

The 'Purāṇa', Bulletin has been started by the Purāṇa Department of the All-India Kashiraj Trust with the aim of organising the manifold studies relating to the Purāṇas. It specially discusses the several aspects of text-reconstruction, of the interpretation of the vast cultural and historical material, and of the obscure esoteric symbolism of legends and myths of the Purāṇas. The editors invite contributions from all those scholars who are interested in the culture of the Purāṇa literature in which the religion and philosophy of the Vedas have found the fullest expression.

Statement of ownership and other particulars about

पुराणम्—PURĀṆA

1. Place of PublicationFort Ramnagar, Varanasi
2. Periodicity of Publication ... Half-yearly
3. Printer's NameVinaya Shankar
NationalityIndian
AddressRatna Printing Works,
B21/42 A, Kamachha, Varanasi
4. Publisher's NameYogendra Narain Thakur
General Secretary, All-India
Kashiraj Trust
NationalityIndian
AddressAll-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi.
5. Editors' Name with AddressR. K. Sharma (New Delhi),
Dr. R. N. Dandekar (Pune),
Sri A.S. Gupta (*Editor-in-Charge*)
(Purāṇa Deptt Fort Ramnagar,
Varanasi).
NationalityIndian.
6. Name of the ownerAll-India Kashiraj Trust, Fort
Ramnagar, Varanasi.

I, Yogendra Narain Thakur, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true, to the best of my knowledge.

Yogendra Narain Thakur

पुराणम्
PURĀṆA

(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

With the financial Assistance from the Ministry of Education,

Government of India

VASANTA PAÑCAMĪ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्

SILVER JUBILEE NUMBER



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT, RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

KAPILA, THE FOUNDER OF THE SĀMĀKHYA SYSTEM,
IDENTICAL WITH THE DESTROYER OF THE SONS OF
THE KING SAGARA ?

by

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

[अशिष्टान् सगरनृपपुत्रान् कपिलो नाम मुनिः स्वतेजसा ददाहेति पौराणिकी प्रसिद्धिः । कपिलोऽयं सांख्यप्रवक्तृरिति भागवते, देवीभागवते चोक्तम् । पुराणद्वयोक्तं मतमिदं पुराणवाङ्मयमतानुसारेणैव न संगतं भवति; सांख्यवक्तुः कपिलाद् भिन्नोऽयं कपिल इति च मते लेखकेनात्र प्रतिपादिते । निबन्धलेखकेन अभिहितं यद् भागवत-देवीभागवते एव सगरपुत्रनाशकं सांख्यवक्तारं मन्येते, नान्यत् पुराणमुपपुराणमितिहासो वा, अतो मतमिदं न श्रद्धातुं शक्यते । एवंसकृत्-कपिल-संबद्धानि देश-काल-पित्रादि-गुण-कर्मादीनि न सांख्यवक्तारि कपिले संगतानि भवन्ति—इति लेखकेन विस्तरेण प्रदर्शितम् ।

यतो एवंसकृत् कपिलो विष्णु-वासुदेव-रूपेण प्रसिद्धिं गतः, सांख्यवक्ता कपिलोऽपि विष्णोरवताररूपेण संमानितो वैष्णवैरर्वाकालिकैः, अतो एवंसकृत् कपिल एव सांख्यवक्ता कपिल इति प्रसिद्धिर्जाता, या वैष्णवसंप्रदाय-विशेषालम्बना भागवतकारेणानुसृता । द्वयोर्मुन्योः कपिलेतिपदाभिधेयत्वपि अस्याः प्रसिद्धेः (वस्तुतः भ्रान्तदृष्टेः) हेतुः ।

कपिलद्वयैष्यविषयकमिदं भ्रान्तं मतम् आदौ अविशेषदर्शना भागवत-कारेण प्रोक्तम्, ततश्च देवीभागवतकारेणानुसृतम् । सांख्यवक्तुर्भिन्नः कपिलः ('अक्रधनु'—'वासुदेवा'परनामा) संकल्पबलेन वह्निमुत्पाद्य सगरपुत्रान् ददाह—इति प्राचीनपुराणेभ्यो विज्ञायापि भागवतकारः स्वेच्छया एवंसकृतं कपिलं सांख्यवक्तारं मेने—इत्यपि भवितुं मर्हति इति लेखको वक्ति । आदिविदुषा सिद्धेश्वरेण परमर्षिणा सहजातधर्मज्ञानवैराग्यैश्वर्येण कपिलेन सगरपुत्रदहनरूपं कर्म कृतमिति कथन मध्यात्मशास्त्रदृशा च संगतं भवतीति लेखकीया दृष्टिः ।

निबन्धान्ते सांख्यवक्तु-कपिल-कालविषये काचिद् दुःसमाधेया समस्या चोपन्यस्ता लेखकेन ।]

The Bhāgavata, after stating the burning of the sons of the king Sagara by a sage named Kapila in 9.8.10-12, remarks in the following two verses (13-14)¹ that this Kapila is the same as the founder of Sāṅkhya. These two verses suggest that it is not the wrath of the sage that burnt the sons of Sagara to ashes; in fact it is their sinful acts that caused their death. The Devī-Bhāgavata (6.15.42),² while giving incidentally examples of the ill-results of lust, wrath, greed and egoism, categorically states that the sons of Sagara were burnt by the Sāṅkhya teacher Kapila on account of *daiṇyoga* (the power of destiny).

This incident of burning was so widely known that a poet like Bhavabhūti has clearly referred to it in his Uttararāmacarita (1.23).³ Though Kālidāsa in his Raghuvamśa⁴ (13.3) spoke of the digging of the earth by the sons of Sagara with a view to finding out the sacrificial horse and the carrying away of the horse by Kapila to the nether region and was silent on the incident of the burning of the sons of Sagara by the fire created by the wrath of Kapila, yet we have no doubt that he was aware of this incident.

A careful study of the relevant Purāṇic passages would reveal that the philosopher (i. e. founder of Sāṅkhya) Kapila was not the destroyer of the sons of Sagara. We shall also try to show the causes that gave rise to this wrong identification.

(A) The episode of the burning of the wicked sons of the king Sagara by the wrathful sage Kapila is set out in the following

1. न साधुवादो मुनिकोपभर्जिता नृपेन्द्रपुत्रा इति सत्त्वधामनि ।
कथं तमो रोषमयं विभाव्यते जगत्-पवित्रात्मनि खे रजो भुवः ॥
यस्येरिता सांख्यमयी दृढेह नौर्यया मुमुक्षुस्तरते दुरत्ययम् ।
भवान्णवं मृत्युपथं विपश्चिदः परात्मभूतस्य कथं पृथङ्मतिः ॥
2. कपिलः सांख्यवेत्ता च योगाम्यासरतः शुचिः ।
तेनापि दैवयोगाद्धि प्रदग्धाः सगरात्मजाः ॥
3. तुरगविचयव्यग्रानुर्वीभिदः सगराध्वरे कपिलमहसामर्षात् प्लुष्टान् पितुश्च
पितामहान् । (v. I. पितुः प्रपितामहान्) ।
4. गुरोरियक्षोः कपिलेन मेघे रसातलं संक्रमिते तुरङ्गे ।
तदर्थमुर्वीमवदारद्भिः पूर्वेः किलायं परिवर्षितो नः ॥

Purāṇic works and the epics⁵ :

Vāyu-p. 88. 147-148; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.53.25-35 and 2.63.144-146; Viṣṇu-p. 4.4.11, 23 (in prose); Brahma-p. 8.52-56; Matsya-p. 12.42b-43a (The destroyer is called Viṣṇu; there is no separate mention of the name Kapila); Padma-p. 5.8.147; 6.21.37b-39a; Liṅga-p. 1.66.18; the printed reading विष्णुङ्कारमार्गणैः is to be corrected to विष्णुना येऽश्वमार्गणे; Agni-p. 273.28a-29a; Nārādiya-p. 1.18.95-109; Viṣṇudharmottara-p. 1.18.14-16a; Śiva-p. 5.38.51-53; Nara-simha-p. 26.7; Br. Dharma-p. 2.18:28-29 and 2.22.41; Br. Nārādiya-p. 89.99-113; Rāmāyaṇa 1.40.24-30; Mahābhārata, Vana-p. 47.18-19 and 107.28-33; Udyoga-p. 109.17b-18a; Anuśāsana-p. 153.9 and Harivaṁśa 1.14.24-25.⁶

5. Though Harivaṁśa (1.15.7) and Brahma-p. (8.68) inform us that 'the śruti says that the king Sagara had two wives' yet no Vedic text is found to contain any information about this king or his sons. This is why no Vedic text is of any help to us in determining the identity of the destroyer Kapila. It is quite reasonable to think that the word śruti in the aforesaid Purāṇic passage simply means 'tradition' (*aitihya*).
6. स तं देशं सुतैः सर्वैः खानयामास पार्थिवः । आसेदुश्च ततस्तस्मिन्स्तदन्तस्ते महार्णवे ॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं हरिं कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् ॥ विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण हंसं नारायणं प्रभुम् ॥ तस्य चक्षुः समासाद्य तेजस्तत् प्रतिपद्यते । दग्धाः पुत्रास्तदा सर्वे चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥ (Vāyu-p. 88.146-148). ततो मुनिरदीनात्मा ध्यानभङ्गप्रघषितः ॥२५॥ क्रोधेन महताविष्टश्चक्षुभे कपिलस्तदा । प्रचचाल दुराघर्षो षष्टितस्तैर्दुरात्मभिः ॥२६॥...उन्मीलयत् तदानेत्रे वह्निचक्रसमद्युतिः । तदाक्षिणी क्षणं राजन् राजेतां सुभृशारुणे ॥२९॥...अवैक्षत स गम्भीरः कृतान्तः कालपर्यये । क्रुद्धस्य तस्य नेत्राभ्यां सहसा पावकाचिषः ॥३०॥ क्रोधाग्निः स महाराज ज्वालाभ्यासदिगन्तरः ॥३०॥ दग्धाश्चकार तान् सर्वान् आवृण्वानो नभस्तलम् ॥३५॥ (Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.53.25-35). स तु देशं सुतैः सर्वैः खानयामास पार्थिवः । आसेदुश्च ततस्तस्मिन् खनन्तस्ते महार्णवे ॥१४४॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं हरिं कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् । विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण हंसं नारायणं प्रभुम् ॥१४५॥ तस्य चक्षुः समासाद्य तेजस्तत् प्रतिपद्यते । दग्धाः पुत्रास्तदा सर्वे चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥ (Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.63.144-146). ततश्च तेनापि भगवता किञ्चिदीषत् परिवर्तितेन लोचनेन विलोकिताः स्वशरीरसमुत्थेन अग्निना बह्यमाना विनेशुः (Viṣṇu-p. 4.4.11). ततस्तत्-पुत्र-बलमशेषं परमर्षिणा कपिलेन तेजसा दग्धम् (*ibid* 4.4.12). स तं देशं तदा पुत्रैः खानयामास पार्थिवः । आसेदुस्तु तदा तत्र खन्यमाने महार्णवे ॥५४॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं हरिं

कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् । विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण स्वपन्तं पुरुषं तदा ॥५५॥ तस्य चक्षुः-समुत्थेन तेजसा प्रतिबुध्यतः । दग्धाः सर्वे मुनिश्चेष्टाश्चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥ ५६ (Brahma-p. 8.54-56). ततः षष्टिसहस्राणि सुषुवे यादवी प्रभा ॥४२॥ खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धा विष्णुना येऽश्वमार्गणे (Matsya-p. 12.42b-43a). ततः षष्टिसहस्राणि सुषुवे यादवी प्रभा । खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धा विष्णुना येऽश्वमार्गणे ॥ (Padma-p. 5.8.147). तत्रैकमादिपुरुषं ददृशुस्ते त्वरान्विताः ॥ ३७॥ चोरोऽयमवदंश्चेति कपिलं जगतां प्रभुम् । तस्य चक्षुःसमुत्थेन वह्निना प्रतिबुध्यतः ॥३८॥ दग्धाः षष्टिसहस्राणि चत्वारस्तेऽवशेषिताः ॥ ३९॥ (Padma-p. 6.21.37b-39a). ततः षष्टिसहस्राणि सुषुवे यादवी प्रभा । खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धाः विष्णुङ्कारमार्गणैः । (Liṅga-p. 1.66.18). प्रभा षष्टिसहस्राणां सुतानां जननी त्वभूत् । २८॥... खनन्तः पृथिवीं दग्धाः कपिलेनाथ सागराः (Agni-p. 273.28a-29a). तत्रापश्यन् महात्मानं कोटिसूर्यसमप्रभम् । कपिलं ध्याननिरतं वाजिनं च तदन्तिके ॥९५॥ ततः सर्वे ते संरब्धास्तं मुनिं पश्य वेगतः । हन्तुं मुद्युक्तमनसो विद्वन्तः समासदन् ॥६९॥ [एतन्तरं 'दुःशीलतानिन्दापरका बहवः श्लोकाः कपिलेनोक्ताः] इत्युक्त्वा कपिलः क्रुद्धो नेत्राभ्यां ससृजेऽनलम् । स वह्निः सागरान् सर्वान् भस्मसाद् अकरोत् क्षणात् ॥ Nārādiya-p. 1.18.95-109). कपिलस्य समीपस्थं ददृशुस्ते तुरङ्गमम् । तुरङ्गसहितं दृष्ट्वा कपिलं ते त्वमर्षिताः ॥१४॥ कुदाललेपिकाहस्तास्तस्य जग्मुर्वधेऽप्यया । तान् बाधमानान् दुर्बुद्धीन् संददर्श तदा ऋषिः ॥१५॥ चक्षुषा दृष्टमात्रास्ते भस्मीभूतास्तु सागराः । (Viṣṇudharmottara-p. 1.18.14-16a). महाराजोऽथ सगरस्तद्दह्यान्वेषणाय च । स तं देशं तदा पुत्रीः खानयामास सर्वतः ॥ आसेदुस्ते ततस्तत्र खन्यमाने महार्णवे ॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं कपिलं विश्वरूपिणम् ॥ तस्य चक्षुःसमुत्थेन वह्निना प्रतिबुध्यतः । दग्धाः षष्टिसहस्राणि चत्वारस्त्ववशेषिताः ॥ (Śiva-p. 5.38.51-53). अस्थिशर्कराभूताः कपिलमर्हर्षिनिर्दग्धाश्च गुरवः सागराख्या गङ्गातोयसंपृष्टा दिवमारोपिताः (Narasimha-p. 26.7). ततो भग्नसमाधिश्च कपिलो नाम वै मुनिः । उन्निरद्रित्वा नयने तान् ददर्श स तामसान् । हुंकारशब्दसंयुक्त-चक्षुर्दर्शनतो मुनिः । तत्क्षणादेव वै भस्म चकार तान् कृतागसः ॥ (Brhaddharma-p. 2.18.28-29). तत्रापश्यन् महात्मानं कोटिसूर्यसमप्रभम् । कपिलं ध्याननिरतं सति चैव तदन्तिके ॥९९॥ प्रमत्ताः पापनिरताः सागरा अविवेकिनः । सर्वे ते सहसा ह्येते मुनिं बन्धुं समुद्यताः ॥१००॥ हन्यतां हन्यतामेव बध्यतां बध्यतामिति । १०१॥...परित्यक्तसमाधिस्तु तान् दृष्ट्वा विस्मितो मुनिः । उवाच भावगम्भीरं लोकोपद्रवकारिणः ॥१०५॥

The burning incident has not been mentioned by the Garuḍa-p. (1.138.29), the Kūrma-p. (1.21.5-7) and the Saura-p. (30.38) though they speak of the king Sagara, his wives and his descendants.

इत्युक्त्वा कपिलः क्रुद्धो नेत्रादग्निं विसृष्टवान् । स बह्निः सागरान् सर्वान् भस्मसादकरोत् तदा । (Brhannāradiya 8.96.99-113). ते तु सर्वे महात्मानः भीमवेगा महाबलाः ॥२४॥ ददृशुः कपिलं तत्र वासुदेवं सनातनम् । २५का श्रुत्वा तु वचनं तेषां कपिलो रघुनन्दन । रोषेण महाताविष्टो हुंकार मकरोत् तदा ॥२९॥ ततस्तेनाप्रमेयेण कपिलेन महात्मना । भस्मराशीकृताः सर्वे काकुत्स्थ सगरात्मजाः ॥३०॥ (Rāmāyaṇa 1.40.24-30). योऽसौ भूमिगतः श्रीमान् विष्णुर्मधुनिसूदनः । कपिलो नाम देवोऽसौ भगवानजितो हरिः ॥१८॥ येन पूर्वं महात्मानः खनमाना रसातलम् । दर्शनादेव निहताः सगरस्यात्मजा विभो ॥१९॥ (Mbh. Vana-p. 47.18-19). अपश्यन्त ह्यं तत्र विचरन्तं महीतले । विदार्य पातालमथ संक्रुद्धाः सगरात्मजाः ॥२८॥ते तं दृष्ट्वा ह्यं राजन् संप्रहृष्टतनूरुहाः । अनादृत्य महात्मानं कपिलं कालचोदिताः । संक्रुद्धा संप्रघावन्त अश्वग्रहणकाङ्क्षिणः । ततः क्रुद्धो महाराज कपिलो मुनिसत्तमः ॥३१॥ वासुदेवेति यं प्राहुः कपिलं मुनिपुङ्गवम् । स चक्षुर्विकृतं कृत्वा तेजस्तेषु समुत्सृजत् ॥३२॥ ददाह सुमहातेजा मन्दबुद्धीन् स सागरान् ॥३३॥ (Mbh. Vana-p. 107.28-33). अत्र चक्रधनुर्नाम सूर्याज् जातो महानृषिः । विदुर्यं कपिलं देवं येनार्ताः सगरात्मजाः ॥ (Udyoga-p. 109.17b-18a). महतश्चूर्णितान् पश्य ये हासन्त महोदधिम् । सुवर्णधारिणा नित्यमवशसा द्विजातिना ॥ (Mbh. Anuśāsana-p. 153.9) : “महतः सगरपुत्रान् आसन्त उपासन्त, सुवर्णधारिणा शोभनो ब्राह्मणवर्णस्तस्य धारिणा धर्त्रा द्विजातिना कपिलेन” (Nilakanṭha's comment). The word महोदधि in this verse may be taken as the name of a particular ocean. स तं देशं तदा पुत्रैः खानया-मास पार्थिवः । आसेदुस्ते ततस्तत्र खन्यमाने महार्णवे ॥२३॥ तमादिपुरुषं देवं हरिं कृष्णं प्रजापतिम् । विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण स्वपन्तं पुरुषोत्तमम् ॥२४॥ तस्य चक्षुः समुत्थेन तेजसा प्रतिबुध्यतः । दग्धा स्ते वै महाराज चत्वारस्त्व-वशेषिताः ॥२५॥ (Harivamśa 1.14.23-25).

Far a full account of the whole episode beginning with Sagara's performing the horse sacrifice and ending with the burning of his sons to ashes by the fire created by the wrathful sage Kapila, readers should read some verses more preceding the verses referred to here. There is no need to give an account of the episode as it is wellknown to the readers of the Purāṇas.

Since the genealogical accounts in these Purāṇas seem to be brief, the non-mention of the incident does not prove that it was not known to the authors of these Purāṇas. The Brahmavaivarta, the Devī-p. the Kālikā-p., the Mārkaṇḍeya-p., the Skanda-p., the Vāmana-p., and the Bhaviṣya-p. are silent on the king Sagara and his descendants. Though the Devī-Bhāgavata, which contains a reference to this incident, has chapters on the Solar race in the 7th book, yet it furnishes us with no information of Sagara or his sons, as it abruptly ends after giving an account of the life of the king Hariścandra (27.42) - a remote ancestor of Sagara.

According to us this non-mention is of great importance. It cannot be explained away by saying that since the 'mention of Kapila's promulgating Sāmkhya' was of little significance, it had not been stated in the Purāṇic works. Since most of the epithets used in the aforesaid passages in the Purāṇas, Upapurāṇas and the epics (some are found to use more than five epithets to describe Kapila and some have more than three verses to describe him) are such as are commonplace and do not bear any important significance, the nonuse of such a significant epithet 'the founder of Sāmkhya' must be due to some real (i. e. historical) cause. According to us this cause is no other than the non-recognition by the authors of these Purāṇic works of the fact of burning by the founder of the Sāmkhya system.

(B) That the philosopher Kapila was deemed as different from the destroyer Kapila by the Purāṇic authors may be fairly ascertained if the period of their appearance as shown in the Purāṇas is considered. While according to the Purāṇas the destroyer Kapila appeared in the Vaivasvata manvantara (the 7th manvantara) since Sagara belonged to the dynasty of Ikṣvāku, the son of Vaivasvata manu (Sagara appeared a few generations before Rāma Dāśarathi), the philosopher Kapila appeared in the Svāyambhuva manvantara (the 1st manvantara), for he is said to be the son of Devahūti, the daughter of Svāyambhuva Manu.⁷

7. Regarding Devahūti and Kardama (the parents of the philosopher Kapila) and Kapila's teachings to his mother, vide D. Bhāg. 8.3.12-19; Bhāgavata 3.24.6-19, Śiva-p. 2.1. 16.15, 2.5.16.13, Br. Vaivarta-p. 4.22.47; 1.9.6. It is to be noted that no older Purāṇa contains any information about the parentage of Kapila. The Skanda-p. is found

Since this information is found neither in the epics, nor in the older Purāṇas, nor does it occur in any ancient work on philosophy⁸ its authoritativeness may be doubted, but as here we are dealing with the question of identity of the two Kapilas on the basis of the Purāṇic views it is not necessary for us to examine the validity of the Purāṇic statements.

The Viṣṇu-purāṇa, which is one of the older Purāṇas, also places Kapila in the same period. From Viṣṇu-purāṇa 2.13-14 it appears that Kapila, the philosopher, was contemporary with Bharata (Jaḍa-Bharata) of the Svāyambhuva manvantara.⁹ The Kālikā-p. also places him in this Manvantara (31.3-5).

It would be wrong to hold that Kapila of the Svāyambhuva manvantara was alive in the Vaivasvata manvantara also, for he is nowhere regarded in the Purāṇas as a longlived (*dīrghajīvin* or *cirajīvin*) person. One Kapila (along with four others) is regarded as '*sukhaśāyin*' (sleeping peacefully) in the Ṛkpariśiṣṭa (Khilasūka 1.10). Even if this expression is interpreted to mean 'a longlived person' yet it serves no purpose, for there is no reason to take this Kapila as identical with the philosopher Kapila. He may rightly be regarded as the destroyer Kapila, who is often described (vide Brahma-p, 8.55; Hariv. 1.14.24) as विष्णुं कपिलरूपेण स्वपन्तम् (mark the

to hold a slightly different view. It says that Devahūti was the daughter of Tṛṇabindu and that Jaya and Vijaya were Kapila's elder brothers (Kārttika-māsa-māhātmya 28.2-3). The Sāttvata-tantra (a work of later times) says; कपिलाख्य ईशः श्रीदेवहूतितनयः' (2.10). It is noteworthy that the Bhāgavata refers to a work called Sattvata-tantra in 1.3.8.

8. The Māthara-vṛtti on Sām-kā(1) speaks of Kardama (a Prajāpati) and Devahūti (the daughter of Svāyambhuva Manu) as the parents of Kapila. This is evidently based on the Bhāgavata. (A verse from the Bhāgavata is found to have been quoted in this vṛtti.)
9. One remarkable point deserves notice. The Viṣṇu-p (2.13.54) says that the king of the Sauvīra country wanted to know from Kapila of the nature of *śreyas*. (This information is found in other Purāṇas also). The Viṣṇudharma (an unpublished Upapurāṇa) informs us that once Kapila was asked by the gods and sages to expound the nature of *śreyas* (vide Yoga-cintāmaṇi by Śivānanda, p. 58), which shows that the nature of *śreyas* was one of the topics chiefly dealt with by the teachers of Sāṃkhya; cp. Sāṃkhya-kārikā 'तद्-विपरीतः श्रेयान् व्यक्ताव्यक्तज्ञविज्ञानात्' (2)'.¹⁰

use of the root स्वप् to recline, to rest, to lie down).¹⁰ It is quite likely that this sage remained in the state of 'suspended animation' for a very long period.¹¹

Like the difference in *manvantara*, we find difference in *yuga* also in connection with the appearance of these two Kapilas. While the Purāṇas place the philosopher Kapila in the Satya or Kṛta yuga (कृते युगे परं ज्ञानं कपिलादिस्वरूपधृक्, Viṣṇu-p. 3.2,54), they place Sagara in the Tretā yuga (Pargiter : A. I. H. T. p. 177).

(C) Moreover the Purāṇic declarations like 'the philosopher Kapila is the first incarnation of Viṣṇu in human form' (Viṣṇudharma, vide 'Studies in the Upapurāṇas', I, p. 146) place him to such an earlier period as cannot be assigned to the destroyer Kapila, who appeared some generations before Dāśarathi Rāma. Harivaṃśa 3.14.4 and Matsya-p. 171.4 speak of the presence of Kapila, the Sāṃkhya-teacher and Hiraṇyagarbha (Brahmā), the yoga-teacher in the earliest period of creation—a statement which shows that according to the Paurāṇikas the Sāṃkhya-teacher Kapila appeared long before the birth of the destroyer Kapila. In some of the Purāṇas (vide Vāyu-p. 65.53-54) Kardama, Kapila's father, is said to be a Prajāpati (one of the 21 Prajāpatis; Śānti-p. 334.36-37).

(D) Purāṇic statements about the parentage of the two Kapilas do not seem to uphold the identity of the two Kapilas.

10. See the following verse of the Brahmāṇḍa-p. about the destroyer Kapila saying that he remained in the state of meditation for a period of one hundred divine years (अगस्त्यपीतसलिले दिव्यवर्षशतावधि । ध्यायन्नास्तेऽधुनाम्मोक्षो एकान्ते तत्र कुत्रचित् ॥ 2,52.16)
11. I have used the word 'suspended animation' in the Haṭhayogic sense of *śarīra rodha*, which has great similarity with it. It is well-known that Haridāsa yogin, who was acquainted with the Sikh ruler Ranjit Singh, was able to remain in this state for a considerable length of time; vide W. G. Osborne : The Court and Camp of Runjeet Singh (p. 47 'in the course of ten months he remained under ground); Dr. J. M. Honigburger : Physician to the Court of Lahore (pp. 126-130); Dr. Mc. Greegar : History of the Sikhs. Interested readers may profitably read the article 'Studies on Shri Ramanand Yogī during his stay in an air-tight box' in Indian Journal of Medical Research, 49 (1961).

While the Purāṇas inform us that the philosopher Kapila was the son of Devahūti and Kardama, they never ascribe the same parentage to the destroyer Kapila. The only information in this respect (which is mythical in character) is found in the Mbh. which says that the destroyer Kapila was born of the sun (सूर्याञ् जातो महानृषिः, विदुयं कपिलं देवं येनार्ताः सगरात्मजाः, Vana-p. 109. 17-18). It has however no connection with real parentage. The assertion of the Mahābhārata that the Sāṃkhya teacher Kapila is आदित्यस्थ (remaining in the sun, 339.68) cannot be taken as proving his identity with this Kapila.

(E) In connection with the incident of burning we find the Mahābhārata to declare that this sage was called Vāsudeva by people (वासुदेवेति यं प्राहुः कपिलं मुनिपुङ्गवम्, Vana-p. 107.32). That the destroyer Kapila was actually called by this name (or appellation) in ancient India is borne out by the following passage of the Śārirakabhāṣya on Br. sū. 2.1.1, “या तु श्रुतिः कपिलस्य....कपिलमिति श्रुतिसामान्यमात्रत्वात् । अन्यस्य च कपिलस्य सगरपुत्राणां प्रतसुर्वासुदेवनाम्नः स्मरणात्”. (Mark the word वासुदेवनाम्नः). This shows that in the Rāmāyaṇa passage ‘ददृशुः कपिलं तत्र वासुदेवं सनातनम्’ (1.40.25) we are to take Vāsudeva as another name of Kapila and not as denoting the sense of ‘a divine being in which all reside’.¹² This however is a significant name (i. e. based on some *guṇa* or *karman* of the person concerned) as will be discussed in the sequel.

The philosopher Kapila is never said to have another name as Vāsudeva, though in a very few passages of the Purāṇas he is regarded as an incarnation or form of Viṣṇu. Such expressions simply show excellence, glory or divinity in the sage and they cannot be taken as proving real identity in the two Kapilas.

In the Udyoga-p of the Mbh. we find the statement that the sons of Sagara were destroyed by a great sage named Cakradhanu (109.17-18). The philosopher Kapila has never been called by this name. (*Vide infra* for a discussion on this name).

12. सर्वाणि तत्र भूतानि निवसन्ति परात्मनि ॥ ६८ ॥
भूतेषु च स सर्वात्मा वासुदेवस्तवः स्मृतः ।
भूतेषु वसते योऽन्तर्बसन्त्यत्र च तानि यत् ॥ ६९ ॥
घाता विघाता जगतां वासुदेवस्ततः प्रभुः ॥ ७० ॥
(Brahma-p. 233.68-70).

(F) A consideration of the places associated with the two Kapilas reveals that one has no connection with the other. The philosopher Kapila is connected with the river Sarasvatī¹³, Bindusaras¹⁴ (being the places where his father Kardama resided), Pulaha-āsrama,¹⁵ and the river Ikṣumati.¹⁶ [It is not necessary to identify these here.] None of these has been mentioned in the Epic-Purāṇic passages that refer to the destroyer Kapila. Similarly the places mentioned in connection with the destroyer Kapila¹⁷ have never been mentioned in connection with the philosopher Kapila.

There is no need to deal here with the aforesaid Purāṇic passages in order to solve any contradiction or problem that may arise from them. We simply assert that none of the places referred to

13. तत्कर्ममाश्रमपदं सरस्वत्या परिश्रितम् ।
स्वयंभूः साकमृषिभिर्मरीच्यादिभिरभ्यगात् ॥
Bhāg. 3.24.9; Kardama is the father of Kapila.
14. अथ संप्रस्थिते शुक्ले कर्मो भगवानृषिः ।
आस्ते स्म बिन्दुसरसि तं कालं प्रतिपालयन् ॥
(Bhāg. 3.21.35)
15. देवहृत्यै परं ज्ञानं सर्वाविद्यानिवर्तकम् । १७
उपदिश्य महायोगी स ययौ पुलहाश्रमम् ॥ १९
(D. Bhāg. 8.3.17, 19). Mahāyogin refers to Kapila. If D. Bhāg. 9.21.16-18 are taken as referring to the philosopher Kapila, then the place (situated somewhere in South India) as described here is also to be accepted as connected with him. The name of the place is not given.
16. बभूवेक्ष्मतीतीरे कपिलर्षेर्वराश्रमम् (Viṣṇu-p. 2. 13. 48).
17. The places mentioned are : महातल (Bṛhaddharma-p. 2.22.41); प्रागुदक्दिश् (north-eastern direction, Bhāg. 9.8.10); पूर्वोत्तरदेश (Mbh. Vana-p. 107.28); महोदधि (Anuśāsana-p. 153.9); पूर्वदक्षिणसमुद्र (south-east ocean, Harivaṃśa 1.14.22; Brahmanḍa-p. 2.63.143; Brahma-p. 8. 53; Padma-p. 6 21. 35). According to Udyoga-parvan 109.17-18 the destroyer Kapila resides in the southern direction. The statement of Viṣṇudharma (कपिलं पूर्वसागरे, Studies in the Upapurāṇas I, p. 123) may also be considered in this connection.

in connection with the destroyer Kapila has any connection with the philosopher Kapila—a fact which tends to disprove the identity of the two Kapilas.

(G) We find that some significant expressions, which are used as the epithets of the philosopher Kapila in the philosophical and Purāṇic works, have never been used in connection with the destroyer Kapila—a fact which undoubtedly shows that the authors of these works were aware of the difference between these two Kapilas.

The first epithet of this sort is *ādividvas*, which is used in connection with the philosopher Kapila in an aphoristic statement of Pañcaśikha quoted in the Vyāsabhāṣya on Yogasūtra 1.25. We find the Purāṇas to declare that Kapila promulgated the science of the self. The destroyer Kapila has never been described in a similar way.

The second epithet is *siddheśvara* or words having a similar sense. These are found in Gītā 10.26, Brahma-vaivarta-p. 4.22.47, Bhāgavata-p. 3.24.19, Padma-p. 6.212.42-43 etc. (It is used in Sātvata-tantra 2.10 also.) None of these epithets is found in the Purāṇic passages describing the destroyer Kapila.

The third is *paramarṣi*, which is found in the aforesaid aphorism of Pañcaśikha, in Sāṃkhya-kārikā 69 and in Śānti-p. 217. 1, 349.65, Vana-p. 220.21. Only once it has been used (in Viṣṇu-p. 4.4.23) in connection with the destroyer Kapila.¹⁸

The epithet *mokṣadharmajña* is applied to the philosopher Kapila in Viṣṇu-p. 2.13.49 etc., which is highly significant, as Sāṃkhya is regarded as the philosophy of liberation (संख्यं तु मोक्षदर्शनम् Śānti p. 300.5). It has not been used in connection with the destroyer Kapila.

(H) As to the time and cause of the wrong identification, our views are as follows :

18. The word *paramarṣi* has a technical meaning also as stated in Vāyu-p. 59-80 (निवृत्तिसमकालं तु बुद्ध्याव्यक्तमृषिः स्वयम् । परं हि ऋषते यस्मात् परमर्षिस्ततः स्मृतः ॥ ; the printed reading seems to be slightly corrupt) and in the Yuktidīpikā comm. on Sāṃ-kā 15 (यस्य सत्त्वप्रधानं कार्यकरणं स परमर्षिः). It appears that the Viṣṇu-purāṇa has used the word in its usually accepted sense of 'a great sage' (परमभ्रासौ ऋषिश्च).

(i) Since the Purāṇic works (except the Bhāgavata) in their chapters on *vamśānucarita* do not state that the destroyer Kapila was also the founder of Sāṃkhya and since these chapters are rightly regarded as forming the older parts of the Purāṇic works, it is quite justified to hold that the wrong idea of identity of the two Kapilas arose long after the composition of these chapters and one or two centuries before the composition of the two Bhāgavatas. We have already said that the chapter on *vamśānucarita* in the Devībhāgavata are silent on the king Sagara and his descendants and the D. Bhag. speaks of the two Kapilas (in a separate section) while mentioning the bad effects of lust, wrath, etc.

(ii) The destroyer Kapila, on account of his burning the wicked sons of the king Sagara, came to be regarded by the Vaiṣṇava sects as an incarnation of Viṣṇu,¹⁹ who is always conceived as the protector of the *jīvas* even by destroying the wicked. Since the teachings of the philosopher Kapila are found to have been incorporated in the authoritative treatises of some of the ancient Vaiṣṇava sects (as may be proved by the 12th chapter of the Ahirbudhnyasāṃhitā dealing with the contents of the Śaṣṭitantra), it may be rightly presumed that the philosopher Kapila was also regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu by the ancient sects of Vaiṣṇava dharma¹⁹. Since both the Kapilas were deemed as the forms of Viṣṇu there arose the idea in later times that the destroyer Kapila was the same as the philosopher Kapila.

(iii) It appears that the use of the word '*kapila*' as the 'name' also played an important part in creating the wrong idea of identity. The word *kapila* (adj.) means 'brown, tawny, reddish', and in this sense the word seems to have been used in connection with the destroyer sage (known by the name Cakradhanu or Vāsudeva) who had been described as having fire-like colour.²⁰ It may also be

19. So far as the Sāṃkhya tradition is concerned Kapila is regarded as आदिविद्वान्, परमर्षि, सहजातधर्मज्ञानवैराग्यैश्वर्यं and विश्वाग्रज.
20. कपिलं तेजसां राशिम्..... (बृहन्नारदीय० 8.123); कोटिसूर्यसमप्रभम् (बृहन्नारदीय० 8.99, नारदीय० 18.95); तेजोराशिमनुत्तमम् । तेजसादीप्यमानं तु ज्वालामिरिव पावकम् (वनपर्व 107.27); ज्वालामालमिवानलम् (ब्रह्माण्ड० 2.53.21).

surmised that since the colour *kapila* has a great resemblance to fire, the person who created fire from his body or eyes came to be called Kapila. [It may be noted in this connection that the act of creating fire from the body depends upon the supernormal power known as *samāna-jaya* and this power renders the body effulgent—Yogasūtra 3.40]. In connection with the philosopher, the word Kapila must be taken as his personal name.

There is however some difficulty in determining the proper name of the destroyer sage. We have already said that Śaṅkarācārya tells us that the name of this sage is Vāsudeva (वासुदेवापरनाम्नः) which is in consonance with the Vanaparvan-passage quoted above. Since the Mbh. in another parvan uses the word Cakradhanu as the name of this sage (अत्र चक्रधनुर्नाम) a doubt arises about the actual personal (proper) name of the sage. It would be too much to assume that there were two different traditions regarding the incident of burning the sons of Sagara. It is quite reasonable to think that Cakradhanu was the name given by the parents of the sage in the 'ceremony of naming' and afterwards the sage came to be called Vāsudeva on account of his similarity with Viṣṇu as stated above. It may also be surmised that since the Mbh. does not say चक्रधनुर्नाम्ना (i. e. *nāman* in the third case-ending),²¹ the word Cakradhanu may be taken as an epithet. We are however in favour of taking Cakradhanu as the personal name, for the word as an epithet has no obvious fitness in its context and as far as I know the word is not found as a name of any other sage.

(iv) We have already said that the statement showing identity of the two Kapilas is found in the Bhāgavata and the Devībhāgavata only. As to which of these two Purāṇas spoke of the identity at first we think it more reasonable to hold that the mistaken idea arose at first in the author of the Bhāgavata and this is why he, being aware of the divine nature of the philosopher Kapila,

21. If the word *nāman* is not used in the third case-ending it may signify simply प्रसिद्धि and not a 'proper name'; cp. नाम प्रसिद्धौ । नामपदस्य संज्ञार्थत्वे प्रकृत्यादिभ्य उपसंख्यानम् इति तृतीयया भाव्यमित्यवधेयम् (Comm. by Rucipati Upādhyāya on Anargharāghava 1.3). This is why sometimes we find the use of both नाम and नाम्ना in the same sentence : मारिषा नाम नाम्ना (Viṣṇu-p. 1.15.8).

tried to exonerate him from the fault of violence—the greatest fault for a yogin—by offering the explanation embodied in verses 9.8.13-14. As these Bhāgavata verses put the explanation in a highly philosophical way and as they do not point to the real cause directly, while the Devībhāgavata verse (6.15.42) does not say anything philosophically but directly mentions a popular cause (viz. *daiṇayoga*) it follows that the author of the D. Bhāg. came to know of this explanation from the Bhāgavata. That the explanation of the D. Bhāg. is nothing but a popular version of what the Bhāgavata says in a philosophical way may be readily accepted.

(I) As the author of the Bhāgavata²² is sometimes found to deal with the tales and incidents of ancient times independently²³

22. According to us the Bhāgavata is later than the older parts of all the earlier Purāṇas. Our study of the Bhāgavata reveals that the Bhāgavata was composed by a single person who was highly learned and was a follower of Vaiṣṇava śāstra, especially the Pañcarātra Āgama. By utilizing the Purāṇic materials he composed a *kāvya* giving it a Purāṇic character. This is why the nature of the composition of the Bhāgavata is not similar to that of the other Purāṇic works which have been composed by different persons (belonging to different or even rival sects) at different times. The original forms of these Purāṇas have been revised in various ways from time to time by using the process of incorporation, augmentation and rejection. This is why all of these Purāṇas have, unlike the Bhāgavata, more than one version or recension. Only a few verses seem to have been interpolated in the Bhāgavata. In a forthcoming paper we shall demonstrate our view in detail.

23. A remarkable example of this tendency of the author of the Bhāgavata is his assertion that Śuka, the son of Vyāsa, narrated the Bhāgavata-purāṇa to the king Parikṣit (1.3.41-42), who has born just after the Bhārata war (Aśvamedha-p. 66.8). But according to the Mahābhārata (which was known to the author of the Bhāgavata as it has been referred to in Bhāgavata 1.4.25) Śuka left his mortal coil before the Bhārata war (Sānti-p. 333). Since Śuka was highly praised in the Mahābhārata the author of the Bhāgavata deliberately connected him with the Bhāgavata with a view to proving the exalted character of the Bhāgavata dharma. Curiously enough though the last days of the king Parikṣit have been described in the Mahābhārata beginning with the curse uttered by the sage Śāmika and ending with the biting of the Takṣaka nāga with great detail (Ādiparvan 40-43), yet there is no mention of his hearing the Bhāgavata from Śuka.

(i.e. he does not follow the accounts as given in the older works) it is more plausible to presume that he deliberately identified the philosopher Kapila with the destroyer Kapila to serve some purpose. The purpose seems to show that Viṣṇu (Kapila is regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu in 1.3.10) protects the world even by causing destruction directly or indirectly. Since the Vaiṣṇava author of the Bhāgavata took the sage Kapila as an expounder of *ātmajñāna* or a promulgator of *mokṣasāstra* he thought it illogical to conceive that Kapila created fire in order to burn some persons to ashes (even though they were wicked). This is why he declared that the sons of Sagara were burnt by the fire of their own bodies (स्वशरीराग्निना भस्मसादभवन् 9.8.12)—a statement which suggests that they were burnt as a result of their own sinful acts²⁴ and that there was no agency or volition of Kapila in the act of burning.

The Bhāgavata words 'नृपेन्द्रपुत्रा मुनिकोपभजिताः इति न साधुवादः' clearly indicate that the incident of burning of the wicked sons of Sagara by Kapila was regarded as an established fact in the Purāṇic tradition and that from older Purāṇas the author of the Bhāgavata knew that the wicked sons of the king Sagara were really consumed by the fire created by the sage. As he connected the act of burning with the philosopher Kapila (either ignorantly or deliberately) he tried to justify the act in his own way.

24. Like the Bhāgavata, Viṣṇu-p. 4.4.11 also says स्वशरीररसमुत्थेन अग्निना दह्यमाना विनेशुः. Though all Purāṇic works except these two expressly state that fire was created by Kapila from his eyes or his body (i.e. Kapila's volition was active in producing the fire) which burnt the sons of Sagara into ashes, the author of the Viṣṇu-p. (who was a Vaiṣṇava) tried to minimize the agency of Kapila in the act of burning. That there was some connection between Kapila and the act of burning is admitted by this Purāṇa as is proved from the words कपिलतेजसा दग्धम् stated just after the above passage. In this respect the author of the Bhāgavata seems to follow the Viṣṇu-p. (which however does not regard the destroyer Kapila as the founder of Sāṃkhya of whom it speaks in connection with the life of Jada Bharata in sec II.) but he went one step further and declared that there was no rise of wrath in Kapila. Since the author of the Bhāgavata took this Kapila as identical with the philosopher Kapila he was compelled to express the above view.

There are, however, strong grounds to believe that the author of the Bhāgavata changed the incident in the aforesaid manner deliberately. Though the Bhāgavata says that the sons of Sagara were burnt by the fire born of their own bodies, yet it mentions 'Kapila's opening the eyes' (उन्मिषे तदा मुनिः, 9.8.11). What was the use of opening the eyes by Kapila possessing an absolutely pacified mind if the fire was born of the bodies of the persons (who were burnt) without having any connection with Kapila's volition or activity? Does it not indicate that the author of the Bhāgavata was personally aware of the incident as described in the older Purāṇas and that he described the incident changing it slightly in order to serve some purpose?²⁵

The reason afforded by the Bhāgavata (9.8.13-14) with a view to exonerating the sage from the sin of violence was deemed so justified that in later times it was reiterated (in a popular form) by the author of the Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa in 2.52.29-31²⁶ (the chapter is however not on *vamśānucarita*) in connection with the destroyer Kapila, who is not regarded by this Purāṇa as the founder of Sāṃkhya.

(J) The present writer is of opinion that if the act of burning the sons of Sagara is judged in accordance with the principles of *adhyātmavidyā*, it cannot be attributed to the philosopher Kapila. We find the historical statement of Pañcaśikha (quoted in the Vyāsabhāṣya on Yogasūtra 1.25) that Kapila instructed Āsuri in Sāṃkhya by assuming a *nirmāṇa-citta*. Since this *citta* is caused by *dhyāna* it is bereft of all latent impressions (Vide Yogasūtra 4.6). It is inconceivable that a yogin possessing such a high stage gets so highly enraged that he becomes compelled to create fire to kill

25. Some Āgamic works are found to speak of the Sāṃkhya teacher Kapila. It may be surmized that the author of an Āgama work identified the philosopher Kapila with the destroyer Kapila and the author of the Bhāgavata, who was a follower of Vaiṣṇava Āgamas, simply re-stated the view of his tradition with his own observations.
26. स्वकर्मणैव निर्दग्धाः प्रविनङ्क्ष्यन्ति सागराः ॥२९॥ काले प्राप्ते तु युष्माभिः स तावत् परिपाल्यताम् । अहं तु कारणं तेषां विनाशाय दुरात्मनाम् ॥३०॥ भविष्यामि सुरश्रेष्ठा भवतामर्थसिद्धये । (ब्रह्माण्ड० २।५२।२९क—३१ख.) Here कारण is the same as the निमित्तमात्र in the Gītā (11,33).

some persons however wicked they are. It is well known that these yogins are so powerful that even evil thoughts of wicked persons get restricted if they happen to come near them.²⁷

The destroyer Kapila seems to be a yogin of a lower stage though he possessed certain supernormal powers. It may be easily accepted that this Kapila (who appeared at the time of the king Sagara) cannot be regarded as *ādividvas*, cannot be recalled in the act of *manuṣya-tarpaṇa* (vide the *Gṛhya-sūtras* etc.), cannot be described as ऋषि प्रसूतं कपिलं यस्तमग्रे (*Śvetāśvatara-up.4.5*) and cannot be regarded as a mind-born son of Brahmā appearing at the earliest period of creation. All these show that the ancient Indian tradition did not recognize the two Kapilas as one.

(K) We want to conclude this discussion by presenting a problem regarding the time of the Sāṁkhya teacher Kapila.

We have already said that there are Purāṇic statements that place Kapila in the Svāyambhuva manvantara or in the Satya yuga or in the earlier period of creation. Such statements must be regarded as of mythical character and they simply mean that Kapila was a man of hoary past.

But in the Mahābhārata we find such statements of non-mythical character as seem to place Kapila at a much later period, thus giving rise to a grave contradiction.

It is said in the Śānti-p., that Pañcaśikha (the disciple of Āsuri, the disciple of Kapila) taught Dharmadhvaja Janaka, king of the Videha country, in Sāṁkhya (320.4,24).²⁸ We find no mention

27. The Kālikā-p., which has no chapter on varṁśānucarita and which does not say even incidentally anything about the killing of the sons of Sagara by Kapila, describes in chap. 32 an incident which shows vehement wrath of the Sāṁkhya teacher Kapila (as may be inferred from verses 12-13) to Svāyambhuva Manu. This must be due to the confusion that the philosopher Kapila is identical with the destroyer Kapila.
28. The Śānti-p. says that the king Janadeva Janaka was also taught by Pañcaśikha (218-219). This king has not been mentioned in the Purāṇic lists of the Janaka dynasty and the Mahābhārata does not say anything about his time.

of Dharmadhvaja Janaka in the genealogical lists in the Purāṇas²⁹ except in the list in the Bhāgavata. According to this Purāṇa Dharmadhvaja appeared one generation after Śiradhvaja, the father-in-law of Dāśarathī Rāma (9.13.18-20) who was born some generations after the king Sagara. Accepting the Bhāgavata genealogy as valid a question presents itself—if the grand-disciple of the philosopher Kapila taught a person who appeared one generation after the father-in-law of Rāma, how can Kapila be held as appearing in the Kṛta yuga or in the Svāyambhuva manvantara as stated before so far as the Purāṇic view is concerned ?

It should be noted here that this Kapila (i. e. the teacher of Pañcaśikha who instructed Dharmadhvaja) cannot be regarded as the destroyer Kapila, for there is a period covering more than 20 generations between Sagarā and Daśaratha, a contemporary of Śiradhvaja. We have already shown that (i) no Purāṇic work (except the two Bhāgavatas) says that the destroyer Kapila was the founder of Sāṁkhya and that (ii) the ancient Indian tradition never seems to have ascribed those activities and characteristics to the destroyer Kapila that exclusively or especially belong to the philosopher Kapila.

The aforesaid problem seems to be highly perplexing and I plead my inability to solve it.

29. Brahmāṇḍa-p. 3.64.1-24; Vāyu-p. 89.1-23; Viṣṇu-p. 4.5. 11-14; Garuḍa-p. 1.138.44-48; Bhāgavata 9.13.1-27; Rāmāyaṇa 1.71.3-20. Though the Viṣṇu-p. does not mention Dharmadhvaja in the genealogy of the Janaka dynasty yet it mentions him in connection with the Keśidhvaja-Khāṇḍikya dialogue (6.6). That this Dharmadhvaja is identical with Dharmadhvaja in the dynastical list in the Bhāgavata is beyond doubt.