

ISSN 0081 - 3907

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY
ORIENTAL JOURNAL

Volume XLII: 1999



ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY
TIRUPATI - 517502

Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal
Vol. 42, Pts. 1 & 2, 1999. Edited and published by
Dr. M. Srimannarayana Murti, Professor & Director, Oriental
Research Institute, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati, 1999.

ISSN 0081 - 3907

The responsibility for the facts stated, opinions expressed or conclusions reached, is entirely that of the authors of the articles, and the Oriental Research Institute accepts no responsibility for them.

Price Rs. 50=00

Copies can be had of:

The Librarian

Sri Venkateswara University Library

TIRUPATI-517 502

India.

Laser typeset in the *S.V.U. Oriental Research Institute*
Printed at *L.V. Graphics*, Tirupati-517501

CONTENTS

Dravidian Loan Words in Sanskrit <i>L. Chakradhara Rao</i>	1
Vāstoṣpati, Rudra and Cyavana <i>Sadashiv A. Dange</i>	13
Kṣetrayya, The Poet-Musician <i>M.V. Rama Sarma</i>	23
Phenomenology and Advaitavedānta <i>V. Kutumba Sastry</i>	29
A Vyākaraṇa Perspective on Disambiguation <i>Karunasindhu Das</i>	43
Sources and Methods of Pāṇini <i>M. Srimannarayana Murti</i>	57
Art and Architecture of Rāyalasīma (from the earliest to the 6th century A.D.) <i>I.K. Sarma</i>	79
Cultural Integration in India through Purāṇas (with particular reference to Andhra c. 300 A.D. - 650 A.D.) <i>P.V. Parabrahma Sastry</i>	87
Rājamalla's Jambūsvāmicarita <i>Satya Vrat</i>	99

TEXTS AND STUDIES

The Philosophy of Vedic Sacrifice	115
<i>T.N. Dharmadhikari</i>	

REVIEWS 171

- Veluri Subba Rao: *Theories of Knowledge*
S.G. Moghe: *Studies in Applied Pūrva Mīmāṃsā*
S.C. Chakrabarti (ed.): *Buddhism and World Culture*
A. Kaul & S. Chattopadhyay (ed.): *Kalātattvakośa*, vol. IV
Lawrence A. Babb: *Ascetics and Kings in a Jain Ritual Culture*
Surekhā Śrī: जैन दर्शन में सम्यक्त्व का स्वरूप [Hindi]
Mukundcharandās: *Lord Swāminārāyan*
Mukundcharandās: *Handbook to the Vachanāmṛutam*
Ravindra Kumar (ed.): *Morality and Ethics in Public Life*

L. CHAKRADHARA RAO

DRAVIDIAN LOAN WORDS IN SANSKRIT

The vocabulary of Sanskrit language is divided into two categories: native words which can be traced back to Proto-Indo-European and loan words which are imported at some time from a different language. The contact between two languages is the cause for linguistic borrowing. In India Sanskrit had contacts with Dravidian and other languages like Muṇḍā from second millennium B.C. There is no doubt about the influence of Sanskrit language on other linguistic families. Other languages like Muṇḍā and Dravidian languages influenced Sanskrit language also.

This kind of linguistic borrowing is recognized by Jaimini who made a sūtra: *coditam tu pratiyeta avirodhāt pramāṇena*, (*Mīmāṃsā-darśana*, 1.3.10) for this purpose. Jaimini opines 'when the meanings of the words of Vedas are not understood by Āryans and well understood by *mlecchas* (*anāryans* 'not Āryans') one can grasp meanings from them'. Śabara confirmed the sūtra

and elaborated its meaning in his *Bhāṣya*. Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa (9th century A.D.) in his *Tantravārtika* supported the occurrence of Dravidian as well as other loan words in Sanskrit. He states that some Sanskrit scholars give folk etymologies to Dravidian words by resorting to add vowels to Dravidian words which have consonantal endings and gives some examples. Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa states that *pāp*, which means 'serpent', is a Dravidian word and is not a Sanskrit word as stated by Sanskrit pandits who derived it from Sanskrit *pāpa*, which means 'sin'. Note the following etymology of the word *pāp* and appreciate the sagacity of Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa:

pāmu n. 1. 'serpent', 2. 'a planet known as Rāhu', Ka. *pāvu*, 'serpent', Kod. *pāmbi*, Tu. *pāvu*, Ta. Ma. *pāmbu*, To. *pob*, Kol. *pam*, NK. *pām*, *bām*, Ga. Ollari *bām*, P.Dr. **pāp* (*Telugu Etymological Dictionary*, vol. V, p. 120 translated).*

D.E.D. entry 4085 confirms *Tantravārtika*.

Kumāriḷa further writes that *atarā* which means 'way' is a loan word from Dravidian and Sanskrit scholars construed it with Sanskrit root *ṭṛ* - *taraṇē* and tells the folk etymology for *atarā* is one which cannot be crossed. The etymology of the word is given below:

Ta. *tāri* 'way, road, path, right mode', *tarai* 'way, path' (< Te. *dāri*), Ko. *adari* 'road, path', Ka. *dāri* 'way, road, path', Tu. *dāri* id., Te. *dāri* id. 'manner, mode'. Cf. Ta. *atar*, 'way, path, public road, rule'. (D.E.D. entry 3170).

The *Telugu Etymological Dictionary* (vol. IV, p. 227) reconstructed its Proto form as **atar*.

* Abbreviations and transliteration are as used in D.E.D. (*A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, 1984).

Kumāriḷa gives several other Dravidian words like *cōr*, *āl*, *vayir*, etc. and condemns the unnecessary efforts of Sanskrit scholars who tried to prove them to be Sanskrit.

We have to eulogize the wisdom of Jamini, Śabara and Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa for their etymologies of Dravidian words. Their statements are supported by the modern linguists.

Sanskrit grammarians and lexicographers are not so discriminatory as the Dravidian grammarians and lexicographers who clearly stated that a great number of Sanskrit words entered into their languages and carefully distinguished them from native Dravidian words. There are certain principles to decide the Dravidian origin to Sanskrit words.

If the word is an isolated one in Sanskrit and has no root and derivatives and is surrounded by Dravidian languages in which the word is prevalent and has root and derivatives, then it must be a word, taken from Dravidian languages. When Sanskrit language has several synonyms expressing the same object or idea while the Dravidian languages have only one word to indicate the object or idea then the word must be of Dravidian origin. When the Sanskrit word has no cognates and when the word is found in almost all Dravidian languages the word must be an original Dravidian word and is borrowed into Sanskrit. Lexicographers and grammarians offer fanciful (folk) etymologies to the word which Dravidian lexicographers and grammarians deduce it from Dravidian root, the word must be of Dravidian origin. When the meaning of the word in Dravidian languages is radical and natural whilst that of Sanskrit is

metaphorical or collateral, then the word must be considered as Dravidian in origin. If the Telugu and Tamil pandits in spite of their prejudice to Sanskrit consider a word which appears both in Telugu and Sanskrit as native, then the word must be purely Dravidian.

There are retroflex sounds, i.e. *ṭ*, *ṭh*, *ḍ*, *ḍh*, *ṇ* which do not occur in any other Indo-European languages except in Sanskrit. All the Dravidian languages have retroflex sounds. Hence we can conclude that the words with retroflex sounds appearing in Sanskrit are Dravidian words. According to *साभ्यां नो णः समानपदे* (Pāṇ. 8.4.1) and *अट्कुप्नुम्ब्यवायेऽपि* (ibid. 8.4.2) *n* changes to *ṇ*. Even though this change is due to phonological reasons one cannot deny the fact that this is due to the influence of Dravidian languages. The cause for the repeated use of the indeclinable *त्वा/या* in a sentence is due to the influence of Dravidian languages. In Indo-European languages a word like 'say', etc. are used before a quotation. But in Sanskrit *इति* is used after a quotation due to the influence of Dravidian languages which use the words *ani* (Telugu), *endu* (Kannada), *iñji* (Goṇḍi) after a quotation. Yāska (7th century B.C.) refers to *śabdānukṛti* 'imitation of sounds', in word formation of *kāka*, *kokila* and *dundubhi*. In every language there is sound symbolism operative to a greater or lesser extent. In Dravidian languages there are a number of nominal and verbal forms which must be taken to have been motivated through direct sound imitation. Onomatopoeia is not as much prevalent in Indo-European languages as in Dravidian languages. Due to the influence of Dravidian Languages Sanskrit developed several such words like *kaṭakaṭāyati*, etc. Sanskrit used several causal forms due to the influence of Dravidian languages where the use of causal forms is a formal and regular one.

H. Gundert, F. Kittel, Charles Philip Brown and T. Burrow dealt with several hundreds of Dravidian words in Sanskrit. T. Burrow states that the total list of Dravidian words in Sanskrit will be more than 500 and less than 750, and it may well turn out to be considerably more. My post-Doctoral Research work reveals that the number of Dravidian loan-words in Sanskrit is more than one thousand.

Some Dravidian words in Sanskrit are given and discussed below:

1. Skt. *arka* 'Calotropis gigantea': Ta. *erukku* 'Calotropis gigantea', Ma. *erika* id., Ka. *ekke, ekka, erke, yakka*, 'gigantic swallow-wort or manure-leaf, C. gigantea', R.Br.Ta. *ekkamale, ekkamāle, ekkame* 'swallow-wort, C. gigantea' (D.E.D entry 814).

As there is no short *e* in Sanskrit, PIE. **e* changes to short *a* and the Dravidian word becomes *arka* in Sanskrit. *Arka* in Sanskrit means 'sun' and is derived from Proto-Indo-European **erg*. Thus the word *arka* acquires two meanings, i.e. sun and *C. gigantea* in Sanskrit due to homonymy. We know that loan words cause homonyms in a language.

2. Skt. *agasti* 'Agasti grandi flora': Ta., Ma. *akatti*, Ka. *akace, agace, agase*, Tu. *agase* and Te. *agise, avise*, mean 'Agasti grandiflora'.

This tree grows in South India and the word is used in major South Dravidian Languages. The name of the great sage Agastya can be derived from the name of this tree. *Agasti* is one of the earliest loan words in Sanskrit.

3. Skt. *attā* f. 'mother; mother's sister, elder sister, mother-in-law', Skt. *atti/attikā* 'elder sister', Skt. *anti/antikā* id., Skt. *artikā* id.: Ta. *attai* 'father's sister, mother-in-law', Ka. *atti, atte* 'mother-in-law', Tu. *atte* 'mother-in-law, aunt', *attige* 'elder brother's wife', Te. *atta* 'mother-in-law, father's sister, maternal uncle's wife', Kuvi *atta* 'aunt', Go. *ati* 'father's sister'.

Atta is a Dravidian word and is used in several Dravidian languages, but is not used in Sanskrit language frequently and remained as a lexical item. *Attā* has been used in Prakrits due to Dravidian influence at a later period.

4. Skt. *aravinda* 'lotus': Te. *araviri* 'a flower half-opened', Ka. *araviri* 'to half open', Ta. *arai* 'half', *viri* 'to bloom'. Sanskrit *vinda* is a contraction of the form: Ta. *virinda* and Te. *viccu* 'to bloom'.

It is supposed that the lotus is the flower which is open half the time.

5. Skt. *ulūkhala* 'mortar': Ta. *ulakkai* 'pestle', Ma. *ulakka*. 'pestle for pounding rice', *alke* 'pestle', Ko. *olk* 'pestle', To. *wask* 'grain-pounder', Ka. *olake, onake, onike* 'wooden pestle for pounding rice and other things', Kod. *olake* 'wooden pestle' (D.E.D. entry 672).

The article pestle for pounding rice, etc. along with the word is borrowed by Aryans from Dravidian people.

6. Skt. *kaṭhina* m. f. n. 'hard, firm, stiff', Skt. *kaṭhara*, Skt. *kaṭhura*, Skt. *kaṭhora*: Ta. *kaṭṭi* 'anything

hardened, coagulated', *kaṭṭu* 'to harden, coagulate (sf.) strength, firmness', Ka. *kaḍugu* 'to become hard or solid', *gaṭṭi* 'firmness, hardness', *gaḍacu*, *gaḍasu*, 'firmness, hardness, severity', Tu. *gaṭṭi* 'firm, hard', *gaḍusu* id., Te. *kaṭṭiḍi* 'cruel, hard-hearted', *gaṭṭi* 'hard, firm', *gaḍusu* 'hard, shrewd', *gaḍḍu* 'hard, difficult' (Collected Papers, p. 185).

As there are no retroflex sounds in Sanskrit the words *kaṭhina*, etc. in Sanskrit must be Dravidian.

7. Skt. *kānana* n. 'forest': Ta. *kā* 'forest, pleasure grove, garden', *kān* 'forest', *kānam* 'woodland, grove', *kānal* 'grove or forest on the seashore', Ma. *kāvu* 'garden, grove', *kānal* 'dry jungle', Ka. *kā* 'forest', Te. *kāna* 'forest' (refer to Sanskrit *kāntāra* 'forest') (ibid. p. 191).

P.Dr.**kān* 'forest' is the root for all the Sanskrit words beginning with *kān*.

8. Skt. *kekā* 'the cry of a peacock': Ka. *kēku*, *kēgu* 'to cry as a peacock', Te. *kēka* 'a loud cry', *kēkariñcu* 'to cry, yell', *kēkarinta*, 'a cry or shout', Go. *kēyānā* 'to call'.

In Sanskrit the words connected with peacock, i.e. *mayūra*, etc. are Dravidian in origin.

9. Skt. *keyūra* 'bracelet': Etymologists rightly point out that the first part of the Sanskrit word *keyūra* is connected with Proto-Dravidian *key* 'hand' and the second part with Dravidian *ūru* < *uru* (< P.Dr. **ut*) to be attached to.

10. Skt. *gārdabha* 'donkey': Ta. *kaḷutai* 'ass', Ma. *kaḷuta* id., Ko. *kaḷt* id., *kaḷd* 'a term of abuse', To. *katy* 'ass', Ka. *kaḷte*, *katte*, Kod. *katte*, Te. *gāḍida*, Kol. *gaḍḍi*, Nk. *gāḷdi*, Pa. *gade*, *garad*, Go. *gāḷdi*, Kuwi *gārde*.

Intervocalic *ḷ* changes to *ḍa* in Telugu.

11. Skt. *candana* 'sandal (tree, wood, paste)': Ta. *cāttu* 'to daub, smear, anoint', *cāntam* 'sandal', *cāntu* 'sandal tree, sandal wood', Ma. *cāntu* 'compound ointment of sandal, camphor', Ka. *cādu/cāndu* 'a fragrant substance, perfume', Te. *cādu* 'to rub into a paste' (D.E.D. entry 2448).

Now Telugu people in Rayalaseema use the verb *cādu* 'to anoint'.

12. Skt. *taḍ* 'to beat, knock, strike': Ta., Ma., Ka., Te. *taṭṭu* 'to beat, strike, knock', Ka. *tāṭu* 'to beat, strike', Malt. *taḍ* 'to slap'.

P.Dr.**taṭ* 'to beat' is the root which is borrowed into Sanskrit. The retroflex sound *ḍ* indicates Dravidian origin.

13. Skt. *tāla* 'palmyra palm': Ka. *tāl* 'toddy palm', Tu. *tāḷi*, *tāḷi* id., Te. *tāḍu*, *tāḍi*, *tāḷu* id., Kol. *tāḷi māḷ* 'palmyra tree', NK. *taḷ māḷ* id., Pa. *tāl* id., Ga. *tāḷi* id., Konda *tāl maram*, *tāṭi maram* id., Kuru *tāl* 'palm tree', Malt. *tālmi* (D.E.D. entry 3180).

P.Dr.**tāl* 'toddy palm' is borrowed into Sanskrit as *tāla* where 'ḷ' changes to 'l'.

14. Skt. *nakra* 'crocodile': Ka. *negal*, *negale* 'alligator', Tu. *negalu* id., *negaru* 'a sea-animal, the

vehicle of Varuṇa', Te. *negaḍu* 'a pobyypus or marine animal supposed to entangle swimmers' (D.E.D. entry 3732).

15. Skt. *nagara* 'town, city': Ta. *nakar* 'house, abode, mansion, temple, place, town, city', Ma. *nakar* 'town, city', Tu. *nagaru*, id., Te. *nagaru* 'palace', *navaru* 'temple'.

Dravidians had city culture where as Aryans had village culture (D.E.D. entry 3568).

16. Skt. *naraka* 'hell': Ta. *narukku* 'to cut off, chop', n. 'a piece cut off', Ma. *narukkuka* 'to cut off, chop', *narukku* 'a bit of palm leaf', Te. *naruku*, *naraku*, *naruku* 'to cut, chop', n. 'a cut, hound', Go. *narkāna* 'to cut (wood)', Malt. *narke* 'to claw' (D.E.D. entry 3625).

In *naraka* 'hell' creatures are cut into pieces in accordance with their sins committed by them in this world. *Naraka* has its sound etymology in Dravidian languages whereas it has no sound etymology in Sanskrit.

17. Skt. *nīra* 'water, liquor, juice':

All the Dravidian languages have the word *nīra* 'water'. Brahui has *dīr* (< *nīr*) to indicate water. Proto Dravidian form for this is **nīr* 'water'. In *Vedas* we do not find *nīr* or its derivatives. We find this word *nīra* 'water' in Classical Sanskrit. Sanskrit has no cognates for *nīra*. Hence this word is definitely a Dravidian loan word (with Proto-Dravidian form **nīr* in Sanskrit).

18. Skt. *paṭṭaṇa/pattana* 'city: Ta. *paṭṭi* 'cow-stall, sheepfold, hamlet, village', *paṭṭam* 'sleeping place for animals', *paṭṭu* 'hamlet, small town or village', *paṭṭinam* 'maritime town, small town', *paṭappu* 'enclosed garden', *paṭappai* id. 'backyard, cow stall', Ma. *paṭṭi* 'fold for cattle or sheep', Ko. *poṭy* 'Badaga village', To. *oṭy* id., Ka. *paṭṭi* 'pen, fold, abode, hamlet', *paṭṭa* 'city, town, village', Tu. *paṭṭu* 'nest', Te. *paṭṭu* 'abode, dwelling, place' (D.E.D. entry 3868). P.Dr. **paṭ-ṭ*.
19. Skt. *pūga* 'Areca catechu': Ta. *pāḱku* 'areca nut, areca palm', *paku* 'areca nut', *pāḱku-veṭṭi* 'crackers for slicing areca nuts', Ma. *pāḱku* 'a raw areca nut', *pāḱku-veṭṭi* 'betel-knife', Tu. *pāḱuṭṭi* 'knife for cutting betel nuts', Te. *pōka* 'Areca catechu, the areca tree, an areca nut', Kol. *pōke* 'betel', Kuwi *pōka mrānu* 'areca tree' (D.E.D. entry 4048).
20. Skt. *mayūra* 'peacock': Ta. *maññai*, *mayil* 'peacock', Ma. *mayil*, Ko. *mil*, To. *mi-s*, Ka. *mayla*, *maylu*, Kod. *mayli*, Tu. *mairu*, Pa. *maññil*, *mañil*, Ga. (Olla) *mañgil*, Go. *mal*, *mailu*, Konda *miril*, *mrilu*, Pe. *mal* (pl. *ku*), Mand. *mel* (pl. *ke*), Kui *medu*, *melu* (D.E.D. entry 4642).
- The bird peacock is known to Dravidian and a new one to Aryans. Hence Aryans took it as a loan word.
21. Skt. *mīna* 'fish': Ta. *mīn* 'fish', Ma. *mīn*, Ko. *min*, To. *mi-ni*, Ka. *mīn*, Kod. *mini*, Tu. *minu*, Te. *mīnu*, Pa. *mini*, Ga. *mīn*, Go. *mīn*, Koda. *min*. (pl. *minga*), Pe. *min* (pl. *-ku*), Mand. *min* (pl. *minga*), Kui. *mīnu*, Kuwi *minu*, *mīnu*, Malto. *minu* (D.E.D. entry 4885). The P.Dr. form for fish is **mīn*.

22. Skt. *meka* 'goat': Ka. *mēke* 'she-goat', *mē* 'the bleating of sheep or goats', Te. *mēka/meka* 'goat', Kol. *meke* id., NK. *mēke* id., Pa. *mēya*, *mēya* 'she-goat', Ga. *mēge.*, Go. *mekā*, *mēka*, Kur. *mēknā* 'to call (loud)', Malt. *meque* 'to bleat' (D.E.D. entry 5087).

Aja 'goat' is a well known word in Sanskrit and *mēka* in Sanskrit is only a lexical item.

23. Skt. *allī* 'creeper': Ta. *valli* 'climber, creeper', Ma. *valli* 'creeper, vine, the pepper vine', Ka. *balli* 'creeper, vine', Kod. *balli* 'creeper', Tu. *balli* 'creeper, esp. the betel vine', Te. *valli*, *vallika* 'creeper, climbing plant' (D.E.D. entry 5316).

24. Skt. *śuṇḍā* 'elephant's trunk': Ta. *tuṇḍam* 'beak, bill, nose, elephant's trunk', *toṇṭai*, *tontalam* 'elephant's trunk', Ko. *duṇḍ* id., Ka. *toṇḍlu*, *toṇḍlu*, *toṇḍla*, *suṇḍalu*, *suṇḍil*, *suṇḍila*, *soṇḍalu*, *soṇḍilu*, *soṇḍlu* id., (Coorg) *duṇḍu* 'face of a cow', Kod. *duṇḍi* 'snout, face (insulting)', Tu. *saṇḍilu*, *soṇḍilu* 'elephant's protosois', Te. *toṇḍamu*, Md. NK. *soṇḍam* 'elephant's trunk', Go. *oṇḍi*, id. (D.E.D. entry 3311).

Elephant is not familiar to Aryans. Hence they do not have words connected with the body part's of elephant. Hence *śuṇḍā* is a Dravidian loan word in Sanskrit.

25. Skt. *hoḍa* 'boat, raft': Ta. *ōṭam* 'boat, raft', Ma. *ōṭam* 'boat', *ōṭa* 'a large sea boat', Ka. *ōḍa* 'boat', Tu. *ōḍa* id., Te. *ōḍa* 'ship, vessel', Pa. *ōḍa* 'boat, trough', Ga. *ōḍa* 'boat' (D.E.D. entry 1039). P.Dr. * *oṭ*.

Aryans used Sanskrit word *nau* for ship or boat and Dravidians used *ōṭ* for boat.

The foregoing study is an attempt to appreciate and evaluate the linguistic tolerance of Aryans who borrowed several Dravidian loan words into Sanskrit without any prejudice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burrow, T & M.B. Emeneau, *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, London, 1984.
- Burrow, T., *Collected Papers on Dravidian Linguistics*, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, 1968.
- Caldwell, Robert, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages*, University of Madras, Madras, 1961.
- Chakradhara Rao, L., *Telugu-vyutpatti-kōśam* (Telugu Etymological Dictionary) in 8 volumes, Andhra University Press, Andhra University, Visakhapatnam, 1978 to 1995.

VĀSTOṢPATI, RUDRA AND CYAVANA

The deity Vāstoṣpati presents a rather interesting mixture of concepts and beliefs. He is first mentioned in the *Ṛgveda* (RV) and has maintained his importance through ages to the Puranic period (A.D. 200-1000 or later). The *vāstu-s* (*vāstūni*) of Viṣṇu are spoken of in the RV (I.154.6); but Viṣṇu's association with these *vāstu-s* is not as being their 'lord'. He is not the special deity of the *vāstu-s*. The idea is that he owns the *vāstu-s* and stays in them, as Mitra and Varuṇa stay in their *vāstu-s*, that are full of riches (RV. VIII.25.5). It is also observed that the meaning of the term *vāstu* shows variation as it was used in various periods and contexts, as is shown by Ram Gopal.¹ In the present article, the idea is to examine the status of the deities (mentioned in the title), as also to see a phase of the personality of Cyavana, a point that has been un-noticed by scholars. That *vāstu*, in one of its connotations, was a dwelling is already noted by the RV in a hymn to Vāstoṣpati (RV. VII.54. and cf. also 55). This deity was invoked at the building of a dwelling, as Sāyaṇa says

referring to the *Āśvalāyana-gr̥hyasūtra* (II.9.9). This would clearly show that a definite presiding deity of the dwelling was already set at the period of the RV (cf. also VIII.17.14). However, there are two other gods who are said to be *Vāstoṣpati*, irrespective of the implication of the term *Vāstoṣpati* (whether *yajña-vāstu* 'place of sacrifice', or the dwelling or any other place). One is *Tvaṣṭṛ* (V. 41.8: (*aham*) *vāstoṣpatim̐ tvaṣṭāraṃ rarāṇaḥ*);² and the other, more frequently, is *Rudra*. He appears to be more so in the context of the *yajña-vāstu*, as we shall see. *Rudra*, as *Vāstoṣpati*, is clearer in the post-*Ṛgvedic* texts. In this capacity he is also called *vāstavya* (*ŚatapathaBr.* I.7.3.1; 7).¹ According to a myth at the *ŚatapathaBr.* (= *Śat.Br.*) the gods went to heaven by means of a sacrifice; but, the 'god of the cattle' (*Rudra*) was left behind in the *vāstu*. This would mean that *Rudra* is the master of the sacrificial site after the sacrifice is over, and, when the main offerings were cast into the fire. The text specifically mentions that whatever remains (of the offerings and of the place of sacrifice) is the *vāstu*. *Rudra*, being its *lōrd*, is *Vāstavya*. The myth further says that when the gods had almost left, *Rudra* followed them (like a sentinel?) and appeared in the north with his weapon held high. He told them to set apart some portion for him. The gods instructed the *Adhvaryu* priest to replenish the portions and, from a share of each god, to form a whole share for *Rudra*. The *Adhvaryu* did it. This new share was the *vāstu*. *Rudra* was the *Vāstavya* on this account also,³ as this new share belonged to him. It has to be noted, however, that this offering, as such, is not called *raudra* ('meant for *Rudra*'). It is also to be noted, that in the RV in one hymn by the seer *Dīrghatamas*, where the birth of *Vāstoṣpati* is described, the act is called *raudraṃ*

brahma (X.61.1). In the present context, the offering is called *sviṣṭakṛt*, and even the god is named *Sviṣṭakṛt*. The point is, why the god is *Agni Sviṣṭakṛt*, when the offering is made for *Rudra*? Another point is, that the *sviṣṭakṛt* offering is always the last — or, more correctly, an additional one when the main gods have been offered to. The idea is twofold. *Rudra* is to be kept away from the main offerings; and, at the same time, his inclusion is arranged by proxy. *Rudra* is acclaimed, even here, as the 'lord of cattle'; and yet, he is to be kept at a distance. This has been his trait in rituals.⁴ Even so, he has to be satisfied. This was done with this *sviṣṭakṛt*. The proxy in this case is that he is not mentioned as *Rudra*, but as *Agni*. The proxy, however, is very thin here. If we see the various names of *Agni Sviṣṭakṛt* here it would be clear that they are the names of *Rudra*. It is said, that 'Agni' is called *Śarva* by the eastern people; 'Bhava' by the *Bāhīkas*; he is also called 'lord of cattle' (*paśūnām pati*; cf. the name of *Rudra* in the myth just referred to above); he is also *Rudra*. The point is that *Rudra* is here suppressed by the concept of *Agni*; and even elsewhere *Agni* and *Rudra* are fused, as is seen in the context of the birth of *Kumāra*.⁵

Being the controller of the *vāstu* in the double sense of the term, *Rudra* gets to be called *Vāstoṣpati*. It is seen that he not only is the 'lord' of the sacrificial place (*yajña-vāstu*), after once the sacrifice is over, and of the offering made after the main offerings are offered, but he is the deity of the household, in which capacity he equals *Vāstoṣpati* (known to the *RV*. VII.54) mentioned above. This is clear from a ritual. When a householder went on a journey he was advised to invoke *Vāstoṣpati* with the hymn from the *RV* mentioned above (VII.54); and it is said that, if he did not do so, *Vāstoṣpati* would harm

him and the dwelling (TaittirīyaSam. III.4.10.1-3). The same hymn is prescribed when a new dwelling is constructed and it is to be entered for the first time. The *brāhmaṇa-s*, who are to be fed at this entry, would utter: *śivaṃ vāstu* ('auspicious be the dwelling'), thus handing over the new dwelling to the owner with the propitiation of Vāstoṣpati (Āśvalāyana-grS.II.9.9). The Vedic people had a clear idea of the difference between the status of Vāstoṣpati and Gṛhapati, though both were seen as aspects of Agni. Gṛhapati was the visible form of Agni, who is also termed Damūnas. The aspect of Vāstoṣpati was invisible and lying under the visible 'lord of the dwelling'. In essence, he was the god of the basement and the whole structure, if any, above the main. The structure above the main is termed by the *Manu-smṛti*: 'Prṣṭha-vāstu' (III.91; Kullūka, *grhasyopari yad grham*). At the daily worship a *bali* was to be offered in the centre of the main house (ibid. 89 *vāstumadhya*) to Brahmā and also to Vāstoṣpati, separately. The mention of Brahmā is as, by that period, he was considered to be the lord of the cosmic space with also the Vedic ritualist concept of Brahman (ritual and prayer) and the altar being at the centre.⁶ The fusion of Vāstoṣpati and Agni (the un-seen and the seen aspects) is seen in the fact that, if Vāstoṣpati is not propitiated by the householder while going on a journey, Agni would burn the dwelling; but, here we have a further identification, "Rudra, indeed, is Vāstoṣpati". If he goes away without offering the share to Vāstoṣpati (*vāstoṣpatīyam*), "Agni would kill him becoming Rudra". Thus, Agni, Rudra and Vāstoṣpati are identified. According to a famous myth, Manu, the father of Nābhānediṣṭha, divided his wealth among his sons. At that time, Nābhānediṣṭha was in his preceptor's house

practising the vow of a *brahmacārin* (and was learning the *Vedas*). When he returned, and seeing that the division was already made leaving him, he asked his father what happened to his share. Manu said that, now, he should go to the sacrifice of the *Āngirases*. The *Āngirases* are leaving for the heavenly world; but, they cannot proceed, as they get confused each time when they come to the sixth day. Manu tells *Nābhānediṣṭha* that he should go there and get them recite two hymns (*RV. X.61* and *62*) on the sixth day.⁷ Their impediment being cleared, they would give him whatever they had collected for the sacrifice. *Nābhānediṣṭha* did it; and the *Āngirases* gave him saying the thousand (cows, that are remaining), now, belong to him. As he was about to gather the thousand, a man wearing black (soiled) garment approached him suddenly from the north and said that the thousand, that is the remainder in the *vāstu* (*vāstuham*), belonged to him and that *Nābhānediṣṭha* should not take it away (*Ai.Br. V.14 = 22.9; Taitt.Sam. III.1.9.3ff*). The man in the soiled garments is *Rudra*; and the 'remainder' in the *vāstu* (here, *yajña-vāstu*, place of the sacrifice) belonged to him. Hence, he is the 'lord of the *vāstu*', *Vāstoṣpati* (cf. also *TaittSam. 3: rudraḥ khalu vai vāstoṣpatiḥ*; and *III.1.9.5: yajñāvāstau rudra āgacchat*). Comparing the two myths regarding *Rudra* certain points come to the fore: (i) In both *Rudra* is said to be *Vāstoṣpati*; (ii) *Rudra*, as *Vāstoṣpati*, has a double nature. Propitiated, he is benevolent. Even in the second myth, it is further said, that he eventually granted the thousand cows to *Nābhānediṣṭha*; this would show him to be kind. But, he is also cruel; because he, as *Agni*, would kill the householder, if not propitiated before the start of his journey; he wields his weapon against the gods; and (iii) *Rudra's* quarter is

the north. This would show that the basic concept behind Vāstoṣpati was of a mixture of good and evil. This brings us to the association of Vāstoṣpati with Cyavana (Cyavāna).

Apart from the two myths regarding Vāstoṣpati mentioned above, there is an important reference to Cyavāna and Vāstoṣpati, together. In the second myth mentioned above, Nābhānediṣṭha figures; and he is successful in winning over Rudra = Vāstoṣpati. Now, the hymn in which Vāstoṣpati is mentioned is the RV. X.61. This one, along with X.62, is enjoined to be recited, according to the myth, to clear the Aṅgirasas from getting confused and make their ascent to heaven sure. This means that the myth presupposes the hymn. According to the hymn (X.61) it is Cyavāna who readies the altar (v. 1: *amimīta vedim*). The ritual is called Raudra brahma (*ibid.*) as we have noted earlier. Later in the hymn, it is said that the gods fashioned Vāstoṣpati (*ibid.* v. 7: *vāstoṣpatiṃ vratapām atakṣan*). Sāyaṇa (on v. 1) does not say so in many words; but, he is reminded of the myth and jots down a sentence from it relating to the confusion of the Aṅgirasas. The manner in which Vāstoṣpati was fashioned is to be noted. It is said, that this was when the father united with daughter; and this daughter is said to be Kṣmā, which is earth (*ibid.* v. 7: *kṣmayā saṃ jagmānaḥ*).⁸ This makes Vāstoṣpati an autochthon, i.e. a being born from the earth. There is a minute suggestion that, as soon as he was born from the earth, Vāstoṣpati was held and fashioned by the gods. This detail, with his nature of being cruel, is the basis of the Purāṇic myth which tells that, as soon as Vāstoṣpati (or, Vāstupuruṣa) was born from the earth, he was seized by the gods and other powers and was pinned down to the earth. The purāṇas further

say that, the gods and the other powers (including the evil ones) are to be shown and propitiated in and round the area where the building is to be structured. According to the Purāṇas, the Vāstupuruṣa (Vāstoṣpati of the Vedas) was terrible to look at and was deformed (like a dwarf). It is also said that the Vāstupuruṣa, called also Vāstu, was like a demon in appearance (AgniP. 93.3: *asurākṛtim*).⁹ The mixed nature – benevolent and cruel – of Vāstupuruṣa makes him of unpredictable nature. Cyavāna's mention in the hymn of Nābhānediṣṭha, which also speaks of the fashioning of Vāstoṣpati, has to be taken note of in viewing Cyavāna's personality in the Brāhmaṇa texts.

First of all, the good-evil (cruel) syndrome is seen in the case of Cyavāna (Cyavana). This is clear in the account of king Śaryāta and his daughter. Undisturbed, Cyavana is not harmful; but, being disturbed, he spreads confusion in the people of the king. Later, being propitiated by the king by giving his daughter to him, he officiates at the king's sacrifice. The ŚatBr. (IV.1.5.1ff) and the JaiminiyaBr (JaiBr.) which has about the same account (III.120-128) give some more details about his nature. It is said that, when the Bhṛgu or the Aṅgirasas went to the heavenly world, Cyavana was left behind; he was ghostlike in appearance (ŚatBr. op.cit. 1). The motif of the others going to heaven and some one left behind is seen also in the myth of Nābhānediṣṭha noted above. The *vāstuha*, in that myth, of which Rudra is said to be the lord and which very much tallies with the concept behind Vāstoṣpati, and also tallies with the expression *jahe* (*ibid.* *kṛtyārūpo jahe* 'he was left, of evil form as he was'). The word *vāstuha* would mean *vāstau hīnam*

(‘left in the *vāstu*’). Though the expression is about any object that is left, it also reflects the position of Rudra=*Vāstoṣpati*, who is separated from the other gods. He is ‘left’ away; and he is the lord of what is left away. According to the *JaiBr.* (III.120) he asks his sons to leave him near the pool of the *Sarasvatī*. So, he is *vāstau hīnaḥ*. Not only that, he knows the technique, or ritual, of *vāstupa* (*ibid*). The appearance and the behaviour of *Cyavana* reflects those of *Vāstoṣpati* and *Rudra*. In the *Mahābhārata* we meet a person very much of this type, and also named *Cyavana*, who tests the king *Kuśika* and his wife very torturously.¹⁰ It is clear that he could not be the same *Cyavana* as we have in the Vedic context. But, *Cyavana* seems to have become a type, the other such being *Durvāsa*; and myths came to be woven round them. In all such myths, and legendary accounts, about these persons the common trait is the same. The person is endowed with supernatural power; he is a mixture of good-evil; he acts waywardly. Another such one is the ‘sage’ known as *Aitaśa*,¹¹ who asks his sons to leave him away in the un-inhabited place and prattles like a mad man. However, the oldest and the earliest is *Cyavāna*, who appears to be a veritable alter-ego of the *Vāstoṣpati*, and also knows the science of the *Vāstupa*. It is not improbable, that, as being the very embodiment of the deity or the lord of the *vāstu*, he chose to appear like the *Vāstoṣpati*. And, the norm for *Vāstoṣpati* was *Rudra*.

REFERENCES

1. Ram Gopal, “Vedic *Vāstu* and its Derivatives”, *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, vols. XLV-XLVII (MM. Prof. J.H. Dave Fel. Vol.), Bombay, 1987, pp. 37-42.

2. Geldner, 'Vāstoṣpati (und) Tvaṣṭṛ'. *Ca* is found in a variant commentary. The *Samhitā* does not warrant it. Hence it is not in the regular commentary of Sāyaṇa.
3. Vishva Bandhu, in his *Vaidika-Padānukrama-Kośa*, p. 2828, suggests *vāstu* to be 'ashes, rubbish', etc., and *vāstavya* to be 'one covered with ashes'. This may suit the later appearance of Rudra. Ram Gopal rightly rejects this suggestion; *ibid.* p. 38f.
4. cf. the rite at the 'Tryambaka-havis' at the Sākamedha, where Rudra is requested to go beyond the Mūjavat mountain, ŚatBr. II.6.2.17.
5. ŚatBr. VI.1.3.9ff. Here the boy Kumāra, said to be an aspect of Agni is said to have various forms – Sarva, Paśupati, Ugra, Bhava, Mahādeva and so on which characterize Śiva-Rudra. On this see Sadashiv A. Dange, 'Kumāra, Kārttikeya and the Peacock', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, vol. 74 for 1999 (to be published).
6. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, I.48 for the places of different deities and powers; *MatsyaP.* 235.39-46.
7. The sixth day was important. It indicated full birth or a change in the state of the foetus; cf. the birth of Kārttikeya, *Mahābhārata*, *Vana.* 229.52. On the sixth day in the twelve-day sacrifice, the Śukra cup of Soma is taken up, with the identification of Śukra and the sun, both being the givers of life. Cf. also the belief in *ṣaṣṭha kāla* for meals, *Mahābhārata*, *Aśvamedhika.* 57.18; also 90.26-27; cf. also other beliefs regarding the sixth day at Dange, *Encyclopaedia of Purāṇic Beliefs and Practices*, Navrang, New Delhi, vol. V, 1990, p. 1543; 1549.
8. On a detailed discussion on this point and the meaning of the myth, see Dange, *Sexual Symbolism from the Vedic Ritual*, Ajanta Books International, Delhi, 1979, pp. 141-160.
9. See Dange, *Encyclopaedia of Purāṇic Beliefs and Practices*, vol. V, p. 1502f., where a figure is also given. See also, by the same author, 'Vāstupuruṣa', in *Purāṇa-Itihāsa-Vimarśa* (Essays in Honour of Prof. S.G. Kantawala), Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Delhi, 1998, pp. 46-51.
10. Here he comes into his palace any time, goes out any time; but, he has to be attended to by the king and the queen. He

yokes them to a chariot and asks them to pull it. Ultimately he gives them boons, being pleased with their sincerity. See *Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana*. Chs. 52-55. The present writer has studied the whole legendary account in his forthcoming book *Myths from the Mahābhārata*, vol. II (under 'Tests'), Arya Books International, New Delhi (in press). He has also studied there parallels from the *Mahābhārata* and elsewhere.

11. AitareyaBr. VI.33 = 30.7.

M.V. RAMA SARMA

KṢETRAYYA, THE POET-MUSICIAN

Kṣetrayya is one of the three illustrious Vāggeya-kāras, the other two being Annamācārya and Tyāgarāja. These three have given a new dimension to Telugu poetry by making it a spontaneous, overflow of powerful emotions. This emotional content is in the realm of *bhakti*.

Kṣetrayya, originally Movva Varadayya, comes of a cultured Niyogi family in Movva. Movva named after the great sage Maudgalya, in Krishna district, occupies a central position with Srikakulam - the capital of the first Andhra kings on one side, and on the opposite side it has Kuchipudi - the centre for Bharatanāṭyam. Kṣetrayya must have studied in Kuchipudi along with Mohanāṅgī, a *devadāsī*, dedicated to the worship of Movva Gopāla. She is a temple dancer, but well learned and Kṣetrayya develops a fascination for her and both happen to worship Movva Gopāla with implicit faith in him. They love each other because of their artistic sensibilities. Kṣetrayya composes songs and she sets them

to dance. This love of Kṣetrayya for Mohanāṅgī creates tensions in the village and it looks as though he has to leave the village. In his perplexity and puzzlement Kṣetrayya prays to Movva Gopāla. Revelation comes to him from Movva Gopāla instructing him to propagate *bhakti* and ennoble people through his *padams*. He is blessed by the Lord.

With great faith in Movva Gopāla Kṣetrayya starts his odyssey of life, even though parting from Mohanāṅgī becomes unbearable. He first visits Golconda then ruled by Abdulla Kutub Shah, a lover of music and dance and a patron of poets. The court intrigues, the amorous glances of Kamalā, the court dancer, no doubt displease Kṣetrayya, but he resists the temptations of the court and moves on to Kanchi.

Next to his worship of Movva Gopāla is his adoration for Kanchi Varada because he is named after him. One night he is locked in the temple and in the early hours of the morning he visualizes the great scene of the Lady leaving the Lord in the morning after having spent the night with Him. This is one of the glorious *padams* of Kṣetrayya, picturesque and imaginative.

His next visit is to Madurai and he is treated with affection by Tirumala Nāyaka. He writes nearly 2000 *padams* while in Tirumala Nāyaka's court. Finally he moves on to Thanjavur where he is received with pomp and ceremony by the ruler Vijayarāghava Nāyaka. Vijayarāghava becomes deeply attached to Kṣetrayya and treats him with great regard and esteem. Even though the court poets have been in his court for years and lavish rich praise on the king everyday, they are given only a secondary position. This hurt the court poets

for they cannot appreciate the naked Śṛṅgāra and the colloquial style in Kṣetrayya's *padams*. Nor can they understand why the king is so fond of him despite Kṣetrayya's address to the king in the first person and as a Vītarāya. This leads to an unhealthy competition and Kṣetrayya has to accept the challenge and offer a *padam* to be completed by the court poets. He leaves for Rameswaram and he is away from the court for three months. The court poets get into a frenzied mood for they are great scholars with no understanding of men and matters. What will be the reaction of a woman who expects her lover to come any minute, but finally gets frustrated because he does not turn up? She sees others enjoying the company of their lovers. The court poets cannot imagine the state of that woman. When Kṣetrayya returns they admit their defeat and he himself completes the *padam* in a simple, yet suggestive manner. Vijayarāghava becomes immediately pleased with Kṣetrayya and honours him as Kṣetrājña, one who is identified with the Lord.

On his return journey with Mohanāṅgi, reunited to him in Thanjavur, Kṣetrayya visits Golconda only to get into a strange situation. The Nawab offers a challenge that Kṣetrayya has to compose 1500 *padams* in 40 days, as Tulasimūrti, the court poet, admits his inability to perform that formidable task. Mūrti and Kamalā try to divert Kṣetrayya's attention by giving him a love potion, but finally Kṣetrayya fulfils his obligation. Revelation is given to him again and he is commissioned by Movva Gopāla to return to Movva after visiting a few more sacred places like Srisailam and Tirupati. On a Kṛṣṇāṣṭamī day Kṣetrayya and Mohanāṅgi reach Movva. The celebration reaches its great heights when a

halo appears over Kṣetrayya's head and he becomes one with Movva Gopāla. Mohanāngī while dancing leans on him and becomes one with him. This scene reminds us of Milton's description of Adam and Eve in *Paradise Lost*, Book IV, where he says, he for God only, she for God in him. To Mohanāngī Kṣetrayya is God, and to him Movva Gopāla is the supreme Lord. I have followed this imaginative reconstruction of Kṣetrayya's life in my fourth novel, *The Bliss of Life* (translated into Telugu as *Kṣetrayya*). The bliss of life for Kṣetrayya is rapture divine and a mystic elation from a physical to a spiritual plane.

The one obvious feature in Kṣetrayya's *padams* is the Śṛṅgāra element presented in its most realistic manner. Śrīnādhā introduces Śṛṅgāra in his poetry. This is enlarged and overdone by *Prabandha* writers in the time of Kṛṣṇadevarāya. *Manucaritra*, *Vasucaritra* and other romances of the time describe elaborately and vividly the scenes of love making in the night time. So it is said that in the Telugu romances what the sun does not see, the poet sees. This is the usual comment made on these descriptive accounts of naked Śṛṅgāra or physical love in the *Prabandhas*.

Śṛṅgāra is of two types: *saṃyoga* and *vipralambha*, the first one describes fruition in love with all its pleasures, the second one refers to the suffering that comes to the lovers through separation. Kṣetrayya adds a new phase of Śṛṅgāra, devotional love or *madhura-bhakti*, where the poet becomes the bride and the Lord is the groom. The bride waits for her lover sometimes in hope and sometimes in despair. All the varied emotional experiences of lovers are given an imaginative expression and invariably this love transcends the limitations of

physical love for it does not figure at the human level. It is like the doctrine of the divine spouse in Christianity or like the bridal mysticism in the poetry of the metaphysical poets of the 17th century in English literature, where the poet is the bride longing for communion with the Lord, the groom.

Kṣetrayya follows the literary conventions of his day, partly based on Jayadeva's *Aṣṭapadī* and Annamācārya's *Śṛṅgāra-kīrtanas*. He presents the sublime, devotional love in a pure, simple, homely language. These *padams* are extremely musical, with a literary flourish and a dance potential. They can be sung rapturously and for the first time Kṣetrayya shows the innate quality of the *padams* being set to dance.

Kṣetrayya thus brings poetry to the common man and makes him enjoy the rich imaginative pictures gloriously intermixed with the spoken language. We are told that in Thanjavur even the milkmen going about the streets in the morning used to sing the *padams* of Kṣetrayya joyously. His *padams* reveal that he has read *Rasamañjarī* thoroughly. The kings and patrons naturally like the *śṛṅgāra* element and Kṣetrayya would have catered to the popular taste. But the poet has his sublime moments for every *padam* is a sacred offering to Movva Gopāla. He may be visiting Raṅganāthasvāmī in Srirangam or any other Lord any where else, but his *padams* remarkably take us to Movva Gopāla. We are in the world of devotional love, inspirational poetry for a divine spouse. We also get involved in the *śṛṅgāra* element in his *padams*. We are in two worlds, the mundane and the divine, as we listen to Kṣetrayya's *padams* or see them set to dance. Kṣetrayya never refers to his ancestry as the poets of his day invariably have done. He has

no identity of his own, he is a part of the *prapatti* tradition that makes him surrender himself to His will. This is sublimation of desires of the purest type. Kṣetrayya excels everyone else in Telugu poetry in his willing surrender to Movva Gopāla as his Lord Supreme. This surrender to the Lord, as envisaged in the *Gītā* or in Milton's *Paradise Lost* is the highest and noblest form of human existence. And this is Kṣetrayya's sublime love for Movva Gopāla.

Kṣetrayya's *padams* have a place in folk literature. The sweetness and the melody in these poetical compositions make them enduringly rich in their appeal to the common man as well as to the elite and the sophisticated. Kṣetrayya's *padams* especially have an immediacy and relevance for they insist on an unswerving loyalty to God, and as long as human nature believes in the rightness and the justness of God, these *padams* with their rich music dance potential and literary flourish will be a source of aesthetic pleasure and spiritual illumination.

V. KUTUMBA SASTRY

PHENOMENOLOGY AND ADVAITAVEDĀNTA

Parallelism in the philosophical thought is not an uncommon phenomenon. It is partly accidental as it is said that 'great people think alike' and partly on account of the influence of previous thinkers. Ideas penetrate into the minds of men through various ways and means. Sometimes they enter into one's mind through one's own conscious efforts and sometimes, or to put it better, most of the time they enter into one's mind through an unknown and unconscious way. The data thus entered in one's mind through either way plays the role of supportive thought content plugged to which one's flights into the reasoning, contemplation and reflections take off. Under these conditions the results of such reasoning, contemplation and reflections carry parallelism with the previous thought but as the total data which is in the mind of the contemplator is not fully retrievable with its sources either by him or by the others such parallelism becomes partly inexplicable.

In the writings of Husserl, who is the pioneer and the foremost philosopher of phenomenological tradition, the influence of the Advaitic thought is quite cognizable. As is the case with several individual philosophers, there are several unsettled questions with regard to the philosophy of Husserl starting with the question what does the term 'phenomenology' mean to Husserl. As a person who cannot entertain even slightest claim of specialization of phenomenology of western philosophy, I relay upon the views of one or two authors on Husserl and quote them extensively to elucidate the point of view of Husserl. Of course, I shall make my observations with regard to the parallelism that I found in the Advaita Vedānta.

As it appears from the writings of W.T. Jones, Joseph J. Kockelmans and Richard Schmitt, the 'intentionality of the absolute being', the 'phenomenological reduction' or 'bracketing' or the concept 'epoche' are the two main fundamental themes that Husserl has advocated in his philosophy.

Let us examine Husserl's ideas about the term 'phenomenology' and 'phenomenological reduction' first. Husserl's phenomenology seems to differ from the phenomenology of others. According to him phenomenology can begin only after the 'transcendental phenomenological reduction' has been performed. For the beginning phenomenologist, there are number of different ways of approaching the reduction. One may follow Descartes on his road of total doubt. Alternatively one may examine one of the traditional philosophical disciplines, i.e. logic. By either way one is led to question what had previously seemed to be self evident. On the Cartesian road we are led to question all

presuppositions of human experience; in logic, the presuppositions of judging of validity and truth become questionable. We begin, then, by questioning what we had previously taken for granted or by wondering at what seemed to be most familiar. This involves a change of attitude. We must look at the world with 'new eyes'.¹

Husserl explains his notion of 'new attitude' by employing several phrases. "I no longer attach any validity to the 'natural belief in the existence of what I experience'. I 'invalidate', 'inhibit', 'disqualify' all commitments with reference to experienced objects. 'I bracket the objective world'." This last is one of the best known phrases used in this connection.²

Husserl draws his metaphor from mathematics where we place an expression in brackets and put a sign in front of it. By this bracketing the objective world we 'give it a different value'. In performing the reduction the phenomenologist establishes himself as 'disinterested spectator' and changes his practical aims. The result of this change of attitude is a change in my experience. Previously experienced reality now becomes 'mere phenomenon'. This Kantian term is here used in a new sense; any object of experience becomes 'phenomenon' for the observer who recognizes the objects's claim to reality but reserves decision on the validity of that claim.

In the 'natural', 'pre-analytic' and 'pre-phenomenological' attitude we generally believe that we live in a real world. This belief is 'put out of action' 'suspended', 'we make no use of it'. We are left with a world as phenomenon, a world which claims to be; but we refuse for the time being to pass on the validity of these claims.³

At this point we may turn our attention towards terms *loka-dṛṣṭi* and *sāstra-dṛṣṭi*, *vyāvahārika-dṛṣṭi*, *pāramārthika-dṛṣṭi*, *tattva-dṛṣṭi* and *atattva-dṛṣṭi* are used quite frequently in the Advaita. In the *loka-dṛṣṭi* which is nothing but the 'usual standpoint' or the state of 'pre-phenomenological reduction' to use Husserlian terminology, things in the world are given to our experience with various names and forms. Characteristics and qualities and do's and don'ts. As against this, in the *sāstra-dṛṣṭi* all names and forms, characteristics and qualities, do's and don'ts are dispensed with as non-real and the world is presented to one's experience in its essential nature as non-dual Brahman. Husserl says that phenomena can begin only after the 'transcendental phenomenological reduction'. Advaitins also say that the *pāramārthika-dṛṣṭi* or *sāstra-dṛṣṭi* can arise only after sublimation of the world by one's own efforts of employing *pratyakṣa* or inquiry. This concept of *parīkṣā* enjoined by *Upaniṣads* such as *parīkṣya lokān karmacitān brāhmiṇirvedamayāt nāsti akṛtaḥ kṛtena*,⁴ *śrotavyo mantirididhyāsitavyaḥ*,⁵ etc. can be equated with the 'philosophical reflection' of Husserl.

The *Kāthopaniṣad* speaks about a courageous person who 'has turned his eyes inward and reflected upon himself within the body with a desire to attain immortality'. The *Upaniṣads* and the Advaita-vendānta also speak about another concept, namely *pravilāpa* which means the reduction of all effects into their causes or realizing that effects do not have an independent existence than their causes.⁷ There are numerous references in *Upaniṣads* highlighting the philosophical reflection. *Pravilāpa* is the process of *pravilāpa*. The gross world (*sthūla-prapañca*) is to be reduced to its causal first

i.e. the subtle world (*sūkṣma-prapañca*) that in turn is to be reduced into its causal form, i.e. the causal word (*kāraṇa-prapañca*) and that in turn is to be reduced to its cause, i.e. the Brahman without the world (*niṣprapañca-brahman*).

Similarly in the scheme of five sheaths (*pañca-kośas*) the gross *annamaya-kośa* is to be reduced to the subtle *prāṇamaya-kośa*, the *prāṇamaya* into the *manomaya*, the *manomaya* into the *vijñānamaya*, the *vijñānamaya* into the *ānandamaya*, the *ānandamaya* into the *puccha-brahman*. Once this *pravilāpa* or reduction is done with the help of *parīkṣā* or inquiry or philosophical reflection, the world presented to us in the state of natural stand point changes completely. This change of natural standpoint is beautifully described by the Upaniṣadic statements such as *yatra vedāḥ avedāḥ*,⁸ 'the state in which the Vedas cease to be the Vedas', etc. When the ignorance which is responsible for the origination of various types of distinctions is dispelled and rooted out completely the *avidyā* or nescience with all its effects, i.e. the world ceases to exist in all the three times, i.e. past, present and future.⁹ Despite total change in the natural standpoint we still continue to experience the world exactly as we experienced it before, but without granting its 'claim to be valid and real' to put it in Husserl's phrase. This is the typical experience of a *jīvanmukta* or one who is liberated while living. The world appears to such a person in an entirely changed way. This seems to be the same as the phenomenological way of experiencing. I quote words of Husserl in this context: "We put out of action the general thesis which belongs to the essence of the natural standpoint, we place in brackets whatever it includes respecting the nature of being. This entire natural world, therefore,

which is continually 'there for us' 'present to our hand' and will ever remain there, is a 'fact-world' of which we continue to be conscious even though it pleases us to put it in brackets. If I do this, as I am fully free to do, I do not then deny this 'world', as though I were a sophist. I do not doubt that it is there as though I were a skeptic; but I use the 'phenomenological' *apöche* which completely bars me from using any judgement that concerns spatio-temporal existence (*Dasein*).¹⁰

The reduction of the world into its ultimate cause is clearly spoken of in the *Upaniṣads* and the texts on the Advaita-vedānta. For example:

prapañcopaśamaḥ śivodvaitaḥ.¹¹
*anvayavyatirekābhyāṃ pañcakośavivekataḥ/
 svātmānaṃ tata uddhṛtya param brahma*

prapadyate//¹²

W.T. Jones interprets the above passage of Husserl in the following way: "it is important to understand both what Husserl meant by 'doubt' and also how radical was the doubt that he wished us to learn to cultivate. To begin with, at least as far as this passage goes, doubt does not mean disbelieving something but suspending judgement about it. Now it is obviously possible to bracket particular beliefs within the natural standpoint, and we often do so if we cannot get a clear view of some object. If, for instance, I am at the theatre, I may wonder whether the books in a bookcase on the set are real or painted, and not being able to get on the stage I may simply suspend judgement, neither believing nor disbelieving that they are painted. Husserl wants me to suspend judgement not only in cases where I cannot get a clear and unimpeded view of something, but even

in cases where, for instance, ... where the book is not on the stage but in my hand. Of course, I am not to suspend the experience of holding the book in my hand. But I am to suspend judgement about whether I am actually have the book in my hand. To put this in Husserl's technical language, I am not to doubt the being of the book; I am to doubt that the book has being in the mode of existence, for it may have being in the mode of a dream."

From the discussion and illustration given above it becomes clear that Husserl's 'bracketing' is some sort of suspension of judgement with regard to the reality of the worldly objects, though there is no suspension experience. Advaitin also speaks the same language and says that the worldly things continue to be presented to our consciousness very much alike for a common man and realized man (*jñānin*), but *jñānin* experiences them with an awareness that they are non-real. With regard to the suspension of judgement, it is clear from the above passage of Husserl and his interpretation that while objects of world continue to be experienced, judgement with regard to their spatio-temporal existence is to be suspended. It is also said that as we suspend judgement in case of unclear objects, it is to be suspended in case of clear objects also just as we suspend judgement in case of objects of dream where things are experienced clearly but their spatio-temporal existence cannot be conceded.

Now, it is clear that Advaitin too puts forth the same argument. Taking the dream objects as an example, the Advaitin argues that the world objects also are neither real nor unreal but non-real as totally unreal objects such as square circle cannot be given to our experience; and the objects which are given to our experience but

sublated later on, such as dream objects, cannot be real, for real objects cannot be sublated. As the dream objects are given to our experience and later sublated, they are neither real nor unreal but non-real to put it distinctively. This argument is extended to the world in the waking state also and it is also judged as non-real. Though it appears as if that there is no question of 'suspension of judgement' according to the Advaita, indeed, it is a case of suspension of judgement as the status of reality of the worldly objects is stated as neither real nor unreal but indescribable. Indescribability of the objects can be nothing other than suspending the judgement with regard to their reality.

Sometimes, of course, the pure self is enjoined to be pulled out from the mind-body complex instead of reducing or dissolving the mind-body complex into it. The *Kāthopaniṣad* speaks that one should pull out his pure self from the mind-body complex just as inner tender straw is pulled out from the outer straw.¹³

Apavāda is another concept which runs parallel to the concept *praviḷāpa* with some difference. It is in the form of 'setting aside' objects other than the pure self as *anātman*. *Apavāda* enjoys the support of well known *śruti: neti neti*.¹⁴ The *Daśaśloki* of Śaṅkara also explains *apavāda* or negation well. *Praviḷāpa* may be understood as the dissolution of effects into their cause, whereas *apavāda* is the negation of the characteristics and objects of the world as *anātman*. By both these efforts the pure self is experienced as distinct from the world of effects.

Further, The *Chāndogyopaniṣad* emphasises that all effects are mere appearances originated through distinct

names and their cause alone is real. It discusses the essence of the objects and states that the pot, plate, etc. are distinct only on account of their distinct names and hence mere appearances devoid of reality and that they are none but the clay.¹⁵ Therefore, the clay is the reality over which pot, etc. effects are superimposed. It further concludes that effects do not have reality other than that of their cause. Cause and effect are not distinct in their essence. The distinction is only on account of distinct names by which we refer to them. Extending the logic further, it conveys that the Brahman alone is real and everything other than the Brahman is superimposed on it. Hence, the world is nothing but an appearance. The essence of the world objects is nothing but the Brahman.

This discourse of the *Chāndogya* also is in the form of phenomenological reflection through which the world is reduced or bracketed in the Brahman. In its effort to do away with the names and forms of effects such as pot, etc. and to find the very essence of them the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* clearly speaks about the Husserlian concept of 'bracketing'.

In yet another place in the *Chāndogya* it is stated that each element, i.e. *pr̥thivī* (earth), *ap* (water) and *tejas* (fire) are, indeed, a conglomeration of all the three of them. On analysing, every element ceases to exist as one single element and its true nature of being a composition of all the three elements is realized.¹⁶

Thus, the *Upaniṣads* speak about the philosophical reflection and phenomenological reduction in several places in several ways. There is no dearth of information to prove that the essence of the worldly objects is

distinct from the appearances of them. Thus, broadly speaking the *Upaniṣads* and the Advaita-vedānta also preach some sort of phenomenological reduction or bracketing and experiencing of the essence of the worldly objects. They also confirm that such an experience of the essence of the worldly objects will be entirely different from the experience of worldly objects of appearance.

Advaitins bring in the concept of superimposition (*adhyāsa*) and argue that the object superimposed does not possess reality other than the reality of its substratum. Since the world is superimposed on the Brahman, Brahman the substratum alone is the real and the world is non-real. With regard to the concept of *praviḷāpa* it is said that the effects are to be dissolved into their causes. In this way causal relationship is envisaged while effects are dissolved into their causes. In Husserl's philosophy both the concept of superimposition as well as the causal relation are not taken into account. It is agreed that Husserl's phenomenological reduction can be approached in a number of different ways. It is also said that 'one may follow Descartes on his road of total doubt. Alternatively one may examine one of the traditional philosophic disciplines, e.g. logic in an attempt to uncover the aims implicit in its development. By either way one is led to question what had previously seemed self evident'. Now we may add one more way, the 'superimposition way' or the '*adhyāropāpavāda* way' as yet another alternative to undertake the phenomenological reduction. Indeed, Advaitins call *adhyāropāpavāda* as a 'method' to realize the Brahman. Husserl also called the phenomenological reduction as a method. But it

is not clear in his philosophy as to realize what such reduction be undertaken.

Now, a word on the intentionality of the absolute being. Richard Schmitt writes: "Absolute being (Sciendes) is in the form of an intentional life which, whatever else it may be aware of, is at the same time aware of itself. The 'I' which transforms the world into mere phenomenon is, in so doing, aware of itself as transforming the world and cannot be subjected to the same transformation. But apart, from its 'modes of relatedness' and its 'modes of behaviour' this 'I' is completely devoid of any content which could be studied or explicated. It is completely indescribable being no more than a pure ego". Intentionality strictly as per above description can be accepted as similar to *sākṣin* despite our stand that *sākṣin* is totally *udāsīna* or 'disinterested witness'. But Husserl also speaks about the 'tendency of consciousness to direct itself towards objects'. This is not acceptable to Advaita as the *sākṣin* is *udāsīna*. It is the nature of the *antaḥkaraṇa* and *in-driyas* to tend towards their objects as according to the scheme of Advaita-vedānta.

The comparison made above throws light on certain basic issues which have been analysed and examined in both the traditions. The findings of both the traditions also appear to be similar to each other in several aspects. A few of such instances are as follows:

1) Both the traditions envisage that the world that is given in everyone's experience is only an appearance of it but not the essence of it.

- 2) Both the traditions emphasize the necessity to undertake the 'philosophical reflection' to understand and experience the truth of world.
- 3) Both the traditions give top pre-eminence to the pure consciousness in the scheme of their philosophies and see that their philosophies centre around the consciousness.
- 4) Both the traditions realize the necessity to understand the distinction between the eternal and the non-eternal between appearance and reality of the worldly objects, and
- 5) Both the traditions attempt to set aside the various appearances of the world and to reduce the world to consciousness, of course, in their own way.

However I feel that the thinking in the tradition of Advaita is more complete and systematic. More complete because they start the philosophy with the assertion that there is only one ultimate reality. And the world with all its numerous forms and names is to be accounted as mere appearance possessing somewhat lower reality so that it can be effective and functional and to be discarded or absolved into the ultimate reality. Husserl does not start with the assumption of one ultimate reality but reaches the same conclusion. More systematic because Advaitins speak elaborately about how the apparent world gathers its reality in the state pre-phenomenological reduction. They say that it is on account of *adhyāsa* or superimposition. Husserl does not pay his attention to the question that when in reality the world is mere appearance why and from what source and in what way it obtained its reality in our experience. 'Suspension for the time being' seems to be

unsystematic and arbitrary as it is on account his wish and desire he does it. Whereas in Advaita-vedānta, since world is superimposed on the Brahman and not on account of somebody's wishes and fancies, it is once again totally negated but not 'suspended for the time being'.

It also appears to me that when Husserl speaks about consciousness he refers at best the *sākṣin* of the Advaita but not Brahman as such as he speaks about consciousness from within the frame of epistemic experience. Advaita is one step ahead of him that it transcends epistemic experience when it speaks about the Brahman.

REFERENCES

1. Schmitt Richard, 'Phenomenological Reduction' in: Joseph J. Kochelmans (Ed), *Phenomenology: the Philosophy of Edmund Husserl and its Interpretation*, Doubleday & Company Inc., New York, 1967, pp. 58-59.
2. *ibid.* p. 59
3. *ibid.* pp. 59-60
4. *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, 1.2.12.
5. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, 2.4.5.
6. *kaścīd dhīraḥ . pratyagātmānam aikṣat āvṛttacakṣur amṛtattvam icchan, Kaṭhcopaniṣad*, 2.1.1.
7. *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, 6.13.1-2.
8. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, 4.3.22.
9. *vibhedajanake jñāne nāśam ātyantike gate/ avidyā saha kāryeṇa nāsīd asti bhaviṣyati//*

10. W.T. Jones, *A History of Western Philosophy: The Twentieth Century to Wittgenstein and Sartre*, Second revised edition, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., New York, 1975, pp. 255-266.
11. *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad*, 7.
12. Vidyāraṇya's *Pañcadaśī*, 1.37.
13. *Kāthopaniṣad*, 2.3.17.
14. *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, 2.3.6.
15. *Chādogyopaniṣad*, 6.1.4.
16. *ibid.* 6.4.1.

A VYĀKARAṆA PERSPECTIVE ON DISAMBIGUATION

While body language, viz. winking of an eye, movement of the hands or so and speech behaviour could be equally communicative in terms of Semiotics, human articulation was duly admitted in India as the most accurate and effective vehicle of communication¹ as early as 700 B.C. and methods of disambiguation too could be far behind. Ambiguity of expression in fact seized Indian mind from a very early date. It was defined and treated as one of interpretation of sentence meaning arising out of understanding the *Vedas* and the popular tongues alike as a means to valid cognition. And a sentence, or for that matter, sentence-meaning was approached from either synthetic or analytical viewpoint. Some construed it as a synthetic construction of component parts; others took it up as a single whole but agreed on analysis of the same into parts as a pedagogic exercise. The *Naiyāyikas*, *Bhāṭṭas* and rhetoricians fall in the first line which the *Prābhākaras* and the grammarians of Pāṇini's school belong to the second. Interestingly, a sentence

meaning is always identified as something more than the sum-total of component word-meanings. The complex network of semantico-syntactical relations responsible for this 'something more' was construed in terms of *tātparya* (faculty of purport), *samsaragamaryādā*, *lakṣaṇā* or so in schools of Indian logic, rhetorics and *Mīmāṃsā*. It was found also that contextual necessities demand certain semantic adjustments among associatives in an expression. Verily, mere grasping of primary meaning, etymological, conventional or so, does not go far and suffice to help in grasping the whole gamut of a sentence-meaning. Schools of thought settled down, therefore, to the task of finding out an efficient device commensurate with their systemic compulsions for interpreting the same. Besides there are words in Sanskrit which do with or without minimum phonemic changes signify different senses, though mutually related. Some words are even possessed of two or more extremely different denotations (e.g. *hari* meaning 'the lord' or 'a lion').

True, selection restriction effected by semantic compatibility may come to our rescue on many an occasion. But there are many other cases where in spite of perfect syntactic coherence, import of a sentence differs in accordance with space, time, person or so. The major role played by context in ascertaining the signification of an expression has, therefore, been duly taken notice of. As it is evident, ambiguity thus occurs at either word-level or sentence-level.

Indian logicians followed by rhetoricians admitted a faculty of implication (*lakṣaṇā*) in addition to one of denotation (*abhidhā*) in course of justifying a secondary word-meaning in a given context. The *Bhāṭṭa* school

of Mīmāṃsā admitted the same faculty to bridge the gap among individual word-meanings. Ambiguity at the sentence-level too was sought to be clarified with the same device by some including the vedāntins and the rhetoricians. It may be either a case of *viparīta-lakṣaṇā* where the face-value meaning of an expression contradicts the exact import thereof (e.g. *upakṛtaṃ bahu tatra*, etc. in reference to a mischief done by someone) or a hyperbole (*arthavāda*) implying praise or censure of something caring little for literal meaning² or an expression consisting of different meaningful words but still signifying as a single whole an indivisible unitary meaning (*akhaṇḍārtha*) (e.g. *tat tvam asi, so 'yaṃ devadattaḥ*, etc.) determined in compliance with the discourse-context (*prakaraṇa*). Verily, what a sentence actually means is to be ascertained always according as the speaker intends on communication.³ Hence rhetoricians have accepted a third faculty, viz. *vyañjanā*, the faculty of suggestion in case a meaning is suggested on the basis of either primary or secondary meaning.

The Grammar school of Pāṇini combines in one both the holistic and analytical attitudes to sentence as well as sentence-meaning. Both of them are upheld as immutable and still they are analysed into parts for practical needs. The same is the case with words,⁴ since they are construed as consisting of linguistic items, viz. root, suffix, prefix, infix, augment, etc. together with a variety of phonetic changes, viz. guṇation, lengthening, palatalization, elision and the like, wherever necessary. Likewise a compound is treated as the totality of meaningful units⁵ joined together and each segment of meaning of the compound is accordingly assigned to a constituent unit.

Sanskrit grammar has, for obvious reasons, ascertained some distinctive features morphological or otherwise as veritable ways to disambiguation, e.g.:

- i. *mahad-dhana* 'wealth of the great',
*mahā-dhana*⁶ 'the great wealth'.
- ii. *rāja-sakhā* 'one whose friend happens to be the king',
*rāja-sakhā*⁷ 'the friend of the King'.
- iii. *vaṭa-cchāyā* 'shadow of a banian tree',
vaṭa-cchāyā (n.)⁸ 'shadow of banian trees'.
- iv. *strī-sabhā* 'a women's conference',
strī-sabha (n.)⁹ 'unity of the womenfolk'.

Accentual peculiarities prevailing in various types of compound too help a lot in this respect. The classic example of chanting a *mantra* with wrong accentuation in the word *indra-śatru* and its fatal outcome¹⁰ may be an eye-opener here. Verily, in a form like *sthūla-prṣatī*, obtained by either *bahuvrīhi* or *karmadhāraya* type of compound, nothing but the position of acute accent therein can decode the exact meaning. If there were acute accent on the final syllable,¹¹ it would be a case of *karmadhāraya*. With acute accent retained in the initial segment¹² the form belongs to *bahuvrīhi* type so that it means a cow on the skin of which there are large spots.

Of course, there are compounds where ambiguity in respect of number can be hardly grappled with by any means. For example, *rāja-puruṣa* may equally mean servant of either one king or many kings.

The device of affixation including zero affixation represented otherwise by suffixal elision¹³ comes to be another effective instrument of disambiguation. Some

cases of ambiguity at the word-level and the Pāṇinian method for disambiguation this way may be summed up as follows :

TABLE I

Word	Meanings
<i>puṣya</i>	1. 'a constellation of stars' 2. 'the moon adjacent thereto' 3. 'a period of time indicated by the moon at that position'
<i>vaṅga</i>	1. 'the Vaṅga tribe' 2. 'habitat thereof' (P. 4.2.81)
<i>jambū</i>	1. 'blackberry tree' 2. 'blackberry fruit' (P. 4.3.166)
<i>cañcā</i>	1. 'a human form made of grass, etc.' 2. 'a human being so named' (P. 5.3.98)
<i>siṃha</i>	1. 'a lion' 2. 'pictorial image of a lion' as an emblem on a flag or so' (P. 5.3.100)
<i>vāsudeva</i>	1. 'Lord Vāsudeva' 2. 'an image of the Lord meant for earning livelihood (P. 5.3.99) though not for sale, nor meant for worship'

In each of the above instances, suffixal elision of *lup* type is taken recourse to for retaining the form intact and yet admitting the additional quota of semantic acquisitions. In other words, *jambū* 'blackberry tree' + suffix (meaning 'fruit') - suffix = *jambū* 'blackberry fruit'.

TABLE II

Word	Meanings
<i>kāṃboja, cola, kerala, śaka, yavana</i>	1. 'a warrior tribe or the habitat thereof'
Also, <i>aṅga, vaṅga, magadha, kuru</i>	2. 'a descendant of the tribe or the kind of the land'
<i>pāṇinīya, āpiśala, (P.4.2.64)</i>	1. 'subject of study propounded by a teacher' 2. 'a student of the subject or an expert therein'
<i>aṣṭaka, daśaka, trika (P.4.2.65)</i>	1. 'a bunch of rules' 2. 'a student of the rules or an expert therein'

Affixation followed by suffixal elision of *luk* type is held responsible for semantic increment in the above.

TABLE III

Word	Meanings	Feminine = Meaning
A. <i>avanti, kunti, kuru, śūrasena, madra</i>	a warrior clan or its habitat	
+		
Feminine suffix = <i>avanti, kunti, etc.</i>		Governing queen of the land, eg. Avanti

A secondary suffix is elided and feminine suffix affixed to the base to justify the meaning of the resultant words (P. 4.1.176-177).

	Feminine word-form	Meaning
B.	<i>āmalakī, badarī,</i> <i>jambū, etc.</i> changed to neuter, viz. <i>āmalaka,</i> <i>badara, jambu</i>	a tree fruit of the tree concerned.
C.	<i>śraviṣṭhā, phalgunī,</i> <i>anurādhā, svātī</i> <i>viśākhā</i> change in gender (<i>śraviṣṭha, phalguna,</i> <i>anurādha, svāti,</i> <i>viśākha</i>	a constellation of stars something derived out of the constellation (P. 4.3.34)

The above words mean differently in different genders. To Pāṇini, the semantic increment is due to a secondary suffix which is elided.

TABLE IV

Word	Meanings
<i>kaṭha, caraka</i> (P. 4.2.64, 4.3.107)	1. name of a teacher of a subject of Vedic study 2. subject of study propounded 3. A student of the subject or an expert therein

Here each subsequent meaning results from the precedent one by way of affixation followed by elision of the same.

An extension, development or shift of meaning is easily perceptible in the above cases without reference to *lakṣaṇā* or so, Pāṇini construed the phenomenon in terms of morphological increment with this in view that similar extension, shift or otherwise of meaning is very much a result of affixation in many other instances without any elision of suffix. True, a secondary meaning gains ground invariably in a given sentential context while the morphologicistic viewpoint apparently seeks to construe all semantic items within the word boundary itself. But even then, in fact, Pāṇini marked to a large extent, in his formulations certain limits of circumstantial environment, viz. number, gender or so and admitted thereby context-sensitive meaning faculty of morphemes. The school he led did not however formally accept a separate faculty of import of word for secondary meaning. To many a Sanskrit grammarian, in fact, no meaning is that much secondary; it may at best be called less conventional (*aprasiddha*). In other words, each morpheme is possibly impregnated with a variety of senses (*sarve sarvārtha-vācakāḥ*) and one out of many is chosen at a time according to circumstantial necessities. The *Vākyapadīya* is credited with an exhaustive formulation on usual cases of commonplace ambiguity and respective keys to their disambiguation. A neighbouring word or absence thereof, modulation of a speaker's voice, accent as well as space, time, person concerned and some such extra-linguistic considerations of either psychological or sociological implications play the catalytic role in ascertaining the intended word-meaning in an expression.¹⁴

Thus *saindhava* denotes salt in a dining hall, but a horse in the battle-field. The word *citrabhānu* means fire in the context of description of night, but with reference to description of a day, it means the sun. The Aryans and non-Aryans are reported to have meant by *yava* two different objects, viz. barley and kaṅgu respectively and in the Vedic observation, viz. *yavamayaś carur bhavati* it is barley that is referred to since the said item is described as follows:

*yadānyā oṣadhayo mlāyante athaite modamānās
tiṣṭhanti.*

A popular saying also goes that it is through morphological analysis in grammar, conventional use noted in a dictionary, association with a neighbouring word and the like that meaning of a word is ascertained.¹⁵ Verily, these are words which are of more than one denotation ascertained in a given context. There is also the possibility that conventional meaning of any word being incompatible within the context, a contextual meaning, be it secondary, unconventional or so is postulated for the same.

Grammarians have identified as many as six facets of word meaning, viz. genre (*jāti*), particular (*vyakti*), gender (*liṅga*), number (*saṃkhyā*), case (*kāraka*) and the word-form itself, the choice between the first two being a major bone of contention among philosophers of language. As Patañjali points out in the *Mahābhāṣya*, Pāṇini took a pragmatic view in this respect and opted for either according to circumstances.¹⁶ The role of context is emphasized time and again with reference to signification in the *Mahābhāṣya*. For example, the word, viz. *siddha* in *siddhe śabdārthasambandhe* is construed

as one opposed to *kārya*.¹⁷ Here Patañjali takes recourse to the maxim: *vyākhyānato viśeṣapratipattir na hi saṁdehād alakṣaṇam* to mean that it is interpretation that disambiguates an ambiguous rule or so. Canons of interpretation were also formulated. Definition rules too occur as clarification of meaning of the technical terms used. Verily, popular words employed as technical terms may very often lead to confusion in absence of proper definition rules. In the given circumstances, between the technical and non-technical meanings it is the former that serves the purpose in the *śāstra* though in some cases at least both are equally relevant.¹⁸ Preference of the principle to the subsidiary, or for that matter, of the primary to the secondary was also duly emphasized in respect of interpretation of grammatical rules.

The meta-language of rules is however, not always the proper idol for popular expressions. Thus the co-ordinate compound, viz. *agnīṣomau* of names of two gods does not lie exclusively with the pair of the said gods, it refers equally to a pair of persons in a phrasal environment, viz. *agnīṣomau māṇavakau*. Even grammatical norms could not but accept equal treatment of both direct (*pratipadokta*) and secondary (*lākṣaṇika*) forms indicated in the *paribhāṣa*: *gā-mā-dāgrahaṇeṣv aviśeṣaḥ*.

The claim of *lākṣaṇika* or for that matter, admission of *lakṣaṇā* as a semantic device for disambiguation could hardly be ignored by grammarians for long. Thus Patañjali admits the situations where a contextual meaning is signified by a word in a sentence. Verily, each *lākṣaṇika* meaning, so to say, is related this way or that to the primary meaning concerned, the connecting link between the two being one between either the locus and

the locatee or qualification and qualificand or proximity, association or so.¹⁹

Some sort of similarity too bridges the gap in many cases. This gives rise to two types of secondary meaning, viz. *śuddha-lākṣaṇika* and *gauṇa-lākṣaṇika*. In each case, however, a development or shift of primary meaning is evident, Patañjali has, therefore, accepted the phenomenon as a semantic one²⁰ and both Kaiyaṭa and Nāgeśa thereupon admit the play of faculty of implication.²¹ Interpretation of the above case in terms of *abhedopacāra* by Candragomin is not different altogether. The same device of superimposition of one upon the other is of frequent utility in any natural language and each case of its occurrence justifies itself with the instrument, the relationship involved and the rational superimposition.

What we have gathered from Sanskrit grammatical sources on ways and means to disambiguation may be summed up as follows:

1. Morphemic distinctions and accentual peculiarities help a lot in disambiguating compound forms.
2. In certain cases of mutually related signification, zero affixation is an effective instrument of disambiguation in case similar semantic departure is verifiable elsewhere with affixation resulting in either internal or external flexion.
3. Even within a word boundary itself, certain items of contextual circumstances, viz. number, gender, etc. reign supreme in ascertaining the exact word-meaning.

4. A plethora of signals lying beyond the word boundary too works well with words either possessed of double or multiple conventional denotations or context-sensitive to the extent of admitting a secondary or unconventional meaning to its fold.
5. Early grammarians ignored *lakṣaṇā* but their followers did not fight shy of accepting it. The widely accepted device of superimposition is but another mode of approaching a secondary meaning.
6. Interpretation tuned to speaker's intention is the ultimate resort for disambiguation; canons of interpretation, definition rules and the like converge in this exercise.

True, an artificial language is free from ambiguity, but that alone at the cost of nuances and subtleties of expression frequently encountered in a natural language.

REFERENCES

1. *śabdasya apīyastvāc ca śabdena samjñākaraṇaṃ vyavahārārthaṃ loke, Nirukta, 1.*
2. *vidhinā tv ekavākyatvāt stutyarthena vidhīnām syuḥ, Jaimini.*
3. *vākyajanya-jñānaviśayatve hi na padārthasamsargavattvaṃ tantram ... kintu tātparyaviśayatvam, Vedāntaparibhāṣā, I.*
4. *apoddhārapadārthā ye, ye cārthāḥ sthitalakṣaṇāḥ/ anvākheyās ca ye śabdā ye cāpi pratipādakāḥ//*
Vākyapadīya, 1.24.
5. *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ, P. 2.1.1.*
6. *āṃ mahataḥ samānādhikaraṇajātīyayoh, P. 6.3.46.*
7. *rājāhaṣsakhībhyāḥ ṭac, P. 5.4.91.*
8. *chāyābāhulye, P. 2.4.22.*
9. *aśālā ca, P. 2.4.24.*

10. *mantra hīnaḥ svarato varṇato vā
mithyāprayukto na tam artham āha/
sa vāgvajro yajamānaḥ hinasti
yathendraśatruḥ svarato 'parādhāt//
Mahābhāṣya, Paśpaśā.*
11. *samāsasya, P. 6.1.223.*
12. *bahuvrīhau prakṛtyā pūrvapadam, P. 6.2.1.*
13. *pratyayasya luk-ślu-lupaḥ, P. 1.1.61.*
14. *saṃyogo viprayogaś ca sāhacaryaḥ virodhitā/
arthaḥ prakaraṇaḥ liṅgaḥ śabdasyānyasya sannidhiḥ//
sāmartyam aucitī deśaḥ kālo vyaktiḥ svarādayaḥ/
śabdārthasyānavacchede viśeṣasmṛtihetavaḥ// VP. 2.315-316.*
15. *śaktigrahaḥ vyākaraṇopamānakośāptaśabdād vyavahārataś ca
vākyaśya śeṣād vivṛter vadanti sānnidhyataḥ siddhapadasya
vṛddhāḥ.*
16. *dravya eva padārthe eṣa vighno nyāyāḥ ākṛtāv api
padārtha eṣa vighno nyāyāḥ yan nityaḥ tam padārthaḥ
matvaiṣa vighraḥ kriyate siddhe śabde, etc., Paśpaśā.*
17. *saṃgrāhe tāvat kāryapratidvandvibhāvān manyāmaha nitya-
paryāyavācino grahaṇam, Mahābhāṣya, Paśpaśā.*
18. *kṛtrimākṛtrimayoḥ kṛtrime kāryasampratyayaḥ, and ubhaya-
gatir iha bhavati.*
19. *tātsthyāt tathaiva tādharṇyāt tatsāmīpyāt tathaiva ca, tatsā-
hacaryāt tādarthyād jñeyā vai lakṣaṇā budhaiḥ, quoted in
Paramalaghumañjūṣā.*
20. *puṣyasamīpagate candramasi puṣyaśabdo vartate, Mahābhāṣya
on P. 4.2.3.*
21. *maghādayaḥ śabdāḥ aparityakta-liṅga-saṃkhyā eva candramasi
vartante, Pradīpa thereon; and lakṣaṇāsthale svaliṅga-
tyāgābhāvāt, Uddyota thereon.*

M. SRIMANNARAYANA MURTI

SOURCES AND METHODS OF PĀṆINI

Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is a synchronic grammar describing the Sanskrit language of 7th century B.C. Hence it is confined to only certain Vedic texts, certain dialects spoken by certain groups of the Old Indo-Aryan speech community. The Vedic texts he accounted for could not properly be listed out, for several forms in the extant Vedic texts could not be described by the rules of Pāṇini on the one hand, and several Pāṇinian usages could not be located in the extant texts on the other. Pāṇini himself refers to the dialects of the East and the North; but he does not specify his dialect. Patañjali, his commentator who flourished after lapse of a minimum of four hundred years, says that the area of his language was Āryāvarta and that 'the usage of the learned' (*śiṣṭavyavahāra*) in that region was the target language.¹ The language of the learned of those days, was very close to the Vedic language; for, it is only this speech community which was closely associated with the sacrifices involving the Vedic texts for recitation and ritual.²

For the understanding of Pāṇini, we have two works, namely the *Vārtika* of Kātyāyana and the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali. Kātyāyana refers to one commentator of Pāṇini called Vyādi who was supposed to have written a great commentary from the semantic point of view called *Samgraha*, extending over one lakh ślokaś.³ As Bhartṛhari records, the *Samgraha* became already a tough work to be read and understood, and Patañjali wrote his *Bhāṣya* based upon the *Samgraha* with elaboration of the salient features of the linguistic speculations of *Samgraha*.⁴ While the *Vārtika* is a critique evaluating his author's opinion in very brief statements as crisp as those of the sūtra, Patañjali chose to write a *bhāṣya*, an advocacy of the author. In a *bhāṣya* the commentator explains not only the text but also his own statements. So wherever he has to differ from his author Patañjali explains the statements of Pāṇini and Kātyāyana at first and then gives his views beginning his discourse with *apare*,⁵ *pare*,⁶ *anye*,⁷ etc. After Bhartṛhari (4th cent.A.D.) the *Samgraha* lost irrecoverably, except for a few scanty illustrations cited in the works of Bhartṛhari. Thus we lost a full picture about the semantic considerations which Pāṇini had before him for formulating his rules.

As Patañjali says, Pāṇini formulated his rules with enormous effort and tranquility of mind in a calm and peaceful locale in a comfortable posture facing east without any mundane expectations out of his work. He did not even name his work.⁸ *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is a label tagged to the work on the ground that it was supposed to have been composed in eight chapters.⁹ Kātyāyana attests that even by his time there were different versions for several groups of the sūtras besides variants in the text.¹⁰ Bhartṛhari laments that the text tradition was

broken time and again and it was restructured in different periods for restoration.¹¹ Thus the interpretation of the rules of Pāṇini itself became a science and a serious subject of study in order to obtain a clear picture about the methods and sources of the grammatical tradition followed by Pāṇini. Even today there are many modern scholars who raise doubts about the exact extent of the text and opine that several chapters were only interpolations and not in the author's text.

Just as the name of the book is not specified, the name of the subject was also not mentioned in Pāṇini's *sūtra-pāṭha*, a text which is meant to be transmitted orally and memorized by the students. Patañjali calls this subject *Śabdānuśāsana*.¹² As Nāgeśa explains, on the basis of the derivative conventional sense (*yoga-rūḍha*), grammar is called *śabdānuśāsana*; for, correct words are suggested to the speech community by excluding the wrong or corrupt words. Here the exclusion is possible from the point of view of meaning only. It is because there cannot be any word which is either correct or corrupt exclusively without any reference to meaning. An empty word without meaning is as good as the sound of a drum. A word or its meaning may undergo change in form or obtain new shades of meaning respectively. So the grammarian has to come to help in cases of ambiguity or confusion arising out of inability to correlate the words with their meanings correctly. For example the word *aśva* is correct in the sense of 'horse' and wrong in the sense of 'one who does not have wealth' for which *asva* should be used.¹³ Similarly the words *samaja* and *samāja* are correct in the senses of 'a herd of beasts' and 'a society of human beings' respectively and wrong when used in vice versa.¹⁴

Śabdānuśāsanam is a necessary aid for any interaction in the speech community either at sacrifice or in common parlance. There are two methods known during the times of Pāṇini and Patañjali for preparing *śabdānuśāsanam*, namely 'enumeration' and 'prescription'. In the enumeration method all the words which gained currency in the learned assembly are grouped and listed out one after another. The text thus constituted is called *pratipada-pāṭha* 'magazine of words'.¹⁵ Depending upon phonological, morphological and semantic considerations the magazines get different nomenclatures like *nighaṇṭu*, *kośa*, *dhātu-pāṭha*, *gaṇa-pāṭha*, etc. *Nighaṇṭus* are the lists of words which are considered to be fit and fixed in usage in a given text, wherein analogy fails considerably.¹⁶ *Kośas* are lists of words grouped according to meanings, which serve as a dictionary and a thesaurus.¹⁷ The *dhātu-pāṭhas* give the lists of roots with their basal meanings.¹⁸ The *gaṇa-pāṭhas* give the lists of nouns which fall under groups with similar morphological patterns by proportional analogy.¹⁸ Even in the *Vedalakṣaṇa* literature,¹⁹ we find various works containing large lists of words of uneven nature; e.g. words of irregular *sandhi*,²⁰ words ending with *nakāra*,²¹ etc. The other types of *Vedalakṣaṇa* works like *anukramaṇis*²² fall in line with the word magazines of the grammarians. All these works are of limited function and hence are recommended for memorization.

The prescription method is of another type which contains rules by application of which the words are obtained.²³ Before rules are formulated the grammarian assembles the words he decides to treat into groups on the basis of semantic associations. Grouping is a

convenience to formulate semantic categories into which each word is expected to occur. These groups could be the established word magazines or the lists formulated for the purpose by the grammarian.

The rules are hierarchically arranged so that a general rule is superseded by an exceptional rule.²⁴ This prescriptive method is of use for description of a language on a large canvas as that of Pāṇini, which has both the Vedic and spoken forms of Sanskrit as the target. The genius of Pāṇini is that the arrangement of rules is more sophisticated than a flow chart of a computer program. Hence the grammatical method of Pāṇini is adaptable to the grammar of the modern computer languages, especially in handling large data bases of Indian languages. In this sense Pāṇini's grammar is a prescriptive grammar and it operates well only in the cases of words which were assembled by the author and known to his speech community. Thus it should never be understood that the grammar can create new words unknown to the author by applying various rules. Patañjali illustrates this phenomenon with a counter example of potter. One who is in need of earthenware like pots for use in ritual or household goes to the potter and orders for making new pots as per his requirements and specifications. The pots are made accordingly. In the same way no one goes to a grammarian with a request for coining new words or meanings for his use in the language.²⁵ So Kātyāyana declares the axiom that the words, meanings and their relationships are fixed in the language²⁶ and each one can be recalled with any one of the three. The successful functionalism of the rules is in proportion to the arrangement of rules. The arrangement of rules confirms in its turn the grouping of words in the magazine.

Vyākaraṇa is another general name for grammar like *śabdānuśāsana*. It is used by Kātyāyana in his *vārtika*, (Pāṇ. 1.1.1, vt.14): *lakṣyalakṣaṇe vyākaraṇam*. It means that the term *vyākaraṇa* is applicable either exclusively or collectively to the rules (*lakṣaṇa*) as well as to the words derived by such rules (*lakṣya*), because the rules cannot have exclusive and purposeful existence without word magazines and vice-versa.²⁷ The rules and the word magazines are at the free will of the grammarian. The *lakṣaṇas* lead to the grammarian's linguistic predilections and the *lakṣyas* to the word magazines. Hence with the help of these two, the whole *pratipadapāṭha* of Pāṇini could be reconstructed, besides theorizing his linguistic speculations. The *dhātu-pāṭhas* and *gaṇa-pāṭhas* are to be added to the reconstructed word magazine to fix the boundaries of the latter; for words obtained by the sūtras in their turn also depend upon and limited to the *dhātu-pāṭha* and *gaṇa-pāṭha*.

Pāṇini is concerned with ways of unambiguous representation of knowledge through language.²⁸ Therefore the earliest known names for the grammarian are *sūri*,²⁹ *vidvān*,³⁰ *paṇḍita*³¹ and *budha*.³² We try to understand his logic by the analysis of his rules; for, the linguistic methods to describe the out put of language users also apply to the language of the grammarian.³³ So the grammarian's rules also become the target language as much as the user's language for the structural analysis into linguistic units such as sentence, compound, word, morpheme and phoneme. Understanding the knowledge of the speaker through communication in the final analysis rests on the listener. The foundation of the communication system is on the logic behind categorization of knowledge before it is translated into series of speech sounds. Arraying of vocables into various meaningful

speech units is of course a quick process done by analogy. So as Bhartṛhari says, the grammarian opines that the classification of language into sentences, words and sounds is nothing but analysis of language.³⁴ There are two alternative perceptions here. One view is to treat the sentence as an indivisible single unit in correspondence with the unitary nature of thought conceived in the mind of the speaker and communicated with it to the listener. The other view is to treat the sentence as a physical body containing a concatenation of several vocables in correspondence with the diversity of vocables from the point of view of the physiological form of language.³⁵ In fact these two perceptions are not exclusive, but are mutually dependent in communication and cognition of language, as much as two sides of a coin.³⁶ Just as *jāti* 'universal' cannot exist without *vyakti* 'individual (substance)', and vice-versa, the semantic considerations and phonological constrains cannot hold water independently.³⁷ Pāṇini, therefore, read his rules in such a way that they can be understood and interpreted from the semantic as well as phonological points of view. Here the psychological considerations dominate with reference to the speaker while the phonological considerations precede with reference to the listener.

Pāṇini's semantic preferences are known from the distribution and arrangement of the vocabulary into 'fields' in his word magazine. The word 'field' is used in a technical sense that it is an area in which various words are grouped and arranged in an hierarchy with certain semantic constrains. The words are hierarchically grouped with the presumption that the words do not have any absolute senses as we find in a lexicon and different elements define and delimit each other without overlapping like pieces of a mosaic. Thus each word

in a field becomes significative of a sense, or a variety of senses with different shades of the basal meaning in association with other members of the field.³⁸ Within a field each word shares certain characteristic features of the next word and also certain special features as in the case of colours in a spectrum. In other words the meanings of words obtain specifications by inclusion and exclusion. This interdependency of meanings of words is manifested within word magazines, within sentences and also within derivatives and compounds. Patañjali explains this phenomenon in his *Bhāṣya* on Pāṇ. 2.1.1: *samarthaḥ padavidhiḥ*, while discussing about the meaning of a compound word. In the presence of the meanings of other words, the meaning of a word is restricted and determined precisely after the grammatical connections.³⁹ Three alternative theories are suggested, namely exclusion (*bheda*), inclusion (*samsarga*) and exclusion-inclusion (*bheda-samsarga*).⁴⁰ According to the theorists of exclusion the word *rājñāḥ* denotes all the possessions of the king like servant, wife, and house, and the word *puruṣa* denotes all those persons who could be masters of the man. In a sentence like *rājñāḥ puruṣaḥ* both the referents are grammatically connected through mutual expectancy and the referent of *rājan* eliminates the *puruṣa* from the association of other masters except the king, while the referent of *puruṣa* eliminates the association of *rājan* with other possessions except *puruṣa*. In this thought the individual is taken as the meaning of the word. The theorists of inclusion (*samsarga*) hold that *puruṣa* denotes the universal (*jāti*) of 'manhood'; the association of *rājñāḥ* determines the man as associated with the king alone. One can have both exclusion and inclusion operating in the determination of meaning. Thus the determination

of the meaning of a word set in a grammatical relation cannot be denied. So the meanings of words are relative and not absolute.

A well developed and popular word magazine arranged according to fields is the *Nāmalingānuśāsana* of Amarasimha. As the title suggests, it furnishes lists of nouns with their gender, which are divided into various fields and subfields. It serves as a dictionary and also as a thesaurus.⁴¹ As a dictionary it provides meanings of each noun with other nouns, which are considered in a loose sense as synonyms, and as a thesaurus it helps to identify and select a choice word fitting to the context and matching to the taste of the speaker from among the lists of words. But the scope and nature of the *Amarakośa* is of limited destination.

The analysis of the vocabulary into fields, as an universal model, is expected to cover the entire vocabulary, so that every object - both conceptual and material - which is knowable and namable is comprehended. If the metaphysics of the Vaiśeṣikas is viewed as a science seeking "to know the ultimate grounds of being, or what it is that really exists, embracing both psychology and ontology", through the analysis of language, the categorization of the Vaiśeṣikas can be claimed as a best workable structure of semantic fields. As known historically from Śivāditya's *Saptapadārthī*, the Vaiśeṣikas have divided the whole vocabulary in seven main fields called categories (*padārthas*), with different subfields: nine subfields of substance (*dravya*), twentyfour subfields of quality (*guṇa*), five subfields of action (*kriyā*), two subfields of generality (*sāmānya*), innumerable subfields of particularity (*viśeṣa*), one subfield of inherence (*samavāya*) and four subfields of non-existence

(*abhāva*).⁴² This is an excellent workable theory and the meanings of each and every word can be described by distributing each meaning in one or the other field and subfield. The Vaiśeṣika metaphysics provides the domains in which each meaning can be distributed logically, but it does not give any information as to how the vocabulary was distributed at that time. It cannot be said with certainty without the help of other systems of science which deal with language. Thus we are turning towards Pāṇini. In other words the Vaiśeṣikas and the Vaiyākaraṇas stand as counter parts supplying the theory and practice; hence Bhartṛhari always refers to the Vaiśeṣikas in his *Vākyapadiya*. Thus Pāṇini does not give any where his metaphysics to represent human knowledge. But very perusal of the rules reveals that the whole arrangement progresses according to some semantic structure. For example Pāṇini treats nouns, gender and number as much as Amara-siṃha. But the groupings in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* are entirely of different type from the *Amarakośa*, for the structures of the word magazines differ from each other depending upon their aim and scope.

Pāṇini identifies the cases of peculiarity and groups them into different fields. To illustrate a sample survey of the rules ordaining singular number to certain *dvandva* compounds in 2.4.2-16 reveals the classification system of the vocabulary in the following fields:

Animate and inanimate objects constitute the main fields. The animate field comprehends three sub-fields of human beings, animals and plants. The sub-field of human beings comprises of the following sub-fields: religious *śākhās*,⁴³ rites in different *śākhās*,⁴⁴ education system comprising of different courses in curriculum,⁴⁵

caste system including professional castes,⁴⁶ army ranks and cadres,⁴⁷ sentiments and feelings,⁴⁸ amusements and musical instruments,⁴⁹ foods and drinks,⁵⁰ and parts of body.⁵¹ The animal sub-field constitutes of its sub-fields: wild animals,⁵² domesticated animals and milk products,⁵³ inferior animals⁵⁴ and animals of permanent rivalry⁵⁵. The sub-field of plant kingdom embraces the sub-fields: trees,⁵⁶ grasses⁵⁷ and grains⁵⁸. The inanimate field covers the sub-fields of places of habitation,⁵⁹ objects used in household,⁶⁰ regional directions,⁶¹ rivers⁶² and mountains⁶³.

The formation of the compound *mārjāra-mūṣikam* with singular number, ordained according to the rule 2.4.9: *yeṣāṃ ca virodhaḥ śāśvatikaḥ* cannot be purposive unless the permanent rivalry is also included in the sense of the compound; otherwise it would be only *mārjāra-mūṣikau* with dual number as a casual *dvandva* compound.⁶⁴ So also the socio-religious overtones are manifested and included in the meanings of the compounds like *gavāśvam*, *gavāvikam*, *kubja-vāmanam*, *putra-pautram*, *darbha-śaram*, etc. (Pāṇ. 2.4.11). When such concepts are not included the forms will be *gośavau*, etc.⁶⁵ Thus in the absence of semantic associativity a member in a group becomes incommensurable with another member either in a sentence or in a compound.⁶⁶ Therefore, as Helārāja observes, a mustard seed cannot be compared with a mountain. But a bull can be compared with a *gavaya*, which possesses all the characteristics of a bull excluding dewlap.⁶⁷

Operation of the semantic division into fields is more conspicuous in the case of the kinship words formed by the addition of the patronymic suffixes, which are dealt with by Pāṇini in the *Taddhita* section of the

Aṣṭādhyāyī (cf. Pāṇ. 4.1.92: *tasyāpatyam*, etc.). The patronymic names are essential not only to serve as surnames in order to signify the male parent or paternal ancestor, but also to assign different religious and legal duties and rights to different individuals in a family.⁶⁸ In this context a person is related to his father, grandfather, great-grandfather and the preceding ancestors in the backward counting and to his son, grandson, great-grandson, son of the great-grandson and so on in the forward counting.

For practical convenience each person is determined in his family by three preceding and three succeeding generations. To achieve accuracy in nomenclatures two restrictions are imposed on the community. Firstly the personal name of the child should not be a word formed by secondary derivative; thus it should always be a primary derivative.⁶⁹ Secondly the formative suffix to signify the son, grandson, great-grandson and so on should be different in form.⁷⁰ For example Garga is the name of person which is a primary derivative, and his son, grandson and great-grandson are denoted by the secondary derivatives Gārgi 'son of Garga', Gārgya 'son of Gārgi/grandson of Garga', and gārgyāyaṇa 'son of Gārgya/grandson of Gārgi/great-grandson of Garga respectively.⁷¹ The common nomenclature for these patronymic derivative suffixes is *apatya*, while the suffixes signifying the grandson and great-grandson are called *gotra* and *yuvan* respectively.⁷² Several new shades of meaning are added for economy in effort and efficiency in expression. Economy in effort is achieved by limiting the number of forms to grow and the efficiency by catering to certain legal and religious implications through semantic change. For example the secondary derivative with *yuvan* suffix like *gārgyāyaṇa*

can be used only when the male parents of three generations are alive.⁷³ Otherwise the derivative with *gotra* suffix like *gārgya* alone is to be used even for the great-grandson. So the scheme of the expressiveness of patronymic derivatives is dynamic within a specified field of one's own self, his son, his son's son (i.e. grandson), and grandson's son (i.e. great-grandson). The variety of the suffixes does not change the semantic structure and thus the sense of each patronymic name is understandable with reference to the others within the field of patronymic names.

In conclusion it can be said in unambiguous terms that the rules of Pāṇini can be better understood from the semantic point of view. For this purpose a word magazine in different semantic fields is to be constituted. This constituted word magazine is different from the *gaṇa-pāṭha* and *dhātu-pāṭha* which are formulated on phonological and morphological considerations and which serve to delimit the boundaries of the semantic fields. When all the semantic fields are related the vocabulary of Pāṇini can be constituted into an articulated whole without gaps and without overlappings. Such a comprehensive list helps to explain the cultural changes the nation passed through historically and to develop semantic structures as much as the phonological and morphological structures.

REFERENCES

1. By region of domiciliation and by religious practices the *śiṣṭas* are the *Vaiyākaraṇas* who reside in the *Āryāvarta* and practice sacrifice. Cf. *ke punaḥ śiṣṭāḥ. vaiyākaraṇāḥ. ... evaṃ tarhi nivāsata ācārataś ca. sa cācāra āryāvarta eva. kaḥ punar āryāvartaḥ. prāg ādarsāt, pratyak kālakavanād, dakṣiṇena himavantam, uttarena pāriyātram. etasminn āryanivāse ye*

brāhmaṇāḥ kumbhīdhānyā alolupā agṛhyamāṇakāraṇāḥ kiṃcid antareṇa kasyās cid vidyāyāḥ pāragās tatrābhavantaḥ śiṣṭāḥ, Mahābhāṣya [= MB] of Patañjali on the Aṣṭādhyāyī [= Pāṇ], 6.3.109, p. 174 (BORI edn).

Cf. also 2.4.10, p. 475, wherein Patañjali describes the boundaries of Āryāvarta.

śiṣṭaprayogād āṇ apatyādīnām nivṛttir bhaviṣyati. sa cāvāśyam śiṣṭaprayoga upāso ye 'pi paṭhyante teṣām api viparyāsanivṛtṭyarthāḥ, MB. 1.3.1, p. 259.

yo hi śiṣṭavyavahāro brāhmaṇībhyaḥ samprayacchatīty eva tatra bhavitavyam, ibid. 1.3.55, p. 284.

2. The śiṣṭas are very accurate in their usage in the context of sacrifice, whereas they are flaccid in common place conversation; cf. evaṃ hi śrūyate. yarvāṇas tarvāṇo namarṣayo bābhūvuḥ pratyakṣadharmāṇaḥ parāparajñā viditaveditavyā adhigatayāthātathyāḥ. te tatrābhavanto yad vā nas tad vā na iti prayoktavye yarvā ṇas tarvāṇa iti prayuñjate yājñe punaḥ karmaṇi nāpabhāṣante, MB. 1.1.1, p. 11.

The use in the sacrifice is the main standard dialect and the correctness of any thing is determined from this sacrificial ideology. So Patañjali remarks: evaṃ tarhi yajñāt karmaṇo 'niravāsītānām, MB. 2.4.10, p. 475.

3. saṃgraha etat prādhānyena parīkṣitam nityo vā syāt kāryo veti, MB. 1.1.1, p. 6.

saṃgraho vyādikṛto lakṣaślokaśamkhyo grantha iti prasiddhaḥ, Nāgeśa's Udyota thereon.

Kātyāyana mentions Vyāḍi in his vārtika: dravyābhīdhānaṃ vyāḍiḥ, 1.2.64, vt. 45, p. 244.

Patañjali mentions that Pāṇini is Dākṣīputra 'son of Dākṣī (= daughter/grand-daughter of Dakṣa)'; cf.

sarve sarvapadādesā dākṣīputrasya pāṇineḥ/ekadeśavikāre hi nityatvaṃ nopapadyate// MB. 1.1.20, p. 75.

He also mentions that Saṃgraha was composed by Dākṣāyaṇa 'great-grandson of Dakṣa'; cf. śobhanā khalu dākṣāyaṇasya saṃgrahasya kṛtīḥ. śobhanā khalu dākṣāyaṇena saṃgrahasya kṛtir iti, MB. 2.3.66, p. 468.

So Vyāḍi should also be patronymically related to Pāṇini. He could be the nephew/grand-nephew of Pāṇini as per the derivative system of Pāṇini; see fn. 70 below.

4. cf. *prāyeṇa saṃkṣeparucīn alpavidyāparigrahān/*
saṃprāpya vaiyākaraṇān saṃgrahe 'stam upāgate//
kr̥te 'tha patañjalīnā guruṇā tīrthadarsīnā/
sarveṣāṃ nyāyabijānām mahābhāṣye nibandhane//
VP. 2. 481-82.
5. e.g. *apare punaḥ 'sici vṛddhiḥ' (7.2.1) ity uktvākāraikārukārān*
udāharanti. te manyāmahe yayā pratyāyante sā saṃjñā, ye
pratiyāyante te saṃjñīna iti, MB. under the vārtika: yathā
laukikavaidikeṣu, 1.1.1, vt. 4, p. 38.
6. e.g. *vipratīṣedhe param ity ucyate pūrve cāṇādayaḥ pare*
ghādayaḥ. pare 'ṇādayaḥ kariṣyante. sūtraviparyāśā caivaṃ
kr̥to bhavati, MB. 4.2.92, p. 219.
7. *naivam anye manyante. kathaṃ tarhy anye manyante. guṇa-*
karmaṇi lādividhiḥ sapare. guṇakarmaṇi lādividhayo bhavanti
saha pareṇa yogena, MB. 1.4.51, p. 335.
8. *pramāṇabhūta ācārya darbhāpavitrapāṇiḥ śucāv avakāse prān-*
mukha upaviśya mahatā yatnena sūtraṃ prapayati sma. tatrā-
śakyam varṇenāpy anarthakena bhavitum, kiṃ punar iyatā
sūtreṇa, MB. 1.1.1, vt. 7, p. 39.
9. Patañjali attests the usage in his statement: *evam eṣā śiṣṭa-*
jñānārthāṣṭādhyāyī, Pāṇ. 6.3.109, p. 174.
10. The vārtikas evidence that the text tradition of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*
underwent many changes resulting in the emergence of versions,
at least for different portions of it (see my article : 'Two Ver-
sions of the *Ekasaṃjñādhikāra*', *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, XII,
1971). Existence of a tradition to interpret rules of Pāṇini
from semantic point of view is evident from the *Mahābhāṣya*
and the *Vākyapadīya* (see my article: '*Ekasaṃjñādhikāra* in
the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*', *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, X, 1967). Therefore
it is indispensable to begin to inquire into the meaning of rules
in the light of the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Vākyapadīya*.
11. VP. 2.481ff.
12. *atha śabdānuśāsanam. śabdānuśāsanam sāstram adhiḥkṛtaṃ*
veditavyam. keṣāṃ śabdānām. laukikānām vaidikānām ca,
MB. 1.1.1, p. 1.
13. *asvagoṇyādayaḥ śabdāḥ sādhaso viṣayāntare/*
nimittabhedāt sarvatra sādhasvaṃ ca vyavasthitam// VP.1.176.
14. cf. *saṃjñāyām samajaniṣadanipatanamanavidasūnībhṛṇīṇaḥ,*
Pāṇ. 3.3.99.

15. om ity uktvā vṛttāntasaḥ sam ity evam adīn śabdān paṭhanti. MB. 1.1.1, p. 5.
16. e.g. Yāska's Nirukta.
17. e.g. Amarasimha's Nāmalingānuśāsana alias Amarakośa.
18. The Dhātupāṭha and the Gaṇapāṭha constitute the integral parts of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, for the rules are operative on the basis of these magazines. These magazines are published separately also; see *Word Index to Pāṇini - Sūtra-pāṭha and Parisiṣṭas*, BORI, 1935.
19. Cf. K. Parameswara Aithal, *Veda-lakṣaṇa - Vedic Ancillary Literature - A Descriptive Bibliography*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1993.
20. The Ṛgvedaprātisākhya-pariśiṣṭa contains a list of words from the Ṛgveda with difficult sandhis; see *Veda-lakṣaṇa*, entry 314, p. 217.
21. e.g. Nāntapadāni, ibid. 737, p. 388.
22. e.g. Śuklayajurveda-sarvānukrama, ibid. 1322, p. 611.
23. katham tarhīme śabdāḥ pratipattavyāḥ. kiñcit sāmānyaviśeṣa-vallakṣaṇam pravartya yenālpēna yatnena mahato mahataḥ śabdaughān pratipadyeran, MB. 1.1.1, p. 6.
24. utsargāpavādaḥ. kaścīd utsargaḥ kartavyaḥ kaścīd apavādaḥ. kathamjātīyakaḥ punar utsargaḥ kartavyaḥ kathamjātīyako 'pavādaḥ. sāmānyenotsargaḥ kartavyaḥ. tad yathā. karmanya aṅ (3.2.1). tasya viśeṣeṇopavādaḥ. tad yathā. āto 'nupasarge kaḥ (3.2.3), ibid.
25. ye punaḥ kāryā bhāvā nirvṛttau tāvattesām yatnaḥ kriyate. tad yathā. ghaṭena kāryam kariṣyan kumbhakārakulam gatvāha kuru ghaṭam kāryam anena kariṣyāmīti. na tadvacchbdān prayokṣyamāṇo vaiyākaraṇakulam gatvāha kuru śabdān prayokṣya iti. tāvaty evārtham artham apādāya śabdān prayuñjate, MB. 1.1.1, p. 7-8.
26. siddhe śabdārthasambandhe, MB. 1.1.1, vt.1, p. 6.
27. śabdo lakṣyaḥ sūtram lakṣaṇam. ... sūrtrāṇi cāpyadhīyāna iṣyate vaiyākaraṇa iti. naiṣa doṣaḥ. samudāyeṣu hi śabdāḥ pravṛttā avayaveṣv api vartante, MB. 1.1.1, vt. 14, p. 12.
28. yadi tarhi śiṣṭāḥ śabdeṣu pramāṇam kim aṣṭādhyāyā kriyate. śiṣṭajñānārthāṣṭādhyāyī. katham punar aṣṭādhyāyā śiṣṭāḥ śakyā vijñātum. aṣṭādhyāyīm adhīyāno 'nyam paśyaty anadhīyānam ye 'tra vihitāḥ śabdās tām prayuñjānam. sa paśyati.

nūnam asya daivānugrahaḥ svabhāvo vā yo 'yaṃ na cāṣṭādhyāyīm adhīte ye cātra vihitāḥ śabdās tāṃś ca prayunkte. avam nūnam anyān api jānāti, MB. 6.3.109, p. 174.

Bhartṛhari generalises this in:

na so 'sti pratyayo loke yaḥ śabdānugamād ṛte/
anuviddham iva jñānaṃ sarvaṃ śabdena bhāsate//

Vākyapadīya (= VP), 1.131.

29. Ānandavardhana calls the grammarian sūri: dhvanir iti sūribhiḥ kathitāḥ, Dhvanyāloka, 1.13.
30. cf. prathame hi vidvāṃso vaiyākaraṇāḥ, ibid. 1.16. Ānandavardhana takes vidvat as a synonym of sūri; sūribhiḥ kathitā iti vidvadupajñeyam uktiḥ, 1.16.
31. Śaṅkara in his Brahmasūtrabhāṣya (1.1.1 intr.) refers to the grammarian by the word paṇḍita; cf. tam etam evaṃlakṣaṇam adhyāsam paṇḍitā avidyeti manyante.
See my paper 'Grammarian and Poetician on Linguistic Variability', S.V.U. Oriental Journal, vol. 41, fn. 23, p. 49-50
32.vyaṅgyo vācyād dhvanir budhaiḥ kathitāḥ/ Kāvya prakāśa, 1.4. Maṃmaṭa himself paraphrases budha as vaiyākaraṇa: budhair vaiyākaraṇaiḥ pradhānabhūtasphoṭarūpavyaṅgyavyaṅjakasya śabdasya dhvanir iti vyavahāraḥ kṛtaḥ, ibid. p. 19 (BORI edn.).
33. Cognition of language comprises of the cognition of the vocables in the utterance and the cognition of the referents of the vocables and of the sentence. In recognition of this hierarchy Pāṇini read the rule *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā* (1.1.68). The same process holds water even in the case of the rules of Pāṇini himself. See for details my article: 'Bhartṛhari on *svaṃ rūpaṃ śabdasyāśabdasaṃjñā*', Adyar Library Bulletin, 44-45, 1980-81.
34. cf. arthabhāgaiḥ tathā teṣāṃ antaro 'rthaḥ prakāśyate/
ekasyaivātmaṇo bhedaḥ śabdārthāḥ aprthak sthitau//
VP. 2.31.
35. dvāv apy upāyau śabdānāṃ prayoge samavasthitau/
kramo vā yaugapadyaṃ vā yau loko nātivartate// VP. 2.467.
36. bhedenādhigatau pūrvaṃ śabdau tulyaśrutī punaḥ/
tanreṇa pratipattāraḥ prayoktrā pratipāditaḥ// VP 2.475.
kramān na yaugapadyasya kaścīd bhedo 'sti tattvataḥ/
yathaiva bhāvān nābhāvaḥ kaścīd anyo 'vasiyate// VP. 3.3.84.

However for illustration of the operation of the grammatical rules, the rules can be interpreted either from the *krama* or *yaugapadya* points of view. Thus it has become customary for the commentators to examine how a given rule holds good according to each view. This resulted in the divergence of two schools of grammarians called *Svābhāvika-pakṣa* 'naturalistic school' and *Vācanika-pakṣa* 'conventionalistic school'. See my paper: 'Bhartṛhari on Viśeṣaṇānām cājāteḥ of Pāṇini', *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*, XV, pt. 1, 1972.

37. This duality of language structure is epitomized by Bhartṛhari: *śabdaḥ kāraṇam arthasya sa hi tenopajanyate/ tathā ca buddhiviśayād arthāc chabdaḥ pratiyate*//VP. 3.3.32. Helārāja's annotation is very significant on this verse: *tathā hi buddhau śabdārthayoḥ pūrvam abhedenāvasthānam ata eva sthānakaraṇavyāpārād abhivakto 'rthasvarūpaśabalaḥ śabdaḥ śrotṛbhir avadhāritas tathaiva svarūpācchuraṇayārtham avagamayati, Prakīrṇaprakāśa, on VP. 3.3 (Sādhana).32.*
38. One and the same word may denote different shades of meaning in different speech communities. See my monograph, *An Introduction to Sanskrit Linguistics*, pp. 307-309.
39. Patañjali illustrates thus: *ayaṃ daṇḍaḥ astīti gaṃyate. sa daṇḍaḥ kartā bhūtvānyena śabdenābhisambadhyamānaḥ karaṇam sampadyate. tad yathā. kaścit kaṃcid pṛcchati. kva devadatta iti sa tasmā ācaṣṭe. asau vṛkṣa iti. katarasmin yas tiṣṭhatīti. sa vṛkṣo 'dhikaraṇam bhūtvānyena śabdenābhisambadhyamānaḥ kartā sampadyate, MB. 2.1.1, vt. 5, p. 366.*
40. *bhedasamsargau vā sāmartyam iti. kaḥ punar bhedaḥ sam-sargo vā. iha rājñā ity ukte sarvaṃ svaṃ prasaktam. puruṣa ity ukte sarvaḥ svāmī prasaktaḥ. ihedānīm rājapuruṣa ity ukte rājā puruṣam nivartayaty anyebhyaḥ svāmibhyaḥ. puruṣo 'pi rājānam anyebhyaḥ svebhyaḥ, MB. 2.1.1. vt. 2, p.364.*
- Patañjali hints at this theory in the *Paśpaśāhnika*: *athavā śabdair api śabdā vyākriyante. tad yathā. gaur ity ukte sarve sandehā nivartante nāsvo na gardabha iti, MB.1.1.1, p. 12.*
- On the basis of this determinative function of words, Bhartṛhari developed two theories called *Samsargavāda* and *Bhedāpohavāda* to explain the denotation of number by the first member of the compound. See VP. III.14 (*Vṛtti*). 98. See also my *Sanskrit Compounds*, pp. 160-183.

41. With the knowledge of one word, one would be able to know several significant things and words associated with that word, for the thesaurus records the lists in such a way that it furnishes the whole and its parts, qualificant and its qualifiers, the doer and his actions, the product and its ingredients, etc. The derivation of each word signifies the motif behind its formation. Thus absolute synonymity is practically impossible. So the user has to select his choice word. For example if one knows the word peacock, he can know from the thesaurus the class to which the peacock belongs, its parts, its cries, its place of haunt, etc. (*Amarakośa*, 2.5.30-31). Let us take the field of *manuṣya* in the *Amarakośa* (2.6.1-38). It gives common names for human beings, names of man, general names of woman, special names of woman because of physical features like shape of the body, manners, social status like queen, house wife, prostitute, age, sexual disposition, mental abilities, caste, profession, progeny, names based on kinship with reference to the other members of the family, etc. So one can locate any specific word matching to the occasion, if he knows at least one item in the field.
42. *pramitiviṣayāḥ padārthāḥ. te ca dravya-guṇa-karma-sāmānya-viśeṣa-samavāyābhāvākhyāḥ saptaiva*, etc., *Saptapadārthī*, 2ff, p. 2ff (Adyar, 1932).
43. Pāṇ. 2.4.3: *anuvāde caraṇānām*, e.g. *kaṭhakālāpam*.
44. Pāṇ. 2.4.4: *adhvaryukratur anapumsakam*; e.g. *arkāśva-medham*.
45. Pāṇ. 2.4.5: *adhyayanato viprakṣṭākhyānām*; e.g. *padakakramakam*.
46. Pāṇ. 2.4.10 *sūdrānām aniravasitānām*; e.g. *takṣāyaskāram*.
47. Pāṇ. 2.4.2: *dvandvaś ca prāṇitūryasenāṅgānām*; e.g. *rathikāśvāroham*.
48. Pāṇ. 2.4.13: *vipratīṣiddham cānadhikaraṇavāci*; e.g. *sukhaduḥkham*, counter example: *kāmakrodhau*.
49. Pāṇ. 2.4.2: e.g. *mārḍaṅgikapāṇavikam*.
50. Pāṇ. 2.4.12: *vibhāṣā vṛkṣamṛgatṛṇadhānyavyañjanapaśuśakunyaśvavaḍavapūrvāparādharrōttarānām*; e.g. *dadhighṛtam, vrīhiyavam*.
51. Pāṇ. 2.4.2; e.g. *pāṇipādam*.
52. Pāṇ. 2.4.12: e.g. *rurupṣat*.

53. Pāṇ. 2.4.11: *gavāśvaprabhṛtīni ca*; e.g. *gavāśvam, ajāvikam*.
Pāṇ. 2.4.12; e.g. *dadhighṛtam*.
54. Pāṇ. 2.4.8: *kṣudrajantavaḥ*; e.g. *daṃśamasākam, yūkālikṣam*.
55. Pāṇ. 2.4.9: *yeṣāṃ ca virodhaḥ śāsvatikaḥ*; e.g. *mārjāramūśakam*.
56. Pāṇ. 2.4.12; e.g. *plakṣanyagrodham*.
57. *ibid. kuśakāśam*.
58. *ibid. vrīhiyam*.
59. Pāṇ. 2.4.7: *viśiṣṭalingo nadī deśo 'grāmāḥ*; e.g. *kurukuru-kṣetram*.
60. Pāṇ. 2.4.14: *na dadhipayaādīni*; e.g. *ulūkhalamusale*.
61. Pāṇ. 2.4.12: e.g. *pūrvāparam, adharottaram*.
62. Pāṇ. 2.4.7: e.g. *gaṅgāśoṇam*.
63. The rivers and places of habitation like *janapadas* are considered for *ekavadbhāva*. The other areas include the mountains and forests. So the *Kāśikā* gives as a counter example of 2.4.7: *kailāśagandhamādane*.
64. Cf. *virodhe hi 'yeṣāṃ ca virodhaḥ' ity evaṃ siddham. kadā ca śvacanḍālasya virodhaḥ? yadā virodhaṃ dvandvo nācaṣṭhe kevalaṃ cārthamātre vartate tadā śvacanḍālam ihāstīti, Nyāsa on Kāśikā, 2.4.11.*
65. *gavāśvaprabhṛtiṣu yathocāritaṃ dvandvavṛttam. rūpāntare tu nāyaṃ vidhir bhavati - go'svam, go'svau, Kāśikā, 2.4.11.*
66. Pāṇini uses the word *aviprakṛṣṭa* for associativity in the rule 2.4.5: *adhyanto 'viprakṛṣṭākhyānām*. Therefore a *samāhāradvandva* between *pada* and *krama* is possible because the latter follows the former in the curriculum. But such a *samāhāradvandva* is not possible between *yājñika* and *vaiyākaraṇa* because the two subjects, namely *yajña* and *vyākaraṇa* do not have indispensable hierarchy in the curriculum. So an *itaretarayogadvandva* compound alone is possible. Cf. *Kāśikā* and *Nyāsa* on the above rule.
67. cf. *yadvā yatra kiṃcit sāmānyam ityādibhāṣyasyākṣepaḥ - sarvatrapadārtheṣu sāmānyaviśeṣayogād aupamyam syād ity atiprasaṅgo merur iva sarṣapa ity api syāt...*, *Helārāja's Prakīrṇaparakāśa* on VP. 3.Vṛtti.397.
- So also the expression *himavān iva loṣṭhaḥ* cannot bring out any comparison. See my *Sanskrit Compounds*, pp. 215 and 223.

68. E.g. the enumeration of *sapiṇḍa* is extended up to seven generations only. In other cases the *āśauca* at the birth and death of a child or a member of the family, common meals, etc. are discontinued among the members even if they are *sagotra*. Cf. *Kāśikā* on Pāṇ. 4.1.165: *vānyasmin sapiṇḍe sthāviratare jīvati: ubhayatra daśāhāni kulasyānnaṃ nabhuḥyate/ dānaṃ pratigraho yajñāḥ svādhyāyas ca nivartate//*
quoted in *Nyāsa* on *Kāśikā*, 4.1.165.
69. Cf. *yājñikāḥ paṭhanti. daśamyuttarakālaṃ putrasya jātasya nāma vidadhyād ghoṣavad ādyantarantaḥstham avṛddhaṃ tripuruṣānūkam anaripatiṣṭitaṃ taddhi pratiṣṭhitatamaṃ bhavati dvyakṣaraṃ caturakṣaraṃ vā nāma kṛtaṃ kuryān na tad-dhitam iti, Mahābhāṣya*, 1.1.1, p. 4 (BORI edn.).
70. The *apatya* and *gotra* suffixes can also be added to the female descendants. So *Dākṣī* [*< dakṣa + iñ (4.1.95: ata iñ) + niṣ (4.1.35: ito manuṣyajāteḥ)*] is the only form for daughter, grand-daughter, great-grand-daughter and so on of *Dakṣa*. The same *apatya* affix is ordained by Pāṇ. 4.1.95 to signify child and grand-child. In masculine on the other hand, we have *dākṣāyaṇaḥ* with *yuvan*-suffix *phak* (by the rule Pāṇ. 4.1.101: *yañiyos ca*) signifying the great-grandson with all *Dakṣa*, his son and great-grandson being alive: cf. *yūni yad uktam striyāṃ tan na bhavati, Kāśikā*, on 4.1.94: *gotrād yūny astriyām*.
71. *Gārgiḥ* is formed according to Pāṇ. 4.1.95, *gārgyaḥ* according to 4.1.105: *gargādibhyo yañ, gārgyāyaṇa (phak)* according to 4.1.101: *yañiṇos ca*
72. Pāṇ. 4.1.92: *tasyāpatyam*; 4.1.162: *apatyaṃ pautraprabhṛti gotram*; 4.1.163: *jīvati tu vaṃśye yuvā*.
Cf. *kriyānimittako 'patyaśabdaḥ, na pataty anenety apatyam iti auṇādiko yatpratyaḥ. yasya ca yenāpatanaṃ tat tasyāpatyam. vyavahitajanito 'pi pautrādīḥ pitāmahāder apatana-hetur bhavati, Haradatta's Padamañjarī* on *Kāśikā*, 4.1.93.
73. Pāṇ. 4.1.163. In this context a younger brother of a grandson is also called *yuvan*, even if any one in the preceding generations is dead; *bhrātari ca jyāyasi*, 4.1.164. So also even one of the elder persons like paternal uncle (*pitṛvya*) is alive, and son or

grandson is dead, the son of the grandson is called optionally yuvan; cf. *vānyasmin sapinḍe sthaviratāre jīvati*, 4.1.165. So Gārgyāyaṇa could be great-grandson, whose brother, paternal uncle or grandfather is alive, while others are dead.

I.K. SARMA

ART AND ARCHITECTURE OF RĀYALASĪMA

(from the earliest to the 6th century A.D.)

The presentation here confines to the formative period of art and architecture restricted to the area of Rāyalasīma. The appellation *Rāyalasīma* covers approximately the present districts of Nellore, Chittoor, Kurnool, Cuddapah, Anantapur and neighbouring Bellary, Kolar districts of Karnataka, which were under the Rāyas of Vijayanagara.

While undertaking the study of art and architecture specially of the formative stages, two basic factors have to be kept in mind:

A) *Private house worship*: This is household worship of certain deities with the integument rituals. Apart from recitation, invocation, the forms of God were caused in miniature, portable types out of clay, wood or stone. This *gr̥hya* ritual modes are basic to the growth of art, iconography and subsequently, architecture;

B) *Temple worship*: A variety of forms of Gods, associated with large structures in brick or stone medium

to house them came up prior to 6th century A.D. itself. Such bigger temples, *stūpas* were in brick media, the principle deities, artistic embellishments, however, were of stone in a majority of cases. Studies on Art and Architecture in this area of Rāyalasīma have not been planned or undertaken in a desired and deserving scale. A beginning is made here.

I. NOTICES ON EARLY HISTORICAL SITES: AND BUDDHIST REMAINS IN RĀYALASĪMA

The Southward extent of Mauryan empire (Aśokan) includes a major part of Cuddapah, Kurnool, Anantapur and Nellore districts, and river Pennar is generally assumed to be the southernmost border line.

Aśokan edicts of Rajulamandagiri and Erragudi (Pattikonda Tq.) apart from the mounds at these sites, are well-known for the data on Buddhist spread under Mauryan patronage. Recently at Siddhulagavalu Rock shelters located in Ketavaram village (Kurnool Tq.), inscriptions and Buddhist remains were reported. The Mauryan empire has left considerable impact in Nellore area is attested by the discovery of Silver punch-marked coins from the villages of Duvvuru (20 km. North-West of Nellore on the left bank of Pennar) and Alluru (20 km. North-East of Nellore). Apart from coins, the extensive ruins of fortified towns with early brick structures were noticed at Duvvuru (Nellore Tq.) and also at Pudur (Sullurpet Tq.). Nellore is also famous for the earliest discovery of Roman coins and medals in a pot. In the year 1786, a peasant found below the ruins of a small brick temple, a hoard of Roman coins and medals in a pot. Kodavaluru and Padugupadu have also yielded hoards of Sātavāhana coins and the earliest ruler

represented was Vasīṣṭhīputra Sātakarṇi IV. The coins are closer to the horse types of Anantapur (Bathalappalli) and Cuddapah (Adapur) areas of 1st-2nd century A.D.

Buddhapadu (Mahimaluru) in Atmakur (Tq.), has a Buddhist base. Ramatirtham (Gaundlapalem) in Kovur (Tq.) revealed an early historical mound with rouletted ware and the temple is apsidal on plan. Rudrakota (Kavali Tq.) has yielded a *chatra* and lotus fragments in an extensive Buddhist site. Lingarajupalem, near Dharmavaram in Anantapur Dt. has a mound locally known as *Rākāsimitṭa* where a Buddhist *stūpa* in a land of 6 acres extent was found. A stone *dharmachakra*, *triratna* and leaf motif were also reported from this place.

In Cuddapah district, Buddhist mounds of the later Sātavāhana period were known from Adapur (Rajampet Tq.), Penukanchiprolu, Peddachappalle (Kamalapuram Tq.), and Pushpagiri (Cuddapah Tq.). In fact Adapur excavations revealed a *stūpa* and monastery of the later Sātavāhana period, apart from inscriptions, sculptures (*Buddha-pāda*) and Sātavāhana coins. The existence of an orthodox wave of Buddhism in the Rāyalasīma area is certain but its natural and historical associations, have not yet been properly studied.

II. EARLY BRĀHMANICAL TEMPLES:

The worship of Śiva appears very early in Rāyalasīma. The temples confined to all the three Indian styles, *Nāgara*, *Drāviḍa* and *Vesara* based on the Vedic *maṇḍalas*. The evidence that has come forth recently from a probe within the Paraśurāmeśvara shrine at

Gudimallam (Chittoor Dt.) is first of its kind and highly significant as it brought to light a unique *Rudrasthāna* wherein a *mānuṣa-liṅga* is set within two circular *argha-pīṭhas* and surrounded closely by a square *śilā-prākāra-vedikā* in its earliest phase-I (3rd-2nd century B.C.). The form of the standing two-handed, almost life-size, divine being was identified as Rudra-yajamāna. He has no *yajñopavīta* and third eye. In his right hand a goat, (an *yajña-paśu*) is held upside down whose omentum was offered to fire and while in the left hand an *ājya-pātra* is held at *kaṭi*. He stands firmly on the shoulders of a crouching *minapāda-yakṣa*. This massive *liṅga* was fixed into two circular *arghya-pīṭhas*. There is no arrangement for *abhiṣeka* and the two circular *pīṭhas* of polished sand stone served as offering platforms. Raw flesh is offered to God as the cut bones of bull, goat and pig found here attest. This set up has undergone a change in the next phase-II during 1st-2nd centuries A.D. as an apsidal temple in brick was raised around and a lime floor laid within the intervening spaces. Even then no *abhiṣeka* arrangement is caused at this state also. However, in the succeeding phase-III starting from the middle of 9th century A.D. a bigger temple of stone was raised confining however to the apsidal alignment of the earlier brick temple.

The archaeological data unearthed here makes the earliest temple at Gudimallam, a hypaethral *śilāvedika-liṅgasthāna* in open, datable to 3rd century B.C. Such simple open-air *śilāpaṭa* shrines are however known from the coin depictions of north-west India. The icon of *Rudra-yajamāna* here reflects consummate-skill and ability. It is the most ideal divine figure, a work of a *suśilpin*, unparalleled in the realms of Indian art.

Remarkable data has come forth from the recent excavations at Siddheswaram and Virapuram (both in Nandikotkur Tq., Kurnool Dt.) wherein a series of square shrines of brick with *liṅga-pīṭhas* in the centre were unearthed. The river bank (*tīrtha*) of Krishna enroute to Srisailam, has revealed several such *śiva-sthānas*, which were caused by *Mahārāṭhis* (1st-2nd century A.D.) and continued till the times of the *Ikṣvāku* rulers as the rich coin evidences associated with these temple units indicated. Great significance lies in the discovery of five brick temples at Siddheswaram where systematic *vāstu-vinyāsa* rituals were observed as seen from the pottery vessels numbering - twenty placed at the cardinal and corner directions below the *adhiṣṭhāna* level. It may be noted here that Gurzala inscription of the last *Ikṣvāku* king Rudrapuruṣadatta refers to the temple of Halampurasvāmī at Alampur.

It is now clear that the Nava-brahma group of temples in stone were preceded by the early art forms and smaller temples of brick existed as the recent digs below Padma-brahma temple (Alampur), Siddheswaram and Kudali-Sangameswaram revealed. At Kudali, much before the rise of the massive early *Čālukyan* edifice - the place has several smaller brick shrines with lime stone *liṅga-pīṭhas*. The later *Sātavāhana-Ikṣvāku* lead coins and Roman gold coins were associated in their foundational levels as offerings.

The early *Čālukyan* temple groups at Pitikayagulla, Satyavolu (Giddalur Tq., Prakasam Dt.) have a similar set up in their early foundations. *Mūlasthāneśvara* temple, Pottapi (Kurnool), though largely built in stone much later (11th century A.D.), preserves an archaic style similar to *Kapoteśvara* temple, Chejarla. The

Paraśurāmeśvara temple at Attirala, like Gudimallam detailed above, is an apsidal type in plan and elevation. A probe here will be highly rewarding.

The Agastheśvara temple complex of Chilamakuru (closer to Cuddapah) has within the sanctum a thumb-shaped *liṅga* (*aṅguṣṭha-mātraḥ puruṣaḥ*), an archaic type. Its foundation also appears much early. Gangaperuru (Cuddapah) is renowned for a *chāyā-stambha* inscription referring to *gograhaṇa* (cattle raid) during the Ikṣvāku period and the place is stated to be the home of Karṇāṭa-Gaṅgas.

III. EARLY CULT OBJECTS AND RISE OF TRIMŪRTI TEMPLES:

Cultic orientation of *trimūrti* and ritual worship in the houses is well attested by 1st-2nd century A.D. itself in *Āndhradēśa*. The handy stone plaques depicting *trideva* (*Brahmā-Īśvara-Viṣṇu*) are known from Keesari-gutta (Karimnagar Dt.), Kunidena (Guntur Dt.), Kanakadurga temple premises and Madugula (Vijayawada). To this class belong the series of stone (red slate and buff sandstone), plaques obtained from the ancient mounds of Peddamudiyam, the Muḍivemu-agrāhāra of early Cālukyan fame in Cuddapah district. Here besides, *Trideva*, *Vināyaka* and *Kumāra* are also found depicted in some examples, thus augmenting *pañca-deva* worship by early 5th century A.D.

Two more examples of limestone were found by me in the collections of Sri Venkateswara Oriental Institute, Tirupati (my visit 3.8.79). They were collected by (late) Sri Veturu Prabhakara Sastry of Muktyala Village, Nandigama Tq. of Krishna Dt.

Recently B. Rajendra Prasad of Sri Venkateswara University reported another example of soapstone (measuring 21x20x3cm.) from Duvvuru (Buchireddypalem Tq., Nellore Dt.). This is yet another unique plaque which contained in relief Trimukha-brahmā on lotus, *linga* and Nandi, Padmamukhī Lakṣmī with *nara* below.

It may be noted that the copper plate inscriptions of the time of Early Pallava king Simhavarman; (obtained from Buchhiredipalem and Paturu villages) confer *brahmadeya* grants to 170 Vedic scholars belonging to 26 *gotras*. The *Brahmā-Īśvara-Viṣṇu-lakṣitāyatanas* caused by the early Pallava kings demonstrate the transformation of the household *trideva* cult into the public temple worship by 5th century A.D.

P.V. PARABRAHMA SASTRY

CULTURAL INTEGRATION IN INDIA THROUGH PURĀṆAS

(with particular Reference to
Andhra C.300 A.D. - 650 A.D.)

Leaving the allusions in the epics to the migration of Agastya to the South, there prevails the popular belief that some renowned *sūtra-kāras* like Bodhāyana and Āpastamba flourished in the Krishna-Godavari delta region some time in the fourth century B.C.¹ The *brāhmaṇas* in Āndhra region mostly belong to these particular *śākhās* of Bodhāyana and Āpastamba. Further the Andhra recension of the *Taittirīya-saṃhitā* is believed to have been standardized by Āpastamba himself. The episode of Baveri narrated in the *Suttanipāta* indicates that Brāhmaṇa religion was flourishing in the Decan even during Buddha's time.² A more specific allusion to the existence of certain *brāhmaṇa* families in the south can be inferred from the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali of 2nd century B.C. He pointedly mentions more than once that his predecessor grammarian Vararuci was one among the southerners (*dākṣiṇātyas*)

who were fond of using the words with *taddhita* endings (*priyataddhitā dākṣiṇātyāḥ*).³ Vararuci's southern origin clearly indicates that there existed some reputed institutions or *gurukulas* for higher studies in *Vedas* and *sāstras* in the Deccan even before Patañjali's time. It is not known from which part of the Deccan Vararuci hailed. That he was remembered long in the scholarly circles is borne out by an epigraphic mention of the title *adyakāla-vararuci* attributed to a donee in the Koneki grant of Cālukya Viṣṇuvardhana II⁴ datable in 669-70 A.D. The comparison is not with Pāṇini or Patañjali. There is no evidence to say that these highly learned *brāhmaṇas* of the pre-Christian era received any royal patronage in the Deccan or far south. As a matter of historical truth there existed no well settled ruling families worth the mention in this region. Ambition for political supremacy was not known till the Sātavāhanas founded an integrated political dominion out of all the petty chiefdoms of Andhra, Asmaka and Mulaka. Even during their long reign of more than two and a half centuries we notice only a single record referring to *brahmadeya* gifts at least as sacrificial fees, and that is the Nanaghat inscription of Nāganikā,⁵ datable to the latter part of the first century B.C. This inscription undoubtedly offers us a glimpse into the prevalence of the cult of Vedic sacrifices in western Deccan. But in the eastern part such evidence is lacking. All the earliest records in this part beginning from the time of Aśoka up to the Ikṣavākus in the third century A.D. are Buddhist in nature and gifts as *brahmadeya* are not noticeable in them. There seems no attempt by those few *brāhmaṇas* of undertaking the missionary work of propagating *brāhmanism* as a religious faith. Society at large was least benefited by

those few *brāhmaṇas* in the early phase of Aryanization of the Deccan.

But in that early historical phase, say from the third century B.C. contacts with the Buddhists started in the Deccan. According to the latest count there are more than seventy Buddhist centres discovered in Andhra and many of them yielded structural as well as epigraphical evidences datable to a period as late as twelfth century A.D.⁶ It would not be an exaggeration if we say that Buddhism as a popular belief commanded enormous influence over the society for more than a millennium beginning from the time to Aśoka and declining in the seventh century as noticed by Huian Tsang. Buddhism was the earliest religion which endeavoured in maintaining social contacts irrespective of caste and creed with a missionary spirit and a majority of the common families, particularly in the coastal Andhra and Telangana followed Buddhism.

Contrastingly the Vedic *brāhmaṇas* did not try to propagate their religion among the common folk. In fact there is little in the Vedic scriptures which can be conveniently adopted in the daily life of the common people. It was all confined to the cult of sacrifices and Upanishadic philosophical discourses useful for the intellectuals alone. Not even temples were constructed for the worship of the deities of the common people. So Buddhism naturally gained the upper hand in attracting the masses. Even the small gifts of stones for a *caitya* a garland to decorate the *stūpa*, sweeping the premises of *caitya* or *vihāra*, lighting a lamp near the *caitya* and doing any manual service in a Buddhist place were attached with the result of great virtue. Such acts were easily accessible to the lay worshippers and similar ways

of easy worship were practically denied for the benefit of the common folk in the Vedic scriptures.

Thus when Buddhism was at its zenith in Andhra there came the whirlwind like invasion of Samudragupta some time after 350 A.D. His Allahabad *praśasti*⁷ narrates no less than a dozen rulers vanquished by him in the Deccan, most of them being in coastal Andhra and Kalinga. Many of them are said to have been captured and released out of compassion as inferred from the words *grahaṇa-mokṣa-anugraha*. But the subsequent history reveals that the rulers of only Vengi and Kanchi namely Hastivarman and Viṣṇugopa respectively were retained in their positions, the rest of the vanquished rulers being replaced by his favourites. It is not certain that even the same kings of Vengi and Kanchi were permitted to rule their respective kingdoms or replaced by other members of the same families.

Samudragupta did not acquire any political gain from his southern conquest. He might have become eligible for performing the prestigious Aśvamedha sacrifice. Puṣyamitra, the Sunga king who revolted against the Maurya king Bṛhadratha in about 180 B.C. is known to have performed Aśvamedha to indicate his successful revolution against the Buddhist Mauryas and his attempt to uphold the cause of Brahmanism. To perform Aśvamedha in the early days was significantly indicative of political conquest and a determined effort to uphold *dharma* as dictated in the Brahmanical scriptures. In the same ideological pursuit Samudragupta's conquest of the rulers of the south where the spread of the heretic religion, Buddhism was conspicuously on a high pitch was to make himself qualified for performing the Aśvamedha as part of his endeavour to uphold

Brahmanical *dharma*, as indicated in one of the legends he used on the coins (*bhuvan̄ jītvā gupto jayati divan̄ dharmeṇa*). Thus, Samudragupta's southern invasion, in the absence of any territorial gain is to be interpreted as his attempt to promote Brahmanical *dharma* in a more effective manner to bring the masses into its fold. Perhaps it was his intention to wage a cold war against Buddhism in general and particularly in the Deccan where Buddhism dominated as a religious following among the masses. Perhaps it was on this ground that some *sūtrakāras* considered Andhra to be a land not to be visited by the brāhmaṇas and those who visit there should undergo certain purificatory rites.⁸

It is an admitted belief that the bulk of the Purāṇa literature was subjected to the process of re-editing under the patronage and instructions of the Gupta rulers, so as to render Brahmanism easily accessible to the common man, incorporating the descriptions of several holy places spread over all the country. Secondly, they provide easy methods of acquiring virtue through simple rituals or *vratas*, charities or *dānas*, reciting devotional songs of *saṃkīrtanas* and the like which are much easier to observe than the Vedic sacrifices involving greater expenditure and manual strain. Thirdly the Purāṇas constantly advocate the cult of *Bhakti* and for that purpose provide worship of images of innumerable gods Śiva, Viṣṇu, Kārtikeya, Durgā, Gaṇeśa and so on according to the liking of the devotee. This kind of worship became very close to the simple ways of propitiating the primitive gods of the indigenous people. In fact, a large number of indigenous deities which were being worshipped by the common folk have been taken into the Purāṇas under different Sanskritized names with simple legends called *sthala-purāṇas* being incorporated in them. The

origins of the great pilgrim centres like Srisailam, Tirumala and Ahobilam in Andhra according to the respective *sthala-purāṇas* are connected with the tribal people. This clearly indicates the deities of the pre-historic, say the neolithic, period have been conveniently transformed into Paurāṇic gods Śiva, Narasiṃha, Durgā and so on. This kind of assimilating other popular beliefs led to the inclusion of the Buddha in the Purāṇas as one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu. Perhaps this was one of the main factors which contributed for the decline of Buddhism, for, the lay worshippers of that faith ungrudgingly switched over their religious affiliation to Brahmanical Purāṇa system. We notice categorical statements in the inscriptions of the medieval period which support the view of the common man that all the four kinds of the popular beliefs namely Jaina, Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava and Bauddha are the same in essence because the respective gods are but the manifestations of the singular Supreme Absolute.⁹ This kind of ideological compromise among the Hindus is the basis for the evolution of the *smārta* system of Brahmanical religion, particularly in the Deccan where Buddhism predominated in the early phase. Most of the deities which were being popularly worshipped by the indigenous people were taken as Hindu gods under different names and worshipped through brāhmaṇa priests with Vedic *mantras*. The Goddess Bhramarāmbā, the consort of Mallikārjuna at Srisailam till recent times was worshipped on certain occasions by the local tribals called *ceñcus* in their way of offering animals before the deity. Now it is stopped.

With its origin in the Vedic culture the antiquity of the Purāṇa-dharma goes back to an uncertain period. As a matter of fact a number of Purāṇa quotations

relate to the earlier versions or direct borrowings from Vedic texts as well as their immediate explanatory literature like the *Brāhmaṇas*, *Āraṇyakas*, *Śāstras*,¹⁰ etc. It is again a fact that the cultural history of India is wholly based on these scriptures although interpretations and methods of approach differ. Finally in the *Bhagavadgītā*, 10.41 Lord Kṛṣṇa proclaims that whatever being animate or inanimate endowed with Divine grace and super-power is to be comprehended as His own manifestation:

*yad yad vibhūtimat sattvaṃ śrīmad ūrjitam eva vā/
tat tad evāvagacches tvaṃ mama tejoṃśasambhavam//*

This is the secret in the concept of having the multitude of gods, semi-gods, *avatāras* and perceiving Divinity in rivers, hills, trees, birds, animals, and even serpents. A preceptor or *guru* is deemed to be the personified form of the gods *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu*, *Maheśvara* and finally the actual Supreme Absolute. The ruler of the earth is no other than the god *Viṣṇu*. The warrior who dies on the battle field attains Divinity and hence originates the cult of hero-worship. The god *Śiva* is deemed to be manifested in all sorts of animates and inanimates as attributed to Him in the *Rudrādhyāya*.

The attribution of *vinivatita-catuvana-saṃkārāsa* to *Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi* in the Nasik inscription of *Pulumāvi II*,¹¹ indicates his endeavour in upholding the four-fold caste-based social order. Much information about the process of Aryanization in Andhra can be gathered from the traditional accounts preserved in the form of local records and the inscriptions of fourth century A.D. onwards. In the *Kaifiyats* of some villages¹² like *Upputuru*, *Motupalli*, *Inagallu* and *Vangipuram* references are made to the immigration of Northern

brāhmaṇas from the Gangetic valley at the instance of Trilocana Pallava. Some *Kaifiyats* contain an account regarding the struggle between the Bauddhas and the Jainas on the one hand and the brāhmaṇas supported by the king Trilocana Pallava on the other. They also refer to the Pallava king's endeavour in founding brāhmanical temples and arranging for worship in them by brāhmaṇa priests. These established traditional accounts clearly indicate that the early Pallava rulers as a consequence of Samudragupta's invasion were immensely interested in propagating the religion as taught in the Purāṇas.

* Their efforts are directed to discourage Buddhist missionaries on one hand and patronize the brāhmanical temples on the other. There are indications in these local records that some deities worshipped by the non-brāhmaṇa priests are admitted into Purāṇic pantheon. From the inscriptions also we notice that the Sālaṅkāyanas and the Pallavas were the earliest rulers who started founding *agrahāras* and *brahmadeyas*. The Kolleru plates of Sālaṅkāyana Vijayanandivarman¹³ record the grant of the village Videnūrapallika for 157 brāhmaṇas. Pallava Simhavarman son of Yuvarāja Śrī Viṣṇugopa grants the village Pantura in Mundarāṣṭra in Nellore region to 170 brāhmaṇas,¹⁴ all of them being learned in *Vedas* the and *Vedāṅgas*. The Penugonda plates of the king Hastivarman likely Sālaṅkāyana Hastivarman II datable to the latter part of the fourth century A.D. describes the donee brāhmaṇas, sixty in number, as well versed in *Veda*, *Vedāṅga*, *Itihāsa*, *Purāṇa*, *Niroga* (medical science), *Chandovichiti* (metrical science) and *Pravacana* (exposition of the texts).¹⁵ This is the earliest reference to *Itihāsa*, *Purāṇa* and *Pravacana* in the inscriptions which clearly indicates that consequent on Samudragupta's military march to the South

there was a marked change in the religious life of the society. Decline of Buddhism and growth of Brahmanism or *Purāṇa-dharma* are conspicuously noticeable from the inscriptions datable from the last quarter of the fourth century A.D. No new Buddhist establishments are datable to a subsequent period in the region, although the earlier ones continued to be frequented by the devotees.

The institution of Temple played a tremendous role in the evolution of *Purāṇa* culture. The *Purāṇas* are very liberal in the aspect of dedicating temples to any god of one's liking unlike *Bauddha-caityas*, which were built to commemorate only the Buddha. There is no village in this country which does not have at least one temple. It is a place where not only the object of worship is installed, but also liberal gifts of different kinds are offered by all sects of people. It stands as a symbol of religion of the society. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* gives some principles regarding the construction of temples, which are elaborated in the *Āgama* works. The *Purāṇas* offer a detailed description regarding the origin of several deities.

The *Purāṇas* advocate the policy of adoptability to the changed environment caused by the heretic systems of Buddhism and Jainism. The rigidity of the Vedic injunctions was let loose in order to evolve Brahmanism as a popular religion by incorporating more ways of *Bhakti* in the place of the Vedic ritualism. Even the common *vratas* can be performed by persons of all castes. The well known *vrata* of *Satyanārāyaṇa* for example describes in its story that two kings, a *brāhmaṇa*, a *vaiśya*, his wife and daughter, a low cast-born firewood vendor and lastly the cowherd-boys were described to have

been benefited by performing it. It is said to be forming few chapters in the *Revākhaṇḍa* of the *Skānda-purāṇa*. Most of the families in the Deccan observe this *vrata* frequently. Whether the said chapters are originally in that *Purāṇa* or interpolated in later times is not our concern, but this bit of Brahmanical ritual is popularly observed and teaches how the god is benevolent to all alike. It is well-known from the *Mahābhārata*, the story of Dharmavyādha,¹⁶ where Kauśika, a learned Brāhmaṇa is asked by a house-wife to go to a slaughterer named Dharmavyādha and learn from him about *Dharma*. It is enough if we remember that Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Śiva, Devī and the other numerous gods who are described in the different *Purāṇas* are worshipped by all Hindus from Himalayas to Kanyakumari. People of all linguistic and sectarian affiliations in the country are brought together in the matter of religion by the *Purāṇas* alone. We today boast ourselves as Hindus as a united nation irrespective of our regional differences because of only our regard in the epics and *Purāṇas*. People from all parts of the country observe the main festivals with uniform belief as described in the *Purāṇas*. These are the main features of Hindu culture without going deep into the philosophical ponderings. For this kind of religious integration in South and North we owe much to the Gupta emperors who initiated indirectly the task of getting the *Purāṇas* re-edited by the learned brāhmaṇas who incorporated in them a number of holy places in the South also as pilgrim centres.

REFERENCES

1. P.V.Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, I.1, p. 67 and p. 70.
2. *Suttanipāta*, vv. 1019ff.

3. Under the *vārttika*: *yathā laukika-vaidikeṣu, Mahābhāṣya, Pāśpaśāhnikā*.
4. EI. XXXI, p. 68, text line 26.
5. ASWI V, pp.60f; D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions I*, pp. 192ff.
6. cf. The Bekallu inscription dated 1195 A.D., *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh, Warangal District*, No.20 refers to Buddhism as a living faith in Andhra.
7. D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions I*, p. 265.
8. D.C. Sircar, *Society and Administration in Ancient and Medieval India*, pp. 121ff.
9. *Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh, Warangal Dist.*, No. 20, lines 28-35, p. 50.
10. *itihāsa-purāṇābhyāṃ vedārthaṃ samupabṛmhayet*.
11. D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions I*, p. 204.
12. N. Venkataramanayya, *Trilochana Pallava and Karikala Chola*, Madras, 1929, pp. 5, 6.
13. IA. V, p. 175.
14. *Bhāratī* (Telugu monthly), August, 1982, pp. 4ff.
15. EI. XXXV, pp. 145ff.
16. *Mahābhārata, Araṇya*, 207 *Adhyāya*.

SATYA VRAT

RĀJAMALLA'S
JAMBŪSVĀMICARITA

Written in V.S. 1632 (1575 A.D.),¹ probably at Agra, in deference to the fervent pleadings of Todarshah, a wealthy *śrāvaka* of Bhaṭṭariyā (Aligarh),² the *Jambūsvāmicarita* [= JSC]³ of Rājamalla purports to be a Purānic biography of Jambūsvāmī, the last *kevalin*, revered in both the sects of the Jainistic faith. Notwithstanding the unanimity in contents, Rājamalla's poem betrays substantial divergences from Brahmajinadāsa's *Jambūsvāmicarita*. While the theme in the former is loosely strung and lacks homogeneity, Rājamalla assuredly outstrips Brahmajinadāsa in śāstric equipment and poetic excellence.

No reasonable doubt can be entertained about the purānic character of JSC. It is rather rich in all that shapes the genius of a purānic poem. It is marked in its inception by a detailed exposition of the traditional divisions and subdivisions of time as conceived in the Jainistic tradition, besides the topography of Jambūdvīpa

and its most important constituent, the Bharatakṣetra. The description has no conscious connection with the poem and has been evidently admitted to import it purāṇic hue. True to its sectarian objective JSC has gone the whole hog to glorify the Jaina faith⁴ and pour scorn on Buddhism and the non-dualistic Vedānta.⁵ The Jaina canon is eulogized as an antidote to all the malaise that afflicts the 'heretic' faiths. Gautama's discourse in canto Three has also sectarian overtones in that it is addressed to detailing the seven tattvas, celebrated in the Jainistic thought as a gateway to final emancipation. The dogged exposition of the twelve *anupreksās*, though out of joint with the theme, is intended to lend it a philosophic touch but settles down as an extension of the glorification game.

The exhaustive description of the earlier births of the *Dramatis Personae* and the tendency to attribute their present conduct and predicament to the operation of the earlier actions that combine to determine the purāṇic character of a poem, emerge as its most glaring characteristic. Bhavadeva, the son of Brāhmaṇa Āryavasū, is born as Śivakumāra and is subsequently elevated to the divine status of Vidyunmālī in Brahmottara as a result of his severe penance. It is this Vidyunmālī who is born as Jambūsvāmī to Arhaddāsa and Jinamatī. The monk Saudharma was none else but Jambū's elder brother Bhāvadeva in an earlier birth. The four wives of Sūrasena, a leading merchant of Campāpurī, become wives of Vidyunmālī as a result of devotion to religious pursuits and incarnate as wives of Jambū in the present birth.

The purāṇic gimmick of interweaving ancillary stories in the main story to enhance its interest and accept-

ability has assumed frightening proportions in JSC. A sizable part of the poem has been usurped by the stories that Jambū's newly wed wives relate to wean him away from his resolve to embrace asceticism in preference to mundane pleasures and those with which he counters them with equal tenacity. The poem is likewise marked by many a supernatural event. The heavenly nymphs and deities rush down to the earth to arrange the assembly (*samavasaraṇa*) of Vardhamāna Jina. Śivakumāra is reminded of his earlier birth at so much as the sight of the monk Sāgaracandra. Not unlike the purāṇic writings, the writing of JSC has been viewed as a sacred task to derive religious merit.⁶ In the spirit of the purāṇas the poem ends with self-glorification (*māhātmya*).⁷ In accordance with its objective, JSC culminates in quietude, the *sānta-rasa*. Almost all the characters in the poem ultimately overcome worldly snares and attain the supreme bliss. It is a measure of the efficacy of its purāṇic overtones that the reader, on perusal of JSC, is overwhelmed by a deep sense of detachment and comes to long for higher goals of life.

THEME:

Composed of about 2400 verses, JSC seeks to describe in thirteen cantos of uneven size, the life-account of Jambūsvāmī, universally acclaimed as the last *kevalin*. The story as dealt with in the poem consists of four well-marked segments. Canto one which concerns itself with detailing the early Mughal emperors especially Akbar and his manifold achievements, besides the genealogy and religious fervour of Shah Todar, forms a preface (*kathāmukha*) to the poem. The next three cantos and a half are intended to be no more than a

prelude (*pūrvapīṭhikā*). They are padded with exhaustive descriptions of the earlier births of almost all the characters. The poem proper – the biography – begins from the later half of canto Five.

Aptly named Jambūsvāmī as a consequence of his mother's seeing the Jambu fruit in dream, he blossoms into a personable and powerful youth. The victory over the Vidyādhara Ratnacūla establishes him as a brave warrior and brings rich laurels. On hearing Saudharma's sermon, Jambū is overcome by complete indifference towards worldly objects and pleasures, and decides to embrace asceticism then and there, but at the intercession of his parents, defers his resolve to a day after his marriage with four comely maidens of the town. He conducts himself with astounding equipoise in the bedroom and thereby foils the advances of his newly wed wives. They scoff at his strange behaviour and strive hard to deflect him from the thorny path of asceticism with appropriate stories. He firmly refutes their logic. He escapes from the marital noose and is ordained into monkhood which paves the way for his ultimate emancipation. Canto thirteen has the trappings of an adjunct, details as it does the twelve well-known *anupreṣās*.

The strings of the story are obviously loose. The first four cantos have a tenuous link with the central theme and could have been conveniently dropped. As noted earlier, they form a prologue to the poem proper. However, the execution of even the core story is not beyond reproach. The digression, ancillary stories included, have raised irritating impediments in the poem which only serve to disrupt the flow of the theme at places more than one. The harsh fact is that cantos Ten and Eleven have made nonsense of the story. The stories

related therein to wear Jambū from his resolve, belong to the realm of purāṇas rather than a *mahākāvya*. JSC provides a unique instance of how lack of proportion can afflict even the well meaning poems. And to stretch the poem to one additional canto after the *phalāgama* defies both the theory and practice. Canto Thirteen is no better than a needless appendage.

SOURCE OF JSC:

With its sublime objective of seeking release from worldly bondage, the fascinating story of Jambūsvāmī commands wide respect. True to his sectarian predilections, Rājamalla based his account on Guṇabhadra's *magnum opus*, the *Uttara-purāṇa* (76.1-213). The way he has executed his story does not betray substantial differences from Guṇabhadra.

The account of the earlier births of the various characters as detailed in JSC, closely follows the *Uttara-purāṇa*, minor aberrations notwithstanding. Thus while in Rājamalla's version Jambū and his elder brother represent Bhavadeva and Bhāvadeva, sons of Āryavasū, a brāhmaṇa of Vardhamānapura in one of their earlier births; Jambū's elder brother, in Guṇabhadra, is named Bhagadatta and their father was Rāṣṭrakūta, a wealthy merchant of Vṛddhagrāma.⁸ The two concur on the point that it was the elder brother who had opted for monkhood first. As he returns to prompt the younger brother into the order, the latter, as testified by the two poems, was engaged in marriage festivities. His (Bhavadeva's) wife has been given the name of Nāgavasū in JSC, while she is called Nāgaśrī in the *Uttara-purāṇa*, and it is her mother who is named Nāgavasū (76.156).

Bhavadeva, even after he is ordained into monkhood, is unable to shake off fascination for his wife and continues to crave for her vicinity (JSC. III.185-193). As revealed by the *Uttara-purāṇa*, he regains his calm after he is rapped by Suvratā for his misdemeanour (76.167-90). In JSC, it is his wife Nāgavasū, now reduced to a skeleton, whom he chances to meet in a *caitya*, who administers the rebuff (III.220-228).⁹ JSC concurs with the *Uttara-purāṇa* in describing that Śivakumāra (Bhavadeva) came to entertain affection for him and was reminded of his earlier birth on seeing the monk Sāgaradatta (Bhāvadeva).¹⁰ While in Guṇabhadra Vidyuccara is said to have broken into Arhaddāsa's house with his gang of 500 thieves (76.53-56), Rājamalla, for obvious reasons, has dispensed with the gang.

Despite some divergences in the sequences and spirit of the stories related by Vidyuccara, in the two works, to impress upon Jambū the futility of discarding the pleasures in hand in the wild hope of achieving richer dividends later, they do not differ in essentials. It is, however, notable that the story of jackal who had died in a bid to catch a fish leaving behind a mass of flesh, as related in the *Uttara-purāṇa*, has been amalgamated by Rājamalla in the story of the old trader and his unchaste wife. The ancillary stories told by Jambū's wives in JSC to realize the same objective are, however, conspicuous by their absence in the *Uttara-purāṇa*. Jambū therein relates the well-known story of the man hanging in a well with honey flowing into his mouth intermittently, to uphold his contention,¹¹ which leads his parents, wives and Vidyuccara to the bliss of liberation. It does not differ in spirit from the story that Jambū tells to counter his third wife Vinayaśrī. According to

The analysis of the *anityānuprekṣā* that follows is notable for its depth and vehemence and underscores the impermanence of the worldly objects with telling effect:

जीवितं चपलं लोके जलबुदबुदसन्निभम्।
 रोगैः समाश्रिता भोगा जराक्रान्तं हि यौवनम्॥
 सौन्दर्यं च क्षणविध्वंसि सम्पदो विपदन्तकाः।
 मधुबिन्दूपमं पुंसां सौख्यं दुःखपरम्परा॥
 इन्द्रियारोग्यसामर्थ्यचलान्यभ्रोपमानि च।
 इन्द्रजालसमानानि राजसौघघनानि च॥ JSC. XIII.13-15.
 इत्यध्वं जगत्सर्वं नित्यश्चात्मा सनातनः।
 अतः सदर्भिनं कर्तव्यं ममत्वं वपुरादिषु॥ ibid. XIII.17.

Of the ancillary sentiments, *śṛṅgāra* expresses itself with a measure of tenacity. The gleeful depiction of *śṛṅgāra* in both its aspects may sound odd in a poem dominated by tranquility, it, however, bears testimony to the wide acceptance it has evoked, down the ages. It is honest not to allow the erotics to be swept away in the spate of quietism. The love in union (*sambhoga-śṛṅgāra*) finds effective expression in Śivakumāra's amorous exchanges with the youthful maidens (JSC. IV.70-72). The sting of *vipralambha* is inherent in Bhavadēva's impatient longings for the proximity of his wife whom he had discarded soon after the marriage to seek the greener pastures of asceticism (III.192-193). However, these frivolities are not compatible with the puritanism of the author. Notwithstanding the effective depiction of *śṛṅgāra*, the woman to Rājamalla is a despicable creature, a crucible of urine and excreta, more dreadful than a snake, a veritable noose to the man aspiring for higher goals of life.¹²

Not unlike *śṛṅgāra*, the Heroic sentiment is also interwoven in the texture of the poem. The description of the diverse fights to establish the hero's credentials as a powerful warrior had settled down as a mannerism of sorts in the purāṇic writings. Rājamalla revels in detailing such like motifs which were curiously looked upon as a substitute of effective delineation of *vīra-rasa*. The stubborn description of the trumpeting of the elephants, twangs of the bows, creakings of the chariots, dances and fights of the headless bodies (*kabandhas*), the screening of the sun with the volley of arrows in the course of the battle, reflects the same tendency.¹³ The ethereal, fury and Gāruḍa missiles and serpent-nooses¹⁴ that are freely traded in Ratnacūla's encounters with Mṛgāṅka and Jambūkumāra, also betray an adherence to the time-worn mannerisms. It is in the espousal of the *kṣātra-dharma* in canto Seven that the *vīra-rasa* finds the most effective expression (VII.30-32). These combats in JSC, however, seem to be intended to respect the theory. Like the *śṛṅgāra*, violence is also at odd with the author's commitment to peace. The way Jambū undergoes remorse and denounces violence soon after his victory in the first battle,¹⁵ attest to the author's innate abhorrence of war. It is, however, ironic that he plunges into another war soon after this wholesale condemnation of violence.

Pathos emerges in Mahāpadma's wailings as his son Śivakumāra falls into swoon, and the piteous cries of Jambū's mother and wives over his resolve to opt for monkhood. Pathos in such writings is shorn of sting. They tend to view screams and curses as a substitute of *karuṇa-rasa* (XII.20-21).

The description of the terror struck by Śreṇika's furious tusker in the soldiery leads to the emergence of *bhayānaka-rasa*. The warriors are so overcome by fear as the tusker goes berserk that none of them makes even a feeble attempt to tame the beast (VI. 73, 75-76). The furiousness of the tusker, on the other hand, gives rise to *raudra-rasa* crushing all that comes his way and scaring everybody to flee with his fearsome trumpeting, he appears to be a replica of Yama (VI.63-65).

Adbhuta, *bībhatsa* and *vātsalya* also contribute to heighten the aesthetic pleasure in JSC.

DEPICTION OF NATURE:

The theme of JSC is such that it can hardly afford the luxury of drawing the beauties of the natural phenomena. However, Rājamalla has sought to highlight his love for nature by some lovely sketches. The depiction of the natural beauties in JSC comes as a gust of fresh air, its brevity notwithstanding. Though Rājamalla sticks by and large, to the contemporary trends, his predilection for the natural style is beyond question. In view of the aversion of the post-Kālidāsan poets to the *ālambana* form of nature, his commitment to its innate beauties deserves esteem. It asserts itself with a vengeance in the description of the rainy season. With the rumblings of the cloud, rain showers, cool breeze and flashes of lightening, he has sought to capture the essence of the season.¹⁶

In deference to the tradition, Rājamalla has sought to impute human actions and feelings on the nature which serves to establish a pleasing communion between

the two. But he is not much enamoured of personifying the natural phenomena. It is in the description of the spring and rainy season that he has resorted to the device, albeit sparingly. The lightning conducts itself like a reckless dancer in baring her charms on the stage of the sky to enthrall the viewers below with the performance.¹⁷ The spring, on the other hand, appears like a proud sovereign equipped with the royal paraphernalia (VI.47).

It is, however, the ornate style of depicting nature that fascinates him the most. The spring has been described in this vein. The *utprekṣā* serves to invest the description with winsome charm. While the *aśoka* tree in conjunction with the *campaka* seems to be a mass of flesh of the heart of the separated folk, burst under severe pangs; the *kiṃśuka* flowers look like the pyres that burn them down with gruesome ferocity (VI.52-53).

PHYSICAL CHARMS:

Rājamalla has as sharp an eye for the physical charms as for the beauties of nature. It was difficult to chalk out a new course in defiance of the all-pervasive *nakhaśikha* device, but Rājamalla's equipment has enabled him to make the description as lonely as it was possible to do within the compulsions of the theme. The figures of speech like *upamā* and *utprekṣā* that he has pressed into service with some tenacity, serve to highlight the beauty of emperor Śreṇika in relief. His curly hair appeared as if they were off-springs of the cobra of cupid. The sandal paste on his broad chest invited comparison with the moon-shine spread over the valley of Meru (II.16, 21).

CHARACTERIZATION:

JSC does not have many characters to boast. Besides the hero, his parents, wives and Vidyuccara are the *dramatis personae* that join to weave the warp and woof of the poem. It is however, Jambūsvāmī's character that has claimed the maximum attention.

Though viewed as a paragon of many a virtue, it is the contradictory valour and tranquility, *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti*, that distinguish Jambūsvāmī's character. He tames the mighty tusker in a trice while the professional trainers flee in fear. His victory over the well-equipped Ratnacūla draws fulsome acclaim from Śreṇika and Mṛgāṅka, the powerful rulers of Magadha and Kerala. It was in fact their battle that he had accepted to fight. However, violence is alien to his genius. He rues the havoc he had let loose in the battle.

His *nivṛtti* leads him to conduct himself like a recluse in the midst of affluence and comforts otherwise available to him. He is unmoved by the advances of his newly wed wives as if they were shorn of charms and he of virility. As a matter of fact, woman to him is no more than a crucible of filth (XII.3-5). His *nivṛtti* culminates in his release from worldly bondage.

Of the minor characters, the notorious thief Vidyuccara deserves esteem rather than disdain. He, after he has broken into his house for burglary, acts as a pedagogue in a sustained bid to persuade Jambū to desist from the thorny path of asceticism. He himself undergoes a change of heart and tastes the bliss of liberation.

LANGUAGE:

JSC seems to have been composed with the limited objective of earning religious merit through the dissemination of faith. It is therefore futile to expect polished or ornate language in such a writing. The genius of the theme does not provide much scope for linguistic niceties. It is couched throughout in a lucid and simple phraseology which has been instrumental in realizing the objective to which it owes its genesis. The poet has not hesitated to sacrifice the chastity of the language to ensure its simplicity. JSC has received a large sprinkling of un-pāṇinian forms, which though common to the purāṇas, sound odd in a *mahākāvya*. The un-pāṇinian forms in the poem relate to almost all the sections of Sanskrit grammar; e.g.:

ततोवाच (तत उवाच), सोपायं (स उपायं), निर्धुनंतीव (निर्धुन्वतीव), अभिनन्दत (अभ्यनन्दत), वधैनम् (जह्येनम्), वदे (वदामि), स्मरती (स्मरन्ती), सुवर्द्धन्तौ (सुवर्द्धमानौ), दर्शितुं (द्रष्टुम्), विद्यति (विद्यमाने), चलमानैः (चलदभिः), नाभिराज्ञः (नाभिराजस्य), व्याकुलीभूतचेतसः (व्याकुलीभूतचेताः) etc. call attention. *Asti sma cādyāpi vibhāti* (I.6), *abhāst sma* (II.225), *dhyānam ekāgryam dhyāyann iha* (III.124), *patir bhāvī bhavitā ko 'tra* (VI.17), *pratas-the 'smin* (VIII.102), such like expressions are also not scarce in the poem. These quaint forms and usages and others of their ilk tend to dent the sobriety of the language. It would, however, be illogical to conclude that Rājamalla is not worthy of pure and serene language. It is the zeal to ensure wide popularity for his poem that seems to have deflected him from an effective medium that would have been commensurated with the genius of a *mahākāvya*.

JSC suffers from a lack of variety in expression. It has mostly claimed a unitrack language. But as is evident from the delineation of the variant sentiments, the author is abreast of the different tiers of language and is fairly equipped to work up phraseology appropriate to the various situations. His language is certainly simple but not void of sheen. The poem is adorned with a number of wise sayings which are couched in a diaphanous phraseology.

FIGURES OF SPEECH:

The figures of speech, used in JSC, serve to lend clarity to the expression. Rājamalla is not much fond of the *śabdālamkāras*. They have been used sparingly in the poem. *Upamā* is the favourite *alamkāra* of the author. He has deep fascination for the *upamānas* culled from nature. On hearing the son's decision to embrace monkhood, Jinamatī, his mother, trembled as the frost-burnt *kamalini* shakes in a storm (IX.52). This hidden simile (*gūḍhopamā*) is equally interesting. As the saline water whets hunger similarly Akbar's sword as soon as it drank the water of the sea, after feasting on the flesh of the enemy became impatient to devour all the three worlds.¹⁸

The same poetic excellence is reflected in the use of *utprekṣā*. It has been pressed into service rather liberally in describing the spring and Śrenika. The emperor's deep navel appeared as if it were a ditch fashioned to entrap the she-elephant of female sight (II.223). *Aprastutaprasāmsā* emerges with vigour in VII.66 as the young deer (*mrgaśāvaka*) and the infuriated lion

described therein are intended to imply Vidyādhara, Ratnacūla and Jambūkumāra respectively.

Atīśayokti, *parisaṃkhyā*, *yamaka*, *rūpaka*, *viśama*, *bhrāntimān*, *arthāntaranyāsa* are the other important *alaṃkāras* that have been employed in JSC to lend clarity to the expression.

METRE

Like most of the purāṇic writings, JSC has been composed in the ubiquitous *anuṣṭup*, interspersed with other metres in some of the cantos. JSC has claimed eight metres in all, which, besides *anuṣṭup* are *vaṃśastha*, *upajāti*, *śārdūlavikrīḍita*, *vasantaṭilakā*, *indravajrā*, *sraḡdharā* and *mālinī*.

Within its parameters, JSC may be said to have realized its objective. It is not shorn of poetic beauties either, though it is hemmed by its purāṇic character.

REFERENCES

1. अथ संवत्सरेऽस्मिन् श्रीनृपविक्रमादित्यगताब्दसम्बत् १६३२ वर्षे चैत्र सुदि ८ वासरे श्रीपतिसाहिजलादीन अकबरसाहिप्रवर्तमाने | *Probe Prasasti to JSC*, p. 239.
2. JSC. I.66-127.
3. Ed. Jagadish Chandra Shastri, Māṅik Chandra Digambar Jain Granthamālā, No. 35, Bombay, V.S. 1993.
4. जैनो धर्मः क्षणं यावद्विस्मयी न महात्मणिः | JSC: II.124.
5. *ibid.* II.112-115.
6. जम्बूस्वामिकथोव्याजादात्मानं तु पुनाम्यहम् | *ibid.* I.144.
7. *ibid.* XIII:170-177.
8. *Uttara-purāṇa*, 76.153.

According to Hemacandra and Jayaśekhara Jambū's elder brother was Bhavadatta. Their parents Revatī and Āryavāna were residents of Sugrāmanagar, JSC, Introduction, p. 12, fn. 1.

9. In Hemacandra's version when Bhavadatta (Bhāvadeva) comes to enlighten his younger brother, he himself is overwhelmed with worldly longings. He retraces. The fellow monks ridicule him for his vacillation. It is in his second visit that Jambū accompanies him to the teacher and is ordained by him into monkhood, *ibid.* p. 13, fn. 1.
10. *Uttara-purāṇa*, 76.151; JSC. IV.109.
11. This story seems to belong to the floating literature. It is found in the *Mahābhārata*, Buddhist *Avadānas* and Christian literature, JSC. Introduction, p. 7, fn. 2.
12. JSC. X.9-10, 13.
13. *ibid.* VII.231-241.
14. *ibid.* VIII.50-51, 67-68.
15. तत्केवलं मयाकारि हिंसाकर्म महत्तरम्।
तत्केवलं प्रमाद्वा यद्वेच्छता यशश्चयम्॥ *ibid.* VIII.18.
प्राणान्तेऽपि न हन्तव्यः प्राणी कश्चिदिति श्रुतिः। *ibid.* VIII.19
16. *ibid.* II.47, 49, 50, 55.
17. विद्युन्नटी नमो रंगे विचित्राकारधारिणी।
प्रतिक्षणविवृत्ताङ्गी नृत्यारम्भमिवातनोत्॥ *ibid.* II.53.
18. शिते कृपाणेऽस्य विदारितारिणः पलाशनात्कुर्वति पानमब्धितः।
ततोऽधिकं क्षारतया बुभुक्षिते जगत्त्रयं त्रासमगादनेहसः॥ *ibid.* I.23.

TEXTS AND STUDIES

THE PHILOSOPHY OF VEDIC SACRIFICE

by

T.N. DHARMADHIKARI



**ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY
TIRUPATI - 517502**

CONTENTS

Preface	119
Yajña, Kāla and Loka	121
Yajña, Prajanana and Mithuna	152

PREFACE

The Philosophy of the Vedic Sacrifice is an outcome of Principal Dr. H. R. Karnik Memorial Lectures, delivered by me on 26th and 27th November 1998 at the Department of Sanskrit, the University of Mumbai.

The topic of my lectures was the 'Philosophy of the Vedic Sacrifice'. It may be noted that the Vedic rituals have been studied, in different aspects, in depth by scholars here before. I have discussed the aspect of its philosophy in my lectures.

At the very outset, I extend my heart-felt thanks to the authorities of the University of Mumbai and its Department of Sanskrit, for inviting me to deliver lectures, under Principal Dr. H.R. Karnik Indological Lecture-ship Endowment. I also pay my sincere and reverential homage to the late Dr. H.R. Karnik, in whose sacred memory the lecture scheme is instituted.

I sincerely record my thanks to Prof. Dr. M. Sri-mannarayana Murthi, the Director of the Oriental Research Institute, Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati, for kindly taking up these lectures for publishing them in *S.V.U. Oriental Journal*.

T.N. Dharmadhikari

CHAPTER I

YAJÑA, KĀLA AND LOKA

Traditionally the Vedic literature is divided into two sections,¹ viz., Pūrva-kāṇḍa and Uttara-kāṇḍa, representing respectively the *karma-kāṇḍa* and the *jñāna-kāṇḍa* - the two wings of the Vedic literature.

According to the Vedic tradition and the Mīmāṃsā school, the *karma-kāṇḍa* consists of the *Nitya*, *Naimittika*, *Kāmya* and even *Niṣiddha* sacrifices. The *uttara-kāṇḍa* deals with the *Brahmopāsti*. *Nitya* and *Naimittika* sacrifices are regarded as obligatory. They are performed not for any personal material gains, or for fulfilling one's own personal material desires. The performance of *Nitya* and *Naimittika* sacrifices avoid the obstacles, which may have occurred due to their non-performances.

If any material gain is said to be derived from the performances of such sacrifices, it must be regarded as secondary. *Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra*, 1.20.3 states in this regard, that the mango tree be planted for its sweet fruit; but the shadow and fragrance are also derived. Thus when *Dharma* is performed, its secondary fruits also do follow. Further, though their performances result, also in achieving the fruits like *Svarga*, etc., such fruits are of secondary importance.² Principally they purify the intelligence and mind of the sacrificer and create in him the urge for the knowledge of self and consequently the urge for inner perception of the Brahman.³

Thus they prove indirectly the cause for *Brahma-jñāna*. Hence *Brahma-jñāna* is the ultimate goal of the *Nitya* sacrifices, just as 'mango fruit' is of planting its tree.

Kāmya sacrifices are condemned by the *Muṇḍako-paniṣad*⁴ and even by the *Bhagavadgītā*⁵ on the philosophical level.

Niṣiddha sacrifices amounting to *abhicāra* must be rejected. They fall under the *tāmasa* category; *Vedas* do not enjoin them, but only refer to them, so that they may be avoided.

According to pre-Śāṅkarācārya view, *karma*, i.e. sacrifice, and *jñāna* jointly lead to salvation. Just as a bird cannot fly with only one of its two wings, a *sādhaka* also cannot achieve salvation with only one of the two wings of the *Vedas*.

Śāṅkarācārya however proposes an acute contradiction between *karma* and *jñāna*.⁶ But the contradiction is in the form of *saha-anavasthāna* 'non-coexistence' only,⁷ i.e., one cannot undertake practising both *karma* and *jñāna* simultaneously. It may then follow that, *karma* and *jñāna*, independent of each other may lead to salvation.⁸ Not accepting this proposition, Śāṅkarācārya states that, *karma*, i.e. sacrifice, can never lead one to salvation. It is only the *jñāna* which is competent to lead one to salvation. *Karma*, i.e. the sacrifice, would only be an *upāya*, i.e. the means to create *jñāna-niṣṭhā* in the sacrificer. *Karma* makes the sacrificer fit for achieving *Brahma-vidyā*, which is explained in the *uttara-kāṇḍa*, and it gives rise to *jñāna-niṣṭhā* in him. But, once the effect in the form of *jñāna-niṣṭhā* is produced, the *karma*

ceases to exist. Then the *jñāna-niṣṭhā*, thus produced independent and irrespective of *karma*, leads one to salvation.⁹ The utility of *karma*, 'the sacrifice', comes to an end, after it has given rise to *jñāna-niṣṭhā*. Thus *jñāna-niṣṭhā* owes its origin to *karma*. *Karma* is therefore *upāya* 'the cause', and *jñāna-niṣṭhā* is the *upeya*. *Jñāna* is the single means for achieving salvation and *karma* ceases to function after it has given rise to *jñāna-niṣṭhā*.

Śabara, the well known commentator on the *Jaimini-sūtras*, relates the sacrifice with *niḥśreyasa*, and not with *preyas*.¹⁰ He states that the *Veda*, when studied, is the cause of giving rise to the desire of the knowledge of *Dharma*, and *Dharma* relates one to *niḥśreyasa*. It may be noted that, *Dharma*,¹¹ according to *Mīmāṃsakas*, means sacrifice.

Manu also declares that the body of the sacrificer becomes *brāhmī* 'related to Brahman', due to sacrifices and great-sacrifices he performs.¹²

In the light of the views referred to above, we have to examine the nature of Vedic sacrifice.

SACRIFICE

The *Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra*, I.2.1-2 defines sacrifice as: *dravyaṃ devatā tyāgaḥ*, which is explained by the commentators as: *devatoddeśena dravya-tyāgaḥ yāgaḥ* 'the offerings of oblations to the deities may be regarded as sacrifice'. This definition, though not free from the defects, serves the purpose of giving a general idea of sacrifice. The sacrifice which is meant by *Kātyāyana* may be called *dravya-yajña* only and appears to have been based on the actual practice and procedure of the sacrifice, with reference to Vedic injunctions.

Yogī Aravinda, in his *Guide to Upaniṣads* (p. 104) observed: "The whole process of the universe in its very nature is sacrifice". Thus he referred to the cosmic sacrifice ever-rotating in the creation of Prajāpati and probably suggested that the practice of the *dravya-yajña*, represents the cosmic one.

The famous verse of the *Ṛgveda* (X.90.16), viz. *yajñena yajñam ayajanta devās tāni dharmāṇi prathamāny āsan*, perhaps refers to this cosmic sacrifice. Imitating the cosmic sacrifice, the gods performed their sacrifices. They were the first *dharmans*. The word *dharmans* may etymologically suggest that the cosmos is well regulated and its working is governed by some fixed rules, which saves it from being a chaos.¹³ Sāyaṇa on this verse names this cosmic sacrifice as *mānasa-yajña*, and concludes: 'thus the meaning of this *sūkta*, which interprets the creation, is comprehended' (*etāvātā sṛṣṭipratīpādakasūktabhāgārthaḥ saṅgrhītaḥ*).

In this cosmic sacrifice, as explained by other verses of this *sūkta*, the spring season was offered as *ājya*, summer was the fuel and autumn the principal oblation, the cosmic *puruṣa* was *paśu*.¹⁴ The sacrifice was *sarvahut*, wherein all pervading *Puruṣa* was offered. (cf. Sāyaṇa: *puruṣaḥ yasmin yajñe hūyate*). This is evidenced by the *Mīmāṃsakas*, who often refer to *sa ātmano vapām udakkhidat* (TS. 2.1.1.8) 'Prajāpati drew out his own omentum for the performance of sacrifice'. Now TS. 6.1.11 states that, the sacrificer holds ready for sacrificing himself (i.e. offering himself as an oblation), as soon as he is consecrated.¹⁵ In that he offers an animal to Agni and Soma, that is a buying of himself (in exchange of *paśu*). Therefore of it one should not eat, for as it were, it is a buying off of a man. The

Atharvaveda (2.34.1) prays that the victim purchased from Paśupati (in exchange of the sacrificer) may be deemed as an oblation.

Thus the concept, that the *yajamāna*, the sacrificer, who is often identified with *Prajāpati*, is expected to offer himself as an oblation in sacrifice, owes its origin to the cosmic *Puruṣa* in the cosmic sacrifice.

The sacrificer, identified with *Prajāpati*, is replaced by an animal. In certain sectarian traditions the animal is substituted by *ājya* 'the ghee', which is regarded as an essence of an animal. Further *puroḍāśa* 'the sacrificial cake' appears to have taken place of *paśu*. TBr. 3.2.8.8 clearly states that the *puroḍāśa* is the form of *paśu* (*paśor vai pratimā puroḍāśaḥ*). Cp. also MaitS. 4.3.6; TS. 7.1.9.1, TBr. 1.8.6.3; TānBr. 21.10.30, ŚBr. 1.2.3.5, AitBr. 2.9, etc. in this respect.¹⁶ Thus the *dravya-yajña* appears to have been linked with the cosmic sacrifice of *Prajāpati* in respect of offering oblation of himself.

The *Aitareya-Upaniṣad* (1.3.13) refers to this *Puruṣa* as *Brahman* (*sa etam eva puruṣam brahma tatam apaśyat*). This *Upaniṣad* conceives that the *Puruṣa* is the *sukṛta* of the universal energy (1.2.3: *tābhyaḥ puruṣam ānayat. tā abruvan sukṛtam bata iti. puruṣo vāva sukṛtam*). Indeed the *Veda* could not find a better word other than *puruṣa* to express the full connotation of the universal or cosmic energy's developed divine and godly form.

This *Puruṣa* is *Prajāpati*. In *Agniciti* rite, a golden plate of *Puruṣa* (*hiraṇmayam puruṣam*, TS. 5.2.7) is placed on the fire-altar. ŚBr. 7.4.1.15 identifies this

Puruṣa with Prajāpati and consequently also with the yajamāna, the sacrificer.¹⁷ ChānUp. identifies this Puruṣa with the sacrifice itself.¹⁸

ŚBr. 11.1.7.8 narrates a tale related to the source of sacrifice as follows: 'Prajāpati offered himself as an oblation in sacrifice. He projected his image, viz. the sacrifice. Therefore they say that Prajāpati is sacrifice'.¹⁹ ŚBr. 4.3.4.3 also identifies the sacrifice with Prajāpati.

Thus Prajāpati is identified with both the sacrificer and the sacrifice. This may suggest that Prajāpati has to immolate himself and then can he manifest himself in the form of creation - the universe. Yajamāna thus represents the cosmic Puruṣa and the sacrifice is the image of ever-rotating cosmic sacrifice. Therefore ŚBr. 4.3.4.3 states that the sacrifice is the visible form of Prajāpati (*eṣa vai pratyakṣaḥ yajñāḥ yat prajāpatiḥ*).

ŚBr. 1.5.1.7 also refers to Manu's sacrifice, saying - Manu first performed the sacrifice, imitating which his offsprings used to perform sacrifices.²⁰ Therefore while choosing the Hotṛ-priest, the Adhvaryu addresses the Hotṛ-priest, with the words: "May this god Agni, the divine Hotṛ, the learned, the knower, recite (perform sacrifice) like Manu",²¹ etc. The sacrifice of Manu may also be regarded as cosmic sacrifice.

The concept of *yajña-cakra-pravartana* of the *Bhagavadgītā* (3.14-15) also appears to have been based on the working of cosmic sacrifice. It may be noted that according to BG, it is the ever-rotating cosmic sacrifice that causes the rainfall.

The sacrifice is thus related or even identified with Prajāpati, the creator. His creation is regarded as sixteenfold and He is the seventeenth.

ŚBr refers to Prajāpati as possessed of sixteen *kalās* (cp. ŚBr. 7.2.2.17: *ṣoḍaśakalaḥ prajāpatiḥ*; also 11.1.6.36: *ṣoḍaśakalo vai puruṣaḥ*; also 13.2.2.13: *ṣoḍaśakalam vā idam sarvam*, etc.). The *Praśna-Upaniṣad*, 6.1-5 has narrated His sixteen *kalās* and has stated that Puruṣa is beyond them (cp. *puruṣa ity evam procyate. sa eṣa akalo 'mr̥to bhavati*). This Puruṣa therefore is counted as seventeenth.

Sāṅkhya system,²² the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*²³ and even Marāṭhī *Jñāneśvari*²⁴ support this view. Saint Nāmadeva in his prayer, says: "O Lord of sacrifice (*yajñeśa*)!, your image exists in seventeen syllables.²⁵ I repeatedly pay my regards to you". Which are these seventeen syllables? TS. 1.6.11 counts them. They are : *ā, śrā, va, ya, a, stu, śrau, ṣaṭ, ye, ya, jā, ma, he, ya, ja, vau* and *ṣaṭ*.²⁶ Before proceeding to offer certain oblations, including the principal offerings - the Adhvaryu addresses the Āgnīdhra priest with : *āśrāvaya* ('do you announce, oh Āgnīdhra!'). Āgnīdhra then responds with: *astu śrauṣaṭ* ('may the deity hear us'). The Adhvaryu again gives a call to the Hotṛ priest with *yaja* (do you recite the *yājyā* verse). The Hotṛ then recites the *yājyā*, augmenting it with *yeṣ yajāmahe* which is technically called *āgūḥ* (we recite the *yājyā* verse). After the recitation of the *yājyā* verse, the Hotṛ suffixes it with *vauṣaṭ* 'an exclamatory formula' (Sāyaṇa: *havir dīyate iti tasya śabdasyārthaḥ*. Cp. also the MaitS. 1.4.11 in this respect).

Thus Prajāpati, the seventeenth or seventeenfold, is always connected with the sacrifice; e.g. TS. 6.2.10 enjoins to cover the roof of *sadas* pandal with seventeen roof-coverings, if the sacrificer desires offsprings; since Prajāpati, the creator, is seventeenfold.²⁷

Vājapeya sacrifice, to be performed after Ṣoḍaśī, very well exemplifies the seventeenfold character of Prajāpati in all respects.²⁸ Seventeen priests including a *sadasya*, are chosen for the performance of the Vājapeya sacrifice. The sacrificer is consecrated for seventeen days. Seventeen *stotras* are chanted by the Udgātṛ group and equal number of *śastras* are recited by the Hotrakas. The sacrificial post (*yūpa*) is measured in seventeen *aratnis* in height and is covered by seventeen pieces of cloth. Seventeen cups of *Soma* are offered to Prajāpati. The number of *surā* cups also is seventeen. Seventeen pots of *Nīvāra* are measured out for offering *caru* to Bṛhaspati. Seventeen victims are offered to Prajāpati. Seventeen chariots run the race. Seventeen chariots, seventeen carts, seventeen horses, seventeen elephants, seventeen gold coins, seventeen female slaves, seventeen goats, seventeen sheep, seventeen garments and seventeen hundred cows are given away as *dakṣiṇā*. The ground for running a race is measured with seventeen throws of an arrow. Seventeen trumpets are sounded. The *Brahman* sits on a wheel fixed horizontally on a peg fixed in the ground and sings the *Sāman*. This wheel consists of seventeen spokes. Seventeen *ujjiti* formulas are recited.²⁹ Thus the entire procedure of the Vājapeya revolves around seventeen, that is Prajāpati.

ŚBr. 10.4.1.17 significantly refers to the *ṣoḍaśa-kalās* of Prajāpati and identifies him with the Prāṇa :

Cp. *tad vai loma iti dve akṣare*
tvag iti dve
asṛg iti dve
meda iti dve
māṃsam iti dve
snāva iti dve
asthīti dve
majjā iti dve
tāḥ ṣoḍaśa kalāḥ

atha ya etad antareṇa prāṇaḥ saṃcarati
sa eva saptadaśaḥ prajāpatiḥ.

Further it (10.4.1.19) identifies the *ṣoḍaśa-kalās* of Prajāpati, with sixteen Ṛtviks employed in the Soma-sacrifice. Cp. *tasmā etasmai saptadaśāya prajāpataye etat saptadaśam annaṃ samaskurvan ya eṣa saumyo 'dhvaro, atha yā asya ṣoḍaśa kalāḥ ete te ṣoḍaśartvijāḥ ... (tasmān na saptadaśam ṛtvijaṃ kurvīta).*

It is needless to dilate upon the point that, this symbolic identification with Prajāpati suggests the linking up of the sacrifice and sacrificer with cosmic creation and Prajāpati, the creator.

Now, this Prajāpati appears to have manifested, himself principally in two aspects in his creation, viz. the time and the space, i.e. *kāla* and *loka*, which are regarded as eternal.

In a tale told by ŚBr. 1.7.4.1, Prajāpati conceived a passion for his own daughter - either the sky or Dawn: *divaṃ vā uṣasaṃ vā*.³⁰ Commenting on this passage Harisvamī comments: *lokātmanā divaṃ, kālātmanā uṣasaṃ*. Thus metaphorically Prajāpati manifested

creation through *loka* or *kāla*; i.e., space and time (cp. also AitBr. III.33).

The sacrificial details lead us to conclude that the entire sacrificial procedure is scheduled around the time and the space.

TIME

Let us first deal with the time. As far as Time is concerned, we observe that, even in the primary rite of Agnihotra, the oblations are offered at the sunrise and sunset, i.e. at the joints of day and night. Darśa and Pūrṇamāsa sacrifices are offered at the two joints of black and bright halves of month. The *parvans* of the Cāturmāsya sacrifice are performed at the joints of seasons, and the Soma sacrifice is offered at the joint of two years. Ayana sacrifices are performed during the tenure of one full year.

Sixteen bricks termed as *vyuṣṭis* are placed in the fire altar. They represent the various forms of dawn. Sixteen formulas for placing sixteen bricks are collected in TS. 4.3.11. The first brick represents the first dawn of the beginning of the creation. Cp. Sāyaṇa on TS.4.3.11.1: *ādisṛṣṭikāle prathamo yaḥ prabhāta-kālaḥ tadrūpā iyam iṣṭakā*). The next bricks represent the dawns of next days (*aparā pratidina-saṅcārīṇī*). The dawns refer to *kāla*, and are involved in the structure of sacrifice.

Time is regarded as divine wheel; and it takes one full year for its single rotation. A period of one year is often identified with Prajāpati and also with sacrifice.³¹ ŚBr. 11.1.6.12-13 tells us that 'Prajāpati created his own image and it was *saṃvatsara*; hence *saṃvatsara* is

said to be Prajāpati. After all He himself has portrayed his image which is *saṃvatsara*'.³²

Samvatsara is also a symbol or image of sacrifice. ŚBr. 3.1.4.5 enjoins to offer five *audgrabhana*-libations in the rite of consecrating a sacrificer, because the sacrifice is to commensurate with the *saṃvatsara*.³³ There are five seasons of a *saṃvatsara* and therefore he makes five libations. MaitS. 1.10.5 and 1.10.8 identify the sacrificer with *yajña* and also with Prajāpati respectively.

Rgveda, I.164.11 refers to this undecaying and ever-rotating wheel,³⁴ having twelve spokes (viz. months) and wherein rest 720 offsprings, each two forming couples (in the form of days and nights).

TS. 5.7.1 states: one who piles the fire-altar after announcing to Prajāpati, does not go to ruin. The horses should stand on either side of the proposed altar - on the left the black, and on the right the white. Having touched them he should put down the bricks. That is the form of Prajāpati, viz. the horse, which is connected with Prajāpati, verily having announced to Prajāpati, in his direct presence, he piles the fire altar. He does not go to ruin. The white horse is the form of the day, the black of night.

The bricks are the form of the day, the mortar or cement (*puriṣa*) between two layers are the form of night. When about to put down the bricks, he should touch the white horse, when about to put down the cement, he should touch the black horse. Verily with the days and nights he piles the altar. Thus in the piling the altar with day and night involves the concept of time.

AitareyaBr. 4.15 and ŚāṅkhāyanaBr. 20.1 enjoin to perform *Abhiplava-ṣaḍaha* sacrifice during the period of one full year; wherein the units of six Soma sacrifices (*ṣaḍahas*) are repeated. ŚāṅkhāyanaBr. refers to this sacrifice as *devacakra* 'the divine wheel', which is the symbol of immortality. AitareyaBr. reads: *pariyad vā etad devacakraṃ yad abhiplavaḥ ṣaḍahaḥ*, i.e. *Abhiplava-ṣaḍaha* sacrifice is ever-rotating (*pariyad*) divine wheel. Sāyaṇācārya connects this divine wheel of time, with two *lokas* also (cp. *yo 'yam abhiplava-ṣaḍahaḥ tad etat asmiṃś ca amuṣmiṃś ca ubhayor lokayor pariyad vai parivartamānam eva devacakraṃ*).

In Prāyaṇīya and Udayaṇīya *iṣṭis* of the Soma sacrifices the Adhvaryu offers seventeen *sāmidhenī* fuel-sticks, and the Hotṛ recites seventeen *sāmidhenī* verses, one at each offering. They are identified with twelve months and five seasons of a *saṃvatsara*. The sum of twelve months and five seasons is calculated as seventeen, the figure which is again identified with Prajāpati (cp. MaitS. 3.7.2: *saptadaśa sāmidhenīḥ kāryāḥ pañca ṛtavaḥ dvādaśa māsā eṣa saṃvatsarah*).

In the performance of a normal *iṣṭi* sacrifice, the Hotṛ recites fifteen *sāmidhenī* verses (practically eleven verses, but the first and the last being repeated thrice, making up a number of fifteen). These fifteen verses are looked upon as fifteen days of one fortnight. Further these *sāmidhenī* verses are composed in Gāyatrī metre of twentyfour syllables. Thus fifteen *sāmidhenī* verses consist of three hundred and sixty syllables, which are identified with the equal number of days of a year, a *saṃvatsara*, which is the symbol of Prajāpati.³⁵

Cāturmāsya sacrifice is believed to have originally been a yearly repeated rite of cosmic regeneration and rebirth. In *Vaiśvadeva-parvan* of Cāturmāsya sacrifice, following offerings are made:³⁶

- 9 Principal offerings
- 9 Prayāja libations
- 9 Anuyāja libations
- 2 Ājyabhāga libations, and
- 1 Sviṣṭakṛt offering.

The total number of offerings comes to thirty, which is equal to the number of days in one month, which is also one of the units of time. MaitS. 1.10.8, in this respect remarks that the *Virāj* metre also consists of thirty syllables. It is said that Prajāpati created his *prajā* from the womb of the *Virāj* metre. Even the sacrifice is born of the womb of the *Virāj* metre. Secondly, thirty nights make one month. The months are the (parts) of a *saṃvatsara* which is Prajāpati. The sacrificer is born of the couple of *Prajāpati* and *Virāj*. MaitS. further states that a group of twelve nights got united with each of the thirty offerings of *Vaiśvadeva-parvan*. The number of nights multiplying with that of offerings comes to 360. The total nights of a year are also 360. Thus is the sacrifice concerned with the time (*kāla*).

As stated above *Virāj* is a metre of three quarters, each having ten syllables. Thus the total syllables of *virāj* are thirty. In *Agnicayana* rite, there are variants of length of *dīkṣā*. Thus one be consecrated for three, six, ten, twelve, thirteen, fifteen, seventeen, twentyfour or thirty nights, etc. All these days are linked by TS. 5.6.7 with *saṃvatsara*.³⁷

ŚBr. 9.3.3.18 identifies *Vasor-dhārā* offerings in *Agniciti* rite with a *saṃvatsara* of 360 days³⁸ (cp. also ŚBr. 9.1.1.43 referring to *Śatarudriya* offerings). ŚBr. 10.5.4.1-19 is very important in this respect. This section identifies the fire altar with this terrestrial world, the mid-region, the sky, the *Āditya*, *Nakṣatra*, the metres, etc., and finally links them with a *saṃvatsara*, time. Further it states that the fire-altar is all beings, all gods; for, all the gods, all the beings are the waters and the fire altar is the same as those waters. (In as much as they are the foundation and ultimate source of the universe, and everything is contained therein. It may be remembered here that the *Vedas* have opined that this all was but a surge of water in the beginning. Cp. also: *āpo nārā iti proktāḥ ... etc.*, and RV. X.129.3: *apraketam salilam sarvam ā idam*. Cp. also ŚBr. 6.8.2.2-3: *āpo va asya sarvasya pratiṣṭhā, adbhyo hīdam sarvam jāyate*; also ŚBr. 10.5.4.3: *ime lokā apsv antaḥ*).

ŚBr further states that the navigable streams (*nāvyaḥ*) (round the sun) are identified with the enclosing stones kept round the fire altar, and there are three hundred and sixty such enclosing stones, because three hundred and sixty navigable streams encircle the sun on all sides (*ṣaṣṭiś ca ha vā trīṇi ca śatāni ādityam nāvyaḥ samantam pariyanti*); the navigable streams indeed are also the *yajuṣmatī* bricks which are three hundred and sixty in number.

The soul (*ātman*) of this altar is the same as *Hiraṇmaya Puruṣa*. Its feet are the gold plate (*rukma*) and lotus leaf (*puṣkara-parṇa*), i.e. the water and the sun's orb (*tasyaite pratiṣṭhe rukmaś ca puṣkaraparnam ca āpaś ca ādityamaṇḍalam ca, etc.*).

Further ŚBr states that, Hiraṇmaya Puruṣa, who is indeed the soul of the fire-altar, is the end of everything here (cp. also 8.7.2.6). He is in the midst of all the waters, endowed with all objects of desire, but he is without desire, for no desire of anything troubles him.

ŚBr quotes a verse which states: 'By knowledge one ascends that state where desires are vanished, so one must know the symbol conceived in the fire-altar' (*vidyayā tad ārohanti yatra kāmāḥ parāgatāḥ*). It further states that the clouds are the filling cement between the layers of the bricks, the moon the oblations, the Nakṣatras the enkindling sticks ... etc.

Thus the entire passage explains the fire altar, its bricks, etc. in the context of *saṃvatsara*, and the creation of the cosmos, the cosmic sacrifice and urges that this symbol reflected in the construction of fire altar be known, which leads to the state, where desires do not trouble the sacrificer.

TS. 7.3.11 relates *vaṣaṭ*, *svāhā* and *namaḥ* with *bhūtam*, *bhavyam* and *bhaviṣyat* - past, present and future-, the fractional units of time. Sāyaṇa on this passage comments that *vaṣaṭ svāhā* and *namaḥ* represent the names of Brahman (cp. *vaṣaṭkārādīni brahmaṇo nāmāni, ebhiś ca satyatvam ākhyāyate*). Thus he suggests the identification of 'time' with Brahman and that these three names of Brahman lead to eternal Truth. Thus time is the form of Brahman.

The bricks for constructing the fire altar are identified with days and nights by TBr. 3.11.10: *ahorātrāṇi iṣṭakāḥ*. ŚBr identifies the five layers of fire altar with five *ṛtus* making one *saṃvatsara*; cp. ŚBr 6.1.2.18:

pañca vā ṛtavaḥ, pañca citayaḥ, also 6.2.1.36: *ṛtavo haite yad etāś citayaḥ*.

In Soma sacrifice, *ṛtu-grahas* 'the season cups' are filled with the Soma juice, and are offered to *Indrāgnī*. TS 6.5.3 significantly gives the reason why *ṛtu-grahas* are offered. It states: 'By means of sacrifice, the gods went to heavens. They were afraid that the men will follow after them. They therefore blocked their way by means of the year. The Ṛṣis clearly perceived this by means of *ṛtu-grahas*. Therefore, in Soma sacrifice, twelve *ṛtu-grahas* are drawn and offered. They are drawn in pairs. The year also consists of twelve months and the *ṛtus* are formed with couple of months. For offering, the Adhvaryu sets out by the southern side of *Havirdhāna* pandal and the *Pratiprasthātṛ* by the northern. Therefore the sun goes south for six months and north for next six months. The cups are drawn also for *samsarpa* and *aṃhaspatya* months, viz. the intercalaries.

Thus the offering of *ṛtu* cups are not only related to 'time', but also are in clear imitation with the movements of sun, in the creation of *Prajāpati*, causing *Uttarāyana* and *Dakṣiṇāyana* and consequently the *ṛtus*, completing the cycle of the year.

SPACE

Having thus dealt, in short, with the time aspect of the manifestation of *Prajāpati*, let us now turn to the space aspect, viz. the *loka*. The *loka* or its collateral dialectic form *u-loka* (cp. RV. II.30.6, III.2.9) which may be the abridged form of *uru-loka* originally means the wide space. Further the three worlds -

referred to by the Vedic literature - viz. *bhūḥ*, *bhuvah* and *svah*, known by the common term of *vyāhṛtis*, and which are covered by the wide space, are secondarily known as *lokas*. They are otherwise called by the terms, viz. *Ṙṥthivī*, *Antarikṣa* and *Dyauḥ*.

TS and TBr clearly state that the sacrifice finds support in *Dyauḥ* and *Ṙṥthivī* (cp. TS. 2.6.9: *dyāvā-ṣṥthivyor hi yajñah upaśritaḥ*, TBr. 3.5.10: *upaśrito divaḥṣṥthivyoḥ omanvatī te 'smin yajñe dyāvāṣṥthivī stām*, etc.).

Dyāvāṣṥthivī are regarded as the universal parents. *Dyauḥ* is a bull and *Ṙṥthivī*, the cow,³⁹ which further form a couple and leads to *prajananam* 'the creation'.

AitareyaBr. 4.27.5-6 described the marriage of *Dyauḥ* 'the heaven' and *Ṙṥthivī*, and connected them with *Bṛhat* and *Rathantara Sāmans* respectively. The story goes as follows: 'These two worlds were ones joined together, but in course of time they got separated. As a result, there were no rains and even the sun did not shine. The gods then brought *Dyauḥ* and *Ṙṥthivī* together and contracted their marriage. In the form of *Rathantara Sāman*, the earth delighted the heaven and in the form of *Bṛhat Sāman*, the heaven delighted the earth. Then they placed the earthly sacrificial ground on the moon, in the form of her black spot. Therefore the sacrificer expects to perform sacrifice in the bright half of the month since the moon becomes fuller day by day in the bright half and the black spot on the moon becomes conspicuous'.

TBr. 1.4.6 identifies *Ṙṥthivī* and *Dyauḥ* with *Rathantara* and *Bṛhat Sāmans* respectively (cp. *iyam vā rathantaram, asau bṛhat*).

In the description of *agnyādhāna*, i.e. setting up the sacred fires, the TBr. 1.1.3 narrates the following myth: 'Dyauḥ and Pṛthivī were once closely joined together; but then they got separated so that the creatures could find space to move (cp. Sāyaṇa: *prāṇinām avakāśārtham īśvarānujñayā parasparaviyogaṃ gatau*). But while separating from each other, they, due to their intense love, said to each other, "let our best parts, worthy of sacrifice, be exchanged". The heaven placed its best part on the earth. That became salty soil on the earth. The earth gave her best part to heaven. That became the black spot on the moon. Therefore in the *Agnyādhāna* rite, the Adhvaryu places the salty soil in the pit of the *Āhavanīya* fire, and while doing so he contemplates upon the black spot of the moon. Thereby he sets up the fire on the substance of both, viz. Dyauḥ and Pṛthivī. Thus the sacrifice here has direct bearing with the two *lokas*.

The above myth is narrated in TS. 5.2.3 also. The similar myth is referred to in ŚBr. 1.2.5.18. It states: "The *Āgnīdhra* strikes the altar and smooths it down from east to west. The gods were preparing for war against Asuras. They said to one another, 'come, let us remove what imperishable place of worship is on the earth, to the moon, for our safety. If Asuras, on conquering us, will drive us away, we will prevail again from that place'. Accordingly they removed to the moon, the imperishable place of earth. That now is the black spot on the moon. It is for this reason that the *Āgnīdhra* smooths the altar down, i.e. by stroking along the altar, he shifts it to the moon".

These myths, no doubt, establish the intimate relation between the *dravya-yajña* and the cosmic *yajña*, through the space aspect.

Besides these myths, there may be found many such metaphors or identifications which would support the relation of the *dravya-yajña* with metaphysical cosmic one. E.g. TS. 3.2.9 identifies the earth and heaven with *Hotṛ* and *Adhvaryu* respectively (*iyam vai hotā asau adhvaryuḥ*), etc.

Ṛṥhivī is identified with *Citrā* sacrifice, and more significantly with the goddess *Aditi*; TS. 2.4.6: *iyam vai citrā*, TBr. 1.7.6: *iyam vai devy aditir viśvarūpī*, also TBr. 1.4.3. ŚBr. 5.1.5.26 finally identifies *dyāvāṛṥhivī* with *Prajāpati*.

According to the *Kāṭhaka-śruti*, the three sacred fires, viz. *Dakṣiṇa*, *Gārhapatya* and *Āhavanīya* are identified respectively with *Ṛṥhivī*, *Antarikṣa* and *Dyauḥ* (KS 3.6: *saha vā ime agnes tanvaḥ - iyam odanapacanaḥ, antarikṣam gārhapatyaḥ, dyauḥ āhavanīyaḥ*).

ŚBr. 12.8.2.8 identifies the three Soma-pressing sessions (i.e. *savanas*) with the three *lokas*, saying: *ayam vai lokaḥ prātaḥ-savanam, antarikṣam vai mādhyandinaḥ savanam, dyaur vai tṛtīyam savanam*. It may be noted that the three *savanas* represent the time aspect, viz. morning, mid-day and evening also.

Three elevations of *ukhā*-pot used in the *Agnicayana* also represent the three *lokas*. *Ukhā*-pot is therefore deemed as prototype of the three *lokas*. Cp. TS. 5.1.6: *tryuddhiḥ karoti traya ime lokāḥ eṣāḥ lokānām āptyai*; MaitS. 3.1.7: *tryuddhiḥ kāryā, trayo vā ime*

lokāḥ, eṣāṃ vā eṣā lokānām ukhā pratimā kriyate, etc.

The *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* (I.8.5) enjoins to recite the *vyāhṛtis*, viz. *bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ* and *svaḥ*, which are the names of three *lokas*, before offering the Agnihotra libations. These *vyāhṛtis* are further identified with Brahman, Satya, and Ṛta. The text further declares without hesitation that, no sacrifice is possible without these *vyāhṛtis*.

The Hotṛ priest, before taking charge of his office, looks at the space between the sky and the earth and recites:*bhūḥ prapadye bhuvaḥ prapadye svaḥ prapadye, bhūr bhuvaḥ svaḥ sarvaṃ prapadye*, 'I approach the earth, the mid region, the sky, the earth, the mid-region, the sky and the all' (cp. *Kāty.Āraṇyaka-pariśiṣṭa*). Thus he keeps all the range of the space in his sight. ŚBr. 2.1.4.10-11 enjoins to set up the sacred fires with *vyāhṛtis*, viz. *bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ* and *svaḥ*, and further explains that Prajāpati manifested the earth with *bhūḥ*, the mid-region with *bhuvāḥ* and heaven with *svaḥ*. Thus *bhūḥ, bhuvāḥ* and *svaḥ* pervade all what is manifested by Prajāpati. The sacrificer sets up the sacred fires with *bhūḥ, bhuvāḥ* and *svaḥ*, in that he sets up the fires with all that is created by Prajāpati.

TS. 5.5.4 enjoins to place two *virāja* bricks on the layers of the fire altar. In that the sacrificer places the two *lokas* on the fire-altar. These bricks are the forms, the symbols of the two *lokas* (cp. *yad virājau upadadhāti ime eva upādhatte*).

In Agniciti rite the sacrificer steps on the constructed fire altar and recites: "I mount from the earth to the

mid-region, from the mid-region to the highest sky and from the highest sky, I enter into the light of Svar". (Cp. VS. 17.67, also TS. 4.6.2: *pr̥thivyā aham antarikṣam āruham antarikṣāt divam āruham divo nākasya pr̥ṣṭhāt svar jyotir agām aham*). This reference not only connects the sacrifice with the *lokas* but also sheds light on the ultimate achievement of the performance of the sacrifice.

Agni forms the integral part of sacrifice. He is referred to by TS. 5.1.5 as born of the embryo of the couple, viz. *dyu* and *pr̥thivi*; cp. *sa jāto garbho asi rodasyoḥ ... ime vai rodasī, tayor eṣa garbhaḥ yad agniḥ*.

While constructing the fire altar, the Adhvaryu places the bricks, named as *Ṛtavyāḥ* 'related to *Ṛtus* - the seasons',³⁹ TS. 5.4.2, in this regard states as follows: 'The Adhvaryu puts down the seasonal bricks to arrange the seasons. He puts them down in pairs; therefore the seasons are in pairs. The middle layer is as it were unsupported. It is as it were the *antarikṣa*. He puts four bricks in the middle layer for its support. The seasonal bricks are the internal cement between two layers. In that he puts down the seasonal bricks, it is to keep apart the layers'.⁴⁰

Thus *Ṛtavyā* bricks in the rite of Agniciti are related to *kāla* as well as to *loka* elements. TS. 5.6.10 gives similar interpretation of piling the fire altar. It states: 'Prajāpati constructed the fire altar with the seasons, just as he constructed the *saṃvatsara* with them. By spring he piled the front half of the altar, by summer its right wing, by rainy season its tail, by autumn its left wing, by the winter its middle. One who knows this, piles the fire altar with the seasons'.⁴¹

Further it explains: 'The earth is the first layer, the mid-region is the second layer, the yonder world is the third layer, sacrifice is the fourth layer, sacrificer is the fifth layer and *saṃvatsara* is the sixth layer'.⁴² Thus there are six layers of bricks and six of mortars. They amount to twelve. The months of a year are twelve. Thus the sacrificer finds support in the year'. This interpretation also accounts for both time and space, i.e. *kāla* and *loka*.

ŚBr. 11.2.7.1 explains the sacrifice allegorically, as follows: 'The year is the sacrifice, the seasons are the Ṛtviks, the months are oblations, half-months are the pots containing oblations. The days and nights are the attendants'.⁴³

The Hotṛ recites eleven Sāmīdhenī verses. This earth is the first verse, the fire is the second, the wind is the third, the mid-region is the fourth, the heaven is the fifth, the sun the sixth, the moon the seventh, the mind is the eighth, the speech the ninth, the austerity is the tenth and finally the Brahman is the eleventh.

The ṛta 'the cosmic law' is the first āghāra libation, the *satya* is the second. With them he achieves ṛta and *satya* and wins whatever he can win by them.

This description covers *kāla*, *lokas*, and some other aspects of creation, the cosmic law and even the eternal truth: *Satya*.

In Agnicayana rite, a golden plate with twentyone projections is placed on the *ukhā*-pot. TS. 5.1.10 explains that the twentyone projections are twentyone worlds (*lokas*) of gods.⁴⁴ Similarly there are twelve

months, five seasons, three worlds, totalling twenty, and as twentyfirst is the yonder sun. Thus twentyone projections of a golden plate are identical with the *kāla* and *lokas*.

Vauṣaṭ is the exclamatory utterance made by the Hotṛ priest after the recitation of *yājyā* verse, at the offering of certain oblations. AitBr. 11.6 explains it as follows: 'In *vauṣaṭ* the Hotṛ utters *ṣaṭ*, i.e., six; *Ṛtus* 'the seasons' are six. Thereby he arranges the seasons and makes them firm. In making the seasons firm, all this which exists becomes firm.⁴⁵

Thus, *Dyauḥ* is made firm in *Antarikṣa*, *Antarikṣa* is made firm in *Ṙṥthivī*, *Ṙṥthivī* in waters, waters in truth, truth in Brahman (*Vedas*), and Brahman in *tapas* (austerity).

The Hotṛ utters *vauṣaṭ*. *Vau* is *Āditya*. Seasons are six. In uttering *vau* and *ṣaṭ*, he places *Āditya* firmly in the seasons. The *Ṙṣis* thus knew that the seasons are governed and regulated by the sun. Thus the utterance of *vauṣaṭ* is linked with *kāla* as well as with *lokas*, and other aspects of creation.

ŚBr. 1.9.3.9 explains the three *Viṣṇu*-strides, to be stepped by the sacrificer, at the end of the *Iṣṭi* sacrifice. By the first step he gains the earth, by the second the *Antarikṣa*, and by the third the *Dyauḥ*.⁴⁶ Why does the sacrificer step *Viṣṇu*-strides? *Viṣṇu* truly is the sacrifice. *Viṣṇu* means all-pervading. By striding, *Viṣṇu* obtained for gods that all-pervading power (*vikrānti*) which now belongs to them. By stepping *Viṣṇu*-strides, the sacrificer also achieves all-pervading power. Thus *Viṣṇu*-strides pervade all the three *lokas*.

TS. 1.1.11 includes the formulas, viz. *dive tvā antari-kṣāya tvā, pṛthivyai tvā* for *viṣṇu-krama*. In stepping Viṣṇu-strides, the sacrificer thus identifies himself with Viṣṇu and consequently with the sacrifice.⁴⁷

Besides the three *lokas*, the wide space encompasses the Nakṣatras, the sun, the moon, etc. of which we may make some observations in the context of sacrifice.

In placing the bricks to construct the fire altar, the Adhvaryu places some bricks named as Nakṣatras. TS. 5.4.1 in this regard states that, on the east side of the altar the Adhvaryu puts down some Nakṣatra bricks, pointing west, and on the west side some Nakṣatra bricks pointing east. Therefore the Nakṣatras 'the constellations' move both ways, west and east.⁴⁸ Cp. also TS. 4.4.10.⁴⁹

TS. 5.2.1 enjoins that the sacrificer should step the strides of Viṣṇu. After stepping the Viṣṇu-strides, the sacrificer should turn round on his own body. He should turn round from left to right. In that he turns with the turning of the sun.⁵⁰ Thus sacrificer is identified with sun who is regarded as responsible for Ṛtus and also as Viṣṇu.

Occasionally, I would like to state that, like Prajāpati, Viṣṇu is also very closely associated, or to be more precise, identified with the sacrifice or sacrificial details. Prajāpati is associated in his capacity as a creator, while Viṣṇu, due to his all-pervading nature. It may be noted that the word Viṣṇu is derived from $\sqrt{viṣ}$ (*viṣ!*) 'to pervade'.

The bunch of sacrificial grass is related to Viṣṇu by TS. 1.1.11 (*viṣṇoh stūpo 'si*). The verse:

viṣṇor nu kaṃ vīryāṇi pravocaṃ
yaḥ pārhivāni vimame rajāmsi/
yo askabhāyat uttaram sadhastham
vicakramāṇas tredhorugāyah//

is utilized by TS. 1.2.13 and 6.2.9, for tying the props to the Havirdhāna carts wherein stalks of Soma are kept, and Viṣṇu is always regarded as a protector of oblations (viṣṇo havyaṃ rakṣasva, TS. 1.1.3.10). Cp. in this context viṣṇo rarāṭam asi 'You are forehead of Viṣṇu'; viṣṇoḥ pṛṣṭham asi 'You are back of Viṣṇu'; viṣṇoḥ śrīnyaptre sthaḥ 'You are the chin of Viṣṇu' (TS. 1.2.13). It may be noted that, Viṣṇu is regarded as the presiding deity over the Havirdhāna pandal.

The sacrificial post (yūpa) is as high as the sacrificer (TS. 2.1.8: yajamānena yūpaḥ sammitaḥ). Viṣṇu is regarded to be the presiding deity of the sacrificial post also (TS. 6.3.3: vaiṣṇavo vai devatayā yūpaḥ) etc.

Instead of multiplying the citations to this effect, I would like to quote from Gonda's *Presidential address*, 1978, p. 3, who says: 'According to Ronou, Keith and others, there could be little doubt as to the solar nature of Vedic Viṣṇu, but after renewed discussions of important questions, it has in the last decades, become sufficiently clear that a central feature of Viṣṇu's character was his relations with the cosmic axis, the imaginary but highly sacred central pillar, which putting the cosmic levels into communications, reaching the earth in its navel, constitutes a canal, through which the heavenly blessings may penetrate into the abode of men and which makes travelling to heaven possible. Viṣṇu may be said to represent this pillar itself and to be present in any part of it. At the upper end is his high domain,

at the lower end he is the sacrificial post (*yūpa*) and is constantly identified with the sacrifice which is located in the navel of the earth'.

We may remember here the *Rk*, viz. *yajñam āhur bhuvanasya nābhim*, included in *brahmodya* by TS. 7.4.18.

It may be noted here that, the sacrificer and his wife climb up the *yūpa* measuring seventeen *aratnis* in height in the *Vājapeya* sacrifice and declare that they have reached the heavens. (Cp. TS. 1.7.9: *jāya ehi suvo rohāva, rohāva hi suvaḥ*; BŚŚ. 11.11: *bāhū udgrbhṇāti suvar devān aganma amṛtā abhūma, prajāpateḥ prajā abhūma ... etc*).

REFERENCES

1. Sāyaṇa's introduction to his commentary on TS: वेदस्तावत् काण्ड-द्वयात्मकः। तत्र पूर्वीस्मिन् काण्डे नित्यनैमित्तिककाम्यनिषिद्धरूपं चतुर्विधं कर्म प्रतिपादितम्। तेषु नित्यनैमित्तिकानुष्ठानात् अकरणे प्रत्यवायरूपमनिष्टं परिह्रियते। उत्तरकाण्डे ब्रह्मोपदेशो ब्रह्मोपास्तिश्च इत्युभयं प्रतिपाद्यते।
2. *Āpastamba-Dharma-sūtra*, 1.20.3: तद् यथा आग्ने फलार्थे निर्मिते छाया गन्ध इत्यनूपद्येते एवं धर्मं चर्यमाणमर्था अनूपद्यन्ते।
3. Sāyaṇa's introduction to TS: न केवलं नित्यनैमित्तिकाभ्याम् अनुषङ्गिक-स्वर्गप्राप्तिः, किंतु धीशुद्ध्या विविदिषोत्पादनद्वारा ब्रह्मज्ञानहेतुत्वमपि तयोरस्ति। तथा च वाजसनेयिनः समामनन्ति 'तमेतं वेदानुवचनेन ब्राह्मणा विविदिषन्ति यज्ञेन दानेन तपसा अनाशकेन' (बृउ. 5.4.4.22) इति।
4. *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, I.2.7: प्लवा ह्येते अदृढाः यज्ञरूपाः।
5. BG. II.42: यामिमां पुष्पितां वाचं प्रवदन्त्यविपश्चितः।
6. Śāṅkarācārya's Comm. on *ĪśaUp.* verse 2: ज्ञानकर्मणोः विरोधं पर्वतवत् अकाम्यं न स्मरसि किम्?।
7. Ānandagiri: सह अनवस्थानलक्षणं विरोधम् on above.

8. Śaṅkarācārya on BG. 3.4. (i.e. न कर्मणामनारम्भात्): ज्ञानकर्मनिष्ठयोः परस्परविरोधात् एकेन पुरुषेण युगपदनुष्ठातुमशक्यत्वे सति इतरेतरानपेक्षयोः एव पुरुषार्थहेतुत्वे प्राप्ते, कर्मनिष्ठायाः ज्ञाननिष्ठाप्राप्तिहेतुत्वेन पुरुषार्थहेतुत्वं न स्वातन्त्र्येण।
कर्मणां क्रियाणां यज्ञादीनाम् इह जन्मनि जन्मान्तरे वा अनुष्ठितानाम् उपात्तदुरितक्षयहेतुत्वेन सत्त्वशुद्धिकारणानां, तत्कारणत्वेन च ज्ञानोत्पत्तिद्वारेण ज्ञाननिष्ठाहेतुनाम्।
also: कर्मणामनारम्भात् नैष्कर्म्यं नाश्नुते इति वचनात् तेषामारम्भात् नैष्कर्म्यम् अश्नुते। कर्मारम्भस्यैव नैष्कर्म्योपायत्वात्। न हि उपायमन्तरेण उपेयप्राप्तिरस्ति। कर्मयोगोपायत्वं च नैष्कर्म्यलक्षणस्य ज्ञानयोगस्य श्रुतौ इह च प्रतिपादनात्, etc.
9. Śaṅkarācārya's Comm. on *Brahmasūtra*, 3.4.25: उत्पन्ना हि विद्या फलसिद्धिं प्रति न किञ्चिदपेक्षते, उत्पत्तिं प्रति तु अपेक्षते – यज्ञादिश्रुतेः।
10. Śābara on *Jaiminiya-sūtra*, I.1.1: अधीतो वेदो धर्मजिज्ञासायां हेतुः। स हि निःश्रेयसेन पुरुषं संयुनक्तीति प्रतिजानीमहे। ... तथा (चोदनया) यः लक्ष्यते सोऽर्थः पुरुषं निःश्रेयसेन संयुनक्ति।... तस्मात् चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थः श्रेयस्करः। ... य एव श्रेयस्करः स धर्मशब्देन उच्यते। ... यः पुरुषं निःश्रेयसेन संयुनक्ति स धर्मशब्देन उच्यते।
11. Śābara on JS. I.1.1: यजतिशब्दवाच्यमेव धर्मं समामनन्ति। कोऽर्थः? यो निःश्रेयसाय ज्योतिष्टोमादिः।
12. Manu. II.28: महायज्ञैश्च यज्ञैश्च ब्राह्मीयं क्रियते तनुः।
13. Cp. Ait.Ār. 2.1.7: वरुणोऽस्य प्रजां धर्मेण दाधार। (Cp. वरुण as धृतव्रत, वरुण as धर्मस्य पतिः, MaitS. 2.6.6).
14. RV. X.90.6: यत् पुरुषेण हविषा देवा यज्ञमतन्वत। वसन्तो अस्यासीदाज्यं ग्रीष्म इध्मः शरद हविः।
RV. X.90.15: अबध्नन् पुरुषं पशुम्।
15. TS. 6.1.11: पुरा खलु वावैष मेधायत्मानमारभ्य चरति यो दीक्षितः, यदग्नीषोमीयं पशुमालभते आत्मनिष्क्रयण एवास्य सः तस्मात् तस्य नाशयं पुरुषनिष्क्रयण इव हि।
Also AV. 2.3.4.1: य ईशे पशुपतिः पशूनां चतुष्पदामुत यो द्विपदाम्। निष्क्रीतः स यज्ञियं भागमेतु..., etc.
ĀpŚS. 7.28.55: आयुष्यो ह वा अस्यैष आत्मनिष्क्रयण इति वाजसनेयकम्।
MaitS. 3.6.7: देवताभ्यो आत्मानमालभते यो दीक्षिते।
16. TBr. 3.2.8.8. पशोर्वै प्रतिमा पुरोडाशः।
AitBr. 2.9: स वा एष पशुरेव आलभ्यते यत् पुरोडाशः। तस्य यानि किंशारूणि

तानि रोमाणि, ये तुषाः सा त्वग् ये फलीकरणाः तदसुग् यत् पिष्टं किक्नसाः तन्मांसं, यत् किञ्चित्कं सारं तदस्थि, सर्वेषां वा एष पशूनां मेधेन यजते यः पुरोडाशेन यजते।

MaitS. 4.3.6: एते वै पशवो यद् व्रीहयश्च यवाश्च। यद् व्रीहियमयः पुरोडाशो भवति तेनैव पशुरालभ्यते।

ŚBr. 1.2.3.5: पशुर्ह वा एष आलभ्यते यत् पुरोडाशः।

TS 7.1.9.1; TBr. 1.8.6.3; TānBr. 21.10.10: पशवो वै पुरोडाशः। etc.

17. ŚBr. 7.4.1.15: अथ पुरुषमुपदधाति। स प्रजापतिः। सोऽग्निः। स यजमानः। स हिरण्मयो भवति।
18. ChāndogyaUp. 3.16.1-7: पुरुषो वाव यज्ञः।
19. ŚBr. 11.1.8.3: स देवेभ्य आत्मानं प्रदाय अथैतमात्मनः प्रतिमामसृजत यद् यज्ञम्। तस्मादाहुः प्रजापतिर्यज्ञ इति। आत्मनो ह्येतं प्रतिमामसृजत।
Cp. ŚBr. 4.3.4.3: एष वै प्रत्यक्षं यज्ञः यत्प्रजापतिः।
20. ŚBr. 1.5.1.7: मनुर्ह वा अग्ने यज्ञेनेजे तदनुकृत्य इमाः प्रजा यजन्ते। तस्मादाह मनुष्वदिति।
21. अग्निर्देवो दैव्यो होता देवान् यक्षत् विद्वान् चिकित्वान् मनुष्वत्।
22. Sāṅkhya-kārikā: मूलप्रकृतिरविकृतिः महदाद्याः प्रकृतिविकृतयः सप्त। षोडशकस्तु विकारः न प्रकृतिर्न विकृतिः पुरुषः।
23. Bhāgavata-purāṇa, 11.22.22: सांख्ये सप्तदशके भूतमात्रेन्द्रियाणि च। पञ्च पञ्चैकमनसा आत्मा सप्तदशः स्मृतः।
24. Jñāneśvarī, 12.7: संतरावियेचे स्तन्य देसी। अनाहताचा हल्लरू गासी। समाधि बोधे निजविसी। बुझाऊनि।
25. Nāmadeva: सतरा अक्षरांत असे तुझी मूर्ती, श्रीयज्ञेशा तुजप्रती नमो नमो।
26. TS. 1.6.11.1: यो वै सप्तदशं प्रजापतिम् अन्वायत्तं वेद प्रति यज्ञेन तिष्ठति न यज्ञात् भ्रंशते - आश्रावयेति चतुरक्षरम् अस्तु श्रौषट् इति चतुरक्षरम् यज इति द्वयक्षरम् ये यजामहे इति पञ्चाक्षरं दव्यक्षरं षषट्कारः। एष वै सप्तदशः प्रजापतिः यज्ञमन्वायत्तः।
27. TS. 6.2.10: सर्पदशच्छदि प्रजाकामस्य सप्तदशः प्रजापतिः प्रजापतेः आत्स्यै।
28. ĀpŚS. 18.1.5: सर्वैः सप्तदशो भवति।
ĀpŚS. 18.1.6-7: सप्तदश दीक्षाः।
ĀpŚS. 18.1.8: सप्तदशारात्निर्यूपः सप्तदशारात्निर्यूपः सप्तदशः प्रजापतिः प्रजापतेरात्स्यै।
ĀpŚS. 18.2.13: सप्तदश प्राजापत्यान् यूपान् उपाकरोति।
TBr.1.3.4: सप्तदश पशूनालभते। सप्तदशः प्रजापतिः प्रजापतेरात्स्यै।

- ĀpŚS. 18.3.4ff: दक्षिणभावे सप्तदशरथान् ददाति सप्तदश अनांसि सप्तदश अश्वान् सप्तदश हस्तिनः सप्तदश निष्कान् सप्तदश दास्यः सप्तदश अजाः सप्तदश अवीः सप्तदश वासांसि, सप्तदश गवां शतानि...etc.
- TāṇḍyaBr. 18.6.5: सप्तदश स्तोत्राणि। सर्वः सप्तदशः।
- LāṭyŚS. 8.11.5: सदस्यसप्तदशान् वृणीते। etc.
29. TS.1.7.11: अग्निरेकाक्षरेण प्रजापतिः सप्तदशाक्षरेण।
30. Cf. AitBr. III.33: प्रजापतिर्वै स्वां दुहितरमभ्यध्यायत् दिवम् इत्यन्ये आहुः उषसम् इत्यन्ये।
31. ŚBr. 3.1.4.5: संवत्सरसंमितो वै यज्ञः।
32. ŚBr. 11.1.6.12-13: स ऐक्षत प्रजापतिः सर्वं वा अत्सारिषं च इमा देवता असूक्ष्मि। स सर्वत्सरोऽभवत्। सर्वत्सरो ह वै नामैतत् यत् संवत्सरः इति। स ऐक्षत प्रजापतिः इमं वा आत्मनः प्रतिमामसूक्ष्मं यद् संवत्सरम् इति। तस्मादाहुः प्रजापतिः संवत्सरः इति। आत्मनो ह्येतं प्रतिमामसृजत्।
- Cp. ŚBr. 1.6.3.35: स वै संवत्सर एव प्रजापतिः।
- ŚBr. 11.1.1.1: संवत्सरो वै यज्ञः प्रजापतिः। तस्यैतद् द्वारं यदमावास्या चन्द्रमा एव द्वारपिधानः।
33. ŚBr. 3.1.4.5: तानि पञ्च जुहोति। संवत्सरसंमितो वै यज्ञः पञ्च वा ऋतवः संवत्सरस्य तं पञ्चधिराप्नोति। तस्मात् पञ्च जुहोति।
- MaitS. 1.10.5: संवत्सरो वै यज्ञः। यज्ञः प्रजापतिः।
- MaitS. 1.10.8: संवत्सरः प्रजापतिः।
34. RV. I.164.11: द्वादशारं न हि तज्जराय वर्षीतिं यन्नं परि द्याम् ऋतस्य। आ पुत्रा अग्ने मिथुनासौ अत्र सप्त शतानि विशतिश्च तस्युः।
- Cp. also RV. I.164.12, 13, 14.
35. TS. 2.5.8: पञ्चदश सामिधेयीरन्वाह पञ्चदश वा अर्धमासस्य रात्रयः अर्धमासस्य संवत्सर आच्यते। तासां त्रीणि च शतानि षष्टिश्चाक्षराणि तावतीः संवत्सरस्य रात्रयः अक्षरस्य एव संवत्सरम् आप्नोति।
- Cp. also MaitS. 1.7.3: यावन्ति वै सामिधेयीनामक्षराणि तावन्ति संवत्सरस्याहानि; पञ्चदश सामिधेयीः पञ्चदश अर्धमासस्य रात्रयः।
36. MaitS. 1.10.8: नव हवीषि, नव प्रयाजाः, नवासुयाजाः, द्वौ आज्यभागौ, अग्ने समनयति, तद् त्रिंशत् त्रिंशदक्षरा विशद् विशाजो वै योनेः प्रजापतिः प्रजा असृजत्, विशाजो वा सृजन् योनेः सजमानः प्रजायते। त्रिंशत् त्रिंशद्वै रात्रयो मासः। यो मासः स संवत्सरः, संवत्सरः प्रजापतिः। तद् प्रजापतेश्च वा सृजद् विशावश्च योनेः मिथुनात् सजमानः प्रजायते।

एकैकया वा आहुत्या द्वादश द्वादश रात्रीरयुवत। ता चावतीः संख्याने तावतीः संवत्सरस्य रात्रयः।

37. TS. 5.6.7: अग्नेर्वै दीक्षया देवा विराजमानुवन्। तिस्रो रात्रीः दीक्षितः स्यात् त्रिपदा विराड् विराजमानोति। षड् रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्यात् षड्वा ऋतवः संवत्सरः, संवत्सरो विराड् विराजमानोति। दश रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्याद् दशाक्षरा विराड् विराजमानोति। द्वादश रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्यात् द्वादश मासाः संवत्सरः संवत्सरो विराड् विराजमानोति, त्रयोदश रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्यात् त्रयोदश मासाः संवत्सरः संवत्सरो विराड् विराजमानोति। पञ्चदश रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्यात् पञ्चदश वा अर्धमासस्य रात्रयः अर्धमाससः संवत्सर आप्यते संवत्सरो विराड् विराजमानोति। सप्तदश रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्यात् द्वादश मासाः पञ्चर्तवः स संवत्सरो विराड् विराजमानोति, चतुर्विंशति रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्यात् चतुर्विंशतिरर्धमासाः संवत्सरः संवत्सरो विराड् विराजमानोति। त्रिंशत् रात्रीर्दीक्षितः स्यात् त्रिंशदक्षरा विराड् विराजमानोति। मासं दीक्षितः स्यात् यो मासः स संवत्सरः संवत्सरो विराड् विराजमानोति, चतुरो मासो दीक्षितः स्याच्चतुरो वा एतं मासो वसवोऽविभरुः।
38. ŚBr. 9.3.3.18: कथमस्यैषा वसोर्धारा संवत्सरमग्निमानोति कथं संवत्सरेणाग्निना संपद्यते इति। षष्टिश्च ह वै त्रीणि च शतान्येषा वसोर्धारा। अथ षड् अथ पञ्चत्रिंशत् ततो यानि षष्टिश्च त्रीणि च शतानि तावन्ति संवत्सरस्य अहानि ... यानि षट् षड् वा ऋतवः तदूतूनां रात्रीराप्नोति तदुभयानि संवत्सरस्याहोरात्राणि आप्नोति। अथ यानि पञ्चत्रिंशत् स त्रयोदशो मासः स आत्मा त्रिंशदात्मा प्रतिष्ठा द्वे प्राणा द्वे शिर एव पञ्चत्रिंशम् एतावान् वै संवत्सरः एवमु हास्यैषा वसोर्धारा संवत्सरमग्निमानोत्येवं संवत्सरेणाग्निना संपद्यन्ते।
39. उरुव्यचसा महिनी असश्चता पिता माता च भुवनानि रक्षतः।
सुधृष्टमे वपुष्ये न रोदसी पिता यत् सीमधि रूपैरवासयत्॥
स वह्निः पुत्रः पित्रोः पवित्रवान् पुनाति धीरो भुवनानि मायया।
धेनुं च पृश्निं वृषभं सुरेतसं विश्वाहा शुक्रं पयो अस्य दुक्षत॥ RV. I.160.2-3.
40. TS. 5.4.2: ऋतव्या उपदधाति ऋतूनां क्लृप्त्यै। द्वन्द्वमुपदधाति तस्माद् द्वन्द्वमृतवः। अधृतेव वा एषा यन्मध्यमा चितिः अन्तरिक्षम् इव वा एषा, द्वन्द्वमन्यासु चितीषूप दधाति चतस्रो मध्ये धृत्यै। अन्तःश्लेषणं वा एताश्चितीनां यदूतव्या, यदूतव्या उप दधाति चितीनां विधृत्यै।
41. TS. 5.6.10: प्रजापतिः अग्निमचिनुत ऋतुभिः संवत्सरम्। वसन्तेनैवास्य पूर्वार्धमचिनुत प्रीष्मेण दक्षिणं पक्षम् वर्षाभिः पुच्छम् शरदा उत्तरं पक्षं हेमन्तेन मध्यम्।
42. TS. 5.6.10: इयं वाव प्रथमा चितिः ओषधयो वनस्पतयः पुरीषम् अन्तरिक्षं द्वितीया वयांसि पुरीषम् असौ तृतीया नक्षत्राणि पुरीषम् यज्ञश्चतुर्थी दक्षिणा पुरीषम् यजमानः पञ्चमी प्रजा पुरीषम्.... संवत्सरो वै षष्ठी चितिः ऋतवः पुरीषम् षट् चितयो भवन्ति षट् पुरीषाणि द्वादश संपद्यन्ते द्वादश मासाः संवत्सरः संवत्सर एव प्रति तिष्ठति।

43. ŚBr. 11.2.7.1-6: संवत्सरो यज्ञः, ऋतव ऋत्विजः, मासा हवीषि, अर्धमासा हविष्पात्राणि, अहोरात्रे परिवेष्टी, इयमेव प्रथमा सामिधेनी, अग्निः द्वितीया, वायुः तृतीया, अन्तरिक्षं चतुर्थी, द्यौः पञ्चमी, आदित्यः षष्ठी, चन्द्रमाः सप्तमी, मनोऽष्टमी, वाङ् नवमी, तपो दशमी, ब्रह्म एकादशी, एता हि वा इदं सर्वं समिन्धते एताभिः इदं सर्वं समिद्धम् – तस्मात् सामिधेन्यो नाम।
44. TS. 5.1.10: हिरण्यं रुक्ममन्तरं प्रति मुञ्चते अमृतमेव सृः योरन्तर्धत्ते एकविंशति-निर्बाधो भवति एकविंशतिर्वै देवलोकाः द्वादशमासाः पञ्चर्तवः त्रय इमे लोकाः असौ आदित्यः एकविंशः।
45. AitBr.: षड् इति वषट् करोति षड् वा ऋतवः ऋतूनेव तत्कल्पयति ऋतून् प्रतिष्ठापयति। ऋतून् वै प्रतितिष्ठतः इदं सर्वमनुप्रतितिष्ठति यदिदं किं च ...। एतानि वा एतेन प्रतिष्ठापयति, द्यौः अन्तरिक्षे प्रतिष्ठिता अन्तरिक्षं पृथिव्यां पृथिवी अप्सु आपः सत्ये सत्यं ब्रह्मणि वौषट् इति वषट् करोति, असौ वा (आदित्यः) वौ एतमेव (आदित्यमेव) ऋतुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति।
See अत्र सायणः – वौषट्शब्दाभिधेयमादित्यं षट्शब्दाभिधेयेषु ऋतुषु स्थापयति।
46. ŚBr. I.9.3.9: इदमेव प्रथमेन पादेन पस्मार, अथेदमन्तरिक्षं द्वितीयेन, दिवमुत्तमेन। यद्वेव विष्णुक्रमान् क्रमते यज्ञो वै विष्णुः स देवेभ्यः इमां विक्रान्तिं विचक्रमे येषामियं विक्रान्तिः।
47. Cp. Sāyaṇa on TS. 1.1.11: विष्णुपादबुद्ध्या यजमानेन स्वपादस्य भूमौ प्रक्षेपाः विष्णुक्रमाः।
48. TS. 5.4.1: पुरस्तादन्याः प्रतीचीः उप दधाति पश्चादन्याः प्राचीः तस्मात् प्राचीनानि च प्रतीचीनानि च नक्षत्राण्यावर्तन्ते।
49. TS. 4.4.10: कृत्तिका नक्षत्रमग्निर्देवता etc.
50. TS. 1.7.6; 5.2.1: दक्षिणा पर्यावर्तते ... आदित्यस्यैव आवृतमनु पर्यावर्तते।

CHAPTER II

YAJÑA, PRAJANANA AND MITHUNA

The sacrifice is not only related to cosmos through time and space and with all that is covered by them; it is also regarded as *prajanana*, i.e. the creation itself. The *Kāṭhaka-Samhitā* (6.7) in clear terms states that, Agnihotra means creation.¹

It is again obvious that *prajanana* 'the creation' cannot be conceived without a *mithuna*. Let me therefore examine the references to *prajanana* and *mithuna* related to the concept of sacrifice.

According to TS. 1.5.9 the sacrifice proves to be productive. The sacrificer offers the Agnihotra libations in the fire. The oblation is thus sacrificed, but according to the text of TS, the oblation is like the seed sprinkled in the womb of a female, from which a similar but a fresh sprout takes birth. Agni is as if the womb. It is the *Tvaṣṭṛ* who modifies the seed.² As many modifications of the seed as *Tvaṣṭṛ* makes, in so many shapes does it become fruitful.

The *Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad*, 3.11 states that a man meets the death three times and is born thrice. Virtually he dies for the first time when the seed is sprinkled.³ But then a similar sprout is born of it. Thus for the birth of a sprout, the seed has to sacrifice itself.

Even according to modern science, I am told that 'the sacrifice' is the most fundamental process of all biological systems. The bio-chemical reactions underline the growth and function of all multicellular organisms. In all bio-chemical systems, energy is stored in the form of bonds between atoms. These atoms comprise the molecules that make up the cells, tissues, etc. The bond is broken and molecule is sacrificed and then the energy is released, in order for the creation to proceed. Thus the self sacrificing, and the creation of new sprouts out of that is eternally rotating in the cosmic universe.

In Soma sacrifice a cup of Soma is drawn and offered to Patnīvat Agni and Tvaṣṭṛ. The Soma-drop is referred to as seed in this context (TS. 6.5.8: *indo ityāha reto vā indū reta eva tad dadhāti*). While drawing this Soma-cup, the Adhvaryu gives a call to the Agnīdh and to the Neṣṭṛ priests, viz. "O Agnīdh! sit on the lap of the Neṣṭṛ; O Neṣṭṛ! lead up the wife of the sacrificer". In that the Agnīdh as if impregnates the Neṣṭṛ and the Neṣṭṛ, the wife. The Neṣṭṛ causes the Udgāṭṛ to look at the wife. (The Udgāṭṛ is here regarded as Prajāpati.) Verily it serves for the production of offsprings. In the procedure here, accordingly to the text, the wife uncovers her thigh and pours water over it, and let it flow up to her womb. It as if resembles the pouring of seed (cp. TS. 6.5.8). This procedure of Pātnīvata cup suggests the process of creation. It may be remembered here that this Soma-cup is offered to Patnīvat Agni, along with Tvaṣṭṛ who shapes the seed in various forms.

The bricks - *iṣṭakās* - to be placed on each layer of fire altar are referred to as cows - *dhenavaḥ*. (Cp. TS. 4.4.11.23: *tā me agna iṣṭakā dhenavaḥ santu*, TS. 5.4.2: *imā me agna iṣṭakā dhenavaḥ santu*, etc.) TS. 5.7.2

enjoins to place one brick named as *ṛṣabha*⁴ 'a bull', on each of the fire layers. This is the forming of a *mithuna* for creation.

TS. 5.5.4, describing the rite of constructing the fire altar, relates a tale, as follows:⁵ The waters were the wives of Varuṇa. Agni longed for them. He had a union with them. His seed fell away, it became this earth; what second fell away became the yonder sky. TS further identifies this earth and the sky with two *virāj* bricks to be placed in the fire altar. In placing them the Adhvaryu places two worlds in the altar. Further the seed which the yonder sky sprinkles, is absorbed in the earth. It is propagated. It becomes plants and shoots. Then the fire eats.

In placing the two *virāj* bricks, the space aspect, discussed before, is also involved.

With reference to the Cāturmāsya sacrifice, TBr. 1.6.8 states that Prajāpati created the *prajā* by performing the Vaiśvadeva-parvan (*vaiśvadevena vai prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata*. ... etc. Cp. also MaitS. 1.10.5: *sa prajāpatiḥ akāmayata ... prajāḥ sṛjeya iti sa cāturmāsyāny apaśyat ... cāturmāsyaḥ prajā asṛjata ... agniṣṭomād vaiśvadevaṃ yajñakratuṃ nirmāya prajāpatiḥ prajā asṛjata* ... etc.).

TBr. 2.1.2 states that Prajāpati once desired for creation. He conceived a *mithuna* 'couple' in Agnihotra.⁶ The sacrificer offers one libation at the sun-rise with formulas, and the second without employing any formula. This makes a couple for creation.

The allegorical union of king's wives and the dead horse in Aśvamedha sacrifice may perhaps hint at *prajanana*.

Thus there are numberless references to *mithunas* in the description of sacrifice. I may quote some more. Cp.

- i. ŚBr. 1.3.1.9: *yoṣā vai srug vṛṣā agniḥ* 'the ladle is female and fire the male'.
- ii. ŚBr. 1.3.1.19: *yoṣā vai patnī reta ājyam* 'the wife is female and *ājya* 'the melted ghee' is the seed'.
- iii. TS. 5.6.2: *kumbhās ca kumbhīs ca mithunāni bhavanti, mithunasya prajātyai* 'in fire altar the bricks in the form of big pitchers and small pitchers are placed, they form a couple and cause the creation.
- iv. ŚBr. 1.7.2.11: *asau vā anuvākyā iyaṃ yājyā te ubhe yoṣe. tayor mithunam asti vaṣaṭkāra eva, tad vā eṣa eva vaṣaṭkāraḥ ya eṣa tapati* 'the yonder sky is *anuvākyā* verse; this earth is *yājyā* verse. They both are female. They had a union with *Vauṣaṭ*, the sun.
- v. TS. 6.1.3: *mekhalayā yajamānaṃ dīkṣayati yoktreṇa patnīm mithunavāya* 'the Adhvaryu consecrates the sacrificer with *mekhalā* (the belt); and the wife with *yoktra* (the girdle), for forming union.

In the Iṣṭi sacrifice, the *praṇītā*-water is placed towards the north of the Gārhapatya fire. Nobody is allowed to pass through them. SBr. 1.1.1.20-21 remarks: 'Water is female and Agni is male. One should not pass through the narrow passage between them; lest he would disturb their union' (cp. *yoṣā vā āpaḥ vṛṣā agniḥ. tā nāntareṇa sañcareyuḥ, nen mithunaṃ caryamāṇam antareṇa sañcarān iti*).

Sacred Agni is generated by friction of lower and upper *araṇīs* 'the two logs of wood', which are metaphorically referred to as *Urvaśī* and *Purūravas* and the generated Agni being their son named as *Āyuh*⁷ (cp. TS.1.3.7 also 6.3.5).

The *JaiminiyaBr.* 2.84, in the prescription of *Ekāhas* 'one day Soma sacrifices', states that the *ayuja-stomas* and *yugmānta-stomas* form the divine couple. Even the *Br̥hat* and *Rathantara sāmans* form a divine couple.

In the *Vājapeya* sacrifice, *Soma* cups and *Surā* cups are offered. *Soma* is male, while *Surā* is regarded as female. They form a couple.

The *Br̥haj-jābālopaniṣad* (2.1) professes that the entire universe is formed from the couple of *Agni* and *Soma* (*agniṣomātmakam viśvam*).

With reference to *Devikā-haviṃṣi*, *TBr.* 1.7.2 repeatedly confirms that *Soma* sprinkles the seed and *Agni* procreates (*somo vai retodhāḥ agniḥ prajanayitā*).

In the *Brahmodya* verses of *TS* (7.4.18), therefore, *Soma* is regarded as the seed of young sprinkling horse (*somam āhur vṛṣṇo aśvasya retah*).

Agniṣomau is therefore a dual divinity, very important in the sacrificial procedure. Even in *Pūrṇamāsa* sacrifice, the cake or *ājya* is jointly offered to them. *Agniṣomau* are jointly regarded as one of the two principle deities of *Pūrṇamāsa-īṣṭi*.

Thus the *dravya-yajña* 'the procedure of the physical sacrifice' is the dramatization of the metaphysical

cosmic sacrifice in creation. Consequently the sacrificer, who is consecrated in sacrifice, i.e. who undergoes the *dīkṣā*, is referred to by the *śrutis* as an embryo. Cp. TS. 6.1.3: *garbho vā eṣa yad dīkṣitaḥ* 'the sacrificer is embryo during *dīkṣā* period. He therefore wears the garment which resembles the *ulba* 'the membrane fluid enveloping the embryo'.⁸ Imitating the embryo, the sacrificer clenches his fists. According to AitBr. 1.3, one who is consecrated in sacrifice is again conceived as embryo by the priests.

Since the sacrificer is regarded as an embryo, he is not expected to leave the *vedi* which represents the womb. If he leaves the *vedi*, it is like miscarriage of the embryo (cp. TS. 6.5.2: *garbho vā eṣa dīkṣitaḥ yonir dīkṣitavimitam, yad dīkṣito dīkṣitavimitāt pravaset yathā yoner garbhaḥ skandati, tādr̥g eva tat*).

TS. 6.2.5 further states that, the embryo grows by the nutrition of milk. The sacrificer should also therefore take milk only, as the sacrificial food (*vrata*), (*payasā vai garbhā vardhante garbha iva khalu vā eṣa yad dīkṣitaḥ yad asya payo vratam bhavati ātmānam eva tad vardhayati*).

The *ukhya*-fire, which the sacrificer carries in the net of six strings is also identified with the embryo and the net as the womb (cp. TS. 5.6.9: *garbho va eṣa yad ukhyaḥ, yoniḥ śikyam*). The sacrificer should not allow the *ukhya*-fire fall out of the net, lest the embryo would be miscarried (*yac chīkhyāt ukhām nirūhet yoneḥ garbham nirhanyāt*).

Manu (2.169) also supports that the initiation in sacrifice is the third birth (*mātur agre 'dhijananam*,

dvitīyam mauñjibandhane, tṛtīyaṃ yajña-dīkṣāyām... etc.). As stated before the *Jaiminiya-Upaniṣad*, 3.11, in other words, tells us that the man meets the death three times. He meets the death, second time, when he is consecrated in sacrifice, then he is reborn for the third time. And this process of creation is an unending one. It is continuous. TBr. 2.1.4 remarks: *asamsthito vā eṣa yajñah yad agnihotram*. To represent this creation the bricks called *sr̥ṣṭiṣṭakās* are placed in the fire altar. Thereby the sacrificer comprehends the creation in the order it is created (TS. 4.3.10, 5.3.4: *sr̥ṣṭīr upadadhāti yathāsr̥ṣṭam eva avarundhe*). The order of creation is narrated in TS. 4.3.10, viz. *prajā*, *Brahmā*, *bhūtāni*, *Saptarṣis*, *Dhātā*, *pitarah*, *ṛtus*, months, year, *kṣatra*, *paśus*, *sūdra* and *Ārya* and so on.

Thus the entire manifestation of the Universe through time and space and through *prajanana*, is observed in the concept of sacrifice. Therefore the sacrifice may be looked upon as a prototype of *Prajāpati*'s cosmic creation or manifestation. In other words, the cosmic prototypes were thought to be manipulated by ritual operations. Hence the performances of Vedic rituals may be treated as instruments to comprehend the ever-active creation, and its origin - the creator - the *Prajāpati* - the ultimate or eternal truth.

Eventually let me refer to another aspect of the sacrifice, under the remark of the *Bhagavad-gītā* (III.13 & IV.31),⁹ which glorifies partaking of the food, which is left after its offering in the sacrifice.

In the sacrificial procedure, a portion of oblation, e.g. of a *puroḍāśa* 'a sacrificial cake' is offered to a deity, along with the sacrificer's recital of a *tyāga*-formula:

'idaṃ na mama', and a part of the remnant is, thereafter, consumed by the sacrificer and the priests, etc.

Upaniṣads remark that the mind is nourished with the subtle part of food.¹⁰ Naturally the subtle part of that food, which is consecrated under the sacred precept of offering to the deities, with the concept of *tyāga*, would form the sanctified pure, and accomplished mind. Such mind can detach itself from the material desires.

The actions arise from the mind. The purified mind can only give rise to purified actions which are lifted to the higher divine plane. *Śiva-saṃkalpa-sūkta* (VS. 34) cherishes that the mind, without which no action is possible, should invoke pious intentions.¹¹ This food is termed as *vighasa*, *amṛta* or in later period as *prasāda*, and it radically differs from the common food. This aspect of sacrifice therefore illustrates: *tena tyaktena bhuñjīthāḥ* of the *Īśopaniṣad* (1). The sacrifice thus purifies the cause to purify the effect, considering the dictum: *kāraṇa-guṇāḥ kāryam anusañkrāmanti*.

Thus for purifying the act, the sacrifice cherishes to purify its root, viz. the mind, and for purifying the mind it purifies its cause, viz. the food, by offering it to deities, with a concept of *tyāga* behind it.

It is believed that the mind is responsible for binding and liberation.¹² The purified mind thus becomes the force for liberation.

It may be noted in this context that the concept of *bhuñjate te tv aghaṃ pāpā ye pacanty ātmakāraṇāt*, (BG. 3.13) appears to have been adopted under the influence of *kevalāgho bhavati kevalādī* (RV. X.117.6).

Further, sacrifice is the worship, finally rendered to Prajāpati or Parameṣṭhī, with a deep feeling of gratitude, along with the offerings made to him. Sacrifice is not a mere prayer or dry worship. The feeling of gratitude not only makes the life beautiful, but also fills one's life with bliss. One can even experience this feeling of bliss, when he expresses the gratitude to his parents or guru. Secondly what the sacrificer offers to Prajāpati, is created and owned by Prajāpati himself. It is like worshipping the ocean with the water of ocean only. This again reminds us of *kasya svid dhanam* of the *Īśopaniṣad*. Sacrifice thus is not the philosophy expressed in the words, but that translated in action.

Allow me to pick up again the aspect of action and evaluate it further. According to BG. 3.14, the sacrifice owes its origin to action (*yajñah karmasamudbhavaḥ*). Action is the law of nature. Universe is ever active. Even the *prāṇa* 'the life-force', according to ŚBr. 8.1.4.10 is none else than the pulsation, i.e. the action of contraction and expansion which may be termed as *spanda*. Cosmic sacrifice begins rotating at the first *spanda* in Prakṛti. This *spanda* is reflected in placing the *prāṇa-bhṛt*-bricks in the fire-altar (TS. 5.3.1, 4.3.2).¹³ *Prāṇa-bhṛt*-bricks are related to the creation of *ṛtus* also.

TBr and MaitS. 4.1.1 tell us that the sacrifice is best of all best actions (*yajño vai śreṣṭhatamaṃ karma*). BG classifies the actions into three categories, viz. *sāttvika*, *rājasa* and *tāmasa* and condemns the latter two of them. *Śreṣṭhatama-karma* can point only to the *sāttvika* type of action.

Now if this eternal cosmic sacrifice is ever going on, why then the Vedas enjoined to perform the physical

sacrifice, i.e. *dravya-yajña* which is the prototype of that cosmic sacrifice? The answer is - the Vedas have built up this occult science of sacrifice for approaching and comprehending the divine cosmic sacrifice and divine sacrificer - Prajāpati and to become one with the all-pervading eternal truth - *Satyam* through the inevitable action which is inherent in Prakṛti and through the knowledge of *ṛta* the cosmic law governing the working of the universe.

Devayajyā, i.e. the sacrifice is *daivya-karma* 'the divine work' (cp. *daivyāya karmaṇe śundhadhvaṃ devayajyāyai*, VS. 1.13); and it is *śreṣṭhatama-karma* 'best of all the best acts', because it has to be performed in tune with the call - 'work do you perform with one passion for truth'; as the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, 2.1 states: *mantreṣu karmāṇi kavayo yāny apaśyan tāni tretāyām bahudhā santatāni. tāny ācaratha niyatam satyakāmāḥ eṣa vaḥ panthāḥ sukṛtasya loke [tretā = agnitretā]*. The action, which is inevitable, and which otherwise binds a person in the cycles of births and deaths, serves as a force for liberation, if performed in the spirit of sacrifice.

The priests also believe themselves as linked up with the divinities. The Adhvaryu, while drawing the oblation material, recites: 'Urged by divine Savitṛ, with arms of Aśvins, and hands of Pūṣan, I draw the oblation material which is agreeable to Agni' (TS. 1.1.4: *devasya tvā savituh prasave śvinor bāhubhyām pūṣṇo hastābhyaṃ agnaye juṣṭam nirvapāmi*).

Before the recitation of Sāmīdhenī verses, the Hotṛ says: 'I approach the eternal truth, the cosmic law, the immortality, the unafflicted dear form of Prajāpati' (*satyam prapadye ṛtam prapadye amṛtam prapadye*,

prajāpateḥ priyām anārtām tanuvam prapadye,
TBr. 3.5.1).

Brahmā priest, when being chosen, also recites the similar formula (cp. BŚS. 3.23) with addition of *brah-makośam prapadye...* etc. i.e. 'I approach the treasures of Brahman'. Thus *prajāpater āptyai* appears to be the aim of even many sacrificial details.

ŚBr. 11.2.7.9 states: 'the former *āghāra* offering is *ṛta* and the next *āghāra* offering is *satyam*. Whatever has to be achieved by *ṛta* and *satya* is all obtained by offerings of these two *āghāra* offerings'.¹⁴ Thus *ṛta* and *satya* are identified with two *āghāra* offerings. *Ṛta* means the cosmic laws and *satya* points towards the eternal Truth.

TBr. 1.5.6 recommends to recite a verse in Cāturmāsya sacrifice, viz.

*ṛtam eva parameṣṭhī, ṛtam nātyeti kiñcana/
ṛte samudra āhitaḥ ṛte bhūmir iyaṃ śritā//*

meaning, "ṛta, the cosmic law stands highest. No one can transgress it. The oceans are placed in the rule of ṛta 'the cosmic law', and earth confines herself in the discipline of ṛta".

According to the Vedic texts, *yajña* is the origin of *ṛta*, 'the cosmic law'. It is a royal road leading to *ṛta* (cp. MaitS.: *ṛtasya pathā preta iti, eṣa vā ṛtasya panthāḥ yad yajñah*; KS. 28.4: *yo vai yajñiyo medhyaḥ sa ṛtasya panthāḥ*; ŚBr. 1.3.4.16: *yojño vai ṛtasya yoniḥ*, MaitS. 1.10.11: *ṛtam vai satyam yajñah*, MaitS. 1.8.7: *ṛtam vai satyam agnihotram*), etc.

The sacrificer enters upon a vow and recites: "I enter upon a vow, in that I proceed from untruth to truth" (VS. 1.5: *agne vratapate vratañ carisyāmi ... idam aham anṛtāt satyam upaimi*).

Yājñavalkya in his BrUp. 3.9.23 declares that the consecration of sacrifice is based on truth (*kasminn u dīkṣā pratiṣṭhitā iti, satye iti ... satye hy eva dīkṣā pratiṣṭhitā iti*).

According to the sacrificial procedure also, a sacrificer, while stepping on *kṛṣṇājina*, for initiation, recites: *ā 'haṃ dīkṣām āruham ṛtasya patnīm ṛtam satye 'dhāyi, satyam amṛte 'dhāyi, ṛtam ca me satyaṃ cābhūtām. jyotir abhūvaṃ suvar agamam nākasya pṛṣṭham bradhnasya viṣṭapam agamam* (TBr. 3.7.7) i.e. 'I step on *dīkṣā*, the guardian of *ṛta* 'the cosmic law'. The cosmic law is deposited in truth and the truth in cosmic law. *Rta* and *Satya* may belong to me. I have become the *jyoti* 'the light', etc. (Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara on this passage comments: *yathā nākasya avidyamāna-duḥkhasya āditya-maṇḍalasya pṛṣṭham uparibhāgam, bradhnasya parivrḍhasya ātmanaḥ viṣṭapam sthānam paramātmākhyam gamisyāmi yena aikyam gataḥ param brahma jānāti*).

In Vājapeya sacrifice, the sacrificer and his wife ascend the *yūpa* 'the sacrificial post' and whilst at the top of the *yūpa*, they declare: "We have become immortal" (VS. 9.21; KātŚS. 14.5.6: *amṛtā abhūma*).

The sacrificer wishing to pile the fire-altar symbolically deposits Agni in himself and then performs Agniciti-rites. Śrutis declare that he thereby achieves the position of immortal-fire. He therefore procreates fire

from fire, immortal from immortal (VS. 13.1: *may gr̥hñāmy agne agnim; ŚBr.: atha yad ātmann agniṃ gr̥hītvā cinoti tad agner adhi agniṃ janayati amṛtā amṛtam*).

By the performance of the Agniciti rite the sacrificer conquers rebirth. He becomes one with Agni, which is the state of immortality (cp. ŚBr. X.1.4.14: *tad āhu kiṃ tad agnau kriyate yena yajamānaḥ punar mṛtyun apajayatīti, agnir vā eṣā devatā bhavati yo 'gniṃ cinut amṛtam u vā agniḥ*).

TĀ. 1.13 records a verse, for utilizing it in placing the right *diśaḥ* bricks, in the Ārunaketuka-cayanam. The verse runs as:

*aṣṭayonim aṣṭaputrām aṣṭapatnīm imām mahīm/
ahaṃ veda na me mṛtyuḥ na cāmṛtyur aghāharat//*

This verse according to Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara points to the *mukti* 'liberation' of the ṛṣi.¹⁵

TBr. 3.10.11 states that the sacrificer conquers immortality by the performance of Savitr-citi.¹⁶

ŚBr. 6.1.2.36 declares that Agniciti be performed for achieving immortality.¹⁷ It further supports this view saying: 'prāṇas performed Agniciti. They became one with Prajāpati. Prajāpati created gods. They performed Agniciti. They became immortal. The sacrificer conquers that immortality which prāṇas and gods conquered'.

ŚBr. 10.1.4.1 further states: "Prajāpati was composed of both these, the mortal and immortal; his vital airs alone were immortal, his body was mortal. By this

sacrificial performance of Agni-citi, he made himself undecaying and immortal. In like manner is the sacrificer, composed of both mortal and immortal. His vital airs alone are immortal and his body mortal; by this sacrificial performance, he makes himself uniformly undecaying and immortal (*ajaram amṛtam ātmānaṃ kurute*)”.

TS 1.6.9 narrates a myth, saying that Parameṣṭhī formerly performed the new-moon and full-moon sacrifices. He achieved the highest position (*parāṃ kāṣṭhām*). Prajāpati, Indra, Agni and Soma also performed this sacrifice. They also obtained the highest position. One, who offers the new-moon and full-moon sacrifices reaches the highest position.

It may be noted that the celebrated commentator Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, interprets *parāṃ kāṣṭhām* as permanent state of soul, which showers unexcelled joy and bliss and saves one from the cycles of birth and re-birth (*yā prāṇināṃ sadā niratīsayānanda-nirvṛtidāyini śāśvati punarjanmacchedinī sā paramā kāṣṭhā, tāṃ gacchati*).

In *Jñānakāṇḍa*, BrUp. 1.4.10 states: “Before the manifest creation, Brahman only existed. It realized itself ‘I am Brahman’, It became All, every thing (*sarvam*). The gods, who were thus awakened in knowledge, became All. Then the ṛṣis, then the men became All. The seer Vāmadeva, when realized himself as Brahman, said, ‘I have become Manu and Sūrya too’ (RV. 4.26.1)”.¹⁸ Thus one when realizes that he is Brahman, becomes this All.

Similar results are stated as far as *karma-kāṇḍa* is concerned. The sacrificial text of ŚBr. 5.1.1.8 also

declares that, one who performs Vājapeya becomes this All (*sa yo vājapeyena yajate sa idaṃ sarvaṃ bhavati*). He conquers Prajāpati. ĀpŚS. 18.1.2-3 also repeats this view (cp. *prajāpatim āpnoti*).

ŚBr. 13.6.1.1 narrates a myth of Nārāyaṇa. Puruṣa Nārāyaṇa once desired to transcend All the *bhūtas* and to become All, every thing. He performed Puruṣamedha, thereby, He pervaded All, He became All. Therefore, one who performs Puruṣa-medha, pervades All, surpasses All and becomes All and every thing.

The famous *Puruṣa-sūkta* (RV. X.90) wherein Puruṣa is described as *sarvaṃ*, is utilized in Puruṣamedha sacrifice, in praise of victims tied to *yūpa*. The *Puruṣa-sūkta* consists of sixteen verses. From this Puruṣa, sixteen *kalās* emerge (cp. also Sarvamedha in this context, ŚBr. 13.7.1.13).

TA. 10.63 states: *yajñe sarvaṃ pratiṣṭhitam, tasmād yajñam paramaṃ vadanti*, i.e. All is established in sacrifice. It is *viśvatodhāra* 'supporting from All sides' (TS 4.6.5). RV. X.44.6 refers to sacrifice as a boat, and ABr. I.13 as a boat capable to carry across (*sutarmā nauḥ*).

The Rgvedic verse I.170.4:

*aram kṛṇvantu vedim, sam agnim indhatām puraḥ/
tatrāmṛtasya cetanaṃ yajñam te tanavāvahai//*

refers to sacrifice as *amṛtasya cetanaṃ* 'percipient of immortality'.

Āmnāya is *kriyārtha*. The sacrifice enjoined by *āmnāya* is *śreṣṭhatama-karma*, aiming at the awakening of consciousness of the sacrificer in immortality. It creates in the sacrificer the urge for immortality, the quest

for spiritual vision, constant awareness of the nature of the supreme divinity, and all this through actions, of course, lifted to divine planes.

In a sacrifice the sacrificer practises *jñāna* under the guise of *karma*. It may therefore be concluded that the sacrifice incorporates in itself a substantial amount of *jñāna*. Sacrifice therefore may be referred to as *jñāna* concretized.

From the above discussions, it appears to me that the sacrifice served a medium between human and transcendental worlds; and that knowing the inner meaning of sacrifice through action pointed the way to transcendence.

The sacrifice is viewed as a cosmic process and also a life process; that is why the Vedic seers say: *āyur yajñena kalpatām*.

Rituals are thus invested with cosmic significance, and sacrificial 'act' is perhaps 'acting' of cosmic procedure.

In the above discussions, I have tried to rationalize the rituals by characterizing them as symbolic of cosmos, mostly on the basis of myths. In my opinion, myths are the *arthavādas*, not only in the sense in which the *Mīmāṃsakas* take it, but in the real sense of the term - *artha-vāda* 'the speech motivated to explain the purpose (*artha*) of the precepts or rules'. There appears to be a perfect dialogue between myths and the rituals connected with them. In Ritual literature, we find a wonderful blend of procedure of rites and the myths, each of which be explained in the terms of other, with a

view to comprehend the philosophy or the inner meaning of Vedic rituals.

I need not involve myself in the controversies launched by various schools of philosophies referred to, in the beginning. I may only state that, the sacrifice, being the best work, performed for the sake of supreme is in itself a source of bliss. In services to supreme, the *karma* finally gets transmuted into joy - the bliss. If however some Vedāntin is bent on the teaching *jñānād eva tu kaivalyam*, I would like to quote BG. 4.33: *sarvaṃ karmākhilam pārtha jñane parisamāpyate* 'all the *karma* performed in the true spirit of sacrifice results in *jñāna*'.

To sum up, sacrifice primarily means the offerings made to deities. It is *dravya-yajña* with some procedural details. It appears to have been skillfully conceived as a prototype of ever going, eternal, endless cosmic sacrifice, ever rotating in the universe, which is manifested through time and space. It is occult science of knowing the creation, by comprehending *ṛta*. It is a way to approach Prajāpati, the creator, or Viṣṇu 'the all pervader'. It is the best of best actions, lifted to the divine plane by diminishing the desires for material gains.

Thus the texts of the rituals reveal such results of the *nitya* sacrifices as are mostly similar to the *jñāna-kāṇḍa*. *Dravya-yajñas* must however be performed with the knowledge of their essence. Then the *dravya-yajñas* will result in the *jñāna-yajñas*.

The prayer from the *Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka*, X.60: *tasyaivaṃ viduṣo yajñasyātmā*, etc.,¹⁹ conceiving the entire life as sacrifice, is very important in this regard.

I have dared to express my thoughts before the brilliant audience of the learned scholars and admirers of Oriental Studies, with a view to revise myself where necessary. I know, I am not perfect and not infallible. I know my limitations. I would only like to persuade you, to agree with me, at least on one of my views, that the sacrificial rites are not awefully empty.

REFERENCES

1. *Kāṭhaka-saṃhitā*, 6.7: प्रजननं वा एतत् अग्निहोत्रम्। सृष्टिर्वा एतत् यद् अग्निहोत्रम्।
2. TS. 1.5.9: अग्निहोत्रं जुहोति यदेव किं च यजमानस्य स्वं तस्यैतद्रेतः सिञ्चति प्रजनने, प्रजननं हि वा अग्निः त्वष्टा रूपाणि विकरोति।
3. *Jaiminīya-upaniṣad*, 3.11: त्रिहं वै पुरुषो भ्रियते त्रिः विजायते स ह एतदेव प्रथमं भ्रियते यद् रेतः सिक्तं संभूतं भवति।
4. TS. 5.7.2: पशवो वा एते यदिष्टकाः चित्वाचित्याम् ऋषभमुपदधाति मिथुनमेवास्य तद्यज्ञे करोति प्रजननाय। तस्मात् यूथे यूथे ऋषभः।
5. TS. 5.5.4: आपो वरुणस्य पत्नय आसन् ता अग्निरभिध्यायत् ताः समभवत् तस्य रेतः परापतत् तदियमभवत्। यद् द्वितीयं ... तदसावभवत्। इयं वै विराद असौ स्वराद यद् विराजौ उपदधाति इमे एवोपधत्ते। यद्वा असौ रेतः सिञ्चति तदस्यां प्रति तिष्ठति तत् प्रजायते। ता ओषधयो वीरुधो भवन्ति। ता अग्निः अत्ति।
6. TBr. 2.12: प्रजापतिरकामयत् प्रजायेयेति। स एतदग्निहोत्रं मिथुनमपश्यत्।
7. TS. 1.3.7: उर्वश्यस्यायुरसि पुरुरवा ...।
TS. 6.3.5: उर्वश्यस्यायुरसीत्याह मिथुनत्वाय।
8. Cp. TS. 6.1.3: उल्बं वासः प्रोणुति।
TS. 6.1.4: मुष्टीकरोति।
AitBr. 1.3: पुनर्वा एतमृत्विजो गर्भं कुर्वन्ति यां दीक्षयन्ति।
9. BG. III.13: यज्ञशिष्टाशिनः सन्तः मुच्यन्ते सर्वाकिल्बिषैः।
भुञ्जते ते त्वर्षं पापाः ये पचन्त्यात्मकारणात्॥
BG. IV.31: यज्ञशिष्टामृतभुजो यान्ति ब्रह्म सनातनम्।
10. *Chāndogya-upaniṣad*, 6.5.1: योऽपिष्ठः तन्मनः।

11. Śukla-Yajurveda - Mādhyandina-saṃhitā, 34.3: यस्मान् ऋते किंचन कर्म क्रियते तन्मे मनः शिवसंकल्पमस्तु।
12. Maitrāyaṇī-upaniṣad, 6.34: मन एव मनुष्याणां कारणं बन्धमोक्षयोः।
13. TS. 5.3.1: प्राणभृत उपदधाति ... एष वै वायुर्यत् प्राणः यदृतव्या उपधाय प्राणभृत उपदधाति ..., etc.
14. ŚBr. 11.2.7.9: ऋतमेव पूर्वं आधारः। सत्यमुत्तरः। अव ह वा ऋतसत्ये रुन्दे। अथ यत् किंच ऋतसत्याभ्यां जय्यं सर्वं हैव तज्जयति।
15. Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara: अहमिति मन्त्रद्रष्टृत्वं दर्शयति। तस्मात् मे एवं विदुषः न मृत्युः, ज्ञानसामर्थ्यात् अमृतत्वमेव। मुक्त एव भविष्यामि।
16. TBr. 3.10.11: तस्मै हैतम् अग्निं सावित्रम् उवाच, तं स विदित्वा अमृतो भूत्वा स्वर्गं लोकम् इयाय। आदित्यस्य सायुज्यम् अमृतो हैव भूत्वा स्वर्गं लोकम् एति। आदित्यस्य सायुज्यम्।
17. ŚBr. 6.1.2.35: एतद् वै रूपं कृत्वा प्राणाः प्रजापतिरभवन्, एतद् रूपं कृत्वा प्रजापति-देवान् असृजन्, एतद् रूपं कृत्वा देवा अमृता अभवन्। तद् यदेव एतेन प्राणाः सन्वन् यत् प्रजापतिः यद् देवाः तदेव एतेन भवति।
18. RV. 4.26.1: अहं मनुरभवं सूर्यश्च अहं कक्षीवान् ऋषिरस्मि विप्रः। अहं कुत्समार्जुनेयं न्युञ्जे अहं कविरुशना पश्यता मा।
19. TA. 10.60: ॐ तस्यैवं विदुषो यज्ञस्यात्मा यजमानः, श्रद्धा पत्नी, शरीरमिध्मम् उरो वेदिर्, लोमानि बहिः, श्वेदः शिखा, हृदयं यूपः, काम आज्यं, मनुः पशुः, तपोऽग्निः, शमयिता दक्षिणा, वाक् होता, प्राण उदगाता, चक्षुरध्वर्युः, मनो ब्रह्मा, श्रोत्रमग्नीध्र, यावदधियते सा दीक्षा, यदश्नाति यत् पिबति तदस्य सोमपानं, यद्रमते तदुपसदो, यत्संचरत्युपविशत्युत्तिष्ठते च स प्रवर्ग्यो यन्मुखं तदाहवनीयो यदस्य विज्ञानं तज्जुहोति यत् सायं प्रातर्मध्यन्दिनं च तानि सबनानि ये अहोरात्रे ते दर्शपूर्णमासौ येऽर्धमासाश्च मासाश्च ते चातुर्मास्यानि य ऋतवस्ते पशुबन्धाः, ये संवत्सराश्च परिवत्सराश्च तेऽहर्गणाः, सर्ववेदसं वा एतत् सत्रं, यन्मरणं तदवधुथः, एतद्वै जरामर्यम् अग्निहोत्रं सत्रम्, य एवं विद्वान् उदगयने प्रमीयते देवानामेव महिमानं गत्वा आदित्यस्य सायुज्यं गच्छति, अथ यो दक्षिणे प्रमीयते पितृणामेव महिमानं गत्वा चन्द्रमसः सायुज्यं गच्छति, एतौ वै सूर्याचन्द्रमसोर्महिमानौ ब्रह्मणो विद्वानभिजयति तस्माद् ब्रह्मणो महिमानमाप्नोति तस्माद् ब्रह्मणो महिमानम् इत्युपनिषत्।

REVIEWS

THEORIES OF KNOWLEDGE. [By] Veluri Subba Rao. Sri Satguru Publications, 40/5, Shakti Nagar, Delhi-110 007, 1998. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series, 239, 241, 244. Pub. in three Books: Book I: *Its Validity and its Sources*, pp. xxv+227, Price: Rs. 350=00.

Book II: *A Critique*, pp. xi+192, Price: Rs. 350=00.

Book III: *Validity of Knowledge*, pp. xi+118, Price: Rs. 300=00.

The book under review is the *magnum opus* of Late Professor Veluri Subba Rao (d. 24.4.1994). It was indeed a production of 30 years of penetrating study of different *śāstras* with a blend of traditional scholarship and modern interpretation. His aim was to present a comprehensive book on Indian theories of knowledge, in sequence to his investigation into the Indian theories of meaning for his doctoral thesis. It is envisaged to present comprehensively, including minute details, the ideas of ancient Indian philosophers in a historical perspective on the nature of knowledge, which is the threshold to realize the true form of knowledge which in its turn in essence is nothing but liberation.

The work is divided into three books. The first book deals exhaustively with historical survey of the themes and literature of different theistic and nontheistic systems of philosophy including Vedic, Kumārila and Prabhākara Mīmāṃsās, Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita, Sāṃkhya, Tarka, Nyāya, Jaina and Bauddha. The *pramāṇas* 'means of valid knowledge' and theories of knowledge of each school are given with copious arguments in favour of one's own school.

Book II titled *Critique* is an objective ascertainment of convincingness of arguments advocated by various exponents. For example after examining all the theories on knowledge beginning with the derivation of the word *jñāna* he concludes (on p.8): "knowledge is one that has the genus (*jāti*)". Again on page 20 he observes: "The objection of the Śāṅkarite against the logician that *vyavasāya* (original knowledge) is destroyed in the third minute and hence its *anuvyavasāya* is not possible may not be an invariable sequel of *vyavasāya*. If it is desired to be known it is membered for the purpose. This is my own opinion of course". However the author's predilections for the views of the Naiyāyikas and the Mīmāṃsakas are visible all through the *Critique*; e.g. "Thus the Anyathākhyāti theory appears to be nearer to experience than any of the others mentioned above for as already stated, the cognition of a 'mistaken notion' is subsequently produced. This experience cannot be refuted" (p. 162).

Another fascinating inquiry as regards to the validity of knowledge is made in the third book. The nature of correct cognition is discussed at full length beginning with the logician's view, who defines it as knowledge which is right or correct. Here the author has attempted to present the abstruse dialectics of the Naiyāyikas and other philosophers. The abstruseness resulted in because of linking knowledge with the ultimate goal of life as advocated by each school against the accepted epistemology and ontology. Having examined the views of *svataḥ prāmāṇya* and *parataḥ prāmāṇya* theories in all details, Subba Rao opines: "Even in the productional aspect it is better to hold that validity of knowledge is from external sources. If validity were produced along with the knowledge concerned (i.e. from the same causes of knowledge) we should be accepting that the same causes are capable of producing two different effects - validity and knowledge which is absurd" (p.79-80).

The volume contains a glossary, concordance of the technical terms and an index for each book.

It is unfailingly an indispensable tool for further philosophical inquiries about knowledge and also for higher textual criticism of various texts in Indian Philosophy. Even though this book could not be published during the author's life time, it is gratifying that

his son Dr. Ananta Ramam was able to publish it through M/s Satguru Publications, who deserve hearty approbation for excellent execution with elegance.

* * * * *

STUDIES IN APPLIED PŪRVA MĪMĀMSĀ. [By] S.G. Moghe. Ajanta Publications, P.O. Box 2192, Malka Ganj, Delhi-110 007. 1998. Pp. 16+214. Price: Rs. 295=00.

The extant ancient literature evidences for the emergence of various śāstras and schools of philosophy in order to protect the Vedic texts which are supposed to be orally transmitted (*āmnāya*) from teacher to the taught and to make relevant the knowledge of the interpretation of the texts meaningful not only in the contemporary period but also in posterity. Therefore interpretation became an independent science besides understanding the texts, as is evident in the case of the Pāṇinian school of grammar. This has promoted borrowing methods of interpretation from one school to the other and amalgamation into an integrated technique. As Śaṅkara puts, *vākyārthavicāraṇā* 'interpretation of the meaning of sentence', leave alone whether it is a Vedic passage, a *smṛti* passage or a literary discourse, is the means to understand any given text. The Vaiyākaraṇas and the Mīmāṃsakas have laid the foundation for interpretation of sentence and the linguistic theories of these schools were mostly adapted with different additions and modifications. Therefore a study of the borrowings of interpretative techniques of one school into the other is a very challenging and at the same time enchanting enterprise. Dr. Santaram Ganesh Moghe worked over decades in the Dharma-śāstra and noticed the Mīmāṃsā techniques in the interpretation of the Smṛti texts. Series of articles which were published on these issues were compiled and brought into a volume.

Moghe begins with the interpretation of the technical name *atideśa* in Pūrva-mīmāṃsā. *Atideśa* 'transference' is a very ancient technique, well-known even much earlier to Pāṇini, for the principle of *anuvṛtti* presupposes the existence of transference, without which the rules of Pāṇini cannot proceed. Moghe has rightly interpreted the problem in a historical perspective. In the same

strain he has explained the application of the techniques of *punarvacana* (repetition), *vākyabheda* (splitting of sentence), *ūha* (substitution), *anuvāda* (restatement), etc., and their application in Dharma-śāstra works like *Parāśaramādhava* of Vidyāraṇya, *Smṛticandrikā* of Devanabhaṭṭa, *Bhagavantabhāskara* of Nīlakaṇṭha and *Dattakacandrikā* of Kuberabhaṭṭa. Now the author turns to search for Mīmāṃsā principles in literature and literary criticism. Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa*, Kumārasambhava, *Meghadūta*, and *Mālavikāgnimitra*, Śaṅkarārya's *Jayamaṅgalā* on *Kāmandakīya-nītisāra*, etc. were targeted for his investigation. The host of examples furnished in these articles stand testimony to the author's laudable perseverance. A glossary of the illustrations arranged either alphabetically or subject-wise would have enhanced the utility of the book.

* * * * *

BUDDHISM AND WORLD CULTURE. [Ed. by] Samiran Chandra Chakrabarti. School of Vedic Studies, Rabindra Bharati University, Calcutta - 700 050. Pp. 10+117. Price: Rs. 100=00.

The book under review is a compilation of twelve papers presented in a seminar on 'Buddhism and World Culture' organized in Rabindra Bharati University in 1984 by then Head of the Department of Sanskrit Late Prof. Krishnanath Chatterjee and edited in 1998 by Prof. Samiran Chandra Chakrabarti, present Director of the School of Vedic Studies. Thus the latter deserves to be congratulated and taken as a model for sustaining true spirit of *paramparā*. In the paper 'Overview', S.C. Chakrabarti has given a brief summary of the proceedings beginning with the origin and development of Buddhism from sixth century B.C.

The word *culture* in its final analysis comprehends those conspicuous and peculiar ways of life leading the man from unhappiness to happiness envisaged by the community. Thus this monograph presents various thought provoking and revolutionizing modes of life which are specific to the ideals of Buddhism on the one hand and influenced other cultures in the world on the other. Kewal Krishan Mittal in his paper 'The Buddhist understanding of World Culture' showed that the Buddhistic term *saṃsāra* is equivalent to

culture and that the understanding of the world exists itself leads to liberation with the passage of Nāgārjuna: 'between *samsāra* and *nirvāṇa* there is not even the slightest difference' (p.25). E. Nandivara Nayake Thero has shown how Buddha and Buddhism played a role in revolutionizing the norm of thought, manner of speech, way of life, harmonious peace-loving moral, and scientific reasoning. Lokesh Chandra in his paper 'Buddhist Oikoumenē', has given an account of the countries which were influenced by Buddhism, including Tibet, China, Korea, Japan, Mongolia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand and Laos. Biswadeb Mukherjee in his article 'Some observations on the Buddhist influence on Chinese culture' has shown the influence of two Buddhist concepts *karma* and *anattā* in the writings of non-buddhists like Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu (p.49). Latika Lahari in her paper has shown the influence of Buddhist rock-cut architecture in China with the illustration of Chinese Buddhist sites and caves. Anukul Chandra Banerjee dealt with influence of Buddhism in Tibet. Lama Chimp gave an account of the influence of Buddhism on Mongolians who live in China, Mongolian Peoples Republic and Russia. While Sanghasen Singh discussed some of the glossary remarks in the *Sphuṭārthā Śrīghanācārasaṅgrahaṭīkā*, Anantalal Thakur gave an account of the influence of Buddhism on Indian Logic.

Ramendra Nath Ghose has discussed in detail the logical and linguistic implications in Nāgārjunas's method of *prasaṅgāpādana* reasonings for solving the apparent contradictions of the fourfold negation (*catuṣkoṭīniṣedha*). The *prasaṅgāpādana* is a method of pure negation (*prasajya-pratiṣedha*), wherein something impossible is imposed and is denied later. It would be very interesting here to see the same principle is explained in the same way by Bhartṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya*. Perhaps one may even see the influence of this Buddhist idea on Bhartṛhari in his assertion that all the linguistic operations are only *prasaṅgas* 'assumed' with reference to Brahman, wherein the existence of the world and the language which describes it are negated as absolute realities.

The papers in this short monograph not only review the contributions of Buddhism to world culture but also suggest guidelines for future work on Buddhism by way of surveying the research work done in different places.

KALĀTATTVAKOŚA - A Lexicon of Fundamental Concepts of Indian Arts, vol. IV: Manifestation of Nature - *Sṛṣṭivistāra*. Ed. Advaitavadini Kaul & Sukumar Chattopadhyay. Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, New Delhi in association with Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Bungalów Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi - 110 007. Pp. xxxviii+429. Price: Rs. 450=00.

The *Kalātattvakośa* is an indispensable tool for the Sanskritists interested in higher textual criticism in specialized disciplines of Āyurveda, Vyākaraṇa, Jyotiṣa, Gaṇita, Darśana, Itihāsa, Purāṇa, Vāstu, Śilpa, Saṅgīta, Nāṭya and Alaṅkāra, for it provides the necessary background in the semantic evolution of several technical terms within the holistic frame work of Indian cultural heritage in a historical perspective. The Volume IV contains the terms, 'which speak of both becoming and being, the material and the non-material, entity, substance and process', namely *indriya*, *dravya*, *dhātu*, *guṇa-doṣa*, *adhibhūta-adhidaiva-adhyātma*, *sthūla-sūkṣma-para*, *sṛṣṭi-sthiti-saṃhāra*. The meanings obtained for these words in the Vedic texts are taken as the basis and those in other disciplines like grammar are targeted for analysis and comparison.

Just as the meanings a word would accumulate in future cannot be predicted, the meanings of several words which developed in the past in different periods cannot also be accounted for precisely, because the accumulated meanings are often not gradable on account of the texts available to us are uneven in time and space. Several words in the earliest known texts like the *Ṛgveda* and others of the same genre are imprecise with regard to their meanings; for, the attributable basal meaning by application of grammar is itself unsatisfactory by logical contextualization. This is more so in the case of those words which turned into technical names and obtained coinage in different fields of knowledge. To begin with the meanings of words in the Vedic texts as basic is again axiomatic. This axiomatic sense forms the basis for a workable holistic system to account for the semantic growth in different branches of knowledge. For reasons of commonness in meaning in some areas in knowledge representation one and the same word gets used in different subjects. Such a word again gets restricted in its meaning within a given branch of learning in relation to other words in the same category, as for example the word *dhātu* in the grammatical

literature gets different restrictions in the expressiveness of action in relation to other components in a verb (p. 123). Grouping or pairing of words is an advantageous method in order to draw lines of demarkation in the area of the meanings which a word can denote. For example the word *guṇa* in dramaturgy and poetics has its specialized meaning restricted in relation with other words *lakṣaṇa*, *alaṅkāra* and *doṣa* (pp. 185-189), which are to explain the expressiveness of the language artistically. The *guṇa* is an inherent quality of the sentence to present itself agreeable, sweet and graceful. Its existence can be demonstrated negatively by sentences which are not agreeable by the existence of *doṣas* 'defects'. Hence Bharata has defined *guṇa* as 'the negation of defect' (p. 189). In the realm of textual tradition *adhibhūta-adhidaiva-adhyātma*, *sthūla-sūkṣma-para*, and *śṛṣṭi-sthiti-saṁhāra* are to be considered as related in a single semantic field for the relative significance of each item in the given system of philosophy or art form. For example "the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (III.7.1-23) explains *adhibhūta* as organic beings, the material world, *adhidaiva* as nature-phenomena and *adhyātma* as indivisible self (body)" (p. 259). In the *Tantra-Āgama*, '*adhibhūta* and *adhyātma* are interrelated terms especially with reference to sense and motor organs' (p. 265). The *Mataṅga-pārameśvara Āgama* states: 'all the instruments of knowledge and action have the characteristic of *adhyātma* abiding in the body, *adhibhūta* the physical and *adhidaiva* the divine aspect each' (p. 266).

It is very interesting to find unity in diversity as being demonstrated by contraction and expansion of meanings through metaphor. The elaborate discussions on the development of the sense of *guṇa* from 'rope' (*raju*) to a line (*rekhā*) convinces how the words are unfailing guides for the study of cultural growth both in theory and practice. Thus the lexical items in a dictionary cannot be viewed as isolated entities and they become significant only in juxtaposition with other related items. In view of this, the project of *Kalātattvakośa* is throwing open new vistas in the studies of Indian culture, with special reference to Indian artistic traditions.

The Sanskrit extracts are provided with translation and interpretation in English to the best advantage of the users of the lexicon. This multiplex volume is an outcome of concerted effort of many eminent scholars from various disciplines.

ASCETICS AND KINGS IN A JAIN RITUAL CULTURE. [By] Lawrence A. Babb. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 41, U.A. Bungalow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi 110 007. Lala Sundar Lal Jain Research Series XI. 1st Indian edn. 1998 (first pub. in 1996, USA). Pp. xviii+244. Price: Rs. 225=00.

Lawrence A. Babb has combined the theory and the practice of Jain ritual culture in a blend of anthropological and historical perspectives. Thus one finds interesting to read through the book as it furnishes how various religious festivals came into existence and how they are practiced as on today among different sects of Jainism. Unlike Viṣṇu or Śiva in Vedic tradition, the principal object of worship is absent in Jainism, and its role is taken over by the Tīrthaṅkaras, who are human beings. Here the Jainistic ritual differs also from Buddhist ritual, wherein the *caityas* are built to commemorate the Buddha only. Babb makes a detailed inquiry into the origin of worship of human beings as divinities, ritual role of the worshipper, systems of belief, the sects and subjects of Jains like Śvetāmbaras, Digambaras, Dādāgurus, Bisa and Dāsa sections, image worshipping, social order consisting of monks (*sādhus*), nuns (*sādhvīs*), laymen (*śrāvakas*) and laywomen (*śrāvikās*), etc. The action of ritual is called *pūjā* which is considered as leading the layman to reach his desired goal. The *pūjā-vidhāna* in course of time acquired complexity with several rules of worshipping (*pūjana-vidhī*). Babb has given in detail all the rituals that are being found as on today in the locales Ahmedabad and Jaipur. The author has taken his reader also to the similarities and differences between Jain ritual culture and other traditions. Several myths, tales, beliefs and customs were presented along in the vivid narration of rules and regulations of the ritual.

The study of the book reveals that Indian religion and philosophy evidence that religion gave birth to philosophy as a protest. But philosophy surrendered to religion for its survival, for religion is nothing but a bundle of activities combining men and materials with a tight schedule of programme covering all the time of awaken state. Therefore Buddhism and Jainism, even though born out of protest against Vedic sacrificial ritual, had to develop ritual of their own partly on the model of the Vedic ritual. It is because of the same reason Buddhism and Jainism got amalgamated with

the Hindu temple religion which emerged during Bhakti movement. So the author rightly remarks: "It is probably true that many of the elaborations and flourishes of major Jain *pūjas* have been influenced by Vaiṣṇava patterns" (p. 177).

'Kings' in the title is used in a metaphorical sense, symbolizing that it was the *ṣatriyas* or *rājpuṭs* who were converted from Hindu tradition to Jainism, from non-vegetarianism to vegetarianism and from ferociousness to complaisance. Satya Rajan Banerjee's overview of the book in his Foreword is an additional value to enhance the enthusiasm of the readers.

* * * * *

जैन दर्शन में सम्यक्त्व का स्वरूप [Hindi]. By Surekhā Śrī. Vichakshana Smrity Prakashana, Jaipur, Rajasthan. Pp. 18+282. Price. Rs. 100=00.

Sādhvī Surekhā Śrī took to the study of the predominant Jain concept *samyaktva* out of love of labour and also to get full understanding of the tenets of Jainism, besides obtaining a Ph.D. degree. *Samyaktva* as a technical name in Jaina philosophy signifies a state of right inclination towards the essence of spiritual welfare. Another word of synonymous function is *samyagdarśana* 'perception of right faith resulting from the use of discretionary power of thought and understanding of the truth of the universal law of cause and effect'. It is the only way by which one can obtain conviction of the transitoriness of the world and in turn towards the highest good (*niḥśreyasa*). The Jaina religious leaders have laid a very regulated programme to be followed by the ardent (*śraddhālu*) devotees to lead a true *śrāmaṇic* life. As Surekhā Śrī observes, without *samyaktva*, a person knowledgeable in Grammar may be honoured here, but he does not lead himself any where (p. 26).

Mithyātva 'spiritually perverse attitude' is an obstacle for *samyaktva*. *Mithyātva* arises because of uncritical acceptance of views, indiscriminate acceptance of views, changing to wrong views, doubting about the spiritual truths, sticking to false beliefs, etc. So when once a person has a natural predilection for true spirituality, he can overcome the false ideas and attain liberation. So

samyaktva has become a fundamental base for the Jain religious spirituality and philosophy. Surekhā Śrī has not only elucidated the whole structure of the *samyaktva* theory, but also compared it with similar concepts in other systems of philosophy like Buddhism, Vedānta, Sāṃkhya and Yoga to establish the existence of common agenda as a necessary requisite for any philosophical inquiry, and to show the advantage of the systematic theology of Jainism.

* * * * *

LORD SWĀMINĀRĀYAN (An Introduction). By Sādhu Mukundcharandās. Swāminārayan Aksharapith, Shāhibaug Road, Amdāvād - 380 004. 1999. Pp. vi+79. Price: Rs. 25.00.

HANDBOOK TO THE VACHANĀMRUTAM (Spiritual Teachings of Bhagawān Swāminārāyan). By Sādhu Mukundcharandās. Swāminārāyan Aksharapith. 1999. Pp. xxiv+258. Price: Rs.90=00.

The *Lord Swāminārāyan* is a short biography of Ghanashyam alias Neelakanth (3.4.1781 - 1.6.1830) who emerged as a boy of miracles, a man of spirituality and a pontiff of *Ekāntik Dharma* in North India and revolutionized the Hindu way of life by his preachings about ephemeral nature of material life in Gujarat. Ghanashyam left his house at the age of eleven and travelled through all over the country, including Nepal covering a distance of 12,000 km. and exposed himself to a variety of superhuman experiences. He had the wisdom to absorb all good in every walk of life and practiced *Aṣṭāṅgayoga*. A new leaf turned in his life on entering into Gujarat in 1800. The nineteen year old Neelakanth was initiated as *śādhu* by Rāmānand in a village called Piplanā under the names Swāmi Sahajānand and Nārāyan Muni. Swāminārāyan became a lovely name for many of his disciples and he started constructing temples all over Gujarat and also in other places outside Gujarat.

Swāminārāyan brought many a reform in Hindu religious practices like abolition of animal sacrifices of *Vāma-mārga* cult. He also introduced social service in his order of life, as for example he carried grain on horseback at night from village to village to

distribute to the people who were affected by famine in Kāthiāwād in 1813. He preached to his followers to keep absolute distance to woman, and at the same time he fought against adultery in the name of religion and for upliftment of woman. He enlarged the scope of *mokṣa* to all alike in his order. His sermons to the *paramahamsas* and devotees during the years 1819 to 1829 were systematically recorded in prose. Four *paramahamsas* Gopālānand, Muktānand, Nityānand and Shukhānand compiled them under the title *Vachanāmṛutam*.

The *Handbook to the Vachanāmṛutam* is a legendary introduction to the willing disciples to take to the scenario in which the Bhagwān had led a life to serve as a model to his followers and also undertaken the religious reforms, sermonized his ideals to his followers. Sādhu Mukundcharandās did his best in presenting the information in a very brief and concise narration. He did not leave even the details like political background, contemporary religious practices and social life including modes of dressing. In order to get oneself with the ideas of God and to thwart the luring enticements of worldly pleasures which are transient and harmful to the growth of oneself as a full man of purity, the *Vachanāmṛutam* is advised to be kept on the desk for quick use on every day.

Swāminārāyan gave utmost importance to the teacher. Therefore he defines *moha* as 'the state of mind when a person frowns at the Sādhu, Guru or God, who restrains him from enjoying his favourite *Panch Viśhayas* and who does not obey their wishes' (p. 196). The *Vachanāmṛutam* runs in the form of a dialogue between the teacher and the taught on various aspects like Ātmā, Bhakti, dieting, endeavour, friend, God, happiness/suffering, wrong/right associations, mind, merit, demerit, liberation and so on.

Today the followers of Swāminārāyan have formed into a sect known as Bochāsanwāsi Akshar Purushottam Swāminārāyan Sansthā. The two monographs were brought out from Swāminārāyan Askharpith, Ahmadabad, under the inspiration of H.D.H. Pramukh Swami Maharaj, the present pontiff of the organization.

MORALITY AND ETHICS IN PUBLIC LIFE. [Ed. by] Ravindra Kumar. Mittal Publications, 4594/9, Daryaganj, New Delhi, 1999. Pp. xii+148. Price: Rs. 295.

Deterioration of moral values, increase of corruption and indulgence in corrupt practices have become global evils of the contemporary society. Advances in education, science and technology with unsurpassed modernization in living habits have not provided the necessary mental make up to lead a happy life with contentment and honesty. The social organizations like International Amnesty have condemned time and again the victimization of the underprivileged and suppression of the weak, which were reported to have been occurred not only in India, but also in many advanced countries. Therefore search for ways and means to stop erosion of values has become an essential effort for the intellectuals, politicians, industrialists, and social organizations.

The *Morality and Ethics in Public Life*, edited by Ravindra Kumar on behalf of N.V. Gadgel National Society, contains 18 papers contributed by men of varied professions. All the scholars have uniformly underlined one theme that in Indian circumstances, morality could be restored by connecting the past with the present. To mention D.R. Bali remarks aptly in his paper 'Axiological Imperatives of our Society': "To ensure justice and equality to all, irrespective of caste, creed and sex, political system and economic thinking would have to be based on essentials of morality and religion" (p. 1). But the ways and means to enforce in practice are not very definite, for the political situations as on today do not permit any concrete action. However, the inquiry should continue so that one day the demand for change becomes absolute. Introduction of discourses on morality and ethics in the school/college curriculum, changing the mentality of the people through different media, etc. are some general suggestions available for implementation. G.P. Potty, Asis Banerjee, Chandra Muzaffar, D.S. Shastri, M.R. Kazimi, H.P. Kanoria, Srisurang Poolthupya, D.P. Jain, Har-nan Das Johar, M.C. Bhatt, S. Padmanabhan, Intalhab Alamkhan, Dinh Quang Kim, M. Srimannarayana Murti, David Emmanuel Singh and D. Sundaram are the other scholars who reacted against the 'loss of values' in India in particular, and in the world in general. M.R. Kazimi has a case study on the role of print media

on Indian values. David Emmanuel Singh in his paper 'Society, Morality and Christian Theism' has touched upon some contemporary socio-political events including M.F. Husain's portrayal of Sarasvatī in nude, an article in the *Indian Express* on Laloo Yadav and style of functioning of commissions of inquires, etc.

How far the public life and the private life of each citizen can be separated and viewed exclusively is another problem raised temporarily out side our country. In India from time immemorial the private and public behaviours of man cannot be different, and the both become interdependent and inseparable from the point of view of religion. Religion is an unfailing and indispensable tool to protect and perpetuate moral values and save humanity from loss of faith in social institutions and integrity.

This volume is a welcome contribution of the intellectuals on contemporary social problems arising out of overplay of antisocial elements. This attempt will go a long way in restoration of Indian values and standards of morality in public life.

M. Srimannarayana Murti

FORM IV

(See Rule 8)

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Place of publication | Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502
Andhra Pradesh, India |
| 2. | Periodicity of its
publication | Halfyearly |
| 3. | Printer' Name
Nationality
Address | M. Rajendran
Indian
The L.V. Graphics
268, Prakasam Road
Tirupati-517501 |
| 4. | Publisher's Name
Nationality
Address | Dr. M. Srimannarayana Murti
Indian
Professor & Director
Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502 |
| 5. | Editor's Name
Nationality
Address | Dr. M. Srimannarayana Murti
Indian
Professor & Director
Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502 |
| 6. | Name and Address of
individual who owns
the periodical | Sri Venkateswara University
Tirupati-517 502 |

I, M. Srimannarayana Murti, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

TIRUPATI - 517502
19th October 1999

(Sd) *M. Srimannarayana Murti*
Publisher

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

- Dr. L. Chakradhara Rao Professor of Telugu
Andhra University
Visakhapatnam - 530 003
- Dr. Sadashiv A. Dange Professor of Sanskrit (Rtd)
Girnar, Mulund East
Gokale Road
Mumbai - 400 081
- Dr. Karunasindhu Das Professor of Sanskrit
Rabindra Bharati University
Calcutta - 700 050
- Dr. T.N. Dharmadhikari Director (Rtd),
Vaidika Samsodhana Mandala
Ādiparṇa
42-43/63 United Western Society
Karvenagar
Pune - 411 052
- Dr. I.K. Sarma Director (Rtd), Salar Jung Museum
Flat No. 4, IInd Floor
Latha Apartments, Vidyanagar
Hyderabad - 500 044
- Dr. M.V. Rama Sarma Formerly Professor of English &
Vice Chancellor,
Sri Venkateswara University
Padma Nilayam
18/96, Kapilateertham Road
Tirupati - 517 507

Dr. V. Kutumba Sastry

Professor of Sanskrit
Pondicherry University
Kalapet
Pondicherry - 605 014

Dr. V. Parabrahma Sastry

Deputy Director (Rtd),
Archaeology & Museums (A.P.)
H.N. 2-1-514/A, Nallakunta
Hyderabad -500 044

Dr. Satya Vrat

Principal (Rtd)
7/34, Purani Abadi
Near Namdev Flour Mill
Sri Ganganagar
Rajasthan

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor

Professor M. Srimannarayana Murti

Honorary Referee Members

Professor K. Satchidananda Murty	Sangam Jagarlamudi
Professor N.S. Ramanuja Tatacharya	Bangalore
Professor G.V. Subrahmanyam	Hyderabad
Professor A.V. Narasimha Murthy	Mysore

STAFF MEMBERS

Dr. M. Srimannarayana Murti	Professor of Sanskrit & Director
Dr. V. Venkataramana Reddy	Associate Professor
Dr. C. Govinda Raju	Assistant Professor in Telugu
Dr. M. Prabhakara Rao	Research Assistant in Telugu
Sri T. Ananthanarayana	Research Assistant in Sanskrit
Dr. E. Chandramouli	Research Assistant in Telugu
Dr. C.V.S. Subrahmanya Sarma	Research Assistant in Sanskrit
Dr. M. Munirathnam	Research Assistant in Sanskrit
Dr. T.S.R. Narayanan	Research Assistant in Sanskrit

ISSN 0081-3907

SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY ORIENTAL JOURNAL

The Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Research Institute was established in 1939 by Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams and handed over to the Sri Venkateswara University in 1956. It publishes the half-yearly periodical entitled **Sri Venkateswara University Oriental Journal** with original research papers on language and literature of Sanskrit and Telugu, Linguistics, Indian Philosophy and Religion, Ancient Indian History, Fine Arts and Ancient Indian Science. Learned papers written mainly in English, partly in Sanskrit and Telugu are received from eminent scholars for publication in the Journal. The papers sent for publication should not normally be more than 12 typed pages with double space and wide margins. Standard system of transliteration should be followed in reproducing original texts. Contributors are requested to retain one copy with them as the manuscripts submitted cannot be returned. Twentyfive off-prints of the published article and one copy of the Journal will be sent to the authors free of cost.

The journal also contains reviews of books on Indology. Two copies of books are to be submitted for review in the Journal.

For further details please write to
The Professor and Director
Oriental Research Institute
Sri Venkateswara University
TIRUPATI-517 502 (A.P.)