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Nevertheless, Śrīdattopādhyāya cited from the Brāhmaṇasarvasva and accepted its reading, which elicited commendation from scholars like P. V. Kane.  

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 recognize established non-Vedic customs. That is why he wrote Dolāyātrā-viveka and Rasayasātra-viveka and thereby gave these customs a footing in the realm of Smṛti. Śūlapāṇi wrote many works of which the Śrāddhaviveka can be credited with some contribution to certain Maithila works. Thus, Rudradhara, a Maithila, This is a clear refutation of the view expressed- in Aniruddha, Ballilasena, Viicaspati that Haridasa has drawn profusely from the work of Śrīdattopādhyāya and that is why he wrote the Gam;hya. Smṛti, Śūlapāṇi, however, is the correct form as it has been used in Vedic works. Names ending in niḥka are often found in the Itihāsa-parāṇa literature. The son of Kuśa (Rama’s son) was called Kuṇānābh (Rāmacarita I.32.2).
Hiranyanābha was not only a practitioner of yoga but also a teacher of yoga. Most probably he was the promulgator of a yoga-schout. From the statement of the Viṣṇupurāṇa (IV.19.13) that Hiranyanābha taught some yogic treatise to his disciple (yogam adhyāpayāmnasa) it can be rightly presumed that he composed some work on yoga. The finite verb adhyāpayāmnasa presupposes the existence of a definite work.

The Bhāgavata (IX.12.4) and the Śīva-prāṇa (V.39.26) speak of the essential characteristics of yoga as taught by Hiranyanābha. The yoga is said to be (i) adhyātmā or adhyātmāsāmyātika (one whose name is adhyātma), (ii) mahodaya and (iii) hrdayagranthihbibhada or hrdayagranthibhedana (one that breaks the knots of hearts).

Adhyātma means adhyātmika 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 Kaṭha-up. I.2.12). Since yoga deals with adhyātma, a yogin is called adhyātmacintaka, adhyātmajita or adhyātmavī.2 The categories and tenets propounded and discussed in adhyātma vidyā are to be found in many works (vide Śāntiparvan, chaps. 194, 247, 285; Nārāyaṇaparāṇa I.44).

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

In the Muktika-up. (2.39) the word mahodaya is used in the sense of manonāsā (destruction of manas). If Nāsa is taken in the Sānkhyān sense, i.e., the state of being one with the material cause (cf. the Sānkhyasūtra 'Nsāḥ kāraṇalayaḥ' 1.121), manonāsā would refer to the ayakta state of the citā, 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 beneficent verse of the Praśastapādabhāṣya (Padārthadhanmaṅgahāraḥ pravakṣyate mahodayah) in the sense of 'everlasting cessation of pains' (ātyontikā duḥkhaniṛttiḥ), vide Nyāya-kandali.

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

1. Viṣṇuparāṇa 88.208; Brahmāṇḍaparāṇa II.63.208; Viṣṇuparāṇa IV.4.48; Bhāgavata IX.12.3-4.
2. Śānti parvan 275.18; 310.10; 310.15; 202.4; Manumṛgi 6.82; Svāmeha-prāvan 39.24.
It is interesting to note that the Raghuvansha of Kālidāsa (18.27) mentions the name of the son of Hiranyanabhā 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 Hiranyanabhā was Viśvasaha according to Viṣṇupuruṣa (IV.4.48) and Brahmāṇḍapuruṣa (II.63.206), while according to Bhāgavata (IX.12.3) the name was Vidhṛti. It is worthwhile to note that Kālidāsa, in his Raghuvansha, subscribes to the view held by the Viṣṇu and Brahmāṇḍa purāṇas and that he further informs us that Viśvasaḥa became an ascetic after appointing Hiranyanabhā 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 Itiḥāsapurāṇa literature. In the case in question it seems· that the original name was Viśvasaḥa 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 suha and dhrīti are more or less synonymous. It is the common style of the Purāṇas to use synonymous words while referring to persons or places.1

The Purāṇas inform us that Hiranyanabhā 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 Hiranyanabhā. A Purānic genealogy 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 Hiranyanabhā. 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 Hiranyanabhā in Yoga.2 Who was this Yājñavalkya? Most probably it is the same Yājñavalkya who had two wives viz. Maitreyī and Kātyāyant and whose wisdom has been admirably shown in the Bhādarānyaka up. We understand that the extant works on yoga (viz. the Togacīrīya-yāna and the Bhād-yogi-yāna-yāna and similar other works on yoga) are based on the original teaching of this Yājñavalkya. This

Yājñavalkya is said to be an inhabitant of Mithilā (Brhadāyogijyājñavalkya 1.1). The author of the Yājñavalkya Smṛti is also said to be Mithilāsthā (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 Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad.

In ancient times Mithilā (the Videha-nagarī as the Vīramitrodaya 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 Hiranyanabhā of the Kosala country with a desire to know atman.

The word Yājñavalkya is not a proper name; it means ‘a descendant of Yājñavalkya’ It is difficult to ascertain the proper name of this Yājñavalkya. He may be a person of the Viśvāmitra clan. We have nothing to say here on the date of this sage.

Hiranyanabhā is said to have been taught in yoga by one Jaimini, who is said to be a great yogin (mahāyogītvarṇa) in Vīṣṇupuruṣa (IV.4.18). The Bhāgavata (IX.123) and the Śiva-puruṣa (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 Sāṅgīti (vide Skanda-puruṣa, Nāgarakhaṇḍa 131.37).3 Sāṅgīti was the daughter of the sage Sāṅḍilya (Mahābhārata, Śalyapravara 54.6-7). Most probably this Jaimini is the same as the teacher of Hiranyanabhā.

Some may say that since Hiranyanabhā was a great teacher of the Sāma-veda (vide the Purānic chapters on the Vedasākhāvibhāga),4 Jaimini, the guru of Hiranyanabhā, must be supposed to be the sage who divided the Sāma-veda, being instructed by Vīṣṇa. According to the Purāṇas, Hiranyanabhā appeared after Jaimini, the Sāma-teacher, and it can be surmised that the long-lived sage Jaimini imparted yogavidyā to Hiranyanabhā at his old age. It may also be supposed that Hiranyanabhā was instructed in Yoga by a direct or indirect śīya (disciple, follower) of Jaimini and this is why he was called ‘jaiminisīya’.

2. Tasmād adhigata yoge Yājñavalkyena dīnaṁat (Vīṣṇupuruṣa 88.208; Brahmāṇḍapuruṣa II.63.208). Hiranyanabhah, yato Yājñavalkyo yogam aṅkā (Viṣṇu IV.4.48). "tato Hiryananabhah Togacīrīya-vatu Jaiminehi Śiṣyoh Kausalyo śākyātimani Yājñavalkyo dhvayād yatoḥ" (Bhāg. IX.12.3-4).
4. Viṣṇupuruṣa III.4–6; Vāyu-puruṣa 60–61; Brahmāṇḍapuruṣa I.34–35; Bhāgavata XII 6–7; Agnīpurāṇa 271.1–10.
It is interesting to note that according to *Viṣṇupuruṣa* (88.207-208), Hiranyanābha was the pupil of the grandson of Jaimini. This may be a fact; for Hiranyanābha is said to be the direct disciple of Sukarman in *Sāmaveda* and Sukarman was the grandson of Jaimini.1

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 *Yājnavalkya 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 *Viṣṇupuruṣa* (IV.19.13) says that Kṛta was another student of Hiranyanābha in yoga (vide also *Harivaniśita* 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-saṁhita-s* and taught them to his disciples who came to be known as the chanters of kārtasāmans (*Kārtikeya-samagāh*).2

Hiranyanābha's contribution to the *Sāmaveda* was noted by the Purāṇas. It is stated that he composed 500 *Sāma-saṁhita-s* and taught them to his disciples who were called Eastern Sāman Chanters, (*prācyasamagāh*).3

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (XIII.5.4.4), informs us that Hiranyanābha was an ātyātra. From the commentaries by Durga and Skanda on the *Nirukta* (1.14) we know that ātyātra means ‘ātyātāsita’ (one whose nature is to roam about), i.e., a parivrājaka. This shows that Hiranyanābha became a sannyāsin in the latter part of his life (vide Bhagavadaita : *Bhāratavarṣa kā Brhat Iśīśa* Vol. II, pp. 137-138).

The Purānic Chronology of Hiranyanābha presents some difficulties. Some say that there were two Hiranyanābhas 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 *Iśīna-puruṣa* literature both śīṣya and putra are used indiscriminately. In *Bhāgavata* III.1.25 occurs the word tanaṇa, which is explained by Śṛṅghara as śīṣya.
2. *Viṣṇupuruṣa* 79.95 and *Bṛhatmāndaguruṇa* II.15.64 also speak to the same effect.
3. For a fuller discussion on the contribution of Hiranyanābha in the field of *Sāmaveda*, vide R. S. Bhattacharya : *Puruṣottama vedaviṣyāsaka sāmagrī kā samiṣṭāṁaka adhyayana*, pp. 299-305.

---

1. *The Viṣṇupuruṣa* (II.13.44) says : *Hiranyagarbhasvacanaṃ Vicintyathām*. These vacana-s (statements) are quoted in *Viṣṇupuruṣa* II.13-42.44. The commentator Śṛṅghara says that these two verses belonged to the *Hiranyagarbha-āstra*. Śāṅkarācārya in his *bhāṣya* on the *Samatsujīta* 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.

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 *Hiranyagarbha-yoga*. Can it be supposed that these verses originally belonged to the treatise composed by Hiranyanābha?