

सम्पादक-मण्डल

डा. रामकरण शर्मा
भूतपूर्व कुलपति, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी; नयी दिल्ली
डा. रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर
भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे
डा. जोर्जो बोनाजोली

EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. R.K. Sharma
Formerly Vice-Chancellor, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University,
Varanasi; 63 Vigyan Vihar, New Delhi - 110092.
Dr. R.N. Dandekar
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune
Dr. Giorgio Bonazzoli, M.A. (Milan); M. Th. (Rome)

EDITOR

Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, M.A., Ph.D., Vyakaranacharya

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Ganga Sagar Rai, M.A., Ph.D.
Oscar Pujol, M.A.

लेखेषु प्रतिपादितानि मतानि लेखकैरेवाभ्युपगतानि; न पुनस्तानि
सम्पादकैर्न्यासेन वाभ्युपगतानीति विज्ञेयम् ।

Authors are responsible for their views, which do not bind the Editors
and the Trust.

Authors are requested to use Devanāgarī characters while writing
Sanskrit ślokas and prose passages. They are also requested to follow the
system of transliteration adopted by the International Congress of
Orientalists at Athens in 1912 [ऋ = r̥; च् = c; छ = ch; द् = ḍ; श् = ś; ष् = ṣ;
in].

Traditional Sanskrit scholars are requested to send us articles in
Sanskrit (i) dealing with the religious & philosophical matters in the
Purāṇas and (ii) explaining the obscure & difficult passages in the
Purāṇas.

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

Vol. XXXV, No. II]

[January 27, 1993

वसन्तपञ्चम्यङ्कः.

Vasanta-Pañcamī Number

CONTENTS—लेखसूची

	Pages
1. मातृस्तवः [Eulogy of Mātṛs] with notes —By R.S. Bhattacharya	1-11
2. The aim of the Purānic etymologies [पुराणोक्तनिर्वचनानामुद्देश्यम्] —By Tiziana Pontillo Istituto di Glottologia Universita Cattolica del Sarco Cuore Largo Gemelli, 1 20123 MILANO (ITALY).	12-27
3. Kaca and Devayānī : The wise and the foolish [कचो देवयानी च; विज्ञोऽज्ञश्च] —By Subhash Anand Jnanadeep Vidyapeeth, Pune	28-67
4. Puranic sources of Śrī Rāmānuja with reference to his Vedārthasaṅgraha [श्रीरामानुजकृते वेदार्थसंग्रहनामके ग्रन्थे समुद्धृतानि पुराणवचनानि] —By Dr. N. Gangadharan Reader, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Madras, Madras.	68-87
5. Pollution and Karman in the Pātityagrāmanirṇaya [पातित्यग्रामनिर्णयसंज्ञके पुराणे पातित्यं कर्म च] —By Dr. Stephen Hillyer Levitt	88-105

144-30 78th Road, Apt. I H
Flushing, New York 11367, U.S.A.

6. Some comments on Dr. Chaturvedi's editorial policy
on Puranic manuscripts 105-120
—By *Oscar Pujol*
All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi
7. Activities of the All-India Kashiraj Trust 121-128
सर्वभारतीय-काशिराजन्यासस्य कार्यविवरणम् 129-135

मातृस्तवः

[Eulogy of Mātṛs]

प्रचण्डमणिकुण्डलं भृकुटिभासुरोग्राननं
करालमतिभीषणं विकृतवेषमत्युल्वणम् ।
ज्वलत्परशुवल्लकीडमरुण्डखट्वाङ्गिनं
नमामि वृषभस्थितां त्रिनयनां महाभैरवीम् ॥ २५

सितप्रवरपङ्कजे भ्रमरवृन्दनादाकुले
सदा विमलविस्तृते विपुलराजहंसस्थिताम् ।
स्थितां प्रवरविराजते ऋषिकुलोपसंसेवितां
नमामि शिरसा पितामहसमुद्भवां मातरम् ॥ २६

शरच्छशिशतोज्ज्वलां तुहिनशङ्खकुन्दप्रभां
स्फुरत्किरणभासितां सितवृषासने संस्थिताम् ।
जटाविकटजूटके दधति चन्द्रलेखां तु यां
नमामि त्रिशिखायुधां प्रमथनाथदेहोद्भवाम् ॥ २७

मयूरवरगामिनीं दरदशुद्धवर्णोत्कटां
वर्णं च चरणं कलितघण्टिकां निशितशक्तिहस्तोद्यताम् ।
प्रभासिकररश्मिभिर्ज्ञानज्ञानायमानांशुकां
नमामि गुहसंभवां त्रिदशशत्रुनिर्णाशनीम् ॥ २८

तसीप्रचयचान्द्रप्रभूतकुसुमा पुञ्जोपमां
गदामुसलधारिणीं धनुशङ्खचक्रायुधाम् ।
गरुत्मरथसंस्थितां विपुलपुण्डरीकेक्षणां
नमाम्यजितसंभवां विमलसिद्धिदां वैष्णवीम् ॥ २९

प्रभिन्नघनकज्जलच्छविवराहरूपाननां
कृपाणकरभासुरां परिघकालपाशोद्यताम् ।
कृतान्ततनुसंभवां प्रलयमेघघोषस्वरां
महामहिषवाहिनीं शुभकरीं नमाम्यादरात् ॥ ३०

विशुद्धकनकप्रभां चकितविद्युदुल्कोषमां
करीन्द्ररवसंकुलां विविधभूषणैर्भूषिताम् ।
स्फुरत्कुलिशधारिणीं सुरसमूहसम्पूजितां
नमामि वरदायिकां विपुलभोगदां शक्रजाम् ॥ ३१

दिवाकरशतप्रभां सितकपालमालाधरां
करालदशनाननां प्रलयवह्निपिङ्गेक्षणां ।
रुस्तनुघातिनीं रुधिरमांसमेदःप्रियां
नमामि शिवसंस्थितां शरणदां महोग्रायुधाम् ॥ ३२

चलच्छवणचामरप्रहतषट्पदारावितं
कपोलमदवारिणा दशदिशान्तरामोदयन् ।
गजेन्द्रवदनां शुभां सकलविघ्नविध्वंसनीं
नमामि गणनायिकां प्रमथनाथदेहोद्भवाम् ॥ ३३

स्फुटप्रकटविक्रमं सकललोकपालार्चितं
सुरारिकुलनाशनं प्रणतपापदुःखापहम् ।
नरो नमति मातरं स्तवति सर्वदेवस्तुता-
मवाप्य विपुलं सुखं व्रजति मातृलोकं परम् ॥ ३४
(देवीपुराण ८७/२५-३४; ८७/२४-३३ वङ्गीयसंस्क०)

NOTE ON THE MĀTRSTAVA

The deities called *mātr̥s* or *mātr̥kās* (mother-goddesses) are well-known in the field of Tantric worship.¹ They are said to be the *śaktis* of the supreme Mother and their chief function is to help the Goddess in her act of killing demons.²

As regards the number and names of the *mātr̥s* we find divergent views, usually they are said to be seven,³ eight⁴ or nine.⁵

1. For a detailed study of *mātr̥s*, see T. B. Coburn: *Devīmāhātmya: The Crystallization of the Goddesses Tradition*; David Kingslay: *Hindu Goddesses*; E. O. James: *The Cult of the Mother Goddesses*; J. N. Tewari: *Goddess cults in Ancient India*.
2. ब्रह्मरुद्रादिदेवानां समाकारस्तु ताः स्मृताः। जगत्-कल्याणकारिण्यः स्वस्वसेनासमावृताः ॥ (D. Bhāg.), यस्य देवस्य या शक्तिर्यथा भूषणवाहनम् । तदवदेव हि तच्छक्तिरसुरान् योद्धुमाययी ॥ (Saptaśatī 8.14); मातृगणः कर्तव्यः स्वनामदेवानुरूपकृतचिह्नः (Bṛhatsamhitā 58.56).
3. ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैव कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा वाराही चैव माहेश्वरी चामुण्डा सप्त मातरः॥ (quoted in the Śāntanarū on Saptasatī 8.38); ब्रह्माण्डाद्याः स्मृताः सप्त देवता मातरो बुधैः (Halāyudha's lexicon quoted in Vyākhyāsudhā on Amara 1. 1. 35).
4. ब्रह्माण्डाद्या अष्टमातरः । ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैव कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा वाराही नारसिंहैन्द्री चामुण्डा मातरः स्मृताः इति डामरतन्त्रे नवार्णविधाने उक्ताः (Nāgoji's comm. on Saptasatī 8.38), ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैन्द्रा कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा वाराही चण्डी चामुण्डा मातरोऽप्यवतः पराः ॥ (Kalpadrukos'a, p. 391, verse 105; mark the word ऐन्द्रा), ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैन्द्री वाराही वैष्णवी तथा कौमारीत्यपि चामुण्डा चर्चिकल्पष्टमातरः ॥ (quoted in Vyākhyāsudhā on Amara 1.1.35); ब्रह्मणा कात्तिकयेन इन्द्रेण च यमेन च वराहेण च देवेन विष्णुना परमेष्ठिना ॥ २९ माहेश्वरी च-राजेन्द्र इत्येता अष्टमातरः (Varāha-p. 27.29-30a Cr. ed.; here the names of eight source-gods are stated from whom eight mātr̥s namely ब्रह्मणी, कौमारी, इन्द्रजा (i. e. ऐन्द्री), यमदण्डधरा, वाराही, वैष्णवी, योगेश्वरी and माहेश्वरी are said to appear (Varāha-p. 27.32.Cr.ed.); ब्रह्मणी वैष्णवी रौद्री कौमारी शिवदूतिका ऐन्द्री च नारसिंहि च वाराही चाष्टमातरः॥ (quoted in Śāntanavī on Saptasatī 8, 38); ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैव कौमारी वैष्णवी तथा वाराही च तथेन्द्राणी चामुण्डा सप्त मातरः॥ अष्टमी तु महालक्ष्मी नाम्ना प्रोक्ता तु मातरः। (D. Bhāg.); ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चण्डी वाराही वैष्णवी तथा कौमारी चैव चामुण्डा चर्चिकल्पष्टमातृकाः॥ (an oft-quoted verse in Tantric works); ब्रह्मणी माहेशी कौमारी वैष्णवी च वाराही इन्द्राणी चामुण्डा महालक्ष्मीति मातरः प्रोक्ताः॥ (Prapañcasāra 7.11. mark the word चामुण्डा; here the names are eight in number). In some commentaries on Amara 1.1.36 the

According to some the number is 64 (vide Durgārcanapaddhati pp. 676-677); in the Viṣṇu-dharmottara-p. (1. 226), the number is nearly 200.

The following eulogy of the mātṛs in the metre Pṛthvī occurs in the Devī-purāṇa. Two editions of this Upapurāṇa are available—one in Bengali characters edited by Pt. Pañcānana Tarkaratna with a Bengali translation, published by the Bangabasi Press and the other in Devanagari characters edited by Dr. Puspendra Kumar Sharma with the help of a few MSS, published by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, New Delhi. The eulogy is called Mātṛstava in 87.24.

(Verse 25) The verse is highly perplexing since it eulogises one deity though it contains words of both masculine and feminine genders. As this *stotra* is called Mātṛstava, it cannot reasonably be held that the first three feet of the verse extol a male deity and the last foot a female deity.⁶ It is also surprising to note that only the last foot has variants of masculine gender which goes against the context; Cp. 87. 15 (पूजयित्वा तु शक्तयः), 87.17 (परा शक्तिर्या सावाद्या), 87.22 (रुद्रदेव्यस्तु पूजिताः). That no male deity has been eulogised here is proved from the first two verses of Chap. 88 also.⁷

following verse mentioning eight names is quoted; ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरीन्द्राणी वाराही वैष्णवी तथा कौमारी चर्ममुण्डा च कालसंहारिणीति च॥

5. ब्राह्मी माहेश्वरी चैन्द्री वाराही वैष्णवी तथा कौमारी चर्ममुण्डा च काली संकर्षिणीति च॥ (quoted in the comm. Śāntanavī on Saptasatī 8.38). The wellknown nine Durgās (नवदुर्गाः) are regarded as nine Mātṛs. They are Jagaddhātṛī or Brahmāṇī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī, Nārasimhī, Indrāṇī, Cāmuṇḍā and Kātyāyanī (or Lakṣmī).
6. Curiously enough, the author of the Bengali translation has taken the masculine adjectival words as qualifying Mahābhairavī (a feminine word) without giving any remark. We have retained here the printed readings as our readings are not fully based on manuscript evidence.
7. दिव्यैः शिवागमैस्त्वेताः पूजिताश्च मुमुक्षुभिः । गारुडे भूततन्त्रे च कालतन्त्रे च पूजिताः ॥ साध्यन्ते सर्वकार्याणि चिन्तामणिसमा शिवा पाषण्डिभिर्भविष्येस्तु बौद्धगारुडवादिभिः॥ (88.1-2). Is the Kālatantra mentioned here a Buddhist work? Mark the word Baudha in verse 2.

Thus it is quite reasonable to hold that the masculine epithets are to be changed into feminine epithets (namely ०कुण्डलाम्, ०ग्राननाम्, ०भीषणाम्, ०ल्वणाम् and ०खट्वाङ्गिनीम्).

In the reading करालमतिभीषणाम्, there arises a problem about the non-feminine word करालम्. If it is changed into करालाम् it would render the metre defective. Kālī is usually described as करालवदना. Can we take the expression as करालमुखभीषणाम् in the sense of करालमुखेन भीषणाम् (the third case-ending showing *hetu*).

The verse evidently extols the goddess Mahābhairavī. This name is however not read in the well-known lists of mātṛkās. Mahābhairavī seems to be the same as Kālī described in Saptasatī 7.5-7. This Kālī may be regarded as a mātṛkā; see the Viṣṇu-dharmottara-p. Sec 1, Ch. 226; see also the remarks of the comm. Śāntanavī (काली नाम शक्तिः कापि अपरा देवी, on 7.5). Mātṛkās are regarded as śaktis of various deities (See Saptasatī 8.11-13).

The Beng. ed. reads भ्रुकुटि for भृकुटि (in the first foot). Both the forms are found in the lexicons and in poetical as well as Tantric works. The word is sometimes read with a long ī and three forms with long ī (भ्रुकुटी, भ्रुकुटी and भृकुटी) are mentioned in the Śāntanavī comm. on Saptasatī 7.5, विकृतवेषमुल्वणाम् (read in the Dev. ed.) is corrupt as it is metrically defective.

The variant भास्मर for भासुर (in the first foot) is wrong, as there is no word as bhāsmara. *Bhāsmara* may be a slip of the scribe for *bhāsvara*.

(Verse 26) The verse eulogises the mātṛkā named Brāhmī also called Brahmāṇī, who is here said to come out from Pitāmaha (i. e. Brahmā); cp. Saptasatī 8.14 and 11.12).

The reading स्थिति is corrupt as it cannot be construed with the other words in the verse. स्थितां is to be construed with सितप्रवरपङ्कजे, which is qualified by भ्रमरवृन्दनादाकुले and विमलविस्तृते. The expression विपुलराजहंसस्थिताम् is an independent adjective of मातरम्.

The expression प्रवरविराजिते in the third foot (read in both the editions) creates much difficulty, so far as its analysis is concerned. The word creates metrical fault also. It is difficult to conceive the correct reading of this expression.

संसेविता in the third foot (in the Beng. ed.) seems to be a printing error.

(Verse 27) The eulogises the mātṛkā Māheśvarī; Cp. Saptasāti 8.15 and 11.13).

The reading शशिशत (in the first foot) is better than the variant शशिकर as this shows development of brightness which is intended here.

The reading भाषितां (in the second foot) in both the editions is to be corrected to भासितां as the root Bhāṣa (भाष व्यक्तायां वाचि) is incompatible with rays (*kirāṇa*). वृषासनस्थिताम् read in both the editions is to be corrected to वृषासने संस्थिताम् for metrical reasons.

दधाति in the third foot cannot be accepted as it renders the metre defective. The reading दधति (in the Beng. ed.) is metrically faultless but the form is grammatically indefensible. It cannot be the root *dhā* of the Juhotyādi group but the root दध धारणे of the Bhvādi group, which is however ātmanepadin. Even if we take दधति (for दधते) as an example of Puranic licence, yet it is extremely difficult to construe this word with the rest of the words of the third and fourth feet. Are we to understand the sentence as meaning या (not याम् as read in the printed editions) जटाविकटजूटके चन्द्रलेखां दधति तां (which is to be understood) नमामि. This however is not a normal use of words.

त्रिशिखाभूतां in the fourth line (in the Dev. ed.) is not only metrically defective, but yields no proper meaning also.

(Verse 28) This eulogises the mātṛkā Kaumārī; Cp. Saptasāti 8.16, 11.14.

The variant गामिणी (in the first foot) is wrong. Had the word been analysed as मयूरवरगामः अस्ति अस्याः, then गामिणी would have

been correct. But as गाम is no word, the word must be spelt with the dental *na*. The compound is to be analysed as मयूरवरं गामिनी (dvitīyā tatpuruṣa).

The meaning of *daradas'uddha* (read in both the editions) is not clear. Darada meaning red lead does not seem to be applicable here. Most probably the reading *darada* is corrupt. There is however no metrical fault in this reading.

The second foot is metrically defective. Moreover the expression वर्णं च चरणं bears no sense. There is no metrical fault in the meaningful remaining portion (निशितशक्तिहस्तोद्यताम्) of this foot, which shows that the portion वर्णं च...घण्टिकां requires to be corrected. The reading वर्णन्ध (in the Beng. ed. for वर्णं च) does not help in any way correct the reading of this portion. We propose here a conjectural reading: पदाकलितघण्टिकां⁸. It is difficult to explain how the corrupt reading वर्णं च...घण्टिकां came into existence.

In the third foot the Dev. ed. reads प्रभानिकररश्मिभिः. There is no *visarga* or *repha* after भि which is objectional; perhaps there is a printing mistake here. प्रभानिकररश्मि is a meaningful word, though it is better to read प्रभासिकररश्मि (प्र + भास् + णिनि = प्रभासिन्). The Dev. ed. reads ऋग्गायमानांशुकां which has no meaning and as such the reading is to be taken as corrupt. It is metrically faulty also. झनझनायमानांशुकां (the reading of the Beng. ed.) is metrically faultless. It bears a sense also (झनझनायमानम् अंशुकं यस्याः ताम्). झनझनायमान- making a twinkling sound. Since the *amśuka* (garment) has metallic ornaments it produces twinkling sound. The usual form is झणझणायमान (with a cerebral *n*); cp. the word झणत्कार.

The variant निर्णसनीम् for निर्णसनीम् (in the fourth foot) is wrong. The reading निवर्हिणीम् is metrically defective. नाशनी is from

8. पदेन आकलिता पदाकलिता, पदाकलिता: घण्टिका: यस्या: ताम्

the word नाशन with the feminine suffix डीप्.⁹

(Verse 29) This eulogises the mātṛkā Vaiṣṇavī; Cp. Saptasāti 8.18 and 11.16.

The reading of the first foot is highly corrupt and the reading तसी (Beng. ed.), the variants प्रभूतकुसुमातसी and प्रभूतकुसुमापञ्चोपमा (Beng. ed.) do not show the original reading. Our conjectural reading is प्रभूतकुसुमातसीप्रचयसान्द्रपुञ्जोपमा¹⁰ one compound word. The reading is slightly objectionable as कुसुमातसी (कुसुम+अतसी) is awkward, the usual form being अतसीकुसुम. Can the form be defended by taking it as कुसुमभूता अतसी? cp. वाहनकेसरी in Saptasāti 2.50.

मुषल is read in the Beng. ed. (in the second foot). मुसल seems to be the earlier form, as it is derived from the root *mas* (मसी परिणामे)¹¹."

The reading धनुशङ्ख in this foot must be corrupt as it creates metrical fault. The form धनु is unusual, the usual form being धनुस् which again creates metrical fault. We may read धनु with the prefix सु and thus keep the metre intact (सुधनुशङ्ख) though such an amendment is hardly justifiable. The variant चन्द्रायुधाम् is corrupt as चन्द्र cannot be taken as a weapon.

The Beng. ed. reads विपुल for विमल in the fourth foot, which is more acceptable.

(Verse 30) This eulogises the mātṛkā Vārāhī though the name is not stated here expressly; Cp. Saptasāti 8.19 and 11.17.

The variant छविं in the first foot creates metrical fault. The whole first foot is to be taken as a compound word. About the grammatical correctness of वाहिनी in महामहिषवाहिनी explaining the word महावृषभवाहिनि, see Śantanavī in Saptasāti 11.13.

9. See the comments of Bhāskara on the word दक्षयज्ञविनाशिनी—'यदात्र उपान्त्यस्वरोऽकारः पठ्यते तदा विनाशनशब्दात् ल्युडन्तान् डीप् इकारपाठे तु गिन्यन्तात् (on Lalitāsahasranāma, verse 171).

10. प्रभूतकुसुमातसीप्रचयस्य यः सान्द्रः पुञ्जः स उपमा यस्याः सा'—the word is to be understood in this way.

11. Later lexicons read both the forms.

As the variant शूकरी (for शिवकरी) in the fourth foot creates metrical fault it is corrupt. Since the verse eulogises Vārāhī and since the name of the mātṛkā has not been expressly stated in the verse, some intelligent scribe replaced शिवकरी by it without noticing that the reading would create metrical fault.

(Verse 31) This verse eulogises the mātṛkā Indrāṇī (also called Aindrī); cp. Saptasāti 8.21 and 11.19.

The reading विद्युल्ललितोपमा in the first foot (Dev. ed.) is corrupt as it is metrically defective. Moreover ललित can hardly be used appropriately with विद्युत्; the compound is hardly satisfactory. Unfortunately no variant of this reading has been given in the Dev. ed. As the reading in the Beng. ed. is meaningful, it is accepted here.

The second foot has a variant कवीन्द्रवर. There is no propriety in mentioning *kavi* here. As the use of both इन्द्र (in the sense of श्रेष्ठ) and वर with reference to one and the same entity is futile, we take the reading करीन्द्रव as correct. संकुल may aptly be used with रव (and not with वर).

The fourth foot has a variant विपुलभागभवां (in the place of विपुलभोगदा) which is evidently corrupt as it corrupts the metre and yields no acceptable sense. The variant शत्रुजाम् (in the place of शक्रजाम्) seems to be written inadvertently by the scribe. It may also be supposed that the variant is due to the Bengali script in which the forms of क्र and त्रु are very similar.

(Verse 32) This verse seems to eulogise the mātṛkā Cāmuṇḍā, for in the Purāṇas she is said to kill the Demon Ruru. Cāmuṇḍā's description in the Saptasāti is in consonance with the epithets given in this verse. Cāmuṇḍā is said to be one of the mātṛkās in Prapañcasāra 7.11.

The Beng. ed. reads मालाधरी in the first foot. It is usual to use मालाधरा with the feminine suffix टाप्. The use of the feminine suffix

डीप् is sometimes found in such words in the *stotras* and Tantric works.¹²

The variant प्रलयरवीव पिङ्गोक्षणाम् in the second foot is metrically defective. Moreover रवीव पिङ्गोक्षणा is grammatically indefensible.

The reading रूतनुघातिनी (in Dev. ed.) or रूतनुघातिनी (in Beng. ed.) in the third foot is metrically defective. The correct Puranic form is रू and not रू. According to us the correct reading would be रूद्वितनुघातिनी which is in consonance with the metre. It is said in the Varāha-p. that before the killing of the demon Ruru by Cāmuṇḍā, his body was divided into two parts (called Carman or Carma and Muṇḍa).¹³ On account of these two bodies Cāmuṇḍā may rightly be described as रूद्वितनुघातिनी. We may read रूद्वितय also.

It is better to read मेदःप्रियां (in the third foot) as read in the Beng. ed. and not मेदप्रियां (as read in the Dev. ed.) as the stem is मेदस्. Some opine that as शिर is also used for शिरस्, so मेद may also be used for मेदस् (Cp. the maxim सर्वे सान्ता अदन्ताः in later grammatical works).

In the fourth foot there is a variant शिवसंस्थिता. The reading शवसंस्थिता is preferable, for Cāmuṇḍā is often described as प्रेतसंस्था¹⁴ or शववाहना in Tantric works.

12. For an unusual or far-fetched explanation of धरी in the word मालापुस्तकपाशाङ्कुशधरी (Śaṅkara's Annapūrnāstōtra 9), see the Sanskrit notes by Pandit Pañcānana Tarkaratna : 'मालापुस्तकपाशाङ्कुशा चासी धरीभवेति समासः । धरं पर्वतमिच्छति इति धरशब्दात् क्यचि कर्तरि क्विपि रूपम्' ।

13. देवी च त्रिशिखेनाजौ तं रूदं समताडयत्। तथा तु ताडितान्तस्य दैत्यस्य शुभलोचनो चर्ममुण्डे उभे सम्मक् पृथग्भूते बभूवतुः॥ ३०। रुरोस्तु दानवेन्द्रस्य चर्ममुण्डे क्षणाद् यतः अपहृत्याहरद् देवी चामुण्डा तेन साभवत्॥ (Varāha-p. 95.30-31 Cr.ed., quoted in the Lalitāsahasranāma-bhāṣya, verse 196 on the name Caṇḍikā).

14. On the meanings of प्रेत the comments of the Vivaraṇa comm. on Amarakoṣa 3.3.60 are worth noting: प्राण्यन्तरं नरकलोकस्यः प्राणिविशेषः प्रागुक्तः। अथवा मरणादूर्ध्वम् अकृतासपिण्डीकरणे प्रेतशब्दः । यथा 'सपिण्डीकरणादूर्ध्वं प्रेतत्वं विनिवर्तते' इति । मृतमात्रेऽपि, यथा प्रेतसंस्कारः.

(Verse 33) The mātṛkā eulogised here seems to be Gaṇanāyikā, though her name is not read in the well-known lists of mātṛkās.

The reading प्रहृष्टषट् (in the first foot) in the Dev. ed. is metrically defective. Moreover चामरप्रहृष्ट does not yield a good sense. The reading प्रहत (in the Beng. ed.) suits the metre and is meaningful also (चामरेण प्रहतैः षट्पदैः आराविताम्).

The reading दशदिशान्तरामोदयन्¹⁵ (in Beng. ed.) is better than दशदिशान्तरं मोदयन्¹⁶ (in the Dev. ed.).

The third and fourth feet have variant reading in which all adjectival words are read in the masculine gender referring to the deity Gaṇanāyaka. Since it is a verse of the Mātṛstava, a male deity cannot be extolled here, and as such the variant readings are to be taken as corrupt.

(Verse 34) The verse seems to extol not any particular mātṛ but mātṛs in general.

In the third foot the Beng. ed. reads यमति, which must be corrupt as the root *yama* in the sense of *uparama* (cessation) is intransitive while in the sentence there is the object मातरम्. Moreover the correct form in this root would be यच्छति and not यमति.

In this foot the Dev. ed. reads स्तवति and the Beng. ed. स्तुवति. Grammatically the word should be स्तौति from the root ष्टु स्तुतौ. स्तवति may be taken here in the sense of स्तवं करोति.

The reading देवस्तुता in the Beng. ed. seems to be a printing error, for a word in the first case-ending cannot be construed with the other words in this verse.

- R. S. Bhattacharya

15. It is to be analysed as दशदिशान्तः + आमोदयन्.

16. It is to be analysed as दशानां दिशानाम् अन्तरं मोदयन् (here the stem is दिशा and not दिग्). *Antara* (meaning *avakāśa*) should have been used here in plural number. It would be wrong here to analyse दिशान्तरम् as अन्या दिशा for the word in this sense cannot be properly construed with *daśa*.