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IDENTITY OF HIRAÑYANĀBHA— A KṢATRIYA YOGIN

By
RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

[Page 78]

In the Praśna-upaṇiṣad, we find the following passage:

अयं हृद्धु कृत-नामम् ∥ प्रच्छ-भगवन् हिरण्यनाम: कृसिद्योऽरुक्तवेव

No further information of this Hiraṇyañābha is found in the Upaniṣads.

Mention of Hiraṇyañābha is however found in some Vedic Sārṅhītās, Brāhmaṇas and Śrautaṣṭātras. The relevant passage in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is noteworthy:

अभिमलितयाजाहि स पुरुषा न इति कृसिद्यो राज्य सत्त्वाय अभिमलितयाजाहि स पुरुषा न इति कृसिद्यो

From the commentaries by Durga and Skanda on Nirukta 1.14 we know that अरुक्त means अप्रवर्त्तेन (one who habitually wanders, i.e. a parivṛṭaka). This shows that the rājaputra Hiraṇyañābha became a
sannyasin in the last part of his life. See also Śaṅkhāyana Śrutasūtra XVI. 9. 13 and Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 2.6.

Curiously enough the Purāṇas contain some passages that throw much light on the life and activities of this Hiranayanābha. The life of Hiranayanābha as described in these works shows that not only Janaka and his descendants were ātmaśīvīs (see Viṣṇupurāṇa IV. 5. 14.) but a few kings of other dynasties also were yogins of high prominence.

Now we are going to quote relevant Puranic passages. It is needless to say that the readings of these passages are corrupt in some places which may be corrected with the help of comparative study. These verses occur in the description of the dynasty of Kuṣa, son of Rāma.

The Vāyu-p. (88. 206b-209a) reads:

बृहिष्टाद्वयुक्तश्चापि राजा विभ्यसहः किंतु ||
हिरण्यानामकीश्लोकम् वरिष्टाद्वयुक्तभवत् ||
पौराणिक जैसे: शिष्यः सुभा: सन्तोषः शर्माः हः
शतानि संहितानां हः पञ्चो योगिणिवतः हः
तस्मादशिष्यः योगो याज्ञवल्क्यश्रीमता
पुष्पास्त्रुता सुभाः विद्वानः ..................................

[The Beng. ed. reads बृहिष्टास्य (206b) and पुष्प (209a)].

The Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa (II. 63.207b-210a) reads:

बृहिष्टाद्वयुक्तश्चापि राजा विभ्यसहः किंतु || 207
हिरण्यानामकीश्लोकम् वरिष्टाद्वयुक्तभवत् ||
पौराणिक सः वै शिष्यः सुभा: प्रसाद: सामसूः || 208
शतानि संहितानां हः पञ्चो योगिणिवतः हः
तस्मादशिष्यः योगो याज्ञवल्क्यश्रीमता || 209
पुष्पास्त्रुता सुभाः विद्वानः ..................................

It will be shown afterwards that here the readings in Brahmāṇḍa-p.
(Venk. ed.) are better than those in the Vāyu-p. (Ananda. ed.).

The Viṣṇu-p. (IV. 4. 48) reads:

ततो बृहिष्टास्य ततो विभ्यसहः जसोऽहः ||
हिरण्यानामकीश्लोकम् महायोगिन्यवेदिनि-
शिष्यः यतो याज्ञवल्क्यो योगवाक्य

(Jiv. ed. with the comm. of Śrīdhara)

The Bhāgavata (IX. 12. 3-4) reads:
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खण्डस्तम्नुसारस्माद् विभिन्नस्तम्भं सुभा: ||
ततो हिरण्यानामस्मृतं योगारायस्तु || जैसे: || 3
शिष्य कीलोक्तया श्रावन्त्य याज्ञवल्क्यश्रीमत्या यतः ||
योगो महायोगिनि हृदयप्रभाग्येनस्मि || 4
[v.1. viṣṇु (3): v. 1. मेधावि (4)]

The comm. Śrīdhara observes: जैसे: शिष्यो योगवार्त्ताः (verse 3); तदाह यतः सधारां कीलोक्त याज्ञवल्क्य श्रीमत: आधारां योगवार्त्ताः.

The Śivapurāṇa (V. 38. 24-26) reads:

tतस्मादस्तम्नुसारस्माद् तस्माद् विभिन्नस्तम्भं || 24
हिरण्यानामस्मृतं तत्रुग्रद्योगवार्त्ताः || 25
तस्मादशिष्यः योगवार्त्ताः || 25
शिष्यो जैसे: जैसे: सामसूः विद्वानः हृदयप्रभाग्येनस्मि || 26

The Garuḍa-p. (I. 138. 42) reads:

विभिन्नस्तम्नुसारस्माद् तस्माद् विभिन्नस्तम्भं ||
हिरण्यानामस्मृतं: || 42

From these Puranic passages we can gather the following facts about Hiranayanābha:

(A) Hiranayanābha appeared in the dynasty of Kuṣa, son of Rāma, after 15th or 16th generation. This is to be regarded as approximate for the simple reason that the readings in the printed Purāṇas are corrupt in many places. Moreover the enumeration of the descendants in the Puranic lists of royal dynasties is not always precise; a few non-significant kings may not have been mentioned by the authors of the purāṇas.

(B) The name of the father of Hiranayanābha is विभिन्नस्त, as is read in the Vāyu, Viṣṇu and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas. विभिन्नस्त is the reading in the late Bhāgavata and Śiva purāṇas seems to be of later origin. The name having the same sense as विभिन्नस्त seems to have been coined chiefly for metrical reasons. विभिन्नस्त is undoubtedly the corrupt form of विभिन्नस्त. Hiranayanābha is said to be the eldest (varīṣṭa) son of his father. Vasīṣṭha (the reading in Vāyu-p.) is to be corrected to varīṣṭha.

(C) Hiranayanābha was an inhabitant of Kosala i.e. Ayodhya. Since he was a descendant of Kuṣa, to whom the kingdom of Kosala was given by
Rāma with its capital Kuśasthali on the table-land of the Vindhya hill, he is rightly called Kausalya (or Kausālā). This Kosala is sometimes called Dakṣiṇa Kosala, for which Kosala is also used by the authors of the Purāṇas; see Gauḍa-p. I. 68. 17 where Kosala is the same as Dakṣiṇa Kosala.

The Bhāgavata also uses the word कौसल्य, which is wrongly construed with Yājñavalkya by the commentator Śrīdhara. This means that Yājñavalkya, the disciple of Hīranyanābha, was an inhabitant of Kosala. This is untenable as there is no grounds to hold this view. Kausālāyaḥ ought to have been construed with विवेकानादि. The Śiva-p. (कौसल्यो याज्ञवल्क्योपप) seems to be misled by the Bhāgavata.

(D) The Viṣṇu-p. clearly says that Hīranyanābha was a disciple of Jaimini, a great yogin. The Bhāgavata is also of the same opinion (योगाचार्यो हिरण्यनाधर) जैमिनि: शिष्य:—words so arranged as to yield the sense clearly).

A question may be raised about the validity of this view as no sage named Jaimini is described as a great yogin in the Itihāsa-purāṇas or in the yogic works.

The problem may be solved if we think that Hīranyanābha was one of the later promulgators of Śāma-veda-recensions and that Jaimini was the first promulgator of the Śāma-veda-sākhās. Thus it may reasonably be concluded that Hīranyanābha was an indirect disciple of Jaimini in the field of Sāmakṣa.

The problem may be solved in another conjectural way. We may read the Viṣṇu-p. passage as हिरण्यनाब्हतो महायोगी:—, जैमिनिशिष्य्:, thus construing महायोगी: not with Jaimini but with Hīranyanābha. It is not necessary that all epithets of a substantive are to be read before it as is held by Rhetoricians.

(E) The Vāyu and other Purāṇas declare that Yājñavalkya achieved yoga from Hīranyanābha.

It is unfortunate that such a valuable information is not found in the available works on yoga. Even the yogic works ascribed to Yājñavalkya, namely योग (मि) = याज्ञवल्क्य and बृहद्योगियाधिवास् (or बृहद्योगियाधिवास्-वातसहिता:) do not speak of Hīranyanābha as the teacher of Yājñavalkya.

There is however no doubt about the existence of Yājñavalkya, the yogin.
sāman songs are helpful in attaining one-pointedness, which is the firm basis of all yoga practices, as has been stated in the Yajñavalkya-smṛti: यज्ञवल्क्यस्मर्तिः पद्म नामात्मानविद्याचारम्। सामाज्यानलयानम् परम् ब्रह्मचिष्ठ्यचारितः॥ (3.112). Puranic authors were fully aware of the power of sāman songs; that is why they emphatically declared 'सामानि यो वेद स वेद ब्रह्म' (Vāyu-p. 79.95; Brahmāṇḍa-p. II. 15.68). The Puranic statement is found in slightly different form in an authoritative work of the Vedic tradition also; see Bhaddevatā 8.130 (सामानि यो वेद स वेद तत्त्वम्)।

1. Śaṅkara explains कीसव्यः as कीसव्यः भवः. Madhvācārya also explained it in the same way. Kosalā is another name of Ayodhyā (see Vaijayantika's 4.3.5; Kalpadru-kos'a. p. 17, verse 15).

   Some editions seem to read kausalya with palatal s'. According to Max Muller there is no authority for the palatal s'. (S. B. E. vol. 15, p. 283 fn.) In the Purāṇa also the word is sometimes read with palatal s'. According to the Paninian tradition the word is to be spelt with dental s; see commentaries on Pā 4.1.171 (तुंडदकाळिणि) Tattvabodhini on Uṇḍāi-sūtra 106 (उष्णामित्वाद्) and Auṇḍikapadārṇava 1.443. The Bhāgavata verse हिरण्यानाम: कीसव्यम् (12.7.77) is quoted in the Caranāyuvā (sec. on Sāmaveda). The comm. Mahidhara explains कीसव्यम् by kosa-lapata (p. 46), which is unacceptable.

2. Śaṅkara explains rājapurta as जालित श्रवणे।

3. In many passages of the printed Purāṇa the name is read as हिरण्यानामनि or हिरण्यानामभिः. There is no doubt that the correct form is हिरण्यानाम. Names of kings ending with नाम are found in the Purāṇas, e. i. कुमार (the name of the son of Kuśa, son of Rāma, Rāmāyaṇa 1.32.2).

4. cp. इति इक्ष्वाकुपायाय राजा: प्राच्यः सूर्यादि: | तथे ध्रुवाभिः प्राचायेऽृध्रू रूपी: || (Vāyu-p. 88.213); सर्व प्राच्यायां प्राच: स्मालित: (Kūrma-p. 1.241 in कृत्याकारणम्)।

5. Use of synonyms in proper names is often found in the Purāṇas. As for example अदितिन इस used for the king अदितिन, श्रवणे for the king श्रवणे, विपुलाद्यस्मि for the sage विपुलाद्यस्मि, दिशादिशाभिः for दिशादिशाभिः, द्रव्यव्रताद्यस्मि for the demon द्रव्यव्रताद्यस्मि, etc. As the proper names were often based on the गुप्त-कार्मणि of persons, the tendency of using synonyms came into existence in natural course.

6. कुस्मा कुस्माद् राजा पुरी वाचि कुस्मस्ती। रस्य निवेषिता वेष्ये किर्मिकर्म्यस्यनुपूर्वकेषु || (Vāyu-p. 88.199; Brahmāṇḍa-p. 2.64.199). The division or Kosala into northern and southern is not stated in Vedic literature.

7. See Yajñavalkya-smṛti 1.2 (स्मितिस्मितिः स क्योऽधिकः) and 3.110 (किर्मिकर्म्यते) and the Janaka-yājñavalkya dialogue on Śaṅkhyā-yoga views in Śānti-p. (Chaps 303-306 cr. ed.).
THE UPPER DATE OF AYODHYAMĀHĀTYMYA OF SKANDA PURĀNA

BY

JAHNAWI SHEKHAR ROY

[As I have already observed in my paper in the Journal of the Rāṣṭrīya Sanskrit Parishad, 1913, the date of the manuscript of the Ayodhyamāhātya is earlier than the time of Rāma. The earliest known manuscript of the Skanda Purāṇa is that of the Mahārāja of Patna, who presented it to the British Museum in 1793. However, there is a manuscript in the Library of the University of Calcutta, which is dated 1795. The manuscript is in the handwriting of the late Dr. S. N. Dasgupta, who was a noted scholar of the 19th century. He was also the author of the first complete edition of the Skanda Purāṇa.]

[Introduction]

Dr. Bakker has put the upper date of Ayodhyamāhātya (AM) as 1093 A.D., that is, the date of the Candradeva inscription of Ayodhyā. Rather, he pushes the date a little more forward. If we accept his argument, AM must have been composed after 1184 A.D., that is, the date of the installation of Tretā-kā-Thākur temple by king Jayendra. Dr. Pathak, V.S. and Dr. Tiwari, J.N. agree with it (1093 A.D.) and further add that the lower limit of the date of the composition of AM should be 1148 A.D., viz, the date of the construction of Tretā-kā-Thākur at Svaradvārā as given in Jayendra’s inscription found in the ruins of the Tretā-kā-Thākur mosque built by Aurangzeb. Aparently, it seems that both, Dr. Bakker and on the other hand Dr. Pathak and Tiwari, agree on the upper date. But actually it is not so. Dr. Pathak and Tiwari in fact, dismiss the main argument of Dr. Bakker as speculative.

The two set of arguments annul each other. So, it becomes imperative to