

## BOARD OF EDITORS

1. Dr. Anant Lal Thakur, K. P. Jaiswal Institute, Patna.
2. Dr. A. C. Banerjee, Professor and Head, Department of Sanskrit, Gorakhpur University.
3. Dr. Babu Ram Saksena, 3, Moti Lal Nehru Road, Allahabad.
4. Sri Braj Basi Lal, Director, Centre of Advanced Studies, Simla.
5. Dr. D. N. Shastri, 301, Urmila Shastri Road, Meerut.
6. Sri Gopal Chandra Sinha, Retired District Judge and Ex-Member, Official Language (Legislative) Commission, Govt. of India.
7. Dr. Hem Chandra Joshi, Department of Sanskrit, Gorakhpur University.
8. Dr. J. P. Sinha, Department of Sanskrit and Prakrit Languages, Lucknow University (Editor-in-Charge).
9. Prof. K. A. Subramania Iyer, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, Lucknow University and Sanskrit University, Varanasi.
10. Dr. Satyavrata Shastri, Professor of Sanskrit, Delhi University.
11. Dr. Satyavrat Singh, Ex-Vice-Chancellor, Sanskrit University, Varanasi.
12. Dr. Siddheswar Bhattacharya, Vishvanath Temple, Benaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

ऋतम्  
RTAM

JOURNAL

OF

Akhila Bharatiya Sanskrit Parishad

Volume VII

July 1975—Jan. 1976

Nos. I & II



Mahatma Gandhi Marg, Hazratganj  
LUCKNOW

Nevertheless, Śrīdattopādhyāya cited from the *Brāhmaṇasarvasvā* and accepted its reading, which elicited commendation from scholars like P. V. Kane<sup>1</sup>.

Chronologically, Śūlapāṇi comes last among the Gauḍīya writers. In his outlook Śūlapāṇi was very much like Śrīdattopādhyāya and Caṇḍeśvara, for like them he too was ready to recognise established non-Vedic customs. That is why he wrote *Dolāyātrā-viveka* and *Rasayātrā-viveka* and thereby gave these customs a footing in the realm of Smṛti. Śūlapāṇi wrote many works of which the *Śrāddhāviveka* can be credited with some contribution to certain Maithila works. Thus, Rudradhara, a Maithila, in his *Śrāddhāviveka*<sup>2</sup> cites from the *Gauḍīya-śrāddhāviveka*, of Śūlapāṇi.<sup>3</sup>

Vācaspatimiśra in his *Śrāddhacintāmaṇi*, sometimes called *Śrāddhavidhi*, has drawn profusely from the work of Śūlapāṇi (as many as 18 times and that too on important issues). Besides this, there is also verbal similarity between the two works which can be easily detected.

In his *Dvaitanirṇaya* too Vācaspati refers to Śūlapāṇi's views, e. g. "yattu śrādhāṃ yāgadānobhayarūpam iti śrāddhāvivekamataṃ tanna...||"<sup>4</sup> This is a clear refutation of the view expressed in Śūlapāṇi's *Śrāddhāviveka* (pp. 23-26). Compare also *Dvaitanirṇaya*, p. 102 with *Śrāddhāviveka*, pp. 175-176. There is so much similarity in the views of Śūlapāṇi and Vācaspati that Haridāsa Tarkācārya, a very old commentator on the *Śrāddhāviveka*, confused Śūlapāṇi's views with those of Vācaspati. This shows that the work earned for its writer a great name. The fact that a writer of the calibre of Vācaspatimiśra quoted from the *Śrāddhāviveka* so many times is in itself sufficient proof of Śūlapāṇi's influence on Vācaspatimiśra in particular and Maithilas in general.

In conclusion we may say that these writers, at least the last four, viz. Aniruddha, Ballālasena, Halāyudha and Śūlapāṇi greatly influenced the Maithila Smṛti at least in its formative stage and that was quite natural. But at the same time we should not fail to notice that the Maithilas also had their contribution in the formation of Gauḍīya Smṛti and that this give and take policy of the writers of ancient and mediaeval India created unity in diversity, the much acclaimed heritage of the Indian people.

1. *History of Dharmasāstra*, IV. p. 434, fn. 966.

2. *Tridāṇḍi-śrāddha*, p. 50 of the Chowkhamba edn.

3. MM. Chandicharan Smṛtibhushana's edn. 3rd. 1327 B. S., pp. 331-332.

4. *Dvaitanirṇaya*, p. 75.

## HIRAṆYANĀBHA : A KṢATRIYA YOGIN

Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya

Varanasi

In the traditional history of India we find mention of many Kṣatriyas who attained perfection through yoga. A verse *Kṣatriyā janakā-dyastu* quoted by Brahmānanda in his commentary on the *Haṭhayogapradīpikā* (4.15) expressly states that the Kṣatriyas like king Janaka and others achieved perfection through yoga. The *Gītā* (9.33), the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (IV.5.14) and the *Bhāgavata* (IX.13.27) declare that a good number of Kṣatriya kings were well-versed in self-knowledge. The Upaniṣads also speak of many Kṣatriya kings, who were *ātmavids* and who taught self-knowledge to their disciples.

Hiraṇyanābha,<sup>1</sup> a Kṣatriya king, born in the dynasty of Rāma, was a great yogin who taught *yoga-vidyā* to many sages. Though his name has not been mentioned in the extant works on yoga, yet it appears that he was well-known to the Paurāṇikas.

Hiraṇyanābha is mentioned as a *yogācārya* both in *Bhāgavata* (IX.12.3-4) and *Śivapurāṇa* (V.39.25). The *Praśna Upaniṣad* (6.1) mentions one Hiraṇyanābha who was a *rājaputra* a Kṣatriya by birth, (vide the *bhāṣya* by Śaṅkara) and who, while a *kumāra* (crown-prince, *yuvārāja*), approached the sage Bhāradvāja with the desire to know the "Puruṣa" endowed with all the sixteen parts (*ṣoḍaśakalā puruṣa*). There is not the slightest doubt about the identity of these two Hiraṇyanābhas mentioned in the Upaniṣad and in the Purāṇas.

1. In many passages of the Purāṇas the name is printed as Hiraṇyanāmin, Hiraṇyanābhi or Hiraṇyanābha. Hiraṇyanābha, however, is the correct form as it has been used in Vedic works. Names ending in *nābha* are often found in the *Itihāsa-purāṇa* literature. The son of Kuśa (Rama's son) was called Kuśanābha (*Rāmāyaṇa* I.32.2).

Hiraṇyanābha was not only a practitioner of yoga but also a teacher of yoga.<sup>1</sup> Most probably he was the promulgator of a yoga-school. From the statement of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (IV.19.13) that Hiraṇyanābha taught some yogic treatise to his disciple (*yogam adhyāpayāmāsa*) it can be rightly presumed that he composed some work on yoga. The finite verb *adhyāpayāmāsa* presupposes the existence of a definite work.

The *Bhāgavata* (IX.12.4) and the *Śivapurāṇa* (V. 39.26) speak of the essential characteristics of yoga as taught by Hiraṇyanābha. The yoga is said to be (i) *adhyātma* or *adhyātmasamjñaka* (one whose name is *adhyātma*), (ii) *mahodaya* and (iii) *hṛdayagrānthishedaka* or *hṛdayagrānthishedana* (one that breaks the knots of hearts).

*Adhyātma* means *ādhyātmika* i.e., a system that deals with the categories which are called ātman. They are the body, the mind and the self (Cf. the expression *adhyātmayoga* in *Kāṭha-up.* I.2.12). Since yoga deals with *adhyātma*, a yogin is called *adhyātmacintaka*, *adhyātmajña* or *adhyātmani*.<sup>2</sup> The categories and tenets propounded and discussed in *adhyātma vidyā* are to be found in many works (vide *Śānti-parvan*, chaps. 194, 247, 285; *Nāradyapurāṇa* I. 44).

The epithet *mahodaya* requires some explanation. The commentator Śrīdhara says that it means that the yoga is endowed with supernormal powers. The word *udaya* (rising) may be taken in the sense of *siddhis*, since *siddhis*, lying in a dormant state in the *antaḥkaraṇa*, arise owing to the proper application of the *yogāṅga-s*.

In the *Muktika-up.* (2.39) the word *mahodaya* is used in the sense of *manonāśa* (destruction of *manas*). If *Nāśa* is taken in the Sāṅkhyan sense, i.e. the state of being one with the material cause (cp. the *Sāṅkhyasūtra* 'Nāśāḥ kāraṇalayaḥ' 1.121), *manonāśa* would refer to the *avyakta* state of the *citta*, which happens at the time of *kaivalya* of *Puruṣa*. This sense of *mahodaya* cannot altogether be rejected; for the word is used in the first benedictory verse of the *Praśastapādabhāṣya* (*Padārthadharmasaṅgrahaḥ pravakṣyate mahodayaḥ*) in the sense of 'everlasting cessation of pains' (*ātyantiki duḥkhanivṛttiḥ*), vide *Nyāyakandali*.

The breaking of the knots of the heart (*hṛdayagrānthishedana* or *grānthishedaka*) is an old yogic conception and is found in many ancient works—Vedic, Tantric and Philosophical (vide *Muṇḍaka-up.* 2.2.8). We have the word

1. *Vāyupurāṇa* 88.208; *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* II.63.208; *Viṣṇupurāṇa* IV.4.48; *Bhāgavata* IX.12.3-4.

2. *Śānti-parvan* 275.18; 310.10; 310.15; 202.4; *Manusmṛti* 6.82; *Āsvamedhaparvan* 39.24.

*avidyāgrānthis* in *Muṇḍaka-up.* (2.1.10) and *guhāgrānthis* in *Muṇḍaka-up.* (3.2.9.) *Guhā* signifies *hṛdaya* or *buddhi*.<sup>1</sup> The expression *hṛdayagrānthis* occurs also in *Muktika-up.* (2.12) and in *Sarva-up.* (2). These knots are nothing but the tendencies and impressions of ignorance which give rise to desire etc., that subsist in one's heart. In the Tantras three *grānthis* are frequently mentioned, viz. *Brahmagrānthis*, *Viṣṇugrānthis* and *Rudragrānthis*.

Hiraṇyanābha is said to be Kauśalya or Kausalya in the *Purāṇas* *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (II.63.207-208); *Vāyupurāṇa* (99.190); *Bhāgavata* (XII.6.77); *Matsyapurāṇa* (49.75) and in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (XIII. 5.4.4). *Harivamśa* (I.20.43) speaks of him as Kauśala which is the same as Kausalya. In the *Praśna-up.* (6. 1) Śāṅkara explains the word Kauśalya as 'an inhabitant of Kosalā' (*Kosalāyām bhavaḥ*).<sup>2</sup> Kośalā or Kosalā or Koṣalā (also used in masculine gender) is the same as the Ayodhyā *janapada* through which flows the Sarayū (*Rāmāyaṇa* I.5.5). Kālidāsa asserts that Hiraṇyanābha ruled the Uttarakośala *janapada*.

The *Rāmāyaṇa* informs us that the Kośala country was divided into two halves by *Rāma*. Kuśa, Rāma's son, ruled over part of Kośala while Lava ruled over the Uttarakośala (*Rāmāyaṇa* VII.107.17; *Vāyupurāṇa* 88.200). It is to be noted here that though Uttarakośala was ruled by Lava, yet it was afterwards ruled by Hiraṇyanābha who appeared in the dynasty of Kuśa, the brother of Lava.

Curiously enough the *Bhāgavata* (IX.12.14) and the *Śivapurāṇa* (V 39.26) employ the epithet Kauśalya or Kausalya to the sage Yājñavalkya, a disciple of Hiraṇyanābha. It is difficult to solve the problem. It is a proved fact that Yājñavalkya, the great yogin, was an inhabitant of Mithilā and as such he cannot be said to be an inhabitant of the Kosala country. We can, however, support the aforesaid view by accepting the word Kausalya in the sense of 'the disciple of Kausalya' (through *lakṣaṇā*) and by taking the word Kausalya as referring to Hiraṇyanābha. This, however, is a far-fetched explanation and hardly satisfactory. It is better to regard the view held by the *Bhāgavata* and the *Śivapurāṇa* as wrong.

1. Cp. the *Śruti* quoted in the *Vyāsbhāṣya* 4.22 (*Guhā yasyām nihitaṁ brahma śāśvatam... vedayante*), and also. *Taṣmād idaṁ guhā hṛdayam* (*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* XI.2.6.5).

2. It appears that later writers failed to understand the meaning of the word Kośala. The *Bhāgavata*-verses on Hiraṇyanābha have been quoted in the *Garaṇavyūha* (Section on *Sāmaveda*). The commentator explains the word Kauśalya as "the son of Kośala".

It is interesting to note that the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa (18.27) mentions the name of the son of Hiranyanābha as Kausalya. Here Kausalya means king of the Kosala country. The information given by Kālidāsa is based on the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (XIII.5.4.4).

The name of the father of Hiranyanābha was Viśvasaha according to *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (IV.4.48) and *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (II.63.206), while according to *Bhāgavata* (IX.12.3) the name was Vidhṛti. It is worthwhile to note that Kālidāsa, in his *Raghuvamśa*, subscribes to the view held by the *Viṣṇu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* purāṇas and that he further informs us that Viśvasaha became an ascetic after appointing Hiranyanābha king of his country (18.25-26).

Regarding the difference in the name of one and the same person we may say that such a difference is frequently found in the Itihāsapurāṇa literature. In the case in question it seems that the original name was Viśvasaha and the name Vidhṛti was used as a synonym for it at a later stage and that the Paurāṇikas recorded both the names in their compositions. The words *saha* and *dhṛti* are more or less synonymous. It is the common style of the Purāṇas to use synonymous words while referring to persons or places.<sup>1</sup>

The Purāṇas inform us that Hiranyanābha was born in the dynasty of Kuśa, the son of Rāma of the Solar race (*Bhāgavata* IX.12.3-4; *Viṣṇu* IV.4.48). The Purāṇas mention more or less 16 kings who appeared after Kuśa and before Hiranyanābha. A Purāṇic geneology is not to be taken as a true historical record and there is every possibility that many more kings might have appeared between Kuśa and Hiranyanābha. Generally the Purāṇas mention the names of only principal rulers and regard indirect or secondary sons as direct and actual sons as is known to all.

The Purāṇas expressly declare that the celebrated yogin Yājñavalkya was taught by Hiranyanābha in Yoga.<sup>2</sup> Who was this Yājñavalkya? Most probably it is the same Yājñavalkya who had two wives viz. Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī and whose wisdom has been admirably shown in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka up.* We understand that the extant works on yoga (viz. the *Yogiyājñavalkya* and the *Bṛhad-yogi-yājñavalkya* and similar other works on yoga) are based on the original teaching of this Yājñavalkya. This

1. Vide R. S. Bhattacharya : *Itihāsapurāṇa kā anuśilana* pp. 8-9.
2. *Tasmād adhigato yogo Yājñavalkyena dhīmatā (Vāyupurāṇa 88.208; Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa II.63.208). Hiranyanābhah, yato Yājñavalkyo yogam avāpa (Viṣṇu IV.4.48). Tato Hiranyanābho'bhūd Yogācāryastu Jaimineh| Śiṣyah Kauśalyo ādhyātmani Yājñavalkyo'dhyogād yatah|| (Bhāg. IX.12.3-4).*

Yājñavalkya is said to be an inhabitant of Mithilā (*Bṛhadyogiyājñavalkya* 1.1). The author of the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* is also said to be *Mithilāsthā*<sup>1</sup> (residing at Mithilā Janapada) in 1.2—a fact which tends to show that this *Smṛti* has as its source the teachings of Yājñavalkya. There are striking resemblances between the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*.

In ancient times Mithilā (the Videhanagari as the *Viramitrodaya* commentary observes) had some close connection with the Kosala country as both of these countries are often jointly mentioned in Vedic works (vide *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* I.4.1.17; XIII.5.4.4; *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa* 2.329). Thus, it was quite possible for Yājñavalkya of Mithilā to approach Hiranyanābha of the Kosala country with a desire to know *ātman*.

The word Yājñavalkya is not a proper name; it means 'a descendent of Yājñavalkya'. It is difficult to ascertain the proper name of this Yājñavalkya<sup>2</sup>. He may be a person of the Viśvāmītra clan. We have nothing to say here on the date of this sage.

Hiranyanābha is said to have been taught in yoga by one Jaimini, who is said to be a great yogin (*mahāyogīśvara*) in *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (IV.4.18). The *Bhāgavata* (IX. 123) and the *Śivapurāṇa* (V.39.25) subscribe to this view.

Who was this Jaimini? There were many Jaiminis in ancient India. One Jaimini was the husband of the female ascetic Śāṇḍīlī (vide *Skandapurāṇa, Nāgarakhaṇḍa* 131.37).<sup>3</sup> Śāṇḍīlī was the daughter of the sage Śāṇḍīlyā (*Mahābhārata, Śalyaparvan* 54.6-7). Most probably this Jaimini is the same as the teacher of Hiranyanābha.

Some may say that since Hiranyanābha was a great teacher of the *Sāmaveda* (vide the Purāṇic chapters on the *Vedasākhāvibhāga*),<sup>4</sup> Jaimini, the *guru* of Hiranyanābha, must be supposed to be the sage who divided the *Sāmaveda*, being instructed by Vyāsa. According to the Purāṇas, Hiranyanābha appeared after Jaimini, the *Sāma*-teacher, and it can be surmised that the long-lived sage Jaimini imparted *yogavidyā* to Hiranyanābha at his old age. It may also be supposed that Hiranyanābha was instructed in Yoga by a direct or indirect *śiṣya* (disciple, follower) of Jaimini and this is why he was called '*jaiminiśiṣya*'.

1. *Yājñavalkyasṛti*, I. 2.
2. Śaṅkarācārya says that Yājñavalkya is the *apatya* (a descendant) of Yājñavalkya. Yājñavalkya of the *Br. up.* is the son of Devarāta (*Bhāṣya* on *Br. Up.* I.4.3).
3. For an account of the life of Śāṇḍīlī, vide Smt. Jyotirmoyī Bhattacharya : *Śāṇḍīlī : One of the Yoginīs in Ancient India* ( *Journal of the Yoga Institute* ), (Vol. XVII.4.)
4. *Viṣṇupurāṇa* III.4-6; *Vāyupurāṇa* 60-61; *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* I.34-35; *Bhāgavata* XII 6-7; *Agnipurāṇa* 271.1-10.

It is interesting to note that according to *Vāyupurāṇa* (88.207-208) Hirāṇyanābha was the pupil of the grandson of Jaimini. This may be a fact; for Hirāṇyanābha is said to be the direct disciple of Sukarman in *Sāmaveda* and Sukarman was the grandson of Jaimini.<sup>1</sup>

It should be noted in this connection that there is nothing to prevent us from recognizing Jaimini, the *Sāmaveda*-teacher (or some of his followers in *Sāmaveda*), as a sage (or sages) well-versed in Yoga. It should be borne in mind that according to the *Yājñavalkya smṛti* (III.112) the *sāman*-s are highly helpful for a person who wants to cultivate concentration (*ekāgratā*) or wants to realize the *brahman*.

The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (IV.19.13) says that Kṛta was another student of Hirāṇyanābha in yoga (vide also *Harivaṃśa* I.20.43). Kṛta was the son of the king Sannati or Sannatimat who belonged to the dynasty of Pūru of the Lunar dynasty. This Kṛta was a versatile scholar of the *SāmaVeda*. He composed many *Sāma-saṃhitā*-s and taught them to his disciples who came to be known as the chanters of *kārtasāmans* (*Kārtāḥ sāmāgāḥ*)<sup>2</sup>.

Hirāṇyanābha's contribution to the *Sāmaveda* was noted by the Purāṇas. It is stated that he composed 500 *Sāma-saṃhitā*-s and taught them to his disciples who were called Eastern *Sāman* Chanters, (*prācya-sāmāgāḥ*).<sup>3</sup>

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (XIII.5.4.4), informs us that Hirāṇyanābha was an *āṭaṇāra*. From the commentaries by Durga and Skanda on the *Nirukta* (1.14) we know that *āṭaṇāra* means 'āṭanaṣila' (one whose nature is to roam about) i.e., a *parivrājaka*. This shows that Hirāṇyanābha became a *sannyāsin* in the latter part of his life (vide Bhagavaddatta : *Bhāratavarṣa kā Bṛhat Itihāsa* Vol. II, pp. 137-138).

The Purāṇic Chronology of Hirāṇyanābha presents some difficulties. Some say that there were two Hirāṇyanābhas and their position became confused. Since we have hardly any interest in chronological matters, it is needless to discuss the date of this yogin in detail.

1. In the *Itihāsapurāṇa* literature both *śiṣya* and *putra* are used indiscriminately. In *Bhāgavata* III.1.25 occurs the word *tanaya*, which is explained by Śrīdhara as *śiṣya*.
2. *Vāyupurāṇa* 79.95 and *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* II.15.64 also speak to the same effect.
3. For a fuller discussion on the contribution of Hirāṇyanābha in the field of *Sāmaveda*, vide R. S. Bhattacharya : *Purāṇagata vedaviśayaka sāmāgrī kā samikṣātmaka adhyayana*, pp. 299-305.

At the end we want to draw the attention of our readers to a fact that deserves discussion. In many works some verses on yogic practice are quoted with the remark that they belong to a work called *Hiranyagarbhayoga*.<sup>1</sup> Can it be supposed that these verses originally belonged to the treatise composed by Hirāṇyanābha ?

1. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (II.13.44) says : *Hiranyagarbhavacanāṃ Vicintyettham*. These *vacana*-s (statements) are quoted in *Viṣṇupurāṇa* II.13-42-44. The commentator Śrīdhara says that these two verses belonged to the *Hiranyagarbhaśāstra*. Śaṅkarācārya in his *bhāṣya* on the *Sanatsujāta* section of the *Mahābhārata* quoted two verses on some yogic practice with the remark that they belong to *Hiranyagarbha*. Ancient scholars hold *Hiranyagarbha* as the creator, *Brahmā*.