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AKRÚRA, having set off in his quick travelling-car, proceeded to visit Krishña at the pastures* of Nanda; and, as he went along, he congratulated himself on his superior good fortune, in having an opportunity of beholding a descended portion of the deity.† “Now,” thought he, “has my life borne fruit; my night is followed by the dawn of day: since I shall see the countenance of Vishnu, whose eyes are like the expanded leaf of the lotos. I shall behold that lotos-eyed aspect§ of Vishnu, which, when seen only in imagination, takes away the sins of men. I shall, to-day, behold that glory of glories,|| the mouth of Vishnu,¶ whence proceeded

---

* Gokula.  
† Namely, Chakrín, in the original.  
§ Here follows, in the Sanskrit, a stanza left untranslated:  
चं ते सप्तो चेष्य चं ते सप्तो मिर: ।  
से परमराजापि द्वं विष्णुभविष्यति ॥  
Śrīthara gives this stanza; but Ratnagarbha does not appear, from my MSS. of his commentary, to recognize it.  
¶ Literally, “the lotus-eye.”  
|| धाम धामायि | Variant, preferred by the commentator Ratnagarba,  
धाम देवानां, “light of the gods”.  
¶ The original has Bhagavat.  
* V.
the Vedas and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,

1 The commentator explains this to mean Hayagriva,—or Vishnú with the neck and head of a horse,—who, it is said, in the Second Book of the Bhágavata, appeared at the end of a great
day, and all their dependent sciences. I shall see the sovereign of the world, by whom the world is sustained; who is worshipped as the best of males; as the male of sacrifice in sacrificial rites. I shall see Késava, who is without beginning or end; by worshipping whom with a hundred sacrifices, Indra obtained the sovereignty over the gods. That Hari, whose nature is unknown to Brahmá, Indra, Rudra, the Aswínas, the Vasus, Adityas, and Maruts, will (this day,) touch my body. The soul of all, the knower of all, he who is all, and is present in all, he who is permanent, undecaying, all-pervading, will converse with me. He, the unborn, who has preserved the world in the various forms of a fish, a tortoise, a boar, a horse,
the earth upon his crest, and who has descended upon earth for its protection, will (this day,) call me by my name. Glory to that being, whose deceptive adoption of father, son, friend, brother, mother, and relative the world is unable to penetrate! Glory to him, who is one with true knowledge, who is inscrutable,* and through whom, seated in his heart, the Yogin crosses the wide expanse of worldly ignorance and illusion! I bow to him, who, by the performers of holy rites, is called the male of sacrifice (Yajnapurusha); by pious worshippers† is termed Vásudeva; and, by the cultivators of philosophy, Vishnú. May he in whom cause, and effect, and the world itself is comprehended be propitious to me, through his truth; for always do I put my trust in that unborn, eternal Hari, by meditation on whom man becomes the repository of all good things."§

His mind thus animated by devout faith, and meditating in this manner, Akrúra proceeded on his road, and arrived at Gokula a little before sunset, at the time of the milking of the cows. And there he saw Krishná, amongst the cattle, dark as the leaf of the full-blown lotos; his eyes of the same colour,* and his breast decorated with the Srivatsa mark; long-armed, and broad-chested; having a high nose, and a lovely countenance brightened with mirthful smiles; treading firmly on the ground, with feet whose nails were tinted red; clad in yellow garments, and adorned with a garland of forest-flowers;§ having a freshly-gathered creeper in his hand,|| and a chaplet of white lotos-flowers on his head.¶ Akrúra** also beheld, there, Balabhadra, white as a swan, a jasmine, or the moon, and dressed in blue raiment; having large and powerful arms,∥ and a countenance as radiant as a lotos in bloom,—like another Kailásamountain, crested with a wreath of clouds.

When Akrúra saw these two youths, his countenance expanded with delight, and the down of his body stood erect (with pleasure). For this he thought to be supreme happiness and glory; this, the double manifestation of the divine Vásudeva. §§ This was the twofold gratification of his sight, to behold the creator

---

* Ameya.
† Sátvata.
‡ Védanta.
§ The original here has "at the milking-place of the cows", Sridhara's and Ratnagarbha's comment: चारों चेहरे। दोहोरखाने।
of the universe: now he hoped that his bodily form would yield fruit,—as it would bring him in contact with the person of Kṛṣṇa,—and that the wearer of infinite forms would place his hand on his back; the touch of whose finger alone is sufficient to dispel sin, and to secure imperishable felicity; that hand which launches the fierce irresistible discus, blazing with all the flames of fire, lightning, and the sun, and, slaughtering the demon-host, washes the collyrium from the eyes of their brides; that hand into which Bali poured water, and thence obtained ineffable enjoyments below the earth,† and immortality, and dominion over the gods for a whole Manwantara, without peril from a foe. "Alas! He will despise me for my connexion with Kaṁsa,—an associate with evil, though not contaminated by it. How vain is his birth, who is shunned by the virtuous!‡ And yet, what is there,\\n
Some of my MSS. have, instead of न मीनोपहर्तः, अवज्ञानोपहर्तः। This variant is noted by the commentator Ratnagarbha, and appears in the text of Śrīdhara.

† The original implies that Bali, who had dwelt below the earth, obtained, &c.,

‡ बजएश मां कौम्पैरियः दृष्टादृष्टिभूतमतिर्दृष्टिः।

For Bali—a Daitya, son of Virochana,—successively sovereign of Pātalā and an Indra, see Vol. II., p. 69, and p. 210, note 1; Vol. III., p. 18, note 1, and p. 23.

The translation, towards the end of the present chapter, is very free, generally.
CHAPTER XVIII.

Grief of the Gopis, on the departure of Kṛiṣṇa and Balarāma with Akrūra: their leaving Gokula. Akrūra banes in the Yamunā; beholds the divine forms of the two youths, and praises Viṣṇu.

THUS meditating, the Yādava approached Govinda, (and addressed him,) and said “I am Akrūra,” and bowed his head down to the feet of Hari.* But Kṛiṣṇa laid upon him his hand, which was marked with the flag, the thunderbolt, and the lotus, and drew him (towards him), and affectionately embraced him. Then Rāma† and Keśava entered into conversation with him, and, having heard from him all that had occurred, were much pleased, and led him to their habitation: there they resumed their discourse, and gave him food to eat, and treated him with proper hospitality.‡ Akrūra told them how (their father) Anakadundubhi,§ the princess Devakī, and (even his own father,) Ugrasena had been insulted by the iniquitous demon, Kaliṣa: he also related to them the purpose for which he had been despatched. When he had told them all these things, the destroyer of Kesin¶ said to him: “I was aware of all that you have told me, lord of liberal gifts.* Rāma and I will go, to-morrow, to Mathurā, along with you. The elders of the cowherds shall accompany us, bearing ample offerings.† Rest here tonight, and dismiss all anxiety.‡ Within three nights I will slay Kaṁsa and his adherents.”§

Having given orders, accordingly, to the cowherds, Akrūra, with Keśava and Rāma,§ retired to rest, and slept soundly in the dwelling of Nanda. The next morning was bright; and the youths prepared to depart for Mathurā, with Akrūra. The Gopīs, seeing them about to set forth, were much afflicted; they wept bitterly; their bracelets were loose upon their arms; and they thus communed together:|| “If Govinda depart for Mathurā, how will he return to Gokula? His ears will there be regaled with the melodious and polished conversation of the women of the city. Accustomed to the language of the graceful females of Mathurā, he will never again endure the rustic expressions of the Gopīs. Hari, the pride of the station,† is carried off; and a fatal blow is inflicted upon us by inexorable destiny. Expressive smiles, soft language, graceful airs, elegant gait, and significant

---

* The original has Bala.
§ Updyana.
¶ Balabhadra, in the Sanskrit.
|| The translation is, hereabouts, free and expanded.
¶ Goshītha.
glances belong to the women of the city.* Hari is of rustic breeding; and, captivated by their fascinations, what likelihood is there of his returning to the society of any one amongst us?† Kesava, who has mounted the car, to go to Mathurā, has been deceived by the cruel, (vile), and desperate Akrūra. Does not the unfeeling traitor know the affection that we all here feel for Hari, the joy of our eyes, that he is taking him away? Unkind that he is, Govinda is departing from us, along with Rāma. Haste! Let us stop him. Why talk of telling our seniors that we cannot bear his loss? What can they do for us, when we are consumed by the fires of separation? The Gopas, with Nanda at their head, are, themselves, preparing to depart. No one makes any attempt to detain Govinda. Bright is the morning that succeeds to this night, for the women of Mathurā; for the bees of their eyes will feed upon the lotos-face of Achyuta. Happy are they who may go hence without impediment, and behold, enraptured, Kṛśna on his journey. A great festival will give pleasure, to-day, to the eyes of the inhabitants of Mathurā, when they see the person of Govinda.: What a blissful vision will be seen by the happy women (of the city), whose brilliant eyes shall regard, unchecked,
Accordingly, the intelligent Akrūra bathed, and rinsed his mouth; and then, entering the stream, he stood meditating upon the supreme being. But he beheld (mentally) Balabhadra, having a thousand hooded heads, a garland of jasmine-flowers, and large red eyes; attended by Vāsuki, Rambha, and other mighty serpents, praised by the Gandharvas, decorated with wild flowers, wearing dark-coloured garments, crowned with a chaplet of lotuses, ornamented with brilliant ear-rings, inebriate, and standing at the bottom of the river, in the water. On his lap he also beheld, at his ease, Kṛishṇa, of the complexion of a cloud, with full and coppery eyes, having an elegant form, and four hands, armed with the discus and other weapons, wearing yellow clothes, decorated with many-coloured flowers, and appearing like a cloud embellished with streams of lightning and the bow of Indra. His breast was marked with the celestial sign; his arms were radiant with bracelets; a diadem shone on his brow; and he wore a white lotus for his crest. He was attended by Sanandana and other holy sages, who, fixing their eyes upon the tips of their noses, were absorbed in profound meditation.

When Akrūra beheld Balarāma and Kṛishṇa in this situation, he was much amazed, and wondered how they could so quickly have got there from the chariot. He wished to ask them this; but Janārdana deprived him of the faculty of speech, at the moment. Ascending, then, from the water, he repaired to the car; and there he found them both, (quietly) seated, in the same human persons as before. Plunging, again, into the water, there he again beheld them, hymned, as before.
by the Gandharvas, saints, \* sages, † and serpents. Apprehending, therefore, their real character, he thus eulogized the eternal deity, who consists of true knowledge:

"Salutation to thee, who art uniform and manifold, all-pervading, supreme spirit, of inconceivable glory, and who art simple existence!§ Salutation to thee, O inscrutable, who art truth, and the essence of oblations!|| Salutation to thee, O lord, whose nature is unknown, who art beyond primeval matter, who existest in five forms,\* as one with the elements, with the faculties,\** with matter, with the living soul, with supreme spirit!†† Show favour (to me), O soul of the universe, essence of all things, perishable or eternal, whether addressed by the designation of Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, or the like. I adore thee, O god, whose nature is indescribable, whose purposes are inscrutable, whose name, even, is unknown; §§ for the attributes of appellation or kind* are not applicable to thee, who art that,\* the supreme Brahma, eternal, unchangeable, uncreated.† But, as the accomplishment of our objects cannot be attained except through some specific form,‡ thou art termed, by us, Krishna, Achyuta, Ananta, or Vishnu. § Thou, unborn (divinity), art all the objects of these impersonations; thou art the gods, and all other beings; thou art the whole world; thou art all. Soul of the universe, thou art exempt from change; and there is nothing except thee in all this existence. Thou art Brahma, Paravatati, Aryan,|| Dhatri, and Vidhatri; § thou art Indra,\* air, fire, the regent of the waters, †† the god of wealth,\* and judge of the dead; §§ and thou, although but one, presidest over the world, with various energies addressed to various purposes. Thou, identical with the solar ray, createst the universe; all elementary substance is

\* Muni.
† Siddha.
§ Chauru, varash

|| Haris.
\* See Vol. I., p. 2, note 1, where this passage is referred to and enlarged on.
\** Indra.
\†† Atman and paramatman. The first is the same as jivatman. See Vol. IV., p. 268, note \*.
\** Paramatman.
§§ Abhidhāna here takes the place of the more ordinary nāman, the term rendered "appellation", just below. See Vol. IV., p. 346, supplement to p. 267, note \*.

\* It should seem, from a collation of passages, that jāti, the expression here used, is synonymous with rūpa. Do nāman and jāti signify 'genus' and 'species'? See Vol. II., p. 328, text and note \*; and p. 337, supplementary note to p. 59, l. 8.
† Aja.

|| Kṣaṇāmūni.

§ SuchauchandanaIVAchārabhāriśe

|| Corrected from "Aryan".
\* Dhātra and Vidhātra are said to be Brahmac as protectors and creator.

\* To represent tridalapati, ‘lord of the gods.’
†† toyaka: Varuṇa, to-wit.
\** Dhana-pati; namely, Kubera.
§§ The original yields Antaka, who is one with Yama. See Vol. II., P. 216, note 1.
composed of thy qualities; and thy supreme form is
denoted by the imperishable term sat (existence).
To him who is one with true knowledge; who is, and
is not, perceptible,* I bow. Glory be to him, the lord
Vásudeva, to Sankarshaña, to Pradyumna, and to Ani-
ruddha!"'

CHAPTER XIX.

Akrúra conveys Kúshña and Ráma near to Mathurá, and leaves
them: they enter the town. Insolence of Kaúsa’s washerman;
Kúshña kills him. Civility of a flower-seller: Kúshña gives
him his benediction.

THUS, the Yádava (Akrúra), standing in the river,
praised Kúshña, and worshipped him with imaginary*
incense and flowers. Disregarding (all) other objects,
he fixed his (whole) mind upon the deity; and, having
continued, for a long time, in spiritual contemplation,†
he (at last,) desisted from his abstraction, conceiving
he had effected the purposes of soul.‡ Coming up from
the water of the Yamuná, he went to the car; and
there he beheld Ráma and Kúshña, seated as before.
As his looks denoted surprise, Kúshña said to him:
“Surely, Akrúra, you have seen some marvel in the
stream of the Yamuná; for your eyes are staring, as
if with astonishment.” Akrúra replied: “The
marvel
that I have seen in the stream of the Yamuná I behold
before me, even here, in a bodily
shape;
for he whom
I have encountered in the water, Kúshña,
is,
also,
your wondrous self, of whose illustrious
person the
whole world is the miraculous development.§ But

* Sat and asat, ‘real’ and ‘unreal’.
† Ratnasarga, one of the commentators on the Vishnú-purána, refers,
to a similar purport, to the Mahábhrata. The passage intended is,
apparently, in the Śánti-parvan,—ll. 1288, et seq.
‡ Or Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. I., p. 45.

§ Mano-maya.
† Brahma-bhútā.

Nv.

This is the same stanza with what immediately follows, and should
have been connected with it, in the translation.

§ जनमनस्‌भावधर्म स्य व्यक्त महाभ्रात: ||
तेनाशेषवरेरेश्च भवत रूपम्‌ संस्कारः ||

V.
enough of this. Let us proceed to Mathurá. I am afraid Kaýnsa will be angry at our delay: such is the wretched consequence of eating the bread of another."

Thus speaking, he urged on the quick horses; and they arrived, after sunset, at Mathurá. When they came in sight of the city, Akúrdr said to Kríshná and Ráma: "You must now journey on foot, whilst I proceed alone in the car. And you must not go to the house of Vasudeva; for the elder has been banished, by Kaýnsa, on your account."

Akúrdr, having thus spoken, left them, and entered the city; whilst Ráma and Kríshná continued to walk along the royal road. Regarded, with pleasure, by men and women, they went along sportively, looking like two young elephants. As they roamed about, they saw a washerman colouring clothes; and, with smiling countenances, they went and threw down some of his fine linen. The washerman was the servant of Kaýnsa, made insolent by his master’s favour; and he provoked the two lads with loud and scurrilous abuse, until Kríshná struck him down, with his head to the ground, and killed him. Then, taking the clothes, they went their way, clad in yellow and blue raiment, until they came to a flower-seller’s shop. The flower-seller looked at them with astonishment, and wondered who they could be, or whence they could have come. Seeing two youths so lovely, dressed in yellow and blue garments, he imagined them to be divinities descended upon earth. Being addressed by them with mouths budding like lotoses, and asked for some flowers, he placed his hands upon the ground, and touched it with his head, saying: "My lords have shown me great kindness, in coming to my house, — fortunate that I am. I will pay them homage." Having thus spoken, the flower-seller, with a smiling aspect, gave them whatever choice flowers they selected, to conciliate their favour. Repeatedly prostrating himself before them, he presented them with flowers, beautiful, fragrant, and fresh. Kríshná, then, being much pleased with him, gave him this blessing: "Fortune, good friend, who depends upon me, shall never forsake you. Never shall you suffer loss of vigour or loss of wealth. As long as time shall last, your descendants shall not fail."

---

* Prasádpamó gáthá masyaityam ✓

† Váta-rádhás.

§ Rajaka. From the context the word seems to denote a dyer.

|| Varáchará yam káppípa prákáśa vachyadvámni.

The lads did not "throw down some of his fine linen", but asked him for it.

Varáchará tī is the reading preferred by the commentator Ratu-nagarbha; Varácharánī, that accepted by Śrídhrā: and neither of them mentions that of the other.

† Varáchará rajjā kámap parasáradhánésham.

Instead of Prápadam, some MSS. have Prápadam.

---

* Prápadamó gáthá masyaityam ✓

† Prápadam, which implies nothing more than a respectful inclination of the head and uplifting of the hands.

‡ Amala.

§ Vásthitam ná yam náphitam sántati.

This lection, Ratúngarbhā’s, is the one followed by the Translator. Śrídhrā’s and that of nearly all my best MSS. begins the verse with the words Vásthitam.
lights (on earth), you shall, finally, obtain, by calling me to recollection, a heavenly region, the consequence of my favour. Your heart shall ever be intent on righteousness; and fulness of days shall be the portion of your posterity. Your descendants shall not be subject to natural infirmities, as long as the sun shall endure.”* Having thus spoken, Kṛṣṇa and Rāma,† worshipped by the flower-seller, went forth from his dwelling.

* These incidents are told, with some unimportant differences, in the other accounts of Kṛṣṇa’s youth.

† Baladeva, in the original.

CHAPTER XX.

Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma meet Kubja; she is made straight by the former: they proceed to the palace. Kṛṣṇa breaks a bow intended for a trial of arms. Kaṁsa’s orders to his servants. Public games. Kṛṣṇa and his brother enter the arena: the former wrestles with Chāṇūra, the latter, with Mushiika, the king’s wrestlers, who are, both, killed. Kṛṣṇa attacks and slays Kaṁsa: he and Balarāma do homage to Vasudeva and Devaki: the former praises Kṛṣṇa.

AS they proceeded along the high road, they saw coming (towards them) a young girl, who was crooked, carrying a pot of unguent. Kṛṣṇa addressed her sportively, and said: “For whom are you carrying that unguent? Tell me, lovely maiden;* tell me truly.” Spoken to as it were through affection, Kubja,† well disposed towards Hari, replied to him also mirthfully, being smitten by his appearance: “Know you not, beloved, that I am the servant of Kaṁsa, and appointed, crooked as I am, to prepare his perfumes?: Unguent ground by any other he does not approve of: hence I am enriched through his liberal rewards.” Then said Kṛṣṇa: “Fair-faced damsel, give us of this unguent,—

* Indivara-lochana.
† No proper name, here and near the top of the next page, but “the deformed girl”. The word kubja is rendered “crooked”, above.

The name of the damsel, we are thus told, was Naikavakrā. In the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, X., Prior Section, XLII., 3, her name appears as Trivakrā. She was so called, the commentator Śrīdhara remarks, because triply deformed,—namely, in the neck, in the chest, and in the waist.
fragrant, and fit for kings,—as much as we may rub upon our bodies." “Take it,” answered Kubja. And she gave them as much of the unguent as was sufficient for their persons. And they rubbed it on various parts of their faces and bodies, till they looked like two clouds, one white and one black, decorated by the many-tinted bow of Indra. Then Krishna, skilled in the curative art, took hold of her, under the chin, with the thumb and two fingers, and lifted up her head; whilst, with his feet, he pressed down her feet; and, in this way, he made her straight. When she was thus relieved from her deformity, she was a most beautiful woman; and, filled with gratitude and affection, she took Govinda by the garment, and invited him to her house. Promising to come at some other time, Krishna smilingly dismissed her, and then

They had their bodies smeared in the style called Bhauktichchheda (भक्तिच्छेद); that is, with the separating or distinguishing (chheda) marks of Vaishnava devotion (bhakti),—certain streaks on the forehead, nose, cheeks, breast, and arms, which denote a follower of Vishnu. See the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 33.||

The story is similarly told in the Bhāgavata, &c.

The bending or breaking of a bow is a favourite incident in Hindu heroic poetry; borrowed, no doubt, from the Rāmāyaṇa, where, however, it has an object: here it is quite gratuitous.

1 The story is similarly told in the Bhāgavata, &c.
2 The bending or breaking of a bow is a favourite incident in Hindu heroic poetry; borrowed, no doubt, from the Rāmāyaṇa, where, however, it has an object: here it is quite gratuitous.

laughtered aloud, on beholding the countenance of Bala-deva.†

Dressed in blue and yellow garments, and anointed with fragrant unguents,† Keśava and Rāma proceeded to the hall of arms, which was hung round with garlands.: Inquiring of the warders which bow he was to try, and being directed to it, he took it, and bent it. § But, drawing it with violence, he snapped it in two; and all Mathurā resounded with the noise which its fracture occasioned. Abused by the warders for breaking the bow, Krishna and Rāma retorted, and defied them, and left the hall.||

When Kāṃsa knew that Akrūra had returned, and heard that the bow had been broken, he thus said to Chañúra and Mūṣhīka, (his boxers): “Two youths, cowherd boys, have arrived. You must kill them both, in a trial of strength, in my presence; for they prac-

† Keśava, in the original.
‡ भक्तिच्छेदपुरुषसाधी। See note 1 in the preceding page.
§ According to the original, in all my MSS., &c., the youths, not the hall, were thus adorned.
|| रामा, in the original.

Instead of चायोम, the lection of Śrīdhara, Ratnagarbha has चायोम, and says that we here have the name of the bow, Ayogava. The commentators mention and explain other readings; and my MSS. supply still more.

† Malā-guddha. See note 1 in p. 39, infra.
tise against my life. I shall be well pleased if you kill them in the match, and will give you whatever you wish; not else. These two foes of mine must be killed by you, fairly or unfairly. The kingdom shall be ours in common, when they have perished." Having given them these orders, he sent, next, for his elephant-driver, and desired him to station his (great) elephant, Kuvalayāpīda,—who was as vast as a cloud charged with rain,—near the gate of the arena, and drive him upon the two boys, when they should attempt to enter. When Kañśa had issued these commands, and ascertained that the platforms were all ready (for the spectators), he awaited the rising of the sun, unconscious of impending death.†

In the morning, the citizens assembled on the platforms set apart for them; and the princes, with the ministers and courtiers,* occupied the royal seats. Near the centre of the circle, judges of the games§ were stationed by Kañśa, whilst he himself sat apart, close by, upon a lofty throne. Separate platforms were erected for the ladies of the palace,|| for the courtiers,* and for the wives of the citizens.† Nanda and the cowherds had places appropriated to them, at

BOOK V., CHAP. XX. 25

† The Bhāgavata enters into even fewer particulars than our text, of the place set apart for the games. The Hari Vānśa gives a much more detailed description, which is, in some respects, curious. The want of any technical glossary, and the general manner in which technical terms are explained in the ordinary dictionaries, render it difficult to understand exactly what is intended; and any translation of the passages must be defective. The French version, † however, probably represents a much more splendid and theatrical scene than the text authorizes, and may, therefore, admit of correction. The general plan is nothing more than an enclosed space, surrounded by temporary structures of timber or bamboo, open or enclosed, and decorated with hangings and garlands. It may be doubted if the details described by the compiler of the Hari Vānśa were very familiar even to him; for his description is not always very consistent or precise. Of two commentators, one evidently knows nothing of what he attempts to explain; but, with the assistance of the other, the passages may be thus, though not always confidently, rendered:

"The king, Kañśa, meditating on these things, went forth, from his palace, to the place which had been prepared for the sight of the ceremonial (†), to inspect the scaffolds (‡) which had been constructed. He found the place close set with the several platforms (‡) of the different public bodies (§), strongly put together, and decorated with roofed pavilions of various sizes, supported by columns, and divided into commodious chambers (§). The edifice was extensive; well arranged, secured by strong rafters, (§) spacious and lofty, and commodious and secure. Stairs led to the different galleries. (§) Chairs of state (§) were placed in

* Śradhāṅgana, nāg. || Antahkura.


§ Chairs of state.
the end of which sat Akrūra and Vasudeva. Amongst the wives of the citizens appeared Devaki, mourning various parts of it. The avenues that conducted to it were narrow(1). It was covered with temporary stages and sheds,(11) and was capable of sustaining the weight of a multitude.

"Having seen the place of the festival thus adorned, Kaṁsa gave orders, and said: 'To-morrow let the platforms, and terraces, and pavilions(11) be decorated with pictures, and garlands, and flags, and images;' and let them be scented with fragrant odours, and covered over with awnings.(13) Let there be ample heaps of dry pounded cow-dung(14) provided on the ground,* and suitable refreshment-chambers be covered over, and decorated with bells and ornamented arches.(15) Let large water-jars be securely fixed in order, capable of holding a copious supply, and provided with golden drinking-cups. Let upartments be prepared (16), and various kinds of beverage, in appropriate vessels, be ready. Let judges of the games be invited, and corporations, with their chiefs. Let orders be issued to the wrestlers, and notice be given to the spectators; and let platforms, for their accommodation, be fitted up in the place of assembly."(17)

* Aksha-vāta is the reading of my oldest MS., instead of the ordinary range-vāta.
† Harivānsha, ii. 4527—4537: which means that Devaki loved her son.
§ Mancha; previously rendered “scaffolds”; “pavilions” being used to represent vadābhī or valābhi.
indefence. Covered with must* and blood from the elephant, whom, when goaded upon them by his

In justification of the rendering of the above, an explanation of the technical terms, taken either from dictionaries or from the commentators,† may be subjoined. (Karîsa went to the Preshkâhârâ (پیش‌شکار), literally, ‘house of seeing;’ but it is evident, from its interior being visible to spectators on the tops of the houses,—as subsequently mentioned,—that it was not a

* These two substantives are to render mancha. See note † in the preceding page.
† Harivîndâna, d. 4642—4656:

This word, a popularized form of the Persian mast, مامت, is here used to translate mada, the ichor which exudes from the temples of a rutting elephant. Mast is an adjective, signifying ‘proud’, ‘in rut’.
† Nilakantha and Arjuna Miśra. To the scantlings of scholia, added in the following pages, that are taken from the former, I have annexed his name. The remaining elucidations which Professor Wilson indicates to be commentatorial are derived from the latter.
like two lions amidst (a herd of) deer. Exclamations of pity arose from all the spectators, along with ex-

(सारिनिर्वृत्त.) * It is difficult to understand the necessity of rafters in an inclosure in which the platforms and stages seem to have been erected independently of any floor or wall; but the commentary explains Nirvyūha, “strong brackets, projecting from a house:” सारिनिर्वृत्त प्रचीन युद्धभागम् द्वितीयाष्टि यत्र। (?) Asliṣṭha-aśuliṣṭha-manchārohaṇam. The first epithet is explained, ‘not contracted’ (संकृतिः); the second, ‘well constructed’ (साधुरितिः); and, for the ‘ascending’ (चर्यांतिः), we have सालयविकारण ‘where was a line of steps’ or ‘ladders’. There is another rendering of the text, however, which may be rendered: “Having steps well secured in their ascent above” (उद्यानस्थलिंकं मधाराहस्मन)। (?) Seats for kings” (पुष्प-वालिः). (3) Such is the literal purport of Sanchāra-patha-sankula (संचारपथसञ्जुल) implying, possibly, the formation of passages by fences on either side. (6) This is doubtful. The phrase is (एवं नवनिर्भावि) Chhannaṁ tad-vedikābhī. Chhanna means, literally, ‘covered’, and can scarcely be used in the sense of ‘overspread’ or ‘filled with’. Vedikā means an elevated floor or terrace, with which a hall or edifice cannot well be ‘covered’, and therefore, requires the sense here given to Chhanna. The commentators are silent. (4) The Manchavāsas and Valabhis, as above. The other term is Vithi, ‘a shop’, ‘a stall’, ‘a terrace’, ‘a road.’ (?) Let them be Vapushantali (वपुष्यम) “having painted or sculptured figures” (विज्ञ्यावदिशुक्त). * The other

* I have altered, here and below, “निर्वृत्त”, and the same form in Sanskrit. सारिनिर्वृत्त is a variant.
† Nilakanṭha’s.
‡ Nilakanṭha’s explanation of चर्यांति।
§ चर्यांतिकरण—“the reading of Arjuna Miśra,—and चर्यानांतिः-शुभिः are further variants that I find.
|| See the original, at the foot of p. 26, supra.
§ Nilakanṭha.

VOUS PURĀNA.

driver, they had slain, and armed with his tusks, Balabhadra and Janardana confidently entered the arena,

theatre, or covered edifice. If a building at all, it was merely a sort of stockade. One commentator calls it “a place made for seeing the sacrifice”: प्रधनस्वगतिर्वाच ततः गाम्भर्जः। (?) Mancha-
nāṁ avalokakakā (वालोकाभक्ति). The Mancha is commonly understood to signify a raised platform, with a floor and a roof, ascended by a ladder: see Dictionary. (?) Mancha-vā (सचार). Vāla is either ‘site’ or ‘inclosure,’ and is used, here, without much affecting the sense of Mancha. The compound is explained, by the commentators, ‘prepared places’ (रचितभुवन), or ‘the sites of the platforms’ (सचारभुवन). (?) The Śrenis (श्रेनिः), associations of artificers practising the same art. One of the commentaries understands the term to be here used to denote, not their station, but their labours: “The structure was the work of the artificers” (मयं देवीया). (?) Several words occur, here, of technical import. The passage is:

विशेषान्तरुकच्चमियमेवभोजित्वम्।

कुर्सिमिव तुवाहिनखरसीखम् महिमम्।

Valabhi is said, by the commentator, to mean a structure with a pent roof, supported by six columns; Kuṭā, a circular one, having seven roofs (something, perhaps, like a Chinese pagoda,) and four columns. The Eka-stambha is a chamber, supported by one column: चलनिविक्रियान्तरुकात्मकसिदिकोणीम् हुंकारामि। कुर्सिमिव प्रथामिव: कौरम् सत्यचिरिमुक्तमिव।। (?) Sārāniṇirvṛta

* गर्भोत्सवकारोतिः।
† Nilakanṭha.
‡ The ensuing definitions I find in Arjuna Miśra only.
§ Some MSS. begin this line with उच्चारांगारः।
|| What is meant, here, as the first sentence is from Nilakanṭha, who therein explains, first, चलनिमिति, and then कुर्सिमिति: which he reads instead of कुर्सिमिति. The rest of the Sanskrit, giving a definition of the latter term, is, perhaps, altered from the same commentator.
pressions of astonishment. “This, then,” said the people, “is Krishna. This is Balabhadra. This is he

commentary renders it merely ‘pleasant’ or ‘agreeable’ (सुखिष्ठा). (19) ‘Covered above with cloths’ (उपवनीतदर्पण). The use of
the awning or Shamiyána is very common in India. (20) For the
wrestlers to rub over their bodies, to absorb the perspiration
(महाराज लेक्टर्प्रवृत्ति). (21) This is, all, rather questionable.
The passage is, most usually:

चंदनङ्गोत्सङ्गभव यवानादृष्टिः I
Vali, or Bali, in one sense, means ‘the edge of a thatch,’ and
may be put for some sort of temporary structure,—a kind of re­
tiring or refreshment-room for the boxers and wrestlers. In some
copies, it is read पताकारविभिः, “beautiful with cloths spread,”
on which the performers may sit, when disengaged; perhaps, a
sort of carpet on the ground. (16) The expression is, again, Vali
(सनीयोगवल्लभमार). Another sense of the word is “offering
of viands, or of the remains of a sacrifice, to all beings;” but
that cannot be its purport here: nor is it ever used in the sense
of viands in general. The verb Kalp or Káj also usually implies
‘making’. (17) Manchaváta;† ‘in the Samajá’ or ‘assembly’.
(18) Maháraná (महराज), “the great place of the performance.”
Ranga is ‘acting’ or ‘representation’; also, the place or site of
it. (19) All the copies consulted, except one, offer an irregularity
of construction, which, although defended by the commentators,
 is a license scarcely allowable. The epithets of the first verse
are, all, in the plural number; they then occur in the singular,
to agree with the only substantive in the description, Samajavána.
According to the commentators, the plural term Mancháti (मन्चादि)
understood is the substantive to the epithets of the first stanza,
and Samájávána (the singular), to those of the other verses.
This awkwardness is, however, avoided by the reading of an old
and very good copy, which puts it, all, in the singular; as:

† To render “platforms”. My oldest MS. has चंदनाङ्ग:।
‡ So do the Calcutta edition of the Harivamsha, my oldest MS., and,
so far as I know them, MSS. generally.

(20) The expression is Charána; literally, ‘foot;’ explained,
by the commentator,† Stambha, ‘post’ or ‘pillar’. (21) The reading
of most of the copies is Phanottama (पनोत्तम), which may be
 taken as the sense of Talottama, ‘coaches or benches with cushions.’
(22) Manchárgiráth (मन्चागिराठ), ‘temporary houses.’ (23) Or,
‘fronting to the east’ (कादुपेश); (24) Nirmukti (निर्मक्त);
explained, by the commentator,§ to mean ‘fine threads’, ‘net-work’,
or ‘gauze’, through which persons, females especially, may see,
without being seen. (25) सल्कमेर्दबुधाथिः पताकाथिः। (26) “With
ridges and projections” (सल्कमादुधाथिः). The commentator||
explains this: “with flags on the top of them” (उपरिप्रेक्ष्य सल­
कमादुधाथिः). (27) This appears to be intended for an epithet
of the women; although Astráana is not usually applied to dress:

शोभिता वर्णरुपाथिः।†
Phala, of course, is ‘fruit’. Avadánasa is explained, in lexicons,
what is eaten to excite thirst: one comment** gives it, “what
may be sucked,” as tamarinds and the like. Chángeri is ex­
plained “fluids for drinking, made with sorrel or acid fruits”;
that is, sherbets. (28) उत्तमाचारिः or उत्तमाचारिः is an
epithet of the Prekshágarán, †† or look-out house of the women
(सीता चुँचवत्रः), situated on the tops of their houses, according

* See Vol. IV., p. 276.
†?
‡ Nilakántha.
§ Idem.
|| Idem.
¶ Parts of two lines. See the original, in p. 29, supra.
** Nilakántha’s.
†† The original exhibits the plural, as does the translation which
Professor Wilson here annotates.
Arjuna-trees felled. * This is the boy who trampled and danced on the serpent Kāliya; † who upheld the mountain Govardhana for seven nights; § who killed, as if in play, the iniquitous Arishta, Dhenuka, and Kesin. * * This, whom we see, is Achyuta. ** This is he who has been foretold by the wise, skilled in the sense of the Pārvatīs, as Gopīla, who shall exalt the depressed Yādava race. This is a portion of the all-existing, all-generating Viṣṇu, descended upon earth, to the commentators; *** वृक्षोपरि, गुरुद्वाय-समानमात्रं तत्तभवः: an arrangement very compatible with the form of Indian houses, which have flat roofs, commonly enclosed by a trellis-work or jalousie of masolתיy. §§ It is observable, that, in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, and in the Mahābhārata, on various public occasions, the women take their places on the platforms, or in the pavilions, without curtains or screens.

* See Vol. IV., pp. 279 and 281.
† Ibid., p. 291.
‡ Ibid., pp. 315, 316.
§ Ibid., pp. 333, 334.
|| Ibid., pp. 297, 298.
¶ Ibid., p. 340.
** Here the original, according to all my MSS., &c., has the following stanza, unrended by the Translator, as in his Hindu-made version:
अयं वास्त्र महावचनवत्ते स्थितम् श्रवणं यातः: इति।
प्राप्यति भीष्मचा योधयोगयोगनमनः॥
Both the commentators recognize these verses; and Ratnagarbha expounds them.
†† Sarva-bhūta. Ratnagarbha explains it by sarvatman.
*** The words quoted are Nilakaṇṭha's. Arjuna Miśra has something different.
§§ Professor Wilson's translation of the two passages quoted in pp. 25, 26, and pp. 27, 28, supra, and his notes on the same, have suggested numerous remarks which I have withheld; the subject of this episodical matter not being one with which the Viṣṇu-purāṇa is very intimately connected.

who, will, assuredly, lighten her load." Thus did the citizens describe Rāma and Kuṣṇa, as soon as they appeared; whilst the breast of Devaki glowed with maternal affection; * and Vasudeva, forgetting his infirmities, felt himself young (again), on beholding the countenances of his sons as a season of rejoicing. The women of the palace, and the wives of the citizens, wide opened their eyes, and gazed intently upon Kuṣṇa. † "Look, friends," said they to their companions; "look at the face of Kuṣṇa. His eyes are reddened by his conflict with the elephant; and the drops of perspiration stand upon his cheeks, outvying a full-blown lotus in autumn, studded with glittering dew. ‡ Avail yourself, now, of the faculty of vision. Observe his breast,—the seat of splendour,—marked with the mystic sign, § — and his arms, menacing destruction to his foes. Do you not notice Balabhadrā, dressed in a blue garment,—his countenance as fair as the jasmine, as the moon, as the fibres of the lotos-stem? See how he gently smiles at the gestures of Mushāka and Chānūra, as they spring up. And now behold Hari advance to encounter Chānūra. What! Are there no elders, judges of the field? || How can the delicate form of Hari,—only yet in the dawn of

* Drōg-विरचय तरः।
† This sentence is somewhat interpolated, and otherwise freely rendered.
‡ Sundaram, as appears from the context, here means, as the commentators interpret it, "hoar-frost," rather than "dew."
adolescence,—be regarded as a match for the vast and adamantine bulk of the great demon?* Two youths, of light and elegant persons, are in the arena, to oppose athletic fiends, headed by the cruel Čáňúra.† This is a great sin in the judges of the games, for the umpires to suffer a contest between boys and strong men.‡

As thus the women of the city conversed (with one another), Hari, having tightened his girdle, danced in the ring, shaking the ground (on which he trod). Balabhadra, also, danced, slapping his arms in defiance. Where the ground was firm, the invincible Kríshňa contended, foot to foot with Čáňúra. The practised demon Mushtika was opposed by Balabhadra. Mutually entwining, and pushing, and pulling, and beating each other with fists, arms, and elbows, pressing each other with their knees, interlacing their arms, kicking with their feet, pressing with their whole weight upon one another,†† fought Hari and Čáňúra. Desperate


* The original has no such term, but मुष्टिकनिपात, “striking with fists.”  † Aratni-dwaga. Aratni’ never, I believe, signifies “fore-arm;” and the definition of the fifth technicality shows that it cannot bear the import of ‘elbow,’ its more ordinary signification, when it does not denote a measure. Again, as it does not here mean ‘fist’—one of its senses,—it seems likely that it must denote the ulnar side of the hand. So, indeed, the term is explained by Arjuna Miśra, where he comments on the Mahābhārata, Vana-parvan, sū. 15781. His words are: अर्जुनम् करतंपत्वेच।

** The subjoined verse is rejected, without remark, by Ratnagarbha, and is absent from my two old copies of the mere text, but occurs, though uncommented, in Śrīdhara’s text, and in several of my MSS.: अरुपिनासनिरघ्धता वाचिलचिह्नः। Some excellent copies give, instead of अरुपिनासनिरघ्धता; अरुपिनासनिरघ्धता:।

Professor Wilson, when he accepted, in his translation, the seventh and eighth technicalities, should have accepted āśma-nirghdta, also, which cannot be divorced from the other two, since it stands in the original, between them.
spectators. In proportion as the contest continued, so Chānūra was gradually losing something of his original vigour, and the wreath upon his head trembled from his fury and distress; whilst the world-comprehending Kṛishṇa contended with him as if but in sport. Beholding Chānūra losing, and Kṛishṇa gaining strength, Kuñṣa, furious with rage, commanded the music to cease. As soon as the drums and trumpets were silenced, a numerous band of heavenly instruments was heard in the sky; and the gods invisibly exclaimed: “Victory to Govinda! Kesava, kill the demon Chānūra!” Madhusūdana, having, for a long time, dallied with his adversary, at last lifted him up, and whirled him round, with the intention of putting an end to him. Having whirled Chānūra round a hundred times, until his breath was expended in the air, Kṛishṇa dashed him on the ground, with such violence as to smash his body into a hundred fragments, and strew the earth with a hundred pools of gory mire. Whilst this took place, the mighty Bala­deva was engaged, in the same manner, with the demon bruiser; Mushiika. Striking him on the head with his fists, and on the breast with his knees, he stretched him on the ground, and pummelled him there, till he was dead. Again, Kṛishṇa encountered the royal bruiser Tosalaka, and felled him to the earth with a blow of his left hand. When the other and the two last terms are explained: “the flower of the wreath on his head:”

*a* Called, in the original, not by his name, but by the epithet amitryuit. 

† Bala-deva.  

‡ Malla-raja, “prince of mallas”. For malla, see note 1, below. || Corrected from “Tomalaka”. Professor Wilson’s MS. may have shown a broken ত, Most copies yield Tosala, the reading, apparently, accepted by Ratnagarbha, and that of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, which has, jikewise, the short form, Tosa. In very good MSS. of the Harivināsā I find Tosala and Tosala. Professor Wilson’s Bengal translation has Salaka.  

§ Malla; which Professor Wilson renders, indifferently, by “athlete”, “boxer”, and “bruiser”. The last two terms are inadequate, while the first is inadequate, as being much too wide for the occasion. ‘Pancratist’, in an accommodated acceptance, may answer to represent malla; for the pancratist fought nude, whereas it appears that his Hindu analogue contended clothed. The fighting of Hari, Chānūra, and Baladeva clearly evinces, that the malla-yuddha corresponded to the classical παντοσώμον and παντομαχόν, not, indeed, the regular agonism, so much as the lawless description that was practised at Sparta,—the characteristic of which was a combination of boxing and wrestling.
saw Cháñúra, Mushtika, and Tosalaka killed, they fled (from the field); and Krishán and Sankarshana danced, victorious, on the arena, dragging along with them, by force, the cowherds of their own age. Kañsá, his eyes reddening with wrath, called aloud to the surrounding people: “Drive those two cowboys out of the assembly: seize the villain Nanda; and secure him with chains of iron: put Vasudeva to death with torures intolerable to his years: and lay hands upon the cattle, and whatever else belongs to those cowherds who are the associates of Krishán.”

Upon hearing these orders, the destroyer of Madhústidana, Vana-parwan, quoting from some Niti-sastra, as follows:

```
Et latus medium sulcus diducit arenam. §
```

The yielding sand being furrowed into a ditch, or a water-course, by the dead bodies being dragged over it.

The text is:

```
Girivêchântamata pîrûta ten jñâyata.
Kata kâsya dhiheh vâneyev mahâyays: ||
```

It appears, from this, that the Hindu pancratium recognized eight modes of procedure: tearing out the hair, felling to the ground, kicking on the head, punching the belly with the knee, pommelling the cheeks with clenched fists, elbowing, slapping, and whirling round. Four of these modes of annoyance, counted from the first, are reckoned legitimate as against an ordinary Khâtriyâ: five, as against a reprobate or titular Khâtriyâ: six, as against a Vâśya: seven, as against a Śûdra; and all eight, as against an adversary of mixed extraction.

Our modern fancy have nothing to learn, on the score of humanity, from their Aryan predecessors of the ring, any more than from the roughs of Sparta, among whom even biting and scratching were not accounted foul play.

* Harshita, ‘delighted.’
† Insert ‘the towns’, pur.

where he was seated, laid hold of him by the hair of his head, and struck his tiara* to the ground. Then, casting him down upon the earth, Govinda threw himself upon him. Crushed by the weight of the upholder of the universe, the son of Ugrasena (Kañsá), the king, gave up the ghost. Krishán† then dragged the dead body, by the hair of the head, into the centre of the arena; and a deep furrow was made by the vast and heavy carcass of Kañsá, when it was dragged along the ground by Krishán, as if a torrent of water had run through it.† Seeing Kañsá thus treated, his brother Smáman† came (to his succour): but he was encountered, and easily killed, by Balabhádra. Then arose a general cry of grief from the surrounding
circle, as they beheld the king of Mathura* (thus) slain, (and treated) with (such) contumely, by Krishna. Krishna, accompanied by Balabhadrä, embraced the feet of Vasudeva and of Devaki: but Vasudeva raised him up; and he and Devaki recalling to recollection what he had said to them at his birth, they bowed to Janárdana; and the former thus addressed him: “Have compassion upon mortals, O god, benefactor; and lord of deities. It is by thy favour to us two, that thou hast become the (present) upholder (of the world). That, for the punishment of the rebellious,§ thou hast descended (upon earth,) in my house, having been propitiated (by my prayers), sanctifies our race. Thou art the heart|| of all creatures; thou abidest in all creatures; and all that has been, or will be, emanates from thee, O universal spirit. Thou, Achyuta, who comprehendest all the gods, art eternally worshipped with sacrifices: thou art sacrifice itself, and the offerer of sacrifices. The affection that inspires my heart, and the heart of Devaki, towards thee, as if thou wast our child, is, indeed, but error and a great delusion.** How shall the tongue of a mortal such as I am call the creator of all things, who is without beginning or end, son? Is it consistent that the lord of the world, from whom the world proceeds, should be born of me, except through illusion?* How should he, in whom all fixed and moveable things are contained, be conceived in the womb, and born of a mortal being?† Have compassion, therefore, indeed, O supreme lord, and, in thy descended portions, protect the universe. Thou art no son of mine. This whole world, from Brahmä to a tree,: thou art. Wherefore dost thou, who art one with the Supreme, beguile us? Blinded by delusion, I thought thee my son; and for thee, who art beyond all fear, I dreaded the anger of Kansa; and, therefore, did I take thee, in my terror, to Gokula, where thou hast grown up. But I no longer claim thee as mine own.§ Thou, Vishnu,—the sovereign lord of all,∥ whose actions Rudra, the Maruts, the Aświns, Indra,¶ and the gods cannot equal, although they behold them; thou, who hast come amongst us, for the benefit of the world,—art recognized; and delusion is no more.”

---

* See Vol. IV., p. 338.
† The original makes both the father and mother show him this honour:

\[ अच्छे वर्न देवकी च अनादेनाः \]

\[ वरदा। \]
\[ दुर्विता। \]
\[ अन्ता। \]

‡ प्रवेषति समसासांस्तो मूलविषयती।

** सापूर्व सम सनं दुर्बितलि बाप्वति।

\[ देवस्याः आपरभीता तद्विद्विवमना। \]
CHAPTER XXI.

Krishna encourages his parents; places Ugrasena on the throne; becomes the pupil of Sandipani, whose son he recovers from the sea: he kills the marine demon Pancjanya, and makes a horn of his shell.

HAVING permitted to Devaki and Vasudeva (an interval of) true knowledge, through the contemplation of his actions, Hari again spread the delusions of his power over (them and) the tribe of Yadu. He said to them: “Mother; venerable father; you have, both, been long observed, by Sankarshana and myself, with sorrow, and in fear of Kaṁsa. He whose time passes not in respect to his father and mother is a vile being, who descends, in vain, from virtuous parents.† The lives of those produce good fruit who reverence their parents, their spiritual guides, the Brahmins, and the gods. Pardon, therefore, father, the impropriety of which we may have been culpable, in resenting, without your orders,—to which we acknowledge that we are subject,—the oppression we suffered from the power and violence of Kaṁsa.”‡ Thus speaking, they offered homage to the elders of the Yadu tribe, in order, and, then, in a suitable manner, paid their respects to the citizens. The wives of Kaṁsa, and those of his father,§ then surrounded the body of the king, lying on the ground, and bewailed his fate, in deep affliction. Hari, in various ways, expressed his regret (for what had chanced), and endeavoured to console them, his own eyes being suffused with tears. The foe of Madhu then liberated Ugrasena from confinement, and placed him on the throne, which the death of his son had left vacant.* The chief of the Yādavas,† being crowned, performed the funeral rites of Kaṁsa, and of the rest of the slain. When the ceremony was over, and Ugrasena had resumed his royal seat, Krishna: (addressed him,) and said: “Sovereign lord, command, boldly, what else is to be done. § The curse of Yayati has pronounced our race unworthy of dominion; but, with me for your servant, you may issue your orders to the gods. How should kings disobey them?”||

Thus having spoken, the human Kesava summoned, mentally, the deity of the wind,—who came upon the instant,—and said to him: “Go, Vāyu, to Indra, and desire him to lay aside his pomp,†† and resign to

---

* The curse pronounced on the elder sons of Yayati, on their refusing to take upon them their father's infirmities. See Vol. IV., p. 48.
† Yudhāśīha.
‡ Hari, in the original.
§ Vayavāśāyaḥ viśeṣo vatsrāṇaśaṅkam jñitaḥ.
|| kāryanāmaḥ.
†† ‘Pride’, rather,—garva; namely, says Retasgarha, at the recollection of Krishna's having lifted up Mount Govardhana.
Ugrasena his (splendid) hall, Sudharman. Tell him that Krisha commands him to send the royal hall, the unrivalled gem of princely courts, for the assemblage of the race of Yadu. Accordingly, Vayu, Vayu, went, and delivered the message to the husband of Sachipati, who (immediately) gave up to him the hall Sudharman; and Vayu conveyed it to the Yadavas, the chiefs of whom, thenceforth, possessed this celestial court, emblazoned with jewels, and defended by the arm of Govinda. The two excellent Yadu youths, versed in all knowledge, and possessed of all wisdom, then submitted to instruction, as the disciples of teachers. Accordingly, they repaired to Sandipani— who, though born in Kasi, resided at Avanti—to study (the science of) arms, and, becoming his pupils, were obedient and attentive to their master; exhibiting an example, to all men, of the observance of instituted rules. In the course of sixty-four days, they had gone through the elements of military science, with the treatises on the use of arms, and directions for the mystic incantations, which secure the aid of supernatural weapons. Sándipani, astonished at such proficiency, and knowing that it exceeded human faculties, imagined that the Sun and Moon had become his scholars. When they had acquired all that he could teach, they said to him: “Now say what present shall be given to you, as the preceptor’s fee.” The prudent Sándipani, perceiving that they were endowed with more than mortal powers, requested them to give him his dead son, (drowned) in the sea of Prabhása.

* Or the name may be read Sudharmś. Both forms are authorized.
† राजिर्मिति राजाभिसेनाय प्राणमपरमस्।

**संध्वीका समा पुज्ञस्वायं चुंडविराज्ञित्।

†† काशि, काशि, of the Kasi tribe.” See my Benares, &c., p. 9, note 1.
‡‡ काशि, “of the Kasi tribe.” See my Benares, &c., p. 9, note 1.
§ The Sanskrit has Pavana.
|| Here the original calls Indra by his appellation Purandara.
¶ वायुवर्मितां दिव्यं समा न च वायुवर्म्यः।

**संध्वीका सन्ध्वार्थो न च संध्वियोक्तानां।

The ordinary reading, and that accepted by Ratnagarbha, ends the second line with -सयाः।

** Sandrap-jāna-maya.

†† Kāśī, “of the Kasi tribe.” See my Benares, &c., p. 9, note 1.
§ The term, apparently, is chosen with a view to imply diligent studentship.
¶ These three expansions are to represent the expressions specified in note 1 in this page.
§ Guru-dakshinā.
¶ The mantras and Upanishads, the commentators allege.
** Śrīdhara and Ratnagarbha.

1 They read through the Dhanur-veda,|| which treats of military matters; with the Rahasya, ‘the mystical part,’ ¶ and the Sangraha, ‘collection’ or ‘compendium’,—said to be, here, the Astra-prayoga,** ‘the employment of weapons.’

2 Prabhása is a place of pilgrimage in the west of India, on the coast of Gujarat, near the temple of Somanátha, and town of Putton Somnath. It is also known by the name of Soma-tirtha; Soma, or the Moon, having been here cured of the con-
Taking up their arms, they marched against the Ocean. But the all-comprehending Sea said to them: “I have not killed the son of Sāndipani.” A demon† named Panchajana; (who lives) in the form of a conch-shell, seized the boy. He is still under my waters.§ On hearing this, Kṛṣṇa plunged into the sea; and, having slain the vile Panchajana, he took the conch-shell,—which was formed of his bones, (and bore it as his horn)—the sound of which fills the demon-hosts with dismay, animates the vigour of the gods, and annihilates unrighteousness.|| The heroes also recovered the boy from the pains of death, and restored him, in his former person, to his father. Rāma and Janārdana

sumption brought upon him by the imprecation of Daksha, his father-in-law. Mahābhārata, Śalya Parvan; Vol. III., p. 249.

1. "भृगृहायं तत्क्ष्णी ्तु सार्धायां सहोदरः.
   देवाणं न मया पुच्छो हि: सातोपनेरिति॥"

Various MSS. have, instead of सार्धायां, सार्ध्याः, पायाः,
जनाताः; and मचेनाताः. It is impossible to say what reading the Translator accorded the preference to.

† Dāguna.
§ For his origin, see Vol. II., p. 69, note ||.
|| The Sea here addresses Kṛṣṇa as asura-sūdana, “slayer of demons.”

Professor Wilson has here omitted to translate a stanza, of some little importance, if only by way of connecting what precedes with what follows. It is recognized by both the commentators, and runs thus:

"तं भाष्यमापृथ्वी गालं गुप्तं हृदि:।
बलं वशं दारम्यालिनां वच्चलं वनस्त।"

We learn, from this, that Hari blew Pānchajanya,—the name of his newly acquired shell,—and proceeded to the city of Yama; and that Bala-deva conquered Yama, son of Vivasvāt.

For the origin of Yama, see Vol. III., p. 20; for the situation of Yama’s city, Vol. II., p. 239.
CHAPTER XXII.

Jarasandha besieges Mathurā; is defeated, but repeatedly renewes the attack.

PARASARA.—The mighty Kañsa had married the two daughters of Jarasandha,* one named Asti, the other, Prápti.† Jarasandha was king of Magadha,‡ who, when he heard that Kṛishnā§ had killed his son-in-law, was much incensed, and, collecting a large force, marched against Mathurā, determined to put the Yadvavas and Kishita to the sword.|| Accordingly, he invested the city with three and twenty numerous divisions of his forces.2 Rāma and Janárdaya sallied from the town, with a slender, but resolute, force, and fought bravely with the armies

1 See Vol. IV., pp. 150, 151.
2 With twenty-three Akshauhinis, each consisting of 109,350 infantry, 65,610 horse, 21,870 chariots, and as many elephants.** The Hari Vamša enumerates, as the allies, or tributaries, of Jarasandha, a number of princes from various parts of India. But this is a gratuitous embellishment.

* See Vol. IV., pp. 150 and 173; also, note in p. 344.
† Corrected from “Asti” and “Prápti”.
‡ Corrected, here and everywhere, from “Magadha”. See Vol. IV., p. 151, note †.
§ Hari, in the original.
|| This sentence is rendered with great looseness.
¶ Corrected from “109,300”.
** So say the commentators on the Amara-kosa, II., VIII., II., 49. For a venerable statement of the component parts of an akshauhini, see the Mahābhārata, Adi-parvan, sl. 792—296.
†† Sl. 5013—5022.

BOOK V., CHAP. XXII.

of Magadha.* The two youthful leaders prudently resolved to have recourse to their ancient weapons; and, accordingly, the bow of Hari, with two quivers filled with exhaustless† arrows, and the mace: called Kaumodaki,§ and the ploughshare|| of Balabhadra, as well as the club☆ Saunaunda, descended, at a wish, from heaven. Armed with these weapons, they (speedily) discomfited the king of Magadha and his hosts, and reentered the city, (in triumph).

Although the wicked (king of Magadha,) Jarasandha was defeated, yet Kṛishnā knew, that, whilst he escaped alive, he was not subdued; and, in fact, he soon returned, with a (mighty) force, and was again forced, by Rāma and Kṛishnā, to fly. Eighteen times1 did the haughty prince of Magadha** renew his attack.

1 The Bhāgavata†† and Hari Vamśa say ‘seventeen times.’ The latter indulges in a prolix description of the first encounter, nothing of which occurs in the Bhāgavata, any more than in our text.

* निकृष्णाय यथायायावरायुभि रामजनार्दनः। युवपायं समं तथावराय पद्यविनिककः॥
† अक्षया ‘इन्द्रसत्तुल.’
‡ Gada.
§ A present from Varūṇā, according to the Mahābhārata, Adi-parvan, sl. 8200. It takes its name from Kumodaka, an epithetical appellation of Kṛishnā.
|| Ilala, which means, ordinarily, ‘plough.’ For its synonym, sūra, synecdochically used in the same way as in the text, see Vol. III., p. 332, note ¶.
☆ Musala; a weapon shaped like a pestle, it should seem.
** To render मायाधी राज्य।
†† X., Latter Section, i., 44.
*† Sl. 5126.
upon the Yādavas, headed by Kṛishṇa, and was as often defeated and put to the rout, by them, with very inferior numbers. That the Yādavas were not overpowered by their foes was owing to the present might of the portion of the discus-armed Vishṇu. It was the pastime of the lord of the universe, in his capacity of man, to launch various weapons against his enemies: (for) what effort of power to annihilate his foes could be necessary to him whose fiat creates and destroys the world? But, as subjecting himself to human customs, he formed alliances with the brave, and engaged in hostilities with the base. He had recourse to the four devices of policy,—or, negotiation, presents, sowing dissension, and chastisement,—and, sometimes, even betook himself to flight. Thus, imitating the conduct of human beings, the lord of the world pursued, at will, his sports.

* On the credit of both the commentators, we here have no proper name, but the word for brother-in-law, Śyāla. According to Ratnagarbha, Śiśirāyana is thus alluded to, and proleptically; for Garga was still to marry his sister, Gauri.

† Corrected from “Gargya”, with the suffrage of several MSS. Probably the Garga is meant who—as we read in the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, X., Prior Section, Chapter XLV,—served as instructor to Kṛishṇa and Balarama. See Vol. IV., p. 279. But Gargya seems to be the reading of the Harvaṇikā, II. 1957—1959.

Two Gargas, then, are named in the present Chapter. See p. 58, infra.

** Ayak-chāhra; ‘iron-filings’, more likely.

†† Hara, in the original.
became the friend of Garga;* and the latter begot a
son, by his wife, who was as (black as) a bee, and was,
therefore, called Kalayavana.† The Yavana king, having
placed his son, whose breast was as hard as the point
of the thunderbolt, upon the throne, retired to the
woods. Inflated with conceit of his prowess,
Kalayavana demanded of Nārada who were the most mighty
heroes on earth. To which the sage answered “The
Yadavas.” Accordingly, Kalayavana assembled many
myriads of Mlechchhas and barbarians,‡ and, with a

1 This legend of the origin of Kalayavana is given, also, by
the Hari Vansua. The Bhagavata, like our text, comes, at
once, to the siege of Mathūra by this chief; but the Hari Vanīśa
suspends the story, for more than thirty chapters, to narrate an
origin of the Yadavas, and sundry adventures of Kṛṣṇa
to the south-west. Most of these have no other authority,
and are, no doubt, inventions of the Dakhni compiler; and the
others are misplaced.

2 So the Bhāgavata describes him,§ as leading a host of
Mlechchhas (or barbarians) against Kṛṣṇa; but, in the Mahā-
bhārata,—Sabha Parvan, Vol. I., p. 380,—where Kṛṣṇa describes
the power of Jarasandha, he admits that he and the Yadavas fled
from Mathūra to the west, through fear of that king; but no
account is given of any siege of Mathūra by Kalayavana. The
only indication of such a person is the mention,† that Bhagadatta,

* व भारतपाल भ त न पवनश्री यामिना:।
The original, it will be observed, does not here name Garga, which I
have corrected from “Gārgya”.
† क्कोटिकी भाषायः सहमेव ज्ञातः।
‡ सूत्र त नरस्तु भाष शास्ति यो युवनाधिपः।
अपयनालो राजा धृतीया वशोः खना॥

† Chapter CXV.
§ It calls him Yavana the Asura.
|| SL 578, 579.

vast armament of elephants, cavalry, and foot, advance-
ed, impatiently, against Mathūra and the Yadavas;

the Yavana king, who rules over Muru* and Naraka, in the west
and south, is one of his most attached feudatories. This king is,
in various other places, called king of Prājapatiśa; as he is in
a subsequent passage of the same book,—Sabha Parvan, p. 374;†
and this name is always applied to the west of Assam:† His
subjects are, however, still Yavanas and Mlechchhas; and he
presents horses, caps set with jewels, and swords with ivory hilts,
—articles scarcely to be found in Assam, which cannot well be
the seat of his sovereignty. It seems most likely, therefore, that
the story may have originated in some knowledge of the power
and position of the Greek-Bactrian princes, or their Scythian
successors; although, in the latter compilations, it has been mixed
up with allusions to the first Mohammedan aggressions. See

अमदानी नाचाराज वृक्षात्रिक पिनः कथा।
स वाचा प्रणालिक कथा का निष्ठाव।

Here, Bhagadatta—with the epithet aparyanta-bala, ‘of boundless
might’,—is said to be paramount over Muru and Naraka, in like manner
as Vārūṇa rules the west. The direction of Bhagadatta’s kingdom is
not assigned.

M. Fauche’s translation of this passage, while correcting Professor Wil-
son’s view of its meaning, as to some points, turns an epithet into a
king, and gives him what belongs to Bhagadatta:
“De lui relève encore le roi Aparyantabal, souverain des Yavanas,
qui règne sur le Mourou et le Naraka, comme Vārūṇa sur la plage
occidentale;”
“Et Bhagadatta, le vieil ami de ton père, Bhagadatta, qui se corbe
plus que toute autre, puissant roi, devant sa parole et son geste.”

For the position of Vārūṇa’s city, see Vol. II., p. 239.

* It has more than once been conjectured that we should read Muru,
in this place. But Muru and Naraka, I take it, are, here, not names of
countries,—as is generally supposed,—but two demons, so called, at last
slain by Kṛṣṇa. See Chapter XXIX. of this Book.
† SL 1836.
wearying, every day, the animal that carried him, but insensible of fatigue, himself.

When Kṛṣṇa knew of his approach, he reflected, that, if the Yādavas encountered the Yavana, they would be so much weakened by the conflict, that they would then be overcome by the king of Magadha;* that their force was much reduced by the war with Magadha,† whilst that of Kálayavana was unbroken; and that the enemy might be, therefore, victorious.‡ Thus, the Yādavas were exposed to a double danger. § He resolved, therefore, to construct a citadel, for the Yadu tribe, that should not be easily taken,—one that even women might defend, and in which, therefore, the heroes of the house of Vrishá|| should be secure; one in which the male combatants of the Yādavas should dread no peril, though he, himself, should be drunk, or careless, asleep, or abroad. Thus reflecting, Kṛṣṇa† solicited a space of twelve furlongs from the ocean; and there he built the city of Dwára, defended by high ramparts, and beautified with gardens---

1 According to the Mahābhārata, he only enlarged and fortified the ancient city of Kuśasthali, founded by Raivata. Sabbath Parvan.†† See, also, Vol. III., p. 253, of this work.

•* Ṛṣiṇī-yādghatam ādityāh vākāc chakṣe !

| ।
| ।

† Literally, “by the king of the Magadhas,” महाधवेन।

‡ A free translation; and so is much of what follows.

§ There is no Sanskrit for this sentence. It is taken from the commentaries.

|| Vrishá-pungava. For Vrishiá, see Vol. IV., p. 58.

|| The original has Govinda.

†† Śī. 614. M. Fauche, in his translation, converts Raivata into a mountain.

and reservoirs of water, crowded with houses and buildings,* and splendid as the capital of Indra, Amarávati.† Thither Janárdana conducted the inhabitants of Mathurá, and then awaited, at that city, the approach of Kálayavana.‡

When the hostile army encamped round Mathurá, Kṛṣṇa,§ unarmed, went forth, and beheld the Yavana king. Kálayavana, the strong-armed, recognizing Vāsudeva, pursued him,—him whom the thoughts of perfect ascetics|| cannot overtake. Thus pursued, Kṛṣṇa entered a large cavern, where Muchukunda, the king of men, was asleep. The rash Yavana, entering (the cave), and beholding a man lying asleep there, concluded it must be Kṛṣṇa, and kicked him; at which Muchukunda awoke, and, casting on him an angry glance, the Yavana was instantly consumed, and reduced to ashes.** For, in a battle between the gods and demons, Muchukunda had, formerly, contributed to the defeat of the latter; and, being overcome with sleep, he solicited of the gods, as a boon, that he should enjoy a long repose. “Sleep long, and soundly,”‖‖ said the gods; “and whoever disturbs you shall be instantly burnt to ashes by fire emanating from your body.”∥

1 The name of Muchukunda, as one of the sons of Mándhátrī, ‡‡

* Prákára; ‘strong buildings’, Ratnagarbha says.
† See Vol. II., p. 240, text and notes.

|| आसि जालवने सप्तरथ च स्वयं यदी।

§ The Sanskrit has Govinda. || Mahá-yogin, Sudurmati.

** इतमात्राभु तेनार्थे अजात च वन्योऽभिन्नाम।

|| These words are interpolated by the Translator.

∥ Corrected from “Mándhátrī”.

†† These words are interpolated by the Translator.
Having burnt up the iniquitous Yavana, and beholding the foe of Madhu, Muchukunda asked him who he was. “I am born,” he replied, “in the Lunar race, in the tribe of Yadu, and am the son of Vasudeva.” Muchukunda, recollecting the prophecy of old Garga, fell down before the lord of all, Hari, saying: “Thou art known, supreme lord, to be a benefactor of mankind; for thy glory I am unable to endure. Thy words are of deeper tone than the muttering of the rain-cloud; and earth sinks down beneath the pressure of thy feet. As, in the battle between the gods and demons, the Asuras were unable to sustain my lustre, so even I am incapable of bearing thy radiance. Thou alone art the refuge of every living being who has lighted on the world. Do thou, who art the alleviator of all distress, show favour upon me, and remove from me all that is evil.* Thou art the oceans, the mountains, the rivers, the forests; thou art earth, sky, air, water, and fire: thou art mind, intelligence, the unevolved principle,† the vital airs, the lord of life; the soul;‡ all that is beyond the soul; the all-pervading; exempt from the vicissitudes of birth; devoid of (sensible properties) sound and the like; undecaying, illimitable, imperishable, subject neither to increase nor diminution.§ thou art that which is Brahma,—without beginning or end. From thee the immortals, the progenitors, the Yakshas, Gandharvas,∥ and Kinnaras, the Siddhas, the nymphs of heaven,¶ men, animals,‖ birds, reptiles,‖‖ deer,‖‖‖ and all the vegetable world, proceed; and all that has been, or will be, or is now, moveable or fixed. All that is amorphous, or has form; all that is gross, subtle, moveable, or stable,§§ thou art, O creator of the world; and beside thee there is not anything. O lord, I have been whirl-

* भाय जातो सब्जातिष्ठ श्रस्य हर मामतम ।
† Aaryákīta.
‡ Puīha.
§ Nālā.
∥ Corrected from “Gandharbhās”.
¶ Apsaras.
‖ Puīha, which often means ‘sacrificial animals’. Compare the title Paśupati; also, the terms paśubandha and nirūdha-paśubandha, Vol. III., p. 40, note §, and p. 113, note †.
‖‖ Sarīśripa; rather “reptiles” than “insects”, as it is rendered in Vol. II., p. 92.
‖‖‖ Wild beasts, rather; mriţa.
§§ Ratnagāthā has, instead of सुका धर चिँहर, सुक्तार तथा: and this reading gets rid of two tautologies; for “moveable or fixed” occurs just before.
ed round, in the circle of worldly existence, for ever; and have suffered the three classes of affliction;* and there is no rest† whatever. I have mistaken pains for pleasures, like sultry vapours: for a pool of water; and their enjoyment has yielded me nothing but sorrow.§ The earth, dominion,‡ forces, treasures, friends,§ children, wife, dependants, all the objects of sense,** have I possessed, imagining them to be sources of happiness; but I found, that, in their changeable nature, †† O lord, they were nothing but vexation. The gods themselves, though (high) in heaven, were in need of my alliance. Where, then, is everlasting repose? Who, without adoring thee,—who art the origin of all worlds,—shall attain, O supreme deity, that rest which endures for ever? Beguiled by thy delusions, and ignorant of thy nature,* men, after suffering the various penalties of birth, death, and infirmity, behold the countenance of the king of ghosts, † and suffer, in hell, dreadful tortures,—the reward of their own deeds. Addicted to sensual objects, through thy delusions I revolve in the whirlpool of selfishness and pride; and, hence, I come to thee, as my final refuge, who art the lord deserving of all homage, than whom there is no other asylum;: my mind afflicted with repentance for my trust in the world, and desiring the fulness of felicity, emancipation from all existence.”§

* These are alluded to in the opening stanza of the Sāṅkhya-kārikā:

** भूखेन्द्रमिथाश्चातिः दत्तपदाते दैवतीति।

** सत्यं सत्यं चतुर्विद्यानां चांभवते।

** श्रीमान् श्रीनानि तन्मि सतपाय चायमन।

† प्रेतराज, an epithet of Yama.

‡ परमपदं चाती न विचित्त।

§ निर्षणे परिषात्पत्तिः सांबिनाय।

This means: “longing for emancipation,—of uncreated glory.” So says Ratnagarbha, who also allows the epithet of ‘emancipation’ to signify “resort of perfect yogins”. Śridhara gives the second interpretation only.

The ‘emancipation’ of the Hindus is not release “from all existence”, but from consciousness of pleasure and pain. The distinction is, at all events, good, as a piece of idealism.
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CHAPTER XXIV.

Muchukunda goes to perform penance. Kríshná takes the army and treasures of Kúayavana, and repairs, with them, to Dwáraká. Balárama visits Vraja: inquiries of its inhabitants after Kríshná.

THUS praised by the wise Muchukunda, the sover­

reign of all things, the eternal lord, Hari, said to him:

"Go to whatever celestial regions you wish, lord of men, possessed of might irresistible, honoured* by my favour. When you have fully enjoyed all heavenly pleasures, you shall be born in a distingl­

ished family, retaining the recollection of your former births; and you shall, finally, obtain emancipation."† Having heard this promise, and prostrated himself before Achyuta, the lord of the world, Muchukunda went forth from the cave, and, beholding men of diminutive stature, now first knew that the Káliage had arrived.

The king, therefore, departed to Gandhamadana, to perform penance.

Having returned to Mathurá, and took captive his enemy, returned to Mathurá, and took captive his army, rich in horses, elephants, and cars, which he conducted to Dwáraká,* and delivered to Ugrasena; and the Yádu race was relieved from all fear of invasion.† Baládeva, when hostilities had entirely ceased, being desirous of seeing his kinsmen, went to Nandá's cow-pens;† and there again conversed with the herds­

men and their females, with affection and respect. By some, the elders, he was embraced; others, the juniors, he embraced; and with those of his own age, male or female, he talked and laughed.§ The cowherds made many kind speeches to Haláyudhá; but some of the Gopás spoke to him with the affectation of anger, or with feelings of jealousy, as they inquired after the loves of Kríshná with the women of Mathurá. "Is all well with the fickle and inconstant Kríshná?" said they. "Does the volatile swain, the friend of all instant­

amuse the women of the city by laughing at our rustic efforts (to please him)? Does he ever think of LIS, singing in chorus to his songs? Will he not come here once again, to see his mother? But why talk of these things? It is a different tale to tell, for him without us, and for us without him. Father,
mother, brother, husband, kin,—what have we not abandoned for his sake? But he is a monument of ingratitude.* Yet tell us, does not Ki'ishna talk of coming here? Falsehood is never, O Ki'ishna, uttered by thee. Verily, this is Dámodara,† this is Govinda, who has given up his heart to the damsels of the city,—who has, no longer, any regard for us, but looks upon us with disdain.‡ So saying, the Gopís, whose minds were fixed on Ki'ishna,§ addressed Ráma, in his place, calling him Dámodara and Govinda,∥ and laughed, and were merry;* and Ráma consoled them by communicating to them agreeable, modest, affectionate, and gentle messages from Ki'ishna. With the cowherds he talked mirthfully, as he had been wont to do and rambled, along with them, over the lands of Vraja.†

* This visit of Balaráma to Vraja is placed, by the Hari Vaniśa, anterior to the fall of Mathurá; by the Bhágavata, long subsequent to the establishment of the Yadus at Dwáraká.

† See Vol. IV., p 281.
‡ Dámodara; priti-bhakti pratisita sva-suḥa suhāsyam: purusāsya pritima vimchita nu nu.
§ Of this Dámodara, or Govinda, whose heart is attached to the women of the city, the love has departed, as towards us; and, therefore, he is hard to be seen. And yet he delights us.
∥ Hari, in the original.

Balaráma finds wine in the hollow of a tree; becomes inebriated; commands the Yamuňá to come to him, and, on her refusal, drags her out of her course: Lakshmi gives him ornaments and a dress: he returns to Dwáraká, and marries Revátí.

WHILST the mighty* Śesha,† the upholder of the globe, was thus engaged in wandering amidst the forests, with the herdsmen, in the disguise of a mortal,—having rendered great services to earth, and still considering what more was to be achieved,—Varuṇa,‡ in order to provide for his recreation, said to (his wife,) Váruṇī§ (the goddess of wine): “Thou, Madirá,∥ are ever acceptable to the powerful Ananta.¶ Go, therefore, auspicious and kind goddess,++ and promote his enjoyments.” Obeying these commands, Váruṇí went and established herself in the hollow of a Kadamba-tree, in the woods of Vrindávana. Baladeva, roaming about, (came there, and,) smelling the pleasant fragrance of liquor,+++ resumed his ancient passion for strong drink. The holder of the ploughshare,++++ observ-

* Mahátmán.
† See Vol. II., pp. 74, 85, and 211, note 1.
‡ See Vol. II., p. 85.
§ See Vol. I., p. 146, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 212.
∥ Different, of course, from the Madirá named in Vol. IV., p. 109.
¶ The same as Śesha. See Vol. II., p. 211.
++ गदा कुडे कुड़े++ Ratnagarbha reads, instead of कुड़े, कुड़ा।
+++ Madi1·a. See Vol. II., p. 211.
++++ LANGALIN, in the original; the same, in effect, as Haláyudha. Vide supra, p. 63, note ||.

V.
ing the vinous drops distilling from the Kadamba-tree, was much delighted, (and gathered) and quaffed them,\(^1\) along with the herdsmen and the Gopīs; whilst those who were skilful with voice and lute celebrated him in their songs.\(^*\) Being inebriated (with the wine), and the drops of perspiration standing like pearls upon his limbs, he called out, not knowing what he said: "Come hither, Yamunā river. I want to bathe." The river, disregarding the words of a drunken man, came not (at his bidding). On which, Rāma, in a rage,

\(^1\) There is no vinous exudation from the Kadamba-tree (Nucleca Kadamba); but its flowers are said to yield a spirit, by distillation; -whence Kadambari\(^\S\) is one of the synonyms of wine, or spirituous liquor. The grammarians, however, also derive the word from some legend; stating it to be so called, because it was produced from the hollow of a Kadamba-tree on the Gomanta\(\|\) mountain: गोमन्तच्या कदम्बोकोटाराजता। The Hari Vaṁśa,\(\|\) which alone makes the Gomanta mountain the scene of an exploit of Krīshṇa and Rāma, makes no mention of this origin of wine; and the Bhāgavata\(\|\|\) merely says, that Vāruṇī took up her abode in the hollow of a tree.\(\|\|\) There must be some other authority, therefore, for this story.

\(^*\) उप्योगीयमानो बलिद गीतवाक्यविषार्थः। This verse, it is observable, has an excessive syllable at the end of its first half.

\(^\dagger\) Viśwala.

\(^\ddagger\) The Sanskrit has Lāṅgalin. See the preceding page, note \(^\ddagger\)\ddagger\.

\(^\S\) Personified, Kadambari is said to be daughter of Chitraratha and Madira. For Chitraratha, see Vol. II., p. 86, note 1.

\(^\|\) Corrected, here and below,—and in the Sanskrit,—from "Gomanta". For the mountain in question, see Vol. II., p. 141, note 2, ad finem. The Harivṃśa places it near the Sahya mountains.

\(^\|\|\) Chapter XVII.

\(^\|\|\|\) X., Latter Section, XVI., 19.

\(^\|\|\|\|\) Compare the Harivṃśa, Chapter XC VIII.

took up his ploughshare,\(\ast\) which he plunged into her bank, and dragged her to him, calling out: \(\dagger\) "Will you not come, you jade? Will you not come? Now go where you please, (if you can)." Thus saying, he compelled the dark river to quit its ordinary course, and follow him whithersoever he wandered through the wood.\(\|\) Assuming a mortal figure,\(\|\) the Yamunā, with distracted looks, approached Balabhadra,\(\|\) and entreated him\(\|\|\) to pardon her, and let her go. But he replied: "I will drag you with my ploughshare, in a thousand directions, since you contemn my prowess and strength."\(\|\|\) At last, however, appeased by her reiterated prayers, he let her go, after she had watered all the country.\(\|\|\|\) When he had bathed, the goddess

\(^\ast\) Hala. Vide supra, p. 51, note \(\|\).

\(^\dagger\) \(\|\) The Bhāgavata and Hari Vaṁśa\(\|\|\) repeat this story; the latter, very imperfectly. The former adds, that the Yamunā is

\(^\|\) Rāma, in the original.

\(^\|\|\) The Sanskrit here exhibits Mūsālāyudha, "Bludgeon-armed", a name of Baladeva. Vide supra, p. 51, note \(\|\).

\(^\|\|\|\) \(\|\) The Harivṃśa, Chapter XCVIII.
of beauty, * Lakshmi, came, and gave him a beautiful lotos to place in one ear, and an ear-ring for the other; † a fresh necklace of lotos-flowers, sent by Varuṇa; and garments of a dark blue colour, as costly as the wealth of the ocean: and, thus decorated with a lotos in one ear, a ring in the other; § dressed in blue garments, and wearing a garland, Balaráma appeared united with loveliness. Thus decorated, Ráma sported two months ill Vrásja, and then returned to Dwáráká, where he married Revátí, the daughter of King Raivata, || by whom he had (two sons,) Niśátha * and Ulmuka. 1

still to be seen following the course along which she was dragged by Balaráma. The legend, probably, alludes to the construction of canals from the Jumna, for the purposes of irrigation; and the works of the Mohammedans in this way—which are well known,—were, no doubt, preceded by similar canals, dug by order of Hindu princes.

1 See Vol. IV., p. 109.

* The Sanskrit has only Kánti for "the goddess of beauty." It is a name of Lakshmi, who is mentioned, in the original, several stanzas further on.

† अवसरोपणं चाष गृहीतेऽयं च कुष्ठिस्व।
Professor Wilson has rendered the explanation of the commentators.

‡ This expression is to render samudrdrha.

§ कथानतः स तद्य चाषकुष्ठलमूर्तिः।

§§ Corrected from "Niśátha".

CHAPTER XXVI.
Krishna carries off Rukmíni: the princes who come to resuce her repulsed by Balaráma. Rukmíni overthrown, but, spared by Krishna, founds Bhojakáśa. Pradyumna born of Rukmíni.

BHÍSHMAKA * was king of Vidarbha, † residing at Kuñójina. 1: He had a son named Rukmíni, and a beautiful daughter termed Rukmíni. Krishna fell in love with the latter,§ and solicited her in marriage: but her brother, who hated Krishna, ¶ would not assent to the espousals. At the suggestion of Jarásandha, and with the concurrence of his son, the powerful (sovereign) Bhíshmaka affianced Rukmíni to Śivapála. ¶ In order to (celebrate) the nuptials, Jarásandha and other princes, the friends of Śivapála, ** assembled

1 Vidarbha is the country of Berar; and the name remains in the present city of Beder. The capital, however, Kuñójina, is, commonly, identified with a place called Kundapoor, about forty miles north-east of Amarávati (in Berar).

* The elongated form of Bhishma, as this king is called in the Mahabhárata.
† Literally, "in the country of the Vidarbhas": निद्धभेषिते।
‡ See Vol. II., p. 156, note 3.
§ And she, we are told, with him:

चाचहासिनि चक्रित्वादरभूणि; सा च तं चाचहासिनि।

Chácumónsiní is an epithet, not a second name, of Rukmíni. For Chácarensiní, another of Krishna’s numerous wives, see Vol. IV., p. 112; also, infra, p. 81, note §, and p. 83, note ¶.

|| Called Chakrin, in the Sanskrit.

¶ The beginning of this Chapter is translated in Original Sanskrit Texts, Part IV., p. 179, note 161.

** See Vol. IV., pp. 104 and 106.
in the capital of Vidarbha; and Kṛṣṇa, attended by Balabhadra and many other Yādavas, also went to Kuṇḍina, to witness the wedding. When there, Hari contrived, on the eve of the nuptials, to carry off the princess; leaving Rāma and his kinsmen to sustain the weight of his enemies. Pannāraka, the illustrious Dantavakra, Vidūratha, Śiśupāla, Jarāsandha, Śālva, and other kings, indignant (at the insult), exerted themselves to kill Kṛṣṇa, but were repelled by Balarama and the yadavas. Rukmin, vowing that he would never enter Kuṇḍina again, until he had slain Kṛṣṇa, pursued and overtook him. (In the combat that ensued), Kṛṣṇa destroyed, with his discus, as if in sport, the host (of Rukmin),—with all its horse, and elephants, and foot, and chariots,—and overthrew him, and hurled him on the ground, and would have put him to death, but was withheld by the entreaties of Rukmiṇī. “He is my only brother,” she exclaimed, “and must not be slain by thee. Restrain your wrath, O divine lord; and give me my brother, in charity.” Thus addressed by her, Kṛṣṇa, whom no acts affect, spared Rukmin; and he (in pursuance of his vow,) founded the city Bhojakāta, and (ever afterwards) dwelt therein. After the defeat of Rukmin, Kṛṣṇa married Rukmiṇī, in due form; having, first, made her his own by the Ṛtkṣasa ritual. She bore him the gallant Pradyumna, a

1 When she had gone forth from the city to worship Ambikā: Bhāgavata. Indrāni, the wife of Indra: Hari Varāṇa. Our text tells the circumstance more concisely than the others.

§§ The “discus”, chakra, is not here mentioned; but Kṛṣṇa is designated as Chakrī. The original of the passage where the discus was supposed to be spoken of is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>निर्जित: परितिनिर्जितो च चक्रिः</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find no reading but this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 After depriving him of his eyebrows and hair. In the Bhāgavata, Balarama also interferes in favour of Rukmin, and reproves Kṛṣṇa for disfiguring him.

2 Of course, this was somewhere in the neighbourhood of Kuṇḍina, or Vidarbha, and is, usually, supposed to be situated on the Narmada.

3 That is, by violence. Thus Manu: “The seizure of a maiden, by force, from her house, while she weeps, and calls for...”
portion of the deity of love. The demon Šambara† carried him off; but he slew the demon.

assistance, after her kinsmen and friends have been slain in battle, or wounded, and their houses broken open, is the marriage styled Rākṣasa. § III., 33. || According to the Bhāga-vata, Rukmiṇī sends to invite Kṛishṇa to carry her off, and instructs him how to proceed.

* "The deity of love" is to render Madana, a name of Kāma or Ananga.
† See Vol. II., p. 70.
§ This is from the translation of Sir William Jones.
|| हला चित्ता च भिला च क्रोधन्ती दुःखात।
प्रजाज्ञ क्याहरण राष्ट्री विनिष्ठते।

CHAPTER XXVII.

Pradyumna stolen by Šambara; thrown into the sea, and swallowed by a fish; found by Māyādevi: he kills Šambara, marries Māyādevi, and returns, with her, to Dwārakā. Joy of Rukmiṇī and Kṛishṇa.

MAITREYA.—How, Muni, happened it that the hero Pradyumna was carried away by Šambara? And in what manner was the mighty Šambara killed by Pradyumna?

PARĀṢARA.—When Pradyumna was but six days old, he was stolen, from the lying-in chamber, by Šambara, terrible as death;* for the demon foreknew that Pradyumna, if he lived, would be his destroyer.† Taking away the boy, Šambara cast him into the ocean, swarming with monsters;‡—into a whirlpool of roaring waves, the haunt of the huge creatures of the deep. § A large fish swallowed the child; but he died not, and was born anew, from its belly;*|| for that fish,

* The Bhāga-vata tells the story in the same manner; but the Hari Vaniṣṭa omits the part of the fish.

† Here, as below, the original has kāla-śambara, i. e., according to Rātanagṛbha, "black Šambara", or "Šambara, equal to death." Śrīdhara gives only the latter interpretation.
‡ चयं जातमार्ण तू प्रज्ञ कृत्यकुराहत।
ममित्र हितीति मुनि इतयादायश्च।

|| ग्रदहोरः।
§ कालीकषमिनितां वुत्सौरे समराजे।
|| पतितं तच्छैवंको मस्यो जयाहि वास्कम।

1 The Bhāga-vata tells the story in the same manner; but the Hari Vaniṣṭa omits the part of the fish.
with others, was caught by the fishermen, and delivered, by them, to the great Asura Śambhara. His wife Māyādevi, the mistress of his household, superintended the operations of the cooks, and saw, when the fish was cut open, a beautiful child, looking like a new shoot of the blighted tree of love. Whilst wondering who this should be, and how he could have got into the belly of the fish, Nārada came, to satisfy her curiosity, and said to the graceful dame: "This is the son of him by whom the whole world is created and destroyed,*—the son of Vishnū, who was stolen, by Śambhara, from the lying-in chamber, and tossed (by him,) into the sea, where he was swallowed by the fish. He is now in thy power. Do thou, beautiful woman, tenderly rear this jewel of mankind." Thus counselled by Nārada, Māyādevi took charge of the boy, and carefully reared him, from childhood, being fascinated by the beauty of his person. Her affection became still more impassioned, when he was decorated with the bloom of adolescence. The gracefully-moving Mayavati,† then, fixing her heart and eyes upon the high-minded Pradyumna, gave him, whom she regarded as herself, all her magic (and illusive) powers.‡

**This** reads Śrīdhara. Ratnagarbha ends the second verse with जटरानवनपितः; several MSS. unaccompanied by commentary, with जटरानवनपितः.

- समझानम: चूितिसंवारकरिष्टः।
- बिख्या।
- Gajā-gāminī; literally, "having the gait of an elephant."
- Another name of Māyādevi. Some MSS. yield, here and elsewhere, Māyārati.
- सामान्यति दृढ़ी चारे माता: चर्चा महात्मे।
- श्रुतायांकृतमृताय तत्ततसर्वेश्च।

Observing these marks of passionate affection, the son of Kṛishnā* said to the lotos-eyed (Māyādevi): "Why do you indulge in feelings so unbecoming the character of a mother?" To which she replied: "Thou art not a son of mine; thou art the son of Vishnū, whom Kāla Śambhara† carried away, and threw into the sea. Thou wast swallowed by a fish, but wast rescued, by me, from its belly.‡ Thy fond mother, O beloved, is still weeping for thee." When the valiant§ Pradyumna heard this, he was filled with wrath, and defied Śambhara to battle. In the conflict that ensued, the son of Mádhava|| slew the whole host of Śambhara. Seven times he foiled the delusions of the enchanter, and, making himself master of the eighth, turned it against Śambhara,¶ and killed him. By the same faculty he ascended into the air,** and proceeded to his father's house, where he alighted, along with Māyavati, in the inner apartments. When the women beheld Pradyumna, they thought it was Kṛishnā himself. Rukmiṇī, her eyes dimmed with tears, spoke tenderly to him, and said: "Happy is she who has a son like this, in the bloom of youth. Such would be the age

---

* Kashāi, in the original.
† See note * in p. 73, supra.
‡ Here the original again has kāla-śambhara.
§ Mahā-balā.
|| Mahāvari in the Sanskrit.
** In the original there is only the word जय, to denote this procedure. Neither of the commentators remarks on the passage. See Vol. III., p. 311, note ||.
of my son Pradyumna, if he was alive. Who is the fortunate mother adorned by thee? And yet, from thy appearance, and from the affection I feel for thee, thou art, assuredly, the son of Hari."

At this moment, Krishna, accompanied by Narada, arrived; and the latter said to the delighted Rukmini:* "This is thine own son, who has come hither, after killing Sambara, by whom, when an infant, he was stolen from the lying-in chamber. This is the virtuous Mayavati, his wife, and not the wife of Sambara. Hear the reason. When Manmatha (the deity of love,) had perished,† the goddess of beauty,† desirous to secure his revival, assumed a delusive form, and, by her charms, fascinated the demon Sambara, and exhibited herself to him in various illusory enjoyments.: This

1 When he was reduced to ashes by a fiery glance from Siva, in resentment of his inflaming him with passion for Uma. This legend is a favourite with the Saiva Puranas, and is told in the Linga and Kaliiká; also, in the Padma Puráña, and Káshi Khańda of the Skanda Puráña. They do not say much about his resuscitation, however; Siva, in pity of Rati's grief, restoring him only to a bodiless existence, as Ananga, whose place is to be in the hearts of men. The Linga adds, that, when Vishnu, in consequence of the curse of Bhrgu, shall be born as the son of Vasudeva, Karma shall be born as one of his sons.

† The daughter of Daksha, but not enumerated amongst those formerly specified (Vol. I., p. 109). She was born from his inspiration, according to the Kaliiká Puráña.

of these readings; in which, apparently, he thought he saw वायव्य, in the sense of something ‘airy’ or ‘unreal’. The whole expression signifies “sexual congress and other enjoyments”.

† The original has Dwárvati.

† The rendering of this Chapter deviates rather more widely than usual from literality.

I find no variants of this passage.

† This expression is to render रुपिणी, “the beautiful one,”—an epithet, here, of Rati.

‡ Śridhara has बिभाषयुपमोजेय. Ratnasagarba, while mentioning this lection, prefers बिभाषायुपमोजेय; and some MSS. of the mere text exhibit बिभाषायुपमोजेय. The Translator seems to have taken the first
CHAPTER XXVIII.

Wives of Kriṣhṇa. Pradyumna has Aniruddha: nuptials of the latter. Balarāma, beat at dice, becomes incensed, and slays Rukmi and others.

RUKMIṆĪ bare to Kriṣhṇa these other sons: Chārudeśhūṇa, Sudeshhūṇa, Chārudeha, * Susheṇa, Chāru-gupta, Bhadrachāru, Chārvinda,† Suchāru, and the very mighty Chāru;† also, one daughter, Chārunatī. Kriṣhṇa had seven other beautiful wives:§ Kā-

* Mahābhāra, in one MS., follows Chārudeha. It would be difficult to prove that it is not a proper name.
† Instead of Susheṇa and Chārvinda, the Bṛḍgava-puraṇā has Vi- chāru and Chārunchandra.
‡ A single copy has Chandra.
Several other sons of RukmiṆī, elsewhere recognized as such, are here unnoticed. See Vol. IV., p. 112, note **.
§ The original is as follows:

चन्द्र स्वरूपः कष्टक वष्पः सति गदमनः ||

It is signified, by this verse, that seven beautiful wives are about to be named; but it is not expressly said that the specification is restricted to seven wives, or to beautiful ones only. The commentators, however, endeavour to reduce the catalogue to a septenary. Sridhara's identification, in order to this reduction, is spoken of, by the Translator, in his note in p. 81, infra, but is not accepted by him. Further particulars Śrīdhara does not enter into; and the Translator, who does not even allude to Ratnagarha's roll of the ladies, assumes that we are to find, here, precisely the same seven—and no more,—that are enumerated at the beginning of Chapter XXXII. of this Book. But, as will appear from my annotations that follow, it is more or less possible that several wives are designated over and above the heptad with which the commentators content themselves. My Ajmere MS. ends the verse quoted above with वर्ष्रुतस्तिरोमनः; thus premising 'very beautiful' wives,—not simply 'beautiful',—and omitting all definition of their number.

Ratnagarha asserts that the seven are: Mitravindā, Satyā, Jāmbavati, Rohiṇī, Susīḷā, Satyabhāmā, and Lakshmanā; and the words connected with these names are, he pronounces, epithets. Unlike Śrīdhara, he

†† कालखण्डः || Possibly, this is a proper name, Kāmarūpīṇi; but, probably, it is an epithet. See the Harivahāṣa, il. 6701.
amiable and excellent daughter of the king of Madra, *

* Madra-rajya. Leaving out of question the interpretation "king of Madra", our choice lies, according to circumstances, between "king of the Madras" and "King Madra." In the purest Sanskrit, only the former of these two significations is admissible. There are many cases, in later literature, similar to Madra-rajya, thus considered; such as Kâdârjaja, Vatnârajya, Bhogatârajya, Bhogapati, &c. &c. Instances in which there is not the option spoken of above, but in which, at variance with classical canons, substantial members of a compound stand in apposition, are Varadârajya, Bhogadeva, Kâmadeva, Madhavanadeva, Nandike, Venkateha, Bhoileela, Kapileswara, Ramakrishna, Gorakhshandha, Seshanaga, Agbásura, &c. &c.

Mâdri's father might, as has been said, be Madra-rajya in the sense of "King Madra"; only no such ruler has been discovered among Kâshâna's contemporaries. Conclusively, Kâshâna—also the lady who bears the patronym of Mâdri is distinctively called,—is said, in the Bhâgavata-purâôa, to have been daughter of Madrakhipati, which it would be very unsafe to translate otherwise than by "king of the Madras".

In Sanskrit, names of countries and kingdoms are denoted, very frequently, by compounds ending with a word for country or kingdom, -drâ, -ya, -deva, -jaja, -rajya, -shâra, Examples of such names standing independently are rare, and seem to be confined to feminines. Most generally, a plural is employed; and this plural imports a people. Thus, where we have heads, Bhoileela, Kâmadeva, Madhavanadeva, Nandike, Venkateha, Bhâileela, Kapileswara, Ramakrishna, Gorakhshandha, Seshanaga, Agbásura, &c. &c.

The preponderant usage here referred to may, perhaps, be accounted for in this wise. The earliest Hindus were grouped in tribes, not in nations; and these tribes were distinguished by lineage, not by place of abode. The titles which they bore were eponymous and, thus, where we should be disposed to say "he lives in Mâlava," an ancient Hindu would have said "he lives in the country of the Mâlavas," which is identical with "he lives among the Mâlavas," or, in accordance with the somewhat more prevalent idiom, "he lives among the Mâlavas," which is identical with "he lives among the Mâlavas." The preponderant usage here referred to may, perhaps, be accounted for in this wise. The earliest Hindus were grouped in tribes, not in nations; and these tribes were distinguished by lineage, not by place of abode. The titles which they bore were eponymous; and it should seem that they were long in acquiring fixed habitations. Hence, it may be surmised,—and not for the reason that led Louis Philippe to style himself "king of the French";—it is that we read of, for instance, "the king of the Panchânas"; somewhat as, from a sense of vagueness, the Yavanas, Hûnas, Chinas, Turushkas, and Sâkas were never localized, further than by the indeterminate forms Yavana-la, "country of the Yavanas," and the like. In later times, as history informs us, kingdoms of more or less definite bounds were established, and lasted for long periods. But the old idiom had become so firmly rooted as, in spite of the altered state of things, to hold its ground; and the option of mentioning a region or state (by its simple name), instead of its people, was seldom accepted. The sole exceptions seem to be afforded

1 The number specified, however, both in this place and in Chapter XXXII., is nine, instead of eight. The commentator endeavors to explain the difference, by identifying Rohini with Jâmavat. But, in the notices of Krâsha's posterity, both in

by the names of cities which were, of themselves, kingdoms; and most Hindu cities bore appellations of the feminine gender. The Kurukshetra, Mârthu, Sâchigu, and Avasani of the Aste-râdhrâma I take to be cities with masculine names,—like Kâshâna, &c., not countries.

If this view be not fallacious, we can, therefore, only plead convenience, when we speak of Ahiha, Ánarta, Chedi, Keralâ, Kosala, Kurukshetra, Madra, Magadhâ, Mâlava, Sûrasena, &c., after the manner of the latest and most corrupt Sanskrit, and of the living vernaculars of India. Similarly, we find, in Latin, only Sabiunum aegris or Sabiunus aegris, and in Sabinius veriari, in Sabinius projici; but, in the present day, we have Sabina. The Greeks, it is true, devised the name Sintris; and, in the same way, they invented the names Abiria, Citrabhâni, Gandârîta, etc., though the ancient Hindus recognized no countries denominated Ahiha, Kârta, Gandhára, &c.,

* I have parenthesis this name, as being added by the Translator. The original has सुलीला बोधि धवल. The latter word is, palpably, an epithet of the former, and suggested thereby. The Hârâvinda, sl. 6700, places this point beyond all doubt. We must read, therefore, "Suâli,

elimate "amiable and excellent". Vide supra. p. 78, note §. Suâli appears, in p. 107, infra, under her patronym Mâdri.

To Mâdri the Bhâgavata-purâôa assigns progeny bearing the names of Prâghošha, Gâttavat, Sûjâna, Bala, Prâbala, Urâwaga, Mahâakti, Saha, Oja, and Parâjita.

† According to the Bhâgavata-purâôa, she had ten children: Bhânu, Subhânu, Svarbhânu, Prabhânu, Bhânumat, Chandrabhânu, Bûhdbhânu, Atihbânu, Sûbhânu, and Prûbhânu.

‡ Corrected from "Sattarjita". The original has Sattarjita, patronymic of Sattarjita, for whom and his daughter Satyabhâmâ, see Vol. IV., pp. 79, 80.

§ वालवालिनः. Here we have, possibly, another name of Laksâmanâ, rather than an epithet. For Chârnâhâra, see Vol. IV., p. 112, note §. Also see note § in p. 83, infra. My Ajmer see MS. gives वालवालिनः; and Priyadarshini, too, is a lady's name, as in my Vasavadatta, p. 236.

|| Śûdrâ is intended. Vide supra, p. 78, note §.
he had sixteen thousand other wives.†  

This work and the Bhágavata, she is distinct from Jámbavati. She seems, however, to be an addition to the more usually specified eight, of whose several marriages the Bhágavata gives the best account. In addition to the three first,—respecting whom particulars are found in all,—Kálindi, or the Yamaná,‡ is the daughter of the Sun, whom Kríshña meets on one of his visits to Indraprastha,§ and who claims him as the reward of her penance. His next wife, Mitra-vindá, is the daughter of his maternal aunt, Rájá́dhídevi (Vol. IV., pp. 101 and 103), and sister of Vinda and Anuvinda, kings of Avantí:|| she chooses him at her Swayamvara. The Hari Váníśá † calls her Sudáttá,** daughter of Síbi; and she is, subsequently, termed Sáhyá by our text.†† Nagmájí, or Satyá,‡‡ the next wife, was the daughter of Nágamájí, king of Kausálá, §§ and was the prize of Kríshña’s overcoming seven fierce bulls, whom no other hero had encountered with success. Bhadrá,|| princess of Kékáya,¶—also Kríshña’s cousin, the daughter of Śrutakírtti (Vol. IV., pp. 101 and 103),—was his next; and his eighth wife was Mádri,*** the daughter of the

* Chakrín, in the original.† In all, Kríshña’s wives amounted to sixteen thousand and one hundred, as we read in Vol. IV., p. 112. But vide infra, p. 105, note §§.‡ See Vol. III., p. 20.§ A city on the Jumna, near the present Delhi. It belonged to the Páṇḍavas. || See Vol. IV., supplementary note on p. 103.

¶ Sl. 9179 and 9187. In sl. 6703 of the same work, this or another daughter of Síbi seems to be called Tanwi.

** Corrected from “Saúdátá”. See note || in the page following.

†† In p. 107, infra.

‡‡ Transformed, in the text, into “the virtuous”. See note ; in p. 79, supra.

† The Bhágavata-púrāṇa describes Nagmájí as Kauśalya, which Śridhara interprets by Ayoñíjá-páti, “King of Ayoñíjá”; and this city was the capital of Kosála.

||| Her children, we read in the Bhágavata-púrāṇa, were Sángramájí, Bhirátesá, Súra, Prahardá, Arijít, Jaya, and Subhadra.

¶¶ See Vol. IV., p. 103, text and note §. The Bhágavata-púrāṇa simply gives Bhadrá the epithet Kaíkeyí. ** See note * in the last page.

The heroic Praduyumna was chosen, for her lord, at her public choice of a husband, by the daughter of Rukmíní;* and he had, by her, the powerful and gallant prince Aniruddha, who was fierce in fight,† an ocean of prowess, and the tamer of his foes. Késáva demanded, in marriage, for him, the granddaughter of

* Rakundáti was her name. See Vol. IV., p. 112, text and note ††. The Bhágavata-púrāṇa calls her Rukmaváti, also. For Rukmíní, vide supra, p. 67.

† रुकुम्भि नाम:।

†† Vide supra, p. 80, note *.

§ Corrected from “Lakshmáni”. Vide supra, p. 80, note *. In the Hariváčásá, sl. 6702 and 9179, Lakshmáni takes the place of Mádri, and is followed, according to the Calcutta and Bombay editions, by Bhekapála, for which see Vol. IV., p. 112, note ||. Is it a third synonym? Vide supra, p. 81, note §.

|| Corrected from “Saúbhíma”. See the Hariváčásá, sl. 9180. Professor Wilson’s “Saúdáttá” and “Saúbhíma” were taken, I suspect, from the “Soudáttá” and “Soubhíma” of M. Langlois; his ou, a transliteration of उ, being supposed to represent उ, ou.

Rukmin; and, although the latter was inimical to Krishña,* he betrothed the maiden† (who was his son’s daughter,) to the son of his own daughter (her cousin Aniruddha). Upon the occasion of the nuptials, Ráma and other Yádavas attended Krishña: to Bhojakaka, the city of Rukmin. After the wedding§ had been solemnized, several of the kings, headed by him of Kalinga,|| said to Rukmin: “This wielder of the ploughshare¶ is ignorant of the dice, which may be converted into his misfortune. Why may we not contend with him, and beat him, in play?”** The potent Rukmin replied to them, and said “So let it be.” And he engaged Balaráma†† at a game of dice, in the palace. Balaráma:: soon lost to Rukmin a thousand Nishkas.\ The Nishka is a weight of gold, but, according to different authorities, of very different amount. The commentator§§ here terms it a weight of four Suvarnas, each about 175 grains Troy.\n
* Sauri, in the original.
† Subbhadrá. See Vol. IV., p. 112.
‡ The Sanskrit has Hari.
§ Of Prádryumna,—according to the original,—that is to say, Aniruddha.
¶ Kálikarma-prjñapáda: “the king of Kalinga, and others.”
|| Halin, i. e., Balaráma. Vide supra, p. 63, note ||, and p. 65, note ||.\n\n*** “न जयामो जयं कस्मात्त्रूणिनं सहायति”
न जयामो जयं कस्मात्त्रूणिनं सहायति:||
Ratnagarbha has जनमेव: instead of जनं जयं:||
†† Ráma, in the original.
‡‡ The Sanskrit has Bala.
§§ Sridhara. Ratnagarbha is silent.
||| In reckoning money by tale, the nishka, according to the first chapter of the Liitdvati, is equivalent to sixteen drammas. See Colebrooke’s Algebra, &c., p. 1.

and then pledged ten thousand, which Rukmin, who was well skilled in gambling, also won. At this, the king of Kalinga laughed aloud:* and the weak and exulting Rukmin grinned, and said:† Baladeva is losing; for he knows nothing of the game; although, blinded by a vain passion for play, he thinks he understands the dice.”§ Haláyudha, galled by the broad laughter of the Kalinga prince,§ and the contemptuous speech of Rukmin, was (exceedingly) angry, and, overcome with passion, increased his stake to ten millions of Nishkas. Rukmin accepted the challenge, and, therefore, threw the dice. Baladeva won, and cried aloud “The stake is mine.” But Rukmin called out, as loudly, that he was the winner. “Tell no lies, Bala,”|| said he. “The stake is yours; that is true: but I did not agree to it. Although this be won by you, yet still I am the winner.”¶ A deep voice was then heard in the sky,—inflaming still more the anger of the high-spirited Baladeva,—saying: “Bala has rightly won the whole sum, and Rukmin speaks falsely. Although he did not accept the pledge in words, he did so by his acts,** (having cast the dice).” Bala-
rāma,* thus excited, his eyes red with rage, started up, and struck Rukmin with the board on which the game was played,† and killed him.‡ Taking hold of a golden column, he dragged it from its place, and used it as a weapon to kill those princes who had taken part with his adversaries.§ Upon which, the whole circle, crying out with terror, took to flight; and escaped from the wrath of Baladeva.¶ When Kṛṣṇa heard that Rukmin had been killed by his brother, he made no remark, being afraid of Rukmin (on the one hand,) and of Bala (on the other); but, taking with him the (newly) wedded Aniruddha, and the Yādava tribe, he ** returned to Dwārakā.

The Bhāgavata and Hari Vamsa—which, both, tell this story,—agree in the death of Rukmin; but, in the Mahābhārata, he appears, in the war, on the side of the Pāṇḍavas. The occurrence is a not very favourable picture of courtly manners; but scenes of violence have never been infrequent at the courts of Rajpoot princes.

* The Sanskrit has Bala.
† Ashāpada.
‡ See the original words quoted in note § in the preceding page.
§ चार्क्स च सहासृश्यं जातानुभमय वचः।
चातः चत्वह वेदावस भुवति दशात्।
|| साध्याः सर्वं यात्ताश्च दिवसः।
|| मन्त्रमान्तयं सर्वं वचमुखिः वचः।
|| Madhūsūdana, in the original.
¶ Keśava, according to the reading accepted by Śrīdhara. The other, Ratnagarbha’s lection, represents Bala as leading off Keśava and the rest.

CHAP. 29.

Indra comes to Dwārakā, and reports to Kṛṣṇa the tyranny of Nāraka. Kṛṣṇa goes to his city, and puts him to death. Earth gives the ear-rings of Aditi to Kṛṣṇa, and praises him. He liberates the princesses made captive by Nāraka, sends them to Dwārakā, and goes to Swarga, with Satyabhāmā.

ŚAKRA,* the lord of the three worlds, came mounted on his fierce† (elephant,) Airāvata, to (visit) Saurī (Kṛṣṇa,) at Dwārakā.: Having entered the city, and been welcomed by Hari, he related (to the hero) the deeds of the demon § Nāraka.| "By thee, Madhūsūdana, lord of the gods," said Indra, "in a mortal condition, all sufferings have been soothed. Arishṭa, Dhenuka, Chānūra, Mūshāka,¶ Keśā, who sought to injure helpless man,** have, all, been slain by thee. Kāṁśa, Kuvalayāpīḍa, the child-destroying Pūtana, have been killed by thee; and so have other oppressors of the world. By thy valour and wisdom

* Or Indra. For him and his mother, see Vol. II., p. 27. Śaka and Hari were, both, sons of Aditi. See Vol. I., p. 151; and Vol. III., p. 18, text and notes 1 and †.
† Matta.
‡ Dwāravati, in the original.
§ Dāitya. See the next note.
|| The less famous Nāraka was son of Viprachitti, son of Kaśyapa and Dānua, and, hence, was a Dānava, according to our Purāṇa. See Vol. II., pp. 70–72. The Nāraka of the text was not a Dānava; nor can he be called a Dāitya, except by a very loose use of the term. As appears from note 1 in the next page, his father was Vīśṇu; and our text expresses that his mother was Bhūmi.
¶ Ratnagarbha’s text does not mention the two pancratists Chānūra and Mūshāka.
** Tapaswi-jana.
the three worlds have been preserved;* and the gods, obtaining their share of the sacrifices offered by the devout, enjoy satisfaction. But now hear the occasion on which I have come to thee, and which thou art able to remedy.† The son of the earth,‡ called Na­raka, who rules over the city of Prágyotisha,§ in­flicts a great injury upon all creatures. Carrying off the maidens of gods, saints,|| demons, and kings, he shuts them up in his own palace.¶ He has taken away the umbrella of Varuna,** impermeable to water, the jewel-mountain crest of Mandara,||| and the celestial nectar-dropping ear-rings of my mother;§§ Aditi;¶¶ By Vishnu, as the Varaha Avatara;||| but found and adopted by Janaka. Kalika Purana.

In the centre of the country of Kamartipa," inhabited by Kiratas; the site of the shrines of Devi, as Dikkaravasini and Kamakhya.--- Kalika Purana.

§ The original does not make him over that city, but simply says that it was the scene of his cruelties. For Prágyotisha, vide supra, p. 55, note †.

|| Siddha.

||| Mandira.

||| Called Prachetas, in the Sanskrit.

¶¶ See note * in the preceding page.

§§ Corrected, here and everywhere below, from “Aditi”.

\\|||| See Vol. I., p. 61, note 2, ad finem.

\\|||| Vide supra, p. 54, note 2.

\\|| In Assam, according to Professor Wilson, in his collected Works, Vol. III., p. 77. Also see Vol. I., Preface, p. X. of the present work, where correct “Kámakhyá”.

he now demands my elephant, Airávata.† I have, thus, explained to you, Govinda, the tyranny of the Asura. You can best determine how it is to be prevented.”†

Having heard this account, the divine Hari: (gently) smiled, and, rising from his throne,§ took Indra|| by the hand. Then, wishing for the eater of the serpents, Garuḍa immediately appeared; upon whom his master, having first seated Satyabhámá upon his back, ascended, and flew to Prágyotisha. Indra|| mounted his elephant, and, in the sight of the inhabitants of Dwáraká, went to the abode of the gods.

The environs of Prágyotisha were defended by nooses, constructed by the demon Muru,** the edges of which were as sharp as razors;||| but Hari, throwing his discus Sudárśana!! (amongst them), cut them to pieces. Then Muru started up; but Keśava slew him,
and burnt his seven thousand sons, like moths, with the flame of the edge of his discus. Having slain Muru, Hayagriva, and Panchajana, the wise Hari rapidly reached the city of Prágyotisha. There a (fierce) conflict took place with the troops of Naraka, in which Govinda destroyed thousands of demons; and, when Naraka came into the field, showering upon the deity all sorts of weapons, the wielder of the discus and annihilator of the demon-tribe cut him in two with his celestial missile. Naraka being slain, Earth bearing the two ear-rings of Aditi, approached the lord of the world, and said: "When, O lord, I was upheld by thee in the form of a boar, thy contact then engendered this my son. He whom thou gavest me has now been killed by thee. Take therefore these two ear-rings, and cherish his progeny. Thou, lord, whose aspect is (ever) glorious, hast come to this sphere, in a portion of thyself, to lighten my burthen. Thou art the eternal creator, preserver, and destroyer of the universe; the origin of all worlds; and one with the universe. What praise can be worthily offered to thee? Thou art the pervader, and that which is pervaded; the act, the agent, and the effect; the universal spirit of all beings. What praise can be worthily offered to thee? Thou art the abstract soul, the sentient and the living soul of all beings, the imperishable. But, since it is not possible to praise thee worthily, then why should the hopeless attempt proceed? Have compassion, O universal soul, and forgive the sins which Naraka has committed. Verily, it is for the sanctification of thy son, that he has been killed by thee." The lord, who is the substance of all creatures, having replied to the Earth "Even so," proceeded to redeem the (various) gems from the dwelling of Naraka. In the apartments of the women he found sixteen thousand and one hundred damsels.

These were captive princesses, according to the Bhágavata; of this passage there are several different readings, of little consequence.

| * suroot, or else suroh, in the original. The variant of some copies, sruh, substitutes Mura for Muru. These persons—whose names are often confounded in MSS.—were, both, slain by Kfisha. The latter is said, by Sridhara, to have been a Rákshasa. |
| † śalabha. |
| † vide supra, p. 2, note g. |
| § vide supra, p. 48. |
| || Samupadravat, "assaulted." |
| || Shalabha. |
| || Vidya-pragangha bhuta-bhavana bhuta-bhavana. |
| || Vide supra, p. 17, note e. |
| || Viceri; "transformer," literally: "by means of rain and the like," say the commentators. |
He also beheld (in the palace,) six thousand large* elephants,† each having four tusks; twenty-one lakhs§ of horses of Kâmanjōa§ and other excellent breeds.|| These¶ Govinda despatched to Dwârakâ, in charge of the servants of Naraka. The umbrella of Varûna, the jewel-mountain, which he also recovered, he placed upon Garûda:** and, mounting him, himself, and taking Satyabhâmâ with him, he set off to the heaven of the gods, to restore the ear-rings of Aditi.¹

Apsarasas, or celestial nymphs, according to the Kâlikâ Purâna; and these, upon their rescue by Krîshna, became his wives.††

¹ The legend of Naraka is related, in more detail, in the Bhágavat and Hari Vamsa, but is still more fully narrated in the Kalika Purâna. It may be considered as one of the various intimations that occur in the Purânas, of hostilities between the worshippers of Vishnu and Siva; Naraka being, in an especial degree, favoured by the latter.

* Ugra.
† According to the reading of some MSS., there were as many horses,—common ones, it is to be supposed, since a particular kind is specified just below.
‡ Niyuta; a term variously defined by different authorities. See notes on the beginning of Chapter III. of Book VI.
§ Kâmbhavana. I For the Kâmanjâs, see Vol. III., p. 291, note 1.
|| I find nothing, in the original, answering to the words “and other excellent breeds”.
¶ That is to say, agreeably to the original, the girls, the elephants, and the horses.

** दृश्यं वाच्यं हर्षं तपौविं मशिपर्यमस्मि !
वारोपयामासो दरिणेऽवं पथ्यागायने।

I find no variants of this stanza, save as to its closing word, which Ratnagarbha reads यथेऽनेनः।
†† According to the text of our Purâna, also, Krîshna married them. Vide infra, p. 105.

CHAPTER XXX.

Krîshna restores her ear-rings to Aditi, and is praised by her: he visits the gardens of Indra, and, at the desire of Satyabhâmâ, carries off the Pârijâta-tree. Sāchî excites Indra to its rescue. Conflict between the gods and Krîshna, who defeats them. Satyabhâmâ derides them. They praise Krîshna.

GARUDA, laden with the umbrella of Varûna, and the jewel-mountain, and bearing Hrishikeśa* (on his back, to the court of Indra), went (lightly), as if in sport, along. When they arrived at the portals of Swarga, Hari blew his shell; on which the gods advanced to meet him, bearing respectful offerings.† Having received the homage of the divinities, Krîshna went to the palace of the mother of the gods, whose turrets: resembled white clouds; and, on beholding Aditi, paid his respects to her, along with Śakra; and, presenting to her her own ear-rings, informed her of the destruction of (the demon) Naraka. The mother of the world, well pleased, then fixed her whole thoughts upon Hari, the creator, and thus pronounced his praise: "Glory to thee, O god with the lotos-eyes, who removest all fear from those that worship thee. Thou art the eternal, universal, and living soul; the origin of all beings;§ the instigator of the mental fac-

* “And his wife:” सवार्थं च हस्यकिंशस्। For Hrishikeśa, see Vol. I., p. 2, note 1.
† सर्पदण्डिनः।
‡ Śikhara.
§ समातनाक्षरबंधुनायासूतभवं।
VISHNU PURANA.

uity and faculties of sense;* one with the three qualities; beyond the three qualities; exempt from contraries; pure; existing in the hearts of all; void of colour, extension, and every transient modification;† unaffected by (the vicissitudes of) birth, or death, sleep, or waking. Thou art evening,† night, and day; earth, sky, air, water, and fire; mind, intellect, and individuality.§ Thou art the agent of creation, duration, and dissolution; the master over the agent; in thy forms which are called Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva...

This thy illusion beguiles all who are ignorant of thy true nature,—the fools who imagine soul to be in that which is not spirit.* The notions that “I am—this is mine”, which influence mankind, are but the delusions of the mother of the world, originating in thy active agency.† Those men who, attentive to their duties, diligently worship thee, traverse all this illusion, and obtain spiritual freedom. Brahma and all the gods, men, and animals; are, alike, invested by the thick darkness of fascination, in the gulf of the illusions of Vishnu. That men who, having worshipped thee, should seek the gratification of their desires, and their own preservation,—this, O lord, is, also, thy delusion. It is the sport of thy fascinations that induces men to glorify thee, to obtain, thereby, the continuance of their race, or the annihilation of their enemies, instead of eternal liberation.§ It is the fault of the impure acts of the unrighteous (to proffer such idle requests to one able to confer much more important benefits)—like asking for a rag to cover one’s nakedness|| from the tree that bestows whatever is solicited.|| Be propitious,
then, imperishable, author of all the error that deceives the world; and dispel, O lord of all creatures, the con­ceit of knowledge, which proceeds from ignorance.*

Glory to thee, grasper of the discus, wielder of the bow, brandisher of the mace, holder of the shell! For such do I behold thee, in thy perceptible form. Nor do I know that form of thine which is beyond perception. Have compassion on me, supreme god."†

Vishnú, thus hymned by Aditi, smiled, and said to the mother of the gods: "Mother, goddess, do thou show favour unto me, and grant me thy blessing."§

"So be it," replied Aditi, "even as thou wilt; and, (whilst thou dwellest) amongst mortals, the first of men, thou shalt be invincible by gods or demons." Then Satyabhámá, accompanied by the queen of Indra,** addressed Aditi respectfully, and solicited her benedictions; and Aditi (in reply,) said to her: "Fair-browed dame, thou shalt never suffer decay, nor loss of beauty. Thou shalt be the asylum of all loveliness, dame of faultless shape."* With the assent of Aditi, Indra† then respectfully saluted Janárđana in all due form, and conducted him and Satyabhámá through Nandana and other pleasant gardens of the gods; where Keśáva, the destroyer of Keśin;† saw the Párijátá-tree,§ the favourite of Śachí, which was produced when the ocean was churned for ambrosia: the bark was of gold; and it was embellished with young sprouting leaves of a copper colour, and fruit-stalks bearing numerous clusters of fragrant fruit.|| When Satyabhámá noticed this tree, she said to her beloved lord, Govinda: "Why should not this divine tree be transported to Dwáraka? If what you say is true, and I am really dear to you, then let this tree be taken away from hence, and planted in the garden of my dwelling. You have often said to me: 'Neither Jámbavátí nor Rukmini is so dear to me, Satyá, as you are.' If you have spoken the truth, and not mere flattery,|| then let this Párijátá-tree be the ornament of my mansion. I long to shine amidst my fellow-queens, wearing the flowers of this tree in the braids of my hair."""
Thus solicited by Satyabhāmā, Hari smiled upon her, and, taking the Pārijāta-plant, put it upon Garuḍa. The keepers of the garden (remonstrated and) said: “This Pārijāta-tree belongs to Śachi, the queen of the sovereign of the gods. It is not proper, Govinda, for you to remove it. At the time when the ocean was churned for the beverage of immortality, this tree was produced, for the purpose of providing Śachi with flowery ornaments. You cannot be suffered to depart with it. It is through ignorance that this is sought for by any one; as it is the especial property of her on whose countenance the king of the gods delights to look. And who shall go away with impunity, who attempts to carry it off? Assuredly, the king of the gods will punish this audacity; for his hand launches the thunderbolt, and the immortals attend upon his steps. Forbear, then, Kṛiṣṇa; nor provoke the hostility of all the gods. The wise will not commence actions that can be productive only of unpleasant consequences.” Satyabhāmā, on hearing these words, was exceedingly offended, and said: “What right has

Śachi, what has Indra, to the Pārijāta-tree? It was produced at the churning of the ocean, as the common property of all worlds. Wherefore, gods, should Indra alone possess it? In the same manner, guardians of the grove, as nectar, as the moon, as (the goddess) Śrī (herself), so the Pārijāta-tree is the common property of all the world; and, since Śachi, confiding in the strength of her husband's arm, would keep it to herself, away with submission to her! Satyā takes away the tree. Go quickly; and let Paulomī be told what I have said. Repeat to her this contemptuous message from Satyabhāmā: ‘If you are the beloved wife of your lord, if your husband is obedient to your authority, let him prevent my husband from carrying off this tree. I know your husband, Śakra; I know the sovereign of the divinities; and I, who am a mortal, take this Pārijāta-tree away from you.’”

Accordingly, the warders (of the garden) went and reported to Śachi the message (of Satyabhāmā). Śachi appealed to her husband, and excited the king of the gods to resent this affront; and Indra, accordingly, attended by the army of the celestials, marched to attack Hari, in defence of the Pārijāta-tree. The gods were armed with clubs, swords, maces, and darts;
and Indra* wielded the thunderbolt. As soon as Govinda saw the king of the gods† advancing against him, on his elephant, attended by the immortals, he blew his shell, so that the sound filled all the regions, and he showered, smilingly, myriads of arrows upon his assailants.§ Beholding the air, in all directions, overspread with his darts, the celestials (in return,) hurled innumerable missiles; but every one of these the destroyer of Madhu,|| and lord of all worlds, cut, playfully, into a thousand pieces (with his shafts). The devourer of serpents (Garuda,) laid hold of the neck of the sovereign of the waters,‡ and tore it to fragments with his beak, as if it had been a little snake. The son of Devaki threw his mace at the club of Yama, and cast it, broken, upon the ground. He cut in bits ** the litter†† of the lord of wealth,;; with his discus; a glance of his eye eclipsed the radiance of the sun; §§ he severed Agni into a hundred parts, with his arrows, and scattered the Vasus through the realms of space. With his discus he cut off the points of the tridents|| of the Rudras, and cast themselves upon the earth; and,

with the shafts shot from his bow, he dispersed the Sadhyas, Viśvas, Maruts, and Gandharvas, like fleeces of cotton from the pods of the Simel† tree, through the sky. Garuda, also, diligently plied his beak, and wings, and nails, and bit, and bruised, and scratched the deities who opposed his lord.§

Then the king of the gods and the foe of Madhu|| (encountered, and) overwhelmed each other with countless shafts, like rain-drops falling from two heavy clouds. Garuda, in the conflict, engaged with Airāvata; and Janárđana was opposed to all the deities. When all the other weapons had been cut to pieces, Indra* stood armed with his thunderbolt, and Krishnā, with the discus Sudarśana.** Beholding them thus prepared for fight, all the people of the three spheres exclaimed

* Viśve. These deities are not mentioned severally, but always collectively. See Vol. III., p. 185, note beginning near the foot.
† शाक्रे. The original has, thus, Śānapati. See Vol. IV., p. 240, note ||.
§ The Sanskrit has Garutmat.
|| संहारांचा भजन प्रबाक्य सत्ता: शरासुद्धा:।
|| संहारांचा भजन प्रबाक्य शरासुद्धा:।

Herein is exemplified the figure of speech which is called, in Sanskrit, yathā-sankhyā. A similar, but more complete, instance of construction by the correspondent order of terms is afforded in the following couplet:

"Vir simplex, fortasse bonus, sed pastor inebrius,
Vult, tentat, peragit, plurima, pauca, nihil."

Stanzas of like verbal collocation might be adduced, in any quantity, from medieval compositions. In the Third Book of Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia is a sonnet contrived, throughout, like its beginning:

"Vertue; beautie, and speech, did strike, wound, charme,
My heart, eyes, ears, with wonder, love, delight."

* Śakra, in the original.
† For "the king of the gods" the Sanskrit has Śakra.
‡ Literally, 'the gods,'—deva.
§ शुभ च द्वारांत्र वहाभारानयः निर्मिति।
Professor Wilson's favourite MS. indefensibly ends this verse with वहाभारानयः; whence "smilingly". Read: "And he discharged a volley of arrows, amounting to myriads of thousands."
|| Mahusudana.
‡ Namely, Varuna.
** Viśve. This word denotes that the pieces were no larger than sesameum-seeds.
†† Śibhāda.
;; Kubera, to wit.
 §§ चार्तीर्षं च द्वारांत्र जीतोजयः।
|||| Śala, 'pikes.'

||| Mahusudana.
||| Śasvāda, in the original.

** विजयेश्वरसिद्धिपुण्यतिथिपुण्यम् च लयः।
यदाय वाष्णो वर्ष क्रमव्रत युद्धशून्यम्।
"Alas! alas!" Indra launched his bolt; but in vain; for Hari caught and arrested it. He forbore, however, to hurl his discus, and only called out to Indra to stay.† Satyabhāmā, seeing Indra disarmed, and his elephant disabled by Garuda, and the deity, himself, about to retreat, said to him: "King of the triple sphere, it ill becomes the husband of Śachi to run away. Ornamented with Pārijāta-garlands, she will approach you. Of what use is the sovereignty of heaven, embellished with the Pārijāta-tree, no longer beholding Śachi meet you with affection, as of yore? Nay, Śakra: fly not! You must not suffer shame. Here, take the Pārijāta-tree. Let the gods be no longer annoyed. Śachi, inflated with pride of her husband, has not welcomed me to her dwelling with respectful presents. As a woman, I am light of purpose, and am anxious for my husband's fame. Therefore have I instigated, Śakra, this contest with you. But I do not want the Pārijāta-tree; nor do I wish to take that which is another's property. Śachi is proud of her beauty. What woman is not proud of her husband?" Thus spoken to (by Satyabhāmā), the king of the gods turned back, and said to her: "Desist, wrathful dame, from afflicting your friend by further reproaches. § I am not ashamed of being vanquished by him who is the author of the creation, preservation, and destruction of the world; who is the substance of all things;* in whom, without beginning or middle, the universe is comprised; and from whom, and by whom, identical with all things, it proceeds, and will cease to be.† What disgrace is it, O goddess, (to any one,) to be discounited by him who is the cause of creation, continuance, and dissolution? His form is the parent of all worlds, though infinitely subtle, and known to those only by whom all that may be known is known. Who is able to overcome the unborn, unconstituted, eternal lord, who has willed to become a mortal, for the good of the world?"1

1 The Bhāgavata merely says: "Incited by his wife, Kṛiṣhṇa took away the Pārijāta-tree, having subdued the gods, and planted it in the garden of Satyabhāmā." The Hari Vamsa makes a long story of it, and tells it with some variations, especially in the commencement; Satyabhāmā's desire for the Pārijāta-tree having been excited by Nārada's presenting a flower from it to Kṛiṣhṇa's other spouse, Rukminī.

* Viṣṇa-śūpīn.
† विष्णु-शुपीन, in the Sanskrit.
‡ The insertion, here, of the words "to you", justified by the original, would make this sentence intelligible. The Sanskrit is as follows:

ौरूप्याः रूपकाच्योद्धानिविष्णुपुराणः।
अयानी चाचार्यां अवयायाद्विगुणाभृत्तम्॥
ष आः वैद्यानि चाचार्यां च यस्तु: वैद्यातिविवरः।

§ आः वैद्यानि चाचार्यां च यस्तु: वैद्यातिविवरः।
CHAPTER XXXI.

Krishṇa, with Indra's consent, takes the Pārijāta-tree to Dwārakā; marries the princesses rescued from Naraka.

Kṛṣṇa, being thus eulogized by the king of the gods, smiled, and spake gravely to him (in reply). "Thou art Indra," said he, "the king of the celestials. We are (but) mortals, O lord of the world. Thou must pardon, therefore, the offence that I have committed. Let this Pārijāta-tree be taken to its appropriate situation. I removed it in compliance with the words of Satyā. Receive back, also, this your thunderbolt, cast at me: for this is your proper weapon, *—the destroyer of your foes." Indra† answered, and said: "Thou beguildest us, O lord, in calling thyself a mortal. But we know thee to be the lord, although not endowed: with subtlety of discernment. Thou art that thou art, engaged in the (active) preservation § of the earth; thou extractest the thorns implanted in her bosom, destroyer of the demon-race. Let this Pārijāta-tree be transferred to Dwārakā; and it shall remain upon earth as long as thou abidest in the world of mortals."" Hari, having assented to the proposal of Indra, †† returned to earth, hymned by attendant sages, * saints, † and quires of heaven.

When Krishṇa arrived over Dwārakā, he blew his shell, and delighted all the inhabitants with the sound. Then, alighting from Garuḍa, he proceeded, with Satyabhāmā, to her garden, ‡ and there planted the great Pārijāta-tree, the smell of which perfumed the earth for three furlongs, § and an approach to which enabled every one to recollect (the events of) a prior existence; so that, on beholding their faces in that tree, all the Yādavas contemplated themselves in their (original) celestial forms. Then Krishṇa took possession of the wealth, elephants, horses, and women, which he had recovered from Naraka, and which had been brought (to Dwārakā) by the servants (of the demon); and, at an auspicious season, he † espoused all the maidens whom Ṛāṇaka had carried off (from their friends): at one and the same moment, ** he †† received the hands of all of them, according to the ritual, in separate mansions. §§ Sixteen thousand and one hundred was the number of the maidens. §§ And into so many dif-

---

* Siddha.
† Kṛṣṇa.
‡ Nīshkūṭa.
§ Trāṭa.

†† Devendra, in the Sanskrit.

|| तत्स चाद्वे: च वेदवन्यानमानो दः।
|| वेद्योऽद्वीरतन्त्रालो मुखदेवनस्।

† The Sanskrit here has Janārdana.
** Kala.
†† Govinda, in the original.

§§ Our Purāṇa is at variance with itself as to the number of Krishṇa's wives. See Vol. IV., p. 119, with which compare pp. 81, 82, supra.
ferent forms did the foe of Madhu* multiply himself; so that every one of the damsels thought that he had wedded her; in his single person.† And the creator of the world, Hari, the assumer of universal shape, abode severally in the dwelling of each of these his wives.‡

* Madhusūdana.
† एकीक्षित तत्सा: जन्या मंत्रिमा साधुमुद्रम्।
‡ मेरव पाणियम्यां भवावलंकत्याविनित।

Sridhara, at least according to my single MS. of his commentary, begins this stanza with एकीक्षितमेव, at the expense of metrical correctness.

† विग्राहणं व जलस्वत्ता तात्सा नेष्वु केवलः।
‡ ब्रजवस सवीरां विभ्रमधरे हरि।

CHAPTER XXXII.

Children of Kṛṣṇa. Uṣhā, the daughter of Bāla, sees Aniruddha in a dream, and becomes enamoured of him.

PARĀŚARA.—I have enumerated to you Pradymna and the other sons of Rukmiṇī. Satyabhāmā bore Bhānu* and Bhaimarika.† The sons of Rōhilī were Diptimat, Tāmrāpaksha,‡ and others. The powerful Sāmba§ and other sons were born of Jāmbavati. Bhadra-vinda|| and other valiant youths were the sons of Nāgmaṇī. Śaibyā (or Mitra-vindā*) had several sons, of whom Sangrāmājīt was the chief. Vīraka and others were begotten (by Hari) on Mādrī.** Lakṣmaṇā had Gātravat and others; and Śruta and others were the sons†† of Kālinda‡‡; Kṛṣṇa§§ had sons, also, by his

* Two MSS. have Bhānu.
† Corrected from “Bhairika.” In giving this mangled form of the name, Professor Wilson was misled by an error in his favourite MS. The scansion of the line shows that a syllable is missing. Messrs. Böhlīngk and Roth have helped to perpetuate “Bhairika”.
‡ Corrected from “Tāmrāpaksha”, in which reading Professor Wilson was again led astray by an error in the MS. referred to in the last note. Messrs. Böhlīngk and Roth wrongly credit our Translator with “Tāmrāpakshin”. One of my MS. yields Tāmravarnī; another, “Diptimat and others”. Also vide supra, p. 79, note **.
§ Corrected from “Sāmba”. || My Ajmere MS. has Bhadramanda.
¶ Supplied by the Translator, on the authority of the commentator Sridhara. Ratnagarbha considers Śaibyā as one of Kṛṣṇa’s eight wives of the first order; but he does not identify her, by name, with any one of those specified in note ¶ to p. 78, supra.
** Vide supra, p. 81, note ••.
†† There were three of them,—unnamed,—according to the reading of my Arrah MS. ‡‡ Vide supra, p. 78, note §, and p. 81, note 1.
§§ Chakrin, in the original.
other wives,—in all, one hundred and eighty thousand.
The eldest of the whole was Pradyumna, the son of Rukmini: his son was Aniruddha, from whom Vajra* was born: his mother was Usha,†—the daughter of Bana, and granddaughter of Bali;§ whom Aniruddha won in war.‡ On that occasion, a fierce battle took place between Hari and Sankara, in which the thousand arms of Ma were lopped away by the discus of the former.||

Maitreya.—How happened it, (venerable) Brahman, that a contest on account of Usha arose between Siva and Kfishna? And in what manner did Hari cut off the thousand arms of Ma?** This, illustrious sir, thou art able to narrate.††

Parasara.—Usha, the daughter of Bana, having seen Parvati sporting with (her lord,) Sambhu, was inspired with a wish for similar dalliance. The beautiful Gauri,wiki who knows the hearts of all, said to Usha:

and gives the ten names of each set, with one or two exceptions. §§

* Corrected from "Vraja". See Vol. IV., pp. 112, 113.
† Corrected, here and everywhere below, from "Ushā", which, likewise, occurs, but not in our Purāṇa. See Vol. II., p. 69.
§ The original is चायिषान स रेषि कह।
|| The Sanskrit has Chakrin.
** कृष्ण च यम कामवान जनवासिन:।
†† The original adds:
महाभीमुष्ण जातं कवन्त चायोमसन: हरे।
So reads Śrīdhara. Ratnagarbha has:
महाभीमुष्ण जातं जनवासा कबामसमास:।
§§ Vide supra, p. 79, notes *, †, §, ¶, and **; p. 81, notes * and †; and p. 82, note ||.||
Putting aside the portraits of gods, spirits, snake-gods, and demons, the princess selected those of mortals, and, amongst them, the heroes of the races of Andhaka and Vrishni. When she came to (the likenesses of) Krishna and Rama, she was confused with shame. From (the portrait of) Pradyumna she modestly averted her eyes; but, the moment she beheld the picture of his son, the object of her passion, her eyes wide expanded, and all her bashfulness was discarded. “This is he! This is he!” said she (to Chitralekha). And her friend, who was endowed with magic power, bade her be of good cheer, and set off, through the air, to Dwarka.

BEFORE this took place, Bana had been engaged in the adoration of the three-eyed (god), and had thus prayed to him: “I am humiliated, O lord, by (the possession of) a thousand arms in a state of peace. Let some hostilities ensue, in which I may derive some advantage from their possession. Without war, what is the use of these arms? They are but a burthen to me.” Sankara replied: “When thy peacock-bannei shall be broken, thou shalt have war,—the delight of the evil spirits that feast on the flesh of man.” Bana, pleased (by this promise), proffered his thanks to Sanbhru, and returned to his palace, where he found his standard broken; at which his joy was increased.

At that time, the nymph Chitralekha returned (from Dwarka), and, by the exercise of her magic power, brought Aniruddha (along with her). The guards of
the inner apartments, discovering him there with Ushá,* reported it to the king, who immediately sent a body of his followers (to seize the prince). But the valiant youth, taking up an iron club, slew his assailants;† on which, Bána mounted his car, advanced against him, and endeavoured to put him to death. Finding, however, that Aniruddha was not to be subdued by prowess, he followed the counsel of his minister, and brought his magical faculties into the conflict, by which he succeeded in capturing the Yadu prince, and binding him in serpent-bonds.‡

When Aniruddha was missed from Dwáraratí, and the Yádavas were inquiring of one another whither he had gone, Náraḍa came to them, and told them that he was the prisoner of Bána; having been conveyed, by a female possessed of magic faculties, to Soñitapura.§ When they heard this, they were satisfied; for they had imagined he had been taken away by the gods, (in reprisal for the Párijá-tá-tree).* Kríshná,† therefore, immediately summoned Garúda, who came with a wish;‡ and, mounting upon him, along with Bala and Pradyumna, he set off for the city of Bána. On their approach to the city, they were opposed by the spirits who attend on Rudrá:§ but these were soon destroyed by Hari; and he and his companions reached the vicinity of the town.|| Here, mighty Fever—an emanation from Mahéśwara,‖ having three feet and three heads‖—fought desperately with Vishńu,** in defence of Bána. Baladeva, upon whom his ashes were

near Gwálpára, as the city of the Dáityas. Asiatic Researches, Vol. XIV., p. 443. Hamilton†† notices the remains of a city, so called, in Dinajpóor. In the Kálıká Puráṇa, Bána is described as the friend and, apparently, neighbour of Naraka, king of Prág- jyotiáha;§§ or Assam.

|| Alluding to the three stages of febrile paroxysms, or to the recurrence of tertian ague. A contest with this enemy, in the course of military operations, is an allegory which the British armies in India too often illustrate.
scattered, was seized with burning heat, and his eyelids trembled; but he obtained relief by clinging to the body of Krishná.* Contending, thus, with the divine holder of the bow,† the Fever (emanating from Śiva) was quickly expelled from the person of Krishná by Fever; which he himself engendered.§ Brahmac,|| beholding the impersonated malady bewildered by the beating inflicted by the arms of the deity, entreated the latter to desist; and the foe of Madhú refrained, and absorbed into himself the Fever he had created.¶ The rival Fever then departed, saying to Krishná: “Those men who call to memory the combat between us shall be (ever) exempt from febrile disease.”**

Next, Vishnú overcame and demolished the five fires,†† and, with perfect ease,‡ annihiliated the army

---

* Tannānyayam-anubhata: Kṣaṇā-kumbhagamata.

† To render Śāṁgana, as Krishná is denominated from his bow spoken of in note ** in the preceding page.

‡ Vaishūli, is the epithet given it in the Sanskrit.

§ Krishná here figures as a practitioner of homoeopathy.

|| Pitāmaha, in the original.

†† Naarāyaṇa-bhūta-tantraparipūjana-vibhūsana.

||] to maṇasi-bhūta-kśetra, dhanam-pitāmaḥ;||

||] tataḥ pārśva-vatī tīrthaṁ tātāmaṁ jāraṁ.

** Vijnana.

†† “The protectors of that city,”—namely, Bāńa’s, says Ratnagarbha.

‡‡ Śrīvāsa.
Hari,* took to flight. Bāña, when he saw Śankara disabled, the Daityas destroyed, Guha† fled, and Śiva's followers: slain,§ advanced, on his vast car,—the horses of which were harnessed|| by Nandīśa,— to encounter Krīṣhṇa and his associates Bala and Pradyumna.** The valiant Balabhadra, attacking the host of Bāña, wounded them, in many ways, with his arrows, and put them to a shameful rout; †† and their sovereign beheld them dragged about by Rāma,,; with his ploughshare, or beaten, by him, with his club, or pierced, by Krīṣhṇa, §§ with his arrows. He, therefore, attacked Krīṣhṇa; and a fight took place between them. They cast at each other fiery shafts, that pierced through their armour: but Krīṣhṇa intercepted, with his arrows, those of Bāña, and cut them to pieces. Bāña, nevertheless, wounded Kesava; and the wielder of the discus wounded Bāña; and both, desirous of victory, and seeking, enraged, the death of his antagonist, hurled (various) missiles at each other. When

* The original has Krīṣhṇa.
† I.e., Kārttikeya.
‡ To render pramatha-saṅγya.
§ Praśūṣaṅga, "by the bearer of the bow Śärnga", the original particularizes.
|| Read 'driven',—sangrihiita.
¶ Also called Nandi and Nandin. Generally he is represented as a follower of Śiva. See Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXXIX., and p. 122.
** The Sanskrit here calls him by his patronym, Karśhni.
†† Bala, in the original.
\\ Parenthesis: Some copies read "Madhuḍiśa, or Madhuvidhiśa, according to various copies.
§§ The Hari Vaṁśa calls her, also, Lambā, and intimates her being the mother of Bāña, and as identical with Durgā. The word, in the lexicons, designates a naked woman, and is, thence, applicable to Durgā, in some of her forms.

† Kolavī (कोलवी) is said to be an eighth portion of Rudrāṇi, and the tutelary goddess of the Daityas, composed of incantations (मल्लिविंशि). §§ The Hari Vaṁśa calls her, also, Lambā, and intimates her being the mother of Bāña, and as identical with Durgā. The word, in the lexicons, designates a naked woman, and is, thence, applicable to Durgā, in some of her forms.

† Ratnagarbha explains this as follows:

\(\text{मधुविन्दौ गुष्टी वरम्भिकविन्दौ कोशिकर्तरं}\)

† Hari, in the original.
§ Read "enemy",—ari.
|| Here called, in the original, by his epithetical appellation, Madhuḍiśa, or Madhuvidhiśa, according to various copies.
¶ Variant: Kolavi. And Ratnagarbha, in my best MSS., has Kollavi.

** नया इतिहासियानुकूलकी पुढ़ते हरेः।
Ratnagarbha says: कोलवी इतिहासी मल्लिविंशि देवकुलदेवता।

Also see note §§, below.
†† The Sanskrit has Hari.
‡‡ बालेविंशि, according to Śridhara. बालेविंशि is Ratnagarbha's reading.
§§ This is from Śridhara, who says: कोलवी नाम इतिहासी विबासी: मल्लिविंशि कुलदेवता।

* The Sanskrit yields "all the arrows".
† Ratnagarbha says: कोलवी इतिहासी मल्लिविंशि देवकुलदेवता।

Also see note §§, below.
† Ratnagarbha says: कोलवी इतिहासी मल्लिविंशि देवकुलदेवता।

Also see note §§, below.
†† The Sanskrit has Hari.
‡‡ बालेविंशि, according to Śridhara. बालेविंशि is Ratnagarbha's reading.
§§ This is from Śridhara, who says: कोलवी नाम इतिहासी विबासी: मल्लिविंशि कुलदेवता।


\(\text{Ratnagarbha ends the second verse with ज्ञनतान्तरादलित्वं]]: and some MSS. give, with this reading, संहृत:, instead of अर्ज्जुन।}

\(\text{Ratnagarbha has Chakrī।}

|| St. 10722.
the numerous arms of the Asura. Beholding Kṛiṣṇa
with the discus again in his hand, and preparing to
launch it once more, for the total demolition of Bāṇa,
the foe of Tripura (*Śiva,* respectfully addressed him.†
The husband of Uma,† seeing the blood streaming from

* In the Eighth Chapter of the Rāva-ndhātya, it is said, that Tripuri-
khsetra, where Śiva flung down Tripura, the Asura, lies to the north of
the Narmāda. The Twenty-ninth Chapter of the same work somewhat
discordantly relates as follows. The demon Bāṇa, in reward of his austeri-

ties as a votary of Śiva, received from him the gift of a city. Brahmā
and Viṣṇu adding, each, another, he obtained the epithet of Tripura, or

† The Translator has strangely misunderstood the import of the fol-

owing stanzas:

† Ratnagarbha reads -वोीद्रस्त्, for -त्रोडरस्त्; -धि, for -धिय; and

† वादके तस्मा, for धियस्तहे तु. One other variant which I find is

† चिन्ति च बहिन्मण सहस्मतिविश्वम.
that, also, is this world, with its gods, demons, and mankind. Men contemplate distinctions, because they are stupefied by ignorance," So saying, Kṛishṇa went to the place where the son of Pradyumna was confined. The snakes that bound him were destroyed, being blasted by the breath of Garuḍa; and Kṛishṇa, placing him, along with his wife, upon the celestial bird, returned, with Pradyumna and Rāma, to Dwārakā.

There can be little doubt that this legend describes a serious struggle between the Śaivas and Vaishnavas, in which the latter, according to their own report, were victorious; and the Śaivas, although they attempt to make out a sort of compromise between Rudra and Kṛishṇa, are obliged to admit his having the worst of the conflict, and his inability to protect his votary. The Bhāgavata tells the story much as the text. The Hari Vānśa amplifies, even more than usual; the narrative occupying nearly seventy pages of the French translation. The legend is to be found, to the same purport, but in various degrees of detail, in the Agni Purāṇa, Kūra Purāṇa, Padma Purāṇa (Uttara Khaṇḍa), Vāmana Purāṇa, and Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa, (Kṛishṇa Jānma Khaṇḍa).

There was a Vāsudeva who was called Pauṇḍraka, a Vasudeva, assumes the insignia and style of Kṛishṇa, supported by the king of Kāśi. Kṛishṇa marches against and destroys them. The son of the king sends a magical being against Kṛishṇa: destroyed by his discus, which also sets Benares on fire, and consumes it and its inhabitants.

MAITREYA.—Of a truth, the divine Śauri, having assumed a mortal body, performed great achievements in his easy victories over Śakra, and Śiva, and all their attendant divinities. I am now desirous to hear from you, illustrious (sage), what other mighty exploit the humiliator of the prowess of the celestials performed.

PARASARA.—Hear, excellent Brahman, with reverent attention, an account of the burning of Vārānasī by Kṛishṇa, in the course of his relieving the burthens of the earth.

There was a Vásudeva who was called Pauṇḍraka,  

1 From being, the commentator says, king of Puṇḍra.  

* Asura.  
† In the original, Prādyumna. Aniruddha is intended.  
‡ The Sanskrit has Aniruddha.  
§ To represent Garutmat.

|| चाजेन्द्रकां रामकार्यसामीमेदं: पूरितम् ||  
"Rāma, Kāśī, and Dāmodara went to the city of Dwārakā."
and who, though not the Vásudeva, was flattered, by ignorant people, as the descended deity, until he fancied himself to be the Vásudeva who had come down upon earth.* Losing all recollection (of his real character), he assumed the emblems of Vishnu, and sent an ambassador to the magnanimous Krishna, with this message: “Relinquish, thou foolish fellow, the discus. Lay aside all my insignia, my name, and the character of Vásudeva, and come and do me homage; and I will vouchsafe thee means of subsistence.”† At which, Janardana laughed, and replied: “Go, messenger, back to Paundraka, and say to him, from me: I will despatch: to thee my emblem the discus, without fail. Thou wilt rightly apprehend my meaning, and consider what is to be done; for I shall come to thy city, bringing the discus with me, and shall, undoubtedly, consign* it to thee. If thou wilt command me to come, I will immediately obey, and be with thee to-morrow. There shall be no delay.† And, having sought thy asylum, I will so provide, O king, that I shall never more have anything to dread from thee.” So saying, he dismissed the ambassador, (to report these words to his sovereign), and, summoning, Gaṇuḍa,§ mounted him, and set off for the city (of Paundraka)."
When the king of Kāśī* heard of the preparations of Kesava, he sent his army (to the aid of Pauṇḍraka), himself bringing up the rear;† and, with the force of the king of Kāśī,‡ and his own troops, Pauṇḍraka, the (false) Vāsudeva, marched to meet Kṛishṇa.§ Hari beheld him afar off, standing in his car, holding a discus, a club, a mace,|| a scimitar, and a lotos, in his hands; ornamented with a garland of flowers; bearing a bow; and having his standard made of gold. He had, also, the Śrīvatsa mark delineated on his breast; he was dressed in yellow garments, and decorated with ear-rings and a tiara.** When the god whose standard is Garuḍa beheld him, he laughed with a deep laugh, and engaged in conflict with the hostile host of cavalry and elephants, fighting with swords,†† scimitars,‡‡ according to his enumeration of them, are 261: my copy has 316. §§

* Kāśī-pati. See note †, below.
† शव्यंबपरिचरण: भाषिक्यालड़ उपायः।
Ratnagarbha defines भाषिक्यालड़ by सहाय: 'ally.' Compare Vol. IV., p. 2, text and note ¶.
‡ Kāśi-rāja. See Vol. IV., p. 344, supplementary note on p. 87.
§ The original has Kesava.
|| Probably the Translator forgot to strike out this word, after inserting 'club'. Kṛishṇa has only four insignia, named, in the original, as follows:
प्रभुः शराृङ्गवाताद शाप्लेन्द्रातै: भाषिक्यालड़: ।
For Kṛishṇa's complete equipment of weapons, vide infra, p. 140.
** Kṛiṣṇa. || Nisthūla.
†† Niśtrīkula.
§§ The Calcutta edition has 326; the Bombay edition, 317, in three Sections of 66, 128, and 134, severally.

maces, tridents,* spears,† and bows. Showering upon the enemy the shafts from his śārṅga: bow, and hurling at them his mace and discus, he §§ quickly destroyed both the army of Pauṇḍraka and that of the king of Kāśī.|| He then said to the former, who was foolishly wearing his emblems: 'Pauṇḍraka, you desired me, by your envoy, to resign to you all my insignia. I now deliver them to you. Here is my discus. Here I give up my mace. And here is Garuṇḍa: let him mount upon thy standard.' Thus speaking, he let fly the discus and the mace, by which Pauṇḍraka was cut to pieces, and cast on the ground; whilst the Garuṇḍa (on his banner) was demolished by the Garuṇḍa (of Vishnu). The people, beholding this sight, exclaimed "Alas! alas!" But the valiant king of Kāśi,** adhering to the imposture of his friend, continued the conflict,†† till Śauri:: decapitated him with his arrows, shooting his head into the city of Kāśi, §§ to the marvel of all the inhabitants. Having, thus, slain Pauṇḍraka and the king of Kāśi,||| with all their followers, Śauri returned

* śālā, 'pikes'.
† śakta.
§ Corrected from "śāṅga", a mistake found in Professor Wilson's Hindu-made version.
§§ Janardana, in the original.
|| Kāśi-rāja.
¶ Garutmat, in the Sanskrit; and so twice, just below.
** काशीनामाधिया: "king of the Kāśis," literally.
†† सुधुधु शव्यंबवन्ति निच्छुषापविचिति दिन्ति।
The two commentators remark, in the same words: चपचति।
चानुषिक्षित: सुधुधुं।
|| This name does not appear in the original.
### Book V., Chap. XXXIV. 125

The Calcutta edition has 326; the Bombay edition, 317, in three Sections of 66, 128, and 134, severally.

* Kāśi-puri. See note †, below.
† kāśi-puri, "the city of the Kāśis."
to Dwäraká,* where he lived in the enjoyment of heavenly delights.†

When the inhabitants of Káśi: saw the head of their king§ shot into their city, they were much astonished, and wondered how it could have happened, and by whom the deed could have been done.‖ Having ascertained that the king had been killed by Kriśhna,‖ the son of the monarch (of Káśi),‖ together with the priest of the family, propitiated Śankara; and that deity, well pleased to be adored in the sacred place** Avimukta,†† desired the prince to demand a boon. On which he prayed, and said: “O lord, mighty god, through thy favour, let thy mystic spirit!! arise to destroy Kriśhna, the murderer of my father.” “It shall be so,” answered Śankara. And from out of the southern fire §§ up­sprang a vast and formidable female,† like flame out of

* The Bhágavata‖ names him Sudakshiña; the Padma, Dañdapañi.
† A personified Kriyá, a magical creation. The Padma has

fire, blazing with ruddy light, and with fiery radiance streaming amidst her hair.* Angrily she called upon Kriśhna, and departed to Dwäraká; † where the people, beholding her, were struck with dismay, and fled, for protection, to Madhusúdana, the refuge of all worlds. The wielder of the discus,† knowing that the fiend § had been produced by the son of the king of Káśi,‖ through his adoration of the deity whose emblem is a bull, and being engaged in sportive amusements, and playing at dice, said to the discus: “Kill this fierce creature,‖ whose tresses are of plaited flame.” Accordingly, Sudarśana, the discus of Vishnu, immediately attacked the fiend, ** fearfully enwreathed with fire, and wearing tresses of plaited flame.†† Terrified at the might of Sudarśana, the creation of Maheśwara:‖ awaited not his attack, but fled with speed pursued by him with equal velocity, until she reached Váráṇasi, repelled by the superior might of the discus of Vishnu.

The same. The Bhágavata makes the product of the sacrificial fire a male, and sends him to Dwäraká, accompanied by a host of Bhútas, Śiva’s attendant goblins.

* My MSS. present a great variety of readings in the epithets applied to the being under description.
† Dwáravati, in the Sanskrit.
‡ Chakrín.
§ Mahá-kriyá.
‖ Káśi-rajá.
|| Kriyá.
** Kriyá.
†† This is far from literal; and the same may be said of the remainder of the paragraph.
::: Káśa máhárajinı

---

1 The Bhágavata‖ names him Sudakshiña; the Padma, Dañdapañi.
2 A personified Kriyá, a magical creation. The Padma has

---

* The Sanskrit has Dwáravatí.
† पुनःबालवर्ती माति हुमे धर्मः स्वास्ति चय
‡ Not literal.
§ Káśi-páti.
|| तत्कृत्र: पतिः श्रीकां तथा कामिनिः पुरे।
जनं विभिन्निष्ठतिर्भाष्य धनित्यभिन्निष्ठतिः।
|| Vásudeva, in the original.
** Mahá-kshetra.
†† This name of Benares is found in the Káśi-khanda, as well. It occurs, also, in the Jábála Upanishad. See my Benares, &c., p. 4, note 2.
||| “Thy mystic spirit” is to translate kriyá, for which see note 2 in the present page.
||| X., Latter Section, XVI., 27.
The army of Kāši,* and the host of the demigods attendant upon Śiva,† armed with all kinds of weapons, then sallied out, to oppose the discus; but, skilled in the use of arms, he consumed (the whole of) the forces by his radiance, and then set fire to the city, in which the magic power of Śiva§ had concealed herself. Thus was Vāraṇāsī burnt, with all its princes and their followers, its inhabitants, horses, elephants, and men, treasures and granaries, houses, palaces, and markets. The whole of a city that was inaccessible to the gods was, thus, wrapped in flames by the discus of Hari, and was totally destroyed. The discus, then, with unmitigated wrath, and blazing fiercely, and far from satisfied with the accomplishment of so easy a task, returned to the hand of Vishnū.††

1 According to the Bhāgavata, the magical being, himself, destroys Sudakshinā and his priest; but Sudarśana consumes the people and the city. The Padma ascribes the destruction of the king and all his city to the discus. The Hari Vaiśnava closes its narrative with the death of Pauṇḍraka, and makes no mention of the destruction of Benares. The circumstance is alluded to in a preceding section (s. 159), by Nārada, when detailing the exploits of Kṛṣṇa.

2 In this legend, again, we have a contest between the followers of Vishnū and Śiva intimated; as, besides the assistance given, by the latter, to Pauṇḍraka, Benares—Vāraṇāsī or Avimukta,—has been, from all time, as it is at present, the high place of the Śaiva worship.† There is, also, an indication of a Vaiśnava schism, in the competition between Pauṇḍraka and Kṛṣṇa for the title of Vāsudeva and the insignia of his divinity.

* Kāḍa-balā; which may mean either “the army of the Kāśis” or “the army of the king of the Kāśis.”
† This phrase is to represent pramatha.
§ Dravrma implies combustion.
|| Pṛkāra.
†† The latter portion of this paragraph is translated very freely.
CHAPTER XXXV.

Samba carries oft' the daughter of Duryodhana, but is taken prisoner. Balarama comes to Hastinapura, and demands his liberation: it is refused: in his wrath, he drags the city towards him, to throw it into the river. The Kuru chiefs give up Samba and his wife.

MAITREYA.—I have a (great) desire to hear, (excellent) Brahman, some further account of the exploits of Balarama.* You have related to me his dragging the Yamunā,† and other mighty deeds; but you can tell me, venerable sir: some other of his§ acts.

PRAŚARA.—Attend, Maitreya, to the achievements performed by Rāma, who is the eternal, illimitable Śesha, the upholder of the earth. At the choice of a husband by the daughter|| of Duryodhana, the princess was carried off by the hero Samba, the son of Jambavatī.† Being pursued by Duryodhana,||| Karṇa,|| Bhishma,||| Droṇa, and other celebrated chiefs, who were incensed at his audacity, he was defeated and taken prisoner. §§ When the Yādavas heard of the occurrence, their wrath was kindled against Duryodhana and his associates; and they prepared to take up arms against them.* But Baladeva,† in accents interrupted by the effects of ebriety, forbade them, and said: “I will go, alone, to the sons of Kuru. § They will liberate Samba, at my request.” Accordingly, he went to the elephant-styled city|| (Hastinapura), but took up his abode in a grove without the town, which he did not enter. When Duryodhana and the rest heard that he had arrived there, they sent him a cow, a present of fruits and flowers, and water.** Bala received the offering in the customary form, and said to the Kauravas: “Ugrasena †† commands you to set Samba at liberty.” When Bhishma, Droṇa, Karṇa, Duryodhana, and the others heard this, they were (very) angry; and Bāhlīka:: and other (friends of the) Kauravas, who looked upon the Yadu race as not entitled to regal dignity, said to the wielder of the club: §§ “What is this, Balabhadrā, that thou hast uttered? What Yadava shall give orders to the chiefs of the family of Kuru? |||| If Ugrasena issues his mandates to the Kauravas, then

* Balabhadrā, in the Sanskrit.
† Vide supra, pp. 65–68.
‡ Mahābhāga.
§ Bala’s, according to the original.
|| Her name was Laksmaṇa, according to the Bhāyavata-purāṇa, X., Latter Section, XVIII., 1.
||| Vide supra, p. 79, note 3; and p. 107.
||| See Vol. IV., p. 158.
||| Bāl, pp. 108 and 126.
:: Bāl, p. 167.
§§ तत, कृष्णा महाभीरे: कर्णद्वियमादियः।
भीषणद्वियदैवेन विजयायुध निस्रजितम ||
The translation of this stanza, as will be seen, is considerably interpolated.

† The Sanskrit has Bala.

‡|§| Mahābhārata.

§ Kaurana.

|| I find two readings.—नगर्नामाक्ष्युष्य and नगर्न गदाक्ष्युष्य.

For Hastinapura or Hāstiniapura, see Vol. IV., p. 139.
† Bala, in the original.

|| गामधुसूजहे च रामाय गदाक्ष्युष्य।
†† See Vol. IV., p. 98; also, supra, p. 45.
:: See Vol. IV., p. 154, where correct “Bāhlīka”.
||| See Vol. IV., pp. 148 and 152.
we must take away the white umbrella that he has usurped, and which is fit only for kings.* Depart, therefore, Balaráma.† You are entitled to our respect: but Sámba has been guilty of improper conduct; and we will not liberate him, either at Ugrasena’s commands, or yours. The homage that is due to us, their superiors, by the Kukura‡ and Andhaka§ tribes, may not be paid by them. But who ever heard of a command issued by a servant to his master?|| Elevation to an equal seat has rendered you arrogant. We have committed a great mistake, in neglecting, through our friendship for you, the policy (that teaches the danger of treating the abject with deference).¶ Our sending you (to-day,) a respectful present** was an intimation of (personal) regard, which it was neither fit for our race to have proffered, nor for yours to have expected.”

Having thus spoken, the Kuru chiefs, unanimously refusing to set the son of Hari at large, immediately returned into the city.* Bala,† rolling about with intoxication, and the wrath which their contemptuous language had excited, struck the ground furiously with his heel, so that it burst to pieces with a loud sound that reverberated through the regions of space.: His eyes reddened with rage, and his brow was curved with frowns, as he exclaimed: “What arrogance is this, in such vile and pithless creatures! The sovereignty of the Kauravas, as well as our own, is the work of fate,§ whose decree it, also, is, that they now disrespect or disobey the commands of Ugrasena. Indra|| may, of right, give his orders to the gods; and Ugrasena exercises equal authority with the lord of Śachi. Fie upon the pride that boasts a throne the leavings of a hundred mortals! Is not he the sovereign of the earth, the wives of whose servants adorn themselves with the blossoms of the Párijáta-tree? Ugrasena shall be the undisputed king of kings; for I will not return to his capital, until I have rid the world wholly of the sons of Kuru.** I will destroy Kárna,
Duryodhana, Droṇa, Bhīṣma, Bāhlika, Duḥṣāsana,† Bhūrīśravas,† Somadatta; Śāla,§ Bhīma, Arjuna, Yuddhiṣṭhīra,|| the twins,‡ and all the other vile descend­
nants of Kuru, with their horses, elephants, and chariots.
I will rescue the hero Sāmba from captivity, and
carry him, along with his wife, to Dwārakā, where I
shall again behold Ugrasena and the rest of my kin.
Or, authorized by the king of the gods to remove the
burthens of the earth, I will take this capital of the
Kauravas, ** with all the sons of Kuru, and cast the city
of the elephant†† into the Bhagfrathi.”**: 

So saying, the wielder of the club, §§ (Baladeva), his
eyes red with rage, plunged the blade of his plough­
share¶ downwards, beneath the ramparts of the city,¶¶
and drew them towards him. When the Kauravas be­
held Hastinápura tottering, they were much alarmed,
and called loudly (on Rāma), saying: “Rāma, Rāma!
Hold, hold! Suppress your wrath! Have mercy upon
us! Here is Sāmba, and his wife, also, delivered up to
thee. Forgive our sins, committed in ignorance of thy
wondrous power.”* Accordingly, issuing, hurriedly,
from the city, the Kauravas delivered Sāmba and his
bride to the mighty Balarāma, who, bowing to Bhīṣma,
Droṇa, and Kṛiṣṇa, † who addressed him in conciliatory language, said “I am satisfied,” and so desisted.
The city bears the marks of the shock it received, even
to the present day,—such was the might of Rāma,—
proving both his strength and prowess. The Kauravas,
then, offering homage to Sāmba and to Balarāma,‡ dis­
missed the former, with his wife and a bridal portion.†

---

* See Vol. IV., p. 158.
† Ratnagarbha’s text introduces both Bhūrī and Bhūrīśravas.
‡ For Somadatta and his sons, Bhūrī, Bhūrīśravas, and Śāla, see
§ Corrected from “Śalīya,” for which I find no authority. See note †; above; also, supra, p. 70, text and note **.
|| For these three personages, see Vol. IV., pp. 102 and 159.
¶ According to the commentators, Nakula and Sahadeva. See, for
them, Vol. IV., pp. 103 and 159.
** Kauravādhanī.
†† नवर्ष नागसागरस्।
§§ Musālāyudha. Vide supra, p. 67, note **.
|||| “The blade of his ploughshare” is to render hala. Vide supra,
p. 51, note ||.
||| Prakāra-vapra.

---

1 This adventure is related in the Bhāgavata, and very briefly
noticed in the Hari Vaṇaśa; but I have not found any mention
of it in the Mahābhārata. It may have been suggested, originally,
by Hastināpura having sustained some injury, either from an
earthquake, or from the encroachments of the river, which, as is
recorded, compelled the removal of the capital to Kausāmbi
(Vol. IV., p. 164).

---

* अविनाशजमाशाय जमाशायजपास्।
† See Vol. IV., p. 147.
‡ Halin, in the Sanskrit. Vide supra, p. 84, note ¶. Halin means
the same as Halāyudha, for which vide supra, p. 63, text and note ||.
The Asura Dwivida, in the form of an ape, destroyed by Balarama.

HEAR, also, Maitreya, another exploit performed by the mighty Balarama.* The great Asura,† the foe of the friends of the gods, Naraka,‡ had a friend, of exceeding prowess, in the monkey named Dwivida, who was animated by implacable hostility against the deities, and vowed to revenge on the whole of them the destruction of Naraka by Krishna, at the instigation of the king of the celestials, by preventing sacrifices, and effecting the annihilation of the mortal sphere. Blinded by ignorance, he, accordingly, interrupted all religious rites, subverted all righteous observances, and occasioned the death of living beings. He set fire to the forests, to villages, and to towns; sometimes he overwhelmed cities and hamlets with falling rocks; or, lifting up mountains in the waters,§ he cast them into the ocean: then, taking his place amidst the deep, he agitated the waves, until the foaming sea rose above its confines, and swept away the villages and cities situated upon its shores. Dwivida, also, who could assume what shape he would, enlarged his bulk to an immense size; and, rolling, and tumbling, and trampling amidst the cornfields, he crushed and spoiled the harvests.* The whole world, disordered by this iniquitous monkey, was deprived of sacred study† and religious rites,‡ and was greatly afflicted.

On one occasion, Halayudha§ was drinking in the groves of Raivata, along with the illustrious Revati|| and other beautiful females; and the distinguished Yadu, in whose praises songs were sung, and who was preeminent amidst graceful and sportive women, resembled Kubera, the god of riches, in his palace.¶ Whilst thus engaged, the monkey (Dwivida) came there, and, stealing the ploughshare** and the club of Baladeva,†† grinned at and mocked him,‡‡ and laughed at the women, and threw over and broke the cups filled with wine.§§ Balarama,||| becoming angry at this,

---

* Bala, in the original.
† Amarendra.
‡ Vide supra, pp. 87, et seq.
§ Some MSS. have पोतिषु,—“in boats”—a reading noticed by Ratnagarbha.

---
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For आहल, some MSS. have आहिध. ||| Bala, in the original.
threatened the monkey; but the latter disregarded his
menaces, and made a chattering noise;* on which,
Bala, starting up, seized his club, in wrath; and the
monkey† laid hold of a large rock, which he hurled
at the hero. Bala, casting his club at it, as it neared
him, broke it into a thousand fragments, which, toge­
er with the club, fell upon the ground. Beholding
the club prostrate, the monkey sprang over it, and
struck the Yádava violently on the breast with his
paws. Bala replied with a blow of his fist upon the
forehead§ of Dwivida, which felled him—vomiting
blood, and lifeless,—to the earth. The crest of the
mountain on which he fell was splintered into a hun­
dred pieces by (the weight of) his body, as if the
Thunderer|| had shivered it with his thunderbolt. The
gods threw down a shower of flowers upon Ráma,
and approached him, and praised him for the
glorious feat he had performed. “Well has the world been freed,”
said they, “by thy prowess, O hero, of this vile ape,
who was the ally of the enemy of the gods!”¶ Then
they and their attendant spirits** returned, well pleased,
to heaven. Many such inimitable* deeds were wrought
by the illustrious† Baladeva, (the impersonation of)
Śesha, the supporter of the earth."

* Aparineya.
† Dhimat.
‡ Śl. 9802.
§ Corrected from “Menda”.

† This exploit of Balaráma is, also, similarly, but more vul­
garly, related in the Bhágavata. It is simply said, in the Hari
Ványa,†—and erroneously,—that Mainda§ and Dwivida were
conquered by Kríshňa.

* “Attendant spirits” is to render guhyaka. The Guhyakas attended
CHAPTER XXXVII.

Destruction of the Yadavas. Samba and others deceive and ridicule the Rishis. The former bears an iron pestle: it is broken, and thrown into the sea. The Yadavas go to Prabhasa, by desire of Krishna: they quarrel and fight, and all perish. The great serpent Sesha issues from the mouth of Rama. Krishna is shot by a hunter, and again becomes one with universal spirit.

IN this manner did Krishna, assisted by Baladeva, destroy demons and iniquitous monarchs, for the good of the earth; and, along with Phalguni, also, did he relieve earth of her load, by the death of innumerable hosts. Having, thus, lightened the burdens of the earth, and slain many (unrighteous princes), he exterminated, by the pretext of an imprecation denounced by Brahmins, his own (Yadava) race. Then, quitting Dwaraka, and relinquishing his mortal being,||

1 A name of Arjuna, the great friend of Krishna, to whom the latter served as charioteer, in the war between the Pandus and Kurus.

* Daitya.
† For the various names of Arjuna, and their origin, see the Mahabharata, Virda-parvan, ii. 1375, et seq.
‡ The original here names Harli.
§ Samskrutihi-vibhagat. For akshauhini, vide supra, p. 50, notes 2 and 22.
|| My Arrah MS. here inserts as follows: खली माणुसां माणु इङ्ग्रेजी ब्रिटिशं। हृदया चालानि कार्यालि देवामि हितार्थायं। कुचिपुचिक विबंधन सुधिरसुधिरमिथामि। पाण्डवमेंद्रमुनि'सुभूषणं विपुरोगमि।
observed by some boys of the Yadu tribe. Giddy with youth, and influenced by predestined results,* they dressed and adorned Samba, the son of Jambavatś, as a damsel; and, conducting her to the sages, they addressed them with the usual marks of reverence, and said: “What child will this female, the wife of Babhru,† who is anxious to have a son, give birth to?” The sages, who were possessed of divine wisdom, were very angry to find themselves thus tricked by the boys, and said: “She will bring forth a club, that shall crush the whole of the Yadava race.” The boys, thus spoken to by the sages, went and related all that had occurred to Ugrasena; and (as foretold,) a club was produced from the belly of Samba. Ugrasena had the club—which was of iron,—ground to dust and thrown into the sea; but the particles of dust (there) became rushes.† The term is Eraka (एरका), which is explained, in some medical lexicons, “a kind of grass.” The commentator also calls it a kind of grass; and, in the text of the Mahabhirata, the term subsequently used, and as synonymous with it, is Trīna (त्रिना), ‘grass.’ The Mahabhirata, when describing the affray which follows, mentions, that the grass, or rushes, on being plucked by Kṛishṇa and the Yadavas, turn to clubs. The text, and that of the Bṛgavata, here say, that the powdered particles, floating on the sea, became rushes. Or the latter may imply, that they fastened upon grass or weeds. The commentator, however, explains, that the particles of iron being borne to land, they were so transformed. The Mahabhirata says nothing of the piece which could not be pounded; and this seems to be an embellishment, either of our text or the Bhagavata. The Mahabhirata, however, adds another precaution, which the two others have left unnoticed. Ugrasena causes a proclamation to be made, that none of the inhabitants of Dwārakā shall, thenceforth, drink wine, on pain of being impaled alive; and the people, for some time, observe the prohibition.

* Tomara.
† The original yields ‘triturate’: तृतीयचिन्त चिन्तुः।
§ Corrected from “Jarā”. Vide infra, p. 102, note ‡.
|| Śakra, in the Sanskrit.
‖ I have inserted this word, inadvertently omitted by the Translator.
‡‡ विद्धि: खंभांत्रितः।
the purpose of relieving it of its load. The demons* have been slain, and the burthen of earth has been removed. Now let the immortals once again behold their monarch in heaven.† A period exceeding a century has passed. Now, if it be thy pleasure, return to Swarga. This is the solicitation of the celestials. But, should such not be thy will, then remain here as long as it may be desirable to thy dependants."‡ To this, Kríshña replied: § “All that thou hast said I am well aware of. The destruction of the Yádavas by me has commenced. The burthens of the earth are not removed, until the Yádavas are extirpated. I will effect this, also, in my descent, and quickly; for it shall come to pass in seven nights. When I have restored the land of Dwáráká to the ocean, and annihilated the race of Yádu, I will proceed to the mansions of the immortals. Apprise the gods, that, having abandoned my human body, and accompanied by Sánkarsana, I will then return to them.|| The tyrants that oppressed the earth,  

† Nothing of this kind occurs in the Mahábhráta. Our text, therefore, offers an embellishment. The Bhágavata, again, improves upon the text; for, not content with a messenger, it makes Brahmá (with the Prajápatí), Siva (with the Bhútas), Indra (with the other divinities), all come, in person; indicating, evidently, a
Yadavas, he said: “See! Behold these fearful phenomena! Let us hasten to Prabhāsa, to avert these omens.”* When he had thus spoken to the eminent Yadava,† the illustrious Uddhava: saluted and said to him: “Tell me, O lord, what is proper that I should do. For it seems to me, that thou wilt destroy all this race. The signs (that are manifest) declare (nothing less than) the annihilation of the tribe.” Then Krishna§ replied to him: “Do you go by a celestial route, which my favour shall provide you, to the holy (place) Badarikāśrama, || in the Gandhamadana mountain, the shrine of Naranārayana; and on that spot, sanctified by them, thou, by meditating on me, shalt, obtain perfection,** through my favour. When the race (of Yadu) shall have perished, I shall proceed to heaven; and the ocean shall inundate Dwāraka, when I have quitted it.”

Accordingly, Uddhava, thus instructed †† by Kesava, saluted him with veneration, and departed to the shrine of Naranārayana.  

1 In the Mahābhārata, it is said, merely, that Uddhava, who was versed in Yoga, foreseeing the destruction of the Yadavas,

*  भृगविषयं प्रमाणं याम मा चिरमः।
†  एवमुस्ति तु कणेन यादवमप्रसारत:।
‡  इस वेर्स रिजनिज क्षिद्धर, लेकिन नियो क्षिद्धर; और उसका स्नेन है विशिष्ट उपरात्र। मे आमेर एसी हो गई है; मे अजुर एसी एम्स ऑफ़।।
§  भगवत, इन ओरिजिनल।
||  क्षिद्धर गल्ल स्नेन इस हर्मिटेज़ बेर्स इस टेलर्न नाम, बादारी, इस्टेंडर बादारी, दो प्रमोड़ों बेर्स इस्त्रिहरा।।
¶  यह आमेर आई वेर्स इंद्रिया, वेर्स इंद्रिया।  
††  आनुमोदिता।
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Then the Yadavas ascended their rapid cars, and drove to Prabhāsa, ¹ along with Krishnā, Rāma, and the rest of their chiefs. ² They bathed there; and, excited* by Vāsudeva, the Kukuras† and Andhakas indulged in liquor. As they drank, the destructive flame of dissension was kindled amongst them by mutual collision, and fed with the fuel of abuse. Infuriated by the divine influence, they fell upon one another with missile weapons; and, when those were expended, they had recourse to the rushes§ growing nigh. The rushes in their hands became like thunderbolts; and they struck one another, with them, fatal|| blows.

went away; that is, according to the commentator, he practised penance, and went to heaven: जगास थोमासात्यह परीक्षेत।

The Bhāgavata, taking the hint, makes much more of it than our text, and expands it into a long course of instruction, given by Krīshṇa to Uddhava, occupying 150 leaves.

¹ Vide supra, p. 47, note 2. By sending the Yadavas to Prabhāsa, (the commentator asserts,) Krīshṇa prevented, purposely, the Yadavas from obtaining Mukti, ‘final liberation’, which would have been the consequence of dying at Dwārakā. Death at Prabhāsa conferred only Indra’s heaven.

² The Mahābhārata describes them as going forth with horses, elephants, and cars, and their women and abundance of good cheer, and varieties of wine and meat:

| चुनानाविधत चक्रपर्व मानसविद्य:।

* Anumodita.
† Corrected, here and frequently elsewhere, from “Kukuras”.
¶ śastra, which almost always signifies an edged weapon, in contradistinction from astra, ‘a missile weapon’.
|| Sudāruka.
Pradyumna, Sámba, Kréitavarmán, Sátyaki, Aniruddha, Prithu, Vípíthu, Cháruvarman, Cháruka, Akrúra, and many others struck one another with the rushes, which had assumed the hardness of thunderbolts. Keśava interposed, to prevent them; but they thought that he was taking part with each, severally.

The Bhagavata, like the text, adverts only in this general manner to the conflict; but theMahábhárata gives the particulars. Yuyudhána reproaches Kréitavarmán with having aided Aśvattháman in his night-attack on the Páñđu camp, and killing warriors in their sleep. Pradyumna joins in the abuse. Kréitavarmán retorts. Sátyaki repeats the story of the Syamantaka gem, by which he accuses Kréitavarmán of being an accomplice in the murder of Satrjáti (See Vol. IV., pp. 75, et seq.). Satyabhámá, the daughter of the latter, then mixes in the quarrel, and incites Keśava to avenge her; but Sátyaki anticipates him, and murders Kréitavarmán. Sáineyya and the Bhogas attack Sátyaki; the Andhakas defend him; and the affray becomes general. Keśava attempts to part the combatants, until Pradyumna is killed; and, then, taking up a handful of rushes, which become an iron club, he kills, indiscriminately, all that come in his way. The conflict continues, until the greater part of the combatants have fallen, including all Keśava’s sons; and he, then, in wrath, sweeps off all the survivors, except Babhru and Dáruka, with his discus.

Krishna, then, enraged, took up a handful of rushes, to destroy them; and the rushes became a club of iron. And with this he slew many of the murderous Yádavas; whilst others, fighting fiercely, put an end to one another. The chariot of the holder of the discus, named Jaitra, was quickly carried off by the (swift) steeds, and swept away by the sea, in the sight of Dáruka, (the charioteer). The discus, the club, the bow, the quiver, the shell, and the sword of Kesava, having circumambulated their lord, flew along the path of the sun. In a short time there was not a single Yádava left alive, except the mighty Keśava and Dáruka. Going towards Ráma, who was sitting at the root of a tree, they beheld a large serpent coming out of his mouth. Having issued from his mouth, the mighty snake proceeded towards

---

1 The Mahábhárata, as observed at the end of the last note, adds Babhru; but it presently gets rid of him. Keśava sends him to take care of the old people, the women, and children, in Dwáráká, whilst Dáruka goes to bring Arjuna to their aid. But, as he goes along,—overcome with grief for the loss of his kindred, and approaching separation from Keśava,—he is killed by a club that is cast from a snare, or trap, set by a hunter. Keśava then goes to Dwáráká, and desires Vasudeva to await the coming of Arjuna; after which, he returns to Ráma, and sees the phenomenon described in the text; the serpent being Sesa, of whom Balaráma was the incarnation. The Bhágavata does not mention this incident; merely observing, that Ráma, by the power of Yoga, returned into himself,—that is, into Víshnu.

---

1 The Bhágavata, like the text, adverts only in this general manner to the conflict; but the Mahábhárata gives the particulars. Yúyudhána reproaches Kréitavarmán with having aided Aśvattháman in his night-attack on the Páñđu camp, and killing warriors in their sleep. Pradyumna joins in the abuse. Kréitavarmán retorts. Sátyaki repeats the story of the Syamantaka gem, by which he accuses Kréitavarmán of being an accomplice in the murder of Satrjáti (See Vol. IV., pp. 75, et seq.). Satyabhámá, the daughter of the latter, then mixes in the quarrel, and incites Keśava to avenge her; but Sátyaki anticipates him, and murders Kréitavarmán. Sáineyya and the Bhogas attack Sátyaki; the Andhakas defend him; and the affray becomes general. Keśava attempts to part the combatants, until Pradyumna is killed; and, then, taking up a handful of rushes, which become an iron club, he kills, indiscriminately, all that come in his way. The conflict continues, until the greater part of the combatants have fallen, including all Keśava’s sons; and he, then, in wrath, sweeps off all the survivors, except Babhru and Dáruka, with his discus.

---

† Ibid., p. 93.
‡ For these two brothers, see Vol. IV., p. 96.
§ I know nothing of him. In Vol. IV., p. 113, we have a Sucháru.
¶ The same as Cháru, for whom see p. 78, supra.
‖ The same as Sátyaki. See Vol. IV., p. 93.
** See Vol. IV., p. 147.
†† Corrected from “Satrjáti”.
‡‡ See Vol. IV., p. 80.
§§ Was this Sátyaki, Sátyaki’s father? See Vol. IV., p. 92.
the ocean, hymned by saints,* and by other great serpents. Bringing an offering of respect, Ocean came to meet him; and, then, the majestic being, adored by attendant snakes, entered into the waters of the deep.† Beholding the departure of (the spirit of) Balabhadra, Kesava said to Dáruka: “All this is to be related, by you, to Vasudeva and Ugrasena. Go and inform them of the departure of Balabhadra, and the destruction of the Yādavas; also, that I shall engage in religious meditation, and quit this body. Apprise Áhuka,§ and all the inhabitants of Dwārakā, 1 that the sea will inundate the town. Be ready, therefore, in expectation of the coming of Arjuna; and, when he quits Dwārakā, no longer abide there, but go whithersoever that descendant of Kuru shall repair. Do you, also, go to the son of Kuntí, 11 and tell him, that it is my request that he will grant what protection he can to all my family.

Then depart, with Arjuna and all the people of Dwāravatī; and let Vajra be installed sovereign over the tribe of Yadu.”∗

Dáruka, being thus instructed, prostrated himself, again and again, before Kríshňa, and walked round him repeatedly, and then departed, as he had been desired; and, having conducted Arjuna to Dwāravatī, † the intelligent (servant of Kríshňa) established Vajra as king. The divine Govinda, then, having concentrated in himself that supreme spirit: which is one with Vásudeva, was identified with all beings.† Respecting the words of the Brahman,—the imprecation of Durvāsas,§ the

---

1 The process is explained by the commentator: || “By the force of Dhyāna (or abstraction), Kríshňa satisfies himself that he is Brahma (ख्रीष्ण्याविष्टता याशा), or universal spirit; and is, next, convinced, that he is, therefore, all things (वर्त्तमानत्वप्रायत्मः); by which his individuality ceases.”

2 The story is told in the Mahābhārata. Durvāsas was, on one occasion, hospitably entertained by Kríshňa; but the latter omitted to wipe away the fragments of the meal which had fallen on the foot of the irascible sage, who, thereupon, foretold, that Kríshňa should be killed as in the text.

∗ वचन खुरातीबिचित्रिताः। So Śridhara. Ratnagarbha reads: वचन खुरातांबिचित्रिताः।
† Corrected, here and just above, from “Dwāravatī”. The original has Dwārakā.
‡ परं न्यः।
§ सुवर्ण खुराच। See, for Durvāsas, Vol. I., pp. 135 and 154.
|| What follows is taken from Śridhara, whose words are: गद्यवाच परं न्यः महाराज विष्ठेवेत खुरातिः तामाः सत्यत्वचाराः चतुर्भुत्त्वाचातिः द्वाराचिकाः। Ratnagarbha comments to the same effect.
¶ And it is told briefly by both the commentators on the Viśňu-purāṇa.
illustrious Kṛṣṇa* sat engaged in thought,† resting his foot upon his knee. Then came there a hunter, named Jaras,§ whose arrow was tipped with a blade made of the piece of iron of the club, which had not been reduced to powder;§ and, beholding, from a distance, the foot of Kṛṣṇa, he mistook it for part of a deer, and, shooting his arrow, lodged it in the sole.²|| Approaching (his mark), he saw the four-armed king, and, falling at his feet, repeatedly besought his forgiveness, exclaiming: “I have done this deed unwittingly, thinking I was aiming at a deer. Have pity upon me, who am consumed by my crime! For thou art able to consume me.” Bhagavat replied: “Fear not, thou, in the least.* Go, hunter, through my favour, to heaven, the abode of the gods.” As soon as he had thus spoken, a celestial car appeared; and the hunter, ascending it, forthwith proceeded to heaven. Then the illustrious (Kṛṣṇa), having united himself with his own pure, spiritual,§ inexhaustible, inconceivable, unborn, undecaying, imperishable; and universal spirit, which is one with Vāsudeva, abandoned his mortal body and the condition of the threefold qualities.¹§

* This is an allegorical personage, however; for Jarā signifies ‘infirmity’, ‘old age’, ‘decay.’ **
† The Bhāgavata explains how this part of the foot became exposed. Kṛṣṇa had assumed one of the postures in which abstraction is practised. He had laid his left leg across his right thigh, by which the sole of the foot was turned outwards.
‡ Corrected from “Jarā”, which the original cannot yield, as a huntress would be called lubdhaki. The original is as follows:

चापो च जरा नाम के तहा तत्र बुधकः.

Thus explain both Śridhara and Ratnagarbha.

¹ He became Nirguṇa, ‘devoid of all qualities.’ ||
² Brahma-bhūta.
³ The epithet apramāya, ‘boundless’, is here omitted.
⁴ तथान्तर च उपयोगमय चित्रित्त्र गौतम: ||

* न तेषिन्म भवम्कर्षिणि
† Brahma-bhūta.
‡ The epithet apramāya, ‘boundless’, is here omitted.
§ तथान्तर च उपयोगमय चित्रित्त्र गौतम: ||

Thus explain both Śridhara and Ratnagarbha.

¹ He became Nirguṇa, ‘devoid of all qualities.’ ||
² Brahma-bhūta.
³ The epithet apramāya, ‘boundless’, is here omitted.
⁴ तथान्तर च उपयोगमय चित्रित्त्र गौतम: ||

Thus explain both Śridhara and Ratnagarbha.

¹ He became Nirguṇa, ‘devoid of all qualities.’ ||
² Brahma-bhūta.
³ The epithet apramāya, ‘boundless’, is here omitted.
⁴ तथान्तर च उपयोगमय चित्रित्त्र गौतम: ||

Thus explain both Śridhara and Ratnagarbha.

¹ He became Nirguṇa, ‘devoid of all qualities.’ ||
² Brahma-bhūta.
³ The epithet apramāya, ‘boundless’, is here omitted.
⁴ तथान्तर च उपयोगमय चित्रित्त्र गौतम: ||
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CHAPTER XXXVIII.

Arjuna comes to Dwārakā, and burns the dead, and takes away the surviving inhabitants. Commencement of the Kali age. Shepherds and thieves attack Arjuna, and carry off the women and wealth. Arjuna regrets the loss of his prowess, to Vyāsa, who consoles him, and tells him the story of Ashvākra's cursing the Apsarasas. Arjuna and his brothers place Pari-kshit on the throne, and go to the forests. End of the Fifth Book.

ARJUNA, having found the bodies of Kṛiṣhṇa and of Rāma, performed, for them and the rest (of the slain), the obsequial rites.* The eight queens of Kṛiṣhṇa, who have been named,† with Rukmiṇī at their head,‡ embraced the body of Hari, and entered the (funeral) fire. Revati, also, embracing the corpse of Rāma, entered the blazing pile, which was cool to her, happy in contact with her lord.§ Hearing these events, Ugrasena and Anakadundubhi, with Devaki and Rohiṇī, committed themselves to the flames. It is merely said, in the Mahābhārata, that Vasudeva expired; on which, four of his wives burnt themselves.

* Obsequial rites” is to render sahakāra.
† Vide supra, pp. 78, et seq., and p. 107.
‡ चक्रवर्धिनी मुखः: “Rukmiṇī and the rest.”
§ विवेष ज्ञाते वर्यते तत्सनासङ्कीत्यतथापि

1 The Mahābhārata takes the wives of Kṛiṣhṇa, first, to Indraprastha; and there Rukmiṇī and four others burn. But Satyabhāmā and others become ascetics, going to perform Tapasya in the forest.
2 It is merely said, in the Mahābhārata, that Vasudeva expired; on which, four of his wives burnt themselves.

The Kali age commenced from the death of Kṛiṣhṇa, according to the usual notions; but it is commonly supposed to commence a little later, or with the reign of Parikshit.††

The Bhāgavata agrees with the text, in excepting the temple of Dwārakā, and asserting that it still remains, in direct contradiction of the Mahābhārata, which declares, that the sea did not spare any part whatever. It is clear, therefore, that, when the latter was compiled, the temple was not standing, and that it was

* Prota-kārya.
† Kaunteya. Vide supra, p. 150, note ¶.
‡ Dwāravati, in the Sanskrit.
§ Vide supra, p. 46, text and note *.
|| Kāla-kārya. There are three unimportant variants. Ratnagarbha notes and elucidates two of them.
¶ यदुवर्धिनी, “the temple of the Yadus.”
** This sentence greatly abridges the original.
The son of Prithá* (Arjuna,) halted the people (he had brought from Dwáráká,) in the Panchananda country,1 in a rich and fertile spot. But the desires of the robbers (of the neighbourhood) were excited, when they observed so many widowed females,—also, such great riches,—in the possession of Arjuna* alone.† erected between the date of the compilation and that of the two Puráñas. The present shrine, which is held in great repute, stands at the extremity of the peninsula of Gujerat. It is still an object of pilgrimage. It was so in the reign of Akbar (Ayeen Akbaree); and has been so, no doubt, from a remote period. The image formerly worshipped there was carried off 600 years ago; and this was, most probably, subsequent to the date of both the Puránas: for the idol was a form of Krishña, called Raínáchoor,—a popular divinity, unknown in the Purúránik pantheon. Another image was substituted in place of that which was taken away. Notwithstanding the testimony of our text, and that of the Bhágívata, the originality of the temple is disputed; and it place thirty miles south from Poorbundur is said to be the spot where Dwáráká was swallowed up by the ocean. Hamilton (from Macmurdo, &c.,) Vol. I., p. 662.

1 “The country of the five rivers,”! the Punjab:—rather an out-of-the-way route from Dwáráká to Dehli.

Inflamed, by their cupidity, they assembled the villainous Ábhiras,* and said to them: “Here is this Arjuna,—immensely rich,† and having numerous women, whose husbands have been slain,—passing confidently amongst us; a disgrace to all brave men.” His pride is raised by the death of Bhishma, Droná, Jayadratha, Karña, and others (whom he has slain). He does not know the prowess of (simple) villagers. Up! up! Take your long thick staves.§ This stupid fellow despises us. Why should we not lift up our arms?” So saying, they rushed, armed with cudgels and clods of earth,||

† See Vol. IV., pp. 101, 102.
‡ The son of Pfitha (Arjuna,) halted the people (he had brought from Dwaraká,) in the Panchanada country, in a rich and fertile spot. But the desires of the robbers (of the neighbourhood) were excited, when they observed so many widowed females,—also, such great riches,—in the possession of Arjuna* alone.† erected between the date of the compilation and that of the two Puráñas. The present shrine, which is held in great repute, stands at the extremity of the peninsula of Gujerat. It is still an object of pilgrimage. It was so in the reign of Akbar (Ayeen Akbaree); and has been so, no doubt, from a remote period. The image formerly worshipped there was carried off 600 years ago; and this was, most probably, subsequent to the date of both the Puráñas: for the idol was a form of Krishña, called Raínáchoor,—a popular divinity, unknown in the Purúránik pantheon. Another image was substituted in place of that which was taken away. Notwithstanding the testimony of our text, and that of the Bhágívata, the originality of the temple is disputed; and it place thirty miles south from Poorbundur is said to be the spot where Dwáráká was swallowed up by the ocean. Hamilton (from Macmurdo, &c.,) Vol. I., p. 662.

1 Ábhiras mean herds;* and they are, afterwards, called, by Arjuna, Gopás, ‘herdsmen.’ The pastoral tribes of the west of India, and, particularly, those of Afghanistan, almost always combine the character of freebooter with that of shepherd.

† I find, everywhere, अय्यर, ‘archer.’ See note † in the preceding page.
‡ In no MS. do I find, in lieu of ध्वनि, घनि, which might suggest Professor Wilson’s “such great riches.”
§ Instead of भवता, क्रियात्मा is preferred by Ratnagarbha, according to my oldest copy of his commentary. And so reads my Arrah MS. My Ajmere MS. gives, in the place of the verse beginning as above, a whole stanza, and one of very different import.
|| Nothing to yield "clods of earth" is read in the text as alone I find it:

* Professor Wilson must have supposed that the reading was स्वप्नोऽहंमहर्षा दर्श्यो भूसुधारिणः। सहस्रोऽहंभासचं तं जो महिमेन्त्यस्य॥
† Śridhara and Ratnagarbha: दर्श्योऽहंभासचं तं जो महिमेन्त्यस्य॥
‡ I know no authority for this meaning. For the Ábhiras, see Vol. II., p. 168, notes 4, etc.; p. 185, notes 2, etc.
upon the people, who were without their lord. Arjuna encountered them, and said to them, in derision: "Retire, wretches, ignorant of what is right, unless ye are desirous of dying." But they disregarded his menaces, and seized his treasures, and his women,—the wives of Viśwakṣena. Thereupon, Arjuna began to brace his heavenly bow, Gaṇḍiva, irresistible in battle. But it was in vain; for, in spite of all his efforts to tighten it, it continued flaccid. Neither could he call to recollection the incantations of the superhuman weapons. Losing all patience, he launched, as best he might, his shafts upon the enemy; but those shot from Gaṇḍiva merely scratched the skin. The arrows given him, by Agni, to carry certain destruction, now were themselves destroyed, and were fatal to Arjuna, in his contest with herdsmen. He endeavoured to recall the might of Kṛishṇa,—animated by which, his numerous arrows had overthrown mighty kings;—but he tried in vain: for, now, they were put aside by the peasants; or they flew at random, wide of their aim. His arrows being expended, he beat the banniti with the horn of his bow: but they only laughed at his blows; and the barbarians, in the sight of Arjuna, carried off all the women of the Viśnu and Andhaka tribes, and went their way.

Then Jishnu was sorely distressed, and lamented bitterly, exclaiming: "Alas! alas! I am deserted by my lord!" And he wept; and, in that instant, the bow and (heavenly) arms, his car and steeds, perished entirely, like a donation to an unlearned Brahman. "Resistless," said he, "are the decrees of fate, by whom feebleness has been inflicted upon me,—deprived of my illustrious friend,—and victory given to the base. These two arms are mine; mine is this fist; this is my place; I am Arjuna: but, without that righteous aid, all these are pithless. The valour of Arjuna, the strength of Bhima, was, all, his work; and, without him, I am overcome by peasants: it cannot be from any other

1 The principal wives of Kṛishṇa, however, according to the Mahābhārata, escaped. The occurrence is described, there, much in the same way, but more briefly. It is not detailed in the Bhāgavata.
cause." So saying, Arjuna* went to the city of Mathurā,† and there installed the Yādava prince, Vajra, as its king. There he beheld Vyāsa, who was living in a wood; and he approached the sage,§ and saluted him respectfully. The Muni surveyed him for some time, as he lay prostrate at his feet, and said to him:|| "How is it that I see you thus shorn of your lustre?" Have you been guilty of illicit intercourse with women?** Or of the death of a Brahman? Or have you suffered some grievous disappointment, that you are so dejected?†† Have your prayers for progeny, or other good gifts, proved fruitless? Or have you indulged improper passions, that your lustre is so dim?‡‡ Or are you one that devours the meal he has given to the Brahmans? Say, Arjuna, have you seized upon the substance of the poor? Has the wind of a winnowing-basket lighted upon you? Or has an evil eye gazed upon you, Arjuna, that you look thus miserable? §§

* Jīshūn, in the original. This is one of the many names or epithetical designations of Arjuna.
† Śrīdhara and Ratnagārītha notice a variant expressing that Arjuna went from Indraprastha to Hastinapura. Māy Ajmere and Arrah MSS. simply substitute Indraprastha for Mathurā.
§ The Sanskrit has Phāṅguna.
|| Pārtha is the word here used.
† विच्छायः कथमसतत्सीदेः।
** This sentence is to render चरीरकीचिन्हनम्। Both Śrīdhara and Ratnagārītha dwell at length on the first of these words and its variant चरीरा।
†† सहस्वयः।
‡‡ सामान्यकाृत्य वा ते बाजन्माना मित्तातः।
चमक्ष्यार्धितिवा ले विनाशिविवचतमः।
§§ विच्छायः।

Have you been touched by the water of a finger-nail? Or has the water of a water-jar sprinkled you? Or, what is, most probably, the case, have you been beaten by your inferiors in battle?***

Arjuna,† having sighed deeply, related to Vyāsa all the circumstances of his discomfiture, and continued: "Hari, who was our strength, our might, our heroism, our prowess, our prosperity, our brightness, has left us, and departed. Deprived of him, our friend, illustrious, and ever kindly speaking, we have become as feeble as if made of straw.: Purushottama, who was the living§ vigour of my weapons, my arrows, and my bow,** is gone. As long as we looked upon him, fortune, fame, wealth, dignity™ never abandoned But Govinda is gone from amongst us. That Kṛishṇa has quitted earth, through whose power Bhīshma, Drona, the king of Anga,*** Duryodhana, and the rest were consumed. Not I alone, but Earth, has grown old, miserable,†† and lustreless, in the absence of the holder of the discus.‡‡ Kṛishṇa, through devotion to whom Bhīshma and other mighty men perished like

* The Translator has here somewhat departed from the order of the original.
† Pārtha, in the original.
*** तत्र भैरव महते श्रीतपृतिभिभिभाषाय।
होना वेद सुनेत जातासुरायां रूपः॥
Ratnagārītha begins this stanza with गीरौष, i.e., दारेष, he says.
§ Mūrtta.
|| Substituted, by the Translator, for Gāṅāṭa.
¶ Unati.
*** Anga-rāja. Karṇa is intended.
†† सहस्वयः।
‡‡ चरीराः।
**: Chakrin.
V.
moths in the flame of my valour, is gone; and I am, now, overcome by cowherds. The bow Gāṇḍiva, that was famed throughout the three worlds, has been foiled, since he has departed, by the sticks of peasants. The myriad of women over whom I was lord has been carried off from me by thieves, armed but with cudgels. The whole household of Kṛišṇa, O Kṛišṇa, has been (forcibly) carried away by peasants, who, with their staves, have put my strength to shame. That I am shorn of my lustre I do not marvel: it is wonderful that I live. Surely, grand-sire, I alone am so shameless as to survive the stain of indignity inflicted by the vile.”

Vyāsa replied to Arjuna, and said: “Think no more, my son, of your disgrace. It does not become you to grieve. Know that time subjects all beings to similar vicissitude. Time effects the production and dissolution of all creatures. All that exists is founded on time. Know this, Arjuna, and retain your fortitude. Rivers, seas, mountains, the whole earth, gods, men, animals, trees, insects are, all, created, and, all, will be destroyed, by time. Knowing that all that is is the effect of time, be tranquilized. These mighty works of Kṛišṇa, whatever they have been, have been performed to relieve earth of its burthens: for this he has come down. Earth, oppressed by her load, has had recourse to the assembly of the immortals; and Jñānādana, who is one with time, has descended on that account. This object has been, now, accomplished. All the kings (of the earth) are slain; the race of Vṛiṣṇi and Andhaka is destroyed: no more remained for him to accomplish. Therefore has the lord departed whither he pleased, his ends being, all, fulfilled. At the period of creation, the god of gods creates; in that of duration, he preserves; and, at the end (of all), he is mighty to annihilate. Now all is done. Therefore, Arjuna, be not afflicted by thy defeat. The prowess of mortals is the gift of time. Bhīṣma, Droṇa, Karna, and other kings have been slain by thee alone. This was the work of time: and why, therefore, should not thy discomfiture, by those less than thou art,
was pursuing his religious penances, standing in water, and meditating on the eternal spirit, for many years. In consequence of the overthrow of the Asuras, there was a great festival on the summit of Meru; on their way to which, Rambhá, Tilottamá, and hundreds and thousands of beautiful nymphs: saw the ascetic Ashtávakra; and they praised and hymned him (for his devotions). They bowed down (before him), and eulogized him, (as he was immersed) up to his throat in water, his hair twisted in a braid. So they sang, in honour of him, whatever they thought would be most agreeable to that most eminent of Brahmans. Ashtávakra (at last,) said to them: ‘I am well pleased with you, illustrious damsels. Whatever you wish for, ask of me, and I will give it you, however difficult it may be of attainment.’ Then all those nymphs, Rambhá, Tilottamá, and others, recorded in the Vedas, replied: ‘It is enough for us that thou art pleased. What need we aught else, venerable Brahman?’

But some for it by his yet unborn son. The father angrily cursed him, that he should be born bent in every part; and he was, accordingly, brought forth crooked (vakra) in eight limbs (ashtan). He became, nevertheless, a celebrated sage. See, also, Hindu Theatre, Vol. I., p. 293, note.

† See, for them, Vol. II., p. 75, note 3.
§ “Illustrious damsels” is to translate सहभागिन्: || अस्मिन्.||
** Prasád dvaapárai ràja kásháma samayita dri:
†† With the name Ashtávakra compare Naikavakrá and Trivákra, for which vide supra, p. 21, note †.

††§§ 

was pursuing his religious penances, standing in water, and meditating on the eternal spirit, for many years. In consequence of the overthrow of the Asuras, there was a great festival on the summit of Meru; on their way to which, Rambhá, Tilottamá, and hundreds and thousands of beautiful nymphs: saw the ascetic Ashtávakra; and they praised and hymned him (for his devotions). They bowed down (before him), and eulogized him, (as he was immersed) up to his throat in water, his hair twisted in a braid. So they sang, in honour of him, whatever they thought would be most agreeable to that most eminent of Brahmans. Ashtávakra (at last,) said to them: ‘I am well pleased with you, illustrious damsels. Whatever you wish for, ask of me, and I will give it you, however difficult it may be of attainment.’ Then all those nymphs, Rambhá, Tilottamá, and others, recorded in the Vedas, replied: ‘It is enough for us that thou art pleased. What need we aught else, venerable Brahman?’

If some for it by his yet unborn son. The father angrily cursed him, that he should be born bent in every part; and he was, accordingly, brought forth crooked (vakra) in eight limbs (ashtan). He became, nevertheless, a celebrated sage. See, also, Hindu Theatre, Vol. I., p. 293, note.

† See, for them, Vol. II., p. 75, note 3.
§ “Illustrious damsels” is to translate सहभागिन्: || अस्मिन्.||
** Prasád dvaapárai ràja kásháma samayita dri:
†† With the name Ashtávakra compare Naikavakrá and Trivákra, for which vide supra, p. 21, note †.
(amongst them) said: 'If, exalted sir, you are (indeed) pleased with us, then grant us a husband, the best of men,' and sovereign of the Brahmans.'† 'So be it,' replied Ashťavakra, and, thereupon, came up from the waters. When the nymphs beheld him coming out of the water, and saw that he was (very) ugly, and crooked in eight places, they could not restrain their merriment, but laughed aloud. The Muni was (very) angry, and cursed them, and said: 'Since you have been so impertinent as to laugh at my deformity, I pronounce upon you this imprecation: through the grace I have shown unto you, you shall obtain the first of males for your husband; but, in consequence of my curse, you shall (afterwards) fall into the hands of thieves.'

When the nymphs heard this uttered by the Muni, they endeavoured to appease him; and (they so far succeeded, that) he announced to them, they should finally return to the sphere of the gods. It is in consequence, then, of the curse of the Muni Ashtavakra, that these females, who were, at first, the wives of Kesava, have, now, fallen into the hands of the barbarians; § and there is no occasion, Arjuna, for you to regret it in the least. All this destruction has been effected by the lord of all; and your end is, also, nigh at hand, since he has withdrawn from you strength, splendour, valour, and preeminence.¶ Death is the doom of every one who is born; fall is the end of exaltation; union terminates in separation; and growth tends but to decay.* Knowing (all this), wise men are susceptible of neither grief nor joy; and those who learn their ways are even as they are,—(equally free from pleasure or pain).* Do you, therefore, most excellent prince, understand this (truth), and, along with your brothers, relinquish everything, and repair to the holy forest. Go, now, and say, from me, to Yudhishṭhīra, † that he, to-morrow, with his brethren, tread the path of heroes."

Thus instructed by Vyāsa, Arjuna went and related to the other sons of Pṛithā all that he had seen, had experienced, and had heard. § When he had communicated to them the message of Vyāsa, the sons of Pāṇḍu placed Parīkṣit on the throne, and went to the forest.

I have thus narrated to you, Maitreya, in detail, the actions of Vāsudeva, when he was born in the race of Yadu.

---

* Purubbottama, i.e., Vishṇu or Kṛṣṇa.
† According to all my MSS., the term here rendered "sovereign of the Brahmans" is in the vocative, and applies to Ashťavakra.
‡ Purubbottama, as above.
§ Dasyu.
¶ Addressed, in the original, as Pāṇḍava.
* Māhātmya.
CHAPTER I.

Of the dissolution of the world: the four ages: the decline of all things, and deterioration of mankind, in the Kali age.

MAITREYA.—You have narrated to me, illustrious sage, the creation (of the world), the genealogies (of the patriarchs), the duration* of the Manwantaras, and the dynasties† (of princes), in detail. I am now desirous to hear from you (an account of) the dissolution of the world, the season of total destruction, and that which occurs at the expiration of a Kalpa.†

PARĀŚARA.—Hear from me, Maitreya, exactly (the circumstances of) the end of all things, and the disso-

---

1 Two kinds of great or universal dissolution are here intimated; one occurring at the end of a Kalpa, or day of Brahmá, to which the term Upasahhriti is applied in the text, and Âyantika-laya by the commentator; § and the other taking place at the end of the life of Brahmá, which is termed a great or elemental dissolution: Mahá-pralaya and Prákṣīta-pralaya.

---

* Sáhíti.
† Vahulanucharita.
‡ Upasahhriti.
§ Ratusagarbha.
lution that occurs either at the expiration of a Kalpa, or that which takes place at the close of the life of Brahmā. A month (of mortals) is a day and night of the progenitors: a year (of mortals is a day and night) of the gods. Twice a thousand aggregates of the four ages is a day and night of Brahmā. The four ages are the Kṛita, Tretā, Dwāpara, and Kali; comprehending, together, twelve thousand years of the gods. There are infinite successions of these four ages, of a similar description, the first of which is (always) called the Kṛita, and the last, the Kali. In the first, the Kṛita, is that age which is created by Brahmā; in the last, which is the Kali age, a dissolution of the world occurs.

MAITREYA.—Venerable sir, you are able to give me a description of (the nature of) the Kali age, in which four-footed virtue suffers total extinction.

1 These measures of time are more fully detailed in the First Book. See Vol. I., pp. 46, et seq.
2 This is an allusion to a popular notion, originating, probably, with Manu: “In the Kṛita age, the Genius of truth and right stands firm on his four feet; but in the
3 Read “creation.” Professor Wilson here went wrong from following his favourite MS., which, from the fault of the抄ist, begins the verse with “the round of ages” and not “the round of ages in the sense of ‘age,’ is neuter.
4 “At the close of the life of Brahmā” is to translate मात्रते।
5 Aśeṣa.
6 “Such an act is just what it is:” या शेर प्रायविचित्रिक्या कली।† This is, it may be attended by inconvenience to the individual, but is utterly inefficacious for the expiation of sin.
choose to think so; all gods will be gods to them that worship them; and all orders of life will be common alike to all persons. In the Kali age, fasting, austerity,† liberalitas, practised according to the pleasure of those by whom they are observed, will constitute righteousness. Pride (of wealth) will be inspired by very insignificant possessions. Pride of beauty; will be prompted by (no other personal charm than fine) hair. Gold, jewels, diamonds,$ clothes, will, all, have perished; and then hair will be the only ornament with which women can decorate themselves. Wives will desert their husbands, when they lose their property; and they only who are wealthy will be considered, by women, as their lords. He who gives away much (money) will be the master of men; and family descent

* Whether it is conformable or contradictory to the Vedas and the law. The passage may be rendered, also: “The doctrine or dogma of anyone soever will be scripture.”

† He will not part with the half of the half of half a Pañ—a that is, with ten Cowries: a Pañ—a being equal to eighty Cowries (or small shells).§ Five Pañ—a are equal to one Anna, or the sixteenth of a Rupee; and, at two shillings the Rupee, ten Cowries are equal to about one-seventh of a farthing.

§ They will be valued for their individual use only, not from any notion of their generic sanctity.

&#1057; kṣudra, ‘hunger,’ ‘famine.’

§ Tāpasa, ‘ascetics.’

§ See Colebrooke’s Algebra, &c., p. 1.
dance, in the Kali age; and men will never enjoy pleasure and happiness.* They will take their food without previous ablution, and without worshipping fire, gods, or guests, or offering† obsequial libations to their progenitors. The women will be fickle; short of stature, gluttonous. They will have many children, and little means. Scratching their heads with both hands, they will pay no attention to the commands of their husbands or parents. They will be selfish, abject, and slatternly; they will be scolds and liars; they will be indecent and immoral in their conduct, and will ever attach themselves to dissolute men. Youths, although disregarding the rules of studentship, will study the Vedas. Householders will neither sacrifice nor practise becoming liberality. Anchorets§ will subsist upon food accepted from rustics; and mendicants will be influenced by regard for friends and associates.† Princes, instead of protecting, will plunder, their subjects, and, under the pretext of levying customs, will rob merchants of their property. In the Kali age, every one who has cars, and elephants, and steeds will be a Raja; every one who is feeble will be a slave.* Vaiśyas will abandon agriculture and commerce, and gain a livelihood by servitude,† or the exercise of mechanical arts. § Śūdras, seeking a subsistence by begging, and assuming the outward marks of religious mendicants, will become the impure followers of impious and heretical doctrines.‡

Oppressed by famine and taxation, men will desert their native lands, and go to those countries which are fit for coarser grains.³ The path of the Vedas being

---

* The Bhāgavata has: “Religious students will be regardless of vows and purification; householders will beg, not give alms; anchorets will dwell in villages; and mendicants will be desirous of riches.”

† Read “and they will not offer”, &c.

‡ “Gavedhuka (Coix barbata) and other bad sorts of grain.”

§ “Countries growing wheat, barley, and the like.”

† Bhūtiya, ‘servant.’

◊ Śūdra-wtitti.

@ Kāru-karmam.

³ For gavedhukd, the same grain, see Vol. I., p. 95.

¶ This is Ratnagarbha’s reading.
VISHNU PURANA.

In the Kali age, Maitreya, men, corrupted by unbelievers, will refrain from adoring Vishnu, the lord of sacrifice,* the creator and lord of all, and will say: "Of what authority are the Vedas? What are gods, or Brahmans? What need is there of purification with water?"† Then will the clouds yield scanty rain; then will the corn be light in ear; and the grain will be (poor and) of little sap. Garments will be, mostly, made of the fibres of the San; the principal of trees will be the Sami; the prevailing caste will be the Sudra. Millet will be the more common grain; the milk in use will be, chiefly, that of goats; unguents will be made of Ushira-grass. § The mother- and father-in-law will be venerated in place of parents; and a man's friends will be his brother-in-law, or one who has a

rank them lower than rice, is a classification that could have occurred to a native of Bengal alone.

† The Vayu says three and twenty; the Bhagavata, from twenty to thirty.

‡ The complaints of the prevalence of heterodox doctrines, and neglect of the practices of the Vedas, which recur in the
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wanton wife. Men will say: "Who has a father? Who has a mother? Each one is born according to his deeds." And, therefore, they will look upon a wife's or husband's parents as their own. Endowed with little sense, men, subject to all the infirmities of mind, speech, and body, will daily commit sins; and everything that is calculated to afflict beings, vicious, impure, and wretched, will be generated in the Kali age.

Then shall some places follow a separate duty, devoid of holy study, oblations to fire,* and invocations of the gods.† Then, in the Kali age, shall a man acquire, by a trifling exertion, as much eminence in virtue as is the result of arduous penance in the Krita age (or age of purity).‡

1 Several of the Purāṇas contain allusions to the degeneracy of the Kali age; but none afford more copious details. The description in the Bhāgavata is much shorter; that of the Vāyu is much the same, and employs many of the same verses and illustrations.

2 This might be suspected of being said ironically, referring to what had been just observed of places where a religion prevailed that required neither study nor sacrifice. The commentator, however, understands it literally, and asserts, that allusion is here made to the Vaishnav faith, in which devotion to Vishū or Kṛṣṇa, and the mere repetition of his name, are equally efficacious, in the Kali age, with the penances and sacrifices of the preceding ages. Therefore, he concludes, the Kali, by this one property, is the best of all the ages: अनितिकिन गुर्णित कल्याणक नानाधिक रक्षयें। This interpretation is confirmed by the following Chapter.

* Vanaṭhākha. See Vol. II., p. 29, notes 3 and 5.
† Swadhd and swādhi. See Vol. III., p. 122, note †; ad finem.
‡ Both the commentators give this explanation.
CHAPTER II.

Redeeming properties of the Kali age. Devotion to Vishnu sufficient to salvation, in that age, for all castes and persons.

UPON this subject, Maitreya, you shall hear what the wise Vyasa has related, as it is communicated truly by me.

It was, once, a matter of dispute, amongst the sages, at what season the least moral merit obtained the greatest reward, and by whom it was most easily displayed. In order to terminate the discussion, they went to Veda Vyasa, to remove their doubts. They found the illustrious Muni, my son, half immersed in the water of the Ganges; and, awaiting the close of his ablutions, the sages remained on the banks of the sacred stream, under shelter of a grove of trees. As my son plunged down into the water, and again rose up from it, the Munis heard him exclaim: “Excellent, excellent is the Kali age!” Again he dived, and, again rising, said, in their hearing: “Well done, well done, Sudra! Thou art happy.” Again he sank down; and, as he once more emerged, they heard him say: “Well done, well done, women! They are happy. Who are more fortunate than they?”

After this, my son finished his bathing; and the sages met him, as he approached to welcome them. After he had given them seats, and they had proffered their respects, the son of Satyavati* said to them: “On what account have you come to me?” They replied: “We came to you to consult you on a subject on which we entertain some doubt. But that may be, at present, suspended. Explain to us something else. We heard you say: ‘Excellent is the Kali age. Well done, Sudra! Well done, women!’ Now we are desirous to know why this was said, why you called them, repeatedly, happy. Tell us the meaning of it, if it be not a mystery. We will then propose to you the question that occupies our thoughts.”

Being thus addressed by the Munis, Vyasa smiled, and said to them: “Hear, excellent sages, why I uttered the words ‘Well done! Well done!’ The fruit of penance, of continence, of silent prayer, and the like, practised, in the Krita age, for ten years, in the Treta, for one year, in the Dwapara, for a month, is obtained in the Kali age, in a day and night. Therefore did I exclaim: ‘Excellent, excellent is the Kali age.’ That reward which a man obtains, in the Krita, by abstract meditation, in the Treta, by sacrifice, in the Dwapara, by adoration, he receives, in the Kali, by merely reciting the name of Kesava. In the Kali age, a man displays the most exalted virtue by (very) little exertion: therefore, (pious sages,) who know what virtue is, I was pleased with the Kali age. Formerly, the Vedas were to be acquired, by the twice-born, through the diligent observance of self-denial;* and it was their duty to celebrate sacrifices conformably to the ritual.

* चद्विभि चविभि चविभि चविभि चविभि चविभि
† जानवी, in the original.
‡ ‘Great’, according to the Sanskrit.

See Vol. IV., p. 158.
† Brahmacharya.
‡ Vratacharya.
Then idle prayers, idle feasts, and fruitless ceremonies were practised but to mislead the twice-born; for, although observed, by them, devoutly, yet, in consequence of some irregularity in their celebration, sin was incurred in all their works; and what they ate or what they drank did not effect the fulfilment of their desires. In all their objects the twice-born enjoyed no independence; and they attained their respective spheres only with exceeding pain. The Sudra, (on the contrary,) more fortunate than they, reaches his assigned station by rendering them service, and performing merely the sacrifice of preparing food, in which no rules determine what may or may not be eaten, what may or may not be drunk. Therefore, most excellent sages, is the Sudra fortunate.

"Riches are accumulated, by men, in modes not incompatible with their peculiar duties; and they are then to be bestowed upon the worthy, and expended in constant sacrifice. There is great trouble in their acquisition; great care, in their preservation; great distress, from the want of them; and great grief, for their loss. Thus, eminent Brahmans, through these and other sources of anxiety, men attain their allotted spheres of Prajápati and the rest, (only by exceeding labour and suffering). (This is not the case with women,) A woman has only to honour her husband, in act, thought, and speech, to reach the same region to which he is elevated; and she, thus, accomplishes her object without any great exertion. This was the purport of my exclamation 'Well done!' the third time. I have, thus, related to you (what you asked). Now demand the question you came to put to me, in any way you please; and I will make you a distinct reply."

The Munis then said (to Vyása): "The question we intended to have asked you has been already answered, by you, in your reply to our subsequent inquiry." On hearing which, Kṛishṇa Dwāpāyana laughed, and said to the holy persons: who had come to see him, whose eyes were wide open with astonishment: "I perceived, with the eye (of) divine (knowledge), the question you intended to ask; and, in allusion to it, I uttered the expressions 'Well done! Well done!' In truth, in the Kali age, duty is discharged with very little trouble by mortals whose faults are, all, washed away by the water of their individual merits; by Sudras, through diligent attendance (only) upon the twice-born; and by women, through the slight effort of obedience to their husbands. Therefore, Brahmans, did I thrice ex-

\* Kathā. "Praise of Kṛishṇa", the commentators say.
\+ A free rendering.
\: पायम्पः भिद्विषीयां सच्छव. This implies "possessing the privilege of domestic sacrifices." For the pākyajnas, which have nothing to do with ordinary cookery, see Vol. III., p. 114, notes 1 and 2.
\§ This has not the connexion with what precedes that the Translator supposed. For "in which", read "and for him", or the like,—to render freely.
\|| Muni-kārdrāila.
\ nền It is, rather, implied, that there is difficulty in the proper application of them:

तथा सत्कषिपतो ग्राफिर्य गर्भव भवान द. ।

\* I find no Sanskrit for this clause.
\† In the original, Prájápatya. For this heaven, see Vol. I., p. 98, notes 1 and 2.
\; Tāpasa.
\§ Some MSS. yield 'time'.
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press my admiration of their happiness; for, in the Kṛita and other ages, great were the toils of the regenerate to perform their duty. I waited not for your inquiry, but replied, at once, to the question you purposed to ask. Now, ye who know what virtue is, what else do you wish me to tell you?”

The Munis then saluted and praised Vyāsa, and, being freed, by him, from uncertainty, departed as they came. To you, also, excellent (Maitreya), have I imparted this secret,—this one great virtue of the (otherwise) vicious Kali age. The dissolution of the world, and the aggregation of the elements, I will now describe to you.

1 The illustration of the efficacy of devotion to Vishnu, given in this Chapter, is peculiar to this Purāṇa; but the doctrine is common to it and the Bhāgavata. It is repeatedly inculcated in that work. The parallel passage, in the Twelfth Book, § is the following: “Purushottama, abiding in the hearts of men, takes away all the sins of the Kali age, produced by place or property. Bhagavat, abiding in the heart, and heard, repeated, read of, worshipped, or honoured, dissipates the ills of men for ten thousand births. As fire, entering into the substance of gold, purifies it from the alloy with which it is debased in the mine, so Vishnu, united with the devotee, is the refiner from all that is evil. By learning, penance, suppression of breath, friendship, pilgrimage, ablation, mortification, gifts, prayer, the soul attains not that exceeding purity which it derives from the presence of Vishnu. Therefore, with all your soul, O king, hold Kesava ever present in your heart. Let one about to die be most careful in this; for so he goes to supreme felicity. Let the name of the supreme god, Vishnu, be repeated, diligently, by all, in their last moments; for he who desires liberation shall attain it by the frequent repetition of the name of Kṛishṇa. Final felicity is derived, in the Kṛita age, from holy study; in the Treta, from religious rites. In the Dwāpara, it is attained by pious services; but, in the Kali age, it is secured by repeating the name of Hari.” Similar doctrines are taught in the Gītā, and other Vaishnava works. See Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVI., p. 116.

§ Chapter III., 45—52:

विष्णु पुराणा
CHAPTER III.

Three different kinds of dissolution. Duration of a Parárdha. The clepsydra, or vessel for measuring time. The dissolution that occurs at the end of a day of Brahmá.

THE dissolution* of existing beings is of three kinds,—incidental, elemental, and absolute.1 The incidental is that which relates to Brahmá, and occurs at the end of a Kalpa; the elemental is that which takes place after two Parárdhas; the absolute is (final) liberation* (from existence).

MAITREYA.—Tell me, excellent master, what is the enumeration of a Parárdha, the expiration of two of which is the period of elemental dissolution.1

PARÁSARA.—A Parárdha, Maitreya, is that number which occurs in the eighteenth place of figures, enumerated according to the rule of decimal notation.2 At

1 Maitreya has a rather indifferent memory (see Vol. I., pp. 46, 47); but the periods specified in the two places do not agree. In the First Book, two Parárdhas, as equal to one hundred years of Brahmá, are 311,040,000,000,000 years of mortals.

2 Counting according to this mode of enumeration, a Parárdha is represented by 100,000,000,000,000. The Váyu Puráña† has

* Moksha.
† Quoted by Śridhara and Ratnagarbha, as follows:

The English of this is, in brief, as below, and corrects Professor Wilson’s representation, in several particulars:

- Eka: 1
- Dasa: 10
- Sata: 100
- Sahasrā: 1,000
- Ayuta: 10,000
- Niguta: 100,000
- Prayuta: 1,000,000
- Arbuda: 10,000,000

1 The first is called Naimittika,† ‘occasional’ or ‘incidental,’ or Brähmya, as occasioned by the intervals of Brahmá’s days; the destruction of creatures, though not of the substance of the world, occurring during his night. The general resolution of the elements into their primitive source, or Prakriti, is the Prakritika destruction, and occurs at the end of Brahmá’s life. The third, the absolute or final, Atyantika, is individual annihilation; Moksha, exemption for ever from future existence.‡ The Bhágavata§ here notices the fourth kind, of which mention occurred in a preceding passage (Vol. I., p. 113),—Nitya, or constant dissolution;—explaining it to be the imperceptible change that all things suffer in the various stages of growth and decay, life and death. “The various conditions of beings subject to change are occasioned by that constant dissolution of life which is rapidly produced by the resistless stream of time, taking everything perpetually away.”

1 Pratisanchara. See Vol. I., p. 52, note *.
† Corrected from “Naimittaka”.
‡ Vide supra, p. 61, note §, ad finem.
§ XII, IV., 35.
the end of twice that period, elemental dissolution occurs, when all the discrete products of nature are withdrawn into their indiscrete source. The shortest period of time is a Mātra, which is equal to the twinkling of the human eye. * Fifteen Mātrās make a Kāsthā; thirty Kāsthās, one Kalā; fifteen Kalās, one Nādikā. A Nādikā is ascertained by a measure of water, with a vessel made of twelve Palas and a half of copper, in the bottom of which there is to be a hole made with a tube of gold, of the weight of four Māshas, and four inches long. † According to the Māgadha measure,

---

\[\text{Nyarbuda} \cdot 100,000,000\]
\[\text{Vṛinda} \cdot 1,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Kharva} \cdot 10,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Śankha} \cdot 1,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Padma} \cdot 10,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Samudra} \cdot 1,000,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Madhya} \cdot 1,000,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Anta} \cdot 10,000,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Parārdha} \cdot 100,000,000,000,000,000\]

2 parārdhas, i.e., half-paras, = a para.

Our commentators' manuscripts of the Vāyu-purāṇa must have differed very noticeably, as to the foregoing passage, from those to which I have access.

A nyūta denotes, according to different authorities, a hundred thousand, a million, etc. More usually, however, it is a synonym of lakha; as in the passage annotated supra, p. 92, note †. See Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth's Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, sub voce नियुत. For a very learned article on Sanskrit numeration, from the pen of Dr. Albrecht Weber, see the Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. XV., pp. 132-140.

* Corrected from "Nyavrunda," and the Sanskrit similarly.
† The original word is not, here, a technicality.
‡ Read "Madhya." See note † in the preceding page.
§ Anta is here omitted.
|| In the Līlāvatī, Chapter II., Section I., the parārdha is arrived at differently, in this wise:

---

\[\text{Ekā} \cdot 1\]
\[\text{Dūṣā} \cdot 10\]
\[\text{Śata} \cdot 100\]
\[\text{Śaba} \cdot 1,000\]
\[\text{Ayuta} \cdot 10,000\]
\[\text{Lakha} \cdot 100,000\]
\[\text{Prayuta} \cdot 1,000,000\]
\[\text{Koṭi} \cdot 10,000,000\]
\[\text{Arbuda} \cdot 100,000,000\]
\[\text{Abja} \cdot 1,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Kharva} \cdot 10,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Śakharva} \cdot 100,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Mahāpadma} \cdot 1,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Śankha} \cdot 10,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Kalā} \cdot 100,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Antya} \cdot 1,000,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Madyā} \cdot 10,000,000,000,000,000\]
\[\text{Parārdha} \cdot 100,000,000,000,000,000\]

As words, abja is a synonym of padma; and jaladhi, of samudra.

---

The expression अर्धशाली is explained, by the commentators, to mean "twelve and a half." The Bhāgavata-purāṇa has dwaddalārdha.
the vessel should hold a Prastha (or sixteen Palas) of water. Two of these Nādikās make one Muhūrta,—thirty of which are one day and night. Thirty such periods form a month; twelve months make a year, or a day and night of the gods; and three hundred and sixty such days constitute a year of the celestials. An aggregate of four ages contains twelve thousand divine years; and a thousand periods of four ages complete a day and night of Brahmā. That period is, also, termed a Kalpa, during which fourteen Manus preside; and, at the end of it, occurs the incidental or Brahmā dissolution. The nature of this dissolution is very fearful. Hear me describe it, as well as that which takes place at the elemental dissolution, which I will, also, relate to you.

At the end of a thousand periods of four ages, the earth is, for the most part, exhausted. A total dearth then ensues, which lasts a hundred years; and, in consequence of the failure of food, all beings become languid and exanimate, and, at last, entirely perish.* The eternal Vishnu then assumes the character of Rudra, the destroyer, and descends to reunite all (his) creatures with himself. He enters into the seven rays of the sun,†; drinks up all the waters (of the globe), and causes all moisture whatever, in living bodies or in the soil, to evaporate; thus drying up the whole earth. The seas, the rivers, the mountain torrents, and springs are, all, exhaled; and so are all the waters of Pātāla,§ (the regions below the earth). Thus fed, through his intervention,|| with abundant moisture, the seven solar rays dilate to seven suns,‡ whose radiance glows above.

1 See Vol. II., p. 297, note 1.
2 These, also, have their several appellations. The commentator || quotes the Vedas,** as the authority: Árāga,†† Bhrāja, Paṭala, Patanga, Swarnabhāj,‡‡ Jyotishmat, and Śavībhāsa. §§

† Auyaga. See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.
†† See the Taṁśīrīya-dvārāyaka, I., VII., I. The seven rays are there called Ároga, Bhrāja, Paṭala, Patanga, Swarnabhāj, Jyotishmat, and Vibhāsa.
§ “The Pātālas”, according to the Sanskrit. For these domains, see Vol. II., pp. 209, et seq.
|| Anubhāsā.
† Both the commentators give the names following.
** Hereon the commentators cite a stanza: Ratnagarbha gives it as anonymous; but Śrīdhara refers it to the Kārma-purdha. The seven rays are said to be Śnūnāmā, Bāriṅa, Viśvakarman, Viśvavarachas (?), Vṛchās, Vasu, Saṁśīpadvasu (?). Compare the particulars in notes 1 and † to p. 297 of Vol. II.
†† So reads Ratnagarbha. Śrīdhara has Aroga.
‡‡ Corrected from “Swanabhāk”. Śrīdhara’s reading, in my one MS., seems to be Swānabhāmen.
§§ Vibhāvasu, according to Śrīdhara.
below, and on every side, and sets the three worlds and Pātāla on fire. The three worlds, consumed by these suns, become rugged and deformed; throughout the whole extent of their mountains, rivers, and seas; and the earth, bare of verdure, and destitute of moisture, alone remains, resembling, in appearance, the back of a tortoise. The destroyer of all things, Hari, in the form of Rudra, who is the flame of time, becomes the scorching breath of the serpent Sesha, and thereby reduces Pātāla to ashes. The great fire, when it has burnt all the divisions of Pātāla, proceeds to the earth, and consumes it, also. A vast whirlpool of eddying flame then spreads to the region of the atmosphere, and wraps them in ruin. The three spheres show like a frying-pan, amidst the surrounding flames that prey upon all moveable or stationary things. The inhabitants of the two (upper) spheres, having discharged their functions, and being annoyed by the heat, remove to (the sphere above, or) Mahar-loka. When that becomes heated, its tenants, who, after the full period of their stay, are desirous of ascending to higher regions, depart for the Jana-loka.

Janárdana, in the person of Rudra, having consumed the whole world, breathes forth heavy clouds; and those called Saṁvartaka, resembling vast elephants, in bulk, overspread the sky, roaring, and darting lightnings. Some are as black as the blue lotos; some are (white) as the water-lily; some are dusky, like smoke; and some are yellow; some are (of a dun colour,) like (that of) an ass; some, like ashes sprinkled on the forehead; some are (deep blue,) as the lapis lazuli; some
(azure), like the sapphire; some are (white) as the conch or the jasmine; and some are (black) as collyrium; some are (of bright red), like the lady-bird; some are of the fierceness of red arsenic; and some are like the wing of the (painted) jay. (Such are these massy clouds, in hue.) In form, some resemble towns; some, mountains: some are like houses and hovels; and some are like columns. Mighty in size, and loud in thunder, they fill all space. Showering down torrents of water, these clouds quench the dreadful fires which involve the three worlds; and then they rain, uninterruptedly, for a hundred years, and deluge the whole world. Pouring down, in drops as large as dice, these rains overspread the earth, and fill the middle region, and inundate heaven. The world is now enveloped in darkness; and, all things, animate or inanimate, having perished, the clouds continue to pour down their waters for more than a hundred years.

CHAPTER IV.

Continuation of the account of the first kind of dissolution. Of the second kind, or elemental dissolution; of all being resolved into primary spirit.

WHEN the waters have reached the region of the seven Rishis,* and the whole of the three worlds is one ocean, they stop. The breath of Vishnu becomes a (strong) wind, which blows for more than a hundred years, until all the clouds are dispersed. The wind is then reabsorbed; and he of whom all things are made, the lord by whom all things exist,† he who is inconceivable, without beginning, beginning of the universe,‡ reposes, sleeping upon Śesha, in the midst of the deep. The creator,§ Hari, sleeps (upon the ocean), in the form of Brahma,—glorified by Sanaka|| and the saints who had gone to the Jana-loka, and contemplated by the holy inhabitants of Brahma-loka, involved in mystic slumber, the celestial personification of his own illusions, and meditating on his own ineffable spirit, which is called Vāsudeva.**

---

* Indragopa. See Vol. IV., p. 284, note •.
† नकःप्रियसिद्धिमात्र व।
‡ "Houses and hovels" is to render kālīgāra, which denotes a superstructure on the roof of a house.
§ Śridhara reads sthalā, 'a heap', 'a tent'; Ratnagarbha, ārā, 'wool'. Other lections which I find are sthalā, 'a mound', 'a tent'; and sthāla, of unasserted signification.
|| Naśaka-talā.
§ Bhava-loka.

† See Vol. II., p. 226, and p. 230, note †.
‡ मूलभावः।
§ Corrected from the printer's error "without beginning of the universe." The original is अनकारचिरितविश्वः।
|| See Vol. I., p. 59, and p. 77, note 1; also, Vol. II., p. 200, note †.

** श्राविषमवनां दिशा चोगिनित्रु समाख्यतः।
चातुर्थ वायुद्रवायं चित्रमन्त्रितमिव।

For Yoganidra, which the Translator here renders by "mystic slumber", see Vol. IV., p. 260, note 1.
This, Maitreya, is the dissolution* termed incidental; because Hari, in the form of Brahmá, sleeps there, as its incidental cause. †

When the universal spirit wakes, the world revives; when he closes his eyes, all things fall upon the bed of mystic slumber. † In like manner as a thousand great ages constitute a day of Brahmá, ‡ so his night consists of the same period,—during which the world is submerged by a vast ocean. Awaking at the end of his night, the unborn, Vishńu, in the character of Brahmá, creates the universe anew, in the manner formerly related to you. ¹

I have, thus, described to you the intermediate dissolution|| of the world, occurring at the end ‡ of every Kalpa. I will now, Maitreya, describe to you elemental dissolution. When, by dearth and fire, all the worlds and Pátaḷas are withered up, and the modifications of Mahat and other products of nature are, by the will of Kríshńa, destroyed, the progress of elemental dissolution is begun. Then, first, the waters swallow up the property of earth, (which is the rudiment of smell);

¹ The Naimittika Pralaya is described in the Váyu, Bhágavata, Kurma, and other Puráṇas, to the same effect, and, very commonly, in precisely the same words.

* Pratisanchara.
† “Incidental cause” is for nimitta. See Vol. I., p. 65, note †, ad finem.
‡ The original has Padmayoni, the same as Abjayoni, for which see Vol. I., p. 17, note †.
|| Pralaya.
|| Sásthāra.

and earth, deprived of its property, proceeds to destruction. Devoid of the rudiment of odour, the earth becomes one with water. * The waters, then, being much augmented, roaring, and rushing along, fill up all space, whether agitated or still. † When the universe is, thus, pervaded by the waves of the watery element, its rudimental flavour is licked up by the element of fire; and, in consequence of the destruction of their rudiments, the waters themselves are destroyed. † Deprived of (the essential rudiment of) flavour, they become one with fire; and the universe is, therefore, entirely filled with flame, ‡ which drinks up the water on every side, and gradually overspreads the whole of the world. While space is enveloped in flame, above, below, and all around, the element of wind seizes upon the rudimental property, or form, which is the cause of light; † and, that being withdrawn, ‡ all becomes of the nature of air. The rudiment of form being destroyed, and fire ** deprived of its rudiment, air extinguishes fire, and spreads, resistlessly, over space, which is deprived of light, when fire merges into air. Air, then, accompanied by sound, which is the source of ether, extends

* Śridhara, like several independent MSS., here interposes the following verse:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>रसायणं समुमुष्टेऽपि स्तत्तं सरसायम्</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तिष्ठति विचरणं म ।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† तिष्ठति विचरणं च ।

‡ कथासिपुषी विषु ज्ञातिष्ठर्न गृहस्य सः ।
| मममथसारसमरसा च रसायणं सरसायम् |

† कथासिपुषी विषु ज्ञातिष्ठर्न गृहस्य सः ।

|| ज्ञातिष्ठति विषु ज्ञातिष्ठर्न गृहस्य सः ।

|| प्रातिहारिकं परं ब्रह्मेऽधुरं रसायनम् ।

† Pralaya.

** Vishádeva.
everywhere throughout the ten regions of space,* until ether seizes upon contact,† its rudimental property, by the loss of which, air is destroyed, and ether: remains unmodified: devoid of form, flavour, touch,§ and smell, it exists unembodied || and vast, and pervades the whole of space. Ether,¶ whose characteristic property and rudiment is sound, exists alone, occupying all the vacuity of space.** But then the radical element†† (egotism,) devours sound; and all the elements and faculties are, at once, merged into their original.: This primary element is consciousness, §§ combined with the property of darkness,|| and is, itself, swallowed up by Mahat, whose characteristic property is intelligence;¶¶ and earth and Mahat are the inner and outer boundaries of the universe. In this manner,—as (in the creation,) were the seven forms of nature (Prakrti), reckoned from Mahat to earth,***—so, at the (time of

---

* Sparma.
† Kha.
§ Sparma.
|| I find no reading but murtimat, which means 'embodied'.
¶ Akasa. See Vol. I., p. 34, note •.
** Pahirasam Gatsasahen Gatsasah. || See Vol. I., p. 33, note •.
†† Bhuladda. See Vol. I., p. 33, note •.
§§ Chismasamkata. || See Vol. I., p. 33, note †.
||| This phrase is to render tamaa, for which see Vol. I., p. 34, note 1, and p. 35, note •.
¶¶ Buddha.

*** Ev ars mahaand: jnana-mahayuja.  

---

The seven prakrtis, or productive productions, are, in the pure Sankhya philosophy, mahat, ahamkara, and the five tanndras. See the Sankhya-karika, III., and the commentaries.

With the statements in the text, which counts the seven prakrtis from mahd-buddhi—the same as mahat,—compare Vol. I., p. 40.

* Pratyaksha.
† Sarwa-maddala.
‡ Dwipa.
§ Bhuladda.
|| Mahat.
¶ See Vol. I., p. 20, note •.

** This phrase is to render tirasja, for which see Vol. I., p. 34, note 2, and p. 35, note •.
†† Puna.
‡‡ Sarvea.
species,* or the like,—which is one with (all) wisdom, and is to be understood as (sole) existence,†—that is Brahma, infinite glory;‡ supreme spirit, supreme power,§ Vishnú, all that is; from whence the (perfect) sage|| returns no more. Nature (Prakrīti)—which I have described to you as being, essentially, both discrete and indiscrete,—and spirit¶ (which is united with body), both resolve into supreme spirit. Supreme spirit is the upholder of all things, and the ruler of all things,** and is glorified, in the Vedas and in the Vedánta, by the name of Vishnú.

Works, as enjoined by the Vedas, are of two kinds, active (Pravṛttta) and quiescent (Nivṛttta), by both of which the universal person†† is worshipped by mankind. He, the lord of sacrifice,‡‡ the male of sacrifice, §§ the most excellent male,|| is worshipped, by men, in the active mode, by rites enjoined in the Rig-, Yajur-, and Sáma-Vedas. The soul of wisdom, the person of wisdom,¶¶ Vishnú, the giver of emancipation, is worshipped, by sages,*** in the quiescent form, through mediative devotion.* The exhaustless†† Vishnú is whatever thing that is designated by long, short, or prolated syllables, or that which is without a name. He is that which is discrete, and that which is indiscrete; he is exhaustless spirit, supreme spirit, universal spirit,§§ Hari, the wearer of universal forms. Nature, whether discrete or indiscrete, is absorbed into him; and (detached) spirit,§ also, merges into the all-diffusive|| and unobstructed spirit. ¶ The period of two Parárdhas, as I have described it to you, Maitreya, is called a day of that potent Vishnú; and, whilst the products of nature are merged into their source, nature into spirit, and that into the Supreme, that period is termed his night, and is of equal duration with his day.** But, in fact, to that eternal supreme spirit there is neither day nor night; and these distinctions are only figuratively applied to the Almighty.†† I have, thus, explained to you the nature of elemental dissolution, and will now expound to you which is final.

---

* Nāman and jāti. Vide supra, p. 16, note *.  
† Sāttā.  
‡ धर्मः ।  
§ “Supreme power” is to render śiva.  
|| Yati.  
¶ Parusha.  
** This expression is to translate paramesvara.  
†† Sarva-mūrti.  
¶¶ Yajñeshvara.  
§§ Yajña-puṇya.  
||| Purushottama.  
***** Indra-mūrti.  
*** Yāgin.  
† The Bhágavata notices the Prákṛita pralaya much more briefly; and it is omitted in the Váyu.

---

* Indra-yoga.  
† Ayánga. See Vol. I., p. 17, note *.  
‡ Viśdmatman.  
§ Parusha.  
|| Yāgin.  
¶ Atman.  
*** अति न प्रकृति चीनि प्रकृति पुष्टि तथा ।  
तत्र सिद्धि निभाय वाच्या नवकाला महामुनि।  
†† उपवार्षिक यज्ञ तथा ग्रही द्वीपुर्णे।
CHAPTER V.

The third kind of dissolution, or final liberation from existence. Evils of worldly life. Sufferings in infancy, manhood, old age. Pains of hell. Imperfect felicity of heaven. Exemption from birth desirable by the wise. The nature of spirit or god.

Meaning of the terms Bhagavat and Vāsudeva.

THE wise man, having investigated the three kinds of worldly pain,*—or mental and bodily affliction, and the like,—and having acquired (true) wisdom, and detachment (from human objects), obtains final dissolution. The first of the three pains, or Ādhyātmika, is of two kinds, bodily and mental. Bodily pain is of many kinds, as you shall hear. Affections of the head, catarrh, fever, cholic, fistula, spleen, hemorrhoids,† intumescence, sickness, ophthalmia, dysentery, leprosy, and many other diseases constitute bodily affliction. Mental sufferings are love, anger, fear, hate, covetousness, stupefaction,** despair, sorrow, malice, disdain, jealousy, envy, and many other passions which are engendered in the mind. These and various other annoyances, mental or corporeal, are comprised under the class of (worldly) sufferings, which is called Ādhyātmika (natural and inseparable). That pain to which, excellent Brahman, the term Ādhibhautika (natural, but incidental,) is applied, is every kind of evil which is inflicted* (from without,) upon men by beasts,† birds, men, goblins,‡ snakes, fiends,§ or reptiles;|| and the pain that is termed Ādhaivaika (or superhuman,) is the work of cold, heat, wind, rain,¶ lightning, and other (atmospherical phenomena). Affliction, Maitreya, is multiplied in thousands of shapes, in (the progress of) conception,** birth, decay, disease, death, and hell. The tender (and subtile) animal exists in the embryo,†† surrounded by abundant filth, floating in water,‡‡ and distorted in its back, neck, and bones; enduring severe pain, even in the course of its development,§§ as disordered by the acid, acrid,|| bitter,¶¶ pungent,*** and saline articles of its mother's food; incapable of extending or contracting its limbs, reposing amidst the slime of ordure and urine, every way incommode, unable to breathe, endowed with conscious-

* The three kinds of affliction, † inseparable, incidental, and superhuman, are fully described, in the commentary on the first verse of the Sānkhya Kārikā, p. 8, in a similar strain as that which is adopted in the text.

† Tāpa-traya.
‡ Here the original inserts śvāsa, 'asthma' (?).
§ Moha.
|| Anśigā.
¶ Vide supra, p. 60, note .
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* There is free interpolation here.
† Mṛgha.
‡ Priśācha.
§ Rākṣasā.
|| Sarśripa.
¶ Insect 'water', ambu.
*** Garbhā.
†† Garbhā, again.
‡‡ I find no Sanskrit for these words.
§§ वर्षमानातितिवेदन: ।
||| Katu.
¶¶ Tilakha.
*** Ushka.
ness,* and calling to memory many hundred (previous) births. Thus exists the embryo, in profound affliction, bound (to the world) by its (former) works.

When the child is about to be born, its face is smeared by excrement, urine, blood, mucus,† and semen; its attachment to the uterus is ruptured by the Prajapatiya§ wind; it is turned head downwards, and violently expelled from the womb by the powerful and painful winds of parturition; and the infant, losing, for a time, all sensation, when brought in contact with the external air, is immediately deprived of its intellectual knowledge. || Thus born, the child is tortured in every limb, as if pierced with thorns, or cut to pieces with a saw, and falls from its fetid lodgement, as from a sore, like a crawling thing, upon the earth.' Unable to feel** itself, unable to turn itself, it is dependent upon the will of others for being bathed†† and nourished. Laid upon a dirty bed; it is bitten by insects and mosquitoes, §§ and has not power to drive them away. Many are the pangs attending birth; and (many are those) which succeed to birth; and many are the sufferings which are inflicted by elemental and superhuman agency, in the state of childhood.* Enveloped by the gloom of ignorance, and internally bewildered, man knows not whence he is, who he is, whither he goeth, nor what is his nature; by what bonds he is bound; what is cause, and what is not cause; what is to be done, and what is to be left undone;† what is to be said, and what is to be kept silent; what is righteousness, what is iniquity; in what it consists, or how; what is right, what is wrong;† what is virtue, what is vice. Thus, man, like a brute beast, addicted only to animal gratifications, suffers the pain that ignorance occasions.§ Ignorance, darkness, inactivity influence those devoid of knowledge, so that pious works are neglected; but hell is the consequence of neglect of (religious) acts, according to the great sages; and the ignorant, therefore, suffer affliction both in this world and in the next.

When old age arrives, the body is infirm; the limbs are relaxed; the face is emaciate and shrunken; the skin is wrinkled, and scantily covers the veins and

---

* Sachaitanya.
† There is no word for “mucus”, in the original.
‡ Corrected from “Prajapati”.
|| “Intellectual knowledge” is to render vijnana.
§ Prajapatiya: a variant.
** The original, kshudriya chayanam, denotes scratching.
†† A variant yields ‘drinking milk’.
**: Srastara, with prastara as a variant. See Vol. III., p. 131, note *., and p. 150, note *.
§§ Dainka, ‘gadflies.’

---

BOOK VI., CHAP. V.

---
206 VISHNU PURANA.

The neck droops; the feet and hands are relaxed; the body trembles; the man is, repeatedly, exhausted, subdued, and visited with interrupted knowledge.* The principle of selfishness afflicts him, and he thinks: "What will become of my wealth, my lands,† my children, my wife, my servants, my house?" The joints of his limbs are tortured with severe pains, as if cut by a saw, or as if they were pierced by the sharp arrows of the destroyer;‡ he rolls his eyes, and tosses about his hands and feet; his lips and palate are parched and dry; and his throat, obstructed by foul humours and deranged vital airs,§ emits a rattling sound; he is affected with burning heat, and with thirst, and with hunger; and he, at last, passes away, tortured by the servants of the judge of the dead,|| to undergo a renewal of his sufferings in another body. These are the agonies which men have to endure, when they die. I will now describe to you the tortures which they suffer in hell.

Men are bound, when they die, by the servants of the king of Tartarus,¶ with cords, and beaten with sticks, and have, then, to encounter the fierce aspect of Yama, and the horrors of their terrible route. In the different hells there are various intolerable tortures with burning sand,** fire, machines, and weapons: some

---

* बलोत्तरदाघारणम्।
† चेयकृतिः, 'activity.'
‡ सुभस्माशिलामन:।
§ हस्ताक्षर: समस्याव विश्वायेऽपि।
¶ ततः धनु: पशुपुशाचारसाधनाभिनिय।
|| "Past life," in the sense of previous state of existence. The original expression is अच्छिन्नस्माधि।

† Dhānya, 'grain.'
‡ The Sanskrit has Antaka, the same as Yama. Vide supra, p. 15, note §§.
§ This is a free rendering.
|| बायक्षिकःस्थितिः।
¶ वायुजितः।
** कार्यविधिः। Compare the Laws of the Mānavas, XII., 76.
are severed with saws; some, roasted in forges; some are chopped with axes; some, buried in the ground; some are mounted on stakes; some, cast to wild beasts, (to be devoured); some are gnawed by vultures; some, torn by tigers; some are boiled in oil; some, rolled in caustic slime; some are precipitated from great heights; some, tossed (upwards) by engines. The number of punishments inflicted in hell, which are the consequences of sin, is infinite.

But not in hell alone do the souls of the deceased undergo pain: there is no cessation, even in heaven; for its temporary inhabitant is ever tormented with the prospect of descending again to earth. Again is he liable to conception and to birth; he is merged again into the embryo, and repairs to it, when about to be born; then he dies, as soon as born, or in infancy, or in youth, or in old age. Death, sooner or later, is inevitable. As long as he lives, he is immersed in manifold afflictions, like the seed of the cotton amidst the down that is to be spun into thread. In acquiring,

loosing, and preserving wealth, there are many griefs; and so there are in the misfortunes of our friends. Whatever (is produced that) is (most) acceptable to man, that, Maitreya, becomes a seed whence springs the tree of sorrow. Wife, children, servants, house, lands, riches contribute much more to the misery, than to the happiness, of mankind. Where could man, scorched by the fires of the sun of this world, look for felicity, were it not for the shade afforded by the tree of emancipation? Attainment of the divine being is considered, by the wise, as the remedy of the three-fold class of ills that beset the different stages of life, conception, birth, and decay, - as characterized by that only happiness which effaces all other kinds of felicity, however abundant, and as being absolute and final.

It should, therefore, be the assiduous endeavour of wise men to attain unto God. The means of such at-

1. Some further particulars of the different hells, and the punishments inflicted in them, have been given before. See Vol. II., pp. 214, et seq.

2. Some further particulars of the different hells, and the punishments inflicted in them, have been given before. See Vol. II., pp. 214, et seq.

* Minshá, 'crucibles.'
† Dvacip, 'ounces,' or 'panthers.'
§ Barsháns, 'panthers.'
|| Na vējas dvijëva nhari kuvapatit: ||
bhātivyānāti bhātyānāti niṣkōnti: ||

1. All this is conformable to the Sánkhya doctrines, in particular, although the same spirit pervades all Hindu metaphysics.
2. Tasmá Tat prāptaye yatnā karatvayā paścëtāra narāli:

The expression Tat-práptaye, "for the obtaining of that," refers to the phrase immediately preceding,—Bhagavat-práptiti, "attaining of," or "attaining to, Bhagavat," the Lord.
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tainment are said, great Muni, to be knowledge and works. Knowledge is of two kinds,—that which is derived from scripture, and that which is derived from reflection.* Brahma that is the word is composed of scripture; Brahma that is supreme is produced of reflection.† Ignorance is utter darkness, in which knowledge obtained through any sense (as that of hearing,) shines like a lamp; but the knowledge that is derived from reflection breaks upon the obscurity like the sun.‡ What has been said by Manu, when appealing to the meaning of the Vedas, with respect to this subject I will repeat to you.† There are two (forms of) spirit (or God),—the spirit which is the word, and the spirit which is supreme. He who is thoroughly imbued with the word of God obtains supreme spirit.§ The Atharva Veda, also, states that there are two kinds of know-

---

* Brahma is of two kinds; Śabda-Brahma,—spirit, or God, to be attained through the word (that is, the Vedas,) and the duties they prescribe; and Para-Brahma,—spirit, or God, to be attained through reflection, by which the difference between soul and matter is ascertained.

† This seems intended as a quotation from Manu; but it has not been found in the code. It is:

```
म ज्ञानं संवधानं दीपविकृतियोऽयस्मि।
यथा हृदीलाभं चाचारं निद्रितविवेकम्॥
''

```

‡ जयं तस्म रवाजां दीपविकृतियोऽयस्मि।
क्षुद्रविद्याश्च चाचारं निद्रितविवेकम्॥

§ This stanza appears in the Maitri-UPANISHAD, VI., 22; and it occurs in the Mahābhārata, Śānti-parvan, II. 8550, 8551.

---

†† Viveka.

††अचर्य तस्म रवाजां दीपविकृति योऽयस्मि।
यथा हृदीलाभं चाचारं निद्रितविवेकम्॥

§§ This stanza appears in the Katha-UPANISHAD, VI., 22; and it occurs in the Mahābhārata, Śānti-parvan, II. 8550, 8551.

---

1 The commentator quotes other passages from the Vedas, of a similar tendency; intimating, however, the necessity of performing acts prior to attaining knowledge; as: **वथाय कर्मभि पक्के ततो चार्य तु परमा नति! "The decoction (preparatory process) being digested by rites, thereafter knowledge is the supreme resource."**

**वस्तुविकृति सूक्तिसविद्यामृतस्म्वते।**

** "Having crossed the gulf of death by ignorance (ceremonial acts), man obtains immortality by (holy) knowledge."**
fined by the term Bhagavat. The word Bhagavat is the denomination of that primeval and eternal god; and he who fully understands the meaning of that expression is possessed of holy wisdom,—the sum and substance of the three Vedas. The word Bhagavat is a convenient form to be used in the adoration of that supreme being: to whom no term is applicable; and, therefore, Bhagavat expresses that Supreme Spirit, which is individual, almighty, and the cause of causes of all things. The letter Bha implies the cherisher and supporter (of the universe). By ga is understood the leader, impeller, or creator. The dissyllable Bhaga indicates the six properties,—dominion, might, glory, splendour, wisdom and dispasion. The purport of the letter va is that elemental spirit in which all beings exist, and which exists in all beings. And, thus, this great word Bhagavat is the name of Vāsudeva,—who is one with the supreme Brahma,—and of no one else. This word, therefore, which is the general denomination of an adorable object, is not used, in reference to the Supreme, in a general, but a special, signification. When applied to any other (thing or person), it is used in its customary or general import. In the latter case, it may purport one who knows the origin, and end, and revolutions of beings, and what is wisdom, what ignorance. In the former, it denotes wisdom, energy, power, dominion, might, glory, without end, and without defect.

The term Vāsudeva means, that all beings abide in that Supreme Being, and that he abides in all beings; as was formerly explained by Keśidhwaja to Khândi-
kya, called Janaka,* when he inquired of him an explanation of the name of the immortal,† Vásudeva. He said: “He dwelleth internally in all beings; and all things dwell in him; and, thence, the lord Vásudeva is the creator and preserver: of the world. He, though one with all beings, is beyond and separate from material nature (Prakṛiti), from its products, from properties, from imperfections; he is beyond all investing substance; he is universal soul. All the interstices of the universe are filled up by him.§ He is one with all good qualities; and all created beings are endowed with but a small portion of his individuality.|| Assuming, at will, various forms, he bestows benefits on the whole world, which was his work.¶ Glory, might, dominion, wisdom,** energy, power, and other attributes are collected in him. Supreme of the supreme, in whom no imperfections†† abide, lord over finite and infinite,‡‡
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god in individuals and universals,* visible and invisible, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, almighty. The wisdom, perfect,† pure, supreme, undefiled, and one only, by which he is conceived, contemplated, and known,—that is wisdom: all else is ignorance.”

* अतिक्रियाविक्षिप्त: See Vol. IV., p. 255, note §. The commentators concrete vyashā into Sankarshaṇa, &c., and samāśṭi into Vásudeva.
† Asta-dosha.

---

* Vide infra, p. 217, notes 1, *, and ‡.
† Ananta.
‡ “Creator” and “preserver” are to render dhātṛi and vidhātṛi; for which vide supra, p. 16, note §.
§ स सर्वभूत: प्रकरिति विज्ञानात्

युक्तां व्रतः सुने सत्योऽवत्।

अतीतस्वयंवर्णोऽधिकारा

तेनामृत्वं वचसुवानाराशि॥

Instead of स सर्ववृत्त: प्रकरिति, the stanza begins with स सर्वभूत-प्रकरिति, according to several MSS.
|| Sakti.

†† आचार्यश्रीतात्मात्मातीश्च:

संसाधितात्मातिश्रवितोऽसी।

** Mahāvabodha.
†† Kleda.
‡‡ Parāparaśa.
CHAPTER VI.

Means of attaining liberation. Anecdotes of Khâändikya and Kesidhwaja. The former instructs the latter how to atone for permitting the death of a cow. Kesidhwaja offers him a re­quital; and he desires to be instructed in spiritual knowledge.

HE, Purushottama, is, also, known by holy study* and devout meditation;† and either, as the cause of attaining him, is entitled Brahma. From study let a man proceed to meditation; and from meditation to study: by perfection in both, supreme spirit becomes manifest. Study is one eye, wherewith to behold it; and meditation is the other. He who is one with Brahma sees not with the eye of flesh.§

MAITREYA.—Reverend teacher, I am desirous of being informed what is meant by the term meditation (Yoga), by understanding which I may behold the Supreme Being, the upholder of the universe.

PARÁŚARA.—I will repeat to you (Maitreya,) the explanation formerly given by Kesidhwaja to the magnanimous Khâändikya, also called Janaka.*

MAITREYA.—Tell me, first, Brahman, who Khâändikya was, and who was Kesidhwaja; and how it happened, that a conversation relating to (the practice of) Yoga occurred between them.

PARÁŚARA.—There was Janaka, (named) Dharma­dhwaja, who had two sons, Mitadhwaja and Krita­dhwaja; and the latter was a king ever intent upon existent supreme spirit:‡ his son was the celebrated Kesidhwaja. The son of Mitadhwaja was Janaka, called Khâändikya.† Khâändikya was diligent in the way of works, and was renowned, on earth, for religious rites. Kesidhwaja, on the other hand, was endowed with spiritual knowledge. These two were engaged in hostilities; and Khâändikya was driven from his principality by Kesidhwaja. Expelled from his dominions, he wandered, with a few followers, his priest, and his counsellors, amidst woods and mount­

---

* Both study of the Vedas (Swádhyaśa) and abstraction (Yoga) are to be practised. When a man is weary of one, he may apply to the other. The Yoga, however, limits the practical part to silent prayer.

† Sañyama. ‡ Yoga.

§ That is to say, Janaka, son of Khâändika. In the Bhágavata-purāṇa, IX., XIII., 20, he is called son of Mitadhwaja; and, the original of the Vishnu-purāṇa being ambiguous, I have corrected accordingly Professor Wilson's "Amitadhwaja", just below. Mitadhwaja was patronymically called Khâändika; and his father must have been called Khâändika, with other names.

† No such names occur amongst the Maithila kings of the Vishnu Purāṇa (see Vol. III., pp. 330, et seq.); but, as there noticed (p. 333, note 2§), the Bhágavata inserts them. Janaka is used as a title. Kritadhwaja, in some of the copies, is read Kshitigowda.

|| The verses quoted by the Translator are given by both the commentators, and as from the Yoga-tâtra.

† Here, as in p. 214, supra, the original does not yield "Janaka, called Khâändikya", but Khâändikya-janaka. Also see note * above.

§ But also see note *** in the page referred to.
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ains, where, destitute of true wisdom, he performed many sacrifices, expecting, thereby, to obtain divine truth, and to escape from death by ignorance.1

Once, whilst the best of those who are skilled in devotion (Keśidhwaja,) was engaged in devout exercises; a fierce tiger slew his milch-cow,2 in the lonely forest. When the Raja heard that the cow had been killed, he asked the ministering priests what form of penance would expiate the crime. They replied, that they did not know, and referred him to Kaśeru. Kaśeru,3 when the Raja consulted him, told him that he knew not, but that Śunaka would be able to tell him. Accordingly, the Raja went to Śunaka; but he replied: “I am as unable, great king, to answer your question as Kaśeru has been; and there is no one now, upon earth, who can give you the information, except your enemy Khāṇḍikya, whom you have conquered.”

Upon receiving this answer, Keśidhwaja said: “I will go, then, and pay a visit to my foe. If he kill me, no

1 The performance of rites, as a means of salvation, is called ignorance, in the Vedas (vide supra, p. 211, note 1). Works are recommended as introductory to the acquirement of knowledge; it is ignorance to consider them as finite.

2 Tasya dhenum (तस्य धेनुम्). One copy has Homa-dhenum, ‘cow of sacrifice;’ another, Dharma-dhenum, || ‘cow of righteousness.’ The commentator explains the terms as importing the same thing,—a cow yielding milk for holy purposes, or for the butter which is poured, in oblations, upon the sacrificial fire.

* The translation is free hereabouts, as throughout the rest of the Chapter.
the world to come; whilst the earth would be mine. Now, if I do not kill him, I shall subdue the next world, and leave him this earth. It seems to me, that this world is not of more value than the next: for the subjugation of the next world endures for ever; the conquest over this is but for a brief season. I will, therefore, not kill him, but tell him what he wishes to know."

Returning, then, to Kesidhwaja, Khánidikya* desired him to propose his question, which he promised to answer; and Kesidhwaja related to him what had happened,—the death of the cow,†—and demanded to know what penance he should perform. Khánidikya, in reply, explained to him, fully, the expiation that was suited to the occasion; and Kesidhwaja then, with his permission, returned to the place of sacrifice, and regularly fulfilled every necessary act. Having completed the ceremony, with its supplementary rites, Kesidhwaja accomplished all his objects. But he then reflected thus: "The priests whom I invited to attend have, all, been duly honoured; all those who had any request to make have been gratified by compliance with their desires; all that is proper for this world has been effected by me. Why, then, should my mind feel as if my duty had been unfulfilled?"

So meditating, he remembered that he had not presented to Khánidikya the gift that it is becoming to offer to a spiritual preceptor; and, mounting his chariot, he immediately set off to the thick forest where that sage abode. Khánidikya, upon his reappearance, assumed his weapons, to kill him. But Kesidhwaja exclaimed: "Forbear, venerable sage. I am not here to injure you, Khánidikya. Dismiss your wrath; and know that I have come hither to offer you that remuneration which is due to you, as my instructor. Through your lessons I have fully completed my sacrifice; and I am, therefore, desirous to give you a gift. Demand what it shall be."

Khánidikya, having once more communed with his counsellors, told them the purpose of his rival's visit, and asked them what he should demand. His friends recommended him to require his whole kingdom back again; as kingdoms are obtained, by prudent men, without conflicting hosts. The reflecting king Khánidikya laughed, and replied to them; "Why should a person such as I be desirous of a temporary earthly kingdom? Of a truth, you are able counsellors in the concerns of this life; but of those of the life to come you are, assuredly, ignorant." So speaking, he went back to Kesidhwaja, and said to him: "Is it true that you wish to make me a gift, as to your preceptor?"

"Indeed, I do," answered Kesidhwaja. "Then," rejoined Khánidikya, "as it is known that you are learned in the spiritual learning that teaches the doctrine of the soul, if you will communicate that knowledge to me, you will have discharged your debt to your instructor. Declare to me what acts are efficacious for the alleviation of human affliction."

* The original has Khánidikyajanaka.
† Dharma-dhenu.
CHAPTER VII.
Keśidhwaja describes the nature of ignorance, and the benefits of the Yoga or contemplative devotion. Of the novice and the adept in the performance of the Yoga. How it is performed. The first stage, proficiency in acts of restraint and moral duty: the second, particular mode of sitting: the third, Prāśāyāma, modes of breathing: the fourth, Pratyāhāra, restraint of thought: the fifth, apprehension of spirit: the sixth, retention of the idea. Meditation on the individual and universal forms of Vishū. Acquisition of knowledge. Final liberation.

"BUT," said Keśidhwaja, "why have you not asked of me my kingdom, now free from all annoyance? What else except dominion is acceptable to the warrior race?"

"I will tell you," replied Khāṇḍikya, "why I did not make such a demand, nor require that territory which is an object of ignorant ambition. It is the duty of the warrior to protect his subjects (in peace), and to kill, in fight, the enemies of his sway. It is no fault, that you should have taken my kingdom from one who was unable to defend it, to whom it was a bondage, and who was, thus, freed from the incumbrance of ignorance. My desire of dominion originated in my being born to possess it. The ambition of others, which proceeds from (human) frailties, is not compatible with virtue. To solicit gifts is not the duty of a prince and warrior; and, for these reasons, I have not asked for your kingdom, nor made a demand which ignorance alone would have suggested." Those only who are destitute of knowledge, whose minds are engrossed by selfishness,† who are intoxicated with the inebriating beverage of self-sufficiency,‡ desire kingdoms,—not such as I am."

When King Keśidhwaja heard these words, he was much pleased, and exclaimed: "It is well-spoken." § Then, addressing Khāṇḍikya|| affectionately, he said: "Listen to my words. Through desire of escaping death by the ignorance of works, I exercise the regal power, celebrate various sacrifices, and enjoy pleasures subservive of purity. Fortunate is it for you, that your mind has attached itself to the dominion of discrimination. Pride of your race! now listen to the real nature of ignorance. The (erroneous) notion that self consists in what is not self, and the opinion that property consists in what is not one's own, constitute the double seed of the tree of ignorance. The ill-judging embodied being, bewildered by the darkness of fascination, situated in a body composed of the five elements, loudly asserts 'This is I.' But who would ascribe spiritual individuality to a body in which soul is distinct from the ether, air, fire, water, and earth, (of

* By referring to note † in p. 240, infra, it will be seen that yama and niyama are the first and second stages, while "apprehension of spirit", bhāvānā, should not be counted as a stage.

† Mamata.  
‡ Aham-māna.  
§ 'Enough' साध्यति ग्राहः | A sacred license of grammar is here taken, as is remarked by the commentators.  
|| The original has Khāṇḍikya-janaka.
which that body is composed)? What man of understanding assigns to disembodied spirit corporeal fruition, or houses, lands, and the like, that it should say 'These are mine'? What wise man entertains the idea of property in sons or grandsons, begotten of the body, after the spirit has abandoned it? Man performs all acts, for the purpose of bodily fruition; and the consequence of such acts is another body; so that their result is nothing but confinement to bodily existence. In the same manner as a mansion of clay is plastered with clay and water, so the body, which is of earth, is perpetuated by earth and water, (or by eating and drinking). The body, consisting of the five elements, is nourished by substances equally composed of those elements. But, since this is the case, what is there in this life that man should be proud of? Travelling the path of the world for many thousands of births, man attains only the weariness of bewilderment, and is smothered by the dust of imagination. When that dust is washed away by the bland * water of (real) knowledge, then the weariness of bewilderment sustained by the wayfarer through repeated births is removed. When that weariness is relieved, the internal man is at peace, and he obtains that supreme felicity which is unequalled and undisturbed. This soul is (of its own nature,) pure, and composed of happiness and wisdom. The properties of pain, ignorance, and impurity are those of nature (Prakriti), not of soul. There is no affinity between fire and water; but, when the latter is placed over the former, in a caldron, it bubbles, and boils, and exhibits the properties of fire. In like manner, when soul is associated with Prakriti, it is vitiated by egotism and the rest, and assumes the qualities of grosser nature, although essentially distinct from them, and incorruptible. Such is the seed of ignorance, as I have explained it to you. There is but one cure of worldly sorrows—the practice of devotion: no other is known. Then, said Khândikya, “do you, who are the chief of those versed in contemplative devotion, explain to me what that is: for, in the race of the descendants of Nimi, you are best acquainted with the sacred writ-

1 The text is somewhat obscure; but it is, in some degree, cleared up by the next illustration. No one would think of applying the property of self—the idea of possession, or personality, to soul separated from body. But the objection is equally applicable to soul in the body; for, whilst there, it is as distinct, in its nature, from the materials of body, as if it was disembodied, and quite as incapable of individual personal fruition.

* Adho.
† This clause is to render चम्पाबोधि कलिष्ठे।
‡ इव ज्ञातरो यथा पुंवष्टरो वन्य तथा समस्त।
§ I find no Sanskrit answering to this sentence.
|| Sashdra.
¶ Vásand.

1 That is, in the race of princes of Mithilā.
ings in which it is taught.” “Hear,” replied Kesidhwaja, “the account of the nature of contemplative devotion, which I impart to you, and by perfection in which the sage attains resolution into Brahma, and never suffers birth again. The mind of man is the cause both of his bondage and his liberation: its addiction to the objects of sense is the means of his bondage; its separation from objects of sense is the means of his freedom. The sage who is capable of discriminative knowledge must, therefore, restrain his mind from all the objects of sense, and therewith meditate upon the Supreme Being,—who is one with spirit,—in order to attain liberation. For that Supreme Spirit attracts to itself him who meditates upon it, and who is of the same nature; as the lodestone attracts the iron by the virtue which is common to itself and to its products. Contemplative devotion is the union with Brahma, effected by that condition of mind which has attained perfection through those exercises which complete the control of self; and he whose contemplative devotion

1 The term Yoga (योग), which is that used in the text, in its literal acceptation signifies ‘union,’ ‘junction,’ from यौग्य ‘to join’: in a spiritual sense, it denotes “union of separated with universal soul;” and, with some latitude of expression, it comes to signify the means by which such union is effected. In the Bhagavad Gita, it is variously applied, but, ordinarily, denotes the performance of religious ceremonies as a duty, and not for interested purposes. It is elsewhere defined “exemption from the contact of pain:” The date of 15 February 2023.

2 The first stage is the Ātma-prayatna, the practice of moral and religious restraint,—Yama, Niyama, &c. When the novice is perfect in these, then he is fit to attain the perfectibility of an adept, through the especial practices which treatises on the Yoga prescribe. When the mind has attained the state which can alone be attained through them, then the union with Brahma, which is the consequence, is called Yoga:

The Ātma-prayatna is defined to be that which has Yama, &c.

1 This illustration is, however, only to a limited extent explanatory of the nature of Yoga; for, though the lodestone and iron unite, by virtue of a community of kind, yet the union that takes place is only that of contiguity, Sannyoga (संयोग), not that of identification or unity, Tad-aikya (तद-एक्य). Some further explanation, therefore, is required.

2 The word has been, according to the commentator Sridhara, whom Ratnagarbha here closely follows.

10 By the commentator Śridhara, whom Ratnagarbha here closely follows.
is characterized by the property of such absolute perfection is, in truth, a sage, expectant of final liberation from the world.*

"The sage (or Yogin), when first applying himself to contemplative devotion, is called the (novice or) practitioner (Yoga-yuj); when he has attained spiritual union,† he is termed (the adept, or) he whose meditations are accomplished.‡ Should the thoughts of the

for its object, ्तपड़तेयस्मिन्दिविषयः. The next phrase, तत्परिष्ठा, is explained ्तत्परिष्ठा, ‘depending upon, or relating to, such control,’ ्तत्परिष्ठा: the same as ्तत्परिष्ठा:, condition or state of mind which is विशिष्टा, ‘perfected,’ of that state of mind union with Brahma is Yoga. Union with Brahma is the abstraction that proposes the identity of the living with the supreme spirit,—of the Jivátman: with Brahma: जीवात्मादेऽविशिष्टावचयः. And Yoga is understanding of the identity of the contemplator and the object contemplated: आत्मात्याज्ञानी। A text of Yajnavalkya§ is quoted to this effect:||

**Bhávan Yajnaválkya-víti योगसत्तवाणीस्ययुः।** संज्ञागीय सहस्रं जीवात्मापरमानि:।

"Know holy wisdom to be the same with Yoga, (the practice of) which has eight divisions. That which is termed Yoga is union of the living with the supreme soul."

‡ Vinishpanna-samádhi ‡ is the expression of the text, which can scarcely be regarded as an appellative. The commentator terms the adept Brahma-jnáin, "he who knows Brahma."

§ Corrected from "Yajñaválkya". With reference to Yajñaválkya, wide infra, p. 230, note ‡.

* Mukti.
† Nishkáma.
‡ Compare Vol. III., p. 77, note 1; also, Vol. IV., p. 294, notes 1 and ‡: "Ahitii, astya, and aparigraha I should render 'not killing', 'not thieving', and 'not coveting'; rather than "compassion", "honesty", and "disinterestedness".
§ Súddhyána, "the murmuring of sacred texts." In the Rájá-mártanda we find the following definition, in explanation of the Yoga-dístra, II., 1: ।

**स्वतःयः प्रस्तुतपृष्ठाः सत्त्वाणां ज्ञायः। The Sútradhá-chandriká has:**

**स्वतःवात्मान्यन्तीप्रत्यक्षाः सत्त्वाणां ज्ञायः।**

|| स्वतःवात्मान्यन्तीप्रत्यक्षाः सत्त्वाणां ज्ञायः।

The Translator should not have rendered स्वतःवात्मान्यन्तीप्रत्यक्षाः as if it denoted "self-control". The fifth observance is प्रवृत्त सन्तः,—the Translator's "mind intently",—which is equivalent, the scholiasts say, to pratiśthána, 'persevering devotion.' See the Yoga-dístra, II., 32.

By Ratnagarbha, as follows:

**वत्सालसौरी पि की मल: सौंपि जतनयात्रयः।**

**वत्सालसौरी पि पुनरर्ति च शंखः।**
(virtues), respectively termed the five acts of restraint* (Yama), and five of obligation† (Niyama), bestow excellent rewards, when practised for the sake of reward, and eternal liberation, when they are not prompted by desire (of transient benefits).† En- dowed with these merits, the sage,§ self-restrained, should sit in one of the modes termed Bhadrasana, &c., and engage in contemplation.¹ Bringing his vital airs, called Práña, under subjection, by frequent repetition, is, thence, called Práháyáma, which is, as it were, a seed with a seed.² In this, the breath of expiration and that of inspiration* are alternately obstructed, constituting the act twofold; and the suppression† of both (modes of breathing) produces a third.¹ The exercise of the Yogan, whilst endeavouring to bring before his thoughts the gross form of the eternal, is denominated Álamana.²: He is then to perform the tition of certain prayers, and meditation on the visible form of the deity,—termed, likewise, Álamana, and presently mentioned.§¹ Práháyáma is performed by three modifications of breathing. The first act is expiration, which is performed through the right nostril, whilst the left is closed with the fingers of the right hand: this is called Rechaka. The thumb is then placed upon the right nostril, and the fingers raised from the left, through which breath is inhaled: this is called Púraka. In the third act, both nostrils are closed, and breathing suspended: this is Kumbhaka. And a succession of these operations is the practice of Práháyáma. || ² Álamana is the silent repetition of prayer.¶¹ Práña and apáña. † Satiyuga.

|| The commentators cite, in description of this posture, a stanza from Yájnavalkya. Perhaps it is taken from the Yájnavalkya-gítha, for which see my Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems, p. 14.

Besides the bhadrásana, the Yoga philosophy prescribes postures denominated padáusaha, svasásana, ivánásana, and viráusaha. These seem to be the principal out of an aggregate said to consist of eighty-four, among which are the siddhásana, kamaalásana, dásáusaha, &c.

¶ Correctly, संतीय च यौ में च, “with a seed, and also without a seed.” The term ‘seed’ is here, of course, a technicality.

Samádhi, as sabja and as mriyija, is spoken of in the Yoga-śástra, 1, 46 and 50. The abstract meditation referred to is, in other words, divided into that in which there is distinct recognition of an object, and that in which there is not such recognition.

See, further, note ¹ in the following page.

¹ The commentators cite, in description of this posture, a stanza from Yájnavalkya. Perhaps it is taken from the Yájnavalkya-gítha, for which see my Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems, p. 14.

² Correctly, संतीय च यौ में च, “with a seed, and also without a seed.” The term ‘seed’ is here, of course, a technicality.

³ Samádhi, as sabja and as mriyija, is spoken of in the Yoga-śástra, 1, 46 and 50. The abstract meditation referred to is, in other words, divided into that in which there is distinct recognition of an object, and that in which there is not such recognition.

See, further, note ¹ in the following page.

² The commentators cite, in description of this posture, a stanza from Yájnavalkya. Perhaps it is taken from the Yájnavalkya-gítha, for which see my Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems, p. 14.

³ Samádhi, as sabja and as mriyija, is spoken of in the Yoga-śástra, 1, 46 and 50. The abstract meditation referred to is, in other words, divided into that in which there is distinct recognition of an object, and that in which there is not such recognition.

See, further, note ¹ in the following page.

⁴ The commentators cite, in description of this posture, a stanza from Yájnavalkya. Perhaps it is taken from the Yájnavalkya-gítha, for which see my Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems, p. 14.

⁵ Samádhi, as sabja and as mriyija, is spoken of in the Yoga-śástra, 1, 46 and 50. The abstract meditation referred to is, in other words, divided into that in which there is distinct recognition of an object, and that in which there is not such recognition.

See, further, note ¹ in the following page.
Pratyáhāra, which consists in restraining his organs of sense* from susceptibility to outward impressions, and directing them entirely to mental perceptions. By these means the entire subjugation of the unsteady senses is effected; and, if they are not controlled, the sage will not accomplish his devotions. When, by the Práňáyáma, the vital airs are restrained, and the senses are subjugated by the Pratyáhāra, then the sage will be able to keep his mind steady in its perfect asylum.†

Kánḍikya then said (to Keśidhwaja): “Illustrious sage, inform me what is that perfect asylum of the mind,** resting on which, it destroys all the products of (human) infirmity.” To this, Keśidhwaja replied: “The asylum of mind is spirit (Brahma), which, of its own nature, is twofold, as being with, or without, form; and each of these is supreme and secondary.†

The Brahma that is without form (Amártta) may be Para or Apara. Supreme formless spirit is without attributes of any kind. Secondary formless spirit is invested with the attributes of power, glory, truth, perfection. Spirit embodied, or with form in his highest state, is, according to our text, Vishnú and his manifestations. Spirit, in an inferior or secondary series of bodily forms, is Brahmá and all other living beings.‡

Apprehension of spirit,§ again, is threefold. I will explain the different kinds to you. They are: that which is called Brahma, that which is named from works, and that which comprehends both. That (mental apprehension) which consists of Brahma is one; that which is formed of works is another; and that which comprehends both is the third: so that mental apprehension* (of the object or asylum of the thoughts) is threefold. Sanandana and other (perfect sages) were endowed with apprehension of the nature† of Brahma. The gods and others, whether animate or inanimate, are possessed of that which regards acts. The apprehension that comprehends both works and spirit exists in Hiraňyagarbha§ and others, who are possessed of contemplative knowledge, of their own nature, and who, also, exercise certain active functions, as creation and the rest.|| Until all acts, which are...
the causes of notions of individuality, are discontinued, spirit is one thing, and the universe is another, to those who contemplate objects as distinct and various.* But that is called true knowledge, or knowledge of Brahma, which recognizes no distinctions, which contemplates only simple existence, which is undefinable by words, and is to be discovered solely in one's own spirit.† That is the supreme, unborn, imperishable form of Vishnu, who is without (sensible) form, and is characterized as a condition of the supreme soul, which is variously modified from the condition of universal form.‡ But this (condition) cannot be contemplated by sages in their (early) devotions;§ and they must, therefore, direct their minds to the gross form of Hari, which is of universal perceptibility. || They must meditate upon him as Hiranyakarsha, as the glorious Vāsava, as Prajāpati, as the winds, the Vasus, the Rudras, the suns, stars, planets, Gandharvas, Yakshas, Daityatas, all the gods and their progenitors,†† men, animals, mountains, oceans, rivers, trees, all beings, and all sources of beings, all modifications whatever of nature and its products,* whether sentient or unconscious, one-footed, two-footed, or many-footed.¶ All these are the sensible form of Hari, to be apprehended by the three kinds of apprehension. All this universal world, this (world) of moving and stationary beings, is pervaded by the energy of Vishnu, who is of the nature of the supreme Brahma. This energy is either supreme, or, when it is that of conscious embodied spirit,§ it is secondary. Ignorance, or that which is denominated from works, is a third energy,† by which the omnipresent energy of embodied spirit is ever excited, and whence it suffers all the pains of repeated worldly existence. Obscured by that (energy of ignorance or illusion), the energy that is denominated from embodied spirit is characterized by different degrees of perfection, in all created beings. In things without life,|| it exists in a very small degree;

* षट्षटिनी लिङ्गम् विनिष्ठश्रानतम् ||
विष्णु सिन्धु समलिङ्गम् विनिष्ठश्रानतम् ||
† प्रमणायिनि मन्त्रायिनि मन्त्रायिनिर्वजनेण पुनः ||
‡ विनिष्ठश्रानतम् विनिष्ठश्रानतम् विनिष्ठश्रानतम् ||
§ विनिष्ठश्रानतम् विनिष्ठश्रानतम् परमाणम्: ||
¶ This expansion is to represent yoga-agni, for which see p. 298, supra.
|| Veda-gocochara.
§ Bhagavat.
** Marut.
†† सवला इव्यवोयः: ||
‡‡ Puṣu.

† The term used, throughout, is Śakti (शक्ति), 'power,' 'ability,' 'energy.' By the first kind, or Parā, is understood knowledge able to appreciate abstract truth, or the nature of universal soul; by the second, ability to understand the nature of embodied soul; and, by the third, inability to discern one's own nature, and reliance on moral or ceremonial merit. These different kinds are called energies, because they are the energies or faculties of the Supreme Spirit, or, according to the Vaishnavas, of Vishnu, accompanying soul in all its various conditions of existence.

¢ प्रधानदिव्यबिन्दुः ||
† Add "or footless": अपादस्यः ||
‡ Miraṭa.
§ विनिष्ठाव्यः ||
|| As stones and the like, Ratnagarbha says.
it is more, in things that (have life, but) are without motion:* in insects,† it is still more abundant; and still more, in birds; it is more in wild animals;‡ and, in domestic animals,§ the faculty is still greater. Men have more of this (spiritual) faculty than animals; and thence arises their authority over them:|| the faculty exists, in an ascending degree, in Nāgas, Gandharvas, Yakshas, gods, Śakra, Prajāpati, and Hiraṇyagarbha, and is, above all, predominant in that male (Vishnū) of whom all these various creatures are but the diversified forms, penetrated universally by his energy,—as all-pervading as the ether.¶

"The second* state of him who is called Vishnū, and which is to be meditated upon by the (advanced) sage, is that (imperceptible,) shapeless**, form of Brahma, which is called, by the wise 'That which is,'§ and in which all the before-described energies reside. Thence proceeds the form of the universal form, the other great form of Hari, which is the origin of

---

1 The first, which has been intended to be described in the foregoing passages, was the universal, visible form of Vishnū; the second is his formless or imperceptible condition.

2 Sat (सत्), "what is being."

---

* Sthāvara. Ratnagarbha explains that trees, &c. are intended.
† Sarisṛipa, which the Translator generally renders "reptiles". Vide supra, p. 59, note †; and p. 94, note ††.
‡ Mrsīga.
§ Paśu.
|| पञ्चभो मन्यार्थान्तरस्वरूपः प्रभावितः।
¶ एतत्त्वेन्तिष्ठाप्त्वां तत्थ कपालिणि पारिव।
** बलसञ्ज्ञितस्मिन युक्ति नमस्ते चन्द्र।

** Amārta.

— those manifested forms (or incarnations) that are endowed with every kind of energy, and which, whether the forms of gods, animals, or men, are assumed by him (Hari,) in his sport. This active interposition of the undefinable god, all-comprehending and irresistible, is for the purpose of benefiting the world, and is not the necessary consequence of works.* This form of the universal form is to be meditated upon by the sage,† for the object of purification; as it destroys all sin. In the same manner as fire, (blazing) in the wind, burns dry grass;‡ so Vishnū, seated in the heart, consumes the sins of the sage: and, therefore, let him (resolutely) effect the fixation of his mind upon that receptacle of all the (three) energies, (Vishnū); for that is (the operation of the mind which is called) perfect Dhārana:¶ and, thus, the perfect asylum § of individual, as well as universal, spirit, that which is beyond the three modes of apprehension,|| is attained, for the (eternal) emancipation of the sage. The minds of other beings, which are not fixed upon that asylum, are altogether impure, and are all the gods and the rest, who spring from acts.¶ The retention or apprehen—

---

1 Retention, or holding of the image or idea formed in the mind by contemplation: from Dhī (धी), ‘to hold,’ literally or figuratively.

* These two sentences are a very free rendering.
† Read ‘the novice’; the original being yojā-yuj. Vide supra, p. 228.
‡ Kakṣa, ‘dry wood.’
§ पुष्पावयः।|| मायावयः।
** वशुद्धिः समवायः देवयः कर्मवीयः॥
sion, by the mind, of that visible form of Vishnu, without regard to subsidiary forms, is, thence, called Dhāraṇā; and I will describe to you the perceptible form of Hari, which no mental retention will manifest, except in a mind that is fit to become the receptacle of the idea. The meditating sage must think (he beholds internally the figure) of Vishnu, as having a pleased and lovely countenance, with eyes like the leaf of the lotus, smooth cheeks, and a broad and brilliant forehead; ears of equal size, the lobes of which are decorated with splendid pendants; a painted neck; and a broad breast, on which shines the Śrīvatsa mark; a belly falling in graceful folds, with a deep-seated navel; eight long arms, or else four; and firm and well-knit thighs and legs, with well-formed feet and toes. Let him, with well-governed thoughts, continue.

1 The explanation of Dhāraṇā given in the text is rendered unnecessarily perplexed by the double doctrine here taught, the attempt to combine the abstractions of Yoga theism with the sectarian worship of Vishnu.

* मुच्छ भावति रूपं स्वामास्यत्विश्वुष्मः

** भा बै भारस्य श्रीघ्र बाहिरं तत्र भारतः

In dhāraṇā, or 'fixed attention', no mediate rest is required, such as is spoken of in note 1 to p. 231, supra.†

† Mārtta.

* तत्र मुच्छे हरे रूपं वाहिकं गराणिच्च

†तकुलामनाघरि भारस्य मोपपवते

§ Su-kapola.

1 The original has昏迷ीरि. Śrīdhara and Ratuagarbha say: रेखाक्षेत्रवांशः तांखमः

† See p. 5, and p. 124, note 9, supra.

** बौद्धिकिश्चित्रमहानिष्ठिना चोदरेश्व

†* विनाच्यतनः गौरी समाधायानास्ममः

तास्वात्वाहुक्तदूर्स्थव गौरार्दणः

†† सा वद्यानं भारस्य तदवस्यानमवेत ततः

* Kṣipra.

†† Kṣipra.

††† बौद्धिकिश्चित्रतांखमानानास्मात्

* Kṣipra.

†††† भा बै भारस्य श्रीघ्र बाहिरं भारतः

††††† Kṣipra.

†††††† Kṣipra.

††††††† Kṣipra.

†††††††† Kṣipra.

††††††††† Kṣipra.
Dhyāna (or meditation), which is perfected by six stages; and, when an accurate knowledge of self, free from all distinction, is attained by this mental meditation, that is termed Samādhi.  

1 They are: 1. Yama, &c., acts of restraint and obligation; 2. Āsana, sitting in particular postures; § 3. Prāṇayāma, modes of breathing; 4. Pratyāhāra, exclusion of all external ideas; 5. Bhāvanā, apprehension of internal ideas; ** 6. Dhāraṇā, fixation or retention of those ideas.  

† The result of the Dhyāna or Samādhi is the absence of all idea of individuality, when the meditator, the meditation, and the thing or object meditated upon are, all, considered to be but one.

According to the text of Patanjali: "Restraint of the body, retention of the mind, and meditation, which, thence, is exclusively confined to one object, is Dhyāna. The idea of identification with the object of such meditation, so as if devoid of individual nature, is Samādhi."

† I do not know whence this classification is taken; and I doubt its correctness exceedingly. According to the Yoga-sāstra, n., 29, the six stages preceding dhyāna are yama, niyama, āsana, prāṇayāma, pratyāhāra, and dhāraṇā. Yama and niyama can scarcely, from their very nature, be taken as parts of a whole; and bhāvanā is not at all a stage subservient to the attainment of yoga.

§§ Here we have an extract from the Yoga-kāstra,—III., 1—3. These aphorisms are read as follows: योगशास्त्रकारण धारणाः। तथा विधिभावस विपरीतत्।

Thus we have definitions of dhāraṇā, dhyāna, and samādhi.

† श्रवणभाष्यः।

‡ Ratnagarbha.
there is no difference between it (individual) and supreme spirit: difference is the consequence of the absence of (true) knowledge. When that ignorance which is the cause of the difference between individual and universal spirit† is destroyed, finally and for ever, who shall (ever) make that distinction (between them) which does not exist? Thus have I, Khánükya, in reply to your question, explained to you what is meant by contemplative devotion, both fully and summarily. What else do you wish to hear?"

Khánükya replied (to Kesidhwaja, and said): "The explanation which you have given me of the real nature of contemplative devotion has fulfilled all my wishes, and removed all impurity from my mind. The expression 'mine,' which I have been accustomed to use, is untruth; and cannot be otherwise declared by those who know what is to be known. The words 'I' and 'mine' constitute ignorance; but practice is influenced by ignorance. Supreme truth § cannot be defined; for it is not to be explained by words. Depart, therefore, Kesidhwaja. You have done all that is necessary for my (real) happiness, in teaching me contemplative devotion,—the inexhaustible bestower of liberation from existence." *

Accordingly, King Kesidhwaja, after receiving suitable homage from Khánükya, returned to his city.

Khánükya, having nominated his son Raja,† retired to the woods, to accomplish his devotions; his whole mind being intent upon Govinda. There, his entire thoughts being engrossed upon one only object, and being purified by practices of restraint, self-control, and the rest, * he obtained absorption into the pure and perfect spirit† which is termed Vishnu. Kesidhwaja, also, in order to (attain) liberation, became averse from his own perishable works, and lived amidst objects of sense (without regarding them), and instituted religious rites without expecting therefrom any advantages to himself. Thus, by pure and auspicious fruition, being cleansed from (all) sin, he, also, obtained that perfection which assuages all affliction for ever.

---

* Five kinds of emancipation are enumerated in the Bhagavata-purāṇa, III., XXIX., 13: sālokāna, sārūpya, sārūpya, and ekatwa.
† The original words are itman and Brahma.
§ Asat.
|| Šreyas.
¶ Viśnu. Vide supra, p. 61, note §.

† This is to render Brahma.

|| Sva nārāyaṇa śrī kāmācara prabhavat: ||

युध्य कृष्ण यात्रा जनायक्यासिः स्वविस्त्तिः॥

16*
CHAPTER VIII.


I HAVE now explained to you, Maitreya, the third kind of worldly dissolution, or that which is absolute and final, which is liberation and resolution into eternal spirit.1 I have related to you primary and secondary creation, the families (of the patriarchs), the (periods of the) Manwantaras, and the genealogical histories* (of the kings). I have repeated to you, (in short,) who were desirous of hearing it, the imperishable Vaishnava Purana, which is destructive of all sins, the most excellent of all holy writings, and the means of attaining the great end of man. If there is anything else you wish to hear, propose your question, and I will answer it.

Maitreya.—Holy teacher,† you have, indeed, related to me all that I wished to know; and I have listened to it with pious attention.: I have nothing further to inquire. The doubts inseparable from the mind of man have, all, been resolved by you;* and, through your instructions, I am acquainted with the origin, duration, and end † of all things; with Vishnu, in his collective fourfold form;1 his three energies;2 and with the three modes of apprehending the object of contemplation.‡ Of all this have I acquired a knowledge, through your favour; and nothing else is worthy to be known, when it is once understood that Vishnu and this world are not (mutually) distinct. Great Muni, I have obtained, through your kindness, all I desired,—the dissipation of my doubts;§ since you have instructed me in the duties of the several tribes, and in other obligations; the nature of active life, and discontinuance of action; and the derivation of all that exists from works.|| There is nothing else, venerable Brahman, that I have to inquire of you. And forgive me, if your answers to my questions have imposed upon you any fatigue. Pardon me the trouble

1 The term is Layo Brahmani (लयो ब्रह्मणि), which means ‘a melting away,’ ‘a dissolution,’ or ‘fusion,’ from the root Li (लि), ‘to liquefy,’ ‘to melt,’ ‘to dissolve.’

* Vaiśhkāmukharita.
† Bhagavat.
‡ Bhakti.
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1 Or with Vishnu in the four modifications described in the First Book,†—spirit, matter, form, and time. See Vol. I., pp. 18, 19.
2 Or Śakti, noticed in the last Chapter;—p. 235, supra.
3 Or Bhāvanās, also described in the preceding Chapter;—p. 233, supra.
4 Or with Vishnu in the four modifications described in the First Book,†—spirit, matter, form, and time. See Vol. I., pp. 18, 19.
5 Or Śakti, noticed in the last Chapter;—p. 235, supra.
6 Or Bhāvanās, also described in the preceding Chapter;—p. 233, supra.

† Satīyama. See Vol. I., p. 26, note •.
‡ ज्ञानयुगीयो राजश: शक्तिविविधा गुरुः।
विधाना चारपावेष्यं ब्रह्म भव्याभावं।
§ Aparāndeha.
|| बर्षेन्द्रीश्यो धममा विद्विश्व युद्धेष्टः।
पुरुषं त ग्रिहुम च चात्रं कर्म समाधिभम्।
¶ Substituted for “section.”
that I have given you, through that amiable quality of the virtuous which makes no distinction between a disciple and a child.

Parāśara.—I have related to you this Purāṇa, which is equal to the Vedas (in sanctity), and by hearing which, all faults and sins whatever are expiated. In this have been described to you the primary and secondary creation, the families (of the patriarchs), the Manwantaras, the regal dynasties;† the gods, Dāityas, Gandharvas, serpents;§ Rākshasas, Yakshas, Vidyādharas, Siddhas, and heavenly nymphs;§ Munis endowed with spiritual wisdom, and practisers of devotion;|| the (distinctions of the) four castes, and the actions of the most eminent amongst men;|| holy places on the earth, holy rivers and oceans, sacred mountains, and legends ** of the (truly) wise; the duties of the different tribes, and the observances enjoined by the Vedas.†† By hearing this, all sins are, at once, obliterated. In this, also, the glorious Hari has been revealed,—the cause of the creation, preservation, and destruction of the world; the soul of all things, and himself, all things; §§ by the repetition of whose name man is, undoubtedly, liberated from all sins, which fly like wolves that are frightened by a lion. The repetition of his name with devout faith* is the best remover of all sins; destroying them, as fire purifies the metal (from the dross). The stain of the Kali age, which ensures to men sharp punishments in hell, is, at once, effaced by a single invocation of Hari.† He who is all that is,—the whole egg of Brahmā, with Hiranyagarbha, Indra; Rudra, the Ádityas, the Aświns, the winds, the Kūñnaras, the Vasus, the Śadhyas, Viśwadevas, the (celestial) gods,§ the Yakshas, serpents,|| Rākshasas,§ the Siddhas, Dāityas, Gandharvas, Dānavas, nymphs,** the stars, asterisms, planets, the seven Rishis,†† the regents and superintendents of the quarters,:: men, Brahmans, and the rest, animals tame and wild, §§ insects,||| birds, ghosts and goblins,|| trees, woods, mountains, rivers, oceans, the subterranean regions,***

* Bhakti.†
† ब्रह्मार्क्षण्यसमाध्यं मर्गारतिमप्युपासत्
प्रसातिः चित्तयः संज्ञावसूक्तिः
:
Devendra, in the original.
§ Sura.
I do not find them named in the Sanskrit.
¶ The original yields Rākshasas.
** Apsaras.
†† See Vol. II., p. 226.
:: "The quarters and superintendents of the quarters: चित्तिष्ठिताविभिन्निकारितिः The term Dīshādhipati is synonymous with Dīkṣāpati; for which, see Vol. III., 170, note §.
Śridhara—if I may judge from the single MS. of his commentary which is accessible to me,—has नित्यम्, with reference to the like of which, see Vol. IV., p. 164, note §.
§§ Paru and māiga.
|| Sarasā. Vide supra, p. 236, note †; also, Vol. I., p. 84, note §.
*** Corrected from "legions".

† Vahkūnācharita.
‡ Uraga.
§ Apsaras.
|| मुग्धों भावितं ज्ञानं कष्टनः सपस्तानितम्
|| पद्मां विपिष्ठयाचिति ज्ञातः
|| पद्मां विपिष्ठयाचिति ज्ञातः
|| पद्मां विपिष्ठयाचिति ज्ञातः
** Charita.
†† चरिष्ठमाध्यं घनं विद्याधीन्द्रं कर्णम्
:: Bhagavat.
 §§ Sarva-bhūta.
the divisions of the earth, and all perceptible objects,—he who is all things, who knoweth all things, who is the form of all things, being without form himself, and of whom whatever is, from (Mount) Meru to an atom, all consists,—he, the glorious Vishnu, the destroyer of (all) sin,—is described in this Purana. By hearing this (Purana) an equal recompense is obtained to that which is derived from the performance of an Aśwamedha sacrifice, or from fasting at (the holy places) Prayāga,* Pushkara,† Kurukshetra,: or Arbudā.§ Hearing this (Purana) but once is as efficacious as the offering of oblations in a perpetual fire for a year. The man who, with well-governed passions, bathes at Mathurā, on the twelfth day of (the month) Jyeshthā,¹ and beholds (the image of) Hari, obtains a great recompense:² so does he who, with mind fixed upon Kesava, attentively recites this Pu-

¹ This month is also called Jyeshthā-mūla,** which the commentator†† explains to mean the month of which the root or cause (Mūla) of being so called is the moon's being full in the constellation Jyeshthā. But it may be so termed, perhaps, from the lunar asterism Mūla,—which is next to Jyeshthā,—falling, also, within the moon's passage through the same month.

* See Vol. III., p. 246, note 2; and Vol. IV., p. 218, note ‡.
† See Vol. I., Preface, p. XXX.; and Vol. II., p. 96.
‡ See Vol. II., p. 133, note 1; and p. 142, note 4.
§ For this mountain, vide ibid., p. 131, note 1, and p. 141, note 2; also, Vol. IV., p. 222, note ‡.
|| Insert “of the light fortnight”.
¹ मासेति परमां गतिः. This means, that he obtains emancipation.
** See note ‡ in the next page.
†† Both the commentators give the ensuing explanation. See, further, Nilakṣetra on the Mahābhārata, Anuśaṇa-parva, d. 4909.

The man who bathes in the waters of the Yamuna, on the twelfth lunation* of the light fortnight of the month in which the moon is in the mansion Jyeshthā,† and who fasts and worships Achyuta in (the city of) Mathurā, receives the reward of an uninterrupted Aśwamedha. Beholding the (degree of) prosperity (enjoyed by others) of eminence, through (the merits of) their descendants, a man’s paternal ancestors, his parents, and their parents exclaim: “Who­soever of our descendants, having bathed in the Yamuna,§ and fasted, will worship Govinda in Mathurā, in the light fortnight of Jyeshthā,|| will secure for us eminent exaltation;¶ for we shall be elevated by the merits of our posterity.” A man of good extraction will present obsequial cakes to his fortunate (ancestors) in the Yamuna, having worshipped Janārdana in the light fortnight of Jyeshthā.** But the same degree of merit that a man reaps from adoring Janārdana†† at that season, with a devoted heart, and from bathing in the Yamuna, and effecting the liberation of his progenitors by offering to them (on such an occasion,) obsequial cakes, he derives, also, from hearing, with equal devotion, a section of this Purana:: This Pu-
rāṇa is the best of all preservatives for those who are afraid of worldly existence, a certain alleviation of the sufferings of men, and remover of all imperfections.

This (Purāṇa), originally composed by the Rishi (Nārāyaṇa), was communicated, by Brahmā; to Ribuḥ; he related it to Priyavrata, by whom it was imparted to Bhaṅguri. Bhaṅguri recited it to Tapasītra; and he, to Dadhīccha, who gave it to Sārasvata. From the last Bṛigu received it, who imparted it to Purukutsa; and he taught it to Narmandā. The goddess delivered it to Dhrītarāśtra.

1 This name is also read Tambamitra. One copy has Tava mritṛaya, “to thy friend,” as if it was an epithet of Dadhīccha: but the construction of the verse requires a proper name. “Bhaṅguri gave it to Tambamitra; and he, to Dadhīccha.”

2 Sansādra.

† Literally, “a cure for men’s bad dreams”: सार्वभूतस्य प्रकाष्णिणाम्।

‡ Called, in the original, by his epithet Kamalodbhava,—the same as Abjyoni. See Vol. I., p. 17, note †.

§ See Vol. I., p. 77, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 380.

|| See ibid., pp. 107, et seq.

|| For a Bhaṅguri, see Vol. II., p. 113, note 1.

*** This reading I find nowhere. See, further, note ††, below.


**: See Vol. I., p. 17.

§§ Ibid., p. 100.

||| Ibid., p. 17; Vol. III., p. 268, text and note †, and p. 283.

*** See Vol. I., p. 188, note 1; and Vol. II., p. 74.

†† So reads, like, my Ajmere MS., my oldest MS. of all. Ratnagṛbha has Tambamitra; and my Arrah MS. yields Stambamitra.

††† This is Śrīdhara’s lection.

§§§ Corrected from “Dādhibhīl”.
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the Nāga king, and to Apiṛuṇa, of the same race, by whom it was repeated to their monarch, Vāsuki. Vāsuki communicated it to Vatsa; and he, to Aśva- tara, from whom it successively proceeded to Kambala and Elāpatra. When the Muni Vedaśira descended to Pātāla, he there received the whole (Purāṇa) from these Nāgas, and communicated it to Pramati. Pramati consigned it to the wise Jātukarṇa; and he taught it to many other holy persons. Through the blessing of Vasīthā, it came to my knowledge; and I have, now, Maitreya, faithfully imparted it to you. You will teach it, at the end of the Kali age, to Śaṅkuka.

1 A different series of narrators has been specified in the First Book.—Vol. I., p. 17.

† The original has only Nāga.

†† Corrected from “Purāṇa”. See Vol. II., p. 288. From note * to ibid., p. 290, it seems that other Purāṇas read Varuṇa and Aruṇa (?).

‡ The original is धुरतराजाय नागायापुरुसाय च। Apiṛuṇa is not, then, said to be of the same race. In the passages referred to in the preceding note, he figures as a Grāmāni or Yaksha.

§ Literally, “to the king of the Nāgas”, नागराजाय।

|| See Vol. II., p. 74, and p. 86, note 1.

|| For the Nāga called Vatsa, see Vol. II., p. 287, note *.

** For Aśvatara, Kambala, and Elāpatra, see Vol. II., p. 74.

†† The original seems to denote that Vedaśira became master of Pātāla:

पतालभर्ती सम्पुर्णामदत्वा वेदशीरा सुनिः।

; By the word नेन, immediately following the mention of Elāpatra, it is implied that from him alone the Purāṇa passed to Vedaśiras.

§§ Variant: Praṇita.

||| Some of my best MSS. give Jātukarṇa. For both names, see Vol. III., p. 36, text and note *.

पुलाय, according to my Ajmere MS.

*** Variants: Śānika, Śānika, and Śīnīka. For Śīnīka, see Vol. I., Preface, p. LV.

††† On which Ratnagṛbha remarks: च च समस्मातानानेऽधि। कन्तेमेव-बन्धितस्।
removes the contamination of the Kali, shall be freed from all his sins. He who hears this every day, acquires himself of his daily obligations to ancestors, gods, and men. The (great and) rarely attainable merit that a man acquires by the gift of a brown cow; he derives from hearing ten chapters of this (Purāṇa). He who hears the entire (Purāṇa), contemplating, in his mind, Achyuta,—who is all things, and of whom all things are made; who is the stay of the whole world, the receptacle of spirit; who is knowledge, and that which is to be known; who is without beginning or end, and the benefactor of the gods,—obtains, assuredly, the reward that attends the uninterrupted celebration of the Āśwamedha rite. He who reads, and retains with faith this (Purāṇa), in the beginning, middle, and end of which is described the glorious Achyuta, the lord of the universe in every stage, the master of all that is stationary or moveable, composed of spiritual knowledge, acquires such purity as exists not in any world,—the eternal state of perfection (which is) Hari. The man who fixes his mind on Vishṇu goes not to hell. He who meditates upon him regards heavenly enjoyment only as an impediment; and he whose mind and soul are penetrated by him thinks little of the world of Brahmā; for, when present in the minds of those whose intellects are free from soil, he confers upon them eternal freedom. What marvel, therefore, is it, that the sins of one who repeats the name of Achyuta should be wiped away? Should not that Hari be heard of whom those devoted to acts worship with sacrifices, continually, as the god of sacrifice; whom those devoted to meditation contemplate as primary and secondary, composed of spirit; by obtaining whom, man is not born, nor nourished; nor subjected to death; who is all that is, and that is not, (or both cause and effect); who, as the progenitors, receives the libations made to them; who, as the gods, accepts the offerings addressed to them; the glorious being who is without beginning or end; whose name is both Śvāhā and Śvadha; who is the abode of all spiritual power; in whom the limits of finite things cannot be measured; and who, when he enters the ear, destroys all sin?"
I adore him, that first of gods, Purushottama, * who is without end and without beginning, without growth, without decay, † without death; who is substance that knows not change. I adore that ever inexhaustible spirit, § who assumed sensible qualities; who, though one, became many; who, though pure, became as if impure, by appearing in many and various shapes; who is endowed with (divine) wisdom, and is the author of the preservation of all creatures. ¶ I adore him, who is the one conjoined essence and object of both meditative wisdom and active virtue; who is watchful in providing for human enjoyments; who is one with the three qualities; who, without undergoing change, is the cause of the evolution of the world; who exists of his own essence, ever exempt from decay. ** I constantly adore him, who is entitled heaven, †† air, fire, water, earth, and ether; * * who is the bestower of all the objects which give gratification to the senses; who benefits mankind with the instruments of fruition; who is perceptible, who is subtle, who is imperceptible. May that unborn, eternal Hari, whose form is manifold, and whose essence is composed of both nature and spirit, * bestow upon all mankind that blessed state which knows neither birth nor decay!

---

* विश्वन शुभोदकमालोमिश्रित ।
† Paridha. : Apakshaya.
§ तकनि नेति वीष्णुष्ण सदायाय ।
†† ब्रह्मण्यपुमुतं: विश्वासयाय ।
¶ अशुद्धमवेश: ।
** भ्रामण्यपुमुतं: विश्वासयाय ।
††† यमण, the same as दक्ष, which is generally rendered ‘ether’. See Vol. I. p. 34, note †.
No one among the contemporaries of Professor Wilson is known to have qualified himself more adequately than Colonel Vans Kennedy for discussing the subject of the Puráñas; and it has, therefore, been considered that the following correspondence must, with all its defects, possess, to the readers of these volumes, sufficient interest to justify its republication in this place. The seven letters of which it consists—namely, five entitled On Professor Wilson’s Theory respecting the Puráñas, the Professor’s Reply, and the Colonel’s Rejoinder,—originally appeared in the London Asiatic Journal for 1840 and 1841, addressed to its editor. F. H.]

---

Sir: In the learned and ingenious remarks contained in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishánu Puráña, Professor Wilson remarks that the Puráñas “may be acquitted of subservience to any but sectarian imposture. They were pious* frauds for temporary purposes;” † and that they “are, also, works of evidently different ages, and have been compiled under different circumstances, the precise nature of which we can but imperfectly conjecture from internal evidence, and from what we know of the history of religious opinion in India. It is highly probable that, of the present popular forms of the Hindu religion, none assumed their actual state earlier than the time of Śankara Āchārya, the great Śaiva reformer, who flourished, in all likelihood, in the eighth or ninth century. Of the Vaishnava teachers, Rá-

---

* Colonel Kennedy omitted this word. † Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.
mānuja dates in the twelfth century; Madhavāchārya, in the thirteenth; and Vallalba, in the sixteenth; and the Purāṇas seem to have accompanied, or followed, their innovations; being obviously intended to advocate the doctrines they taught.** He further observes that "a very great portion of the contents of many [of the Purāṇas], some portion of the contents of all, is genuine and old. The sectarian interpolation, or embellishment, is always sufficiently palpable to be set aside without injury to the more authentic and primitive material; and the Purāṇas, although they belong especially † to that stage of the Hindu religion in which faith in some one divinity was the prevailing principle, are, also, a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas." : And yet Professor Wilson, at the same time, maintains that religious instruction is not one of the five topics which are treated of in a genuine Purāṇa, and that its occurrence in the Purāṇas now extant is a decisive proof that these are not the same works, in all respects, that were current, under the denomination of Purāṇas, in the century prior to Christianity.

These, however, and similar remarks contained in that Preface, seem to be inconsistent and inconclusive; for, if the Purāṇas, in their present form, are of so modern a date, and if the ancient Purāṇas are no longer extant, by what means can it be ascertained that any portion of the contents of the works now bearing the name of Purāṇas is genuine and old?

** Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.
† Colonel Kennedy—a very heedless quoter,—had "essentially".
‡ Vol. I., Preface, pp. XI., XII.

Professor Wilson rejects, as not belonging to the Purāṇas, in the time of Amara Simha (B.C. 50), all those parts of the present Purāṇas which relate to the rites and observances and to the theology of the Hindus; but it is those parts only which admit of being compared with other Hindu works, and with all that is known of the Hindu religion. It is, also, unquestionable that certain works denominated Purāṇas have been immemorially considered, by the Hindus, as sacred books;* and it must be evident that, unless the doctrines of the Hindu religion were inculcated in those works, they could contain nothing which could communicate to them a sacred character. The opinion, therefore, of Professor Wilson, that the genuine Purāṇas treated of profane subjects only, is, obviously, incompatible with that profound reverence with which the Purāṇas are regarded by all Hindus, even at the present day. The only argument, also, which he has adduced in support of this opinion depends entirely upon the use and meaning of the term pancha-lakśhaṇa, as applied to a Purāṇa. But the passage in Sanskrit, quoted in the note in page VII., does not admit of the restricted sense which Professor Wilson has given to it; because the first of the five topics¹ there mentioned, or sarga, is inadequately expressed † by "primary creation, or cosmogony." This will be at once evident by a reference

¹ The five topics, as explained by Professor Wilson, are:
1. Primary creation, or cosmogony; 2. Secondary creation, or the destruction and renovation of worlds, including chronology; 3. Genealogy of gods and patriarchs; 4. Reigns of the Manus, or periods called Manwantaras; and, 5. History.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.
† But see what the Colonel says in p. 299, note 2, infra. 17*
to the contents of the Translation of the Vishnu Purana, where, under sarga, are enumerated: *Vishnu, the origin, existence, and end of all things; his existence before creation; his first manifestations; description of Pradhana, of Prakriti, of the active cause; development of effects, of the mundane egg. For the description of all that precedes the appearance of the mundane egg, which occurs in the Vishnu and other Puranas, is the most abstruse and sacred part of Hindu theology; as it explains the real nature of the Supreme Being, and of those manifestations of his divine essence which lead men to believe in the actual existence of a material world. The first, therefore, of the five topics treated of in a genuine Purana, according to Professor Wilson, necessarily includes religious instruction; because the antecedents to creation could not have been described without, at the same time, explaining the distinction between the one sole-existing spirit and those illusive appearances which seem to be composed of matter. The second, also, of those topics is, equally, of a religious nature; for an account of the destruction and renovation of worlds must, necessarily, include a description of the means and agents employed, by the Supreme Being, for those purposes. Under the first two topics, consequently, is comprised a great part of what is contained in the Puranas, as at present extant: namely, a description of the real essence of the Supreme Being, and of the illusive nature of the universe; of the production of Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, and their female energies; of the origin of angelic beings and holy sages; and of all the circumstances relating to the repeated creation, destruction, and renovation of the world; and it may, therefore, be justly concluded, that these subjects were also treated of in the eighteen Puranas, as originally committed to writing, and that the term 'pancha-lakshana' affords no grounds for the conclusion which Professor Wilson has deduced from its use and meaning.

But those parts of the present Puranas which relate to festivals, rites, and observances, and to the worship of particular deities, may appear to support this remark of Professor Wilson: "They [the Puranas] are no longer authorities for Hindu belief, as a whole: they are special guides for separate and, sometimes, conflicting branches of it; compiled for the evident purpose of promoting the preferential, or, in some cases, the sole, worship of Vishnu, or of Siva." * It is not clear what is here meant by the "Hindu belief, as a whole;" for there are, I believe, no traces, now extant, of the Hindu religion having ever existed as one uniform system of belief in one and the same deity. But the antiquity of the Upanishads is not disputed; and, in one or other of them, the attributes of the Supreme Being are distinctly ascribed to Brahma, Vishnu, Siva, Devi, Surya, and Ganesh; and, consequently, when the Upanishads were composed, there must have been some Hindus who paid a preferential worship to one or other of those deities. These, however, are precisely the same deities to whom the attributes of the Supreme Being are ascribed in one or other of the Puranas; and, therefore, if the antiquity

* This is not a fair representation.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.
of the Upanishads be admitted, the variety of deities proposed for worship in the Purānas now extant can be no proof that these works were recently compiled, for sectarian purposes. The Vedas, indeed, have not yet been so examined as to admit of its being determined whether the same distinction is to be found in them; but Mr. Colebrooke has stated that the whole of the Indian theology is founded on the Upanishads, and that several of them, which he has described, were extracts from the Vedas. The six deities, therefore, just mentioned, were, most probably, objects of worship, when the religious system of the Vedas flourished; and it must, in consequence, be altogether improper to consider the worshippers of one of those deities, in preference to the others, as sectarian, if, by this term, is intended such sectarian as have existed in India in later times. For, according to the principles of the Hindu religion, there is unity in diversity; and, hence, it is held that these apparently different deities are merely variant forms of one and the same Supreme Being, and that, consequently, the worship of any one of them is equally holy and effective,—as it is, in fact, the adoration of the Supreme Being in that particular form. Sectarianism, at the same time, consists in the exclusive, and not merely preferential, worship of a particular deity; but in not one of the Purānas is there a single intimation, or injunction, which, virtually, or expressly, sanctions the rejection of the worship of Viṣṇu, or Śiva, or of any of the other six deities. The orthodox Hindus, therefore, are, even at the present day, votaries, but not sectaries, of either Viṣṇu or Śiva; and such they appear to have been from the remotest time,—as the particular worship of Brahmā has long ceased, and, though particular worshippers of Śūrya and Gāṇeśa have existed, and, perhaps, still exist, in India, they have never been numerous, and the worship of Devī has degenerated into rites and ceremonies which, though practised by many Hindus, are, generally, considered to be contrary to the tenets and ritual of the Hindu religion.¹

Professor Wilson also has not explained the sectarian purposes to promote which he thinks the works at present bearing the names of Purānas were compiled in a period so comparatively modern as that between the eighth and seventeenth centuries. But he cannot mean to contend that Viṣṇu and Śiva were not objects of worship in the earliest times of the Hindu religion, or that they were worshipped with the same rites and ceremonies; and, if not, the mere ascribing, in those works, preeminence to either Viṣṇu or Śiva, and a superior excellence to the worship of either of those gods,—which is all that occurs of them,—can be no proof that the Purānas, as now extant, are mere modern works, compiled for sectarian purposes; because in not one of the eighteen Purānas is it, in any manner, intimated that Viṣṇu or Śiva ought not to be worshipped; and, on the contrary, numerous passages occur in them, in which precisely the same rewards are promised to the worshipper of either god. So far, indeed, is any one of the Purānas from inculcating the exclusive worship of either Viṣṇu or

¹ I here merely allude to the worship of Devi by the sacrifice of animals, and not to the abominable worship described in the Tantras.
Śiva, that Vishṇu is introduced, in some of them, teaching the worship of Śiva, and, in others, Śiva, teaching the worship of Vishṇu. The only distinction which appears to exist between these gods is, that, in particular Purāṇas, each is represented as the Supreme Being, when the other becomes, in a certain sense, inferior, without, however, detracting from his divine excellence. It is, also, remarkable that it is not in separate Purāṇas only that preeminence is ascribed to either Vishṇu or Śiva, or even to Brahmā; but this ascription occurs in the very same Purāṇa. For, as far as I have observed, there are only five Purāṇas in which the supremacy is uniformly ascribed to the same god: namely, the Linga and Skanda, in which Śiva is identified with the Supreme Being; the Vishṇu and Bhāgavata, in which this honour is attributed to Vishṇu; and the Brahma Vaivarta, in which Kṛṣṇa is represented as the Supreme Being, and his favourite mistress, Rādhā, as his sakti or energy. When, therefore, in the Purāṇas as now extant, equal reverence is given not only to Vishṇu and Śiva, but to four other deities, and when nothing occurs, in them, which in the least sanctions the rejection of the worship of those deities, or in any manner condemns or disparages it, it seems evident that such works could not have been composed for the sectarian purpose of promoting the exclusive worship of either Vishṇu or Śiva, or of any other god.¹

¹ I should except the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa (for I have not met with any Upanishad in which Kṛṣṇa is represented as the Supreme Being); but this Purāṇa appears to me to be of a much more ancient date than that ascribed to it by Professor Wilson.
of the present Puráñas are, perhaps, modern, therefore these works must be modern compilations, is, obviously, contrary to every principle of just reasoning; because, as it is admitted that ancient materials existed anterior to the supposed compilation of the present Puráñas, and as no cause can be assigned for their disappearance—if such existed,—in the tenth or eleventh century, it is most reasonable to conclude that the Puráñas now extant do, actually, consist of those very materials, and that they are, in fact, the very same works which were current, under that denomination, in the time of Amara Siúña. Professor Wilson, however, seems to have given more weight to the internal testimony arising from those passages of the Puráñas which he thinks have a modern appearance, than to that which results from those parts which the Puráñas must have contained from their first composition, in order to entitle them to a sacred character and to that reverence with which these works have been always regarded by the Hindus. But the fixing the precise date when the Puráñas received their present form is a question of little or no consequence, when it is admitted that there is “abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era.”

The Puráñas, therefore, cannot be—as also remarked by Professor Wilson, in p. XI.—pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarian imposture. But these are the principal grounds on which he rests his opinion, that the Puráñas now extant did not receive their present form until a thousand years after the birth of Christ. Professor Wilson, however, does not explain in what this imposture consisted, or for what sectarian purpose it was intended. That there are, at this day, and may have been, for many centuries, exclusive worshippers of Vishnú, or Siva, is undoubted; but, as I have before observed, this exclusive worship is not sanctioned by anything that is contained in the Puráñas now extant; nor do they, in any manner, countenance those more obscure sects which have existed in India in later times. The opinion, also, of Professor Wilson, that “the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole [of the Rájasa division of the Puráñas], although it is to some of the series; for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Puráña,”* is, unquestionably, erroneous; because, in not one of the eighteen Puráñas is there the slightest indication of the Tántrika worship, or the slightest allusion to it; for the worship of Devi, in the form of Durgá or Káli, by blood, flesh, and spiritual liquors, is essentially different from that of Devi as Śakti: in the one, it is her image which is worshipped, and, in the latter, it is a naked virgin. Had, however, imposture for sectarian purposes been the object for which the Puráñas were written, it must have been evident in every part of them; but, on the

---

1 Strictly speaking, not the virgin, but the κόρη of the virgin.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XXI., XXII.
contrary, I have no doubt that, were they carefully and dispassionately examined, it would satisfactorily appear that they contain nothing which is incompatible with those principles of the Hindu religion which are universally acknowledged by all Hindus. The argument, consequently, deduced from the assumption that the Purāṇas, as now extant, are pious frauds, and, therefore, modern compilations, is refuted by the whole scope and tendency of those works; nor, were it even proved that interpolations and additions have taken place in them, would this circumstance detract from the authenticity of such portions of them as afford strong internal evidence of their antiquity. But what more conclusive evidence of their antiquity can be required than—as is admitted by Professor Wilson himself—their containing a correct description of the doctrines, the legends, and the institutions of the Hindu religion which were prevalent in India three centuries before the Christian era? For it is, obviously, much more probable that the present Purāṇas are works which were then extant, than that eighteen different persons should, each, have conceived, thirteen hundred years afterwards, the design of writing a Purana, and should have been able to compile or compose, so accurately, eighteen different works which correspond so exactly in numerous essential and minute particulars.

The eighteen Purāṇas, also, as Professor Wilson states, consist of 400,000 slokas, or 1,600,000 lines; and it must, therefore, be evident that nothing but the most attentive examination of the whole of such extensive works, and a thorough knowledge of the

exact state of India, and of all the changes which may have taken place, in the country and amongst the people, during the last two thousand years, could enable any person to fix, with any degree of certainty, from the internal evidence of the Purāṇas, the date when each of them was composed. A name, a circumstance, or even a legend may have a modern appearance; but its recentness, or antiquity, can only be determined by there being some known facts with which it can be compared; and it is the want of such facts, in the present state of our knowledge of Hindu history, that renders all reasoning, with respect to the dates of the events mentioned in the Purāṇas, so completely inconclusive. Most of the legends, also, are of a miraculous nature; and no date, therefore, can be inferred from them. Professor Wilson, however, undeterred by such considerations, has not hesitated to fix the time when each Purāṇa was composed, and to place the compilation of the Purāṇas, as now extant, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries. But his reasons for assigning so modern a period to the compilation of those works appear to rest, principally, if not entirely, on the contents of the different Purāṇas not corresponding with his preconceived opinion of what a Purāṇa ought to be. For Professor Wilson thus observes, with respect to the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa: “The character of the work is, in truth, so* decidedly sectarian, and the sect to which it belongs, so distinctly marked,—that of the worshippers of the juvenile Kṛishna and Rādhā, a form of belief of known modern origin,—that it can scarcely have found a notice in a

* Colonel Kennedy omitted the words “in truth, so”.
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work to which, like the Matsya, a much more remote date seems to belong. Although, therefore, the Matsya may be received in proof of there having been a Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa at the date of its compilation, dedicated especially to the honour of Kṛiṣṇa, yet we cannot credit the possibility of its being the same we now possess. 

"Thus, Professor Wilson decides, not only that “the Brahma Vaivarta has not the slightest title to be regarded as a Purāṇa,”† but, also, that the Purāṇa which bore that name is no longer extant; and yet he adduces neither argument nor proof in support of this decision, and of his gratuitous assumption that this Purāṇa owes its origin to the modern sect of the worshippers of the juvenile Kṛiṣṇa. He admits, also, that the first three Books (or nearly two-thirds,) of this Purāṇa are occupied in the description of the acts of Brahmā, Devī, and Gaṅgā; but he does not explain why the supposed sectarian writer, instead of composing a work solely in honour of Kṛiṣṇa, and in support of his sect, has dedicated so great a part of the Purāṇa to the celebration of other deities. In the same manner, Professor Wilson remarks, with respect to the Vāmana Purāṇa: “It is of a more tolerant character than the Purāṇas, and divides its homage between Śiva and Vishṇu with tolerable impartiality. It is not connected, therefore, with any sectarian principles, and may have preceded their introduction. It has not, however, the air of any antiquity; and its compilation may have amused the leisure of some Brahman of Benares three or four centuries ago.”† But this, surely, is not the manner in which the question whether the Purāṇas, as now extant, are ancient and original compositions, or mere modern compilations, ought to be discussed,—far less, decided. On the contrary, the particular passages of the Purāṇas which are supposed to be modern ought to be adduced, or referred to; and it should, then, be shown that the circumstances and events, or the doctrines and legends, mentioned in them could not be of an ancient date, because they had occurred, or had been introduced, in modern times, or that they were posterior to modern events of known dates; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has not followed this method, but trusted to conjecture and inferences deduced from erroneous premises, it seems evident that his speculations respecting the modern period in which the present Purāṇas were composed must be considered to be either groundless or not yet supported by the requisite proof.

1 The object of this Purāṇa is to represent Kṛiṣṇa as the Supreme Being, and Rādhā, as his energy; and it is, therefore, altogether improbable that it should have been compiled for the purpose of promoting the modern worship of the juvenile Kṛiṣṇa, or that a modern work should have been written, and substituted in the place of the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa mentioned in the Matsya.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI.  † Ibid., p. LXVII.
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† As, however, Professor Wilson places the introduction of sectarian principles in the eighth or ninth century,† the date of the Vāmana Purāṇa, if compiled previous to their introduction, must be the eighth century, at least, and not the fourteenth or fifteenth.

The preceding observations will have, perhaps, evinced that the remarks contained in Professor Wilson’s Preface to his Translation of the *Vishnú Purāna* have been written under the impression of two conflicting opinions: for he is obliged to admit that the Purānas now extant were compiled from ancient materials, and that they are “a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas”; and yet he contends that those works are pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarian imposture. But both these opinions cannot be correct; and it must, therefore, be most accordant with probability to conclude that, although interpolations and additions may, possibly, have taken place in the Purānas, as now extant, they are, still, in all essential respects, the very same works which have been, from remote times, held sacred by the Hindus. That, however, alterations have been made in the present Purānas is a mere supposition, which has never yet been supported by any clear and satisfactory proof; and the inconsistent and inconclusive reasoning, employed by a person so well acquainted with the Purānas as Professor Wilson, to prove that they are mere modern compilations, must, alone, evince that the internal evidence of the Purānas, even in their present form, affords such incontrovertible proof of their antiquity, that even those who wish to contest this are obliged to admit it, and to explain it by having recourse to the conjecture, that ancient materials existed, from which those parts of the extant Purānas which are, most probably, ancient, were compiled. But, as this conjecture is altogether gratuitous, and unsupported by proof, it may be much more reasonably concluded that the Purānas now extant are the very same works which have been always known, under that denomination, from the remote time when they were originally composed;* and Professor Wilson himself remarks that “they never emanated from any impossible combination of the Brahmins to fabricate for the antiquity of the entire Hindu system any claims which it cannot fully support;”† and that “the origin and development of the doctrines, traditions, and institutions [described in the Purānas now extant] were not the work of a day; and the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity,—to an antiquity that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions, or beliefs of the ancient world.”

* Of this untenable position Colonel Kennedy nowhere offers any proof.
† Vol. I., Preface, p. XI.
‡ Ibid., p. XCIIX.

VANS KENNEDY.

Bombay, 28th August, 1840.

Sir: In the letter which I addressed to you on the 28th ult., I confined myself to such observations as seemed to evince that the remarks contained in Professor Wilson’s Preface to his Translation of the *Vishnú Purāna* were written under the impression of two conflicting opinions, which could not, both, be correct. As my attention has, thus, been again directed to the question whether the eighteen Purānas, as now extant,
are ancient compositions, or modern compilations, I am induced to enter into a further discussion of this subject. For it is evident that, if the works now known under that denomination were written between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries, for temporary purposes, in subservience to sectarian imposture, they cannot be a valuable record of the form of Hindu belief which came next in order to that of the Vedas. Nor can they, indeed, afford any authentic information with respect to the state of the Hindu religion previous to the twelfth century; because, even admitting that those works may have been partly compiled from ancient materials, there are no means now available by which what is genuine and old that may be contained in them can be distinguished from what is supposed to be spurious and modern.

The limits of a preface may have prevented Professor Wilson from fully discussing this question; but, as that Preface extends to seventy-five quarto pages, it is most probable that he has, at least, stated, in it, the principal reasons which induce him to consider the Purāṇas to be modern compositions. To me, however, it appears that those reasons, instead of supporting Professor Wilson's opinion, should lead to a directly contrary conclusion. The arguing, in particular, that, because not one of the present Purāṇas corresponds with the term pucha-lakṣaṇa, or "treatises on five topics,"—which is given as a synonym to a Purāṇa, in the vocabulary of Amara Siṃha,—therefore it is decidedly proved "that we have not, at present, the same works, in all respects, that were current, under the denomination of Purāṇas, in the century prior to Christianity,"* is, certainly, altogether inconclusive. For a mere descriptive term cannot be received as proof, when the argument itself admits that the works which it was intended to describe are no longer extant, and that, consequently, there are no means of determining whether the term did, or did not, apply strictly to those works. On the supposition, also, that the Purāṇas now extant are modern compositions, written in imitation of the ancient Purāṇas, it must be evident that those works could not have been restricted to the treating only of the five topics mentioned by Professor Wilson; for he himself observes that the description of a Purāṇa, included in the term pucha-lakṣaṇa, is utterly inapplicable to some of the present Purāṇas, and that to others it only partially applies. But, though it may be supposed that the Brahmins might possibly recompose their sacred books, it is altogether improbable that they would so alter them, as to leave no resemblance between the original and its substitute; and, consequently, had the prescribed form for the composition of a Purāṇa required the treating of five topics only, in that precise form would the present Purāṇas (if modern compilations) have, no doubt, been written. As, therefore, they do not exhibit that form, and as they could not have succeeded to the reverence in which the ancient Purāṇas were held, unless they resembled those works, (at least in form,) it is most reasonable to conclude that a Purāṇa, as originally composed, was not "a treatise on five topics." The miscellaneous nature, consequently, of the contents of the present Purāṇas cannot

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XL
be admitted as a valid objection to their antiquity, on a mere supposition, which is not only improbable in itself, but which is, also, disproved by the sacred character that has been immemorially ascribed to the Puráñas, which, it is obvious, they could not have received, had they treated only of the profane topics mentioned by Professor Wilson.

The argument also supposes that the original eighteen Puráñas were current prior to the Christian era; and, before, therefore, the conclusion can be granted, the time and manner in which those works have become extinct should be proved: for, as numerous Sanskrit works which were, unquestionably, extant at the commencement of the Christian era, have been preserved until the present day, nothing but satisfactory proof can establish that the Puráñas alone, although held to be sacred books, have completely disappeared. It requires to be particularly considered that the Puráñas consist of eighteen distinct works, comprising an aggregate of 1,600,000 lines,* and that India, more than one million of square miles in extent, has been, during the last two thousand years, divided into at least ten distinct regions,† differing in language and in local customs and prejudices. Were it, therefore, even conceded that the Brahmans, since the Christian era, had succeeded in suppressing the whole of the eighteen Puráñas, and in substituting other works in their place, in some one or other region of India, still copies of the original Puráñas would have been preserved in the other regions. Nothing but the entire extirpation of the Brahmanical religion, throughout the whole of so extensive a country, could have effected the complete destruction of such voluminous works,—the more especially, as their sacred character would have rendered their preservation an object of constant solicitude. But, until a complete suppression of the ancient Puráñas had been effected, other works could not have been substituted in their place; and, thus, the objection to the supposition that the Puráñas, as now extant, were not written until between the eleventh and seventeenth centuries becomes insuperable. For, admitting the dates assigned to each of the Puráñas by Professor Wilson, it may be asked: Was the ancient Puráña, bearing the same name, extant until it was superseded by the modern one, or was it not? In the first case, in what manner was its supersession accomplished? Professor Wilson extends the period during which he supposes the Puráñas to have received their present form, to eight centuries; and he, thus, admits that the replacing of the ancient Puráñas by new works did not proceed from a combination of the Brahmans to remodel the Hindu religion on new but premeditated principles. It becomes therefore impossible to understand how any individual could, without the consent and assistance of the Brahmans, effect the suppression of an ancient Puráña, and the substitution, in its place, of a work of his own composition or compilation, throughout the whole of India. If, for instance, the Bhágavata was written by Bopadeva, at Doulutabad, in the twelfth century, was the original Bhágavata then in existence, or not? If it

* See Vol. I., Preface, p. XXIV.
† For the particulars of this unscientific classification, see Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II., p. 179.
was, what reason, consistent with probability, can be assigned for supposing that the Brahmans of all India would have suppressed one of their sacred books, to which they ascribed a divine origin, and received, as entitled to the same reverence, the acknowledged composition of an obscure grammarian? The supposition is, evidently, absurd. It is strange, also, that Mr. Colebrooke should have remarked that "Bopadeva, the real author of the Śrī Bhāgavata, has endeavoured to reconcile all the sects of Hindus, by reviving the doctrines of Vyāsa. He recognizes all the deities, but as subordinate to the Supreme Being, or, rather, as attributes or manifestations of God;" for, with the omission of the word "attributes", this is precisely the same doctrine which is invariably taught in each and all of the eighteen Purāṇas. The Bhāgavata, therefore, as now extant, could not have been written for the purpose of inculcating a new doctrine; for, in that respect, it entirely corresponds with the other Purāṇas: nor is the representation, in it, of Vishnu as the Supreme Being inconsistent with the principles of the Hindu religion as explained in the other Purāṇas. It, in consequence, does not afford the slightest internal evidence of its having been written for the purpose of sectarian imposture; nor have I observed, in it, any passage which indicates that this Purāṇa could not have been written prior to the twelfth century. If, however, the original Bhāgavata was not then in existence, the objection still remains insuperable; for nothing can render it in the least probable that the Brahmans of all India would receive the composition of an obscure individual as a sacred book entitled to their reverence. It must, also, be evident that, if the Purāṇas which were current in the century prior to the Christian era have not been suppressed, there can be no reason for supposing that they have not been preserved until the present day. But it seems unquestionable that the Purāṇas then current could not have been subsequently suppressed, and other works substituted in their place, unless the Brahmans of all India had combined together in order to effect that object; and Professor Wilson, himself, remarks that the Purāṇas, in their present form, "never emanated from any impossible combination of the Brahmans to fabricate for the antiquity of the entire Hindu system any claims which it cannot fully support." A combination, therefore, of the Brahmans being considered to be impossible, it must appear most probable that the eighteen Purāṇas have been preserved, during the last eighteen hundred years, in the same manner as other Sanskrit works of the same period have been preserved, and that the present Purāṇas are, in fact, in all essential respects, the same works which were current, under that name, in India in the century prior to the Christian era.†

Another argument adduced by Professor Wilson, in

---


† Throughout this critique, Colonel Kennedy seems to ignore the predictive sections of the Purāṇas,—a very essential feature in almost all of them.
support of his opinion, is the sectarian tendency of the Purānas. But he does not clearly explain what he means by that term; and, in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," he has observed: "This is not the case, however, with the first two on the list, the Saurapātas and Gānapātas: these are usually, indeed, ranked with the preceding divisions, and make, with the Vaishnāvas, Śaivas, and Śāktas, the five orthodox divisions of the Hindus." In this passage, however, some inadvertency must have occurred: for, according to Professor Wilson's own account, the Śāktas cannot be included among the orthodox divisions of the Hindus; and I suppose, therefore, that the worshippers of Devī were here intended. But Vishnū, Śiva, Devī, Sūrya, and Gaṅapati are the very deities, and the only ones, whose worship is described or mentioned in the Purānas; and, as this is admitted to be orthodox, it must follow that the Purānas could not have been written for sectarian purposes. What are the sects, therefore, to which Professor Wilson alludes, in that Preface, is not apparent. But his notion of a sect would seem to originate in this singular opinion, which he has expressed with respect to the Paurānik account of the Hindu religion: "The different works known by the name of Purānas are, evidently, derived from the same religious system as the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata, or from the mytho-heroic stage of Hindu belief." For, in both those poems, the passages which relate to the legends and tenets of the Hindu religion are merely incidental, and do not form a principal part of those works; while, on the contrary, the legends and tenets of the Hindu religion are not only the principal, but the sole, subject of the Purānas. It is much more probable, therefore, that such incidental notices of those topics as occur in the two poems were derived from the Purānas, than that such extensive works as the Purānas—which embrace all the details of Hindu mythology, and all the abstruse doctrine of Hindu theology,—were derived from poems which are, principally, of an historical character. To conclude, consequently, that, because those topics are treated of at much greater length in the Purānas than in the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata, therefore the Purānas were written at a later period than those poems, is, evidently, erroneous. At the same time, on what grounds does Professor Wilson suppose that there ever was a "mytho-heroic stage of Hindu belief"? He merely says that Rāma and Kṛishṇa "appear to have been, originally, real and historical characters," who have been "elevated to the dignity of divinities," and that the Purānas belong, essentially, to that stage of Hindu belief "which grafted hero-worship upon the simpler ritual" of the Vedas. But Professor Wilson adduces neither argument nor quotation in support of this opinion; and it is, therefore, sufficient to observe that, in the Purānas, the Rāmāyaṇa, and Mahābhārata, Rāma and Kṛishṇa are invariably described, not as mere men, but as in-
carnate forms of Vishṇu, and that not a single passage can be produced, from those works, which inculcates hero-worship.

Professor Wilson, however, not only remarks that "Śiva and Vishṇu, under one or other form, are almost the sole objects that claim the homage of the Hindus, in the Purāṇas,"* but also rests much of his reasoning, with respect to the date when each Purāṇa, as at present extant, was composed, and to its having been written for sectarian purposes, on the character of Kṛishṇa as a hero-god. For, in describing the Brahma Purāṇa, he observes: "Then come a number of chapters relating to the holiness of Orissa, with its temples and sacred groves dedicated to the Sun, to Śiva, and Jagannātha,"—the latter, especially. These chapters are characteristic of this Purāṇa, and show its main object to be the promotion of the worship of Kṛishṇa as Jagannātha.† With regard, also, to the Vishṇu Purāṇa, he remarks: "The fifth book of the Vishṇu Purāṇa is exclusively occupied with the life of Kṛishṇa. This is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the Purāṇa, and is one argument against its antiquity."‡ And this objection he explains, in speaking of the Brahma Vaivarta Purāṇa, where he observes that the decidedly sectarian character of that Purāṇa shows that it belongs to the sect, of known modern origin, which worship the juvenile Kṛishṇa and Rādhā.* But Professor Wilson does not specify the forms of Śiva, the worship of which is mentioned in the Purāṇas, as he states; and, on the contrary, it is unquestionable that, in those works, it is strictly enjoined that Śiva should be worshipped under no other figure or type than that of the Linga; and, as Śiva was never incarnate, there could be no form under which he could be worshipped. With regard, also, to Vishṇu, Professor Wilson confines his remarks to the eighth incarnation only, that of Kṛishṇa. But the Purāṇas contain long details relating to the incarnation of Vishṇu in the human forms of Rāmachandra and Paraśurāma; and why, therefore, should Kṛishṇa alone be considered as a real historical character who has been elevated to the dignity of divinity? The answer is obvious. There is a sect, of known modern origin, who worship the juvenile Kṛishṇa and Rādhā; and it may, in consequence, be concluded that the Purāṇas in which Kṛishṇa is mentioned were written for the purpose of promoting the extension of that sect. But, as no sect has selected Rāmachandra or Paraśurāma as the peculiar object of their worship, no argument could be founded on the mention of their names in the Purāṇas; and, therefore, it was unnecessary to notice them. But they were, both, greater heroes than Kṛishṇa, and lived several centuries before him;† and, had, consequently, hero-

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.
† Ibid., p. XXVIII.
‡ Ibid., p. CIX.
worship ever prevailed in India, it must seem most probable that it would have originated with Ráma-chandra,—whose expedition to Lánká is the subject of a celebrated and revered poem,—had the Hindus ever considered him to be merely a mortal prince. It is, however, needless to continue these observations; for Professor Wilson has, himself, refuted his own opinion; as he has also remarked that Kríshna is not represented in the character of Bála Gopála (the object of worship of the modern sect,) in the Vishńu and Bhágavata Puránas," and that the life of Kríshna in the Brahma Purána "is, word for word, the same as that of the Vishńu Purána;"† to which I add, that Kríshna is not represented in that character in the Brahma Vaivarta Purána: for it is in those Puránas only that the life of Kríshna is described at length; and, in them, Kríshna invariably appears and acts as a human being, except on occasions when he exerts his divine power; but he is, at the same time, frequently acknowledged and adored as Vishńu in the incarnate form of Kríshna.1

1 I do not exactly understand what Professor Wilson means by this remark: "Ráma, although an incarnation of Vishńu, commonly appears [in the Rámdánya,] in his human character alone."; I suppose he means, that Ráma is seldom described, in that poem, as exerting his divine power; for he always appears, in it, as a man, even when he acts as a god. Nor can I understand what the notion is which Professor Wilson has formed of a divine incarnation; for he observes that the character of Kríshna is very contradictorily described in the Mahábhárata,—usually,
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All suppositions, therefore, that hero-worship ever prevailed in India, or that it is inculcated in the Puránas, or that Vishńu and Śiva have ever been worshipped under any other figure or type than such as exist at the present day, are entirely groundless.

It will hence appear that this remark of Professor Wilson must be erroneous: "The proper appropriation of the third [Rájas,] class of the Puránas, according to the Padma Purána2 appears to be the worship of Kríshna ... as the infant Kríshna, Govinda, Bála Gopála, the sojourner in Vrán dávana, the companion of the cowherds and milkmaids, the lover of Rádhá, or as the juvenile master of the universe, Jagannátha."* But, in the same manner as Professor Wilson thus appropriates, on no grounds whatever, one class of the Puránas to the worship of Kríshna, he also appropriates another class, the Támasa, to the Tántrika worship. For he remarks: "This last argument is of weight in regard to the particular instance specified; and the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole class, although it is to some of the series: for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tántrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Purána."† That is, that there is no incompati-
bility in the Purāṇas—which have immemorially been held to be sacred books,—inculcating a worship not only directly contrary to the Vedas, but which even requires, for its due performance, flesh, fish, wine, women, and which is attended “with the most scandalous orgies amongst the votaries.” The mere mention, however, of such an opinion is, alone, sufficient to show its improbability; and Professor Wilson correctly observes: “The occurrence of these impurities is, certainly, countenanced by the texts which the sects regard as authorities, and by a very general belief of their occurrence. The members of the sect are enjoined secrecy,—which, indeed, it might be supposed they would observe on their own account,—and, consequently, will not acknowledge their participation in such scenes.”

It is, therefore, surprising that, notwithstanding his own previous account of the Śaktas, he should remark, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Purāṇa: “The date of the Kūrma Purāṇa cannot be very remote; for it is, avowedly, posterior to the establishment of the Tāntrika, the Śākta, and the Jaina sects. In the twelfth chapter it is said: ‘The Bhairava, Vāma, Ārhatu, and Yāmala Śāstras are intended for delusion.’” The passage here referred to is, at length, as follows: “Certain acts have been prescribed to Brahmans and others; and for those who do not perform these acts are prepared the lowest hells. But there is no other Śāstra than the Vedas which deserves the name of virtuous; and Brahmans, therefore, ought not to delight in reciting the Yoni Śāstras, which are of various kinds in this world; because they belong to the quality of darkness, and are contrary to the Śrutī and Smṛiti: of these are the Kapāla, the Bhairava, the Yāmala, the Vāma, and the Ārhatu. Thus, for the purpose of deception, are there many such Śāstras; and by these false Śāstras are many men deceived.” This passage, it is evident, condemns these sects, and could not, therefore, have been written by a person who belonged to some one of them. But I have quoted it in order to show the manner in which allusions to philosophical and religious sects occur, in a few instances, in some of the Purāṇas; for, in all such passages, the name only is mentioned, and the doctrine of the sect is never in the least explained. Before, therefore, it is concluded that the name applies to a sect of modern origin, it should, surely, be first proved that no sect existed in India, under that name, until the establishment of the modern sect. In the above quotation, the worship of Śiva in his terrific character, and of Devī as Śakti, is, no doubt, clearly intimated; but it affords no indication of the date when such worship commenced, or of the period during which it may have been prevalent. But it is stated, in more than one Purāṇa, that the Kapāla sect was coeval with the institution of the worship of the Linga; and its antiquity is, further, rendered probable by its having long become extinct in India; and it is evident that, as the Ārhatu is here distinctly called a Yoni

---

1 These three quotations will be found in Professor Wilson’s “Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus,” in the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVII., pp. 223, 224, 225.†

† Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.
† Or Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 256—260.
(that is, a Śākta.) Śāstra, this term can have no reference whatever to the Jaina sect. Were, also, the Tántrika doctrines really inculcated in the Puráñas, the passages relating to them would be so numerous and explicit as to attract attention; and yet, in my examination of those works, I have never met with a single Tántrika passage; and Professor Wilson adduces only the above-quoted text of the Kürma Puráña, which can prove nothing, until the sects alluded to, in it, are satisfactorily ascertained. To found, consequently, any argument with respect to the date when the Puráñas, as now extant, were written, or their sectarian tendency, on a few obscure passages which occur in them, the precise meaning of which it is now impossible to determine, is, surely, a mode of reasoning which may be justly pronounced to be altogether futile and fallacious.

Professor Wilson also states, in too decided and unqualified a manner, that, “In a word, the religion of the Vedas was not idolatry:”* for he, at the same time, correctly remarks that “It is yet, however, scarcely safe to advance an opinion of the precise† belief or philosophy which they inculcate.”: But it unquestionably appears, from several of the Upa-nishads,—which are admitted § to be portions of the Vedas,—that the principal deities have always been represented by images; and it may, therefore, be justly inferred that image-worship has always formed part of the Hindu religion. In its purest form, however, it is probable that the worship of images was practised particularly by the inferior castes, and not, generally, by the Brahmans and Kshattriyas; but that, when the strict observance of the system of religious worship prescribed by the Vedas began to decline, then idolatry gradually assumed that form under which it appears in India at the present day. That such a change has taken place in the Hindu religion is clearly shown in the Puráñas; for, in those works, though the worship of particular deities by various rites and observances is principally inculcated, they still contain numerous passages in which it is explicitly declared that such worship is not the adoration which is most acceptable to the Supreme Being, or the most effectual for obtaining final beatitude.

But the following remarks may appear to fix a modern character on the eighteen Puráñas, as now extant: “It is a distinguishing feature of the Vishńu Puráña, and it is characteristic of its being the work of an earlier period than most of the Puráñas, that it enjoins no sectorial or other acts of supererogation; no Vratas, occasional self-imposed observances; no holydays, no birthdays of Kṛishńa, no nights dedicated to Lakshmi; no sacrifices or modes of worship other than those conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. It contains no Māhátmyas or golden legends, even of the temples in which Vishńu is adored.”*** In these remarks, however, it is assumed that sacrifices and modes of worship which are not conformable to the ritual of the Vedas are prescribed in the Puráñas: but

* Vol. I., Preface, p. III. † The word 'precise' was here omitted.
‡ Vol. I., Preface, p. II.
§ Not with any scientific accuracy.

** Val. I., Preface, pp. XCIIX., C.

V.
this is precisely the question which requires to be proved. It is probable that the worship of images is not authorized by the Vedas; and so far, therefore, the Puránas inculcate a mode of worship which is not conformable to the ritual of the Vedas. But idolatry has, unquestionably, existed, in India, from the remotest times; and, consequently, its being inculcated in the Puránas cannot be admitted as any proof of their being modern compositions. The invocations, also, and prayers to the different deities, contained in the Puránas appear to be in strict accordance with such as are contained in the Vedas; for they are composed of the Gáyatrí and, apparently, of other texts of the Vedas; and, although the rites and offerings with which the deities are directed to be worshipped may, probably, differ from the ritual of the Vedas, they still have been, evidently, intended to conform to it, as far as the difference of image-worship would admit of.¹

¹ It is unnecessary to except, expressly, the worship of Devi by the sacrifice of animals; for Professor Wilson has remarked (Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVII., p. 219): "This practice, however, is not considered as orthodox, and approaches rather to the ritual of the Vámacharins; the more pure Bali [sacrifice] consisting of edible grain, with milk and sugar."

² Or Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 251, 252.
period when the Puráñas were composed; and Professor Wilson has not proved (nor can he, I am con-
vinced, prove,) that the deity to whose honour a fes-
tival is ascribed in the Puráñas, or in whose propitiation a fast or vow is directed to be performed, was not worshipped prior to the eighth or ninth century, or that the preceding mode of worship has been since altered. But, until either of these assumptions is proved, it must be evident that the mention of the fest-
ival, the fast, or the vow, in any of the Puráñas, in no manner proves, or even renders it probable, that that Puráña did not exist prior to the Christian era, in precisely the same state as that in which it is now extant.

I admit, however, that doubts may be reasonably entertained with respect to the antiquity of some of the legends relating to temples and places of pilgri-
mage, which are contained in the Puráñas; for the mis-
cellaneous nature, the want of arrangement, and the humility of style of the Puráñas would easily admit of an account of a particular temple or place of pilgri-
mage being interpolated, without the interpolation being liable to detection from the context. It is, therefor,
possible that, when those works are further exami-
ned, such interpolations may be discovered in them; but, were it, for instance, even proved that the legend of Jagannátha in the Brahma Puráña was an inter-
polation, this would be no proof that that Puráña was written for the promotion of the worship of Jagan-
nátha: for it would be much more reasonable to sup-
pose that the Brahmans of that temple had availed

themselves of the original Puráña, to introduce into it, and to circulate under the sacredness of its name, the legend which they had composed in honour of their god. When, therefore, a passage occurs in any Puráña, which has a modern appearance, it should not, at once, be concluded that the Puráña is a modern composition; but it should first be ascertained whether the passage is really modern, and, if so, whether it may not be an interpolation which does not necessarily affect the antiquity of the Puráña itself. Nothing, however, is so difficult as to decide satisfactorily on the existence of a supposed interpolation in any work; and, with respect to the Puráñas, this difficulty, from the reasons just men-
tioned, and from our almost entire ignorance of the history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era, becomes so insuperable as clearly to evince how completely er-

---

* Contrast what is said in p. 311, note 1, infra.

* Never, in all probability, has this been the case.
roneous it must be to conclude, from their internal evidence, that "the Puráñas are works of evidently different ages, and have been compiled under different circumstances."*

But it is impossible to ascertain, from this Preface, Professor Wilson's precise opinion with respect to what a work ought to be, in order to entitle it to the character of a Puráña; for, in speaking of the Linga, he remarks: "Data for conjecturing the era of this work are defective. But it is more of a ritual than a Puráña; and the Pauránik chapters which it has inserted, in order to keep up something of its character, have been, evidently, borrowed for the purpose."† In considering, however, the age and the scope and tendency of the Puráñas, Professor Wilson has entirely overlooked the sacred character which has immemorially been ascribed to those works; and yet he could not intend to deny so indisputable a fact; in which case it must be evident that the more a Puráña is occupied in "narrating legends, and enjoining rites, and reciting prayers,"† the more it maintains its proper character. Professor Wilson, on the contrary, is of opinion that the religious instruction which is contained in the present Puráñas is a decisive proof that they have undergone some material alteration, and that they are not the same works which were current in the century prior to Christianity. He admits, at the same time, the accuracy of this description of the Puráñas, as they are:1

The principal object of the Puráñas is the moral and religious instruction which is inculcated in them, and to which all the legends that they contain are rendered subservient. In fact, the description of the earth and of the planetary system, and the lists of royal races, that occur in them are, evidently, extraneous, and not essential, circumstances; as they are omitted in some Puráñas, and very concisely discussed in others; while, on the contrary, in all the Puráñas, some or other of the leading principles, rites, and observances of the Hindu religion are fully dwelt upon, and illustrated, either by suitable legends, or by prescribing the ceremonies to be practised, and the prayers and invocations to be employed, in the worship of different deities. It will, I think, be admitted that these are precisely the topics which ought to occupy a sacred book intended for the religious instruction of the Hindus; and that, consequently, so far from its being supposed that the present Puráñas have undergone some material alteration in consequence of these topics being their principal subject, this very circumstance should be considered as a conclusive argument in support of their genuineness and antiquity. As, also, the religious instruction contained in the Puráñas is perfectly uniform, and entirely consistent with the principles of the Hindu religion, and as it, consequently, betrays not the slightest indication of novelty or sectarianism, it must be most consistent with probability to conclude that the eighteen Puráñas, as now extant, are ancient compositions, and not, as Professor Wilson supposes, an "intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients" with "ancient materials."*

---

1 In my work on Ancient and Hindu Mythology, p. 150.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI. † Ibid., p. LXIX.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCI. 
I have, thus, examined the arguments adduced, by Professor Wilson, to prove that the books now extant under the name of Puráñas are not the original eighteen Puráñas which have been immemorially held to form part of the sacred literature of the Hindus, but works which have been compiled, within the last eight hundred years, from ancient and modern materials, and written in subservience to sectarian imposture. The remarks, however, contained in this and my former letter will, perhaps, evince that those arguments are much too inconsistent and inconclusive to render the antiquity and genuineness of the present Puráñas in the least questionable. The admission, indeed, that the original Puráñas were extant in the century prior to the Christian era, is, alone, sufficient to invalidate all suppositions of their being, now, no longer in existence; and, unless, therefore, the time and manner of their becoming extinct are proved, it must be evident that inferences resting merely on their internal evidence cannot be received as any proof that the original Puráñas have not been preserved until the present day. For all reasoning founded on the internal evidence which the Puráñas may afford on any point can be of no avail; as there are, I believe, scarcely any persons competent to decide upon its correctness; and the different conclusions which Professor Wilson and myself have drawn from this internal evidence must show that the impression received from it depends entirely on the disposition of mind and the spirit of research with which the Puráñas are perused. I read them with a mind perfectly free from all preconceived opinion, and with the sole object of making myself acquainted with the mythology and religion of the Hindus; and I did not observe, in them, the slightest indication of their having been written in modern times, for sectarian purposes; but, on the contrary, their perusal irresistibly led me to conclude that they must have been written at some remote period. Even Professor Wilson has not been able to resist this impression of their antiquity; for he declares that it is "as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of* the Puráñas."† Why, therefore, he should have endeavoured—particularly, in his account of each of the Puráñas,—to demonstrate that those works are modern compilations, and that, in consequence, "they are no longer authorities for Hindu belief, as a whole," but "special guides for separate and, sometimes, conflicting branches of it."‡ I pretend not to conjecture.

But it is very evident that Professor Wilson examined the Puráñas with a preconceived opinion of their being modern compilations, and of their containing an account of the sects which have originated in India in modern times;¹ for it is only from the influence of such a preconceived opinion that can have proceeded...
the contradictory and fallacious reasoning, with respect to the age and the scope and tendency of the Purána, which is contained in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Purána. Because that reasoning rests entirely on two assumptions, neither of which is proved nor can be proved: the one, that a genuine Purána should treat of profane subjects only; and the other, that the works now extant under the name of Puránas were written in modern times, for sectarian purposes. Thus, in the account of each of the Puránas, it is pronounced that the main object of the Brahma is the promotion of the worship of Jagannátha (Krishna), and that there is little, in it, which corresponds with the definition of a Purána; that the different portions of the Padma "are, in all probability, as many different works, neither of which approaches to the original definition of a Purána;" that the Linga "is more a ritual than a Purána;" that the Brahma Vaivarta "has not the slightest title to be regarded as a Purána;" that the date of the Kürma "cannot be very remote, for it is, avowedly, communicate to others, "a correct notion of the substance and character of those works." The Purána must not only be read from beginning to end, but examined over again more than once, before any person can be qualified to pronounce a decided judgment upon its age, scope, or tendency. The most ample index of its contents will never suggest or supply those reflections which necessarily arise during its perusal, and which, alone, can produce a correct opinion with respect to the connexion which the different parts of the Purána bear to each other, and with respect to the principal or accessory objects of its composition. A more attentive consideration of the context, for instance, would, perhaps, have prevented Professor Wilson from quoting the line of the Kürma Purána, on which I have remarked in this letter.
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posterior to the establishment of the Tántrika, the Śákta, and the Jaina sects;" and so with respect to the other Puránas. It will not, however, be denied that nothing but the most attentive and repeated actual perusal of the whole of each and all of the Puránas would warrant such positive and unqualified assertions, and that nothing but satisfactory proof of such perusal would entitle them to the least credit; and yet Professor Wilson has stated that the Puránas comprehend a quantity of lines which any European scholar could scarcely expect to peruse with care and attention, unless his whole time were devoted, exclusively, for very many years, to the task. Professor Wilson, therefore, is not, according to his own admission, qualified to decide ex cathedra on the age, or the scope and tendency, of the Puránas. His reasoning, also, in support of the opinions which he had expressed on these points is singularly illogical; for he, first, assumes that a genuine Purána ought to treat of such and such topics only, and then—as not one of the present Puránas conforms to the definition assumed—he at once concludes that those works are modern compilations. But, as the definition fails in eighteen instances, it must appear most

1 Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, No. IX., p. 61.†

2 Professor Wilson, also, has not translated this definition literally from the Sanskrit; and he, thus, argues, not on it, but on the meaning which he has, himself, thought proper to give to the definition. Literally translated, it can mean nothing more than "creation, repeated creation, races or families, manvantaras,§ and

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XXVIII., XXXIII., LXIX., LXVII., and LXXXIX.

† Vide supra, p. 297, note §.

‡ See the Colonel's remark on sarga, in p. 259, supra.

§ This is transliteration, not translation.
probable that it was never intended to be understood in the very restricted sense which Professor Wilson applies to it; and, in my former letter, I have shown that two of the topics, at least, comprise much more than what he has included under them. The non-conformity, however, of the contents of the present Purāṇas to this assumed definition—the precise extent and meaning of which are not ascertained,—is, in fact, the only argument which is adduced, by Professor Wilson, to prove that the works now bearing the name of Purāṇas are not the original Purāṇas, and the only ground on which he pronounces that this or that one of those works does not correspond with the definition of a genuine Purāṇa. But the mere statement of such an argument is, surely, quite sufficient to expose its total invalidity. The other assumption is not only equally groundless, but it is even disproved by Professor Wilson himself; for he has rested his argument, in support of it, entirely on Krishna being, as the juvenile Krishna, the peculiar object of worship of a sect of known modern origin; and yet he is obliged to admit that what accompanies races. To found, therefore, an argument against the genuineness and antiquity of the Purāṇas, as now extant, on such a definition, is, surely, a most singular and futile mode of reasoning. *

Krishna is not represented in that character in three of the Purāṇas in which his life is related at length. The only proof, also, of the Tāntrika doctrines being inculcated in the Purāṇas, which is adduced, is a single obscure line of the Kārma Purāṇa. * But, were that the case, there could have been no difficulty in quoting numerous Tāntrika passage from some one or other of the Purāṇas; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has not supported his opinion by producing such passages, it may be justly concluded that not one of the Purāṇas in any manner advocates "a Tāntrika modification of the Hindu religion." 

The more, therefore, that I consider the remarks contained in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Purāṇa, the more am I at a loss to understand how Professor Wilson could express such contradictory opinions. For he maintains, for instance, "that Brahmans unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Purāṇas, cannot reasonably be contested:" but he equally contends that the internal evidence of the Purāṇas furnishes decisive proof "of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Purāṇas." § On the contrary, it would, surely, be irrational to admit either, after Professor Wilson has proved—as he supposes,—that the works now bearing the name of Purāṇas are "an intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively

* This is hypercriticism. For the original terms referred to, see Vol. I., Preface, p. VII., note 1; also, Vol. III., p. 67, and p. 71, note; and supra, pp. 169 and 244. Professor Wilson's expansions, to be found in Vol. I., Preface, p. VII., are fully authorized. Colebrooke, in his edition of the Amara-kosa, p. 33, following the authority of scholiasts, defines a Purāṇa to be "theogony, comprising past and future events, under five heads: the creation; the destruction and renovation of worlds; genealogy of gods and heroes; the reigns of Manus; and the transactions of their descendants.”
modern ingredients,”* and that not one of those works conforms to the definition of a genuine Purāṇa. It becomes, therefore, requisite either to deny the antiquity and authenticity of the present Purāṇas, or to contest the assumption that the Brahmans have remodelled their sacred books—a supposition so totally improbable, that nothing but the most clear and incontrovertible proof could render it at all credible. Until, consequently, Professor Wilson produces such proof, it must appear most rational and reasonable to conclude that the Brahmans have never remodelled their sacred books (as no motive for their doing so can be conceived), and that the Purāṇas now extant, having been preserved in the same manner as other Sanskrit manuscripts of the same period, are, in all essential respects, precisely the same works which were current in India in the century prior to the Christian era.

Bombay, 29th Sept., 1840.

VANS KENNEDY.

Sir: Notwithstanding my two former letters, there are still one or two points on which I would wish to offer a few remarks, in order to complete my observations on Professor Wilson’s objections to the genuineness and antiquity of the Purāṇas, as now extant. For it will, I think, be admitted that this question is discussed in a very unsatisfactory manner in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishṇu Purāṇa; as that Preface contains merely the conclusions which Professor Wilson has drawn from certain circumstances that are represented solely according to the view which he has taken of them; and, thus, the reader is not afforded the means of judging whether this view is correct, or otherwise. But an inquirer into the real character of the mythology and religion of the Hindus would, no doubt, wish to know the grounds on which Professor Wilson states: “It is not possible to conjecture when this more simple and primitive form of adoration [of the Vedas] was succeeded by the worship of images and types, representing Brahmā, Vishṇu, Šiva, and other imaginary beings, constituting a mythological pantheon of most ample extent; or when Rāma and Kṛishṇa, who appear to have been, originally, real and historical characters, were elevated to the dignity of divinities.”* In that Preface, however,—and in all, I believe, that Professor Wilson has yet published respecting the Purāṇas,—the most questionable assertions are made in the most positive manner; but they remain unsupported by either argument or authority; and, consequently, not even the deference which is justly due to Professor Wilson, as an accomplished Sanskrit scholar, should preclude an examination of his opinions, or the rejection of such as are inconsistent in themselves, or contrary to probability and evidence.

It is particularly remarkable that, in that Preface, Professor Wilson has passed over a material fact,—the sacred character of the Purāṇas,—without a due consideration of which it is impossible to form a correct

* See Vol. I., Preface, p. XCI. Only Professor Wilson makes no such assertion. His words are quoted correctly in p. 295, ad calum, supra.

* Vol. I., Preface, p. IV.
judgment with respect to their age, and their scope and tendency. But it is undeniable that certain works named Puráñas have immemorially been held, by the Hindus, to be sacred books of divine origin, and, therefore, entitled to the greatest veneration. Even at the present day, those works are regarded with the same reverence, and are, in consequence, considered to be incommunicable to Śúdras, women, and barbarians:* and, on this account, a Brahman in my employment declined to read the Puráñas with me; while another Brahman, though he conversed with me on the subjects treated of in those works, and even gave me hints where to find particular passages, would not open the Puráña in which they were contained, in my presence, and show me the passages.† In judging, therefore, whether the Puráñas now extant have been preserved, to the present day, in precisely the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing, the sacred character of those books should, most assuredly, be taken into consideration, and not passed over as of no consequence; for this circumstance, alone, renders it, in the highest degree, improbable that the Brahmans would allow the Puráñas to be lost, and utterly incredible that they would suppress any one of those sacred books, and substitute, in its place, another work of the same name. On this incredible supposition, however, Professor Wilson’s opinion, that the present Puránas are modern compilations, entirely rests. But he has not attempted to explain the manner in which the replacing of the original Puráñas by new works was effected; and, consequently, his positive and unqualified statement, that the date of the earliest of the present Puránas is not prior to the ninth century, is a mere gratuitous assertion, which is not only contrary to probability, but which is even left unsupported by any proof whatever. But every principle of reasoning requires that, before the conclusion is drawn, the premisses of the argument should be, first, established; and, as, therefore, Professor Wilson has neither proved nor rendered probable the premisses from which he draws the startling and questionable conclusion, that the present Puráñas have no title to be regarded as genuine Puráñas, it must be evident that his opinion on this point must be considered to be totally groundless.

Another point essential to the proper discussion of this question is, the ascertaining what it is that should be held to constitute a genuine Puráña; although it might be supposed that no difference of opinion could exist respecting it: for, the Puráñas being sacred books, their contents should, of course, relate, principally, to the rites, ceremonies, offerings, prayers, and invocations with which the deities mentioned in them are to be worshipped, and to the legends and doctrines of the Hindu religion. Professor Wilson, on the contrary, has stated that “The earliest inquiries into the religion, chronology, and history of the Hindus ascertained that there existed a body of writings especially devoted to those subjects.... These were the Puráñas of Sanskrit literature.”

---

* A grosser error than this was never committed to paper.
† Colonel Kennedy's Brahmans must have been very peculiar.
But this statement is altogether erroneous; for not a single Purāna contains chronology and history, in the meaning usually given to these terms; and, in the description of a Purāna, given in that Analysis, are omitted that essential part of all the Purānas which treats of the mythology and religion of the Hindus, and that part which has induced Professor Wilson to pronounce that the Linga is more of a ritual than a Purāna. In his examination, therefore, of the Purānas, he has, avowedly, overlooked topics the due consideration of which is indispensable for the forming a correct opinion of their age, object, and tendency. But this will be best rendered evident by a few remarks on his Analysis of the Brahma Purāna, contained in No. IX. of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

In my last letter I was unavoidably led to observe that Professor Wilson had, evidently, examined the Purānas under the influence of preconceived opinion; and this Analysis completely confirms that remark: for, at its very commencement, he states that “the first verses of the Brahma Purāna”... “sufficiently declare its sectarian bias and indicate it to be a Vaishnava work.”* But, in his “Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus”,† of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. In this, it is also said that a genuine Purāna “should treat of the creation and renovation§ of the universe, the division of time, the institutes of law and religion, the genealogies of the patriarchal families, and the dynasties of kings.” But no other topics than these are mentioned.

§ General Kennedy omitted the words “and renovation”.

Professor Wilson admits that the preferential worship of Vishnū is perfectly orthodox; and, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnū Purāna, he states that one-third only of the Brahma Purāna is dedicated to Vishnū’s incarnation as Jagannātha. Consequently, it is evident that this Purāna is neither sectarian nor exclusively dedicated to the legend of Jagannātha. But this erroneous impression has, evidently, led him to affirm, as erroneously, (unless my copy of this Purāna differs from his), that “the first chapter of the Purāna describes the creation, which it attributes to Nārāyaṇa or Vishnū, as one with Brahmā or Iśwara.” For the only verse to which he can refer will bear no other meaning than this: “Comprehend, O venerable Munis, Brahmā, of boundless splendour, the creator of all beings, Nārāyaṇa, the all-pervading.”† But this error is of material importance; because, in this Purāna, Brahmā is represented as the Supreme Being; and, had it, therefore, been composed after the general worship of Brahmā had entirely ceased,—as it did in remote times,—and the preeminence (as at this day,) of either Vishnū or Śiva had been established, it seems altogether improbable that such a distinction would have been ascribed to Brahmā by any writer. The representing, consequently, Brahmā as the Supreme Being, in four of the Purānas,—the Brahma,
Vāyu, Kurma, and Brahmāṇḍa,—was a circumstance which, certainly, deserved particular attention; because it corresponds with the character in which Brahmattra is represented in several of the Upanishads and in the Institutes of Manu. When, therefore, a circumstance so indicatory of the antiquity of the Purāṇas is passed over by Professor Wilson, it must be evident that his conjectures respecting the dates when those works, as now extant, were compiled, are not entitled to the slightest consideration.

Professor Wilson also attaches no importance to the long account of the Sun and his worship, which is contained in the Brahma Purāṇa; although this, undoubtedly, indicates that it cannot be a modern composition. And a similar description of the worship of the Sun, contained in the Linga Purāṇa, is not even noticed by him, notwithstanding that it contains the Gāyatrī and, apparently, other verses of the Vedas. But it seems unquestionable that, if the Sun was ever an object of popular worship in remote antiquity, this worship had assumed a mysterious character at the time that the Vedas received their present form, and had become restricted to the Brahmans; for Mr. Ward has correctly observed that “the Brahmans consider Sūrya as one of the greatest of the gods; because, in glory, he resembles the one Brahma, who is called tejomaya, or ‘the glorious’. In the Vedas, also, this god is much noticed. The celebrated invocation called the Gāyatrī, and many of the forms of meditation, prayer, and praise, used in the daily ceremonies of the Brahmans, are addressed to him.”1 The descriptions, there-

fore, of a worship so ancient and so celebrated in the Vedas, contained in at least two of the Purāṇas,1 should not, surely, have been overlooked by Professor Wilson, when deciding upon the period when the present Purāṇas were compiled; for these descriptions clearly prove that those works must be ancient, and not modern, compositions.

In the same manner, Professor Wilson takes no notice of the identification, in the Brahma Purāṇa, of Brahmā, Vīshnu, Siva, and Sūrya with the Supreme Being; but, on the contrary, he contends that its main object is the promotion of the worship of Jagannātha. This conclusion, however, is directly contradicted by the contents of that Purāṇa; because it appears, from them, that the legend of Jagannātha occupies one-third only of the work, and that, in it, preeminence is not attributed exclusively to Vīshnu. It is, hence, evident that the view taken by Professor Wilson of the object and tendency of the Purāṇas cannot possibly be correct; since he, thus, discovers a sectarian bias in a Purāṇa which so clearly illustrates that predominant principle of the Hindu religion which inculcates that the preferential worship of particular deities is equally meritorious; for it is, in fact, the worship of the Supreme Being under those forms. But Professor Wilson is not content with pronouncing that the Brahma Purāṇa is a Vaishnava work; for he, at the same time, states that it “is referred to the Śākta class, in

---

which the worship of Śakti, the personified female principle, is more particularly inculcated."* It is not for me to explain how any composition can be both a Vaishnava and a Tāntrika work; but the assumption that there is a class of Purāṇas denominated Sākta is totally unfounded. The division of the Purāṇas into three classes is mentioned in the Padma Purāṇa alone; and all that is said, in it, is, that such and such Purāṇas—naming them—are included in the Sāttwika, Rājasā, or Tāmāsa class.† Nothing, therefore, contained in the Padma Purāṇa in the least authorizes the remark just quoted; and in not one of the Purāṇas is Devī ever represented under the same character as the Śakti of the Tāntrika sect. It, hence, unquestionably appears that Professor Wilson has completely mistaken the object and tendency of the very Purāṇa which he professes to have carefully analysed; and it must, therefore, follow that indices and abstracts of the Purāṇas will never enable any person to form, himself, or to communicate to others, "a correct notion of the substance and character of these works."‡

Professor Wilson, however, hesitates not to pronounce that "It is, nevertheless, obvious that such a Brahma Purāṇa as has been here described cannot have any pretension to be considered as an ancient work, as the earliest of the Purāṇas, or even as a Purāṇa at all."* He, thus, first gives a completely erroneous account of the real nature of the contents of this Purāṇa, and then concludes that it is not even a Purāṇa at all! The question, also, recurs: What is a Purāṇa? Professor Wilson contends that it is a work which "should treat" only "of the creation and renovation of the universe, the division of time, the institutes of law and religion, the genealogies of the patriarchal families, and the dynasties of kings:" but the Sanskrit authority to which he refers, and which occurs at the commencement of several of the Purāṇas, says, merely, "creation, repeated creation, families, manvantaras, and what accompanies families."† From such a definition as this it is obvious that no opinion can be formed with respect to the subjects which should, alone, be treated of in a Purāṇa; and yet Professor Wilson's objections to the genuineness of the Purāṇas, as now extant, rests principally on their non-conformity to this unintelligible definition. For this appears to be the only reason that has led him to pronounce that the Brahma is not even a Purāṇa at all; because "the greater portion of the work belongs to the class of Māhātmyas,†—

---


† There is no class of Māhātmyas; but passages, bearing that name, the authenticity of which cannot be contested,—as, for instance, the Devī Māhātmya; in the Mārkaṇḍeyā Purāṇa,—have been extracted from the Purāṇas, and circulated as distinct works; and there seems to be no doubt that, in later times, works have been written in imitation of the authentic Māhātmyas; but their

† Vide supra, p. 293, note 2, and p. 300, note 1.
‡ It would be curious to know why the Colonel excepted it.
legendary and local descriptions of the greatness or holiness of particular temples, or individual divinities."* But, as usual, he does not explain why the description of a particular temple, or an individual divinity, should be considered as incompatible with the ancient and original composition of the Purāṇas in which it is contained. He merely assumes that the temple of Kanārka, mentioned in this Purāṇa, is the same as the Black Pagoda, built A.D. 1241, and that the temple of Jagannātha of the Purāṇa is the same as that which was built in A.D. 1198; and hence concludes that the Brahma Purāṇa was written in the course of the thirteenth or fourteenth century.† But he adduces neither argument nor proof in support of this assumption; although, in order to warrant it, it was indispensable to prove that no temple of Kanārka or Jagannātha ever existed in the same situations until the present temples were erected. For it may be equally assumed that the temples mentioned in this Purāṇa were built, and had attained celebrity, several centuries prior to the Christian era: and in what manner is this assumption to be disproved? The history of India during the centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era is almost unknown; and consequently, there are, now, no means available for determining the dates when the temples were erected, when the places of pilgrimage acquired holiness, when spuriousness can always be detected by their not being to be found in the Purāṇas; to which they are ascribed.

* Professor Wilson’s collected Works, Vol. III., p. 17. † Ibid., p. 18.

‡ And the Māhāmyas therein found are, in all likelihood, later than their contexts.

the kings and distinguished personages lived,* or when the events occurred which are mentioned in the Purāṇas. To all these works this remark of Professor Wilson applies: “The Vishnū Purāṇa has kept very clear of particulars from which an approximation to its date may be conjectured.”† For, as far as I have observed, not one of the Purāṇas contains a single circumstance from which it would be possible to determine even the period when it may have been composed. The mere supposition, therefore, that the temples mentioned in the Brahma Purāṇa are the same as those built in A.D. 1198 and 1241 cannot be admitted as a sufficient ground for deciding that that Purāṇa is of modern date; for there is nothing improbable in concluding that other temples of the same names, and in the same situations, may have existed long before those erected in modern times were in existence.

The only reason, also, that can have led Professor Wilson to suppose that descriptions of temples and places of pilgrimage should not be contained in the Purāṇas, is the above-mentioned definition; as it, certainly, does not include such a topic. But it is highly probable that pilgrimages to sacred places, and the visiting of temples, was practised, in remote times, by the Hindus, as they are practised by them at the present day; and no subject, therefore, could be more adapted to such a sacred book as a Purāṇa, than de-

* Inscriptions have brought us acquainted with not a few facts tending to fix the age of later Purāṇik celebrities. And, inscriptions apart, could Colonel Kennedy doubt our knowing the age of Chandragupta?
† Vol. I., Preface, p. CXI.
scriptions of those celebrated places and temples a
pilgrimage to which was deemed to be a pious and
meritorious act.* The legends, also, relating to temples
and places of pilgrimage, which occur in the Purānas,
are of precisely the same kind as those which have
found a place in all religions, and cannot, consequently,
be considered, in themselves, to be any proof against
the antiquity of the Purāna in which they are con­
tained. Many of those places of pilgrimage are not
frequented at the present day, and some of them can­
not, now, be even ascertained; which circumstances
must render it highly probable that they are of a re­
 mote period, and that they would not have been men­
tioned in a particular Purāna, had they not been held
in reverence at the time when it was composed. I ad­
mit that this is an unsatisfactory mode of arguing; but,
in this instance, to supposition supposition can alone
be opposed; for, as I have just observed, the internal
evidence of the Purānas affords no means of deter­
mining the date of any circumstance mentioned in
them.

In his Analysis, therefore, of the Brahma Purāna,
Professor Wilson has, evidently, not only omitted cir­
cumstances which are essential to the forming a cor­
rect judgment of its object and tendency, but he has,
also, under the obvious influence of preconceived
opinion, found, in it, that which it does not contain,
and attached an undue importance to an unintelligible
definition, and to one-third only of the work, without
taking the other two-thirds into his consideration.

* Temples and pilgrimages were not Hindu institutions “in remote
times.”
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But nothing can more clearly evince the disposition
of mind, and the attention with which Professor Wilson
has examined the Purānas, than this elaborate passage,
contained in p. LIX. of the Preface to his Translation
of the Vishnū Purāna: “A considerable portion [of
the Agni Purāna] is then appropriated to instructions
for the performance of religious ceremonies, many of
which belong to the Tāntrika ritual, and are, ap­
parently, transcribed from the principal authorities of
that system. Some belong to mystical forms of Śāiva
worship, little known in Hindusthán, though, perhaps,
still practised in the south. One of these is the Dīkshā,
or initiation of a novice; by which, with numerous
ceremonies and invocations, in which the mysterious
monosyllables of the Tantras are constantly repeated,
the disciple is transformed into a living personation
of Śiva, and receives, in that capacity, the homage
of his Guru.” For, throughout this passage, some one
or other of the names of Vishnū continually occurs; and
it is evident, therefore, that the passage relates to
Vishnū, and not to Śiva. In regard, also to the dikṣā,
these verses, contained in the 27th Chapter, will be
sufficient to prove that this initiation is in the name
of Vishnū, and not of Śiva: “Having propitiated Fire,
sacrifice to Vishnū; and, then, having called the nov­
ces, initiate them standing near.”† This dikṣā is

1 Nothing contained in the passage of the Agni Purāna here
referred to in any manner authorizes the words which I have
placed in italics. Mysterious monosyllables, also, are perfectly
orthodox; for they occur in the Upanishads.

2 मष्ठित्रेष्ठ वजस्यदशामण्डनं संततिः पावनम।
ऋष्येति दीपेषक्ष्याश्चिमुपवासनसःः॥
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also mentioned in the Garuḍa Purāṇa, in which it is equally said that the initiation is in the name of Hari or Vishnū; and not one of the prayers and invocations contained in those two passages is taken from the Tāntrika ritual. It is, indeed, surprising that, after having written the accurate account of the Saktas sect, contained in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," Professor Wilson should state that the Garuḍa Purāṇa contains prayers from the Tāntrika ritual, addressed to the Sun, Śiva, and Vishnū; for he must be well aware that the Tāntrika sect do not worship either Vishnū or the Sun. 

As, however, Professor Wilson has, in that Sketch, confined himself principally to the description of its distinguishing characteristics, — the kumārī-pūjā, or worship of the virgin,— I add these remarks of Mr. Ward, in order to evince how totally impossible it must be to find such doctrines in the Purāṇas: "The Tantras either set aside all these ceremonies [of the Vedas], or prescribe them in other forms." The Tāntrika prayers, even for the same ceremony, differ from those of the Veda; and, in certain cases, they dispense with all ceremonies; assuring men that it is sufficient for a person to receive the initiatory incantation from his religious guide, to repeat the name of his guardian deity, and to serve his teacher. They actually forbid the person called pūrṇābhishiktā to follow the rules of the Veda."1

In that Preface,* also, Professor Wilson observes: "Colonel Vans Kennedy, however, objects to the application of the term Sakti to this last division of the Purāṇas [the Rājasa]; the worship of Śakti being the especial object of a different class of works, the Tantras; and no such form of worship being particularly inculcated in the Brahma Purāṇa. This last argument is of weight in regard to the particular instance specified; and the designation of Śakti may not be correctly applicable to the whole class, although it is to some of the series: for there is no incompatibility in the advocacy of a Tāntrika modification of the Hindu religion by any Purāṇa." Professor Wilson is, thus, obliged to admit that he had completely mistaken the tendency of a Purāṇa which he had analysed; and yet he not only adheres to his opinion, that some of the Purāṇas belong to his imaginary Saktas class, but he has even advanced, in that Preface,† these extraordinary assertions: "The term Rājasa, implying the animation of passion, and enjoyment of sensual delights, is appli-

---

1 I, of course, except this passage: "The adoration of Prakṛti or Śakti is, to a certain extent, authorized by the Purāṇas, particularly the Brahma Vaivarta, the Skanda, and the Kālikā:* the erroneousness of which I have, perhaps, demonstrated in these letters. I am, indeed, strongly inclined to suspect that Professor Wilson's employment of indices and abstracts for the examination of the Purāṇas has often led him to conclude that the term Śakti, which occurs so frequently in those works, denoted Devī in her character of Śakti, as worshipped by the Śaktas. But, in the Purāṇas, this term means power and energy in general; and, when it does not, it invariably denotes the energy of the Supreme Being, or Māyā, or the impersonified energies of the three principal gods.


† P. XXII.
cable not only to the character of the youthful divinity [Krishna], but to those with whom his adoration in these forms seems to have originated,—the Gosains of Gokul and Bengal, the followers and descendants of Vallabha and Chaitanya, the priests and proprietors of Jagannath and Srinathdwar, who lead a life of affluence and indulgence, and vindicate, both by precept and practice, the reasonableness of the Rajsasya property, and the congruity of temporal enjoyment with the duties of religion." All this, however, is not only totally erroneous, but it rests entirely on certain fanciful inferences which Professor Wilson has drawn from the meaning of the term Rajsasya; which is, certainly, a most singular mode of reasoning. He is, here, also in direct contradiction with himself; for, in one part of the paragraph from which this quotation is taken, he says that the Rajsasya Puranas "lean to the Saktas division of the Hindus, the worshippers of Sakti, or the female principle;" and, in conclusion, he speaks of persons vindicating "the reasonableness of the Rajsasya property, and the congruity of temporal enjoyment with the duties of religion." But Professor Wilson attempts not to explain how it can be possible that the same class of Puranas should inculcate the peculiar worship of both Krishña and Sakti; nor what the leading a life of affluence and indulgence has to do with worshipping the yoni of a naked virgin; nor what resemblance there can be between the scandalous and abominable orgies of the Saktas, and the calm though sensual enjoyment of life by the votaries of Krishña, as above described. Nothing, indeed, can be more dissimilar than the worship of the juvenile Krishña and that of Sakti; and, when, therefore, Professor Wilson is of opinion that, in some of the Puranas, both of these dissimilar worships are peculiarly enjoined, it must be evident that he has as much mistaken the object and tendency of the Brahmāṇḍa, the Brahma Vaivarta, the Mārkandeya, the Bhavishya, and Vāmana Purāṇas, as he admits he was mistaken in placing the Brahma Purāṇa in the Śaktas class. I have also remarked, above, that this division of the Puranas into three classes is mentioned in the Padma Purāṇa alone; and that this Purāṇa does not explain the reason why a particular Purāṇa is assigned to a particular class. But, admitting this classification, it appears clearly, from it, that the Purāṇas relating to Śiva are placed in the Tāmasa class; and, consequently, as Tāntrika works are dedicated to Śiva and Devi, if the Rajsasya class of Puranas inculcate Tāntrika doctrines,—as Professor Wilson supposes,—they ought, according to the principle of classification in the Padma Purāṇa, to have been included in the Tāmasa, and not in the Rajsasya, class. The writer, however, of that Purāṇa has not so classed them; and, thus, all the reasoning which Professor Wilson has founded on the meaning of the term Rajsasya is refuted by the very authority that he has adduced in support of it.

It is, at the same time, obvious that all the arguments adduced by Professor Wilson against the genuineness of the Purāṇas, as now extant, presuppose that descriptions of rites and ceremonies, injunctions for the preferential worship of particular deities, legends, tenets and doctrines, and moral and religious instruction should not find a place in a genuine Purāṇa; for
he takes no notice of those parts of the present Purāṇas which relate to these subjects, and, thus, rejects at least two-thirds of the whole of the eighteen Purāṇas now extant, as being spurious and modern. But it is evident that it is only from a due consideration of these subjects, and a careful comparison of what is said, respecting them, in one Purāṇa, with what is said in the other Purāṇas, that a correct opinion can possibly be formed with respect to whether those works exhibit one uniform religious system, or whether they indicate that heterodox doctrines have been introduced into them; for, if an undeniable uniformity exists—as I have no doubt it does—in an aggregate of 1,600,000 lines, in the general description of rites, ceremonies, legends, and doctrines, no stronger internal evidence is, surely, requisite, to prove that the present Purāṇas cannot be, as Professor Wilson supposes, an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients.† Professor Wilson also avows that he has not read the Purāṇas, and that the notices which he has given of their contents must have been taken from indices and abstracts, the accuracy of which I have never questioned. ¹ But I am convinced that

¹ In his Analysis of the Brahma Purāṇa, Professor Wilson has observed* that the manner in which he effected his examination of the Purāṇas has been misconceived; and he may, possibly, refer to a letter which I addressed to you, and which appeared in the number of your Journal of March, 1837. In that letter I remarked, in a note: "Was any precaution adopted in order to ascertain that all the chapters of each Purāṇa, or even all the subjects treated of, in it, were actually included in it?

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
Sir: I proceed—with reluctance, however,—to consider another of Professor Wilson's arguments, in which he infers that the present Puráñas must be modern compilations, because the Jaina sect is mentioned in them. But, in my last letter;† I have shown that, had Professor Wilson read the chapter of the Kurma Purána from which he has made a mutilated quotation, he would have observed, from the context, that the term Šr̥hata, contained in it, could not possibly apply to Jina; and, in the passage which he quotes from the Bhágavata;t there is neither proof nor probability that Šr̥hata means either Jina or the Jaina sect.§ It is, also, expressly said, in the Vishnu Purána, Vol. III., p. 209, the Buddhists were called Árhatas, from the phrase he (Buddha,) had employed, of 'Ye are worthy (Arhatha) of this great doctrine.'” It is singular, there-

Therefore, that Professor Wilson should assume, in direct opposition to the authority of the Puráña which he has, himself, translated, that the term Árhatas, when it occurs, as a proper name, in the Puráñas, should be considered to apply to Jina, and not to Buddha. But it has been sufficiently proved that Buddha lived in the sixth century B.C.; and no argument, therefore, could be founded upon the mention of his name in the Puráñas, to prove that not one of the works now extant under the name of Puráñas was written prior to the year 900 A.D.; and, on that account, Professor Wilson has—too evidently, for the support of his opinion,—transferred the term Árhatas from Buddha (to whom, alone, it is applied, in the Puráñas,) to Jina. Professor Wilson, therefore, has not yet proved that the Jaina sect is mentioned in the Puráñas.† But the Buddhists are frequently mentioned in those works; and it is, therefore, a strange mode of reasoning, to infer that anything contained in the Puráñas relates to Jina, when it may apply, with so much more probability, to Vishnu's incarnation, Buddha, from whom the Buddhists, according to the Puráñas, originated.

The preceding remarks, and those contained in my former letters, will evince that Professor Wilson's examination of the Puráñas has been much too incomplete, and that the conclusions which he has drawn from it are much too erroneous to authorize him to state so positively: “That Brahmans unknown to fame have remodelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and, especially, the Puráñas, cannot reasonably be con-

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXVI. and LXVII.
† The Colonel should have written “my last letter but one”. Vide supra, pp. 286, 287.
‡ Vol. II., p. 104, note 1. Arhat, a proper name, occurs there.
§ Arhata, according to circumstances, may denote either a follower of Buddha or a follower of Jina.
|| Vide infra, p. 348, text and note 1, for a lame apology for this interpolation.
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tested,"
and that "It is possible... that there may have been an earlier class of Puráṇas, of which those we now have are but the partial and adulterated representatives."

† This opinion has been maintained by Lieut. Col. Wilford and Mr. Bentley, and, in some measure, countenanced by Mr. Colebrooke; but it still remains unsupported by any proof whatever. Professor Wilson argues thus: In the vocabulary of Amara Siṁha, written 56 B.C., it is said that a Purána is "a treatise on five topics," and, in several of the Puráṇas, it is, further, explained what these five topics are: but not one of the Puráṇas now extant conforms to that definition: therefore, the present Puráṇas cannot be the works which were current, under that name, in the time of Amara Siṁha. This conclusion is, further, supported by his affirming only, but not proving, that the present Puráṇas inculcate the doctrines of sects of known modern origin, and that "circumstances are sometimes mentioned, or alluded to, [in the Puráṇas], or references to authorities are made, or legends are narrated, or places are particularized, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable":

Such is the state of the question. On the first two of these points I have, perhaps, already said more than sufficient; and the only point, therefore, which re-

1 This "it is possible" is singular; for much of Professor Wilson's reasoning depends on the fact, that the original Puráṇas were current in the time of Amara Siṁha.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. XC VIII., XCIX.
† Ibid., p. VI.
‡ Ibid., p. XI.

,... remains to be considered is, whether there is any internal evidence, contained in the Puráṇas now extant, which proves that each and all of those works are modern compilations. I cannot place so much reliance on my own examination of the Puráṇas, as to affirm that there is not; but no passages containing such internal evidence have been yet produced; and, were even passages bearing a modern appearance produced, the dates of the circumstances mentioned in them could not be determined. For the Puráṇas contain no dates; and there exists not any biographical, toponographical, chronological, or historical work which would afford the means of fixing the date when, in India, a place of pilgrimage first acquired sacredness, when a temple was first erected, when a distinguished character lived, when a king reigned, or when an ancient sect, philosophical or religious, was founded, or when it became extinct. All the circumstances and events mentioned in the Puráṇas, from which an inference with respect to their date might be drawn, are of precisely the same kind as the temples in Orissa, from the mention of which, in the Brahma Puráṇa, Professor Wilson infers the modern date of that work; for it is not only necessary to prove that those temples were built in modern times, but it must be, further, proved that, previous to their erection, no temples ever existed, in India, of the same names, and in the same situations. In the quotation, also, from the Kúrma Puráṇa, contained in my second letter,† is mentioned a Váma Śástra; and there is, at this day, a sect

* Vide supra, p. 313, note •.
† Vide supra, pp. 286, 287.
named Vāma Yamāchārin; but, as the Purāṇa gives no description of the Vāma Sāstra, on what grounds can it be reasonably supposed that this is, actually, the same as the Tantras of the left-handed sect of the Sāktas? In all such cases, it is evident that coincidence merely in name is no proof that the name must necessarily apply to the modern temple or sect; and, consequently, its applicability must be proved, before a mere name can be admitted as any proof that the Purāṇas are modern compilations. It is equally evident that, as the Purāṇas contain no dates, and as there are no books to refer to for an illustration of their contents, so far is the recent date of any particular circumstance mentioned in them from being indisputable, that, on the contrary, every adaptation of an occurrence or event, mentioned in the Purāṇas, to a date must depend solely and entirely on conjecture.

No circumstances, therefore, are mentioned in the Purāṇas, the precise or even approximate date of which can be indisputably fixed, or even fixed at all; and it must, hence, follow that those works do not contain any internal evidence which proves their recent composition.*

Professor Wilson's supposition, however, that the Purāṇas have been remodelled by the Brahmans, rests entirely on the further supposition, that circumstances are mentioned, in those works, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable. But I have examined in vain the remarks contained in the Preface to the Translation of the Vishṇu Purāṇa, in order to ascertain what the precise opinion is which Professor Wilson means to express with respect to the genuineness and antiquity of the Purāṇas, as now extant. He maintains that the whole of the Bhāgavata was written by Bopađeva; that the compilation of the Vāmana "may have amused the leisure of some Brahman of Benares"; that the Agni and Brahma Vaivarta have no claims to be regarded as Purāṇas; and that the Linga "is more a ritual than a Purāṇa":* and he, thus, gives approximate dates to nine of the Purāṇas, the dates of the other nine being nearer to, or remoter from, the earliest date mentioned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purāṇa</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mārkaṇḍeya</td>
<td>9th or 10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linga</td>
<td>9th or 10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishṇu</td>
<td>11th or 12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padma 1</td>
<td>12th — 16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vārāha</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgavata</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahma</td>
<td>13th or 14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmana</td>
<td>14th or 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāradaīya</td>
<td>16th or 17th†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But, although Professor Wilson thus expressly ascribes the original composition of two of the Purāṇas to two individuals, and seems to intimate that several of the other Purāṇas were composed in the same manner, he

* That the Purāṇas are not ancient is evident from their very Sanskrit. How, too, as regards their prophetic parts?

† Professor Wilson remarks that the different portions of this Purāṇa "are, in all probability, as many different works"; and the above dates, therefore, apply to different portions of the whole work.

* Vol. I., Preface, pp. L., LXXVI., LX, LXVII., LXIX.
† Ibid., pp. LVIII., LXX., CXL., XXXIV., LXXI., LI., XXIX., LXXVI., LIII.
yet seems to suppose that the groundwork of the present Puráñas was the eighteen ancient Puráñas; for he speaks of “the strong internal evidence, which all of them afford, of the intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients.” He even remarks that “the identity of the legends in many of them [the Puráñas], and, still more, the identity of the words,—for, in several of them, long passages are, literally, the same,—is a sufficient proof that... they must be copied either from some other similar work, or from a common and prior original.”: To argue against such inconsistencies and contradictions is quite out of the question; but it is evident that, if the composition and compilation of the present Puráñas by eighteen different persons occupied eight centuries, those works could not also have been remodelled by the Brahmans, for sectarian purposes; and that, if their groundwork was the ancient Puráñas, not one of them could be the original composition of a modern writer; and that, if such was not their groundwork, it is utterly incredible that eighteen different persons, living at long intervals of time from each other, and while the Muhammadans were extending their dominions over the greatest part of India, should produce eighteen works in which the legends are identical, and long passages are, literally, the same. The supposition, also, that an aggregate of 1,600,000 lines, spread over an extent of a million of square miles, should have been remodelled, whether by the Brahmans or any

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.

† This is, I believe, greatly an overstatement. It is a rare thing, at least in my experience, to find even a single couplet precisely the same in any two Puráñas. See Vol. I., p. 57, note *.  

‡ Vol. I., Preface, p. VI.

other persons, on one uniform plan, seems to be an absolute impossibility; and the motive assigned for such remodelling,—sectarial imposture,—is at once disproved by the simple facts, that not one of the Puráñas inculcates sectarian doctrines, and that the exclusive worshippers of Vishnu, or of Siva, or of any other deity, have always formed, in India, but a small portion of the whole population.

There is, however, a difficulty which embarrasses the decision of this question; for, not only in several of the Puráñas are the names of all the eighteen specified, but, in most of them, the narrator is requested to repeat the Puráña about to be related, expressly by name. Professor Wilson, therefore, correctly remarks that “the identity of the legends in many of them [the Puráñas], and, still more, the identity of the words,—for, in several of them, long passages are, literally, the same,—is a sufficient proof that, in such cases, they must be copied either from some other similar work, or from a common and prior original.” The internal evidence, however, of the Puráñas fully proves that they have not been copied from each other; and this identity, therefore, must have been derived from one common original. But there is nothing improbable in supposing that, previous to the Puráñas being committed to writing in their present state, four or five centuries prior to the Christian era, numerous legends and traditions relating to the modes of worship and the doctrines of the Hindu religion had, in remote times, been formed, preserved, and transmitted by oral communication only. When, therefore, eighteen different per-

1 Such is the manner in which instruction is communicated
sons, in different parts of India, collected together those legends and traditions, and committed them to writing, the greatest similarity would, necessarily, exist in the eighteen works, and the same legend and tradition would often be selected for insertion, and, consequently, often expressed in the same, or nearly the same, words. The existence, therefore, of "a common and prior original", so far from being an argument against the genuineness and antiquity of the present Purāṇas, should, on the contrary, be considered as a decisive proof that those works are, essentially, in the same state as that in which they were first committed to writing. Because, in their present state, each of the Purāṇas is a collection of legends, traditions, and rituals, and not a work systematically written; and it must, hence, be evident that such collections could have been made only at a time when such traditionary lore was fresh in the memory of the Brahmans. The present state, therefore, of the Purāṇas now extant, in which the most important legends, and even the origin of the deities, are related in a discordant manner,—though not in such a manner as in the least affects the perfect homogeneity of the Hindu religion,—is, alone, a strong proof that those works have undergone no alteration since they were first committed to writing; for, as those discordancies have been allowed to remain, it is most probable that religious scruples have prevented the Brahmans from subsequently giving uniformity to their religious system.

But, to the supposition, that the present Purāṇas are modern compilations, written between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, the existence of "a common and prior original" becomes an insuperable objection; for it is highly improbable that such legends and traditions as are contained in the Purāṇas were then current; and, even admitting that they were, it is quite incredible that, in the disturbed state of India, and decay of Sanskrit learning, during that period, eighteen different persons should produce eighteen works in which not only the legends are identical, but long passages literally the same. It may, however, be said that the eighteen ancient Purāṇas were then extant, or, at least, that fragments of them were still preserved. I shall not here repeat what I have already said respecting the incredibility of the suppositions that the Brahmans have suppressed the ancient Purāṇas, and substituted, in their place, the works now bearing that name, or that the Brahmans of all India have received, in the place of the ancient Purāṇas, the acknowledged works of eighteen obscure individuals. On this point, also, it is impossible to ascertain what the opinion of Professor Wilson is: for, in one part of that Preface, he appears to admit, distinctly, that each of the ancient Purāṇas was extant until it was superseded by the present Purāṇa; but, in other parts, he has argued at length, to prove that the present Purā-
ñas cannot be the same works which were current in the time of Amara Śiṅha. Since, therefore, Professor Wilson has, thus, adopted two contradictory suppositions, in order to account for what he supposes to be the spuriousness of the present Puráñas, it must be evident that he has completely failed in proving that the present Puráñas are not genuine. But the levity and irreflection with which Professor Wilson has decided against the genuineness and antiquity of those works will be best judged of from these remarks: “No weight can be attached to the specification of the eighteen names; for they are, always, complete: each Puráña enumerates all. Which is the last? Which had the opportunity of naming its seventeen predecessors, and adding itself? The argument proves too much. There can be little doubt that the list has been inserted, upon the authority of tradition, either by some improving transcriber, or by the compiler of a work more recent than the eighteen genuine Puráñas.”¹

Professor Wilson extends the compilation of the present Puráñas over eight centuries; and, therefore, in order to get rid of the objection to this supposition, which results from each Puráña containing the names of all the eighteen, he thinks it quite sufficient to observe that this specification has been inserted by some improving transcriber,—he must mean, of course, after the last of the present Puráñas was written, that is, after the seventeenth century. Thus, supposition is supported by supposition; and, thus, all Professor Wilson’s reasoning, to prove that the present Puráñas are modern compilations, depends entirely on gratuitous assumptions and groundless assertions.

Whether, however, complete works, bearing the same names, existed previous to the present Puráñas being committed to writing, is a question which admits not of decision. That the names of all the eighteen Puráñas were previously known seems unquestionable;* and it would, therefore, appear most probable that these names had belonged to works which had preceded the present Puráñas. But the internal evidence of the present Puráñas proves that they are, rather, collections of legends, traditions, and rituals, than works systematically written; for they are entirely deficient in arrangement, and the subjects treated of in them have

Śiṅha are now extant; but he has not attempted to explain how long it was that they continued current after that time, nor the time and manner in which they subsequently became extinct; and yet, in discussing a point relating to the present Puráñas, he seems to speak of them as if they were the genuine Puráñas. To elicit, therefore, either meaning or consistency out of such remarks is, evidently, quite impossible.

---

¹ Professor Wilson observes that the objection to the modern composition of the Śrī Bhāgavata is rebutted by there being another Puráña to which the name applies,—the Devi Bhāgavata. But all his remarks on this point are entirely misplaced and unnecessary; because the mere perusal of the Devi Bhāgavata † will at once show that it is, decidedly and avowedly, a Tántrika work: for, in the 26th chapter of the 3rd skandha, is contained a description of the Kumāri-puja, or worship of the virgin. I possess a copy of this work, in twelve skandhas, which appears to be complete.

What, also, does Professor Wilson here mean by genuine Puráñas? He denies that the Puráñas current in the time of Amara

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XLV. † Ibid., p. LXXXVIII., note †.
no further connexion with each other than that they all contribute to inculcate and illustrate some of the tenets and doctrines of the Hindu religion. It is possible, however, that more ancient Puráñas may have existed, which, from various circumstances during their transmission by oral communication only, were no longer in a complete state, when the present Puráñas were committed to writing; and that such fragments of them as were at that time preserved have been incorporated in the present Puráñas, to which, also, the names of the ancient works have been given. But the decision of this question is of no importance; because it is proved that works bearing the names of the Puráñas were current in India in the century prior to the Christian era;* and there is not the slightest reason for supposing that those works have not been preserved until the present day, in the same manner as other Sanskrit manuscripts of the same period have been preserved. From the notices, also, which occur in Greek writers, it appears highly probable that the very same system of religion which is described in the Puráñas prevailed in India at the time of Alexander's invasion; and it may, therefore, be justly concluded that the Puráñas had received their present form four or five centuries prior to the Christian era.†

Even Professor Wilson remarks: "But the same internal testimony furnishes proof, equally decisive, of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or authenticity of the greater portion of the contents of the Puráñas, in the face of abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era."* But it must be evident that these remarks are totally irreconcilable with what Professor Wilson elsewhere observes: "At the same time, they [the Puráñas,] may be acquitted of subservience to any but sectarian imposture. They were pious frauds for temporary purposes."†

It, hence, clearly appears that, in contending for the modern compilation of the present Puráñas, Professor Wilson was influenced by a preconceived opinion, the erroneousness of which he would not admit; but that, in thus forcibly maintaining the antiquity of the greater portion of the contents of those works, he was irresistibly compelled to yield to the convincing proof, which their internal evidence presents, of the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráñas, as now extant. I have, also, sufficiently shown, in these letters, that the present Puráñas do neither inculcate sectarian doctrines nor indicate, in any manner, that they are an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients; but that, on the contrary, they exhibit, throughout an aggregate of 1,600,000 lines, the utmost uniformity in the general description of legends, traditions, modes of worship, and doctrines. It must, consequently, be most reasonable to conclude that the Puráñas now extant received their present form four or five centuries prior to the Christian era, and that, since then,

* This has never been proved. † As to their predictions and all.

* Vol. i., Preface, p. XCIX. † Ibid., p. XI. ; One is at a loss to see where all this has been shown.
they have undergone no alteration whatever; rather than that they are works which, for the purpose of sectarial imposture, either have been remodelled by the Brahmans since the Christian era, or which have been written by eighteen obscure individuals, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries.

Bombay, 30th October, 1840.

Vans Kennedy.

Sir: As the eighteen Puráñas are, undoubtedly, the only source from which a knowledge of the mythology and popular religion of the Hindus can be derived, it becomes of importance to determine whether those works are ancient compositions, or mere modern compilations; and I trust, in consequence, that you will have no objection to my offering a few further remarks on this subject, previous to closing its discussion. In my last letter, however, I observed that the Puráñas contain no dates, and that there is no biographical, topographical, geographical, or historical work which would afford the means of fixing the date when, in India, a place of pilgrimage first acquired sacredness, when a temple was first erected, when a king or distinguished personage lived,* or when a philosophical or religious sect was founded, or when it became extinct. It would, hence, seem that, as the date of the circumstances mentioned in the Puráñas cannot be determined, the question whether they are ancient or modern cannot be decided; as all opinions respecting the period when they may have been written must depend, principally, if not entirely, on conjecture. But the internal evidence of those works affords the strongest proof that they cannot be modern compilations; for the legends, and descriptions of scenery, and of men and manners, contained in them, bear such an unquestionable impression of antiquity, and such a dissimilarity to all that is known of India since the era of Vikramáditya (B.C. 56),* that they irresistibly lead to the conclusion that the Puráñas must have been written at some remote period. When, therefore, the Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford published his opinion, that the works now bearing that name were compiled between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, it might have been expected that he would have supported so startling a statement by the clearest and most conclusive arguments and authorities. But he has, on the contrary,—as I have, perhaps sufficiently shown,—formed that opinion from an imperfect examination of the Puráñas, and maintained it solely by having recourse to gratuitous assumptions and groundless assertions.

The whole, indeed, of the remarks contained in the Preface to the Translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa appear to have been written for the purpose of demonstrating that, “of the present popular forms of the Hindu religion, none assumed their actual state earlier than the time of Śankara Æchárya, the great Śaiva

* Vide supra, p. 313, note *.
reformer, who, flourished, in all likelihood, in the eighth or ninth century. Of the Vaishnava teachers, Rámánuja dates in the twelfth century; Madhwáchárya, in the thirteenth; and Vallabha, in the sixteenth; and the Puráñas seem to have accompanied, or followed, their innovations; being obviously intended to advocate the doctrines they taught."* A still more erroneous opinion was published by Professor Wilson, twelve years before, in his "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus," in which he has observed: "To the internal incongruities of the system, which did not affect its integral existence, others were, in time, superadded, that threatened to dissolve or destroy the whole. Of this nature was the exclusive adoration of the old deities, or of new forms of them; and even, it may be presumed, the introduction of new divinities. In all these respects, the Puráñas and Tantras were especially instrumental; and they not only taught their followers to assert the unapproachable superiority of the gods they worshipped, but inspired them with feelings of animosity towards those who presumed to dispute that supremacy. In this conflict, the worship of Brahmá has disappeared, as well as, indeed, that of the whole pantheon, except Vishnú, Śiva, and Śakti, or their modifications. With respect to the two former, in fact, the representatives have borne away the palm from the prototypes; and Kriṣhna, Ráma, or the Linga, are almost the only forms under which Vishnú and Śiva are now adored in most parts of\+ India."; In this Sketch, however, Professor Wilson at the same time observes that "the worshippers of Vishnú, Śiva, and Śakti, who are the objects of the following description, are not to be confounded with the orthodox adorers of those divinities."* And yet he also states that the present state of the Hindu faith is of, comparatively, very recent origin.† It would, hence, appear that Professor Wilson has formed his opinion of the Hindu religion from the exception, and not from the rule, and that he has given an importance to the sects that have originated amongst upwards of a hundred and thirty millions of people, to which they are not entitled. For it would, no doubt, be considered as a strange mode of judging of the established religion of England, were an opinion to be formed of it from the sects which prevail there: but such seems to have been the manner in which Professor Wilson has contemplated the Hindu religion; and it is too evident that it is in support of this erroneous view of the subject that he has ascribed to the Puráñas a modern origin, and contents which they do not contain. But I am certain that not a single Puráña inculcates the exclusive worship of a particular deity, and that not a passage which is genuine can be found, in any Puráña,\+ which would inspire the followers of

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XVI.
† Colonel Kennedy here omitted the very important words "most parts of".
‡ Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., pp. 3—5.

This Sketch is contained in Vols. XVI. and XVII. of the Asiatic Researches. I refer, throughout this letter, to the part contained in Vol. XVI.

‡ In p. 347, infra, Colonel Kennedy asserts, however, that "there are no means of distinguishing those parts of them [the Puráñas] which
one deity with feelings of animosity towards those who presumed to dispute its supremacy.¹ So far, indeed, is this from being the case, that every sect—as Professor Wilson himself admits—has found it necessary to compose works for the purpose of teaching and supporting its peculiar tenets; which circumstance, alone, is sufficient to prove that the Purāṇas were not adapted for the promotion of such an object, and, consequently, that those works could not have been written in subservience to sectarian imposture, as Professor Wilson supposes.

It is also undeniable that the great mass of the Hindus are Śmartas, though all who are so do not adopt this name;² that is, they consider both Viṣṇu

¹ In the Sketch referred to, Professor Wilson has quoted several Sanskrit authorities, which, if genuine, would disprove this statement: but he has specified neither the book nor the chapter of the Purāṇas from which they are said to be taken; and it would appear that he had not, himself, verified them. Not being able, therefore, to ascertain this point, I must consider these quotations to be spurious; for they are at complete variance with numerous passages that occur in the Purāṇas, which expressly inculcate that Viṣṇu and Śiva ought, both, to be worshipped.

² The Brahmans of the Deccan, for instance, and of Gujarat, call themselves Śaivas; but they are, in reality, Śmartas, as they do not reject the worship of Viṣṇu, though they consider it of less importance than that of Śiva. The same is the case with many of the Brahmans in other parts of India, who call themselves Vaishnāvas, but consider Śiva as entitled to adoration. This, however, is in strict conformity to the Purāṇas, in which are thought to be ancient and genuine from those which are thought to be modern and spurious.³

³ Most venturesomely.

and Śiva to be entitled to adoration, but some of them identify either Viṣṇu or Śiva with the Supreme Being,—an opinion which is clearly inculcated in several of the Purāṇas. But, though, in some of those works, Viṣṇu is represented to be, in some degree, inferior to Śiva, still the latter is frequently introduced, in the Śaiva Purāṇas, as enjoining the necessity of worshipping Viṣṇu, and explaining the mysterious nature of his incarnations; and, in the same manner, though, in the Vaishnava Purāṇas, the supremacy is ascribed to Viṣṇu, still the fullest justice is done to the divinity of Śiva. The exclusive votary of Viṣṇu, on the contrary, refuses all adoration to Śiva; and, in the same manner, the exclusive votary of Śiva denies Viṣṇu to be a proper object of worship; and such votaries, therefore, of these deities are, with reference to the population, by no means numerous in India. It is equally unquestionable that the substitution of the Linga for the image of Śiva occasioned no alteration in the worship of that god; for, in the ritual prescribed for the worship of the Linga, as contained in the Linga Purāṇa, it is said: “Having bathed in the prescribed manner, enter the place of worship; and, having performed three suppressions of the breath, meditate on that god (Śiva,) who has three eyes, five heads, ten arms, and is of the colour of pure crystal, arrayed in costly garments, and adorned with all kinds of ornaments. Thus, having fixed in thy mind the real form of Mahēśwara, proceed to worship him with the proper hymns and prayers.” The Linga, therefore, is the terms Vaishnava and Śaiva denote the preferential, but not the exclusive, worshipper of either Viṣṇu or Śiva.
worshipped by all Śāivas and Śmārtas; for it is, in fact, the only type under which Śiva has been adored from remote times. The worship, also, of Rāma is scarcely known in India; and Professor Wilson is, certainly, incorrect in stating that the worship of Bāla Gopāla, the infant Krishnā, is very widely diffused amongst all ranks of Indian society; for the votaries of Krishnā are by no means numerous, and are to be found only in Bengal,¹ and in some parts of Hindostan proper.

Much of the reasoning, however, adduced in the Preface to the Translation of the Vīshṇu Pūrāṇa, to prove the modern compilation of the Pūrāṇas, is founded on the supposition that the date of the Pūrāṇas in which Krishnā is mentioned—particularly the Brahma Vaivarta,—must be subsequent to the establishment of the sect of "the worshippers of the juvenile Krishnā and Rādhā, a form of belief of known modern origin."† But, in that Preface, Professor Wilson gives it, as his opinion, that the Mahābhārata "is, evidently, the great fountain from which most, if not all, of the Pūrāṇas have drawn;"§ and, in the Sketch above referred to, he remarks: "The worship of Krishnā, as one with Vīshṇu and the universe, dates, evidently, from the Mahābhārata." According to this statement, therefore, it is evident that, as the worship of Krishnā dates from that poem, and as its composition preceded that of the Pūrāṇas, the date of none of those works can in the least depend on the time when the sects of Vallabha and Chaitanya originated,—unless, indeed, Professor Wilson supposes that the Mahābhārata was not written until after the year 1520, A.D. In that Sketch, also, Professor Wilson has observed: "The worship of Krishnā, as one with Vīshṇu and the universe, dates, evidently, from the Mahābhārata; and his more juvenile forms [actions?] are brought preeminently to notice in the account of his infancy contained in the Bhāgavata: but neither of these works discriminates him from Vīshṇu; nor do they recommend his infantine and adolescent state to particular veneration." And, further: "In this description of creation, however, the deity [Krishnā] is still spoken of as a young man; and the Pūrāṇa [the Brahma Vaivarta], therefore, affords only indirect authority, in the marvels it narrates of his infancy, for the worship of the child."* These remarks are quite correct, as far as relates to the veneration of Krishnā; for I have shown, in my former letters, that in not one of the Pūrāṇas is the worship of Krishnā, either as a child or a young man, inculcated, or even indicated. It is, hence, evident that, although the accounts of Krishnā's boyhood, which are contained in several of the Pūrāṇas, may have suggested to Vallabha and Chaitanya the design of establishing the worship of Krishnā, still those Pūrāṇas could not have been written

¹ Mr. Ward remarks: "Six parts out of ten of the whole Hindu population of Bengal are supposed to be disciples of this god. The far greater part of these, however, are of the lower orders; and but few of them Brahmans." Vol. I., p. 200.

* If Colonel Kennedy's information had been coextensive with anything approaching the whole of India, he would never have hazarded this remark.

† Vol. I., Preface, p. LXVI.  ‡ Ibid., p. XCII.

§ Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. I., p. 121.

for the purpose of promoting a form of belief which is not even mentioned in them.

Professor Wilson, at the same time, extends the prevalence of this worship, by identifying the infant Krīṣhṇa with “the juvenile master of the universe, Jagannātha”;* and yet he fixes the date when the temple of Jagannātha was erected, in A. D. 1198,† and that when Vallabha lived, in about A. D. 1520.‡ The worship, therefore, of Jagannātha cannot be the same as that of Krīṣhṇa established by Vallabha; and, in fact, there is not the slightest resemblance between them: because Jagannātha is worshipped as an incarnate form, or, rather, as a type, of Vishṇu, by all Hindus; and, on the contrary, the worship of Krīṣhṇa is not generally practised, and prevails only in particular parts of India. The legend, also, relating to Jagannātha has no further reference to Krīṣhṇa than the name; for it is said, in it, that the temple of Purushottama was erected by a king named Indradyumna, a fervent votary of Vishṇu, who being much distressed for the want of a proper image to place in it, Vishṇu appeared to him, in a dream, and informed him that, the next morning, he would find, in the sea, a sacred tree from which the image was to be made. In the Brahma Purāṇa, it is, further, said that, when the king had, accordingly, found the tree, and brought it on shore, Vishṇu and Viśwakarman (the artificer of the gods) appeared to him, and that Vishṇu directed the latter to form from the tree the images of Krīṣhṇa, his brother Balabhadra, and sister Subadhra, which command

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII.  † Vide supra, p. 312.  ‡ Professor Wilson's collected Works, Vol. III., p. 120.

Viśwakarman immediately executed. Although, therefore, the images worshipped at Jagannātha bear these names, the adoration is, in reality, addressed to Vishṇu, as the lord of the universe; and, consequently, in the ritual prescribed for it, there is no mention whatever of “the infant Krīṣhṇa, Govinda, Bāla Gopāla, the so-journer in Vrīndāvana, the companion of the cowherds and milkmaids, the lover of Rādhā.”*  

Professor Wilson also seems not to have taken into consideration that the ten avatāras of Vishṇu are an essential part of the Hindu religion; as it appears to be sufficiently ascertained that they are alluded to in the Vedas,† and it is certain that the son of Devaki, or Krīṣhṇa, is mentioned in at least two of the Upanishads—the Chhāndogya and Nārāyaṇa. The veneration, therefore, of Krīṣhṇa, as an incarnate form of Vishṇu, which is all that is prescribed in the Purāṇas, must be of as remote a date as the most ancient known state of the Hindu religion;‡ and the mention, consequently, of Krīṣhṇa, in any of the Purāṇas, as an avatāra of Vishṇu, but not as a peculiar object of worship,—in which character he is never described in those works,§—can afford no grounds for supposing that the present Purāṇas are modern and sectarian compilations. Before, therefore, Professor Wilson identified that veneration with the worship of Krīṣhṇa established by Vallabha and Chaitanya, and hence inferred the

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XXII.  † The knowledge of this allusion seems to be the peculiar property of Colonel Kennedy.  ‡ That is to say, as old as the mantras of the Rigveda!  § For disproof of this assertion, see Book V of this Work, passim.
comparatively recent date of the Purāṇas, as now extant, he should have produced, from those works, some passages which either expressly or virtually inculcate that worship; but he himself acknowledges, as I have before observed, that no such passages exist, and thus admits that this objection to the genuineness and antiquity of the Purāṇas rests, solely and entirely, on inferences drawn from suppositions imagined by himself, but which are supported by neither probability nor by any authority whatever.

It is, hence, evident that, in presenting the sects which exist in India as a correct representation of the actual condition of the Hindu religion, and in maintaining that the present state of the Hindu faith "is of, comparatively, very recent origin," Professor Wilson has taken a most erroneous view of the subject. For the great mass of the Hindus adhere to that religious system which has prevailed in India from the remotest times, and which, alone, is inculcated in the eighteen Purāṇas. Even Professor Wilson himself has observed that "the origin and development of their doctrines, traditions, and institutions [of which that system is composed,] were not the work of a day; and the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity, to an antiquity that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions, or beliefs of the ancient world."† As, however, it is only from the Purāṇas that a complete knowledge of those traditions and doctrines can be derived, it is obvious that there are either no grounds for ascribing to them a remote antiquity, or that it must be admitted that the Purāṇas are ancient compositions, and not modern compilations written by eighteen obscure individuals between the eighth and seventeenth centuries: because there are no other works with which the legends, and descriptions of scenery, men, and manners, and of rites, ceremonies, and modes of worship, contained in the Purāṇas, might be compared, in order to ascertain whether they are of ancient or of modern date. And the supposing, consequently, with Professor Wilson, that the Purāṇas are an intermixture of ancient and modern ingredients, can be of no avail; for there are no means of distinguishing those parts of them which are thought to be ancient and genuine from those which are thought to be modern and spurious. But the internal evidence of the Purāṇas proves that those works did not accompany, or follow, the innovations introduced into the Hindu religion by Śankara Āchārya, Rāmānuja, Madhvāchārya, and Vallabha; and that they are not intended to advocate the doctrines taught by those sectaries. For not one of their sects is mentioned, or alluded to, in the Purāṇas, in which works the only deities who are represented to be objects of worship are Vishnu, Śiva, Devi, Gaṅgeśa, and Sūrya; and the worshippers of these deities are, indisputably, held to be the five orthodox divisions of the Hindus. Professor Wilson’s supposition, therefore, that the Purāṇas were written in subservience to sectarial imposture, being, thus, disproved, it follows that the whole of his reasoning, to prove their modern date, founded on their

† Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
“exhibiting a sectarian fervour and exclusiveness,”* is totally futile and fallacious.

The Puránaas, consequently, do not contain—as Professor Wilson states,—the doctrines of sects of known modern origin; as, besides the sects just referred to, he only particularizes, in the Preface to the Translation of the Vishńu Purána, the Sáktas and Jainas as being mentioned in the Puránaas. But, in my former letters, I have sufficiently shown that the tenets and practices of the Sáktas are so completely at variance with every principle of the Hindu religion, that it is impossible that they could be noticed in books which the Hindus hold to be sacred. I also pointed out, in my last letter, that the term Arhata did not—as Professor Wilson assumed,—indicate either Jina or the Jainas; but I stated, erroneously, that it applied, in the passage which I quoted, to Buddha.1 On subsequently comparing, however, the eighteenth chapter of Book III. of the Translation of the Vishńu Purána with the original, I found that the one did not agree with the other; for the terms “Bauddhas” and “Jainas”, which are introduced into the Translation and the notes to it, do not occur in the original.

---

1 This mistake was occasioned by my trusting to the Translation, in which it is said: “These Daityas were induced, by the arch-deceiver, to deviate from their religious duties (and become Bauddhas)."

* Vol. I., Preface, p. V.
† Vide supra, pp. 322, 323.
‡ The whole truth is, that the Colonel not only criticized Professor Wilson’s rendering without reference to the original, but that he interpolated it without acknowledgement, in foisting in the word “Buddha”, so distinguished, typographically, that it seems to be quoted. The excuse offered in note I, above, is very feeble.
engaged in ascetic penances, upon the banks of the Narmadá river."* Professor Wilson, therefore, has given to this chapter an interpretation not authorized by the original, in which nothing occurs which indicates that the composer of this Puráṇa intended to describe either Buddha or Jina, under this illusory form, or to adopt, or allude to, their doctrines, in the words spoken by it.†

I have adverted to this remarkable deviation from the faithful manner in which translations should always be made;‡ because the purport of this legend clearly shows that the terms “Jainas” and “Bauddhas” cannot be contained in any manuscript of the Vishṇu Puráṇa. But Professor Wilson may have supposed that the term Ārhatas denoted the Jainas, and may have understood, from the words budhyadhwam and budhyate,§ that they applied to the Buddhists; and to this there could be no objection, had he expressed his opinion in a note, and not introduced into the text, the title of the chapter, and the index, the term “Jainas” and “Bauddhas”. As, also, the illusory form addressed only the same Daityas,* it is evident that he could not have induced them to adopt the doctrines of both Jina and Buddha; and Professor Wilson, therefore, should have selected either the one or the other as being the false teacher here intended. But it is undeniable that Jina or the Jainas are not mentioned, in the Puráṇas, under these names;† and there is no reason, as I have before shown, for supposing that they are denoted by the term Ārhatas;‡ as no conclusion can be justly drawn from an isolated word which occurs in the Puráṇas, unaccompanied by any explanation of its intent and meaning. It will, hence, appear that this legend cannot apply to the Jainas: nor can it apply to Buddha; for he, according to the Vaishṇava Puráṇas, was not an illusory form emitted from the body of Vishṇu, but an actual incarnation of Vishṇu,§ born in Kikata.|| When, therefore, Professor Wilson has so misunderstood and misinterpreted a passage in a Puráṇa which he has himself translated, it must be evident that no reliance can be placed on the correctness of the opinions which he expresses with respect to the age, and the scope and tendency, of the eighteen Puráṇas. He has, however, intimated that he intends laying before the Royal Asiatic Society analyses of all the Puráṇas, similar to the one of the Brahma Puráṇa, published in No. IX. of the Journal of that Society. But it is obvious that

* Vol. III., p. 207.
† On the contrary, it is beyond doubt that both Jina and Buddha, by implication, are represented as forms of Māyāmōha. First, in the Vishṇu-puráṇa, we have mention of the establishment of the Ārhatas by this “Deluder by illusion”, who then metamorphoses himself, and establishes a sect by which the Bauddha is, unmistakably, intended. The Ārhatas must be either Jainas or Bauddhas; and the Chapter referred to shows that they were, unquestionably, the former. But I have anticipated Professor Wilson’s Reply.
‡ The Colonel, practically, was scarcely so austerely punctilious as his principles. Vide supra, p. 348, note †.
§ On the gross error here accepted, vide infra, p. 362, note †, and p. 377, note †.

† For Paráráśik mention of the Jina-dharma, or “religion of Jina”, see Vol. IV., p. 43, note 1.
‡ Who are the Ārhatas, then?
§ But why assume that the Puráṇas may not contradict each other?
|| Vide supra, p. 178, notes † and †.
such mere details of the contents of each Puráña can afford no information respecting the variety of subjects treated of in those works; and it is certain that, if these details are accompanied with such comments as have been already published by Professor Wilson, the analyses will convey the most erroneous notions of what is actually contained in the Puránas. For Professor Wilson supposes that the Puránas exhibit "a sectarian fervour and exclusiveness"; that they contain the doctrines, or allusions to the doctrines, of philosophical and religious sects of known modern origin; and that, in them, circumstances are mentioned, or alluded to, or legends are narrated, or places are particularized, of which the comparatively recent date is indisputable. But no one of these suppositions—as I have evinced, in the course of these letters,—rests on any grounds whatever; and nothing contained in the Puránas in any manner justifies Professor Wilson's opinion, that those works are pious frauds, written for temporary purposes, and in subservience to sectarian imposture. As, however, he not only entertains such an opinion, but even supposes that the Puránas were compiled by eighteen obscure individuals, between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, it will be evident that no analyses which Professor Wilson may give of those works will convey a correct, complete, and impartial account of the traditions, doctrines, and modes of worship which are described in the eighteen Puránas.

In the remarks, therefore, contained in these letters, my object has been to evince that Professor Wilson has taken a most erroneous view of the remote and actual state of the Hindu religion, and that his preconceived opinions on this subject have led him to assign a modern origin to the Puránas, and to support this statement by ascribing to them sectarian doctrines which they, certainly, do not contain; and that all his reasoning to prove the modern compilation of those works is futile, contradictory, unfounded, or improbable. In this I have, perhaps, succeeded; for, as Professor Wilson has not quoted any passages from the Puránas, in which sectarian fervour and exclusiveness are exhibited,* and in which circumstances of comparatively recent date are mentioned,† it may be concluded that he knew of no such passages; as their production would, at once, have proved the point which he wished to establish. This negative argument acquires the greater force from Professor Wilson having stated that he has collected a voluminous series of indices, abstracts, and translations of all the Puránas; and, consequently, if any passages occur, in them, which inculcate the exclusive worship of Vishnu or Siva, or the worship of Rama, Kshishva, or Sakti, or which mention the Jainas; or any modern sect, or any comparatively recent event, he could have had no difficulty in producing such passages, in support of his statements; and their non-production, therefore, must be considered as strong proof of their non-existence. The supposition, however, that the Puránas were written in subservience to sectarian imposture, was judiciously selected, by Professor Wilson, as his principal argument in proof of

---

* Vide supra, p. 340, notes 1 and 2.
† Professor Wilson does refer to the prophetic parts of the Puránas. See Vol. I., Preface, pp. XVI. and XVII. † Vide supra, p. 330, note †.
their modern compilation; for the internal evidence of the genuineness and antiquity of those works depends entirely on their exhibiting a faithful representation of the Hindu religion as it existed in remote times. But Professor Wilson has not yet proved that the Purāṇas contain sectarian doctrines; and I am convinced that, when the Purāṇas are more fully examined, and the Vedas more completely known, it will be ascertained that the rites, ceremonies, and doctrines of the Hindu religion, described in the Purāṇas, are, essentially, the same as those described in the Vedas, and that no essential difference exists between the ritual of the Vedas and the modes of worship prescribed in the Purāṇas, except the adoration of images; and I can affirm, from actual perusal, that the theological parts of the Purāṇas conform, in every respect, to the doctrines which are contained in the principal Upanishads; and these, it is admitted, are portions of the Vedas. *

With regard, however, to the legends which occur in the Purāṇas, I may be allowed to avail myself of the following remarks which I have made in another work: * "I observe, however (Mr. Colebrooke remarks), in many places [of the Vedas], the groundwork of legends which are familiar in mythological poems: such, for example, as the demon Vṛitra, slain by Indra, who is, thence, named Vṛitrahan; but I do not remark anything that corresponds with the favourite legends of those sects which worship either the Linga or Sakti, or else Rāma or Kṛishṇa. I except some detached portions the genuineness of which appears doubtful; as will be shown towards the close of this Essay." But, instead of considering the allusions to popular mythology which occur in the Vedas as being the groundwork of subsequent legends, would it not be more consonant with reason and probability to conclude that these allusions actually referred to well-known legends? For, otherwise, it will be evident that they must have been altogether unintelligible, expressed, as they were, with so much brevity, and, in fact, merely mentioned in that cursory manner which is usual in adverting to circumstances perfectly notorious. In which case, it would also appear most likely that the legends had been previously collected, and rendered accessible to every one by being recorded in those very works which are still extant under the name of Purāṇas; for it is quite impossible to discover, in the Purāṇas, a single circumstance which has the remotest semblance to the deification of heroes, a notion totally unknown to the Hindus."‡

It, hence, appears that there is an intimate correspondence between the legends, rites, ceremonies, and doctrines described in the Vedas and Purāṇas; and even Professor Wilson admits that there is "abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence

---

* The multiplied errors of this passage it must be unnecessary, at this day, to point out. The writers of the Purāṇas paid little intelligent heed to the Vedas, of which, for the rest, the Upanishads cannot, with any propriety, be considered as portions.

† Colebrooke:"Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology," p. 188.

‡ Colebrooke:"Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology," p. 188.
of the doctrines which they [the Purānas,] teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe, at least three centuries before the Christian era;”* and that “the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity carries it back to a much more remote antiquity.”† But it is evident that such a correspondence with the Vedas, and with the ancient state of the Hindu religion, could not exist in the Purānas, unless they were written at a period when the traditions, the ritual, and the doctrines of the Vedas still constituted the prevailing form of the Hindu religion; and it is, therefore, utterly improbable that (as Professor Wilson supposes,) the Purānas, as now extant, could have been compiled between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, when the Muhammadans were extending their dominion over the greatest part of India, and when the Hindu religion had lost much of its original purity. His reasoning, consequently, is altogether ineffectual to prove that the Purānas are modern compilations; for it is not supported by either probability or proof, or by the internal evidence of those works; and it, thus, entirely fails in demonstrating that the Purānas were written or remodelled for the purpose of promoting the innovations introduced into the Hindu religion by Śankara Āchārya, Rāmānuja, Madhuvāchārya, and Vallabha, and of advocating the doctrines which they taught. All the remarks, therefore, on this subject, which Professor Wilson has yet published, are completely erroneous; and it may,

---

* Vol. I., Preface, p. XCIX.
† Ibid.
futation of Colonel Vans Kennedy’s doctrines of their high antiquity and pure theological character is to be found in the works themselves. Translations of two of them have been published,—that of the Vishnū Purāṇa by myself, and that of the Śrī Bhāgavata by M. Burnouf; and an appeal to these, which are now accessible to all who may be interested in the inquiry, will show how utterly untenable is Colonel Vans Kennedy’s theory. If he objects to the particular examples here named, let him choose his own. He will pardon me for suggesting that he would be more usefully and creditably employed in translating and publishing some other Purāṇa or Purānas than in depreciating the better directed labours of other Sanskrit scholars. The result of such translations will, I have no doubt, confirm the conclusions which I have not found it possible to avoid, and with respect to which the opinions of M. Burnouf coincide with mine. The Purāṇas, in their present form, are of high antiquity, although they are made up, in part, of ancient materials; and, in the legends which they relate, and the practices which they enjoin, they depart as widely from what appears to be the more primitive form of Brahmanism as they do from the subjects which authorities of unquestionable weight, as well as their own texts, declare should form the essential constituents of a Purāṇa.

Whilst, however, I think it a work of supererogation to refute errors which the Purāṇas themselves are at hand to correct, I must beg leave to set Colonel Vans Kennedy right on a matter not of opinion, but of fact. Conscious, no doubt, that his arguments will not bear the test of comparison with the original works, he has attempted, at the close of his last letter, to insinuate a suspicion that the translation is not to be trusted, and charges me with having misunderstood and mistranslated a passage that is of some importance as a criterion of the date of the Purāṇa. He does not say that I have done so purposely, in order to fabricate a false foundation for my opinions; but the tendency of his animadversions leads to such an inference. To this inference I cannot stoop to reply; but I shall have no difficulty in showing that the charge of misapprehension applies not to me, but to Colonel Vans Kennedy.

Now, I will not venture to affirm that, in a work of some extent and, occasionally, of some difficulty, I have never mistaken my original; that I have always been sufficiently careful in expressing its purport; that I may not have, sometimes, in the course of a translation not professing to be literal,* diverged more than was prudent from the letter of my text. The latter may have been the case, in the passage in question; and Col. Vans Kennedy is literally correct in stating that the very words “Jainas and Baudhhas” are not in the Sanskrit, where they are found in the English. At the same time, had he fully comprehended the sense of the preceding passages, had he been aware that all which had gone before related to Jainas and Baudhhas, he must have admitted that their specification, which was recommended by the consideration of perspicuity, and by the construction of the English

* Whatever Professor Wilson may have meant, his words are: “In rendering the text into English, I have adhered to it as literally as was compatible with some regard to the usages of English composition.” Vol. I., Preface, p. CXVI.
version, was warranted by the context, and was, therefore, unobjectionable.*

I will not think so meanly of Col. Vans Kennedy’s criticism, as to suppose it possible that it would cavil at words, or that it would attach any importance to the insertion of the terms “Jainas and Bauddhas” in the place where they occur, if it could be substantiated that, in all the preceding parts of the chapter, the text has had them in contemplation. This he denies, and I maintain. We shall see which is right.

The eighteenth Chapter of the third Book of the Vishnu Purana describes, in the first part, the apostacy of certain persons from the Brahmanical faith, from the Vedas and Smritis—in consequence of the doctrines of a false teacher, who is Vishnu in disguise. The heresies into which they fell were two. Col. Vans Kennedy’s interpretation is “one”; and here is the source of his misapprehension. That he labours under an erroneous view of the sense of the passage, a brief examination of it will irrefutably demonstrate.

In the first place, then, speaking of those who first became followers of the false prophet, the text says, expressly: “They were called Arhatas, from the phrase which the deceiver made use of, in addressing them, ‘arhatha’ (Ye are worthy) of this great doctrine.”† So far there can be no question that the Arhatas are named, by the Vishnu Purana, as one set of schismatics.

* The words in question—Vol. III. p. 211,—are “Jaina and Bauddha”; and, since Professor Wilson tacitly professed to translate on a uniform plan, he should have included them in parentheses, just as, in the preceding paragraph, he has parenthesized the words “and became Bauddhas”.

† Compare the rendering in Vol. III., p. 209.

APPENDIX.

It is very true that we have not the name of the other apostate sect enunciated; but it is indicated in a manner not to be mistaken. “Know ye,” says the teacher,—budhyaswa.* “It is known,” reply the disciples,—budhyate.† If these inflexions of the verb budh, ‘to know,’ do not clearly intimate the followers of a faith who, from the same root, are named Bauddhas, I should like to know to what other class of Indian religionists it can apply.:†

It is not, however, from inferences, even thus palpable, that I am justified in limiting the designation of Bauddhas to the sect here described. Col. Vans Kennedy is told, in my Preface, that I have, invariably, consulted an able commentary on the text of the Vishnu Purana; and to this commentary he either has, or has not, referred: if he has not, he has come to his task of criticism very ill-prepared; if he has, he should, in candour, have admitted that what he is pleased to term my misunderstanding or misrepresentation of the text was shared by learned Hindus, who, most assuredly, could not be suspected of any disposition to derogate from the sanctity and antiquity of such sacred books as the Puranas. If the word Bauddha is inaccurately specified, the error is as much the commentator’s as mine. Col. Vans Kennedy may, possibly, set a higher value upon his own edition than that of any native Pandit: he must not expect others to agree with him in an estimate; and, at any rate, he is bound, in fairness, to admit the existence of such an authority, supposing him to be aware of it,

* Correct to budhyadhvam. Moreover, budhyaswa means “know thou”.

† See note † in the next page. Vide infra, p. 368, note †.
when he condemns an interpretation which it fully justifies. Ratnagarbha, the commentator on the Vishnu Purana, explicitly states that, "in the repeated use of the words budhyaswa* and budhyate,† it is the intention of the text to explain the meaning of the denomination Bauddha (Evam budhyatety-atra puraktie Bauddha-pada-niruktayarthā)." I have been fully authorized, therefore, in inserting the term Bauddhas.

Having, thus, vindicated, unanswerably, the propriety of employing the word Bauddha, we come to that of Jaina. It has been shown that the Arhatas are named; and by these, I affirm, Jainas are intended. Col. Vans Kennedy asserts that the term is applied, in this very place, to Bauddhas, and adds: "It is singular ... that Professor Wilson should assume, in direct opposition to the authority or the Purana which he has, himself, translated, that the term Ārhatas, when it occurs .... in the Purānāśās, should be considered to apply to Jina, and not to Buddha."*: I am not aware that I have said any such thing;§ but that is of no matter. In the passage in dispute, I do understand Ārhatas to mean Jainas; and I am not so singular, in this understanding, as Col. Vans Kennedy fancies. I again appeal to

---

* See note * in the preceding page.
† The commentator, having to do with a verb, would not have used the term purarukti, 'iteration', unless he had been referring to a repetition of the same mood. The text—see Vol. III., p. 311, note 5.—exhibits budhyata, budhyadīnam, and budhyata again. Professor Wilson omitted to translate the first, hastily misrepresented the second, and mistook the third. If evam in the text, and iti in the commentary, had been preceded by budhyate, the result would have been budhyata evam and budhyata iti. † Vide supra, p. 323.
§ As much may, however, fairly be taken as implied in Vol. I., Preface, pp. LXXIX., LXXX.
They are not Bauddhas; that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Arhatas with Bauddhas, there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas. That the term does, very commonly, denote Jainas, is familiar to all who ever heard of either. Perhaps Colonel Vans Kennedy will admit this; perhaps he will, also, admit that the celebrated Jaina teacher and lexicographer Hemachandra is some authority for the accurate designation of the sect of which he was so distinguished an ornament, and that he gives the word Arhat as a synonym of Jina, Tirthankara, and the like.* This is a mere waste of words. When Arhata does not mean a Bauddha, it means a Jaina. It cannot mean a Bauddha, in the passages of the Vishnu Purana which are now under discussion; because the Bauddhas are also specified and distinguished by both text and commentary: it, therefore, does mean Jaina; and, consequently, I am fully authorized in inserting the words Jainas and Bauddhas in the Translation.† The misapprehension is not mine; it is my critic's: with which restitution of what appertains to him, and not to me, I take my leave of him, and of all further controversy with him.

H. H. Wilson.

COLONEL KENNEDY'S REJOINDER.

Sir: The letter of Professor Wilson, inserted in the number of your Journal for May last (received here on the 7th instant), has much surprised me; as I do not understand why he accuses me of "love of disputation" and "pertinacity of opinion": for the opinions expressed in the letters which I, some time ago, transmitted to you are contained in my work on Ancient and Hindu Mythology, published in 1831; and, to prepare materials for that work, I actually read, and carefully examined, all the eighteen Puranas, except the Bhavishya. When, therefore, Professor Wilson, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Purana, took so very different a view of the genuineness and antiquity of the Puranas, as now extant, nothing could be more unobjectionable than my examining critically the remarks contained in that Preface, and making public the result of that examination. Nor could it be reasonably expected that I should admit the correctness of that view, when it appeared to me to have been formed on insufficient and erroneous grounds.

In his letter, Professor Wilson very politely observes: "Conscious, no doubt, that his arguments will not bear the test of comparison with the original works,† he has attempted, at the close of his last letter, to insinuate a suspicion that the translation is not to be trusted." I have, however, neither insinuated nor stated any objections to the accuracy of that Translation, except in one instance, in p. 340, in which Professor Wilson has thus translated a passage of the Vishnu Purana: "The delusions of the false teacher paused

* Hoima-kota, I., 24.
† This conclusion is not easy to accept. Vide supra, p. 360, note *.

1 On the contrary, I have, in my former letters, transcribed the original Sanskrit, in the few instances in which I have specifically contradicted the statements of Professor Wilson.

not with the conversion of the Dāityas to the Jaina and Baudhā heresies." Of this passage I transcribed the original Sanskrit, in my last letter, in order to show that the terms Jaina and Baudhā were not contained in it. But I further observed: "Professor Wilson may have supposed that the term Ārhaṭa denoted the Jaina, and may have understood, from the words buddhyadhwaṃ and buddhyate, that they applied to the Buddhists; and to this there could be no objection, had he expressed his opinion in a note, and not introduced into the text, the title of the chapter, and the index, the terms Jainas and Baudhās." I, thus, anticipated all that Professor Wilson has said on this point, in his letter; and, as he admits, in it, that these terms are not to be found in the original, the question is, simply: Is a translator at liberty to insert, in the original text of the work which he translates, a name which is not contained in it, and then to argue that the work must be of modern date, because that particular name occurs in it? Such is the case, in the present instance; for Professor Wilson affirms that the Jaina are mentioned in the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, and adopts this circumstance as a criterion for fixing the dates when the Purāṇas were composed: but this name is not to be found in that Purāṇa; and I, therefore, justly objected to its being introduced into the Translation.

Professor Wilson, however, in his letter, remarks: "I will not think so meekly of Colonel Kennedy's criticism, as to suppose it possible that it would cavil at words, or that it would attach any importance to the insertion of the terms 'Jainas and Baudhās' in the place where they occur, if it could be substantiated that, in all the preceding parts of the chapter, the text has had them in contemplation." But it is precisely to this that I object; for I contend that, in judging of the genuineness and antiquity of the Purāṇas, their text should be allowed to speak for itself, and not as it may be interpreted by translators and commentators. For, with respect to the passage in dispute, I observed, in my last letter: "Professor Wilson, therefore, has given to this chapter an interpretation not authorized by the original, in which nothing occurs which indicates that the composer of this Purāṇa intended to describe either Buddha or Jina, under this illusory form, or to adopt, or allude to, their doctrines, in the words spoken by it." To this he replies, in his letter: "In the first place, then, speaking of those who first became followers of the false Prophet, the text says, expressly: 'They were called Ārhatas, from the phrase which the deceiver made use of, in addressing them, 'arhatha' (Ye are worthy) of this great doctrine.' So far there can be no question that the Ārhatas are named, by the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, as one sect of schismatics." Admitted. He proceeds: "It is very true that we have not the name of the other apostate sect enunciated; but it is indicated in a manner not to be mistaken. 'Know ye,' says the teacher,—buddhyadhwaṃ.* 'It is known,' reply the disciples,—buddhyate. If these inflexions of the verb buddh, 'to know', do not clearly

1 The italics, in these two instances, are mine.

* Here Colonel Kennedy silently corrects an inadvertence of Professor Wilson. Vide supra, p. 361, note *.
intimate the followers of a faith who, from the same root, are named Bauddhas, I should like to know to what other class of Indian religionists it can apply.*

But there is nothing whatever, in the original, which shows that the second address of this false teacher was intended to inculcate doctrines different from those taught in his first address.† On the contrary, the former appears to be, clearly, a continuation of the latter; and, as it is not said, in the original, that a sect was denominated from the word buddhyadhwam,† in the same manner that it is said that a sect was denominated from the word arhatha, it is most probable that, in this passage, the Arhata sect is, alone, intended.

But Professor Wilson observes: "If Jainas are not meant, what are the schismatics here described by their doctrines, and designated by the term Arhatas? They are not Bauddhas; that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Arhatas with Bauddhas, there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas."

* Professor Wilson seems to forget, here, his note in p. 339;
† The Sanskrit text distinctly enough points to two forms of heterodoxy. The first is intimated as the Jaina, by mention not only of one of the names of its professors, but, also, of one of the differentiae of their doctrines; and the stanza to which reference is made, just above, intends, undeniably, the Bauddha. The writer of the Vishnu-purana seems to regard the Jainas and the Bauddhas as, in some sort, cognate. That he represents the Jainas as preceding the Bauddhas manifests that his information as to the history of these two classes of religionists was far from exact,—a striking argument of his modernity.
† If Colonel Vans Kennedy had recognized that the original has buddh-gata, buddhyadhwam, and buddhata,—and all in one line,—could he have resisted the conclusion that these words indicate Buddha? See, further, note † in p. 377, infra.

It is in this singular manner that Professor Wilson attempts to prove that the Puranas, as now extant, are modern compilations; for he entirely disregards the original text, and substitutes, for it, his own inferences and assumptions. In this instance, he admits, in his letter, that it is the term Ārha, and not Jaina, that is contained in the original; and he, further, admits that, in it, the name Bauddha is not enunciated, but merely indicated; and yet he maintains that he was "fully authorized in inserting the words Jainas and Bauddhas in the Translation." He remarks, also, that, though "Colonel Vans Kennedy may, possibly, set a higher value upon his own erudition than that of any native Pandit, he must not expect others to agree with him in an estimate." But I may be permitted to observe that long experience has convinced me that, although commentaries on Sanskrit works are, no doubt, of much use, yet they are by no means safe guides for ascertaining the plain and unsophisticated meaning of the text. In objecting, therefore, to the translation of the passage in dispute, I did not think it necessary to notice whether or not it agreed with the commentary; and Professor Wilson has, now, most unfortunately for his argument, referred to it: for the commentator never uses the word Jaina, but always Ārha;* as in the passage quoted from the commentary in p. 43 of the Asiatic Journal for May last.† Consec-

* Vide infra, p. 376, note †.  
† Vide supra, p. 363.
sequently, Professor Wilson has no right to quote the commentary of the Vishnu Purana, as an authority in support of his assumption, that the Arhata of the Puranas means the Jaina sect. It is, however, on this assumption that Professor Wilson, when speaking of the date of that Purana, hesitates not to state: "Both Baudhhas and Jainas are adverted to [in it]. It was, therefore, written before the former had disappeared. But they existed, in some parts of India, as late as the twelfth century, at least; and it is probable that the Purana was compiled before that period." Thus, from a few verses of the Vishnu Purana, in which no sect is mentioned except the Arhata, Professor Wilson assumes that the Baudhhas and Jainas are adverted to, in it, and, hence, fixes the compilation of the Vishnu Purana at some time before the twelfth century. On the total invalidity of such a mode of reasoning I need not remark; but it seems extraordinary that he should have called attention to it by his ill-judged letter; as he has, by the arguments contained in it, fully confirmed all that I have said relative to his assertions and statements being at complete variance with what is actually contained in the Puranas, and to his being, in consequence, unqualified to express a correct opinion respecting their age, and their scope and tendency.

I do not, therefore, understand what Professor Wilson means by observing, in his letter, that he has "implicit faith in the ultimate prevalence of truth." I objected to his introducing into his Translation of the Vishnu Purana the names of two sects which are not contained in the original, and to his adopting these names as a criterion for fixing the dates of the Puranas; and he admits these facts. The truth, consequently, in this instance, belongs to my objections. Although, also, he considers it quite superfluous to enter into any controversy with me, yet it has been hitherto supposed that discussion was the best means of ascertaining the truth: and it is, surely, not sufficient that the Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford should be satisfied that his conclusions are true; for it might be expected that he would be prepared to support those conclusions, whenever controverted, by argument and authority. Professor Wilson may think that my deductions are founded on imperfect investigation and inveterate prejudice, and that the refutation of my doctrines of the high antiquity and pure theological character of the Puranas is to be found in the works themselves. But this is not enough; for, if my theory on these points is utterly untenable, it

---

1 Preface to the Translation of the Vishnu Purana, p. LXXII.

* This is mere paltering. Arhata, when it does not mean Baudha, means Jaina; and Professor Wilson, in p. 363, supra, quotes the commentator Ratanagarbha as saying: "Having expounded the doctrine of the Arhata, he proceeded to explain the doctrine of the Baudhhas."

† Is this logic conclusive? Save in a spirit of prophecy, the Baudhhas could not be spoken of before they appeared. But why might not a Hindu writer make mention of them after their disappearance, just as well as during their presence?

‡ See Vol. I, Preface, p. CXL.

* Vide supra, pp. 367, 368.
would, most assuredly, be much more conducive to the prevalence of truth to expose its erroneousness than to refer, for its refutation, to such voluminous works as the Puráñas, which scarcely any person will take the trouble to examine. The weight, however, which should be attached to my opinions respecting the genuineness and antiquity of the Puráñas, as now extant, is not the point in question; for I observed, in my last letter, that Professor Wilson had taken a most erroneous view of the remote and actual state of the Hindu religion, which had, alone, led him to ascribe a modern origin to the Puráñas; but, that, “as he has not quoted any passages from the Puráñas, in which sectarian fervour and exclusiveness are exhibited, and in which circumstances of comparatively recent date are mentioned, it may be concluded that he knew of no such passages; as their production would, at once, have proved the point which he wished to establish.” This negative argument acquires the greater force from Professor Wilson having stated that he has collected a voluminous series of indices, abstracts, and translations of particular parts of all the Puráñas; and, consequently, if any passages occur, in them, which inculcate the exclusive worship of Vishnu or Śiva, or the worship of Ráma, Kríshña, or Śakti, or which mention the Jainas, or any modern sect, or any comparatively recent event, he could have had no difficulty in producing such passages, in support of his statements; and their non-production, therefore, must be considered as strong proof of their non-existence.” It is not, consequently, the opinions which Professor Wilson or myself entertain on this subject that should be considered, but that which is actually contained in the Puráñas. I affirm that the Puráñas do not contain what Professor Wilson has stated is contained in them; and, as I cannot be required to prove a negative, it remains with him to produce such passages, from those works, as will demonstrate that my affirmation is unfounded. Until, however, such passages are produced, I may be allowed to repeat my former conclusions, that Professor Wilson’s opinion, that the Puráñas, as now extant, are compilations made between the eighth and seventeenth centuries, rests solely on gratuitous assumptions and unfounded assertions, and that his reasoning, in support of it, is either futile, fallacious, contradictory, or improbable.

It is not, I may trust, necessary that I should disclaim all intention of depreciating, by what I have written at any time, the labours of any Sanskrit scholar. In the present instance, in particular, as I had given some time and some attention to the examination of the Puráñas, and to acquiring information concerning the remote and actual state of the Hindu religion, I saw no reason for refraining from making public my objections to the view which Professor Wilson had taken of the age, the scope, and the tendency of the Puráñas, in the Preface to his Translation of the Vishnu Puráña. It must, also, be evident that, if the opinions expressed respecting any part of Sanskrit literature were not controverted, when erroneous, it would be impossible that the real nature of that literature could

* Vide supra, p. 340, notes 1 and 2; also, p. 353, note †.
† For Puráñik mention of the introduction of the Parsees into India, vide infra, pp. 381—385.
ever be ascertained. Had, therefore, Professor Wilson been solicitous for the prevalence of truth, he should not have been indignant at the remarks on his theory, which you obliged me by publishing in the *Asiatic Journal*; but, on the contrary, he should have taken the trouble of examining my objections, and of exposing their erroneousness, if unfounded; but, if founded, candour and the love of truth should have induced him to acknowledge that he had called in question, on insufficient grounds, the genuineness and antiquity of the eighteen Purānas.  

*Bombay, 17th July, 1841.*

VANS KENNEDY.

**Note.**

Professor Wilson seems to have misunderstood the reason which led me to point out, in my last letter, that he had misunderstood and misinterpreted a passage in a Purāna which he had, himself, translated: for, in his reply, he merely defends the introduction, into the translation, of the words "Jainas" and "Buddhas";

---

*1 It is singular that Professor Wilson has, in one part of his letter, adopted my view of the subject; as he actually speaks, in it, of "learned Hindus, who, most assuredly, could not be suspected of any disposition to derogate from the sanctity and antiquity of such sacred books as the Purānas." It would seem, therefore, that, however satisfied Professor Wilson may be with the truth of the conclusions which he has published, he, nevertheless, fluctuates in his opinion respecting the sanctity and antiquity of the Purānas, as now extant, or their being modern compilations, made for the purpose of sectarian imposture.*

*See Vol. I., Preface, p. LXXIX. If Colonel Vans Kennedy had quoted more ingenuously, the reader would have seen that, in the passage which Professor Wilson translates from the *Kurma-purāṇa*, the Brahmavatī, Vāma, and Yāmalas scriptures are named with the Ārhat; and, the former being modern, there is a strong presumption that the term Ārhat is meant to denote a faith more recent than the Baudhā, namely, the Jaina. Still more cogent, as against the Colonel, is his own fuller rendering—in pp. 286, 287, supra, of the passage in question. For, there, besides the scriptures just enumerated, those of the Kapālas are specified; and the Kapālas are not known as a sect of much antiquity.

*Vide supra, p. 361.*
conflict of the orthodox divinities and heretical Daityas, some covert allusion to political troubles, growing out of religious differences, and the final predominance of Brahmans. Such occurrences seem to have preceded the invasion of India by the Mohammedans, and prepared the way for their victories."

But, after thus making use of the names “Jainas” and “Bauddhas”, to prove the modern compilation of the Puranas, Professor Wilson now admits that these names are not to be found in the original; but he maintains that he was fully authorized in inserting them in it, by the context and commentary. Yet, in his letter, he quotes no part of the context,* in order to evince that it relates to the Jainas and Buddhists, and rests his argument, in support of its being these sects that are intended in the passage in dispute, solely on the words Ārhat, and budhyadhwam, and budhyate.

But the commentator does not say that Ārhat means Jain; † and Professor Wilson assigns no other reason for supposing that these two sects are one and the same than that, as the Ārhatas cannot be Bauddhas, they must be Jainas. I am, however, obliged to observe that the original does not in any manner admit of this translation in p. 339:* “In this manner, exclaiming to them, ‘Know’ (budhyadhwam), and they replying, ‘It is known’ (budhyate), these Daityas were induced, by the arch-deceiver, to deviate from their religious duties (and become Bauddhas).” For, in the original,—at least, according to my copy of it,—it is not said that the words budhyadhwam and budhyate were spoken by this emanation of Vishnu and the Daityas; but they are distinctly ascribed to Parāśara, the narrator of the Purāṇa, who, after relating what was said by this false teacher, proceeds to narrate that it was thus by saying “know ye”, and, they replying “it is known”, that Māyāmoha caused the Daityas to forsake their religion.† The word budhyadhwam, how-

* The English translation, even apart from Professor Wilson’s supplementations, is quite sufficient to show that the Jainas and Bauddhas are meant to be described.

† I think I am not wrong in saying that Hindu writers, as a rule,—so far as I have examined them,—affect the terms Arhat and Ārhat, rather than Jina and Jain. Possibly the former may have become, comparatively, more dyslogistic, as they easily might, by suggestion; for, though Jina was the name of a Buddha,—but one not much heard of, apparently, in later times,—Arhat denoted another Buddha, whose name was of more frequent mention, perhaps from its adoption by the Jainas. These religionists, while professing no reverence for Buddha, did profess reverence for Arhat, an equivocal designation, and which reminded of the Bauddhas; and this fact, it may be, influenced the Hindus, with their hatred of Buddhism and everything therewith cognate, to call the Jainas, by preference, Ārhatas. It should seem that the Jainas, among themselves, were more generally denominated Jainas.

ever, is used in this address of the false teacher, but evidently in its usual sense; for Professor Wilson thus translates the sentence in which it occurs: “Understand my words; for they have been uttered by the wise.”* There are, consequently, no grounds whatever for supposing that the words budhyadhwam and budhyate were, in this passage, intended to indicate the “Bauddhas”; and, as this emanation of Vishnu was not Buddha,† it must be evident that the doctrines which he is here represented as teaching could not be the same as those which were first taught by Buddha. The original, therefore, did not justify this gloss of Professor Wilson, “and become Bauddhas”: for it is not said, in it, that, after the false teacher had addressed

---

The Colonel, therefore, did not justifi this gloss of Professor Wilson, “and become Bauddhas”: for it is not said, in it, that, after the false teacher had addressed the Daityas* a second time, a second sect was originated; and it appears evident that, throughout this passage, the text relates to no other sect than the Arhata, which is, alone, mentioned in it.

It is, hence, undeniable that Professor Wilson has not “vindicated, unanswerably, the propriety of employing the word Bauddha”; and, consequently, the singular futility of his argument, with respect to the Jainas, becomes the more conspicuous. The Arhatas “are not Bauddhas (he says); that is settled: and, when no perversity of ingenuity can identify Arhatas with Bauddhas, there is no alternative left but to identify them with Jainas.” But, as Professor Wilson has not produced, and I am certain that he cannot produce, any Sanskrit authority which proves that the Arhata of the Puranas is the same as the Jaina sect,† and as

---

* But not those who had already been proselytized. Vide supra, p. 351, note †.
† There is no question that the Puranas were written after the rise of the Jainas, and that the authors of the Puranas, equally with their successors, designated them, preferably, as Arhatas. Vide supra, p. 376, note †.

I do not mean, however, that the Jainas were called Arhatas only. Vide supra, p. 351, note †.

In Nagesa Bhaṭṭa’s gloss on Govardhana’s Saptapathī, entitled Gṛuvvakhyā, the subjuncted verses, which follow a denunciation of Śaṅkaliya as heretical, are quoted from the Linga-purāṇa:

पारस्पर भान्वतां प्रीते इश्वरं तथा ||
लोकायतं न ज्ञातं सोमस्य प्राप्तं तथा ||
पारस्परिकः सौरवं नहं यावश्यधवामिषं ||
एवधिधाति ग्रह्यात्मिकै विकृतां सुरुविष ||
कन्या: प्रमालभृतेः वेदेन्त विद्वानम् ||
वैदिकात्मिकै वाह्यात्मिकै वन्यात्मिकै संबंबित ||

Dor-trines here specified, and stigmatized as repugnant to the Veda, are the Pāucharātra, the Bhāgavata, the Bauddha, the Daigambara, the
he here admits that it is not the same as the Buddhist sect, it must, consequently, follow that the "Jainas" and "Bauddhas" are neither mentioned nor indicated in the passage in dispute; and that he, therefore, attempts in vain to show that he was fully authorized in inserting the names of these sects in his translation.

V. K.

* As to palpable indication of the Bauddhas there, vide supra, p. 368, note j.
temple and the daily worship of the image. Samba is desirous of retaining learned and pious Brahmans for the purpose of performing the oblations and rites, and receiving the donations of the people. He sends to the Sun; but Narada, in the spirit of the prohibition found in Manu, against the performance of idol-worship, as a source of emolument, by Brahmans, apprises Samba that no Brahman can undertake the office of ministering priest without incurring degradation in this life, and punishment in the next. He, therefore, refers Samba to Gaurumukha (White-face), the Purohita (or family-priest) of Ugrasena, king of Mahâra, as the only person who could tell him whom he might most safely employ; and so, as the officiating priests of the Sun, Gaurumukha directs him, in consequence, to invite the Magas to discharge the duty, as they are, in an especial degree, the worshippers of Sûrya.

“The Magas, according to the legend narrated, not very distinctly, by the compiler of the Purâna, were at once the progeny of Agni and Aditya (Fire and the Sun) by Nishkumâha, the daughter of a holy sage named Rûju or Rûjâvâha (ţijus, upright, and dharma, appellation), of the race named Mihira. She was dedicated to Agni by her father; but the Sun, fascinated by her beauty, assumed the form of Agni, and begot a son, named Jalagambu, from whom sprang the Magas. Rûjus, displeased with his daughter, condemned her to solitude and degradation; but the Sun, at Nishkumâha’s entreaty, although he could not raise the Magas to a level with the Brahmans, conferred upon them the almost equal distinction of being his chosen ministers.

“Although Gaurumukha could inform Samba what priests the prince ought to employ, he is represented as ignorant of the place where they dwell, and, referring Samba again to the Sun, Sûrya directs him to repair to Sâkâ-dwipa, beyond the sea of salt water, in which region the Magas corresponded with the caste of Brahmans in Jambu-dwipa, the home of the gods, where they are called the Bhojâs of Sambapura. The descendants were, thence, called Bhojakas. But, in a subsequent period, the prince prevailed upon his kinsmen, the Bhojas of Sambapura, to return with him to India to fulfil the function of ministering priests in the temple of the Sun, which he now completed, building, at the same time, around the temple, a spacious city, which was called, after him, Sambapura. The legend also relates that the Yêdava prince prevailed upon his kinsmen, the Bhosar of Dwârakâ, a branch of the race of Yadu, to give their daughters, in marriage, to his Magas; and their descendants were, thence, called Bhokaskas. But, in a subsequent passage, with an inconsistency not infrequent in some of the Purânas, it is said that ten only of the eighteen families received damsels of the tribe of Bhosar, whilst the other eight, who were of the rank only of Sûtras, although equally worshippers of the Sun, were married to Sâka maidens: their descendants were named Mandagas.
thitinda. Again, in place of the Darbha, or sacred grass of the Brahmins, the Pavitra, or purificatory instrument of sacrifice of the Magas, is said, by Vyasa, to be called Varsha, or (in another place,) Varsama. The latter also observes, almost in at least, the impurity thereby contracted, are characteristic of the month at worship, the prohibition of touching a corpse, or, in worship of the words attributed to Vyasa: 'The man...ary. The latter observes, almost in silence, the covering of the mouth at worship, the prohibition of touching a corpse, or, at least, the impurity thereby contracted, are characteristic of the Parsee faith. A still more decisive indication is furnished by what is related of the Aryanga, which, is, clearly, the sacred girdle of the Parsees, called, most commonly, Kusti or Kosti, but also Asigumahim, according to Anquetil du Perron, as quoted by Dr. John Wilson, in his notices of the Parsee religion. The latter also observes, almost in the words attributed to Vyasa: 'The Kusti bears some analogy to the Magas of the Brahmins. According to him, the Kusti should be put on when the child has attained the age of seven years, and ten days, (which agrees well enough with our text); and the wickedness of not wearing it, and the consequences of such impiety, are similarly described in Zend and Pehlevi works. Unluckily, I have not, at present, the means of consulting Anquetil du Perron, or some other analogies might be traced. But there can be no doubt that another term which occurs in the Sanskrit text is identifiable in the Zend, and that the Varsha or Varsama of the Bhavishya Purana is the Barsam or Barsom of the Vendidad,—a bundle of twigs of the pomegranate, in place of the bundle of sacred grass used by the Brahmins, and equally an essential part of the apparatus employed in the worship of Fire, or oblations offered to that element, in both religions. It is evident, therefore, that the Bhavishya Purana, in the legend of Samba, has in view the introduction of the fire-worship of Iran; and it is curious to find so prompt an adoption by the Brahmins, and such a cordial tolerance of a foreign system of religious practices, and belief. The only question that suggests itself concerns the period at which this took place, the time at which the Brahmins acknowledged the high-priests of the Sun as little inferior, in sanctity, to their own order,—whether it followed the flight of the Parsees to Gujarat, in the beginning of the eighth century, or whether it occurred some few centuries earlier, when, we have reason to infer from numismatic evidence, Persian princes or satraps exercised authority on the north-west frontier of India. Either period would not be incompatible with the probable date of the Bhavishya Purana, which, in its actual form, cannot pretend to very remote antiquity. That the legend is of the more recent era is most likely; and this is confirmed by the circumstance of Samba's being failed to have gone from Dwarka, in Gujarat, to bring the Magas from their native country to India. That the Parsees ever made...
motive and fixed' would be better, since trees are considered to possess souls.


P. 33, notes, l. 14 ab infra. Read Swayamābhū.

P. 46, ll. 1, 2. The original is:

अवन्त: प्रेमचे बिचित्रित एवेलारात! |

The term अप्सरा: here implies 'metaphorically'.

P. 55, notes, l. 9. Read Swayamābhū.

P. 60, notes, l. 2 ab infra. Read Sthilamāyaga.

P. 65, note *. Also see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I, pp. 50, 51 (2nd ed.).

P. 66, notes, ll. 3—5 ab infra. Dr. Muir translates, more correctly: "Every substance (vāstu) is brought into the state of substance (vastuv) by its own inherent power." Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I, p. 51 (2nd ed.).

P. 70, notes, l. 7 ab infra. For the term mukhya, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I, p. 57, text and note 104 (2nd ed.).

P. 80, note, l. 7 ab infra. For the term ambāhāni, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I, p. 24, note 36 (2nd ed.).

P. 84, ll. 13 et seq. For a similar passage, translated from the Tatārīgīṁ-

sahābhd, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I, p. 16 (2nd ed.).

P. 85, notes, l. 11. Instead of ‘Shuddhān’, the Translator had ‘Sorasi’.

Many errors of this stamp have been corrected silently.

P. 95, l. 7. Professor Wilson had “Gavedukā” instead of “Gavedhukā”; for which see Vol. V., p. 175, notes 3 and 4.

P. 95, notes, l. 10. The udārā is a wild grain, according to the commentators.

P. 95, notes, l. 11. For the Professor’s “Kodrava”, I have put ‘Kodrāva’, I have made a remark which plainly evinces that he was not an inhabitant of Eastern India. See the text.

P. 96, l. 10. Where I have printed ‘drop’, the first edition had “doss”. The error was typographical, the original word being Sīnda.

P. 98, notes, l. 4. “The city of the Gandharvas is, properly, Alakā,—on Mount Meru,—the capital of Kubera.” Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnson’s Selections from the Mahābhārata, p. 11.

P. 108, l. 1. For the origin of the name Uttanapāda, see Original Sanskrit Texts, Part I, p. 72 (2nd ed.).

P. 109, l. 4. Daksha’s daughters by Prasūtī furnish several of the Mātrīs, according to diverse enumerations of the members of this group.

P. 111, notes, l. 11. It is observable that we here have Daśānanyā, but not Daśāna and Naya in p. 110.

P. 112, text and note *. Raurava is one hell, and Naraka is another. See Vol. II, p. 214; p. 215, note 11; and p. 216.

P. 114, l. 13. The words “whose essence is the elements” scarcely render aright the original expression, bhūta-bhāvāna.

P. 116, ll. 4, 5. In Áśwālāyana’s Gīyga-sūtra, IV., VIII., 19, we find the following names: Hara, Māda, Sāva, Siva, Bhava, Mahādeva, Ugra, Bhausa, Pāpupati, Rūdra, Sankara, Ṣāna.

P. 117, l. 2. For Uṣá read Uşas. The latter is classical; the former, Vaidik. Compare aptsard and aptsaras.

P. 117, l. 7 and note *. According to the Mahābhārata, Adi-parvan, ii. 2699, Anila had two sons, Manojava and Avijnatagati. Which of the two is the same as Hanumat is undecided. Can Anila be synonymous with Ṣāna? If not, there are two Manojava with mothers of the same name, Śiva.

P. 119, l. 10. Instead of Gauri, some MSS. yield Bhūtiagauri.

P. 119, ll. 23, 24. Dhanaswāra is the term there rendered “the god of riches”; and Kubera is not named in the original.

P. 120, l. 9. Instead of my ‘Sumera’, the former edition had “Mera”, which I find in no MS.

P. 130, l. 21. अप्सरा:—a word often misapprehended by the Translator,—here means ‘metaphorically’, not ‘who is not in need of assistance’. Further, परसेवाः, rendered “the supreme god”, is explained as meaning ‘lord of the great Mā’, i. e., Lakṣmi. The original of the sentence is as follows:

प्रसेवाः परसेवाः हि । युधवोऽप्सरवतः ।

Agni may be deemed to be a god with assistance. Further, Agni may be the god of the Great Mā, his wife, Lakṣmi.

P. 144, note *. My list of corrigenda, entirely overlooked by Professor Müller, points out several gross typographical errors; and these he has reproduced.

P. 147, note, last line. Ordinarily, at least, Rāhu is described as a Dānava, or son of Daun.

P. 148, notes, l. 7. Rāhu is generally considered to be the ascending node; Ketu, the descending.

P. 159, l. 4. Besides this Lakṣmi, the text of the Vaiśiṣṭa-puṇḍita mentions another, of less note, daughter of Dašaka, and wife of Dharmas. See the Index.

P. 159, l. 7. The first edition had, for Niyati, Niryati,—an error of the press.

P. 154, notes, l. 14 ab infra. “Agastyā is a celebrated person in Hindu legend. He is said to have prostrated the Vindhyā mountain, as well as to have drunk the ocean dry. The traditions of the South of India ascribe to him a principal share in the formation of the Tamil language and literature, and the general tenor of the legends relating to him denotes his having been instrumental in the introduction of the Hindu religion and civilization into the Peninsula.” Professor Wilson, in Professor Johnson’s Selections from the Mahābhārata, p. 51, note 2.

P. 155, l. 7. Read Abdhimānīn.


P. 156, notes, l. 8. Pāvaka, I think, is called parent of Kavavāhana.


P. 159, note, l. 3. Instead of ‘Ayumāṇa’, the former edition had “Ayumānta”, which is impossible.

25
P. 166, note §. For the patriarch considered 'Kakubh'.

177, note 1. For the supposed modern representatives of the Dahae, see Sir H. M. Elliot's Supplemental Glossary, pp. 414, 415.

P. 178, l. 2. Read Karisháfahs.

P. 211, notes, l. 5. Read Puloman.

P. 221, text and note 1. According to Sir David Lyndsey's less pagan notions,—which he shared with S. Thomas Aquinas and Peter Lombard,—a humbler class than the gods, the elect, will be indulged with the felicity of contemplating the discomforts of the damned:

"They shall rejoice to see the great dolour

Off dammit folk in hell, and thare torment;

Because of God it is the juste iugement."

P. 236, ll. 10, 11. Compare the Bhagavad-gítã, IX., 16.

P. 286, notes, l. 7. For 1909 read 2010, in correction of Professor Wilson.

P. 287, note *+. For Rambha, see Vol. V., p. 12, text and note \[.\]

P. 288, note *+. For Ápairásã, see Vol. V., p. 251, note *+.

P. 293, notes, l. 12 ab infra. Read Śáka.

P. 316, note 1. It does not appear that the Bhágavata-puráña mentions Jambhámárga. Probably it is named by the scholiast Śridhara: for Professor Wilson not seldom confounds commentary and text.

P. 318, l. 4. A Sauvira is an inhabitant of Sauvira. Read, therefore, 'king of the Sauviras'.

P. 340, l. 32. Read l. 11 ab infra.

P. 341, l. 25. Maháráshtra, it seems, was a designation known to Hiouen Thangā.
P. 2, notes, l. 4. Read Yámas.

P. 6, notes, l. 18. Read Vaisnavavartins.

P. 7, notes, l. 2. The inverted commas should come at the end of the sentence in the line preceding.

P. 16, l. 1. Read Akáti.

P. 18, notes, l. 3. Read Vaikuñatha.

P. 44, notes, l. 5. Read Sánti.

P. 55, note ↓. For the meaning of prákhyáyna, see Vol. V., p. 231, note ↓.

P. 60, l. 6. Kíta seems to be the right name. See Vol. IV., p. 143, text and note ↓.


P. 80, notes, l. 2 ab infra. For father read grandfather.

P. 87, note ↑. For p. 110, note §, read p. 113, note ↑, and p. 114, notes ↓ and §.

P. 131, notes, l. 8 ab infra. The real designation of the work there named is, I find, Prákhyánya-prádhána, as is observed in the line preceding.

P. 199, notes, l. 9. Read vague sense.

P. 209, l. 1. Read Árhatas.


P. 217, note ↔. Read Rishí.

P. 218, l. 9. Instead of “Raja of Káśi” the correct rendering is ‘Raja of the Káśis’.

P. 220, l. 3 ab infra. The translation is not literal here, and yields neither “king of Káśi” nor ‘king of the Káśis’.

P. 230, note ||. See p. 20, note ↓, in the same volume.

P. 245, l. 5. Read Títabindu.

P. 249, notes, l. 3. It is meant that Ánarta and the rest were brothers.

P. 249, note ↓. Read IX.

P. 266, notes, l. 4. Read Rautinára. Also see Vol. IV., p. 129.

P. 266, notes, l. 8. Read Matínára. Also see Vol. IV., p. 129, notes 2 and ||.

P. 267, l. 21. The learned reader may be amused by the whimsical etymologies, of a like character to this, given in the annexed stanza from Appayya Dikshita’s Śivatattvaviveka:

हिंसिधाति: विंशिऴवर्धा व जानवी वियाव: ।
वर्णयवायत: गृह: पश्च: ज्ञाययो यत्व॥

P. 280, note •. Yuvanáśwa is, of course, the patronym of Ambarishá, and the English translation and Bengalee translation was the work of Viswasaha Tarkabhushana. See the same volume.

P. 283, notes, l. 2. ‘Duśasaha’ is a more ordinary form than “Duśasaha”.

P. 321, notes, l. 5. Read Tárápítha.

P. 326, notes, l. 2. For a Yajñavalkya, in connexion with the Yoga philosophy, see Vol. V., p. 230, note ↓.

P. 329, note 4. Wiswasahana is, probably, one with the Viśwasaha of p. 233.

P. 336, note ↓. For 353 read pp. 244, 245.

P. 17, note 1. For hácha, see Vol. III., p. 80, note ↑.


P. 40, note ↑. Compare what is said of Talajangha in p. 57.

P. 57, l. 3. Read Talajangha.

P. 63, notes, l. 13. Read Ruchaka.

P. 67, notes, l. 6. Read Romapáda.

P. 95, l. 3. Read Áváha.

P. 97, note ↑. Read Dhísháha.

P. 100, notes, l. 18. Read Śúra.

P. 111, notes, l. 3 ab infra. Read Hanúsa, Suvañá.

P. 112, note ↑. For Cháruháná, see Vol. V., p. 69, note ↓; p. 81, note ↓; and p. 83, note §.

P. 114, notes, l. 10 ab infra. Read p. 98.

P. 123, notes, l. 10. Insert a comma after “Bíhaspati”.

P. 128, note ↓. Erase another, Atitára.

P. 132, notes, l. 12 ab infra. It is observable that, in p. 102, we have had a Bhima son of Anila.

P. 141, notes, l. 4. Read Dhísháwa.

P. 142, note ↑↑. For Dhíshárāśtra read Dhíshárāśtra’s charioteer, according to the more usual legend.

P. 144, note 3. Read Riksha.

P. 148, notes, l. 6. Read Arimejaya.

P. 157. Erase note §.

P. 171, note 1. For Śrešilda, father of Kúnika, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol IX., p. 154.

P. 178, l. 5 and note ||. For “Chandraprabhóta” and his son Pála, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol IX., p. 147.

P. 182, note ••. Read is Udayin. For Udayin, said to have been son of Kúnika, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol IX., pp. 147, 154.
CORRIGENDA, &c.

P. 184, note 2. A mahâpadma is only a thousand millions, according to the Lîlâvatî. Elsewhere a simple padma is said to be ten thousand millions. See Vol. V., p. 187, note 7, and p. 188, note 11.

P. 202, l. 1. For Gardabhiha, said to have been king of Ujjaini, and father of Vikramâditya, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. IX., pp. 139, 143, 144, 164.


P. 216, l. 1, and p. 217, notes, l. 1. For Viśvaspatika, see the Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society, Vol. IX., p. 146.

P. 217, note 9. For Kantipuri read Kantipuri.

P. 233, notes, l. 11 ab infra. Read Chandrabhâga.


POSTSCRIPT.

The MSS. of the Viśnû-pûrâṇa and of its commentaries used by the Editor belong, chiefly, to himself, and are the best, or copies of the best, which he was able to discover during a long and extensive search in India. He has also carefully examined all the oldest and most valuable MSS. which he knows to exist in England, and an especially excellent one obligingly lent to him by the accomplished Principal of the Benares College, Mr. Griffith. The Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta impressions he has, further, constantly had by his side; and he has frequently consulted them, but to little useful purpose. With few exceptions, the Sanskrit works brought out under the supervision of Hindus are inferior even to indifferent manuscripts; and this must continue to be their character, so long as they betray a systematic disregard of the most elementary principles of editorial probity.

As regards the original and the translation of a book, until the text of the first is duly ascertained, the other can be worth very little; and the MSS. of the Viśnû-pûrâṇa—which is still inedited,—present a choice of lections in almost every line. Professor Wilson sometimes employed one MS., sometimes another; and there are but rare indications that he compared together even two, out of all that were accessible to him. The consequence of impatience of collation is inevitable; and it not seldom happens that he unfortunately had before him, and followed, the very worst reading from among a variety of good and bad.

Had the Editor clearly foreseen, in time, what awaited him, rather than do that which he has done, he would have hazarded a critical edition of the Viśnû-pûrâṇa in the original, and an entirely new translation. The one has long been all but ready for the press; but its appearance has been defeated by one manoeuvre after another, and now can never be realized. An independent version of his own would, certainly, have cost him
much less trouble than the invidious labour which he has expended on these volumes. Of notes he would have been sparing; inasmuch as, in the whole compass of Sanskrit literature, he could not consider the text of even a dozen works to be sufficiently settled to warrant an appeal to them, except in a most general way, for purposes of comparison or illustration.

Though many of Professor Wilson's notes have no very intimate connexion with his translation, others have such a connexion; and some of them are necessary to its very intelligibility. To make a selection, from among these categories, as subject-matter for remark, would have been difficult, and, the question of difficulty apart, would have been liable to objection. Emendations, to be rendered at all convincing, every here and there demanded the production of new matter; and, sometimes, when such matter has lain at the Editor's elbow, it has been offered to the reader, notwithstanding its being only indirectly germane to the occasion. As for his annotations, however, he does not lay the least claim to their being exhaustive. He has given mere specimens,—at best, suggestive of the peril which, in the dawn of the exploration of Sanskrit literature, attends on peremptory statement or positiveness of conclusion,—and equally so where he has amended the Professor's renderings, and, in short, in the discharge of his revisory functions generally. Still, in one important respect he has been solicitous of thoroughness. By citations from, and references to, the other publications of Professor Wilson, he has studied—not unsuccessfully, he trusts,—to make him, as far as possible, his own commentator, corrector, and supplemener.

A copious disquisition on the Puránas as a class, and on the Viśnupurāṇa in particular, is reserved against the emergence of some other opportunity for publishing it.

The sixth volume will be occupied with a full index to the entire work.

LONDON,

July, 1869.