptedly ever since.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>11</sup> HAZRA 1962: 240; MEHENDALE 1970: 297.

<sup>12</sup> K. T. TELANG: *Bhagavadgītā*, 1875, p. 14. Cf. HAMILTON and LANGLEÈS' (*Catalogue des manuscrits samskrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale*, Paris: Imprimerie bibliographique, 1807, p. 6) objections to Bentley's theory that the purāṇas cannot be older than the Muslim period, since they include the names of Muslim princes.

<sup>13</sup> For more complex developments, in four stages, see Sita Nath PRADHAN: *Chronology of Ancient India. From the Times of the Rigvedic King Divodāsa to Chandragupta Maurya, With Glimpses into the Political History of the Period*, Calcutta University, 1927, pp. xii–xiii. Also S. D. GYANI: *Date of the Purāṇas*, NIA 5, 1942–43, 131–135, and *The Date of the Purāṇas*, Pur 1, 1959–60, 213–219; 2, 1960, 68–75.

<sup>14</sup> B. K. GHOSH: *Review of Meyer's Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa*, IHQ 5, 1929, 367–375 at 368–369.

<sup>15</sup> V. VENKATACHALLA IYER: *The Puranas*, QJMS 13, 1922–23, 702–713 at 703.

<sup>16</sup> KANE 1968: 411; also *Paurāṇa-dharma*, Gode vol. (1960), 3.70–82 at 71.

<sup>17</sup> ELIOT (1921: 1.xxxviii; 2.187) mentions explicitly the Matsya°, Mārkaṇḍeya°, and Viṣṇu°. KANE (*The Tantravārtika and the Dharmasāstra Literature*, JBBRAS n. s. 1, 1925, 95–102 at 102) concludes that some of the extant purāṇas were composed several centuries before Kumārila. Cf. also W. CROOKE: *Hinduism*, ERE 6, 1914, 695.

<sup>18</sup> R. G. BHANDARKAR: *A Peep into the Early History of India from the Foundation of the Maurya Dynasty to the Fall of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty* (B. C. 322 – circa 500 A. D.), JBBRAS 20, 1900, 356–408 at 404.

The idea of recasting, which in the minds of most means gradual deterioration (see 1.3.6), often goes hand in hand with the assumption that the texts were subject to continuous inflation and that they became more and more unwieldy in the course of the centuries. This assumption, in turn, has been used as a criterion to establish at least a relative chronology for the purāṇas. The principle is this: “The more boundless the exaggeration is, the more modern the Purana is; this can be taken as a general rule.”<sup>19</sup> The author who made this statement applied it to the Agni°: the Agni° “boundlessly exaggerates the description of Heaven and Hell;” hence “there can be no doubt that the Purana is modern, absolutely modern.”<sup>20</sup> As an extreme application of this expansion hypothesis I may refer to the decision that the Vāmana° is more recent than the Matsya°, based on the fact that the period during which Aditi practised asceticism is a thousand years in the latter, whereas the former “expands” this period to a myriad of years.<sup>21</sup>

Even though the expansion hypothesis appears quite often in purāṇa studies, it has occasionally also been reversed, and replaced by the belief that the opposite is rather true. Not only is Agni° 236.24–66 – on warfare – a later, abbreviated version of Viṣṇudharmottara° 2. ch.177 (quoted in Hemādri’s Caturvargacintāmaṇi), but, more generally, “purāṇas at the time of Hemādri and earlier, rather than being shorter than today, were in most cases longer.”<sup>22</sup>

Rather than proclaiming expansion or retraction of the purāṇas the sole possibility to the exclusion of the other, I agree with the more cautious and open-minded approach, that “when a series from simple to complex is considered providing the chronological framework, a counter argument that with the passage of time, the same complex situation would get simplified also requires to be carefully considered.”<sup>23</sup>

Faced with the endless speculations on the dates of individual purāṇas a number of scholars realized that there are serious limitations to our ability to date purāṇas in their entirety; S. G. Kantawala went as far as to say that “one will have to assign separate dates to sections, chapters or even stanzas of the Purāṇas.”<sup>24</sup> Yet, as I said at the beginning of this section, nothing was more natural than that Western scholars wanted to give the purāṇas generally and each purāṇa in particular a definite place in history; it was equally natural that, once the process had

<sup>19</sup> CHAUDHURI Agni° 1928–29: 133 n. 9. The quotation is nearly identical with WINTERNITZ 1963: 465.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 133.

<sup>21</sup> HOHENBERGER Vāmana° 1963: 6.

<sup>22</sup> J. J. MEYER: Textchronologie aus Schreibfehlern in Indien, ZII 10, 1935–36, 257–276 at 273.

<sup>23</sup> R. N. MEHTA: Purāṇic Archaeology, JUBar 20–21, 1971–72, 5–15 at 6.

<sup>24</sup> The Purāṇas and Epics as Sources of Religious, Social and Cultural History of India, JUBar 19, 1970, 46–58 at 50, quoting more or less literally WINTERNITZ 1963: 469, on the Mahābhārata. Cf. DIMMITT and VAN BUITENEN 1978: 5; BIRWÉ: JAOS 96, 1976, 396; R. C. MAJUMDAR, in a postscript to MEHENDALE 1970: 298.

started, Indian scholars joined in. The result is that even those who do realize that dating a particular purāṇa is highly speculative if not impossible, nevertheless propose more or less specific dates, as the following few examples will illustrate.

Hazra studies the smṛti chapters in the purāṇas and assigns dates to them, but from these dates more often than not he also derives dates for individual purāṇas as a whole.<sup>25</sup> Kane not only quotes approvingly a statement on the Mahābhārata by Winternitz – comparable to Kantawala’s above –; he also adds that it “applies with equal (or perhaps greater) force to the Purāṇas.”<sup>26</sup> Yet, in the same chapter he assigns dates to most individual purāṇas. According to Wendy O’Flaherty,<sup>27</sup> “the dating of the Purāṇas is . . . an art – it can hardly be called a science – unto itself;” nevertheless broad dates such as “Bhaviṣya: 500–1200” or “Brahmavaivarta: 750–1550”, alternate with very precise ones: “Agni: 850”, “Bhāgavata: 950”, “Bṛhadharma: 1250”, etc. More specifically, the Viṣṇudharmottara° enumerates nine *rasas*, and is therefore dependent on the *sānti* section of the Nāṭyaśāstra “not before Ānandavardhana;” since the third book of the Viṣṇudharmottara° is not older than Ānandavardhana, the Viṣṇudharmottara° belongs to the tenth of the first half of the eleventh century.<sup>28</sup> The Agni° is difficult to date for “no particular and pointed date can be applied;” its *alamkāra* section seems to belong to the period between A. D. 750 and 850: “this may be regarded as an approximate date of the Purana.”<sup>29</sup> The Devīmāhātmya is earlier than the seventh century. It must have been inserted in the Mārkaṇḍeya° before that time. Hence the Mārkaṇḍeya° is even older than that.<sup>30</sup> The dynastic lists of the Vāyu° date from the first half of the fourth century; therefore the Vāyu° in its present form came into being in the first half of the fourth century.<sup>31</sup> On the basis of seven – rather six – verses on landgrants which appear in the Padma°, Brahma°, and Bhaviṣya°, Pargiter decided that these three purāṇas existed long before A. D. 500; and, since they are not early purāṇas, he concluded that “the Purāṇas cannot be later than the earliest centuries of the Christian era.”<sup>32</sup>

In view of what has been said earlier in this volume, both on the transmission of puranic materials and on the role of the “mini-purāṇas,” I submit that it is not possible to set a specific date for any purāṇa as a whole. Dates proposed by others will be reported in Part Two. It will become clear, at that point, that even for the better established and more coherent purāṇas – Bhāgavata°, Viṣṇu°, etc. – opinions, inevitably, continue to vary widely and endlessly.

<sup>25</sup> Dates proposed by Hazra for individual purāṇas will be mentioned at the appropriate places in Part II.

<sup>26</sup> KANE 1962: 838.

<sup>27</sup> O’FLAHERTY 1975: 17–18.

<sup>28</sup> SHIMIZU Viṣṇudharmottara° 1969.

<sup>29</sup> CHAUDHURI Agni° 1928–29.

<sup>30</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 472 n. 3.

<sup>31</sup> V. A. SMITH: The Early History of India, <sup>4</sup>1924, p. 32 n. 1.

<sup>32</sup> Note on the Age of the Puranas, JRAS 1912, 254–255. Against Pargiter, on the basis of astronomical passages which cannot be earlier than A. D. 600, J. F. FLEET (A Note on the Puranas, JRAS 1912, 1046–1053), with an emendation for the Padma° (The Puranic Order of Planets, JRAS 1913, 384–385), and one for the Viṣṇu° (The Vishnu-purana and the Planets, JRAS 1913, 1066).

### 2.2.3 The Purāṇas as Religious Documents

It is no exaggeration to say that the purāṇas have been looked upon primarily as religious documents. Vans Kennedy believed that they “were only intended to convey religious instruction, and those who tried to use them for any other kind of information inevitably had to come away disappointed.”<sup>1</sup> Even though such a point of view is at least one-sided, it is as religious documents that the purāṇas have been studied most often.

I have dealt earlier (see *I.3.1*) with the problem of sectarianism in the purāṇas, not only to cast doubt on the widespread belief in “earlier” non-sectarian precursors of the “extant” sectarian purāṇas, but also to show that sectarianism in these texts is far less clear-cut and much more complex than most modern scholars have made it appear. Complexity and variety are indeed the hallmark of puranic religion.<sup>2</sup> Even as Hacker<sup>3</sup> warned that it is no longer justifiable to speak of “*die Dharmlehre der Manusmṛti*,” “*das epische Sāṅkhya*,” or “*das purāṇische Sāṅkhya*,” I want to stress the fact that it would be irresponsible and highly misleading to speak of or pretend to describe *the* religion of the purāṇas. In the case of Indra, for instance, Gonda<sup>4</sup> has clearly shown, first, that the purāṇas do not have a distinct religion of their own and that one should not therefore expect to find a sharply defined distinction between the mighty Vedic Indra and his insignificant puranic counterpart,<sup>5</sup> and, second, that one should also not expect to find “that there is one single Purāṇic Indra.”<sup>6</sup> The infinite variety of religious trends and combinations of trends of each purāṇa, or even of individual sections of a purāṇa, will be indicated in Part Two. In this section I will restrict myself to a few general observations and point out some of the major secondary sources.

As far as Brahmā<sup>7</sup> is concerned, it is clear that his worship had not died out and that a number of puranic passages indeed uphold his glory as the supreme god-

<sup>1</sup> Vans KENNEDY in *Asiatic Journal* n.s. 22, 1837, 240–246 at 241, on Wilson’s analysis of the Brahma° *ibid.* n.s. 20, 1936, 73–74. Cf. V.S. AGRAWALA: *The Purāṇas and the Hindu Religion*, Pur 6, 1964, 333–346.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. SINHA 1956: 125–126.

<sup>3</sup> HACKER 1961: 486.

<sup>4</sup> J. GONDA: *A Note on Indra in Purāṇic Literature*, Pur 9, 1967, 222–261 (also in *Selected Studies*, Leiden 1975, 4, 51–90).

<sup>5</sup> This notwithstanding Jwala Prasad SINGHAL’s thesis (*Ṛgvedīya aura paurāṇika devatāoṃ kā antara*, VIJ 1, 1963, 57–62): *Ṛgvedīya aura paurāṇika devatāoṃ ākāṣa pātāla kā antara hai*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Ranjit Singh SATYASRAY (*Āṅgiras*, JBORS 26, 1940, 125–156 at 153): “The authors of the Purāṇas have been in great confusion about the names of the wives and children of Āṅgiras.”

<sup>7</sup> S.K. DAVE: *The Cult of Brahmā. A Brief Review*, Pur 19, 1977, 342–346. Cf. also Madhusūdana OJHĀ: *Padmayoniḥ Brahmā*, Pur 2, 1960, 282–284; V.S. AGRAWALA: *Hiraṇyagarbha*, Pur 2, 1960, 285–306; Shankar Singh JHALA: *Purāṇoṃ meṃ Brahmā*, *Sodha Patrika* (Udaipur) 20.2, 1969, 37–45.

head. The Puṣkarakhaṇḍa of the Padma°, for instance, is primarily devoted to Brahmā; elsewhere too, one finds passages such as this: "... adoration to the Forefather Brahmā, the lord of the universe, the origin of the universe, who presided over creation, who in the form of Viṣṇu presides over its maintenance, and who in the form of the terrible Śiva destroys it at its dissolution."<sup>8</sup> There is no doubt, though, that, in the purāṇas Brahmā suffered much from the rivalry of Viṣṇu and Śiva.<sup>9</sup> There seems to be general agreement among scholars that Brahmā's decline in favor of the other two gods was a gradual one. Hacker,<sup>10</sup> for example, suggests that there existed, in the last centuries B.C. and the first centuries A.D., "an influential Hindu sect that adored Brahmā as the highest deity;" according to him, "the glory of Brahmā faded away and Viṣṇu and Śiva took his place," somewhere in the fourth or fifth century A.D.

Sarasvatī's transformation from a sacred river in earlier literature to Brahmā's wife in the purāṇas has been a favorite topic for study in recent scholarly literature.<sup>11</sup>

The two deities that dominate puranic literature are, without doubt, Viṣṇu and Śiva. Although "the development of the relations between the two main currents of religious thought and belief as well as those between these and the other denominations cannot yet be described,"<sup>12</sup> everything in the purāṇas points to the fact that "it is Viṣṇu who as a rule occupies a position of pre-eminence in the earlier texts."<sup>13</sup> Or, to avoid the – ever questionable – term "earlier," it is Viṣṇu who is the dominant figure in those purāṇas which have been recognized as mahāpurāṇas.

<sup>8</sup> Mārkaṇḍeya° 45.19 (tr. PARGITER).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. BHATTACHARJI (1970: 15): "In the Purāṇic Age he was unceremoniously abandoned, or if not exactly abandoned he was retained only as the least effective and potent member of the triad."

<sup>10</sup> The Sāṅkhyization of the Emanation Doctrine Shown in a Critical Analysis of Texts, WZKSOA 5, 1961, 75–112 (reprinted Pur 4, 1962, 298–338) at 112. According to Tarapada BHATTACHARYA (The Cult of Brahmā, [ChSSt 70,] Varanasi: ChSSOff, <sup>2</sup>1969) "originally the Purāṇas were texts of the Brahmā cult."

<sup>11</sup> M. P. L. SASTRY: The Word "Sarasvatī" in Sanskrit Literature, PO 6, 1941–42, 190–194; V. V. DIXIT: Brahman and Sarasvatī, PO 8, 1943–44, 66–67; GONDA 1960: 96; A. S. GUPTA: Conceptions of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas, Pur 4, 1962, 55–95; id.: Sarasvatī-stotra, Pur 6, 1964, 1–6; id.: Sarasvatī as the River-Goddess in the Purāṇas, AIOC 22 (1965) 1966, 2.68–80; Mohd. Israil KHAN: The Pauranic Accounts for the Origin of Sarasvatī, MR 124–125, 1969, 703–704; id.: A Paurāṇic Iconographical Account of the Image of Sarasvatī, Pur 11, 1969, 285–296.

<sup>12</sup> J. GONDA: Viṣṇuism and Śivaism. A Comparison, University of London: The Athlone Press, 1970, p. 194. See there, pp. 87–109: The Mutual Relations of the Two Religions.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 195. Hemchandra RAYCHAUDHURI (Materials for the Study of the Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect, <sup>2</sup>Univ. of Calcutta, 1936, p. 178) rejects the purāṇas as sources, for "it is not safe to depend on them in writing the history of ancient Vaiṣṇavism."

An important element in puranic Vaiṣṇavism is *bhakti*. This is especially true for the Bhāgavata°, “denn seiner Bhakti-Lehre verdankt dieses Werk seine Größe.”<sup>14</sup> The only thing that counts in a person’s life, and the sole possible way to salvation, is total, sincere, and emotional devotion to Viṣṇu. Birth, wealth, and all other activities are irrelevant; in fact, being born in a lower caste, being poor, and abstaining from such things as performing austerities or even reciting the Veda, facilitate rather than obstruct the road toward true devotion. Quite naturally one has thought of possible influence of the Tamil Āḷvārs on this type of *bhakti*.<sup>15</sup>

Differently from Śiva’s spouse, to whom I will return later, Lakṣmī or Śrī has hardly any independent role or identity in the purāṇas; she is solely recognized as Viṣṇu’s wife.<sup>16</sup>

Even as Śiva possesses a representation in stone in the form of the *liṅga*, Viṣṇu is occasionally represented in stone in the form of the *śālagrāma*. According to the Varāha°<sup>17</sup> Viṣṇu granted goddess Gaṇḍakī — a village by the name of Śālagrāma is situated on the banks of the river Gandak — a boon as a reward for her protracted ascetic practices: he would forever be her son in the shape of a *śālagrāma*. Various puranic texts deal with different specimens of *śālagrāmas*, depending on their curls, holes, color, and shape, and connect them with as many different forms of Viṣṇu.<sup>18</sup>

As important as — if not more important than — Viṣṇu himself in the purāṇas are his several *avatāras*.<sup>19</sup> Even though the purāṇas also know manifestations of Śiva, they largely reflect the fact that “to an average Hindu, an *avatāra* is necessarily that of Viṣṇu, to the extent that the belief in an *avatāra* of Śiva, Kālī, etc., appears false and novel to him.”<sup>20</sup> The detailed history of Viṣṇu’s *avatāras* still remains to be written. Hacker suggests that the use of the term *avatāra* “in the

<sup>14</sup> GONDA 1963: 151.

<sup>15</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 232–233.

<sup>16</sup> Narendranātha Śarmā CHAUDHURĪ: Goddess Lakṣmī in the Purāṇa and Tantra [in Sanskrit], PO 12.1–2, 1948, 1–6; id.: Bhagavatī Lakṣmī, Pur 4, 1962, 103–111.

<sup>17</sup> CE line 102 after 144.17.

<sup>18</sup> The relevant passages from the Garuḍa°, Padma°, and Agni° have been collated and compared by KIRFEL: Vom Steinkult in Indien, Kahle vol. (1935), 163–172. The texts also contain an interesting description of twenty-four forms of Viṣṇu, resulting from different combinations of his four attributes (*śaṅkha*, *cakra*, *gadā*, *padma*). Cf. also GUSTAV OPPERT: The Original Inhabitants of Bharatavarsa or India, Westminster: Constable, 1893, pp. 337–359: On the Salagrama-Stone, including many puranic references.

<sup>19</sup> S. L. KATRE: Avatāras of God, Allahabad Univ. Studies 10, 1934, 37–130; Sushil Kumar DE: The Doctrine of Avatāra (Incarnation) in Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, Kuppaswami Sastri vol. (1935), 25–37; Kamala RAY: The Ten Incarnations of Viṣṇu in Bengal, IHQ 17, 1941, 370–385; Paul HACKER: Zur Entwicklung der Avatāra-Lehre, WZKSOA 4, 1960, 47–70; Ronald M. HUNTINGTON: Avatāras and Yugas. An Essay in Purāṇic Cosmology, Pur 6, 1964, 7–39.

<sup>20</sup> S. L. KATRE: op. cit., p. 39.

specific Vaiṣṇava sense,” i.e. restricted to the manifestations of Viṣṇu to the exclusion of other gods on the one hand, and encompassing all Viṣṇu’s manifestations on the other, cannot be earlier than the sixth century A. D.<sup>21</sup> In any case, it was in the purāṇas that the concept of *avatāras* “received its greatest development and virtually all the essential facets of its present meaning.”<sup>22</sup>

The lists of Viṣṇu’s *avatāras* in the purāṇas are numerous and extremely varied.<sup>23</sup> There are short lists and there are long lists; in fact, the emphasis often seems to be on the notion that Viṣṇu’s *avatāras* are innumerable. “Even as a perennial lake has canals by the thousands, even so there are innumerable *avatāras* of Hari, the receptacle of goodness.”<sup>24</sup> Gradually, however, the “principal” *avatāras* of Viṣṇu seem to have been set at ten. No purāṇa can help us to attach a date to this development. We only know that the list of ten appears in an inscription at Mahabalipuram of the latter half of the seventh century:

matsyaḥ kūrmo varāhaś ca nārasimho 'tha vāmanaḥ /  
rāmo rāmaś ca rāmaś ca buddhaḥ kalkī ca te daśa //<sup>25</sup>

All these *avatāras* have one element in common: Viṣṇu – or a portion of him – manifests himself in a human, animal, or human-animal form “to redress the balance of good and evil in the world by supporting the forces of good.”<sup>26</sup>

The *matsyāvatāra*<sup>27</sup> in which Viṣṇu saved Manu and, via him, the seeds of all other beings from being submerged by a flood, attracted the attention of Western scholars from an early date onward, mainly because of its similarity to deluge stories in other civilizations. William Jones knew a version of the story which he “literally translated from the Bhāgawat.”<sup>28</sup> The Bhāgavata° version was soon recognized as being more recent than that of the Mahābhārata,<sup>29</sup> but older than that of the Matsya°.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>21</sup> HACKER: op. cit., p. 47.

<sup>22</sup> HUNTINGTON: op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>23</sup> For references to the texts, see bibliography above, especially KATRE, HACKER, HUNTINGTON.

<sup>24</sup> E.g., Bhāgavata° 1.3.26: *avatārā hy asaṃkhyeyā hareḥ sattvanidher dvijāḥ / yathāvidāsinaḥ kulyāḥ sarasaḥ syuḥ sahasraśaḥ //*

<sup>25</sup> H. Krishna SHASTRI: Two Statues of Pallava Kings and Five Pallava Inscriptions in a Rock Temple at Mahabalipuram, Mem. Arch. Survey of India No. 26, 1926, 5.

<sup>26</sup> DIMMITT and VAN BUITENEN 1978: 62.

<sup>27</sup> HOHENBERGER 1930; SURYAKANTA 1950.

<sup>28</sup> As. Res. 1, 1788, 230–234, obviously from a Persian rather than from a Sanskrit source, for “the original is not yet in my possession” (ibid., p. 249).

<sup>29</sup> Franz BOPP: Die Sündfluth nebst drei anderen der wichtigsten Episoden des Mahābhārata, Berlin 1829, p. VIII.

<sup>30</sup> BURNOUF Bhāgavata°: 3.xxv–xxvi. Other early – and later – speculations on whether or not the Indian deluge was connected with the Western Asian flood can be left out of consideration here.

In his *kūrmāvatāra*<sup>31</sup> Viṣṇu became a tortoise, and supported on his back the sinking mount Mandara, to allow the gods and demons to proceed with the churning of the ocean, in their search for *amṛta*.

In his *varāhāvatāra*<sup>32</sup> Viṣṇu manifested himself as a boar and lifted with his tusk the earth which was sinking down in the ocean as a result of the oppression by the daitya Hiranyākṣa.<sup>33</sup>

In the fourth *avatāra*, the last one situated in the *kr̥tayuga*, Viṣṇu incarnated himself as a man-lion,<sup>34</sup> to save the gods and devout men from Hiranyākṣa's twin-brother, Hiranyakaśipu. Hiranyakaśipu became famous not only because of his oppressive reign generally, but because of his efforts to prevent his son, Prahlāda, from worshiping Viṣṇu. The Prahlāda story is very prominent in the purāṇas, and has attracted considerable attention from modern scholars.<sup>35</sup>

Viṣṇu's fifth *avatāra* which, like the four preceding ones, has a mahāpurāṇa named after it, is in the form of a dwarf (*vāmana*).<sup>36</sup> One hundred *aśvamedhas* had made the *daitya* king Bali as powerful as Indra. Viṣṇu, born in the form of a dwarf as the son of Kaśyapa and Aditi, went to one of Bali's sacrifices and requested a piece of land as wide as three of his steps. He then assumed a huge form, and deprived Bali of his supremacy over the gods.

In his sixth *avatāra* Viṣṇu became Paraśurāma,<sup>37</sup> the youngest son of the brahman Jamadagni and his wife, Reṇukā. He relieved the earth of oppression by killing the entire kṣatriya race twenty-one times. One of the stories which is

<sup>31</sup> Klaus RÜPING: Amṛtamanthana und Kūrmā-Avatāra. Ein Beitrag zur puranischen Mythen- und Religionsgeschichte, [Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg,] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970.

<sup>32</sup> Maheshwari PRASAD: Some Aspects of the Varāha-kathā in Epics and Purāṇas, Göttingen: [the author], 1983. Prasad considers the Varāha-kathā to have been a Vedic cosmological myth which only later became associated with Viṣṇu.

<sup>33</sup> In several purāṇas the varāhāvatāra story comprises short, obscure passages which describe the sacrifice (*yajña*) as *varāha*. See V. S. AGRAWALA: Yajña-Varāha. An Interpretation, Pur 5, 1963, 199–236; also RAGHAVAN Matsya<sup>2</sup> 1963.

<sup>34</sup> A. C. SWAIN: A Study of the Man-Lion Myth in the Epics and Purāṇa-Texts, IA 5, 1971, 38–54.

<sup>35</sup> Mohan SINGH: The Legend of Prahlāda, QJMS n. s. 31, 1940–41, 104–109; 32, 1941–42, 46–54; HACKER 1959; ANANTAKR̥ṢṆA ŚĀSTRĪ: Prahlādacarita-samālocanam, Pur 3, 1961, 102–114.

<sup>36</sup> G. Ch. TRIPATHI: Der Ursprung und die Entwicklung der Vāmana-Legende in der indischen Literatur, [Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie 1,] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968; K. L. MANKODI: Vāmana-Trivikrama in Indian Art, Pur 12, 1970, 48–53; B. N. SHARMA: Vāmana in Literature and Art, Pur 12, 1970, 54–64; Ganga Sagar RAI: Vāmana Legend. In the Vedas, Epics and Purāṇas, Pur 12, 1970, 102–104; Hiramani MISHRA: Vāmana's Birth and Mode of Worship in the Purāṇas, Pur 12, 1970, 170–173; A. S. GUPTA: A Note on the Mention of the Spouse and Progeny of Vāmana in the Bhāgavata, Pur 12, 1970, 174–177; V. K. SARMA: Vāmana Tradition and Oṅam Festival in South India, VIJ 9, 1971, 62–70.

<sup>37</sup> GAIL 1977.

prominent in the purāṇas is Paraśurāma's killing of his mother at his father's request after his elder brothers had refused to do so, and her revival as a result of a boon from his father. There is a Reṇukāmāhātmya in the Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa of the Skanda°.

At the juncture of the *tretā* and *dvāpara* ages (see 2.2.4) Viṣṇu manifested himself in the form of Rāma – or Rāmacandra –, the son of Daśaratha. The puranic stories dealing with this topic share much of their material with the Rāmāyaṇa (see 2.1.5), with the significant difference, however, that in the epic Rāma is a heroic, human figure, whereas in the purāṇas – for instance, in the Western Pātālakhaṇḍa of the Padma° –, even as in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*, Rāma is an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. For the important *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa*, see sub *Brahmāṇḍa*°.

Kṛṣṇa, who is connected with the juncture of the *dvāpara* and *kali* ages, is, of course, the *avatāra* which received most attention, both in the texts – in the purāṇas and elsewhere – and in the scholarly literature. Entire sections of purāṇas devoted to the Kṛṣṇa legend will be discussed under the relevant purāṇas in Part Two. The various versions of the story have been studied comparatively, often with the intention to reconstruct the most ancient and original version.<sup>38</sup> Others stressed the changing attitude in the text toward the nature and role of Kṛṣṇa. The purāṇas no longer insist on the part Kṛṣṇa played in the Bhārata war.<sup>39</sup> He is primarily an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, i. e., he has a mission: deliver the world of an evil being, in this case the demon tyrant Kaṃsa. Gradually, however, this role is overshadowed by Kṛṣṇa's early, childish and juvenile exploits; it is this aspect that dominates in the later Kṛṣṇa cults which focus on his "superfluous life as a youth in Vṛndāvana to the almost total exclusion of the rest of his history and biography."<sup>40</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Principally Walter RUBEN: *On the Original Text of the Kṛṣṇa-Epic*, F. W. Thomas vol. (1939), 188–203. [By taking away the interpolations in the *Harivaṃśa* one obtains a version even shorter than that of the *Brahma*°; "this shortest text-form may be the oldest obtainable 'archetype' of the Kṛṣṇa-epic."] Cf., id.: *The Kṛṣṇa-carita in the Harivaṃśa and Certain Purāṇas*, JAOS 61, 1941, 115–127, and his *Krishna. Konkordanz und Kommentar der Motive seines Heldenlebens*, [Istanbuler Schriften 17,] Istanbul: n. p., 1943, which tells the story of Kṛṣṇa's life, divided into *sargas* and paragraphs, each time with a comment. The volume includes various concordances.

<sup>39</sup> PUSALKER 1955: 59–60.

<sup>40</sup> David KINSLEY: "Without Kṛṣṇa there is no song," *History of Religions* 12, 1972–73, 149–180 at 178. Other studies on Kṛṣṇa and his place in the purāṇas include: WEBER *Bhaviṣya* 1868; S. DATTA: *Kṛṣṇa and Purāṇas*, Calcutta 1926; Willibald KIRFEL: *Kṛṣṇa's Jugendgeschichte in den Purāṇa*, Jacobi vol. (1926), 298–316 [deals with a number of shorter purāṇa versions]; S. N. TADAPATRIKAR: *The Kṛṣṇa Problem*, ABORI 10, 1930, 269–344 [pp. 279–320: the purāṇas]; U. Venkatakrishna RAO: *The Sources of the Kṛṣṇa Legend of Bhāsa's Bālacarita*, QJMS n. s. 40, 1949–50, 97–103; id.: *Kṛṣṇa's Story in its Various Settings*, QJMS n. s. 49, 1958–59, 25–50; Jean HERBERT: *Śakata and Pūtanā*, Pur

Rādhā appears only relatively late in the purāṇas.<sup>41</sup> Burnouf<sup>42</sup> already drew the general conclusion that those purāṇas which do not mention Rādhā must necessarily be older than those in which she is mentioned. A text such as the Brahmaparvata°, which was composed “solely to glorify Rādhā,” is inevitably considered to be “a late work.”<sup>43</sup> Similarly, sections of a purāṇa in which Rādhā appears have been labeled more recent than the rest of the same purāṇa.<sup>44</sup> As far as the purāṇas are concerned, the most important question is whether or not Rādhā appears in the Bhāgavata°, under the disguise of the past participle *ārādhi-ta* (10.30.28), and, consequently, whether or not the Bhāgavata° antedates the beginning of the Rādhā cult. In addition to purely positive or negative answers (see sub Bhāgavata°), there is a tendency to accept that the cult of Rādhā was indeed earlier than the Bhāgavata° without it necessarily having to appear in it. It may have been that no Vaiṣṇavas,<sup>45</sup> or at least not all Vaiṣṇavas,<sup>46</sup> adopted Rādhā at an early date; or the absence of the existing Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa love episode in the Bhāgavata° is explained as the result of the lack of northern influence on South Indian purāṇas until much later in history.<sup>47</sup>

For the next *avatāra* the Bhāgavata° once<sup>48</sup> subtly alludes to and three times<sup>49</sup> explicitly mentions by name the Buddha. In the allusion this important development, both for Vaiṣṇavism and Buddhism, is explained by the fact that the Asuras had taken to Vedic ways; to divert them from this path Viṣṇu manifested himself as the Buddha and taught them Upadharma “heresy.” The fact that the

---

2, 1960, 268–278; V. S. AGRAWALA: A Note on Pūtanā and Yaśodā, Pur 2, 1960, 279–281; Baladeva UPADHYAYA: A Brief Survey of the Purāṇas on the Kṛṣṇa Līlā, Pur 11, 1969, 139–168; Charles S. J. WHITE: Kṛṣṇa as Divine Child, History of Religions 10, 1970–71, 156–177; Baladeva UPADHYAYA: Itihāsapurāṇayoḥ Śrīkṛṣṇasya laukikacaritavimarśaḥ [Worldly Life of Śrīkṛṣṇa as Depicted in the Itihāsa and Purāṇa], Pur 16, 1974, 143–154; Benjamin PRECIADO-SOLIS: The Kṛṣṇa Cycle in the Purāṇas, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

<sup>41</sup> Asoke Kumar MAJUMDAR: A Note on the Development of Rādhā Cult, ABORI 36, 1955, 231–257 [pp. 244–251: Rādhā in the purāṇas].

<sup>42</sup> Bhāgavata°: 1.cvi.

<sup>43</sup> PUSALKER 1955: 61. Cf. BROWN Brahmaparvata° 1974 and 1982 [see HAWLEY and WULF 1982 for several other studies on Rādhā].

<sup>44</sup> HAZRA 1940: 13 n. 9, on Vāyu° ch. 104.

<sup>45</sup> KINSLEY: op. cit., p. 163 n. 43.

<sup>46</sup> Asha GOSWAMI: Rādhā, J. Dpt. Skt. Univ. Delhi 1.2, 1972, 34–44.

<sup>47</sup> Sadashiv L. KATRE: Kṛṣṇa, Gopas, Gopīs and Rādhā, Gode vol. (1960), 3.83–92 at 87; Shyam Chand MUKHERJI: A Study of Vaiṣṇavism in Ancient and Medieval Bengal, upto the Advent of Chaitanya (Based on Archaeological and Literary Data), Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1966, Appendix A: Origin and Development of the Worship of Radha, pp. 183–195 at 191.

<sup>48</sup> Bhāgavata° 2.7.37: *devadvaiṣāṃ nigamavartmani niṣṭhitānām pūrbhir mayena vihitābhir adṛśyatūrbhiḥ / lokān ghnatām mativimoham atipralobham veṣaṃ vidhāya bahu bhāṣyata aupadharmyam //*

<sup>49</sup> 1.3.24; 6.8.19; 10.40.22.

Buddhāvātāra is well attested in the Bhāgavata<sup>o</sup>,<sup>50</sup> added to the belief that it was anticipated in the *māyāmoha* episode of the Viṣṇu<sup>o</sup> (3, ch.17–18), led to the conclusion that the Buddha was canonized as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu in the time between the two purāṇas, i.e., according to Gail, between the sixth and mid-eight centuries A.D.<sup>51</sup> This view may well find support in the fact that the Buddha is mentioned as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu in the Pallava inscription at Mahabalipuram which I referred to earlier.<sup>52</sup>

Finally, in his single future *avatāra*, to take place at the end of the *kaliyuga*, Viṣṇu will be born as Kalki. Riding on a white horse, he will destroy the *mlecchas* and their heterodoxies, reestablish the perfect *dharma*, and inaugurate a new *kṛtayuga*. Kalki not only has his own upapurāṇa; this text and other puranic passages referring to him have also been quoted by some to claim Kalki as an historical figure.<sup>53</sup>

For some reason the Śaiva purāṇas – and, hence, Śiva in the purāṇas<sup>54</sup> – have been less well received than the Vaiṣṇava purāṇas. According to Barth<sup>55</sup> the Śaiva purāṇas “are the most spiritless of the collection.” They are like the Tantras, and “affect a very special, almost an esoteric character.” Except for such pieces as the *Devīmāhātmya*, Śaivism “appears to have inspired no work of any brilliancy, such as the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.”

<sup>50</sup> S. HANUMANATHA RAO (Mahayana Buddhism and Pauranic Hinduism. Mutual Influences, JIH 19, 1940, 307–311) finds, for a number of characteristics of Buddhism, corresponding features in the Bhāgavata<sup>o</sup>, to conclude that “Mahāyānism was only a sectarian phase of the great Vaishṇava movement.” HOPKINS (SINGER 1966: 6) detects influence of Buddhist metaphysics on the Bhāgavata<sup>o</sup>. For a survey of references to Buddhism – and other heterodox systems – in the purāṇas, see Radhakrishna CHOUDHARY: Heretical Sects in the Purāṇas, ABORI 37, 1956, 234–257.

<sup>51</sup> Adalbert J. GAIL: Buddha als Avatāra Viṣṇus im Spiegel der Purāṇas, Deutscher Orientalistentag 17 (1968) 1969, 917–923.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. HAZRA 1940: 88.

<sup>53</sup> E.g., K. P. JAYASWAL: The Historical Position of Kalki and His Identification with Yaśodharman, IA 46, 1917, 145–153 [Kalki ruled from A. D. 473 or 503 until 533 or longer, and died ca. A. D. 543]; D. R. MANKAD: Kalki. The Earliest Check to Buddhism, NIA 4, 1941–42, 337–343 [soon after Buddha's death, “Kalki ... ousted both Buddhism and Jainism out of the Northern India”].

<sup>54</sup> On puranic Śaivism generally, see H. MEINHARD: Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Śivaismus nach den Purāṇen, Berlin: Reimer, 1928; Eugen ROSEŃ: Beiträge zur Kenntnis des śivaitischen Namenglaubens. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchung, Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1934; C. V. NARAYANA AYYAR: Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India, [Madras Univ. Histor. Ser. 6,] Madras: Univ., 1936 [uses Tamil purāṇas]; GONDA 1963: 194–213 Der allgemeine oder purāṇische Śivaismus; V. S. AGRAWALA: Aṣṭamūrti Śiva the Great God with Eight Forms, JOIB 14, 1964–65, 280–286; Heinrich von STIETENCRON: Bhairava, Deutscher Orientalistentag 17 (1968) 1969, 863–871; Wendy D. O'FLAHERTY: The Symbolism of the Third Eye of Śiva in the Purāṇas, Pur 11, 1969, 273–284; id.: The Symbolism of Ashes in the Mythology of Śiva, Pur 13, 1970–71, 26–35.

<sup>55</sup> BARTH 1879 = 1921: 197.

Within the mahāpurāṇas Śiva seems to have fared less well than Viṣṇu.<sup>56</sup> Even if we do not take the association of the eighteen mahāpurāṇas with the three *guṇas* (see 1.3.1) literally, the fact remains that Viṣṇu is connected with *sattva*, Śiva with *tamas*. Also, in the Hindu cosmogonical system Śiva was assigned the least enviable role: even if the Śaiva texts also call him the creator and the preserver, in the broader scheme he is the destroyer. In the list of eighteen mahāpurāṇas Śiva can claim far fewer his own – Śiva°, Liṅga°, Skanda° – than Viṣṇu. In addition, the very purāṇa that bears Śiva's name encountered difficulties being recognized as a mahāpurāṇa: in a number of lists its place has been taken by the Vāyu° (see 1.3.3). However, whereas Viṣṇu seems to dominate in the mahāpurāṇas considered to be earlier texts, “the later stratifications of purāṇic myths and legends not rarely testify to Śiva's coming to the fore, also to enact independently and alone the three great rôles of unfolding, preservation and reabsorption.”<sup>57</sup>

The nature of Śiva posed a problem for Western scholars: “Permanently ithyphallic, yet perpetually chaste: how is one to explain such a phenomenon?”<sup>58</sup> An examination of the many motifs of Śaiva mythology in the purāṇas, by Wendy O'Flaherty,<sup>59</sup> has contributed much toward a better understanding of “the paradox of Śiva the erotic ascetic.”

As I indicated earlier, even though less prominently than in the case of Viṣṇu, the purāṇas do recognize *avatāras* of Śiva. E. g., the Kūrma<sup>60</sup> states explicitly that Śiva “will make *avatāras*;” the same text<sup>61</sup> also lists twenty-eight *avatāras* of Śiva (*mahādevāvātārāṇi*) in successive *kaliyugas* of the Vaivasvata *manvantara*, the last of whom is Lakulīṣa or Lakulīśvara, “who lives in the Kāyāvātāra *tīrtha*” (see sub Vāyu°).

One of the most important elements in Śiva mythology is the *liṅga*. Here too, the purāṇas have made a sizable contribution. Puranic materials have been used to show that the *liṅga* cult was pre-Aryan.<sup>62</sup> Among the stories in the texts which account for the fact that god Śiva can be worshiped in the form of a phallus, the one that attracted most attention is Śiva's visit to the women in the Devadāruvana, the loss of his *liṅga* following a curse by the sages, and the conclusion that prosperity would return to the world on the condition that the *liṅga* be wor-

<sup>56</sup> L. ROCHER: Śiva in the Purāṇas, in Michael W. MEISTER (ed.): Discourses on Śiva, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985, pp. 202–211.

<sup>57</sup> GONDA: Viṣṇuism and Śivaism, p. 195.

<sup>58</sup> Robert C. ZAEHNER: Hinduism, OUP, 1962, p. 113.

<sup>59</sup> O'FLAHERTY 1973 (and see notes above).

<sup>60</sup> CE 1.28.33–34: *kariṣyaty avātārāṇi śaṅkaro nīlaloḥitaḥ / śrautasamāpratiṣṭhārtham bhaktānām hitakāmyayā // upadekṣyati tajjñānam śiṣyāṇām brahmasamjñitam / sarvavedantasāram hi dharmān vedanidarśitān //*

<sup>61</sup> CE 1.51.2–10.

<sup>62</sup> E. g., Adris BANERJI: Foreign Elements in Hindu Ritual and Practice, IHQ 28, 1952, 257–264.

shipped.<sup>63</sup> Some texts, such as the *Vidyēśvarasaṃhitā* of the Śiva°, go as far as to proclaim that a *liṅga* is superior to a Śiva image, and that Śiva worship is worthless in the absence of a *liṅga*.

Pārvatī, Śiva's "consort,"<sup>64</sup> plays a major role in the purāṇas. Even as Lakṣmī to Viṣṇu, Pārvatī is Śiva's wife – even more than once in succession. But she is other things, too. Sometimes she is represented as being one half of Śiva, in his *ardhanārīśvara* form. On other occasions she is, in terms borrowed from the evolutionary system of Sāṃkhya, the female Prakṛti, Śiva being the male Puruṣa. Very often she is Śiva's *śakti*, more powerful than the god himself. She is Devī "the goddess." with a character and identity strictly her own.

Śakti worship<sup>65</sup> appears, though rather infrequently,<sup>65</sup> in some of the mahāpurāṇas.<sup>66</sup> It is far more prevalent in the upapurāṇas. In some of them it is so prevalent that they have been labeled "Śākta upapurāṇas:" Devī°, Devībhāgavata°, Kālikā°, Mahābhāgavata°; in other puranic texts such as the *Bhaviṣyottara*° and the *Bṛhaddharma*°, which have not been so labeled, it plays nevertheless a very important role. Special mention must be made, in this respect, of the *Devīmāhātmya* of the *Mārkaṇḍeya*°.

Various forms of Śāktism and Devī worship, as they appear in the texts, will be discussed for the relevant purāṇas in Part Two. Let me point out here, though, that the growing importance of the Devī, especially in her form as Kālī or Kālikā, led to a productive period in puranic literature in eastern Bengal and Kāmarūpa (where she is Kāmākhya°).<sup>67</sup> Also, as Durgā<sup>68</sup> she fights many battles with the demons, most importantly with Mahiṣa or Mahiṣāsura.<sup>69</sup> I refer elsewhere in this volume to the role played by the Kālikā° (see there) in the yearly Durgāpūjā.<sup>70</sup> It

<sup>63</sup> Wilhelm JAHN: *Die Legende vom Devadāruvana*, ZDMG 69, 1915, 529–557; 70, 1916, 301–320; Paul DEUSSEN: *Über das Devadāruvanam*, ZDMG 71, 1917, 119–120; JAHN: *Die Legende vom Devadāruvana im Śiva-Purāṇa*, ZDMG 71, 1917, 167–208. Cf. GONDA 1963: 211–212; DIMMITT and VAN BUITENEN 1978: 203–205.

<sup>64</sup> Wendy D. O'FLAHERTY: *The Shifting Balance of Power in the Marriage of Śiva and Pārvatī*, in HAWLEY and WULFF 1982: 129–143.

<sup>65</sup> R. C. HAZRA: *Compilation of Purāṇic Works or Chapters on Śakti-Worship*, OH 4, 1956, 67–88; Raghunath GIRI: *Śakti (the Power) in the Philosophy of the Purāṇas*, Pur 12, 1970, 231–251.

<sup>66</sup> HAZRA: *op. cit.*, p. 81–82: chapters from the *Mārkaṇḍeya*°, *Vāmana*°, *Varāha*°, and *Kūrma*°.

<sup>67</sup> The South Indian *Liṅgāyats* seem to have used vernacular rather than Sanskrit purāṇas (see 2.1.4). On the other hand, the strongly Śākta *Kailāsaṃhitā* of the Śiva° is attributed to them.

<sup>68</sup> B. C. MAZUMDAR: *Durga*, JRAS 1906, 355–362; Narendra Nath CHOUDHURI: *Mother Goddess Durgā*, PO 15, 1950, 32–38; Rabindra Kumar SIDDHANTASHASTREE: *The Conception of Goddess Durga Through the Ages*, *Prabuddha Bharata* 68, 1963, 509–512.

<sup>69</sup> *Reff. to texts*, N. N. CHOUDHURI: *op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>70</sup> Pratapachandra GHOSHA: *Origin of the Durga Puja*, Calcutta: The "Hindoo Patriot" Press, 1874.

is worth noting that in their descriptions of the Durgāpūjā the *nibandhakāras* quote numerous verses from a variety of purāṇas – Bhaviṣya°, Liṅga°, etc. –, which do not appear in the editions of these texts. We may therefore assume that the place of Durgāpūjā in the purāṇas of northeast India was – and probably still is – far more important than their written versions seem to indicate.

The greater or lesser degree to which Tantric<sup>71</sup> practices appear in a purāṇa – or a section of a purāṇa – is most often considered to be an indication of its being more or less recent. Tantric rites are alluded to even in mahāpurāṇas (e. g., Bhāgavata° 11.3.47 seqq.); certain sections of the Agni°, Liṅga°, Śiva°, Brahmavaivarta°, etc., are strongly influenced by Tantra.<sup>72</sup> Several upapurāṇas especially are very close to true Tantric texts: Kālikātantra is another name for the Kālikā°, which contains the famous Rudhirādhyāya. The distinction between Tantras and purāṇas has been formulated as follows:

“Both are didactic and sectarian. As a rule Tantras contain less historical and legendary matter, and more directions as to ritual, but a more important difference lies in this, that while the Purāṇas approve of Vedic rites as well as of others, for which they give directions, the Tantras insist that ceremonies other than those they prescribe are now useless.”<sup>73</sup>

Skanda’s name is connected with the most voluminous of all purāṇas. Claims that, notwithstanding this explicit link, Skanda does not figure prominently in the purāṇa named after him,<sup>74</sup> have been disputed.<sup>75</sup> In reality Skanda does not figure either more or less prominently in the Skanda° than he does in some other purāṇas. Stories about the birth and exploits of Skanda/Kārttikeya are found in a variety of puranic texts; many of these correspond to or are variants on similar tales in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa. Notwithstanding the wide variety of birth-stories – possibly due to the fact that “in different parts of India there were several popular godlings of the War-god type”<sup>76</sup> –, more often than not Skanda’s birth is connected with Śiva and Pārvatī, even though Śiva’s semen was carried for a while by Agni and Gaṅgā. The name Kārttikeya is often explained by the fact that the new-born god was nourished by the Kṛttikās. Even though, especially in South India, Skanda worship is an integral part of Śaivism, Skanda does not therefore totally lose his identity, and remains important as an individual deity in his own right.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Jitendranath BANERJEA: Purāṇic and Tantric Religion, Calcutta: Univ., 1966.

<sup>72</sup> Ch. CHAKRAVARTI: Antiquity of Tāntricism, IHQ 6, 1930, 114–126 at 125.

<sup>73</sup> PAYNE 1933: 50. Cf. GONDA 1963: 27.

<sup>74</sup> KANE 1962: 911.

<sup>75</sup> ASIM KUMAR CHATTERJEE: The Cult of Skanda-Kārttikeya in Ancient India, Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1970, p. 20. See there, pp. 17–24, for a survey of puranic passages dealing with Skanda.

<sup>76</sup> H. JACOBI: ERE 2 (1909), 807.

<sup>77</sup> K. Kailasanatha KURUKKAL: A Study of the Karttikeya Cult as Reflected in the Epics and the Puranas, Univ. of Ceylon Review 19, 1961, 131–138.

Śiva's other "son" – in a variety of ways –, Gaṇeśa, can only claim two upapurāṇas as his own. On the other hand, the Gaṇeśa°, even as the Mudgala°, are directly and totally devoted to Gaṇeśa and Gaṇeśa worship. Gaṇeśa is, more than most Hindu deities, a typically puranic god. "He is the latest of all Brāhmanical gods, for he is not mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa and some of the older Purāṇas; he was absent from the original Mahābhārata."<sup>78</sup> His origin, history, and, not to forget, his unusual appearance, still raise a number of questions, to which only puranic – and assimilated – literature can provide the answer.<sup>79</sup> Although in some texts, especially the two Gāṇapatya purāṇas, Gaṇeśa has been raised to a stature well above all other gods, the majority of puranic texts assign him a far less exalted position. They, in fact, describe him "as owing his popularity, if not his very existence, to a dispute between Śiva and Pārvatī, fomented by a host of minor deities."<sup>80</sup>

Although there are references to an Āditya° and a Sūrya° – the Saura° is decidedly Śaiva –, the two most important puranic texts connected with Sūrya and son worship are the Sāmba° and the Brāhmaparvan of the Bhaviṣya°. References in these texts to Magas, sun worshiping brahmans of Śākadvīpa<sup>81</sup> and to Sāmba bringing them from there to India, attracted the attention of scholars from an early date onward (see sub Sāmba°).

## 2.2.4 The Purāṇas as Historical Documents

"The most systematic record of Indian historical tradition is that preserved in the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas. Five out of the eighteen works of this class, namely, the Vāyu, Matsya, Vishṇu, Brahmāṇḍa, and Bhāgavata contain such lists. The Brahmāṇḍa and the Vāyu, as well as the Matsya, which has large later additions, appear to be the earliest and most authoritative ... Modern European writers have been inclined to disparage unduly the authority of the Purāṇic lists, but closer study finds in them much genuine and valuable historical tradition."<sup>1</sup>

Given the paucity of materials with which to reconstruct ancient Indian history, it was inevitable that scholars attempted to make use of the puranic

<sup>78</sup> JACOBI: ERE 2 (1909), 807–808.

<sup>79</sup> See the appeal by Juan Roger RIVIERE: *The Problem of Gaṇeśa in the Purāṇas*, Pur 4, 1962, 96–102. Cf. also Paul B. COURTRIGHT's effort "to explore the meanings of Gaṇeśa as a mythological and religious figure through an analysis of a number of myths in which his story is told" (*The Beheading of Gaṇeśa*, Pur 22, 1980, 67–80).

<sup>80</sup> Alice GETTY: *Gaṇeśa. A Monograph on the Elephant-faced God*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936, p. 5.

<sup>81</sup> KIRFEL 1954: 32.

<sup>1</sup> Vincent A. SMITH: *The Early History of India, from 600 B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, <sup>4</sup>1924, pp. 11–12.

king lists – *vamśānucarita*,<sup>2</sup> one of the *pañcalakṣaṇas* – exhibited in the purāṇas.<sup>3</sup>

The purāṇas derive all dynasties from the mythical Manu Vaivasvata. One of his sons was Ikṣvāku who became the ancestor of the Aikṣvāka dynasty of Ayo-dhyā, also known as the Solar Race. Another son, Ila, turned into a woman, Ilā, and became the mother of Purūravas, the progenitor of the Aila race of Pratiṣṭhāna, also known as the Lunar Race. The various dynasties which derive from these two races are described up to the time of the Great Battle between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas.<sup>4</sup> The period after the Bhārata battle, corresponding to the evil Kali age, is then related in the form of a prophecy.<sup>5</sup> It is generally accepted that the recording of dynastic history in the purāṇas came to an end with the early Guptas.<sup>6</sup>

As pointed out by Vincent Smith quoted above, opinions on the trustworthiness and usefulness of these lists vary. Initially Westerners<sup>7</sup> expressed skepticism about the purāṇas as historical sources; in the words of an anonymous contributor to the Edinburgh Review:

“The Puranas appear to be extravagant romances, which, however amusing as poetical compositions, can furnish no addition to authentic history, whatever portion of it they may be supposed incidentally to contain. When we find gods and heroes mingling in doubtful fight; events natural and supernatural succeeding each other indifferently; a fact probably historical, followed by another evidently allegorical, – the only rational conclusion is to consider the whole of these poems as works of imagination, and to appreciate their merits by the rules applicable to similar compositions amongst other nations.”<sup>8</sup>

<sup>2</sup> TANDON 1952: 8.

<sup>3</sup> E. g., Ernst WALDSCHMIDT (Geschichte des indischen Altertums, in: Geschichte Asiens, Munich: Bruckmann, 1950, p. 19) speaks of “die für uns wichtige Geschichte der Königsgeschlechter.”

<sup>4</sup> On the problems connected with the Bhārata war, see the proceedings of a seminar held at the University of Calcutta, and edited by D. C. SIRCAR: The Bhārata War and Purāṇic Genealogies (Calcutta University, 1969). The volume contains contributions by Sircar (“there was no ‘great war’ and it is impossible to determine its date,” p. 5); by R. C. MAJUMDAR (“in spite of the defective nature of the Purāṇa accounts, scholars should not reject or ignore them in a hurry,” p. 8); and others.

<sup>5</sup> The idea of describing history in the form of a prophecy also appears in Buddhist literature; cf. the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, TSS 70, 74, 76 (1920–25). See 2.1.5.

<sup>6</sup> PARGITER 1913: xii–xiii. Cf. HAZRA 1962: 252. The view that the purāṇas do not describe any important king or dynasty of the late Gupta era or the post-Gupta period has been challenged by A. B. L. AWASTHI: History from the Purāṇas, Lucknow: Kailash Prakashan, 1975.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Al-Bīrūnī: “Unfortunately the Hindus do not pay much attention to the historical order of things; they are very careless in relating the chronological succession of their kings, and when they are pressed for information and are at a loss, not knowing what to say, they invariably take to tale-tellings” (SACHAU 1888: 2.10–11).

<sup>8</sup> Ed. Rev. 15:29, 1809, 176. The author is Alexander Hamilton, both according to the

Similar skepticism reveals itself in statements by William Ward;<sup>9</sup> he even generalizes: “As writers of history, the Hindoos deserve the severest censure for mixing their accounts with so much fable.”<sup>10</sup> Vans Kennedy, in whose opinion the purāṇas are, and always were, purely religious books, of course refused to detect the slightest historical element in them.<sup>11</sup>

In the meantime James Tod obtained purāṇas from the library of the Rana of Udaipur, in view of his *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan* (1829). He came to the conclusion that the various accounts were “borrowing from some common original source;”<sup>12</sup> even though that source may have been important, he had serious doubts about the present state of the accounts.

“Doubtless the original Poorāns contained much valuable historical matter; but, at present, it is difficult to separate a little pure metal from the base alloy of ignorant expounders and interpolators. I have but skimmed the surface: research, to be capable, may yet be rewarded by many isolated facts and important transactions, now hid under the veil of ignorance and allegory.”<sup>13</sup>

Vincent Smith was one of the first, in 1902, to show, in the specific case of the Āndhra dynasty, that the list of kings and the duration of their reigns, as preserved in the *Matsya*, are basically correct. Admitting that “the historical passages in Purāṇas were liable to receive additions,” he nevertheless concluded:

---

Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, and Rosane ROCHER: Alexander Hamilton, *New Haven Conn.*, 1968, pp. 98–99.

<sup>9</sup> “No doubt, there is much real history in the pooranūs; and, if it were possible to obtain any sober historical work among the numerous Hindu writings, the real facts might be separated from the many fictions with which the pooranūs are filled. Till some such clue, however, can be obtained, I am surprised and sorry, that any person should attempt to illustrate authentic history, and even the divine writings, from these works, which, in their present state, deserve no better name than entertaining romances” (WARD 1811: 2.37–38).

<sup>10</sup> WARD 1811: 1.193. Yet, in a later edition (1820: 3.vi–vii) Ward expresses “his earnest wish that some Sūngskritū scholar would devote his leisure to a work on [Hindoo history], drawn entirely from Hindoo sources; persuaded as he is, that the pooranūs, if thoroughly and judiciously examined, would afford ample materials for a succinct history of India, or supply numerous fragments of the most interesting and important nature.”

<sup>11</sup> “... neither the Vedas, the Upanishads, nor the Purans, profess to be historical compositions; and the ascribing this character to the latter, in particular, is a most erroneous opinion, for, with the exception of the genealogies of the princes of the solar and lunar races, the Purans contain nothing which has the slightest semblance of history... It is true that each Puran contains a description of the division of time according to the Hindu system; but the chronology of no event is fixed more precisely than by referring it generally to such a Kalpa, or Manvantara, or Yuga, as the particular year is never mentioned. The attempting, therefore, to extract either chronology or history from such data, must be an operation attended with equal success as the extraction of sunbeams from cucumbers by the sages of Laputa” (KENNEDY 1831: 130).

<sup>12</sup> Madras: Higginbotham, 1873, 1.18 (orig. 1829).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

“The near approach to accuracy attained by the Mātsya Purāṇa (Radcliffe ms.) in the list of the later Andhra kings shows that the compiler had access to good authorities for the history of his dynasty, and raises a presumption in favour of his information about the earlier kings, although it cannot be controlled by the evidence of coins or inscriptions except to a slight extent.”<sup>14</sup>

The real champion for the purāṇas as texts worthy of the attention of historians of ancient India was, of course, Frederick Eden Pargiter. He explained – and defended against criticism – his opinions in a number of articles; his two books<sup>15</sup> on the subject have become classics in the history of Indian scholarship.

According to Pargiter it is not possible that the memory of important kings of ancient times would have been totally lost; therefore “the presumption is that ancient tradition about kings is *primâ facie* deserving of attention.” It is possible that good things of the past have been magnified, or unpleasant things suppressed; it is also possible that the king lists as we have them contain mistakes and corruptions. However, “false genealogies presuppose and imitate genuine genealogies;” besides, “there appears to have been a sufficiently strong body of traditional knowledge in North India to prevent false particulars from being successfully introduced to any serious extent.” Therefore, acknowledging their limitations “is not the same thing as to declare that these traditional genealogies are unworthy of any trust whatever.”<sup>16</sup>

Pargiter’s work undoubtedly raised the status of the purāṇas as historical documents, and even the status of the purāṇas generally.<sup>17</sup> Again and again one comes across statements to the effect that the purāṇas, as sources of history and otherwise, have been neglected and underestimated so far, but all that has changed now, thanks to Pargiter.<sup>18</sup> In fact, “with the publication of Mr. Pargiter’s [Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age] a new development in Paurāṇic studies may be said to have been started.”<sup>19</sup> From now onward “the Purāṇas represent

<sup>14</sup> Vincent A. SMITH: Andhra History and Coinage, ZDMG 56, 1902, 649–675; 57, 1903, 605–627 at 654. Approved by RAPSON 1922: 267.

<sup>15</sup> See PARGITER 1913 and 1922.

<sup>16</sup> Quotes are from Ancient Indian Genealogies – are they trustworthy?, R. G. Bhandarkar vol. (1917), 107–113.

<sup>17</sup> For a good survey of reactions to Pargiter, see U. N. GHOSHAL: Studies in Indian History and Culture, Bombay: Orient Longmans, 1965 ed., pp. 37–48: The Historical Traditions in the Purāṇas.

<sup>18</sup> S. BHIMASANKARARAO: Historical Importance of the Purāṇas, QJAHRS 2, 1927–28, 81–90, who pleads for a renewed study of the purāṇas to arrive at a reliable history of Āndhra.

<sup>19</sup> N. K. SIDHANTA: The Heroic Age of India. A Comparative Study, London: Kegan Paul, 1929, p. 31. “Though the imagination of an age devoid of the proper historical sense may have confused fact and fiction, it is nevertheless possible to disentangle the two threads and build up a history of the past on the basis of the Purāṇas” (ibid.). Cf. Nripendra Kumar DUTT: The Aryanisation of India, Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay, 1970, pp. 131–146: Pargiter’s Theory.

an authentic historical chronicle.”<sup>20</sup> They give us “a complete picture” and “a trustworthy and accurate account” of the various periods in ancient Indian history.<sup>21</sup> Even in the deteriorated, extant purāṇas “there are various indications which show definitely that particular care was taken in early times to study and preserve correctly the dynastic lists and accounts, which later came to be recorded more or less systematically in the Purāṇas.”<sup>22</sup> Also, “whatever those ancient authors did or wrote, they did it with sincerety and accuracy;” as a result “the Purāṇic lists of dynasties of kings and kingdoms furnish details of dates to an extent that even in days of historical records may be surprising.”<sup>23</sup> Special mention may be made here again of Vincent A. Smith, who used the puranic king lists repeatedly in his authoritative *Early History of India*.<sup>24</sup> The most recent follower<sup>25</sup> of Pargiter is R. Morton Smith. In three articles and one book<sup>26</sup> he not only applied Pargiter’s methods, but further expanded them, and applied them to a longer period of history.<sup>27</sup> He established the chronology of all kings, both prehistoric and historic, from about 1800 B. C. until A. D. 249 (the death of king Pulomavi III of Āndhra).<sup>28</sup>

<sup>20</sup> V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: *The Purāṇas: their historical value*, PO 2, 1937–38, 77–83 at 77.

<sup>21</sup> K. P. JAYASWAL: *History of India 150 A. D. to 350 A. D.*, Lahore: Motilal Banarsi Dass, 1934, pp. 122, 154.

<sup>22</sup> HAZRA 1962: 264.

<sup>23</sup> KRISHNAMACHARIAR 1937: xliii.

<sup>24</sup> E. g., 4pp. 31–32 (Magadha 6th cent. B. C.), 41–43 (Nandas), 51 (Śaiśunāgas and Nandas), 230 (Āndhras); he regrets that the purāṇas pay little attention to South India (p. 467).

<sup>25</sup> And also his defender against criticism: “The only valuable work on [the Purāṇa], by Pargiter, was treated with an unwarranted rudeness, especially by Keith, under the influence of the XIX century principle that because an oral tradition has been handed down, it was probably wrong. If the trend of recent work on our own dark ages, or on the Greek and Roman, has been to rehabilitate tradition, it is quite wrong to refuse that benefit to the Indian: that Indians should have been inaccurate is not impossible, but to say that they told nothing but lies is to make high demands on credulity . . . We therefore believe that the a priori case for belief for Pargiter and the Purāṇa has far more rational support than that for scepticism” (JAOS 77, 1957, 116).

<sup>26</sup> On the Ancient Chronology of India, JAOS 77, 1957, 116–129, 266–280; 78, 1958, 174–192; – Dates and Dynasties in Earliest India, Translation and Justification of a Critical Text of the Purāṇa Dynasties, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973.

<sup>27</sup> “The advocates of Traditional History cannot claim to be heard with respect till [a critical text of the relevant passages of the Purāṇa] has been made; once it has been, it will be seen that the Purāṇa makes good historical sense, consistent with the data of archaeology” (1973, p. v).

<sup>28</sup> For a description and critique of Smith’s book, see P. H. L. EGGERMONT, IJ 18, 1976, 284–287. Eggermont notes that some inconsistencies in Smith’s chronological system result from “the author’s confidence in the existence of a single universal chronology of a supposed original Purāṇa, which he shares with Pargiter and his school. In my opinion it is, on the contrary, evident that there must have existed a great many Puranic chronological

This is not to say that the purāṇas have been universally accepted by historians as documents that could be fully relied on.<sup>29</sup> Pargiter immediately met with criticism from A. B. Keith.<sup>30</sup> A. L. Basham expressed skepticism about using the purāṇas for the reconstruction of ancient Indian history: the king lists do provide information on some historical kings, but, in general, they “are corrupt and, as far as we can see, unreliable.”<sup>31</sup> It also comes as no surprise to see D. D. Kosambi refer to “the endless insipid drivel of medieval Sanskrit Purāṇas.”<sup>32</sup>

In any case, scholars have used purāṇas to reconstruct Indian history, more or less cautiously and critically, with greater<sup>33</sup> or lesser<sup>34</sup> enthusiasm, being aware

systems belonging to various periods of India’s history, and supplying a great variety of data and dates which have coalesced into the attractive collections we have at our disposal at present.”

<sup>29</sup> See WINTERNITZ’ review of PARGITER 1913, WZKM 28, 1914, 302–307. According to V. S. SUKTHANKAR (On the Home of the So-called Andhra Kings, ABORI 1, 1918–20, 21–42 at 28), “a glance at the formidable list of *variae lectiones* published with the text of extracts collected by Pargiter . . . will convince anyone of the futility of trying to get a reliable and in every way satisfactory text.” Cf. N. SUBRAHMANIAN (Historiography: India and the West, Bulletin of the Institute of Traditional Culture, Madras, 1962, Part II, 253–308): The Paurāṇika, like the historical novelist, allows fiction to dominate facts. So they lack credentials from the point of view of the historian” (p. 259); “. . . it is not [the Paurāṇika’s] fault that he confounds the historian; for he never professed to serve the purposes which a modern scientific historian keeps in view; but it is the historian’s misfortune that he has to depend on the Paurāṇika” (p. 260).

<sup>30</sup> For the controversy between Pargiter and Keith, see below. Some Indian scholars, even though they had their own doubts about the purāṇas, felt it necessary to defend them against Keith. E. g., Hemchandra RAYCHAUDHURI: Political History of Ancient India, Calcutta University, <sup>4</sup>1938, p. 6; Vidya Dhar MAHAJAN: Ancient India, Delhi: S. Chand, <sup>4</sup>1968, pp. 12–13.

<sup>31</sup> A. L. BASHAM: The Purāṇas and Indian History, Prachya Pratibha 1, 1973, 18–31 at 25.

<sup>32</sup> D. D. KOSAMBI: Ancient India: A History of Its Culture and Civilization, New York – Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1969, p. 174. Besides, “brahmin indifference to past and present reality not only erased Indian history but a great deal of real Indian culture as well.” Cf. also Kosambi’s The Study of Ancient Indian Tradition, in Indica (Bombay: St. Xavier’s College, 1953), pp. 196–214 (pp. 199–203: Pargiter’s Theory).

<sup>33</sup> PUSALKAR (1968: 708–709), writing about himself, says that “in the Vedic Age, Pusalkar has attempted to give a connected history of ancient India from earliest time to the period of the Buddha.”

<sup>34</sup> D. R. BHANDARKAR (Lectures on the Ancient History of India, on the Period from 650 to 325 B. C., Calcutta University, 1919), in the chapter on “Political History,” quotes purāṇas repeatedly, obviously without enthusiasm. For the period of the Buddha, “The only chronicle that is relied on for this period is the Purāṇas, but it is a hopeless task to reduce the chaos of Purāṇic accounts to any order. Some attempts no doubt have recently been made to deduce a consistent political history from these materials, but without any success as far as I can see” (p. 58). The attempts referred to are S. V. VENKATESWARA AYYAR: The Ancient History of Magadha, IA 45, 1916, 8–16, 28–31, and K. P. JAYASWAL: Saisunaka and Maurya, JBORS 1, 1915, 67–116 (see there, pp. 67–68, for a number of specific rules on how to use the puranic lists).

that “the Purāṇas are often surprisingly right in their statements; but not seldom they are equally mistaken.”<sup>35</sup> One characteristic feature of recent historical research is the search for extraneous evidence which corroborates the data contained in the purāṇas, and, as a result, is considered to lift the suspicion which these data might otherwise be regarded with.<sup>36</sup> This extraneous evidence can take multiple forms. One of them, Vedic literature, will be discussed separately. Other means of checking puranic data include epigraphy and archeology,<sup>37</sup> popular sources,<sup>37a</sup> Buddhist and Jaina literatures generally,<sup>38</sup> and the Sinhalese chronicle Mahāvamsa<sup>39</sup> and the Jaina purāṇas in particular.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>35</sup> L. D. BARNETT: *Political History of India*, CR 3rd ser., vol. 10, Jan.–March 1924, 249 (review of H. C. Raychaudhuri: *Political History of Ancient India*, 1923). Similarly, WINTERNITZ (1963: 1.464): “The Purāṇas are valuable to the historian and the antiquarian as sources of political history by reason of their genealogies, even though they can only be used with great caution and careful discrimination,” with a footnote: “As historical sources they surely do not deserve such confidence as is placed in them by F. E. Pargiter.” Cf. also GYANI Agni° 1964: 2–3; P. C. JOSHI et al.: *Ancient Indian History, Civilization and Culture*, Delhi: S. Chand, 1968, pp. 16–17.

<sup>36</sup> PARGITER himself (1913: xxii) indicates that he corrected puranic names “by reference to other books or to inscriptions.” According to A. A. MACDONELL (*India’s Past*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927, p. 246) the statements of the purāṇas “cannot ... be treated as historical without a good deal more corroborative evidence than has yet been forthcoming.” Cf. R. C. MAJUMDAR (in Sircar: *Bhārata War*, p. 8): “If any Purāṇic account gets support from any other source, then that account may be regarded as historical;” Romila THAPAR (*A History of India*. Volume One, Pelican Books, 1966, p. 28): “Had this literary source [i.e., the purāṇas] been the only one available the basis for discussion of the beginning of Indian history would have been limited.”

<sup>37</sup> H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI (*Notes on Certain Post-Mauryan Dynasties*, AIOC 10, 1941, 390–395 at 390) objects that the purāṇas fail to mention many ruling families known from archaeological evidence, and suspects a number of puranic royal lineages which are not confirmed by inscriptions.

<sup>37a</sup> Ruprecht GEIB (*Indradyumna-Legende. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Jagannātha Kultes*, [Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie 7,] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975) uses, among other things, popular Oriya sources to check the data of the Vaiṣṇava purāṇas on the Jagannātha cult and the Indradyumna legend. The popular – and pre-Vaiṣṇava Śaiva – sources have the advantage that they originated from parties whose interests were diametrically opposed those who produced the Vaiṣṇava sources.

<sup>38</sup> R. C. MAJUMDAR (*Sources of Indian History*, HCIP I, 1951, ch. II, pp. 47–65 at 49): they are “a valuable supplement and corrective,” after the 6th cent. B. C.

<sup>39</sup> According to D. R. BHANDARKAR (*Lectures*, pp. 67–68), the Mahāvamsa is more reliable, though neglected, for the rulers of Magadha than the purāṇas. W. GEIGER (*Mahāvamsa tr.*, PTS 1912, pp. xlii–xliv) did not hesitate to give preference “wholly and unreservedly” to the Sinhalese chronicles over the purāṇas. Against Geiger, and in defense of the purāṇas, see Narendra Nath LAW: *Presidential Address 19th Indian History Congress 1956*, IHQ 32, 1956, suppl. p. 10.

<sup>40</sup> Prahlad C. DIVANJI (*Historical Value of Paurāṇic Works*, JGRS 1, 1939, 102–105 at 108): by comparing the Vaiṣṇava and the Jaina purāṇas “the religious colouring given by any of them or both can be eliminated.”

The puranic king lists have become the object of many – often highly imaginative – calculations in connection with early Indian chronology. E.g., K.P. JAYASWAL: *Chronological Totals in Puranic Chronicles and the Kaliyuga Era*, JBORS 3, 1917, 246–262. D. R. MANKAD's chronological system, which is closely related to his ideas on *yugas* and *manvantaras*, will be referred to in that context. Some scholars were indeed convinced that the puranic data for the earliest – “pre-Bhārata war” – period were as reliable as those for later periods. Cf. A. S. ALTEKAR: *Can we re-construct pre-Bhārata-war History?*, JBHU 4, 1941, 183–229; also R.M. SMITH: *Dates and Dynasties in Earliest India*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973, p.1. According to some “the first great landmark in the Puranic history is the Great Flood” (Jwala Prasad SINGHAL: *Some Lights on Ancient World History from the Purāṇas*, IHQ 3, 1927, 24–27). One author divided the earliest Indian history – 132 reigns from Manu Vaivasvata to Mahāpadma Nanda – into five periods starting in 7350 B. C. (Gulshan RAI: *Five Periods of Traditional History in the Vedic Age*, IHC 4, 1940, 101–116). Expectations were also raised that the early genealogies might solve the problem of the origin and identification of the Indus Valley civilization (K. P. JAYASWAL: *Presidential Address*, AIOC 7, 1933, lix–lxxxvii to lxii; approvingly, A. D. PUSALKER: *Presidential Address*, IHC 13, 1950, 19–29 at 26); these efforts were countered by the argument that archeology “consigns the early part of the traditional account firmly to the realms of mythology” (Romila THAPAR: *A History of India*. Vol. 1, Pelican Books 1966, p. 29).

Examples of studies using puranic data for the reconstruction of India's earliest history are: A. D. PUSALKER: *Genealogy of the Solar Dynasty in the Purāṇas and the Rāmāyaṇa*. A Critical Study, Pur 4, 1962, 23–33; Ronald M. HUNTINGTON: *The Legend of Pṛthu*. A Study in the Process of Individuation, Pur 2, 1960, 188–210; Rai KRISHNADASA: *Ikshvāku Genealogy in the Purāṇas*, Pur 2, 1960, 128–150; M. RAJA RAO: *The Puranic Date of the Mahabharata*, JGJRI 2, 1944–45, 125–143; D. S. TRIVEDI: *The Intervening Age Between Parikṣit and Nanda*, JIH 19, 1940, 1–16; D. R. MANKAD: *Chronological Distance Between Rāma and Kṛṣṇa*, JOIB 14, 1964–65, 1–13.

Other scholars, who do believe in the trustworthiness of the puranic genealogies, prefer to rely on data for the historic period only. Cf. R. C. MAJUMDAR: *Sources of Indian History*, in *The Vedic Age*, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1965 ed., pp. 47–65 at 48; also *Oxford History of India*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958, p. 61.

For the early historical dynasties, up to the Mauryas: P. L. BHARGAVA: *Mauryan and Pre-Mauryan Chronology according to the Purāṇas*, JIH 27, 1949, 171–178; id.: *Pre-Mauryan History according to the Purāṇas*, IHQ 28, 1952, 232–239; H. G. SHASTRI: *The Puranic Chronology of the Mauryan Dynasty*, JOIB 9, 1959–60, 387–392; S. N. ROY: *Textual and Historical Analysis of the Purāṇa-Commentary Relating to the Maurya-Dynasty*, Pur 14, 1972, 94–106.

For the post-Maurya dynasties: S. N. ROY: *Historical Analysis of a Purāṇic Verse Relating to the Śuṅga Dynasty*, Pur 11, 1969, 67–72; K. P. JAYASWAL: *The Yaunas of the Purāṇas and the Last Kushāṇa Emperor in India*, JBORS 18, 1933, 201–206; S. A. JOGLEKAR: *Sātavāhana and Sātakarṇi*, ABORI 27, 1946, 237–287; P. L. BHARGAVA: *The Sātavāhana Dynasty of Dakṣiṇāpatha*, IHQ 26, 1950, 325–329; Sidhakar CHATTOPADHYAYA: *Home of the Satavahanas*, JIH 41, 1963, 749–755; id.: *The Purāṇic Account of the Sātavāhanas*, JIH 44, 1966, 359–365; id.: *A Note on the Sātavāhanas*, ABORI 48–49, 1968, 375–381.

For the Guptas: D. R. PATIL: *Gupta Inscriptions and the Purāṇic Tradition*, BDCRI 2, 1940–41, 148–165 + Appendix (59 pp.); B. BHATTACHARYA: *New Light on the History of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty*, JBRS 30, 1944, 1–46; R. C. MAJUMDAR: *A Forged Purāṇa Text on the Imperial Guptas*, IHQ 20, 1944, 345–350; D. C. GANGULY:

The Purāṇas on the Imperial Guptas, *IHQ* 21, 1945, 141–143; Dasaratha SHARMA: The Purāṇas on the Imperial Guptas, *IHQ* 30, 1954, 374–378; S. N. Roy: Some Notes and Observations on the Purāṇic Account of the Imperial Guptas, *Pur* 12, 1970, 265–285; D. R. MANKAD: Samudragupta in the Purāṇas, *AIOC* 13 (1946) 1951, 2.417–422; A. D. PUSALKER: Vikramāditya in the Purāṇas, *BhV* 8, 1947, 129–134; S. N. Roy: On the Identification of the Purāṇic King Pramati, *VIJ* 7, 1969, 109–118 [Pramati = Candragupta II Vikramāditya].

One last point in connection with the puranic king lists ought to be mentioned here. Arrian's *Indikè* (9.9), quoting Megasthenes, states that "from Dionysus to Sandracottus the Indians counted a hundred and fifty-three kings, over six thousand and forty-three years."<sup>41</sup> Similarly, in Pliny's *Natural History* (6.59): "From the time of Father Liber to Alexander the Great 153 kings are counted in a period of 6451 years and three months."<sup>42</sup> Classical scholars have wondered about these figures, not to mention the intriguing discrepancy.<sup>43</sup> More important is the fact that, at least from Megasthenes' time onward, Indians had puranic lists of kings, some of which came to the notice of the foreign visitor.<sup>44</sup>

Ferdinand Bork<sup>45</sup> drew attention to an important concept for a correct evaluation of the purāṇas as sources of Indian history: one should, above all, not overlook the goal of the purāṇas. According to Bork the composers of the purāṇas were, in no way, motivated by the need to preserve things historical, but solely by the desire to comprehend, from a religious point of view, the great world creation and destruction. In the purāṇas, as elsewhere in Indian "historical" writings, "ist es ... weniger ein historisches, als vielmehr ein zyklisches Denken, das hier die Grundlage bildet."<sup>46</sup> The purāṇas are, indeed, one of the

<sup>41</sup> Loeb, tr., E. Iliff Robson, p. 333.

<sup>42</sup> Loeb, tr. H. Rackem, p. 383.

<sup>43</sup> E.g., Pierre CHANTRAINE: *Arrien. L'Inde*, Paris: Belles Lettres, <sup>2</sup>1952, p. 35. For a different type of speculation, identifying Sandracottus with Candragupta I Gupta – rather than Maurya – who would have been enthroned in 325 or 324 B.C., and on the Indian identity of Father Bacchus, the kind of chronology handed Megasthenes, etc., see K. D. SETHNA: Megasthenes and the Indian Chronology as Based on the Purāṇas, *Pur* 8, 1966, 9–37, 276–294; 9, 1967, 121–129; 10, 1968, 35–53, 124–147.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. L. ROCHER: *The Greek and Latin Data about India. Some Fundamental Considerations*, Zakir Husain vol. (1968), 34. Also KANE 1962: 849.

<sup>45</sup> *Die Purāṇas als Geschichtsquelle*, *WZKM* 29, 1915, 97–133 at 125.

<sup>46</sup> Ulrich SCHNEIDER: *Indisches Denken und sein Verhältnis zur Geschichte*, *Saeculum* 9, 1958, 156–162 at 160. Cf. LEVI (1905: 199), on the Nepal *Vaṃśāvalī*, which "n'est qu'un rameau de la littérature des Purāṇas;" also Henry R. ZIMMER: *The Hindu View of World History according to the Purāṇas*, *The Review of Religion* 6, 1941–42, 249–269. Although not specifically dealing with purāṇas, see Hermann GOETZ: *Die Stellung der indischen Chroniken im Rahmen der indischen Geschichte*, *Ztschr. f. Buddhismus* 6, 1924–25, 139–159 at 159. The importance of motives and intentions in "historical" documents has been stressed, in connection with the Javanese chronicles, by C. C. BERG: *Javanese Historiography. A Synopsis of its Evolution*, in D. G. E. HALL: *Historians of South Asia*, London: OUP, 1961, pp. 13–23 at 18, and *The Javanese Picture of the Past*, in SOEJAT-MOKO: *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, Cornell UP, 1965, pp. 87–117 at 90.

principal sources for the Indian system of cyclical time. According to Kirfel<sup>47</sup> many purāṇas, after removal of later insertions and additions, still clearly show that they begin with the creation myth and end with the destruction of the world. The Indian system of cyclical time has been described so often<sup>48</sup> that a few general remarks can suffice here.

The basic idea of the Indian system of cyclical time is that four periods (*yugas*) succeed one another within a *caturyuga* or *mahāyuga*. The names of the *yugas* are identical with those of the throws of dice, from best to worst: *krta* (or *satya*), *tretā*, *dvāpara*, and *kali*. The purāṇas provide long descriptions of the perfect state of things during the *krtayuga* and even longer descriptions of the terrible evils of the *kaliyuga*, in which we now live.<sup>49</sup> It is said that, in the *krtayuga*, *dharmā* – often represented as a bull – had four legs: *tapas*, *śauca*, *dayā*, and *satya*. In each subsequent *yuga* one leg was lost. In these days only *satya* is left, and even that Kali is trying to destroy.<sup>50</sup>

One feature that sets the *yugas* apart from similar systems in other civilizations is that, in India, the world ages have been assigned specific durations. The four *yugas* extend over periods of 4000, 3000, 2000, and 1000 years. Each of these is preceded by a dawn (*samdhya*) and followed by a twilight (*samdhyaṃśa*) equal to one tenth of the duration of the *yuga* proper. The figures for the *yugas* which appear most often in the purāṇas are, therefore, 4800, 3600, 2400, and 1200, the *caturyuga* being equal to 12,000 years. More often than not these years are said to be divine years. To convert them into human years they have to be multiplied by 360, i. e. 1,728,000 + 1,296,000 + 864,000 + 432,000 = 4,320,000.

Although some texts refer to a world destruction at the end of the *caturyuga*, in a majority of sources one thousand *caturyugas* follow each other without interruption. They make up one *kalpa* or day of Brahmā, and end in a total destruction introducing a

<sup>47</sup> 1959: 9.

<sup>48</sup> E. g., John MUIR: Original Sanskrit Texts, London: Trübner, 1890, <sup>31</sup>, pp. 43–49: Account of the System of Yugas, Manvantaras, and Kalpas, according to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, and other authorities; HOPKINS 1896: 418–422; H. JACOBI: Ages of the World (Indian), in ERE 1, 1910, 200–202; P.-E. DUMONT: Primitivism in Indian Literature, in A. O. LOVEJOY: A Documentary History of Primitivism and Related Ideas, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, pp. 433–443 (= <sup>2</sup>1965); W. N. BROWN: Man in the Universe. Some Continuities in Indian Thought, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1966, pp. 79–80; A. S. GUPTA: The Purāṇic Theory of Yugas and Kalpas. A Study, Pur 11, 1969, 304–323; Cornelia D. CHURCH: The Purāṇic Myth of the Four Yugas, Pur 13, 1970–71, 151–159 [p. 152 n. 2: a list of puranic passages]; Adalbert GAIL: Zur Entwicklung des Manvantara-Abschnitts im Rahmen der älteren Purāṇas, Deutscher Orientalistentag 18 (1972) 1974, ZDMG Suppl. II, 321–330. D. R. MANKAD used the *yugas* and *manvantaras* to work out his own system of chronological computations. His publications on this subject include: The Yugas, PO 6, 1941–42, 206–216; Manvantara, IHQ 18, 1942, 208–230; Manvantara-Caturyuga Method (as employed in Purāṇas for chronological computations), ABORI 23, 1942, 271–290; Chronology of the Kali Dynasties, PO 8, 1943–44, 87–99, 177–187; Some Traditional Chronological Considerations. Purāṇic, Buddhist, Jain, BhV 10, 1949, 19–34; Purāṇic Chronology, Anand: Gangajala Prakashan, 1951; Solar Genealogy Reconsidered, JOIB 15, 1965–66, 350–373.

<sup>49</sup> See KIRFEL 1959.

<sup>50</sup> E. g., Bhāgavata° 1.17.24–25.

night of Brahmā, of equal duration. The night of Brahmā comes to an end at the time of a new creation. The entire system of days and night of Brahmā is repeated again and again, for the entire duration of Brahmā's life: one hundred years. If we add to this that the present Brahmā was preceded by and will be followed by numerous other Brahmās, the Indian system of *yugas* and *kalpas* is without beginning and without end.

Alongside the *yugas* and *kalpas* runs another system which plays a prominent role in the *purāṇas*. Each *kalpa* is divided into fourteen *manvantaras* "Manu intervals," each of which is presided over by a different Manu. It is obvious, for arithmetical reasons, that *manvantaras* and *yugas* cannot originally have been together within the same system. The *purāṇas* normally fix the duration of a *manvantara* at seventy-one *yugas*, but this leaves six *yugas* unaccounted for within a *kalpa* of one thousand. As will be seen in the description of some *purāṇas* later in this volume, the present Manu, Vaivasvata, is the seventh in the ongoing Vārāhakaḷpa.

The system – or systems – of cyclical time play an important role in puranic cosmogonic myths. In fact, "any cosmogonical story is invariably accompanied by an enumeration of the time units . . . Time is cyclical, rather it is without a beginning or an end; its structure is one of a series of cycles."<sup>51</sup> One important aspect of puranic cosmogonic myths is the role played in them by Sāṃkhya concepts, to such an extent that one has been able to speak of a "puranic Sāṃkhya."<sup>52</sup> Hacker<sup>53</sup> proposes some very specific dates for the "sāṃkhyization" of puranic cosmogony. The earliest text is in the Mārkaṇḍeya°, around A. D. 300. It was followed by the Vāyu°-Brahmāṇḍa° (shortly after A. D. 335), the Padma°, the Viṣṇu° (ca. A. D. 500), and the Kūrma° (7th or 8th century). About the account in the Liṅga° one can only say that it is later than that of the Vāyu°-Brahmāṇḍa°.

In connection with the *purāṇas* as sources of Indian history, and Pargiter's role in establishing them as such, a few words must be said about a basic concept which became even more controversial than the results derived from it. From an early article onward<sup>54</sup> Pargiter assigned the *purāṇas* to the class of "ancient kṣatriya literature."<sup>55</sup> This literature, originating from court bards and court

<sup>51</sup> Madeleine BIAUDEAU: Etude de mythologie hindoue. Cosmogonies purāṇiques, BEFEO 54, 1968, 19–45 at 21; 55, 1969, 59–60. See also A. D. PUSALKER: Purāṇic Cosmogony, BhV 2, 1940–41, 177–191; A. P. KARMARKAR: Purāṇic Cosmogony (Its Proto-Indian Origin and Development), Radha Kumud Mookerji vol. (1945), 1.323–332; Catarina CONIO: Mito e filosofia nella tradizione indiana. Le cosmogonie nei Mahāpurāṇa, Milan: Mursia, 1975 [rev. Bonazzoli, Pur 18, 1976, 103–107]; id.: Relationship Between Symbols and Myths in the Cosmogonies of Mahāpurāṇa, Pur 19, 1977, 257–282.

<sup>52</sup> Wilhelm JAHN: Über die kosmogonischen Grundanschauungen im Mānava-Dharma-Śāstram, Leipzig: Drugulin, 1904. [Provides a useful survey of earlier scholarship on "puranic Sāṃkhya," pp. 3–11, and compares Manu 1.5–20, 27 with twenty *purāṇas*.]

<sup>53</sup> The Sāṃkhyization of the Emanation Doctrine shown in a Critical Analysis of Texts, WZKSO 5, 1961, 75–112, reprinted: Pur 4, 1962, 298–338. Cf. also his Two Accounts of Cosmogony, Nobel vol. (1963), 77–91.

<sup>54</sup> Ancient Indian Genealogies and Chronology, JRAS 1910, 1–56.

<sup>55</sup> The idea that *kṣatriyas* had achievements of their own in Indian literature and civilization was not new. In an article first published in Nord und Süd (1893) and reproduced, with additions in response to criticism, in Beiträge zur indischen Kulturgeschichte, Berlin 1903 (pp. 1–36: Die Weisheit des Brahmanen oder des Kriegers?), Richard GARBE stated: "So

priests, “grew up in virtual independence of brahmanical literature,” which was the concern of the *ṛṣi*s; only at a much later stage “was it taken over by the brahmins as a not unworthy branch of knowledge. It was then that it was arranged and augmented with stories and discourses fashioned after brahmanical ideas.”<sup>56</sup> Not only does this *kṣatriya* literature provide better historical data about ancient India than the brahmanical literature; it is the only historical literature worth considering. “The reproach that there was no historical faculty in ancient India is true only as regards the brahmins. The *kṣatriyas* did display almost as much of that faculty as could be expected in such ages in the appreciation bestowed on the dynastical genealogies and ballads of royal exploits.”<sup>57</sup>

The existence of a *kṣatriya* literature – the *purāṇas* – independent of and different from the brahmanical literature – the *Vedas* – has found acceptance with several scholars.<sup>58</sup> But it has been opposed far more often than it has been agreed to. It immediately got Pargiter involved in a prolonged controversy with A.B. Keith, leading to a series of articles in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*.<sup>59</sup> Also, many of those who agreed with Pargiter, against Keith, on the subject of the historical value of the *purāṇas*, sided with Keith, against Pargiter, on the concept of a separate *kṣatriya* literature.<sup>60</sup> According to them, “there have

---

viel steht doch fest, daß die größten geistigen Taten oder vielmehr fast alle Taten von menschlicher Bedeutung in Indien von Männern der Kriegerkaste vollbracht worden sind” (p. 30). He listed the following as being of *kṣatriya* origin: the *āman-brahman* theory, Buddhism, Jainism, and Bhāgavatism. For bibliography on the controversy, see HORSCH 1966: 427.

<sup>56</sup> Ancient Indian Genealogies and Chronology, p. 4.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>58</sup> E.g., RAPSON 1922: 265; S. BHIMASANKARARAO: Historical Importance of the Puranas, *QJAHR* 2, 1927–28, 81–90 at 82–83; N.K. SIDHANTA: The Heroic Age of India, p. 30; WINTERNITZ 1963: 457 (with restrictions; Winternitz, *WZKM* 28, 1914, 306, also does not agree with Pargiter that the *purāṇas* originally contained lists of kings only). WALDSCHMIDT (Geschichte des indischen Altertums, p. 18) casually speaks of “eine weltlich-höfische Überlieferung, die in den Kreisen des Kriegeradels zuhause ist.”

<sup>59</sup> In addition to Pargiter’s 1910 article, mentioned earlier, there are the following: PARGITER: Visvamitra and Vasistha, 1913, 885–904; KEITH: The Brahmanic and Kshatriya Tradition, 1914, 118–126; PARGITER: Earliest Indian Traditional ‘History,’ 1914, 267–296; PARGITER: Brahmanic and Kshatriya Tradition, 1914, 411–412; KEITH: The Earliest Indian Traditional History, 1914, 734–741; PARGITER: Earliest Indian Traditional ‘History,’ 1914, 741–745; KEITH: The Age of the Puranas, 1914, 1021–1031; PARGITER: Irregularities in the Puranic Account of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, 1915, 141–147; KEITH: The Dynasties of the Kali Age, 1915, 328–335; PARGITER: Irregularities in the Puranic Account of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, 1915, 516–521; KEITH: The Dynasties of the Kali Age, 1915, 799–800; PARGITER: Visvamitra, Vasistha, Hariscandra, and Sunahsepa, 1917, 37–67.

<sup>60</sup> V.R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: The Purāṇas, Their Historical Value, *PO* 2, 1937–38, 77–83 at 78–79; according to the same author (1951–55: 1.xii), “the Purāṇas are the fifth Veda, and those who follow it are followers of the Vedic school.” Also PUSALKER: Were the Purāṇas Originally in Prakrit?, *Acharya Dhruva* vol. 3 (1946), 101–104; HAZRA 1962: 242–244.

never been in India two such water-tight compartments as the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya tradition . . . Both are Brahmanical traditions, though produced under different environments and with different aims and objectives.”<sup>61</sup> It is also not true, they argue, that historical sense was a monopoly of the kṣatriyas,<sup>62</sup> and, consequently, that the purāṇas are the sole trustworthy sources for Indian history. In fact, the Vedic data have definite advantages over those of the purāṇas. Besides having been transmitted far more faithfully, they are older and, therefore, much closer in time to many of the events of which the purāṇas had only “faint and inaccurate memories.”<sup>63</sup> The Purāṇas represent “centuries of manipulation, of corruption, of reconstruction, and to evolve a kṣatriya tradition from this mass of priestly lore and to claim for it superiority to the incidental notices of the Vedic text is surely a *tour de force*.”<sup>64</sup> The ideal solution consists in harmonizing the data from the Vedas and the purāṇas.<sup>65</sup> Whereas some doubted whether that is at all possible,<sup>66</sup> P. L. Bhargava’s *India in the Vedic Age* tried to show that “in reality the Vedic and Purāṇic traditions are in agreement and . . . the joints which connect the historical matter of the Purāṇas with mythology are too loose to hinder the attempt of gleaning history from these works.”<sup>67</sup>

Another problem connected with the purāṇas, even if it has little to do with history, is so closely linked to Pargiter’s name – and to the discussions surrounding the brahman/kṣatriya literatures –<sup>68</sup> that it better be treated here. The ques-

---

<sup>61</sup> PUSALKER: *Historical Traditions*, HCIP I, 1951, pp. 269–333 at 309; also *The Brāhmaṇa Tradition and the Kṣatriya Tradition*, Hiriyanā vol. (1952), 151–155 at 153. Cf. U. N. GHOSHAL: *The Beginnings of Indian Historiography and Other Essays*, Calcutta: Ramesh Gopal, 1944, p. 51 n. 13.

<sup>62</sup> PUSALKER: HCIP I, p. 310. Cf. KEITH: JRAS 1914, 118–126.

<sup>63</sup> PUSALKER: HCIP I, p. 312 (“The details of the Dāśarājña as given in the R̥gveda no doubt are a first-hand contemporary account”). Cf. RAYCHAUDHURI: *Political History*, <sup>4</sup>1938, p. 7.

<sup>64</sup> KEITH: JRAS 1914: 741. Cf. K. M. MUNSHI: *The Early Aryans in Gujarāta*, Bombay University, 1941, pp. 6–7, 16–17.

<sup>65</sup> G. S. GHURYE: *Some Problems of Indian Ethnic History*, AIOC 9 (1937) 1940, 911–954 at 954.

<sup>66</sup> RAPSON 1922: 273.

<sup>67</sup> <sup>2</sup>1971, p. 5. Cf. PUSALKAR (OH 12, 1964, 45): “The proper procedure for the writing of traditional history is to base the account on the joint testimony of the Vedic texts and the Purāṇas wherever available, to bring harmony into the conflicting texts as far as possible, and to give a very careful consideration to the evidence of the Purāṇas before rejecting it.” See also PUSALKAR 1955: lxiv–lxv, lxvi–lxvii. V. G. RAHURKAR’s article *Devāpi and Santanu in the R̥gveda*, Gode vol. (1960), 3.175–180, is an effort “to show how the Vedic, the Sautic and the Purāṇic sources can be correlated.” Cf. id.: *The Role of Agastya in the Vedic and Post-Vedic Literature*, PO 22, 1–2, 1957, 40–50, and GONDA’s (1975: 28) criticism.

<sup>68</sup> Several articles listed in note 59 above also deal with this problem.

tion whether the epics were originally written in Prakrit was not a new one.<sup>69</sup> Pargiter also made the question bear on the purāṇas, and defended in great detail their Prakrit originals.<sup>70</sup>

Pargiter's thesis has found some following. Some fully agree with it.<sup>71</sup> Others restrict its applicability to a limited number of purāṇas only,<sup>72</sup> or they refuse to accept Pargiter's idea that the Prakrit purāṇas were originally written in Kharoṣṭhī script.<sup>73</sup> On this point again Pargiter's main critic was Keith. He reasoned that, "if a man could write good Sanskrit, it is absurd to suppose that he would be so helpless as to write bad Sanskrit or bad metre merely because he had a Prākṛit original text to render." According to Keith,

"What we have in fact to recognize is that epic Sanskrit, and still more Purāṇic Sanskrit, are not good Sanskrit in the grammatical sense; that Sanskrit is essentially more popular and more tinged with vernacular than the Brahmanical Sanskrit proper, but to accept the obvious fact that the vernacular influence existed is one thing, to believe that the epic or dynastic account is a translation is quite another."<sup>74</sup>

Among those who reject Prakrit as the original language of the purāṇas, some suggest that the so-called prakritisms in the texts have been introduced there at a later stage only, under the influence of popular speech,<sup>75</sup> or they assume that there existed some parallel genealogies in Prakrit, elements of which became

<sup>69</sup> H. JACOBI's chapter on "Die epische Sprache" (Das Rāmāyaṇa, Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1893, pp. 112–119) was discussed in reviews by A. BARTH (Revue de l'histoire des religions 27, 1893, 287–290 = Œuvres 2, 1914, 151–154) and G. A. GRIERSON (Indian Epic Poetry, IA 23, 1894, 52–56); they both were favorably inclined toward a Prakrit original. Barth even made the general statement: "tout ce qui a été populaire dans l'Inde, en dehors, bien entendu, de la littérature sacrée et scolastique des brahmanes, a commencé par le prākṛit et a fini par le sanscrit." Their thesis was rejected by JACOBI (War das Epos und die profane Literatur Indiens ursprünglich in Prākṛit abgefaßt?, ZDMG 48, 1894, 407–417), with the caveat: "es möge dahingestellt bleiben, wie weit davon auch die Purāṇen berührt werden." WINTERNITZ (1963: 1.449) rejects the idea that the epics were first composed in popular dialects, and only later translated into Sanskrit.

<sup>70</sup> PARGITER 1913: xvii–xviii, 77–83; 1922: 5–14.

<sup>71</sup> V. VENKATACHALLA IYER: The Puranas, QJMS 13, 1922–23, 702–713; N. K. SIDHANTA: The Heroic Age, p. 31; V. V. MIRASHI: The Purāṇas on the Successors of the Śātavāhanas in Vidarbha, Pur 18, 1976, 88–92 at 92.

<sup>72</sup> S. BHIMASANKARARAO (Historical Importance of the Puranas, QJAHR 2, 1927–28, 84): "There are clear indications that some of the puranas, Matsya, Vayu, and the Brahmanda were originally composed in Prakrit but were subsequently sanskritised. The Vishnu, Bhagavata and Garuda were composed directly in Sanskrit."

<sup>73</sup> WINTERNITZ (WZKM 28, 1914, 305, review of PARGITER 1913): "... vertritt Pargiter mit guten Gründen die Hypothese, daß diese ein Prakrit war. Weniger gut begründet scheint mir seine zweite Hypothese, wonach die Schrift, in der dieser Bericht ursprünglich geschrieben war, Kharoṣṭhī gewesen sei."

<sup>74</sup> KEITH: JRAS 1915, 332, 333. Cf. Sten KONOW's review of PARGITER 1913, IA 13, 1914, 195–196.

<sup>75</sup> PUSALKAR: Dhruva vol. (1946), 3.101–104.

incorporated in the Sanskrit accounts.<sup>76</sup> Hazra, on the other hand, comes closer to Keith, except that he posits the existence of a “synthetic Sanskrit,” influenced by Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa, as a medium of expression in religious and social matters in quite early days. Both the epics and the purāṇas, “aiming at religious synthesis as well as mass enlightenment,” absorbed many of the characteristics of this language. Many of these have been expurgated by copyists and editors, but a number of them have been preserved.<sup>77</sup> Suniti Kumar Chatterji speaks of a “Vernacular Sanskrit,” a form of Prakrit “within the same linguistic orbit” as the language of the two epics and of Buddhist Sanskrit.<sup>78</sup>

An interesting, but less often mentioned, offshoot of Pargiter’s belief in the purāṇas as true historical records, is his theory about the aryanization of India. According to Pargiter the original home of the Aryans – i. e., the puranic Ailas or Lunar Race – was the mid-Himalayan region. They entered India, from the North, about 2050, settled in Madhyadeśa and conquered most of North India, and, from about 1600 B. C., started to spread outside India toward the northwest. This move “may have led to the Genesis of the Iranians,” and accounts for the appearance of Aryan gods in the treaty between the Hittites and the Mitanni (ca. 1400 B. C.).<sup>79</sup> Even one century after comparative philology had established that the Aryan Indians populated the subcontinent from the northwest, Pargiter’s theory gained considerable success. India as the homeland of the Aryans was a theme that appealed to many Indian scholars.<sup>80</sup> Those who reacted against it

<sup>76</sup> A. S. GUPTA: Purāṇeṣv apāṇinīyaprayogaḥ, Pur 4, 1962, 277–299, rejected by HAZRA 1963: 187 n. 362a.

<sup>77</sup> HAZRA 1963: 186–187. These remarks were made in connection with the language of the Devī. Hazra also maintained that it was as a reaction against the spread of “synthetic Sanskrit” that Pāṇini and others wrote their grammatical treatises.

<sup>78</sup> Foreword to SATYA VRAT: The Rāmāyaṇa, A Linguistic Study, Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1964, pp. xv–xvi. Elsewhere CHATTERJI (Purāṇa Legends and the Prakrit Tradition in New Indo-Aryan, BSOAS 8, 1935–37, 457–466) pleads for a comparative study of the Sanskritized place names in the purāṇas and their surviving forms in the vernaculars. This might teach us much about the earlier existence of puranic legends, their regional origin, etc. On the language of the purāṇas, see also V. S. AGRAWALA: Important Words from the Purāṇas, Pur 2, 1960, 307–312; – Adam HOHENBERGER: Metren der Kunstdichtung in den Purāṇen, WZKSOA 9, 1965, 48–97; tr., Metres of Classical Poetry in the Purāṇas, Pur 11, 1969, 20–66; – R. A. PATHAK: Some Linguistic Peculiarities in the Purāṇas, Pur 11, 1969, 119–126; – Vinapani PATNI: The Elements of Poetry in the Purāṇas, Pur 15, 1973, 178–200.

<sup>79</sup> PARGITER 1922: ch. 25, pp. 287–302.

<sup>80</sup> Narayana TRIPATHI: Puranic Traditions (about earlier homes and migrations of the Indian Āryas), IHQ 9, 1933, 461–469, 880–885; 10, 1934, 121–124; – Raj Bali PANDEY: The Purāṇas on the Original Home of the Indo-Aryans, IHC 10 (1947), 128–137 = The Puranic Data on the Original Home of the Indo-Aryans, IHQ 24, 1948, 94–103; – PUSALKER: Aryan Origins According to the Purāṇas, Siddheswar Varma vol. (1950), 2.269–272; Literary and Archaeological Evidence on the Aryan Expansion in India, Pur 6, 1964, 307–332; Pre-Harappan, Harappan and Post-Harappan Culture and the Aryan

based their arguments on Vedic data,<sup>81</sup> or on ethnological<sup>82</sup> or archeological<sup>83</sup> evidence.

Closely related to the purāṇas as historical and cosmogonic documents is their role as source materials for early ideas on cosmography and geography. A few words on this subject may be added here as an addendum.

The purāṇas generally conceive the universe<sup>84</sup> as having the shape of an egg (*aṇḍa*), with a horizontal diameter of 500,000,000 *yojanas*. Vertically the cosmos is subdivided by a number of parallel planes. Below the earth (*bhūrloka*) are the seven *pātālas* (underworlds) and – also usually seven – *narakas* (hells), the residence of the demons and the place of punishment for the wicked, respectively. Upward from the earth are six *lokas*: *bhūvar-*, *svar-*, *mahar-*, *janar-*, *tapo-*, and *satya-* or *brahma-*. The earth<sup>85</sup> itself is represented as consisting, first, of a central circular mass of land, Jambudvīpa, with a diameter of 100,000 *yojanas*. Jambudvīpa is surrounded by a concentric ring of water, Lavaṇoda. This is again surrounded by a ring of land (*dvīpa*) and a ring of water, and so on, up to a total of seven continents<sup>86</sup> and seven oceans, the width of each succeeding pair being double that of the preceding one. The whole is finally surrounded by yet another continent, Suvarṇabhūmi, said to be the playground of the gods, and a mountain range, Lokāloka, which separates the world from the non-world.

Jambudvīpa is divided into seven parts (*varṣa*) by six parallel mountain ranges running from west to east. From north to south the mountains are called Śṛṅgavat (or Śṛṅgin), Śveta, Nīla, Niṣadha, Hemakūṭa, and Himavat (or Himālaya). The names of the seven

---

Problem, Quart. Rev. of Historical Studies 7, 1967–68, 233–244; Ṛgveda and Harappa Culture, Renou vol. (1968), 581–594; Jaya Chamaraja WADYAR: Purāṇas as the Vehicle of India's Philosophy and History, Pur 5, 1963, 6–10.

<sup>81</sup> Gordon CHILDE (The Aryans. A Study of Indo-European Origins, London: Kegan Paul, 1926, p. 32): the Veda “carries conviction precisely because the historical and geographical references in the hymns are introduced only incidentally and in a thoroughly ingenious manner.”

<sup>82</sup> J. KENNEDY: The Puranic Histories of the Early Aryans, JRAS 1915, 507–516 at 509–510.

<sup>83</sup> H. D. SANKALIA: Traditional Indian Chronology and C-14 Dates of Excavated Sites, JIH 42, 1964, 635–650 at 650. Sankalia (Puranas and Prehistory in Bihar, JIH 48, 1970, 461–468) believes that the various dynasties mentioned in the purāṇas and later Vedic hymns might refer to peoples who have been shown by archeology to have lived in Bihar, U. P., and W. Bengal, from the time of the stone age.

<sup>84</sup> On Indian cosmography generally, see Willibald KIRFEL: Die Kosmographie der Inder, nach den Quellen dargestellt, Bonn–Leipzig: Schroeder, 1920 [reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1967]. Also, by the same: Das Purāṇa vom Weltgebäude (Bhuvanavinyāsa). Die kosmographischen Traktate der Purāṇas. Versuch einer Textgeschichte, [Bonner Orientalistische Studien, N. S. 1,] Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalistischen Seminars, 1954.

<sup>85</sup> V. VENKATACHELLAM IYER: The Seven Dwipas of the Puranas, QJMS 15, 1924–25, 62–75, 119–127, 238–245; 16, 1925–26, 116–124, 268–283; 17, 1926–27, 30–45, 94–105; Ramji PANDEY: The Concept of Earth in the Purāṇas, Pur 12, 1970, 252–264.

<sup>86</sup> A number of texts represent the earth in the form of a lotus, with mount Meru in the center as the pericarp of the lotus and just four continents around it as its petals. Cf. K. NILAKANTA SASTRI: Caturmahadvipas, JIH 20, 1941, 61–64; Rai KRISHNADASA: Purāṇic Geography. Chatur-dvīpa and Sapta-dvīpa, Pur 1, 1959–60, 202–205; D. C. SIRCAR: Catur-Dvīpa and Sapta-Dvīpa Vasumati, JIH 46, 1968, 19–26.

*varṣas* are: (Uttara)kuru, Hiraṇmaya, Ramyaka, Ilāvṛta, Harivarṣa, Kimpuruṣa, and Bhārata. Only the central *varṣa*, Ilāvṛta, with mount Meru in its center, is again subdivided, by two north-south mountain ranges (Gandhamādana and Mālyavat), into three sections: besides Ilāvṛta in the center, Ketumāla in the west and Bhadrāśva in the east.

Bhāratavarṣa,<sup>87</sup> i. e. India, is different from all other sections of the *bhūloka*, in that it, and it alone, is *karmabhūmi*.<sup>88</sup> It is also different for another reason: mountains and rivers which the texts locate in other *varṣas* and even *dvīpas* are imaginary, whereas the numerous peoples, rivers, mountains, and cities of Bhāratavarṣa, even if they cannot always be identified, may be assumed to reflect some degree of positive information or recollection. As early as 1885 Burgess<sup>89</sup> called on scholars to pay attention to the geographic lists of the purāṇas. Ever since the purāṇas have been – and still are – one of the most important sources for our knowledge of the pre-modern geography of India.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>87</sup> W. KIRFEL: Bhāratavarṣa (Indien). Textgeschichtliche Darstellung zweier geographischen Purāṇa-Texte nebst Übersetzung, [Beiträge zur indischen Sprachwissenschaft und Religionsgeschichte 6,] Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1931. Bhāratavarṣa is, again, most often subdivided into nine sections, called *khaṇḍa*, *bheda*, but also *dvīpa*. Cf. Sashibhushan CHAUDHURI: The Nine Dvīpas of Bharatavarṣa, IA 59, 1930, 204, 224–226. There is a tendency among certain scholars to identify these *dvīpas* of Bhāratavarṣa, not with parts of India but of Greater India. E. g., Surendranath MAJUMDAR: Notes on Puranic Nine Divisions of Aciend India, JBORS 8, 1922, 41–45 [reprinted in his edition of Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, Calcutta: Chuckerverty, Chatterjee & Co., 1924, pp. 749–754]. Cf. also Ordhendra COOMAR GANGOLY: Discovery of Indian Images in Borneo, Rūpam 7, 1926, 114; id.: On Some Hindu Relics in Borneo, Journal of the Greater India Society 3, 1936, 97–103; Buddha PRAKASH: The South East Asian Horizons of the Geographers of the Purāṇas, BhV 20–21, 1960–61, 242–273; Om PRAKASH: An Inquiry after South-Eastern Asia in the Purāṇas, JBRS 52, 1966, 96–107 = Pur 7, 1965, 306–319. – Sometimes Bhāratavarṣa is represented as a tortoise – rather the back of a tortoise – resting on water: Mārkaṇḍeya° ch. 57 is called *kūrmavibhāga* (even as Varāhamihira's Bṛhatsaṃhitā, ch. 14). Cf. C. A. LEWIS: The Shorter Kūrma-vibhāga Texts of the Purāṇas, Pur 9, 1967, 84–97.

<sup>88</sup> E. g., Viṣṇu° 2.3.2: *karmabhūmir iyaṃ svargam apavargam ca gacchatām*.

<sup>89</sup> J. BURGESS: On the Identification of Places in the Sanskrit Geography of India, IA 14, 1885, 319–322 at 319.

<sup>90</sup> Most studies on Indian geography make use of the purāṇas. The following are a few examples directly related to puranic data: D. C. SIRCAR: Text of the Puranic List of Peoples, IHQ 21, 1945, 297–314; id.: Text of the Purāṇic List of Rivers, IHQ 27, 1951, 215–238 [both articles are included in Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1960, <sup>2</sup>1971]; Shashi Bhusaṅ CHAUDHURI: Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India (A Study of the Puranic Lists of the Peoples of Bharatavarṣa). Part I Northern India, Calcutta: General Printers & Publishers, 1955; C. A. LEWIS: The Geographical Text of the Purāṇas. A Further Critical Study, Pur 4, 1962, 112–145, 245–276 [compares and improves on the texts established by Kirfel and Sircar]; V. S. AGRAWALA: Bhuvanakośa Janapadas of Bhāratavarṣa, Pur 5, 1963, 160–181 [comments on Lewis' readings and identifications]; D. C. SIRCAR: Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature, ISPP 7, 1965–66, 231–234 (+ 7 plates), appendices 353–407; M. R. SINGH: The Relative Chronology of the Janapada Lists of the Purāṇas, Pur 9, 1967, 262–276; id.: Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas, Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1972.



## PART II

### INDIVIDUAL PURĀṆAS

(in alphabetical order)

#### *Ādi°*

ED.: + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Navīnakṛṣṇa Lāhā, 1891; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1829 (1907).

LIT.: HAZRA: The Ādi-purāṇa, BhV 6, 1945, 60–73; – HAZRA 1954: 15; – HAZRA 1958: 279–303 [minor Vaiṣṇava upa°], 350 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°]; – KANE 1962: 887; – NCC 2 (1966), 83–84.

The printed Ādi°, in twenty-nine chapters, deals primarily with the story of Kṛṣṇa, his birth, his being moved to Nanda's house, and all other incidents of his youth. It ends with his breaking a pair of *arjuna* trees when he was tied to a mortar by Yaśodā. In connection with all this numerous stories are introduced, all for the glorification of Kṛṣṇa. Kṛṣṇa is not merely conceived as an incarnation of Viṣṇu: he is the Bhagavat himself as well as the eternal *brahma*.

The Ādi° still raises a number of questions which have not been clearly answered. First, there are manuscripts<sup>1</sup> which correspond, but only partly, with the editions; the first four chapters of the printed texts seem to be generally missing in the manuscripts, whereas some manuscripts, in fifty-one or fifty-two chapters, carry the story much farther, up to the killing of Kāṃsa, one of them even adding that this concludes the *pūrvakhaṇḍa* of the text.

Second, there are numerous quotations from the Ādi° in the dharmanibandhas, many of them on cremation, funeral rites, and other items connected with the dead; these verses are found neither in the printed texts nor in the manuscripts. On the other hand, an Ādi° – or Ādya° – appears in the first place in most lists of upapurāṇas, and the title was obviously known to al-Bīrūnī (see I.3.3). Hence the conclusion that the quotations are from *this* Ādi°, which was different from the printed one. Hazra dates the latter between A. D. 1203 and 1525, the other one in the sixth century A. D.

---

<sup>1</sup> HAZRA 1958: 259–260 n. 37.

Finally, further contributing to the confusion around the ambiguous title Ādi° is the fact that the Brahma°, the “first” of the mahāpurāṇas, is often referred to as Ādi°, as well as the fact that the title Ādi° became very popular among the Jains (see 2.1.5).<sup>2</sup>

### Āditya°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 15–21; – KANE 1962: 887–888; – HAZRA 1963: 490–501 [lost upa° of non-sectarian or unknown origin]; – NCC 2 (1966), 72–74.

The Āditya° figures in al-Bīrūnī’s list of eighteen purāṇas; it is one of the three purāṇas which he has actually seen, and he quotes a few verses from it in translation. The Āditya° is also frequently quoted by the *nibandhakāras*, on a large variety of topics: death and ritual for the dead, impurity, marriage and duties of married life, donations, *vratas*, and festivals. For this reason Hazra proposes an early date: fifth century A. D.

There seem to have been several versions of the Āditya°. One of these may have been close to the Saura° which, in a number of manuscripts, is called the Mānavīyasaṃhitā of the Āditya°. One Āditya° is said to have been a section of the Sarasvatī°.

### Agni°

ED.: Rājendralāla Mitra, BI work 65, 1873–79 [with introduction]; – Madras: Vartamānaraṅgiṇī Press, 1880; – Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta: Sarasvatī Press, 1882; – + Beng. tr., Rasika Mohana Caṭṭopādhyāya, Calcutta: Jyotiṣa Prakāśa Press, 1292 (1884); – ĀnSS 41, 1900, <sup>2</sup>1957; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1314 (1907); – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1921; – Gurumaṇḍala Series 17, Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 1957; – Baladeva Upādhyāya, KSS 174, 1966.

GEN. LIT.: WILSON: JASB 1, 1832, 81–86 = Works (1864), 3, 82–91; – WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxv–xxxviii; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 34; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 473; 1963: 496–497; – Sashi Bhushan CHAUDURI: Analysis of the Agni Purana, QJAHRS 3, 1928–29, 127–134; – Harihar V. TRIVEDI: The Study of Ancient Geography. Agni-Purāṇa, IHQ 9, 1933, 470–478; – HAZRA: Our Present Agni-Purāṇa, IHQ 12, 1936, 683–691; – HAZRA 1940: 134–140; – S. N. GAJENDRAGADKAR: Decorative Style and Alamkāras in the Agni Purāṇa, BhV 20–21, 1960–61, 96–110; – KANE 1962: 887; – S. D. GYANI: Agni-purāṇa. A Study, [ChSS 42.] Varanasi: ChSS Off., 1964; – Rāmaśaṅkara BHATṬĀCĀRYA: Agnipurāṇaviśayānukramaṇī. [Purāṇasamīkṣātmikayā bhūmikayā saṃvalitā.] Subject Index to the Agnipurāṇa (With Important Proper Names) With an Elaborate Introduction, Vārāṇasī: Bhāratīya Prakāśana, ca. 1965; – André PADOUX: On Mantras and Mantric Practices in the Agni-Purāṇa, Pur 1978, 57–65.

The Agni°, in 382 or 383 chapters (see 2.1.3), is a typical “encyclopedic” purāṇa (see 2.1.4). “It actually deals with anything and everything.”<sup>3</sup> Some to-

<sup>2</sup> See NCC for the wide variety of texts going under the title Ādi°.

<sup>3</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 496. For a survey of the contents, see BI work 65, 1 pp. vii–xxxvi; CHAUDHURI Agni° 1928–29: 127–131.

pics, such as iconography,<sup>4</sup> are touched upon in various sections of the text. Other subjects are limited to one or two coherent sections; the sections themselves succeed one another without the slightest connection or transition.

Chapters 21–70 have been described as summaries of one or more *pāñcarātra samhitās*;<sup>5</sup> chapters 114–116 are important “for elucidating the cultural history and historical geography of ancient Bihar”;<sup>6</sup> chapters 123–149 are considered to be a summary of the Yuddhajayārṇava.<sup>7</sup>

Chapters 218–231 deal with politics.<sup>8</sup> They treat of the conventional seven constituent elements of the state; the education and other necessary qualifications of the king, together with his daily routine, duties, and privileges; similar topics in connection with ministers and other high officials; administration, civil, judicial, local, and revenue; organization of the army, and the causes of war; principles of interstate relations; etc.

The relationship between chapters 253–258 (ĀnSS), on law, and the second book of the Yājñavalkyasmṛti, involving a disagreement between Losch and Meyer, have been discussed elsewhere in this volume (see 2.1.5).

Materials on trees and water reservoirs occur in two partly overlapping chapters (247: *vāstulakṣaṇam*, and 282: *vṛkṣāyurvedaḥ*), taught by Agni and Dhantantari, respectively; they may have been borrowed from Puṣkara’s teachings in the Viṣṇudharmottara° (2. ch. 29–30).<sup>9</sup>

Two medical chapters (280: *sarvarogaharāṇy auśadhāni*, and 370: *śarīrāvayavāḥ*), have been studied by Reinholt F. G. Müller, who argues for a relative independence of the Agni° teachings from those of Indian medicine generally.<sup>10</sup>

Chapters 328–335 (ĀnSS) deal with metrics (*chandaḥ*); they have been analyzed as a summary of the Piṅgalasūtras, with a commentary.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>4</sup> M.-Th. DE MALLMANN: Les enseignements iconographiques de l’Agni-Purana, [AMG, Bibl. d’Et., 67,] Paris: PUF, 1975.

<sup>5</sup> HAZRA 1940: 136.

<sup>6</sup> Yogendra MISHRA: Bihar in the Agni-Purāṇa, JBRS 40, 1954, 1–7 [a summary at Indian History Congress 16, 1953/1955, 96]; ch. 114 contains the story of Gayāsura and is the Gayāmāhātmya proper; ch. 115–116, the Gayātrāvidhi, are most important for topographical details; ch. 117 mentions Gayā first among the sacred places at which *śrādhā* has to be performed.

<sup>7</sup> HAZRA 1940: 137 n. 128. Cf. Teun GOUDRIAAN and Sanjukta GUPTA: Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature [vol. II.2 in this series], Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981, p. 126 n.

<sup>8</sup> Bambahadur MISHRA: Kingship in the Agni Purana, JIH 38, 1960, 33–42; – Dasharatha SHARMA: Political Thought and Practice in the Agni-Purāṇa, Pur 3, 1961, 23–37; – Bambahadur MISHRA: Polity in the Agni Purāṇa, Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1965; – Rāmoktā Nitīḥ [= Agni° 237 (ĀnSS 238). 2–8], Pur 13, 1970–71, 85.

<sup>9</sup> J. J. MEYER: Die Baumzuchtkapitel des Agnipurāṇa in textgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung, Winternitz vol. (1933), 56–65 [= addition and correction to Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa, pp. 95–104].

<sup>10</sup> Ärztliche Lehren im Agnipurāṇa, RO 28.1, 1964, 127–134 [with free tr.]; – Medizinische Bemerkungen zum Agni-Purana, ArOr 31, 1963, 378–397.

<sup>11</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cl.

The eleven chapters on *alamkāra* (ĀnSS 337–347; BI 336–346) have attracted considerable scholarly attention and discussion.<sup>12</sup> Their contents have been compared with the teachings of various authors and schools of poetics, with different results: after Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha (Kane), pre-Bhoja (De), post-Bhoja (Raghavan). The reason for this disagreement among scholars probably lies in the fact that the *alamkāra* section of the Agni° does not really belong to any specific school; it represents an eclectic compilation, borrowing elements from various schools, obviously not making much of a contribution of its own except the joining together of theories on *rasa*, *rīti*, *guṇa*, *doṣa*, etc., in a way which is purely its own.

Eight lexicographical chapters (ĀnSS 360–367; BI 359–366) are heavily dependent on the Amarakośa, in its Bengal version. About three quarters of the verses in the Agni° are identical with the lexicon; other verses either have been composed by the compilers of the Agni°, or they were originally marginal glosses, or they derive from some other sources.<sup>13</sup>

As to the date of the Agni°, Winternitz flatly states: “To which age this remarkable encyclopaedia or its separate parts belong, it is impossible to say.”<sup>14</sup> Attempts have been made, though, to date certain sections of the text. According to S.K. De<sup>15</sup> the poetics section is later than the middle of the ninth century, “whatever may be the date of the Purāṇa as a whole.” Birwé fixed the date of the lexicographical section between ca. A. D. 1150 for the older part and the 14th century for the younger part, and A. D. 1665. Others again, while discussing sections only, were tempted to broaden their conclusions and use them to date the purāṇa as a whole. Haraprasad Shastri<sup>16</sup> suggests A. D. 800–900; he reasons that the chapters on metrics must precede Halāyudha’s commentary on the Piṅgalasūtras (A. D. 950–1000); otherwise this commentary would be reflected in the Agni° rather than the far more obscure one which is incorporated now, and which

<sup>12</sup> Suresh Mohan BHATTACHARYYA: The Alamkāra-Section of the Agni-purāṇa. Critically Edited, with an Introduction, English tr., and Notes, Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay, 1976. Cf. KANE: Outlines of the History of Alamkara Literature: The Chronology of Alamkāra Literature, Part II, IA 46, 1917, 173–183 at 173–177; – KANE: History of Sanskrit Poetics, Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press, <sup>3</sup>1951, pp. ii–iv; – KANE 1930: 172; – S.K. DE: The Agni-Purana and Bhoja, JRAS 1923, 537–549; – DE: History of Sanskrit Poetics, Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay, <sup>2</sup>1960, pp. 1.97–100; – Prakas Chandra LAHIRI: Theory of Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāṇa, IHQ 9, 1933, 448–460; – V. RAGHAVAN: Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāṇa, IHQ 10, 1934, 767–779; – DE: Date of the Alamkāra Section of the Agni-Purāṇa, PO 2.1, 1937, 15–17; – Suresh Mohan BHATTACHARYYA: Peculiarities in the Alamkāra-section of the Agni-purāṇa, BDCRI 20, 1960, 42–49; – Edwin GEROW: Indian Poetics [vol. V.3 in this series], Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977, pp. 269–270.

<sup>13</sup> Robert BIRWÉ: The Amarakośa and the Lexicographical Chapters of the Agnipurāṇa, JAOS 96, 1976, 383–403. Cf. HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cxlvii–cxlviii.

<sup>14</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 497.

<sup>15</sup> History of Indian Poetics, <sup>2</sup>1960, p. 99.

<sup>16</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cli.

is controverted by Halāyudha. Kane<sup>17</sup> proposes the date of ca. A.D. 900; in addition to the fact that the section on poetics is later than Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, the text of Yājñavalkya as it appears in the Agni° represents an intermediate stage between that of Viśvarūpa's Bālakriḍā and that of Viḅṅāneśvara's Mitākṣarā. Hazra<sup>18</sup> assigns the Agni° to the ninth century, for "Tantric elements began to be absorbed appreciably by the Purāṇas not earlier than about 800 A.D." Gyani<sup>19</sup> allows a period of growth "to its extant form . . . from A. D. 700 or 800 to A. D. 1000 or 1100." Chaudhuri (see 2.2.2) proposes A. D. 750–850, whereas Wilson<sup>20</sup> considered the Agni° probably anterior to the eighth-ninth centuries.

The discovery of a Vahni°, different from the Agni°, and its rise to prominence as the "original" Āgneya°, at the expense of the Agni°, has been discussed earlier (see 2.1.3).

Among the texts that claim to belong to the Agni°, we might mention the Tulākāverimāhātmya<sup>21</sup> and the Rājagṛhamāhātmya.<sup>22</sup>

### Ākhetaka°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 21; – HAZRA 1963: 501 [lost upa° of non-sectarian or unknown origin].

This title occurs in the list of eighteen upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra°. <sup>23</sup> It is not mentioned anywhere else in the literature.

### Āṅgīrasa°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 21; – HAZRA 1958: 351 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

Āṅgīrasa° is another title which occurs in the Ekāmra° list only; one stanza from it is quoted in Gopālabhaṭṭa's Haribhaktivīlāsa. Hazra places the text in Western Bengal or Orissa, shortly before A. D. 900.

### Āścarya°

See *Daurvāsasa*°.

<sup>17</sup> KANE 1930: 172.

<sup>18</sup> HAZRA 1940: 38.

<sup>19</sup> Agni° 1964: 288.

<sup>20</sup> Works (1864), 3, p. 90.

<sup>21</sup> Ed. Madras: Sarasvatibhāṇḍāra Press, 1874; – tr. G. R. SUBRAMIAH PANTULU, IA 30, 1901, 406–408; 31, 1902, 444–446; 33, 1904, 90–92.

<sup>22</sup> Ed. + Hindi C. Lucknow: Lucknow Printing Press, 1904.

<sup>23</sup> Also in the list provided by LANGLEËS, *Recherches asiatiques* 1, 1805, 393.

*Ātma°*

ED.: + *tīkā* by Rāmakṛṣṇa (alias Kākārāma), Bombay: Gaṇapati Krishnāji's Press, 1873; – + *tīkā* + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Rāmāyaṇa Press, 1942 (1885); – Bombay: Gopal Narayana Press, 1905.

LIT.: NCC 2 (1966), 49.

This text is included here, first, because “purāṇa” figures in the title, and, second, to demonstrate the variety of compositions designated by that term. As indicated by the alternate titles, Upaniṣadratna or Upaniṣatsārārthaprakāśa, the *Ātma°* is a summary of the principal Upaniṣads, composed in verse, in eighteen (!) chapters, by Śaṅkarānanda, disciple of Ānandātman. The date of Rāmakṛṣṇa's commentary, according to an Asiatic Society manuscript, is *saṃvat* 1859.<sup>24</sup>

*Auśanasa°*

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 22, 23–24; – HAZRA 1963: 501–502, 504–505 [lost upa° of non-sectarian or unknown origin].

Most lists of upapurāṇas include the *Auśanasa°* or *Uśanaserita°*; Śaukra° probably refers to the same work. However, no later text is known to have quoted from it. Some manuscripts of a *Vindhyamāhātmya*, in forty-one chapters, claim that it belongs to the *Bṛhadauśanasa°*.<sup>25</sup>

*Bārhaspatya°*

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 22; – HAZRA 1963: 502 [lost upa° of non-sectarian or unknown origin].

The list of upapurāṇas in the *Revākhaṇḍa* (1.49) of the *Skanda°* includes a *Bārhaspatya°* “belonging to the *Vāyavīya*.”

*Bhāgavata°*

ED.: It is not possible to give here a complete survey of the editions, with and without commentaries, of the *Bhāgavata°*. The reader be referred to catalogues of printed Sanskrit books (e.g., IOL: 358–376; EMENEAU 1935: 80–82). I shall only recall the oldest edition, which is repeatedly referred to in this volume, and list a few recent ones. Eugène BURNOUF: *Le Bhāgavata purāṇa ou histoire poétique de Kṛṣṇa*, traduit et publié, Paris: Imprimerie Royale, later Nationale, 1840–1898, vol. 4 by Eugène Louis HAUVETTE-BESNAULT, vol. 5 by the same and Alfred ROUSSEL; – Madras: V. Ramaswami Sastrulu, 1937,

<sup>24</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI: Asiatic Society Catalogue 2 (Vedic Mss.), 1923, 1363–1365, no. 1723.

<sup>25</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: 745–747, nos. 4086 (*saṃvat* 1940) and 4087 (*saṃvat* 1924), with a comm. by Vaidyanātha.

2 vols., with preface by V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, the Bhāgavatamāhātmya from the Padma°, etc.; – + Hindi tr., Gorakhpur: Gita Press, <sup>1</sup>1997 (1940), <sup>2</sup>2008 (1951), 2 vols., with the Māhātmya; – Kṛṣṇaśaṅkara Śāstri, Ahmedabad: Śrībhāgavatavidyāpīṭha, 1965–, including the commentaries (for details on these, see below), of Śrīdharaśvāmīn (+ Vamśīdhara and Rādhāramaṇadāśagosvāmīn), Vīrarāghavācārya, Vijayadhvajātīrtha, Jīvaśvāmīn, Viśvanāthacakravartīn, Śukadeva, Vallabhācārya (+ Puruṣottamacaraṇagosvāmīn), and Gīrīdharalāla [I have seen this ed. up to *skandha* 9 only]; – Heinz BECHERT: The Bhagavata Purana. The Birch Manuscript in the State and University Library in Göttingen. With a Concordance by Maheshwari PRASAD, [Śata-pīṭaka Series 228,] New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1976 [facsimile reproduction of the oldest ms. of the Bhāgavata°, 14th–15th cent., Śāradā script]; – + C. Śrīdhara, J. L. Shastri, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Tr., in addition to BURNOUF (above): Manmatha Nath DUTT, Calcutta: H. C. Bass, 1895–96, 3 vols.; – J. M. SANYAL, Calcutta: Oriental Publishing Co. (vol. 1), Datta Bose Co. (vols. 2–5), 1929–39; <sup>2</sup>Calcutta: Oriental Publishing Co., 1950–54; <sup>3</sup>Bombay: Oriental Publishing Co., 1965; – N. RAGHUNATHAN, Madras: Vighneswara Publ. House, 1976 (reprint 1981), 2 vols.; – Ganesh Vasudeo TAGARE, [AITM 7–11,] Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1976–78.

SOME EXTRACTS AND SUMMARIES: Alfred ROUSSEL: Légendes morales de l'Inde, empruntées au Bhagavata Purana et au Mahabharata. Traduites du sanscrit, Paris: Maisonneuve, 1900–01, <sup>2</sup>1969 [extracts from *skandhas* 10, 11, and 12, and from the Māhātmya]; – V. K. RAMANUJACHARI: Śrībhāgavatam – Part XI. Being an Analysis in English of the Instruction given by Śrī Kṛiṣṇa to Ūddhava . . . , Kumbakonam: the author, 1932; – V. K. RAMANUJACHARI: Śrībhāgavatam – Part X. Being an Analysis in English, *ibid.*, 1934; – Srimad Bhagavata, condensed in the poet's own words by Pandit A. M. SRINIVASACHARIAR, Translated by V. RAGHAVAN, Madras: Natesan, 1937; – V. RAGHAVAN: The Bhāgavata, in MORGAN 1953: 363–373 [retold in Raghavan's own words]; – Dilip Kumar ROY: Immortals of the Bhagavat; or Nectar of Immortality . . . , Agra: Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal, ca. 1957 [6 stories told in his own words]; – Srimad Bhagavatam. Abridged by Ramanlal K. SHASTRI. Transl. Bhimbhai D. Mehta and Krishnashanker A. Vyasa, 2 vols., Ahmedabad: Shri Janata Janardana Bhagawat Trust, 1975.

INDEXES: J. E. ABBOTT: The Topographical List of the Bhagavata Purana, IA 28, 1899, 1–6; – NITYASVARŪPA BRAHMACĀRIN: Śrīmadbhāgavatasya mātṛkākramaṇa sūcīpatram, Calcutta: Devakīnandana Press, 1915; – T. R. KRISHNACHARYA: Index to Srimad Bhagavatam. (1) Table of contents, and (2) Alphabetical index of leading topics, places and persons, Madras: Hindi Prachar Press, 1932; – Śrīmadbhāgavata-pādānukramaṇikā. Quarter Index of the Bhagawat-puran, Mathura: Sat-shastra Prakashan, 1979.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxiv–xxx; – J. E. ABBOTT: Similar Passages in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa and the Bhagavadgītā, IA 21, 1892, 94; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 41–49; – Alfred ROUSSEL: Cosmologie hindoue d'après le Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Paris: Maisonneuve, 1898; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 464–466; 1963: 486–489; – C. V. VAIDYA: The Date of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, JBBRAS n. s. 1, 1925, 144–158; – Frz. Jos. MEIER: Der Archaismus in der Sprache des Bhāgavata-Purāṇa mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Verballflexion, ZII 8, 1931, 33–79; – Amarnath RAY: Domicile of the Author of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, IHQ 8, 1932, 49–53; – *id.*: Interpolations in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, IHQ 8, 1932, 253–256; – B. N. KRISHNAMURTI SHARMA: The Date of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ABORI 14, 1932–33, 182–218; – Amarnath RAY: Date of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, JAssRS 2, 1934–35, 73–82; – Amarnath RAY: Bhāgavata Purāṇa and the Kārikās of Gauḍapāda, BSOAS 8, 1935–37, 107–111; – P. M. MODI: Problem of the 'tad uktam' Sūtras in the Brahmasūtras, IHQ 13,

1937, 514–520 [Vallabha refers 3 of the 8 ‘*tad uktam*’ sūtras to the Bhāgavata<sup>o</sup>]; – P. K. GODE: An Illustrated Manuscript of the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa Copied in A. D. 1648, NIA 1, 1938, 249–253; – HAZRA: The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, NIA 1, 1938, 522–528; – HAZRA 1940: 52–57; – S. HANUMANTHA RAO: Mahayana Buddhism and Pauranic Hinduism. Mutual Influence, JIH 19, 1940, 307–311; – Durgashanker K. SHASTRI: The Date of the Bhāgavata, BhV 2, 1940–41, 129–139; – Sushila MEHTA: Some Linguistic Peculiarities of the Bhāgavata, BhV 4, 1942–43, 30–40; – M. R. MAJUMDAR: Discovery of a Folio of Bhāgavata Daśamaskandha Illustrated in the Gujarati Style, JUBo n. s. 12.2, 1943, 41–46; – S. SRIKANTA SASTRI: Paramārthasāra and Śrī Bhāgavata, IHQ 22, 1946, 105–111; – N. RAGHUNATHAN: The Art of Śrīmad Bhāgavata, JOR 16, 1946–47, 129–140; – P. K. GODE: Date of Śrīdharasvāmin, Author of the Commentary on the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, Between A. D. 1350 and 1450, ABORI 30, 1949, 277–283; – Purnendu Narayana SINHA: A Study of the Bhagavata Purana or Esoteric Hinduism, Benares: Freeman, 1901, <sup>2</sup>Madras: Adyar, 1950; – Siddhesvara BHATTACHARYA: A Critique of “The Bhāgavata-purāṇa,” JBRS 36, 1950, 9–50 [a critique of S. N. Dasgupta]; – J. N. BANERJEA: Śrīmad Bhāgavata, The Place of its Origin, IHQ 27, 1951, 138–143; – Bratindra Kumar SENGUPTA: Traces of Sāṅkhya Doctrines in the Śrīmadbhāgavata, IHQ 35, 1959, 327–332; – P. C. DIVANJI: Bhagavadgītā and Bhāgavatapurāṇa as Models for the Yogavāsīṣṭha, JASBO 34–35, 1959–60, 44–58; – Narendra Nath Sharma CHOUDHURI: Śrīmadbhāgavatasya vaiśiṣṭyam, Pur. 2, 1960, 62–70; – Siddhesvara BHATṬĀCĀRYA: The Philosophy of the Śrīmad-Bhāgavata, Santiniketan: Viśva-Bharati, vol. 1 Metaphysics, 1960, vol. 2 Religion, 1962; rev. ed., Varanasi 1982; – P. NAGARAJA RAO: Bhagavata, Ved. Kes. 48, 1961–62, 29–34; – Bimanbehari MAJUMDAR: The Bhāgavata Purāṇa and its Influence in the Sixteenth Century, JBRS 47, 1961, 381–393; – Chintaharan CHAKRAVARTI: A Newly Acquired Old Dated Manuscript of the Bhagavata Purana, ISPP 3, 1961–62, 652–653; – Krishnaji TRIVEDI: The Bhagavata and Indian Culture, Ved. Kes. 48, 1961–62, 438–440; – Jean FILLIOZAT: Les dates du Bhāgavatapurāṇa et du Bhāgavatamāhātmya, W. Norman Brown vol. (1962), 70–77; – KANE 1962: 898–899; – B. S. AGNIHOTRI: The Concepts of Yoga in the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, JBRS 49, 1963, 178–185; – Rasik Vihari JOSHI: The First Verse of the Bhāgavata-mahāpurāṇa, Pur 6, 1964, 378–390; – G. H. BHATT: The Place of Bhāgavata in the Śuddhādvaita of Vallabhācārya, VIJ 2, 1964, 261–263; – CĀRUDEVAŚĀSTRĪ: Śrīmadbhāgavatabhāṣāparicchedaḥ, VIJ 2, 1964, 355–376; – Milo C. BEACH: A Bhāgavata Purāṇa from the Punjab Hills and Related Paintings, Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin, Boston 63, 1965, 168–177; – Karl KHANDALAVALA: The Bhāgavata Purāṇa in Kandra Painting, New Delhi: Lalit Kala Akademi, 1965; – Thomas J. HOPKINS: The Social Teaching of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, in SINGER 1966: 3–22; – J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN: On the Archaism of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, in SINGER 1966: 23–40; – Bimanbehari MAJUMDAR: The Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavata. A Comparative Study, BRMIC 17, 1966, 117–128; – Asutosh Sarma BISWAS: Bhāgavata Purāṇa: a Linguistic Study, particularly from the Vedic Background, Dibrugarh 1968 [Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Book Agency]; – Kishori Saran TRIPATHI: A Critical Study of the Śrīmad-Bhāgavata, Varanasi: BHU, 1969; – Adalbert J. GAIL: Bhakti im Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Religionsgeschichtliche Studie zur Idee der Gottesliebe in Kult und Mystik des Viṣṇuismus, [Münchener Indol. Stud. 6.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969; – SATYAVRAT: Synonyms in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, ABORI 51, 1970, 135–149; – T. S. RUKMANI: A Critical Study of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (With special reference to Bhakti), [ChSSt 77,] Varanasi: ChSS Off., 1970; – Shiva Shanker PRASAD: Did the Author of the Bhāgavata know Kālidāsa?, Pur 14, 1972, 137–140; – Gaṇeśa THĪṬE: Pāñcarātrātmakam sāmṅhyam, Pur 15, 1973, 121–123 [on Bhāgavata<sup>o</sup> 3.26.19ff.]; – V. RAGHAVAN: Did the Bhāgavata Know Kālidāsa?, Pur 15, 1973, 141–142; – Umakant P. SHAH: A Note on Four Paintings of Bhāgavata-Daśama-

skandha, Museum Bulletin 25, 1973–74, 87–88 (+ 4 plates); – Swami TAPASYANANDA: The Place of the Bhagavata Among Puranas, Ved. Kes. 60, 1973–74, 458–460; – O’FLAHERTY 1974: 23–24; – Ramnarayan VYAS: The Synthetic Philosophy of the Bhāgavata, Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas, 1974; – Shiv Prasad BHARDWAJ: Poetic Imagery in Bhāgavata Purāṇa, VIJ 13, 1975, 29–36; – Durgaprasad S. NADKARNI: Textual Restoration in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa. With Special Reference to Metrical Anomalies, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1975; – Jaya CHEMBURKAR: Kāla-śakti of Īśvara in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, JOIB 26, 1976–77, 56–58; – Anand NAYAK: La méditation dans le Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Paris: Dervy-Livres, 1978; – Jawahar Lal SHARMA: The Date of Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Pur 20, 1978, 66–70; – Subhash ANAND: The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, A Guide for the Sādḥaka, Pur 20, 1978, 71–86; – Subhash ANAND: Saḡuṇa or nirḡuṇa, Pur 21, 1979, 40–63; – Clifford G. HOSPITAL: Līlā in Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Pur 22, 1980, 4–22; – Subhash ANAND: Bhakti, the Bhāgavata Way to God, Pur 22, 1980, 187–211 [a ch. from Thesis: The Nature of Spiritual Life in the Bhāgavata-purāṇa (BHU)]; – S. S. PRASAD: The Bhāgavata and the Dharmasāstras, Ind. Taur. 8–9, 1980–81, 333–336.

The Bhāgavata° is composed of twelve sections, called *skandhas*, with a total of 335 *adhyāyas*.<sup>26</sup> The first *skandha* serves as an introduction to the entire Bhāgavata°. At the request of Śaunaka and the other sages gathered in the Naimiṣa forest, the Sūta sings the glory of Lord Kṛṣṇa, praises *bhakti* to him, and describes his *avatāras*. The principal story in this *skandha* is that of Parīkṣit, the son of Abhimanyu, from the time of his being protected in his mother’s womb against Aśvatthāma’s weapon, up to the time when he is cursed by the young Śṛṅḡī, sage Śamīka’s son, to die within seven days. When Parīkṣit therefore withdraws to the bank of the Ganges, vowing to fast unto death, among the sages who gather around him is Śuka, the son of Vyāsa. Parīkṣit avails himself of this opportunity to inquire from this “eminent teacher of yogins” what a man ought to do and avoid when he is about to die. Śuka’s answers to Parīkṣit in the following *skandhas* constitute the main body of the Bhāgavata°.

At the beginning of the second *skandha* Parīkṣit is told that someone who is about to die shall become free of all fear of death; he shall abandon all attachments to pleasure, and give up all connections with his home and family. He shall control his breath, subdue his mind, and concentrate on the syllable *OM*. This will help him develop *yoga* characterized by *bhakti*. Parīkṣit’s question on the nature and types of *dhāraṇā* leads to a discussion of the gross aspect of Bhagavān – the *virāṭpuruṣa* or *mahāpuruṣa* – and his subtle aspect in the heart, and of the distinction between gradual and instantaneous liberation, ending in the description of the death of a *yogin*. Further questions by Parīkṣit result in an account of the creation, of *avatāras*, etc. The last chapter of this *skanda* contains and explains one of the lists of ten characteristics of the purāṇas (see 1.3.2).

The third *skandha* introduces Vidura, the younger brother of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu, who, while on a long pilgrimage to visit holy places, meets Uddhava near

<sup>26</sup> Nearly 27 percent of the *adhyāyas* belong to the tenth *skandha* alone, as follows: 19, 10, 33, 31, 26, 19, 15, 24, 24, 90, 31, 13.

the Yamunā. Uddhava tells him about the Bhārata war and Kṛṣṇa's death. He also advises Vidura to go to Haridvāra, and inquire with Maitreya about the Highest Truth. As a result, Maitreya instructs Vidura on the creation of the world and allied subjects. One chapter (ch. 11) is devoted to the various divisions of time. Next, we learn about the births of Hiranyakaśipu and Hiranyākṣa, and the latter's fight with and defeat by the Boar. Finally, there is the story of Kardama and Devahūti, and the latter's instruction by their son Kapila, leading to Devahūti's final liberation (Kāpileyopākhyāna).

After one chapter on the Svāyambhuva *manvantara*, the fourth *skandha* relates the well known story of Dakṣa's sacrifice. This is followed by the Dhruva legend, and the story of king Pṛthu; the Purañjaropākhyāna concludes with an interesting allegorical explanation of the story. The *skandha* ends with the story of the Pracetas brothers, up to their renunciation and liberation.

Via the stories of Manu's son Priyavrata – the wheels of whose chariot separated the seven *dvīpas* –, of his son Āgnidhra, of the latter's son Nābhi, and of his and Merudevī's son Ṛṣabha who was really a partial (*aṃśakalayā*) incarnation of the Lord, the fifth *skandha* reaches Ṛṣabha's eldest son Bharata, on account of whom the land until then called Ajanābha became known as Bhāratavarṣa. The stories surrounding Bharata lead into a description of the *bhuvanakośa* "the sphere of the earth." This is followed by an account of the sun and its course, the moon, and other planets, to conclude with a description of the seven regions below the earth,<sup>27</sup> and of twenty-eight hells (*naraka*).

The sixth *skandha* tells the story of Ajāmila, who reaches the Viṣṇuloka as a reward for uttering the four syllables Nā-rā-ya-ṇa on his death bed, even though they were really meant to call his son. This is followed by an account of Dakṣa, the son of the Pracetas brothers, and his offspring: the one thousand Haryaśvas, and sixty daughters. The explanation, by Viśvarūpa, Tvaṣṭṛ's son, to Indra, of the Nārāyaṇa *kavaca*, leads to the telling of the story of Indra's killing of Viśvarūpa, Tvaṣṭṛ's sacrifice resulting in the birth of Vṛtra, the Indra-Vṛtra battle, and Indra's triumph. The demon Vṛtra's devotion to Viṣṇu is then explained by referring to the story of king Citraketu, one of Vṛtra's former existences. The *skandha* ends with the story of the birth of the Maruts.

The major part of the seventh *skandha* is devoted to the story of Hiranyakaśipu and his son Prahlāda. Whereas the Viṣṇu° (1. ch. 17–20) laid the foundation for the classical form of the legend, in the Bhāgavata° it "was given its final shape, i. e. the form in which it lives in the mythological memory of the Hindus, and the influence of which no later revisions (Neuerzählungen) or adaptations (Neubearbeitungen) have been able to escape."<sup>28</sup> The latter third of the *skandha* deals with *varṇadharmas* and, at greater length, with the *dharmas* of the four *āśramas*.

<sup>27</sup> Enumerated here as Atala, Vitala, Sutala, Talātala, Mahātala, Rasātala, and Pātāla (5.24.7).

<sup>28</sup> HACKER 1959: 99. See there for a detailed analysis, pp. 98–147.

The eighth *skandha* deals with the *manvantaras*, the six past Manus (Svāyam-bhuva, Svārociṣa, Uttama, Tāmasa, Raivata, Cākṣuṣa) as well as the seven future ones (Sāvārṇi, Dakṣa Sāvārṇi, Brahma Sāvārṇi, Dharma Sāvārṇi, Rudra Sāvārṇi, Deva Sāvārṇi, Indra Sāvārṇi). Numerous legends are woven into this sequence. In the fourth *manvantara* Hari rescued the King of Elephants (*gajendra*) who was seized by an alligator. The sixth *manvantara* is the occasion for a description of the legend of the churning of the ocean. Nine chapters are devoted to the story of Bali, in connection with Viṣṇu's Vāmana *avatāra*, followed by one chapter on the Matsya *avatāra*.

The seventh and present Manu, Śrāddhadeva Manu or Vaivasvata Manu, and his descendants are the subject of the ninth *skandha*. The text traces India's traditional history, both of the solar race, from Vaivasvata Manu's son Ikṣvāku and his son Vikukṣi, and of the lunar race, from Purūravas, the son of Budha and Manu's daughter Ilā. Via endless kings and dynasties the *skandha* finally reaches the dynasties of Pāñcāla, Magadha, and Kuru, and those of Anu, Druhyu, Turvasu, and Yadu, to end with the birth of Vasudeva's and Devakī's son, Kṛṣṇa.

The tenth *skandha* is undoubtedly the one which has been most often read, translated into the vernaculars, and illustrated in paintings. It deals with the life of Kṛṣṇa, more elaborately than is the case in the Harivaṃśa and the Viṣṇu°, and with special reference to his birth, his youth, and his sporting with the *gopīs*. The five chapters on the Rāsālīlā (ch. 29–33) have always attracted special attention.<sup>29</sup> One question which has been often asked is whether the tenth *skandha* refers to Rādhā, Kṛṣṇa's favorite *gopī* in the Brahmavaivarta° and elsewhere. Winternitz answered the question both positively, in his *Geschichte*,<sup>30</sup> and negatively, in the *History*.<sup>31</sup> The fact is that, in the Bhāgavata°, Kṛṣṇa does appear in the company of one individual *gopī*, invisible to the other *gopīs* who passionately search for him. Whether this particular *gopī* is Rādhā or not depends on whether one is willing to read her name in the word *ārādhita* "propitiated" (10.30.28) which the searching *gopīs* apply to Kṛṣṇa in relation to their unknown rival. The importance of one of the later chapters in the tenth *skandha* (ch. 87) is evident from the fact that about thirty different commentaries on it are known. It contains the Vedastuti or Śrutistuti, in which the Śrutis themselves describe and praise the true nature of the supreme being.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Eugène-Louis HAUVETTE-BESNAULT: *Pantchādhyāyī ou Les cinq chapitres sur les amours de Chrishna avec les Gopīs*, JA sér. 6, v. 5, 1865, 373–445. At pp. 374–375 Hauvette-Besnault refers to John Haebler's *Kavya-samgraha* (Calcutta: Thacker, 1847) which contains six or seven other short poems which, even as the *Gītāgovinda*, refer to the same legend. Cf. also Radhakamal MUKERJEE: *Lord of the Autumn Moons*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1957 [Engl. tr., with two introductory essays].

<sup>30</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 466 n. 2.

<sup>31</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 489 n. 1.

<sup>32</sup> Ed. + Bhāgavatārthadīpikā + Śrīdharīprakāśa by Kāśīnātha Upādhyāya, Bombay: Granthaprakāśaka Press, 1784 (1862); – with the same, Bombay: NSP, 1799 (1877); – +

The eleventh *skandha* begins and ends with the destruction of the Yādavas. In the first chapter Kṛṣṇa becomes desirous of annihilating his own kinsmen, but not being able to do so himself, he provokes a curse by brahmins to the same effect. The curse takes effect in the last but one chapter, where the Yādavas are made to drink too much *maireyaka*, and, as a result of this, engage in a brutal, internecine battle. The very last chapter describes Kṛṣṇa's ascent to Vaikuṅṭha. In between the beginning and the end the *skandha* deals with a wide variety of religious and philosophical topics, mostly in the context of a last discourse which Kṛṣṇa addresses to Uddhava (ch. 7–29).<sup>33</sup>

The beginning of the twelfth *skandha* continues, from the end of the ninth *skandha*, and in the usual form of a prophesy, the list of dynasties that will rule in Magadha (Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, Kaṇvas, Āndhras, to be followed by *sūdra* and *mleccha* kings). After a description of the evils of the Kali age, and of world destruction (*pralaya*), the text comes to its logical conclusion with the death of king Parikṣit, and the ensuing snake sacrifice by his son Janamejaya. All this is followed by a discussion of the Vedas and purāṇas – including the second list of their ten characteristics (see 1.3.2) –, three chapters on the life and glory of Mārkaṇḍeya, a summary of the entire Bhāgavata°, and the assurance that of all the purāṇas it is the greatest.

As early as 1805 Colebrooke suggested that the Bhāgavata° belonged to the class of fabrications of which Wilford had been a victim (see 2.1.1). Differently from Wilford's case, in which the pandit was exposed, the author of the Bhāgavata° was successful. "I am myself inclined to adopt an opinion supported by many learned Hindus, who consider the celebrated Śrī Bhāgavata, as a work of a grammarian, supposed to have lived about six hundred years ago."<sup>34</sup> Ward equally referred to the opinion of the pandits, who "suspect it was not written by the moonee Vādūvyasū, but by a dūndēē, named Vōpūdāvū." The principal argument for this is the language of the text. "They say, the language is not that of the other pooranūs, but more difficult, so much so, that not a single learned man in Bengal can thoroughly understand it."<sup>35</sup>

Vans Kennedy disagreed. The purāṇas are always eighteen in number, and the Bhāgavata° is always one of them. To say that it was composed six hundred years

---

Kṛṣṇatattvapraśāśikā by Keśava Bhaṭṭācārya, Bankipur: Khadgavilāsa Press, 1921; – + Sānvayārthadīpikā by Pitāmbara, Bombay: NSP, 1933 (1876). Cf. also R. M. ATHAVALE: Śrūtikalpalatā (A Commentary on Veda-stuti by Pandit Waman) with an Introduction in Sanskrit and English, Bombay: Tukaram Pandalik Shetye, 1936.

<sup>33</sup> Swami MADHAVANANDA: Uddhava Gita or The Last Message of Shri Krishna. Text with English Translation and Notes, Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama, 1971; – D. A. GANGOLLI: The Divine Light (Extracted from Shrimad Maha-Bhagwat). Edited with a Translation in English, Bombay: Popular Book Depot, c. 1949.

<sup>34</sup> On the Védas, or Sacred Writings of the Hindus, As. Res. 8, 1805, 467.

<sup>35</sup> WARD 1811: 2.117.

ago implies that all other purāṇas are equally recent. Unless, of course, one accepts that the Bhāgavata° was interpolated in the list; in that case not only one of the ancient purāṇas but its very name would have disappeared, which makes no sense.<sup>36</sup>

Here as elsewhere Wilson rejected Kennedy's arguments. He concluded that "there does not seem to be any other ground than tradition for ascribing it to Vopadeva the grammarian; but there is no reason to call the tradition in question. . . . The date of the twelfth century, commonly assigned to him, is probably correct, and is that of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa."<sup>37</sup> Burnouf<sup>38</sup> agreed with Wilson, and, via Wilson and Burnouf, Lassen declared unequivocally that the Bhāgavata° is unique in that its author is known: Vopadeva, in the second half of the thirteenth century.<sup>39</sup>

Even though Vopadeva's authorship continued to have some supporters,<sup>40</sup> it has generally been rejected:<sup>41</sup> Vopadeva is not the author of the Bhāgavata° but of two treatises composed in the margin of the purāṇa.<sup>42</sup> Vopadeva, who is generally assumed to be identical with the author of the Mugdhabodha, was a protégé of Hemādri, the minister of Mahādeva (from A.D. 1260) and Rāmacandra (from A.D. 1271).<sup>43</sup> He is the author of the Muktāphala,<sup>44</sup> a compilation of about one thousand ślokas taken from the Bhāgavata°, to illustrate various aspects of Vaiṣṇava religion. He is also the author of the Harilīlā,<sup>45</sup> an *anukramaṇī* to the Bhāgavata°, in twelve chapters corresponding to the twelve *skandhas* of the purāṇa.

I referred earlier to reports by Colebrooke and Ward, according to which the belief in Vopadeva's authorship of the Bhāgavata°, among learned Hindus, was based on the fact that the language of the text is different from and more difficult than that of other purāṇas. As a result the language of the Bhāgavata° has

<sup>36</sup> KENNEDY 1831: 155 n.

<sup>37</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxvii–xxx.

<sup>38</sup> Bhāgavata° 1, p. ci.

<sup>39</sup> LASSEN 1861: 599.

<sup>40</sup> WOLLHEIM DA FONSECA's list of purāṇas ends: "... und Bhagawat-purānam (letzteres unecht)" (Mythology des alten Indien, Berlin: Hempel, 1856, pp. 176–177).

<sup>41</sup> E.g., BHATTACHARYA (Bhāgavata° 1950: Intro. xii), MAJUMDAR (Bhāgavata° 1966: 117), BECHERT (Bhāgavata° 1976: 1).

<sup>42</sup> S. K. BELVALKAR: An Account of the Different Existing Systems of Sanskrit Grammar, Poona: the author, pp. 104–105. Cf. RUKMANI Bhāgavata° 1970: 7–8.

<sup>43</sup> R. G. BHANDARKAR: Early History of the Dekkan, Calcutta: Chatterverty, Chatterjee, 1928, p. 204.

<sup>44</sup> Ed. + Kaivalyadīpikā by Hemādri, Calcutta Or. Ser. 5, 1920.

<sup>45</sup> There are three editions of the Harilīlā, each with a commentary – normally called Harilīlāviveka – by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī: Calcutta Or. Ser. 3, 1920; – ChSS no. 411 = work 71, 1933, under the title Harilīlāmṛta; – Brindavan: Devakīnandana Press, 1906, which attributes the commentary to Hemādri. The three editions display a number of variants.

received much attention,<sup>46</sup> especially the archaisms appearing in what is, for most, a relatively recent text. Wackernagel suggested that it might be worthwhile collecting the vedisms of the Bhāgavata°.<sup>47</sup> This led to a study by F. J. Meier<sup>48</sup> who concluded that, alongside a few archaisms for which the Vedic context is either indicated or suggested, there are many more the origin of which can no longer be traced. It has also been suggested that “in the archaistic emphasis of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa we find an attempt at Sanskritization of the popular Krishna legend.”<sup>49</sup>

The entire controversy about Vopadeva’s authorship of the Bhāgavata° is linked to another problem: does the title “Bhāgavata” in the lists of eighteen mahāpurāṇas refer to the *vaiṣṇava* Bhāgavata°, or does it refer to the Devībhāgavata° or even the Kālikā°? It is important to notice that this question was not initiated by Colebrooke or any other Western scholar, but that it originated within the Indian tradition. On the occasion of a discussion of the term *purāṇa* the Bālabhaṭṭi<sup>50</sup> quotes – and refutes – at length the arguments of “some” (*kecit*) who hold that the well known (*prasiddha*) Bhāgavata° cannot be a mahāpurāṇa. In the preface to the first volume of his Bhāgavata° edition Burnouf translated, in extenso, three short Sanskrit treatises dealing with this problem. The first, Durjanamukhacapeṭikā,<sup>51</sup> “A Slap in the Face of the Wicked,” claims that the Bhāgavata° is one of the original purāṇas proclaimed by Vyāsa; it is not the work of Vopadeva. The second treatise, Durjanamukhpadmapādūkā,<sup>52</sup> “A Kick in the Face of the Wicked,” refutes all the arguments of the preceding text, advocates Vopadeva’s authorship, and thereby implies that the Bhāgavata° is not a mahāpurāṇa. In doing so it also refers to a third treatise, Durjanamukhamahācapeṭikā,<sup>53</sup> “A Big Slap in the Face of the Wicked,” which openly favors the Devībhāgavata° as the true Bhāgavata°. There may have been more

<sup>46</sup> Th. BENFEY: Orient und Occident 3, 1864, 25; W. D. WHITNEY: AJPh 5, 1884, 287; J. WACKERNAGEL: Altindische Grammatik I (Renou pp. 28–29) and RENOUE’s notes, pp. 422–427; W. WÜST: Indisch, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929, pp. 40, 129.

<sup>47</sup> Jacobi vol. (1926), 2.

<sup>48</sup> ZII 8, 1931, 39. Cf. MEHTA Bhāgavata° 1942 [lists of archaisms, epicisms, irregularities, etc.], CĀRUBEVAŚĀSTRĪ Bhāgavata° 1964 [eleven different types of irregularities], NADKARNI Bhāgavata° 1975 [proposes a number of “conjectural emendations”].

<sup>49</sup> VAN BUITENEN Bhāgavata° 1966: 33.

<sup>50</sup> BI work 162, 1904–07, p. 13. Cf. WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxix.

<sup>51</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1279, no. 3545. Cf. WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxix; BURNOUF Bhāgavata° tr. 1, pp. lvii and lix–lxxiii. Burnouf attributes the text to Rāmāśrama; a note on the ms., by COLEBROOKE, says that it is probably by Rāmākṛṣṇa Bhaṭṭa, “a Paṇḍit now living at Benares.”

<sup>52</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1279–1280, no. 3546. Cf. WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxix; BURNOUF Bhāgavata° tr. 1, pp. lvii and lxxiii–lxxxiv. Author unknown.

<sup>53</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1207–1208, no. 3367, with the title Durjanamukhacapeṭikā. Cf. WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxix; BURNOUF Bhāgavata° tr. 1, pp. lvii and lxxxv–xcvi. The author is Kāśinātha Bhaṭṭa of Banaras.

Sanskrit treatises of this kind,<sup>54</sup> and even in modern scholarly literature the debate goes on, both in favor of the *vaiṣṇava* Bhāgavata<sup>55</sup> and in favor of the Devībhāgavata°.<sup>56</sup>

For those who believe in Vopadeva's authorship dating the Bhāgavata° was no problem: the text was composed in the thirteenth century A.D. Others however have looked for a variety of criteria, none of which has found universal acceptance. Arguments have been drawn from comparing the Bhāgavata° with the Mahābhārata and the Viṣṇu° and other purāṇas, with Gauḍapāda, Śāṅkara, and the Ālvārs, with Buddhist and Jaina literatures, with Kālidāsa, Māgha, and Jayadeva's Gītagovinda. The table below shows the various conclusions drawn from all these arguments.<sup>57</sup>

1200–1000 B. C.	S. D. Gyani (Date of the Purāṇas, NIA 5, 1942–43, 132)
900–800 B. C.	Vyas (Bhāgavata° 1974: 34–35)
A. D. 200–300	Ramachandra Dikshitar (1951–55: 1.xxix)
300–400	Tagare (Bhāgavata tr. 1.xxxiv–xxxvii)
400–500	Krishnamurti Sarma (Bhāg.° 1932–33: 190–218); – Rukmani (Bhāg.° 1970: 12–14)
500–550	Hazra (Bhāg.° 1938: 525; cf. 1940: 53–55; 1958: 240 n. 312)
500–600	Majumdar (Bhāg.° 1961: 384; Bhāg.° 1966: 118); – Sharma (Bhāg.° 1978)

<sup>54</sup> In addition to the three texts preserved at the India Office, WILSON (1840 = 1961: xxix) also mentions Bhāgavatasvarūpaviśayaśāṅkānīrāsaratrayodaśa, by Puruṣottama, “thirteen arguments for dispelling all doubts of the character of the Bhāgavata”; cf. CC 1. 403b; 3. 87b. See also CC 1. 403b Bhāgavatavāditoṣiṇī; 2. 92b Bhāgavatavyavasthā; etc.

<sup>55</sup> HAZRA (Bhāgavata° 1938–39: 522–528); he argues that the Śāktas cannot agree among themselves whether to choose the Devībhāgavata° or the Kālikā°. Also TAGARE (Bhāgavata° tr. 1, pp. xx n. 1 and xxii), referring to HAZRA (JOR 21, 1951–52, 63–65). Swami TAPASYANANDA (Bhāgavata° 1973–74: 458) argues that, if the Devībhāgavata° is accepted as a mahāpurāṇa, “the place of the Vaiṣṇava Bhagavata can only be that of a Super-Purana.” According to S. N. TADPATRIKAR (Devī-bhāgavata or Bhagavatī-Purāṇa?, ABORI 23, 1942, 559–562) the Devībhāgavata° was originally called Bhagavatī°; this was changed to Bhāgavata° (= of Bhagavatī), when its supporters claimed for it equal status with the true Bhāgavata°; to distinguish it from the latter the word Devī was added to it.

<sup>56</sup> LALYE's book (Devībhāgavata° 1973: Preface VII) “tries to prove that the Devībhāgavata has got all the characteristics of a mahāpurāṇa.” According to S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI (The Two Bhāgavatas, ABORI 1932–33, 241–249) the Devībhāgavata°, which can be assigned to the 6th century, is slightly earlier than the Bhāgavata°. Ganganatha JHA (Bhagavatam, Kuppaswami Sastri vol. 1935, 1–2) considers the question unresolved, but notes that the Devībhāgavata° rather than the Bhāgavata° fits the description in a verse from the Śiva°. See also Nirmal Chandra SANYAL: The Devī-bhāgavata as the Real Bhāgavata, Pur 11, 1969, 127–158 [includes a good survey of the literature on the controversy, both in Sanskrit and in Western languages].

<sup>57</sup> Hence also mere vague statements such as “one of the later works of Purāṇa literature” (BECHERT Bhāgavata° 1976: 1). In AUFRECHT's opinion, “this Purāṇa was made up, at a comparatively recent period, from the *disjecta membra* of legends concerning Kṛiṣṇa” (CC 1. 793a).

550–600	Ray (Bhāg.° 1934–35: 79)
750	Gail (Bhāg.° 1969: 16)
pre 800–900	Kane (1962: 899)
800–850	Shastri (Bhāg.° 1940–41: 139)
800–900	Pargiter (1922: 80); – Eliot (1921: Introduction)
800–1000	Ingalls (in Singer 1966: Foreword p. vi)
850	Hopkins (in Singer 1966: 6)
850–1000	R. K. Mukerjee (Lord of the Autumn Moons, Bombay: APH, 1957, pp. 65–66)
900	Farquhar (1920: 233); – Radhakrishnan (Indian Philosophy 2.667); – O’Flaherty (Bhāg.° 1974)
900+	Sharma (in Morgan 1953: 38); – Nilakanta Shastri (History of South India, 4p.342)
900–1000	Vaidya (Bhāg. 1925); – Winternitz (1907: 556; 1963: 487)
1000	Dasgupta (1949: 1); – Bhandarkar (1913: 49)
1200–1300	Colebrooke; Wilson; Burnouf; Lassen; Macdonell; etc.

Differently from the endless discussions about the date of the Bhāgavata°, there is less disagreement on its place of origin: the composer or composers of the Bhāgavata° lived in South India, more specifically in the Tamil country.<sup>58</sup>

The Bhāgavata° was not always fully appreciated. Bühler, for example, regretted that, except for the Viṣṇu°, the only other purāṇa that had received any attention, was “that huge forgery of the eleventh or twelfth century A. D., the Bhāgavata.”<sup>59</sup> In general, however, the Bhāgavata° has been acclaimed as the most popular of all purāṇas.<sup>60</sup> It is also the most famous purāṇa, which has influenced Indian thought and religion more strongly than any other composition of this genre.<sup>61</sup> Its influence even continues in a number of devotional movements of the present day.<sup>62</sup> Praise of the Bhāgavata° includes statements that it “is meant for the entire humanity irrespective of caste, creed and nationality,”<sup>63</sup> and that it is “the most enchanting poem ever written.”<sup>64</sup> The Bhāgavata° has also been called a commentary on the Rigvedic *gāyatrī mantra*. One of the arguments for this was its first stanza which, like the *gāyatrī*, ends with the word *dhīmahi*.

<sup>58</sup> PARGITER 1922: 232–233; VAIDYA Bhāgavata° 1925: 156–158; RAY Bhāgavata° 1932: 49; MUKERJEE: Lord of the Autumn Moons, pp. 72–74; HOPKINS Bhāgavata° 1966: 4–6; RUKMANI Bhāgavata° 1970: 9–10; TAGARE Bhāgavata° tr. 1, p. xl; K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI: A History of South India, OUP, 41976, p. 342.

<sup>59</sup> The Roots of the Dhātupāṭha not found in Literature, WZKM 8, 1894, 17–42 at 28.

<sup>60</sup> HAZRA 1940: 52; NAGARAJA RAO Bhāgavata° 1961–62: 29; MEHENDALE 1970: 293.

<sup>61</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxiv; RUKMANI Bhāgavata° 1970: 3; TAGARE Bhāgavata° tr. 1, p. xxxiii; BECHERT Bhāgavata° 1976: 1. Cf. also A. A. MACDONELL: India’s Past, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927, p. 90; ELIOT 1921: 2.187. According to MAJUMDAR (Bhāgavata° 1961: 384) “it rose to its highest pitch in the sixteenth century.”

<sup>62</sup> RAGHAVAN, in MORGAN 1953: 271. According to Raghavan the only other text of comparable importance is the Sūtasamhitā.

<sup>63</sup> D. A. GANGOLLI: The Divine Light, p. i.

<sup>64</sup> D. H. H. INGALLS Bhāgavata° 1966: vi.

This first stanza has been discussed at great length in the commentaries on the Bhāgavata°. <sup>65</sup> Madhusūdana Sarasvatī even devoted a separate treatise to it: Bhāgavatapurāṇaprathamaśloka-vyākhyā. <sup>66</sup>

One of the best indicators of the success of the Bhāgavata° is that it has been commented on by authors belonging to different schools of thought, each of them trying to demonstrate that the purāṇa exhibits the views of his particular school. <sup>67</sup> The most famous commentary is by Śrīdhara Svāmin (between A. D. 1350 and 1450), <sup>68</sup> of the Advaita school: Bhāvārthadīpikā. Śrīdhara was much respected among the Bengal Vaiṣṇavas. Jīva Gosvāmin (16th century), who commented on the Bhāgavata° in his Kramasandarbhā and Vaiṣṇavatoṣaṇī (on *skandha* 10), claims to elaborate on the Bhāvārthadīpikā, even though in reality he represents the Caitanya school. <sup>69</sup> Viśvanātha Cakravartin's Sārāthadarśanī in turn closely follows Jīva. Two other Bengal Vaiṣṇavas wrote commentaries on the Bhāvārthadīpikā: Rādhāramaṇa Gosvāmin (-dīpanī), and Vaṃśīdhara Śarman (-prakāśa). Within the Viśiṣṭadvaita school Sudarśanācārya (14th century), the author of the commentary Śrutaprakāśikā on Rāmānuja's Śrībhāṣya, wrote the Śukapakṣīyā on the Bhāgavata°. To the same school also belongs Virārāghavācārya's Bhāgavatacandrikā (14th century). Ānandatīrtha, of the Dvaita school, wrote a digest of the purāṇa: Bhāgavatātātparyanirṇaya. His interpretations are followed in Vijayadhvajātīrtha's commentary, Padaratnāvalī. The Nimbārka school is represented by Śukadeva's Siddhāntapradīpa. Vallabhācārya (ca. 1480–1530) of the Śuddhādvaita school wrote a commentary, Subodhinī, which was in turn commented on in Puruṣottamacaraṇagosvāmin's Subodhinī-prakāśa (ca. A. D. 1700). Another Śuddhādvaita commentary is Girīdhara's Bālaprabodhinī (1850–1900).

A second indicator of the success of the Bhāgavata° is the number of translation and adaptations, both of the entire text and of the more popular parts, in the vernaculars. <sup>70</sup> In addition to numerous translations into Bengali, <sup>71</sup> there is an

<sup>65</sup> R. V. JOSHI Bhāgavata° 1964.

<sup>66</sup> Published, after Vopadeva's Harilīlā with Madhusūdana's Harilīlāveka, ChSS work 71, 1933, pp. 58–73.

<sup>67</sup> TAGARE Bhāgavata° tr. 1, pp. lxvi–lxix. Mohendranath CHATTERJEE's tr. of *skandha* 1 (Calcutta 1895), pp. (18)–(21) gives a list of 136 "commentaries and dissertations" on the Bhāgavata°.

<sup>68</sup> GODE Bhāgavata° 1949.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. S. K. DE: The Doctrine of Avatāra (Incarnation) in Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, Kuppaswami Sastri vol. (1935), 25–37, for Sanātana Gosvāmin's Bṛhadbhāgavatāmṛta and Rūpa's Laghu- and Saṃkṣepabhāgavatāmṛta.

<sup>70</sup> For a list, see K. TRIVEDI Bhāgavata° 1962: 439.

<sup>71</sup> D. C. SEN (History of Bengali Language and Literature, Calcutta University, <sup>2</sup>1954, pp. 205–208) lists 40 "recensionists" – rather than translators. Many of these, however, deal with the tenth *skandha* only.

adaptation in Nepali,<sup>72</sup> a popular Daśamaskandha in Gujarati, by Bhālaṇa (late 16th century);<sup>73</sup> there is Ekanāth's eleventh *skandha* in Marathi (ca. 1573), Sūradas' (1479–1584) Bhāgavata in Braj, Śaṅkara Deva's (1449–1568) version in Assamese, and Jagannātha Dāsa's Bhāgavata in Oriya.<sup>74</sup> In South India Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's Malayalam Nārāyaṇīyam retold the Bhāgavata° in one thousand verses; Potana's (ca. 1400) Bhāgavatam was one of the most popular compositions in Telugu;<sup>75</sup> and there are translations into Kannada (ca. 1530), and into Tamil by Cevvaiccūtvār (15th century). One Tamil version in particular became known in Europe at an early date, in a French translation by Maridas Poullé (Mariyadās Piḷḷai), "Indian Interpreter of the French Company," with a "discours préliminaire" by Foucher d'Obsonville.<sup>76</sup> Many early European references to "the Bhāgavata° are, in fact, taken from this Tamil version in translation."<sup>77</sup>

The title Bhāgavata appears in various lists of upapurāṇas, but this may well refer to the Bhāgavata° or Devībhāgavata°, depending on whether the composer of the list favored the latter or the former as a mahāpurāṇa.<sup>78</sup>

The list of upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra° includes a Laghubhāgavata°; a few verses from a book with this title are quoted in Gopālabhatta's Haribhaktivīlāsa, praising the pronunciation of Govinda's name.<sup>79</sup> Manuscripts are also preserved

<sup>72</sup> G. A. GRIERSON: A Specimen of the Khas or Naipāli Language, ZDMG 61, 1907, 659–688.

<sup>73</sup> M. R. MAJUMDAR: An Illustrated Gujarātī Verse-Version of the Bhāgavata, Daśama Skandha, Prin. Karmarkar vol. (1948), 106–114.

<sup>74</sup> K. N. MAHAPATRA: Purāṇic Literature of Orissa, AHRJ 11, 1962–63, 21–31 at 28–31: Popularity of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

<sup>75</sup> N. S. KRISHNA MURTHY: Potana's Bhagavatam, Ved. Kes. 48, 1961–62, 70–73.

<sup>76</sup> Bagavadam ou doctrine divine, Ouvrage Indien, Canonique; sur l'Être Suprême, les Dieux, les Géans, les Hommes, les diverses parties de l'Univers, etc., Paris: Tilliard, Clousier, 1788. Sixteen years earlier (May 1772) Joseph de Guignes drew attention to the text: "Réflexions sur un livre indien intitulé Bagavadam, Un des dix-huit Pouranam ou Livres Sacrés des Indiens, dont la traduction a été envoyée en 1769 à M. Bertin, Ministre et Secrétaire d'Etat," in Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres (+ Mémoires 1770–1772), tome 38, 1877, 312–336. The French Bhagavadam was edited again, on the basis of a revised translation by Maridas himself, by H. HOSTEN: Le Bhāgavata. D'après un texte Sen Tamoul. Nouvelle traduction de Maridas Poullé de Pondichéry (1793–1795), Revue historique de l'Inde française 4.1, 1920. See also J. FILLIOZAT: Tamil Studies In French Indology, in Xavier S. Thani Nayagam: Tamil Studies Abroad, 1968, 2–3.

<sup>77</sup> E. g., Friedrich MAJER's Die Verkörperungen des Wischnu, in Julius Klaproth's Asiatisches Magazin, Leipzig 1802, 2 vols. (1.116–138, 221–244, 395–405; 2.11–70) is principally "nach dem Bhagavadam."

<sup>78</sup> HAZRA 1954: 22–23; HAZRA 1963: 502–503 [lost upa° of non-sectarian or unknown origin].

<sup>79</sup> HAZRA 1954: 29; HAZRA 1958: 358–359 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

of a Jaiminibhāgavata°, on the life and deeds of Kṛṣṇa.<sup>80</sup> There is even a recent Kristubhāgavatam, in Sanskrit, on the life of Jesus Christ.<sup>81</sup>

The Mahābhāgavata°, being a totally different kind of work, will be treated separately.

### Bhārgava°

ED.: Śrībhārgavopapurāṇa ... Śrīmahāyogimāhātmyam nāma uttarakhaṇḍaḥ, Sundapalayam: Bhāgavatavarddhini Press, [1910] [Grantha].

LIT.: CC 1.407; 2.93, 215; 3.88.

This title occurs in several lists of upapurāṇas. According to Burnell<sup>82</sup> it is later than Rāmānuja, and is Vaiṣṇava.

### Bhaviṣya°

ED.: Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1879, <sup>2</sup>1910, <sup>3</sup>1959.

LIT.: Albrecht WEBER: Über die Kṛṣṇajananmāshṭamī (Kṛṣṇa's Geburtsfest), Berlin: Dümmler, 1868 (from Abh. kgl. Ak. Wiss. Berlin 1867, pp. 215–336) [on 4. ch. 55]; (anon.): Bhaviṣya Purāna on Manures, CR 95: 189, 1892, 180–183; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 52; – Theodor AUFRECHT: Über das Bhaviṣyapurāṇa. Ein literarischer Betrug, ZDMG 57, 1903, 276–284; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 473–474; 1963: 497; – J. SCHEFTELOWITZ: Die Mithra-Religion der Indoskythen und ihre Beziehung zum Saura- und Mithras-Cult, AO 11, 1933, 293–333; – J. SCHEFTELOWITZ: Varāhamihira's Bṛhat-Saṃh. c. 58 und das Bhaviṣya-Purāṇa, Winternitz vol. (1933), 51–55; – J. J. MEYER: Moses und Zarathustra, Jesus und Muhammed in einem Purāṇa, WZKM 43, 1936, 1–18; – HAZRA: Our Present Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, IC 3, 1936–37, 223–229; – HAZRA 1940: 167–173; – KANE 1962: 896–898; – Adam HOHENBERGER: Das Bhaviṣyapurāṇa, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967; – R. K. ARORA: The Magas, Sun Worship and the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, Pur 13, 1970–71, 47–76; – Franz LÁSZLÓ: Die Parallelversion der Manusmṛti im Bhaviṣyapurāṇa, [AKM 40.2], Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1971; – Raj Kumar ARORA: Historical and Cultural Data from the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, New Delhi–Jullundur: Sterling, 1972; – Ludwik STERNBACH: The Mānava-dharmaśāstra I–III and the Bhaviṣya-purāṇa, Pur 16.2, 1974, suppl. pp. 1–121; – Giorgio BONAZZOLI: Christ in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa (A Methodological Approach to Bhav. P. III 3.2.21–32), Pur 21, 1979, 23–39; – id.: A Devī in Form of Liṅga, Pur 22, 1980, 220–231 [on devīliṅga at Bhaviṣya° 2.1.56; see sub Padma° Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa].

<sup>80</sup> KRISHNAMACHARIAR 1937: 75 n. 1; NCC 7 (1973), 310.

<sup>81</sup> P. C. DEVASSIA: Kristubhagavatam. A Mahakavya in Sanskrit Based on the Life of Jesus Christ. (Sanskrit + Engl. tr.) Trivandrum: Jayabharatam, 1977. The text is in 33 cantos, corresponding to the number of years of Christ. It displays interesting comparisons with personalities and situations from the Indian epics, purāṇas, and recent history, e. g., in connection with Judas: “then the wicked one approached, and saying ‘Salutation to you, O Master’ kissed Him, even as Nathuram gave salutation with folded hands to Mahatma Gandhi.”

<sup>82</sup> BURNELL 1880: 192. According to KEITH (1935: 968–969, nos. 6745, 6746, 6746A), it is “an account of the lives of the Vaiṣṇava saints, known as Alwars.”

The printed Bhaviṣya° is composed of four parts called *parvan*: Brāhmaparvan (215 *adhyāyas*); Madhyamaparvan, divided into three *bhāgas* (21, 21, 20 *adhyāyas*); Pratisargaparvan, divided into four *khaṇḍas* (7, 35, 32, 26 *adhyāyas*); and Uttaraparvan (208 *adhyāyas*). There are, however, manuscripts of the Bhaviṣya° with different subdivisions.<sup>83</sup> I have mentioned earlier the fact that a reference *iti bhaviṣyatpurāṇe* appears in the Āpastambadharmasūtra, and I have indicated the conclusions drawn therefrom (see 2.1.5).

The Brāhmaparvan introduces king Śātānika requesting Vyāsa to instruct him and the other sages visiting him on *dharma*. Vyāsa refers him to his pupil Suman-tu who, at Śātānika's explicit request, agrees to communicate those dharmasāstras that apply to all four *varṇas* rather than to the three higher ones only. Śātānika then elects to hear the Bhaviṣya°, "the most excellent dharmasāstra proclaimed by Brahmā."<sup>84</sup> Wilson and many scholars after him<sup>85</sup> noticed that the initial chapters of the Bhaviṣya° correspond closely to the beginning of the Manusmṛti. Franz László, a student of Kirfel's, elaborated a detailed comparison between the first sixteen chapters (up to 16.9) of the Bhaviṣya° and about four hundred verses from the Manusmṛti (from 1.5 to 3.72).<sup>86</sup> The following chapters of the Brāhmaparvan are devoted to the *tithis* and the worship of Brahmā, Gaṇeśa, Skanda, etc. on some of them. The larger portion of the text (chapters 47–215) is "a kind of compendium in which anything worth knowing about the sun cult has been thrown together."<sup>87</sup> In addition to making use of verses from Varāhamihira's Bṛhatsaṃhitā this section of the text has extensive passages in common with – and is for these, according to the unanimous opinion of scholars, the borrower from<sup>88</sup> – the Sāmbo° (see there).

If one accepts that the Brāhmaparvan borrowed information from the Bṛhatsaṃhitā, the text in its present form cannot be earlier than the end of the sixth century A. D.<sup>89</sup> The passage may, however, be a later interpolation; if so, on the

---

<sup>83</sup> See, for instance, HAZRA 1940: 168–169 n. 22, and ARORA Bhaviṣya° 1972: 9–13. One of these mss. (HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: 424–428, no. 3738) consists of five *parvans*, even as they are enumerated in the printed Bhaviṣya° itself (1.2.2–3): Brāhma, Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva, Tvāṣṭra, and Pratisarga. See also 2.1.3.

<sup>84</sup> Differently from ARORA (Bhaviṣya° 1972: viii), according to whom the "revolutionary" attitude of the text toward caste "marks out the Purāṇa as a sensitive and egalitarian contribution to Indian social history," LÁSZLÓ (Bhaviṣya° 1971: 14) finds that this tendency is restricted to a few passages only; "sonst wird auch in der Version des Bh der Vorrang der Brahmanenkaste öfters mit dem gewöhnlichen Nachdruck betont."

<sup>85</sup> For a list of references, see LÁSZLÓ Bhaviṣya° 1971: 3.

<sup>86</sup> See also STERNBACH (Bhaviṣya° 1974), who expands LÁSZLÓ's comparison to include several other texts.

<sup>87</sup> STIETENCROON Sāmbo° 1966: 16–17.

<sup>88</sup> SCHEFTELOWITZ Bhaviṣya° 1933: 52–54; HAZRA 1940: 171 n. 200.

<sup>89</sup> SCHEFTELOWITZ: *ibid.*, pp. 51–52.

basis of the *smṛti* materials incorporated in the text, the Brāhmaparvan may have been composed about. A. D. 500.<sup>90</sup>

The existence of manuscripts the contents of which are more or less restricted to that of the Brāhmaparvan, has been interpreted to mean that the other three *parvans* of the printed Bhaviṣya° are only later additions.<sup>91</sup> The Madhyaparvan is not even listed among the five *parvans* announced near the beginning of the Brāhmaparvan. The fact that this text shows strong influence of the Tantras was an additional argument to assign it a late date.<sup>92</sup>

The Pratisargaparvan has been principally responsible for Aufrecht's often quoted disappointment with the Bhaviṣya°: the fact that the text (3.1.4.16–5.20) contains a description of the Biblical Genesis made Aufrecht speak of the Bhaviṣya° as a "literarischen Betrug."<sup>93</sup> The Pratisargaparvan is indeed rather special. To quote Hazra:

„It narrates stories about Adam, Noah, Yākuta and others, and speaks about Taimurlang, Nadir Shah and Akbar with their descendants. It gives the story of Jayacandra and Pṛthvirāja, preaches the glory of Satyanārāyaṇa, and fabricates myths about the births of Varāhamihira, Śaṅkarācārya, Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhva, Jayadeva, Viṣṇusvāmin, Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, Ānandagiri, Kṛṣṇa-caitanya, Nityānanda, Kabīra, Nānaka, Ruidāsa, and others. It even knows the British rule in India and names Calcutta and the Parliament (*aṣṭa-kaūśalya*).<sup>94</sup>

Hazra concludes that, even though the *parvan* is mentioned at Bhaviṣya° 1.2.2–3, it "is practically a new work." Others call it a typical example of the unlimited capability of Hinduism to absorb other religions.<sup>95</sup> Against the more facile suggestion that the Genesis passage was incorporated in the text "after Protestant missionaries had begun to preach in India,"<sup>96</sup> Bonazzoli defends the interesting thesis that the puranic passages dealing with the Judaeo-Christian tradition may be due to the influence of the Indian Renaissance.<sup>97</sup>

The Uttaraparvan of the Venkateśvara edition itself claims to be a separate purāṇa called Bhaviṣyottara°.<sup>98</sup> It has been recognized as such, first, by the

<sup>90</sup> HAZRA 1940: 172.

<sup>91</sup> SCHEFTELOWITZ: *ibid.*, p. 51; HAZRA 1940: 169.

<sup>92</sup> HAZRA 1940: 169 n. 224; not later than A. D. 1500.

<sup>93</sup> AUFRECHT (Bhaviṣya° 1903: 284): "Es bereitet kein Vergnügen, einen Betrüger zu entlarven. Schade ist, daß der Besitzer der Śrīvenkaṭa-Druckerei, dem wir mehrere gute Ausgaben von Purāṇas verdanken, von einem gewissenlosen Arbeiter sich hat täuschen lassen." The same argument is still repeated by MEHENDALE (1970: 294), to show that the present text is not "the original Purāṇa of that name."

<sup>94</sup> HAZRA 1940: 169; cf. MEYER Bhaviṣya° 1936.

<sup>95</sup> HOHENBERGER 1930: 29; cf. HOHENBERGER Bhaviṣya° 1967: 5.

<sup>96</sup> ELIOT 1921: 1.lxxiv.

<sup>97</sup> BONAZZOLI Bhaviṣya° 1979: *passim*.

<sup>98</sup> *sāmānyam etat surasattamānām / varṇāśramānām ca narendracandra / khyātam bhaviṣyottaranām adheyam / mayā purāṇam tava sauhṛdena / (2.207.10).*

tradition – most citations from this text in the *dharmanibandhas* are said to be from the Bhaviṣyottara°, not from the Bhaviṣya° – , and, later, in modern scholarly literature.<sup>99</sup> The Bhaviṣyottara°, which is spoken by Kṛṣṇa to Yudhiṣṭhira who requests instruction in the entire *dharma* (*dharmasarvasvam*, 4.1.20), is, to a large extent, devoted to the description of numerous kinds of donations, vows, and festivals. The *mantras* to be recited on these occasions are surprisingly free of Tantric elements. The Bhaviṣyottara° is clearly a compilation, drawing on a number of sources, puranic and other. Hazra proposes the end of the eighth century as the time of its composition.

The Pañcavaradakṣetramāhātmya, which is a *sthalapurāṇa* of Uttaramērūr, South of Kāncīpuram, claims to belong to the Bhaviṣyottara°, constituting its chapters 209–220.<sup>100</sup> An unusually large number of other *māhātmyas*, *kathās*, *stotras*, etc., also claim to be parts of the Bhaviṣyottara°.<sup>101</sup>

### *Brahma*°

ED.: ĀnSS 28, 1895; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1963 (1906); – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1316 (1909); – Gurumaṇḍala Series 11, Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 2 vols., 1954; – + Hindi tr., Prayāga: Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan, 1976.

LIT.: WILSON: JRAS 5, 1839, 65–72 = Works (1864), 3.8–21; – WILSON 1840 = 1961: xvi–xvii; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 32; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 451–452, 1963: 468–469; – HAZRA: The Apocryphal Brahma-Purāṇa, IC 2, 1935–36, 235–245; – F. Otto SCHRADER: Apropos the Apocryphal Brahma-Purāṇa, IC 2, 1935–36, 591–592; – HAZRA 1940: 145–157; – KANE 1963: 893–894; – Surabhi H. TRIVEDI: Brahma Purāṇa, A Critical Study [summary of Ph.D. thesis, submitted in 1960], JUBar 16, 1965, 147–149; – id.: Brahma-Purāṇa, A Formal Study, JOIB 18, 1968–69, 74–100; – Surabhi SETH (= id.): Some Linguistic and Literary Aspects of the Brahma-Purāṇa, J.Dept.Skt., U. Delhi, 1.2, 1972, 6–24; – id.: Art of Warfare as Reflected in the Brahma-Purāṇa, Indological Studies 3, 1974, 156–167; – id.: Religion and Society in the Brahma Purāṇa, New Delhi: Sterling, 1979.

The Brahma°, the editions of which vary only in detail,<sup>102</sup> is composed of 245 chapters, chapters 70–175 constituting the Gautamīmāhātmya. In most lists of

<sup>99</sup> HAZRA: The Bhaviṣyottara, a Non-Sectarian Upapurāṇa of Wide Popularity, JOIB 3, 1953–54, 8–27; HAZRA 1963: 366–396 [non-sectarian upa°].

<sup>100</sup> François GROS and R. NAGASWAMY: Uttaramērūr. Légendes, histoire, monuments. Including the Pañcavaradakṣetramāhātmya, ed. by K. SRINIVASACHARYA, [PIFI, 39,] Pondicherry: IFI, 1970.

<sup>101</sup> See, for instance, IOL which lists 55 “parts,” 12 of which have the title *māhātmya*. For “the Bhaviṣyottara legend about the origin of the Bhadrā and the Tuṅga from the tusks of Viṣṇu incarnated as a boar,” see V.N. N[ARASIMMIYENGAR]: Legend of the Origin of the Tungabhadra River, IA 1, 1872, 212–213.

<sup>102</sup> HAZRA 1940: 145 n. 143. For mss. differing from the edition, see EGGELING 1899: 1231; HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: xcvi.

mahāpurāṇas the Brahma° occupies the first place; hence its alternate title of Ādi°.

Modern research agrees that the Brahma°, as presently edited, is nothing more than a loose “conglomeration of portions belonging to different periods and written by different hands.”<sup>103</sup> Others go farther and label it an “apocryphal” purāṇa which has nothing to do with the real Brahma°, a mere upapurāṇa with the same title.<sup>104</sup>

The Brahma° has numerous passages in common with other purāṇas: Viṣṇu°, Mārkaṇḍeya°, Sāmba°, and Vāyu°, as well as with the Harivaṃśa, and the Anuśāsana and Śānti *parvans* of the Mahābhārata.<sup>105</sup> In all these cases the Brahma° is reputed to be the borrower.

To a large extent – 45 chapters: 28–69 and 176–178, separated by the Gautamimāhātmya – the Brahma° is devoted to a description of the holy places in Orissa.<sup>106</sup> These include places sacred to Viṣṇu (Puruṣottamakṣetra), to Śiva (Ekāmraḥkṣetra), to Devī (Virajākṣetra), and to Sūrya (Koṇārka), however with far more attention being paid to the first than to the other three together. This led Wilson to believe that “it was composed in the course of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, or after the worship of Jagannātha predominated, but before Śiva or the Sun had fallen into disrepute.”<sup>107</sup> This date seems to find support in the fact that the Sun temple at Konarak was built near the middle of the thirteenth century, unless the temple referred to in the Brahma° is not the one built at that time, or unless the *māhātmya* of Orissa was added later to other preexisting sections.

The descriptions of the sanctuaries of different gods have earned the Brahma° a reputation for its “liberal attitude regarding the mutual relations of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism;”<sup>108</sup> the emphasis on Puruṣottamakṣetra, and the presence of a substantial Kṛṣṇacaritra (chapters 180–212) “show its main object to be the promotion of the worship of Kṛṣṇa as Jagannātha,”<sup>109</sup> and point to the “Vaiṣṇava authorship of the Purāṇa.”<sup>110</sup>

Besides the chapters on Orissa,<sup>111</sup> The Brahma° deals with the traditional

<sup>103</sup> TRIVEDI Brahma° 1968–69: 74.

<sup>104</sup> HAZRA 1940: 145–146.

<sup>105</sup> For lists of these passages, see HAZRA 1940: 147–149; TRIVEDI Brahma° 1968–69: 79–81.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Ketaki NAYAK: Orissa as Described in the Purāṇas, Pur 15, 1973, 223–232.

<sup>107</sup> Brahma° 1839: 71.

<sup>108</sup> TRIVEDI Brahma° 1965: 147.

<sup>109</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xvi.

<sup>110</sup> HAZRA Brahma° 1935–36: 242 = 1940: 156.

<sup>111</sup> The last of these chapters (178) includes the story of the sage Kaṇḍu. Its translation was chosen to be read at the joint annual meeting of the French Academies, on 24 April 1820. Cf. A. L. CHÉZY: L'ermitage de Kandou, JA 1, 1822, 1–16. It was translated by A. W. SCHLEGEL in his Indische Bibliothek (1.3, 1822, 257–273), and the Sanskrit text was

subjects of *sarga* (chapters 1–3), *vaṃśa* (4), *manvantara* (5), *vaṃśānucarita* (6–17), and *pratisarga* (231). There are chapters on the geography of the earth (18–27), on hells (214–215), on *karmavipāka*, funeral sacrifices, duties of *varṇas* and *āśramas*, impurity due to births and deaths, etc. (216–230), and the text ends with a discussion of Sāṃkhya and Yoga (234–245).

The Gautamīmāhātmya, also called Godāvarīmāhātmya, of which there exist several separate manuscripts<sup>112</sup> and which has also been separately edited,<sup>113</sup> calls itself a purāṇa,<sup>114</sup> and must originally have been a distinct book. It interrupts the section on Puruṣottamakṣetra, and has been inserted exactly in the middle of the Brahma°.<sup>115</sup> It describes the sacred places along the Godāvari river.

A number of manuscripts add to the text of the printed Brahma° – or contain separately – an Uttarakhaṇḍa.<sup>116</sup> Wilson already recognized the Uttarakhaṇḍa as “nothing more than a Māhātmya of the Balajā river,”<sup>117</sup> totally independent of the Brahma°. The text itself<sup>118</sup> explains the origin of the name of the river as *balāj jātā* “born of strength”, and adds that Balajā was its name in the *kṛtayuga*; in subsequent *yugas* this became Śivakāmadughā, Nandinī, and, finally, Vāṇanāśā. It was given the latter name by the gods who were cured of the wounds inflicted on them by the Daityas, by bathing in it: “We shall therefore call this great river by the name of Vāṇanāśā (she who destroys arrows or an averter of arrows).”<sup>119</sup> The river has been tentatively identified with the Banās in Marwar, which flows into the Chambal.<sup>120</sup>

### *Brahmāṇḍa°*

ED.: Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1963 (1906), 1969 (1912); – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna. Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1315 (1908); – J. L. Shastri, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973; – for numerous “parts,” see. e.g., IOL: 502–504.

printed in LASSEN’S Anthologia Sanscritica, Bonn: Marcus, <sup>2</sup>1868, pp. 48–58 (in the colophon, p. 58, of the text as printed it is erroneously ascribed to the Gautamīmāhātmya).

<sup>112</sup> NCC 6 (1971), 232.

<sup>113</sup> Bombay: Jñānadīpaka Press, 1794 (1872).

<sup>114</sup> 175.78, 87, 88.

<sup>115</sup> It is placed at the end in the Venkateśvara ed.

<sup>116</sup> E.g., R. L. MITRA: Bikaner Mss. Cat. (1880), pp. 187–188, no. 416, has a Brahma° in two parts: Pūrvakhaṇḍa in 123 chapters, and Uttarakhaṇḍa in 37. Its no. 417, pp. 188–189, has only a Brahma° Uttarakhaṇḍa in 37 chapters. Cf. also AUFRECHT 1864: 17–20, no. 63.

<sup>117</sup> Brahma° 1839: 71; “most probably the local legend of some temple in Central India, which is now in ruins, and the memory of which has passed away.”

<sup>118</sup> AUFRECHT’S Bodleian ms., ch. 22.

<sup>119</sup> IOL ms. Eur. D. 386 (ch. 23); cf. WINTERNITZ-KEITH: Bodleian Mss. Cat. 2 (1905), p. 164, no. 1220 = ms. Wilson 571: “2. Index to the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Brahma° according to a ms. containing 37 chapters.”

<sup>120</sup> WILSON Brahma° 1839: 71.

TR.: Ganesh Vasudeo TAGARE, [AITM 22–26,] 1983–84.

LIT.: WINTERNITZ 1907: 480; 1963: 507–508; – HAZRA 1940: 17–19; – KANE 1962: 895–896; – S.N. ROY: On the Date of the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa, Pur 5, 1963, 305–319; – id.: Analysis of a Verse from the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa in Historical Perspective, JOIB 17, 1967–68, 30–35 [3.74.60 on Śātavāhana].

The printed Brahmāṇḍa° is divided into three *bhāgas*, four *pādas*, and 156 *adhyāyas*, as follows:

Pūrvabhāga	}	1. Prakriyāpāda	<i>adhyāyas</i> 1–5
		2. Anuṣaṅgapāda	<i>adhyāyas</i> 6–38
Madhyamabhāga		3. Upodghātapāda	<i>adhyāyas</i> 1–74
Uttarabhāga		4. Upasamhārapāda	} <i>adhyāyas</i> 1–4 <i>adhyāyas</i> 5–44 (= Lalitopākhyāna)

We have noted earlier (see 1.3.3) that the Brahmāṇḍa° may have been originally identical with the Vāyu°, and that it only later separated from it to acquire an existence of its own. Yet, even then the contents of both purāṇas remained identical to a large extent.<sup>121</sup>

It is possible that Vāyu° chapters 10–26, which are missing in the Brahmāṇḍa°, originally did belong to it but were later lost.<sup>122</sup> On the other hand, besides a chapter on Śiva's anger and its appeasement in the Devadāru forest (1. ch.27), the principal distinguishing section within the text of the Brahmāṇḍa° vis-à-vis the Vāyu° are thirty-eight chapters of the Upodghātapāda (3. ch.21–58). Most of these chapters deal with the legend of Paraśurāma, by far the most extensive of all its epic and puranic versions.<sup>123</sup> One characteristic feature of this particular version is that Rāma, from being a *bhakta* of Śiva in the beginning, ends up as a devotee of Kṛṣṇa. “It looks as if the narrator ‘built up’ Śiva with the sole purpose of having Kṛṣṇa's glory shine all the more strongly.”<sup>124</sup> A brief survey of the sections that are common is given under the Vāyu°.

The dates proposed for the Brahmāṇḍa° vary, from the fourth century B. C.,<sup>125</sup> to between A. D. 400 and 600,<sup>126</sup> and the assumption that it reached its present state ca. A. D. 1000.<sup>127</sup>

<sup>121</sup> For a comparison, see KIRFEL 1927: X–XIX.

<sup>122</sup> GAIL 1977: 195.

<sup>123</sup> For a detailed analysis, see *ibid.*, pp. 137–197.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 194.

<sup>125</sup> RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1951–55: 1.xxii.

<sup>126</sup> KANE 1962: 895–896.

<sup>127</sup> S.N. ROY Brahmāṇḍa° 1963.

The title Brahmāṇḍa° also appears in most lists of upapurāṇas; a distinct Brahmāṇḍa upapurāṇa is clearly referred to in Mitramiśra's Vīramitrodaya.<sup>128</sup>

For the Javanese Brahmāṇḍa°, see 2.1.4.

The end of the Brahmāṇḍa°, 4 (Upasamhārapāda), chapters 5–44, forms the Lalitopākhyāna.<sup>129</sup> The Lalitopākhyāna is in the form of a dialogue between Hayagrīva and Agastya. It describes the origin of the goddess: her emergence out of fire, during a sacrifice offered by Indra to the Devī. Even as it was Durgā's main task to destroy the Asura Mahiṣa, and Cāmuṇḍī's to defeat Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa, Lalitā's principal task consists in the destruction of the Asura Bhaṇḍa: hence the description, in the Lalitopākhyāna, of the preparations for war with the Asura, followed by the actual operations, and the final triumph of Lalitā.<sup>130</sup>

Among the texts considered to be connected with the Brahmāṇḍa° the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa<sup>131</sup> is undoubtedly the most important one. The Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa, comprising about 4500 verses in sixty-five chapters, is divided into seven books whose titles correspond to those of the seven *kāṇḍas* of the Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa. Pārvatī asks Śiva how it was possible that Rāma, the eternal god, acted as a human being, showing limited intelligence. It is in response to this question that Śiva recites this "philosophical Rāmāyaṇa," retelling the story in such a way that it answers Umā's question. The philosophical background consists mainly in an attempt to reconcile Śaṅkara's *advaita vedānta* with a belief in

<sup>128</sup> Paribhāṣāprakāśa, p. 14 (ChSS work 30.1). See also HAZRA 1954: 23, and HAZRA 1963: 503–504.

<sup>129</sup> Madras: Vartamānatarāṅgiṇī Press, 1881 [Telugu char.]; – Palghat: Vidyākāpataru Press, 1888 [Grantha char.]; – Palghat: Vāṇivilāsamandira Press, 1905 [Grantha char.]; – Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1969 (1912); – T. N. K. Tirumulpad, Bombay: NSP, 1918. – LIT.: V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: The Lalitā Cult, Bulletin of the Department of Indian History and Archaeology No. 8, University of Madras, 1942.

<sup>130</sup> The Lalitāsahasranāma has been discussed at GONDA 1977: 270. It has been repeatedly edited, also with comm. E. g., with Bhāskararāya Dīkṣita's Saubhāgyabhāskara, NSP 1914, <sup>2</sup>1919, etc.; this comm. was translated by Ananthakrishna Sastry, Madras: Minerva Press, 1899; <sup>4</sup>Adyar, 1970. Also Chaganty Suryanarayanamurthy: Sri Lalita Sahasranamam, Madras: Ganesh and Co., 1962. – LIT.: 'ANNA': Lalita Sahasranama, Ved. Kes. 48, 1961–62, 18–21; – K. B. R. RAO: Sri Lalita-sahasranama and Psychotherapy (A Theoretical Analysis), Ved. Kes. 48, 1961–62, 102–104; – C. L. PRABHAKAR: Goddess Lalita (Lalitāsahasranāma), BhV 29, 1969, 82–93.

<sup>131</sup> For a list of the many editions, see, e. g., IOL: 32–35. In addition, with the comm. by Narottama, Rāmavarman, and Gopāla Cakravartin, ed. Nāgendranāth Siddhāntaratna, with an introduction by P. C. Bagchī, 2 vols., Calcutta Or. Ser. 11, 1925. – TR.: Rai Bahādur Lala Baijnāth: The Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa or The Esoteric Rāmāyaṇa, Allahabad: Standard Press, 1913; <sup>2</sup>SBH extra vol. (serial Nos. 43, 44), Allahabad: Trade Journal Press, 1913 (registered 1916). – LIT.: FARUQHAR 1920: 250–251; – RAGHUVARA MITTĪLĀL SHĀSTRĪ: The Authorship of the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa, GJJI 1, 1943–44, 215–239; – Helmuth VON GLASENAPP: Zwei philosophische Rāmāyaṇas, Ak. d. Wiss. u. Lit. in Mainz, Abt. d. Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl., 1951, No. 6, pp. 73–93; – GONDA 1963: 167–168; – B. H. KAPADIA: The Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa, JOIB 14, 1964–95, 164–170.

Rāma's saving grace. The path to release is not through works, but uniquely through *bhakti* to Rāma, by reciting the Rāma *mantra* (3.8.34), murmuring Rāma's name, etc. Sītā's role next to Rāma shows influence of Śāktism. It was not the real Sītā – who entered the fire beforehand –, but an illusory Sītā who was carried away by Rāvaṇa; the true goddess only returns at the end of the story.

It has been said that the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa was composed by Rāmānanda, a follower of Rāmānuja, and the initiator of the Ramaite movement.<sup>132</sup> It may be safer to say that, next to Rāmānuja's Śrībhāṣya, the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa was the most important text of the Rāmānandins; it definitely influenced Tuṣī Dās, and is still used by the Rāmānandins today. The text has been assigned to the thirteenth or fourteenth century,<sup>133</sup> and to the end of the fifteenth century.<sup>134</sup>

Some sections of the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa also had an existence of their own. One such section is the Rāmahr̥daya (Adhy. Rām. 1.1.59–117), which has been published in several collections of *stotras* and also independently.<sup>135</sup> Far more important is the Rāmāgītā (Adh. Rām. 7.5, in 61 or 62 stanzas), which has been published repeatedly, also with commentaries.<sup>136</sup> It may well have been an independent, older composition which was later inserted into the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa. It argues, against the *samuccayavādins* who believe that both action and knowledge are important, that the latter alone is a means to salvation.

Among the texts claiming to belong to the Brahmāṇḍa° we may further mention the Nāsiketopākhyāna.<sup>137</sup> Belloni-Filippi's edition of this text is based on two manuscripts in the India Office Library, one (no. 3445), in eighteen *adhyāyas*, professing to be part of the Brahmāṇḍa°, and one (no. 3446), in nineteen *adhyāyas*, offering a shorter version of the same tale, which does not claim to be part of any purāṇa. In some sections both manuscripts correspond, or run parallel, in other sections they do not correspond at all. Winternitz<sup>138</sup> called the text “nothing but a most insipid, amplified and corrupted version of the beautiful old legend of Naciketas.”

<sup>132</sup> RAGHUVARA: Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa 1943–44: 238–239. Nīlmani MUKHOPADHYAYA (ed. Kūrma°, Preface p. xiv n.) quotes an opinion that the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa was composed by Śaṅkarācārya.

<sup>133</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 250.

<sup>134</sup> GONDA 1963: 167; P. C. BAGCHI Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa ed. 1925: 77.

<sup>135</sup> E. g., Poona: Jagaddhitecchu Press, 1913; – Lucknow: Navalakishora Press, 1916; – Wai: Siddhnath Press, 1840 (1919).

<sup>136</sup> See e. g., IOL: 2074–76. See also BAGCHI's introduction to the Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa ed.: 60–69, including a translation. Cf. GONDA 1977: 274.

<sup>137</sup> Ed. + Hindi *tīkā*, Bombay: Jñānasāgara Press, 1960 (1903); – Ferdinando BELLONI-FILIPPI: II “Nāsiketopākhyānam,” GSAI 15, 1902, 27–77; 16, 1903, 33–88, 229–255; 17, 1904, 113–153, 273–294 [text in Roman char., slightly abridged, and tr.]. – See also EGGLEING 1899: 1252–1254.

<sup>138</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 508.

The Pinākinīmāhātmya,<sup>139</sup> in twelve *adhyāyas*, is the *māhātmya* of the northern Pinākinī river (modern Pennar), the waters of which have the virtue of delivering men from sins and illnesses. Papesso's edition is based on three manuscripts in the India Office Library (nos. 3434, 3435, 3436).

The Virajākṣetramāhātmya,<sup>140</sup> assigned to the Brahmāṇḍa°, but really an independent work, is as yet unpublished, except for an Oriya translation. Virajākṣetra (Yājapura) is situated on the bank of the Vaitaraṇī river, in Cuttack district. The *kṣetra* is named after the goddess Virajā, the presiding deity of the place.

A Kāñcimāhātmya,<sup>141</sup> in thirty-two *adhyāyas*, claims to belong to the Brahmāṇḍa°. It is different from the Kāñcimāhātmya of the Kālikākhaṇḍa of the Skanda° in that it treats the subject from a purely Vaiṣṇava point of view, whereas the one of the Skanda° is of Śaiva inspiration.

### *Brahmavaivarta*°

ED.: Brahma-vaivarta-purāni specimen. Textum e codice manuscripto Bibliothecae Berolinensis edidit interpretationem latinam adiecit et commentationem mythologicam et criticam praemisit Adolphus Fredericus Stenzler, Berlin: Dümmler, 1829; – Jibananda Vidyasaḡara, Calcutta: Saraswati Press, 1888, 2 vols.; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1889 (Kṛṣṇajamkhaṇḍa), 1909–1910; – Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1890, 1827 (1906); – ĀnSS 102, 1935–36; – Gurumaṅḍala Granthamālā 14, Calcutta: Rādhākṛṣṇa Mora, 1954–55; – J. L. Shastri, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

TR.: Rajendra Nath Sen, [SBH 24.1,2,] Allahabad: Indian Press, 1919–22.

LIT.: WILSON: JASB 1, 1832, 217–237 = Works (1864), 3.91–120; – WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxix–xli; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 34–36; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 474–475, 1963: 498–499; – HAZRA: Some Minor Purāṇas, ABORI 19, 1938–39, 69–79 at 75–76, 79; – HAZRA 1940: 166–167; – B. KAKATI: Female Initiative in Courtship (Episodes in the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa), Prin. Karmarkar vol. (1948), 71–76; – Anand Swarup GUPTA: The Apocryphal Character of the Extant Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Pur 3, 1961, 92–101; – KANE 1962: 894–895; – Anantray J. RAWAL: Religion and Philosophy as Described in the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa, Bull. Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan 16–17, 1971–72, 42–76; – id.: Some Problems Regarding the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa, Pur 14, 1972, 107–124; – D. C. SIRCAR: The Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa and the Vaidya Community of Orissa, JAIH 6, 1972–73, 173–177; – RAWAL: Society and Socio-economic Life in the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa, Pur 15, 1973, 6–92; – Cheever MacKenzie BROWN: God as Mother. A Feminine Theology in India. An Historical and Theological Study of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Hartford, Vt.: Stark, 1974; – RAWAL: Geographical and Ethnic Data in the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa, Pur 17, 1975, 24–37; – Giorgio BONAZZOLI: A General Introduction to the Brahmavaivartapurāṇa. Its Anukramaṇikās and their Significance, Pur 17,

<sup>139</sup> Ed. Valentino PAPPESO: Il “Pinākinīmāhātmyam” attribuito al Brahmāṇḍapurāṇam, GSAI 27, 1915, 81–128 [text in Roman char.].

<sup>140</sup> U. N. DHAL: Virajā Kṣetra Māhātmya of Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa. A Survey, Pur 19, 1977, 292–304.

<sup>141</sup> Ed. P. B. ANANTHACHARIAR, [Śāstramuktāvalī 26,] Conjeeveram: Sri Sudarsana Press, 1906.

1975, 118–148; – id.: Seduction Stories in the Brahmaivaivarta Purāṇa (A Study in Purāṇic Structure), Pur 19, 1977, 321–341; – C.M. BROWN: The Theology of Rādhā in the Purāṇas, in HAWLEY 1982: 57–71; – RAWAL: Indian Society, Religion and Mythology. A Study of the Brahma-Vaivartapurana, Delhi: D.K. Publishers, 1982.

The Brahmaivaivarta° itself explains its title as follows: “Experts on ancient things call this purāṇa Brahmaivaivarta, because in it *brahma* is fully unfolded by Kṛṣṇa.”<sup>142</sup> The printed Brahmaivaivarta° is composed of four parts: Brahmakhaṇḍa (30 *adhyāyas*), Prakṛtikhaṇḍa (67), Gaṇeśa- or Gaṇapatikhaṇḍa (46), and the much larger Kṛṣṇajanmakhaṇḍa (131 or 133).

The beginning of the Brahmakhaṇḍa has, as usual, Sauti arrive in the Naimiṣa forest. Śaunaka and the other sages express their anxiety about the evils of the Kali age; they feel deprived of true knowledge and immersed in an existence from which they want to be liberated by means of devotion to Hari. The Brahmaivaivarta° will provide them with this *bhakti*, for it is the essence of all the purāṇas, and it expels the errors of the purāṇas, the upapurāṇas, and the Vedas (*purāṇopapurāṇānāṃ vedānāṃ bhramabhāñjanam*).<sup>143</sup> The Brahmakhaṇḍa then relates the story of the creation of the universe. Everything proceeds from Kṛṣṇa, including Viṣṇu who comes from his right side, Śiva from his left side, and Brahmā from his navel. At the time of their births they each address a hymn to the supreme Kṛṣṇa. After returning to the Rāsamaṇḍala Kṛṣṇa also produces Rādhā from his heart; she in turn brings forth the Gopis and Gopas. The *khaṇḍa* contains an interesting section on the origin of the mixed castes (chapter 10), some of them being the issue of Viśvakarman and the *apsaras* Ghṛtācī. The last two chapters are devoted to praising Kṛṣṇa and his heaven, Goloka.

The Prakṛtikhaṇḍa, “in gathering together many ancient materials into a short of encyclopaedia of goddesses, also developed a comprehensive theology of the Divine in its feminine manifestations.”<sup>144</sup> All these goddesses – mainly Durgā, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Sāvitrī, and Rādhā, but also many others at lower levels – are conceived as being parts of the primeval Prakṛti. Except for a few passages on hells, Goloka, time divisions and *yugas*, etc., the *khaṇḍa* is primarily devoted to the legends connected with these Prakṛtis, such as Sarasvatī, Gaṅgā, Tulaśī, Sāvitrī, Lakṣmī, Svāhā, Svadhā, Dakṣiṇā, Ṣaṣṭhī, Maṅgalacaṇḍī, Manasā, Surabhi, Rādhā, and Durgā. Whereas some of these legends go back to versions

<sup>142</sup> *vivṛtaṃ brahmakārtsnyam ca kṛṣṇena yatra śaunaka / brahmaivaivartakam tena pravradanti purāvidah* (1.1.61 ĀnSS = 1.1.58cd–59ab Jibananda). BONAZZOLI (Brahmaivaivarta° 1975: 137) reads *brahma kārtsnyam ca* “Brahma (I Khaṇḍa) and the Universe (II Khaṇḍa)”; this interpretation does not fit the variant reading *brahma kārtsnyena* (UPADHYAYA 1978: 153). The latter interprets *vivṛta* as *prakāśita*, whereas Bonazzoli looks for a more philosophical meaning.

<sup>143</sup> For the ambiguous attitude of the Brahmaivaivarta° toward the Vedas, see BONAZZOLI: op. cit., pp. 133–136.

<sup>144</sup> BROWN Brahmaivaivarta° 1974: 34.

in the Mahābhārata, the Devīmāhātmya of the Mārkaṇḍeya°, etc., other legends have served as models for similar stories in later texts, especially the Devībhāgavata°. <sup>145</sup>

The Gaṇeśakhaṇḍa first deals with the various legends connected with the god's birth as a result of Pārvatī's sorrow to be childless, and her performance of the *puṇyaka vrata*. Gaṇeśa subsequently loses his head by the mere fact of Śani casting a glance at him, but the gods provide him instead with the head of an elephant. After a brief interruption to tell the story of the birth of Kārttikeya, the text reverts to explaining the reason why Gaṇeśa lost his head – Kaśyapa's curse on Śiva –, and why it was replaced specifically by the head of an elephant belonging to Indra. The latter half of the *khaṇḍa* is devoted to legends surrounding Paraśurāma, leading up to his slaying Kārtavīryārjuna and the warrior kings who came to the latter's aid. When Paraśurāma next visits Kailāsa, he is prevented from seeing Śiva by Gaṇeśa; the ensuing dialogue between the two ends in a fight in which Gaṇeśa catches Paraśurāma's axe on one of his tusks, and becomes at once Ekadanta. <sup>146</sup>

Notwithstanding its title the Kṛṣṇajamkhaṇḍa deals not only with the birth of Kṛṣṇa, but also with his later adventures, as told by Nārāyaṇa to Nārada. In this particular version of the story the Kṛṣṇa *avatāra* came about not only to rescue the earth from the miseries from which it was suffering, but also, primarily, for Kṛṣṇa to become on earth the lover of Rādhā who, as the result of a curse, had been forced to spend some time living in Vṛndāvana. The *khaṇḍa* presents all the stories of Kṛṣṇa's life, more often than not in greater detail than and including elements unknown to other purānas. <sup>147</sup> Near the end of the text Rādhā's curse is lifted following her worship of Gaṇeśa; she returns to Goloka, where she is ultimately joined by Kṛṣṇa. It is at the end of the Kṛṣṇajamkhaṇḍa (chapter 131 or 133) that the five characteristics (*pañcalakṣaṇa*) are said to be restricted to the upapurānas, whereas the mahāpurānas are supposed to have ten characteristics (see I.3.2). Scholars have both confirmed and denied that the opening stanza of Jayadeva's Gītagovinda refers to an incident related in the Kṛṣṇajamkhaṇḍa. <sup>148</sup>

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., p. 34. Devībhāgavata° 9, ch. 1–49 is to a large extent identical with Prakṛtikhaṇḍa ch. 1–47. For a comparison of both texts, see *ibid.*, pp. 207–215, and HAZRA 1963: 343 n. 776.

<sup>146</sup> For an analysis, see GAIL 1977: 121–137.

<sup>147</sup> The best summary of the contents of the Kṛṣṇajamkhaṇḍa is still the rather critical but extensive survey by WILSON *Brahmavaivarta* 1832: 226–233.

<sup>148</sup> Bimanbehari MAJUMDAR (*Krishna in History and Legend*, Calcutta University, 1969, p. 195) quotes commentators on the Gītagovinda who “seem to rely” on the *Brahmavaivarta*° passage. ASOKE KUMAR MAJUMDAR (*A Note on the Development of Rādhā Cult*, ABORI 36, 1955, 231–257 at 249) holds that, in the *Brahmavaivarta*°, “we have a complete explanation of the enigmatic first verse of the Gīta-Govinda.” S. K. DE (*Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal*, Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay,

It is evident, not only from the fourth *khaṇḍa* but throughout the text, that the Brahmavaivarta° is dedicated to Kṛṣṇa.<sup>149</sup> He is identified with the highest *brahma*, and Gaṇeśa, even in the *khaṇḍa* called after him, is no more than one of his incarnations.<sup>150</sup> Equally important, for the development of Indian religion, is the way in which the Brahmavaivarta° treats Rādhā. More than most other purāṇas the Brahmavaivarta° stresses Rādhā's sensuous nature, and exploits the erotic possibilities of the theme; it also portrays a regular marriage between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā. This has led some to interpret at least the Kṛṣṇajānamkhaṇḍa as a Nimbārka document.<sup>151</sup> Others prefer to suggest that Nimbārka, the author of the Brahmavaivarta°, and also Jayadeva, drew upon a common source rather than upon one another.<sup>152</sup> Influence of Tantra and Caitanya has been held responsible for a new approach to the "seduction stories" of Indra-Ahalyā (4. ch. 61) and Tārā-Candra (4. ch. 80).<sup>153</sup> Tantrism is especially prominent in the Prakṛtikhaṇḍa and Gaṇapatikhaṇḍa.<sup>154</sup>

For all these reasons the Brahmavaivarta° is generally recognized as one of the more recent purāṇas. Both the fifteenth<sup>155</sup> and the sixteenth<sup>156</sup> centuries have been proposed for the transformation into its present form, from an older version belonging to the tenth century.<sup>157</sup> There is general agreement that the Brahmavaivarta° is a work of Bengal.<sup>158</sup>

It is not quite clear whether the Brahmakaivarta° was merely a South Indian version<sup>159</sup> of the Brahmavaivarta°, or whether it was a distinct text. In any case,

<sup>2</sup>1961, pp. 11–12) and BROWN (Brahmavaivarta° 1974: 36–37) deny any connection between both texts.

<sup>149</sup> There are also some strong sectarian statements in favor of Vaiṣṇavism generally. E. g., *avaiṣṇavād dvijād vipra caṇḍālo vaiṣṇavaḥ varah* (1.11.39); *vaiṣṇavasparśamātreṇa mukto bhavati pātaki* (4.1.64). WILSON (Brahmavaivarta° 1832: 217) called the Brahmavaivarta° "perhaps the most decidedly sectarian work of the whole collection."

<sup>150</sup> GAIL 1977: 130.

<sup>151</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 240.

<sup>152</sup> S. K. DE: Pre-Caitanya Vaiṣṇavism in Bengal, Winternitz vol. (1933), 195–207 at 197–198.

<sup>153</sup> BONAZZOLI Brahmavaivarta° 1977.

<sup>154</sup> GUPTA Brahmavaivarta° 1961: 98.

<sup>155</sup> Manmatha Nath RAY: Notes on some of the Vidyas in the Puranas, S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar vol. (1936), 308–316 at 316.

<sup>156</sup> HAZRA 1940: 166, quoting Jogesh Chandra Roy, in Bhāratavarṣa, 1337 Āṣāḍha, 99–104.

<sup>157</sup> For a complete survey of all dates proposed in the scholarly literature, see RAWAL Brahmavaivarta° 1972: 112. Rawal himself places the Brahmavaivarta° between A.D. 1400 and 1600.

<sup>158</sup> See *ibid.*, pp. 117–119, with references to earlier literature.

<sup>159</sup> Quotations from the Brahmakaivarta° in the South Indian Smṛticandrikā do occur in the printed Brahmavaivarta° (HAZRA 1940: 166). See also EGGELING 1899: 1238 n. At Tanjore (BURNELL 1880: 189) there are only *māhātmyas* claiming to belong to the Brahmakaivarta°.

there are a large number of texts, both in print and in manuscript form, which claim to belong either to the Brahmapaivarta° or the Brahmakaivarta°. <sup>160</sup>

At least one author quotes from a Laghubrahmapaivarta°. <sup>161</sup> A few manuscripts have been preserved of a text called Ādibrahmapaivarta°, “very different from the one we now possess.” <sup>162</sup>

### *Bṛhaddharma*°

ED.: Haraprasad Shastri, BI work 120, 1888–97; reprinted: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan 1, Varanasi 1974; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1894, <sup>2</sup>1908.

TR.: Syama Charan BANERJI, [Rambles in Scripture Land, 1,] Lucknow: Indian Commercial Press, 1915 [free and abridged].

LIT.: WINTERNITZ 1963: 509–510; – V. RAGHAVAN: Music in the Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa, Journal of the Music Academy 9, 1938, 37–39; – HAZRA: J. U. Gauhati 6, 1955; – KANE 1962: 896; – HAZRA 1963: 396–465 [non-sectarian upa°].

The Bṛhaddharma°, which includes itself in last position in its list of upapurāṇas (1.25.26), consists of three parts: *pūrvakhaṇḍa* (both BI and Vaṅga chapters 1–30), *madhyakhaṇḍa* (Vaṅga chapters 1–30, BI chapters 31–60), and *uttarakhaṇḍa* (BI chapters 1–14, Vaṅga chapters 1–21). <sup>163</sup>

True to the title of the purāṇa, the first *khaṇḍa* opens with the *sūta* reporting to the sages in the Naimiṣa forest what he heard Vyāsa say to Jābāli concerning *dharma* and its four constituent parts: *satya*, *dayā*, *śānti*, and *ahimsā*. In answer to Jābāli’s next question Vyāsa instructs him on *gurus* in general, and, in particular on those *gurus* who occupy the highest position: one’s parents. The duty to serve one’s parents is illustrated with the story of the hunter Tulādhāra and the latter’s advice to the brahman Kṛtabodha. When Jābāli next requests instruction on *tīrthas*, Vyāsa answers him (chapters 5–30) by reporting a conversation on that topic between goddess Rudrāṇī and her two friends Jayā and Vijayā. The description of holy places – beginning with a Gaṅgāstava – leads to discussions on

<sup>160</sup> See, e.g., IOL: 534–535 and 489, and CC 1: 383 and 380, respectively. On the other hand, there are texts, such as a Kāśimāhātmya, of which some mss. (EGGELING 1899: 123–128) claim to belong to the Brahmapaivarta°, others (BURNELL 1880: 189) to the Brahmakaivarta°.

<sup>161</sup> Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa’s Nirṇayasindhu. See HAZRA 1954: 29–30, and HAZRA 1963: 506.

<sup>162</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: clix. The mss. are nos. 3820 and 3821, pp. 490–493. Scholars have naturally been tempted to consider this text as “the original” Brahmapaivarta° as opposed to “the extant” one (see 1.3). Cf. GUPTA Brahmapaivarta° 1961: 99–100; BROWN Brahmapaivarta° 1974: 28 n. 37.

<sup>163</sup> HAZRA (1963: 396 n. 80) considers chapters 15–21 of the uttarakhaṇḍa to be an essential part of the text. See the same note for a list of mss. Pp. 399–448 provide a most detailed survey of the contents of the Bṛhaddharma°, chapter by chapter.

the origin and sanctity of the *tulasī* plant and the *bilva* tree. Tīrthas not only involve places; the text also describes several *kālatīrthas*, including times which are auspicious for Devī worship. The time for studying purāṇas occasions a discussion not only of purāṇas and upapurāṇas, but also of other texts which are authoritative in matters of *dharma*. The first of these texts, and the source of all others, is the Rāmāyaṇa, which Vālmīki composed, in the *tretāyuga*, at the request of Brahmā, after Sarasvatī had entered the mouth of the poet. Vālmīki, however, refused also to compose the Mahābhārata, which was to be reserved for Vyāsa, in the *dvāparayuga*.

At the outset of the second *khaṇḍa* Jābāli reminds Vyāsa of the greatness of the Gaṅgā, and requests further instruction on this subject. Vyāsa answers by relating a conversation between the sage Śuka and his disciple Jaimini. The first chapter deals with the creation, from the connection (*yoga*) of *brahma* and “*prakṛti* of the three *guṇas*,” of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva. The introduction, in the second chapter, of Dakṣa and his daughter Satī, leads into a lengthy description of Dakṣa, Satī, and Śiva; it ends with Śiva settling in Kāmarūpa, the place where Satī’s *yonī* fell when her body was cut to pieces by Viṣṇu during Śiva’s *tāṇḍava* dance. In chapter eleven Satī appears before Śiva, who was at that time visited by Brahmā and Viṣṇu. Among other things – Brahmā becoming the creator, Viṣṇu being incarnated in many forms – she predicts that she will return to Śiva after having been born as Gaṅgā and Umā. Chapters twelve to twenty-two consequently relate the birth of Satī to Himālaya and Menā. The stories surrounding Gaṅgā are interwoven with numerous other legends, such as the one (ch. 14) in which Nārāyaṇa instructs Nārada on musical topics, after which the latter sings a song in which he distorts the *rāgas* and *rāgiṇīs*. The story of Gaṅgā is only briefly interrupted (ch. 23) to introduce the birth of Himālaya’s second daughter, Umā, and again continues until chapter twenty-eight. The *khaṇḍa* ends with a discourse on Manus and *manvantaras*, and the kings of the solar and lunar dynasties (ch. 29), and the story of the birth of Gaṇeśa and his acquiring an elephant’s head (ch. 30).

The third *khaṇḍa* reverts to the subject of *dharma*. General considerations on *dharma* and caste, are followed by more specific rules for brahmans, kings, *vaiśyas*, and *śūdras*; for *brahmacārins*, *gṛhasthas*, *vānaprasthas*, and *yatis*; and for women, including the obligation for widows to follow their husbands in death (3.8.8–10). After a brief digression on *vratas* for different deities, hymns to the planets, and *yugas*, the story of Veṇa leads to a detailed description of mixed castes. Veṇa created “thirty-six and more” of them, before he was killed and replaced with Pṛthu, under whose reign the brahmans assigned specific trades to the members of the existing mixed castes, and halted the creation of further *varṇasamkara*. The remaining chapters, which are absent from the Bibliotheca Indica edition, contain, among other things, the story of Kṛṣṇa’s birth – in which the Devī plays a prominent role –; a description of the Kali age, which may very

well be indicative of the state of society at the time when the passage was written; and, finally, the usual eulogy of the purāṇa, which is described as “a Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva, and Śākta *śāstra*” (3.21.5: *idaṃ hi vaiṣṇavaṃ śāstram śaivaṃ śāktam tathai-va ca*).

There are good reasons,<sup>164</sup> such as Sanskrit words used with unusual meanings and Sanskrit proverbs which are popular in Bengal, to believe that the Bṛhad-dharma° belonged to Bengal, more specifically at the time when Hinduism became aware of the threat posed by Islam, and found it necessary to react.<sup>165</sup> Hazra therefore proposes the second half of the thirteenth century as the date of its composition.<sup>166</sup>

### *Daurvāsasa*° (= *Āścarya*°)

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 27–28; – HAZRA 1958: 356–357 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

This title occurs in most upapurāṇa lists; according to the Revākhaṇḍa and the Revāmāhātmya it belonged to the Bhāgavata°. Hazra concludes that it must have been written before A. D. 800, but, since no *nibandha* writer draws on it, it must have become extinct before the tenth century A. D.

### *Devī*°

ED.: + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1302 (1896), 1311 (1905), 1334 (1927); – Puṣpendra Kumāra Śarmā, New Delhi: Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, 1976.

LIT.: HAZRA: The Devī-purāṇa, NIA 5, 1942–43, 1–20; – KANE 1962: 889–890; – HAZRA: The Devī-purāṇa. A Work of Bengal, Pur 4, 1962, 351–359; – HAZRA 1963: 35–194 [Śākta upa°]; – NCC 9 (1977), 137–138.

According to the first chapter of the Devī° the text comprises four *pādas*, called (Trailokya)vijaya, Trailokyābhudaya, Śumbhaniśumbhamathana, and, probably, Devāsurayuddha. However, the printed editions, consisting of 128 *adhya-yas*,<sup>167</sup> cover only the materials of the first two *pādas*, and, more particularly, those of the second *pāda*. The fact, first, that the text begins abruptly, and, second, that the colophons at the end of some manuscripts contain such expressions as *ity abhyudayapādaḥ samāptah*, create the impression that we possess not more than one quarter of what the Devī° was supposed to be.

<sup>164</sup> HAZRA 1963: 448–456.

<sup>165</sup> E. g., 3.20.15: *saṃsargo yāvanaś caiva bhāṣā ca yāvanī tathā / surātulyaṃ dvayaṃ proktaṃ yavanānnaṃ tato 'dhikam*.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. KANE (1962: 896): Bengal, 13th or 14th century.

<sup>167</sup> For a description of the mss., of which there are remarkably few, see – in addition to NCC – HAZRA 1963: 35–36 n. 105. A detailed survey of the contents, chapter by chapter, *ibid.* pp. 37–67.

King Nṛpavāhana requested instruction on various *vidyās* from his mentor, Citrāṅgada; the latter referred him to Agastya. In answer to Nṛpavāhana's request to be taught the *vidyā* which would make him powerful and grant him *mokṣa*, Agastya relates the advice which Brahmā once gave Indra for the same purpose. This includes the story of the demon Ghora, whom Viṣṇu granted the boon that he would not be defeated by anyone except the Devī. Ghora's many conquests, up to his defeat, after having taken the form of a buffalo, at the hands of Devī, riding on the back of a lion, in the Vindhya mountains, occupy the first twenty chapters of the text. Chapter twenty-one subsequently deals with the worship of Devī as Mahiṣāsūramardini. Devī worship, in its numerous forms at different times and many different places, is the major theme of the entire text. Devī is praised as Parā Śakti, being the origin of everything, the gods and the world of men alike (chapter 29). Though basically one, she appears in many different forms, with many different names; chapter fifty lists sixty of them, twenty each in her *sātvika*, *rājasa*, and *tāmasa* forms.

Digressions from the main theme are numerous. In addition to a number of stories told by way of illustration – Mahādharmāsura (ch. 40–41), Amayāsura (ch. 43), Ruru (ch. 83–87), Khaṭvāsura (ch. 111), etc. –, there are excursions on the construction and defense of forts (*durga*) – including a list of units of measurement – and towns (*pura*) (ch. 72), on hells and the sins that lead to residence in each of them (ch. 82), on scribes and the preparation of manuscripts (ch. 91), on Veda study (ch. 96), on *dāna* (ch. 102–106), on the division of the originally single Veda into four and their further subdivision into *sākhās* (ch. 107), on the Āyurveda (ch. 108–110, which correspond to Carakasamhitā, Sūtrasthāna ch. 25), etc. etc.

The Devī° has been described as “one of the most important of the Śākta Upapurāṇas.”<sup>168</sup> It is one of those purāṇas for which some enthusiastic Śāktas have tried to claim the title of Bhāgavata°, in the sense of “dealing with the greatness and worship of Bhagavatī.”<sup>169</sup>

The Devī° may have been composed in Bengal,<sup>170</sup> in the latter half of the sixth century A. D. A Devī°, in Kannada, is a favorite text for family reading among the Liṅgāyats (see 2.1.4).

### *Devībhāgavata°*

ED.: Madras: Vartamānatarāṅgiṇī Press, 1881 [Telugu char.]; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1811 (1889); – Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, <sup>2</sup>1832 (1911); – Benares: Satyanāma

<sup>168</sup> HAZRA 1963: 35–36.

<sup>169</sup> Caṇḍeśvara's Kṛtyaratnākara (BI work 237, 1925, pp. 357–358) quotes the entire chapter 21 of the Devī°, calling it Devī° at the beginning and Bhāgavata° at the end.

<sup>170</sup> One argument for this is the “highly incorrect Sanskrit” of the text. HAZRA devotes nearly one hundred pages (1963: 94–188) to an analysis of the language of the Devī°, comparing it with other texts of the Eastern region.

Press, 1894 (1927–28); – Gurumaṇḍalagranthamālā, 2 vols., Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 1960; – Kāśī: Paṇḍitapustakālaya, 2029 (1962–63); / – + comm. °tilaka, by Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa: Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1789 (1868), 1802 (1880); – Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1919.

TR.: Swami Vijnanananda alias Hari Prasanna Chatterjee, [SBH 26,] 1921–23 (reprinted New York: AMS Press, 1974).

LIT.: HOLTSMANN 1895: 57; – HAZRA: The Devī-Bhāgavata, JOR 21, 1951–52, 49–79; – S. N. TADPATRIKAR: Devī-Bhāgavata or Bhagavatī-Purāṇa?, ABORI 23, 1942, 559–562; – T. N. RAMACHANDRAN: Fresh Light on the Deogarh Relief of Nara-Nārāyaṇa, IHQ 27, 1951, 191–196; – HAZRA: Is the Devībhāgavata the Source of the Deogarh Relief of Nara-Nārāyaṇa?, IHQ 29, 1953, 387–392; – KANE 1962: 890; – HAZRA 1963: 284–361; – Dasharatha SHARMA: Verbal Similarities between the Durgā-sapta-śatī and the Devībhāgavata-purāṇa and Other Considerations Bearing on Their Date, Pur 5, 1963, 90–113; – P. G. LALYE: Studies in the Devi Bhagavata, Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1973; – Jaya CHEMBURKAR: Umā Haimavati in the Devī Bhāgavata. A Study, Pur 18, 1976, 93–100; – NCC 9 (1977), 139–141.

The Devībhāgavata°, like the Bhāgavata°, is composed of twelve sections, called *skandha*; it consists of 318 chapters, the distribution of which is clearly indicated at the beginning of the text (1.2.13–16). At the end of the sixth *skandha* (6.31.57) there is a reference to the conclusion of the *pūrvārdha*. Some of the editions include a Devībhāgavatamāhātmya, in five chapters, the colophons of which assign it to the Mānasakhaṇḍa of the Skanda°.

Even as the Bhāgavata° the Devībhāgavata opens with a *gāyatrī*.<sup>171</sup> The first *skandha* (20 chapters) describes the *sūta*'s visit to the sages in the Naimiṣa forest and their desire to hear the purāṇa called Bhāgavata. *Sūta* salutes Bhagavatī, and tells about the purāṇa, its extent and its subdivisions (referred to earlier). He also explains the *pañcalakṣaṇa*, however in such a way that *sarga* means that the originally *nirguṇā* Bhagavatī now manifests herself in the form of three *śaktis* (*sāttvikī*, *rājasī*, and *tāmasī*), and that *pratisarga* means the appearance of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva for the sake of creation, preservation, and destruction. *Sūta* also explains the origin of the purāṇas, in each *dvāparayuga*, from Viṣṇu in the form of Vyāsa, the present Vyāsa being Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana, son of Satyavatī. He taught the Śrīmadbhāgavata° to his son Śuka. The major portion of the *skandha* is, then, devoted to Śuka's birth from an *araṇi*, to his desire not to forego celibacy, his marriage to Pīvarī on the advice of Janaka, and his absorption into the sky through the practice of *yoga*.

The – very short (12 chapters) – second *skandha* is mainly mythological. It starts with the story of Matsyagandhā and the birth, to her and Parāśara, of Vyāsa. It continues with the birth of Śāntanu and his marriage, first to Gaṅgā,

<sup>171</sup> *sarvacaitanyarūpam tām ādyam vidyam ca dhimahi / buddhim ya nah pracodayat* (1.1.1).

and later to Satyavatī. The latter marriage quite naturally leads to Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Pāṇḍu, and Vidura. We are told of the marriages of the former two, and of the birth of Karṇa and the five Pāṇḍavas. The text then concentrates on the Pāṇḍavas, their wives, and their descendants. Via Arjuna, his wife Subhadṛā, and their son Abhimanyu, the text arrives at Parīkṣit, in connection with whom a few stories are told, and, finally, after Parīkṣit's death, at Janamejaya. He is obviously the real goal of the second *skandha*, for it is he who approaches Vyāsa for advice on how to reach peace of mind. Vyāsa satisfies him by proposing to narrate to him the Bhāgavatapurāṇa.

In the third *skandha* (30 chapters) Janamejaya begins to question Vyāsa on Devī and Devī worship. Vyāsa relates to him what he himself heard Nārada report as Brahmā's instructions on the subject. The first few chapters exhibit a charming description of how Devī provided Brahmā, Śiva, and Viṣṇu with a *vimāna* "aerial vehicle," and had them visit several places until they arrived at the residence of Devī Śrībhuvaneśvarī. After the Goddess transformed them into three young girls and allowed them to see the entire universe as reflected in her toe nail, they eulogize her and request her to divulge her own nature. She complies, and also creates, from herself, Mahāsarasvatī, Mahālakṣmī, and Mahākālī to be the *śaktis* of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva, respectively. Twelve chapters (14–25) are devoted to the story of Sudarśana who lost the throne of Kośala but regained it with the help of Devī. This is followed by a description of the *navarātravṛata* which has to be performed in the months of Āśvina and Caitra; a reference to Rāma performing the *vṛata* to rescue Sītā leads to the insertion into the text of a brief summary of the Rāmāyaṇa story.

In *skandha* four (25 chapters) new questions by Janamejaya induce Vyāsa, first to elaborate on Kaśyapa's curse to be born as Vasudeva and Aditi's curse to be born as Devakī and have her sons killed in succession. This is followed by the story of Nara and Nārāyaṇa, their penance at Badarikāśrama – including meditation on *mahāvīdyā* and various *bījas* –, and Indra's attempt to distract them, among other things, by sending Kāma, Rati, Vasanta, and thousands of Apsaras. The text also introduces Prahlāda, and describes his visit to the Naimiṣa forest, and his fight with Nara and Nārāyaṇa. Bhṛgu's curse and the story of Kāvya lead into a discussion of Viṣṇu's *avatāras* in general – they are directed by Devī rather than by Viṣṇu himself –, and, in particular, Viṣṇu's birth as Kṛṣṇa. The story of some of his exploits includes, in the last chapter, his doing penance in order to obtain Śiva's favor.

After explaining the reason why Kṛṣṇa performed penance to Śiva – Śiva being superior to Viṣṇu and his *aṃśāvatara* Kṛṣṇa – about one half (ch. 2–19) of the fifth *skandha* (35 chapters) is devoted to the greatness of Devī, Devīmāhātmya. It tells the story of Mahiṣa's occupation of heaven, the creation by the gods of Mahālakṣmī, her fight with Mahiṣa, and the demon's death, after which Devī retreats to her residence in Maṇḍivīpa. Later chapters include the stories con-

nected with the demons Śumbha and Niśumbha, the story of king Suratha and the *vaiśya*, etc.

*Skandha* six (31 chapters) recounts the story of Indra's killing Tvaṣṭṛ's son Viśvarūpa. As a result Tvaṣṭṛ creates Vṛtra, who defeats Indra and takes possession of heaven. Thanks to Devī's intervention Indra enters into an agreement with Vṛtra, and finally kills him. The text also relates the story of Nahuṣa who replaces Indra after he was again cursed by Tvaṣṭṛ, and expands on Nahuṣa's love for Śacī, until he in turn is cursed by the gods to become a snake. Other chapters in the *skandha* include the story of Hariścandra who bought Śunaḥśepa from Ajigarta, to sacrifice him instead of his own son Rohita. The story of the Bṛḡus being killed by the Haihayas introduces a sequence on the origin of the Haihaya dynasty from Ekavīra, and the latter's marriage to Ekāvalī, who had been abducted by the demon Kālaketu but rescued by Devī. Vyāsa also describes how he was ordered by his mother Satyavati to become the father of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Pāṇḍu, and Vidura, after Vicitravīrya's wives had been widowed.

Starting from Brahmā and Dakṣa the seventh *skandha* (40 chapters) tells the stories of Kaśyapa's marriage to Dakṣa's daughters, and it deals with Kaśyapa's descendants one of whom was Vivasvat, the father of Vaivasvata Manu. One of the latter's descendants is Śaryāti, which allows the text to tell the story of his son-in-law Cyavana who forced Indra to have the Aśvins share the *soma*. This is followed by the story of Revata, whose daughter Revatī was married to Balarāma. Via another descendant of Vaivasvata Manu, Ikṣvāku, the text relates the stories of his son Vikukṣi, and the latter's son Kakutstha. One of Kakutstha's sons, Māndhātṛ, who built many Devī temples, became known as Triśaṅku, and, as such, the father of Hariścandra, to whose adventures the text devotes several chapters (14–27). The final chapters (31–40) of the seventh *skandha* – a total of 507 verses – contain the Devīgītā.<sup>172</sup> At the request of Himālaya Devī agrees to expound the secret meaning of Vedic revelation. She explains that she is *brahma*, and that she creates the world through her *māyā*. She teaches that realizing the identity of *ātman* and *brahma* is the necessary condition for liberation. Knowledge is acquired by renouncing the world and by meditation. This leads to a description of *brahmajñāna* and the ways to attain it, and also to a description of *bhakti*. The last few chapters are devoted to an enumeration of the sacred places, *vratas*, and holy days of Devī, and other instructions for Devī worship. The text ends with a brief reference to Devī's birth as Gaurī, her marriage to Śiva, and the birth of Skanda. The Devīgītā has little in common with the Bhagavadgītā.

After a few chapters on creation and Manu's descendants the eighth *skandha* (24 chapters) mainly deals with the geography of the earth. Following a reference to the seven *dvīpas*, governed by the sons of Manu's son Priyavrata, the text concentrates on Jambudvīpa and its nine *varṣas*, especially Bhāratavarṣa which

<sup>172</sup> GLASENAPP 1927: 145–146.

distinguishes itself from all the other ones by being the *karmabhūmi*. The text then describes the other *dvīpas*, the Lokāloka mountain, etc., finally to arrive at a description of twenty-eight hells including the reasons for being there and the suffering connected with each of them. The movements of the sun, the moon, and the other planets, lead to a description of the year and its parts. The *skandha* ends with instructions on different kinds of Devī worship.

The ninth – and longest (50 chapters) – *skandha* corresponds closely to the Prakṛtikhaṇḍa of the Brahmavaivarta°,<sup>173</sup> except for the fact that verses praising Viṣṇu have been omitted, verses in honor of Devī have been added, and in a number of verses names of Viṣṇu have simply been replaced by names of Devī. The nature and characteristics of this “sort of encyclopaedia of goddesses” have been indicated in the description of the Brahmavaivarta°.

Differently from the Bhāgavata°, in which the tenth *skandha* is by far the longest and most popular, the tenth *skandha* of the Devībhāgavata° is one of the shortest (13 chapters) and in no way more important than the other ones. It basically deals with Devī worship, in different places, by the fourteen successive Manus, starting from Svāyambhuva Manu. Devī as Vindhyaśinī introduces the story of the Vindhya mountain, its raising its peaks out of jealousy of mount Meru, and its being restrained by Devī’s devotee, Agastya. Other stories include Devī’s appearance as Mahākālī and Viṣṇu’s killing of Madhu and Kaiṭabha; her appearance as Mahālakṣmī to kill Mahiṣa; her appearance as Sarasvatī to kill Śumbha and Niśumbha; and her manifestation as Bhrāmārī to kill Aruṇa.

Skandha eleven (24 chapters) opens with a discussion of *sadācāra* – subdivided into *śāstrīya* and *laukika* – and *dharma* – subdivided into *grāmadharma*, *jātidharma*, and *deśadharmā*. The most authoritative source of *dharma* is *śruti*, followed by *smṛti* and *purāṇa*. *Tantra* is acceptable in so far as it is not in conflict with the Veda. The subject of wearing *rudrākṣas* leads to a description of the origin of the *rudrākṣa* trees from Śiva’s tears. The text praises *śirovrata* and *pāśupatavrata*, and tells how to prepare the ashes which have to be applied to the body; it praises *tripuṇḍra* marks, and refers to the healing effects of *bhasmasnāna*. Another five chapters are devoted to the three *saṃdhyās*: *prātaḥsaṃdhyā*, *madhyāhṇasaṃdhyā*, and *sāyaṃsaṃdhyā*. Descriptions of the five *mahāyajñas*, various types of *prāyaścitta*, and *śāntika* and *pauṣṭika homas* conclude the *skandha*.

The *gāyatrī*, which was already alluded to at the end of the preceding *skandha*, and which is conceived as the *ādya śakti*, the mother of the Vedas, and identical with Devī, is the object of discussion at the beginning of *skandha* twelve (14 chapters). Every syllable of the *gāyatrī*, which is given one thousand and eight names, is connected with the names of sages, meters, deities, *śaktis*, colors, and

<sup>173</sup> See sub Brahmavaivarta°, Prakṛtikhaṇḍa.

*mudrās*. It is in this section also that the text recommends the repetition of the Umā Haimavatī story (Kenopaniṣad 3.25) as a means to glorify Devī. The *skandha* concludes with the description of Devī Bhuvaneśvarī's exalted residence, Maṇidvīpa, with Janamejaya's initiation to Devī worship and his performance of a Devīyajña while brahmans recite the Devībhāgavata°, and, of course, with a eulogy of the purāṇa.

The question, both in the tradition and in modern scholarship, whether the Devībhāgavata° or the Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavata° is the true and original Śrīmadbhāgavata° has been discussed under the Bhāgavata°. It should be noted in this connection that the term Devībhāgavata° appears only in the chapter colophons, and in the text of the last two *skandhas*; elsewhere in the text the purāṇa refers to itself either as Bhāgavata° or Śrīmadbhāgavata°, once as Satī° (1.3.41). The text also repeatedly refers to itself as "the best of purāṇas" (*purāṇottama*), and declares that "there are many other purāṇas devoted to Hari and Rudra, but they are not worth one-sixteenth part of this Devībhāgavata°" (12.13.25–26).

Hazra<sup>174</sup> sees arguments both for the Devībhāgavata° having been composed in Bengal and outside Bengal. He therefore concludes that "the author of the Devībhāgavata was a Smārta Śākta Brahmin of Bengal and . . . he migrated to Benares (probably because it was the best place of residence for a Devī-worshipper), lived there for a long time, and then wrote the Devī-bhāgavata."

Ramachandran<sup>175</sup> dated the Devībhāgavata° "not later than the 6th century A.D.," based on his belief that the story of the penance of Nara and Nārāyaṇa, as related in the fourth *skandha*, inspired the relief in the Gupta temple at Deogarh. His arguments did not find acceptance with other scholars,<sup>176</sup> and, in general, the text has been dated much later. Farquhar<sup>177</sup> assigned it to his A.D. 900–1350 period. Hazra<sup>178</sup> narrowed the period down to "the eleventh or twelfth century A.D." Lalye<sup>179</sup> proposes a gradual growth of the text, through five different stages which cannot be dated separately; in any case the final stage must have been reached in the eleventh century.

### Dharma°

LIT.: ASOKE CHATTERJEE: The Dharma-purāṇa as a Part of the Padma-purāṇa, *Sṛṣṭi-khaṇḍa*, OH 1, 1953, 277–288; – id.: The Nature and Date of the Dharma Purāṇa, *ABORI*, 38, 1957, 305–308; – id.: Dharmapurāṇam, *Indological Studies* 3, 1974, 208–213.

<sup>174</sup> HAZRA 1963: 353–359.

<sup>175</sup> RAMACHANDRAN *Devībhāgavata°* 1953.

<sup>176</sup> HAZRA *Devībhāgavata°* 1953; HAZRA 1963: 347–353.

<sup>177</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 269; cf. O'FLAHERTY 1975: 18 (between A.D. 850 and 1350).

<sup>178</sup> HAZRA 1963: 346.

<sup>179</sup> LALYE *Devībhāgavata°* 1973: 102–105.

The Dharma° is considered to be an independent upapurāṇa, rather than a part of the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa of the Padma:<sup>180</sup> it is recognized as such in the Bṛhaddharma° (1.25.25), and it is found in manuscripts as a distinct work. It was composed, in Kāmarūpa, shortly after the first Muhammadan invasion, as a brahman reaction, first, against Śaivism, especially Kāpālika Śaivism which was strongly influenced by Tantricism, and, second, against Islam which upset the traditional social order. “At this critical stage of social disintegration came forward the Brahmins. In order to safeguard the interest of society, they wrote this Dharma-purāṇa, and later on tried to make it a part of the widely read and universally accepted Padma-purāṇa.”<sup>181</sup> They were successful in their effort, thanks to the support of king Dharmapāla. According to Asoke Chatterjee the text was composed, probably between A. D. 1250 and 1325.<sup>182</sup>

The Bṛhaddharma°, being a very different kind of text, has been treated separately.

### Ekāmra°

ED.: Cuttack: Cuttack Printing Co., 1912 [Oriya char.]; – text + tr. ch. 38, Nagendra Nath VASU: Mēghēçvara Inscription of Svapnēçvara Dēva of Orissa, JASB 66, 1897, 11–23 at 14–17.

LIT.: HAZRA: The Ekāmra-Purāṇa. A Work from Orissa, PO 16, 1951, 70–76; – KANE 1962: 888; – K. N. MAHAPATRA: Puranic Literature of Orissa, OHRJ 11, 1962–63, 21–31 at 24–25; – NCC 3 (1967), 71–72.

The Ekāmra° consists of seventy chapters, numbered continuously but divided into five *aṃśas* (10, 22, 14, 16, 8 chapters). It deals with the temples and sacred places of Ekāmraṣetra, or Bhuvaneshvar. The text repeatedly refers to the Śivasamhitā and to the Āgamas and ‘Śivatantras’ as authorities on *vrata*, *prati-ṣṭhā*, etc. The first chapter contains a list of eighteen purāṇas and eighteen upapurāṇas. Hazra dates the Ekāmra° in the tenth or eleventh century; Mahapatra proposes ca. A. D. 1450.

### Ekapāda°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 28; – HAZRA 1963: 505 [lost non-sectarian upa°].

The only reference to this text is in the list of upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra°.

<sup>180</sup> The text is included in the editions of the Padma°, Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa (see there): ĀnSS ch. 44–82, Vaṅgavāsī ch. 47–82, Venkateśvara and Gurumaṇḍala ch. 49–86.

<sup>181</sup> CHATTERJEE Dharma° 1953: 284.

<sup>182</sup> Dharma° 1953: 279–280; Dharma° 1957: 308. Cf. Biswanarayan SHASTRI (Contribution of Assam to Sanskrit, JAssRS 14, 1960, 87–99 at 90): 13th century, in Kāmarūpa.

*Gaṇeśa*<sup>o</sup>

ED.: Bombay: Jagadhditecchu Press, 1798 (1876); – Uddhavācārya Aināpure and Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī Pitrye, Bombay: Gopal Narayan, 1892.

LIT.: Rev. Dr. STEVENSON: Analysis of the Gaṇeśa Purāna, with special reference to the history of Buddhism, JRAS 8, 1846, 319–329; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 57; – GRIERSON: Gāṇapatyas, ERE 6 (1914) 175–176 at 176; – FARQUHAR 1920: 270; – HAZRA: Gaṇapati-Worship and the Upapurāṇas Dealing with It, JGJRI 5, 1947–48, 263–278; – id.: Gaṇeśa Purāṇa, JGJRI 9, 1951–52, 79–99; – Juan Roger RIVIERE: The Problem of Gaṇeśa in the Purāṇas, Pur 4, 1962, 96–102.

Except for occasional references to Gaṇeśa worship in other purāṇas, there are only two upapurāṇas that belong exclusively to the Gāṇapatya sect: the Mudgala<sup>o</sup> and the Gaṇeśa<sup>o</sup>. The Gaṇeśa<sup>o</sup> consists of two parts: the Upāsanakhaṇḍa with 92 chapters, and the Kṛīḍākhaṇḍa (also called Uttarakhaṇḍa in the colophons) with 155.

Gaṇeśa is presented as the supreme deity, surpassing Brahmā, Śiva, and Viṣṇu. The supreme deity can be worshiped in two different ways, either through mystical concentration only, or by offering flowers and other presents to the image of the god at the time of his yearly festival.

The Gaṇeśa<sup>o</sup> – as well as the Mudgala<sup>o</sup> – displays various Tantric elements. It is therefore considered a rather recent upapurāṇa: between 900 and 1350 (Farquhar), between 1100 and 1400 (Hazra), or even not earlier than the seventeenth century (Stevenson).

Chapters 138–148 of the Kṛīḍākhaṇḍa of the Gaṇeśa<sup>o</sup> form the Gaṇeśagītā.<sup>183</sup> The Gaṇeśagītā, in eleven chapters (414 verses), is in the form of a dialogue between Gaṇeśa and king Varenya, his favorite disciple. The text is basically a shorter paraphrase of the Bhagavadgītā. A number of verses are practically borrowed from the latter, except that they have been altered to relay the message of the new author. This message includes the belief that Gaṇeśa is the supreme and all-pervading deity, and that his worship is the best road to salvation. Hence also a number of passages which have no parallels in the Bhagavadgītā, such as those on yogic exercises (chapter 4) and on Gaṇapati worship (chapter 7). Worship is useless unless accompanied by devotion (*bhakti*): “One worshiping without devotion is equal to an outcaste; even an outcaste, if he worships with piety and devotion, will become superior to a brahman” (9.8).

<sup>183</sup> + Nilakaṇṭha's comm, ĀnSS 52, 1906; – Tr.: Kiyoshi YOROI: Gaṇeśagītā. A study, translation with notes, and a condensed rendering of the commentary of Nilakaṇṭha, [Disp. Rheno-Traject. 12,] The Hague: Mouton, 1968. – LIT. H. VON GLASENAPP: Garbe vol. (1927), 140–142; – G. SĪTARAMIAH: Śrī-Gaṇeśa-Gītā. Its Religious and Philosophical Significance, AIOC 22 (1965), 2.241–245.

## Garuḍa°

ED.: + Beng.tr., Candrakumāra Tarkālaṅkāra, Calcutta: Jyotiṣaprakāśa Press, 1292 (1884–1885); – + Beng.tr., Calcutta: Nūtaṇa Saṃsāra Press, ca. 1885; – + Beng.tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1890, <sup>2</sup>1930–31; – Jibananda Vidyasaḡara, Calcutta: Sarasvatī Press, 1890; – Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1963 (1906); – Rāmateja Paṇḍeya, Banaras: Paṇḍitapustakālaya, 1963; – Ramshankar Bhaṭṭacharya, KSS 165, 1964; – CE by AIKT in progress (Pur 24, 1982, 413).

TR.: Manmatha Nath DUTT, [Wealth of India. Suppl., Part II, 1st series,] Calcutta: Soc. for the Resuscitation of Ind. Lit., 1908; <sup>2</sup>ChSSt 67, 1968 [Pūrvakhaṇḍa only]; – A Board of Scholars, [AITM 12–14,] 1982.

GEN. LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: li–lii; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 56; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 479–480, 1963: 505–506; – HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cxcii–cxcii; – Hans LOSCH: Die Yājñavalkyasmṛti, 1927 (see 2.1.5); – S. B. CHAUDHURI and S. C. BANERJEE: The Garuḍa-Purāṇa, IHQ 6, 1930, 553–560; – HAZRA: Some Minor Purāṇas, ABORI 19, 1938–39, 69–79 at 69–75, 77–78; – HAZRA 1940: 141–145; – KANE 1940: 175, 191; – R. C. G. TIWARI: Garuḍa Purāṇa, A Study of its Mythology, PO 23.3–4, 1958, 22–38; – Sibadas CHAUDHURI: Place Names in the Garuḍa Purāṇa (Alphabetically Arranged), IHQ 37, 1961, 53–77; – KANE 1962: 889; – B. H. KAPADIA: The Garuḍa Purāṇam, Pur 8, 1966, 101–114; – N. GANGADHARAN: Garuḍa Purāṇa, A Study, Varanasi: AIKT, 1972 [originally added as appendices to Pur 13/14, 1971/1972]; – Tahsildar SINGH: Some Reflections on Temple Architecture from Garuḍa Purāṇa, Pur 22, 1980, 180–186 [Pūrvakhaṇḍa ch. 47, KSS ed.].

The Garuḍa° consists of a *pūrvakhaṇḍa* (most often 229 chapters, sometimes 240 or 243), and an *uttarakhaṇḍa* (most often 35 chapters, also 34, 45, or 49).

The purāṇa obviously derives its name from Viṣṇu's *vāhana*, the mythic bird Garuḍa, who once received a boon from Viṣṇu that he would become the composer of a *purāṇasaṃhitā* named after him and devoted to the greatness of Viṣṇu (1.2.52–54). From other sources we learn that it was also known under different titles connected with other names for Garuḍa: Sauparṇa°, <sup>184</sup> Tārksya° after Garuḍa's father, <sup>185</sup> and Vainateya° after his mother. <sup>186</sup>

The Garuḍa° is one of the “encyclopedic” purāṇas (see 2.1.4), similar to the Agni°, and perhaps even “modeled after it.” <sup>187</sup> Like the Agni° it “bears little resemblance to what, in theory, a Purāṇa ought to be.” <sup>188</sup>

One chapter (1.65) is devoted to “the science of the magic and mantric meaning of the human body,” also known as *sāmudravidyā*, after its alleged inceptor, Samudra. The text corresponds closely to two passages from Varāhamihira's Bṛhatsaṃhitā (68.1–88 and 70.1–23). Meyer's comparison of both versions led

<sup>184</sup> Bhāgavata° 12.13.8.

<sup>185</sup> See al-Bīrūnī's first list, above 1.3.3; also Dānasāgara, BI work 274, 1956, p. 7.

<sup>186</sup> Vāyu° 104.8 = 2.42.8.

<sup>187</sup> HAZRA 1940: 144; and, consequently, more recent.

<sup>188</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1199.

him to the conclusion that the purāṇa simply converted into *anuṣṭubh* meter the stanzas in *āryā* and other meters of the Bṛhatsamhitā.<sup>189</sup>

The chapters on precious stones (1.68–80) correspond closely to Buddhabhaṭṭa's Ratnaparikṣā; the first stanza, containing the author's name, has been removed, but the text has in no other way been modified, except for numerous variant readings.<sup>190</sup>

The controversy, principally between Losch and Meyer, about the relationship of chapters 1.93–101 with the first chapter of the Yājñavalkya-smṛti, and of chapters 1.102–106 with the third chapter of Yājñavalkya, has been discussed earlier (see 2.I.5).

Apropos of chapters 1.108–115, called the Bṛhaspatīsamhitā,<sup>191</sup> Karmarkar noticed that they contain mainly *subhāṣitas* similar to those in Bhartṛhari's Nītiśataka. Sternbach compared this section with the Cāṇakya-rājanītiśāstra as edited by van Manen,<sup>192</sup> and concluded that, except for the usual summarizing of passages and exchanging of words, both texts were almost identical; the Cāṇakya text had obviously been incorporated in the purāṇa. On the other hand, a different Cāṇakya manuscript turned out to be an abridged version of the purāṇa passage "only in *majorem gloriam* attributed to Cāṇakya."<sup>193</sup>

Chapters 1.146–174 are concerned with medicine;<sup>194</sup> they are introduced: *Dhanvantarīr uvāca*. The diagnoses of a number of diseases: fever, plethora, cough, dyspnea, hiccup, heart disease, diseases resulting from abuse of wine,

<sup>189</sup> J. J. MEYER: Die menschlichen Körperteile in ihrer Bedeutung für Schicksal und Charakter. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte und zur Frage von der Entstehungsart der Purāṇen, WZKM 36, 1929, 108–135, 242–262. [Includes a translation, with comm., of the Bṛhatsamhitā passages, with comparative notes on the Garuḍa°.]

<sup>190</sup> Louis FINOT: Les lapidaires indiens, [Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Etudes, Sc. phil. hist. 111,] Paris: Bouillon, 1896, p. 2; also p. IX. Cf. KIRFEL: Das Nidānasthāna ... (note 194), p. 108, who suggests that some of the readings in the purāṇa are superior to those printed by Finot.

<sup>191</sup> A. P. KARMARKAR: Bṛhaspati-Nītiśāra in Garuḍa-purāṇa, Siddheshwar Varma vol. (1950), 1.239–240; – Ludwik STERNBACH: The Cāṇakya-rājanītiśāstra and the Bṛhaspati-Samhitā of the Garuḍa-Purāṇa, ABORI 37, 1957, 58–110; – id.: An Unknown Cāṇakya Ms. and the Garuḍa-purāṇa, IJ 1, 1957, 181–200 [Univ. of Pennsylvania ms. 1559]; – Ramachandra G. TIWARI: Bṛhaspati Samhita alias Nitisara, A Social, Political and Cultural Study, JIH 38, 1960, 139–166; – STERNBACH: A new abridged version of the Bṛhaspati-samhitā of the Garuḍapurāṇa, Pur 8, 1966, 315–431; published separately, Varanasi: AIKT, 1966.

<sup>192</sup> Calcutta Or. Ser., No. 2, <sup>2</sup>1921.

<sup>193</sup> STERNBACH: A new abridged Version ... (note 191), p. 5. The ms. is Ms. Add. 1040 of Cambridge University Library, containing one introductory verse and 57 maxims.

<sup>194</sup> Willibald KIRFEL: Das Nidānasthāna im Garuḍapurāṇa, Garbe vol. (1927), 102–108; – Surabhi H. TRIVEDI: Garuḍa-Purāṇa and Aṣṭāṅghṛdaya, JOIB 15, 1965–66, 488–508; – Surabhi SHETH (= id.): Garuḍa-Purāṇa and Aṣṭāṅghṛdaya. A Textual Comparison, JOIB 22, 1972–73, 484–500 [the first of these two articles deals with Garuḍa° 146–155/Nidānasthāna 1–6; the second with Garuḍa° 156–167/Nidānasthāna 7–16].

dysentery, etc. etc. (1.146–166), are treated in the same order, and often in the same words, as they are in the *nīdānasthāna* (*adhyaḃyas* 1–16) of Vāgbhaṭa's *Aṣṭāṅghrdaya*. Both texts look like “different manuscripts of the same treatise on pathology.”<sup>195</sup>

Notwithstanding its encyclopedic character, efforts at dating the *pūrvakhaṇḍa* of the Garuḍa° are not lacking. Except for some “spurious” chapters (especially 146–149 and 202) Hazra dates the extant *pūrvakhaṇḍa*, which is modeled after the Agni°, in the tenth century.<sup>196</sup> He thus more or less agrees with Chaudhuri/Banerjee, who date the present text, after all insertions, “not before the 10th or the 11th century A. D.”<sup>197</sup> Their argument was directed against the early date proposed by Haraprasad Shastri, on the ground that Garuḍa was a popular deity in the time of the Guptas.<sup>198</sup> An early date also found favor with Tiwari, who places the nucleus of the Garuḍa° in the first century A. D., and assigns specific chapters to each successive century, up to the sixth.<sup>199</sup>

The Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Garuḍa° is better known under the name of Pre-takhaṇḍa, or Pretakalpa.<sup>200</sup> The textual differences between the editions, which were already considerable for the Pūrvakhaṇḍa, now reach confusing proportions.<sup>201</sup> In 1865 Weber drew attention to the fact that an 1862 edition, in Bombay, was not the Pretakalpa of the Garuḍa°, but the Garuḍapurāṇasāroddhāra.<sup>202</sup>

The author of this text,<sup>203</sup> as of the commentary that accompanies it, calls

<sup>195</sup> KIRFEL: *Das Nīdānasthāna* . . . , p. 108.

<sup>196</sup> HAZRA 1940: 144.

<sup>197</sup> CHAUDHURI and BANERJEE *Garuḍa°* 1930: 560. SINGH (*Garuḍa°* 1980: 180) suggests the 8th or 9th century.

<sup>198</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cxciiv.

<sup>199</sup> TIWARI *Garuḍa°* 1958, where the *Bṛhaspatisaṃhitā* is placed in the 6th century. Elsewhere (*Bṛhaspati Samhita* alias *Nitisara* . . .) the same author has the *saṃhitā* composed near the end of the 3rd century, and retouched in the 6th or 7th century.

<sup>200</sup> ED. + Guj. tr., Surat 1927 (1870); – + Hindi *ṭīkā*, Agra: Ijādakīśana Press, 1874; – + Hindi *ṭīkā*, Meerut: Jvālāprakāśa Press, 1935 (1878), <sup>2</sup>1939 (1882); – + Hindi *ṭīkā*, Khairnagar: Jvālāprakāśa Press, 1938 (1882); – Meerut: Rahamānī Press, 1943 (1886); – + Nepali C., Benares: Harihar Sharma, 1906; – + Hindi C., Benares: Satyanāma Press, c. 1925.

<sup>201</sup> IOL: 885. Cf. HAZRA 1940: 141 n. 148. KIRFEL, who edited and translated (*Ein medizinisches Kapitel des Garuḍapurāṇas*, Weller vol. 1954, 333–356) the chapter on the creation and early growth of humans (ch. 32 in several ed.), concluded that the texts were so different that one could speak of various recensions, and that he could apply his *Pañcalakṣaṇa* principles on them.

<sup>202</sup> *Neue Drucke sanskritischer Texte*, aus Bombay etc., ZDMG 19, 1865, 315–325 at 315–316. CC uses the title *Garuḍapurāṇasārasamgraha*.

<sup>203</sup> ED. Bombay: Jñānasāgara Press, 1919 (1862–63); – + Marathi tr., Poona: Dattaprasāra Press, 1878; – + Navanidhirāma's own *ṭīkā*, Bombay: Jagadīśvara Press, 1801 (1879); – E. TEZA: *Sentenze indiane*, *Annali delle Università Toscane* 16.1, 1879, 359–404 [in appendix III, pp. 395–401]; – + C., Vāsudeva Lakṣmaṇa Śāstrī *Paṃśīkara*, NSP 1903; – + tr., Ernest WOOD and S. V. SUBRAHMANYAM, with Intro. by Sris Chandra

himself Naunidhirāma, son of Śrīharinārāyaṇa, and “purāṇa reciter” (*purāṇasya vaktā*) of king Śrīśārdūla of Jhuñjhuṇāgara.<sup>204</sup> The Sāroddhāra is nearly as long as most versions of the Pretakalpa.<sup>205</sup> Although there are passages in which it appears like a summary of the latter, at the same time it introduces materials from other sources; in this connection the commentary itself refers to another version of the Garuḍa°, and comparison shows that some verses of the Sāroddhāra correspond, some literally, to stanzas in the Bhāgavata°, Bhaviṣyottara°, and Nārada°.<sup>206</sup>

The Pretakalpa<sup>207</sup> has been called “a voluminous though entirely unsystematic work, which treats of everything connected with death, the dead and the beyond;” its materials are said to be presented “in a motley confusion and with many repetitions.”<sup>208</sup> In the face of such value judgments I must refer once again to the large number of editions representing several versions, and to the practical popularity of the text.

„Perhaps the best authority for the present creed of the Hindūs in regard to the future state of the soul, and the best guide to the right performance of funeral Śrāddha ceremonies, is the Garuḍa-purāṇa . . . portions of it are recited at funerals and Śrāddhas in the present day.”<sup>209</sup>

One of several Gayāmāhātmyas claims to belong to the Garuḍa°, <sup>210</sup> and so does a Śrīraṅgamāhātmya.<sup>211</sup> Sometimes the Viṣṇudharmottara° is looked upon as the latter part of the Garuḍa°.<sup>212</sup>

A Garuḍa upapurāṇa figures in the list of the Ekāmra°.<sup>213</sup>

VASU, [SBH 9.] Allahabad: Indian Press, 1911; – Emil ABEGG: Der Pretakalpa des Garuḍa-Purāṇa. (Naunidhirāma's Sāroddhāra). Eine Darstellung des hinduistischen Totenkultes und Jenseitsglaubens. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt und mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Indices versehen, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1921; reprint 1956; – Madras: Vavilla Press, 1924 [Telugu char.]; – Rajahmundry: Sarasvatī Power Press, 1927 [Telugu char.]; – + Hindi tr., Mādhavaprasāda Vyāsa, Benares: Bhārgavabhūṣaṇa Press, 1934; – + Hindi tr., Khūbacanda Śarman, Benares: Navalakiśora Press, 1940.

<sup>204</sup> Identified by ABEGG (Pretakalpa 1921: 27 n. 4) as present Jhuñjhuṇu, the capital of the *tahsil* with the same name, 140 kms NNW of Jaipur.

<sup>205</sup> 16 *adhyāyas*, 1275 *ślokas*, against 35 *adhyāyas*, 1391 *ślokas* (ABEGG: op. cit., p. 29).

<sup>206</sup> ABEGG: op. cit., p. 30.

<sup>207</sup> For a detailed survey of the contents, chapter by chapter (35, according to Jibananda's ed.), see ABEGG: op. cit., pp. 11–27. On this subject, see also Babu SURESHCHANDRA: Le culte des pitṛ d'après les Purāṇa, Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1940.

<sup>208</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 506; cf. HAZRA 1940: 141.

<sup>209</sup> Monier MONIER-WILLIAMS: Brāhmanism and Hindūism, New York: Macmillan, 1891, p. 288.

<sup>210</sup> NCC 5 (1969), 315.

<sup>211</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1201–1202, no. 3359; BURNELL 1880: 188.

<sup>212</sup> BURNELL 1880: *ibid.* See sub Viṣṇudharmottara°.

<sup>213</sup> HAZRA 1954: 28; HAZRA 1963: 505.

*Kaiśika°*

ED.: + Maṇipravāla comm., Parāśara Bhaṭṭa, Madras : Hindubhāṣasamjivānī Press, 1872–73 [Grantha char.]; – Madras: Rāmāyaṇa Press, 1904 [Telugu char.]; – Madras: Śāstrasamjivānī Press, 1916 [Grantha]; – Madras: Saccidānanda Press, 1918 [Grantha]; – Masulipatam: Āryānanda Press, 1926 [Telugu]; – Madras: Rattilam Press, 1955.

LIT.: NCC 5 (1969), 83; – Guy R. WELBON: The Caṇḍāla's Song, in Welbon and Glenn E. Yocum (ed.): Religious Festivals in South India and Sri Lanka, Delhi: Manohar, 1982, pp. 77–99 [includes a transl., pp. 88–93]; an earlier version of this article appeared in Saṃskṛta Ranga 6, 1973, 113–134.

Manuscripts of the Kaiśika°, also called Kaiśikamāhātmya, Kaiśikopākhyāna, Viṣṇusevāmāhātmya, and Viṣṇustavamāhātmya, claim it to be the seventh, fortieth, forty-eighth, sixty-sixth, or seventy-sixth *adhyāya* of the Varāha°. This short, obviously South Indian text, which is still performed today, deals with the story of a *caṇḍāla* devotee-songster, his trials at the hands of a *brahmarākṣasa*, and the ultimate deliverance of both by Viṣṇu.

*Kālikā°*

ED.: Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1891, 1901, 1907; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkarāna and Hrishikesha Shastri, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1316 (1910); – Biswanārāyaṇ Śāstrī, [Jaikrishnadas-Krishnadas Prachyavidya Granthamala 5,] Varanasi: ChSS Off, 1972.

TR.: ch. 71 (Venk.) = 67 (Vaṅga, Varanasi): W. C. BLACQUIERE: The Rudhira'dhya'yā, or Sanguinary Chapter; translated from the Calica Puran, Asiatic Researches 5, 1797, 371–391 [said to have been reprinted, with notes, by K. S. MACDONALD, 1901]; – ch. 1–19 (abridged): H. ZIMMER: The King and the Corpse. Tales of the Soul's Conquest of Evil. Ed. J. Campbell, The Bollingen Series XI, New York: Pantheon Books, 1948; <sup>2</sup>1956, pp. 239–316; Abenteuer und Fahrten der Seele, Gesammelte Werke 4.249–317, Zürich–Stuttgart: Rascher, 1961; – ch. 25 and 34: SURYAKANTA 1950: 102–120; – K. R. VAN KOON: Worship of the Goddess According to the Kālikāpurāṇa. Part I. Translation with an Introduction and Notes of Chapters 54–69, [Orientalia Rheno-Trajectina, 14,] Leiden: Brill, 1972.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: lv; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 481, 1963: 510; – Kanaka Lāl BARUA: Early History of Kāmarūpa. From the Earliest Times to the End of the Sixteenth Century, Shillong: the author, 1933; – P. K. GODE: The Date of Kālikāpurāṇa – Before 1000 A. D., JOR 10, 1936, 289–294; – V. RAGHAVAN: The Kālikā (Upa)purāṇa, JOR 12, 1938, 331–360; – id.: The Kālikā-purāṇa, Kālidāsa and Māgha, Woolner vol. (1940), 191–195; – HAZRA: The Kālikā-purāṇa, ABORI 22, 1940–41, 1–23; – D. R. MANKAD: Narakāsura Episode in the Kālikā Purāṇa (Its Historical Interpretation), JAssRS 10, 1943, 14–22; – Tirthanath SARMA: Kālikā Purāṇa – A Compilation of the Time of Dharmapāla of Kāmarūpa, IHQ 23, 1947, 322–326; – HAZRA: Was the Kālikā-purāṇa Composed During the Reign of King Dharmapāla of Kāmarūpa?, BhV 16, 1956, 35–40 [answer: no]; – B. K. BARUA: Kālikāpurāṇa on Iconographical Representations of Some Śākta Goddesses and Their Worship in Medieval Assam, Gode vol. (1960), 3.1–18; – KANE 1962: 888; – HAZRA 1963: 194–259 [Śākta upa°]; – V. S. AGRAWALA: General President's Address, AIOC 22 (1965), 1.109–150; – NCC 4 (1968), 50–54; – P. C. CHOUDHURY: Rājanīti in the

Kālikāpurāṇa, JIH 49, 1971, 169–180; – Maheshwar NĒOG: Mudrās in the Kālikā-purāṇa, Sangeet Natak 45, July–Sep. 1977, 5–7.

Even though the number of chapters varies, from ninety in the Vaṅga and Chowkhamba editions to ninety-three in the Venkaṭeśvara edition, the printed editions of the Kālikā°, occasionally called Kālī°, present a more or less uniform text.<sup>214</sup>

Even as the Devī° the Kālikā° starts abruptly: Kamaṭha and other *munis* address a number of questions to Mārkaṇḍeya, who has taken up residence near the Himālayas. Mārkaṇḍeya promises them to tell them a *kathā purātānī*, which came down to him from Brahmā, via Nārada, the Vālakhilyas, Yavakṛita, and Asita.

Mārkaṇḍeya's discourse begins with the creation, by Brahmā, of the Prajāpatis – including Dakṣa –, Marīci and the other sages, the beautiful Saṃdhyā, and, above all, a beautiful male being named Manmatha, Kāma, Manobhava, Madana, Darpaka, or Kandarpa. Later Madana accepts as his wife Rati, born of Dakṣa's perspiration.

Brahmā requests Madana, for the good of the world, to make Śiva fall in love. He realizes, however, that this cannot happen without Viṣṇumāyā Yoganidrā. The latter appears and accepts to become Dakṣa's daughter and marry Śiva. The text seizes every occasion to sing the praise of Devī: Brahmā does so to overcome Madana's hesitation, and Dakṣa eulogizes the Goddess when she appears before him as Kālikā.

The daughter born to Dakṣa and his wife Vīraṇī, is called Satī; she immediately becomes a devotee of Śiva. Encouraged by Brahmā and Viṣṇu, and with the help of Madana's arrows, Śiva appears before Satī, and proposes that she become his wife. Brahmā is sent to Dakṣa, obtains his consent, and the wedding of Śiva and Satī takes place in Dakṣa's house. An incident, which has Brahmā fall in love with Satī, and Śiva intent on killing him for this, allows Mārkaṇḍeya to relate in great detail Viṣṇu's intervention, in which he shows Śiva that the three gods – Brahmā, Śiva, and Viṣṇu – are one and the same, and in no way different from one another (chapters 12–13). A description of Śiva and Satī's amorous stay on Kailāsa is followed by the story of Dakṣa's sacrifice to which neither Śiva nor Satī were invited. The story includes all the well-known episodes: Satī giving up her life, Śiva destroying the sacrifice and carrying Satī's body on his head, Brahmā and Viṣṇu entering the body and cutting it to pieces, the pieces being spread over various regions of India, Satī becoming worshiped in all these places under different names, etc.

<sup>214</sup> See, nevertheless, for different versions of the Kālikā°, sub 2.1.3. For a concordance of the editions, see HAZRA 1963: 194 n. 421. See also there for a list of mss. (p. 195 n.), and for a detailed survey of the contents, chapter by chapter (pp. 195–230).

Brahmā's attempt to console Śiva on the banks of lake Śipra occasions a digression on the sacred river Śiprā and the benefits of bathing in it. The fact that the Śiprā originated from the water with which the gods sprinkled Vasiṣṭha and Arundhatī at the time of their wedding leads to the story of how Saṃdhyā was reborn as the daughter of Medhātithi, and how she fell in love with Vasiṣṭha and married him.

Viṣṇu's entering Śiva's heart after the withdrawal of Yoganidrā introduces a new series of chapters (24–40/24–41)<sup>215</sup> in which Mārkaṇḍeya relates details on primary creation (*ādisarga*), secondary creation (*pratisarga*), different kinds of *pralaya*, *yugas*, *manvantaras*, etc. This section also deals with some of Viṣṇu's *avatāras* – Varāha and Kūrma –, Śiva's appearance as Śarabha, the birth of Kapālibhairava and the practices of the Kāpālikas, the story of Naraka of Prāgyoṭṣa, etc.

Chapter 41/42 begins the story of Satī's birth – in the form of Kālī – to Himavat and Menakā. The text tells how she becomes Śiva's attendant while he practices austerities. Śiva allowing her to occupy one half of his body leads to a description of Ardhanārīśvara. Much attention is paid to the story of Bhṛṅgī and Mahākāla, their rebirth as Vetāla and Bhairava, their worship of Śiva and the latter's instruction on how to worship Mahāmāyā Pārvatī. The resulting Vaiṣṇavītantra (chapters 52–56/54–58) is followed by the Uttarantra (57/59), Devītantra (58–62/60–65) including a Kāmākhyāmāhātmya, Tripurātantra (63/66–67), Kāmeśvarītantra (64/68), Śāradātantra (65/69), and a chapter on various kinds of *namaskāras* and *mudrās* (66/70). Chapter 67/71 constitutes the well-known Rudhirādhyāya “Blood Chapter,” on *balidāna* “offering animals to the deity” including *narabali* “human sacrifice.” The following chapters deal with a wide variety of topics, such as the sixteen types of *upacāra*, *nyāsas*, *yantras*, and *mantras*.

Starting with chapter 78/81 the text concentrates on Kāmarūpa, and its many rivers, mountains, and cities, all of which Śiva showed to Vetāla and Bhairava before retreating to Kailāsa. Kāmarūpa became so holy that its inhabitants attained immortality and Yama could no longer control them; the overall effort to bring them back into Yama's power led to a curse by Vasiṣṭha that, in Kāmarūpa, Śiva and other gods shall be worshiped *vāmahāvena*, thus providing a justification for the introduction of Vāmacāra Tantrism. Other chapters provide a mythological explanation for the origin of the Brahmaputra, which was brought down from the Brahmakuṇḍa by Rāma Jāmadagnya; on this occasion the text recounts the well-known stories of Satyavatī who mistakenly exchanged with her mother the two *carus* provided by Bhṛgu, the story of Reṇukā's death, etc.

<sup>215</sup> The figures preceding the virgule refer to the Vaṅgavāsī and Chowkhamba editions, the figures following the virgule refer to the Venkateśvara ed.

Among the subjects treated in the last few chapters reference should be made to a discourse on the qualifications and duties of the king, on rites such as *puṣyasnāna* and *śakradhvajotsava*, and on the different types of sons and the necessity to have them.

The Kālikā° is so much a Śākta text that it also goes under the name of Kālikā Tantra.<sup>216</sup> Sporadic claims that it, rather than the Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavata°, is the true and original Bhāgavata°,<sup>217</sup> have been dismissed by most *nibandhakāras*.<sup>218</sup>

There is general agreement that the Kālikā° originated in Kāmarūpa, or in the part of Bengal which is closest to it.<sup>219</sup> There is less agreement, however, on the date of the text. After having been assigned to the fourteenth century,<sup>220</sup> the year A. D. 1000 was proposed as a *terminus ante quem* for it.<sup>221</sup> Others noticed, in the text (55.17/57.17), an allusion to king Dharmapāla of Kāmarūpa, and consequently placed the Kālikā° at the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century.<sup>222</sup> In the meantime a *terminus post quem* had been set at A. D. 700, in view of the fact that the purāṇa is influenced by Māgha's Śiśupālavadha.<sup>223</sup> Finally, Hazra proposed the tenth or the first half of the eleventh century,<sup>224</sup> with the proviso that the present purāṇa is different from an earlier one, one which had only few Tantric elements, and was composed in Bengal in the course of the seventh century.<sup>225</sup>

Irrespective of its date, even today the Kālikā° plays an important role in the yearly Durgāpūjā.<sup>226</sup> In this connection it might be worth mentioning the composition of a Kālikāpurāṇiyadurgāpūjāpaddhati, by Aśutoṣa Tarkatīrtha,<sup>227</sup> with

<sup>216</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 354; GONDA 1963: 31.

<sup>217</sup> Hemādri's Caturvargacintāmaṇi (BI work 72, vol. 1, 1873, p. 531) and other *nibandhas* quote a verse: *yad idam kālikākhyam ca mūlam bhāgavatam smrtam*.

<sup>218</sup> E. g., Kṛtyakalpataru (vol. 1, GOS 106, 1948, p. 30), Nityācārapradīpa (BI work 160, vol. 1, pp. 18–19), Bālabhaṭṭi (BI work 162, p. 13).

<sup>219</sup> PAYNE 1933: 86; HAZRA 1963: 232; Biswanarayan SHASTRI: Contribution of Assam to Sanskrit, JAssRS 14, 1960, 87–99 at 89–90. V. S. AGRAWALA's presidential address at the 22nd AIOC, held at Gauhati in 1965, called the Kālikā° “verily a Sthala-māhātmya to which we are indebted for a record of mythological beginnings and ethnological statements about Assamese history” (p. 110); it also is “the best of its kind available among such texts” (p. 116).

<sup>220</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 354; PAYNE 1933: 46, 86; GONDA 1963: 31.

<sup>221</sup> GODE (Kālikā° 1936): the Kālikā° is quoted in Nānyadeva's Bharatabhāṣya, end of the eleventh century.

<sup>222</sup> BARUA Kālikā° 1933: 163; SARMA Kālikā° 1947: 326.

<sup>223</sup> RAGHAVAN Kālikā° 1940: 195.

<sup>224</sup> HAZRA 1963: 245 (contra Barua and Sarma, pp. 245–254).

<sup>225</sup> HAZRA 1963: 233–243. He argues against D. C. SIRCAR (The Śākta Pīṭas, 1948; reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973, p. 12 n. 5), according to whom the Kālikā° “seems to have been originally incorporated in the Rudrayāmala Tantra.”

<sup>226</sup> See VAN KOOIJ Kālikā° 1972: 4–5.

<sup>227</sup> Ed. Calcutta 1923, with a Bhūmikā by Haraprasad Shastri.

the explicit purpose of bringing the actual *pūjā* performances into harmony with the rules laid down in the Sanskrit text.

### Kalki°

ED.: Jaganmohana Tarkālaṅkāra, Calcutta: Kavyaprakasha Press, 1873; – + Beng. tr., Jaganmohana Tarkālaṅkāra, Calcutta: Purāṇaprakāśa Press, 1800 (1878); – Jibananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta: Narayan Press, 1890; – + Hindi tr. and notes, Baldev Prasad Mishra, Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1897, <sup>2</sup>1923; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta, Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1315 (1908), <sup>2</sup>1325 (1918); – + Hindi tr., Ramasvarup Sharma, Moradabad: Sanātanadharmā Press, 1922.

LIT.: Emil ABEGG: Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran. Auf Grund der Quellen dargestellt, Berlin–Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1928 [pp. 71–138: Das Kalki-Purāṇa]; – D. R. MAN-KAD: Kalki. The Earliest Check to Buddhism, NIA 4, 1941–42, 337–343; – HAZRA 1958: 303–308; – NCC 3 (1967), 231–232; – Vināyaka Śarmā PARĀṆJAP: Kalkipurāṇavimarśaḥ [Discussion on the Kalkipurāṇa], Pur 10, 1968, 179–187.

The Kalki° consists of three sections, called *aṁśa*, containing seven, seven, and twenty-one chapters, respectively.<sup>228</sup> According to some of the colophons it claims to be a continuation of the Bhāgavata° with regard to future events.<sup>229</sup>

At the request of Brahmā, whom the gods and the earth had approached for protection against the evils of Kali, Viṣṇu promises to manifest himself as the son of Viṣṇuyaśas and Sumati of Śambhala village. The newly born is called Kalki. Kalki studies the Vedas and the various ancillary sciences, and marries Padmāvati, the daughter of king Bṛhadratha of Siṃhala. In the city of Kīkaṭa Kalki fights and defeats the Bauddhas and the Mlecchas. After the arrival of Kṛtayuga disguised as a *maskarin*, Kalki decides to fight Kali who had driven Dharma out of the city of Viśasana; Kali is defeated, and escapes to another continent (*varṣa*). After many other heroic deeds in different places Kalki returns to Śambhala, and inaugurates the Kṛtayuga. At the end of the book Kalki passes on to heaven.

The Kalki° is a Vaiṣṇava purāṇa, representing the *dvaitādvaita* branch of philosophy. It probably belongs to Bengal, where it was composed at a relatively recent date.<sup>230</sup>

### Kapilā°

ED.: + Hindi summary, Vijaya Śaṅkara Tivārī, [Bhāratīya Sāhitya Granthamālā 19.] Vārāṇasi: Bhāratīya Sāhitya Vidyālaya, 1977.

<sup>228</sup> Some manuscripts, though, are not divided into *aṁśas*, and number the chapters continuously.

<sup>229</sup> ... iti śrīkalkipurāṇe anubhāgavate bhaviṣye.

<sup>230</sup> One *terminus ante quem* is śaka 1726 (A. D., 1804), which is the date of Dacca University Ms. 234.

The Kapila°, which is mentioned in the lists of upapurāṇas, has only recently been edited, on the basis of a single manuscript preserved at the Sarasvatībhanav in Varanasi. It consists of 21 *adhyāyas*.

King Śalyajit, who wants to hear about various *punyaḥṣetras*, requests instruction from the sage Kapila. The latter reports to him a conversation between the ṛṣis who perform *tapas* in Puṣkarakṣetra and the sage Bharadvāja, on the greatness of various holy places and the puranic stories associated with them. Even though holy places beyond Orissa are also included, it is clear where the composer's preference lies:

varṣānām bhāratam śreṣṭham deśānām utkalah smṛtaḥ /  
utkalena samo deśo deśo nāsti mahīpate //

### Kauśika°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 28–29; – HAZRA 1958: 357–358 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°]; – NCC 5 (1969), 116.

The title of this lost upapurāṇa may have been Kauśika° or Kauśikī°. A single reference to it, in Bhavānanda's Bengali poem *Harivaṃśa* (sixteenth–seventeenth century), seems to point to local recognition only.

### Kūrma°

ED.: Madras: Vartamānatarāṅgiṇī Press, 1875 [Telugu char.]; – Nilamaṇi Mukhopādhyāya Nyāyālaṅkāra, BI work 106, 1890; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsi Press, 1890, 1905; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1906, 1926; – Gurumaṅḍala Series 22, Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 1962; – Ramashankara Bhattacharya, Varanasi: Indological Bookhouse, 1968; – Critically edited by Anand Swarup GUPTA, Varanasi: AIKT, 1967; + Engl. tr., *ibid.* 1972; – Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1983.

TR.: Ganesh Vasudeo TAGARE, [AITM 20–21.] 1982.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlvi–xlix; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 55; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 477–478, 1963: 502–504; – HAZRA: *Smṛti Chapters in the Kūrma Purāṇa*, IHQ 11, 1935, 265–286; – HAZRA 1940: 57–75; – P.-E. DUMONT: *The Legend of Sītā in the Kūmapurāṇa*, Siddheshwar Varma vol. (1950), 1.236–238; – P. C. DIVANJI: *The Mahāyogas of the Mahārṣi and the Kūrma Purāṇa*, JOIB 7, 1957–58, 67–77; – KANE 1962: 888–889; – Anand Swarup GUPTA: *The Problem of the Extent of the Kūrma Purāṇa Text*, Pur 14, 1972, 125–136; – G. K. PAI: *Cultural History from the Kūrma-Purāṇa*, Cochin: Sukrtindra Oriental Research Institute, 1975.

The Kūrma° was the second purāṇa, after the Vāmana°, to be critically edited by the All-India Kashiraj Trust, in Varanasi. All editions divide the text into two parts, called *pūrvavibhāga* and *uttara-* or *uparivibhāga*. The number of chapters in both sections varies in different editions; in the critical edition there are fifty-one chapters in the first section, forty-four in the second.<sup>231</sup>

<sup>231</sup> Telugu ed. 50 + 46; BI 53 + 45; Vaṅga 52 + 44; Veṅk. 53 + 46. For a concordance, see Critical Edition, pp. li–lxiii; CE + Engl. tr., pp. xiii and xviii.

The text itself (1.1.21–23) tells us that the Kūrma° consists of four *saṃhitās*: Brāhmī, Bhāgavatī, Saurī, and Vaiṣṇavī; it seems to suggest that the text as we have it corresponds to the Brāhmīsaṃhitā, but does not provide any information on the other *saṃhitās*. The Nārada° (1. ch. 106) exhibits a description, not only of the Brāhmīsaṃhitā – in terms corresponding to the content of the preserved text –, but of the other three *saṃhitās* as well.

The Kūrma° is a most interesting document from the religious point of view. Hazra has, at great length, elaborated the thesis that “the Kūrma originally belonged most probably to the Pāñcarātras and . . . afterwards it was appropriated by the Pāśupatas who added to it many new myths, legends, accounts of holy places and the like in order to attain their sectarian end.”<sup>232</sup> Even though the text is called after an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, it presents an intriguing combination of Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva elements.

At the outset the *sūta* relates to the sages in the Naimiṣa forest how Viṣṇu, in the form of a tortoise, held mount Mandara while the gods were churning the ocean. Out of the waters rose Śrī, whom Viṣṇu took as his wife. When the gods inquire about her identity, Viṣṇu informs them that she is his supreme *śakti*, his eternal *māyā* through which he enchants the whole world. It is from her that the other gods, Brahmā, Śiva, and others derive their own *śaktis*. It is clear from these and other details in the opening chapters that Viṣṇu is superior to Śiva and Brahmā; displaying an undeniable influence of Śāktism, they come very close to some of the Pāñcarātra *saṃhitās* such as the Ahirbudhnya.

On the other hand, there are chapters (e. g., 1. ch. 24–25) in which Kṛṣṇa, in order to obtain a son, implores the help of Śiva; he is initiated in the Pāśupata vow by the sage Upamanyu, and “with his mind fixed on Śiva, he repeats his name day and night.” The chapters on the glory of Banaras (1. ch. 27–33) and the description of the various *liṅgas* there (Omkāreśvara, Kṛttivāseśvara, etc.) are equally of Pāśupata origin.

One of the components of the Pāśupata *vrata*, the Pāśupata *yoga*, is the subject of the Īśvaragītā.<sup>233</sup> The Īśvaragītā, in eleven chapters (Kūrma° 2. ch. 1–11; CE 497 stanzas), is a Śaiva adaptation of the Bhagavadgītā.<sup>234</sup> It repeats a number of verses from the latter, with or without variations, and also borrows from the Upaniṣads, especially the Kaṭha and the Śvetāśvatara. At the moment when the

<sup>232</sup> HAZRA 1940: 58.

<sup>233</sup> HAZRA (1940: 62) holds that the Īśvaragītā too, originally belonged to the Vaiṣṇava Kūrma°, and was first spoken by Viṣṇu.

<sup>234</sup> Tr. Vans KENNEDY 1831: App. D, pp. 444–455 [abridged]; – tr. L. Kanno MAL, Lahore: Bombay Sanskrit Press 1924; – ed. + Fr. tr., P.-E. DUMONT: L'Īśvaragītā. Le chant de Śiva, Paris: Geuthner, 1933 [see also F. Edgerton's review, with corrections, JAOS 54, 1934, 306–310]. – LIT.: GLASENAPP 1927: 142–143; – P.-E. DUMONT: La doctrine métaphysique de l'Īśvaragītā, Int. Congr. Orient. 19 (1935) 1938, 381–383; – NCC 2 (1966), 274.

sages in the Badarikāśrama ask Viṣṇu to instruct them on the nature of the world and *brahma*, Śiva appears; he embraces Viṣṇu and, at the latter's request, exposes the Īśvaragītā. He speaks about Ātman and Māyā, about Puruṣa and Prakṛti, and shows himself as the highest lord, the origin and guide of the entire world. The text ends with a description of the path to salvation, and a chapter on *yoga* as a practical means to acquire knowledge. The composite character of the text manifests itself, for instance, in the fact that, on the one hand, it praises *bhakti* which can liberate even a *śūdra*, while, on the other hand, great emphasis is laid on the necessity of realizing the identity of *ātman* and *brahma*, along the lines of the *māyāvāda*. The importance of the Īśvaragītā is underscored by the existence, in manuscript form, of at least four different commentaries, by Vi-jñānabhikṣu, Bhāsurānanda, Yajñeśvarasūri, and Sabhāpatimiśra.

The Īśvaragītā is followed by the Vyāsagītā (Kūrma° 2. ch. 12–33) which deals with *dharmaśāstra* topics, especially the duties of *varṇas* and *āśramas*. These chapters have been analyzed as corresponding to the Uśanas saṃhitā, with a few additional chapters.<sup>235</sup> They too may have been added "by the Pāsupatas most probably at the time of recasting the Viṣṇuite Kūrma-p."<sup>236</sup>

The date proposed for the composition of the Kūrma° is the beginning of the eight century A. D.<sup>237</sup>

A Kaurma upapurāṇa appears in the lists of upapurāṇas in the Revākhaṇḍa of the Skanda° and the Revāmāhātmya. Nothing else is known about it.<sup>238</sup>

### Līlāvati°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 30.

The sole reference to this purāṇa is in the list of upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra°.

### Liṅga°

ED.: Madras: Vartamānatarāṅgiṇī Press, 1877 [Telugu char.]; – Jibananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta: New Valmiki Press, 1885; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1924, 1966; – Gurumaṇḍala Series 16, Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 1960; – Śrīrāma Śarmā Ācārya, Bareilly: Saṃskṛti Saṃsthān, 1970–71 [2 vols., abridged]/ – + comm. Śivatoṣiṇī: Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1857, 1963 (1906); – Poona, 1790 (1868), <sup>2</sup>1789 (1876); – J. L. Shastri, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

TR.: A Board of Scholars, [AITM 5–6,] 1973 [based on Veṅkaṭeśvara ed.]; – 1. ch. 28–33: W. JAHN: Die Legende vom Devadāruvana, ZDMG 69, 1915, 529–557 at 539–545.

<sup>235</sup> HAZRA: Purāṇas in the History of Smṛti, IC 1, 1935, 587–614 at 599–600.

<sup>236</sup> HAZRA 1940: 64–65 n. 132. Contra, CE + Engl. tr., p. ix.

<sup>237</sup> HAZRA 1940: 71, the date of the Vaiṣṇava Kūrma° being after A. D. 550 (p. 66).

<sup>238</sup> HAZRA 1954: 29, and HAZRA 1963: 505–506.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xli–xliii; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 52–53; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 475; 1963: 499; – HAZRA: The Liṅga Purāṇa, IC 4, 1937–38, 415–422; – HAZRA 1940: 92–96; – V. RAGHAVAN: Music in the Liṅgapurāṇa, J.Music Acad. 19, 1948, 203–205; – HAZRA: Did Vallālasena Use the Liṅga-Purāṇa in his Dānasāgara?, JOIB 8, 1958–59, 156–158; – V. V. PARĀMJAPE: Liṅgapurāṇasya kālanirṇayaḥ, Pur 2, 1960, 76–81; – KANE 1962: 903; – V. V. PARĀMJAPE: Liṅgapurāṇāntargatāni nirvacanāni, Pur 5, 1963, 326–332; – id.: Liṅgapurāṇaṃ tantrasāstraṃ ca, Pur 6, 1964, 354–364; – N. GANGADHARAN: The ‘Liṅga’, Origin of Its Concept and Worship, Pur 20, 1978, 87–92; – id.: Liṅgapurāṇa. A Study, Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1980 [thesis Madras, 1973].

The Liṅga° is composed of two parts, *pūrvabhāga* and *uttarabhāga*. They contain 108 chapters and 55 chapters, respectively. The commentator had to resort to all his ingenuity to explain away a verse in the last chapter (2.55.37) which, in reality, says that the *uttarabhāga* contains forty-six chapters.<sup>239</sup> It has also been suggested that, since *pūrvabhāga*, chapter 2 (the *anukramaṇikādhyāya*) only deals with the contents of the *pūrvabhāga*, the *uttarabhāga* is a later addition.<sup>240</sup> There is, indeed, evidence for the existence, at one time or another, of different texts called Liṅga° (see 2.1.3).

The most conspicuous characteristic of the Liṅga° is its aggressive sectarianism. The following two verses (1.107.41–42) have repeatedly been quoted as evidence for this:

“When one hears Śiva being censured, one should at once give up one’s own life but not before killing the other person; he who does so goes to the world of Śiva.

He who tears out the tongue of a person who indulges in censuring Śiva delivers three times seven generations, and he goes to the world of Śiva.”

The text is so much “a manual for the worship of Śiva in the form of a *liṅga*” – Viṣṇu himself composes a hymn in honor of Śiva (1. ch. 18) –, that it has been judged unworthy of the term *purāṇa*.<sup>241</sup> In reality the description of *liṅga* worship in this purāṇa is a composite one. There are chapters (e. g., 1. ch. 25–28) in which Vedic elements and Vedic *mantras* are prominent. In general, however, purification and enlightenment are sought by means of *Pāśupata yoga* which shows the influence of the Tantras. Although I would not go as far as some who feel that “this Purāṇa reveals the true nature of the non-sectarian attitude,”<sup>242</sup> it must be mentioned that even in this purāṇa the other gods, including Viṣṇu and Brahmā, are not totally neglected.

Dates for the Liṅga° vary, from the fifth century A.D.,<sup>243</sup> via the seventh

<sup>239</sup> *Ṣaṭcatvāriṃśad* is interpreted as *ṣaṭ ca nava ca catvāriṃśac ca*. It is interesting to note that the Tamil *uttarabhāga* indeed has 46 chapters; see RAGHAVAN: Tamil Versions of the Purāṇas, Pur 2, 1960, 229.

<sup>240</sup> GANGADHARAN Liṅga° 1980: 13.

<sup>241</sup> MEHENDALE 1970: 294.

<sup>242</sup> GANGADHARAN Liṅga° 1973: iii; absent from 1980.

<sup>243</sup> Tr. AITM 5: xvii.

century at the earliest,<sup>244</sup> to the eight or the ninth century – possibly considerably later –,<sup>245</sup> and between A. D. 800 and 1000.<sup>246</sup>

### *Mādhavī°*

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 30.

One verse is attributed to a Mādhavī° in Bhairava's Ācāranirṇayabhāskarasamgraha. It is possible, however, that the expression *mādhavīpurāṇe* stands for *mādhavīye purāṇe*, for in Mādhavācārya's commentary on the Parāśarasmr̥ti (ed. Bombay 1.1, p. 441) the same verse is introduced with *purāṇe 'pi*. In that case this is not a reference to a Mādhavī°, but to a quotation from "a purāṇa" in one of Mādhavācārya's works.

### *Māgha°*

LIT.: O. C. GANGOLY: Bāla-Gopāla-Stutiḥ. A Newly Discovered Illustrated Ms., Malaviya vol. (1932), 285–289; – HAZRA 1954: 30–31; – HAZRA 1958: 359 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

The Māgha° is known only from a single reference in the colophon of a manuscript of the Bālagopālastuti.<sup>247</sup> It is impossible to know whether the Māgha° is identical with a Māghasmṛti mentioned by Jīva Gosvāmin.<sup>248</sup> It is, according to Hazra, different from the Māghamāhātmya belonging to the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Padma°.

### *Mahābhāgavata°*

ED.: Bombay: Gujarati Printing Press, 1913; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1321 (1914); – Pushpendra KUMAR: The Mahābhāgavata Purāna, An Ancient Treatise on Sakti Cult. Critically ed., with Introduction and Index, Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1983.

LIT.: HAZRA: The Mahābhāgavata-purāṇa. A Work of Bengal, IHQ 28, 1952, 17–28; – HAZRA 1963: 250–283 [Śakta upa°].

Both the 1913 and 1914 editions<sup>249</sup> of the Mahābhāgavata° contain eighty-one

<sup>244</sup> PARĀMJAPE Liṅga° 1963.

<sup>245</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xliii; GANGADHARAN Liṅga° 1980: 135 (some parts may be later).

<sup>246</sup> HAZRA 1940.

<sup>247</sup> *iti śrīparamahāṃsaparivrājakaśrīpādavilvamaṅgalaviracitaśrībālagopālastutiḥ / iti māghapurāṇe bhagavadvākyaṃ.*

<sup>248</sup> GANGOLY (Māgha° 1932: 286): "For all we know, Māgha-Purāṇa may have been an anthology, collection, or encyclopaedia of Vaiṣṇava hymns, in which the Bāla-Gopālastutiḥ found an honourable place, for the hymn is glorified as the Word or message of the Lord himself (Bhagavadvākyaṃ)."

<sup>249</sup> I have not yet seen the 1983 edition.

chapters – with some additional verses in the Calcutta edition. Right at the outset Devī is praised as the *ādyā prakṛti*, who created the universe at her own discretion; she then allowed herself to be born, and had Śambhu as her husband. She herself revealed the Mahābhāgavata° to Vyāsa who, dissatisfied after having composed the eighteen purāṇas, desired also to compose one purāṇa solely in honor of Bhagavatī.

The first few chapters mainly deal with Devī's birth, as Satī, to Dakṣa and Prasūti. Satī resides on the Himālaya with Śiva, for ten thousand years. Dakṣa denounces Śiva, and, on Nārada's advice, arranges a sacrifice to prevent Śiva from creating trouble in his city. Satī fails to convince Śiva to attend the sacrifice, and is not even allowed to do so herself until after showing her anger and assuming different forms. It is in one of these forms, Kālī, that she reaches Dakṣa's house. When Dakṣa complains about her appearance and again denounces Śiva, Satī transforms Kālī into Chāyā Kālī who disappears into the sky. Śiva, who considers Satī to be dead, destroys Dakṣa's sacrifice, and replaces his head by that of a he-goat. After Śiva is told the reason for her disappearance, she appears to him in the sky announcing that she will be born again as the daughter of Himālaya, and become his wife. Meanwhile Śiva shall carry Chāyā Satī on his head. When Chāyā Satī is cut to pieces by Viṣṇu, her limbs are spread over a number of *mahāpīṭhas*, the best of which is Kāmarūpa, where her *yoni* fell, and in which she resides as Kāmākhyā.

Chapters fifteen to nineteen form the Bhagavatīgītā- (Upaniṣad).<sup>250</sup> After her birth to Menā as Pārvatī, Devī reveals her true nature to Himālaya, and shows him her different forms. Himālaya praises her, and, in return, the Devī delivers a discourse on *brahmavijñāna*, which can be attained by worshiping the Goddess.

The next series of chapters (20–35) describe Śiva engaged in austerities in Himavatprastha, and Pārvatī's determination to gain his attention. After the gods' appeal for help from Kāma ends in the latter being reduced to ashes, Pārvatī divulges herself to Śiva as the *ādyā prakṛti* and as identical with Satī. Śiva is pleased, and gains Himālaya's approval to marry her. The section ends with the birth of Kārttikeya and his fight with Tāraka, and the birth of Gaṇeśvara, in Śiva's absence, from the powder collected from Pārvatī's body. Gaṇeśvara is appointed Pārvatī's doorkeeper, but Śiva cuts off his head and replaces it with the head of an elephant.

Chapters thirty-six to forty-eight tell the story of how Rāma killed Rāvaṇa after worshiping – *vedoktena vidhinā* – a clay image of Devī. On this occasion the purāṇa recounts part of the Rāmāyaṇa story, with a number of interesting inno-

<sup>250</sup> Several ed., both in collections of Gītās (Pañcagītā, Calcutta: Kālikā Press, 1904; – Gītāgranthāvalī, Dacca: Vāṅgālā Press, 1906; – Gītāgranthāvalī, Calcutta: Vasumatī Press, 1911), and separately (among others: + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, <sup>2</sup>1910; – + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Elysium Press, 1910).

vations.<sup>251</sup> Chapter forty-nine introduces a new theme: when Brahmā is approached by the Earth to deliver her from the tyrannical rulers who suppress her, he obtains from Devī that she will be born as Kṛṣṇa; Śiva, in turn, is born as Rādhā. Only at the end of the section does the text hint at the fact that, in another *kalpa*, Viṣṇu will be born as Kṛṣṇa, at the end of the *dvāparayuga*.

The final sections of the text – from chapter sixty-four – are devoted to the story of Gaṅgā, her descent on the peak of mount Meru, from there on the Himālayas, and her progress, via Haridvāra, Prayāga, Kāśī, and other places, down to the ocean. High praise is given to Gaṅgā herself, to residing on her banks, bathing in her water, and dying near her. The text ends with a few chapters praising Kālī and Śiva, and their worship in Kāmarūpa.

The Mahābhāgavata° was probably written in the eastern part of Bengal, near Kāmarūpa, in the tenth of eleventh century A. D.<sup>252</sup>

### *Māheśa*°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 31.

This title is mentioned in Mitrāmīśra's Vīramitrodaya and Gopāladāsa's Bhaktiratnākara, in both cases in a list of upapurāṇas attributed to the Brahmavaivarta°.

### *Malla*°

ED.: B. J. Sandesara and R. N. Mehta, GOS 144, 1964.<sup>253</sup>

LIT.: E. D. KULKARNI: Malla Purāṇa. Its Contents and Importance, AIOC 20 (1959) 1961, 2.1.365–372.

At the Bhuvaneshvar All-India Oriental Conference E. D. Kulkarni drew attention to a manuscript of the Malla°, preserved at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. He was primarily interested in the text as a source for lexicographical materials. Although stray references to wrestling occur in other texts,<sup>254</sup> “this is the only text in which we obtain complete information on this science.”

The Malla°, in eighteen *adhyāyas*, is not a text on wrestling generally; it is one of the many caste purāṇas of Gujarat (see 2.1.4). It is the purāṇa of the Jethis,

<sup>251</sup> See the list at HAZRA 1963: 270–272.

<sup>252</sup> HAZRA 1963: 277–280, 280–282.

<sup>253</sup> The edition is based on (1) the BORI ms., ch. 1–9 only; (2) an edition, in 18 chapters, by Bāburāo, alias Vyañkaṭ Śarmā (Baroda: Veerkshetra Press, 1833 = 1911). The two sources, being different, supplement one another, but many lacunae remain. For other relevant literature, see there, p. 5.

<sup>254</sup> See KULKARNI'S (Malla° 1961: 365) list.

professional wrestlers, a sub-section of the brahmans from Modhera, known as Modha Brahmans. In addition to the mythological history of the Mallas, the text provides information on their classification, practices, exercises, diet, etc. It is Kṛṣṇa who imparts *mallavidyā* to one Someśvara.

The author of the text is unknown. The text itself is not older than the fifteenth century, but not more recent than A.D. 1674, the year in which the Poona manuscript was copied.<sup>255</sup> The language is Sanskrit, mixed with Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa, and Gujarātī.

### *Mārkaṇḍeya°*

ED.: K.M. Banerjea, BI work 29, 1862; – Jivarakhana Shastrin, Lucknow, 1865; – Madras: Vartamānatarāṅgiṇī Press, 1875 [Telugu char.]; – Lucknow: Navalakiśora Press, 1876; – Poona: Goṃdhajekara Press, 1876; – + Beng.tr., Nakuleśvara Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Calcutta: Suburban Press, 1877–78; – Jībananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta: Saraswati Press, 1879; – Bombay: Veṅkateśvara Press, 1890, <sup>3</sup>1910; – + Beng.tr., Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1890, 1909; – + Hindi tr., Raghuraja Dube, Lucknow: Navalakiśora Press, 1908; – Śrīrāma Śarmā Acārya, Bareilī: Saṃskṛta Saṃsthāna, 1967.

TR.: F. RÜCKERT: Der gute König in der Hölle. Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāna, ZDMG 12, 1858, 336–340 [15.47–79]; – id.: Die Sage vom König Hariscandra. Mārkaṇḍeya-purāna, ZDMG 13, 1859, 103–133 [7.1–61; 8.4–268]; – B. Hale WORTHAM: Translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna Books VII–VIII, JRAS 13, 1881, 355–379; – Charu Chandra MUKHERJEE, Calcutta, 1893 [up to ch. 40?]; – Manmath Nath DUTT, Calcutta 1896; – F.E. PARGITER, BI work 125, 1904.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxii–xxxv; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 50–52; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 467–473; 1963: 490–496; – D.R. BHANDARKAR: The Date of the Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāna, JBBRAS 23, 1914, 73–74; – FARQUHAR 1920: 150; – Harihara V. TRIVEDI: Studies in Ancient Geography (Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna), IHQ 10, 1934, 642–664; – K.L. BARUA: Kāmarūpa in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna, JASSRS 5, 1937–38, 8–14; – HAZRA 1940: 8–13; – Swami PRAJNANANANDA: Analysis of Music in Markandeya-Purana, Journal of the Music Academy 29, 1958, 130–138; – V.S. AGRAWALA: Padmini-vidyā of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna, Pur 1, 1959–60, 188–197; – id.: Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna – eka saṃskṛtika adhyayana, Allahabad: Hindustani Academy, 1961; – Chintaharan CHAKRAVARTI: The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna: Editions and Translations, Pur 3, 1961, 38–45; – KANE 1962: 901–903; – Pritilata SAXENA: Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna: eka paryavekṣaṇa, Tripathaga (Lucknow), 11.6, 1966, 17–32; – Ram Ugra MISHRA: Yoga in Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna, Journal of the Yoga Institute, Bombay 13.6, 1968, 85–87; – Nileshvay Y. DESAI: Ancient Indian Society, Religion and Mythology as Depicted in the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāna: A Critical Study, Baroda: University, 1968; – id.: Glimpses from Astrology and Chiromancy in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna, Pur 21, 1979, 100–107.

The Mārkaṇḍeya° consists of 137 *adhyāyas*; the purāna proper is interrupted by the thirteen chapters (81–93) of the Devīmāhātmya. The Mārkaṇḍeya° has been called “one of the most important, most interesting, and probably one of the

<sup>255</sup> GOS 144, p. 7. For the contents of the text, chapter by chapter, see there, pp. 8–12.

oldest works of the whole Purāṇa literature.<sup>256</sup> Statements such as this are based on the fact that the beginning of the text answers its description in the Matsya° (53.25–26), on the fact that it “is generally true to the old definition of the Purāṇa of five characteristics,”<sup>257</sup> on the fact that it “has nothing of a sectarian spirit,” and on the fact that its initial chapters “form a sort of supplement to the Mahābhārata.”<sup>258</sup>

The Mārkaṇḍeya°, indeed, starts with a request addressed to the sage Mārkaṇḍeya by Jaimini, one of Vyāsa’s disciples, to explain to him some points which remained unclear after studying “the best of all the *śāstras*,” the Mahābhārata. Mārkaṇḍeya claims that the time has come for him to perform his religious duties, and he refers Jaimini for instruction to four wise birds which live in the Vindhya mountains. The birds answer Jaimini’s initial questions in chapters one to nine. On the occasion of the fourth and last question – why were Draupadi’s sons killed while still unmarried? – the birds tell the story of king Hariścandra (ch. 7–8), a subject which repeatedly attracted the attention of Western translators.<sup>259</sup>

Even though the dialogue between the birds and Jaimini continues after chapter nine, in the second section of the purāṇa (ch. 10–44) the birds actually relate a conversation between Sumati, nicknamed Jaḍa, and his father. Here again the Mārkaṇḍeya° proves to be close to the Mahābhārata: the dialogue between Sumati and his father has been called “a lengthy amplification”<sup>260</sup> of the conversation between Medhāvin and his father in the Mahābhārata.<sup>261</sup> Discussions of *karma*, rebirth, and *saṃsāra* lead to detailed descriptions of hells and the suffering they cause,<sup>262</sup> including the story of virtuous king Vipaścīt’s descent to the netherworld.<sup>263</sup> This second section also contains (ch. 30–33) a description of *śrāddha* which corresponds closely to that of the Gautamadharmasūtra (see 2.1.5). The section ends with a disquisition on *yoga*.

In the third section of the Mārkaṇḍeya° (ch. 45–80, 94–137) the birds relate a conversation between Mārkaṇḍeya and his disciple Krauṣṭuki. Since in these chapters the sage himself is really the main speaker, they have been considered to

<sup>256</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 490.

<sup>257</sup> HAZRA 1940: 9.

<sup>258</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxiv, xxxiii.

<sup>259</sup> In addition to RÜCKERT (*Devīmāhātmya* 1859) and WORTHAM (*Devīmāhātmya* 1881), see also J. MUIR: *Original Sanskrit Texts*, <sup>21</sup>, Amsterdam: Oriental Press, 1967, pp. 379–388.

<sup>260</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 492 = HAZRA 1940: 9.

<sup>261</sup> Tr. P. DEUSSEN: *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhārata*, Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1906, pp. 118–122. Cf. WINTERNITZ 1963: 367–370.

<sup>262</sup> Lucian SCHERMAN (*Materialien zur Geschichte der indischen Visionsliteratur*, Leipzig: Twietmeyer, 1892, pp. 23–46) discusses Mārkaṇḍeya° 10.59 till ch. 15 end.

<sup>263</sup> In addition to RÜCKERT (*Devīmāhātmya* 1858), see WINTERNITZ 1907: 469–471 = 1963: 493–494.

constitute the oldest part of the purāṇa. The section deals primarily with creation, the Manus and *manvantaras*, and genealogies; digressions include seven geographical chapters (54–60), and a passage on the greatness of Sūrya (ch. 102–110).

As indicated earlier the Mārkaṇḍeya° proper is interrupted by thirteen chapters (81–93) which form the Devīmāhātmya.<sup>264</sup> The importance of the Devīmāhātmya, also Caṇḍī(māhātmya) or Saptasatī, is obvious from the mere fact that its role has repeatedly been compared to that of the Bhagavadgītā.<sup>265</sup> It has been called “the principal text of the worshippers of Durgā in Northern India;”<sup>266</sup> even more generally, “no religious book is read with such awe and reverence all over India, by all classes of Hindus, as the Caṇḍī.”<sup>267</sup>

Mārkaṇḍeya is about to describe the eighth Manu, Sāvarnī. To explain the origin of the latter he tells the story of king Suratha. Suratha, dethroned and exiled from his kingdom, continues nevertheless to worry about the welfare of his relatives and his kingdom – and so does, *mutatis mutandis*, a *vaiśya* who has been driven out of his house by his wife and sons. To find an explanation for their unexpected behavior the two men turn to the sage Medhas, who informs them that their *moha* – comparable to that of hungry birds who nevertheless drop grains into the beaks of their young ones – is the result of the cosmic power of goddess Mahāmāyā, who is both responsible for our attachment to worldly things, and capable of delivering us from them. Suratha’s and the *vaiśya*’s question: who is this goddess Mahāmāyā, is the occasion for Medhas to instruct them, and deliver the core section of the Devīmāhātmya.

<sup>264</sup> There are numerous editions and translations of the Devīmāhātmya, many editions also being accompanied by commentaries; see, e.g. IOL 736–745; NCC 9 (1977), 143–150. Some of the earlier ones include: E. BURNOUF: Analyse et extrait du Dévi Mahatmyam, fragmens du Markandéya Pourana, JA 4, 1824, 24–32; – L. POLLEY: Devimahatmyam. Markandeyi purani sectio. Edidit latinam interpretationem annotationesque adiecit, Berlin: Dümmler, 1831. – Among the more recent ones there are: Purnendu Narayan SINHA: The Chandī or The Great Plan, Adyar: Theosophical Publishing House, 1922 [a free tr.]; – V. S. AGRAWALA: Devī-māhātmyam. The Glorification of the Great Goddess, Varanasi: AIKT, 1963 [text + tr.]; – S. SHANKARANARAYANAN: Devimahatmya. Glory of The Divine Mother, Madras: Ganesh, 1968 [text + tr.]; – Jean VARENNE: Célébration de la Grande Déesse (Devī-māhātmya), Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1975 [text + tr.]. – LIT.: Kees W. BOLLE: Remarks on Devī-Symbolism, OH 6, 91–104 at 101–102; – Swami SUDDHASATWANANDA: Devi Mahatmyam, Ved. Kes. 48, 1961–62, 14–17. – V. S. AGRAWALA: The Glorification of The Great Goddess, Pur 5, 1963, 64–89; – id.: Devī-māhātmyam – upodghāṭṭh, Pur 5, 1963, 267–279 [Sanskrit tr., by A. S. Gupta, of the intro. to the 1963 ed.]; – id.: The Devī-Mahatmya, JIH 42, 1964, 823–832; – V. V. MIRASHI: A Lower Limit for the Date of the Devī-Māhātmya, Pur 6, 1964, 181–186; – Thomas B. COBURN: Consort of None, Śakti of All. The Vision of the Devī-māhātmya, in HAWLEY and WULF 1982: 153–165; – id.: Devi-mahatmya. The Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

<sup>265</sup> E. g., BURNOUF (Devīmāhātmya 1824: 24): “This piece has received the same honors as the Bhagavadgītā . . .”; SUDDHASATWANANDA (Devīmāhātmya 1961–62: 14) “like the famous Bhagavat Gīta, it is also chanted daily by thousands of devout Hindus.”

<sup>266</sup> BARTH 1879 = 1921: 1.197.

<sup>267</sup> SINHA Devīmāhātmya 1922: ix.

Medhas explains that, although the goddess is eternal, she manifests herself again and again in the world, to help the gods succeed in their mission. Three of these manifestations are told in the *māhātmya*. The description of the first manifestation, which is very short, concludes the first chapter. Viṣṇu was asleep on the serpent Śeṣa in between two *kalpas*. When Brahmā, seated on a lotus on Viṣṇu's navel, was about again to create the universe, the demons Madhu and Kaiṭabha, issued from Viṣṇu's earwax, decided to kill him. Brahmā addresses a hymn to goddess Yoganidrā, who had taken up residence in Viṣṇu's eye; the goddess appears, awakens Viṣṇu, and the latter kills the two demons.

The second manifestation of the Devī is described in greater detail (chapters 2–4). For an entire century the demons, led by Mahiṣa, have antagonized the gods, with Indra at their head. The gods are defeated, expelled from heaven to live on earth, and Mahiṣa replaces Indra as the ruler of the universe. At that stage the gods, led by Prajāpati, go and tell their story to Viṣṇu and Śiva. Out of the angry faces of these two rises a powerful light (*mahat tejas*), and the same happens to the bodies of Brahmā, Indra, and the other gods. Finally, all these lights coalesce into one, and this one light takes on the form of a woman. The gods rejoice; they hand her their own weapons and many other gifts. The goddess again and again bursts into a loud laughter that shakes the earth. The ensuing battle between the Devī and the demons ultimately ends with the often represented scene in which the goddess jumps on the back of the buffalo and hits him with her trident. In a final attempt to confront the Devī the demon tries to escape through the mouth of the buffalo, but, at the moment when half of his body has emerged, the goddess cuts off his head. Most of the fourth chapter consists of another hymn addressed by the elated gods to the Devī who delivered them of their enemy, and who promises them again to come to their aid whenever necessary.

The third manifestation is treated in even greater detail. When the twin-asuras Śumbha and Niśumbha deprive the gods of their power, the latter remember the promise of the Devī; they travel to the Himālayas, and praise her in yet another hymn. Pārvatī wonders to whom the hymn is addressed, and, out of her body, rises Śivā, to be worshiped as Ambikā and Kauśiki; Pārvatī's own body now becomes black, and she therefore obtains the name of Kālikā. After the failure of a first effort to induce the goddess to become Śumbha's wife, Caṇḍa and Muṇḍa are dispatched to seize her. They are beheaded by Kālī who, as a result of this exploit, shall be worshiped as Cāmuṇḍā. When the battle with the asuras resumes, the goddess is aided by the seven Mātṛs, i.e. the respective *śaktis* of Brahmā, Śiva, Kumāra, Viṣṇu, Varāha, Nṛsiṃha, and Indra. The superiority of the Devī is further underscored by the fact that Śiva himself accepts to become her messenger to the asuras, and that she therefore becomes Śivādūtī. Following an unsuccessful intervention by the demon Raktabīja, Niśumbha is finally killed in the ninth chapter, and, in the tenth chapter, a fierce fight between Caṇḍikā and Śumbha, a fight fought both on earth and above it, ends in the death of the latter. Order having been restored, the gods again address a long hymn to the goddess, a considerable portion of it being in praise of Nārāyaṇī. At the request of the gods the Devī promises to help whenever the asuras attack them, which leads to a number of prophecies of future manifestations of the goddess. In the twelfth chapter the goddess explains to the gods – and, via them, to mankind – the various ways of worshipping her, the ultimate way, of course, consisting in listening to the recitation of the *Devīmāhātmya*.

The final chapter provides the justification for exhibiting the *māhātmya* at this particular juncture of the purāṇa. As a result of Medhas' instruction king Suratha and his *vaiśya* friend produce a clay figurine of the goddess and worship it for three years, at which time Caṇḍikā appears before them. She grants each of them a boon: Suratha not only recovers his kingdom; he will also become the Manu of the next *manvantara*, with the name of Sāvārṇi.

Even though the Devīmāhātmya has, more often than not, been recognized as an originally independent composition, its date and the date of the Mārkaṇḍeya° have, in most cases, been examined simultaneously. The general idea is that the *māhātmya* is a later work which, at a certain moment, has been inserted into the already existing purāṇa. As indicated earlier, the description of the consecutive Manus is interrupted after chapter eighty, and resumes in chapter ninety-four with the same interlocutors, Mārkaṇḍeya and Krauṣṭuki; the interruption occurs on account of the eighth Manu, Sāvārṇi, an incarnation of king Suratha who, after hearing the exploits of the Devī, becomes a worshiper of the goddess. This “obviously very flimsy”<sup>268</sup> connection implies, then, that the purāṇa is older than the *māhātmya*.

Haraprasad Shastri found, in the Durbar Library in Kathmandu, a manuscript of the *māhātmya*, dated A. D. 998.<sup>269</sup> Besides, one stanza from the text (11.11 *sarvamaṅgalamāṅgalye . . .*) appears on an inscription at the Dadhimaṭimātā temple in the former Jodhpur State; D. R. Bhandarkar dated the inscription in A. D. 608, and concluded that the Devīmāhātmya was popular as early as the seventh century.<sup>270</sup> Another indication for the date of the *māhātmya* is that both Bāṇa’s Caṇḍīśataka<sup>271</sup> and Bhavabhūti’s Mālatīmādhava<sup>272</sup> probably presuppose its existence.

Bhandarkar was one of the few who thought that the independent existence of the Devīmāhātmya had not been proven; he therefore also took the seventh century as the date of the purāṇa. Pargiter<sup>273</sup> assigned the *māhātmya* to the sixth and perhaps the fifth century. The two sections which he considered to be the original purāṇa (ch. 45–81; 94–137) “were possibly in existence in the third century, and perhaps even earlier;” the remaining section (ch. 1–44) was composed somewhere in between. Other dates for the Mārkaṇḍeya°, besides Wilson’s ninth/tenth century<sup>274</sup> on the one hand, and “one of the oldest” purāṇas<sup>275</sup>

<sup>268</sup> AGRAWALA Devīmāhātmya 1964: 832.

<sup>269</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1905: liv; cf. 64, no. 1534.

<sup>270</sup> BHANDARKAR Mārkaṇḍeya° 1914: 74. His interpretation was accepted by WINTERNITZ (1963: 495–496) and AGRAWALA (Devīmāhātmya 1964); MIRASHI (Devīmāhātmya 1964) dated the inscription in A. D. 813, but added that the *māhātmya* may “have been composed earlier than that date.”

<sup>271</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 472 n. 3; 1963: 495 n. 3. Cf. PAYNE 1933: 41. G. P. QUACKENBOS (The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, New York: Columbia UP, 1917, pp. 249–251) summarizes the Devīmāhātmya, “the best account of Caṇḍī’s struggle with Mahiṣa” (p. 249), but does not refer to any interdependence.

<sup>272</sup> PARGITER Mārkaṇḍeya° 1904: xii; WINTERNITZ 1907: 472 n. 3; 1963: 495 n. 3. According to R. G. BHANDARKAR (ed., Bom. S. S. 15, <sup>2</sup>1905, p. xvii) Bhavabhūti flourished A. D. 700–725. There is no reference to the Devīmāhātmya in WILSON’s translation of 1826.

<sup>273</sup> PARGITER Mārkaṇḍeya° 1904: xx. Cf. WINTERNITZ 1963: 491.

<sup>274</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxv.

<sup>275</sup> HAZRA 1940: 8. Cf. MEHENDALE 1970: 293.

on the other, are: seventh century or even earlier,<sup>276</sup> and fourth to sixth century.<sup>277</sup>

Pargiter placed the Mārkaṇḍeya°, including the Devīmāhātmya, in Western India, near the Narmadā river. More specifically, “in [the] hills on the north bank overlooking the river at Mandhāta we may place the alleged cave where the first part of the Purāṇa professes that it was delivered.”<sup>278</sup>

### *Matsya*°

ED.: + Marathi *īkā*, Poona: Jagaddhitecchu Press, 1874; – Jibananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta: Sarasvati Press, 1876; – Madras: Vartamāna taraṅgaṇi Press, 1876 [Telugu char.]; – + Hindi *īkā*, Lucknow: Navalakiṣori Press, 1892; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1895; – ĀnSS 54, 1907; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsi Press, 1316 (1909); – Gurumaṅḍalagrānthamālā 13, Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 1954.

TR.: A Taluqdar of Oudh, [SBH 17,] 2 vols., 1916–17; reprint New York: AMS Press, 1974; identical transl., ed. Jamna Das AKHTAR, [The Sacred Books of the Aryans 1,] Delhi: Oriental Publ., 1972; – Robert P. GOLDMAN: Myth as Literature in Ancient India. The Saga of Śukrācārya and the Demons (Matsyapurāṇa, 47), Mahfil 7.3–4, 1971, 45–62 [tr. 47.61–127 and 169–235 ĀnSS].

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlix–li; – WINTERNITZ: 1907: 478–479. 1963: 504–505; – Gayā Prasād DIXIT: The Story of Yayāti as Found in the Mahābhārata and in the Matsyapurāṇa: a Textual Comparison, AIOC 5 (1928) 1930, 1.721–788; – Adam HOHENBERGER: Die indische Flutsage und das Matsyapurāṇa. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Viṣṇuverehrung, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1930; – V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: The Matsya Purāṇa. A Study, [Bulletins of the Dept. of Ind. Hist. and Archaeol. 5,] Madras: University, 1935; – R. C. HAZRA: The Dates of the Smṛti-Chapters in the Matsya-Purāṇa, ABORI 17, 1935–36, 1–36; – HAZRA 1940: 26–52; – G. H. KHARE: Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi and Matsya Purāṇa, NIA 2, 1939–40, 620–624; – K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI: Gleanings from the Matsya Purāṇa, Annals Sri Venkat. Or. Inst. 1.1, 1940, 17–26; – P. V. KANE: The Kauṭīliya and the Matsyapurāṇa, B. C. Law vol. (1946), 2.13–15; – Manoranjan SHASTRI: The Svalpamatsya Purāṇa, JGJRI 9, 1951–52, 183–188; – G. H. GODBOLE: Brahmadeva in Matsya Purāṇa, AIOC 18 (1955), Summaries of Papers, p. 33; – Alessandro BAUSANI: Notizia di una traduzione Persiana inedita del Matsyapurāṇa della fine del secolo XVIII, Rivista degli Studi Orientali 31, 1956, 169–177; – S. G. KANTAWALA: The Cult of Manes as depicted in the Matsya Purāṇa, JOIB 5, 1955–56, 403–410; 6, 1956–57, 22–31; – Bhabatosh BHATTACHARYA: A Peculiar Gift Recorded in the Matsyapurāṇa and Dānasāgara, JGJRI 16, 1958–59, 1–3; – S. G. KANTAWALA: The Brahmā-Sarasvatī Episode in the Matsyapurāṇa, JOIB 8, 1958–59, 38–40; – V. RAGHAVAN: A Unique Two-Khaṇḍa Version of the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 1, 1959–60, 42–57; – Anand Swarup GUPTA: A Study of the Textual Peculiarities of the Śāradā Ms. of the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 1, 1959–60, 58–71; – T. P. DVIVEDI: Keṣucin Matsyapurāṇaślokeṣu gadyabhramah, Pur 1,

<sup>276</sup> N. Y. DESAI: JUBar 14, 1965, 145–147 at 145 (summary of DESAI Mārkaṇḍeya° 1968).

<sup>277</sup> KANE 1962: 903.

<sup>278</sup> PARGITER Mārkaṇḍeya° 1904: viii–xiii. Cf. PAYNE 1933: 40–41.

1959–60, 72–79; – V. RAGHAVAN: Gleanings from the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 1, 1959–60, 80–88; – A.S. GUPTA: The Manuscripts of the Matsya Purāṇa Collated for its projected Critical Edition, Pur 1, 1959–60, 101–111; – id.: The Stotras in the Matsya Purāṇa. An Analysis, Pur 1, 1959–60, 156–159; – id.: Devanāgarī Source of the Ujjain Śāradā Ms. of the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 1, 1959–60, 163–174; – V.S. AGRAWALA and MOTICHANDRA: Yakṣa Worship in Varanasi Matsyapurāṇa (Ch. 180), Pur 1, 1959–60, 198–201; – V.S. AGRAWALA: The Seven-Sea Gift in the Matsya Purāṇa [Saptasāgara-mahādāna] (Matsya Purāṇa, Ch. 287), Pur 1, 1959–60, 206–212; – V. RAGHAVAN: Inventory of Matsya Purāṇa Manuscripts, Pur 1, 1959–60, 220–232; – A.S. GUPTA: Study of a Newly Acquired Śāradā Manuscript of the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 2, 1960, 120–127; – C.R. SWAMINATHAN: A Metrical Analysis of the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 2, 1960, 243–251; 3, 1961, 120–133; – V.S. AGRAWALA: Nārāyaṇa Mahārṇava, Pur 2, 1960, 313–315 [on 172.30b–37a; 248.220–226]; – S.G. KANTAWALA: Home of the Matsyapurāṇa, Pur 3, 1961, 115–119; – V. RAGHAVAN: Further Gleanings from the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 3, 1961, 321–330; – R.S. BETAI: Matsya Purāṇa and Kumārasambhava, JUBo n.s. 30.2, 1961, 39–48; – KANE 1962: 899–901; – S.G. KANTAWALA: Some Linguistic Peculiarities of the Matsyapurāṇa, IL 23, 1962, 66–71; – Nilmadhav SEN: On Some Readings of the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 4, 1962, 193–196; – V. RAGHAVAN: A Sample Edition of the Matsya Purāṇa Text, Pur 4, 1962, 409–417; – S.G. KANTAWALA: Geographical and Ethnic Data in the Matsya-purāṇa, Pur 5, 1963, 127–143; 6, 1964, 411–419; – V. RAGHAVAN: Matsya-Text Relating to Yajña-Varāha (Ān.Ed., 248.67cd–73). Critically Edited, Pur 5, 1963, 237–242; – A.S. GUPTA: Kashmirian Recension of the Matsya Purāṇa, Pur 5, 1963, 333–345; – Nilmadhav SEN: Some Linguistic Aberrations in the Matsyapurāṇa, Pur 5, 1963, 346–349; – V.S. AGRAWALA: Matsya Purāṇa. A Study, Varanasi: AIKT, 1963; – S.G. KANTAWALA: Matsyapurāṇa and the Education of a Prince in Ancient India, JUBar 12, 1963, 75–79; – R.C. DE: A Persian Translation of the Matsya-Purāṇa, Pur 6, 1964, 204–206; – S.G. KANTAWALA: Cultural History from the Matsyapurāṇa, Baroda: M.S. Univ., 1964; – id.: Matsyapurāṇa and Vasudevahiṇḍī, JUBar 13, 1964, 5–8; – id.: A Note on Hiatus in Sandhi in the Matsyapurāṇa, JUBar 15, 1965, 125–129; – D.R. MANKAD: The Matsya Purāṇa and the Rāmāyaṇa, Pur 8, 1966, 159–167; – S.G. KANTAWALA: Prayāgamāhātmya. A Study, Pur 9, 1967, 103–120; – Ajaj Mitra SHASTRI: Candragupta II Vikramāditya and King Pramati in the Matsya Purāṇa, Nagpur Univ. Journal 17, 1967, 150–157; – S.G. KANTAWALA: Purāṇic Etymologies, Kavirāj vol. (1967), 278–280; – S. SRINIVASA SARMA: Concordance of the Agreement and Difference between the Sanskrit Matsya Purāṇa Text and its Tamil Translation, Pur 16, 1974, 155–244; – R.C. HAZRA: Text and Interpretation of a Verse of the Matsya-purāṇa, Pur 17, 1975, 15–23 [ĀnSS 215.24]; – Manabendu BANERJEE: Matsya Purāṇa Chapters on Indian Architecture and Sculpture, Pur 21, 1979, 64–71.

The printed Matsya° consists of 291 chapters, occasionally followed by a short appendix on the merits of listening to its recitation. The editions vary only in detail.<sup>279</sup>

The following brief survey – omitting numerous details and digressions – of the contents of the Matsya° may serve as an illustration of the nature and composition of a typically “encyclopedic” purāṇa (see 2.1.4).

<sup>279</sup> Which does not mean that there were no different versions of the Matsya°. E. g., the Persian translation prepared by Gosvāmī Ānandaghana for Jonathan Duncan, the Resident of Benares 1787–95, either also drew on some other purāṇa, or is based on a different version (DE Matsya° 1964: 205–206).

- 1–8 creation (*sarga, pratisarga*)  
 9 *manvantara*  
 10 story of Vena and Prthu  
 11–12 *vaṁśānucarita* (solar and lunar dynasties)  
 13–15 *vaṁśa* (*pitr̥s*)  
 16–22 *śrāddha*  
 23–24 *vaṁśānucarita* continued  
 25–42 story of Yayāti  
 43–50 *vaṁśānucarita* continued (future dynasties announced)  
 51 *vaṁśa* (Agni)  
 52 *karmayoga* superior to *jñānayoga*  
 53 the *purāṇas*  
 54–102 various sorts of *vrata, dāna*, etc.  
 103–112 Prayāgamāhātmya  
 113–128 cosmography (*bhuvanakośa*)  
 129–140 origin and destruction of Tripura  
 141 *śrāddhānukīrtana*  
 142–145 *yugadharmā*  
 146–160 story of Tāraka  
 161–163 Hiraṇyakaśipu killed by Nṛsiṃha  
 164–171 creation (*sarga, pratisarga*)  
 172–178 the battle for Tārakā (Tārakāmayasaṃgrāma)  
 179 the killing of Andhaka  
 180–185 Vārāṇasimāhātmya  
 186–194 Narmadāmāhātmya  
 195–203 *vaṁśa* (genealogies of sages)  
 204 *śrāddha* (*pitṛgāthākīrtana*)  
 205–207 *dāna*  
 208–214 story of Sāvitrī  
 215–243 duties of the king (*rājadharma*)  
 244–246 Viṣṇu's Vāmana *avatāra*  
 247–248 Viṣṇu's Varāha *avatāra*  
 249–251 the churning of the ocean  
 252–257 architecture (*vāstuśāstra*)  
 258–270 features of images of deities and temples  
 271–273 *vaṁśānucarita* continued (Aikṣvāka, Māgadhā, Āndhra, and other dynasties)  
 274–289 the sixteen *mahādānas*  
 290 the different *kalpas*  
 291 contents of the Matsya°  
 [291'] *purāṇaśravaṇakālīnadharmā*

Wilson does not seem to have been impressed by this “miscellaneous compilation;” even if it includes some real puranic materials, “at the same time it is of too mixed a character to be considered as a genuine work of the Paurāṇik class.”<sup>280</sup>

<sup>280</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: li. This notwithstanding the fact that Louis Mathieu LANGLÈS (Recherches asiatiques, ou Mémoires de la Société établie au Bengale 1, 1805, 228) called the Matsya° “le premier des dix-huit poèmes qui portent ce titre, et le plus important,” and added Alexander HAMILTON’s translation of the “Tableau des matières,” i.e. Matsya° 291.1–29.

Yet, in more recent years the Matsya° has been honored as “one of the best preserved and earliest” of the purāṇas.<sup>281</sup>

Even with a text such as the Matsya° one has speculated on its sectarian affiliation. Labels such as “although a Śaiva work, is it not exclusively so,”<sup>282</sup> alternate with statements that it is primarily in praise of Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa.<sup>283</sup> Perhaps more to the point, the Matsya° “might be called Śaivite with just as much reason as it is called Viṣṇuite. Religious festivals of the Vaiṣṇavas are described side by side with those of the Śaivas.”<sup>284</sup>

According to one opinion the Matsya° developed from the fourth century B. C. up to the third century A. D.,<sup>285</sup> according to another opinion the development spread from the fourth century B. C. until A. D. 1250.<sup>286</sup> After having assigned the Matsya° to a date not later than the sixth century A. D.,<sup>287</sup> Kane more specifically placed it between A. D. 200 and 400.<sup>288</sup> Hazra concluded that “no one date is sufficient for it.”<sup>289</sup>

A Matsya° in Grantha script, deposited in the Palace Library at Trivandrum, is divided into two *khaṇḍas*, *pūrva* and *uttara*; it is composed of 172 chapters. It is this version of the Matsya° which is at the basis of the Tamil Matsya° (Madras: Minerva Press, 1900), by Vadamalayappa Pillai, dated A. D. 1706–07.<sup>290</sup>

In addition, there is also a Svalpamatsya°, first discussed by Manoranjan Shastri (1952). It is composed of forty-nine chapters; all of these, except for the first five which are a summary of the first six chapters of the Matsya°, are devoted to *dharmaśāstra* topics: *dāna*, *śrāddha*, *aśauca*, *prāyaścitta*, etc. The Svalpamatsya° has a number of *ślokas* in common with the Matsya° throughout, but it also has many stanzas which are not found elsewhere. Since the Svalpamatsya° is quoted exclusively by digest writers of Bengal and, even more so, Assam, it may be

<sup>281</sup> KANE 1962: 899. Cf. WINTERNITZ 1963: 504.

<sup>282</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: li.

<sup>283</sup> AUFRECHT 1864: 43. Cf. HAZRA 1940: 51–52, who concludes that the Matsya° “was composed and circulated by Vaiṣṇavite people living somewhere about the river Narmadā.”

<sup>284</sup> WINTERNITZ 1963: 505.

<sup>285</sup> RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1951–55: 1.xxiv. W. KIRFEL (review of Pur 1, at ZDMG 113, 1963, 389) suggests that the language of the present Matsya° is so different from that of the other purāṇas that it must represent a revision of an older version the language of which was closer to that of the other purāṇas.

<sup>286</sup> KANTAWALA Matsya° 1964: 8.

<sup>287</sup> KANE Matsya° 1946 [Matsya° 219 is based on Kauṭilya 1.20–21].

<sup>288</sup> KANE 1962: 899–900 [Kālidāsa was familiar with Matsya° 24, on Purūravas and Urvaśī].

<sup>289</sup> HAZRA 1940: 22. For his dating of individual chapters or groups of chapters, see there, pp. 50–51.

<sup>290</sup> For a comparison of the printed Matsya°, the two *khaṇḍa* text, and the Tamil version, see RAGHAVAN Matsya° 1959–60: 42–57.

considered as “a ritualistic manual in the Smārta manner prevailing ... in Kāmarūpa.”<sup>291</sup> Manoranjan Shastri dates the text in the first half of the eleventh century.

### *Mṛtyuñjaya*°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 31.

The sole reference to this text is in the list of upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra°.

### *Mudgala*°

ED.: Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1976. / Parts: Gaṇeśahṛdayastotra (= 8.49): Poona: Vṛttaprasāraka Press, 1872; – Bombay: Vaibhava Steam Press, [1912]. Śuklakṛṣṇacaturthīvratanirṇaya (= extracts compiled from various *khaṇḍas*, on the significance of Gaṇeśacaturthī), Ahmedabad: Gujarat Press, 1919. Vighneśamānasapūjā (= 5.38): in Bṛhatstotramuktāhāra II, pp. 137–146, Bombay: Gujarati Printing Press, 1916. Yogagītā (= 9.5–16): Ahmedabad: Gujarat Printing Press, 1926.

LIT.: FARQUHAR 1920: 270; – T. K. RAJAGOPALAN (compiler): Śrī-Mudgala-Purāṇāntargata Gaṇeśa Stotras, Madras: the author, 1943 [with brief introductions in English and Marathi]; – Giridharaśarmā CATURVEDI: Mudgalapurāṇaviśayasamālocanam, Pur 4, 1962, 339–350.

The Mudgala° is divided into nine *khaṇḍas*, with a total of 428 *adhyāyas*, each *khaṇḍa* being devoted to the story (*carita*) of a different manifestation of Gaṇeśa: Vakratuṇḍa, Ekadanta, Mahodara, Gajānana, Lambodara, Vikaṭa, Vighnarāja, Dhūmravarṇa, and Yoga (the last one is a combination of different forms of Gaṇeśa). Gaṇeśa is represented as identical with the supreme Brahmā; all other gods are subordinate to him.<sup>292</sup> His *māyā* has two forms: Buddhi and Siddhi. On one occasion his head is said to be Brahmā, his body the universe; elsewhere his head is the *nirvikalpasamādhi*, his body the *savikalpasamādhi*. Like the Gaṇeśa°, the Mudgala° is a Gāṇapatya work, but it is probably more recent than the former.<sup>293</sup>

### *Nandi*°

LIT.: K. V. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR: Nandīpurāṇa, NIA 4, 1941–42, 157–161; – HAZRA: The Nandi-Purāṇa, JGJRI 2, 1944–45, 305–320; – HAZRA 1954: 31; – KANE 1962:

<sup>291</sup> SHASTRI Matsya° 1951–52: 188. Cf. Biswanarayan SHASTRI: Contribution of Assam to Sanskrit, JAssRS 14, 1960, 87–99 at 90.

<sup>292</sup> The Mudgala° is “called ‘the final Purāṇa (*āntyapurāṇa*)’ in the colophons; being intended to supersede all the others, and to dispose of the doubts left there as to which is the supreme deity, by establishing the claims of Gaṇeśa to that position” (EGGELING 1899: 1289).

<sup>293</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 270.

890–891; – HAZRA: 1963: 474–488; – NCC 9 (1977), 334–335; – B. P. PANDYA: Some Remarks on the Title “Nāndī-Purāṇa”, JOIB 28, 1978–79, 48–55.

Even though the Nandi° figures among the upapurāṇas mentioned by the Matsya° (53.61 ĀnSS) and the Skanda° (Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 1.2.81), and even though many verses from it have been quoted in the dharmanibandhas,<sup>294</sup> no manuscript has yet been found. It has been dated in the sixth or seventh century (Hazra), or the eight or ninth century (Kane).

The same text also goes under different names: Nandī°, Nandā°, Nānda°, Skānda°, Vāyaviya°, and Śaukeya°; it is, however, different from the Nandikeśvara°.

A Nāndī° claims to belong to the Vahni°.<sup>295</sup> This text, in fifty-two *adhyāyas*, is actually a caste purāṇa. It was composed for the glorification of the Nāndimukha or Nandavāṇā brahmans of Gujarat and part of Rajputana around Puškara in Ajmer. It describes how these brahmans abandoned their original way of life, and became merchants. Based on their different *gotras* the Nāndimukhas are divided into eleven groups; some are Vaiṣṇava, others Śaiva, and others Śākta.<sup>296</sup>

#### *Nandikeśvara° and Bṛhannandikeśvara°*

ED.: Bṛhannandikeśvarapurāṇoktadurgāpūjāpaddhati. Part I. + Beng. interpr., Hemacandra Śiromaṇi, Calcutta: Vāṇī Press, 1333 (1926).

LT.: HAZRA: The Bṛhannandikeśvara and the Nandikeśvara Purāṇa, B. C. Law vol. 2 (1946), 415–419; – HAZRA 1954: 31, 27 (Bṛhad); – HAZRA 1963: 470–474, 466–469 (Bṛhad) [lost Śākta upa°]; – NCC 9 (1977), 333.

Both titles appear in the lists of upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra° and the Bṛhadharma° (1.25.24). Raghunandana’s Malamāsattva (ed. Caṇḍicarāṇa Smṛtibhūṣaṇa, 1906, p. 213) refers to Nandikeśvarayugma. They have been confused with – but, according to Hazra, are different from – the Nandi° and the Śivadharmā° and Śivadharmottara°. Both upapurāṇas are mainly quoted by authors from Bengal, and are therefore supposed to have been written in that area. The Bṛhannandikeśvara° must have been composed before A. D. 1000, and the Nandikeśvara, which preceded it, was probably written between A. D. 850 und 950.

Some manuscripts of the Kālāgnirudropaniṣad assign this text to the Nandikeśvara°; a Śivastotra also claims to belong to it.

<sup>294</sup> Hence the unexpected attention it has attracted. RANGASWAMI AIYANGAR, e.g., points out that Lakṣmīdhara quotes mainly from four upapurāṇas of which the Nandi° is one. Consequently it must have been important; its disappearance is “one of the unsolved riddles in Purāṇic history” (Nandi° 1942–43: 161).

<sup>295</sup> Nāndīpurāṇa: Nāndimukha (Nandavāṇā) brāhmaṇajātine śāstrīya itihāsa. Ed. + Guj. tr. Vajeśaṅkara Devarāma Bola. Calcutta: Dāmodara Viṭṭalarāma Parakhāṇī, 1995 (1938). The chapter colophons read: *iti śrīvahnipurāṇe nāndimukhoṭpattau ... adhyāyah*. The text of the purāṇa is followed by a Nāndīpurāṇamāhātmya, in fifteen *adhyāyas*.

<sup>296</sup> See HAZRA: OH 2, 1954, 108–110.

*Nārada° and Bṛhannārada°*

ED.: Bombay: Veñkaṭeśvara Press, 1905, <sup>2</sup>1923. — BRĀHMAN-: Hṛṣīkeśa Śāstrī, BI work 107, 1891; reprinted: Chowkhamba Amarabharati Granthamala 3, Varanasi 1975; — Pañcāna-na Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, <sup>2</sup>1316 (1909).

TR.: Ganesh Vasudeo TAGARE, [AITM 15–19,] 1982.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxi–xxxii; — HOLTZMANN 1895: 49–50; — WINTERNITZ 1907: 466–467; 1963: 489–490; — Mario VALLAURI: Composizione e contenuto dei “Purāna” secondo il “Nārada-purāna,” ICO 19 (1935), 354–356 [summary only]; — id.: Composizione e contenuto dei Purāna secondo il Nārada-purāna, R. Università di Torino. Miscellanea della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia. Serie prima, 1936, 57–66; — HAZRA: The Bṛhannāradiya and the Nāradiya Purāna, IC 3, 1936–37, 477–487; — HAZRA 1940: 127–133; — HAZRA 1958: 309–345 (Bṛhan-) [minor Vaiṣṇava upa°]; — KANE 1962: 892–893; — V. M. BEDEKAR: The Identical Philosophical Texts in the Nārada Purāna and the Mahābhārata. Their Contents and Significance, Pur 5, 1963, 280–304; — Anant Shastri PHADAKE: Nārada-purāṇam, Pur 8, 1966, 83–100; — id.: Nārada-purāṇāntargatāni viśiṣṭadharmāśāstravacanāni, Pur 9, 1967, 62–83; — Pinaka Pani Prasad SHARMA: Teerthas in the Nārada Puran, JGRS 36.4, 1974, 21–26; — K. Damodaran NAMBIAR: Nārada Purāna. A Critical Study, Varanasi: AIKT, 1979 [originally published as appendices to Pur 15, 1973 through 21, 1979]; — S. S. UPADHYAYA: The Nāradiya Purāna (A Philosophical Study), Muzaffarpur: Jnananidhi Prakashan, 1983.

The Nārada° has created a great deal of confusion. A Nārada° or Nāradiya° appears in nearly all lists of eighteen mahāpurānas. A Nārada° or Nāradiya° is also included in most lists of upapurānas.<sup>297</sup> The Bṛhaddharma° does not list a Nārada° among the mahāpurānas, but includes (1.25.23) both a Nāradiya° and a Bṛhannāradiya° among the upapurānas. The Library of the Company acquired several manuscripts which in the colophons were called Bṛhannāradiya°, and one manuscript called Rukmāṅgadarita claiming to belong to the Nāradiya°.<sup>298</sup> Manuscripts in Wilson’s possession did not allow him to understand the situation correctly either. As a result, Winternitz described the Nārada° and the Bṛhannārada° as if they were different titles for the same text.<sup>299</sup> The English translation of his Geschichte hesitatingly but erroneously reserved the title of mahāpurāna for the Bṛhannārada°; as far as the “Nāradiya-Upapurāna” is concerned, the English History refers to the Rukmāṅgadarita only.

In reality the Nārada° is composed of two parts. The *pūrvabhāga* is divided into four *pādas*, in which four different speakers address Nārada (chapters 1–41, 42–62, 63–91, 92–125). The *uttarabhāga* consists of eighty-two chapters, of which chapters 1–37 constitute the Rukmāṅgadarita. The Bṛhannārada°, on the other hand, simply consists of thirty-eight *adhyāyas*.

<sup>297</sup> HAZRA 1958: 4–13.

<sup>298</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1208–1211, nos. 3368–3374.

<sup>299</sup> WINTERNITZ 1907: 466–467. Cf. also IOL: 1719, and HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a:

The Bṛhannārada° is “a purely sectarian work lacking all the characteristics of a Mahāpurāṇa.”<sup>300</sup> Viṣṇubhakti, of which there are said to be ten different levels (14. 195–207), is the sole means of salvation. The text describes Vaiṣṇava festivals and ceremonies, glorifies the Gaṅgā recognizing Prayāga and Banaras as the best of all holy places, devotes chapters to the duties of *varṇas* and *āśramas*, *śrāddha* and *vrata*, etc.

Nārada° 1. ch. 1–41 generally corresponds with the contents of the entire Bṛhannāradiya, a number of variants notwithstanding. The remaining chapters of the first part deal with a wide variety of topics. Larger sections include a discussion of the six Vedāṅgas (ch. 50–57), and the detailed contents of the eighteen mahāpurāṇas (ch. 92–109, one entire chapter for each purāṇa). Other chapters discuss *adhyātmajñāna*, *mokṣadharma*, *pāśupata* philosophy, etc. Very prominent are chapters on the worship and *mantras* of a number of deities, including Gaṇeśa, the planets, Mahāviṣṇu, Nṛsiṃha, Hayagrīva, Lakṣmaṇa and Rāma, Hanumān, Kṛṣṇa, Devī, Mahālakṣmī, Maheśvara, etc.

Most chapters, following the Rukmāṅgadarita in the second part, are devoted to the description of holy places, along the Gaṅgā, in Gayā, etc., according to the instructions imparted by the sage Vasu to Rukmāṅgada’s wife, Mohinī. Mohinī visits the holy places, until she disappears in the river Kālindī.

Wilson considered both the Nārada° and Bṛhannārada° to be very recent; he dated them both in the sixteenth of seventeenth century.<sup>301</sup> Hazra dates the Bṛhannārada° circa A. D. 850. In his opinion the Nārada°, being a compilation rather than a coherent whole, belongs to different periods: 1. ch. 1–41 and 2. ch. 1–37 were composed between A. D. 875 and 1000; the remaining sections (1. ch. 42–125 and 2. ch. 38–82) are “comparatively late.”

Several mātmyas claim to belong to the Nārada° or Bṛhannārada°. This is the case, for example, of the Puruṣottamamātmya, of which there are several editions.<sup>302</sup>

Since, as indicated earlier, the title Nārada° appears in most lists of upapurāṇas, Hazra defends the existence, alongside the Nāradamahā° and the Bṛhannārada°, of a Nārada-upa°, different from both of them.<sup>303</sup>

### Nilamata°

ED.: Rām Lal Kanjilal and Pandit Jagaddhar Zadoo, [Punjab Sanskrit Series 5,] 1924; – K. de Vreese: Nilamata or Teachings of Nīla, Leiden: Brill, 1936; – Ved Kumari: The Nilamata Purāṇa. Vol. I A Cultural and Literary Study of a Kaśmīrī Purāṇa; Vol. II A Critical Edition and English Translation, Srinagar: J and K Academy of Art, Culture and Languages, 1968, 1973.

<sup>300</sup> HAZRA 1940: 127.

<sup>301</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxii.

<sup>302</sup> See IOL: 2007–2008.

<sup>303</sup> HAZRA 1954: 32.

LIT.: G. BÜHLER: Detailed Report of a Tour in search of Sanskrit MSS. made in Kaśmīr, Rajputana, and Central India, JBBRAS, Extra Number, 1877, at 37–41; extracts lv–lx; – M. A. STEIN: Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgī. Translated, Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1900; reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1961, at 2. 376–378; – Pandit Anand Koul: History of Kashmir, JASB 6, 1910, 195–219; – Sunil Chandra RAY: History of Sanskrit Literature in Kāśmīra. Pre-Muslim Period, IHQ 31, 1955, 232–256 at 236–237; – WINTERNITZ 1963: 511.

I indicated earlier (2.1.1) how Pandit Sāhib Rām “tampered with” the Nīlamata°, when the Maharaja of Kashmir requested him to prepare a manuscript copy for publication. As a result, there are now two different versions of the text in existence: some manuscripts represent the shorter version clearly indicating lacunae in the text, others exhibit the longer version in which the lacunae have been filled in with the Pandit's additions.<sup>304</sup> Starting with Bühler the attitude of scholars has been clear. On the one hand, “Sāhebrām's revised edition has no value for a critical scholar.” On the other hand, “it deserves always careful consideration as a commentary, because Pandit Sāhebrām possessed a very intimate acquaintance with ancient Kaśmīrian history.”<sup>305</sup>

The Nīlamata° is, for all practical purposes, a *māhātmya* of Kashmir. It relates how Kashmir was created out of the waters of Satīsaras. Through a favor of Viṣṇu the land thus obtained was given to the Nāgas, for them to be safe there from their enemy, Garuḍa. The king of the Nāgas was to be Nīla. At the time the water demon Jalodbhava created destruction in the neighboring countries. Nīla implored the assistance of the father of the Nāgas, Kaśyapa. Kaśyapa in turn approached Brahmā, at whose command all the gods decided to confront the demon. After a fierce battle it was finally Viṣṇu who cut off Jalodbhava's head with his disk. The text then describes how Kashmir came to be inhabited by humans, against the objections of the Nāgas. Originally, and for a period of four *yugas*, the country was made inhabitable for humans only for one half of the year; they arrived in spring but, once the harvest was completed, they had to leave, and the land was occupied by the Piśācas, under their king Nikumbha. At the end of the four *yugas* a brahman, Candradeva, refused to leave during the winter. He was caught by the Piśācas, but freed himself, got access to Nīla and obtained from him, not only that Kashmir become inhabitable for humans all year round, but also the rites by which they would have to live there. Thus the Nīlamata° became the handbook of rites and ceremonies to be observed by the people of Kashmir. Some of these rites are common with other parts of the subcontinent, some are

<sup>304</sup> For a detailed description of the mss. see DE VREESE Nīlamata° 1936: xi–xv. In the edition de Vreese prints the 1396 stanzas of the shorter version first (pp. 1–112), separately from the “additions of the long recension” (pp. 113–134). The 1924 edition includes the “spurious” passages in the text, however with indications to that effect in the footnotes. The 1973 edition simply has 1453 stanzas.

<sup>305</sup> BÜHLER Nīlamata° 1877: 38, echoed by DE VREESE Nīlamata° 1936: xi.

peculiar to Kashmir. The most characteristic among the latter include the drinking of new wine on the first day of snowfall, and the celebration of the birthday of the Buddha, as an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu.<sup>306</sup>

The importance of the Nīlamata° is enhanced by the fact that Kalhaṇa's Rā-jatarāṅgiṇī (1.14) explicitly refers to *matam nīlamuneḥ* as one of its sources.

There is general agreement that the Nīlamata° was not composed prior to the sixth or seventh century.<sup>307</sup>

### Nṛsiṃha°

ED.: Uddhavācārya Aināpure, Bombay: Gopal Narayan, <sup>2</sup>1911; – also included in Grantharatnamālā 1.2, Bombay: Gopal Narayan, 1877–88.

LIT.: HOLTSMANN 1895: 57–58; – M. VALLAURI: Illustrazione e analisi del Narasiṃhapurāṇa, Rivista degli studi orientali 18, 1939, 237–258; – HAZRA: The Narasiṃha-Purāṇa, ABORI 26, 1945, 32–88; – HAZRA 1958: 219–266; – KANE 1962: 878–882, 891–892; – V. RAGHAVAN: The Date of the Narasiṃha Purāṇa, Gonda vol. (1972), 239–240 = Pur 15, 1973, 143–145; – NCC 10 (1978), 201–202.

The Nṛsiṃha° or Narasiṃha°, the printed edition of which<sup>308</sup> consists of sixty-eight *adhyaṅgas*, constitutes the *sūta*'s answer to a number of specific questions asked by Bharadvāja.<sup>309</sup> These questions deal with the common purāṇa themes except that, in this case, several chapters have been reserved for the glorification of Nṛsiṃha (Narasiṃha), who is both a form of and identical with Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu, and who assumes the forms of Brahmā and Rudra for the sake of creation and destruction, respectively. The text is remarkably free of Tantric influence. As usual a large number of well known stories are told throughout the purāṇa: Urvaśī, Yama and Yamī,<sup>310</sup> Prahlāda, etc. One passage, from 57.8 to the end of chapter 61, dealing with *varṇāśramadharmā*, corresponds literally with the Hārītasamhitā in the Ūnaviṃśatisamhitā,<sup>311</sup> and the Laghuhārītasṃṛti of the Dharmasāstrasamgraha.<sup>312</sup>

<sup>306</sup> D. D. KOSAMBI (Ancient India, New York: The World Publ. Co., 1969, p. 179) interprets the Nīlamata° as an attempt, by the brahmins, to revive the cult of Nāga Nīla which had fallen into desuetude because of Buddhism.

<sup>307</sup> BÜHLER: op. cit., p. 41; 1924 ed., Intro. p. 7; VED KUMARI Nīlamata° 1968: 15.

<sup>308</sup> A “worthless edition” according to Hazra (1958: 219 n. 283). The same note (pp. 219–230) provides a detailed description of the mss.

<sup>309</sup> For a summary of contents, see HAZRA 1958: 224–234.

<sup>310</sup> S. G. KANTAWALA (Yama-Yamī Dialogue, JOIB 15, 1965–66, 509–514) draws a comparison between Rgveda 10.80 and Nṛsiṃha° ch. 13. Notice that the story is called *samyāda*, *upākhyāna*, *ākhyāna*, and *purātana itihāsa*; also, Śuka requests Vyāsa to tell him a *puṇyā*, *pāpaharā vaiṣṇavī kathā*.

<sup>311</sup> ED., with Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1904, <sup>2</sup>1910.

<sup>312</sup> ED. Jibananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta: Sarasvatī Press, 1876, 1.177–193.

Hazra considers the Nṛṣiṃha° “one of the oldest and important of the extant Vaiṣṇava Upapurāṇas.”<sup>313</sup> Even though it may not be identical with the text as printed, and although some chapters may have been added later, he dates “the present” Nṛṣiṃha° in the latter half of the fifth century. This opinion is, however, not widely shared; others propose the ninth century,<sup>314</sup> or, as far as the printed text is concerned, a date not earlier than the middle of the thirteenth century.<sup>315</sup>

The Ekāmra° lists the Nṛṣiṃha° among the principal purāṇas, and a Bṛhan-nṛṣiṃha° among the upapurāṇas; Gopālabhaṭṭa’s Haribhaktivilāsa also exhibits quotations from both titles. Hence there must have been an independent Bṛhan-nṛṣiṃha°, earlier than the eleventh century.<sup>316</sup>

### Padma°

ED.: Viśvanātha Nārāyaṇa Maṇḍalika, ĀnSS Extra No. 1: Part I Ādi and Bhūmi khaṇḍas, 1893; Part II Brahma and Pātāla khaṇḍas, 1894; Part III Kriyā and Sṛṣṭi khaṇḍas, 1894; Part IV Uttara khaṇḍa, 1894; – Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1895; – + Beng. tr. Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Vaṅgavāsī Press: Svarga khaṇḍa, 1313 (1906); Pātāla khaṇḍa, <sup>2</sup>1318 (1912); Bhūmi khaṇḍa, 1321 (1914), <sup>2</sup>1334 (1927); Uttara khaṇḍa, 1322 (1915); Brahma khaṇḍa, 1324 (1917); Sṛṣṭi khaṇḍa, 1326 (1919); – Gurumaṇḍalagranthamālā 18, Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 1957: I Sṛṣṭi khaṇḍa; II Bhūmi, Svarga, Brahma khaṇḍas.

GEN. LIT.: Antonius Edmundus WOLLHEIM DA FONSECA: De nonnullis Padmapurani capitibus scriptio inauguralis, Berlin: Kön. Ak. Wiss., 1831; – WILSON: JRAS 5, 1839, 280–313 = Works 3 (1864), 21–82; – WILSON 1840 = 1961: xvii–xx; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 32–34; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 452–455, 1963: 470–477; – HAZRA: The Padma Purāṇa, IC 4, 1937–38, 73–95; HAZRA 1940: 107–127; – Asoke CHATTERJEE: The Antiquity and Origin of the Padma-purāṇa, and its Early Character and Position in the Purāṇic Literature, OH 2, 1954, 175–189; – Ram Shankar BHATTACHARYA: Stotrasūci, Padmapurāṇa (ĀnSS), Pur 1, 1959–60, 151–155 [index of *stotras* from the six *khaṇḍas*]; – KANE 1962: 893–894; – Rāmaśṅkara BHATṬĀCĀRYA: Padmapurāṇasubhāsitāni, Pur 4, 1962, 154–157; – Asoke CHATTERJEE: Padma-purāṇa: A Study, Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1967; – id.: Some Salient Features of Hindu Society as Recorded in the Padma-purāṇa, Pur 10, 1968, 154–178.

The Padma° is one of the more voluminous purāṇas. It also exists in two different recensions: the Bengali version, in five *khaṇḍas*, which has not yet been published, and the Western version, in six *khaṇḍas*, which has been adopted by

<sup>313</sup> HAZRA 1958: 219, 235. The statement at p. 235 (also FARQUHAR 1920: 249) that the Nṛṣiṃha° was translated into Telugu c. A.D. 1300, is in error; the Telugu version has nothing in common with the Bombay edition (K. S. RAMAKOTI SASTRI: Telugu Versions of the Purāṇas, Pur 4, 1962, 348–407 at 388–389; RAGHAVAN Nṛṣiṃha° 1972: 239 n. 1).

<sup>314</sup> KANE 1962: 891–892. FARQUHAR 1920 counts it in its A.D. 550–900 period. GAIL (1977: 107): between the 6th and 8th centuries.

<sup>315</sup> RAGHAVAN (Nṛṣiṃha° 1972): the passage 52.21–32 is borrowed literally from Subhāṭa’s Dūtāṅgada, which was staged in A.D. 1243. VALLAURI (Nṛṣiṃha° 1939) dates the Nṛṣiṃha° between the 13th and the beginning of the 15th centuries.

<sup>316</sup> HAZRA 1954: 27; HAZRA 1958: 356 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

all editions, even those published in Bengal. The *khaṇḍas* are arranged as follows (the figures indicate the number of *adhyāyas*):

Bengal mss.	ĀnSS	Veṅkaṭeśvara Gurumaṇḍala	Vaṅgavāsī
Sṛṣṭi	Ādi 62	Sṛṣṭi 86*	Sṛṣṭi 82
Bhūmi	Bhūmi 125	Bhūmi 125	Bhūmi 125
Svarga	Brahma 26	Svarga 62	Svarga 49
Pātāla	Pātāla 113	Brahma 26	Pātāla 72
Uttara	Sṛṣṭi 82	Pātāla 117	Uttara 255
	Uttara 282	Uttara 255	

Notice that Ādi of ĀnSS corresponds to Svarga in Veṅkaṭeśvara and Gurumaṇḍala, both being different from Svarga in the Bengal manuscripts. Also, Svarga of Vaṅgavāsī (followed by Kedāranātha Bhaktivinoda's edition) corresponds to both Svarga (or Ādi) and Brahma of the other editions (, even though there is a separate Vaṅgavāsī edition of Brahma).

There is general agreement among scholars that the Bengali recension is the older and more original one. Lüders already came to that conclusion while comparing the Ṛṣyaśṛṅga legend of the Padma° with that of the Mahābhārata.<sup>317</sup> One of the most often repeated arguments, however, is that, even in the Bhūmikhaṇḍa of the Western version, the *khaṇḍas* are listed with the names and in the order in which they appear in the Bengali version.<sup>318</sup> On the other hand, even though *the* Bengali recension is considered to be earlier than *the* Western recension, Wilson<sup>319</sup> already noticed that “the different portions of the Padma Purāṇa are in all probability as many different works.” The loose composition of the Padma° is

<sup>317</sup> The story occurs in the Bengal version only; see below, sub Pātālakhaṇḍa. Cf. also WINTERNITZ 1907: 452, 1963: 471; HAZRA 1940: 108.

<sup>318</sup> *Prathamam sṛṣṭikhaṇḍam tu dvitīyam bhūmikhaṇḍakam / trītiyam svargakhaṇḍam ca pātālam tu caturthakam / pañcamam cottaram khaṇḍam sarvapāpapaṇāśanam /* (Gurumaṇḍala, Bhūmi 125.49–50ab). The same fivefold division appears in the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa (Gurumaṇḍala 1.54cd–55), followed immediately by a different fivefold division, this time into *parvans*: (1) Pauṣkara, on the creation by Brahmā, (2) Tīrtha, on mountains, the seven *dvīpas*, and the oceans, (3) on the creation of Rudra and Dakṣa's curse, (4) on the origin of kings and the description of their genealogies, (5) on salvation. Cf. WINTERNITZ 1963: 471 n. Only in the Ādi or Svargakhaṇḍa (Gurumaṇḍala 1.23–24) do we find the sixfold – rather sevenfold – division, in this order: Sṛṣṭi, Bhūmi, Svarga, Brahma, Pātāla, Uttara, and Kriyāyogasāra. Even then, in some manuscripts the five titles are found instead of the six.

<sup>319</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xx. Compare WINTERNITZ: “Wahrscheinlich sind alle diese Bücher nichts anderes als fünf verschiedene Werke, die sich alle den Titel eines Padma-purāṇa beigelegt haben” (1907: 455). WINTERNITZ 1963 insists more on the difference in

also evidenced by the numerous *māhātmyas*, *stotras*, etc., which claim to belong to it.<sup>320</sup>

The Western Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa is composed of eighty-two – or eighty-six – chapters. There are reasons to believe, however, that the Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa proper comprised only chapters 1–43 (ĀnSS, Vaṅga 1–46, Veṅk. 1–48), the remaining chapters representing an independent work: the Dharma° (see there). The Bengal Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa is not significantly different from the Western Sṛṣṭi, except that in all Bengal manuscripts the Dharma° is missing.

The Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa is also known as Puṣkarakhaṇḍa, for it starts with a description of lake Puṣkara (ch. 1–18), a celebrated place of pilgrimage for Brahmā worshipers, about seven miles west of Ajmer. The remaining chapters preceding the Dharma° display a Vaiṣṇava bent, some of them not being free of Tantra influence.<sup>321</sup>

In all editions the Bhūmikhaṇḍa<sup>322</sup> consists of one hundred and twenty-five chapters. Contrary to its title it contains very little description of the earth. It has become “entirely a book of legends.”

The Bengal Bhūmikhaṇḍa is quite different from the printed one. One important characteristic is the distinction made in it between two kinds of *tīrthas*. Not only does the text refer to numerous *sthāvāra* “immovable” *tīrthas* such as sacred rivers and mountains, holy places, etc.; it also recognizes the existence of *jaṅgama* “movable” *tīrthas*; father, mother, spiritual teacher, wife, and even the son belong to this category.

As indicated earlier, the Vaṅgavāsī Svargakhaṇḍa<sup>323</sup> corresponds to two *khaṇḍas* in the other editions: Ādi (ĀnSS) or Svarga (Veṅkateśvara and Gurumaṇḍala) plus Brahma (in all three editions).

---

time; the Padma° “is obviously a rather loose compilation, the parts of which belong to totally different periods, and are probably many centuries apart” (p. 477).

<sup>320</sup> See, for instance, CC 1. 322–323.

<sup>321</sup> Giorgio BONAZZOLI (Devilīṅga. A Note, Pur 20, 1978, 121–129) draws attention to the *hapax legomenon* *devilīṅga* “*devī*’s image,” at Sṛṣṭi 61.57 (Gurumaṇḍala). BONAZZOLI (A Devī in Form of Liṅga, Pur 22, 1980, 220–231) compares Sṛṣṭi 61.57 with Bhaviṣya° 2.1.9.56 (Veṅkat), where *devilīṅga* = “*devī*’s *liṅga*.”

<sup>322</sup> ASOKE CHATTERJEE: The Bhūmi-khaṇḍa in the Bengal Recension of the Padma-Purāṇa, Pur 7, 1965, 262–275.

<sup>323</sup> ED. ASOKE CATURJĪ ŚĀSTRĪ, Banaras: AIKT, 2029 (1972). LIT.: HARA DATTA ŚARMĀ: Padma-Purāṇa and Kālidāsa, [Calcutta Oriental Series 17.E.10,] Calcutta: New Arya Mission Press, 1925; – LOUISE HILGENBERG: Die kosmographische Episode im Mahābhārata und im Padmapurāṇa, textgeschichtlich untersucht, [Bonner Orientalistische Studien 4,] Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934; – S.K. BELVALKAR: The Cosmographical Episode in Mahābhārata and Padmapurāṇa, F.W. Thomas vol. (1939), 19–30; – M.V. VAIDYA: Tīrtha-yātrā in the Arāṇyakaparvan and the Padmapurāṇa, Kane vol. (1941), 530–537; – ASOKE CHATTERJEE: The Svarga-khaṇḍa of the Padma-purāṇa, A Critical Analysis, JAS(L) 20, 1954, 55–66; – id.: A Hitherto Unknown Manuscript of the Svarga-Khaṇḍa of the Bengal Recension, Its Character and Importance, Pur 11, 1969, 297–303.

Differently from the preceding *khaṇḍas*, the Ādi/Svargakhaṇḍa (both sixty-two chapters) is less concerned with the worship of Brahmā, and is resolutely Vaiṣṇava. It deals with the creation of the universe, and a number of places and rivers sacred to Viṣṇu. The Brahmakhaṇḍa (twenty-six chapters) too deals with the glorification of Viṣṇu, it extols the merits of Vaiṣṇava *vratas*, and eulogizes the month of Kārttika and the Tulasī plant. There is also a chapter (7) devoted to the birthday festival of Rādhā (Rādhāṣṭamī), and Rādhā worship is alluded to in various other places.

A large number of chapters, especially in the Ādi/Svargakhaṇḍa, also occur in other purāṇas, mainly the Matsya° and Kūrma°; in most cases the Padma° seems to be at the borrowing end.<sup>324</sup> The cosmographical episode (Ādi 3–9) has been variously said to be based on the Bhīṣmaparvan (ch. 5–13) of the Mahābhārata (Belvalkar), or to be its source (Hilgenberg). The chapters on *tīrthas* (Ādi 10–39) may have been borrowed from the Āraṇyakaparvan (CE 80–83) of the Mahābhārata (M. V. Vaidya).

Far more complex is the relation between the Śakuntalā episode in the Bengal Svargakhaṇḍa (ch. 1–5) and Kālidāsa's play. Wilson suggested that, in the Padma°, "the drama of Kālidāsa is evidently the authority that has been followed."<sup>325</sup> Others argued, on the contrary, that the Śakuntalā episode in the Padma° was the source of Kālidāsa's work.<sup>326</sup>

The Western Pātālakhaṇḍa<sup>327</sup> consists of three distinct parts. The first part (ch. 1–68) belongs to the Rāmaites: Rāma is described as Viṣṇu incarnate, Sītā is identical with Lakṣmī. This section tells the story of Rāma from the time of his victory in Laṅkā and his return to Ayodhyā, and ends with his *aśvamedha* sacrifice. The story is, in many details, different from that of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa. Comparisons have been made, with widely different results, with Kālidāsa's Raghuvamśa<sup>328</sup> and Bhavabhūti's Uttararāmacarita.<sup>329</sup> The second part (ch.

<sup>324</sup> HAZRA 1940: 109, 111 (names of Śiva replaced by names of Viṣṇu).

<sup>325</sup> WILSON: JRAS 5, 1839, 290 = Works (1864), 3.40. Wilson's opinion was upheld by S. K. DE: A History of Sanskrit Literature, Calcutta Univ., <sup>2</sup>1962, p. 140; CHATTERJEE Padmapurāṇa 1967: 109, 114.

<sup>326</sup> Viḥarilal SARKAR: Śakuntalārahasya (Bengali), 1896. Cf. WINTERNITZ 1907: 454, 3.215, 1963: 473; especially Hara Datta ŚARMĀ: Padma° and Kālidāsa.

<sup>327</sup> ASOKE CHATTERJEE: The Position and Antiquity of the Pātāla-khaṇḍa of the Padma Purāṇa, Pur 1, 1959–60, 163–174 and 2, 1960, 52–61; – id.: Śaivism in the Pātāla Khaṇḍa of the Padma-purāṇa, Pur 9, 1967, 98–102.

<sup>328</sup> WILSON: Works (1864) 3.47: the Padma° is based on the Raghuvamśa; CHATTERJEE Padmapurāṇa 1967: 130–138: the Padma° is indebted to the Raghuvamśa; ŚARMĀ: the Padma° is the source of the Raghuvamśa.

<sup>329</sup> WILSON (Works 3.51): "This part of the work agrees in some respects with the Uttara Rāma Charitra, but has several gossiping and legendary additions." S. K. BELVALKAR (Rāma's Later History, HOS 21, 1915, pp. lvii–lviii) considers this section of the Padma° to be prior to the Uttararāmacarita; contra: CHATTERJEE Padmapurāṇa 1967: 72. KANE (ed. Uttararāmacarita, NSP <sup>3</sup>1929, p. xxvii) hesitates, but "would rather say that the Padma-

69–99) relates the conversation between Śiva and Pārvatī, on Kṛṣṇacarita. Kṛṣṇa is Viṣṇu incarnate, Rādhā is Kṛṣṇa's *śakti*. Vṛndāvana is the most beautiful place on earth, superior even to Vaikuṅṭha. Part three (ch. 100–113) deals with Rāma's life after the horse sacrifice. The *sūta* reports the conversation between Rāma and Śaṅkara who came to visit Rāma in Ayodhyā. This section is definitely Śaiva: Rāma – and Viṣṇu – are clearly portrayed as inferior to Śiva. *Linga* worship is praised and described in several places, and the merits of ashes are repeatedly referred to in many chapters.

The Pātālakhaṇḍa of the Bengal manuscripts is a very different document. Two sections of it, chapters 29–96 and 100–122, correspond, to some extent, with the first and the third parts of the editions, respectively. Two other sections, chapters 1–28 and 97–99, have no counterparts in the Western version. Chapters 1–28 deal with the seven Pātālas, the story of Rāvaṇa, the burning of Tripura, and the kings of the solar dynasty. Chapters 97–99 provide the genealogical list of the kings who reigned after Rāma. Chapter thirteen of the Bengal Pātālakhaṇḍa, on the Rṣyaśṛṅga legend, was examined by Lüders. He concluded that the story, as preserved in the Padma<sup>o</sup>, represents an intermediary stage, in between the original version of the Mahābhārata, and the re-worked version, the compiler of which adapted the story to that of the purāṇa.<sup>330</sup>

One version of the Kāśīmāhātmya<sup>331</sup> claims to belong to the Pātālakhaṇḍa, although it appears neither in the editions, nor in the Bengal manuscripts. It is a Śaiva document which openly proclaims Śiva's superiority to Viṣṇu and Brahmā. A number of – unpublished – texts also claim to belong to the Pātālakhaṇḍa. The Bhaṭṭaharacarita (twenty-five chapters),<sup>332</sup> while introducing stories and legends to look like a purāṇa, mainly deals with the country of Medapāṭa (modern Mewar). The Vaidyanāthalingamāhātmya (eight chapters),<sup>333</sup> as the title indicates, glorifies Śiva, primarily in the form of the Vaidyanāthalinga, in Bihar.

---

purāṇa is the borrower." According to M.R. KALE (The Uttararāmacharita, Bombay: Gopal Narayan, 1934, Introduction p. 29), "it is impossible to accept the Padma-purāṇa categorically as the basis of our play. Doubtless several forms of the Rāma-history were current in ancient India, and Bhavabhūti might have derived supplementary material from these."

<sup>330</sup> Heinrich LÜDERS: Die Sage von Rṣyaśṛṅga, NGGW phil.-hist. Kl. 1897, 87–135. In 1899 Joseph DAHLMANN (Mahābhārata-Studien, Berlin: Dames, 1.xxxiv, 283–288) criticized Lüders' method as "unhaltbar und willkürlich." Lüders defended himself in Zur Sage von Rṣyaśṛṅga, NGGW 1901, 28–56. Both Lüders' contributions are reprinted in Philologica Indica (1940), pp. 1–43 and 47–73.

<sup>331</sup> ED. Benares: Benares Akhāvāra Press, 1852; – Benares: Kāśī Press, 1921 (1864); – + Hindi tr., Benares: Gorkhā Press, 1895. – LIT.: CHATTERJEE: Padmapurāṇa 1967: 199–201.

<sup>332</sup> CHATTERJEE Padma<sup>o</sup> 1967: 154–172.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid., pp. 173–177. According to HARAPRASAD SHASTRI (1928 a: p. 205, no. 3475) it is "a description of the well-known Phallic emblem of Śiva at Deoghar in the Santhal Pargana."

The Kaliñjaramāhātmya (five *adhyāyas*),<sup>334</sup> eulogizes Mahādeva in the form of the Kaliñjara mountain in eastern Bundelkhand; its power is so great that by touching it or just looking at it one expiates even as bad a sin as the killing of a brahman. The Holikāmāhātmya (four *adhyāyas*)<sup>335</sup> glorifies and deifies the Holi festival, more or less as a female part of Śiva.

There is a considerable difference between the Western and the Bengal Uttarakhanda.<sup>336</sup> The printed versions (ĀnSS 282 chapters, Vaṅga and Veṅkaṭ 255) are, above all, more extensive than the Bengal manuscripts (173 or 174 chapters). Many chapters of the printed editions have no counterparts in the Bengal manuscripts; on the other hand, there are chapters in the manuscripts (e. g., 98–140, 162–173) dealing with topics which are not treated in the editions.<sup>337</sup> Even for corresponding topics the treatments are generally very different. The Uttarakhanda (ĀnSS Ch. 265) contains a version of the Prahlāda story.<sup>338</sup>

There are a number of sections in the Uttarakhanda which also had an existence of their own.<sup>339</sup> The Gītāmāhātmya (ĀnSS ch. 171–188; Vaṅga 175–192)<sup>340</sup> is arranged in eighteen chapters, even as the Bhagavadgītā itself, and is meant to praise the reading and hearing of each individual *adhyāya* of the basic text. Immediately after the Gītāmāhātmya the editions include the – far more popular – Bhāgavatamāhātmya<sup>341</sup> (in six chapters, ĀnSS ch. 189–194, Vaṅga 193–198), which has been published repeatedly, either separately, or, more often, in con-

<sup>334</sup> Ibid., pp. 178–180.

<sup>335</sup> Ibid., pp. 181–182.

<sup>336</sup> TR. KENNEDY 1831: Appendix D, pp. 456–490: The Legend of Jalandhara, from the Commencement of the Uttara Khand of the Padma°. [There is a longer Jalandhara story in ĀnSS ch. 3–19 and Vaṅga ch. 3–18, and a shorter one in the Kārttikamāhātmya and the Bengal mss.] – LIT.: ASOKE CHATTERJEE: The Characteristic Feature of the Uttara-khanda of the Padma-purāṇa, Pur 3, 1961, 47–60; – B. A. SALETORÉ: The Sābarmatī in the Padma Purāṇa, JOIB 12, 1962–63, 9–28 [Veṅkaṭ. ed., ch. 131–170]; – ASOKE CHATTERJEE: Some Observations on the Date of the Bengal Recension of the Uttara-khanda of the Padma-purāṇa, Pur 5, 1963, 122–126 [2nd half of 17th cent.].

<sup>337</sup> For a concordance between the printed Uttarakhanda and that of the Bengal mss., and for a survey of the contents of the two major sections which are peculiar to the latter, see CHATTERJEE Padma° 1967: 141–147.

<sup>338</sup> HACKER 1959: 165–172. On the passage (AnSS ch. 263) in which Śiva exposes the principles of Vaiṣṇavism to Pārvatī, see JOS ABS: Beiträge zur Kritik heterodoxer Philosophie-Systeme in der Purāṇa-Literatur, Jacobi vol. (1926), 386–396.

<sup>339</sup> For a list of manuscripts, see CHATTERJEE Padma° 1967: 81–84 notes.

<sup>340</sup> ED. separately, Bombay: Gaṇapatikṛṣṇāji's Press, 1793 (1871).

<sup>341</sup> ED. Bombay: Apale Press, 1782 (1861); – Bombay: Gaṇapatikṛṣṇāji's Press, 1789 (1867). – With the Bhāgavata°: Banaras: Satyanam Press, 1926; – Gorakhpur: Gītā Press, 2008 (1950). – With Śrīdhara's comm.: Bombay: Gaṇeśvijaya Press, 1869; – Bombay: Gaṇapatikṛṣṇāji's Press, 1871, 1882; – Bombay: Asiatic Press, 1877; – Bombay: Jagadīśvara Press, 1885. – With Rāmapratāpa's Subodhinī: Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1899. – TR. AITM 7 (= Bhāgavata°, vol. 1), pp. lxxi–cxxix.

junction with the Bhāgavata°, occasionally with Śrīdharaśvaṁin's Bhāvārthadīpikā or other commentaries.

Besides the preceding *māhātmyas* which sing the glory of two religious texts, the Uttarakhanda also encompasses two *māhātmyas* which glorify months of the year. The Kārttikamāhātmya<sup>342</sup> (ĀnSS ch. 90–125, Vaṅga 92–124) is devoted to the “greatness” of the last month of the year, Kārttika. Its popularity is evident from the large numbers of editions, together with translations and commentaries in a number of vernaculars – in addition to Hindi, Nepali, and Marathi mentioned below, also Oriya, Telugu, etc. Nearly as popular as the Kārttikamāhātmya is the Māghamāhātmya<sup>343</sup> (ĀnSS ch. 219–250, Vaṅga 125–127), which glorifies the winter month Māgha. It contains a number of interesting stories “to raise people from the dead,”<sup>344</sup> one of which („The Story of the Young Brahman”) has been used to establish the relation between the Uttarakhanda and the Rāmāyaṇa (see 2.1.5).

The Śivagītā,<sup>345</sup> which is not included in the Ānandāśrama edition of the Uttarakhanda, consists of sixteen *adhyāyas* (806 *ślokas*). Even as in the Bhagavadgītā Kṛṣṇa consoled Arjuna by removing his objections against engaging in battle with his relatives, in the Śivagītā Agastya consoles Rāma about his loosing Sitā to Rāvaṇa. Agastya tells Rāma that, by performing the Virajā *dikṣā*, he will both win Śiva's grace and defeat Rāvaṇa. Rāma performs the *dikṣā* on the bank of the Godāvarī; Śiva appears and provides Rāma with divine weapons to battle Rāvaṇa; he also allows Rāma to see him as identical with the universe, and encourages

<sup>342</sup> ED. Delhi: Hasani Press, 1927 (1870); – Bombay: Jñānasāgara Press, 1928 (1871); – + Hindi comm., Delhi: Nārāyaṇī Press, 1933 (1876); – + Hindi comm., Meerut: C.M. Vāke Press, 1934 (1877); – + Marathi tr., Poona: Dattaprasāraka Press, 1878; – + Nepali comm., Banaras: Durgā Press, 1903; – + Hindi comm., Bombay: Native Opinion Press, 1916; – + Hindi comm., Banaras: Satyanam Press, 1925. – LIT.: ASOKE CHATTERJEE: A Treatise of the Kārttikamāhātmya, Its Character and Importance, Pur 5, 1963, 320–325; – CHATTERJEE Padma° 1967: 139–140, 195–198.

<sup>343</sup> ED. Madras: Jyotiṣkalānidhi Press, 1858 [Telugu char.]; – Bombay: Bāpū Haraśeṭa Devalekara's Press, 1783 (1861); – Madras: Sarasvatīnilaya Press, 1872 [Telugu char.]; – + Marathi tr., Poona: Dattaprasāraka Press, 1878; – Bombay: Śrīvardhanakara's Press, 1879; – Bombay: Native Opinion Press, 1912.

<sup>344</sup> Hans LOSCH: Totenwiedererweckungsgeschichten in Indien, Kahle vol. (1935), 173–180.

<sup>345</sup> ED. Bombay: Viṭṭhala Sakhārāma Agnihotri's Press, 1772 (1850); – Masulipatam: Svadharmaprakāśinī Press, 1873 [Telugu char.]; – + Marathi tr., Poona: Vedāntaprakāśa Press, 1878; – Chidambaram: Brahma-Vidyā Press, 1897 [Grantha]; – + Bengali tr., Calcutta: Dākṣāyaṇī Press, 1318 (1912); – + Gujarati comm., Ahmedabad: Rāmākṛṣṇa Press, 1913; – Bombay: Venkaṭeśvara Press, 1979 (1922); – + comm. Tātparyaprakāśikā, by Paramaśivendra Sarasvatī, Part I, Adhy. I–III, Śrīrangam: Vāṇivilāsa Press, 1906; – + comm. Bālānandini, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sagara Press, 1909. – LIT.: GLASENAPP 1927: 143–145.

him to question Śiva as his *guru*. The latter half of the text is, then, concerned with the teachings of Śiva: the development of the embryo and human life; the *guṇas*, elements, and bodies; the individual soul and its relation to the cosmic soul and the body; death and rebirth; Śiva worship; the five types of liberation (*sālokya*, *sārūpya*, *sārṣṭya*, *sāyujya*, *kaivalya*) and how to achieve them; the five *kośas* that envelop the soul; rituals for Śiva *bhakti*; individuals entitled to liberation. The Śivagītā is less dependent on the Bhagavadgītā than most puranic *gītās*, but it contains several quotations from the Upaniṣads, the Atharvaśiras, Śvetāśvatara, Īśāvāsyā, and, above all, the Kaivalya which it follows in combining Śiva *bhakti* with *advaita*.

The Kriyāyogasāra,<sup>346</sup> both in the Vaṅga edition and in the Venkateśvara edition of the Padma°, consists of twenty-six chapters. In answer to a question by Śaunaka, how religious merit can be achieved notwithstanding the evils of the Kali age in which men are no longer capable of achieving *mokṣa* as it was achieved in earlier ages, the *sūta* reports what Vyāsa had told Jaimini on the subject of *kriyāyoga*, which is superior by far to any form of *dhyānayoga*. *Kriyāyoga* is defined as consisting of worship of Gaṅgā, Śrī, and Viṣṇu, and of generosity, devotion to brahmins, observance of the *ekādaśivrata*, devotion to the *dhātṛī* tree and *tulasī* plant, and hospitality to guests.<sup>347</sup> The text is “a Bhāgavata document on the praise of Viṣṇu worship.” Mahāviṣṇu is the *paramātmā*, who appears as Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Rudra, for the sake of creation, preservation, and destruction; his *ādyā prakṛti* in turn takes on the forms of Brāhmī, Lakṣmī, and Ambikā, to assist the three manifestations of Mahāviṣṇu. Devotion to Viṣṇu – *bhakti*, more specifically *dāsyabhakti* – by repeating his names, wearing his marks, etc., lead to *sārūpya*, *sālokya*, and *kaivalya*. Even an outcaste, who lives by these rules, is superior to a brahman who does not (16.3).

The Kriyāyogasāra became known in Europe at an early date. Anton Edmund Wollheim da Fonseca published an analysis of it in 1846, he repeatedly quotes from it in his *Mythologie des alten Indien*,<sup>348</sup> and he obviously prepared a com-

<sup>346</sup> Ed. + Bengali tr., Rāmanārāyaṇa Vidyāratna, Murshidabad: Rādhāramaṇa Press, 1282 (1874); – + Bengali tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Electro Machine Press, 1320 (1913). – LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xx; – Anton Edmund WOLLHEIM DA FONSECA: Ueber Kriyājogasāra oder die Essenz der Opferwerke, Jahresbericht DMG 1846, 153–159; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 455, 1963: 476–477; – HAZRA: Kriyā-Yoga-Sāra, an independent Uparurāṇa written in Bengal, BhV 12, 1951, 50–58; – HAZRA 1958: 267–279 [minor Vaiṣṇava upa°]; – Shrimannarayana DVIVEDI: Paurāṇika Kriyāyoga evaṃ Kriyāyogasāra, Sammelana Patrikā 49, 1963, 183–189; – Om PRAKASH: A Note on the Nativity of the Kriyāyogasāra, JGJRI 22, 1965–66, 153–155.

<sup>347</sup> *gaṅgāśrīviṣṇupūjā ca dānāni dvijasattama / brāhmaṇānāṃ tathā bhaktir bhaktir ekādaśivrate / dhātṛitulasyor bhaktis ca tathā cātithipūjanam / kriyāyogāṅgabhūtāni prokṛtānīti samāsataḥ / (3.4–5).*

<sup>348</sup> Berlin: Hempel, 1856.

plete edition with German translation.<sup>349</sup> The love story of Mādhava and Sulocanā (ch. 5) figures in Adolf Friedrich von Schack's *Stimmen vom Ganges*.<sup>350</sup>

Hazra argues in favor of the independent character of the Kriyāyogasāra. It begins like other independent puranic texts; the concluding verse (26.55) calls it an upapurāṇa. Nowhere in the text is there any reference to the Padma°, and some of the chapter colophons in at least two manuscripts do not claim attachment to the Padma°. The Nārada° (1. ch. 93) lists the names and contents of the chapters of the Padma°, but does not mention the Kriyāyogasāra. The Brhad-dharma° (1.25.24) includes the Kriyāyogasāra in its list of upapurāṇas. Hazra dates the text to the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century, and locates it in Bengal, most probably in its Eastern part.<sup>351</sup>

A Puṣkaramāhātmya<sup>352</sup> does not claim to belong to any particular *khaṇḍa* of the Padma°, but to a Padmapurāṇasamuccaya.<sup>353</sup> It is a *māhātmya* of the Puṣkara *tīrtha*, near Ajmer, which has a temple of Brahmā. The text of the Bombay edition contains 971 *ślokas*, divided into twenty *adhyāyas*. The Ajmer edition, *samgrhītam tīkītam ca*, consists of just seventy-one stanzas. Chatterjee's study of the text is based on the Asiatic Society manuscript, which is composed of 2200 *ślokas*. All three versions have the first stanza in common, but from then onward are different.

Anantācārya's Prapannāmṛta refers to a Vṛddhapadma°,<sup>354</sup> containing stories about Rāmānuja and the South Indian Āṭvārs. It is not otherwise known.

For the Jaina Padma°, see 2.1.5.

### *Paśupati°*

The manuscript of a Paśupati°, in five *khaṇḍas*, was noticed and described by Haraprasad Shastri.<sup>355</sup> He noted: "It is much more concerned with the origin and

<sup>349</sup> G. RAEDER: Wollheim da Fonseca. Eine biographische Skizze, Berlin: Hempel, 1880, p. 18, refers to an ed. and German tr., still in manuscript form: "Krijājogasāra, indische Märchen auf religiösem Hintergrund, Sanskrit mit deutscher Uebersetzung."

<sup>350</sup> Berlin: Hertz, 1857, pp. 189–225.

<sup>351</sup> Om PRAKASH points out, against Hazra, that there also exist *devanāgarī* mss. of the text (four at Banaras Sanskrit University, and three plus one Maithili at the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute); he points to the danger of drawing conclusions from incomplete data.

<sup>352</sup> ED. Bombay: Jñānasāgara Press, 1871; – Ajmer: Jaina Printing Press, 1977 (1920). – LIT.: ASOKE CHATTERJEE: A note on Puṣkara-māhātmya or the so-called Padma-purāṇa samuccaya, Pur 4, 1962, 176–181; – CHATTERJEE Padma° 1967: 190–194.

<sup>353</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI (1928a: 226–231, no. 8438) concludes that there must have been a Samuccaya of the Padma°, even as there was an Itihāsasamuccaya of the Mahābhārata.

<sup>354</sup> HAZRA 1954: 37; HAZRA 1958: 360 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

<sup>355</sup> 1905: lii–liii and 203, no. 984 (copied in N.S. 824 = A.D. 1704).

the sacred character of the Vāgmatī on which stands the sacred shrine of Paśupati than with Paśupati himself.” Sylvain Lévi<sup>356</sup> showed that the “unique” manuscript of the Paśupati° was, in fact, identical with the better known Vāgvatī (or Vāgmatī) mātmya.

### *Prabhāsa°*

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 32–33; – HAZRA 1958: 359–360.

A Prabhāsaka is included in the list of upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra°. The Prabhāsa° has also been quoted briefly in Sanātana Gosvāmin’s Vaiṣṇavatoṣiṇī (on Bhāgavata° 10.8.13) and in Gopālabhaṭṭa’s Haribhaktivilāsa (p. 689). It is different from the Prabhāsakhaṇḍa of the Skanda°.

### *Purāṇārthaprakāśa*

The Purāṇārthaprakāśa was composed by Pandit Rādhākānta Śarmaṇ,<sup>357</sup> at the request of Warren Hastings, in 1784. It consists of four chapters: *kālasamkhyā*, *dharmānirūpaṇam*, *śṛṣṭyādinirūpaṇam*, and *rājavamsaḥ*. Again at Hastings’ request it was translated into Persian by Zūrāvār Singh.<sup>358</sup> N.B. Halhed translated the Persian version into English.<sup>359</sup> The printed English text has six chapters: (1) Computations of Time, (2) Brehme Perveen, i.e. Knowledge of Brehm, (3) Account of the different Shasters, (4) Explanation of the different Casts, (5) Cosmogony, etc., (6) Of the ancient Rajas.

William Jones<sup>360</sup> received a copy of the Persian translation from John Shore, in 1787; “but the proper names are so murdered, or so strangely disguised in Persian letters, that I am only tantalized with a thirst for more accurate information. If the pundit at your request, will lend me the original, my marhatta writer shall copy it elegantly, with spaces between the lines for a literal English translation, which may perhaps be agreeable, with your consent, to our society.”<sup>361</sup> His letter

<sup>356</sup> 1905: 205–207. For a list of the 22 chapter titles, see there, p. 205 n. 3.

<sup>357</sup> C. BENDALL: Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum, 1902, pp. 74–75, no. 197 (Or. 1124). This writer is preparing an edition of the Sanskrit text.

<sup>358</sup> Ch. RIEU: Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum, vol. I, 1879, pp. 63–64 (Add. 5655).

<sup>359</sup> BM, Add. ms. 5657, foll. 163–194. Ed.: Pooran Arthe Prakash Shastre, by Radhacante Sermen Pendeet; and Ajaweelee, in: Antient Indian Literature, illustrative of the Researches of the Asiatick Society, London: Black, Perrey, and Kingsbury, 1809, No. III, pp. 109–177.

<sup>360</sup> Catalogue of the Library of the Late Sir William Jones, ed. R.H. Evans, London: W. Nicol, 1831, no. 450. See also S. N. MUKHERJEE: Sir William Jones. A Study in Eighteenth-Century British Attitudes to India, Cambridge UP, 1968, p. 102.

<sup>361</sup> G. CANNON (ed.): The Letters of Sir William Jones, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970, no. 457 (p. 735), dated 25 March 1787.

of 12 May seems to indicate that he did receive the Sanskrit text; also, he met and discussed the subject with Rādhākānta, in the Summer of 1787.<sup>362</sup>

### *Purāṇārthasaṃgraha*

LIT.: RAGHAVAN: The Purāṇārthasaṃgraha of Venkaṭarāya, Pur 5, 1963, 47–60. [Contents, by ch., at 57–60]

The Purāṇārthasaṃgraha consists of thirty chapters, and about four thousand *ślokas*. Manuscripts of the text are preserved at the Madras Government Oriental Manuscript Library (D. Nos. 2469, 15622), the India Office Library (No. 6948), etc. It is a compendium of the subject matter of the purāṇas, probably composed in South India, by Venkaṭarāya Sūri, son of Vaḍamala and Alamelumaṅgā. The text is in the form of a dialogue between Lakṣmī and Nārāyaṇa, which accounts for the alternate title: Lakṣmīnārāyaṇīyam.

### *Purāṇasāra*

LIT.: Chintaharan CHAKRAVARTI: Purāṇa Digests, Pur 5, 1963, 31–38.

The Purāṇasāra is “an abstract of the eighteen great Purāṇas, treating principally of their historic portions.”<sup>363</sup> It is attributed to Rudra Rāya, son of Rāghava Rāya, and was probably composed about A. D. 1650.

A Purāṇasāra is quoted frequently by Mādhavācārya in the Ācārakhaṇḍa of his Pārāśarasmtīvyākhyā, and by Nīlakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa in his Ācāramayūkha.

### *Purāṇasarvasva*

LIT.: Ch. CHAKRAVARTI: Purāṇa Digests, Pur 5, 1963, 31–38.

The Purāṇasarvasva is preserved in manuscript form only. It is said to have been compiled at the instance of Puruṣottama, a rich merchant of Varendra *viśaya* in Bengal, either by his son Halāyudha, or by one Govardhana.

### *Puruṣottama*<sup>o</sup>

LIT.: HAZRA 1958: 308–309 [minor Vaiṣṇava upa<sup>o</sup>].

One stanza from a Puruṣottama<sup>o</sup> is quoted in Gadādhara’s Kālasāra. It seems to suggest that Kṛṣṇa himself was one of the speakers. If so, the Puruṣottama<sup>o</sup> is different from the Puruṣottamakṣetra section of the Brahma<sup>o</sup> and the Puruṣottamakṣetramāhātmya of the Skanda<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>362</sup> Ibid., no. 459 (p. 737).

<sup>363</sup> MĪTRA Notices 10 (1892): 62–65, no. 3310.

*Puṣkara°*

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 33.

Even though the Puṣkara° does not appear in any list of upapurāṇas, stanzas from it have been preserved in several texts: Gadādharma's Kālasāra, Gopālabhaṭṭa's Haribhaktivilāsa, and Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's Nirṇayasindhu.

*Rudra°*

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 33.

One verse from a Rudra° has been preserved in Hemādri's Caturvargacintāmaṇi.

*Sāmba°*

ED.: Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1942 (1885), <sup>2</sup>1899.

LIT.: Th. BLOCH: Eine indische Version der iranischen Sage von Sām, ZDMG 64, 1910, 733–738; – HAZRA: The Sāmba-Purāṇa through the Ages, JAS(L) 18, 1952, 91–111; – id.: The Sāmba-Purāṇa. A Saura Work of Different Hands, ABORI 36, 1955, 62–84; – HAZRA 1958: 32–108 [Saura upa°]; – H. von STIETENCROON: Indische Sonnenpriester. Sāmba und die Śākadvīpiya-Brāhmaṇa, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966.

The Sāmba° consists of eighty-four chapters. True to its title, it tells the story of beautiful Sāmba, Vāsudeva's son, who, following a curse by his father – a curse orchestrated by Nārada –, became afflicted with leprosy. On Nārada's advice Sāmba visits and worships Sūrya, “the highest deity to whom all other gods have recourse.” Sūrya is pleased, cures Sāmba's leprosy, and asks him to erect an image of the Sun on the bank of the Candrabhāgā river. Sāmba indeed finds an image of the Sun while bathing in the river, an image constructed by Viśvakarma himself. He establishes the image in Mitravana, and builds a temple for it. In search of priests to worship the image Sāmba is referred once more, by Nārada, to Sūrya; the latter advises him to bring the Magas, who are the “brahmans” of Śākadvīpa and priests who worship the Sun. Sāmba obtains his father's permission to use Garuḍa, flies with him to Śākadvīpa, and returns with eighteen Maga families to what by now is called Sāmbapura in Mitravana. This story of the origin of sun worship in Jambudvīpa is the principal theme of the purāṇa; it is, of course, interrupted and followed by various stories, many of which are meant further to glorify Sūrya and his worship.<sup>364</sup>

Together with a section of the Brāhmaparvan of the Bhaviṣya° (see there) the Sāmba° thus constitutes the most important puranic text on the introduction of sun worship in India. Even though the Bhaviṣya° became known to scholars long before the Sāmba° – and even though, therefore, most early references in the

<sup>364</sup> For a survey of these stories, see HAZRA 1958: 42–56.

scholarly literature are to the former rather than to the latter —, it has now been established that in all passages where the two purāṇas correspond the Sāmba° has to be considered as the source of the Bhaviṣya°. <sup>365</sup> It is therefore preferable to deal with these common passages, which attracted a lot of attention, here rather than under the Bhaviṣya°.

In 1840 Wilson remarked, on the Bhaviṣya°:

“There is some curious matter in the last chapters, relating to the Magas, silent worshippers of the sun, from Śākadvīpa, as if the compiler had adopted the Persian term Magh, and connected the fire-worshippers of Iran with those of India. This is a subject, however, that requires further investigation.” <sup>366</sup>

Further investigation the Magas undoubtedly got. Reinaud <sup>367</sup> proposed two possible dates for the introduction of sun worship in India: either at the time when the Persian satraps exercised authority over the northwest, or, much later, after the flight of the Parsis to Gujarat. He opted for the latter solution. Weber, who devoted much attention to this problem, <sup>368</sup> agreed with Reinaud as far as the Bhaviṣya° is concerned; in his opinion, however, Varāhamihira’s references to sun worship indicate that the Magas had come to India at an earlier date and at that time already had been admitted among the brahmins. <sup>369</sup>

Even though the controversy about the date of arrival of the Magas in India continued — with a wide variety of solutions —, <sup>370</sup> we must rest content with the

<sup>365</sup> HAZRA 1958: 59, 68–82; STIETENCROON Sāmba 1966: 16.

<sup>366</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxxix. As early as 1810 Francis WILFORD referred to passages from the Bhaviṣya°, at Asiatic Researches 11, 70–84. The data he provided were used by C. J. Hier. WINDISCHMANN: Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte 1.2 (1832), 703–704. According to WEBER (Magavyakti, p. 452) the text was used by both “in ihrer verschwommenen und verschwimmenden Weise.”

<sup>367</sup> Joseph Toussaint REINAUD: Mémoire géographique, historique et scientifique sur l’Inde..., Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1849, pp. 391–397.

<sup>368</sup> A. WEBER: (a) Indische Skizzen, Berlin: Dümmler, 1857 (written 1853), pp. 104–105; (b) Über die Magavyakti des Kṛishadāsa Miçra, Monatsber. kgl. pr. Ak. Wiss. Berlin 1879, 446–488, 810–814; (c) Über zwei Parteischriften zu Gunsten der Maga, resp. Çākadvīpiya Brāhmaṇa, ibid. 1880, 27–78 [the two treatises are: Sāmavijaya, and Kḥalavaktracapeṭikā by Rājavallabhāmīśra of Kāśī; on the latter, see NCC 5, 1969, 182].

<sup>369</sup> WEBER: Magavyakti, pp. 457–458. Cf. BARTH 1879 = 1921: 257–258. On the relation between the Bhaviṣya° and the Bṛhatsaṃhitā, see also SCHEFTELOWITZ, sub Bhaviṣya°. According to D. K. BISWAS (The Maga Ancestry of Varāhamihira, IHQ 25, 1949, 175–182) Varāhamihira himself belonged to the sun worshiping Maga-Brāhmaṇa community.

<sup>370</sup> Recent literature on the subject includes, in chronological order: D. K. BISWAS: Sūrya and Śiva, IHQ 24, 1948, 142–147; — id.: A Further Note on the Indian Proto-type of the Javanese Kūṭa-mantra, IHQ 26, 1950, 166–168; — S. N. ROY: Early Purāṇic Account of Sun and Solar Cult, Uttara Bharata 10, 1963, 65–78; — V. V. MIRASHI: Three Ancient Famous Temples of the Sun, Pur 8, 1966, 38–51; — H. HUMBACH: Iranische Sonnenpriester in Indien, XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag (1968) 1969, 882–884; —

statement that “in reality we cannot say much more about [them] than what was already recognized by Weber.”<sup>371</sup> At least one thing is certain. Early in this century D. R. Bhandarkar reported on the existence, near Jodhpur, of a class of brahmans known as Śevaks, who call themselves Śākadvīpa brahmans, and who know that their story is told in “the Nāmāgrantha of the Sūrya-purāṇa and also in the Bhavishya-purāṇa.” An inscription, written by a Maga called Mātṛravi, attests that this group existed in Rājputāna about A. D. 860.<sup>372</sup>

Besides being included in all lists of upapurāṇas, the Sāmba° is also mentioned by al-Bīrūnī (see I.3.3). Farquhar<sup>373</sup> therefore assigned it to his A. D. 550–900 period; Hazra<sup>374</sup> proposed a date between A. D. 500 and 800. Some<sup>375</sup> locate the Sāmba° in Orissa, it being a Saura purāṇa; others prefer North-West India, for “with the exception of the rivers Tapatī and Payoṣṇī all the holy places and rivers, mentioned in this Purāṇa belong to Northern India, especially to its western part.”<sup>376</sup>

The Kapilasamhitā<sup>377</sup> relates the legendary account of Konārka and the construction of the temple there; it “adopted the description in the Sāmba Purānam in an abridged form.”<sup>378</sup>

### Sāradā°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 34; – HAZRA 1963: 488–489 [lost Śākta upa°].

The title Sāradā° does not occur in any list of upapurāṇas. Yet, based on a few quotations in later literature, Hazra considers it to be different from the Kālikā°, Devī°, and Devībhāgavata°, and to have been composed before A. D. 1000.

V. C. SRIVASTAVA: The Purāṇic Records on the Sun-worship, Pur 11, 1969, 229–272; – V. RAGHAVAN: Worship of the Sun, Pur 12, 1970, 205–230; – Lalta Prasad PANDEY: Sun-Worship in Ancient India, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971 [purāṇas, pp. 131–171]; – V. C. SRIVASTAVA: Sun-Worship in Ancient India, Allahabad: Indological Publications, 1972 [pp. 203–271: “The Purāṇic World”]; – id.: Sun-worship in Bali – A Hypothesis, Pur 17, 1975, 63–74; – A. J. GAIL: Der Sonnenkult im alten Indien – Eigengewächs oder Import?, ZDMG 128, 1978, 333–348.

<sup>371</sup> STIETENCROON Sāmba° 1966: 14.

<sup>372</sup> D. R. BHANDARKAR: Ghatiyala Inscriptions of Kakkuta, *samvat* 918, EI 9, 1907–08, 277–281 at 279.

<sup>373</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 205.

<sup>374</sup> HAZRA Sāmba° 1952: 105. This is at least the date of chapters 1–38, 44–46, and 84; chapters 39–43 and 47–83 may have been added later. KANE (1962: 873) sees no reason to date any part of the Sāmba° before A. D. 950.

<sup>375</sup> Nagendranath VASU: The Archaeological Survey of Mayurabhanja, vol. I, Mayurabhanja State, [1911], p. xii. Cf. FARQUHAR 1920: 205; Mano Mohan GANGULY: Orissa and Her Remains – Ancient and Modern, Calcutta: Thacker Spink, 1912, pp. 432, 439.

<sup>376</sup> HAZRA Sāmba° 1952: 110.

<sup>377</sup> NCC 3 (1967), 153. Cf. K. N. MAHAPATRA: Puranic Literature in Orissa, OHRJ 11, 1962–63, 21–31 at 23.

<sup>378</sup> M. M. GANGULY: Orissa and Her Remains, p. 439.

*Sarasvatī*<sup>o</sup>

ED.: Sargas 15–16 + Guj. tr. (and long introduction), Kanaiyalal B. Dave, Bombay: Śrī Kārbasa Gujārātī Sabhā, 1940.

LIT.: BÜHLER's Report on Sanskrit Mss. in Gujarat, IA 1, 1872, 379–380 (discovery, in 1869, of the Āditya<sup>o</sup>, a fragment of the Sarasvatī<sup>o</sup>); IA 2, 1873, 304–305 (a complete copy of the Sarasvatī<sup>o</sup>); – Sureshchandra Kanaiyalal DAVE: The Sarasvatī Purāṇa, Pur 10, 1968, 68–76; – R. N. MEHTA and C. MARGABANDHU: Sahasralīnga Tank, Patan (N. G.), Pur 22, 1980, 164–179.

The Sarasvatī<sup>o</sup> is a local purāṇa from Gujarat, in eighteen *sargas* (2890 verses). It describes the *tīrthas* on the banks of the Sarasvatī, and provides a brief historical sketch – including the reign of king Siddharāja – of the area through which the river flows. It has been dated ca. A. D. 1200.

*Saura*<sup>o</sup>

ED.: ĀnSS 18, 1889, <sup>2</sup>1924; – + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, <sup>2</sup>1908.

LIT.: A. BARTH: Deux chapitres du Saurapurāṇa, de Harlez vol. (1896), 12–25; – Wilhelm JAHN: Das Saurapurāṇam, ein Kompendium spät-indischer Kulturgeschichte und des Sivaismus. Einleitung, Inhaltsangabe nebst Uebersetzungen, Erklärungen und Indices, Straßburg: Trübner, 1908; – P. E. PAVOLINI: Una nuova versione Purāṇica della leggenda di Urvaçī, GSAI 21, 1908, 291–298 (on ch. 31); – B. N. KRISHNAMURTI SARMA: An Attack on Śrī Madhvācārya in the Saura Purāṇa, ABORI 13, 1931–32, 59–76; – HAZRA: The Three Most Prominent Places of Sun-Worship in Ancient India, BhV 4, 1942–43, 212–216; – id.: Saura Purāṇa, NIA 6, 1943–44, 103–111, 121–129; – HAZRA 1963: 492–493; – WINTERNITZ 1963: 470.

The printed Saura<sup>o</sup> consists of sixty-nine *adhyāyas*.<sup>379</sup> It has sometimes been portrayed as part of the Brahma<sup>o</sup>.<sup>380</sup> It has also, wrongly,<sup>381</sup> been confused with the Āditya<sup>o</sup>. The reason for this confusion may be a verse from the Saura<sup>o</sup> itself (1.6), in which the sages ask the *sūta* to tell them “how the Saura<sup>o</sup> was, in earlier days, proclaimed by Āditya.”<sup>382</sup>

Even though the purāṇa is proclaimed by Sūrya, the text is totally dominated by Śiva, who is glorified as the highest truth, and his consort Pārvatī, who is his *śakti*. Śiva creates, sustains, destroys, and survives the destruction. All other gods are created by him, and act as his servants to execute his orders. Even the Vedas owe their authority to him. Those who worship Śiva cannot be harmed; they either reach final liberation or are reborn as kings. Merely meeting them or

<sup>379</sup> The ĀnSS and Vaṅgavāsī editions are practically identical. For a discussion of the mss., see HAZRA Saura<sup>o</sup> 1943–44: 103 n. 1.

<sup>380</sup> Cf. chapter colophons in the editions: *iti śrībrahmapurāṇopapurāṇe śrīsaure ... adhyāyah*.

<sup>381</sup> See JAHN Saura<sup>o</sup> 1908: ix, xiv, and, again, JAHN 1916: 308. Also HAZRA 1963: 493.

<sup>382</sup> *Katham bhagavatā pūrvam ādityenātmārūpiṇā / purāṇam kathitam sauram tan no vaktum ihārhasi.*

conversing with them is a meritorious act. In a number of passages Śīva is identified with the sun; sometimes the sun recommends Śīva worship, or it is said that the sun destroys at the end of short periods, whereas Śīva destroys of the end of Brahmā's life. The purāṇa praises Banaras and describes its various holy places and Śīva *līngas*; it contains a version of the Purūravas-Urvaśī story, and deals with the purāṇas, donations, *vratas*, *pāśūpatayoga*, Devī worship, etc.

Chapters 38–40<sup>383</sup> contain the well known attack on Madhva. In the usual form of a prophecy we are told that Madhuśarman of Āndhra will become a student of the *advaita* teacher Padmapāduka. On account of his violating the rules of *dharmaśāstra*, Madhu will be cursed by his teacher to know the *pūrvapakṣa* view only. He will write a commentary on the Bādarāyaṇa *sūtras* along these lines, and, by doing so, he will pollute Karnāṭa, Talaṅga, and other countries.

Chapters such as these would be helpful to date the purāṇa, were it not that they do not appear in all manuscripts,<sup>384</sup> and, therefore, may well be a later interpolation.<sup>385</sup> The fact that the Saurā° has been quoted by Hemādri has been used in support of this view.

A Saurā°, different from the extant one, is presumed to have existed, but it is now lost.<sup>386</sup>

### *Sauradharmā° and Sauradharmottara°*

LIT.: HARZA 1954: 35; – HAZRA 1958: 347–349 [lost Saura upa°].

The Sauradharmā° is not mentioned in the lists of upapurāṇas, but the title occurs in the Bhaviṣya° (1.4.89; 1.216.37), and many quotations from it are found in the *dharma* literature; on the basis of this latter evidence the text should have been composed before A. D. 800.

A few verses are attributed, in the *dharmanibandhas*, to a Sauradharmottara°; the dates of these quotations suggest that the text was older than A. D. 900.

<sup>383</sup> JAHN Saurā° 1908: 90–106. See also *I.3.1*.

<sup>384</sup> See ĀnSS ed., note on p. 125; also EGGELING 1899: 1188.

<sup>385</sup> Dates proposed for the Saurā° generally do not take these chapters into consideration. E. g., JAHN (Saurā° 1908: xiv); before A. D. 1200; HAZRA (Saurā° 1943–44): between A. D. 950 and 1050; WINTERNITZ (1963): before A. D. 1230–1250. KRISHNAMURTI (Saurā° 1931–32), after an emotional defense of Madhva against this unwarranted attack, says that “the entire account is the interpolation of an ignorant and incorrigible Pandit” (p. 65). BARTH (Saurā° 1896) stands alone in not believing in an interpolation, even though he does not have a high opinion of the chapters: “Comme source d'information, cette haineuse satire est nulle. Les objections de doctrine sont en grande partie fauses ou de simples lieux communs” (p. 15); “Le seul intérêt que présentent ces morceaux vient de la rareté, dans les Purāṇas, de factums semblables, s'attaquant aussi directement a des faits modernes, et aussi de l'apreté sectaire qu'elles respirent” (p. 16).

<sup>386</sup> HAZRA Saurā° 1943–44: 123.

## Śiva°

ED.: Bombay: Gaṇapatikṛṣṇāji's Press, 1806 (1884); – + Hindi tr., Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1895–96, 1906, 1965; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1314 (1908); – Kāśī: Paṇḍitapustakālaya, 2020 (1963); – + Hindi tr., Bareilly: Saṃskṛti Saṃsthāna, 1966 [abridged].

TR.: A Board of Scholars, [AITM 1–4,] Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969–70 [based on the ed. by the Paṇḍitapustakālaya, which follows, with emendations, the Veṅk. ed. of 1906].

LIT.: HAZRA: The Problems Relating to the Śiva-Purāṇa, OH 1, 1953, 46–68; – KANE 1962: 910–911; – Vināyaka PARĀMJAPE: Śivapurāṇe keśāmcit pāthānām vicārah, Pur 5, 1963, 114–121; – GONDA 1963: 202–203; – B.G. TAMASKAR: Life of the People as Depicted in the Maha Siva Purana, QJMS n.s. 58, 1967–68, 81–94; – V.S. AGRAWALA: Shaṭ-kuliyāh, Pur 2, 1960, 23–42; – B. PATNI: Śiva Purāṇa. A Poetic Analysis, Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1980.

On the place of the Śiva° in the list of eighteen mahāpurāṇas, see 1.3.3.

According to a passage in the first chapters of its Vidyēśvarasamhitā and Vāyaviyasamhitā the original Śiva° consisted of twelve parts, called *saṃhitās*. The printed editions – plus the translation in AITM – contain either six or seven *saṃhitās*, with different titles and different arrangements; two of their *saṃhitās* are not even listed in the Śiva° passages.<sup>387</sup> The following is a comparative survey of the *saṃhitās*, in the two passages of the Śiva° itself, and in the two sets of editions – which from now on I will refer to as class A and class B editions.

Śiva°	Class A Bombay 1884 Veṅkaṭ. 1895–96 Vaṅga.	Class B Veṅkaṭ. 1906, 1965 Paṇḍitapustakālaya Tr. AITM
I. Vidyēśvara	XIII. Jñāna ch. 78	Vidyēśvara/ ch. 25
II. Raudra	Vidyēśvara 25	Vighneśa
III. Vaināyaka	(Vaṅga 16)	Rudra 197
IV. Bhauma/Auma	Kailāsa 12	Śatarudra 42
V. Mātr(purāṇa)	XIV. Sanatkumāra 59	Koṭirudra 43
VI. Rudraikādaśa	Vāyu/Vāyaviya	Umā/Auma 51
VII. Kailāsa	pūrvabhāga 30	Kailāsa 23
VIII. Śatarudra	uttarabhāga 30	Vāyaviya
IX. Koṭirudra	Dharma 65	pūrvabhāga 35
X. Sahasrakoṭirudra		uttarabhāga 41
XI. Vāyaviya		
XII. Dharma(purāṇa)		

It is clear from all this that the Śiva° is one of the more composite and unwieldy purāṇas, sections of which “were written by different hands in different climes

<sup>387</sup> HAZRA Śiva° 1953: 51–52. Cf. HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: 277, no. 3546.

and ages;" it is also evident that "there were different traditions regarding the text of the Śiva-purāṇa."<sup>388</sup> Hazra, who did not include the Śiva° in his volume on the mahāpurāṇas, later published an extensive and comparative study of the various *saṃhitās*, which is repeatedly referred to in these pages. He came to the conclusion that the *saṃhitās* contained in the class A editions were generally the older ones, and that all other sections, manuscripts of which are rare, and the contents of which largely depend on the earlier *saṃhitās* as well as on other purāṇas, are more recent. In view of the great disparity between the two sets of editions, I will follow the order of the *saṃhitās* as set forth in the purāṇa itself.

I. The Vidyēśvarasaṃhitā,<sup>389</sup> occasionally called Vighneśasaṃhitā or Vidyā-sārasaṃhitā in the manuscripts, appears in both classes of editions. Except for the Vaṅgavāsī edition, which has sixteen chapters, it uniformly consists of twenty-five *adhyāyas*. The *sūta* visits the sages at Prayāga, and, in answer to their question how to eradicate the terrible evils of the Kali age, promises to teach them the Śiva°, which was first expounded by Śiva and later condensed by Vyāsa, his devotee. The Vidyēśvarasaṃhitā, which is remarkably free of myths and legends, is entirely devoted to the greatness and worship of Śiva. One striking feature is the prominence of the *liṅga*, the praise and ways of worship of which permeate the entire *saṃhitā*. As long as a *liṅga* is installed, even in the absence of an idol of Śiva, Śiva himself is present; conversely, a place which has no *liṅga* is not a place of Śiva worship. While accepting the authority of the Tantras and Āgamas, the text repeatedly quotes Vedic *mantras* and claims a close connection with the Veda generally: it "was born from the essence of the Vedas" (*vedasāra-ja*), it "entirely represents the essence of the Vedānta" (*vedāntasārasarvasva*), etc. Hazra therefore considered it to be "a work of those followers of Āgamic Śaivism who had high regard for everything Vedic." He proposes a tentative date "after 950 A. D.," but refuses to locate the *saṃhitā* in any specific area of India, since the names of rivers in the text are evenly spread over Northern and Southern India.

II. The Rudrasaṃhitā,<sup>390</sup> which is missing in the class A editions, is about six times as long as the Vidyēśvaraṣaṃhitā; it consists of five separate *khaṇḍas*.

The Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa (twenty chapters) has a number of verses, and even chapters, in common with — in Hazra's opinion: borrows chapters and verses from — the Jñānasaṃhitā. Śiva is described both as *paramātmān* and *paramabrahma*. As Śiva he is *nirguṇa*, but in his *saguṇa* form he manifests himself in a threefold way: Brahmā the creator, Viṣṇu the sustainer, and Maheśa or Rudra the annihilator. Viṣṇu is a devotee of Śiva, and does everything according to Śiva's wish. Only he who always seeks refuge in Śiva is a true follower of the Vedas. Also, Śiva worship is the sole way to bring the *saṃsāra* to an end.

<sup>388</sup> HAZRA: *ibid.*, p. 67.

<sup>389</sup> For a list of mss., *ibid.*, p. 56, n. 56.

<sup>390</sup> For mss., *ibid.*, p. 65, n. 84.

The second *khaṇḍa*, the Satīkhaṇḍa (forty-three chapters), borrows, according to Hazra, from the Kālikā° and from the Liṅga°. It tells the story of Satī, her birth, her marriage to Śiva, and their amorous sporting on the Himālayas. This leads to the story of Dakṣa's sacrifice, Satī's self-immolation, and the destruction of the sacrifice and death of Dakṣa at the hands of Vīrabhadra. The *khaṇḍa* ends with Śiva's conciliation by the gods, as a result of which he brings Dakṣa back to life, with the head of a goat, and orders that the sacrifice be completed.

The Pārvatīkhaṇḍa (fifty-five chapters) begins with the story of the marriage of Menā, or Menakā, to Himavat, and the birth to them of a daughter, Pārvatī. It deals with Tāraka and his harassment of the gods, Kāma's destruction by Śiva, etc., to end with the wedding of Pārvatī, and Śiva's return to Kailāsa. Hazra noticed borrowings from the Jñānasamhitā, as well as from the Kālikā°.

The Kumārakhaṇḍa (twenty chapters) deals with the birth and exploits of Skanda/Kārttikeya, especially his role in the battle with Tāraka. Although called Kumārakhaṇḍa, more than one third of this section is devoted to Gaṇeśa, his birth from Pārvatī, his battle with the *gaṇas*, the loss of his head and its being replaced with that of an elephant, and his marriage to Siddhi and Buddhi. Here again Hazra found borrowings from the Jñānasamhitā.

The fifth and last *khaṇḍa* of the Rudrasamhitā, the Yuddhakhaṇḍa (fifty-nine chapters) tells the story of the Tripuras, the Three Cities, from the time of their creation, when Tāraka's sons, Tārakākṣa, Vidyumālī, and Kamalākṣa, obtained them from Brahmā as a boon for intensive penance, up to their destruction by Śiva. The text also devotes several chapters to the story of Jalandhara, from his birth up to his death at the hands of Śiva; to the life story of the Dānava Śaṅkha-cūḍa until he was reduced to ashes – and revived – by Śiva; etc. In this case Hazra mentions borrowings from the Jñānasamhitā and Dharmasamhitā, as well as from the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Padma° and the Prakṛtikhaṇḍa of the Brahmavaivarta°.

III. The Vaināyakasamhitā, which appears in the two lists of *samhitās* in the Śiva°, is missing in all editions and – as far as I can see – manuscripts.

IV. The Bhaumasamhitā,<sup>391</sup> also called Auma/Umāsamhitā, is represented in the class B editions only. The text introduces Kṛṣṇa on a visit to Kailāsa and performing penance there to Śiva, in order to obtain a son. He meets Upamanyu, and requests him to tell him about the greatness of Śiva. Upamanyu complies, and praises Śiva and his trident; he extols Śiva's power to save his devotees from hell. This discussion leads into several chapters on different types of sins, and on the description of hell and the suffering in it. Ways to avoid this suffering include gifts of food, performing penance, listening to the purāṇas, etc. The *samhitā* subsequently describes the seven *dvīpas* of the earth, and other component parts of the universe. It ends with discourses on a variety of topics, such as the develop-

<sup>391</sup> Mss., *ibid.*, p. 65, n. 87.

ment of man, from the foetus, through childhood, youth, marriage, old age, etc.; creation and *manvantaras*; etc. In Hazra's opinion the text borrows most of its chapters from the *Jñānasamhitā*.

V. The *Māṭṛ-* or *Māṭṛpurāṇasamhitā* of the Śiva° lists is unknown to the Śiva° editions.

VI. The *Rudraikādaśasamhitā* is known from manuscripts only. Rājendralāla Mitra<sup>392</sup> considered it to be the *uttarabhāga* of the *Rudrasamhitā*. The text, in seventy-six or seventy-three chapters, deals with the creation, the story of Tāra-ka, the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī, the destruction of the three demon cities, Śiva worship, Gaṇeśa's battle with Śiva's *gaṇas*, his wedding, the phallic emblems of Śiva, Arjuna's austerities during the Śivarātri, mokṣa, etc.<sup>393</sup>

VII. A. *Kailāśasamhitā*<sup>394</sup> appears in all editions, be it with different length in each class. The text mainly treats of world renunciation and the regular duties of the *saṃnyāsin*, including the drawing of *yantras*, *nyāsa*, Śiva worship, etc. It concludes with the rites to be performed during the twelve days following the death of the ascetic. This *saṃhitā* is especially strongly sectarian; it also incorporates *śākta* elements to a higher degree than many other *saṃhitās*. Since Śiva is occasionally referred to with the name Subrahmaṇya and because of a reference to Kanyākumārī, the text probably originated in South India. Hazra considers it to be a product of the puranic *Vīraśaivas*, written not earlier than A. D. 950.

VIII. In the *Śatarudrasamhitā*,<sup>395</sup> which appears in the class B editions only, the *sūta* reports to Śaunaka a conversation in which Nandīśvara, himself a form of Śiva, instructs Sanatkumāra on the hundred incarnations of Śiva, in different *kalpas*, *manvantaras*, and *yugas*. According to Hazra the *Śatarudrasamhitā* is dependent on the *Jñānasamhitā* and *Vāyavīyasamhitā*, as well as on the *Liṅga°*.

IX. Even as the *Śatarudrasamhitā*, the *Koṭirudrasamhitā*<sup>396</sup> is represented in the class B editions only. In this *saṃhitā* the *sūta* complies with the request of the sages to supplement his exposition on Śiva's incarnations with a description of "the divine phallic emblems of the great Lord, both in many places on earth and in any other places glorified by men." In addition to a number of *upalīṅgas*, the text deals extensively with the twelve *jyotirlingas*: Somanātha, Mallikārjuna, Mahākāla, Oṃkeśvara, Kedāreśvara, Bhīmeśvara, Viśveśvara, Tryambakeśvara, Vaidyanātheśvara, Nāgeśvara, Rāmeśvara, and Ghuśmeśvara. Near the end the *Koṭirudrasamhitā* has a *Śivasahasranāma*, and devotes a few chapters to the Śivarātri. Here again, many chapters are said to have been taken from the *Jñānasamhitā*. In Hazra's opinion neither the *Rudrasamhitā*, nor the *Śataru-*

<sup>392</sup> Notices 1 (1871), pp. 66–67, no. 123.

<sup>393</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cxiv and 254–257, no. 3533.

<sup>394</sup> Mss., HAZRA Śiva° 1953: 58, n. 64.

<sup>395</sup> Mss., *ibid.*, p. 65, n. 85.

<sup>396</sup> Mss., *ibid.*, p. 65, n. 86.

drasamhitā, nor the Koṭīrudrasamhitā can be earlier than the fourteenth century A. D.

X. The Sahasrakoṭīsamhitā of the Śiva° lists of *samhitās* does not appear in the editions, nor have I seen any references to it in manuscript catalogues.

XI. The Vāyaviyasaṃhitā<sup>397</sup> is represented in both classes of editions; it is uniformly divided into a *pūrvabhāga* and an *uttarabhāga* – sometimes called *uparibhāga* –, but both parts have different lengths in the two classes of editions.

In the first part Vāyu, disciple of Brahmā and an expert in the Śaivāgama, instructs the sages in the Naimiṣa forest on the greatness of Śiva. Śiva is the great Puruṣa; he is Paśupati, i. e. the one who releases the *paśu* from their *pāśas*. He is the only one who exists beyond time; he created everything else, including Brahmā to whom he taught the Vedas. Māyā is said to be his *śakti*. Although other ways of worship are not excluded, some passages in the text state clearly that Śiva can only be realized through *bhakti*. The *pūrvabhāga* devotes several chapters to the description of world creation, it tells the story of Dakṣa, deals with the *pāśupatavrata*, and ends with the story of Upamanyu, the son of Vyāghrapāda.

The second part opens with the story of how Kṛṣṇa gained the *pāśupata* knowledge from Upamanyu, and obtained a son, Sāmba, by doing penance to “Śiva together with Ambā.” At the sages’ request Vāyu reports to them on the dialogue between Kṛṣṇa and Upamanyu, so that throughout the *uttarabhāga* the latter becomes the teacher, the former the questioner. Initially one shall worship Śiva by means of *karmayajña*; after that one shall resort to *jñānayajña*; ultimately, permanent practice of *yoga* allows the devotee to attain *sāyujya* with Śiva. This text, even as some other sections of the Śiva°, stresses the importance of *bhakti*: one who has mastered the four Vedas is not dearer to Śiva than a Cāṇḍāla who is devoted to him. It extols the *mantra* “*om namaḥ Śivāya*,” which encompasses the Vedas and *śāstras* along with their auxiliaries. Several chapters are devoted to the consecration of a disciple, and the various *nitya*, *naimittika*, and *kāmya* rites to be performed by one who has been initiated. All benefits to be derived from these rites can, however, be reached immediately, merely by installing a *linga* or an image of Śiva.

Hazra concluded that the Vāyaviyasaṃhitā seems to have been composed in South India, somewhere between A. D. 800 and 1000.

XII. The twelfth and last *samhitā* in the Śiva° passages, the Dharmasaṃhitā,<sup>398</sup> appears in the class A editions only. Even though the text holds the Śaivāgama in high regard, praises the *mahāpāśupatavrata*, and advocates *nyāsa* and *mudrās* as integral parts of Śiva worship, it also speaks highly of the *paurāṇadharmā*. It refers to five *mahāyajñas*: *karmayajña*, *tapoyajña*, *svādhyāyayajña*, *dhyanayajña*, and *jñānayajña*. It recommends the last one as the best, but also stresses the

<sup>397</sup> Mss., *ibid.*, p. 61, n. 76.

<sup>398</sup> Mss., *ibid.*, p. 63, n. 81.

importance of *karmayajña* which constitutes the first step on the way up to the realization of Śiva-Brahma. Hazra considers it to be a work of the Māheśvaras, and establishes A. D. 900 as the *terminus post quem* for its composition. There is a commentary on the Dharmasaṃhitā, by Gaṅgādhara, who vigorously defends the Śiva° as being a true *mahāpurāṇa*.<sup>399</sup>

Whereas the class B editions include only, though not all, the *saṃhitās* listed in the Śiva° passages mentioned earlier, the class A editions also comprise two *saṃhitās* which are absent from these Śiva° passages.

XIII. The Jñānasaṃhitā<sup>400</sup> has already been referred to on several occasions in this description of the Śiva°, because, in Hazra's opinion, other *saṃhitās* borrowed verses and even chapters from it. The text recognizes the Vedas as the highest authority, but it was Śiva, as *ṛgyajuḥsāmarūpin*, who communicated them to Viṣṇu. Śiva shall be worshiped with Vedic *mantras*, even though the *saṃhitā* does not, therefore, reject the authority of the Tantras and eventual Śiva worship with Āgamic rather than Vedic *mantras*. The *nirguṇa* Śiva is identical with the *parabrahma*; in his *saguṇa* form he manifests himself as Rudra. Prakṛti was born from Śiva's wish, and, from her, were born the other gods including Brahmā and Viṣṇu. This *saṃhitā*, like some of those discussed earlier, strongly encourages *liṅga* worship as the ideal way to worship Śiva himself. It urges worship under the guidance of a competent teacher; worship will lead to *bhakti*, then to *jñāna*, and, ultimately, to *vijñāna*, i. e. the realization that the only real thing is Śiva. Hazra points out that the text was influenced by the Kumārasambhava, Raghuvamśa, and Kirātārjunīya. He surmises that it may have been composed in Banaras, by someone who was also familiar with the banks of the Narmadā, not before A. D. 950.

XIV. The other *saṃhitā* of the class A editions which does not appear in the Śiva° passages is the Sanatkumārasaṃhitā.<sup>401</sup> It too, stresses the importance of *bhakti*, often to Śiva as Paśupati; the text repeatedly refers to the *pāśupatavrata* and *pāśupatayoga*. It has a number of verses in common with the Liṅga°. Since the Sanatkumārasaṃhitā is remarkably free of Tantric influence, Hazra suggests that it may well be the oldest *saṃhitā*. He dates it in the eighth century, and locates it in Bengal.

(XV.) A Mānavisaṃhitā<sup>402</sup> claims to be part of the Śiva°. In it Manu questions his father, Vivasvat, on which deity creates and upholds the world, and grants liberation from birth and death. He also inquires about *vratas*, *varṇas* and *āśramas*, *śrāddha*, *prāyaścitta*, etc.

Some Bengal manuscripts present a very different Śiva°, in two *khaṇḍas*

<sup>399</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: cxvi–cxvii.

<sup>400</sup> Mss., HAZRA Śiva° 1953: 52, n. 40.

<sup>401</sup> Mss., *ibid.*, p. 59, n. 69.

<sup>402</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: 268–270, no. 3542.

only.<sup>403</sup> The *pūrvakhaṇḍa* (52 to 57 chapters), corresponds to a large extent with the Sanatkumārasaṃhitā. The *uttarakhaṇḍa* (36 chapters), a Pāśupata work recognizing the authority of the Śaivāgamas, establishes the absolute superiority of Śaivism, to the extent of imposing a Śaiva stamp on as typically a Vaiṣṇava *tīrtha* as Puruṣottamaḥsetra. Hazra, who noticed a general partiality in the text toward the sacred places of Orissa, in particular Ekāmraavana, dated this Śiva° in the twelfth century.

### Śivadharmā°

LIT.: HAZRA: The Śiva-dharma, JGJRI 10, 1952–53, 1–20 [contents, by chapter, 3–12].

The unpublished Śivadharmā°, in twelve chapters, “deals exclusively with the religious rites and duties of Śiva-worshippers.” It calls itself a *śāstra* or *dharmaśāstra*; it was originally not meant to be a puranic work, but was taken to be one well before A. D. 1000. It may have been composed, somewhere between A. D. 200 and 500, either in Southern Kashmir or Northern Punjab.

### Skanda°

ED.: Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1867 (1910), including Rāmānanda’s comm. for the Kāśikhaṇḍa; – + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1318 (1911); – Gurumaṇḍala Series 20, Calcutta: Manasukharāya Mora, 1960– [I have seen vols. 1–5 only].

GEN. LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlii–xlii; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 53–55; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 476–477, 1963: 500–502; – HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: clxviii–clxxx; – C. V. VAIDYA: Early Indian History with Correct Dates Found in Skanda Purāṇa, AIOC 7 (1933), 575–582; – HAZRA 1940: 157–166; – KANE 1962: 911–912; – A. B. L. AWASTHI: Studies in Skanda Purāṇa, Lucknow: Kailash Prakashan, 1965; – id.: Skanda Purana on the Dvipantara Trade, Quart. Rev. of Hist. Stud. 5, 1965–66, 206–207; Umakant THAKUR: The Holy Places of East India as Depicted in the Skanda-purāṇa, Pur 14, 1972, 40–57; – id.: The Holy Places of North India as Mentioned in the Skanda-purāṇa, Pur 15, 1973, 93–120, 201–222; – Sudha SAHAI: Pratyabhijñā Philosophy – As propounded by the Skanda Purāṇa, Pur 16, 1974, 139–142; – id.: Śaiva Sects as Found in the Skanda Purāṇa, ABORI 57, 1976, 188–191; – Umakant THAKUR: The Holy Places of West India as Mentioned in the Skanda Purāṇa, Pur 18, 1976, 162–196; 19, 1977, 41–80; – id.: The Holy Places of South India as Depicted in the Skanda Purāṇa, Pur 19, 1977, 305–320; – Savitri V. KUMAR: Paurāṇic Lore of Holy Water-Places with Special References to Skanda Purāṇa, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983.

The Skanda° “is the most extensive of all the Purāṇas and poses perplexing problems.”<sup>404</sup> The scholarly literature unanimously considers it not as a single, coherent text, but “only a name to which extensive works, said to be the Saṃhitās

<sup>403</sup> Mss., HAZRA Śiva° 1953; WILSON 1840 = 1961: liv also described a Śiva° in two parts.

<sup>404</sup> KANE 1962: 911.

or the Khaṇḍas of the original Purāṇa, and numerous Māhātmyas claim allegiance."<sup>405</sup> In the editions the composition of the Skanda° is as follows:<sup>406</sup>

I. Māheśvara-khaṇḍa	1. Kedāra-khaṇḍa	<i>adhyāyas</i>	35
	2. Kumārikā-kh.		66
	3. Aruṇācala-māhātmya pūrvārdha uttarārdha		13 24
II. Vaiṣṇava-kh.	1. Veṅkaṭācala-m.		40
	2. Puruṣottamakṣetra-m. (Veṅk.) Utkala-kh. (Vaṅga, Gur.)		49/57/60
	3. Badarikāśrama-m.		8
	4. Kārttikamāsa-m.		36
	5. Mārgaśīrṣamāsa-m.		17
	6. Bhāgavata-m.		4
	7. Vaiśākhamāsa-m.		25
	8. Ayodhyā-m.		10
	9. Vāsudeva-m.		32/ – /32
III. Brāhma-kh.	1. Setu-m.		52
	2. Dharmāraṇya-kh.		40
	3. Cāturmāsya-m.		– / – /32
	4. (Brahma)uttara-kh.		22
IV. Kāśī-kh.	1. Pūrvārdha		50
	2. Uttarārdha		50 (ch. 51–100)
V. Āvantya-kh.	1. Avantikṣetra-m.		71/71/83
	2. Caturaśītiliṅga-m.		84
	3. Revā-kh.		232/236/236
VI. Nāgara-kh.			279
VII. Prabhāsa-kh.	1. Prabhāsakṣetra-m.		365
	2. Vastrāpathagīranārakṣetra-m. (Veṅk.) Vastrāpathakṣetra-m. (Vaṅga)		19
	3. Arbuda-kh.		63
	4. Dvārakā-m.		44
Total <i>adhyāyas</i> :			1968/1710/?

The Māheśvarakhaṇḍa (I),<sup>407</sup> in three sections, deals with the holy places of north, west, and south India.

<sup>405</sup> MEHENDALE 1970: 294. Cf. WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlv; JAHN 1916: 309; CC 739–743. According to BURNELL (1880: 193), "Like most of what passes for the Brahmāṇḍa and Padma, the Purāṇa has always been much suspected by the best Paṇḍits."

<sup>406</sup> Where different numbers of *adhyāyas* are given, the first figure refers to the Veṅkaṭeśvara ed., the second to the Vaṅgavāsī, the third to the Gurumaṇḍala (vols. I–V only).

<sup>407</sup> MARIO VALLAURI: Sommari dello Skandapurāṇa, GSAI n. s. 3, 1934–35, 5–51 [detailed summary and index of proper names].

North India is represented by a *māhātmya* of Kedarnath, “the highest . . . and coldest of the holy places.”<sup>408</sup> The Kedārakhaṇḍa (I.1) begins with the destruction of Dakṣa’s sacrifice. It devotes several chapters to the churning of the ocean, and proceeds to describe the birth and activities of Pārvatī, up to her marriage with Śiva. The description of Kārttikeya’s birth is followed by that of his successful fight with the demon Tāraka. The *khaṇḍa* ends with the story in which Śiva loses everything to Pārvatī in a game of dice, their temporary separation, and their reunion.

The Kumārikākhaṇḍa (I.2)<sup>409</sup> is a *māhātmya* of the area of Mahīśāgarasaṃgamatīrtha, the sole extant puranic record of the region around Cambay. The text has been dated in the seventeenth century.<sup>410</sup>

The third section of the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa is called Aruṇācalamāhātmya (I.3).<sup>411</sup> Aruṇācala, which rises above the city of Tiruvannamalai, and became well-known in modern times because Ramana Maharishi lived and died there, is the peak at the top of which Śiva appeared in the form of a flame of light to indicate to Pārvatī, who was doing penance, that she was forgiven for having plunged the world in darkness by putting her hands over Śiva’s eyes. The Aruṇācalamāhātmya which claims to belong to the Līṅga<sup>412</sup> seems to correspond, in part at least, with this section of the Skanda°.

The first part of the Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa (II)<sup>413</sup> is the Veṅkaṭācalamāhātmya (II.1), a *māhātmya* of Veṅkaṭādri, also called Śeṣācala or Śeṣādri, the present Tirumalai mountain near Tirupati.

This is followed by the Puruṣottamakṣetramāhātmya, also called Utkalakhaṇḍa (II.2).<sup>414</sup> Puruṣottamakṣetra<sup>415</sup> being the ancient name of Puri, large sections

<sup>408</sup> John D. PLOTT: *Bhakti at the Crossroads*, New York: Carlton Press, 1971, p. 85.

<sup>409</sup> V.M. BEDEKAR: *The Legend of Cirakārin in the Skanda Mahāpurāṇa and the Mahābhārata (A Comparative Study)*, Pur 4, 1962, 197–214 [ch. 6]; – D. C. SIRCAR: *Mahīśāgara-saṅgama*, Pur 5, 1963, 352–354 [note on the preceding]; – R. N. MEHTA: *Kaumārikā-khaṇḍa. A Study*, JUBar 14, 1965, 39–48; – R. N. MEHTA and S. G. KANTAWALA: *Two Legends from the Skandapurāṇa. A Study*, Pur 15, 1973, 124–132 [ch. 39].

<sup>410</sup> MEHTA: *op. cit.* 1965, p. 45.

<sup>411</sup> Sashibhusan CHOUDHURI: *On the Identification of Śoṅācala and Aruṇācala in the Skandapurāṇa*, IHQ 4, 1928, 751–759.

<sup>412</sup> P. P. S. SASTRI: *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji’s Sarasvatī Mahāl Library Tanjore*, vol. 15, Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press, 1932, pp. 6952–6954, no. 10125.

<sup>413</sup> Mario VALLAURI: *Sommari dello Skandapurāṇa*, GSAI n. s. 3, 1934–35, 153–203 and 257–289 [detailed summary and index of proper names].

<sup>414</sup> Binayak MISRA: *Folklore and Purāṇic Tradition about the Origin of God Jagannātha*, IHQ 13, 1937, 600–609; – SŪRYA KĀNTA: *Markandeya and the Flood Legend in the Skanda-Purāṇa*, BhV 10, 1949, 301–329 [ch. 3]; – K. M. MAHAPATRA: *Puranic Literature of Orissa*, OHRJ 11, 1962–63, 21–31; – G. C. TRIPATHI: *Das “Navakalevara”-Ritual im Jagannātha-Tempel von Puri*, 18. Deutscher Orientalistentag (Lübeck 1972) 1974, 410–418; – Ruprecht GEIB: *Indradyumna-Legende. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des*

of this text are important for the study of the origin of the cult of Jagannātha and the related legend of the Mālava king Indradyumna who moved to Orissa and built a temple there for Kṛṣṇa Puruṣottama. On the basis of a comparison of the text with folkloristic traditions about Puri, Misra suggests that it may have been incorporated in the Skanda° before the time of the supremacy of the Gaṅgas in Orissa, possibly in the eleventh century A. D. Mohapatra concludes that the text was composed about A. D. 700.<sup>416</sup>

The Badarikāśramamāhātmya (II.3) is the *māhātmya* of present-day Badrinath, in the Himālayas. Not unlike other sites in other sections of the Skanda°, Badarikāśrama is said to be superior to any other *tīrtha* on earth.

The Kārttikamāsamāhātmya (II.4), in which Brahmā instructs Nārada, and the Mārgasīrṣamāsamāhātmya (II.5) in which Viṣṇu addresses Brahmā, explain and praise the various rites to be performed in the course of these months. The latter text ends with a eulogy of Mathurā, the most sacred of *tīrthas*.

The Bhāgavatamāhātmya (II.6) tells the story of Vajra and Parīkṣit repopulating Mathurā and their listening to the recitation of the Bhāgavata°. The Bhāgavatamāhātmya of the Padma° is printed at the beginning of many Bhāgavata° editions, rather than the one belonging to the Skanda°.

The final sections of the Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa include the Vaiśākhamāsamāhātmya (II.7) dealing with the religious ceremonies to be performed in honor of Viṣṇu in the month of Vaiśākha, the Ayodhyāmāhātmya (II.8) which describes numerous *tīrthas* in the region of Ayodhyā, and the Vāsudevamāhātmya (II.9) which is one of the few sections which is not included in the description of the Skanda° in the Nārada°; it deals, among other things, with the churning of the ocean, the description of the earth, the *dharma* of *varṇas* and *āśramas*, etc.

The first section of the Brāhmakhaṇḍa (III),<sup>417</sup> the Setumāhātmya (III.1), treats of the sacred places and principal shrines of Setubandha or Rāmasetu, i. e. modern Adam's Bridge. Chapter fifteen contains the story of king Dharmasakha who, like king Somaka of the Mahābhārata, had one hundred sons – rather than a single son –, a situation which is disturbing to royal parents. According to Bedekar the Mahābhārata story is the older one, which was later adapted in the Skanda°.<sup>418</sup>

---

Jagannātha-Kultes, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975; – Gopinath MOHAPATRA: The Land of Viṣṇu. A Study on Jagannātha Cult, Delhi: B. R. Publ. Corp., 1979 [includes a transl. of the *māhātmya*, pp. 227–492].

<sup>415</sup> Cf. Sashibhusan CHAUDHURI: Topography in the Purāṇas. Puruṣottamakṣetra, IHQ 5, 1929, 659–665.

<sup>416</sup> MOHAPATRA: op. cit. 1979, p. 211.

<sup>417</sup> MARIO VALLAURI: Sommari del "Skandapurāṇa." II "Brahmiakhaṇḍa," Aevum 12, 1938, 369–410 [detailed summary of III.1 and III.2 and index of proper names].

<sup>418</sup> V. M. BEDEKAR: The Story of Somaka in the Mahābhārata (3.127–128) and Its Metamorphosis in the Skanda Mahāpurāṇa (3.1.15), Pur 10, 1968, 17–26.

In the Dharmāraṇyamāhātmya (III.2) legends relating to the Dharmāraṇyakṣetra, the identification of which is still disputed,<sup>419</sup> alternate with chapters on *sadācāra*, the *dharma* of the *pativrata* and *vidhavā*, etc. Five chapters at the end contain the story of king Ama's son, Kumārapāla, who converted to Jainism and was punished for denying brahmans their earlier privileges.<sup>420</sup>

The Cāturmāsya-māhātmya (III.3) does not appear in the Venkaṭeśvara and Vaṅgavāsī editions of the Skanda°. It is included, though, in the description of the Skanda° in the Nārada° (1. ch. 104.62–68), and published in the Gurumaṅḍala edition.<sup>421</sup> The text deals with the special *vratas* to be observed during the four months of the rainy season.

The first chapter of the Brahmottarakhaṇḍa – also called Uttarakhaṇḍa – (III.4)<sup>422</sup> sets the tone for the entire section: when Śaunaka and the other sages in the Naimiṣa forest request Lomahaṛṣaṇa to instruct them on the supreme power of Śiva, he starts by telling them about the greatness of the *pañcākṣaramantra*. All other chapters, like the first, are filled with various stories illustrating the greatness or leading to the glorification of Śiva. They deal with such topics as Gokarṇa, the Śivacaturdaśī, Pradoṣamāhātmya, the stories of Simantini and Bhadrāyus, the *māhātmya* of the sacred ashes, Umāmaheśvaravrata, the greatness of Rudrākṣa and the Rudrādhyāya, etc. There is also a Bṛhadbrahmottarakhaṇḍa, in forty-three chapters.<sup>423</sup>

The Kāśīkhaṇḍa (IV)<sup>424</sup> is by far the most popular section of the Skanda°; it has been commented on by Rāmānanda and also by Jayarāma. In addition, it is “the

<sup>419</sup> Cf. NUNDO LAL DEY: The Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediaeval India, 3<sup>d</sup> Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corp., 1971, pp. 56–57.

<sup>420</sup> P. K. AGRAWALA: New Skanda Purana Evidence on King Ama of Kanauj, Quart. Rev. of Hist. Stud. 15, 1975–76, 109–114 [ch. 36–40].

<sup>421</sup> It is also reported to be included in the Navalakiṣora ed., which I have not seen.

<sup>422</sup> ED.: Calcutta: Jagadīśvara Press, 1799 (1877); – Delhi: Jvālāprakāśa Press, 1934 (1877); – Bombay: Bāpū Sadāśiv Śeṭa Hegiṣṭe Śrī Vardhanakara's Press, 1880; – Madras: Ādisarasvatīnilaya Press, 1880. – LIT.: MARIO VALLAURI: Il “brahmottarakhaṇḍa” dello “Skandapurāṇa” tradizionale, GSAI n. s. 2, 1930–34, 300–322 [detailed summary and index of proper names].

<sup>423</sup> AUFRECHT 1864: 73–75, no. 126. BARTH (1879 = 1921: 269 n. 2) refers to fourteen chapters devoted to the Śivalīlāmṛta, a long litany similar to the Viṣṇusahasranāma, in honor of Śiva and Devī, a text which is still widely used and has been translated into several modern Indian languages.

<sup>424</sup> ED.: + C. Rāmānanda + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Kāśīkhaṇḍa Press, 1286–88 (1878–80); – + Hindi C., Lucknow: Navalakiṣora Press, 1907; – + C. Rāmānanda, Benares: Saṃskṛta Press, 1925 (1868); – + C. Rāmānanda + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Bengal Superior Press, 1279 (1872); – + C. Rāmānanda, Bombay: Gaṇapati Kṛṣṇājī's Press, 1803 (1881); – + C. Rāmānanda + Beng. tr. (Pūrvārdha), Calcutta: Varāta Press, 1294 (1886). – LIT.: UMAKANT THAKUR: An Account of Vārāṇasī as Depicted in the Skanda-Purāṇa, Satkari Mookerji vol. (1969), 681–684; – DIANA L. ECK: A Survey of Sanskrit Sources for the Study of Vārāṇasī, Pur 22, 1980, 81–101 at 82–85; – id.: Banaras. City of Light, New York: Knopf, 1982.

most famous and extensive” of all the *māhātmyas* of Vārāṇasī.<sup>425</sup> When Agastya travels south to prevent the Vindhya mountains from obstructing the sun, he tells his wife, Lopamudrā, about the sanctity of the shrines, *liṅgas*, *tīrthas*, etc., in Vārāṇasī. When they, subsequently, meet with Kārttikeya, this creates another opportunity, this time for the latter, and even at greater length – from chapter twenty-five onward – to relate to them all the wondrous things he had been told about Banaras by Śiva and Pārvatī. Especially impressive are the lists in chapters 83–84 (Vīreśvarākhyāna) which enumerate all *tīrthas* along the river, from Asi northward and from Ādikeśvara southward toward Vīreśvara, and in chapter 97 (Kṣetratīrthavarṇana) where the text guides us through the city, from north to south. The *khaṇḍa* also contains a Gaṅgāsahasranāma (29.17–168) which Śiva revealed to Viṣṇu and the recitation of which is said to be superior to any other prayer. Eck dates the final composition of the Kāśikhāṇḍa “after the destruction of many of the city’s temples in 1194.”<sup>426</sup>

The first section of the Āvantiyakhaṇḍa (V), the Avantikṣetramāhātmya (V.1),<sup>427</sup> describes the sacred places in and around the city of Ujjain.<sup>428</sup> As the title indicates, the Caturaśītiliṅgamāhātmya (V.2) deals – in as many chapters – with the legendary history of eighty-four *liṅgas*<sup>429</sup> in the Mahākālavana of the Avanti country. The description is provided by Śiva, at the request of Umā.

The Revā- or Narmadākhaṇḍa (V.3),<sup>430</sup> one of the longest sections of the Skanda°, seems to exist in different versions.<sup>431</sup> This text, which is not described in the Nārada°, relates numerous stories on the origin and religious merits of *tīrthas* and temples along the banks of the Narmadā. The last four chapters, which are not included in the Venkaṭeśvara edition, deal with Satyanārāyaṇa. In some manuscripts the Revākhaṇḍa claims to be part of the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the Vāyu°.<sup>432</sup>

The Nāgarakhaṇḍa (VI)<sup>433</sup> is both a *sthala māhātmya* and a caste purāṇa.

<sup>425</sup> Eck: op. cit. 1982, p. 22; also id.: op. cit. 1980, p. 82.

<sup>426</sup> Eck: op. cit. 1982, p. 347; also id.: op. cit. 1980, pp. 83–84.

<sup>427</sup> A. R. G. TIWARI: Skandapurāṇa’s Viṣṇusahasranāma. A Study, Sri Venk. U. Or. J. 6, 1963, 1–10 [74.74–203]; – R. S. GARG: Skandapurāṇa meṃ varṇita Avantikṣetra, Vina (Indore) 38, 1965, 335–337.

<sup>428</sup> Cf. A. D. PUSALKER: Ujjayinī in the Purāṇas, Vikrama vol. (Ujjain 1948), 463–482.

<sup>429</sup> For a list of the *liṅgas*, see EGGELING 1899: 1324.

<sup>430</sup> Wilhelm JAHN: Die Legende vom Devadāruvana, ZDMG 69, 1915, 529–557; 70, 1916, 301–320 [ch. 86 + tr. Hātakeśvaramāhātmya of VI].

<sup>431</sup> E. g., EGGELING 1899: 1360–1362, no. 3669, as compared to MITRA: Notices 5. 42–47, no. 1745. HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928a: 568–572, no. 3909, even has a Revākhaṇḍa in which “nothing is said of the Narmadā.” It is “a Śaiva work dealing with the achievements of Śiva, Kārttika and their followers” (ibid., p. clxxviii).

<sup>432</sup> Cf. EGGELING 1899: 1302–1304, nos. 3595–3597.

<sup>433</sup> R. N. MEHTA: Nāgarakhaṇḍa. A Study, JUBar 17, 1968, 103–127 [summary, pp. 114–121]; – A. S. GUPTA: Ambuvīcikṛtṃ Sarasvatīstotram, Pur 4, 1962, 1–2.

Geographically it is connected with the Hātakeśvarakṣetra.<sup>434</sup> It is also a caste purāṇa, for it deals with the history and organization of the Nāgaras, i. e. the brahmans and banyas who derive their origin from Vaḍnagara. The language of the text shows influence of Gujarati; on the basis of archeological evidence it has been dated in the seventeenth century.

The first part of the Prabhāsakhaṇḍa (VII), the Prabhāsakṣetramāhātmya (VII.1), deals with the sacred places of Gujarat and Saurashtra. Haraprasad Shastri<sup>435</sup> suggests that the text is especially important for the history of the great shrine of Somanātha which was twice destroyed, for “in some MSS. the first and second restoration may be found described.”

The Vastrāpatha(girināra)kṣetramāhātmya (VII.2)<sup>436</sup> contains a variety of mythological stories told by Śiva to Pārvatī. Prabhāsakṣetra may be the best of all holy places; but Girnar is holier than it by one barley corn. The name Vastrāpatha is explained by the fact that, after leaving Kailāsa on account of a dispute there with Viṣṇu, Śiva cast off his garments (*vastra*) in that place, at the same time abandoning his bodily form and becoming invisible. Later the gods convince Śiva to return to Kailāsa, which he accepts to do on one condition, namely that the gods, together with the Gaṅgā and other rivers, remain in Vastrāpatha. That is the reason why, since that time, Viṣṇu resides permanently on the local Raivata-ka mountain and Pārvatī on the Ujjiyanta.

The text of the Skanda° in the printed editions ends with the Arbudamāhātmya (VII.3) which deals with the holy places on and around the Abu mountains, and the Dvārakāmāhātmya (VII.4) which is spoken by Prahlāda<sup>437</sup> to the sages, and devoted to the holy places at Dvārakā or Dvāravatī, i. e. the place which Kṛṣṇa made into his capital after his flight from Mathurā as a result of the harassment by Jarāsandha, the king of Magadha.

On the one hand, the subdivision of the Skanda° into seven *khaṇḍas* finds support in the detailed description of the purāṇa in the Nārada° (1.ch.104). On the other hand, several texts<sup>438</sup> which claim to belong to the Skanda° provide us, be it with differences in detail, with another subdivision, one into six *saṃhitās* and fifty *khaṇḍas*. The *saṃhitās* are: Sanatkumāra, Sūta, Śāṅkarī or Agastya, Vaiṣṇavī, Brāhmī, and Saura or Saurī. Numerous versions of these *saṃhitās*, more often parts claiming to belong to them, have been preserved, most of them in manuscript form only.

<sup>434</sup> See n. 430.

<sup>435</sup> 1928a: clxxix.

<sup>436</sup> Rāmchandra G. ANGAL: The Girnār Māhātmya, IA 4, 1875, 238–244 [extracts in transl.]; – Hem Chandra RAYCHAUDHURI: A Note on the Vastrāpatha-māhātmya of the Skanda Purāṇa, IHQ 5, 1929, 129–133; – R. N. MEHTA and S. G. KANTAWALA: Two Legends from the Skanda Purāṇa. A Study, Pur 15, 1973, 124–132.

<sup>437</sup> Hence EGGELING (1899: 1356) speaks of the Dvārakāmāhātmya “of the Prahlādasamhitā” of the Skanda°.

<sup>438</sup> See HAZRA 1940: 158–161.

Although there is a short text under the title of Sanatkumārasaṃhitā,<sup>439</sup> the Kālikākhaṇḍa,<sup>440</sup> which claims to belong to it, describes a Sanatkumārasaṃhitā consisting of twenty-five *khaṇḍas* and ten thousand chapters. Besides the Kālikākhaṇḍa which contains, among other things, many legends about and prayers addressed to Śiva, there are several other texts which also claim to belong to the Sanatkumārasaṃhitā, such as the Tulasīmāhātmya “praising the miraculous qualities of the Tulasī plant, and raising it to the rank of a goddess,”<sup>441</sup> the Trisīragirimāhātmya,<sup>442</sup> and the Himavatkhāṇḍa.<sup>443</sup>

One text which claims to belong to the Himavatkhāṇḍa is the Nepālamāhātmya,<sup>444</sup> in thirty *adhyāyas*. It describes the religious situation in Nepal, probably in the thirteenth century, giving information on the names of the holy places, their location, and the activities carried on in them. The last few chapters (27–30) deal with the legend of the origin of the Bṛhatkathā; they tell how Guṇādhya erected the Bhr̥ṅgīśvara *līṅga*, and made a pilgrimage to the holy places of Nepal.<sup>445</sup>

Another text belonging to the Sanatkumārasaṃhitā, which has attracted a certain amount of attention, is the Sahyādrīkhāṇḍa.<sup>446</sup> In da Cunha’s edition,<sup>447</sup>

<sup>439</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1365–1366, no. 3675 in 21 *adhyāyas*.

<sup>440</sup> SHASTRI-GUI 1902: no. 285. To the Kālikākhaṇḍa claims to belong a Kāñcīmāhātmya or Kāñcīsthānamāhātmya, which is the source of the Tamil Kāñcīpurāṇam (R. DESSIGANE, P. Z. PAITABIRAMIN, and J. FILLIOZAT: Les légendes vivaïtes de Kāñcīpuram. Analyses de textes et iconographie, [PIFI 27,] Pondicherry: IFI, 1964, p. vii).

<sup>441</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1367–1368, nos. 3678, 3679.

<sup>442</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1368, no. 3680.

<sup>443</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1383–1385, nos. 3694, 3695 in 185 *adhyāyas*; SHASTRI-GUI 1902: no. 253. Cf. A. S. GUPTA: Paśupatistotram [Eulogy of Paśupati Śiva], Pur 17, 1975, 100–105 [text., tr., and analysis of Himavatkhāṇḍa 82.44–54].

<sup>444</sup> The Nepālamāhātmya was analyzed by LEVI 1905: 201–205. Ed. Helga UEBACH: Das Nepālamāhātmyam des Skandapurāṇam. Legenden um die hinduistischen Heiligtümer Nepals, [Münchener Universitäts-Schriften. Reihe der philosophischen Fakultät 8,] Munich: Wilhelm Funk, 1970. The ed. and tr. do not include: (1) 16.13cd–25.50 which repeat stories told in the Rāmāyaṇa, and (2) ch. 27, 28, 30 which have been treated by Lacôte (see following note).

<sup>445</sup> Félix LACÔTE: Essai sur Guṇādhya et la Bṛhatkathā, Paris: Leroux, 1908. An appendix (pp. 291–304) contains the text of ch. 27–30 (Légende de Guṇādhya); see also pp. 33–36.

<sup>446</sup> ED.: J. Gerson da Cunha: The Sahyādrī-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda-Purāṇa. A Mythological, Historical, and Geographical Account of Western India. First Edition of the Sanskrit Text, with Various Readings, Bombay: Thacker, Vining, 1877. – LT.: V. N. NARASIMMIYENGAR: The Legend of Rishya Śṛṅga, IA 2, 1873, 140–143; – J. E. ABBOTT: Identification of Nagapura in the Konkan, IA 24, 1895, 83; – G. K. ВЕТНАМ: Specimens of Modern Brahmanical Legends. No. I. The Mañjunī Purāṇa, IA 24, 1895, 231–242; No. II. The Vanavāsī-Māhātmya, IA 25, 1896, 33–39, 69–80; – Stephan H. LEVIT: The Sahyādrīkhāṇḍa. Some Problems Concerning a Text-critical Edition of a Purāṇic Text, Pur 19, 1977, 8–40.

<sup>447</sup> On this edition, see IA 7, 1878, 208.

this text consists of two parts: *ādirahasya* and *uttarārḍha*, with sixty-seven and twenty-one chapters, respectively. It comprises a number of local legends relative to the Sahyādri range of mountains, which corresponds to the area of the western Ghats. Attached to the Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa is the Reṇukāmāhātmya, in forty *adhyaḃayas*; intended for the glorification of Paraśurāma's mother, it exhibits a number of elements unknown to other versions of the Paraśurāma legend.<sup>448</sup>

The second *saṃhitā*, the Sūtasamhitā,<sup>449</sup> is unquestionably the most popular one. It consists of four *khaṇḍas*: Śivamāhātmyakhaṇḍa (13 chapters), Jñāna-yogakhaṇḍa (20), Muktikhaṇḍa (9), and Yajñvaibhvakhaṇḍa, divided into two parts: *adhobhāga* and *uparibhāga* (47). The latter contains a Brahmagītā (chapters 1–12) which is nothing more than a recast in *anuṣṭubh* meter of the principal *upaniṣads*, and a Sūtagītā (chapters 13–20) the distinguishing characteristic of which is the stress it lays on Śiva's grace (*prasāda*). The trend of the Sūtasamhitā generally may be called Advaitic, with an important place reserved for the kind of Śiva *bhakti* that appears in the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad. The text claims to be *vedasammita*: there is no authority comparable to that of the Vedas; *smṛti* and *purāṇa* can claim authority only if they are based on the Vedas; *tantras* and *āgamas* are even less independently authoritative. Since the text was commented on by Mādhavācārya, it must be earlier than A. D. 1300.<sup>450</sup> Raghavan places it in the tenth century A. D., in South India, for nearly all Śiva shrines mentioned in the text are located there.

Besides the Hālāsyamāhātmya,<sup>451</sup> on the legendary history and religious merits of Hālāsyakṣetra – a name of Madurai –, the principal text that claims to belong to the third, Śāṅkarī- or Agastya-samhitā, is the Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa, a rather voluminous work divided into seven *kāṇḍas*, some of which in turn are preserved in separate manuscripts.<sup>452</sup>

<sup>448</sup> Da Cunha's ed., pp. 398–490, after the Uttarakhaṇḍa. For an analysis of the *māhātmya*, see GAIL 1977: 206–212; also EGGELING 1899: 1370, no. 3682. On some of the special features of this version of the legend, see M. BIARDEAU: La décapitation de Reṇukā dans le mythe de Paraśurāma, Kuiper vol. (1968), 563–572.

<sup>449</sup> ED.: all + C. Tātparyadīpikā by Mādhavācārya: ĀnSS 25, 1893, <sup>2</sup>1924–25, 3 vols.; – S. Ramachandra Sastri and K. Kuppaswamy Sastri, Madras: Brahmavadin Press, 1913–16; – Sri Balamānorama Series 19, Madras: Sri Balamānorama Press, 1932. – LIT.: V. RAGHAVAN: The Sūta Saṃhitā, ABORI 22, 1941, 236–253 [contents, chapter by chapter, pp. 245–248].

<sup>450</sup> HAZRA 1940: 161.

<sup>451</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1320–1321, no. 3622, in 71 *adhyaḃayas*. There are several editions, in Grantha script. It is more or less a tr. of the TiruvīlayātaRpurāṇam of ParañcōtīmuNivar, 16th century (cf. R. DESSIGANE, P. Z. PATTABIRAMIN, and J. FILLIOZAT: La légende des jeux de Čiva à Madurai d'après les textes et les peintures, 2 fasc., PIFI 19, Pondicherry: IFI, 1960, 1.iii).

<sup>452</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1362–1365, nos. 3671, 3672. The *kāṇḍas* are: Sambhava, Āsura, Vīramahendra, Yuddha, Deva, Dakṣa, Upadeśa, together 239 *adhyaḃayas*.

The other three *samhitās* are less well represented in the manuscript collections,<sup>453</sup> although we do have a Saurasamhitā, with “consists chiefly of cosmogonic theories, and speculations on the origin and the cure of evil, and on the nature and attributes of the Absolute as represented by Śiva (or Sadāśiva), the fountain-head of all true knowledge, and therefore the chief object of human worship; whilst the Sun, however, also comes in for a certain amount of adoration.”<sup>454</sup>

Other texts claiming to belong to the Skanda° include the Mahābaleśvaramāhātmya,<sup>455</sup> and the Viśvāmitrīmāhātmya.<sup>456</sup> The latter text, of which there are two manuscripts at the Oriental Institute, Baroda, in seventeen *adhyaayas*, claims to belong to the Uttarakhanda of the Skanda°. It is a *māhātmya* of the Viśvāmitrī, the river flowing near and through Vaḍodarā (Baroda). M.N. Srinivas<sup>457</sup> also refers to a Kāverīmāhātmya which belongs to the Skanda°, and which was translated into Kannada in 1864. It “describes the story of the divine origin of the river, enumerates the sacred bathing places along its course from source to estuary, and some of the temples on its banks. It deals with Coorg, the country in which the river has its origin, and Coorgs, who are its most distinctive, numerous, and important inhabitants. It gives the story of the origins of the Coorgs.”<sup>458</sup>

In 1898/99 Haraprasad Shastri and Bendall discovered, in the Durbar Library in Kathmandu, a manuscript of the Skanda° in Gupta script.<sup>459</sup> On paleographic grounds they decided that it was written before A.D. 659. Since there is no mention of *khaṇḍas* in the colophons, it had to be the original Skanda°, showing that, notwithstanding the modern appearance of the purāṇa, there has indeed at one time been one cohesive Skanda°. The hypothesis<sup>460</sup> that the old manuscript corresponds to the Ambikākhaṇḍa<sup>461</sup> proved to be false.

<sup>453</sup> In connection with the Vaiṣṇavī samhitā, EGGELING 1899: 1343–1344, no. 3651, contains a Talpagirimāhātmya, said to be the last chapter of a Kṣetrakhaṇḍa. Cf. also the Praṇavakalpa, which has been edited more than once: Kumbakonam: Śrī Vidyā Press, 1902 [Grantha]; Dehradun: Tārā Press, 1978 (1922); + Praṇavakalpaprakāśa by Gaṅgādharendra Sarasvatī, ChSS 72, 1933.

<sup>454</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1382–1383, no. 3693, in 16 *adhyaayas*.

<sup>455</sup> Vishvanāth Nārāyan MANDLIK: Notes on the Shrine of Mahābaleśvara, JBBRAS 10, 1871–74, 1–18 [contains the text of the *māhātmya*].

<sup>456</sup> J. P. THAKER: The Viśvāmitrīmāhātmyam, JOIB 26, 1976–77, 170–172.

<sup>457</sup> M.N. SRINIVAS: Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952, pp. 241–246.

<sup>458</sup> Ibid., p. 242.

<sup>459</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1905: lii; description at 141–146 (no. 229); cf. id. 1928a: lxxiv, clxxiii (“the subjects treated are all for the glorification of Śiva, especially, his wars with Andhaka and Tripura”), 538.

<sup>460</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI (Report on the Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts 1895 to 1900, Calcutta: ASB, 1901, p. 4) quotes this judgment as Babu Nāgendra Nātha Vasu’s.

<sup>461</sup> EGGELING 1899: 1321–1323, nos. 3623, 3624.

*Soma*<sup>o</sup>

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 36.

The sole reference to this title is in the list of purāṇas which al-Bīrūnī took down from dictation (see I.3.3).

*Sūrya*<sup>o</sup>

LIT.: HAZRA 1958: 100, 349–350 [lost Saura upa<sup>o</sup>].

There are several indications to suggest the existence, at one time, of a Sūrya<sup>o</sup>, a Saura upapurāṇa different from the Sāmba<sup>o</sup> and the Saura<sup>o</sup>. In addition to textual references, there is also the fact that “round about Jōdhpur there is a class of Brāhmaṇas known as Śevaks, most of whom are religious dependants of the Ōsvāḷ Śrāvaks. They call themselves Śākadvīpa Brāhmaṇas, and know that their story is told in the Nāmagantha of the Sūrya-purāṇa and also in the Bhavishya-purāṇa.”<sup>462</sup>

*Tvaṣṭṛ*<sup>o</sup>

LIT. HAZRA 1954: 36.

The sole reference to this text is in the Aśaucakāṇḍa of Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa's Śmticandrikā.

*Ūrdhva*<sup>o</sup>

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 36.

The sole reference to this work is in Govinda's Vākyaratnākara.

*Uttara*<sup>o</sup>

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 36.

The same two stanzas from this text are quoted in Mādhavācārya's Kālanir-ṇaya, Narasiṃha Vājapeyin's Nityācārapradīpa, and Gadādhara's Kālasāra. The title Uttara<sup>o</sup> may be a reference to the *uttarabhāga* of some recension of the Saura<sup>o</sup>, however not of the printed one.

*Vāmana*<sup>o</sup>

ED.: + Beng. tr., Calcutta: Vidyāratna Press, 1293 (1885); – Poona: Jagadhditecchu Press, 1886; – + Beng. tr., Maheshchandra Pal, Calcutta: Nirapekṣadharmasamcāriṇī

<sup>462</sup> D.R. BHANDARKAR: Ghatiyala Inscriptions of Kakkuta – *samvat* 918, EI 9, 1907–08, 277–281 at 279.

Sabhā, 1893; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1314 (1908); – Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1903, <sup>2</sup>1929; – + Hindi tr., Shyam Sunder Tripathi, Bombay: Venkateśvara Press, 1903; – Critically Edited by Anand Swarup Gupta, Varanasi: AIKT, 1967; + Engl. tr., S. M. Mukhopadhyaya, A. Bhattacharya, N. C. Nath, and V. K. Verma, 1968; + Hindi tr., 1968.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlvī–xlvii; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 55; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 477; 1963: 502; – HAZRA 1940: 76–92; – Ram Shankar BHATTACHARYA: Purāṇa-*viśayasūcī* (Puranic Concordance), Pur 3, 1961, 141–182 [subject index of the Vāmana°]; – KANE 1962: 904–905; – V. RAGHAVAN: The Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 4, 1962, 184–192; – Sībadas CHAUDHURI: Place-names in the Vāmana Purāṇa (Alphabetically Arranged), IHQ 38, 1962, 303–326; 39, 1963, 38–58); – Ṭhākura Prasāda Śarmā DWIVEDI: Vāmanapurāṇasyānuṣṭubhatiriktānām chandasām anusandhānam, Pur 5, 1963, 144–159; – A. S. GUPTA: On the Adhyāyas of the Vāmana-purāṇa, Pur 5, 1963, 360–366; – Adam HOHENBERGER: Das Vāmanapurāṇa, IJ 7, 1963, 1–57; – V. S. AGRAVALA: Vāmana Purāṇa. A Study, Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan, 1964; – A. S. GUPTA: Constitution of the Vāmana Purāṇa Text, Pur 9, 1967, 141–194; – V. S. AGRAVALA: Vāmanapurāṇa ke anusāra Śaiva sampradāya, Kaviraj vol. (1967), 69–71; – V. M. BEDEKAR: The Story of Saṁvaraṇa and Tapatī in the Mahābhārata and Vāmana-purāṇa. A Comparative Study, Pur 12, 1970, 12–32; – Suresh Kaniyalāl DAVE: The Rivers of the Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 12, 1970, 33–47; – Ramchandra PANDEY: Elements of Astrology in the Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 12, 1970, 65–81; – A. P. MISHRA: The Ethico-Religious Philosophy of the Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 12, 1970, 82–101; – A. D. PUSALKER: Some Observations on the Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 12, 1970, 141–146; – Asoke CHATTERJEE: Vāmana-purāṇa and Samaya-pradīpa, Pur 12, 1970, 147–148; – A. S. GUPTA: Does the Vāmana-purāṇa mention Tulasī?, Pur 12, 1970, 149–151; – id.: No Omission in Vāmana-purāṇa of the Text Relating to Gifts for Viṣṇu’s Worship of Śrāvāṇa, Pur 12, 1970, 152; – id.: A Note on Sylvain Lévi’s Interpretation of “Tato jayam udīrayet”, Pur 12, 1970, 153–155; – Ramayan DWIVEDI: A Note on the Prose-passages in the Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 12, 1970, 156–160; – Ganga Sagar RAI: Kurukṣetramāhātmya. A Manuscript Ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya, Pur 12, 1970, 161–164; – id.: A Note on a Kashmirian Manuscript of the Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 12, 1970, 165–169; – Sasanka Sekhar PARUI: Rivers of Kurukṣetra in Vāmana Purāṇa, Pur 17, 1975, 168–187; – Silak Ram PHOGAT: Tirthas of Kurukṣetra as Mentioned in the Mahābhārata and Vāmanapurāṇa, J. Haryana Stud. 8, 1976, 14–32; – S. S. PARUI: Kurukṣetra in the Vāmana Purāṇa, Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1976.

The Vāmana° was the first purāṇa to be critically edited by the All-India Kashiraj Trust in Varanasi. The earlier editions consisted mostly of ninety-five chapters; in addition to splitting and joining a few chapters, the critical edition maintained in its original place, but numbered separately from the rest, twenty-eight *adhyāyas* called Saramāhātmya in which the *sūta* addresses the sages, in between its chapters 1–23 and 24–69 (earlier 1.1–22.46 and ch.50–95, respectively) in which Pulastya speaks to Nārada.

According to the Nārada° (1. ch.105) the Vāmana° consisted of two parts. The description of the first part corresponds rather well with the text as we have it. The Nārada° therefore seems to suggest that the second part is lost. It is called Bṛhadvāmana°, and is said to be composed of four *saṁhitās* of one thousand *ślokas* each: Māheśvarī, Bhāgavatī, Saurī, and Gāṇeśvarī.

The printed Vāmana° opens with a description of Śiva's exploits, more particularly his destruction of Dakṣa's sacrifice. It also exhibits an important version of the Prahlāda story. The text contains a description of the earth (*bhuvanakośa*), from the seven *dvīpas* and oceans, via the nine *varṣas* of Jambudvīpa, down to Bhāratavarṣa and its *dvīpas*, mountains, and rivers. This first section of the critical edition ends with chapters on *sadācāra*, *śauca*, the duties of *varṇas* and *āśramas*, the fight between the asura Mahiṣa and the Goddess, etc.

The Saromāhātmya, which is missing in Vāmana° manuscripts from Bengal and South India, begins with a *māhātmya* of "the great *tīrtha* Brahmasaras" (Pṛthūdaka).<sup>463</sup> It contains an extended version of the Vāmana legend, and praises Kurukṣetra<sup>464</sup> and its many *tīrthas*. The text tells the story of Śiva transporting the *liṅga* which had fallen in the Devadāruvana to Pṛthūdakasaras which, as a result, became known as Sthāṇutīrtha; it concludes with a *māhātmya* of Sthāṇutīrtha and the several Śivaliṅgas established around it.

The section following the Saromāhātmya relates the story of Menā, the birth of Umā, and the latter's marriage to Śiva. It continues with the story of Śumbha and Niśumbha, the birth of Skandha and his fight with the asuras, and the legend of Andhaka up to the time when he is transformed into one of Śiva's *gaṇas*. After several chapters in which Prahlāda again plays a prominent role, the section ends with another detailed account of the Vāmana legend.

The Vāmana° is one of those purāṇas which have met with little sympathy on the part of scholars. It has been said that "there is little order in the subjects which this work recapitulates," and that "its contents can scarcely establish its claim to the character of a Purāṇa."<sup>465</sup> The present Vāmana° "can safely be called an Upapurāṇa rather than a Mahāpurāṇa."<sup>466</sup> That this opinion was not, however, universally shared is clear from the high praise the Vāmana° receives in the introduction to the critical edition, and from the fact that Purāṇam 12.1 (1970) was dedicated as a special "Vāmana number." In fact, at least one aspect of the Vāmana° has aroused the general admiration of critics: its non-sectarian nature and its "catholic" approach to Indian religion. Notwithstanding the title and even though Viṣṇu's incarnation as a dwarf is dealt with in the text, Śiva, the *liṅga*, Śaiva legends, and Śaiva holy places are also well represented.

Wilson's lack of enthusiasm for the Vāmana° is reflected in his thoughts on the date of the text: "its compilation may have amused the leisure of some Brahman of Benares three or four centuries ago."<sup>467</sup> Haraprasad Shastri, on the other hand, saw several arguments to show that "the Vāmana-purāṇa, so far as we find

<sup>463</sup> Devendra HANDA: Pehoa – The Ancient Pṛthūdaka, Pur 9, 1967, 297–306.

<sup>464</sup> Ratna Chandra AGRAWALA: Kurukṣetra in Later Sanskrit Literature, IHQ 31, 1955, 1–31.

<sup>465</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlvi.

<sup>466</sup> HAZRA 1940: 77.

<sup>467</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlvii.

it, seems to be very old."<sup>468</sup> Others choose a middle way, and propose the year A.D. 1000,<sup>469</sup> or "the ninth or the tenth century A.D., and most probably the former."<sup>470</sup>

The title Vāmana appears not only in the lists of mahāpurāṇas, but also in some lists of upapurāṇas. One can only guess whether this was a conscious attempt to remove the Vāmana° from the list of mahāpurāṇas, or whether there was indeed both a mahā- and an upapurāṇa by the same name, or whether the title of the upapurāṇa was a misreading for Mānava°.<sup>471</sup>

The same uncertainty surrounds the Bṛhadvāmana°, quoted in the Laghubhāgavatāmṛta. This may be the second part of the Vāmana°, which I referred to earlier, or it may be "a Vaiṣṇava work [which] dealt primarily with the sports of the cowherd Kṛṣṇa at Vṛndāvana."<sup>472</sup>

### Varāha°

ED.: Hṛīhikeśa Śāstrī, BI work 109, 1893; 2nd ed., Harjivandas Sanskrit Granthamala 8, Varanasi 1982; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1959 (1902); – + Beng. tr., Vaiṅavāsī Press, 1313 (1906); – Critically Edited by Anand Swarup Gupta, 2 vols., Varanasi: AIKT, 1981; + Engl. tr., Ahibhūṣaṇa Bhattacharya, 1981.

LIT.: WILSON 1840 = 1961: xliii–xliv; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 53; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 475–476; 1963: 499–500; – HAZRA: The Varāha-purāṇa, ABORI 18, 1936–37, 321–337; – HAZRA 1940: 96–107; – KANE 1962: 903–904; – K.V. NĪLAMEGHĀCĀRYA: Śrīvarāhapurāṇam Śrīrāmānujasampradāyaś ca, Pur 4, 1962, 260–383; – Ganga Sagar RAY: A Verse of Varāha Purāṇa in Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, Pur 20, 1978, 130.

The editions of the Varāha° consist of 217 or 218 *adhyaayas*, except for the critical edition<sup>473</sup> which is divided into 215 chapters. The Nārada° (1. ch.103) describes a Varāha° in two parts: *pūrvabhāga* and *uttarabhāga*. The contents of its *pūrvabhāga* correspond closely to those of the printed Varāha°; the *uttarabhāga* as described in the Nārada°, in which Pulastya is supposed to be the main interlocutor, is not found in the Varāha°. Also, at the beginning of the last chapter of the editions Sanatkumāra invites Brahmā to instruct him on additional topics; Brahmā agrees, but refers Sanatkumāra to Pulastya. For all these reasons it has been suggested that at one time there existed an *uttarabhāga* which is now lost.<sup>474</sup>

As far as the extant Varāha° is concerned, Hazra analyzed it as consisting of four distinct parts, differing in interlocutors and general characteristics, and therefore belonging to different hands, different places, and different ages.

<sup>468</sup> HARAPRASAD SHASTRI 1928 a: clxxxii–clxxxiii.

<sup>469</sup> CE + Engl. tr., p. xxxv.

<sup>470</sup> HAZRA 1940: 91.

<sup>471</sup> CE + Engl. tr., p. xxxi.

<sup>472</sup> HAZRA 1954: 24; HAZRA 1958: 351–352 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

<sup>473</sup> See its introduction for the description of Varāha° mss. with different compositions.

<sup>474</sup> HAZRA 1940: 106.

In the first section (chapters 1–112, CE 1–111) the *sūta* reports a conversation between the Boar and the Earth. The superiority of Nārāyaṇa – rather than Hari or Viṣṇu – is exhibited throughout the section, and is acknowledged by Rudra himself (70.15–19). Most chapters point to the Pāñcarātras, which does not preclude the presence of a few chapters (e.g., 90–96, CE 89–95) which are distinctly Śākta.

In chapters 113–192 (CE 112–190) the *sūta* reports the conversation in which the Earth repeats to Sanat Kumāra what the Boar told her while he upheld her. This section is clearly Bhāgavata: “the secret *dharma* proclaimed by Varāha shall be disclosed to a sincere Bhāgavata only” (117.47, CE 116.52), etc. It also contains a Mathurāmāhātmya (chapters 152–178, CE 150–178), which has been attributed to Sanat Kumāra, the disciple of Caitanya.<sup>475</sup>

In chapters 193–212 (CE 191–210), called Dharmasaṃhitā (212.1, CE 210.1), the *sūta* reports a conversation between king Janamejaya and the sage Vaiśampāyana, on the results of action (*karmavipāka*) and the region of Yama. In this connection Vaiśampāyana relates Nāciketa’s description of his visit to Yama’s realm.<sup>476</sup>

The last section (chapters 213–218, CE 211–215) contains the *sūta*’s report on a conversation between Sanat Kumāra and Brahmā. It is a *māhātmya* of Uttara Gokarṇa and other places in Nepal, all of which are sacred to Śiva. The whole section, therefore, is strictly Śaiva.

The Varāha°, not unlike the Liṅga°, is one of those purāṇas about which, since they contain very little of the expected *pañcalakṣaṇa* materials, the question has been raised whether they actually deserve the title of purāṇa. Rather than a purāṇa, the Varāha° is “a religious manual, almost wholly occupied with forms of prayer, and rules for devotional observances addressed to Viṣṇu.”<sup>477</sup>

Wilson assigned the Varāha° to “the age of Rāmānuja, the early part of the twelfth century.” Even those who, in general, date the purāṇas in an earlier period, consider the Varāha° to be “a comparative late work,”<sup>478</sup> but not later than the tenth century A. D.<sup>479</sup>

<sup>475</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 309–310; contra, A. S. GUPTA, CE + Engl. tr., pp. 24–25.

<sup>476</sup> Cf. LUCIAN SCHERMAN: Materialien zur Geschichte der indischen Visionslitteratur, Leipzig: Tietmeyer, 1892, p. 11 n. 1: “am ausführlichsten aber ist das Varāha-Purāṇa, in welchem unsere Legende zu zwanzig Capiteln ausgesponnen ist.”

<sup>477</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: xlii. Cf. also HRISHĪKEŚA ŚĀSTRĪ: Varāha° ed., Preface i–ii; HAZRA 1940: 96; WINTERNITZ 1963: 499; MEHENDALE 1970: 294.

<sup>478</sup> HAZRA 1940: 96; MEHENDALE 1970: 294.

<sup>479</sup> KANE 1962: 904. On the basis of *śloka* 218.1 (Venkaṭeśvara; missing in the Vaṅga ed.) HRISHĪKEŚA ŚĀSTRĪ (Preface i) thought that the date mentioned there might be of help: *samvat* 1621 = A. D. 1564. I agree with WINTERNITZ (1963: 499 n. 5) that this is merely the date of a manuscript copy.

*Varuṇa°*

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 36–37.

This title appears in all lists of upapurāṇas, except in that of the Ekāmra°. It has been quoted in Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa's Ghaṭṭanirmāṇādhivāsanaotsargaprayoga.

*Vāsuki°*

ED.: Anantarāma Śāstrī, Delhi: Nag, 1981.

LIT.: ANANTARĀMA ŚĀSTRĪ: Vāsukipurāṇasya kālaḥ purāṇeṣu sthānaṃ ca, Pur 22, 1980, 212–219 [with slight variations, incorporated in ed.]

The Vāsuki° is a local purāṇa of Kashmir, dealing mainly with Vāsuki, the residence of the serpent king with the same name. It is said to be a part of a lost Bhuvanakośavarṇanoddyota, which in turn was a part of the Bhr̥ṅgīśasamhitā. Since the date of the Kedāramāhātmya of the Bhr̥ṅgīśasamhitā is given as Vikrama *saṃvat* 1809,<sup>480</sup> Anantarāma Śāstrī suggests that the date of the Vāsuki°, “saṃ 7,” refers to Vikrama *saṃvat* 1807.

*Vāyu°*

ED.: Rājendralāla Mitra, 2 vols., BI work 85, 1880, 1888; – Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1895; – ĀnSS 49, 1905; – + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1317 (1910).

LIT.: WILSON: JASB 1, 1832, 533–543 = Works (1864) 3. 140–155; – WILSON 1840 = 1961: xxi–xxiv; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 40–41; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 463–464; 1963: 485–486; – V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: Some Aspects of the Vāyupurāṇa. Madras University, 1933; – HAZRA: The Vāyu Purāṇa, IHQ 14, 1938, 131–139; – HAZRA 1940: 13–17; – Devendrakumar Rajaram PATIL: Cultural History from the Vāyupurāṇa, [D. C. Diss. Ser. 2.], Poona: Deccan College, 1946; – KANE 1962: 906–907; – S. N. ROY: Some Late Chapters of Vāyu-purāṇa, Pur 6, 1964, 366–367.

The composition of the Vāyu° is different in the existing editions. In the ĀnSS and Vaṅga editions the text is divided into four *pādas*: 1 Prakriyā (ch. 1–6), 2 Anuṣaṅga (ch. 7–64), 3 Upodghāta (ch. 65–99), and 4 Upasaṃhāra (ch. 100–112; 105–112 = Gayāmāhātmya). In the Bibliotheca Indica and Veṅkaṭeśvara editions the text is arranged as follows:

Prathamakhaṇḍa	}	ch. 1–6 Prakriyāpāda
		7–61 (no title)
Dvitiyakhaṇḍa	}	ch. 1–42 37–42 = Anuṣaṅgapāda
		43–50 Gayāmāhātmya

<sup>480</sup> M. A. STEIN: Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Raghunatha Temple Library, Jammu, 1884, p. 210.

The fact that the Vāyu° may originally have been identical with the Brahmāṇḍa°, and that they only later acquired an existence of their own, has been noted earlier in this volume (see I.3.3). Even then their contents continued to overlap for the most part, except for a few passages some of which have been indicated under the Brahmāṇḍa°.

Among the sections which are peculiar to the Vāyu°, and absent from the Brahmāṇḍa°, there are, in addition to the more or less independent Gayāmāhātmya (ch. 105–112), chapters on *pāśupatayoga* (ĀnSS 10.68–ch.15), on the *kalpas* (ch. 21–22) and *yugas* (ch. 32), geographical sections (ch. 34.58–42; 43.10–38; 44; 45.20cd–66; 48), etc. The *māhātmya* on Maheśvara (ch.23) contains a reference to the Lākuliśas (vv.217–225): at the time when Kṛṣṇa will appear as Vāsudeva, Śiva will become incarnate, in an unguarded corpse at the burning-ground of Kāyā(va)rohaṇa,<sup>481</sup> as the ascetic Lakulīn. “We have then, in the prophecy of the Vāyu, the earliest notice of the Lakulīśa-Pāśupatas.”<sup>482</sup>

With regard to the parts that are common to the Vāyu° and the Brahmāṇḍa° Kirfel defends the thesis that they cannot be the result of the kind of gradual development which is characteristic of other puranic texts. The Vāyu-Brahmāṇḍa° nucleus is the work of a single compiler (“Diaskeuast”) who reworked a number of previously existing, separate pieces into a coherent whole. Kirfel shows<sup>483</sup> how the entire subject matter is presented, in a certain chronological order, in between the creation and the beginning of the present *kalpa* on the one hand, and its conclusion and the appearance of the next *kalpa* on the other. The description of the primary development of matter is followed by the creation of various sorts of beings, leading up to the first Manu, Svāyambhuva, and a description of everything connected with him. The text then proceeds to the following Manus, from the second, Svārociṣa, up to the sixth, Cākṣuṣa. Manu Vaivasvata occasions a description of the Solar and Lunar races who take their origin from him, followed immediately by the prophetic treatment of the future royal dynasties. The last few chapters deal with the remaining seven Manus, the description of world destruction after the last *manvantara*, and the re-creation of the universe at the end of the night of Brahmā.

<sup>481</sup> Kāyāvarohaṇa is modern Kārvaṇ, in Rajputana. For the local *māhātmya*, see D. R. BHANDARKAR: Lakulīśa, Annual Report Archaeological Survey of India, 1906–07, pp. 179–192; also C. D. DALAL’s introduction to Bhāsarvajña’s Gaṇakārikā (GOS 15, 1920), “the only work of the Lakulīśa Pāśupata system, which is available now,” and appendix IV, pp. 37–57, with the Sanskrit text of the Kāraṇamāhātmya. Cf. David N. LORENZEN: The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, Berkely-L. A.: U. C. Press, 1972, pp. 173–192 Lakulīśa and the Pāśupatas.

<sup>482</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 146. Cf. D. R. BHANDARKAR: An Êklingī Stone Inscription and the Origin and History of the Lakulīśa Sect, JBBRAS 22, 1905–07, 151–165 at 154–157; V. S. PATHAK: History of Śaiva Cults in Northern India from Inscriptions (700 A. D. to 1200 A. D.), Banaras: Ram Naresh Varma, 1960, p. 7; GONDA 1963: 215.

<sup>483</sup> KIRFEL 1927: XVII, based on a lucid survey of the contents, pp. XV–XVI.

The Vāyu° has generally been recognized as “perhaps the oldest,”<sup>484</sup> or at least as “one of the oldest and most authoritative”<sup>485</sup> purāṇas. Except for one opinion that most of the purāṇa was composed in the fifth and fourth centuries B. C., and that the present Vāyu° took shape “between 350 B. C. and 500 A. D.,”<sup>486</sup> the fifth century or the fourth and fifth centuries A. D. have generally been proposed as the date of the Vāyu°.<sup>487</sup>

The content of the Gayāmāhātmya<sup>488</sup> has been discussed in another volume in this series.<sup>489</sup> There seems to be general agreement that the Gayāmāhātmya, which is missing in many manuscripts of the Vāyu°, and which appears in many separate manuscripts and editions, was originally an independent text which was only later added on to the existing Vāyu°.<sup>490</sup>

### *Viṣṇu°*

ED.: + Beng. tr., Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1314 (1907), <sup>2</sup>1331 (1924); – + Hindi tr., Munilāl Gupta, Gorakhpur: Gītā Press, 1933, <sup>3</sup>1943; – + Śrīdhara Svāmin’s Ātmaprakāśa or Svaprakāśa: Calcutta: Kāvya prakāśa Press, 1276 (1868); – Calcutta: Sarasvatī Press, 1882; – Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1294 (1886); – + Ratnagarbha Bhaṭṭācārya’s Vaiṣṇavākūṭacandrikā: Bombay: Vṛttadīpa Press, n. d.; – Bombay: Oriental Press, 1811 (1886); – + Viṣṇucitta’s Vyākhyā: Madras: Jñānasūryodaya Press, 1882 [Telugu char.]; – and + Śrīdhara’s comm, Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1967 (1910).

TR.: Horace Hayman WILSON: The Vishṇu Purāṇa, a System of Hindu Mythology and Tradition, Translated from the Original Sanscrit, and Illustrated by Notes Derived chiefly

<sup>484</sup> HAZRA 1940: 13, accepting, however, the presence in the extant Vāyu° of later additions, e. g., ch. 104, which mentions Rādhā, the Tantra, and Śākta philosophy. Cf. BHANDARKAR 1913: 47: “the earliest work of that class”; HAZRA 1962: 253; JACQUES: Gayāmāhātmya, p. xliii.

<sup>485</sup> KANE 1962: 906.

<sup>486</sup> RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR 1951–55: 1.xx.

<sup>487</sup> KANE (1962: 907): between A. D. 350 and 550; WINTERNITZ (1963: 485): not later than the 5th century; FARQUHAR (1920: 145): 4th or 5th century; BHANDARKAR (1913: 47): 5th century. The sole exception is C. V. VAIDYA (JBBRAS n. s. 1, 1925, 155–156): 8th century.

<sup>488</sup> In addition to the text as incorporated in the editions of the Vāyu°, the Gayāmāhātmya has often been edited separately. See, e. g., IOL: 896–897. Notice also Claude JACQUES: Gayā Māhātmya. Edition critique, traduction française et introduction, [PIFI 20,] Pondicherry: IFI, 1962 – Gaya Mahatmya. Translated and published by Babu Hari Ram Sijwar and Gayapal Garain, Gaya: Magadh Shubhankar Press, 1909; – Lalita Prasad VIDYARTHI: The Sacred Complex of Hindu Gayā, Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1961 [Appendix I, pp. 114–117 Gaya Mythology: brief extracts (abridged) tr. from Vāyu° ch. 105–106].

<sup>489</sup> GONDA 1977: 279.

<sup>490</sup> JACQUES: Gayāmāhātmya, p. xliii. According to HAZRA (1940: 17) this must have happened before A. D. 1400, for Vācaspatiśra quotes numerous verses from Vāyu° ch. 105 and 111–112.

from Other Purāṇas,<sup>491</sup> London: Oriental Translation Fund Committee, 1840; – Works of the Late Horace Hayman Wilson, ed. Fitzedward Hall, vols. VI–X, London: Trübner, 1864–1877; – With an Introduction by R. C. Hazra, Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1961; – A Prose English Translation of the Vishnupuranam (based on Professor H. H. Wilson's Translation). Edited ... by Manmathanath Dutt, Calcutta: Elysium Press, 1894, <sup>2</sup>1912.

EXTRACTS AND SUMMARIES: August BLAU: Das Bharatopākhyāna des Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, August Wilmanns vol. (1903), 205–228 [text, tr., notes on 2.13]; – A. PAUL: Krischnas Weltengang, ein indischer Mythos in zwanzig Andachten aus dem Vischnupurānam übertragen, München: Piper, 1905 [extracts from *aṃśa* 5]; – J. M. MACFIE: The Vishnu Purāna. A Summary with Introduction and Notes, Madras etc.: The Christian Literature Society for India, 1926.

LIT.: WILSON: JASB 1, 1832, 431–442 = Works (1864) 3.120–139; – WILSON 1840 = 1961: lvii–lxx; – HOLTZMANN 1895: 36–40; – WINTERNITZ 1907: 455–463, 1963: 477–485; – J. KENNEDY: The Gospels of the Infancy, the Lalita Vistara, and the Vishnu Purana: or the Transmission of Religious Legends between India and the West, JRAS 1917, 209–243, 469–540; – V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: Age of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, IHQ 7, 1931, 370–371; – HAZRA: The Date of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, ABORI 18, 1936–37, 265–275; – A. BANERJI-SASTRI: A Palm-Leaf Manuscript of Viṣṇupurāṇa Dated 1464 A. D. (With Plate), JBORS 24, 1938, 164–165; – HAZRA 1940: 19–26; V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR: The Age of Vishṇu Purāṇa, IHC 13 (1950), 46–50; – J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN: The Śubhāśraya Prakaraṇa (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 6,7) and the Meaning of Bhāvanā, ALB 19, 1955, 3–19; – V. VARADACHARI: Similes in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Pur 3, 1961, 228–234; – KANE 1962: 907–909; – S. N. ROY: Date of Viṣṇu-Purāṇa's Chapters on Māyā-Moha, Pur 7, 1965, 276–287; – Hans H. PENNER: Cosmogony and Myth in the Vishṇu Purāṇa, History of Religions 5, 1965–66, 283–299; – Madhvācārya ĀDYA: Viṣṇupurāṇaviṣayasūci, Supplement to Pur 8.1, 1966; paginated separately, 1–91; – S. N. ROY: On Comparative Chronology of the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata Purāṇas, Pur 10, 1968, 54–67; – V. RAGHAVAN: The Viṣṇupurāṇa and Advaita, ALB 39, 1975, 294–299 = Pur 18, 1976, 193–196; – Arvind SHARMA: A Note on H. H. Wilson's Interpretation of the Role of Rajas in Cosmic Creation in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, Pur 19, 1977, 347–350; – Shrinryu OKUDA: Indra in the Viṣṇupurāṇa, Pur 22, 1980, 27–32 [tr. from Jap., Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies 26, 1977–78, 399–400]; – K. S. R. DATTA: The Viṣṇu-Purāṇa and Advaita, Pur 20, 1978, 193–196; – D. S. PATHAK: Some Aspects of Vishnu Purana, University Research Journal (SNDT Women's Univ., Bombay) 7, 1979, 1–11 of the Engl. Section; – Madhusudan M. PATHAK: Paitāmaha-yajña and the Origin of Sūtas and Māgadhās According to the Viṣṇupurāṇa, Pur 22, 1980, 61–66 [Viṣṇu° 1.13]; – Jyotirmayee BHATTACHARYA: A Wrong Rendering of the Word *mukhyātman* (in Viṣṇu-purāṇa 3.17.29) by Wilson, Pur 22, 1980, 232–233; Harendra DAYAL: The Vishnu Purana, Delhi: Sundeeep Prakashan, 1983.

The Viṣṇu° is one of the shorter purāṇas; it is composed of six *aṃśas*, with a total of one hundred and twenty-six chapters (22, 16, 18, 24, 38, 8).

The first chapter sets the stage for the entire book. When Maitreya questions his teacher Parāśara on the nature of the universe and everything in it, Parāśara

<sup>491</sup> Cf. HACKER (1959: 61 n. 3): “Die Übersetzung des Viṣṇupurāṇa von H. H. WILSON (London 1840) ist vielfach fehlerhaft und heute veraltet ... Der ihr beigegebene reichhaltige Index dagegen ist auch heute noch nützlich.”

tells him how his grandfather, Vasiṣṭha, once prevented him from completely destroying the Rākṣasas, in an effort to avenge the death of his father. As a reward for Parāśara's restraint Pulastya, the ancestor of the Rākṣasas, promised him that he would know all the *śāstras*, and that he would become the composer (*kartr*) of the Purāṇasaṃhitā. This Purāṇasaṃhitā, incorporating everything he learned from Vasiṣṭha and Pulastya, Parāśara now communicates to Maitreya. The chapter ends with the statement: "Out of Viṣṇu this universe has arisen, in him its exists; he is the one who governs its existence and destruction; he is the universe." The first book, then, mainly deals with the creation of the world. Here as elsewhere the story of the creation is placed against the background of Sāṃkhya evolution. Among the stories and legends inserted into this section, one might mention that of prince Dhruva who, as a result of intense Viṣṇu worship, is raised to the sky as the polestar; and, above all, a version of the story of Prahlāda.<sup>492</sup>

The second *aṃśa* begins with a description of the earth, its seven *dvīpas* and oceans. Within Jambudvīpa special attention is paid to mount Meru and Bhāratavaṛṣa. An account of the six other *dvīpas* – Plakṣa, Śālmala, Kuśa, Krauñca, Śāka, and Puṣkara – is followed by descriptions of the seven regions of Pātāla below the earth, and of the different hells below Pātāla. Next, Maitreya requests and receives instruction on the spheres above the earth, including the planetary system, the sun, and the moon. The last four chapters of this *aṃśa* are devoted to the legend of king Bharata.<sup>493</sup>

The third *aṃśa* opens with an account of the Manus and *manvantaras*. In each *dvāparayuga* a Vyāsa divides the Veda into four portions. This leads to a discussion of the many subdivisions of the Vedas. The third *aṃśa* also deals with *varṇāśramadharmā*, *saṃskāras*, and, especially, *śrāddha*. The *aṃśa* ends with the story of Viṣṇu's release, from his body, of *māyāmoha*, to help the gods in their battle against the asuras: the *māyāmoha* turns the asuras away from the Vedas by teaching them heretical – Buddhist and Jaina – doctrines. Having lost the cover (*saṃvaraṇa*) of the Veda, and having become naked (*nagna*), the asuras are easily defeated.

The fourth *aṃśa* is entirely devoted to the description of the royal dynasties, starting from Brahmā and the solar dynasty, and the lunar dynasty involving the story of Purūravas and Urvaśī, down to "the present king," Parīkṣit. The descendants of Parīkṣit inaugurate the prophecy of the future kings; their reigns coincide with the ever worsening *kali* age.

<sup>492</sup> The Prahlāda episode of the Viṣṇu° (1.17–20) is, together with that of the Bhāgavata°, "die gedankenreichste Fassung der Legende," and "[hat] deren klassisch gewordene Gestalt begründet" (HACKER 1959: 61; for a detailed analysis, see there pp. 60–97).

<sup>493</sup> On the Bharata legend, both at Viṣṇu° 2.13–16 and Bhāgavata° 5.7–14, see ERNST LEUMANN: Die Bharata Sage. Erster Theil, ZDMG 48, 1894, 65–83; also August BLAU: Das Bharatopākhyāna des Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, A. Wilmanns vol. (1903), pp. 205–228.

The entire fifth – and longest – *aṁśa* is dedicated to the Kṛṣṇa legend. It is clear from the beginning that the Viṣṇu° – like other purāṇas and unlike later Kṛṣṇa literature – squarely frames Kṛṣṇa’s biography “within the context of an *avatār* whose incarnation was for the purpose of slaying the demon-tyrant Kaṁsa who ruled at Mathurā.”<sup>494</sup> The text describes Kṛṣṇa’s birth, relates most of his exploits, and ends with his death inflicted unintentionally by Jarā’s arrow. The Kṛṣṇa story of the Viṣṇu° has repeatedly been compared with other Kṛṣṇa stories, in the Harivaṁśa and in several purāṇas, the Bhāgavata° in particular. Wilson<sup>495</sup> already held out two possibilities: either the Bhāgavata° amplified and “improved upon” the Viṣṇu°, or the latter’s greater conciseness resulted from its being an abridgment of the former; it is clear that Wilson leaned toward the first alternative. Both the amplification<sup>496</sup> and, to a lesser extent, the abridgment<sup>497</sup> theories have found favor with later scholars.

At the outset of the short sixth *aṁśa* Maitreya requests to be instructed on the dissolution of the world. A new discussion of the four ages is followed by a description of the three types of dissolution, the last of which is final liberation from existence. Abandoning ignorance and acquiring knowledge to reach this goal are realized by means of *yoga*, a description of which closes the text.

The Viṣṇu° has been called “one of the most important of the extant Purāṇas.”<sup>498</sup> It is generally recognized as a true Pāñcarātra document.<sup>499</sup> Although, as such, it is purely sectarian, being Vaiṣṇava from beginning to end,<sup>500</sup> on the other hand, more than any other major purāṇa, it displays the kind of materials which a purāṇa is traditionally supposed to be all about: *pañcalak-ṣaṇa*.<sup>501</sup>

<sup>494</sup> David KINSLEY: Without Kṛṣṇa there is no Song, History of Religions 12, 1972–73, 149–180 at 153 n. 9.

<sup>495</sup> 1840 = 1961: lxviii and 394 n. 1.

<sup>496</sup> E. g., RUBEN: The Kṛṣṇa-carita in the Harivaṁśa and certain Purāṇas, JAOS 61, 1941, 115–127 at 126; WINTERNITZ 1963: 487; HOPKINS Bhāgavata° 1966: 4; GAIL Bhāgavata° 1969: 15–16.

<sup>497</sup> E. g., ROY Viṣṇu° 1968.

<sup>498</sup> HAZRA 1940: 19.

<sup>499</sup> FARQUHAR 1920: 145, repeated by HAZRA 1940: 19.

<sup>500</sup> VAN BUITENEN (Viṣṇu° 1955) noted that Rāmānuja’s Śrībhāṣya 1.1.1 is entirely devoted to the elucidation of the term *pratyastamitabheda* occurring at Viṣṇu° 6.7.53. He considered it “very unlikely that a convinced Advaitin would even quote the Viṣṇupurāṇa as an authority to be reckoned with.” In response to this statement RAGHAVAN (Viṣṇu° 1975) listed several passages in the Viṣṇu° with Advaitic tenor; his view was supported by K. S. R. DATTA (Viṣṇu° 1978).

<sup>501</sup> WILSON 1840 = 1961: lviii. The sectarian character of the Viṣṇu° was denied by RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR (Viṣṇu° 1950: 48). To be sure, Viṣṇu is glorified, but Brahmā and Śiva are one with him. This is enough to show that the purāṇa is not sectarian, and that it “follows the Vedic path dispassionately.”

The date of the Viṣṇu° is as contested as that of any other purāṇa. The following is a survey of various dates proposed.

700–500 B. C.	Ramachandra Dikshitar (Viṣṇu° 1950 “contemporaneous with the Atharvaveda, or slightly later”)
700–300	Ramachandra Dikshitar (1951–55: 1. xxvii)
400–300	Smith (Early History of India, 4pp. 22–23)
A. D. 100–350	Hazra (Viṣṇu° 1936–37: 18)
275–325	Hazra (1940: 24)
300–500	Kane (1962: 909)
before 400	Farquhar (1920: 143)
after 400–500	Pargiter (1922: 80)
550	Gail (Bhāgavata° 1969: 16)
800–900	C. V. Vaidya (History of Mediaeval India, 1.352; cf. idem: Bhāgavata° 1925)
after 800–900	Roy (Viṣṇu° 1968)
ca. 1045	Wilson (1840 = 1961: 1xx)

To this should be added Winternitz’ (1963: 478 n.2) conclusion, after advancing arguments for an early date: “It is no more possible to assign any definite date to the Viṣṇu-purāṇa than it is for any other Purāṇa.”

Remarkably little effort has been made in the scholarly literature to locate the Viṣṇu° in any particular part of India. Except for one author’s hypothesis that the composer may have been a native of the Andhra country,<sup>502</sup> scholars seem to be resigned to the belief that absence of *māhātmyas* and descriptions of *tīrthas* make it nearly impossible to determine the place of origin of the purāṇa.<sup>503</sup>

Several authors of *dharmanibandhas*, and Sanātana Gosvāmin, quote verses from a Bṛhadviṣṇu° or Bṛhadvaiṣṇava°;<sup>504</sup> the latter title also figures in the list of upapurāṇas in the Ekāmra°. It is clear from all these fragments that it was a purāṇa dealing with Viṣṇu worship. There is also a manuscript<sup>505</sup> which, in its colophon, claims to be part of the Bhrgusaṃhitā of the Bṛhadviṣṇu°. Since the text is quoted in Hemādri’s Caturvargacintāmaṇi, the Bṛhadviṣṇu° must have been known about A. D. 1000.

### Viṣṇudharma°

LIT.: HAZRA 1958: 118–155 [major Vaiṣṇava upa°]; – KANE 1962: 873–876; – D. SATYA-NARAYANA: Viṣṇudharma and Alberuni, JGJKSV 33.2, 1977, 53–64.

Even though the – as yet unpublished – Viṣṇudharma° calls itself a *śāstra* rather than a purāṇa, it came to be recognized as a puranic work. In an Asiatic

<sup>502</sup> The only reason being that he knew the Kaikila Yavanas (C. V. VAIDYA: History of Mediaeval Hindu India, Poona: Oriental Book-Supplying Agency, 1921–26, 1.352).

<sup>503</sup> RUBEN: The Puranic Line of Heroes, JRAS 1941, 247–256 and 337–358 at 358.

<sup>504</sup> HAZRA 1954: 25–26; HAZRA 1958: 353–356 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°]; CC 1: 591 b.

<sup>505</sup> MITRA Notices: 2.68–69, no. 653.

Society of Bengal manuscript<sup>506</sup> the text is divided into one hundred and five chapters (over 4000 verses). The principal speaker throughout is Śaunaka who imparts his teaching to Parīkṣit's grandson, king Śātānīka, to reward him for his sincere devotion to Kṛṣṇa-Nārāyaṇa. The Viṣṇudharma° is a work of the Bhāgavatas: no one who is not a Bhāgavata is able to know or praise Viṣṇu.<sup>507</sup>

The authoritativeness of the Viṣṇudharma° is evident from the numerous quotations from it in the *dharmanibandhas*. Al-Bīrūnī repeatedly referred to the Viṣṇudharma°, even though there may have been some confusion with the Viṣṇudharmottara°. <sup>508</sup> Also, the Viṣṇudharmottara° itself claims to be a continuation of the Viṣṇudharma°. <sup>509</sup>

Based on the fact that the genuine Āgneya° (see 2.1.3 and sub Agni°) and the Bhaviṣyottara° borrowed verses and even chapters from the Viṣṇudharma°, based also on the fact that the text does not display any influence of Tantricism, and notwithstanding the fact that the Buddha is included among the Viṣṇuvavatāras, Hazra dates the Viṣṇudharma° between A.D. 200 and 300. <sup>510</sup> Kāmarūpa has been claimed as its place of origin. <sup>511</sup>

Jimūtavāhana quotes eight verses from a Bṛhadviṣṇudharma°<sup>512</sup> in his Kālaviveka. <sup>513</sup> Hazra argues that it is an independent work, since the Kālaviveka also quotes from the Viṣṇudharmottara° and the Viṣṇudharmottarāmṛta. On the other hand, the eight verses ascribed to the Bṛhadviṣṇudharma° do correspond to Viṣṇudharmottara° 1.161.1–8.

### Viṣṇudharmottara°

ED.: Bombay: Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, 1912; – 2. ch. 168–174, in *Jyauṭiṣasiddhāntasamgraha*, ed. Vindhyeśvarīprasāda DVIVEDI, BenSS 38.2, 1917; – Stella KRAMRISCH: *The Viṣṇudharmottaram* (A Treatise on Indian Painting), J.Dept.Lett, Univ. of Calcutta 11, 1924, no. 17, 2–56. Printed separately: *The Viṣṇudharmottara* (Part III). A Treatise on Indian Painting and Image-Making, Calcutta University, 1924, <sup>2</sup>1928; – Ananda K. COOMARASWAMY: *Viṣṇudharmottara*, chapter xli [of *khaṇḍa* 3], JAOS 52, 1932, 13–21 [tr. of 15

<sup>506</sup> On which Hazra's detailed description is based. For this and other mss., see HAZRA 1958: 118–119 n. 36.

<sup>507</sup> *Na hy abhāgavatāir viṣṇur jñātum stotum ca tattvataḥ ... śakyate* (quoted at HAZRA 1958: 122 n. 38).

<sup>508</sup> SATYANARAYANA (Viṣṇudharma° 1977) shows that al-Bīrūnī's description of idol worship is a translation of the Śākrambarīṣasamvāda near the beginning of the Viṣṇudharma°, and that his treatment of the *kaliyuga* corresponds to chapter 6 of the Viṣṇudharma°.

<sup>509</sup> 1.74.35; 1.143.16, quoted at HAZRA 1958: 116 n. 24.

<sup>510</sup> KANE, without proposing a specific solution, rather emotionally challenges this early date.

<sup>511</sup> Biswanarayan SASTRI: Contribution of Assam to Sanskrit, JAssRS 14, 1960, 87–99 at 90.

<sup>512</sup> HAZRA 1954: 24–25; HAZRA 1958: 352–353 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

<sup>513</sup> BI work 136, 1905, p. 460.

śloka + comm.]; – 3rd *khaṇḍa*, ed. Priyabala SHAH, GOS 130, 1958 [text, critical notes, etc.], GOS 137, 1961 [intro., append., indexes, etc.]; – David PINGREE: The Paitāmahasiddhānta of the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa. ALB 31–32, 1967–68, 472–510; – Citrasūtram, cr.ed. + Hindi tr. Asoke CHATTERJEE Śāstri, [Gaṅganātha Jhā Granthamālā 4.] Varanasi: Varanaseya Saṃskṛta Vishvavidyalaya, 1971.

LIT.: G. BÜHLER: [book-notice on Sachau's Alberuni], IA 19, 1890, 381–410; – J. J. MEYER: Textchronologie aus Schreibfehlern in Indien, ZII 10, 1935–36, 257–276; – R. C. HAZRA: The Viṣṇu-dharmottara, an Encyclopaedic Work of the Gupta Period, JUGauhati 3, 1952, 39–64; – Bhabatosh BHATTACHARYA: The Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa: Its Dharmasāstra Contents and Their Utilisation in Mediaeval Digests, JBBRAS n.s. 28, 1953, 6–18; – Siddheśvara MUKHOPĀDHYĀYA: Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇer alankāra adhyāya, OH 2, 1954, 375–404; – HAZRA 1958: 155–218 [major Vaiṣṇava upa°]; – Shyam Chand MUKHERJEE: The Viṣṇudharmottara Chapters on Music: A Critical Study, Pur 2, 1960, 151–167; – KANE 1962: 876–878, 910; – Tadashi SHIMIZU: The Viṣṇudharmottara purāṇa III, Ad. 30 and the Nāṭya śāstra Ad. 6 – A comparative Study, J. of Indian and Buddhist Studies 18.1, 1969, (16) – (21).

Burnell's Tanjore Catalogue lists two manuscripts of a Viṣṇudharmottara°, consisting of twenty-seven chapters, “said to be the Uttarabhāga of the Gāruḍapurāṇa.”<sup>514</sup>

The printed Viṣṇudharmottara°, on the other hand, is a voluminous work, consisting of three sections (*khaṇḍas*), with 269, 183, and 355<sup>515</sup> chapters. The first *khaṇḍa* deals with the origin of the world, geography of the earth, divisions of time, astrology and astronomy, genealogies, the story of Purāravas and Urvaśī,<sup>516</sup> *śrāddha*, *vratas*, praise of Viṣṇu worship, etc.

The second *khaṇḍa* contains a version of a Paitāmahasiddhānta (chapters 166–174). It may be the work of Svayambhū, referred to in the Āryabhaṭṭīya (Gola., 50). The text is important for, among Sanskrit treatises on mathematical astronomy, it is preceded only by the Vedāṅgajyotiṣa and the last chapter of Sphujidhvaja's Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta (A.D. 628). The second section also deals exhaustively with the duties of the king (*rājadharma*), duties of women, duties of *varṇas* and *āśramas*, medicine, *karmavipāka*, the science of war including *dhanurveda*,<sup>517</sup> etc.

In the third *khaṇḍa* it is the sections on painting (*citrasūtra*, chapters 35–43) and image making (*pratimālakṣaṇa*, chapters 44–85) that have attracted most attention, from the time they were translated by Stella Kramrisch, in 1924. The text admits being a compilation of older sources: “these being lost, our text represents the earliest exhaustive account of the theory of painting.”<sup>518</sup> In addi-

<sup>514</sup> 1880: 188. Also M. RANGACHARYA: Descr. Cat. Skt. Mss. Gov. Or. Libr., Madras, 4.1 (1907), pp. 1437–1441, nos. 2111–2118.

<sup>515</sup> SHAH's edition of the third *khaṇḍa* only includes chapters 1–118.

<sup>516</sup> Ch. 130–137, considered to be closer to Kālidāsa's story than most other versions.

<sup>517</sup> According to MEYER (Viṣṇudharmottara° 1935–36) 2. ch. 177 was abbreviated in Agni° 236.24–66 (see 2.2.2).

<sup>518</sup> KRAMRISCH Viṣṇudharmottara° 1928: 4.

tion, the third section also contains chapters on grammar, lexicography, metrics, dramaturgy, poetics,<sup>519</sup> vocal and instrumental music,<sup>520</sup> dancing and acting, and singing. The chapters on painting and image making are followed by instructions on the building of temples, on *vratas*, donations, legal procedure, and the glorification of Viṣṇu.

The Viṣṇudharmottara° has been used extensively by al-Bīrūnī; he may even have known two different versions of it.<sup>521</sup> The text must therefore be earlier than A. D. 1000. Dates proposed for the text as a whole vary: between A. D. 600 and 1000,<sup>522</sup> between A. D. 450 and 650,<sup>523</sup> and between A. D. 400 and 500.<sup>524</sup> The chapters on painting “must have been compiled in the seventh century, contemporary with the latest paintings of Ajantā.”<sup>525</sup> Pingree who translated the Paitāmahasiddhānta, assigns it to the first half of the fifth century.<sup>526</sup>

The Viṣṇudharmottara° is a Pāñcarātra document, compiled most probably in South Kashmir or the northern part of the Punjab.<sup>527</sup>

Jimūtavāhana's Kālaviveka quotes two verses from a Viṣṇudharmottarāmṛta. Since these verses are not found in the present Viṣṇudharmottara°, the quotations must be from an independent work. Hazra dates it between A. D. 600 and 900.<sup>528</sup>

### Vyāsa°

LIT.: Jogendra Chandra GHOSH: Gauḍeśvarācārya Jñānottama, IHQ 13, 1937, 581–588.

Ānandabhaṭṭa's Vallālacarita<sup>529</sup> records that, when king Vallālasena inquired with his teacher Bhaṭṭa Siṃhagiri<sup>530</sup> about the origin of the *varṇas*, *gotras*, and *vaṃśas*, as well as about mixed castes, the latter recited to the king the Vyāsa°.

The tenor of Vyāsa's teachings is to allow for *kṣatriyas* both *anuloma* marriages

<sup>519</sup> 3.30, dealing with *rasa*, and enumerating nine of them, has been used by SHIMIZU to date the purāṇa between A. D. 900 and 1050.

<sup>520</sup> On music in the purāṇas, see Alain DANIELOU and N. R. BHATT: Textes des Purāṇa sur la théorie musicale. Vol. I. Edition critique, traduction française et introduction, [PIFI 11,] Pondicherry: IFI, 1970.

<sup>521</sup> Cf. BÜHLER Viṣṇudharmottara° 1890.

<sup>522</sup> KANE 1962: 910.

<sup>523</sup> SHAH Viṣṇudharmottara 1958: xxvi.

<sup>524</sup> HAZRA 1958: 212.

<sup>525</sup> KRAMRISCH Viṣṇudharmottara° 1928: 5.

<sup>526</sup> G. THIBAUT (Astronomie, Astrologie und Mathematik, Strassburg: Trübner, 1899, p. 58), on the contrary, considered the Paitāmahasiddhānta to be an extract (Auszug) from Brahmagupta's Brāhmasphuṭasiddhānta. Hence the proposition, for the Viṣṇudharmottara° as a whole, of a date between A. D. 628 and 1000 (WINTERNITZ 1963: 508–509). Cf. also GAIL 1977: 98–101.

<sup>527</sup> HAZRA 1958: 114. Cf. BÜHLER Viṣṇudharmottara° 1890: 383; WINTERNITZ 1963: 580.

<sup>528</sup> HAZRA 1954: 37; HAZRA 1958: 360 [lost Vaiṣṇava upa°].

– even the son born of a *sūdrā* wife will be a *kṣatriya* – and *pratiloma* marriages – nothing is wrong for the powerful! A verse from the Manusmṛti is quoted to show that a king is not an ordinary mortal: he is a god in the form of a man.

### Yama°

LIT.: HAZRA 1954: 37–38.

Even though this title does not appear in any list of upapurāṇas, verses from it are quoted in various places of Hemādri's Caturvargacintāmaṇi, and in Sūramiśra's Jagannāthprakāśa.

### Yuga°

ED. LIT.: H. KERN: The Bṛhatsaṅhitā of Varāha-mihira, BI work 48, 1865 [Intro., pp.32–40 Gārgī-sanhitā, 35–39 Yugapurāṇa]; – J. F. FLEET: JRAS 1912, 783–793 [review of The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea, tr. Wilfred H. Schroff]; – K. P. JAYASWAL: Historical Data in the Garga-Samhita and the Brahmin Empire, JBORS 14, 1928, 397–421; – id.: The Paris Manuscript of the Garga-Samhita, JBORS 15, 1929, 129–133; – K. H. DHRUVA: Historical Contents of the Yugapurāṇa, JBORS 16, 1930, 18–66; – N. N. GHOSH: Do the References to the Yavana Invasion of India Found in the Yugapurāṇa, Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, and the Mālavikāgnimitra Form the Evidence of One Single Event?, JGJRI 4, 1946–47, 45–50; – D. R. MANKAD: Yugapurāṇam. Edited with the Help of a New MS., Vallabhvidyanagar: Charutar Prakashan, 1951 [reprinted from JUPHS 20, 1947, 32–64]; – A. K. NARAIN: The Indo-Greeks, OUP 1957 [pp.174–179 Notes on the Yuga Purāṇa; also *passim*]; – KANE 1962: 826–829; – D. C. SIRCAR: The Account of the Yavanas in the Yuga-Purāṇa, JRAS 1963, 7–20; – David PINGREE: Census of the Exact Sciences in Sanskrit. Series A, Volume 2, [Memoirs of the Am. Phil. Soc. 86,] Philadelphia: APS, 1971 [pp.116–117, on Vṛddhagargasamhitā or Vṛddhagārgīya Jyotiṣasamhitā, including Yuga°].

The Yuga° constitutes the last chapter (113) of the unpublished astrological text Vṛddhagargasamhitā or Vṛddhagārgīyā samhitā. In answer to a question posed by Skanda – hence the title Skanda° in one of the manuscripts – about the characteristics of the four *yugas*, Śiva describes briefly the Kṛtayuga, the Tretāyuga, and the Dvāparayuga (stanzas 1–37), and devotes the remaining *ślokas* (38–117 1/2) to the description of the Kaliyuga.

The text of the Yuga° is extremely corrupt, so much so that the first editor of a part of the text (stanzas 37–94), Jayaswal, hypothesized that the original was written either in pure Prakrit or in mixed Sanskrit and Prakrit. Most later re-

<sup>529</sup> Bibliotheca Indica, work 164 (1904), 2. ch. 8. From then onward until ch. 20 the colophons read: *itī vallālacarite vyāsapurāṇe ... adhyāyaḥ*. Ch. 21 starts as follows: *Ṣṣṭhagīrī uvāca: etat tu kathitam Vyāsapurāṇam manujeśvara*.

<sup>530</sup> GHOSH identifies him with Gauḍeśvara Jñānottama (ca. A. D. 1150), author of a comm. Candrikā on Sureśvarācārya's Naiṣkarmyasiddhi (ed. Bombay Sanskrit Series, 38, <sup>3</sup>1925, Introduction by M. HIRIYANNA: Jñānottama is not later than A. D. 1300, perhaps much earlier).

search has, therefore, been concerned with establishing a more acceptable text.<sup>531</sup>

The Yuga° is important primarily as a historical document. It is a matter-of-fact chronicle, very different from the “historical” sections in the purāṇas, of the Magadha empire, down to the breakdown of the Śuṅgas and the arrival of the Śakas. It is unique in its description of the invasion and retirement of the Yavanas<sup>532</sup> in Magadha, and, except for the coins, it is the sole extant record of several Indo-Greek rulers.

The Yuga° has been both called “one of the earliest extant works bearing the title Purāṇa,”<sup>533</sup> and denounced as “quite late” and “worthless.”<sup>534</sup> It has been dated in the second or third century A. D.,<sup>535</sup> and in the first century B. C.<sup>536</sup>

---

<sup>531</sup> DHURVA's reconstruction (Yuga° 1930) of the same section as Jayaswal's – without accepting a Prakrit original – has been judged too imaginative (MANKAD Yuga° 1951: 4; KANE 1962: 826). Mankad edited the entire text, relying in part on Jayaswal, but producing a text very different from his.

<sup>532</sup> GHOSH (Yuga° 1946–47) argues, against RAPSON (1922: 544, 551) and RAYCHAUDHURI (Political History of Ancient India, <sup>3</sup>1931, pp. 259, 267), that the Yavana invasion of the Yuga° and the Mahābhāṣya is separated by a long period from the battle on the banks of the Sindhu referred to in the Mālavikāgnimitra.

<sup>533</sup> KANE 1962: 826.

<sup>534</sup> FLEET (Yuga° 1912: 792–793): “We may safely dismiss the statements of that chapter as worthless for any historical purposes, as regards Menander or anyone else”; cf. also RAPSON 1922: 544.

<sup>535</sup> F. MAX MÜLLER: India What Can It Teach Us?, London: Lognmans, Green, 1883, p. 289; cf. V. A. SMITH: The Early History of India, <sup>4</sup>1924, p. 229 n.

<sup>536</sup> KERN Yuga° 1865; JAYASWAL Yuga° 1928: 399; DHURVA Yuga° 1930: 45; KANE 1962: 218.

## ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
AHRJ	Andhra Historical Research Journal
AIKT	All-India Kashiraj Trust
AIOC	All-India Oriental Conference
AITM	Ancient Indian Tradition and Mythology
AJPh	American Journal of Philology
AKM	Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ALB	Adyar Library Bulletin
AMG	Annales du Musée Guimet
ĀnSS	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series
AO	Acta Orientalia (Leiden)
APH	Asia Publishing House
ArOr	Archiv Orientální
ASB	Asiatic Society of Bengal
As.Res.	Asiatic(k) Researches
BDCRI	Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient
BenSS	Benares Sanskrit Series
BHU	Benares Hindu University
BhV	Bhāratīya Vidyā
BI	Bibliotheca Indica
BORI	Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
BRMIC	Bulletin of the Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
CC	Catalogus Catalogorum
CE	Critical Edition
ChSS	Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series
ChSSOff	Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office
ChSSt	Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies
CR	Calcutta Review
DMG	Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft
Ed.Rev.	Edinburgh Review
EI	Epigraphia Indica
ERE	Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics
GIAPA	Grundriß der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde
GOS	Gaekwad's Oriental Series
GSAI	Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana
HCIP	The History and Culture of the Indian People
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series
IA	Indian Antiquary
IC	Indian Culture
ICO	International Congress of Orientalists
IFI	Institut Français d'Indologie

IHC	Indian History Congress
IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly
IJJ	Indo-Iranian Journal
IL	Indian Linguistics
Ind.Taur.	Indologica Taurinensia
IOL	India Office Library
ISPP	Indian Studies Past and Present
JA	Journal asiatique
JAIH	Journal of Ancient Indian History
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JASB	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
JASBo	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay
JAS(L)	Journal of the Asiatic Society (Letters)
JAssRS	Journal of the Assam Research Society
JBBRAS	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
JBHU	Journal of Benares Hindu University
JB(O)RS	Journal of the Bihar (and Orissa) Research Society
JGJKSV	Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha
JGJRI	Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute
JGRS	Journal of the Gujarat Research Society
JIH	Journal of Indian History
JOIB	Journal of the Oriental Institute Baroda
JOR	Journal of Oriental Research
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
JUBar	Journal of the University of Baroda
JUBo	Journal of the University of Bombay
JUPHS	Journal of the United Provinces (Uttar Pradesh) <b>Historical Society</b>
KSS	Kāshi Sanskrit Series
LDII	Lalabhai Dalpatbhai Institute of Indology
MR	Modern Review
NCC	New Catalogus Catalogorum
NGGW	Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der <b>Wissenschaften</b>
NIA	New Indian Antiquary
NSP	Nirṇayasāgara Press
OH	Our Heritage
OHRJ	Orissa Historical Research Journal
OLZ	Orientalistische Literaturzeitung
OST	Original Sanskrit Texts (J. Muir)
OUP	Oxford University Press
PIFI	Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie
PO	Poona Orientalist
PrAOS	Proceedings of the American Oriental Society
PTS	Pali Text Society
PUF	Presses Universitaires de France
Pur	Puranam
QJAHRs	Quarterly Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society
QJMS	Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society
RO	Rocznik Orientalistyczny
SBAW	Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SBB	Sacred Books of the Buddhists

SBE	Sacred Books of the East
SBH	Sacred Books of the Hindus
SOAS	School of Oriental and African <b>Studies</b>
TSS	Trivandrum Sanskrit Series
Ved.Kes.	Vedanta Kesari
VIJ	Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal
VOJ	Vienna Oriental Journal (= WZKM)
WZKM	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
WZKS(O)A	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd-(und Ost-)Asiens
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZII	Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik



## GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

AUFRECHT, Theodor: *Catalogi codicum manuseriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars octava, codices Sanscriticos complectens*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1864.  
–: see CC.

BARTH, Auguste: *The Religions of India*, Tr. J. Wood, London: Kegan Paul, 1879, <sup>5</sup>1921.  
BHANDARKAR, Ramkrishna Gopal: *Vaiṣṇavism Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, Strassburg: Trübner [Reprint Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1965], 1913.  
BHATTACHARJI, Sukumari: *The Indian Theogony. A Comparative Study of Indian Mythology from the Vedas to the Purāṇas*, Cambridge UP, 1970.  
BURNELL, Arthur Coke: *A Classified Index of the Sanskrit Mss. in the Palace at Tanjore*, London: Trübner [Pp. 187–203 Puranic Literature], 1880.  
BURNOUF, Eugène: *Bhāgavata°* See *Bhāgavata°* ED.

CC: Theodor Aufrecht: *Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors*, Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1891, 1896, 1903. [Reprint Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1962.]

DAS, Govinda: *Hinduism*, Madras: Natesan [Pp. 115–124 The Puranas], 1924.

DASGUPTA, Surendranath: *A History of Indian Philosophy*, Cambridge UP.

–: Vol. 3, pp. 482–495 *Īśvara-gītā, Its Philosophy as Expounded by Vijñāna Bhikṣu*; pp. 496–511 *Philosophical Speculations of Some of the Selected Purāṇas*, 1940.

–: Vol. 4, pp. 1–50 *The Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*. 1949.

–: Vol. 5, pp. 96–129 *The Śaiva Philosophy in the Purāṇas*, 1955.

DIMITT, Cornelia Church, and J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN: *Classical Hindu Mythology. A Reader in the Sanskrit Purāṇas*, Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1978.

EGGELING, Julius: *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, London: Gilbert, Rivington [Vol. 1, part 2, pp. 1184–1414 *Paurāṇik Literature*], 1899.

ELIOT, Charles: *Hinduism and Buddhism. An Historical Sketch*, London: Routledge-Kegan Paul [Reprints 1954, 1957], 1921.

EMENEAU, Murray Barnson: *A Union List of Printed Indic Texts and Translations in American Libraries*, New Haven, Conn.: AOS, 1935.

FARQUHAR, John Nicol: *An Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, OUP, 1920.

GAIL, Adalbert J.: *Buddha als Avatāra Viṣṇus im Spiegel der Purāṇas*, *Deutscher Orientalistentag* 17 (1968), 917–923, 1969.

–: *Paraśurāma, Brahmane und Krieger. Untersuchung über Ursprung und Entwicklung eines Avatāra Viṣṇus und Bhakta Śivas in der indischen Literatur*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977.

GLASENAPP, Helmuth von: *Über vier purāṇische Nachbildungen der Bhagavadgītā*, *Garbe vol.*, 139–147, 1927.

GONDA, Jan: Die Religionen Indiens. I Veda und älterer Hinduismus, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.

–: Id. II Der jüngere Hinduismus, *ibid.*, 1963.

–: Vedic Literature, [A History of Indian Literature I.1,] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975.

–: Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit, [A History of Indian Literature II.1,] *ibid.*, 1977.

GOUDRIAAN, Teun, and Sanjukta GUPTA: Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature, [A History of Indian Literature II.2,] *ibid.*, 1981.

HACKER, Paul: Religiöse Toleranz und Intoleranz im Hinduismus, *Saeculum* 8, 167–179, 1957.

–: Prahlāda. Werden und Wandlung einer Idealgestalt, *Abh. Ak.Wiss.Litt.*, Mainz, No. 9, 1–147, No. 13, 149–253, 1959.

–: Purāṇen und Geschichte des Hinduismus. Methodologische, programmatische und geistesgeschichtliche Bemerkungen, *OLZ* 55, 341–354, 1960.

–: Zur Methode der geschichtlichen Erforschung der anonymen Sanskritliteratur des Hinduismus, *ZDMG* 111, 483–492, 1961.

HARAPRASAD SHASTRI: A Catalogue of Palm-Leaf and Selected Paper MSS. belonging to the Durbar Library Nepal, Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1905.

–: A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta: ASB [Vol. 5 Purāṇa Manuscripts], 1928a.

–: The Maha-Puranas, *JBORS* 14, 323–340, 1928b.

HAWLEY, John Stratton and Donna Marie WULFF (ed.): The Divine Consort. Rādhā and the Goddesses of India, Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1982.

HAZRA, Rajendra Chandra: The Upapurāṇas, *ABORI* 21, 38–62, 1939.

–: Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, Dacca University [Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975], 1940.

–: Great Women in the Purāṇas, in Swami Madhavananda and R.C. Majumdar (ed.): Great Women of India, Mayavati Almora Himalayas: Advaita Ashram, pp. 221–237, 1953.

–: Some Lost Upapurāṇas, *JAS(L)* 20, 15–38, 1954.

–: Studies in the Upapurāṇas. Vol 1 Saura and Vaiṣṇava Upapurāṇas, Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1958.

–: The Purāṇas. The Upapurāṇas, in The Cultural Heritage of India, Calcutta: Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, <sup>2</sup>, 240–270, 271–286, 1962.

–: Studies in the Upapurāṇas. Vol. 2 Śākta and Non-Sectarian Upapurāṇas, Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1963.

HOHENBERGER, Adam: Die indische Flutsage und das Matsyapurāṇa. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Viṣṇuverehrung, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1930.

HOLTZMANN, Adolph: Das Mahābhārata und seine Theile, Kiel: Haeseler [Vol. 4, pp. 29–58 Die Purāṇa], 1895.

HOPKINS, Edward Washburn: The Religions of India, London: Edward Arnold, 1896.

–: The Great Epic of India. Its Character and Origin, New York: Scribner [Reprint Calcutta: Punthi Puṣṭak, 1969], 1901.

HORSCH, Paul: Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur, Bern: Francke, 1966.

IOL: Catalogue of the Library of the India Office. Vol. II Part I Sanskrit Books, 4 vols., London: HMSO, 1938–1957.

JACKSON, A. M. T.: Epic and Puranic Notes, JBBRAS Extra No. The Centenary Memorial Volume, 67–77, 1905.

JAHN, Wilhelm: Aufgaben der Purāṇaforschung, Ernst Kuhn vol., 305–312, 1916.

KANE, Pandurang Vaman: History of Dharmasāstra, Poona: BORI.

–: Vol. 1, pp. 160–167 The Purāṇas, 1930.

–: Vol. 2.1, pp. 98–99 Sūta, 1941.

–: Vol. 5.2, pp. 815–886 Origin and Development of Purāṇa Literature; pp. 887–912 Brief Notes on Individual Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas; pp. 913–1002 Influence of Purāṇas on Dharmasāstra, 1962.

–: <sup>2</sup>Vol. 1.1, pp. 408–421 The Purāṇas, 1968.

KEITH, Arthur Berriedale: Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office. Vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935.

KENNEDY, Vans: Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology, London: Longman, 1831.

[Kennedy's articles in the Asiatic Journal n.s. 33, 1840 – n.s. 36, 1841, have been included as an appendix (pp. 257–380) in Works of the Late Horace Hayman Wilson, ed. Fitzedward Hall, vol. X.]

KIRFEL, Willibald: Die Kosmographie der Inder. Nach Quellen dargestellt, Bonn–Leipzig: Schroeder. [Reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1967], 1920.

–: Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa. Versuch einer Textgeschichte, Bonn: Schroeder [Devanāgarī ed., with English Introduction, by Suryakant Shastri, Varanasi: ChSSOff, 1979], 1927.

–: Bhāratavarṣa (Indien). Textgeschichtliche Darstellung zweier geographischen Purāṇa-Texte nebst Übersetzung [Beiträge zur indischen Sprachwissenschaft und Religionsgeschichte 6,] Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1931.

–: Das Purāṇa vom Weltgebäude (Bhuvanavinyāsa). Die kosmographischen Traktate der Purāṇas. Versuch einer Textgeschichte [Bonner Orientalistische Studien N. S. 1,] Bonn: Orient. Seminar, 1954.

–: Zur Eschatologie von Welt und Leben: Ein purāṇischer Text nebst Übertragung in textgeschichtlicher Darstellung [Bonner Orient. Stud. N. S. 5,] Bonn: Oriental. Seminar, 1959.

KRISHNAMACHARYA/KRISHNAMACHARIAR, Madabushi: A History of the Classical Sanskrit Literature [Vidvan Mano Ranjani Series 7,] Madras: Vijayanti Press [Pp. 30–34 The Purāṇas], 1906.

–: (Assisted by his son, M. SRINIVASACHARIAR) History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, Madras: Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Press [Pp. 72–77 Purāṇas], 1937.

LASSEN, Christian: Indische Alterthumskunde.

Vol. 1, Bonn: Koenig; London: Williams & Norgate, 1847.

–: Vol. 4, Leipzig: Kittler; London: ibid., 1861.

–: <sup>2</sup>Vol. 1, ibid., 1867.

LEVI, Sylvain: Le Népal. Etude historique d'un royaume. Vol. 1, [Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'études 17,] Paris: Leroux, 1905.

LOHANI, Bhāskarānanda: Paurāṇika sāhitya aura saṃskṛti, Lucknow: Rāmā Prakashan, 1963.

MACDONELL, Arthur Anthony: A History of Sanskrit Literature, London: Heinemann [Pp. 299–302 The Purāṇas] [Reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1962 (pp. 251–254)], 1900.

- MANI, Vettam: *Purāṇic Encyclopaedia. A Comprehensive Dictionary of the Epic and Purāṇic Literature*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975.
- MAZUMDAR, B. C.: *The Origin and Character of the Purāṇa Literature*, Asutosh Mookerji vol. 3.2, 7–30, 1925.
- MEHENDALE, Madhukar Anant: *The Purāṇas*, in HCIP vol. 3 *The Classical Age*, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, <sup>3</sup>pp. 291–299, 1970.
- MEYER, Johann Jacob: *Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa. Ein Beitrag zur Frage von der Entstehungsart der altindischen Rechtsschriften und der Purāṇa*, [Indische Forschungen 7,] Breslau: Marucs, 1929.
- MĪŚRA, Jvālāprasāda: *Aṣṭādaśapurāṇadarpaṇa*, Bombay: Venkaṭeśvara Press [Chapter index to the 18 purāṇas, in Hindi], 1922.
- MĪTRA, Rājendrahlāla: *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.*, 11 vols., Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1871–1895.
- MORGAN, Kenneth W. (ed.): *The Religion of the Hindus*. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1953.
- NĀRĀYAṆASWĀMĪ AIYAR, K.: *The Purāṇas in the Light of Modern Science*, Adyar: Theosophical Society. 1914, <sup>2</sup>1916.
- NEVE, Félix: *Les Pourānas. Etudes sur les derniers monuments de la littérature sanscrite*, Paris: Douniol, 1852.
- : *Epoques littéraires de l'Inde. Etudes sur la poésie sanscrite*, Brussels: Muquardt, Paris: Leroux, 1883.
- NCC: *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*, University of Madras. Vol. 1, 1949 (<sup>2</sup>1968), etc.
- O'FLAHERTY, Wendy Doniger: *Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Śiva*, OUP, 1973.
- : *Purāṇa (400 B. C. – 1400 A. D.)*, in Jaroslav Průšek (ed.): *Dictionary of Oriental Literatures*. Vol. 2 *South and South-East Asia*, London: Allan & Unwin, pp. 125–126 [See also *Bhāgavata*<sup>o</sup> 1974], 1974.
- : *Hindu Myths. A Sourcebook Translated from the Sanskrit*, Penguin Books L306, 1975.
- : *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1976. Also Berkeley: UC Press, 1977.
- : *Women, Androgynes, and Other Mythological Beasts*, Univ. of Chicago Press. Also: *Sexual Metaphors and Animal Symbols in Indian Mythology*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.
- PARGITER, Frederick Eden: *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, with Introduction and Notes*, OUP. [Reprint ChSSt 19, Varanasi: ChSSOff, 1962], 1913.
- : *Purāṇas*, ERE 10, 447–455, 1919.
- : *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, OUP. [Reprints Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1962; Delhi: Cosmo, 1979, *Ancient Indian Traditions*], 1922.
- PAYNE, Ernst Alexander: *The Śaktas. An Introductory and Comparative Study*, Calcutta: Y. M. C. A. Publishing House, 1933.
- PUSALKAR/PUSALKER, Achut Dattatreya: *Historical Traditions*, in HCIP vol. 1 *The Vedic Age*, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, pp. 269–333, 1951.
- : *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas*, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. 1955, <sup>2</sup>ibid., 1963.
- : *Purāṇic Studies*, Chitraoashtri vol., 689–774, 1968.
- RAGHAVAN, Venkataram: *Introduction to the Hindu Scriptures*, in MORGAN 1953: 265–276, 1953.

- : The Puranas, in V. Raghavan (ed.): Sanskrit Literature, Delhi: Publications Division, pp. 35–37, 1961.
- RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR, V. R.: The Purāṇas. A Study, IHQ 8, 747–767, 1932.
- : The Purāṇa Index, 3 vols., [Madras Univ. Historical Series 19,] Madras Univ., 1951–55.
- RAMASWAMI SASTRI, K. S.: The Purāṇas and Their Contribution to Indian Thought, in The Cultural Heritage of India, vol. 1, pp. 169–182, 1937.
- : The Purāṇas, in The Cultural Heritage of India, <sup>2</sup>vol. 5, pp. 64–71, 1978.
- RAPSON, Edward James: The Purāṇas, in Cambridge History of India, Cambridge UP, vol. 1, pp. 264–284 [Reprint Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1962], 1922.
- SACHAU, Edward C.: Alberuni's India, [Truebner's Oriental Series 2,] London–Edinburgh [Reprint Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1964], 1888.
- SHASTRI, Hṛishikeśa, and Śiva Candra GUI: A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College, Calcutta: Banerjee Press [Vol. 4 Purāṇa], 1902.
- SINGER, Milton (ed.): Krishna. Myths, Rites, and Attitudes, Honolulu: East-West Center, 1966.
- SINHA, Jadunath: A History of Indian Philosophy, 2 vols., Calcutta: Sinha Publishing House [Vol. 1, pp. 125–177 The Philosophy of the Purāṇas. Viṣṇuism, Śaivism, and Śāktism], 1956.
- SURYAKANTA SHASTRI: The Flood Legend in Sanskrit Literature, Delhi: Ś. Chand, 1950.
- TANDON, Yaspal: Purāṇa-*viṣaya-samanukramaṇikā*. A Concordance of Purāṇa-Contents, [Vishveshvarananda Indological Series 3,] Hoshiarpur: VVRI, 1952.
- UPĀDHYĀYA, Baladeva: Purāṇa aura paurāṇika anuśilana, JBRS 56, 1–8, 1970.
- : Purāṇavimarśa (Authentic Solution of the Critical Problems of Purāṇas), [Vidyabhawan Rashtrabhasha Granthamala 80,] Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan, 1965. <sup>2</sup>1978.
- VENKATACHALLA IYER, V.: The Puranas, QJMS 13, 1922–23, 702–713, 1923.
- WARD, William: Account of the Writings, Religion, and Manners of the Hindoos, Including Translations from Their Principal Works, 4 vols., Serampore: Mission-Press [Vol. 2, pp. 37–268 Of the Pooranūs; pp. 483–487 Reading and Hearing of Pooranūs], 1811.
- WEBER, Albrecht: Akademische Vorlesungen über indische Literaturgeschichte, Berlin: Dümmler, 1852.
- : id., 2nd. ed. (vermehrt), 1876.
- : The History of Indian Literature. Translated from the Second German Edition by John Mann and Theodor Zachariae, London: Trübner, 1878.
- WILKINS, William Joseph: Hindu Mythology, Vedic and Purāṇic, Calcutta: Thacker, Spink [Part 2, p. 77–279, <sup>2</sup>89–360 The Purāṇic Deities. Ch. 1, pp. 77–79, <sup>2</sup>89–92 The Purāṇas], 1882, <sup>2</sup>1900.
- WILSON, Horace Hayman: A Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus, As. Res. 16, 1–136; 17, 169–313 [Reprints Calcutta: Bishop's College, 1846; Select Works, ed. Reinhold Rost, vol. 1, London: Trübner, 1861; Delhi: Asian Publication Services, 1976], 1828–32.
- : See Viṣṇu° Tr. 1840 = 1961.
- WINDISCH, Ernst: Geschichte der Sanskrit-Philologie und indischen Altertumskunde, Straßburg: Trübner, 1917–20.

- WINTERNITZ, Moriz: Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Leipzig: Amelangs Verlag.  
–: <sup>2</sup>Vol. 1, pp. 440–483. Die Purāṇas und ihre Stellung in der indischen Litteratur, 1907.  
–: A History of Indian Literature, Calcutta Univ.  
Vol. 1.2, transl. S. Ketkar and Revised by the Author, pp. 517–586 The Purāṇas and their Position in Indian Literature, 1927.  
–: <sup>2</sup>Vol. 1.2, pp. 454–514, 1963.  
–: Vol. 1, revised transl. by V. Srinivasa Sarma, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp. 495–559, 1981. [Occasional references to the other volumes will be made as Geschichte 2/3 and History 2/3.]

## INDEX

The order is that of the Roman alphabet. Bibliographies, general and topical, are not indexed. The footnotes are indexed selectively; the page number is then followed by “n.”

- Abegg, E. 36, 65  
 Abhimanyu 141, 169  
 Abu 234  
*ācāra* 86, 101  
 Ācāramayūkha 216  
 Ācāranirṇayabhāskarasaṃgraha 188  
 Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa 109, 158–159  
 Ādibrahmavaivartapurāṇa 164  
 Ādikhaṇḍa (Padmapurāṇa) 207, 208–209  
 Ādipurāṇa 32, 133–134; = Brahmapurāṇa  
 33, 134, 155; Hastimalla's 76; Jīnasena's  
 92  
 Aditi 102, 108, 169  
 Ādityapurāṇa 32, 68, 115, 134, 220  
*advaita* 213, 221, 236  
 Āgamas 173, 223, 227, 236  
 Agastya 14n., 78, 158, 167, 171, 212, 233  
 Agastyaparvan (Javanese) 78  
 Agastyasaṃhitā 234, 236  
 Āgneyapurāṇa (genuine) *see* Vahnipurāṇa  
 Agni 21, 114, 135  
 Āgnīdhra 142  
 Agnipurāṇa 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36,  
 37–38, 41, 46, 60–61, 63, 78, 79, 84, 87,  
 89, 98, 102, 103, 114, 134–137, 175, 177  
 Agnivarcaś Bhāradvāja 45, 46  
 Agrawala, V.S. 1, 65  
 Ahalyā 163  
 Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā 28n., 185  
 Aikṣvākaś 116  
 Ailas 116, 129  
 Ajāmila 142  
 Ajanābha 142  
 Ajigarta 170  
 Ajmer 201, 208, 214  
 Akbar 77  
 Ākṣeṭakapurāṇa 137  
*ākhyāna* 17n., 59, 81, 97  
*ākhyāyikā* 30n.
- Akṛtavraṇa Kāśyapa 45, 46  
*alaṃkāra* 136, 252  
 Alexander the Great 123  
 All-India Kashiraj Trust 6, 7, 98, 99, 184,  
 239  
*alpapurāṇa* 27  
 Ālvars 106, 147, 151n., 214  
 Amarakośa 24, 25, 26, 30, 136  
 Amayāsura 167  
 Ambikā 194, 213  
 Ambikākhaṇḍa 237  
 Amoghavarṣa I 92  
*amṛta* 108  
 Ānandabhaṭṭa *see* Vallālacarita  
 Ānandāśrama editions 60, 65n.  
 Ānandatīrtha 149  
 Ānandātman 138  
 Ānandavardhana 103  
 Anantācārya *see* Prapannāmṛta  
 Anāvilpurāṇa 72  
 Andhaka 198, 240  
 Āndhra(s) 117, 119n., 144  
 Āṅgirasapurāṇa 137  
 Anilapurāṇa 74  
 Anu 143  
 Anuśaṅgapāda (Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa) 157;  
 (Vāyupurāṇa) 243  
*ānvikṣikī* 30n.  
 Apabhraṃśa 129  
 Aparārka 15n., 86  
*(ap)āśraya* 27  
 Āpastambadharmasūtra 85–86, 101, 152  
 Appayya Dikṣita *see* Śivapurāṇatāmasa-  
 tvanirākaraṇa  
*ārādhita* 110, 143  
 Arbudamāhātmya 229, 234  
 architecture 198  
*ardhanarīśvara* 113, 181  
 Arjuna 169, 212, 225



- bhakti* 106, 141, 161, 170, 174, 186, 203, 213, 226, 227, 236  
 Bhaktiratnākara 190  
 Bhālaṇa 150  
 Bhāmaha 136, 137  
 Bhandarkar, D.R. 195, 209  
 Bhandarkar, R.G. 101, 148  
 Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 7, 98  
 Bharadvāja 184, 205  
 Bharata 142, 247  
 Bhāratavaṣa 131, 142, 240, 247  
 Bhārata war 44n., 109, 116, 122, 142, 170  
 Bhargava, P.L. 127  
 Bhārgavapurāṇa 151  
 Bhartṛhari *see* Nītiśataka  
 Bhāsūrānanda 186  
*bhāt* 57, 58, 59  
 Bhattacharji, S. 19  
 Bhaṭṭaharacarita 210  
 Bhaṭṭa Siṃhagiri 252  
 Bhaumasamhitā 222, 224  
 Bhavabhūti *see* Mālatīmādhaṇa, Uttarārāmacarita  
 Bhavānanda *see* Harivaṃśa  
 Bhaviṣyapurāṇa 6n., 20, 21, 31, 32, 39, 40, 43, 61, 64, 78, 96n., 103, 114, 151–154, 221  
*bhaviṣyatpurāṇa* 86, 152  
 Bhaviṣyottapurāṇa 113, 153–154, 178, 250  
 Bhīmacandra Kavi *see* Basavapurāṇa  
 Bhoja 136  
 Bhrāmari 171  
 Bṛgu(s) 169, 170, 181  
 Bṛgusamhitā 249  
 Bṛṅgi 181  
 Bṛṅgiśasamhitā 243  
 Bṛṅgiśvara *liṅga* 235  
 Bhūmikhaṇḍa 207, 208  
*bhūrloka* 130  
*bhuvanakośa* 142, 198, 240  
 Bhuvanakośavarṇoddyota 243  
 Bhuvaneshvar *see* Ekāmraṅṣetra  
 Bihar 135, 210  
*bilva* 165  
 (al-)Bīrūni 11, 31, 61, 68, 69, 116n., 133, 134, 219, 238, 250, 252  
 Blau, A. 42  
 Blavatsky, H.P. 10  
 Bonazzoli, G. 53, 61, 153  
 Bork, F. 123  
 Brahmā 17, 19, 21, 76, 104–105, 152, 161, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 173, 180, 181, 183, 185, 190, 194, 200, 204, 205, 208, 209, 210, 213, 214, 221, 223, 224, 226, 227, 232, 241, 242, 247  
 Brahmagītā 236  
 Brahmagupta 100  
 Brahmakaivartapurāṇa 163–164  
 Brahmakalpa 35  
 Brahmakhaṇḍa (Brahmavaivartapurāṇa) 161; (Padmapurāṇa) 207, 208, 209  
 Brāhmakhaṇḍa (Skandapurāṇa) 229, 231–232  
 Brahmakhaṇḍa 182  
 Brāhmaṇa(s) 19, 47n.  
 Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 20, 21, 32, 43, 46, 62, 64, 65, 69, 79, 89, 115, 125, 156–160; and Vāyupurāṇa 33, 44, 244; Javanese 78  
 brahmanical literature 126  
 brahmanicide 56  
 Brāhmaparvan 115, 217, 218, 219  
 Brahmapurāṇa 20, 21, 31, 32, 33, 41, 60, 65, 71, 103, 154–156, 220  
 Brahmputra 181  
 Brahmashphutasiddhānta 251  
 Brahmavaivartapurāṇa 20, 21, 27, 31, 36, 71, 73, 77, 103, 110, 114, 143, 160–164, 190  
*brahmavijñāna* 213  
 Brāhmī 213  
 Brāhmīsamhitā (Kūrmapurāṇa) 185; (Skandapurāṇa) 234  
 Brahmottarakhaṇḍa 229, 232  
 Bṛhad-...-purāṇa 66–67  
 Bṛhadauśanasapurāṇa 138  
 Bṛhadbrahmottarakhaṇḍa 232  
 Bṛhadbṛhadpurāṇa 32, 68, 103, 113, 164–166, 173, 201, 202, 214  
 Bṛhadratha 183  
 Bṛhadvāmanapurāṇa 239, 241  
 Bṛhadviṣṇudharma 250  
 Bṛhadviṣṇupurāṇa 67, 249  
 Bṛhannandikeśvarapurāṇa 201  
 Bṛhannāradapurāṇa 67, 73, 202–203  
 Bṛhannṛsiṃhapurāṇa 206  
 Bṛhaspatīsamhitā 176  
 Bṛhatkathā 92, 235  
 Bṛhatsamhitā 131n., 152, 175–176, 218n.  
 Bṛhatsvayambhūpurāṇa 66n.  
 Buddha 23, 90

- Buddha(avatāra) 110–111, 205, 250  
 Buddhabhaṭṭa see Ratnaparikṣā  
 Buddhi 200, 224  
 Buddhism 24, 101, 110, 111n., 183, 247  
 Buddhist literature and purāṇas 90–91,  
 121, 147  
 Buddhist Sanskrit 129  
 Budha 143  
 Bühler, G. 24, 51, 53, 148, 204  
 Burnell, A.C. 61, 151, 251  
 Burnouf, E. 4, 13, 19, 25, 27, 100, 110, 145,  
 146, 148  
  
 Caitanya 149, 163  
 Caland, W. 87  
 Cambay 230  
 Cambodia, purāṇas in 78  
 Cāmuṇḍā 194  
 Cānakyaśāstrānītiśāstra 88, 176  
 Caṇḍa 194  
 Caṇḍāla 226  
 Caṇḍī(mahātmya) 73; *see also* De-  
 vīmāhātmya  
 Caṇḍīpurāṇa 62; *see also* Kālikāpurāṇa  
 Caṇḍīśataka 195  
 Candra 163  
 Candrabhāgā 217  
 Candradeva 204  
 Cannabasavapurāṇa 76  
 Carakasamhitā 167  
 cāraṇ 58n.  
 caste purāṇas 72, 190–191  
 Caturaśītiliṅgamāhātmya 229, 233  
 Cāturmāsya-māhātmya 229, 232  
 Caturvargacintāmaṇi 62, 102, 217, 221,  
 249, 253  
 caturyuga 124  
 Cevvaiccūṭuvār 150  
 Champa 78  
 Chatterjee, A. 173, 214  
 Chatterji, S.K. 129  
 Chaudhuri, S.B. 40, 79, 137, 177  
 Christian purāṇas 74–75, 151  
 Cidambaramāhātmya 71  
 Citraketu 142  
 Citrāṅgada 167  
 citrasūtra 251  
 Colebrooke, H.T. 25, 28, 144, 145, 146,  
 148  
 ‘cooking’ puranic texts 51  
  
 Coorg(s) 237  
 cosmography 130–131, 209  
 creation 247, 251; *see also* sarga; pratisarga;  
 manvantara; etc.  
 critical editions *see* editions  
 criticism of purāṇas 8–11  
 Cyavana 170  
 cyclical time 123, 124–125  
  
 Dakṣa 142, 165, 170, 180, 189, 224, 226,  
 230, 240  
 Dakṣiṇā 161  
 dāna 29, 70, 86, 167, 198, 199, 221, 252  
 Dānakriyākaumudī 38  
 Dānasāgara 37, 38, 62, 88  
 Daṇḍin 136, 137  
 daṇḍanūi 30n.  
 Darpaka 180  
 daśalakṣaṇī 27, 28, 162  
 Daśaratha 109  
 Dasgupta, S.N. 148  
 dates of purāṇas 100–103  
 Daurvāsasapurāṇa 166  
 Dayānanda Sarasvatī 9–10; *see also*  
 Bhāgavatākhaṇḍana; Satyarthaprakāśh  
 day of Brahmā 124  
 De, S.K. 136  
 della Casa, C. 45  
 Deogarh 172  
 deterioration of purāṇas 38–41  
 Devadāruvana 112, 157, 240  
 Devadāruvanamāhātmya 70n.  
 Devahūti 142  
 Devakī 143, 169  
 Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa *see* Smṛticandrikā  
 Devāpi 14n.  
 Devī 76, 113, 155, 158, 165, 169, 170, 171,  
 180, 189, 190, 194, 195, 203, 221  
 Devibhāgavatamāhātmya 168  
 Devibhāgavatapurāṇa 10, 16n., 61, 113,  
 162, 167–172, 219; and Bhāgavatapurā-  
 ṇa 69, 146–147, 150  
 Devīgītā 170  
 Devīmāhātmya 103, 111, 113, 162, 167,  
 191, 193–196  
 Devīpurāṇa 23, 63, 113, 166–167, 180, 219;  
 Kannada 76  
 Devītantra 181  
 de Vreese, K. 51, 53  
 de Vries, J.D.L. 44  
 Dhaneśvara *see* Śatruṅjayamāhātmya

- Dhanvantari 135, 176  
*dhāraka* 57n.  
*dhāraṇā* 141  
*dharma* literature 37–38  
 Dharmamaṅgal 74  
*dharmānibandhas* 23, 134, 154, 201, 249, 250  
 Dharmapāla 173, 182  
 Dharmapurāṇa 73, 172–173, 208; **Bengali** 74  
 Dharmāranya 72  
 Dharmarānyamāhātmya 229, 232  
 Dharmasakha 231  
 Dharmasamhitā (Śivapurāṇa) 222, 224, 226–227; (Varāhapurāṇa) 242  
*dharmasāstras* and *purāṇas* 85–88  
 Dhṛtarāṣṭra 141, 169, 170  
 Dhruva 142, 247  
 Dhūmravarṇa 200  
*dhyānayoga* 213  
 Digambara 91, 92, 94  
 Dionysus 123  
 Draupadī 192  
 Dravidian *purāṇas* 75–77  
 Dṛḍhasyu 78  
 Druhyu 143  
 Dubois, J.A. 23  
 Durgā 113, 158, 161, 193  
 Durgāpūjā 113, 114, 182–183  
 Durgāpūjātattva 62  
 Durjanamukhacapeṭikā 146  
 Durjanamukhamahācapeṭikā 146  
 Durjanamukhapadmapādukā 146  
 Dūtāṅgada 206n.  
 Dutt, M.N. *see* Garuḍapurāṇa  
 Dvaipāyana 81  
*dvaitādvaita* 183  
*dvāparayuga* 47, 109, 124, 165, 168, 190, 247, 253  
 Dvārakamāhātmya 229, 234  
*dvīpa(s)* 130, 142, 170–171, 224, 240, 247  
  
 earlier *purāṇas* 18–41, 104  
 editions of *purāṇas* 6–7, 59, 98–99  
 Eggeling, J. 4  
 eighteen *purāṇas* 30–34  
 Ekadanta 200  
 Ekāmraḥsetra 155, 173  
 Ekāmrapurāṇa 137, 150, 173, 178, 186, 200, 201, 206, 215, 243, 249  
 Ekāmravana 228  
  
 Ekanāth 150  
 Ekapādapurāṇa 173  
 Ekāvalī 170  
 Ekavīra 170  
*encyclopedic purāṇas* 78–80, 134, 175, 197  
*epics* and *purāṇas* 80–85, 128  
 etymology of *purāṇa* 47n.  
 extent of *purāṇa* literature 1–2  
 Ezourvedam 11  
  
 Farquhar, J.N. 22, 148, 172, 174, 219, 249  
 Father Liber 123  
 Fenicio, G. 11  
 fifth Veda 16–17  
 fivefold division of *purāṇas* 21  
 Flood 107, 122  
 Foucher d'Obsonville 150  
 fourfold division of *purāṇas* 78–79  
 Friederich, R. 78  
 Führer, A.A. 89  
  
 Gadādhara *see* Kālasāra  
*gāgariyā bhaṭ* 59, 74  
 Gail, A.J. 52, 111, 148, 249  
 Gajānana 200  
 Gaṇapatikhaṇḍa 161, 162  
 Gaṇapati Śāstrī *see* Śrīmūla  
 Gaṇapatya *purāṇas* 115, 174, 200  
 Gaṇḍakī 106  
 Gandhamādāna 131  
 Gaṇeśa 115, 152, 162, 163, 165, 174, 189, 200, 203, 224, 225  
 Gaṇeśagītā 174  
 Gaṇeśakhaṇḍa *see* Gaṇapatikhaṇḍa  
 Gaṇeśapurāṇa 115, 174, 200  
 Gaṅgā 114, 141, 161, 165, 168, 190, 203, 213, 234  
 Gaṅgādhara 227  
 Gaṅgas 231  
 Gaṅgāsahasranāma 233  
 Gaṅgāstava 164  
 Gargasamhitā 91n.  
 Garuḍa 204, 217  
 Garuḍapurāṇa 20, 21, 32, 36, 39, 43, 78, 79, 87, 98, 175–178, 251; Dutt's transl. 52  
 Garuḍapurāṇasārasaṃgraha 177n.  
 Garuḍapurāṇasāroddhāra 177–178  
*gāthā* 47, 97  
 Gauḍapāda 139, 147  
 Gaurī 170  
 Gautamasṃṛti 85, 87

- Gautamīmāhātmya 154, 155, 156  
 Gayā 70, 71, 203  
 Gayāmāhātmya 70, 178, 243, 244, 245  
*gāyatrī* 15, 35, 148, 168, 171, 193  
 Geldner, K.F. 17  
 Genesis 153  
 geography 130–131, 156, 170, 231, 244, 247, 251  
 Gerson da Cunha, J. 235  
 Ghaṭṭānirmāṇādhivāsānotsargaprayoga 243  
 Ghora 167  
 Ghṛtāci 161  
 Giridhara 149  
 Girnar 234  
 Gītagovinda 147, 162, 163  
 Gītāmāhātmya 211  
*gītās* in purāṇas 83  
 Godāvāri 156  
 Godavarīmāhātmya *see* Gautamīmāhātmya  
 Gokarṇa 232  
 Goldstücker, T. 8, 19  
 Goloka 161, 162  
 Gonda, J. 104  
 Gopālabhaṭṭa *see* Haribhaktivilāsa  
 Gopāladāsa *see* Bhaktiratnākara  
*gopī* 143, 162  
 Govinda *see* Vākyaratnākara  
 Govindānanda *see* Dānakriyākaumudī  
*grāmaṇī* 54  
 gr̥hyasūtras 80n.  
 Gujarat 72, 220, 234  
 Gujarati purāṇas 74, 150  
 Guṇabhadra 92  
 Guṇāḍhya *see* Bṛhatkathā  
*guṇas* 20, 21, 112  
 Gupta, A.S. 7  
 Gupta(s) 116, 122, 177  
 Gyani, S.D. 60, 63, 137, 147  
  
 Hacker, P. 45, 104, 105, 125  
 Haihayas 170  
 Hālāsya-māhātmya 77n., 236  
 Halhed, N.B. 215  
 Hamilton, A. 2  
 Hanumān 203  
 Haracaritacintāmaṇi 90  
 Haraprasad Shastri 1, 7, 41, 60, 61, 79, 136, 177, 195, 214, 234, 237, 240  
 Hari 107, 143, 161, 172, 242  
 Haribhaktivilāsa 67n., 137, 150, 206, 215, 217  
 Haridvāra 142, 190  
 Harililā 145  
 Harililāmṛta 145n.  
 Hariścandra 170, 192  
 Hārītasamhitā 205  
 Harivaṃśa 31, 81, 83, 85, 92, 143, 155, 248; Bhavānanda's 184; Jinasena's 91–92  
 Harivarṣa 131  
 Harṣacarita 24, 57, 89–90  
 Haryaśvas 142  
 Hastimalla *see* Ādipurāṇa  
 Hastings, W. 2, 215  
 Hāṭakeśvarakṣetra 234  
 Hayagrīva 158, 203  
 Hazra, R.C. 2, 22, 30, 31, 35, 37, 41, 60, 62, 63, 64, 68, 69, 79, 103, 133, 134, 137, 147, 153, 154, 166, 172, 173, 174, 177, 182, 185, 188, 199, 201, 203, 206, 214, 219, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 241, 249, 250, 252  
 hell(s) *see* naraka  
 Hemaçandra *see* Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita  
 Hemādri *see* Caturvargacintāmaṇi  
 Hemakūṭa 130  
 heterodox systems 111n.  
*hetu* 27  
 Hilgenberg, L. 45, 209  
 Himālaya(s) / Himavat 130, 165, 170, 180, 181, 189, 190, 194, 224  
 Himavatkhaṇḍa 235  
 Himavatprastha 189  
 Hindu sects 24  
 Hiraṇmaya 131  
 Hiraṇyakaśipu 84, 108, 142, 198  
 Hiraṇyākṣa 108, 142  
 history in the purāṇas 115–125  
 Hittites 129  
 Hohenberger, A. 22, 52, 65  
 Holikāmāhātmya 211  
 Holtzmann, A. 83  
 Hopkins, E.W. 84  
 Hopkins, T.J. 148  
 Hūṇas 101  
  
 iconography 99n., 135  
 Ikṣvāku 116, 143, 170  
 Ila / Ilā 116, 143  
 Ilāyṛta 131  
 Ildephonsus a Praesentatione 11

- image making 251  
 importance of purāṇas 11–13  
 Indonesia, purāṇas in 78  
 Ingalls, D.H.H. 148  
 Indo-Greek rulers 254  
 Indra 104, 108, 142, 158, 162, 163, 167, 169,  
 170, 194  
 Indradyumna 231  
 Indus Valley civilization 122  
 Īśānakalpa 35  
*īśānukathā* 27  
 Īśāvāsyopaniṣad 213  
 Īśvaragītā 185–186  
 Italy, purāṇa studies in 6  
*itihāsa* 30n., 47, 81, 97  
*itihāsapurāṇam* 17, 81  
  
 Jābāli 164, 165  
 Jābālopaniṣad 17n.  
 Jackson, A.M.T. 42  
 Jacobi, H. 98  
 Jaḍa 192  
 Jagannātha 155, 231  
 Jagannātha Dāsa 150  
 Jagannāthaprakāśa 253  
 Jahn, W. 5  
 Jaimini 17, 71, 83, 165, 192, 213  
 Jaiminiyabhāgavatapurāṇa 151  
 Jaina literature and purāṇas 91–95, 121,  
 147; Kannada 76  
 Jainism 24, 92, 101, 232, 247  
 Jalandhara 224  
 Jalodbhava 204  
 Jamadagni 108  
 Jambudvīpa 130, 170, 217, 240, 247  
 Janaka 168  
 Janamejaya 71, 144, 169, 242  
 Jarā 248  
 Jarāsandha 234  
 Jātakas 90  
 Javanese chronicles 123n.  
 Jayā 164  
 Jayadeva *see* Gītagovinda  
 Jayadratha *see* Haracaritacintamāṇi  
 Jayamaṅgalā 26  
 Jayarāma 232  
 Jayaśrī 91  
 Jayaswal, K.P. 253  
 Jesus Christ 151  
 Jeṭhis 190  
 Jimūtavāhana *see* Kālaviveka  
  
 Jinasena *see* Ādipurāṇa; Harivaṃśa  
 Jinaśrī 91  
 Jiva Gosvāmin *see* Kramasandarbhā; Vaiṣ-  
 ṇavatoṣiṇī  
 Jñānasamhitā 222, 223, 224, 225, 227  
 Jñānayogakhaṇḍa 236  
 Jones, W. 2, 107, 215  
*jyotirlingas* 225  
  
 Kadphises, Wema 101  
 Kailāsa 162, 180, 181, 224, 234  
 Kailāsasamhitā 222, 225  
 Kaiśikapurāṇa 179  
 Kaiṭabha 171, 194  
 Kaivalyopaniṣad 213  
 Kakutstha 170  
 Kālāgnirudropaniṣad 201  
 Kālaketu 170  
 Kālanirṇaya 238  
 Kālasāra 216, 217, 238  
 Kālaviveka 250, 252  
 Kalhaṇa *see* Rājatarāṅgiṇī  
 Kālī 106, 113, 181, 189, 190, 194  
 Kālidāsa 147; *see also* Kumārasambhava;  
 Mālavikāgnimitra; Raghuvamśa; Śāku-  
 tala  
 Kālikā 194  
 Kālikākhaṇḍa 235  
 Kālikāpurāṇa 23, 52, 62, 67, 69, 89, 113,  
 146, 179–183, 219, 224; caste purāṇa 72  
 Kālikāpurāṇīyadurgāpūjāpaddhati 182  
 Kālikātantra 114; *see also* Kālikāpurāṇa  
 Kaliñjaramāhātmya 211  
 Kāliṇḍī 203  
 Kālīpurāṇa 62  
*kaliyuga* 109, 111, 112, 116, 124, 144, 161,  
 165, 183, 213, 223, 247, 253  
 Kalki 111, 183  
 Kalkipurāṇa 73, 183  
*kalpa* 35, 124–125, 190, 194, 198, 225, 244  
*kalpajokti* 97  
 Kāma 180, 189, 224  
 Kāmākhya 113, 189  
 Kāmākhya-māhātmya 181  
 Kamalākaraḥṭṭa *see* Nirṇayasindhu  
 Kamalākṣa 224  
 Kāmarūpa 113, 165, 173, 181, 182, 189,  
 190, 200, 250  
 Kamaṭha 180  
 Kāmeśvarītantra 181  
 Kaṃsa 109, 133, 248

- Kāñcīmāhātmya 160  
 Kāñcīpurāṇa 235n.  
 Kāñcī(sthāna)māhātmya 235n.  
 Kandapurāṇa 77n.  
 Kandarpa 180  
 Kaṇḍu 155n.  
 Kane, P.V. 29, 66, 78, 103, 137, 148, 199, 201, 249  
 Kannada purāṇas 75–76, 150, 237  
 Kantawala, S.G. 102  
 Kanthapura 72  
 Kaṇvas 144  
 Kanyākumārī 225  
 Kapālibhairava 181  
 Kāpālika(s) 173, 181  
 Kapila 142, 184  
 Kapilapurāṇa 183–184  
 Kapilasamhitā 219  
 Kāpīleyopākhyāna 142  
 Kāraṇḍavyūha 90n.  
 Kardama 142  
*karmabhūmi* 131, 171  
 Karmarkar, A.P. 176  
 Karmarkar, R.D. 2  
*karmavipāka* 156, 242, 251  
 Karṇa 169  
 Kārtavīryārjuna 162  
 Kārttika 209  
 Kārttikamāhātmya 212  
 Kārttikamāsamāhātmya 229, 231  
 Kārttikeya 114, 162, 189, 230, 233; *see also* Skanda  
 Kashmir 71, 90, 204–205, 228, 243, 252  
 Kashmiri manuscripts 51  
 Kāśī 190  
 Kāśīkhaṇḍa 229, 232–233  
 Kāśīmāhātmya (Brahmavaivartapurāṇa) 164n.; (Padmapurāṇa) 210  
 Kaśyapa 108, 162, 169, 170, 204  
*kathā* 59, 81  
*kathaka* 58n.  
 Kāthopaniṣad 185  
 Kauravas 116, 143  
 Kauśīkapurāṇa 184  
 Kauśīki 194  
 Kauṭīliyārthaśāstra 26, 55  
 Kāverīmāhātmya 237  
 Kāvya 169  
 Kāyā(va)rohaṇa 244  
 Kāyāvatāra *tīrtha* 112  
 Kedārakhaṇḍa 229, 230  
 Kedāramāhātmya 243  
 Kedarnath 230  
 Keith, A.B. 120, 126, 128, 129  
 Kennedy, V. 2, 3, 4, 16, 24, 28, 39, 95, 100, 104, 117, 144, 145  
 Kenopaniṣad 172  
 Ketumāla 131  
 Khalavaktracapeṭikā 218n.  
 Kharoṣṭhī script 128  
 Khaṭvāsura 167  
 Kīkaṭa 183  
 Kīmpuruṣa 131  
 Kirātārjuniya 227  
 Kirfel, W. 5, 21, 43, 44, 45, 65, 80, 85, 87, 95, 96, 97, 124, 152, 244  
 Konārka / Konarak 155, 219  
 Konow, S. 66  
 Kosambi, D.D. 120  
 Koṭīrudrasamhitā 222, 225–226  
 Kramasandarbhā 149  
 Kramrisch, S. 251  
 Krauṣṭuki 192, 195  
 Krīḍākhaṇḍa 174  
 Krishnamacharya, M. 40  
 Krishnamurti Sharma, B.N. 147  
 Kristapurāṇa 74  
 Kristubhāgavatam 151  
*kriyāyoga* 213  
 Kriyāyogasāra 213–214  
 Kṛṣṇa 109–110, 133, 141, 142, 143, 144, 151, 154, 155, 157, 161, 162, 163, 165, 169, 185, 190, 191, 203, 210, 212, 216, 224, 226, 234, 241, 244, 248, 250  
 Kṛṣṇadāsamiśra *see* Magavyakti  
 Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana 168  
 Kṛṣṇajanmakhāṇḍa 161, 162  
 Kṛtabodha 164  
*kṛtayuga* 108, 111, 124, 183, 253  
 Kṛttikās 114  
 Kṛtyakalpataru 23, 62, 86  
*kṣatriya* achievements 125n.  
*kṣatriya* literature 125–127  
 Kṣetratīrthavarṇana 233  
 Kulkarni, E.D. 190  
 Kullūkabhaṭṭa 33n.  
 Kumārakhaṇḍa 224  
 Kumārapāla 232  
 Kumārasambhava 89, 227  
 Kumārikākhaṇḍa 229, 230  
 Kumārila 101n.  
*kūrma(avatāra)* 108, 181



- Mallapurāṇa 72, 190–191  
 Malliṣeṇamahāpurāṇa 95  
 Mālyavat 131  
 Manasā 161  
 Mānavapurāṇa 241  
 Mānaviśamhitā 222, 227  
 Mānaviśamhitā 134  
*mān bhaṭ* 74  
 Mandara 108, 185  
 Māndhātṛ 170  
 Maṅgalacaṇḍī 161  
 Mangal Gayak 73  
 Mañicūḍāvādāna 91  
 Mañidvīpa 169, 172  
 Mañipurapurāṇa 34n., 75n.  
 Mañjgunīpurāṇa 235n.  
 Manmatha 180  
 Manobhava 180  
 Manu(s) 143, 171, 193, 194, 195, 244, 247  
 Manusmṛti 125n., 152, 253  
 Manu Vaivasvata 82, 97, 112, 116, 125, 143, 170, 227, 244  
*manvantara* 26, 27, 125, 143, 165, 181, 193, 194, 198, 225, 244, 247  
 Marathi/Konkani purāṇas 74–75, 150  
 Mārgaśiṛṣamāsamāhātmya 229, 231  
 Marīci 180  
 Mārkaṇḍeya 71, 82, 97, 144, 180, 181, 192, 193, 195  
 Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa 6n., 20, 21, 31, 32, 65, 71, 73, 79, 83, 87, 89, 103, 155, 191–196  
 Maruts 142  
 Mathurā 231, 234, 248  
 Mathurāmāhātmya 242  
 Mātṛ(purāṇa)samhitā 222, 225  
 Mātṛravi 219  
 Mātṛs 194  
 Matsyagandhā 168  
*mātsyakam nāma purāṇam* 82, 97  
 Matsyapurāṇa 6n., 7, 17, 20, 21, 22, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 41, 43, 45, 46–47, 68, 71, 77, 79, 82, 89, 95, 97, 102, 107, 115, 118, 125, 131, 192, 196–200, 201, 209; SBH transl. 51, 52  
*matsyavatāra* 107, 143  
 Mauryas 122, 144  
 Māyā 226  
*māyāmoha* 247  
 Medapāṭa 210  
 Medhas 193, 194  
 Medhātithi 181; (commentator) 86  
 Medhāvin 192  
 medicine 135, 176, 251  
 Megasthenes 123  
 Mehendale, M.A. 25  
 Mehta, R.N. 61  
 Meier, F.J. 146  
 Menā / Menakā 165, 181, 189, 224, 240  
 Meru 131, 171, 190, 247  
 Merudevī 142  
 Merumandarapurāṇa 77n.  
 meters of the purāṇas 129n., 151  
 metrics 135  
 Mewar *see* Medapāṭa  
 Meyer, J.J. 87, 135, 175, 176  
 “mini-purāṇas” 95–99  
 Misra, B. 231  
 Mitākṣarā 33n., 137  
 Mitanni 129  
 Mitra, R.L. 22, 60, 62, 225  
 Mitramisra *see* Viramitrodaya  
 Mitravāna 217  
 Mitrāyu Vāsiṣṭha 45, 46  
 mixed castes 161, 165  
*mleccha(s)* 111, 144, 183  
 Mohapatra, G. 231  
 Mohinī 203  
 Mrtyuñjayapurāṇa 200  
 Mudgalapurāṇa 115, 174, 200  
*mudrā* 226  
 Müller, F.M. 13  
 Müller, R.F.G. 135  
 Mugdhabodha 145  
 Mukherjee, R.K. 148  
 Muktaṭhala 145  
*mukti* 27  
 Muktikhaṇḍa 236  
*mūlasamhitā* 46  
 Muṇḍa 194  
 Munshi, K.M. 59  
 music 165, 252  
 Nābhi 142  
 Nāciketa 242  
 Nāgarakhaṇḍa 61; (Skandapurāṇa) 229, 233–234; caste purāṇa 72  
 Nāgaras 234  
 Nāgas 204  
 Nahuṣa 170  
 Naimiṣa forest 70, 71, 81, 141, 161, 164, 168, 185, 226, 232  
 Nanda 133

- Nandapurāṇa 32  
 Nandas 119n., 144  
 Nandikeśvarapurāṇa 201  
 Nāndimukha/Nandāvaṇa brahmans 201  
 Nandipurāṇa 200–201  
 Nāndīpurāṇa 23, 201  
 Nandiśvara 225  
 Nāpitapurāṇa 72  
 Nara 169, 172  
 Nārada 162, 165, 169, 180, 189, 202, 217, 231, 239  
 Nāradaipurāṇa 20, 21, 31, 32, 34, 35, 67, 69, 78, 178, 185, 202–203, 214, 231, 232, 233, 234, 239, 241  
 Naraka 181  
*naraka* 130, 142, 156, 167, 171  
*nārāśaṃsī* 47  
 Narasiṃhapurāṇa *see* Nṛsiṃhapurāṇa  
 Narasiṃha Vājapeyin *see* Nityācārapradīpa  
 Nārāyaṇa 162, 165, 169, 172, 205, 216, 242, 250  
 Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa 150  
 Nārāyaṇa *kavaca* 142  
 Nārāyaṇaswāmi Aiyar, K. 10  
 Nārāyaṇī 194  
 Narmadā 71, 196, 227, 233  
 Narmadāmāhātmya (Matsyapurāṇa) 198; (Skandapurāṇa) 229, 233; (Vāyupurāṇa) 46n.  
 Nāsiketopākhyāna 159  
 Nāṭyaśāstra 103  
 Naunidhirāma 96, 178  
*navarātravrata* 169  
 Nāyaṇmārs 77  
 neglect of purāṇas 2  
 Nemi 92  
 Nepal 71, 91, 235, 242  
 Nepālamāhātmya 23, 71, 235  
 Nepali Bhāgavatapurāṇa 150  
 Nīkumbha 204  
 Nīla 130, 204  
 Nīlakanta Sastri, K.A. 148  
 Nīlakaṇṭha *see* Ācāramayūkha; Vya-  
 vahāramayūkha  
 Nīlamatapurāṇa 51, 67, 71, 203–205  
 Nile, source of 50n.  
 Nimbārka 149, 163  
 Nirṇayasindhu 217  
*nīrodha* 27  
 Niśadha 130  
 Nīśumbha 170, 171, 194, 240  
*nīti* 86, 88  
 Nītiśataka 176  
 Nityācārapradīpa 62, 88n., 238  
 Nṛpavāhana 167  
 Nṛsiṃhapurāṇa 23, 32, 205–206  
*nṛsiṃha(avatāra)* 108, 198, 203  
 numismatics 87n.  
*nyāsa* 226  
 O'Flaherty, W.D. 103, 112  
 Old Javanese purāṇas 78  
 Oriental Institute, Baroda 7, 98  
 Orissa 71, 137, 155, 184, 219, 228, 231  
 Oriya Bhāgavatapurāṇa 150  
*Ovi* meter 74, 75  
 Padmapāduka 221  
 Padmapurāṇa 11, 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, 33, 38, 45, 54, 59, 65, 70, 73, 77, 78, 84, 103, 125, 206–214; Raviṣeṇa's 93–94  
 Padmāvati 183  
 Paila 17  
 painting 251  
 Paitāmahasiddhānta 99n., 251, 252  
 Pālikurika Soma *see* Basavapurāṇa  
*pañcākṣaramantra* 232  
*pañcalakṣaṇa* 24–30, 42, 79, 96, 162, 168, 242, 248  
 Pañcālas 143  
 Pāñcarātra 22, 28, 185, 242, 248, 252  
 Pāñcarātrasaṃhitās 22, 135  
 Pañcavaradakṣetramāhātmya 154  
 Pāṇḍavapurāṇa Śubhacandra's 93; Vādi-  
 candra's 93  
 Pāṇḍavas 116, 169  
 Pāṇḍu 141, 169, 170  
 Papesso, V. 160  
 Parāśara 168, 246, 247  
 Pārāśarasmr̥ti 188  
 Pārāśarasmr̥tivyākhyā 216  
 Paraśurāma 108–109, 157, 162, 236  
 Pargiter, F.E. 5, 43, 64, 65, 103, 118, 119, 120, 125, 126, 128, 129, 148, 196, 249  
 Parīkṣit 141, 144, 169, 231, 247, 250  
*pāriplava ākhyāna* 30  
 Parsis 218  
 Pārvatī 113, 114, 115, 158, 162, 181, 189, 194, 210, 220, 224, 225, 230, 233, 234  
 Pārvatikhaṇḍa 224  
 Pāśupata(s) 22, 185, 186, 187, 203, 226, 227  
*pāśupatavrata* 171, 185, 226, 227

- pāśupatayoga* 221, 227, 244  
 Paśupati 226, 227  
 Paśupati-purāna 214–215  
*pātāla* 130, 210, 247  
 Pātālakhaṇḍa 109, 207, 209–211  
*pāṭhaka* 57n.  
 Paūmacariya 93–94  
*paūrāṇika(s)* 13n., 46, 49, 57n., 74, 81, 89, 120n.  
 Periyapurāna 77  
 Persian purāṇas 77  
 Pinākimāhātmya 160  
 Piṅgalasūtras 135, 136  
 Pingree, D. 252  
 Piśācas 204  
 Pīvari 168  
 Pliny 123  
 polity 88, 135, 198  
*poṣaṇa* 27  
 Potana 150  
 Poullé, Maridas 150  
 Prabhāsakhaṇḍa 215, 229, 234  
 Prabhāsakṣetramāhātmya 229, 234  
 Prabhāsapurāna 215  
 Pracetas 142  
 Pradoṣamāhātmya 232  
 Prahlaḍa 45, 96n., 108, 142, 169, 205, 211, 234, 240, 247  
 Prajāpati 180, 194  
 Prakrit originals of purāṇas 128–129  
 Prakriyāpāda (Brahmaṇḍapurāna) 157;  
 (Vāyupurāna) 243  
 Prakṛti 113, 161, 189, 227  
 Prakṛtikhaṇḍa 171, 224  
*pralaya* 26n., 144, 181  
 Prapañcahṛdaya 36n.  
 Prapannāmṛta 214  
*pratiloma* marriage 55  
*pratimālakṣaṇa* 251  
*pratisarga* 26, 168, 181, 198  
 Pratiṣṭhāna 116  
 Prayāga 71, 190, 203, 223  
 Prayāgamāhātmya 71, 198  
*prāyaścitta* 171, 199, 227  
 Prasūti 189  
 Pretakalpa/Pretakhaṇḍa 96, 177–178  
 Priyavrata 142, 170  
 provincial recensions of purāṇas 60  
 Pṛthu 56, 88, 142, 165, 198  
 Pṛthūdaka(saras) 240  
 Pulastya 239, 241, 247  
 Pulomavi III 119  
 Punjab 228, 252  
 Puranam (of AIKT) 6, 240  
 Purānārtha 78  
 Purānārthaprakāśa 2, 68, 215–216  
 Purānārthasamgraha 216  
 Purāṇasamhitā 44n., 45, 47, 175, 247  
 Purāṇasāra 216  
 Purāṇasarvasva 216  
 Purāṇatattvaparakāśa 10n.  
 Purāṇaveda 17, 18, 30, 100  
 Purāṇavidyā 30  
 Purañjaropākhyāna 142  
 Puri *see* Puruṣottamakṣetra  
 Purūravas 17, 116, 143, 221, 247, 251  
 Puruṣa 113  
 Puruṣottamacaraṇagosvāmin 149  
 Puruṣottamakṣetra 155, 156, 228, 230  
 Puruṣottamakṣetramāhātmya 216, 229, 230–231  
 Puruṣottamamāhātmya 203  
 Puruṣottamapurāna 216  
 Pūrvamīmāṃsā 86n.  
 Puṣkara 201, 208, 214  
 Puṣkarakhaṇḍa 105, 208  
 Puṣkarakṣetra 184  
 Puṣkaramāhātmya 214  
 Puṣkarapurāna 70, 217  
 Puṣpadanta *see* Tisatṭhimahāpurisa-guṇālambkāramahāpurāna  
 Rādhā 110, 143, 161, 162, 163, 190, 209, 210  
 Rādhākānta Śarman 2, 215, 216  
 Radhakrishnan, S. 148  
 Rādhārāmaṇa Gosvāmin 149  
 Raghavan, V. 2, 7, 62, 98, 236  
 Raghunandana *see* Durgāpūjātattva;  
 Malamāsātattva  
 Raghuvamśa 89n., 209, 227  
*rājadharmā* 251  
 Rājagrhamāhātmya 137  
*rājakṛt* 54  
 Raja Rao, M. *see* Kanthapura  
*rājasa* purāṇas 20, 21  
 Rājatarāṅginī 51, 205  
 Rājavallabhamiśra *see* Khalavak-tracapeṭikā  
*rakṣā* 27  
 Rākṣasas 247  
 Raktabija 194

- Rāma 85, 93, 157, 158–159, 169, 189, 209, 210, 212  
 Ramachandra Dikshitar, V.R. 25, 70, 147, 249  
 Ramachandran, T.N. 172  
 Rāmagītā 159  
 Rāmahr̥daya 159  
 Rāmāi Paṇḍita *see* Śūnyapurāṇa  
 Ramakoti Sastry, K.S. 77  
 Rāmānanda 159, 232  
 Rāmānandins 159  
 Rāmānuja 100, 151, 159, 214, 242; *see also* Śrībhāṣya  
 Rāmapurāṇa, absence of 34n.  
 Rāmasetu 231  
 Rāmāśrama / Rāmāśrami 26n.  
 Rāma(avatāra) 109, 203  
 Rāmāyaṇa 18, 53, 78, 80, 84–85, 94, 98, 109, 114, 115, 158, 165, 169, 189, 209, 212  
 Rāmopakhyāna 98  
 Ramyaka 131  
 Rangaswami Aiyangar, K.V. 62  
 Rapson, E.J. 19, 40  
 Rāsaliḷā 143  
 Rati 180  
 Ratnaparīkṣā 176  
*ratnīn* 54  
 Rāvaṇa 159, 189, 210, 212  
 Raviṣeṇa *see* Padmapurāṇa  
 Ray, A. 148  
 Reinaud, J.T. 218  
 Reṇukā 108, 181  
 Reṇukāmāhātmya 109, 236  
 Revākhaṇḍa 138, 166, 186, 229, 233  
 Revāmāhātmya 197  
 Revata 170  
 Revatī 170  
 Rohita 170  
 Romaharṣaṇa 17, 45, 81, 232  
 Roy, S.N. 249  
 Rṣabha 142  
 Rṣyaśrṅga 42n., 207, 210  
 Rudhirādhyāya 114, 181  
 Rudra 205, 213, 223, 227, 242  
 Rudraikādaśasamhitā 222, 225  
*rudrākṣa* 171, 232  
 Rudrāṇi 164  
 Rudrapurāṇa 217  
 Rudra Rāya *see* Purāṇasarvasva  
 Rudrasamhitā 222, 223–224, 225  
 Rukmāṅgadarita 202, 203  
 Rukmani, T.S. 147  
 Ruru 167  
 Sabhāpatimīśra 186  
*sadācāra* 171, 232, 240  
*sadasya* 57n.  
 Saddharmapuṇḍarīka 90n.  
 Sahasrakotisamhitā 222, 226  
 Sāhib Rām 51, 204  
 Sahyādrikhaṇḍa 6n., 235–236  
 Śaiśunāgas 119n.  
 Śaivāgama 226  
 Śaivism *see* Śiva  
 Śaka(s) 101, 254  
 Śākadvīpa 115, 217, 218  
 Śākadvīpa brahmans 219, 238  
*śākhās*, Vedic 14n.  
 Śākta / śāktism 22, 113, 159, 167, 182, 185, 225, 242  
*śakti* 113, 167, 168, 169, 185, 210, 226  
 Śakuntalā 84, 209  
 Śākuntala 55n.  
 Śākyamuni 91  
*śātagrāma* 106  
 Śalyajit 184  
 Sāmba 115, 217, 226  
 Sāmbapurāṇa 32, 96, 115, 152, 155, 217–219, 238  
 Śāmbhala 183  
 Śambhu 189  
 Saṃdhyā 180, 181  
*saṃdhyā* 124, 171  
*saṃdhyāṃśa* 124  
 Śamika 141  
 Sāṃkhyā 104, 113, 125, 156, 247  
 ‘sāṃkhyization’ 125  
*saṃkīrṇa* purāṇas 21  
 Śāṃśapāyana, Suśarman 45, 46  
*saṃskāras* 247  
*saṃsthā* 27  
*sānudraavidyā* 175  
 Saṃvartaka 17n.  
 Sāmvavijaya 218n.  
 Sanātana Gosvāmin 249  
 Sanatkumāra 225, 241, 242  
 Sanatkumārasamhitā (Śivapurāṇa) 222, 227, 228; (Skandapurāṇa) 234, 235  
 Sandracottus 123  
 Śani 162  
 Śaṅkara 100, 147, 158, 210

- Śaṅkara Deva 150  
 Śaṅkarānanda *see* Ātmapurāṇa  
 Śāṅkarisamhitā 234, 236  
 Śāṅkhacūḍa 224  
 Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra 30  
 Śantanu 14n., 168  
 Sanyal, J.M. *see* Bhāgavatapurāṇa  
 Saptasatī *see* Devīmāhātmya  
 Śarabha 181  
 Sāradāpurāṇa 219  
 Śāradātantra 181  
 Saraṇyū 42  
 Sārasvatakālpa 35  
 Sarasvatī 105, 161, 165, 171  
 Sarasvatīpurāṇa 134, 220  
*sarga* 26, 27, 168, 181, 198  
 Śaromāhātmya 239, 240  
 Śaryāti 170  
 Ṣaṣṭhī 161  
 Sastri, Anantarama 243  
 Śātanika 152, 250  
 Śatarudrasamhitā 222, 225  
 Sātavāhanas 122  
 Satī 165, 181, 189, 224  
 Satīkhaṇḍa 224  
 Satīpurāṇa 62, 172  
 Satīśaras 204  
 Śatruṅjayamāhātmya 94  
*sāttvika* purāṇas 20, 21, 112  
 Satyanārāyaṇa 233  
 Satyarthaprakash 10  
 Satyavatī 168, 169, 170, 181  
*satyayuga* 124  
 Śaukeyapurāṇa 201  
 Śaukrapurāṇa 138  
 Śaunaka 81, 141, 161, 213, 225, 232, 250  
 Sauparṇapurāṇa 175  
 Sauradharmapurāṇa 221  
 Sauradharmottarapurāṇa 221  
 Saurapurāṇa 20–21, 115, 134, 220–221,  
 238  
 Saurasamhitā 234, 237  
 Saurashtra 234  
 Saurīsamhitā 185  
 Sāvārṇi, Manu 193, 194, 195  
 Sāvārṇi Saumadatti 45, 46  
 Sāvitrī 45, 161, 198  
 Sāyaṇa 16, 33n.  
 Schack, A.F. von 214  
 sectarianism 18–24, 104, 187  
 Śekkiḷār *see* Periyapurāṇa  
 Sen, D.C. 73  
 Śeṣa 194  
 Śeṣācala / Śeṣādri 230  
 Śeṣakṛṣṇa *see* Śūdrācāracintāmaṇi  
 Setubandha *see* Rāmasetu  
 Setumāhātmya 229, 231  
 Śevaks 219, 238  
 Sharma, D.S. 148  
 Sharma, J.L. 147  
 Shastri, D.K. 148  
 Shastri, H. *see* Haraprasad Shastri  
 Shastri, M. 199, 200  
 Siddharāja 220  
 Siddharāma 76  
 Siddhasūri *see* Uttamaśikharapurāṇa  
 Siddhi 200, 224  
 Śīmantiṇī 232  
 Singer, M. 53  
 Sinhalese chronicles 121n.  
 Śīprā 181  
 Śīśupālavadhā 89n., 182  
 Sitā 85, 159, 169, 209, 212  
 Śiva 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 76, 77, 105, 106,  
 111–113, 114, 115, 155, 157, 158, 161,  
 162, 165, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 180,  
 181, 185, 187, 189, 190, 194, 199, 210,  
 211, 213, 220, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226,  
 227, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237,  
 240, 242, 244, 253  
 Śivā 194  
 Śivacaturdaśī 232  
 Śivadharmapurāṇa 201, 228  
 Śivadharmottarapurāṇa 201  
 Śivadūti 194  
 Śivagītā 212  
 Śivamāhātmyakhaṇḍa 236  
 Śivapurāṇa 20, 21, 31, 77, 89, 114,  
 222–228; and Vāyupurāṇa 33, 69, 112;  
 AITM transl. 52  
 Śivapurāṇatāmasatvanirākaraṇa 21n.  
 Śivarahasyakhaṇḍa 236  
 Śivarātri 225  
 Śivasahasranāma 225  
 Śivasamhitā 178  
 Śivastotra 201  
 Skanda 114, 152, 170, 224, 240, 253; *see*  
*also* Kārttikeya  
 Skandapurāṇa 15n., 20, 21, 22, 29, 32, 33,  
 34, 35, 60, 69, 71, 77, 78, 79, 112, 114,  
 201, 228–237  
 Smith, R.M. 119

- Smith, V.A. 66, 116, 117, 119, 249  
Smṛticandrikā 238  
Solar Race 116, 165, 210, 244, 247  
Somaka 231  
Somanātha 234  
Somapurāna 32, 238  
Sphujidhvaja *see* Brahmasphuṭasiddhānta  
*śrāddha* 29, 38, 44, 87, 156, 178, 192, 198,  
199, 203, 227, 247, 251  
Śrī 106, 185, 213; *see also* Lakṣmī  
Śrībhāṣya 15n.  
Śrīdhara(svāmin) 35n., 52, 149, 212  
Śrīmālapurāna 72  
Śrīmūla 33n.  
Srinivas, M.N. 237  
Śrīpurāna 77n.  
Śrīraṅgamāhātmya 178  
Śrīśārdūla 178  
Śrīṅgavat / Śrīṅgin 130  
Śrīṅgī 141  
Sṛṣṭikhaṇḍa (Padmapurāna) 173, 207, 208;  
(Śivapurāna) 223  
Śrutistuti 143  
Sternbach, L. 176  
Stevens, T. 74  
Stevenson, Rev. 174  
*sthalapurāna(s)* 71–72  
*sthāna* 27  
Sthānūtīrtha 240  
Subandhu *see* Vāsavadattā  
Śubhacandra *see* Pāṇḍavapurāna  
Subhadrā 169  
Subhāṣitasamgraha 88  
Subhaṭa *see* Dūtāṅgada  
Subrahmanya 225  
Sudarśana 169  
Sudarśanācārya 149  
Śūdrācaracintāmaṇi 88n.  
Śuka 141, 165, 168  
Śukadeva 149  
Sukthankar, V.S. 81, 99  
Sulocanā 214  
Sumantu 17, 152  
Sumati 192  
Sumati Ātreya 45, 46  
Śumbha 170, 171, 194, 240  
Śunaḥśepa 170  
Śuṅgas 122, 144, 254  
sun worship 115, 152, 217, 218, 237  
Śūnyapurāna 74  
Surabhi 161  
Sūramiśra *see* Jagannāthaprakāśa  
Suratha 170, 193, 194, 195  
Sūrdās 150  
Sūrya 21, 155, 193, 217, 220  
Sūryapurāna 115, 238  
*sūta* 46, 50n., 53–59, 61, 71, 81, 141, 168,  
210, 213, 220, 223, 225, 239, 242  
Sūtagītā 236  
Sūtasamhitā 234, 236  
Suvarṇabhūmi 130  
Svadhā 161  
Svāhā 161  
Svalpamatsyapurāna 199  
Svargakhaṇḍa 207, 208–209  
Svargārohaṇaparvan 31  
Svayambhū 251  
Svayambhucaityabhaṭṭārakoddesa 66n.  
Svayambhūpurāna 11, 66n., 71, 91  
Svāyambhuva Manu/*manvantara* 142, 244  
Śveta (*dvīpa*) 49, 130  
Śvetāmbara 92, 94  
Śvetāsvataropaniṣad 185, 213, 236  
Tagare, G.V. 147  
Tagore, Devendranath 9  
Talpagirimāhātmya 237n.  
*tāmasa* purāna 20, 21, 112  
Tamil purāna 77, 150, 199  
Tantra(s), tantri(ci)sm 19, 40, 63, 86, 111,  
114, 153, 154, 163, 171, 173, 174, 181,  
182, 187, 205, 208, 223, 227, 236, 250  
*tapas* 13n.  
Tapti 71  
Tārā 163  
Tāraka 189, 198, 224, 225, 230  
Tārakākṣa 224  
Tārakāmayasamgrāma 198  
Tārakṣyapurāna 32, 175  
Telugu purāna 77, 150  
ten characteristics *see* *daśalakṣaṇī*  
Theosophists 10  
Thiruvilayadalpurāna 77n.  
threefold division of purāna 20  
*tīrtha(s)* 78, 86, 165, 208, 209, 220, 231,  
233, 240, 249  
*tīrthamkaras* 94  
*tīrthayātrā* 70  
Tirupati 230  
Tiruvannamalai 230  
Tisatṭhimahāpurisaguṇālamkāramahāpurā-  
ṇa 92–93

- tīthi* 152  
 Tiwari, A.R.G. 177  
 Tod, J. 117  
 Trayyāruṇi 46  
*tretāyuga* 109, 124, 165, 253  
*tripuṇḍra* 171  
 Tripura 198, 210, 224, 225  
 Tripurātantra 181  
 Triśaṅku 170  
 Triśaṣṭīlakṣaṇamahāpurāṇa 92  
 Triśaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita 92  
 Triśiragirimāhātmya 235  
 Trita 84  
 Trivedi, S.H. 65  
 Tulādhāra 164  
 Tulākāverimāhātmya 137  
*tulasī* 165, 209, 213, 235  
 Tulasī 161  
 Tulasimāhātmya 235  
 Tulsī Dās 159  
 Turvasu 143  
 Tvaṣṭṛ 142, 170  
 Tvaṣṭṛpurāṇa 238  
  
 Uddhava 141, 142, 144  
 Ugraśravas 81  
 Ujjain 233  
 Umā 158, 165, 233, 240  
 Umāmaheśvaravrata 232  
 Umāsamhitā 222, 224  
*upabrmhāṇa* 15  
*upadharmā* 110  
 Upadhyaya, B. 28  
 Upagupta 91  
*upākhyāna* 97  
 Upamanyu 185, 224, 226  
 upaniṣad(s) 9, 13n., 138, 185, 236  
 Upaniṣadratna *see* Ātmapurāṇa  
 Upaniṣatsārārthaprakāśa *see* Ātmapurāṇa  
*upapurāṇa(s)* 67–70  
 Upasamhārapāda 157  
 Upāsanakhaṇḍa 92  
 Upodghātapāda 157  
 Ūrdhvaapurāṇa 238  
 “Ur-Purāṇa” 41–45  
 Urvaśī 17, 205, 221, 247, 251  
 Uśanaseritapurāṇa 138  
 Uśanassamhitā 186  
 Uśanassmṛti 87  
*ūti* 27  
 Utkala 71  
 Utkalakhaṇḍa 230–231  
*utsarpiṇī* 92  
 Uttamaśikhrapurāṇa 95, 97  
 Uttara Gokarṇa 242  
 Uttarakāṇḍa 85  
 Uttarakhaṇḍa (Padmapurāṇa) 207,  
 211–213, 224  
 (Uttara)kuru 131  
 Uttaramērūr 154  
 Uttarapurāṇa 238  
 Uttarāramacarita 109, 209  
 Uttaratāntra *see* Kālikāpurāṇa  
  
 Vadamalayappa Pillai 199  
 Vādicandra *see* Pāṇḍavapurāṇa  
 Vaḍodara *see* Baroda  
 Vāgbhaṭa *see* Aṣṭāṅgahr̥daya  
 Vāgmatī-/Vāgvatimāhātmya 215  
 Vahnipurāṇa 63, 137, 201, 250  
 Vaidya, C.V. 148, 249  
 Vaidya, M.V. 209  
 Vaidyanāthalingamāhātmya 210  
 Vaikuṇṭha 144, 210  
 Vainateyapurāṇa 175  
 Vaināyakasamhitā 222, 224  
 Vaiśākhmāsamāhātmya 229, 231  
 Vaiśampāyana 17, 82, 242  
 Vaiśhya, C. *see* Purāṇatattvaprakāśa  
 Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa 229, 230–231  
 Vaiṣṇavatoṣiṇī 149, 215  
 Vaiṣṇavīsamhitā (Kūrmapurāṇa) 185;  
 (Skandapurāṇa) 234  
 Vaiṣṇavism *see* Viṣṇu  
 Vaiṣṇavītantra 181  
 Vaivasvata Manu *see* Manu Vaivasvata  
 Vajra 231  
 Vakratuṅḍa 200  
 Vākyaratnākara 238  
 Vālakhilyas 180  
 Vallabha 100  
 Vallabhācārya 149  
 Vallālacarita 252  
 Vallālasena 252; *see also* Dānasāgara  
 Vālmiki 165; *see also* Rāmāyaṇa  
 Vāmacāra tantra 181  
 Vāmanapurāṇa 7, 10, 20, 21, 22, 29, 32, 35,  
 60, 64, 65, 73, 78, 102, 184, 238–241  
*vāmana(avatāra)* 108, 143, 198, 240  
*vaṃśa* 26, 27, 198  
*vaṃśānucarita* 26, 27, 72, 116, 198  
 Vaṃśidhara Śarman 149

- Vāṇanāśā *see* Balajā  
 Vanavāsīmāhātmya 235n.  
 Vaṅgavāsī editions 60, 64n.  
 van Kooij, K.R. 52  
 Vārāhakaḷpa 125  
 Varāhamihira 100, 218; *see also* Bṛhat-saṃhitā  
 Varāhapurāṇa 7, 20, 21, 31, 32, 106, 179, 241–242  
*varāha*(*avatāra*) 97, 108, 181, 198  
 Vārāṇasī *see* Banaras  
 Vārāṇasīmāhātmya 198  
 Vareṇya 174  
*varṇa*(*dharma*) 29, 86, 142, 156, 165, 186, 203, 205, 227, 231, 240, 247, 251  
*varṣa* 130–131, 240  
 Varuṇa 243  
 Vāsavadattā 90n.  
 Vasiṣṭha 181, 247  
 Vasiṣṭhadharmaśāstra 15n.  
 Vāstrapatha(girināra)kṣetramāhātmya 229, 234  
*vāstulakṣaṇa* 135  
 Vasu 203  
 Vasudeva 143, 169  
 Vāsudeva 22, 31, 244  
 Vāsudevamāhātmya 229, 231  
 Vāsukipurāṇa 243  
 Vāyavīyaṣaṃhitā 222, 225, 226  
 Vāyu 226  
*vāyuproktam purāṇam* 82, 97  
 Vāyupurāṇa 15n., 17, 21, 32, 43, 46, 54, 68, 70, 79, 85, 89, 90, 96, 103, 115, 125, 155, 157, 233, 243–245; caste purāṇa 72; *see also* Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa; Śivapurāṇa  
 Veda(s) 2, 8, 10, 13–17, 18, 19, 55, 56, 80, 126–127, 130, 144, 161, 167, 183, 187, 189, 220, 223, 226, 227, 236, 237  
 Vedāṅga 203  
 Vedāṅgajyotiṣa 251  
 Vedastuti 143  
 Veṇa 56, 88, 165, 198  
 Venkātācalamāhātmya 229, 230  
 Venkatachalla Iyer, V. 9  
 Venkātādri 230  
 Venkātarāya Sūri 216  
 Venkāteśvara editions 60, 65n.  
 vernacular purāṇas 72–78  
 vernacular Sanskrit 129  
 Vetāla 181  
 Vicitravīrya 170  
 Vidura 141–142, 169, 170  
 Vidyāsārasaṃhitā 223  
 Vidyeśvarasaṃhitā 113, 222, 223  
 Vidyunmālī 224  
 Vighnarāja 200  
 Vighneśasaṃhitā 222, 223  
 Vijayā 164  
 Vijayadhvajatīrtha 149  
 Vijñānabhikṣu 186  
 Vijñāneśvara *see* Mitākṣarā  
 Vikāṭa 200  
 Vikukṣi 143, 170  
 Vimalasūri *see* Pāṇinīyā  
 Vindhya(s) 167, 171, 192, 233  
 Vindhyaṃhātmya 138  
 Vindhyaśālinī 171  
 Vipācit 192  
*vīra* 54  
 Vīrabhadra 224  
 Virajā *dikṣā* 212  
 Virajākṣetra 155  
 Virajākṣetramāhātmya 160  
 Virajananda 9, 10  
 Viramitrodaya 88n., 158, 190  
 Vīraṇi 180  
 Vīrarāghavācārya 149  
 Vīraśaiva(s) 75, 76, 225  
 Vīreśvarākhyāna 233  
 Virūpākṣapaṇḍita *see* Cannabasavapurāṇa  
*visarga* 27  
 Viśasana 183  
 Viṣṇu 4, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 76, 85, 105–111, 112, 113, 142, 155, 161, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 173, 175, 180, 181, 183, 185, 186, 187, 190, 194, 198, 203, 204, 205, 208, 209, 210, 213, 223, 227, 231, 233, 234, 240, 242, 247, 249, 251, 252  
 Viṣṇudharmapurāṇa 61, 249  
 Viṣṇudharmottarāmṛta 250, 252  
 Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa 45, 61, 87, 100, 102, 103, 135, 178, 250–252  
 Viṣṇumāyā 180  
 Viṣṇupurāṇa 4, 20, 21, 29, 31, 32, 41, 42, 43, 45–46, 65, 73, 77, 84, 85, 115, 125, 143, 148, 155, 245–249  
 Viṣṇusevāmāhātmya 179  
 Viṣṇusmṛti 87  
 Viṣṇustavamāhātmya 179  
 Viṣṇuśāśas 183  
 Viśvakarman 161, 217

- Viśvāmitrīmāhātmya 237  
 Viśvarūpa 142, 170  
 Viśvarūpa *see* Bālakriḍā  
 Vivasvat 170  
 Vopadeva 69, 144–147; *see also* Harilīlā;  
     Mugdhabodha; Muktāphala  
*vrata* 86, 134, 165, 198, 203, 209, 221, 227,  
     251, 252  
*vrātyastoma* 56n.  
 Vṛddha-...-purāṇa 66–67  
 Vṛddhagargasamhitā 253  
 Vṛddhapadmapurāṇa 214  
*vrkṣāyurveda* 135  
 Vṛndāvana 109, 162, 210, 241  
 Vṛtra 142, 170  
*vṛtti* 27  
 Vyas, R. 147  
 Vyāsa 10, 14, 16, 45, 46, 47, 48, 82, 144,  
     146, 152, 164, 165, 168, 169, 170, 189,  
     192, 213, 223, 247  
 Vyāsagītā 186  
 Vyāsapurāṇa 252–253  
*vyavahāra* 86  
 Vyavahāramayūkha 62  
  
 Wackernagel, J. 146  
 Ward, W. 11, 72, 80, 117, 144, 145  
 Weber, A. 4n., 94, 177, 218, 219  
 Wilford, F. 49, 50, 51, 53, 144  
 Wilson, H. H. 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 18, 19, 20,  
     21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 35, 36, 40,  
     41, 42, 51, 53, 59, 79, 83, 100, 137, 145,  
     148, 152, 155, 156, 195, 198, 202, 203,  
     207, 209, 218, 240, 248, 249  
 Winternitz, M. 4, 5, 12, 30, 67, 69, 70, 103,  
     136, 143, 148, 159, 202, 249  
 Wollheim da Fonseca, A. E. 12, 69, 213  
  
 Yādavas 143, 144  
*yajña* 13n., 108n.  
 Yajñavaibhavakhaṇḍa 236  
 Yājñavalkyasmṛti 86, 87, 135, 137, 176  
*Yājñeśvarasūri* 186  
 Yama 74, 181, 242  
 Yama and Yamī 205  
 Yamapurāṇa 253  
 Yamunā 142  
 Yaśodā 133  
 Yavakṛita 180  
 Yavanas 254  
 Yayāti 198  
 Yoga 141, 156, 248  
 Yoga 200  
 Yoganidrā 180, 181, 194  
 Yuddhajayārṇava 135  
 Yuddhakhaṇḍa 224  
 Yudhiṣṭhira 82, 154  
*yuga(s)* 82, 124–125, 161, 165, 181, 198,  
     204, 225, 244, 253  
 Yugapurāṇa 91n., 253–254