

TWO LEGENDS FROM THE PURĀṆAS:
A STUDY IN UPABR̥MHAṆA **

Introductory:

Purāṇas form an important branch of Sanskrit literature and are « rooted in Vedic literature »¹. They are said to be the very quintessence not only of the *Vedas* and of the *Vedāṅgas*, but the very soul of the *Vedas*². They are reckoned as the fifth *Veda*³. All this points to the close relationship of the *Vedas* and the *Purāṇas*. Hence they are very important not only for the religious and cultural history of India, but also for the Vedic studies as ancillary literature.

Various principles of Vedic interpretation have been expounded⁴. The Mbh states that the moonlight in the form of *smṛti* is manifested

* Faculty of Arts, M.S. University of Baroda.

** Paper read at the Seminar on the « Aspects of Vedic Interpretation » held under the auspices of Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona, Poona (India) from 28th January 1980, to 31th January 1980.

1. M. WINTERNITZ, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 518 (Translated by Mrs. S. Ketkar), University of Calcutta, Calcutta, 1927.

2. *ātmā purāṇaṇi vedānām/Skandapurāṇa, Revākhaṇḍa* 1.22, Venkateshvar Steam Press, Bombay; *sarvavedavedāṅgaśāstrāṇāṇi, sārabhūtam/Nāradyapurāṇa* 1.1.21; Venkateshvar Steam Press, Bombay, Saṃvat 1962; *sarvavedārthasārāṇi purāṇānīti/Nāradyapurāṇa* 1.1.61; *vedāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ sarve nātra saṃśayaḥ/Nāradyapurāṇa* 2.24.17; cf. *Skandapurāṇa, Revākhaṇḍa* 1.2.2; cf. *nigamakalpataror galitaṇi phalam/BhP* 1.1.3.

3. *purāṇaṇi pañcamo veda iti Brahmānuśāsanam/Skandapurāṇa, Revākhaṇḍa* 1.18.

4. ARTHUR A. MACDONELL, *The Principles to be followed in Translating the R̥gveda*, « Commemorative Essays Presented to Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar », pp. 3-19, BORI, Poona, 1917; A. B. DHRUVA, *The Veda and Its Interpretations*, « Malaviya Commemoration Volume », pp. 447-58, Benares Hindu University, Benares, 1932; S. S. BHAWE, *The Soma-Hymns of the R̥gveda*, Part I, pp. 2-3. Oriental Institute, M.S. University of Baroda, Baroda, 1957 (M.S. University of Baroda Research Series, No. 3).

by the full moon in the form of *Purāṇas*⁵. The Mbh 1.1.204 and the *Purāṇas*, e.g. *Vāyupurāṇa* 1.201, expound a tenet that the *upabṛṃhaṇa* of the *Veda* is to be done with the help of *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa*⁶. *Upabṛṃhaṇa* is *śrutipratipannārtha-viśadīkaraṇa*⁷ and according to Jivagosvāmin *Purāṇa* is so called because it nourishes and supplements the meaning of the *Veda*⁸.

It is quite well-known that some Vedic *mantras*, myths and legends have migrated to the *Itihāsa* and *Purāṇa*-literature. *En passant* it may also be noted that there are some enigmatic hymns in the *Ṛgveda*. Therein there is also a class of hymns known as the dialogue-hymns or the *ākhyāna*-hymns or the ballads. It is in this context that *Purāṇas* throw some times some important light in their exegesis⁹ by playing a supplementary, confirmatory and/or explanatory rôle. It is quite true that the tenet of *upabṛṃhaṇa* is a time-honoured principle and hence it is to be utilized with care and caution. The utilization of the Epic and *Purāṇic* tradition which in a sense represents the continuation of Indian tradition and culture, would not run counter to the thesis of Karl F. Geldner and R. Pischel who advocated that « the Indian literature of later periods provides the best key »¹⁰ to the understanding of the RV.

In this paper it is proposed to examine afresh the two renowned legends *viz.* (i) the Brahmā-Sarasvatī legend and (ii) the Soma-Tārā legend, especially from the point of view of *upabṛṃhaṇa*.

5. *purāṇapūrṇacandreṇa śṛmtijyotsnāprakāśinā*/Mbh. Ādiparvan, Appendix I, p. 885 (cr. ed. BORI, Poona). *Vide* also P. V. KANE, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. V, Part II, p. 914, fn. 1449, BORI, Poona, 1962.

6. *itihāsapūrāṇābhyāṃ vedāṃ samupabṛṃhayet*/Mbh. 1.1.204; *vide* also Rāmānuja, Śrībhāṣya on Brahmāsūtra 1.1.1 (p. 69, edited by Vasudeva Shastri Abhyankar, Poona, 1935).

7. RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA, *Itihāsa-Purāṇa-kā Anuśilana* (Hindi), p. 25, fn. 1; Indological Book House, Varanasi, 1963.

8. RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA, *op. cit.*, p. 238; *cf.* *pūrāṇāt purāṇam*/Jivagosvāmin as referred to by RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA, *ibid.*, p. 46.

9. *Vide* T. G. MAINKAR, *The Upabṛṃhaṇa and the Ṛgveda Interpretation*, pp. 8, 10, 16 (L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1975). BALADEVA UPADHYAYA, *Purāṇavi-marśa* (Hindi), pp. 243 ff. (Chowkhamba Vidyabhavan, Varanasi, 1965). He gives also the classification of the working of the principle of *upabṛṃhaṇa* (*ibid.*).

10. M. WINTERNITZ, *op. cit.*, p. 72. T. G. Mainkar has « made an effort to indicate the utility as well as the necessity of the *upabṛṃhaṇa* » (*ibid.*, Preface, p. 5) and he observes that « it is to be remembered that the traditional cry for "*upabṛṃhaṇa*" also has its rightful place by the side of these modern principles » (*ibid.*, p. 17). For various principles of interpreting the *Purāṇas* *vide* ANAND SWARUP GUPTA, *The Problem of Interpretation of Purāṇas*, *Purāṇa*, Vol. VI, No. 1, January 1964, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi (Benares), pp. 62 ff.

Synopsis of the legends:

(i) *Brahmā-Sarasvatī Legend:*

The Brahmā-Sarasvatī legend is broadcast in Sanskrit literature and this Vedic legend is re-told with additions and alterations in several *Purānas*¹¹.

In the MP¹² which is one of the earliest *Purānas* the legend is narrated in the context of the primal creation (*ādisarga*). On the epoch-making event of the creation Brahmā meditated on Sāvitrī and whilst he was engrossed in *japa*, his body was cut in twain and the one-half became the female and the other half, the male. This female half was reckoned as his daughter as she was born of his body (*aṅgajā*) and she came to be variously known as Śatarūpā, Sāvitrī, Gāyatrī and Brahmāṇī. Being mad at Śatarūpā's peerless beauty he gazed at her libidiously in all directions¹³ and finally he married her, the blameless one, who gave birth to Manu Svāyambhuva *alis* Virāj and other sons.

The MP has a second half of this legend and it begins with a significant query regarding the *śaṅotra*-marriage of Brahmā and Sarasvatī and the *Purānakāra* offers an allegorical explanation of it¹⁴. It is pointed out that this primal creation is the result of divine knowledge. It is divine and supersensuous in character. Moreover, in this context Brahmā is the presiding deity (*adhiṣṭhātā*) and the *vedarāśī*, whereas Gāyatrī is said to preside over the *Vedas* (*tad-adhiṣṭhitā*). This couple is corporeal as well as incorporeal and their inseparable concomitant relationship is compared by the *Purānakāra*, for example, with the inseparableness of the sunshine and the shadow, suggesting thereby that their co-habitation is natural and in the fitness of things. At the end the MP notes that Brahmā was abashed of his condemnable act and he cursed Cupid for urging him to commit such an ignominious and abominable act; thus the episode tends to breathe an ethical atmosphere.

It is significant to note that the MP adds a remark that the mortals do not know the ways of the immortals, *i.e.* to say they have their own laws and the human valuation is not to be applied to these laws and an entertaining of such an idea is deemed inauspicious. It is interesting to note here that the BhP¹⁵ in the context of Kṛṣṇa's relationship with *gopīs* observes that the fault of the violation of *dharma* does not

11. Vide SIDDHESHVAR CHITRAVASHASTRI, *Prācīnacaritrakośa* (Hindi), p. 527, Bharatiya Charittrakosha Mandal, Poona, 1964.

12. MP 3.30 ff., 4.1 ff., 24, 25.

13. As a consequence of his gazing at her in all directions Brahmā came to have five faces and his fifth head was covered in his matted hair and it was lopped off by Śiva (MP 3.40; 183.86).

14. Vide S. G. KANTAWALA, *The Brahmā-Sarasvatī Episode in the Matsyapurāna*, JOIB, Vol. VIII, No. 1, September, 1958, pp. 38 ff. Wilson designates it as an allegory (H. H. WILSON, *Viṣṇu-Purāna*, Vol. I, p. 108, London, 1864). Anand Swarup Gupta designates the relationship as symbolical (*ibid.*, p. 63).

15. BhP 10.33.30-31.

accrue to the *tejīyas*, just as no blemish accrues to the fire, the devourer of everything; hence an ordinary mortal should not commit such an act.

According to the BhP¹⁶ Svayambhū, the lord of speech, gave birth to a beautiful daughter named Vāc *alias* Sarasvatī and loved her passionately, even though she did not love him. His sons Marīci and others came to know about his *adharmamati* and beseeched him not to behave so, as such an act was not committed in the past and they pointed out that even for the *tajīyas* such an act did not conduce to fame. Moreover, people obtain *kṣema* by following his act and hence he must follow the *dharma*¹⁷. Thus the BhP also adds an ethical note here. On finding his sons present he gave up his body. Later in the same chapter¹⁸ it is stated that when Brahmā found that his *prajā* did not procreate further, he had his *kāya* divided into two halves giving rise to a *mīthuna* consisting of one male and another female. The male part came to be known as Manu Svāyambhuva, the king, and the female part came to be known as *Śatarūpā*, his queen who carried on the task of creation successfully.

Note that according to this BhP-version *Śatarūpā* is Svāyambhuva Manu's wife, whereas according to the MP-version he is her son *i.e.* she is his mother. Thus the BhP depicts the incestuous relationship between a brother and a sister, whereas the MP delineates it between a father and a daughter.

The *Vāyupurāṇa* mentions *Śatarūpā* as the female portion of Brahmā¹⁹.

According to the *Vāmana-Purāṇa*, Brahmā, the grand sire of the world, had created all the movable and non-movable objects. Again he thought of creation and he created a beautiful maiden whom he invited for copulation. On account of his sinister act his head was torn asunder²⁰.

According to the *Manusmṛti-version*²¹ Brahmā divided himself in twain and the one half became the male and the other half the female in whom he produced Virāj by the *māithunadharmā*²².

All these versions inherit the theme of incest from the *Vedas*.

16. BhP 3.12.28 ff.

17. BhP 3.12.31-32.

18. BhP 3.12.15 ff.

19. D. R. PATIL, *Cultural History from the Vāyu-Purāṇa*, p. 42. Deccan College, Poona, 1946.

20. *Vāmana-Purāṇa*, Critical Edition, All-India Kashiraj Trust, Varanasi, Saroha-māhātmya, ch. 28, stanzas 3-5.

21. *Manusmṛti* 1.32 (Gujarati Printing Press, Bombay, 1913).

22. Kullūka on *Manusmṛti* 1.32.

(ii) *Soma-Tārā Legend:*

The Soma-Tārā episode is broadcast in Sanskrit literature²³ and amongst its Purāṇic occurrence the MP-version is summarized here, as it is one of the earliest *Purānas*²⁴. Being intoxicated with the acquisition of power, prosperity and lordship over the seven worlds after the performance of the Rājasūya sacrifice, Soma, once, chanced to see Bṛhaspati's wife Tārā, the paragon of beauty. Both were passionately attracted and enamoured of each other and he abducted her to his abode and enjoyed her maddening company for a number of days. At this event Bṛhaspati was much perturbed and was very miserable. He (*i.e.* Bṛhaspati) entreated him (*i.e.* Soma) to return his better-half in vain. At last, out of affection for Bṛhaspati, Śiva with his legion and allies gave a fierce battle to Soma and when it foreboded the destruction of the entire universe, Brahmā interceded and requested Soma successfully to return Tārā to Bṛhaspati, the lord of speech (*vākpati*, MP 23.46). Bṛhaspati regained his *enceinte* wife and repaired to his abode merrily. Then Budha was born of her. Thus the legend depicts a case of seduction, rape and adultery.

Discussion:(i) *Brahmā-Sarasvatī Legend:*

The germs of the incestuous relation between a father and a daughter depicted in the first half of this legend are traceable to the RV 1.71.5; 10.61.5-9 (the Nābhānediṣṭha hymn). The *Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā* 4.2.12 mentions Prajāpati as being enamoured of his daughter Uṣas. This legend occurs several times in the *Brāhmaṇa* literature; *e.g.* *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.7.4.1ff, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 3.33, where it specifically occurs

23. *Vide* SIDDHESHVAR CHITRAVSHASTRI, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-203, 243, 250; GIORGIO BONAZZOLI, *Seduction Stories in the Brahmavaivartapurāna*, Purāṇa, Vol. XIX, No. 2, July 1977, p. 328, fn. 24. It is significant to note that according to Bonazzoli also this story can be considered to be a good example of the saying « itihāsapurāṇābhyāṃ vedam samupabr̥ṃhayet » (*ibid.*, p. 331).

24. *Cf.* GIORGIO BONAZZOLI observes that out of the several Purānas in which this legend occurs, « Devī Bhg and Matsya deserve a special attention because they give importance to the description of Tārā's beauty and to the pleasures of Candra and Tārā's union, elements that will have great significance in the BVP » (*ibid.*, p. 329). These two *Purānas* dwell also on the seduction theme. (*Vide ibid.*, p. 333). He continues to observe that « a study of such stories (*i.e.*, *seduction-stories*; bracket ours) helps to understand the Purāṇic attitude towards tradition and the moral feelings of the composers on one hand, while on the other hand it provides a clue to the structure of a purāṇa, its handling of mythical themes, revelation and its topics that constitute the matter » (*ibid.*, p. 322). In this paper Bonazzoli studies the structure of two stories, *viz.*, Indra-Ahalyā and Candra-Tārā. *Vide* also D. R. PATIL, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

as a case of Prajāpati's incest with his daughter²⁵. The AV 9.10.12 mentions the placing of the seed in the daughter. Thus the MP and the BhP inherit the Vedic legacy of incest. This half is interpreted from several points of view, e.g. (i) natural phenomenon of the arrival of the sun and the dawn²⁶, (ii) philosophical interpretation: father as *manas*, the thinking principle and daughter as *vāṇī* and the union of the two representing the *śabda*, (iii) *ādhidaivika* interpretation: primal creation²⁷, and (iv) sociological interpretation: « the most primitive stage of the society had kinless organisation and hence the "father" was not supposed to be the "kin" of the children »²⁸ and the memory of such society is preserved in this episode. The first stage shows the « maternal or even prematernal stage of society and the second, the paternal stage, when "father" came to be the rightful kin of the children »²⁹. Thus the episode is a relic of the free sexual commerce between a father and a daughter at some stage of development of the society. At this juncture one is reminded of Manu's injunction that a father and a daughter should not sit in privacy because a powerful host of sense-organs drags even the wise and the learned astray³⁰ indicating thereby the slippery and weak moments of human mind.

It may, however, be mentioned that this first half symbolises the cosmological process, wherein the celebrated characters « are to be taken as representatives of the two principles of creation, the male and the female »³¹, as the legend occurs in the context of *ādisarga*.

25. A. A. MACDONELL, *The Vedic Mythology*, p. 119 (Indological Book House, Delhi, 1971). J. MUIR, *Original Sanskrit Texts*, Vol. I, pp. 107 ff., Vol. IV, pp. 45 ff. Trubner & Co., Ludgate Hill., London, 1890. SIDDHESHWAR CHITRAVSHASTRI, *op. cit.*, p. 464.

26. According to T. G. MAINKAR the Purāṇic addition « confirms the Sūrya-Uṣas interpretation of the original Ṛgvedic account » (*ibid.*, p. 11) and he continues to observe that « the Vedic poets... are seen indulging in a free use of metaphorical and symbolical language, as a result of which we get many unintelligible passages » (*ibid.*, p. 11).

27. Vide BALADEVA UPADHYAYA, *op. cit.*, pp. 257 ff.

28. S. A. DANGE, *Prajāpati and His Daughter*, Purāṇa, Vol. V, No. 1, January 1963, p. 45; for details *vide* pp. 39-46; *vide* also his *Sexual Symbolism from the Vedic Ritual*, Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1979, Ch. 8 « The Lusty Father », pp. 141 ff.

29. S. A. DANGE, *op. cit.*, p. 46. K. V. NILAMEGHACHARYA examines this episode with the help of « certain Mimāṃsīc tenets of interpretation of the Vedic texts and on the basis of these texts he asserts that such Vedic accounts are supernatural and divine... ». This relationship « has nothing to do with any worldly relation of the father and his daughter of the primitive society » (*Prajāpati-tat-kanyā-vṛttānta-mimāṃsā*, Purāṇa, Vol. VI, No. 1, January 1964, pp. 79-80; *vide ibid.*, pp. 79-96). T. G. MAINKAR remarks that « the other portions of the Ṛgveda to me, indicate the Ṛgvedic ethical and moral ideals would in all probability accept such an incest » (*ibid.*, p. 11). Vide S. G. KANTAWALA, *Cultural History from the Matsyapurāṇa*, M.S. University of Baroda, Baroda, 1964 (1965), p. 66, fn. 25 (M.S. University of Baroda Research Series, No. 8).

30. *Manusmṛiti* 2.215.

31. T. G. MAINKAR, *op. cit.*, p. 11; *vide* also S. G. KANTAWALA, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

The second half of the episode given in the MP is important from the interpretational point of view. It tries to palliate the graveness of the sexual act of Brahmā with Sarasvatī by taking it as an allegory³². The germs of this half are traceable to the Vedic literature. In the RV Savitr̥, who is one of the solar deities, is called also Prajāpati³³. « In the *sūtras* Prajāpati is identified with Brahmā (AGS 3.4 etc.) »³⁴. In the *Brāhmaṇas*³⁵ Sarasvatī is identified with Vāc and Vāc is identified with Prajāpati³⁶. The *Kauṣītakī Upaniṣad* 5.1 states that Vāc is Sarasvatī and the BhP refers to the union of Vāc and Prajāpati who is *girāṇ pati*³⁷. This identification explains also why she is said to have her abode in Brahmā's mouth³⁸. In the *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* Sarasvatī is called *brahmayoni*³⁹. In the MP 4.24 Gāyatrī is said to be *brahmavādīnī*, « singer of the Vedas »; thus this confirms her connection with the Vedas. And this is testified by the *Tāṇḍya-Brāhmaṇa* 2.3.10.1 which refers to the present of the three *Vedas* by Soma to Sitā, the daughter of Prajāpati. According to the MP Sarasvatī is Sāvitrī who is the daughter of the Sun. *Sūryasya duhitā* is one of the important concepts of the RV. *Sūryasya duhitā* is the genius of poetry or muse of poetry⁴⁰, or in other words « she is poetry personified, while Sūrya originally stood for prayer or poetry. Sarasvatī is the guardian deity of poetry »⁴¹. Sāvitrī who is also designated as Sarasvatī is also Śatarūpā in the MP and Śatarūpā in this context appears to symbolise the multi-aspect of literary creation of the poets. Thus the Vedic concept of *Sūryasya duhitā* finds its *upabr̥hmana* in the *Purāṇas*.

(ii) Soma-Tārā Legend:

The germs of the Soma-Tārā legend are traceable to the famous Ṛgvedic Brahmajāyā hymn⁴². According to the Ṛgvedic account Soma, the king, restored the *Brahmajāyā* to Bṛhaspati⁴³. It is significant to

32. On the causes of the introduction of this allegory *vide* J. MUIR, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 112-13. J. Muir designates it as « mystical explanation ».

33. *divó dhartā bhūvanasya prajāpatiḥ*/RV 4.53.2a.

34. A. A. MACDONELL, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

35. *e.g.* ŚB 3.9.1.7; AB 3.1.10; A. A. MACDONELL, *op. cit.*, p. 87; A. B. KEITH, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, HOS, Vol. 31, pp. 173-74 (1925).

36. A. B. KEITH, *op. cit.*, HOS, Vol. 32, p. 344 (1925).

37. BhP 3.12.20.

38. *Vide* MP 13.52.

39. *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* 23.30 as quoted by A. S. GUPTA, *Sarasvatīstotra*, Purāṇa, Vol. VI, No. 1, January 1964, p. 1.

40. *Vide* K. F. GELDNER, *Kommentar* (Stuttgart), p. 141 (on RV 9.72.2); S. S. BHAWE, *The conception of Muse of Poetry in the Rgveda*, JUB, Vol. XIX, Part II, September 1950, pp. 19 ff.

41. R. N. DANDEKAR, *Vedic Bibliography*, Vol. II, p. 165 (University of Poona, Poona, 1961) on S. S. BHAWE, *ibid.*

42. RV 10.109; *vide* also AV 5.17. On the interpretation of RV 10.109, *vide* S. S. BHAWE, *An Interpretation of RV 10.109 (Brahmakīlbiṣā)*, « *Studia Indologica*, Festschrift für Wilibald Kirfel », 1955, pp. 17 ff.; T. G. MAINKAR, *op. cit.*, pp. 8. ff.

43. RV 10.109.2,5.

note that the AV 5:17.4 refers to Tārikā who is a forerunner of Tārā and also the occurrence of the vocable *Tārakāmaya* qualifying the compound word *surāsurasavināśaḥ* in the BhP 9.14.7. The *Vāyupurāṇa* also describes the battle as Tārakāmaya⁴⁴. The RV 10.109.2 and the AV 5.17.2 describe Soma as a *rājā* and the *Purāṇas* also describe him as a king. According to H. Oldenberg and K. F. Geldner *ādhi* in RV 10.109.3 stands for Brahmajāyā's illicit son Budha⁴⁵ and this suggests the sin. *En passant* it may be mentioned that the *Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa* mentions one Saumāyana Budha. In this connection it is well to note that in the *Purāṇas*, at the time of the *Jātakarmotsava*-ceremony at Bṛhaspati's abode gods asked Tārā as to the biological fathership of Budha. She was overcome with bashfulness and when asked repeatedly she replied that Soma was his biological father⁴⁶. The query about the fathership and consequent bashfulness of Tārā indicate the sin-character of her dalliance with Soma. According to the Vedic evidence⁴⁷ Brahmajāyā is Vāc. In his *bhāṣya* on RV 10.109.7 Sāyaṇa explains *Brahmajāyā* as *Brahmaṇaḥ Bṛhaspater jāyā* and on RV 10.109.6 as *juhū*. On RV 10.109.1 while quoting an *itihāsa* Sāyaṇa remarks that *juhū* is *vāc*. Naturally, she becomes the wife of Bṛhaspati *alias* Brahmaṇaspati, the Lord of speech⁴⁸. Soma's taking away Brahmajāyā in the Vedic context stands metaphorically for prayers or hymns being increasingly sung in his honour⁴⁹, and this interpretation may be extended to the Purāṇic version also. The warrior-like and romantic character of Soma is also traceable to the *Vedas*⁵⁰. Thus this episode symbolises also the close connection of *Vāc* and its presiding deity.

Both the legends in the *Purāṇas* try thus to supply the missing links, explain, elaborate and interpret the Vedic themes by the technique of *upabṛmhaṇa*. Moreover, these legends reflect also the development of social and moral ideas of the ancient Indian society.

M. S. University of Baroda.

ABBREVIATIONS

BhP = *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*, Gita Press, Gorakhpur, Saṃvat 2022.

MP = *Matsya-Purāṇa*, Anandashram Sanskrit Series, Vol. 54. Anandashram Press, Poona, 1907.

RV = *Rgveda* with Sāyaṇācārya's commentary, Vaidika Samshodhana Mandal, Poona, Vol. I, 1933; Vol. II, 1936; Vol. III, 1941; Vol. IV, 1946.

44. D. R. PATIL, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

45. S. S. BHAWE, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

46. *Vide* MP 24.4 ff.; *vide* also D. R. PATIL, *op. cit.*, pp. 44, 157.

47. S. S. BHAWE, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

48. *Cf.* RV 2.23.2; *Bṛhadāranyaka-Upaniṣad* 1.3.20-21 (*Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Sāṅkarabhāṣya*, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1964).

49. S. S. BHAWE, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

50. A. A. MACDONELL, *op. cit.*, p. 110. *Cf.* RV 9.86.32 where he is spoken of as *pātir jānīnām*. *Vide* also A. A. MACDONELL, *op. cit.*, p. 107.