

सम्पादक-मण्डल

- डा. रामकरण शर्मा
भूतपूर्व कुलपति, सम्पूर्णानन्द संस्कृतविश्वविद्यालय, वाराणसी; नयी दिल्ली
डा. रामचन्द्र नारायण दाण्डेकर
भण्डारकर प्राच्यशोधसंस्थान, पुणे
डा. जोजो 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
सम्पादकैरन्यसिन 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 = r; च् = c; छ = ch; ढ = ḍ; श् = ś; ष = ṣ;
m].

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. XXXVII. No. 2]

[July 12, 1995

व्यासपूर्णमाङ्कः

VYĀSA-PŪRNIMĀ NUMBER

Contents-लेखसूची

	Pages
1. वैदिकग्रन्थेषु व्यासोक्तयः <i>Compiled By R. S. Bhattacharya</i>	133
2. विष्णुस्तोत्रम् <i>Compiled By R.S. Bhattacharya</i>	134
3. The back-ground of the Purāṇic etymologies [पौराणिकनिर्वचनानां पृष्ठभूमिः] <i>By Tiziana Pontillo</i> Istituto di Glottologia Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Largo Gemelli, 20123 Milano (Italy)	135-144
4. Bhakti in the philosophy of the Purāṇas [पौराणिकदर्शने भक्तिः] <i>By Prof. Raghunath Giri ;</i> B 37/ 165 A Girinagar, Birdopur Varanasi 221010	145-163
5. Nīlasundaragiri-- A Puranic viewpoint [नीलसुन्दरगिरिविषये पौराणिकं मतम्] <i>By Dr. Kailash Chandra Dash</i> Dept. of History B.G.B . College, Bhuvaneswar, 751014, Orissa	164-170

being stripped although he mentions her being dragged into the assembly hall. Even in the very killing of Duḥśāsana, Bhīma refers to Draupadī being dragged by her hair and only asks him with which hand he had dragged her, and Duḥśāsana boastfully displays the hand in question, but neither refers to any stripping. In each case it is the insult to which Draupadī was subjected by being dragged into the royal court in a single garment while in her monthly period which features with the occasional additional detail of her being dragged by her hair.

The internal evidence, therefore, suggests that the vastraharaṇa of Draupadī and the preservation of modesty by Kṛṣṇa's miraculous intervention is an interpolation. The comparatively recent character of the interpolation can be estimated when we notice that even in Bhāsa's play Dūtavākya (circa 4th century B.C.) both Duryodhana and Kṛṣṇa only refer to Draupadī being dragged by her hair and not to her being stripped. This passage, including the appeal to Kṛṣṇa for succour, was inserted into the epic after the *Bhāgavata* and the *Devī Bhāgavata* purāṇas had been composed. That makes it a fairly late interpolation and the contribution of the Vaiṣṇavite *bhakti* movement. Confirmation of this diagnosis is available from the Critical Edition of the *Sabhā Parva* which omits Draupadī's appeal to Kṛṣṇa as also that of the *Karṇa Parva* which omits reference to the stripping in Bhīma's speech during the slaying of Duḥśāsana.

SOME NOTEWORTHY READINGS IN THE KŪRMA PURĀṆA

By

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

[अत्र कूर्मपुराणस्य केषाञ्चित् पाठानामर्थादिविषये विमर्शः कृतः ।]

(1) The Kūrma-purāṇa (=KP) reads : श्रीपतेरुदरं भूयः प्रविवेश कुशध्वजः (1.9.25). Here Kuśadvaja undoubtedly means Brahmā. Surprisingly enough the word is not found in any of the lexicons known to us.

The dictionary of Monier Williams however mentions kuśaketu as a name of Brahmā and remarks that the meaning is found in Galanos' Dictionary (s. v. Kuśa). (*Ketu* is the same as *dhvaja*). Unfortunately this dictionary is not with us.

Though no direct proof can be given from Sanskrit literature, yet there is reason to believe that the Kuśa grass has some connection with Brahmā. The Mārkaṇḍeya-p. 91.11 is found to extol Brahmāṇi as कौशाम्भःक्षरिका¹ which evidently shows this connection.

It is quite likely that in some Puranic tale Brahmā has been connected with the Kuśa grass. Unfortunately we have not come to know of such a tale.²

(2) Describing the Vāmana incarnation KP. says that Vāmana learnt *samācara* from Bharadvāja:

कृतोपनयनो वेदान्घ्नेष्ट भगवान् हरिः ।
समाचारं भरद्वाजात् त्रिलोकाय प्रदर्शयन् ॥
(1.16.44)

What is meant by *samacara* here? Usually the word means manners, customs, virtuous conduct, behaviour, usage. But these cannot be construed with the verb अघ्नेष्ट : (he studied or read).

The word *samācāra* is used in Brahmasūtra 3.3.3 and according to Śaṅkara it means वेदब्रह्मोपदेशपरग्रन्थः ।

It is quite reasonable that KP. uses the word in this very sense in the above verse.

(3) While mentioning Rāma's marrying Sītā, KP. compares it with Kārttikeya's marrying Senā: सेनामिव च षण्मुखः (1.20.25; Saṅmukha,

having six faces, is a name of Kārttikeya). In fact the actual name of the wife of Kārttikeya is Devasenā. The use of Senā for Devasenā is in accordance with the rule विनापि प्रत्ययेन पूर्वोत्तरपदयोर्विभाषा लोपो वक्तव्यः (Kāśikā 5.3.83)³

A similar example is found in KP. 1.11.227 (योगिनां त्वं कुमारकः) in which Kumāraka is used for Sanatkumāra. The secondary suffix *ka* is in *svārtha*.

(4) KP reads: महाकल्पश्च कल्पानाम् (2.11.10).

It is somewhat difficult to determine the import of mahākālpa. Mahākālpa is not the name of any kalpa (For a list of *kalpas*, see Sk. Revā, ch. 13). It may be said that as *mahāpralaya* is a particular kind of *pralaya*,⁴ so *mahākālpa* must be a particular kind of *kalpa*. *Kālpa* of a higher kind is however not mentioned in the Purāṇas.

It appears that some particular *kalpas* have been regarded as *mahākālpas* on account of some reasons (appearance of some great *avatāra* or occurrence of some great event); for example, the Pādma kalpa is regarded as a *mahākālpa* in Viṣṇu-p. 1.3.27. According to the comm. Śrīdhara *mahākālpa* is a secondary (*avāntara*) kalpa which, on account of possessing some glorious merit, has been regarded as *mahākālpa*.⁵

(5) In the eulogy of Śiva KP. reads:

यया सन्तरते मायां योगी संक्षीणकल्मषः ।

अपारतरपर्यन्तां तस्मै विद्यात्मने नमः ॥ (1.10.68)

The reading *apāratara* does not yield any good sense; it seems to be corrupt. A careful consideration of the variant readings reveals that it ought to be corrected to *avārapāraparyāntām*.

Avārapāra is a well-established word, for it has been used by Pāṇini in his sūtra (4.2.93). राष्ट्रवारपाराद् घञौ According to the comm. Prakriyāsarvasva *avāra* means *avāktīra* (the near bank) and *pāra* means *parāktīra* (the distant bank). Thus *avārapāraparyānta* would mean 'embracing all far and near'; cp. the word *parāvara* in Muṇḍaka-up. 2.2.8 (तस्मिन् दृष्टे परावरे), in which *parāvara* means cause (*para*) and effect (*avara*); see Śaṅkara's bhāṣyā परं च कारणात्मना, अवरं च कार्यात्मना ।

(6) In सर्वोपनिषदां देवि गुह्योपनिषदुच्यते

(1.11.232) the significance of the word *guhya* requires to be determined, for *guhya* may aptly be applied as an epithet to all the Upaniṣads. The word *guhyaopaniṣad* is found in 1.15.195 (वेदान्तगुह्योपनिषत्सु गीतः) also. It occurs in Matsya-p. 248. 73 and in Harivaṁśa 3.34.40 (गुह्योपनिषदासनः). The word is found in Śvetāśvatara Up. 5.56 also.

It appears that *guhya upaniṣad* means that portion of an Upaniṣad which chiefly deals with the nature of brahman.

(7) While referring to Śiva KP. uses the word *pitāmaha* in 1.29.64; similarly it uses the word for Sūrya in 1.41.1.

In these places the word is to be taken in a broader sense ('the great father') and not in the conventional sense of Brahmā.

(8) In the passage शंकरो धर्मवाहनः (1.7.28) *dharma* stands not for *dharma* (merit) but for the bull; cp. वृषो हि भगवान् धर्मः (Mbh. Śānti-p. 342. 88).

(9) The word *brahman* (neuter) is used as an epithet to the unmanifested *prakṛti* or *pradhāna* of Sāṅkhya in 1.4.89 (ब्रह्माग्रे समवर्तत) (This is found in Vāyu-p. 4.20 and in other Purāṇas also; see also the Puranic passage quoted in the comm. Ujjvalā on Āp. Dharma Sūtra 1.8.22.4).

The use of *brahman* for *prakṛti* is justifiable as it is the ultimate material cause of all internal and external entities. All kinds of activities fall under the *guṇas* (i. e. *prakṛti*); that is why some Purāṇas ascribe creation and dissolution to the *prakṛti* (एतदेव जगत्सृष्टिं करोति विकरोति च, Matsya-p. 3. 15; एतत् = अव्यक्त प्रधान), and some go to the length of saying that the Mahat principle comes out on account of 'the act of seeing' of *prakṛti*; ईक्षणादेव प्रकृतेर्महत्तत्त्वमजायत (SK., Kumārikā-khaṇḍa 37. 7).

While referring to *prakṛti*, Sāṅkhyan works also use the word *brahman*; see प्रकृतिः प्रधानमधिकुस्ते, ब्रह्म अव्यक्तं बहुधात्मकं मायेति पर्यायाः (Māthara-vṛtti on Sāṅ. Kā. 22).

(10) KP. 2. 37. 13 says that according to Sāṅkhya (एतत् सांख्यदर्शनम्) *ātman* (i. e. *puruṣa*) is *eka*. Since it is an established fact that Sāṅkhya accepts the plurality of *puruṣas*, some may take the reading as doubtful.

According to us the reading *eka* is correct, for *eka* in the above passage does not mean 'one in number', but it means 'simple', 'non-composite' unmixed (*asamhata*, *ekarasa*, *akhaṇḍa*); cp. असंहतस्य

एकात्मकस्य ब्रह्मणः (Śārīrakabhāṣya on Br. Sū 1.1.5). We may say that here *eka* stands for *ekarūpa* (of one and the same form) in which sense *eka* is used in many places in śāstric works.

This *ekatva* of *puruṣa* is in consonance with the view of Sāṃkhya-kārikā II which says that both *vyakta* and *puruṣa* are opposite in character (तद्विपरीतः) and both *avyakta* and *puruṣa* are similar in some points (तथा च पुमान्). Now as *avyakta* is *eka* (one in number), so *puruṣa* is *eka* (of one form or nature). Here the same word *eka* is used in two different senses.⁶ The comm. Gauḍapāda has expressly remarked ' तस्मात् पुरुषोऽप्येकः'

(11) I want to conclude the article by referring to the peculiar reading of a verse. KP. 1.11.281-282 contains an enumeration of fourteen *vidyās* :

शिक्षा कल्पो व्याकरणं निरुक्तं छन्द एव च ।
ज्योतिःशास्त्रं न्यायविद्या मीमांसा चोपबृंहणम् ॥ 281 ॥
एवं चतुर्दशैतानि विद्यास्थानानि सत्तम ।
चतुर्वेदैः सहोक्तानि धर्मो नान्यत्र विद्यते ॥

Curiously enough the number of *vidyāsthānas* comes to 13, the names being Śikṣā, Kalpa, Vyākaraṇa, Nirukta, Chandas, jyotiḥśāstra (i.e. Jyotiṣa), Nyāyavidyā, Mīmāṃsā and Upabṛhṇaṇa (i.e. Itihāsa-Purāṇa).⁷

It is well known that in the established list of 14 *vidyāsthānas* four Vedas, six Vedāṅgas, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, Dharmasāstra and Purāṇa (in which Itihāsa is included) are enumerated.⁸

Thus it is clear that the KP. list does not mention Dharmasāstra. It should be noted that the particle च cannot stand for the 14th *Vidyāsthāna* (i.e. Dharmasāstra), for here the purpose of the verse is to give the names of the *Vidyāsthānas* and च cannot stand as the name of any *śāstra*.

Thus it stands to reason that the reading of the second line of verse 281 deserves to be corrected. That the reading विद्या is corrupt may be proved by the fact that *vidyā* cannot reasonably be the name of any *vidyā* or *vidyāsthāna*.

It may be conceived that the original reading was न्यायधर्मो (*Dharma* standing for Dharmasāstra). This is however highly doubtful, for the

reading is not supported by the variants and it is difficult to explain how the word *dharma* was changed into *vidyā* by the scribes.

These verses with the same readings have been quoted by Bhāskara in his commentary on Lalitāsahasranāma (on verse 129). It is unfortunate that a scholar like Bhāskara failed to notice this discrepancy.

A conjecture may be hazarded about the occurrence of the word विद्या in the place of धर्म in न्यायधर्मो (conceived as the original reading). It may be surmised that the word *dharma* was discarded by some scribe willingly as he thought that since *dharma* (meaning merit) was said to exist in the *vidyāsthānas* only (धर्मो नान्यत्र विद्यते), *dharma* could not be the name of any *vidyāsthāna*. The vacant place was filled up with the word *vidyā* by the scribe on account of its being capable of signifying *dharma* (merit), without considering the impotence of this word in conveying the sense of Dharmasāstra. It is needless to say that this conjecture possesses little strength and we request scholars to afford a better solution of the problem.

1. हंसयुक्तविमानस्थे ब्रह्मणीरूपधारिणि ।
कौशाम्भःक्षरिके देवि नारायणि नमोऽस्तु ते ॥
कुशस्थेदमम्भः कौशाम्भः (comm. Caturdharī); कुशो दर्भः, तस्येदं कौशम् (Comm. Śāntamavī)
2. It may be noted in this connection that Brahmā has a few names that have become more or less obsolete. The lexicon Śabdārṇava reads Saja and Sarvānanda's comm. on the Amara reads Sañja as the names of Brahmā; see also Jajjaṭa's comm on Caraka, Cikitsā 1.50 in which yajña is taken as a name of Brahmā.
3. See Mahābhāṣya, Paspasāhnikā: अथवा पूर्वपदलोपोऽत्र द्रष्टव्यः, अत्यन्तसिद्धः सिद्ध इति । तद् यथा देवदत्तो दत्तः, सत्यभामा भामेति. There is a similar rule नामैकदेशग्रहणे नाममात्रग्रहणम्. The form Satyā is found in the Mahābhāṣya (उवाच सत्या सक्तुत्य पाञ्चाली धर्मचारिणीम्, Vana-p 232. 60); for the use of Bhāmā, see Kathāsaritsāgara 39. 197 (स दृष्ट्वा शोभितं वध्वा तां शौरिमिव भामया)
4. The comm. on the Vyāsabhāṣya passage कल्पप्रलयमहाप्रलयेषु (1.25) show the distinctive character of these two kinds of pralayas; see also the comm. on Śārīrakabhāṣya passage कल्पान्तरप्रभवप्रलययोरपीति.
5. On तस्यान्तेऽभूत् महाकल्पः (Viṣṇu-p 1.3.25) Śrīdhara observes: महाकल्प इति अवान्तरकल्प एव, पुष्करादुर्भावादिगुणैर्महत्त्वान् महाकल्प इत्युच्यते.
6. As to how one and the same word can denote different senses in the same context or sentence, the reply is that in a work like Sāṃkhyakārikā which is composed in the

sūtra-style (though the sentences are in verse), the fault of vākyabheda does not apply : अथैकत्वादेकं वाक्यमिति न्यायस्य सूत्रान्यविषयत्वाद् न वाक्यभेदः (comm. Vivaraṇa on Pañcapādikā, p. 82). This is the reason for describing the sūtra as viśvatomukha (स्वल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद् विश्वतोमुखम्..... सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः).

7. cp. इतिहासपुराणाभ्याम् वेदं समुपबृंहयेत् (Mbh. Ādi 1.267); see also Vāyu-p. 1.201; Padma-p. śrīti 2.51; Śiva-p. Vāyaviya 1.1.36).

8. पुराणन्यायमीमांसाधर्मशास्त्राङ्गमिश्रिताः ।
वेदाः स्थानानि विद्यानां धर्मस्य च चतुर्दश ॥

(Yāj. Smṛti 1.3)

अङ्गानि वेदाश्चत्वारो मीमांसा न्यायविस्तरः ।

पुराणं धर्मशास्त्रं च विद्या होताश्चतुर्दश ॥

(Viṣṇu-p. 3.6. 28).

QUESTION BOX

[Scholars are earnestly requested to send us articles or notes bearing their well-considered opinions on the questions (or problems) put forward in this column for solution.

The column was started from the Vyāsa-pūrṇimā number (XXXV. 2) containing six questions. It is gratifying to note that Dr. N. Gangadharan of the Sanskrit Deptt. of Madras University has send his opinions on all the six questions (see below). We have received some more questions for this column which shows the growing interest of scholars in the Puranic field. Questions from the lovers of the epics and Purāṇas are solicited- **Editor**]

(7)

FIVE HUSBANDS OF DRAUPADĪ

The story of Draupadī having five husbands has been a point of controversy since Mahābhārata itself. I shall like to know if the fact of her having five husbands is clearly attested by the Puranic evidence as well. I shall also like to know if the propriety of her marrying five persons is discussed in the Purāṇas. Please give the necessary references.

Your's etc.

PRP Verma (Advocate).

Kabirnagar, Varanasi

(8)

KUMĀRASAMBHAVA THEME IN PURĀṆAS.

Sir,

I have been working on the Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa. The story is said to be based essentially on the Puranic version. It is well known that Kālidāsa was an admirer of Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa. In the 23rd Sarga of the Bāla Kāṇḍa there seems to be another version of the burning of Kāmadeva, quite different from the popular version. The main differences are as follows :

(a) The event took place after the marriage of Pārvaṭī and not before it.