

# **Sectarianism and Heresy in Early Purāṇic Descriptions of the Kali Yuga**

von John Steven Stavrellis

**Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät  
der  
Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn**

**Bonn 2023**



Sectarianism and Heresy in Early Purāṇic Descriptions of the Kali Yuga

.....  
**(Originaltitel der Dissertation)**

**Inaugural-Dissertation  
zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde  
der  
Philosophischen Fakultät  
der  
Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität  
zu Bonn**

**vorgelegt von**

John Steven Stavrellis

.....  
**(Vor- und Zuname)**

**aus**

Lakewood, New Jersey, USA

.....  
**(Geburtsort)**

**Bonn 2023  
(Erscheinungsjahr der Dissertationspflichtexemplare)**

**Zusammensetzung der Prüfungskommission:**

Prof. Dr. Dr. Manfred Hutter

.....  
**(Vorsitzende/Vorsitzender)**

Prof. Dr. Konrad Klaus

.....  
**(Betreuerin/Betreuer und Gutachterin/Gutachter)**

Prof. Dr. Lewis Doney

.....  
**(Gutachterin/Gutachter)**

Prof. Dr. Carmen Brandt

.....  
**(weiteres prüfungsberechtigtes Mitglied)**

**Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 15. Juni 2023**

# **Sectarianism and Heresy in Early Purāṇic Descriptions of the Kali Yuga**

von John Steven Stavrellis

**Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät  
der  
Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn**

**Bonn 2023**



## Abstract

Changes in the meaning of the Sanskrit word “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” over a period spanning from the height of the Mauryan to the end of the Gupta Empire, mirror the dramatic sociopolitical shifts which, during that same stretch of time, were transforming the face of Hindu religion and the relationship of royal power to religious authority. This period saw sectarian rhetoric from newly ascendant religious groups gradually turn more acrimonious as competition for royal patronage and social influence became increasingly fierce. Why this word should be at the epicenter of worsening relations between religious rivals becomes clear when one considers its most common English gloss: “heretic.” In order to better evaluate the fitness of this translation, however, we must examine the various stages of its semantic history by closely studying instances of its use from Aśoka’s edicts up to the early sectarian Purāṇas.

## Acknowledgments

I wish to put down here a small word of thanks to my advisor Prof. Dr. Konrad Klaus, for years of patient academic support. Part of the research for this dissertation was conducted while in India in 2014-2015 through an American Institute for Indian Studies Doctoral Research Grant. For that financial support, I am grateful. To Fawaz Dabbagieh, the truest best friend I could ever ask for. To my parents for their understanding. To Prof. Charles Hallisey, for always trying to steer me in productive directions. To Reinhold Grünendahl, for helpful remarks. To Prof. Jason Freitag, for helpful information on the Tod manuscript. To Prof. Donald Davis, for getting me started with *dharmasāstra*. To the members of my thesis committee. To Prof. Micah Auerbach, for always believing in me as a scholar. To Edward Weech and Nancy Charley at the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society in London. To Tillo Detige for reading parts of this dissertation. To Julia Holz and Florian Saalfeld, for their camaraderie in Bonn. To my sisters Lisa and Irene. To Klaus Wagensonner, for always providing me with comfort and inspiration. To Florian Büther, for urging me to get over the finish line. To Marvin Yuen, for getting me over the finish line.



## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abbreviations.....	v
Note on Translation and Transliteration .....	vi
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Part One</b>	
<b>Chapter One: “Pāṣaṇḍa”: Its Etymology and Semantic Evolution .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Section 1.1: Heresy Denied.....	6
Section 1.2: Indological Study of Heresy.....	11
Section 1.3: “Pāṣaṇḍa” and “Hairesis” .....	21
Section 1.4: The Etymology of “Pāṣaṇḍa” .....	32
Section 1.5: From Aśokan “Pāsaṇḍa” to Purāṇic “Pāṣaṇḍa” .....	43
1.5.1 Prakrit and Middle Indic Sources .....	43
1.5.2 Sanskrit sources .....	51
<b>Part Two</b>	
<b>Chapter Two: Setting the End Times in Stone.....</b>	<b>64</b>
Section 2.1: The Sātavāhanas and the Inscription of Gautamī Balaśrī .....	65
Section 2.2: Perpetual endowments and land grants to Buddhists .....	70

<b>Conclusion: Heretics, Atheists, Infidels, and Apostates .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>Appendix One: An Annotated Translation of Vāyu Purāṇa Chapter 58 .....</b>	<b>83</b>
Translation.....	85
Sanskrit Text .....	106
<b>Appendix Two: Verses on Pāṣaṇḍas from the <i>Viṣṇudharmāḥ</i>.....</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>149</b>
<b>Index.....</b>	<b>162</b>

## Abbreviations

### Texts

ĀnSS	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series
BḍP	<i>Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa</i>
BhNS	<i>Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra</i>
BhP	<i>Bhāgavata Purāṇa</i>
BrP	<i>Brahma Purāṇa</i>
HV	<i>Harivaṃśa</i>
KAS	<i>Kauṭīlīya-Arthaśāstra</i>
KūP	<i>Kūrma Purāṇa</i>
LiṅP	<i>Liṅga Purāṇa</i>
MBh	<i>Mahābhārata</i>
MDhŚ	<i>Mānava-Dharmaśāstra</i>
MtP	<i>Matsya Purāṇa</i>
PS	<i>Parama Saṃhitā</i>
SkP	<i>Skanda Purāṇa</i>
Sn	<i>Sutta Nipāta</i>
Ssā	<i>Samayasāra</i>
Tv	<i>Tantravārttika</i>
ViP	<i>Viṣṇu Purāṇa</i>
VR	<i>Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa</i>
VāP	<i>Vāyu Purāṇa</i>

For all of the above texts, I used the GRETIL online versions available at <https://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.html>, except in the following cases: VāP, where I used the 1905 Ānandāśrama edition edited by N. Apte; Ssā, where I used the text as given in Johnson's appendix in *Harmless Souls*; Tv, where I used Kunio Harikai's critical edition.

### Languages and Sigla

<	derives from
>	develops into
BHS	Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit
HS	Hybrid Sanskrit
lit.	literally
MI	Middle Indic
Pā.	Pāli
Pkt.	Prakrit
Skt.	Sanskrit

## Note on Translation and Transliteration

All translations are mine unless otherwise noted. When a translation is not given in quotation marks, it is a looser paraphrase but still accurately reflects the content of the original. When in quotation marks, it is a literal word-for-word translation. All cross-references in the footnotes refer to the same chapter unless otherwise specified. I use italics for all Sanskrit, Pāli, MI, and Prakrit terms, except for terms which have become common in English, like “dharma,” “yuga,” and “karma.” When referring to a word as a lexical item, I always place it in quotation marks, to differentiate, for example, “*paṣaṇḍa*” as a word from *paṣaṇḍas* as an actual group of people. I follow standard IAST transliteration of Sanskrit throughout.

# Introduction

The goal of the present study is to accomplish two things. Firstly, I have set out to write the definitive work on *pāṣaṇḍas*, as no such work currently exists. We have a number of journal articles and book chapters touching upon *pāṣaṇḍas*, but nothing like a book-length study on the subject. Secondly, I wish to open up a space in Indology and the study of South Asian religions more generally for the discussion of heresy and heresiology. I feel this to be strangely missing from the field of South Asian religious studies. Part One of my study focuses on arriving at a fuller understanding of what “*pāṣaṇḍa*” signifies through an in-depth examination of the history of its use in ancient texts and through tracing what modern scholars have written about its etymology. Part Two looks at the importance of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” as a concept for understanding the history of sectarian competition and the development of the idea of the Kali Yuga.

With these aims in mind, I wanted to make an attempt at a critical edition for Chapter 58 of the *Vāyu Purāṇa*, one of the earliest Purāṇic Kali descriptions. Like most Purāṇas, VāP has never benefitted from having a comprehensive critical edition compiled from its manuscripts. I have thus added two manuscripts available to me to the 1905 Ānandāśrama edition, improving upon it where I could, and providing a new translation (Tagare’s 1987 translation being more of a loose paraphrase). This I provide in Appendix One. Appendix Two contains my translations of sections from the *Viṣṇudharmāḥ*, a Vaiṣṇava text dating to around the same time as VāP which also contains a wealth of material on heretics. Vdha has had a critical edition published, but has never been translated.

There is much more to be said on all of these topics. But, in order to make a start, I felt it necessary to get a better grasp on what we are talking about when we use the word “*pāṣaṇḍa*.”

## **Part One**

# Chapter One

## “Pāṣaṇḍa”: Its Etymology and Semantic Evolution

Lists of those religious sects deemed worthy of being scorned and shunned begin to appear in Hindu texts sometime in the first few centuries CE, in a range of Sanskrit genres, but especially in the group of texts identifying themselves as Purāṇas.<sup>1</sup> The audience of these Purāṇic texts, meant to include both royals and commoners alike, is told to avoid the named sects at all costs.<sup>2</sup> Most often named in the lists are Jains and Buddhists (who may be considered archetypal heretics from the standpoint of later Vedic tradition); but they also include groups virtually unknown outside the field of Hindu studies—and, until recently, not widely understood even within the field: Vaiṣṇava groups like the Pāñcarātras/Bhāgavatas, and Śaiva groups like

---

<sup>1</sup> The Purāṇic genre is difficult to characterize because of the sheer variety of material it has come to include. It is sometimes categorized as straightforward mythological narrative, “[consisting] principally of stories about the Hindu gods, goddesses and supernatural beings, with a sprinkling of tales about men, women and famous seers...”; see Cornelia Dimmitt and J. A. B. van Buitenen, *Classical Hindu Mythology: a Reader in the Sanskrit Purāṇas* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978), 5. The contents of the Purāṇas are, however, so variegated that such a description inevitably falls short; we may point to the fact that it is not uncommon to find the Purāṇas described, both individually and collectively, as being encyclopedic in nature; on the idea of “encyclopedic Purāṇas,” see, for example, R. C. Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* (Dacca: University of Dacca, 1940), 194; P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra: Ancient and Medieval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 5, pt. 2, Government Oriental Series/B 6 (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962), 842, 925; Ludo Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, History of Indian Literature, vol. 2, fasc. 3 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986), 12, 79; and compare the above quote from *Classical Hindu Mythology* with Dimmitt and van Buitenen, *Classical Hindu Mythology*, xii, 5–6. Most importantly for our considerations here, at some point in time (likely around the first few centuries CE), a large amount of legal material began to be incorporated into texts across the genre. Indeed, Hindu tradition often groups Purāṇas with legal texts (i.e. Dharmasāstras) and the two Sanskrit epics as forming a collective category of *smṛti*—the category of Hindu scripture most concerned with dharma as law. For the relationship of the Purāṇic genre to *dharmasāstra*, see Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, 85–88; for an attempt at dating the incorporation of *smṛti* material into the Purāṇas, see Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records*, 188–189.

<sup>2</sup> Although Indian tradition asserts that the Purāṇas contain the “dharma of women and Śūdras,” or were composed with folk customs in mind, the intended audience member very often seems instead to be the king, or else a member of the upper-caste twice born who are eligible to perform Vedic rituals; this is particularly true of those chapters containing material on *dharmasāstra*. On the Purāṇas containing the dharma “*strīśūdradvijabandhūnām*,” see Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, 16; Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records*, 213, 238. On Purāṇic discourse being significantly directed at kings, see Ronald Inden, “Imperial Purāṇas: Kashmir as Vaiṣṇava Center of the World,” in *Querying the Medieval: Texts and the History of Practices in South Asia*, ed. Ronald Inden, Jonathan Walters, and Daud Ali (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 29–98.



the Pāsupatas, Kāpālikas, and Kālāmukhas.<sup>3</sup> While the present study is not primarily focused on these groups, we will have more than a little to say about their role in Purāṇic discourse on heresy.

Our main concern, however, is simply to establish whether it is possible to speak of heresy with regard to India's religious traditions; for, as will be seen, that question is far from having been settled over the long history of Indology's existence as a scholarly field. Our inquiry will require us to carefully examine the epithet most frequently imposed upon the offending groups listed by the Purāṇas: the word "*pāṣaṇḍa*." We must also revisit the subject of what is understood by the term "heresy" in a western context, and of how that meaning has evolved over time. We thus begin at the level of lexicology: the level of words, their meanings and their chronological developments, where we find philology, sociolinguistics, and the study of religion intersect. By first dealing with the main terms from a philological perspective, we will be in a better position to deal with the larger sociohistorical problems regarding heresy in ancient India, and to carry out an informed investigation of the earliest groups who were denouncing (and being denounced by) their rivals as heretics.

The only two researchers to have dealt at length with heresy in ancient India are Wendy Doniger and, more recently, Vincent Eltschinger.<sup>4</sup> This is in stark contradistinction to the wealth of scholarly work on heresy and heresiology in the history of the Abrahamic religions. Before continuing on, I wish to reflect on this puzzling disparity when comparing the relative silence on heresy in India to the copious scholarship on heresy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The

---

<sup>3</sup> For a study of the Kalamukhas, see David N. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972).

<sup>4</sup> Only Doniger and Eltschinger have composed extended studies exclusively devoted to examining scriptural material (and especially Purāṇic material) relating to *pāṣaṇḍas*, while also subjecting that material to a thorough methodological analysis. See n. 21 below.

explanation for the discrepancy may, at least partially, lie in the bias—found amongst both Western and Indian academics—that, because Hinduism has no authoritative body like the Holy See or the Muslim ‘*ulamā*’ (or so the argument goes), it thus follows that there was no real orthodoxy in India, solid and starkly defined. In the absence of orthodoxy, there could be no real heresy.

### **Section 1.1: Heresy Denied**

This argument has been most often and most forcefully put forward in the asseverations of Indian nationalist thinkers past and present, of which I will give just a few representative examples here. We may begin with the religious apologetics of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan (b. 1888 – d. 1975), whose work as both a statesman and a public intellectual holds a unique significance for the formation of a modern Hindu identity over the decades leading up to India’s independence.<sup>5</sup> In 1937, Radhakrishnan, who would go on to become independent India’s first vice president, but who at the time was the holder of Oxford’s Spalding Chair of Eastern Religions and Ethics, published a brief autobiographical essay in a volume entitled *Religion in Transition*.<sup>6</sup> The volume’s editor had approached him, among several other eminent religious scholars of his day, to explain what modern religiosity meant for him. In this remarkably candid essay, Radhakrishnan described a respect for other faiths which he had harbored since he was a child: “This attitude of respect for all creeds, this elementary good manners in matters of spirit, is bred into the marrow of one’s bones by the Hindu tradition, by its experience of centuries.

---

<sup>5</sup> For a study of the relationship of Radhakrishnan’s nationalist politics to his spiritual and cultural philosophy, and the influence of both on contemporary Hindu identity, see Michael Hawley, “Re-Orienting Tradition: Radhakrishnan’s Hinduism,” in *Historicizing “Tradition” in the Study of Religion*, ed. Steven Engler and Gregory P. Grieve (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 298–317.

<sup>6</sup> Radhakrishnan was the first ever holder of that chair, and the first Indian to ever hold an endowed chair at Oxford.

Religious tolerance marked the Hindu culture from its very beginnings.”<sup>7</sup> In the same paragraph, Radhakrishnan juxtaposed his own innate respect for other faiths to the injurious remarks about Hinduism he would hear from the teachers at the Christian missionary schools he attended as a child.

Six decades later, the spirit of Radhakrishnan’s statements would be echoed in the words of another Indian nationalist author and politician, Indian National Congress MP Shashi Tharoor. Writing in 1997, just five years after the 1992 destruction of the Babri Mosque, Tharoor spoke out against the Hindutva religious extremists who, in his view, were forcing onto Hinduism a rigid doctrinaire intolerance which was unnatural to it: “In one sense Hinduism is almost the ideal faith for the twenty-first century: a faith without apostasy, where there are no heretics to cast out because there has never been any such thing as a Hindu heresy...Hinduism with its openness, its respect for variety, its acceptance of all other faiths, is one religion that should be able to assert itself without threatening others.”<sup>8</sup> For Tharoor, this made Hindu fundamentalism an absurdity and a contradiction in terms: “It is odd to read today of ‘Hindu fundamentalism,’ because Hinduism is a religion without fundamentals: no organized church, no compulsory beliefs or rites of worship, no single sacred book.”<sup>9</sup> Tharoor and Radhakrishnan were admittedly writing under vastly different historical and political circumstances, but their evaluation of Hinduism is the same on this point; from its ancient past to its modern present, the very concept of heresy finds no place in Hindu history.

---

<sup>7</sup> Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, “My Search for Truth,” in *Religion in Transition*, ed. Vergilus Ferm (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937), 17.

<sup>8</sup> Shashi Tharoor, *India: From Midnight to the Millenium* (New York: Arcade Publishing, 1997), 128–129.

<sup>9</sup> Tharoor, *India*, 54. Tharoor would repeat these and many similar statements in his 2018 book *Why I am a Hindu*; for example: “There is no such thing as a Hindu heresy...[Hinduism is] a faith that uniquely does not have any notion of heresy in it: you cannot be a Hindu heretic because there is no standard set of dogmas from which you can deviate that make you a heretic.” See Shashi Tharoor, *Why I am a Hindu* (London: C. Hurst & Co., 2018), 10.

But it certainly does. We have ample evidence of conflict, both between different religious communities (e.g., Vedic Hindu vs. Buddhist and Jain) and within those communities (e.g., “Vedic” vs. “non-Vedic” Pāsupata; Sthaviravāda vs. Mahāsāṃghika; Digambara vs. Śvetāmbara), from our readings of Sanskrit and Prakrit sources.<sup>10</sup> In each case, these conflicts gave rise to the rigidification of doctrine and the codification of religious laws for the expulsion of those aberrant individuals and groups who had strayed from proper belief and practice. Our sources give enough accounts of violence against offending sects that writing off all such accounts out of hand as mere myth or exaggeration is historiographically irresponsible.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, it may not be surprising to hear patriotically-charged statements about ancient Indian history being made by nationalist politicians; but seasoned Indologists and other scholars of South Asian studies also echo these claims, often in a similarly eulogizing tone. For example, we find such a declaration in P. V. Kane’s expansive *History of Dharmaśāstra*:

For over two thousand years, our ancient writers and smṛtis like those of Manu...have allowed to *tarka* a place in the matter of finding out what Dharma is and have been most tolerant of differing views even on fundamental matters...without perpetrating atrocities and indulging in wholesale persecutions. A man may be a monotheist, or a polytheist or an image-worshipper, an agnostic, or atheist or an idealist philosopher...yet he may nevertheless be held to be a full Hindu, if he conforms to the general attitude towards Veda and social usages. A more radical tolerance than what our people showed throughout the ages is almost unthinkable.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> For Vedic vs. non-Vedic Pāsupatas, see Jaya Chemburkar, “Brāhmaṇised Pāsupata Sect in the *Kūrma Purāṇa*,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, n.s., 60–61 (1985–1986): 44–55; on Buddhist sectarian conflict, see P. Demiéville, “À Propos du Concile de Vaiśālī,” *T’oung Pao*, 2nd ser., 4/5 (1951): 239–296; on Śvetāmbaras vs. Digambaras, see Paul Dundas, *The Jains*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2002), 46–47.

<sup>11</sup> For example, we might well regard as an exaggeration that the eleventh century Pāṇḍya king Sundara had 8000 Jains impaled after his conversion to Śaivism; but on what evidence can we then claim that no Jains at all were killed, that the entire account is fictitious, or that, even if fictionalized, it did not represent actual physical violence having occurred between Jains and South Indian Śaivites? A cursory dismissal of such accounts is all the more irresponsible given that Purāṇic myth provides a template according to which a Hindu ruler might style himself as a righteous exterminator of *pāṣaṇḍas* in the figure of Pramiti/Kalkin. On textual accounts of violence against Jains, see Helmuth von Glasenapp, *Der Jainismus: Eine indische Erlösungsreligion* (Berlin: Alf Hager Verlag, 1925), 62–65; Dundas, *The Jains*, 127.

<sup>12</sup> Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, 5.2: 1475–1476. “*Tarka*,” usually translated as “logic,” here indicates the application of human reasoning and analysis as opposed to a reliance on holy writ and revelation.

Or again, in phrasing very similar to that of Radhakrishnan and Tharoor: “To hunt down heretics, real or supposed, has been a favourite business of some religions for centuries. This has been absent from Hinduism. Hinduism is not bound by any fixed creed nor does it rely on a single book or a prophet as its founder...Tolerance is thus of the essence of Hinduism and even an atheist is often met with amusement and not with persecution.”<sup>13</sup> Kane made these statements even as he documented elsewhere in the many volumes of his *History* the various laws against heresy to be found throughout *dharmasāstra* texts.<sup>14</sup>

A similar curious ambivalence on the topic of heresy can be found in the writings of the eminent French Indologist Louis Renou. In a discussion of the Mahānubhāva (Mānbhāu) sect of western India—which arose out of the medieval *bhakti* movement and rejected the authority of the Vedas—Renou remarks, “The prototype of these semiheresies (it is quite difficult in India to be completely heretical) are Buddhism and Jainism. These are movements which have always remained separate from Hinduism, although in time they have been impregnated by many influences from Hindu forces surrounding them. Since the appearance of these very old sects, such schisms have never taken place again.”<sup>15</sup> Clearly reticent to use the term “heresy,” Renou

---

<sup>13</sup> Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, 5.2: 1624.

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra: Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 2, pt. 1, Government Oriental Series/B 6 (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941), 358–359. Here, Kane mentions *Mānava-Dharmasāstra* 4.163 forbidding *nāstikya*, that is, being a *nāstika* (a non-believer or denier of the Vedas), and MDhŚ 9.225, where Manu instructs the king to swiftly banish those belonging to heretical sects (*pāṣaṇḍasthān*) from his capital city (*kṣipraṃ nirvāsayet purāt*). On *nāstikas*, see the conclusion of the present study.

<sup>15</sup> Louis Renou, “Introduction,” trans. J. K. Balbir, in *Hinduism*, ed. Louis Renou (New York: George Braziller, 1961), 46. In a similar passage from an earlier work, Renou puts “heretical” in scare quotes, again stating that the schismatic breaks brought about by Mahāvīra and the Buddha were isolated occurrences within Hindu history never to be repeated: “L’exemple lointain du Mahāvīra et du Buddha, ces fondateurs de religions ‘hérétiques’ totalement séparées de l’hindouisme, ne semble pas avoir été suivi dans l’Inde postérieure, durant mille cinq cents ans au moins.” See Louis Renou, *L’Hindouisme: Les textes, les doctrines, l’histoire*, “Que sais-je?” Le point des connaissances actuelles 475 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951), 95. In the same work, however, he refers to the Ājīvikas as belonging to “...des hérétiques ou des extrémistes, plutôt que des hindouistes orthodox...,” further muddling the question of whether there were “real” heretics in ancient India or not. *Ibid.*, 105.

spoke only of semi-heresies, even as he acknowledged that two of India’s great religious traditions *would* be considered heretical from a Hindu standpoint.<sup>16</sup> We may reasonably question the assertion that schisms never occurred again after the rise of the Buddhists and Jains, since accusations of heretical breaks with Vedic authority continue to arise in Indian religious polemics into the medieval period and beyond.<sup>17</sup> Adding to the confusion, Renou elsewhere spoke concretely of orthodoxy on the one hand and accusations of heresy on the other; he even recognized that such accusations occurred not only against the likes of arch-heresiarchs Mahāvīra and the Buddha, but *within* the six Vedic philosophical systems, or *darśanas*, of orthodox Hinduism itself:

Même dans les domaines les plus orthodoxes, il arrive que la révérence au Veda soit un simple “coup de chapeau,” donné en passant à une idole dont on entend ne plus s’encombrer par la suite. Nous venons de parler d’orthodoxie : le Veda est précisément le signe, le seul peut-être, de l’orthodoxie indienne. On voit en effet, à l’intérieur même des “six *darśana*,” c’est-à-dire de ce qui passe pour représenter la pensée brâhmanique orthodoxe, telle de ces doctrines accuser telle autre d’hérésie, et le point majeur sur lequel s’appuie cette accusation est précisément le Veda, le fondement de l’autorité védique.<sup>18</sup>

Even as Renou makes a rather noncommittal remark here that Vedic orthodoxy is founded on a mere “tip of the hat” to the Vedas, he nevertheless speaks of Vedic orthodoxy as a recognizable phenomenon; we may add that, for all its being founded on an at-times vague Vedic “lip

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Renou’s seemingly contradictory remarks that sectarianism “...is the reality of Hinduism and shapes its history,” but also that, “...sects have never constituted more than islands of relatively slight numerical significance within Hinduism as a whole.” This last statement is highly questionable. Renou, “Introduction,” 45. Renou also expressed in the same work the not-uncontroversial opinion that, “Sikhism...may be considered a religious movement at the extreme limits of Hinduism; it is not considered a heresy.” Ibid., 16.

<sup>17</sup> See for example, Florinda De Simini’s discussion of the twelfth century Sena king Ballālasena rejecting certain Purāṇic material because of its “approval of heretical *śāstras*” (*pāṣaṇḍasāstrānumatam*) and because of being composed by “cheats, heretics, and phonies” (*bhaṇḍapāṣaṇḍaliṅginām*) in his *Dānasāgara*. Florinda De Simini, *Of Gods and Books: Ritual and Knowledge Transmission in the Manuscript Cultures of Premodern India*, Studies in Manuscript Cultures 8 (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2016), 243 n. 628. See *Dānasāgara* 66–67. For Christians as *pāṣaṇḍas* in nineteenth century Hindu polemics against Christian missionizing, see Richard Fox Young, *Resistant Hinduism: Sanskrit Sources on Anti-Christian Apologetics in Early Nineteenth-Century India* (Vienna: Brill, 1981), 177–178.

<sup>18</sup> Louis Renou, *Le destin du Vēda dans l’Inde = Études védiques et pāṇiniennes*, vol. 6, Publications de l’Institute de civilization indienne, fasc. 10 (Paris: De Boccard, 1960), 2–3.

service,” the presence and power of Brahmanical orthodoxy is very real in Indian history.

Accordingly, even if Renou elsewhere could only bring himself to speak of “semi-heresies,” he had to admit that accusations of heresy within and amongst Indian sects were a real occurrence (and, as it turns out, not a rare one).<sup>19</sup>

## Section 1.2: Indological Study of Heresy

One could adduce many more instances of scholars denying any presence of heresy in the whole of Hinduism’s existence.<sup>20</sup> A fundamental problem with these statements is that they are founded on outmoded notions of heresy which have already been critiqued, amended, and superseded by historical research in the Abrahamic traditions. This is unfortunately the case even in the work of Wendy Doniger and Vincent Eltschinger who, as I have stated above, are the only two Indologists to have undertaken a detailed analysis of the subject.<sup>21</sup> Turning now to Doniger and Eltschinger’s respective essays on heresy in India, I will highlight differences in their approaches, but also assumptions regarding heresy which they both hold in common. I then point

---

<sup>19</sup> One need only look at how many groups (including the Pāñcarātras) the eighth century Śaivite religious leader and polemicist Śaṅkara accused of heresy. He was also accused of it himself. See Ganesh Thite, “Pāñcarātra and Heresy,” *Purāna* 18, no. 1 (January 1976): 84; Gregory J. Darling, *An Evaluation of the Vedāntic Critique of Buddhism* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987), 118–119.

<sup>20</sup> A few more examples from scholars of various fields may drive this point home. According to the anthropologist Christoph von Fürer-Haimendorf, “The concern about the orthodoxy of their fellow-men’s beliefs shown at times by the adherents of such religions as Christianity and Islam, is foreign to Hindus. No one thinks of those professing different beliefs as ‘heretics,’ and in doctrinal matters the individual is free to follow any line he may choose.” Christoph von Fürer-Haimendorf, “Freedom and Conformity in Tribal, Hindu and Buddhist Societies of India and Nepal,” in *The Concept of Freedom in Anthropology*, ed. David Bidney (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1963), 162. Again from within the field of Indology, Hajime Nakamura asserted, “Generally speaking, we *cannot find in any Indian religion the conception of ‘heretic’* in the sense of [its] Western usage.” Hajime Nakamura, *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples: India-China-Tibet-Japan*, rev. ed. by Philip P. Wiener (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1964), 170; italic emphasis in the original. And in the words of political scientists Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, “Without an organized church, [Hinduism] is innocent of orthodoxy, heterodoxy, and heresy.” Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, *In Pursuit of Lakshmi: The Political Economy of the Indian State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 37.

<sup>21</sup> Other Indologists have made mention of ancient Indian heresy in their work, or even published whole articles on the topic; however, with the exception of the works by Doniger and Eltschinger, these have all been relatively brief mentions or short articles. Moreover, they tend to merely list passages referring to *pāṣaṇḍas* without attempting a more thorough analysis, whether sociohistorical, text-critical, or otherwise.

to ways in which scholars in the study of the Abrahamic religions, having significantly deepened our general understanding of heresy, provide chances to move past the unnuanced assumptions which have to date hampered the study of Indian heresy.

Doniger’s work on the concept of heresy in India can primarily be found in her 1971 article “The Origin of Heresy in Hindu Mythology” and in her 1973 PhD dissertation of the same title, which she published in 1976 as *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*.<sup>22</sup> Taken together, these three publications can be considered the first book-length analytical study on ancient Indian heresies. Doniger has elsewhere referred to herself as a “postmodern Eliadean,” and, indeed, her approach in these three works owes much to the comparative mythologist method prevalent in the 1970s and most associated with Mircea Eliade.<sup>23</sup> She treats passages from a wide range of Sanskrit texts spanning millennia of religious activity as exemplars of underlying mythic tropes. In this way, she makes the useful distinction of myth cycles which attribute the origin of heresy to *asuras* (demonic archrivals of the Vedic *devas*), and myth cycles which attribute heresy’s origin to the *devas* themselves, who created heretical religions to entice the *asuras* away from the Vedic practices making them too powerful to be destroyed.<sup>24</sup> The latter is the case, for example, in the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* when the god Viṣṇu produces from his own body (*śarīrataḥ samutpādyā*) a being called “Māyāmoha” to lure the *asuras* away from the teachings

---

<sup>22</sup> Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Origins of Heresy in Hindu Mythology,” *History of Religions* 10, No. 4 (May 1971): 271–333; Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Origins of Heresy in Hindu Mythology” (PhD diss., Oxford University, 1973); Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty, *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976). Much material is repeated among these three works, often word-for-word. The same is also true of the chapter on heresy in Doniger’s 2016 book *On Hinduism*. See Wendy Doniger, *On Hinduism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 592 n. 1.

<sup>23</sup> Wendy Doniger, “Minimyths and Maximyths and Political Points of View,” in *Myth and Method*, ed. Laurie L. Patton and Wendy Doniger (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996), 110.

<sup>24</sup> See, for example, Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Origins of Heresy,” 295–296, 308, 320–322. Cf. Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Origins of Heresy” (diss.), iii–v, 49–53. For more on the *asuras*, see A. A. Macdonnell, “Demons and Fiends,” *Vedic Mythology*, Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 3, Heft A (Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner, 1897), 156–157. It will be remembered that the *asuras* had their own priests, and that Vedic texts mention the *asuras* performing the same righteous sacrifices as the *devas*, e.g. AiBr. 2.31; cf. ŚBr 2.4.3.2.



of the three Vedas (*trayīdharma*).<sup>25</sup> First, Māyāmoha appears to the demons as a Jain monk, “bald and carrying peacock feathers” (*muṇḍo barhipatradharo*), and tricks some into becoming Jains. To other demons, he comes wearing red robes (*raktāmbara*), and these he tricks into becoming Buddhists. Thus does Māyāmoha deceive the *asuras* into deserting the dharma proclaimed in the Vedas and Smṛtis (*dharmam vedasmṛtyuditam*).

When these demons have turned to the *adharma* of Jainism and Buddhism, some become revilers of the Vedas, others revilers of the gods (*kecid vinindāṃ vedānāṃ devānāṃ apare*). By inducing the *asuras* to join Jainism, Buddhism, and other sorts of heretical sects (*anyapāṣaṇḍaparakāraiḥ*), Māyāmoha deludes and weakens them until they can be killed by the Vedic gods “who are followers of the true path” (*hatās ca te ‘surā devaiḥ sanmārgaparipanthinaḥ*).<sup>26</sup> The myth’s insinuations are hardly veiled. The Hindu audience of ViP is encouraged to view the Buddhists and Jains around them as both deluded and demonic. Anyone who, like the *asuras*, exchanges the armor of true dharma (*saddharmakavacaḥ*) for the nakedness of heresy will be similarly destroyed.<sup>27</sup> At the end of the myth, it is advised that all *pāṣaṇḍas* be avoided, because even talking with them leads men to fall to hell (*patanti narake*

---

<sup>25</sup> Māyāmoha literally means “deception and delusion” or “delusion by deception.” The account here is taken from ViP 3.18. For Doniger’s discussion of this myth, see Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Origins of Heresy,” 310; for Elstchinger’s discussion of the same myth, see Vincent Elstchinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics: Studies on the History, Self-understanding, and Dogmatic Foundations of Late Indian Buddhist Philosophy*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte 851, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 81 (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014), 59–66. For the dating of ViP to somewhere around the sixth century CE, see Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, 249; see also n. 198 above. With somewhat more certainty, however, Rocher states, “[The ViP] is generally recognized as a true Pāñcarātra document...it is purely sectarian, being Vaiṣṇava from beginning to end...”; *ibid.*, 248. That is a strong statement, especially considering Rocher’s own skepticism of labeling some Purāṇas as sectarian; *ibid.*, 18–24. I would suggest that, even when certain Purāṇas seem to include both Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva layers or elements, signaling some eclecticism, they are *always* hostilely sectarian with regard to Buddhism and Jainism (with very few exceptions, if any).

<sup>26</sup> “*Sat-mārga*” could also be translated as the “right” or “good path.”

<sup>27</sup> *Pāṣaṇḍas* are frequently said to be “*nagna*,” “naked,” because they lack the protection of the Vedas. See, for example, VāP 78.25–40. Cf. Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Origins of Heresy,” 277.

*narāḥ*). That this message is particularly directed at Hindu kings might be surmised from the fact that it is directly followed by the story of King Śatadhanu, wherein Śatadhanu is reborn as a dog simply because he exchanged respectful greetings with a heretic on one occasion.

Aside from such myths explicitly about heresy, Doniger also collates myths from various Hindu scriptures describing the origin of evil's existence (and, therefore, also of heresy's existence): in these myths, evil arises from moral degradation over time, or from demonic origins, or from the error of the gods, or from man's inherent hunger and desire, etc. As Doniger states, "...the mythology of the origin of evil provides an essential background to the mythology of the origin of heresy." This shows that Doniger is primarily interested in heresy as mythology, and furthermore as just one facet of a broader Hindu mythology of evil.<sup>28</sup> Myth, however, does not arise in a sociopolitical vacuum, and doctrinal accusations of heresy must always go hand-in-hand with worldly struggles over power and authority. For her part, Doniger forgoes any attempt to connect the myths she describes to distinct moments in Indian history: "Historians of religion may regret that I have not traced the historical development of the mythology of heresy but have instead treated the separate philosophical strands."<sup>29</sup> Doniger goes on to explain that her decision to eschew a historical approach is due to the difficulty of dating Hindu texts, and because "there is no clear-cut [historical] development in Hindu mythology," with new elements accumulating on older cultural strata without ever entirely eclipsing them.<sup>30</sup> It should not surprise us, then, that

---

<sup>28</sup> Doniger O'Flaherty, "The Origins of Heresy" (diss.), ii. Cf. Doniger O'Flaherty, "The Origins of Heresy," 287. Of the word "*pāṣaṇḍa*" itself, Doniger says that its etymology is obscure but cites Manfred Mayrhofer's dictionary entry (see p. 40 below) connecting "*pāṣaṇḍa*" to "*pāriṣada/pārṣada*." She speculates about a possible significance existing between "*pāṣaṇḍa/pārṣada*" and the word "*upāniṣad*," beyond the simple fact that both are based on the root *ṣad*. A similar claim was made by Paul Deussen; Paul Deussen, *Die Philosophie der Upanishads*, Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religion 1, pt. 2 (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1899), 13–14. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to support any significant relationship existing between the two words.

<sup>29</sup> Doniger O'Flaherty, "The Origins of Heresy" (diss.), 5. Cf. Doniger O'Flaherty, *The Origins of Evil*, 11.

<sup>30</sup> Doniger O'Flaherty, "The Origins of Heresy" (diss.), 5–6. Cf. Doniger O'Flaherty, *The Origins of Evil*, 11–12.

Doniger gives us only general impressions, at best, of the relationships between groups labeled heretical and the wider political circumstances in which they existed at any given time period. In her 1982 essay “The Image of the Heretic in the Gupta Purāṇas,” Doniger does speculate that “many of the myths of heresy may be expressing intercaste tensions as well as political tensions on a higher scale” during the reigns of the kings of the Gupta dynasty (mid-third to mid-sixth centuries CE).<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, the article does not give a clear idea of what those precise tensions might have been, how they might have unfolded under Gupta rule, or what role groups like the Pāñcarātras and Pāśupatas might have played in them.<sup>32</sup>

In the four decades separating Doniger’s and Eltschinger’s studies, scholarly understanding of early Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva groups increased considerably, both with regard to their theological doctrines and to the sociopolitical contexts in which they rose to prominence. Eltschinger’s treatment of Purāṇic discourse on heresy clearly benefits from these advances. In the first chapter of his 2014 work *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, Eltschinger discusses apocalyptic prophecies of the Kali Age found in epic and Purāṇic texts, the Kali being the final and worst cosmic age in the four-part Hindu cycle of yugas. His discussion of these prophecies and the heresies of which they warn is part of a larger investigation of Buddhist philosophical apologetics dating to the first centuries CE and arising from the argumentation of Buddhist logicians like Dharmakīrti, Dignāga, and Vasubandhu. Eltschinger’s main objective is to demonstrate that the tradition of Buddhist epistemology represented by these philosophers arose partially in response to the increasingly hostile atmosphere facing Indian Buddhists during this

---

<sup>31</sup> Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Image of the Heretic in the Gupta Purāṇas,” in *Essays in Gupta Culture*, ed. Bardwell L. Smith (Columbia, MO: South Asia Books, 1983), 108.

<sup>32</sup> Pāśupatas and Pāñcarātras only receive two brief mentions in the chapter. See Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Image of the Heretic,” 115, 120.

same period.<sup>33</sup> He rightly points out that epic and Purāṇic chapters telling of the Kali Age arose in a political milieu where Brahmanical Hinduism portrayed itself as assailed by the corrupting influence of both heretical sects and barbarian (*mleccha*) rulers.<sup>34</sup> Interestingly, Eltschinger concludes that there seem to be two strata in scriptures speaking about the Kali Age: one stratum in which barbarians are the main threat to the Brahmanical social order of *varṇāśramadharmā* and heretics receive relatively less attention, and another (in Eltschinger’s view, later) stratum in which the opposite is true and more verses speak of the heretical onslaught.<sup>35</sup>

Into the first category may be placed passages from the *Mahābhārata* prophesying future barbarian incursions in the end times. MBh 3.188.45 states that “the entire world will be made up of barbarians” (*mlecchabhūtaṃ jagat sarvaṃ bhaviṣyati*).<sup>36</sup> One of the few prophetic passages mentioning *pāṣaṇḍas* in this section of the MBh occurs in the foretelling of Viṣṇu’s coming incarnation as the king Kalkin. After all barbarians and heretics are killed by Kalkin, Vedic Brahmins, *sādhus*, sages, ascetics, and hermitages “which are freed of heretics will be grounded in/fixed upon truth” (*brāhmaṇāḥ sādhas caiva munayaś ca tapasvinaḥ āśramāḥ hatapāṣaṇḍāḥ sthitāḥ satye*); then a new Kṛta Age, the best age of the four-*yuga* cycle, will dawn.<sup>37</sup> The

---

<sup>33</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 71.

<sup>34</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 36. In Purāṇic lists of *mlecchas*, one finds foreign invaders like the nomadic Central Asian Śakas, but also South Asian tribes and ethnic groups which Vedic Brahmins deemed to be non-Ārya, e.g. the Āndhras. See, for example, MP 144.57–58.

<sup>35</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 64–66.

<sup>36</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 45.

<sup>37</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 50. “*Āśramāḥ hatapāṣaṇḍāḥ*” is an alternate reading for “*āśramāḥ sahapāṣaṇḍāḥ*” at MBh 3.189.9, as highlighted by Eltschinger; *ibid.*, 50 n. 77. It could also be translated as “the hermitages which have had (their) heretics killed/destroyed,” just as *hatadvīṣ* means “one with (all his) enemies slain.” We know from other sources that Viṣṇu as Kalkin explicitly comes to rid the world of *mlecchas*, Śūdra kings, and *pāṣaṇḍas*, as at VāP 98.106–109 and MtP 47.248–250. While I agree with Eltschinger that “*hatapāṣaṇḍāḥ*” would seem to make more sense given the context, “*hatapāṣaṇḍāḥ*” only appears in three manuscripts used for the critical edition of MBh, which is likely why “*sahapāṣaṇḍāḥ*” was chosen for the edited base text and “*hatapāṣaṇḍāḥ*” was deemed a *varia lectio*. Also, if we take into account all the other neutral uses of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” in MBh, it becomes even more difficult to reject “*sahapāṣaṇḍāḥ*” here. See the discussion of neutral “*pāṣaṇḍa*” in MBh at Section 1.5.2 below. I also find doubtful Alf Hiltebeitel’s translation, “hermitages [that were formerly filled] with heretics”; see Alf Hiltebeitel, “Buddhism and the Mahābhārata: Boundary Dynamics in Textual

explanation given for the relative paucity of references to *pāṣaṇḍas* in these prophetic sections of the MhB is based on Eltschinger’s hypothesis that they were likely composed in the first two and a half centuries CE, “at a time when significant parts of northwestern and northern Indian were under Śaka, Pahlava, and especially Kuṣāna rule...[T]hese predictions mirror the Brahmanical orthodoxy’s most dramatic concern of the day and are likely to be meant as incentives for the main addressee of the Epic, the *dharma* king.”<sup>38</sup> Eltschinger cites work by Alf Hiltebeitel and others who see in the MhB “a long history of Brahman dissatisfactions...with heterodoxies and heterodox rule,” including a grudge against the emperor Aśoka and his Buddhist leanings.<sup>39</sup> However, the most menacing face of heterodox rule at this time, according to Eltschinger’s hypothesis, was kings who were non-Kṣatriya and/or non-Āryan, rather than royal Kṣatriya apostates to Jainism or Buddhism. The MhB’s message to Hindu kings, as a kind of positive analog to the ViP’s warning about King Śatadhanu, was to reestablish proper dharmic rule: non-*mleccha*, non-Śūdra, and especially pro-Vaiṣṇava.

Chapter 58 of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* also gives a long and detailed prophecy of the Kali Age, but with comparatively more frequent and more detailed mentions of *pāṣaṇḍas*. It would thus fall into the second and later of Eltschinger’s hypothetical strata.<sup>40</sup> Thus, we have at VāP 58.64–66: “Indeed, heretics (like) the red-robed ones [i.e. Buddhists], Nirgranthas [i.e. Jains], and the ones with skulls [i.e. the Śaiva Kāpālika sect], other (heretics) who are sellers of the Vedas, (still) other (heretics) who are sellers of holy sites: these and other heretics who are followers of paths (which go) against the *varṇas* and *āśramas* certainly arise when the Kali Age has fully

---

Practice,” in *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia*, ed. Federico Squarci (Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2005), 127.

<sup>38</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 54.

<sup>39</sup> Hiltebeitel, “Buddhism and the Mahābhārata,” 122, quoted in Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 48.

<sup>40</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 54–56.

arrived.”<sup>41</sup> We might expect to see Buddhist and Jains included in this list, as we do, but how are we to make sense of the Śaiva Kāpālikas being called heretics when VāP itself is a largely Śaiva text? VāP as we now have it includes a chapter on Pāśupata yoga, so we can assume that at some point it was adopted and utilized by Pāśupata groups, even if we cannot be sure it was originally compiled by them. The Kāpālikas are known to have undertaken extreme transgressive vows, like only eating out of a skull bowl, particularly one made from the skull of a dead Brahmin.<sup>42</sup> But at least some Pāśupata groups are also known to have engaged in socially transgressive practices as part of their religious vows, such as making lewd gestures or speaking nonsensically in public.<sup>43</sup> Generally speaking, early Pāśupata and Pāñcarātra teachings enjoined religious practices not connected with Vedic sacrifice, and sometimes claimed superiority to Vedic texts and practices—even if they never explicitly rejected the Vedas in quite the same way as did the Jains and Buddhist.

One example can be found in the *Parama Samhitā*, an early Pāñcarātra text, which begins with the story of the Brahmin sage Devala meeting with the sage Mārkaṇḍeya and asking him to teach him the path to bliss (*śreyomārgam*). Devala laments that even after learning the Vedas with all their parts and auxiliaries (*vedāḥ sāṅgopāṅgāḥ*), he found nothing in the whole of them that was without doubt (*na caiteṣu samasteṣu saṁśayena vina kvacit*).<sup>44</sup> Mārkaṇḍeya replies that having seen many teachers and thousands of *śāstras*, he had not perceived any genuine good in them (*ācāryā bahavo dṛṣṭāḥ śāstrāṇi ca sahasraśaḥ nopalabdham mayā teṣu kiṁcid aikāntikam*

---

<sup>41</sup> *Kaṣāyinaś ca nirgranthās tathā kāpālinaś ca ha vedavikrayiṇaś cānye tīrthavikrayiṇo 'pare varṇāśramāṅgāṃ ye cānye pāṣaṇḍāḥ paripanthinaḥ utpadyante tathā te vai samprāpte tu kalau yuge.*

<sup>42</sup> Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas*, 81.

<sup>43</sup> Sunthar Visuvalingam, “The Transgressive Sacrality of the Dīkṣita: Sacrifice, Criminality and *Bhakti* in the Hindu Tradition,” in *Criminal Gods and Demon Devotees: Essays on the Guardians of Popular Hinduism*, ed. Alf Hiltebeitel (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), 428.

<sup>44</sup> PS 1.3–4.

*hitam*).<sup>45</sup> He then proceeds to teach Devala the *saṃhita*, which was taught by Viṣṇu himself and is of ultimate benefit to the world (*lokānāṃ paramaṃ hitam*).<sup>46</sup> As Eltschinger points out, because of such practices and attitudes, many representatives of Vedic orthodoxy would not have drawn any distinction between Kāpālikas, Pāśupatas, or Pāñcarātras: all would be labeled heretics, right along with the Jains and Buddhists.<sup>47</sup> An illustration of this is found in the writings of Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa (c. 700 CE), who had the authority of the entire Mīmāṃsā school of logic and Vedic exegesis behind him when, in the *Tantravārttika*, he affirmed the collective unacceptability (*anapekṣaṇīyatvaṃ*) of Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra, Pāśupata, Buddhist, and Jain texts because they contain logical reasoning and philosophies which go against Vedic revelation (*śrutivirodhaheturāśanābhyaṃ*).<sup>48</sup>

The Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata response to orthodox condemnation was an increasing insistence on their own Vedic legitimacy and the denial of their rivals' legitimacy, coupled with a concerted effort to set themselves apart from all others. These are likely the circumstances under which large portions of classic Dharmaśāstric material were incorporated into Purāṇic texts.<sup>49</sup> The added sections urge strict observance of the *varṇa* hierarchy and regular donations to Brahmin priests—along with *pūjā* and devotion to Śiva or Viṣṇu.<sup>50</sup> Chemburkar has pointed out that Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata religiosity was domesticated in the process; the role of potentially transgressive renunciant ascetics was diminished, and religious devotion became more a matter of householder worship and temple priest officiation.<sup>51</sup> The sectarian Purāṇas were a key tool in

---

<sup>45</sup> PS 1.9.

<sup>46</sup> PS. 1.34–35.

<sup>47</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 68.

<sup>48</sup> Tv on *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-sūtra* 1.3.1–4. See Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 67.

<sup>49</sup> See n. 1 above.

<sup>50</sup> See, for example, chapters 71–82 of VāP and their rules regarding *śrāddha*.

<sup>51</sup> Chemburkar, “Brāhmanised Pāśupata Sect,” 52.

helping these Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva groups convince wider Hindu society of their Vedic validity, and especially in winning state approval from kings.<sup>52</sup> Many Indian kings of the first millennium were only too receptive. As Davidson states, “[In] seeking legitimacy and identity, Indian kings from all areas began to increase their patronage of literature and strategize their support for religion, searching for religious counselors that could bolster their political and military agendas.”<sup>53</sup> According to Eltschinger, Śaivism more than Vaiṣṇavism prevailed in the effort to promote itself among kings eager for religious clout.<sup>54</sup> But in both cases, it would have been appealing for a king to present himself as a semi-divine fragment of the deity at the center of state worship; while the identification of kings with various gods was already present in earlier Vedic ritual, this took on a new significance in the Purāṇic rituals that became dominant during the centuries of the first millennium.<sup>55</sup>

Although Eltschinger’s arguments are convincing on the whole, his chronology of epic and Purāṇic strata can only be accepted with caution. Further research may determine why some apocalyptic accounts emphasize *mlecchas* over *pāṣaṇḍas*, and others vice versa; there is not yet enough evidence to say whether or not these might rather be two alternate but contemporaneous textual traditions of apocalyptic prophecy. Mere reluctance to speak of *pāṣaṇḍas*, or speaking of them in vague and coded ways, may not necessarily mean that *mlecchas* were a more pressing threat. As was just stated, Eltschinger claims that the main source of militant aggression towards

---

<sup>52</sup> See Kunal Chakrabarti, *Religious Process: The Purāṇas and the Making of a Regional Tradition* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2018), 124–131.

<sup>53</sup> Ronald M. Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 26, qtd. in Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 102; Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism*, 86, qtd. in Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 85 n. 200.

<sup>54</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 4, 84–85, 100–106, building especially on the work of Alexis Sanderson. See Alexis Sanderson, “The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period,” in *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, ed. Shingo Einoo (Tokyo: Sanbikō Busshorin, 2009), 252–303. For Pāñcarātra Vaiṣṇava attempts to gain royal influence and patronage, see Inden, “Imperial Purāṇas,” 29–91.

<sup>55</sup> See Hartmut Scharfe, *The State in Indian Tradition*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 2: Indien, Part 3: Geschichte 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 92–96.



Buddhism was political Śaivism. And yet textual sources denouncing Buddhists and Jains as *pāṣaṇḍas* are as likely as not to be Vaiṣṇava (like ViP explored above) rather than Śaiva or “mixed” (e.g., VāP or KūP); looking through the epigraphical record, we find stone and copperplate inscriptions from kings claiming to be devotees of or divine fragments of Viṣṇu with a frequency rivaling that of their Śaiva counterparts. Finally, we again find that the topic of heresy for Eltschinger’s study is relegated to a position of secondary importance; the history of Mahāyāna apologetics is his main overall focus and the subject to which he gives the most attention.

### **Section 1.3: “*Pāṣaṇḍa*” and “*Hairesis*”**

Both Doniger and Eltschinger show a marked ambivalence about translating *pāṣaṇḍa* as “heretic.” Their reluctance springs from what they perceive as a semantic mismatch between Sanskrit “*pāṣaṇḍa*” and Greek “*haíresis* (αἵρεσις),” specifically involving the element of choice. In Doniger’s words, “The primary difficulty which arises when the Greek-derived term is applied to Indian religion is that the element of choice, which characterises not only heresy but...the more general concept of sin in Western but not in Indian theology, is totally inapplicable to the Hindu concept of heresy.”<sup>56</sup> Referring to Doniger’s statement, Eltschinger says of himself that he translates “*pāṣaṇḍa*” as “heretic” “by convention more than conviction.”<sup>57</sup> What is known about the etymology of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” is the subject of Section 1.4 below. But in order to evaluate whether our best translation for “*pāṣaṇḍa*” is as dubious as Doniger and Eltschinger suggest, we must first delve more deeply into the word “heresy” itself.

---

<sup>56</sup> Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Origins of Heresy” (diss.), 11. Cf. Doniger O’Flaherty, “The Image of the Heretic,” 109–110. Whether or not choice plays a comparable role in Indian notions of *pāpa* and Western notions of evil, Judeo-Christian or otherwise, is beyond the scope of the present paper.

<sup>57</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 36 n. 3.

As Doniger notes, in neither the case of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” nor that of “*haíresis*” did the earliest attestations of the word carry the condemnatory pejorative tone which it would later develop.<sup>58</sup> The classical usage of the verb “*haireîn* (αἰρεῖν)” did indeed encompass “to choose,” but also “to take or seize,” “to gain,” “to grasp mentally or comprehend,” “to prefer,” “to decide,” and “to elect,” as in the election of magistrates.<sup>59</sup> Its evolution over time brought on a host of additional meanings, and in the case of some of those meanings, the sense of “choice” more or less fell away. Luckily, historians of Hellenistic Greece and of early Christianity have given detailed accounts of the semantic evolution that the word “*haíresis*” underwent. I summarize here some of the most significant among the relevant studies before demonstrating how they may be of benefit to our understanding of “*pāṣaṇḍa*.”

As early as the 1930s, scholars of biblical studies had already drawn an overall outline of classical and Hellenistic “*hairéō*,” the forms derived from it, and their various uses in the Old and New Testaments.<sup>60</sup> The late 1970s and early 1980s, however, saw a number of publications which covered the topic in far greater detail, pointing out key shifts in the semantic range of “*haíresis*” and the cultural circumstances in which they occurred.<sup>61</sup> In 1978, John Glucker mentioned “*haíresis*” as one of the chief terms used in connection with philosophical communities in Greece during the final decades of the Roman Republic.<sup>62</sup> By collecting

---

<sup>58</sup> Doniger O’Flaherty, *On Hinduism*, 39.

<sup>59</sup> The first person present active form is “*hairéō* (αἰρέω),” “I choose, take, seize, elect, etc.,” and the middle voice *hairéomai* (αἰρέομαι). The sense of “to take, grasp, take away” may indicate that *hairéō* is related to the Sanskrit root √hr. On the early political meaning of “*hairéō*,” see *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Ancient Mediterranean Religions*, s.v. “Heresy.”

<sup>60</sup> See, for example, H. Schlier, “αἰρέομαι,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1, ed. G. Kittel et al. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933), 179–183.

<sup>61</sup> Besides the two studies referenced here, see also Marcel Simon, “From Greek Hairesis to Christian Heresy,” in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*, *Théologie Historique* 54 (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1979), 101–116.

<sup>62</sup> This occurs in Glucker’s larger study of philosophical communities and pedagogy in the Athenian Academy during the time of Antiochus of Ascalon (d. circa 68 BCE). John Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, *Hypomnemata* 56 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 166. Although the relationship between the

instances of the term “*haíresis*” from texts and inscriptions of this period, along with instances of the related terms “*diatribḗ* (διατριβή)” and “*skholḗ* (σχολή),” Glucker showed that “*diatribḗ*” and “*skholḗ*” were used to refer to institutionalized schools, while “*haíresis*” at this time referred to a philosophical system in the abstract rather than to a philosophical school as a pedagogical institution.<sup>63</sup> What is more, its meaning of a general philosophical “school of thought” or “persuasion” did not arise directly from the earlier meaning of “to choose,” but from political and governmental uses of “*haireîn*” which, by the third century BCE, had already become formulaic. Glucker took issue with the claim that the late technical philosophical sense “denotes ‘a choice, an election, whether of good or evil,’” stating that, “by the time of Polybius, its new senses are already stereotyped, and it is well on its way to acquiring the more technical connotations, in such contexts where the sense of ‘choice’ has been quite forgotten and will simply not do.”<sup>64</sup> Citing multiple examples, Glucker argued that even by Polybius’s time (d. circa 118 BCE), “*haíresis*” indicated a disposition, inclination, or attitude (usually a favorable one) toward something, very often toward a military ally or in the context of a civic or political

---

economy of late Roman antiquity and the proliferating academic schools of thought mentioned by Glucker and Heinrich von Staden below is beyond the scope of this paper, it is useful to mention that the *pax Romana* falls directly in the period during which “*haíresis*” comes to mean a distinct doctrinal sect. This was a period of relative stability and economic prosperity, witnessing widespread trade and the flourishing of centralized, planned urban centers throughout the lands under Roman control. See Bryan Ward-Perkins, “Specialisation, Trade, and Prosperity: An Overview of the Economy of the Late Antique Eastern Mediterranean,” in *Economy and Exchange in the East Mediterranean during Late Antiquity*, ed. Sean Kingsley and Michael Decker (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2015), 167–176. Compare this to analogous economic conditions under Mauryan rule at the time of Aśoka as described by Jason Neelis, *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*, Dynamics in the History of Religion 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 187–190; and by Peter Falk, “The Tidal Waves of Indian History: Between the Empires and Beyond,” in *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*, ed. Patrick Olivelle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 145–164. Note also the allegations of Diodorus (d. circa 30 BCE) that philosophers were simply founding new *haíreseis* for their personal financial gain; Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 83.

<sup>63</sup> Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 167.

<sup>64</sup> Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 168 n. 18.

affiliation.<sup>65</sup> We may go so far as to translate “*haíresis*” in this sense as “partiality to something,” or some sort of partisanship, be it political or, later, philosophical.<sup>66</sup> As we will see, this comes very close to Aśokan “*pāsaṃḍa*.”<sup>67</sup>

It proved to be a short step for “*haíresis*” to go from meaning particular philosophical predilections to designating a group of people *having* said predilections.<sup>68</sup> That the latter meaning came to predominate is demonstrated by the findings of Heinrich von Staden in his 1982 study of competing medical schools in second century Alexandria. Starting with the Alexandrian physician Galen (d. circa 210) and his text *Perì hairéseōn toîs eisagoménois* (Περὶ αἰρέσεων τοῖς εἰσαγομένοις; Latin: *De sectis ad eos qui introducuntur*; literally, “On the Sects: for Beginners”), von Staden showed that in second century Alexandria, *haíresis* “served to refer—positively, negatively, or neutrally—to any group of people perceived to have a clear doctrinal identity.”<sup>69</sup> In Galen’s case, the specific “doctrinal groups” were rival schools of medical methodology (The “Empiricists” vs. the “Rationalists,” etc.). The application of *haíresis* to these groups was in fact already well-established by Galen’s time: “...Alexandrian medicine

---

<sup>65</sup> According to Glucker, this particular civil and political application of the term in earlier centuries lent to it a certain prestige which it carried over to its later philosophical use; Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 191–192.

<sup>66</sup> As seen in stock phrases like “*haíresis prós tina*” (αἵρεσις πρὸς τινα) and “*haíresis kai eúnoia*” (αἵρεσις καὶ εὐνοία); Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 172. See also Glucker’s reference of the definition given by Elias, the late sixth century commentator on Aristotle and student of Olympiodorus: “αἵρεσις is the opinion of educated men, agreeing among themselves and disagreeing with others”; Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 181. It is interesting to note that Elias was likely a Christian, while his teacher Olympiodorus was the last pagan Neoplatonist teacher of the Alexandrian School; Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 180.

<sup>67</sup> Albeit that *pāsaṃḍa* from the very start indicates partisanship of a religious/philosophical nature and not a political one.

<sup>68</sup> “By the time of Plutarch, the use of αἵρεσις to denote a philosophical sect is already firmly established”; Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 182.

<sup>69</sup> Heinrich von Staden, “Hairesis and Heresy: The Case of the *haireseis iatrikai*,” in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3, *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. Ben F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders (London: SCM Press, 1982), 76. Note that “*haíresis*” becomes *secta* in Latin. “[T]he standard Latin equivalent of αἵρεσις is *secta*...”<sup>193</sup> Furthermore, “*secta*” like “*haíresis*” originally was an abstract term without institutional implications, from an early meaning of “path” or “way” to a later one meaning, like “*haíresis*,” a faction; Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 194–202.

of the pre-Christian era seems to offer the first examples of the systematic application of *hairesis* both to an opposing school of thought and to one's own. In doxographic treatises of polemical as well as apologetic character, early Alexandrian medical authors frequently employ "*hairesis*" for the purpose of partisan group characterizations."<sup>70</sup> Moreover, the Alexandrian "*hairesis* literature" of late antiquity, both before and after the rise of Christianity, was marked by "sharp conflict" and debate, and by clear boundaries of group identity: "[E]vidence suggests that a group with fairly coherent and distinctive theories, with an acknowledged founder (*hairesi-archēs*), and with publicly identifiable leaders who articulate (a) their rejection of rival theories through theoretically founded polemics, as well as (b) their own systematic alternatives, would qualify as a *hairesis*."<sup>71</sup> The two stages of semantic change pointed out by Glucker and von Staden involve considerable overlap, and many of von Staden's conclusions in his own study further confirm Glucker's points.<sup>72</sup> The main difference between the two stages may simply lie in the fact that, in von Staden's case, Alexandrian "*hairesis*" was more explicitly associated with distinct, identifiable groups of learned individuals who were publicly defending the soundness of their own medical/philosophical/religious systems against the criticisms of their rivals.

Similar suggestions of factionalism and disunion were evident in the earliest known occurrences of the word "*pāṣaṇḍa*," even when—as with pre- and early-Christian "*hairesis*"—the later, more clearly pejorative sense of the word had not yet developed. These first attestations are found in the Middle Indic stone inscriptions of the Mauryan emperor Aśoka, with "*pāṣaṇḍa*" appearing in the form of its MI equivalent "*pāsaṃḍa*."<sup>73</sup> Carved during Aśoka's reign in the third

---

<sup>70</sup> Von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy," 77–78.

<sup>71</sup> Von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy," 80.

<sup>72</sup> See, for example, von Staden's remarks about institutionalization at von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy," 93–95.

<sup>73</sup> The language of Aśoka's edicts reflects the influence of several local vernaculars. Perhaps because of this, it is very common with Aśokan edicts to find a word written several different ways in one and the same inscription, sometimes even in the same line. If we were to compile a list of different spellings for *pāsaṃḍa* as found in RE V,

century BCE, these inscriptions contain his famous rock edicts, in which the emperor lays out what Romila Thapar calls Aśoka’s “policy of *Dhamma*.”<sup>74</sup> It comprised an imperially enacted code aimed at spreading a spirit of civic responsibility and social morality throughout the lands under Mauryan influence; it also served to reinforce an image of paternalistic centralized rule with Aśoka himself at its core. Of the various virtues discussed in Aśoka’s edicts, the one which concerns us here is found in RE XII.<sup>75</sup> That edict is devoted, in its entirety, to the inculcation of harmony and goodwill among religious sects. To paraphrase the edict, after Aśoka declares that he has in various ways praised and patronized all sects (*savapāsaṃdāni*), including both sects made up of renunciant ascetics and non-renunciant householders (*pavajitāni ca gharastāni*), he remarks that he does not regard praise or gifts as highly as he regards the growth and development of these sects’ innermost substance (*sāraṇadhī*). Conceding that such growth could take many forms (*bahuvidhā*), Aśoka holds that its very root lies in watching one’s speech (*vaciguttī*). And in what way does one watch one’s speech? “There should not be praise of one’s own sect or rebuke of another’s sect without occasion (for it), or [even if there is occasion for it, the rebuke] should be light...Whoever praises his own sect and rebukes the sect of another, all out of devotion to his own sect, [thinking] ‘I cause my own sect to shine’—he, doing thus, instead harms his own sect more grievously.”<sup>76</sup> That Aśoka had to make such a decree implies

---

VII, and XII of the Gīrnār, Dhāulī, and Shāhbāz Garhī inscriptions, for example, we would have “*pāsaṃda*,” “*pāsaḍa*,” “*praṣaṃda*,” “*paṣaṃda*,” “*praṣaḍa*,” and “*paṣaḍa*.” On the mixing of dialects in Aśokan inscriptions, see Truman Michelson, “Linguistic Notes on the Shāhbāzgarhī and Mansehra Redactions of Asoka’s Fourteen-Edicts: Second Part,” *American Journal of Philology* 30, no. 4 (1909): 416–429.

<sup>74</sup> Romila Thapar, *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 148–178.

<sup>75</sup> The text cited here is based on the edict as it appears in the Gīrnār inscription. See Aśoka, *Inscriptions of Asoka: New Edition*, ed. and trans. E. Hultzsch, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), 20–22.

<sup>76</sup> *Āptapāsaṃdāpūjā va parapāsaṃdāgarahā va no bhava aprakaraṇamhi lahukā va asa...yo hi koci āptapāsaṃdāṃ pūjayati parapāsaṃdāṃ va garahati savaṃ āptapāsaṃdābhattiyā kiṃti āptapāsaṃdā dīpayema iti so ca puna tatha karoto āptapāsaṃdāṃ bāḍhataraṃ upahanāti*. All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. My reading differs slightly from Hultzsch’s: Aśoka, *Inscriptions of Asoka*, 20–21; and also from Bloch’s reading: Jules Bloch, *Les Inscriptions d’Asoka*, Collection Émile Senart 8 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950), 122–123. “*Prakaraṇa*” here means “occasion” in the sense of a reason, opportunity, or excuse for doing something. That Aśoka’s *pāsaṃdas* are

that open disparagement of the sects of others was an actual occurrence in his time. Otherwise, there would have been no need to stress this point by having it inscribed in several places across his realm. More fundamentally, this passage demonstrates that the word which would later come to mean a specifically heretical sect simply meant, for Aśoka, any sect whatsoever, whether one's own or another's. We can thus draw a close parallel with von Staden's description of Alexandrian "haíresis" because (1) Aśokan "pāsaṃḍa" in and of itself lacks any pejorative meaning, and (2) the ways both "haíresis" and "pāsaṃḍa" are used imply circumstances of inter-sectarian debate and contestation.

I am in full agreement with Glucker that the process by which "haíresis" came to be specifically applied to heretical sects in the modern sense had little to do with "a choice," whether between good and evil, God and sin, or anything else. Instead, it had to do with doctrinal and sectarian partisanship. The neutral meaning of "faction" or "sect" continued well into early Christian times. For instance, towards the end of the first century CE, Josephus referred to the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as "hairéseis" in his autobiographical *Life of Josephus*.<sup>77</sup> This shows the term being applied to more explicitly religious groups compared to the philosophical schools with which it had been associated in earlier centuries. We even find the more or less neutral meaning of "haíresis" in the Bible itself, as when Paul states in 1 Cor. 11:19, "And indeed, there have to be factions among you so that the approved among you (i.e., approved by God) may be shown."<sup>78</sup> Paul is clearly not saying here that heresies must be permitted to exist.

---

specifically religio-philosophical groups, see Delhi-Toprā Pillar Edict VII, where Aśoka names among the various *pāsaṃḍas* (*nānāpāsaṃḍesu*) the Buddhist monastic *saṃgha* (with which Aśoka was personally most connected), Vedic Brahmins (*bābhanesu*), Ājīvikas, and Jains (*nigaṃthesu*); Aśoka, *Inscriptions of Asoka*, 132.

<sup>77</sup> See Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 184–185; von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy," 96.

<sup>78</sup> Δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα καὶ οἱ δοκιμοὶ φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν. For more examples of neutral "haíresis" in the Bible, see Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 185–186; von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy," 96–97. Cf. Gustav Roth's mention of this same verse in connection with Aśokan *pāsaṃḍa* vis-à-vis *diatribás* in the Greek inscription of Aśoka discovered in Kandahar in 1963. Gustav Roth, "Vergleichende

Rather, he is saying it is natural that factions might form in Christian communities (as had already happened in Corinth's Christian community), however undesirable that might be; and that those groups which enjoyed God's approval would subsequently be made manifest—by successfully prevailing in an environment of competition with other factions. In the Christian context, however, breaking away into a faction was no longer a simple matter of philosophical dispute or academic debate. It stands to reason that, eventually, it came to be cast as turning away from divine truth and towards deluded false belief.<sup>79</sup>

What should we make of Doniger's claim that, unlike the Christian heretic, "The Hindu heretic does not choose his false doctrine; it is thrust upon him by his own ignorance or by a curse"?<sup>80</sup> Here, I believe Doniger overstates the element of choice in Christian *haíresis*. One could just as justifiably say that Christian heretics in the eyes of early theologians were not choosing freely but were instead deluded by the devil, just as the *asuras* were deluded by Māyāmoha. As Christine Caldwell Ames notes, soon after "*haíresis*" developed its familiar Christian connotation, "such wrong choices were associated with the sabotaging, evil inspiration of Satan. Apologist Justin Martyr (d. 165), one of the most important architects of 'heresy,' credited it to 'devils' who 'attempt nothing else than to seduce men from God who made them.'"<sup>81</sup> In any event, we have already seen that the term "*haíresis*" as it applied to doctrinal groups in Late Antiquity had little to do with "choice."

---

Beobachtungen zu Asokas Felsenedikt XIII," in *Expanding and Merging Horizons: Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften 351, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 53, ed. Karin Preisendanz (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), 155–156.

<sup>79</sup> See von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy," 97–98.

<sup>80</sup> Doniger O'Flaherty, "The Origins of Heresy" (diss.), 11; Doniger O'Flaherty, "The Image of the Heretic," 110; Doniger, *On Hinduism*, 38.

<sup>81</sup> Christine Caldwell Ames, *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 11.



Why, then, the overemphasis on choice in heresy?<sup>82</sup> Following Glucker, we may trace the source ultimately to the early Christian etymologies of the word provided by “Isidore [of Seville]...and similar ‘authorities.’” The folk etymologies of early theologians like Tertullian (d. circa 240 CE) and Isidore (d. 636 CE) often link heresy to choice, with heretics obstinately choosing to follow their own wills rather than the example set by the apostles.<sup>83</sup> According to Glucker, however, caution should be exercised when dealing with “Patristic passages whose etymological explanation *ex post factum* is suspect...”<sup>84</sup> And not all early theologians defined heresy by reference to the meaning of choice. According to von Staden, Clement of Alexandria (d. circa 215 CE) and Basil (d. 379 CE) instead defined “*hairesis* as heresy” in terms of “falling away, breaking away, separation, estrangement, alienation” from God and true faith.<sup>85</sup> This may be fruitfully compared to the common Purāṇic and Dharmaśāstric definition of heretical *pāṣaṇḍas* as being “*vedabāhya*”—falling completely outside of and having no connection with the Vedas.<sup>86</sup>

Before moving on to discuss the etymology of “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” I wish to make one final point about the relationship of heresy to orthodoxy. As has been demonstrated, many who have claimed there were never heresies in India have tied that assertion to a secondary claim that India also never had orthodoxy. We have already seen from the example of Renou that any attempt to downplay the impact of Vedic orthodoxy in Indian history is a fraught endeavor. But how certain are we of the presence of institutionalized orthodoxy in early Christianity, and its relationship to heresy? As Ames points out, “Christianity would be neither Rome’s official religion, nor a

---

<sup>82</sup> Not only on Doniger’s part, but on the part of other scholars as well. See, for example, Simon’s acceptance of “choice” as the main meaning of “*hairesis*” at Simon, “From Greek Hairesis,” 104.

<sup>83</sup> Simon, “From Greek Hairesis,” 104, 115.

<sup>84</sup> Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 168 n. 18.

<sup>85</sup> Von Staden, “Hairesis and Heresy,” 97.

<sup>86</sup> E.g., at MDhŚ 12.95.

majority religion in numbers, until the late fourth century.”<sup>87</sup> In spite of this, Ames elaborates, “By the year 300, Christians had been condemning each other as heretical for at least two centuries.”<sup>88</sup> What sense does it make to speak of institutionalized orthodoxy, and then tie heresy to orthodoxy’s preexistence, at a time when there was neither a centralized, organized church to define heresy nor ecclesiastical law to condemn it?

Ames clarifies that, “In early Christianity, heresy didn’t ‘presume the existence of formal authority.’ It only presumed the existence of people thinking that they were, in an absolute sense, authoritatively right.”<sup>89</sup> These assertions build on the important work of Walter Bauer and the “Bauer thesis”: the argument that in many regional centers of early Christianity, whatever “orthodox” groups existed would have constituted the minority rather than the majority.<sup>90</sup> Although the Bauer thesis has had its critics, the main point stands that early Christian heresy “is not so much a matter of an organized group of men defecting from an organized church; it is first and foremost a ‘school of thought’ advocating unorthodox doctrines.”<sup>91</sup> In this early period, there *was* no organized church from which to defect, and there was certainly no state institutionalization in Rome to initiate punitive anti-heterodox measures. Unorthodox schools of Christian thought were plentiful, and they themselves often countered orthodox groups with their own accusations of heresy.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Ames, *Medieval Heresies*, 14.

<sup>88</sup> Ames, *Medieval Heresies*, 12.

<sup>89</sup> Ames, *Medieval Heresies*, 23.

<sup>90</sup> See, for example, Bauer’s comments that in the second century, the influence of Rome’s orthodox groups only spread as far as Hierapolis in western Asia Minor; even in Hierapolis itself, orthodoxy was “im Hintertreffen”; Walter Bauer and Georg Strecker, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 10, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964), 195. On how the Bauer thesis has been critiqued and developed, see Rodney J. Decker, “The Bauer Thesis: An Overview,” in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Early Christian Contexts: Reconsidering the Bauer Thesis*, ed. Paul A. Hartog (Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 2015), 6–33.

<sup>91</sup> Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, 187.

<sup>92</sup> Ames, *Medieval Heresies*, 38, 51.

This directly calls into question facile correlations of heresy to established, entrenched, institutionalized orthodoxy as its necessary precursor and antecedent. We may conclude that Christian orthodoxy was no more firmly established during these early centuries than was Brahmanical orthodoxy in India during the time of the early sectarian Purāṇas.<sup>93</sup> In the early centuries CE, Brahmins already enjoyed state backing from many kings throughout India, and state patronage was largely still flowing to Vedic priests as it had in previous centuries, albeit with increased competition, not only from Buddhist and Jain communities but also from newly ascendant Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva groups like the Pāñcarātras and Pāśupatas.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, by the time of the sectarian Purāṇas, the Hindu legal tradition was already denouncing heresy in *smṛti* texts. Thus, even in the absence of an overarching sense of unifying “Hindu-ness,” doctrinal lines were being drawn and competing communities were solidifying with a consciousness of their own identities and of what differentiated them from the groups who opposed them.<sup>95</sup> Eltschinger shows that the religious apologetics leading up to the middle of the first millennium were accompanied by a clear demarcation of in-group vs. out-group, *vaidika* vs. *pāṣaṇḍa*, Buddhist vs. *tīrthika*. The role played by the category of the *mleccha* barbarian also shows that

---

<sup>93</sup> The composition of major portions of many early Purāṇas was likely roughly contemporaneous with Constantine’s conversion to Christianity, a major step in the actual establishment of institutionalized Christian orthodoxy.

<sup>94</sup> Chakrabarti, *Religious Process*, 124–131.

<sup>95</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 174–190. The point about Indian heresy and Vedic orthodoxy not depending on an overarching sense of unifying Hindu-ness is specifically in response to the arguments of Elaine M. Fisher. Fisher contends that early Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism should not be seen as new sects under the umbrella of a preexisting unified Hindu religion, with any social consciousness of belonging to a “Hindu tradition” only arising in the late medieval and early modern period. They also should not be seen as new variants of Brahmanical Vedic religion, according to Fisher, because they include within themselves strands of Tantrism that are often anti-Brahmin or because they subordinate the Vedas and Vedic practices to specifically Vaiṣṇava or Śaiva doctrines and rituals (as we have already seen above in the example of the Pāñcarātra PS). See Elaine M. Fisher, *Hindu Pluralism: Religion and the Public Sphere in Early Modern South India* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017), 31–49. Be that as it may, in the contexts of the religious polemics we find in the sectarian Purāṇas, Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva groups were quick to fall back on orthodox Vedic authority when it came to defending themselves against their rivals, even (or especially) when that meant openly downplaying or disavowing their own Tantric backgrounds. In delineating who was a *pāṣaṇḍa* and who was not, early Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva groups were already laying the groundwork in the first millennium CE for the later Hindu identity of which Fisher speaks.

an overarching sense of Indian-ness (even if we cannot call it anything like a modern sense of “Hindu-ness”) also had a role to play in the Brahmanical fight to maintain the *varṇāśramadharmā* social order. Numerous appeals to orthodoxy of a kind, however tenuous or changing, based on the Vedas and bolstered by various Brahmanical justifications (be it Kumāriḷa’s Mīmāṃsā argumentation or Śāṅkara’s Upaniṣadic exegesis), simply cannot be overlooked across Hinduism’s history. Suffice it to say that further work on the defensibility of Vedic orthodoxy as a concept is just as much an Indological desideratum as further work on Indian heresy.

#### **Section 1.4: The Etymology of “Pāṣaṇḍa”**

Efforts in the nineteenth century to decipher Aśoka’s edicts brought about the first discussions amongst Western Orientalists on how to accurately render “*pāṣaṇḍa*” into English. In 1838, James Prinsep and Kamalākānta Vidyālaṃkāra, the pandit assisting Prinsep in his study of the Brāhmī inscriptions, translated the MI variant form “*pāsaṃḍa*” in the Girnār and Dhaulī Rock Edicts as “unbeliever.”<sup>96</sup> It may be that the Bengali pandit explained the term to Prinsep according to its later Purāṇic meaning; or else Prinsep may have been influenced by H. T. Colebrooke’s 1808 translation of the *Amarakośa*; at AK 2.7.45, Colebrooke translated the words “*pāṣaṇḍāḥ sarvaliṅgināḥ*,” along with the associated commentarial glosses, as: “heretics and imposters...who assume the exteriors of the four tribes and orders; but whose practice is in contradiction to the *Vēdas*: for example (say the Commentators) the *Baudd’has*, &c.”<sup>97</sup> In any

---

<sup>96</sup> On multiple spellings in these inscriptions, see n. 73 above.

<sup>97</sup> H. T. Colebrooke, *Cōsha, or Dictionary of the Sanscrit Language by Amera Sinha: with an English Interpretation, and Annotations* (Serampore: n.p., 1808), 178 c. Italics in the original. This likely stands as the earliest piece of writing in which the word “*pāṣaṇḍa*” is assigned an English equivalent. In Colebrooke’s numbering, the line occurs at verse 44 rather than 45. It is unclear which of the numerous commentaries on AK he is paraphrasing, but it appears to be from the *Padacandrikā* of Mukuṭa: “*trayībāhyaviparītavyavahārāḥ...bauddhakṣapaṇakādayaḥ...sarveṣāṃ varṇāśramāṇāṃ kiṃcil liṅgaṃ te pāṣaṇḍā ity eke | sarvāśramiṇāṃ liṅgāni bhajante sarvaliṅgina iti rudraḥ*” (the last line quotes the no longer extant

case, Prinsep and Kamalākānta rendered “*pāsaṃḍa*” as “unbeliever” throughout their translations.<sup>98</sup> To give an example, their rendition of the line “*devānaṃpiyo piyadasi rājā sarvatā ichati save pāsaṃḍā vaseyu*” from Girnār RE VII reads: “The heaven-beloved king Piyadasi everywhere ardently desireth that all unbelievers may be brought to repentance and peace of mind.”<sup>99</sup> In 1846, H. H. Wilson followed Prinsep’s rendering of “*pāsaṃḍā*” in translating the matching line of RE VII found in the Shāhbāz Gaṛhī inscription: “The beloved of the gods, the Raja Priyadarsi, desires that all unbelievers may everywhere dwell (unmolested)...”<sup>100</sup> However, by 1849, Wilson was already calling this translation into question. In a paper he presented that year, Wilson gave his reasoning for no longer being content with Prinsep’s previous renditions of “*pāsaṃḍā*” as unbelievers who were “repenting” or “being converted”:

It may be reasonably doubted, however, if the inscription has reference to conversion of any kind, and whether the term, Pāshanda, as it is used in these tables, admits of the ordinary translation of unbeliever. Such a sense is clearly incompatible with the opening passage which declares that King Piyadasi honours or worships, (pujayati) all pāshandas... There can be no doubt of the rendering, the words are distinct, and their sense is clear enough, and we cannot conceive of a pious king making a public announcement that heresies are the objects of his especial reverence and bounty. Pāshanda, must therefore, have some other sense, and the remainder of the edict, indicates its meaning to be any form of religious faith, any profession of belief.<sup>101</sup>

---

*Rudrakośa*). See also Maheśvara’s comment at AK 2.7.45 (*bauddhakṣapaṇakādiṣu duḥśāstravartīṣu*). Colebrooke makes mention later in this passage of the variant form “*pākhaṇḍa*.”

<sup>98</sup> It is helpful to note that, at the time of Prinsep’s initial work on the Girnār and Dhaulī inscriptions, the *Śabdakalpadruma* was still being compiled; it would likewise be many years before the appearance of either the Monier-Williams dictionary or Böhtlingk’s *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*.

<sup>99</sup> James Prinsep, “On the Edicts of Piyadasi, or Asoka, the Buddhist monarch of India, preserved on the Girnār rock in the Gujerat peninsula, and on the Dhaulī rock in Cuttack; with the discovery of Ptolemy’s name therein,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 7, no. 75 (March 1838): 255. Hultzsch gives the most accurate reading of the Girnār inscription, e.g., the reading of “*sarvatā*” instead of “*savatā*”; see *Aśoka, Inscriptions of Asoka*, 13.

<sup>100</sup> H. H. Wilson, “On the Kapur-di-Giri Rock Inscription: Note by the Director,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 8 (1846): 314. The Shāhbāz Gaṛhī Inscription is cited in older sources as *Kapur-di-giri* and *Kapurdi-garhi*, from the name of the village still called Gaṛhī Kapūra; it is located in the Mardān district of modern-day Pakistan’s Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. Wilson’s rendering comes closer than Prinsep’s to the correct meaning of the optative “*vaseyu*” (Pā. *vaseyya*); Aśoka “wishes [that] all sects may dwell everywhere,” i.e., that they may take up residence throughout his empire, wherever they like.

<sup>101</sup> H. H. Wilson, “On the Rock Inscriptions of Kapur di Giri, Dhauli, and Girnār,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 12 (1850): 217 (from a paper read before the society on 3 February 1849). Wilson states again further on, “The term, Pāshanda, I may here add, although rendered heresy, or heretic, does not bear properly so restricted a meaning.” *Ibid.*, 242.

The poor fit of “heretic” in the context of the Aśokan inscriptions was cause enough for Wilson to conclude that “*pāsaṃḍa*” must have held multiple meanings. “*Pāsaṃḍa*” for Aśoka was in no way a term of condemnation; this much was evident. In an appendix to his 1852 translation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Sūtra*, Eugène Burnouf stated his agreement with Wilson that *pāsaṃḍa* in the rock edicts was not used to mean a heretic but “les Religieux et les ascètes d’une croyance qui n’est pas la sienne.”<sup>102</sup> Accordingly, Burnouf translated the line from the inscriptions quoted above as: “Piyadasi, le roi chéri des Dêvas, désire en tous lieux que les ascètes de toutes les croyances résident (tranquilles)...,” closely following Wilson’s corrected rendering.<sup>103</sup>

Based on these early findings, scholars were able in the latter half the 19th century to trace a general pattern of historical change for the word “*pāsaṃḍa*.” Hendrik Kern may have been the first to describe this pattern in explicit terms, and the first to compare the evolution of “*pāsaṃḍa*” to similar historical changes in meaning displayed by the Greek word “*haíresis*.” Writing in 1873, Kern stated that instances of “*pāsaṃḍa*” in the Gīrnār, Dhaulī, and Shāhbāz Garhī inscriptions clearly showed it to mean “sect” or “member of a sect”; the definition of Skt. “*pāsaṃḍa*” as meaning a specifically heretical sect, or an individual heretic, represents a later

---

<sup>102</sup> Eugène Burnouf, Appendix X to *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi: traduit du Sanscrit, accompagné d’un commentaire et de vingt et un mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1852), 755. Note that here Burnouf implies that “*pāsaṃḍa*” especially means a sect or belief other than one’s own (in this case, other than Aśoka’s own Buddhist faith); Burnouf may have imagined a somewhat pejorative tone to exist even in this early stage of the word’s history. He does not explicitly allow for the possibility that “*pāsaṃḍa*” may also designate a sect to which one *does* belong. However, the juxtaposing of “*āptaṃpāsaṃḍa*” (“one’s own sect”) and “*parapāsaṃḍa*” (“another’s sect”) in the Aśokan edicts indicates that, for Aśoka at least, “*pāsaṃḍa*” did not exclusively mean only “someone else’s (and not my own) sect.” See, for example, RE XII. There was considerable and ultimately unresolved disagreement over whether to read “*āpta*” for Gīrnār’s clear “*āpta*”; see Truman Michelson, “The Interrelation of the Dialects of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka 2: The Dialect of the Gīrnār Redaction,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31, no. 3 (1911): 235–236; E. Hultzsch, “Introduction: Grammar of the Gīrnār Rock-Edicts,” in *Inscriptions of Asoka: New Edition*, CII 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), lviii–lix. In this case, I opt for presenting the inscription as it actually stands (especially given the existence of MI forms like “*appa*,” “*appaṇaya*,” ultimately leading to Hindi “*apnā*,” “*āpā*,” “*āp*,” etc.). See *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, comp. R. L. Turner, 11 fascs. (London: Oxford University Press, 1962–66), s.v. “*ātmán*,” 51.

<sup>103</sup> Burnouf, Appendix X to *Le Lotus*, 755.

change. Kern went on to note that the English “sect”/“sectarian”—and, perhaps more significantly, the Greek “*haíresis*”—also developed a pejorative connotation over time; they gradually came to denote sects (and individual members of sects) other than the predominating or recognized ones: “eene andere secte dan de heerschende...iemand van eene andere secte dan de erkende, de gewone.”<sup>104</sup> Thus, as described by Kern, this pejorative sense indicates sects other than those to which one is accustomed, or sects other than those which are widely recognized or officially sanctioned (by society, by the state, etc.).

Towards the end of the 1800s, scholarly discussion of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” mainly turned to identifying its etymological relationship to the word “*parṣad*” (council, assembly, entourage), with this discussion largely appearing in the French and German philological literature of the time.<sup>105</sup> Already in 1873, Kern had connected “*pāṣaṇḍa*” to Skt. “*pārṣada*” and “*pārṣadya*”—both forms being derived from the word “*parṣad*” by adding the secondary suffixes (*taddhita pratyayas*) -*a* and -*ya*, respectively, plus *vṛddhi* strengthening of the vowel of the initial syllable.<sup>106</sup> Ultimately, Kern derived all three forms from the verbal root √*sad*, “sit.” As to the exact derivational steps through which √*sad* became “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” he only hypothesized that there was an original nasal in the root which must have been lost, but which was preserved in, for example, Skt. “*āsandī*” (a type of long chair or couch).<sup>107</sup> In 1880, Émile Senart stated his

---

<sup>104</sup> Hendrik Kern, *Over de Jaartelling der Zuidelijke Buddhisten en de Gedenkstukken van Açoka den Buddhist*, Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen: Afdeling Letterkunde 8 (Amsterdam: C. G. Van der Post, 1873), 66–67.

<sup>105</sup> On the legal significance of “*parṣad*,” see Robert Lingat, *The Classical Law of India*, trans. J. Duncan M. Derrett (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 15–17; 233. For a Vedic teacher having a “retinue” (*saparṣatkam*), as mentioned at *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* 3.2.52, see Hartmut Scharfe, *Education in Ancient India*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 2: India, 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 126–127 n. 66. On the relationship between *parṣad* and *pariṣad*, see below.

<sup>106</sup> Both derived forms signify “a member of an assembly, retinue, council, etc.”; thus, also, “companion,” “attendant.”

<sup>107</sup> Kern, *Over de Jaartelling*, 67. As he stated in 1888 and again in 1892, Georg Bühler agreed with Kern that Aśokan *pāsaṇḍa* must stand for Skt. “*pārṣada*,” based on the evidence of “*praṣaṇḍa*” and “*praṣaḍa*” in the Shāhbāz Garhī inscription (which Bühler believed actually stood for \**parṣaṇḍa* and \**parṣaḍa*). He did not, however

agreement with Kern (and with Burnouf and Wilson before him) as to the meaning of “*pāsaṃḍa*” in the Aśokan inscriptions: “...[I]l désigne l’ensemble des adhérents d’une croyance particulière et définie.”<sup>108</sup> Even so, in 1888, Senart went beyond Kern to specify a new theory for the exact process by which “*pāsaṃḍa*” might be derived from “*parśad*.” Senart believed that “*pāsaṃḍa*” developed directly from “*pārśada*,” through metathesis of the *-r-* to \**pāśarda*, followed by retroflexion of the *-d-* to \**pāśarḍa*, and, finally, the nasalization of the *-r-* (?).<sup>109</sup> This theory does not seem to have found much support amongst Senart’s contemporaries. A consonant cluster composed of *-r-* preceding *-d-* or *-dh-* in a Sanskrit word does sometimes appear as retroflexion in a Prakrit equivalent, as in Skt. *ardha* > Pā. *aḍḍha*, “part, half”; but this is not always the case, as with Skt. *mardana* > Pā. *maddana*, “crushing,” and Skt. *mardati* > Pkt. *maddai* or *maḍḍai*, “he/she/it crushes.”<sup>110</sup> Yet, following this model, we would expect \**pāsadda* or \**pāsadda*, for which we have no evidence. Furthermore, Senart’s explanation would not

---

make any mention of Kern’s hypothesis about a nasalized version of  $\sqrt{sad}$ , nor did he offer his own explanation of how “*pārśada*” became \**pārśaṃḍa*. His only addition to Kern’s hypothesis was that the retroflexion of *-d-* to *-ḍ-* could be attributed to “the phonetic laws of the Prakrit dialects,” i.e., the Prakritization of Skt. “*pārśada*.” See G. Bühler, “Correspondence: A New Asoka Inscription,” *The Academy: A Weekly Review of Literature, Science, and Art* 823, February 11, 1888, 100–101; G. Bühler, “Aśoka’s Twelfth Rock-Edict, According to the Shāhbāzgarhī Version,” *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. 1 (1892): 19 n. 41.

<sup>108</sup> Émile Senart, “Étude sur les Inscriptions de Piyadasi: Troisième article,” *Journal Asiatique*, 7th ser., 16 (August–September 1880): 248.

<sup>109</sup> Émile Senart, “Notes d’Épigraphie Indienne I,” *JA*, 8th ser., 11 (April–May–June 1888): 517–518. Senart gives as an example of such *-r-* nasalization Skt. *utkarṣa* > Pā. *ukkamsa*, “excellence.” However, this nasalization has nothing to do with the presence of *-r-* per se, but rather with how the so-called “law of mora” occasionally leads to a nasalized short vowel standing for a long vowel, since, in Pāli, both are considered “long” in terms of morae (the first *-a-* in *utkarṣa* would, in Sanskrit, be considered long since it comes directly before a consonant cluster); compare Skt. *jigīṣati* > Pā. *jigīṃsati*, “he/she/it desires to win.” What is more, this nasalization occurs especially frequently before a sibilant: Skt. *harṣa* > Pā. *haṃsa*, “bristling” (as in Pā. *lomahaṃsa*); Skt. *gharṣati* > Pā. *ghaṃsati*, “he/she/it rubs.” This rarely, if ever, occurs when *-r-* precedes *-d-*; the expected pattern is seen in the following: Skt. *dardara* > Pā. *daddara*, “a grinding or crashing sound”; Skt. *kardama* > Pā. *kaddama*, “mud”; Skt. *śārdūla* > Pā./Pkt. *saddūla*, “tiger.” On the “law of mora” in Pāli, see Wilhelm Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 1, no. 7 (Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner, 1916), 42–44; Thomas Oberlies, *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka, with a Concordance to Pischel’s Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 21–24.

<sup>110</sup> CDIAL, s.vv. “*mārdati*,” “*mardana*,” 568–569.



account for a form like “*praṣaṃḍa*,” which has a nasal before *-ḍ-* but also retains its *-r-*.<sup>111</sup> On the whole, such a dramatic metathesis of *-r-* followed by *-r- > -n-/-ṇ-* nasalization is altogether implausible. Nonetheless, Senart’s was a more complete theory for the etymological derivation of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” than the one given by Kern, and it remains perhaps the most detailed theory to be suggested by any scholar to date.

In 1889, K. F. Johansson expressed his dissatisfaction with Senart’s theory, even though he, like Senart, also derived “*pāṣaṇḍa*” directly from “*pārṣada*,” positing a reconstructed form \**pārṣanda* and stating that this form and “*pārṣada*” were “hybrids” (“zwitterformen”).<sup>112</sup> Like Kern, however, he attributed the nasal in “*pāṣaṇḍa*” to an alternate nasalized version of the root √*sad*, which was supposedly forgotten but would resurface from time to time. He did not appear to give a reason for the retroflexion of *-nd-* from \**pārṣanda* to “*pāṣaṇḍa*.” In 1894, Johansson argued that both “*pariṣad*” and “*parṣad*” were made up of the prefix *pari-* + √*sad*, *par-* being a secondary form of *pari-* having undergone the elision of *-i-*.<sup>113</sup> Johansson went on to argue that “*parṣad*” and “*pariṣad*” were originally two separate words (both stemming from the same components) which eventually merged due to their similar meanings.<sup>114</sup> In the same article, Johansson reiterated his assertion that MI “*pāsaṃḍa*” arose from “*pārṣada*” via \**pārṣanda*, again

---

<sup>111</sup> Senart’s only way to account for such forms was to conjecture that they were “*tatsamas graphiques*.” See Senart, “Notes d’Épigraphie Indienne I,” 518. For a skeptical view regarding this claim of “orthographic *tatsamas*,” see G. A. Grierson, “Linguistic Relationship of the Shahbazgarhi Inscription,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1904): 730; see also “Notes of the Quarter,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1904): 478.

<sup>112</sup> K. F. Johansson, “Der Dialekt der sogenannten Shāhbāzgarhi-redaktion der vierzehn Edikte des Königs Aṣoka,” in *Actes du Huitième Congrès International des Orientalistes, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiania*, sect. 2, *Aryenne*, fasc. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1892), 156. By “zwitterform,” Johansson meant a MI-Sanskrit hybrid form, like those seen in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>113</sup> K. F. Johansson, “Indische Miscellen,” *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde* 3 (1894): 198–201. Johansson believed this abbreviated form of *pari-* to be analogous to Greek *perí*, *per*, *hupér* (περί, περ, ὑπέρ), ultimately indicating an “*i*-less locative Indo-Germanic \**per*.”

<sup>114</sup> Johansson furthermore alleged that “*pariṣad/parṣad*” and the German verb *folgen*, “to follow,” could be traced to a single Indo-Germanic source. We need not go into the somewhat convoluted justification for this claim here.

mentioning a nasalized version of  $\sqrt{sad}$  and, like Kern, giving the word “*āsandī*” as supposed proof. Lastly and perhaps most interestingly, Johansson identified “*pāsaṃḍa*” as a Prakritization of “*pārṣada*” which then reentered into Sanskrit.<sup>115</sup>

In the first volume of his *Altindische Grammatik*, published in 1896, Jakob Wackernagel countered Johansson’s theory for explaining the relationship of “*pariṣad*” to “*parṣad*” with one of his own. Unlike Johansson’s abbreviated prefix, Wackernagel attributed the elision of *-i-* to hypersanskritization of the sort often seen in BHS, indicating a form of hypercorrection in the transformation of MI words to Sanskrit ones.<sup>116</sup> In such a scenario, the *-i-* in “*pariṣad*” would have been mistaken for the “epenthetic *-i-*” which often appears between two Prakrit consonants that would in Sanskrit form a consonant cluster (e.g., Skt. *kleśa* > Pā. *kileśa*).<sup>117</sup> Wackernagel referred to “*pārṣada*” as belonging to Epic Sanskrit, although its appearance in Yāska’s *Nirukta* would seem to weigh against designating it as such. When Otto Franke reviewed Wackernagel’s *Grammatik* the following year, Franke stated categorically that “*parṣad*” was *not* a hypersanskritization of “*pariṣad*”; he reasoned that “*parṣad*” being the basis for Aśoka’s “*pāsaṃḍa*” (through *pārṣada*) was proof of this.<sup>118</sup> Although Franke did not elaborate, we may understand him to be arguing that “*parṣad*” would need to be an early form, predating Aśoka, for it to be the foundation for “*pāsaṃḍa*.” We may also understand Franke to be arguing that, if *parṣad* was indeed a hypersanskritization, that fact would make MI “*pāsaṃḍa*” a Prakritization

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 200 n. 3. Cf. Johansson on “hybrid forms,” n. 112 above.

<sup>116</sup> Jakob Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, vol. 1, *Lautlehre* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896), 60.

<sup>117</sup> For the “epenthetic *-i-*,” see Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 1., *Grammar* William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953) 30; cf. “anaptyctic vowels,” Oberlies, *Pali: A Grammar*, 112–113; 366; Richard Pischel, *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen*, GIAPA 1, no. 8 (Strasbourg: Karl. J. Trübner, 1900), 141–142.

<sup>118</sup> R. Otto Franke, Review of *Altindische Grammatik*, vol. 1, *Lautlehre*, by Jakob Wackernagel, *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 23 (1897): 175–176.

of an already hybridized form (and Skt. “*pāṣaṇḍa*” a Sanskritization of a Prakritization, etc.). The series of necessary steps can be visually represented as follows:

Skt. *pariṣad* > Pā./MI *parisā* > HS *parṣad* ~ HS *pārṣada* > MI *pāsaṃḍa* > HS *pāṣaṇḍa*

Chronologically, this would make little sense, as hybridized forms in Sanskrit are held to date to a time later than Aśoka’s.<sup>119</sup> Franke appears to be one of the few supporters of Senart’s theory, stating that the *-ṃḍ-* in “*pāsaṃḍa*” stood for the double consonant *-ḍḍ-*, “die ihrerseits durch wanderung und darauf folgende assimilation des *r* hervorgerufen ist.”<sup>120</sup> By contrast, C. C. Uhlenbeck was apparently unwilling to settle on any particular one of the aforementioned theories; under the entry for “*pāṣaṇḍa*” in his *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch*, he asked, “Wie ist der nasal zu beurteilen?”<sup>121</sup> He may, however, have been partial to Kern’s theory, as “*āsandī*” is mentioned at the end of the entry.

F. W. Thomas was the last of the nineteenth-century Indologists to comment on the etymology of “*pāṣaṇḍa*.” In a study presented in 1899, Thomas theorized that *-ṇḍa* was a variant of the suffix *-da*, the history of which he traced through several Indo-European languages. As with some of Johansson’s more sweeping claims, the relative worth of Thomas’s larger arguments concerning an Indo-European *d*-suffix is largely irrelevant to the present study. Nevertheless, while stating his case, Thomas did come to several illuminating conclusions about Sanskrit words ending in *-ṇḍa* which have clear implications for our investigation of the etymology of “*pāṣaṇḍa*.” Thomas compiled an extensive list of words featuring the ending *-ṇḍa* and noticed that words having this ending often carried a hypocoristic or *kose* meaning, denoting

---

<sup>119</sup> Epigraphical evidence of hybrid Sanskrit forms begins to emerge in the late second century BCE. See Richard Salomon, *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Other Indo-Aryan Languages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 83–86. See also Edgerton, *Grammar*, 5.

<sup>120</sup> Franke, review of *Altindische*, 176.

<sup>121</sup> *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache*, comp. C. C. Uhlenbeck (Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 1898/1899), s.v. “*pāṣaṇḍas*,” 164.

endearment, familiarity, or derision—very much like a diminutive.<sup>122</sup> We will examine this hypocoristic quality of *-ṇḍa* in greater detail below. Thomas (perhaps somewhat like Franke; and, to a lesser degree, Johansson) did not believe “*parṣad*” to be a shortened form of *pariṣad*, but rather a separate word altogether, and one of “early authority”; neither did he follow Kern in connecting “*parṣad*” to  $\sqrt{sa(n)d}$ , instead seeing the final *-d* as evidence of his Indo-European suffix, i.e. *parṣa-d*, likewise in *tara-d* and *drṣa-d*.<sup>123</sup>

The sole theory to be presented in the twentieth century concerning the etymology of “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” proposed by H. W. Bailey in 1952, proves itself to be the least likely of all those examined here. Bailey saw “*pāṣaṇḍa*” as a Persian loan word springing from the Old Iranian root  $\sqrt{fras}$ , “ask,” cognate of Skt.  $\sqrt{prach}$ , and seen in Av. “*frašna*” (cf. Skt. “*praśna*”), “question; interrogation.”<sup>124</sup> As M. A. Dandamayev has noted, in old Iranian, this root took on a juridical or magisterial significance: in the context of a judicial investigation, it means “to judge” and “to punish”.<sup>125</sup> This sense is also evident in a related Khotanese word mentioned by Bailey, “*pharṣavata*,” indicating an official interrogator.<sup>126</sup> Bailey claimed that Aśokan *pāsaṇḍa* was originally Old Iranian \**frašanta*, “asking,” which theoretically then entered Khotanese as \**pharṣanda*, “(spiritual?) questioner,” and thence entered into Mauryan-era MI. Several serious problems with this theory are readily apparent. There is no discernible reason why a Persian loan word mostly applying to judges and royal officials should have been employed for groups of Indian ascetics. Bailey gives no indication of how a foreign loan word could have come to be generally associated with Indian religious groups throughout the subcontinent in the first place

---

<sup>122</sup> F. W. Thomas, “The D-Suffix,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* 5, pt. 2 (1900): 115.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 88; 117.

<sup>124</sup> H. W. Bailey, “Kusanica,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 14, no. 3 (1952): 427–428.

<sup>125</sup> Muhammad A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6 (Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers, 1992), 9.

<sup>126</sup> Bailey, “Kusanica,” 425–426.

(such that Aśoka would so widely use it in his rock and pillar inscriptions across northern India), or what necessity there would have been to look beyond local dialects to name those groups. Religious mendicants and ascetics were not solely to be found in Khotanese-speaking regions, nor were they especially associated with those regions. What is more, and as we will investigate in greater detail, there is a wealth of words in Sanskrit and MI featuring the ending *-ṇḍa*, a suffix attested in ancient Indian grammatical texts. A much more likely etymology is to be discovered by beginning our investigation there than by looking as far afield as ancient Persia.<sup>127</sup>

Bailey’s theory aside, any further speculation on the etymology of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” had more or less come to a halt by the early twentieth century. In 1932, D. R. Bhandarkar argued that Aśokan *pāsaṃḍa* and Skt. “*pāṣaṇḍa*” were two separate words existing contemporaneously in Aśoka’s day, with “*pāṣaṇḍa*” already meaning “heretic” from that early date based on evidence from the *Kauṭīlīya-Arthaśāstra*.<sup>128</sup> A Sanskrit equivalent for “*pāsaṃḍa*,” according to Bhandarkar, was not to be found in “*pāṣaṇḍa*” but in a reconstructed \**pārṣaṃḍa*. Still, other than the questionable claim that “*pāsaṃḍa*” and “*pāṣaṇḍa*” were distinct but contemporaneous words,

---

<sup>127</sup> Bailey mentions the word “*lipi/dipi*,” “inscription, written edict” (very likely a loan word from Old Persian which Aśoka used to refer to his own edicts), in support of his theory that “*pāṣaṇḍa*” is also of Iranian origin; *ibid.*, 428. The difference, however, is that Aśokan “*lipi/dipi*” has a demonstrable connection to a foreign milieu, not least of all because both the Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī systems of writing are arguably based (directly or indirectly) on the Aramaic script used by the Achaemenids, Seleucids, and Arsacids; see E. Hultzsch, “Introduction: Asoka’s Empire,” in *Inscriptions of Asoka: New Edition*, CII 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), xlii; Harry Falk, *Schrift im alten Indien: Ein Forschungsbericht mit Anmerkungen*, ScriptOralia 56 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1993), 258; Salomon, *Indian Epigraphy*, 28–30. “*Pāṣaṇḍa*” has no such clear connection to a Persian provenance. For two skeptical reactions to Bailey’s theory, see Romila Thapar, “Dissent and Protest in the Early Indian Tradition,” *Studies in History* 1, no. 2 (1979): 188; *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, comp. Manfred Mayrhofer, vol. 2 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1963), s.v. “*pāṣaṇḍah*,” 266; for a somewhat more favorable appraisal, see K. R. Norman, “Notes on the Greek Version of Aśoka’s Twelfth and Thirteenth Rock Edicts,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* No. 2 (1972): 113.

<sup>128</sup> D. R. Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, 2nd ed. (Kolkata: University of Calcutta, 1932), 156–157. It will be shown that the earliest instances of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” in KAŚ do *not* mean heretic. What is more, KAŚ would not provide direct evidence for language use in Aśoka’s time as it is generally accepted to have been composed much later, with its earliest identifiable strata having been composed between 50 CE and 125 CE. See Patrick Olivelle, introduction to *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra*, by Kauṭilya (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 26; 29. See also Section 1.5.2 below.

no new etymology is presented in this theory (Johansson having already proposed the same reconstructed form in 1889).<sup>129</sup> B. M. Barua gave a single line to the subject in his 1946 work on *Aśoka*, stating without further discussion that “*pāsaṃḍa*’s” development from Skt. “*pārṣada*” was evident from the reading “*praṣaṃḍa*” seen in the Shāhbāz Garhī inscription.<sup>130</sup>

By mid-century, the consensus among philologists seems to have been that the etymology of “*pāsaṃḍa*” would remain uncertain. In his 1957 annotations to Wackernagel’s 1896 *Altindische Grammatik*, Albert Debrunner remarked, in summation, “doch ist die Bildung von *pāsaṃḍa* unklar.”<sup>131</sup> Manfred Mayrhofer also admitted that difficulties remained in explaining the derivation of the word, even as he asserted that it was somehow to be connected with “*parśad/pariśad*”: “Trotz lautlichen Schwierigkeiten ist das Wort wohl kaum von *parśat* (*pariśad*-) und seinen Ableitungen *pāriśada*-..., *pārṣada*-, zu trennen.”<sup>132</sup> In 1968, P. V. Kane took issue with Barua’s assertion that “*pāsaṃḍa*” developed from “*pārṣada*,” saying, “It is difficult to see how from *pārṣada*...we can get *pāsaṃḍa* (phonetically as well as semantically), when it means a heretical sect (or even any sect or denomination).”<sup>133</sup> Kane did not, however, mention any of the older Indologists who held this view before Barua; nor did he go on to propose an alternative explanation.

---

<sup>129</sup> In the first edition of *Aśoka*, printed in 1925, Bhandarkar makes no mention of this reconstructed form, instead pointing to the word “*pārṣada*,” which he defines as “member of a *parśad*,” as being the Sanskrit equivalent of “*pāsaṃḍa*.” See D. R. Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, 1st ed. (Kolkata: University of Calcutta, 1925), 172.

<sup>130</sup> B. M. Barua, *Aśoka and his Inscriptions*, Parts 1 and 2 (Kolkata: New Age Publishers, 1946), 238.

<sup>131</sup> Albert Debrunner, *Jakob Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik: Nachträge zu Band I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), 37. See also p. 10 above.

<sup>132</sup> *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, s.v. “*pāsaṃḍaḥ*,” 265. See also W. B. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa: Die Jainas und die anderen Weltanschauungen vor der Zeitenwende: Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung, und Anmerkungen* (Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1977) 1: 219; see also n. 28 above, and Joel Brereton, “Pāsaṃḍa: Religious Communities in the Aśokan Inscriptions and Early Literature,” in *Grhastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 20 n. 3.

<sup>133</sup> P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra: Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 2nd rev. ed., Government Oriental Series/B 6 (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1968), 238.

## Section 1.5: From Aśokan “*Pāsaṃḍa*” to Purāṇic “*Pāṣaṇḍa*”

### 1.5.1 Prakrit and Middle Indic Sources

Joel Brereton has already made an initial effort to collect appearances of Prakrit/MI “*pāsaṃḍa*” outside the inscriptions of Aśoka in order to shed light on the question of the term’s early meaning.<sup>134</sup> I add here a number of texts not mentioned by Brereton which will serve to further flesh out our overall view of the semantic history of Prakrit/MI “*pāsaṃḍa*” through a corpus-based lexicological approach. Paying attention to related words and grammatical structures frequently appearing alongside “*pāsaṃḍa*” will illuminate both the history of the term and its specific meanings in individual texts.<sup>135</sup> Perhaps the earliest non-Aśokan use of MI “*pāsaṃḍa*” is found in the Jain king Khāravēla’s Hāthīgumphā cave inscription, located at Udayagiri in modern-day Odisha. Unfortunately, the inscription is undated and fragmentary; large portions are weathered to the point of being illegible. In the final line of this lengthy inscription, Khāravēla himself is described as *guṇavisesakusalo savapāsaṃḍapūjako*, “...skilled in excellent qualities, a worshiper of all sects....” The term thus has the same neutral meaning in Khāravēla’s inscription that it has in the Aśokan edicts; indeed, the phrasing looks very much like the “*savapāsaṃḍāni...pūjayati*” of RE XII.<sup>136</sup> Thapar even theorizes that Khāravēla was purposely emulating Aśoka in styling himself as *savapāsaṃḍapūjako*.<sup>137</sup> Although many

---

<sup>134</sup> Brereton, “Pāṣaṇḍa,” 20–42. Curiously, Brereton’s study does not take into account any Purāṇic materials related to *pāṣaṇḍas*.

<sup>135</sup> I am drawing on the insights of Todd L. Price and his discussion of using collocations (the words which accompany a term the meaning of which is under investigation) and colligations (the grammatical structures accompanying said term) in the study of the Greek New Testament. See Todd L. Price, “Collocations and Colligations (Part 1),” in *Structural Lexicology and the Greek New Testament: Applying Corpus Linguistics for Word Sense Possibility Delimitation Using Collocational Indicators*, Perspectives on Linguistics and Ancient Languages 6 (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2015), 97–125.

<sup>136</sup> See above, p. 24, especially n. 76.

<sup>137</sup> Romila Thapar, *The Past Before Us: Historical Traditions of Early North India* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), 330.

readings of damaged portions in the Hāthīgumphā inscription have been the subject of fierce scholarly debate, the reading of “*savapāsaṃdapūjako*” is undisputed.

No conclusive dating of the Hāthīgumphā inscription is possible either on paleographic grounds or based on the contemporaneous kings it mentions. Scholars have placed Khāravēla’s rule over the kingdom of Kāliṅga anywhere from the second century BCE to the first decades of the first century CE.<sup>138</sup> We may cautiously suggest that if Thapar is correct in her emulation hypothesis, Aśoka and his policies (and specifically the statements of his edicts, rather than, for example, the semi-legendary material about Aśoka found in later Buddhist sources) would need to still be fresh in the collective memory of the time; this would support an earlier date for Khāravēla’s reign, likely before the turn of the common era.<sup>139</sup> More significant for our present study is the occurrence, in both Aśoka’s and Khāravēla’s inscriptions, of *pāsaṃḍa* alongside MI “*sava* (Skt. *sarva*),” “all,” implying numerousness, a multiplicity of different sects. The importance of this seemingly minor point will become clear as we investigate other occurrences of “*pāsaṃḍa/pāsaṇḍa*.”

### ***Pāli Pāsaṇḍa***

Turning now to appearances of “*pāsaṇḍa*” in Pāli texts, we may briefly summarize Brereton’s analysis of the *Sīsūpacālā Sutta* (SN I.133–134) found in the *Bhikkhunī Saṃyutta* of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*.<sup>140</sup> A close parallel to this *sutta* is found in the *Cālātherīgāthā* (Thīg 182–

---

<sup>138</sup> For a discussion of the dates suggested by various scholars, see John Cort, *Framing the Jina: Narratives of Icons and Idols in Jain History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 41.

<sup>139</sup> Upinder Singh has recently suggested a mid-first century BCE date for Khāravēla. See Upinder Singh, *Inscribing Power on the Realm: Royal Ideology and Religious Policy in India c. 200 BCE–300 CE* (Amsterdam, J. Gonda Fund Foundation of the KNAW, 2022), 6. Singh has also suggested that Khāravēla was openly mimicking the language of Aśoka’s inscriptions in attempt to show that he had in fact surpassed him, using imagery of “wealth and opulence...to establish Khāravēla’s reputation and superiority in relation to Aśoka”; *ibid.*, 15.

<sup>140</sup> In all editions of the Pāli Canon I have consulted, the -ṇ- of *pāsaṇḍa* is written out and not merely represented by an *anusvāra* (unlike, for example, the spelling seen in the Aśokan inscriptions or in many Jain Prakrit texts). In order to reflect this, I switch to the spelling *pāsaṇḍa* when referring to the term as it appears in Pāli.



188).<sup>141</sup> The nuns Sīsūpacālā (also spelled Sīsūpacālā) and Cālā are two of the three sisters of the monk Sāriputta.<sup>142</sup> In both of these texts, one of the nuns is questioned by the demon Māra. Although, as the titles suggest, a different sister is involved in the *Sīsūpacālā Sutta* vs. the *Cālātherīgāthā*, their responses to Māra’s questions are virtually identical. While Sīsūpacālā/Cālā is sitting in the Andhavana forest outside of Sāvatti, Māra appears and asks her, “Whose sect do you like, nun?”<sup>143</sup> She answers, “I, sir, do not like any sect at all!”<sup>144</sup> Māra then proceeds to mock her, asking how she can be an ascetic and not belong to a sect, ultimately saying she must be deluded (*momuhā/momūhā*).<sup>145</sup> The nun explains, “Outside of this (i.e. outside of Buddha’s doctrine), sectarians take pleasure in [mere] speculative views. I do not like their teachings, they are not experts of Dharma.”<sup>146</sup> The *Therīgāthā* version gives her further response as: “They do not understand Dharma, they are not experts of Dharma.”<sup>147</sup> She states that the Buddha, on the other hand, taught her the Dharma which is characterized by “the transcending of speculative views (*diṭṭhinaṃ samatikkamaṃ*)”; she then lists the Four Noble Truths.<sup>148</sup> Referring again to the Buddha, her final words in the SN version are, “*tassa rocemi sāsanaṃ ’ti*.”<sup>149</sup> Sīsūpacālā/Cālā says “*sāsana*” here instead of “*pāsaṇḍa*,” as Brereton rightly notes, and the implication is clear enough: the Buddha’s *sāsana* is no mere sect.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> The *Cālātherīgāthā* is not mentioned by Brereton and does not figure into his analysis of the *Sīsūpacālā Sutta*.

<sup>142</sup> According to legend, all three sisters took ordination as Buddhist nuns; see ThīgA 162, DhA II.188.

<sup>143</sup> *kassa nu tvaṃ bhikkhuni pāsaṇḍaṃ rocesī ’ti*; by GRETIL numbering, SN 1.5.8.2.

<sup>144</sup> *na khv’āhaṃ āvuso, kassaci pāsaṇḍaṃ rocemī ’ti*. SN 1.5.8.3.

<sup>145</sup> SN 1.5.8.4.

<sup>146</sup> *ito bahiddhā pāsaṇḍā || diṭṭhisu pasīdanti ye || na tesam dhammam rocemi || na te dhammassa kovidā ||* SN 1.5.8.5.

<sup>147</sup> *na te dhammam vijānanti || na te dhammassa kovidā ||* Thīg 184.

<sup>148</sup> Thīg 185–186.

<sup>149</sup> SN 1.5.8.5. Albeit with slightly different wording, the version at Thīg 187 also ends with Cālā stating that, upon hearing the Buddha’s teachings, she was pleased, and that it was his doctrine that she liked: *tassāhaṃ vacanaṃ sutvā, vihariṃ sāsane ratā*.

<sup>150</sup> Brereton, “Pāsaṇḍa,” 23–24. Pā. “*sāsana*” / Skt. “*śāsana*” is a complex term, especially so in Buddhist contexts. “*Buddhasāsana*,” one of the most common Pāli terms for what one follows in becoming a follower of the Buddha (*yo ha ve daharo bhikkhu yuñjati buddhasāsane so imaṃ lokaṃ pabhāseti*, “Indeed, that young monk who joins the

Elsewhere in the Pāli canon, “*pāsaṇḍa*” appears with its fully neutral meaning. In the *Milindapañha*, a completely neutral use of the term appears in a simile given by the monk Nāgasena to the Bactrian Greek king Milinda. When Milinda asks Nāgasena to explain the usefulness of the austere religious practices (*dhutaṅga*) taken on by Buddhist ascetics, Nāgasena responds with a series of lengthy similes. In one of these similes, he compares a capable Buddhist ascetic to a sovereign ruler having complete power over his entire realm. Such a ruler is surrounded by his subjects, his army, and a variety of other members of the royal entourage (*rājaparīsā*).<sup>151</sup> We find in the list of groups reverently approaching the king the term *samaṇabrāhmaṇasabbapāsaṇḍagaṇā*, “groups of ascetics and Brahmins of all sects.” A translation of “heretics” for *pāsaṇḍa* in this instance would be entirely out of place.<sup>152</sup> We might also justifiably assume Buddhists to be included in *sabbapāsaṇḍagaṇā*, so that the insider/outsider, *sāsana/pāsaṇḍa* distinction seen in the *Sīsupacālā Sutta* would not apply.

---

*buddhasāsana* illuminates this world...” Dhp 382.25.23), is often translated as “the Buddha’s dispensation,” or “the Buddha’s teaching.” In several modern Southeast Asian languages that have incorporated it from Pāli, the word has come to generally mean “religion” (in Thai, for example, Christianity is *sāsanā khrit*, “the *sāsana* of Christ”). Olivelle is right to point out that Skt. “*sāsana*” is a politically charged term, and that the concept of *buddhasāsana* is likely part of the mirror-image representation of the Buddha as both world-renouncing ascetic and world-conquering monarch (*cakravartin*) which recurs throughout Pāli texts; Patrick Olivelle, “The Ascetic and the Domestic in Brahmanical Religiosity,” in *Asceticism and Its Critics: Historical Accounts and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Oliver Freiberger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 26. “*Śāsana*” has strong legal and governmental overtones; it can mean a royal decree, proclamation, or order; royal rule and dominion; government in general; and especially chastisement, correction, discipline, or punishment at the hands of an instructor or ruler. “*Śāsana*” can also mean a contract, official document, or authoritative text; that the words “*śāsana*” and “*śāstra*” are closely related is noteworthy. A slightly less political but equally valid translation of *śāsana/sāsana* is “message”—a *śāsanahārin* is a messenger or envoy.

<sup>151</sup> It is interesting that the word “*parīsā*” is used here, given the possible etymological connection of “*pariṣad*” to “*pāsaṇḍa*” as described above.

<sup>152</sup> T. W. Rhys Davids’s translation gives, “...Samanas and Brahmans, and the followers of every sect...,” reflecting the neutral use of the term; see *The Questions of King Milinda*, Part 2, trans. by T. W. Rhys Davids, Sacred Books of the East 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894), 266. I. B. Horner’s translation, on the other hand, has “...recluses and brahmans and groups of every (heretical) sect...” The fact that she includes “heretical” only parenthetically may indicate that she was uncertain of the appropriateness of a pejorative interpretation; see *Milinda’s Questions*, vol. 2, trans. by I. B. Horner, Sacred Books of the Buddhists 23 (London: Luzac & Co., 1969), 220. Indeed, it makes little sense for a righteous king to be reverently approached by groups of heretics in this simile.

Even in examples from the Pāli Canon where “*pāsaṇḍa*” is seen to carry its semi-pejorative sense—being used only for sects other than one’s own, the sects of “outsiders,” as in the *Sīsupacālā Sutta*—translating the term as “heretic” would most often lead to awkward tautologies. Such is the case in a passage from the *Samantapāsādikā*, the commentary to the Theravāda Vinaya monastic code. This text includes an account of the Third Buddhist Council which, according to Theravāda tradition, was convened by Aśoka himself. After a description of Aśoka’s supposed supernormal abilities, which he possessed by virtue of being a *cakravartin*, Sp provides a legendary retelling of how Aśoka came to espouse Buddhism: “The king (Aśoka), it is said, having received consecration, followed an outside sect [i.e. a non-Buddhist sect, *bāhirapāsaṇḍam*] for just three years. He rejoiced in the teaching of the Buddha in the fourth year (of his reign). His father Bindusāra, it is said, was a worshipper of Brahmins. He gave a continuous supply of food to Brahmins, sects belonging to Brahmins, pale-colored mendicants, etc., numbering sixty thousand.”<sup>153</sup> According to this account, Aśoka initially continued his father’s practice of feeding sixty thousand non-Buddhist mendicants, specified as *paṇḍaraṅgaparibbājakājīvaka-nigaṇṭhādayo*, “pale-colored mendicants, Ājīvikas, Jains, etc.”<sup>154</sup> He quickly grew displeased, however, because of their visible lack of tranquility and discipline. A shorter version of the same narrative is found in the great Pāli chronicle, the *Mahāvamsa*: “Having seen their [i.e., the ascetics’] unstillness at the meal, Aśoka ordered his ministers: ‘Having examined (the ascetics), I will give alms.’ Having (thus) ordered, having examined the

---

<sup>153</sup> *Rājā kira abhisekaṃ pāpunivā tīṇi yeva saṃvaccharāni bāhirapāsaṇḍam pariṅaṇhi, catutthe saṃvacchare buddhasāsane pasīdi | Tassa kira pitā Bindusāro brāhmaṇabhatto ahosi | So brāhmaṇānañ ca brāhmaṇajātiyapāsaṇḍānañ ca paṇḍaraṅgaparibbājakādīnaṃ saṅghisahasamattānaṃ niccabhattaṃ paṭṭhapesi |* verse 46, p. 167 in N. A. Jayawickrama’s edition. Here *jātiya=jātika*; Pā. *brāhmaṇabhatto*= Skt. *brāhmaṇabhaktaḥ*. Some texts have *bāhirakapāsaṇḍam*, but this would not change the meaning.

<sup>154</sup> The “pale color” of these *paribbājakas* could either refer to their being clothed in white or being covered in ash and dust, like the Pāśupatas.

various sectarians individually, (and) having given (them) food, the wise (Aśoka) sent (them all) away.”<sup>155</sup> In both versions, after having observed the ascetics and found them lacking in serenity, the king thereupon encountered the Buddhist monk Nigrodha. Seeing Nigrodha’s spiritual composure caused Aśoka to gain faith in Buddhism.<sup>156</sup> Following his conversion, Aśoka discontinued the feeding of the sixty thousand non-Buddhist sectarians and instead began offering daily meals to sixty thousand Buddhist monks.

Here we see “*pāsaṇḍa*” having a decidedly negative tone in a story with a clear sectarian slant, centering on the triumph of Buddhism over its rivals. Nevertheless, translating *pāsaṇḍa* as “heretic” or “heretical sect” leads to infelicitous repetition. With “*bāhirapāsaṇḍa*,” it is obviously repetitive if we translate with “an outside heretical sect.”<sup>157</sup> All heretics and infidels are by definition outsiders from a subjective standpoint where one believes oneself to be a holder of correct doctrine. The case is similar with the word “*brāhmaṇajātiyapāsaṇḍānaṃ*,” “sects belonging to/made up of Brahmins.” All Brahmanical sects are, from a Buddhist perspective, heretical. In these cases from Sp and Mhv, “*pāsaṇḍa*” still seems to mean simply “a sect,” even as it is being strictly applied only to non-Buddhist sects in a context where Buddhism is being elevated above its rivals.

---

<sup>155</sup> *Disvānupasamaṃ tesaṃ Asoko parivesane | vīveyya dānaṃ dassan’ti amacce saṃniyojayi || Ānāpayitvā matimā nānāpāsaṇḍike visuṃ | vīmaṃsitvā nisajjāya bhojāpetvā visajjayi ||* Mhv 5.35–36.

<sup>156</sup> Unbeknownst to Aśoka, Nigrodha was, in fact, Bindusāra’s grandson and Aśoka’s nephew. When Aśoka had killed his brother Sumana to seize the throne, Sumana’s pregnant wife saved herself by fleeing to a caṇḍāla village where she gave birth to Nigrodha. Nigrodha’s biography can be found at verse 47, p. 167–168 in Jayawickrama’s edition, and at Mhv 5.38–61.

<sup>157</sup> Past translations have been marred by such awkward repetitions. Jayawickrama translates *bāhirapāsaṇḍa* as “outside heretical sect” and *brāhmaṇajātiyapāsaṇḍānaṃ* as “heretical teachers born of the Brahmin caste”; see Buddhaghosa, *The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna: Being a Translation and Edition of the Bāhiranidāna of Buddhaghosa’s Samantapāsādikā, the Vinaya Commentary*, trans. N. A. Jayawickrama, Sacred Books of the Buddhists 21 (London: Luzac & Co., 1962), 39. Madhav Deshpande, in a study of the Aśokan epithet *devānaṃpiya*, also quotes and translates these lines from Sp, rendering *bāhirapāsaṇḍa* as “outsider-heretic.” See Madhav M. Deshpande, “Interpreting the Aśokan Epithet *devānaṃpiya*,” in *Aśoka in History and Historical Memory*, ed. Patrick Olivelle (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2009), 37.

## The *Samayasāra*

Kundakunda's *Samayasāra* provides a unique case of “*pāsaṃḍa*” being used to criticize sectarianism itself, as part of a radical redefinition of the Jain process of liberation. The composition of *Ssā* took place in a context of major philosophical innovations, both within Jainism and outside of it. As W. J. Johnson has demonstrated, *Ssā* puts forward an oftentimes dramatic reconfiguration of Jaina doctrine, bearing close affinities with Mahāyāna Buddhist, Vedāntic, and Sāṃkhya philosophical concepts.<sup>158</sup> At the same time, Kundakunda seems to defuse the sectarian threat those concepts pose by adapting them to more traditional Jain frameworks.<sup>159</sup> The nature of the text means that the use of “*pāsaṃḍa*” in *Ssā* has as much to say about intra-community dynamics as about inter-sectarian polemics.

As far as dating is concerned, Johnson describes the difficulty posed by *Ssā*'s being a “layered” or “composite” text, with the text as it has come down to us showing evidence of, “substantial modification and addition, probably as a result of non-Jaina philosophical influences.”<sup>160</sup> The main doctrinal difference between earlier and later strata of *Ssā* concerns the nature of the soul and whether it is ever truly tainted by the accumulation of karmic effluents (*āsravas*) caused by a person's actions. Some verses stress a more traditional reasoning of freedom from passion as the mechanism by which the *jīva* is released from karmic fetters.<sup>161</sup> However, the main philosophical thrust of *Ssā* involves the more radical view that the *jīva* is in reality always untouched by karma, and that bondage in *samsāra* only comes about through

---

<sup>158</sup> See W. J. Johnson, *Harmless Souls: Karmic Bondage and Religious Change in Early Jainism with Special Reference to Umāsvāti and Kundakunda* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995), 137; 232–233; 252–253; 303.

<sup>159</sup> One such framework is the Jain doctrine of *anekāntavāda*. For an example of Kundakunda trying to bring his more radical innovations in line with *anekāntavāda*, see Johnson's discussion of *Ssā* 345–348; Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 246–247.

<sup>160</sup> Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 96. A similar “composite” nature can be spoken of with regard to the Purāṇas and parts of the Sanskrit epics.

<sup>161</sup> See, for example, the discussion of *Ssā* 237–241 in Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 291.

ignorance of the *jīva*'s true nature. This is Ssā's "gnostic" layer, where liberation occurs by coming to know the *jīva*'s pure essence and not, as orthodox Jain teachings profess, by a stopping of all karma.<sup>162</sup> Johnson cites E. H. Johnston's view that this layer uses Sāṃkhya terminology from the third or fourth century CE, which may help to date verses from this portion of Ssā.<sup>163</sup>

The verses relevant to the present study are found at Ssā 408–413, at the very end of the text.<sup>164</sup> According to Ssā 408, only the deluded think liberation is achieved through the outward "marks" (*liṅgas*) of religious practice: "Fools, having taken up the marks of sectarian ascetics or the marks of householders, which are of many kinds, say 'this mark is the path to liberation.'"<sup>165</sup> Whether the "marks" be those of sectarian ascetics or those of lay householder-disciples, true *arhats* renounce such marks along with their own bodies (*dehaṇim*) and instead devote themselves to (right) vision, wisdom, and practices (*daṃsaṇaṇāṇacarittāṇi*).<sup>166</sup> It is not made explicit whether "*liṅga*" here might also refer to physical sectarian marks painted or branded on the skin. Ssā 152 indicates, however, that it certainly does include all external religious practices like ascetic *tapas* and lay vow-taking: anyone who practices *tapas* or takes a religious vow without recognizing the highest truth (*paramatṭha*, i.e. the pure essential self) only practices a fool's *tapas* (*bālatavaṃ*) or a fool's vow (*bālavaḍaṃ*).<sup>167</sup> We can thus understand all the external

---

<sup>162</sup> See Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 239–246. See also Johnson's discussion of similar ideas in Kundakunda's *Pravacanasāra*, *ibid*, 200–203.

<sup>163</sup> See E. H. Johnston, *Early Sāṃkhya: An Essay on its Historical Development According to the Texts* (London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1937), 14 n. 1. Johnson seems hesitant to give his own hypothesis as to the dates of Kundakunda or Ssā, only saying that some passages from Ssā could be even later than the fourth century; see Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 95.

<sup>164</sup> Derivatives of "*pāsaṃḍā*" occur three times in Ssā; all three instances are found in these verses.

<sup>165</sup> "*Pāsaṃḍiyaliṅgāṇi va gihaliṅgāṇi va bahuppayārāṇi | ghettuṃ vadanti mūḍhā liṅgam iṇaṃ mokkhamaggo 'tti.*" Some manuscripts read "ya" for "va," "gihiliṅgāṇi" for "gihaliṅgāṇi," and "ghittuṃ" for "ghettuṃ." For Johnson's translation of this verse, see Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 295.

<sup>166</sup> Ssā 409. Right vision, conduct, and practice are traditional Jain religious concepts here reoriented by Kundakunda towards knowledge of the true self.

<sup>167</sup> See Johnson's discussion of Ssā 152 at Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 280.

trappings of ascetic and lay religious practice to be the *liṅgas* at issue. “*Pāsaṃḍa*” in Ssā 408–413 does not necessarily refer only, or even primarily, to non-Jain ascetics, although they, too, come under Kundakunda’s criticism. Rather, Jain adepts aspiring to liberation are Kundakunda’s target audience.<sup>168</sup> Furthermore, as Johnson points out, the *giha/pāsaṃḍa* lexical pair is replaced at Ssā by *sāgāra/aṇagāra*, “*anagāra*” being a term typically applied to Jain ascetics.<sup>169</sup> Thus, “*pāsaṃḍa*” in these verses encompasses all ascetics, Jain or not: *any* ascetic of *any* sect who mistakes the outward trappings of his or her asceticism for the path to liberation is a fool. And any Jain ascetic who does not recognize the self’s true nature is practicing a fool’s asceticism. We may thus have a distinction being made in Ssā that is somewhat analogous to the one made by Sīsupacālā—that is, a distinction between mere *pāsaṃḍas* and true *arhats*. All this being said, although these verses seem to cast sectarianism in a less than positive light, “*pāsaṃḍa*” itself is still fairly close to its neutral usage.

### 1.5.2 Sanskrit sources

#### The *Kauṭīlīya-Arthaśāstra*

The attitude towards *pāṣaṇḍas* in the juridico-political KĀŚ is no less ambiguous than in the Prakrit sources just examined.<sup>170</sup> Wherever they are mentioned in KĀŚ, *pāṣaṇḍas* are always set apart from Vedic theologians and ascetics, who enjoy privileges and protections which *pāṣaṇḍas* lack.<sup>171</sup> For example, proprietors of religious rest houses (*dharmāvasathas*) were required to report to city officials when any *pāṣaṇḍas* were lodging with them; no such

---

<sup>168</sup> The question of whether this would include *lay* adepts—and whether Kundakunda’s innovations obviate the need for (external) renunciation altogether—is left open. See Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 229; 302–303.

<sup>169</sup> See Johnson, *Harmless Souls*, 296–297.

<sup>170</sup> “*Pāṣaṇḍa*” and its derivatives appear a total of twelve times in KĀŚ.

<sup>171</sup> Vedic scholars and ascetics are most often referred to in KĀŚ as *śrotriyas* and *tapasvins*, respectively.

requirement existed for *śrotriyas* and *tapasvins* staying at those same establishments.<sup>172</sup> However discriminatory such statements may be, they do not amount to evidence that “*pāṣaṇḍa*” had yet become a pejorative. Indeed, other passages in KĀŚ would indicate the opposite. KĀŚ 3.16.32–33 makes no legal distinction between Vedic theologians and *pāṣaṇḍas* with regard to usucaption: *śrotriyas* and *pāṣaṇḍas* alike only gain direct ownership of property through an act of the king, and not by the sheer fact of being permitted to use that property.<sup>173</sup> It is perhaps surprising to see Vedic priests on a level with *pāṣaṇḍas* here, if only in legal terms. More to the point is the fact that a pejorative use of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” would make no sense in these verses. The context has only to do with *pāṣaṇḍas*’ legal standing and has nothing at all to do with their moral qualities.

The few instances in KĀŚ where sectarians are discussed in a disparaging way always feature the word “*vṛṣala*” rather than “*pāṣaṇḍa*.”<sup>174</sup> In each of these verses, it is implied that *vṛṣalas* are of bad character or are to be avoided.<sup>175</sup> The most relevant example occurs at KĀŚ

---

<sup>172</sup> KĀŚ 2.36.5. Although the verse does not specify which authorities should be notified, it is implied that *pāṣaṇḍas* should be reported to either a *nāgarika* or a *sthānika*, who are both mentioned in verses directly prior to KĀŚ 2.36.5. It must also be mentioned that it is not entirely clear in KĀŚ whether the king should allow *pāṣaṇḍas* within his domain at all. KĀŚ 2.1.32 cautions the king that, among all manners of renunciants (*pravrajitabhāvaḥ*), the only ones he should allow to settle within his territory are Vedic ascetics in the forest hermit stage of life (i.e., *vānaprastha*). Yet other passages (one of them being KĀŚ 2.36.5 just examined) betray the fact that *pāṣaṇḍas* already resided more or less freely within the kingdom. See Olivelle’s note to KĀŚ 2.4.23, in Kauṭilya, *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya’s Arthasāstra*, trans. Patrick Olivelle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 507.

<sup>173</sup> See Brereton’s brief discussion of this verse at Brereton, “Pāṣaṇḍa,” 28.

<sup>174</sup> “*Vṛṣala*” is a diminutive formed by adding the ending *-la* to “*vṛṣa*, man.” It seems to have been exclusively used as a pejorative to mean a contemptible or low-born person, and it often appears in close connection to Śūdras, *mlecchas*, and *pāṣaṇḍas*. See H. K. Deb, “Was Candragupta low-born?,” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 8, no. 3 (1932), 466–471; on the diminutive suffix *-la*, see G. C. Tripathi, “On the formation of the word Śakuntalā,” *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 31/32, no. 1/2 (1970–1971; 1971–1972), 39–43.

<sup>175</sup> Two instances involve a female *vṛṣalī*: KĀŚ 1.12.5 includes “*muṇḍā vṛṣalyah*” in a list of people of questionable morals who can be coerced into acting as secret agents for the king; this passage is unquestionably referring to bald nuns, or bald female ascetics of one kind or another, who belong to non-Vedic sects. KĀŚ 3.14.37 includes the husband of a *vṛṣalī* in a list of people who defile a sacrifice by participating in it. It is not clear, however, whether “*vṛṣalī*” at KĀŚ 3.14.37 is referring to a woman belonging to a heretical sect, or is more generally referring to a female Śūdra, barbarian, etc. On KĀŚ 1.12.5 and KĀŚ 3.14.37, see Mark McClish, “Political Brahmanism and the State: A Compositional History of the *Arthasāstra*,” PhD diss. (University of Texas at Austin, 2009), 272–273 n. 405. These three instances are the only occurrences of “*vṛṣala*” in KĀŚ.



3.20.16, where a fine is imposed on anyone who would feed Buddhist or Ājīvika ascetics—or ascetics from other such sects—as part of Vedic rituals for the gods or for one’s ancestors. Here, Buddhist and Ājīvika ascetics are referred to as “*vr̥ṣalapravrajitān*,” figuring them as “despicable/vile/wicked recluses.”<sup>176</sup> The phrase “*vr̥ṣalapravrajitān*” serves to denigrate Buddhist ascetics, Ājīvika ascetics, and all others like them; it also functions to call into question their spiritual validity vis-à-vis the priestly authority of Vedic orthodoxy. Such being the case, if “*pāṣaṇḍa*” had acquired its full vituperative force by this time, then we would have every reason to expect it instead of “*vr̥ṣala*” in this verse. We may conclude that KAŚ represents a period during which sectarian divisions between Vedic and non-Vedic religious groups were taking on a new importance and a new solidity, as was being reflected in new theories of state governance diverging from the Aśokan model of many sects under one imperial dharma. Nevertheless, the vocabulary of conflict and castigation had not yet fully formed.

### **The *Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra***

The best scholarly estimates assign the composition and redaction of BhNŚ to roughly the same period as the composition and redaction of KAŚ—that is, somewhere around the last two centuries BCE and the first two centuries CE.<sup>177</sup> Being a dramaturgical manual, BhNŚ generally has little to say about sectarian interactions during the time it was composed. Buddhists and Jains are often listed alongside *śrotṛiyas* matter-of-factly and without further comment when

---

<sup>176</sup> “*Śākyājīvakādīn vr̥ṣalapravrajitān devapitr̥kāryeṣu bhōjayataḥ śatyō daṇḍaḥ.*” Based on the openly antagonistic stance towards non-Vedic religious groups seen in this verse, Olivelle takes it to be a somewhat later interpolation, precisely because such a stance seems to be lacking in the rest of KAŚ. See Olivelle’s note to KAŚ 3.20.16, in Kautīlya, *King, Governance, and Law*, 622; see also McClish, “Political Brahmanism,” 272–273 n. 405. I agree with Olivelle’s assessment; however, taking into consideration that Ājīvikas are mentioned (rather than, say, Jains) and that “*vr̥ṣala*” is used instead of “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” I would be hesitant to assign it to a date very much later than 200 CE.

<sup>177</sup> For the dating of the composition and redaction of KAŚ, see McClish, “Political Brahmanism,” 309–315; Patrick Olivelle, introduction to *King, Governance, and Law*, 28–31. For the dating of the composition and redaction of BhNŚ, see P. V. Kane, “Outlines of the History of Alankāra Literature: The Chronology of Alankāra Literature, Part II,” *Indian Antiquary* 46 (1917), 174–183.

the text discusses how members of these religious groups should be depicted on stage.<sup>178</sup> As in KĀŚ, we find instances of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” being used as an entirely neutral term.<sup>179</sup> However, one curious step in the ritual for consecrating the building site of a new playhouse is suggestive of how social perceptions of *pāṣaṇḍas* may have been shifting. The ritual given in BhNŚ for laying the new playhouse’s foundation is distinctly Brahmin-centric, with gifts being made to Brahmin priests at various stages of the building process. From the very start, before the initial measurements have been made on-site, gifts should be given to Brahmin priests when they have chosen an auspicious astrological date for the groundbreaking.<sup>180</sup> Once the basic floor plan has been laid out, BhNŚ gives the following requirement for the success of the ritual: “Inauspicious things are indeed to be removed [from the vicinity]; thus, ascetics who are sectarians [should be driven away], and also such men [as] ones who wear red garments and also ones who are impaired/disturbed.”<sup>181</sup> The wearing of red garments, as we are now well aware, is a very common, thinly veiled reference to Buddhist monks. This verse mirrors similar attitudes found in

---

<sup>178</sup> See, for example, BhNŚ 21.151, where it is stated that actors portraying Buddhists, Jains, and *śrotriyas* should all be bald (*śākyaśrotriyanirgranthaparivrāḍḍikṣiteṣu ca śiromuṇḍam tu kartavyam*). Note, however, BhNŚ 17.38, where, although being listed alongside Buddhists, *śrotriyas* seem to nevertheless be set apart from them by the adjective “*cokṣa/caukṣya*,” “pure.”

<sup>179</sup> See, for example, BhNŚ 17.79: after specifying that Buddhist and Jain characters should be addressed by the term “*bhadanta*,” BhNŚ states that the remaining sects (*pāṣaṇḍāḥ śeṣāḥ*) should be addressed according to their own conventions (*svasamayāśritaiḥ*). See also BhNŚ 35.66 (according to the numbering in M. Ghosh’s 1956 edition), where it is said that a *sūtradhāra* should be “*nānāpāṣaṇḍakāryajñāḥ*”; see Bharata, *The Nāṭyaśāstra Ascribed to Bharata-Muni: the Original Sanskrit text edited with Introduction and Various Readings from MSS. and printed texts*, vol. 2, ed. M. Ghosh (Calcutta: Calcutta Asiatic Society, 1956), 204. “*Pāṣaṇḍa*” appears four times in BhNŚ.

<sup>180</sup> BhNŚ 2.32.

<sup>181</sup> BhNŚ 2.37cd–38ab: “*Utsāryāṇi tv aniṣṭāni pāṣaṇḍyāśramiṇas tathā | kāṣāyavasanās caiva vikalās caiva ye narāḥ.*” Variant readings for “*pāṣaṇḍyāśramiṇaḥ*” include “*pāṣaṇḍāśramiṇaḥ*” and “*pāṣaṇḍāśramaṇaḥ*” (?). See Bharata, *Bhāratīya-Nāṭya-Çāstram: Trait  De Bharata Sur Le Th atre*, vol. 1, *Texte Sanskrit*, ed. Joanny Grosset (Paris: E. Leroux 1898), 18 (BhNŚ 2.40 in Grosset’s edition). “*Vikala*” in this verse is often taken to refer to people who are crippled or handicapped in some way, but here it could be referring back to *pāṣaṇḍas*, describing them as being mentally deficient or confused people; the verse is somewhat vague. Regardless, the effect is clear: *pāṣaṇḍas* are inauspicious and to be grouped with the physically and mentally impaired.

the *Mṛcchakaṭīka*, where seeing a non-Vedic ascetic is likewise declared to be an ill omen.<sup>182</sup>

This verse is evidence that “*pāṣaṇḍa*” as a term was moving ever further away from neutral categorization and ever closer to invective; sectarian ascetics appear as unwanted (“unwished for” being a literal translation of “*aniṣṭa*”), unlucky, deficient.

### **Purāṇic “*pāṣaṇḍa*”**

Between the third and the fourth century CE, we see Sanskrit “*pāṣaṇḍa*” begin to change dramatically, both in its frequency of appearance and its manner of use. It is no coincidence that this time period also marks the beginning of a great swell of Purāṇic literature being composed over the next several centuries. It will be demonstrated that the transformation of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” into a pejorative denoting heresy takes place largely within and because of sectarian Purāṇic literature, especially Purāṇic descriptions of the Kali Yuga. We have already seen glimmers of this transformation in some of the texts we have just examined. To supplement that discussion and to illustrate the final transition of “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” we can take the Sanskrit epics, the *Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*, and some of the early Purāṇas themselves as case studies to compare word frequency and meaning. Within this rough framework, the epics are the earliest texts and the Purāṇas the latest, with MDhŚ falling somewhere in between; however, there was likely considerable temporal overlap in the composition, expansion, and redaction of all three text groups. Comparing instances of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” to instances of two other closely related pejoratives, “*nāstika*” and “*vṛṣala*,” it emerges that pejorative “*pāṣaṇḍa*” is virtually absent from the Sanskrit epics, with “*nāstika*” and “*vṛṣala*” appearing with far greater frequency. The situation is reversed by the time we reach the early Purāṇas, with “*pāṣaṇḍa*” largely supplanting the other two terms.

---

<sup>182</sup> See *Mṛcch* 7.9+, where, at the very end of Act VII, Cārudatta catches sight of a Buddhist monk and declares it to be “*anābhuyudayika*.” See also *YDh* 1.269–270, where it is stated that seeing bald people and people in red garments in one’s dreams is a sign of being supernaturally obstructed or possessed (*upasṛṣṭa*) by Vināyaka (i.e., by Gaṇeśa).

The first phase in this framework presents a picture similar to what we have seen in KAŚ and BhNŚ: the relatively few times “*pāṣaṇḍa*” does appear, it is used in its neutral sense.<sup>183</sup> According to John Brockington, the *Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa* had likely reached its final form by the third century CE, with MBh reaching the form in which we now have it by the fourth century CE; much of both epics, however, would have been composed over the centuries directly prior to this.<sup>184</sup> There is already ample evidence of antipathy towards non-Vedic sects in the Sanskrit epics. “*Nāstika*” appears in VR six times, while it appears a surprising fifty-nine times in MBh.<sup>185</sup> However, “*pāṣaṇḍa*” never appears at all in VR, and only appears seven times in the whole of MBh.<sup>186</sup> Of those seven instances, only one features “*pāṣaṇḍa*” used as a pejorative. Brereton has already examined three of MBh’s examples of neutral “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” at MBh 12.292.20, 12.211.4, and 13.24.56.<sup>187</sup> To give one more example, during the dialogue between the sage Kaṇiṅka Bharadvāja and the king Śatruṃtapa at MBh 12.138, Kaṇiṅka advises the king to use spies disguised as “sectarian and Vedic ascetics, etc. (*pāṣaṇḍāms tāpasādīms ca*).”<sup>188</sup> In this very Arthaśāstric passage, the use of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” closely mirrors its more or less neutral use in KAŚ, with *pāṣaṇḍas* being distinguished from Vedic ascetics but nevertheless appearing alongside them without much indication of opprobrium or derision.

---

<sup>183</sup> Note, however, that there are no instances of “*vr̥ṣala*” or “*nāstika*” in BhNŚ, and no instances of “*nāstika*” in KAŚ. On “*vr̥ṣala*,” see n. 174 above. On, “*nāstika*” see the conclusion to the present study.

<sup>184</sup> Establishing a *terminus post quem* for either of the Sanskrit epics is difficult indeed, but Brockington states that the earliest parts of both VR and MBh could date as early as 400 BCE. See John Brockington, *The Sanskrit Epics*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 2: Indien, Part 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 26–27. He also notes that many portions of MBh give strong indications to their having been composed in the first few centuries CE; *ibid.*, 134–135.

<sup>185</sup> “*Vr̥ṣala*” only appears once in VR, at 2.76.30, as a synonym for “Śūdra.” “*Vr̥ṣala*” appears twenty-seven times in MBh, also most often as a synonym for “Śūdra.”

<sup>186</sup> If we leave out the later *Bhagavadgītā*, in which “*pāṣaṇḍa*” appears four times, all pejorative.

<sup>187</sup> See Brereton, “Pāṣaṇḍa,” 26–27.

<sup>188</sup> MBh 12.138.40. For an analysis of the dialogue between Kaṇiṅka and Śatruṃtapa, see Adam Bowles, *Dharma, Disorder, and the Political in Ancient India: the Āpaddharmaparvan of the Mahābhārata*, Brill’s Indological Library 28 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 262–268.

The single clear pejorative use in MBh is found at 3.186.43, which, like the closely connected chapter 3.188, gives a description of the Kali Yuga.<sup>189</sup> There, it is said that in the Kali Age, *āśramas* will cease to exist (*āśramā...na bhavanti yugakṣaye*), being filled instead with many heretics who are teachers of the good qualities of the food of others (*bahupāṣaṇḍasamkīrṇāḥ parānnaguṇavādināḥ*; likely a disparaging reference to Jain and Buddhist alms-taking). In the previous verse, *pāṣaṇḍas* are made out to be hedonists, being described as ones who are of false or improper conduct (*vṛthācārāḥ*), who drink liquor (*pānapā*), who defile the guru's bed (*gurutalpagāḥ*; lit. "one who goes to the guru's bed," i.e., has sexual intercourse with his wife), and who desire the "this-worldly" growth of their own flesh and blood (*aihalaukikam īhante māṃsaśoṇitavardhanam*; as opposed to the "other-worldly" practice of religious austerity). There can be no question as to how to translate "*pāṣaṇḍa*" at MBh 3.186.42–43; these verses are focused squarely on *pāṣaṇḍas*' falseness and depravity. It is to be noted that MBh 3.188, which gives the most detailed description of the Kali Yuga to be found in MBh, never mentions *pāṣaṇḍas*, while it does mention *nāstikas* (once), *mlecchas* (six times), and *vṛśalas* (twice), along with other pejoratives later associated with *pāṣaṇḍas* like "*vedanindaka*" and "*hetuvādin*." I take these two accounts of the Kali Yuga at MBh 3.186 and 3.188 to be relatively late and likely drawn from sources roughly contemporaneous with the ones upon which the Purāṇic Kali descriptions are based.

In the second stage, use of "*pāṣaṇḍa*" is still relatively infrequent, but the word now carries its full pejorative sense. The MDhŚ is the exemplar of this intermediate stage, overlapping with both the latest portions of the epics and the earliest portions of the sectarian

---

<sup>189</sup> The Kali Yuga is only mentioned by name once in VK, at 6.26.13 (mentioned by the alternate name *tiṣya*). On the ambiguity surrounding the phrase "*sahapāṣaṇḍāḥ*" at MBh 3.189.9, see above, n. 37.

Purāṇas. Olivelle expresses the belief that the original composition of MDhŚ likely occurred at the hands of either a single individual or a small team of individuals, with the bulk of its composition having occurred within a single generation between the second and the third century CE.<sup>190</sup> He describes the Brahmin composers of MDhŚ much as Hildebeitel describes the Brahmin composers of MBh: both are made up of Brahmins who are “out of sorts” (in Hildebeitel’s words) with the world around them, disgruntled by the recent memory of the “bad old days” (in Olivelle’s words) of Mauryan rule and the ascendancy of Buddhism and Jainism.<sup>191</sup> Indeed, at MDhŚ 12.95 we are told that all scriptures which are outside the Vedas (*vedabāhyāḥ smṛtayaḥ*) produce no fruit in the hereafter (*niṣphalāḥ pretya*), are grounded in darkness (*tamoniṣṭhā*), and are known to be false (*anṛtāni*) because of their belonging to recent times (*arvākkālikatayā*).<sup>192</sup> Compared to the timelessness of the Vedas, all sectarians were upstart newcomers, and this very newness counted against them.

*Nāstikas* are mentioned eight times in MDhŚ, and *vṛṣalas* are mentioned twelve times. “*Pāṣaṇḍa*” only appears five times, but of these five, only one instance is neutral rather than pejorative. The neutral occurrence is found at MDhŚ 1.118; at MDhŚ 1.111–118, a sort of table of contents is given listing the topics covered in Manu’s law code.<sup>193</sup> The last item named on this list—coming after regional laws (*deśadharmān*), laws of particular castes (*jātidharmān*), and

---

<sup>190</sup> Patrick Olivelle, Introduction to *Manu’s Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmasāstra*, by Manu (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 6–7; 19–25. Hildebeitel expresses a similar opinion about the MBh, suggesting that MBh was largely composed by a committee of Brahmins between the mid-second century BCE and the year zero, over no more than two generations. See Alf Hildebeitel, *Rethinking the Mahābhārata: A Reader’s Guide to the Education of the Dharma King* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 18–20.

<sup>191</sup> Elsewhere, Olivelle has stated that, “[Brahmin exceptionalism] takes center stage in Manu...His entire treatise is organized around the Brahman and his central and exceptional position within society”; see Patrick Olivelle, “Innovations of Manu (Mid-Second Century C.E.),” in *A Dharma Reader: Classical Indian Law*, ed. and trans. Patrick Olivelle (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 74.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. MDhŚ 12.33.

<sup>193</sup> See Brereton’s discussion of this verse in Brereton, “Pāṣaṇḍa,” 27.

laws of particular families (*kuladharmān*)—are the laws of sectarian ascetic groups (*pāṣaṇḍagaṇadharmān*).<sup>194</sup> Olivelle notes that these topics are not found in MDhŚ, at least not as a single unified chapter, and theorizes that this list may have been added later or may have been a list of contents for a version of MDhŚ different from the extant one.<sup>195</sup> This list is somewhat reminiscent of the list found at KAŚ 1.19.29 giving all the various sorts of court cases over which the king should preside as part of his royal duties; among them are court cases involving *pāṣaṇḍas*. I might suggest that the list at MDhŚ 1.111–118 is something like a traditional list of the topics of law still somehow connected to the older *arthaśāstra* tradition.

All other verses mentioning *pāṣaṇḍas* in MDhŚ betray the same hostile attitude toward them as that found in the Purāṇas. Each of the four remaining instances occur alongside concerns about the same evils decried in Purāṇic descriptions of the Kali Yuga: Śūdra kings, the intermingling of *varṇas*, people (especially women and Śūdras) not acting as they are supposed to.<sup>196</sup> We find at MDhŚ 4.30 one of the classic definitions of pejorative “*pāṣaṇḍa*”: “One should not honor, even with a mere word, heretics who are ones engaged in prohibited acts, [followers of] a cat’s vow, ones who deceive, rationalists, and ones having the behavior of herons.”<sup>197</sup> This

---

<sup>194</sup> Olivelle, following Medhātithi, translates “*gaṇa*” here as “guilds,” but we find “*pāṣaṇḍigaṇa*” at MDhŚ 4.61 as a *tatpuruṣa* rather than a *dvandva* (this is, I think, the reading to be preferred over “*pāṣaṇḍijaṇa*”). See Manu, *Manu’s Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmasāstra*, trans. and ed. Patrick Olivelle and Suman Olivelle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 93; 516. Cf. “*pāṣaṇḍagaṇapramādāt*” at *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* 6.8.19.

<sup>195</sup> See Olivelle’s note to MDhŚ 1.117–118 in Manu, *Manu’s Code*, 243.

<sup>196</sup> *Mlecchas*, however, are not explicitly mentioned in any of these verses.

<sup>197</sup> “*Pāṣaṇḍino vikarmasthān baiḍālavratikāñ śaṭhān | haitukān bakavṛttīmś ca vānmātreṇāpi nārcayet.*” Both the “cat’s vow” and the treacherous “behavior of herons” are traditional motifs found elsewhere in ancient Indian literature, including in Buddhist Jātakas. MDhŚ 4.195 defines someone following the “cat’s vow” as one who bears the “banner of dharma (*dharmadvajī*),” but who is actually greedy (*lubdhah*), deceitful (*lokadambhakah*, lit. deceiving the whole world), and cruel or savage (*himsrah*). The follower of the cat’s vow as a false bearer of the “*dharmadhajam*” is also found in the *Biḷāra Jātaka*, showing how the motif must have already been reduced to a standard formula. The following verse at MDhŚ 4.196 defines one having a heron’s behavior as someone with downcast eyes (*adhodrṣṭiḥ*) who, just like the cat-vow follower, is hypocritical, greedy, cruel, and deceitful. The reference to “downturned eyes” is reminiscent of the monastic rule that Buddhist monks should walk with lowered eyes (*okkhittacakkhunā*), found in the seventh *sekhiya* rule of the Theravāda *Paṭimokkha*. On the “cat’s vow,” see Renate Söhnen-Thieme, “Buddhist Tales in the Mahābhārata?,” in *Parallels and Comparisons: Proceedings of the*

verse appears, word for word, at ViP 3.18.100. Although it is impossible to say with certainty that ViP borrowed it from MDhŚ, it is telling that the verse fits as well in a Purāṇic as in a Dharmasāstric context. In both cases, the word now carries its full pejorative sense, with all its implications of moral degeneracy, religious hypocrisy, charlatanism, and dereliction of all Vedic duties to gods and ancestors.

Finally, we come to the third stage, represented by the early Purāṇas and their chapters on the Kali Yuga. If we accept that VāP and ViP represent some of the oldest surviving Purāṇic material, then the transition is striking indeed.<sup>198</sup> “*Pāṣaṇḍa*” appears nine times in VāP, more than either “*vr̥ṣala*” (four times) or “*nāstika*” (eight times).<sup>199</sup> In ViP, which is likely somewhat later than VāP, “*pāṣaṇḍa*” appears eighteen times, with “*vr̥ṣala*” only appearing twice and “*nāstika*” not appearing at all.<sup>200</sup> It almost goes without saying that every instance of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” found in VāP and ViP is pejorative. In the Purāṇic genre, to speak of *pāṣaṇḍas* is to speak of heretics. From here onwards, the pejorative meaning becomes the dominant meaning of the word, perhaps even the sole meaning; Medhātithi in the ninth century glosses “*pāṣaṇḍa*” at

---

*Fourth Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas*, ed. Petteri Koskikallio (Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2009), 358–360. On the behavior of herons, see Petteri Koskikallio, “Baka Dālbhya: A Complex Character in Vedic Ritual Texts, Epics and Purāṇas,” *Studia Orientalia* 85 (1999): 338–344.

<sup>198</sup> As Christophe Vielle has convincingly demonstrated, VāP and BḍP both developed out of an earlier Purāṇa calling itself “*Vāyuprokta*.” He places the composition of VāP/BḍP at the beginning of the fourth century CE, and the composition of ViP around the sixth century CE. See Christophe Vielle, “From the *Vāyuprokta* to the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas*: Preliminary Remarks towards a Critical Edition of the *Vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*,” in *Epics, Khilas, and Purāṇas: Continuities and ruptures. Proceedings of the Third Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, September 2002*, ed. Petteri Koskikallio (Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2005), 543; 546.

<sup>199</sup> Compare this to the *Matsya Purāṇa*, in which “*pāṣaṇḍa*” appears six times, while both “*vr̥ṣala*” and “*nāstika*” appear twice. Three of the four instances of “*vr̥ṣala*” in VāP occur in chapters describing the Kali Yuga: VāP 58, 98, and 99. “*Nāstika*,” however, never appears in these chapters.

<sup>200</sup> Of course, this is not the exact case with every Purāṇa. In the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*, which shares a close history with VāP, “*pāṣaṇḍa*” appears eight times, “*vr̥ṣala*” six, and “*nāstika*” fourteen. In the *Kūrma Purāṇa*, “*pāṣaṇḍa*” occurs seven times, “*vr̥ṣala*” six, and “*nāstika*” fifteen. As we can see, however, even in these Purāṇas, “*pāṣaṇḍa*” is never very far behind.



MDhŚ 1.118 with its pejorative meaning while, as we have seen, the verse itself has it in its neutral meaning.<sup>201</sup>

Although “*nāstika*” and “*vr̥ṣala*” never fade away entirely, with “*nāstika*” in particular still retaining much of its derogative force, “*pāṣaṇḍa*” largely takes over as the main term of intersectarian polemics and apologetics. In the later medieval period, we get polemical sectarian texts like the *Pāṣaṇḍacapēṭikā* of Vijayarāmācārya and the *Pāṣaṇḍamukhamardana* of Rāmadatta: “A Slap (in the face) of Heretics” and “Pounding the Face of Heretics,” respectively. We may conclude this section by restating that “*nāstika*” and “*vr̥ṣala*” represent an older vocabulary of antagonism towards groups threatening Vedic orthodoxy.<sup>202</sup> “*Vr̥ṣala*” was a more general term of abuse, and could be applied to Śūdras (recall that it is most often used as a synonym of “Śūdra”) and all those deemed equal to/as bad as Śūdras—which is to say, *mlecchas* and sectarian ascetics, as well as kings and Brahmins who had converted to the frowned-upon sects. The hypothesis that Olivelle proposes with regard to Śūdras in MDhŚ also applies to the term “*vr̥ṣala*”: “‘Śūdra’ for Manu, I think, is often a code word; it identifies the enemy and it encompasses a wide cross-section of society, both past and present.”<sup>203</sup> Olivelle surmises that Buddhists and Jains are often obliquely referred to through this coded language, and that regions like Northwestern India gave real cause for there to be a *pāṣaṇḍa-mleccha-Śūdra* connection in

---

<sup>201</sup> “*Pāṣaṇḍam pratiṣiddhavratacaryā bāhyasmṛtisamāśrayās tatra ye dharmāḥ*”; “The word ‘*pāṣaṇḍa*’ [means] those performing vows which are forbidden; these laws [mentioned] there are ones connected to scriptures which are outside [the Veda].” Once again, an inappropriate application of the pejorative meaning leads to an awkward, oxymoronic interpretation. “The laws of heretics” should come across as a very odd phrase indeed, especially in a text that describes heretics as having no principles, morals, or dharmic sense whatsoever.

<sup>202</sup> For example, we see “*vasala*” as a term of verbal abuse used against the Buddha by the Brahmin Aggika Bhāradvāja in the *Vasala Sutta* (*Sutta Nipāta* 1.7), whereupon the Buddha explains that one is known to be a *vasala* not by birth but by his deeds. We also find “*natthika*” at Sn 2.2.5, used to refer to a holder of extreme nihilistic views. Thus, there was no Brahmin monopoly on the term “*nāstika*”/“*natthika*”; Buddhists also used it to denounce what they looked upon as wrongheaded doctrine. Furthermore, the *Vasala Sutta* shows that Buddhists may have had an effective theological retort to “*vasala*” as a term of abuse.

<sup>203</sup> Olivelle, Introduction to *Manu's Code*, 40. For *mlecchas* as fallen Kṣatriyas, see MDhŚ 10.43 and MBh 14.29.14–16.

the orthodox Vedic imaginary. This is especially true given that MDhŚ itself puts forward that all the major barbarian groups then known were Kṣatriyas in the mythic past, but had fallen from their original status to the state of Śūdras.<sup>204</sup> Also to be taken into account here are verses in MDhŚ stating that any twice-born person who becomes a *nāstika* loses his twice-born status (becoming, for all intents and purposes, a Śūdra).<sup>205</sup> All this aside, both “*nāstika*” and “*vṛṣala*” begin to be supplanted by “*pāṣaṇḍa*” between the third and fourth century, at which point it becomes the most powerful term of denunciation and derision. Part Two of this study is devoted to exploring the socio-historical conditions which gave the word its new power.

---

<sup>204</sup> Olivelle, Introduction to *Manu's Code*, 40–41.

<sup>205</sup> See, for example, MDhŚ 11.66.

## **Part Two**

# Chapter Two

## Setting the End Times in Stone

If we accept that the predictions regarding the Kali Yuga found in the early Purāṇas reflect living conditions in South Asia during the first centuries CE, I believe we can take them at their word when they describe the period as a time of great adversity and tribulation. There is evidence from both Roman and Chinese sources that the Antonine Plague, starting in 165 CE and lasting some 15 years, spread with frightening rapidity, probably originating in Central Asia and following trade routes to China in the east and across the Roman Empire in the west.<sup>1</sup> The last century BCE and the first centuries CE also witnessed several periods of global cooling, possibly due to large volcanic eruptions in the Arctic, resulting in lower crop yields and widespread famines.<sup>2</sup> Recent dendrodata indicate that the second half of the third century CE began a period of lower precipitation ultimately culminating in what was likely one of the worst droughts ever to have occurred in the region, beginning in 338 CE and lasting for almost 40 years.<sup>3</sup> Not only would these famines and droughts have directly impacted northwestern India, but they would also have set in motion the waves of Central Asian invaders entering the subcontinent during this

---

<sup>1</sup> See Craig Benjamin, *Empires of Ancient Eurasia : The First Silk Roads Era 100 BCE - 250 CE* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 271–273; Raoul McLaughlin, *Rome and the Distant East: Trade Routes to the Ancient Lands of Arabia, India, and China*, (London: Continuum, 2010), 59–60; R. J. Littman and M. L. Littman, “Galen and the Antonine Plague,” *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 94, no. 3 (Autumn 1973): 243–255.

<sup>2</sup> See Brandon T. McDonald, “The Antonine Crisis: Climate Change as a Trigger for Epidemiological and Economic Turmoil,” in *Climate Change and Ancient Societies in Europe and the Near East: Diversity in Collapse and Resilience*, ed. Paul Erdkamp et al. (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 379–403; Joseph R. McConnel et al., “Extreme Climate after Massive Eruption of Alaska’s Okmok Volcano in 43 BCE and Effects on the Late Roman Republic and Ptolemaic Kingdom,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, vol. 117, no. 27 (July 2020): 15443–15449.

<sup>3</sup> See M. McCormick et al., “Climate Change during and after the Roman Empire: Reconstructing the Past from Scientific and Historical Evidence,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 43, no. 2 (Autumn 2012): 190–191.

period.<sup>4</sup> Droughts, famines, and plagues continued through the fifth and sixth centuries.<sup>5</sup>

Politically, the breakdown of Mauryan rule around 185 CE left a power vacuum to be filled by smaller dynasties of both native and foreign origin over the ensuing centuries. Any or all of these factors could have contributed to a general feeling that the natural order of the world was coming apart, particularly amongst the more conservative sections of ancient Indian society.<sup>6</sup>

But how do we explain the preoccupation with heresy which dominates Purāṇic descriptions of the Kali Yuga? What sociopolitical factors led to an increased animosity towards sectarians, culminating in “*pāṣaṇḍa*” becoming a pejorative? I believe important clues can be found in royal inscriptions from the period. In this section, I attempt to establish that the idea of the Kali Yuga, in addition to being a religious and cosmological motif about the fast-approaching “end of days,” was also a powerful political motif. It presented kings with a new ideal and new mythic imagery with which to glorify themselves and their dynasties. As a political motif, it may have even rivaled the older motif of the world-conquering *cakravartin*. The political significance of Kali Yuga imagery is an important piece in the puzzle of how sectarian rivalry led to a contentious cultural discourse over who was and was not a heretic that would go on for centuries.

## **Section 2.1: The Sātavāhanas and the Inscription of Gautamī Balaśrī**

Recent studies have highlighted the rule of the Sātavāhana dynasty as a period during which several important shifts were taking place that would change the course of Indian culture;

---

<sup>4</sup> See M. McCormick et al., “Climate Change,” 198–199; Kyle Harper, *The Fate of Rome: Climate, Disease, and the End of an Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 190–192.

<sup>5</sup> This includes the well-known plague of Justinian in the mid-sixth century CE, which also coincided with periods of famine. Multi-decade droughts occurred again in 440 CE and in 539 CE. See M. McCormick et al., “Climate Change,” 198–199. Several of the major famines mentioned in the *Mahāvamśa* and *Dīpavamśa* may have occurred during these periods. See U. D. Jayasekera, *Early History of Education in Ceylon: From Earliest Times Up to Mahāsena* (Colombo: Dept. of Cultural Affairs, 1969), 63–64.

<sup>6</sup> See Johannes Bronkhorst, *How the Brahmins Won: From Alexander to the Guptas*, *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Section 2: South Asia, Vol. 30 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 10–11.

one of the most significant of these shifts was a change from the predominant use of MI for inscriptions and Prakrit for *kāvya* to Sanskrit being used for both.<sup>7</sup> The time of Sātavāhana rule, from around 50 BCE until 250 CE, was also the period during which a religious shift was taking place in Indian religion. With the composition of the epics and early Purāṇic material, coupled with the rising influence of Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sectarian groups, new religious practices and new modes of religious devotion were asserting themselves in public life and gaining royal attention. The inscriptions that the Sātavāhanas left behind provide valuable evidence of how the epic/Purāṇic spirit was beginning to influence the imagery through which royal power justified and glorified itself.

Paiṭhaṇ (Skt. Pratiṣṭhāna), the largest urban center under Sātavāhana power and, according to tradition, their capital, lies along the northern stretch of the Godāvārī River in modern-day Maharashtra.<sup>8</sup> It was known to the Greeks and Romans as a major center of commerce, being located on ancient highways connecting it to maritime trade through the port city of Barygaza/Bharukaccha in Gujarat.<sup>9</sup> In addition to being a city of commercial importance, it was something of a center of Brahmin orthodoxy, both during Sātavāhana rule and in later times.<sup>10</sup> Through their inscriptions, the Sātavāhanas insisted upon their own Brahmin status and

---

<sup>7</sup> See Andrew Ollett, *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit Sanskrit and the Language Order of Premodern India* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017), 45–47.

<sup>8</sup> Shailendra Bhandare rightly points out that Paiṭhaṇ does not appear in any known Sātavāhana inscriptions, and we do not have any conclusive evidence dating to Sātavāhana times that it was actually their capital. Rather, Paiṭhaṇ has come to be known as the seat of Sātavāhana rule mainly from Jain sources. See Shailendra Bhandare, “Historical Context,” in *Excavations at Paithan, Maharashtra, Beyond Boundaries: Religion, Region, Language and the State*, vol. 5, ed. Derek Kennet et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020), 16–17. The Sātavāhanas are referred to in the Purāṇas as having originated in Andhra. See Ajay Mitra Shastri, “Purāṇas on the Sātavāhanas: An Archaeological-Historical Perspective,” in *The Age of the Sātavāhanas*, ed. Ajay Mitra Shastri (New Delhi: Aryan Books International, 1999), 4–8.

<sup>9</sup> On Paiṭhaṇ in the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, see Bhandare, “Historical Context,” 13–14.

<sup>10</sup> See, Jon Keune, “Eknāth in Context: The Literary, Social, and Political Milieus of an Early Modern Saint-poet,” *South Asian History and Culture*, vol. 6, no. 1 (2015): 71. On the Brahmins living on the Godāvārī mentioned in the *Vatthugāthā*, Sn 5.1, see Bhandare, “Historical Context,” 11–12.

their reverence for Vedic norms, making Vedic sacrifice (*yajña*) a central feature of their rule. This is expressed in extravagant fashion in the cave inscription sponsored by the Sātavāhana queen Nāganikā around 40 BCE at Nāṇeghāt.<sup>11</sup> Judging by the list of sacrifices the Sātavāhanas claimed to have performed in this inscription, they must have fostered a thriving community of orthodox Brahmins within the core of their kingdom through the lavish patronage they offered during their sacrificial ceremonies. The various parts of this inscription, taking up a number of cave walls, list off a dizzying array of Vedic sacrifices along with costly ritual donations (*dakṣiṇā*) of elephants, thousands of cows and horses, money, and “mountains of grain (*dhamṇāgiri*).”<sup>12</sup> This was all done to demonstrate their status not as petty warlords but as ideal Vedic kings.<sup>13</sup> As Upinder Singh notes, the Nāṇeghāt inscription was signaling a departure from the Buddhist- and Jain-oriented rule of kings like Aśoka and Khāravala—Khāravala himself being a contemporary of Nāganikā.<sup>14</sup> However, the Sātavāhanas were keenly aware of the donative practices of their rivals.<sup>15</sup> Such donative practices still followed the Aśokan model, where a ruler’s status as emperor was publicly demonstrated through his patronage of all religious sects. As such, they continued this practice to demonstrate both their wealth and their imperial ambitions.

### **The Nāsik inscription of Gautamī Balaśrī**

A little over a century and a half later, a noticeable change is seen in the way Sātavāhana rulers represent themselves in epigraphic form. When granting the tax revenue from a nearby

---

<sup>11</sup> See Ollett, *Language*, 195; Singh, *Inscribing Power*, 20.

<sup>12</sup> For the text of the Nāṇeghāt inscription, see James Burgess, *Report on the Elura Cave Temples and the Brahmanical and Jaina Caves in Western India*, Archaeological Survey of India, vol. 5 (London: Trübner 1883), 60.

<sup>13</sup> See Ollett’s detailed analysis of the Nāṇeghāt inscription of Nāganikā at Ollett, *Language*, 28–35, especially 31–33.

<sup>14</sup> See Singh, *Inscribing Power*, 20 n. 36; 27.

<sup>15</sup> See Singh, *Inscribing Power*, 20.

village to Buddhist monks of the Bhadāvanīya (Skt. Bhadrayānika) sect living in cave *vihāras* near present-day Nāsik, the Sātavāhana queen Gautamī Balaśrī took the occasion to commission an inscription eulogizing her son Gautamīputra Śrī Sātakarṇi.<sup>16</sup> As Singh has recognized, whereas the Nāṅghāt inscription is framed along the lines of well-trodden *cakravartin* imagery, the Nāsik inscription betrays the mark of a whole new set of motifs and a completely different set of divine/legendary figures.<sup>17</sup> While the Nāṅghāt inscription opens with an invocation of mostly old Vedic gods (among them Indra, Varuṇa, and Yama), we find Sātakarṇi being likened to Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna, and Bhīma in the Nāsik inscription.<sup>18</sup> What is most relevant for the present study, however, is that the Nāsik inscription also contains elements that seem to speak directly to concerns about the Kali Yuga. Sātakarṇi is said to have prevented the intermixing of the four *varṇas* (*vinivatitacātuvaṇasakarasa*). Compare this, for example, with VāP 58.98, where people at the end of the Kali Yuga are said to be “fallen from the [observation of] the *varṇas* and *āśramas* [and]...engaged in horrible intermixing.”<sup>19</sup> The inscription emphasizes that Sātakarṇi only used and levied taxes obtained in accordance with the law (*dhamopajitakaravinīyogakarasa*). Compare this to VāP 58.48, which declares that kings in the Kali Age do not protect their citizens but are only “seizers of taxes.”<sup>20</sup> In a similar tone, ViP 6.1.34 states that, in the Kali, kings are “ones who seize the wealth of the people through the

---

<sup>16</sup> The Bhadrayānikas were a subset of the Vatsīputriyas. On their mention in the Mahāvamśa, see Kaḷalallē Sekhara, *Early Buddhist Sanghas and Vihāras in Sri Lanka: Up to the 4th Century A.D.* Campbell: Rishi Publications, 1998), 48. This inscription dates to about 103 CE. See Ollett, *Language*, 196.

<sup>17</sup> See Singh’s analysis of the Nāsik inscription and its difference from the Nāṅghāt inscription at Singh, *Inscribing Power*, 26; 39–42.

<sup>18</sup> Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vasudeva are each mentioned once in the Nāṅghāt inscription, possibly indicating a Pāñcarātra presence in Sātavāhana territory; however, no other Vaiṣṇava or Śaiva influence is discernible elsewhere in the inscription. For the text of the Nāsik inscription, see E. Senart, “The inscriptions in the Caves at Nāsik,” *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. 8 (1905–6): 59–60.

<sup>19</sup> “...*varṇāśramaparibhraṣṭāḥ saṃkaraṃ ghoram āsthitāḥ*.” See Appendix 1, p. 99 and 124.

<sup>20</sup> “*Arakṣitāro hartāro balibhāgasya pārthivāḥ*.” See Appendix 1, p. 89 and 113.



guise of taxes.”<sup>21</sup> The description of Sātakarṇi as being one who had “crushed the pride and arrogance of the Kṣatriyas (*khatiyadapamānamadana*)” not only highlights his status as overlord and as a Brahmin king, but also references the Paraśurāma avatar of Viṣṇu who killed all Kṣatriyas in the world twenty-one times. In a similar vein, the Nāsik inscription proclaims Sātakarṇi the chief or most excellent Brahmin (*ekabamhaṇa*), again calling attention to his Brahmin birth. In both cases, it is useful to remember that, according to Purāṇic dynastic lists, there were no more true Kṣatriya kings left at this advanced stage of the Kali Yuga; only *mleccha*, Śūdra, and Brahmin kings were left.<sup>22</sup> Finally, Sātakarṇi is praised as having slayed the Śakas, Yavanas, and Pahlavas (*sakayavanapahlavanisūdanasa*), calling to mind the figures of Pramiti and Kalkin, who rid the world of *mlecchas* and *pāṣaṇḍas* at the end of time.<sup>23</sup>

Although the yugas are never explicitly mentioned in the Nāsik inscription, the message still comes across that Gautamīputra Śrī Sātakarṇi was preventing the evils of the Kali Yuga from taking hold in the world. Later *praśastis* routinely present kings as bringing about a new Kṛta Yuga.<sup>24</sup> For example, the medieval Śilāhāra king Aparājita in the Janjirā plate inscription is called a “goad to the neck of the Kali Age (*kaligalāṅkuśa*),” as if the yuga were an elephant that the king was driving off. This metaphor (in the form “*kaligajāṃkuśa*”) is repeated in the Kaśeli plate inscription, there being applied to the Śilāhāra king Bhoja II.<sup>25</sup> And just as Sātakarṇi was likened to Rāma, Arjuna, and Kṛṣṇa, later inscriptions would take this one step further and

---

<sup>21</sup> “...*hartāraḥ śulkavyājena pārthivāḥ...janavittānām...*”

<sup>22</sup> For example, at VāP 99.326–327: after Mahānandin of the Nanda dynasty, there were no more Kṣatriya kings (*tataḥ prabhṛti rājāno bhaviṣyāḥ sūdrayonayaḥ*), with Mahānandin’s son Mahāpadma being born of a Śūdra woman. VīP 4.24.20 even goes so far as to liken Mahāpadma to Paraśurāma in that he ended all future Kṣatriya rule (*mahāpadmanāmā nandaḥ paraśurāma ivārapo ‘khilakṣatrāntakarī bhaviṣyati*). This necessarily means that any later king who is not a Brahmin must be either a Śūdra or a barbarian.

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, VāP 58.77–79, Appendix 1, p. 94 and 120.

<sup>24</sup> For more examples of inscriptions praising kings as “ushering in a new Kṛta,” see Scharfe, *The State*, 50.

<sup>25</sup> See V. V. Mirashi, *Inscriptions Of The Śilāhāras*, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. 6 (New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1977), 32; 34; 217; 273.

identify the king with Viṣṇu or Śiva, making him out to be semi-divine.<sup>26</sup>

Two major Kali evils missing from the Nāsik inscription are *pāṣaṇḍas* and uppity Śūdras. With regard to Śūdras, Sātakarṇi is said to be the promoter of both twice-born and Śūdra families (*dijāvarakuṭubavivadhanasa*; “*avara*” means low, with “*avaravarṇa*” being another term for Śūdra). And it would be strange indeed to castigate *pāṣaṇḍas* in an inscription celebrating a donation to Buddhist monks. It may be that, as Eltschinger has suggested, the presence of *mleccha* invaders was a more present danger than sectarians and Śūdras at this time. Or the Sātavāhanas may simply have been practical rulers. As R. C. C. Fynes has argued, Sātavāhana patronage of Buddhists and Jains does not say so much about their tolerance of non-Vedic religious groups as much as it speaks to their sense of realpolitik and to their imperial ambitions.<sup>27</sup> But in the next section, I will suggest one factor that could have brought orthodox attitudes toward non-Vedic sects to a tipping point.

## **Section 2.2: Perpetual endowments and land grants to Buddhists**

Perhaps building on and improving older Mauryan methods, the Sātavāhanas had a highly efficient system of collecting tolls, duties, and taxes from merchants and artisans, land revenue from agriculturalists, and tribute from their feudatories.<sup>28</sup> Even the name “Nāṇeghāt” is a testament to the Sātavāhanas’ systematized collection of tolls from travelers and merchants;

---

<sup>26</sup> See Scharfe, *The State*, 95–97. VāP 57.72 explicitly encourages this view of the semi-divinity of kings, saying all *cakravartins* arise from a fragment of Viṣṇu (*viṣṇor aṃṣena jāyante pṛthivyām cakravartinah*). On the names of later Sātavāhana rulers showing a strong Śaiva influence, see I. K. Sarma, “A Chaturmukha Liṅga from Amarāvati and the Spread of Lakuliśa Pāsupatism,” in *Madhu: Recent Researches in Indian Archaeology and Art History*, Shri M. N. Deshpande Festschrift, ed. M. S. Nagaraja Rao (Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1981), 227.

<sup>27</sup> R. C. C. Fynes, “The Religious Patronage of the Satavahana Dynasty,” *South Asian Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1 (1995): 47.

<sup>28</sup> See Meera Visvanathan, “The First Land Grants: The Emergence of an Epigraphic Tradition in the Early Deccan,” in *Social Worlds of Premodern Transactions : Perspectives from Indian Epigraphy and History*, ed. Mekhola Gomes et al. (Delhi: Primus Books, 2021), 10–11.

“*nāṇe*,” related to Skt. *nāṇaka*, means a coin.<sup>29</sup> A large stone pot still standing near the Nāṇeghāt cave probably held the coins collected from travelers as toll payments.<sup>30</sup> The wealth the Sātavāhanas amassed helped fund the numerous large religious donations they made. We have already seen that one of the reasons they engaged in these lavish donative practices was because they had something to prove. Rival kings were also styling themselves as unsurpassed benefactors and supreme rulers, constantly threatening to call the Sātavāhana’s strategic self-image into question. Of their rivals, their fiercest competition was with the Śaka Kṣaharāta kings to their north, originally from Central Asia but having established a kingdom in Gujarat in the first decades CE.<sup>31</sup>

Bhandare points out that the Sātavāhana-Kṣaharāta rivalry achieves almost legendary proportions in Jain texts, with the *Bṛhatkalpasūtrabhāṣya* telling that the Sātavāhana king would launch an attack on the Kṣaharāta’s maritime stronghold at Bharukaccha during every monsoon season.<sup>32</sup> Indeed, the two dynasties frequently tried to wrest territory from each other and assert control over major trade routes.<sup>33</sup> But their efforts to outdo each other in the arena of religious donations led to a surprising result. They came up with new ways to make a single donation continue indefinitely. This was something that had never been done before. And, at least at first, the only communities to receive these new forms of indefinite donation were Buddhist.<sup>34</sup>

In the late first century CE, the Kṣaharāta rulers had managed to extend their reach into Sātavāhana territory, which included taking Nāsik for themselves. Not long later, Uṣavadāta, the

---

<sup>29</sup> The word “*nāṇaka*” indicates the influence of Kuṣāṇa coin minting. See D. V. Chauhan, *Understanding Ṛgveda* (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1985), 22.

<sup>30</sup> Smita Halder, “Revisiting the Naneghat Inscriptions,” *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 76th Session* (2016): 156.

<sup>31</sup> See Singh, *Inscribing Power*, 27.

<sup>32</sup> Bhandare, “Historical Context,” 12.

<sup>33</sup> See Visvanathan, “Land Grants,” 4.

<sup>34</sup> For example, see the perpetual endowment being called a “*bikkhuhala*,” Visvanathan, “Land Grants,” 10.

son-in-law of the Kṣaharāta king Nahapāna, made a record of his donation to the Buddhist community living in Nāsik’s cave *vihāras*.<sup>35</sup> But this donation featured something unseen before in donations to Indian ascetic groups. Instead of a simple direct donation of land or monastic requisites (food, clothing, or medicine), Uṣavadāta records the lending of three thousand *kārṣāpaṇas* to two different weavers’ guilds (two thousand to one, one thousand to the other), with the guilds putting the interest paid on the loans towards purchasing robes for the monks and meeting their daily needs. The loan was never meant to be paid back, and the interest was to provide for the monks in perpetuity; in the inscription, it was called an “*akṣayanivi* (Skt. *akṣayanīvī* or *-nīvi*),” a “permanent endowment.” This is the first time we have evidence of such an arrangement being made. The size of the initial loan is not particularly impressive. Directly underneath the inscription just mentioned, Uṣavadāta three years later recorded another much more opulent direct donation of two thousand gold coins (equaling seventy thousand *kārṣāpaṇas*) to “venerable gods and Brahmins (*bhagavatām devānaṃ brāhmaṇānaṃ ca*).”<sup>36</sup> Rather, what is remarkable is the financial inventiveness of the *akṣayanivi* and the direct relationship into which it placed the monks and weavers’ guilds.

Around a year later, the Sātavāhanas had regained control of Nāsik, at which point we see another financial innovation in the context of a donation to the Buddhist *saṃgha*. Gautamīputra Śrī Sātakarṇi—the same king later eulogized in the inscription of Gautamī Balaśrī discussed above—doubled the gift of a field Uṣavadāta had made to the monks at Nāsik during the time it was under Kṣaharāta control.<sup>37</sup> But he did more than just extend the size of the plot of land that

---

<sup>35</sup> See Visvanathan’s analysis of this inscription at Meera Visvanathan, “Uṣavadāta’s *akhayanivi*: the Eternal Endowment in the Early Historic Deccan,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 41 (2018): 516–524. Ollett dates it to 74 CE; see Ollett, *Language*, 203.

<sup>36</sup> See Visvanathan, “Uṣavadāta’s *akhayanivi*,” 517–518. It should be noted that these were given not as *dakṣiṇā*, but as *dāna*.

<sup>37</sup> See Visvanathan, “Land Grants,” 6–8. Ollett dates this inscription to 78 CE; see Ollett, *Language*, 195.

was donated. He added the stipulation that whatever profits resulted from the tilling of that land would have immunity (*parihāra*) from taxation or administrative interference of any kind.

Instead, the profits would go in their entirety to the community of monks.

Lastly, Sātakarṇi's son and successor, Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śrī Puḷumāvi, combined both innovations some thirty years later. Puḷumāvi slightly altered the earlier donation of a village which his grandmother had made to the community of Bhadāvanīya monks at Nāsik.<sup>38</sup> Firstly, the original village in the donation was changed to a different one. Secondly, and more interestingly, instead of merely giving up his claim to the tax revenue from the village, Puḷumāvi termed the donation of the village itself as an “*akhayanivi*,” probably making the monks themselves its landlords. Again, we see the village being declared to have all the same immunities listed in Sātakarṇi's land grant (no such immunities were mentioned in Gautamī Balaśrī's initial donation).

It stands to reason that these new forms of religious donation were associated with Buddhist monasteries. In regard to Sātavāhana religious patronage, Ollett states:

Monasteries were perhaps the only institutions in which networks of religious practice, agriculture, and commerce crossed, apart from the state itself. The cultural and intellectual roles played by Buddhist communities are especially important. Through their monuments and teaching...these communities could formulate and propagate ideas about the social and political fabric into which they were woven. Their ability, in principle, to organize this kind of cultural hegemony might have been one of the main reasons why rulers, even those who might have been personally hostile to Buddhism, supported them.<sup>39</sup>

As we have seen, in both Uṣavadāta's case and in the case of the Sātavāhanas, far more costly donations were made to Brahmins compared to the ones given to Buddhists. However, as Ollett

---

<sup>38</sup> Visvanathan, “Uṣavadāta's *akhayanivi*,” 527–529. Ollett dates this inscription to 106 CE; see Ollett, *Language*, 196.

<sup>39</sup> Andrew Ollett, “Sātavāhana and Nāgārjuna: Religion and the Sātavāhana State,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 41 (2018): 467. See also, Gail Omvedt, *Buddhism in India: Challenging Brahmanism and Caste* (Los Angeles: SAGE, 2013), 122.

suggests, Brahmin communities likely lacked the same direct connection with merchants and guilds which had long been fostered by Buddhism and Jainism. Visvanathan also maintains that these new donative innovations:

...can be best understood by locating [them] within the urban society of the early historic Deccan, marked by regional political conflicts, a money economy, institutions and individuals engaged in commerce and long-distance trade, as well as the expanding religious networks of Buddhism. Much has been written about how Buddhism, from its very beginnings, responded to and built upon the economic networks of its time. The *akhayanivi* represents one more link in this chain, drawing as it did upon both the thriving worlds of commerce and finance as well as the moral economies of merit that bound donative relationships between *saṃgha* and society.<sup>40</sup>

When seen through the lens of Purāṇic descriptions of the Kali Yuga, another facet of these donative networks emerges. At *Viṣṇudharmāḥ* 105.43, it is said that heretics, “...are ones who seize the taxes of the king, rob the householders, [and] live off of trade [while] covered in the appearance and clothing of a sage.”<sup>41</sup> Also referencing the mercantile economy of the first centuries CE, *Vdha* 105.51 states, “The twice-born are lowly eaters of the food of others, devoted to seizing taxes. And kings are indeed then Vaiśyas and not born from Kṣatriya lineages.”<sup>42</sup> This recalls *VāP* 58.51 which states that, “all will be merchants in the worst age.”<sup>43</sup> This should suggest that the composers of the Kali Yuga texts took a dim view of the mercantilism surrounding them. The new donative practices of the Kṣaharātas and Sātavāhanas also take on a new dimension when we think of the Buddhist recipients of land grants and perpetual endowments as “*rājaśulkaharāḥ*,” “eaters of the king’s taxes,” or indeed, as fake mendicants defrauding unassuming laypeople.<sup>44</sup> What I would like to suggest here is that it is

---

<sup>40</sup> Visvanathan, “Uṣavadāta’s *akhayanivi*,” 532.

<sup>41</sup> “*Rājaśulkaharāḥ kṣudrā gr̥hasthaparimoṣakāḥ | muniveṣākṛticchannā vāñijyam upajīvikāḥ.*” Appendix 2, p. 142 and 144.

<sup>42</sup> “*Śulkādānaparāḥ kṣudrāḥ parapakāśino dvijāḥ | vaiśyās tathā tu rājāno na tu kṣatriyavaṃśajāḥ.*” Appendix 2, p. 143 and 145. Recall that pāṣaṇḍas are referred to as *parānnaguṇavādīnaḥ* at MBh 3.186.43.

<sup>43</sup> “*Sarve vāñijakās cāpi bhaviṣyanty adhame yuge...*” Appendix 1, p. 90 and 114.

<sup>44</sup> On the possibility of the description of Śūdra Buddhist monks having “white teeth (*śukladanta*)” being a corruption of “*śulkādāna*” at *VāP* 58.59, see Appendix 1, n.27.

perhaps no coincidence that this period, which marks the early stages of concerns about the onslaught of heresy, is also the period in which, as Ollett states, “[t]here was not only a quantitative increase in the support that the state extended to Buddhist communities, but a qualitative change in the nature of the state’s relation to these Buddhist communities.”<sup>45</sup> We should not be blind to the possibility that this may have inflamed already heightened worries amongst orthodox Brahmin onlookers that the “bad old days” might indeed be returning. In any case, something had to be done about it. And that “something” was the composition of the epics and the Purāṇas.

We should also carefully consider Singh’s hypothesis that, because Uṣavadata was a *mleccha*, he was barred from performing the large royal sacrifices of Vedic tradition.<sup>46</sup> Thus, he had to find another means to publicly perform his role as royal donor. Instead, he resorted to the royal giving of *dāna*; it was originally a practice defined and embellished by Buddhist and Jain communities, but Purāṇic literature shows that in the first centuries CE, Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva groups were laying claim to the practice as well.<sup>47</sup> *Dāna* is even worked into the Yuga framework in Purāṇic verses stating that, whereas Vedic *yajña* is appropriate for the Dvāpara Yuga, only *dāna* is appropriate in the Kali.<sup>48</sup> All Kali predictions reviling *mlecchas* aside,

---

<sup>45</sup> Ollett, “Sātavāhana and Nāgārjuna,” 430. Ollett also notes that inscriptional evidence of support to Buddhists from Sātavāhana rulers, either in the form of money or land, vanished by the start of the second century CE; *ibid.*, 430. I believe we should at least entertain the possibility that either orthodox Brahmin displeasure or new Hindu sectarian influences played some part.

<sup>46</sup> Singh, *Inscribing Power*, 34–35.

<sup>47</sup> On *śrauta* sacrifice being replaced by the *mahādāna* ritual, first Buddhist and the Hindu, see Ronald Inden, “The Ceremony of the Great Gift (mahādāna): Structure and Historical Context in Indian Ritual and Society,” in *Asie Du Sud: Traditions Et Changements*, Colloque Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, no. 582, ed. Marc Gaborieau (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1979), 131–136. See, for example, VāP 80, and especially 80.61, which seems to be explicitly directed at kings: “Gifts are the highest dharma, praised devotedly by good (people). Rulership over the three worlds is indeed established through gifts”; “*dānāni paramo dharmah sadbhīḥ satkrīya pūjitaḥ | trailokyasyādhipatyam hi dānād eva vyavasthitaḥ.*” See also Vdha 60, where the gift of land is called the highest of all gifts: “*atidānaṃ sarveṣāṃ bhūmidānam ihocyate...*”, Vdha 60.3.

<sup>48</sup> See, for example, MDhś 1.86, “*dvāpare yajñam evāhur dānam ekaṃ kalau yuge.*”

Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism did succeed in taking root amongst the foreign rulers of Northwest India.<sup>49</sup> One verse from *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* even seems to encourage *mlecchas* to become devotees of Viṣṇu.<sup>50</sup> I believe Singh is right to suggest that there was a political advantage for *mleccha* rulers to resort to *dāna* (whether Buddhist, Jain, Vaiṣṇava, or Śaiva) since they could not engage in *yajñas*. Purāṇic Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata ritual still involved donations to Brahmins, providing a useful workaround to being banned from giving *dakṣiṇā*.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, this would only have strengthened the connection between *mlecchas* and *pāṣaṇḍas* in the orthodox imagination.

---

<sup>49</sup> See, for example, P. Pal, “Siva as Dispenser of Royal Glory on Kushan Coins,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, n.s., vol. 2 (1988): 31–34.

<sup>50</sup> “*Kirātaḥūṇāndhrapulindapulkaśā ābhīraśumbhā yavanāḥ khasādayaḥ | ye ‘nye ca pāpā yadapāśrayāśrayāḥ śudhyanti tasmai prabhaviṣṇave namaḥ*”; BhP 2.4.18.

<sup>51</sup> Now, with a new cast of sectarian ritualists and temples to whom gifts could be made, in addition to Vedic priests. See Inden, “Great Gift,” 135.



# Conclusion

## Heretics, Atheists, Infidels, and Apostates

I have dwelt at length in this study on the history of “*pāṣaṇḍa*” and its changes in meaning. I hope to have demonstrated that it is a history which bears surprising parallels to the history of “*haíresis*.” One of the reasons I have dedicated a fair amount of space to the topic is due to the fact that several other Indological scholars have questioned the suitability of “heretic” as a translation for “*pāṣaṇḍa*.” By way of concluding, I would like to look more closely at these scholars’ arguments to see what they can tell us both about the challenges of translation and about the nature of heresy itself.

### Heretic or Apostate? Insider or Outsider?

In one of a very few studies to deal with the subject of religious persecution in pre-Muslim India, Alexis Sanderson touches upon the issue of translating “*pāṣaṇḍin*,” stating that the term is, “often misleadingly translated ‘heretic.’”<sup>1</sup> Sanderson continues, “The term ‘heretic’ is better reserved to denote professed followers of a religion whose views or practices reject or are seen as rejecting the established norms of that same religion. From the Vaidika point of view those it terms *pāṣaṇḍin* are apostates rather than heretics...”<sup>2</sup> In Sanderson’s view, because Jains and Buddhists have given up all Vedic practices and are, in a literal sense, *vedabāhya* (in that they show no reverence to the Vedas), they do not meet the criterion that heretics must still see themselves as members of the faith whose doctrines they have radically contravened. As we have

---

<sup>1</sup> For another important study which touches on the subject of religious persecution in ancient India, see Upinder Singh, *Political Violence in Ancient India* (Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> Alexis Sandersom, “Tolerance, Exclusivity, Inclusivity, and Persecution in Indian Religion During the Early Mediaeval Period,” in *Honoris Causa: Essays in Honour of Aweek Sarkar*, ed. John Makinson (London: Allen Lane, 2015), p. 162.

already noted in Part One, Eltschinger has shown reticence to translate “*pāsanda*” as “heretic,” stating, like Sanderson, that that term is more suitable for dissension “within one and the same denomination.”<sup>3</sup>

Once again, I believe we can gain some insights from our colleagues in the study of the Abrahamic religions. Peter Schadler has written a detailed study of how the eighth century Christian Arab theologian John of Damascus used the framework of heresy to describe the relationship of Islam to Christianity. As Schadler makes clear, John would have been perfectly aware of how heresy had been defined by earlier theologians, including definitions hinging on someone who was originally a Christian turning away from correct belief. Nevertheless, John still found the category of heresy expansive enough to be used in his characterization of Muhammed as a false prophet.<sup>4</sup> At the beginning of his work, Schadler laments the overly-rigged definition of heresy prevalent across several fields in the humanities: “The idea that the heretic was once a member of the faithful is...firmly rooted in modern scholarship across disciplines, and although there are some voices who witness to authors who worked with alternative understandings...these are silenced by the multitude of voices testifying otherwise.”<sup>5</sup> As an example of the limitations presented by strictly adhering to a rigged technical definition of heresy, Schadler presents the case of Manichaeism. Manicheans were generally not framed as former Christians who had turned heretic, and yet they feature prominently in early Christian

---

<sup>3</sup> Eltschinger, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics*, 36 n. 3. See above, p 21.

<sup>4</sup> As Schadler states, “John’s particular interest in the Ishmaelites was in their opinions and how those opinions and ideologies differed from the Church’s; he spends little time on how they arrived at their state, with the exception of explaining that Muhammad helped to lead them to it.” See Peter Schadler, *John of Damascus and Islam: Christian Heresiology and the Intellectual Background to Earliest Christian-Muslim Relations*, History of Christian-Muslim Relations 34, (Leiden: Brill 2018), 93. Jeremy Cohen has written on how medieval theologians also applied the category of heresy to Jews. See Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 317–63.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Schadler, *John of Damascus*, 24.

heresiology. Schadler remarks, “It is thus somewhat surprising that Manichaeism’s very presence in virtually every Christian heresiology written after [Mani’s] time has not caused more to stop and reflect on whether the paradigm espoused above needs adjustment.”<sup>6</sup> The Manicheans nevertheless fell under the category of heresy because they, “portrayed themselves as the true heirs of Jesus Christ and the representatives of authentic Christianity, and attempted to claim the exclusive rights to universal truth...”<sup>7</sup>.

With the Manicheans, as with the early Muslims and medieval Jews, even if they were not originally Christians who had strayed from correct belief, they nevertheless spoke through biblical motifs, personages, and traditions which dangerously overlapped with those of Christians. In the same way, *pāṣaṇḍas* were dangerous precisely because they claimed to have knowledge of true dharma, which Vedic texts also claimed to teach. *Pāṣaṇḍas* dressed in the garb of “real” ascetics. They looked for all the world like “real” ascetics. And that was precisely the problem. Around the same time John of Damascus was writing, the eighth-century Mīmāṃsā scholar Kumārila Bhaṭṭa wrote in *Tv* a scathing denunciation of all the groups he considered heretical. He said that the scriptures of heretics like the Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra, Pāśupata, Buddhist and Jain sects claimed to talk about dharma and *adharma*; but in fact, they were only “scented with the fragrance of a little bit of truth which agrees with Śruti and Smṛti like non-violence, honest speech, self-control, generosity, mercy, etc.”<sup>8</sup> And therein lay their deceitfulness. *Vdha* 25.58 is saying much the same thing when it describes *pāṣaṇḍas* as “ones who make their living off of a false imitation of dharma.”<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Peter Schadler, *John of Damascus*, 26.

<sup>7</sup> Peter Schadler, *John of Damascus*, 26.

<sup>8</sup> *Tv* on *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-sūtra* 1.3.1-4 .

“*sāṃkhyayogapāñcarātrapāśupataśākyanirgranthaparigrhītadharmādharmanibandhanāni...hiṃsāsatyavacanadam adānadayādīśrutismṛtisaṃvādistokārthagandhavāsita...*” See also above, p.

<sup>9</sup> “*Dharmavyājopajīvinah!*”; see Appendix 2, p. 135 and 138.

To put it another way, the heretic talks like “one of us,” even though he is not one of us. Building on the work of George Zito, Adam Powell explains that the heretic’s use of the “insider language” of orthodoxy brings about a menacing state of confusion:

[T]he institutionalised manner of speaking is threatened because the heretic’s proclamations reveal that the same language can have an entirely different meaning, or worse yet, the pre-existing discourse can remain unchanged whilst justifying a new set of behaviours, a realisation that often leads to cognitive dissonance among the orthodox adherents who are now confounded by the sense of equivocation.<sup>10</sup>

I would argue, following Zito and Powell, that confusion, dissonance, and equivocation are at the heart of heresy in Purāṇic accounts, and at the heart of descriptions of the Kali Age in general.<sup>11</sup> But I would also argue, in response to Sanderson and Eltschinger, that any ambiguity between apostate and heretic is not due to people straying from a strict definition of heresy. Rather, it is a feature of what makes heresy what it is. The conceptual boundaries separating the infidel, the apostate, and the heretic were historically never particularly concrete. Both the apostate (the outsider who was once an insider) and the heretic (the insider who should not be inside) blur the line between “self” and “other,” “us” and “them.” So, for that matter, does the *mleccha*, the absolute outsider who is nevertheless encroaching on the daily reality of Indian society, in its very midst (or worse, ruling over it). As J. Z. Smith puts it, “From heresy to deviation to degeneration to syncretism, the notion of the different which claims to be the same, or, projected internally, the disguised difference within, has produced a rich vocabulary of denial and estrangement. For in each case, a theory of difference, when applied to the proximate ‘other,’ is

---

<sup>10</sup> Powell, Adam, “Irenaeus, Joseph Smith, and the Sociology of Heresy,” PhD diss., (Durham University, 2013), 29.

<sup>11</sup> Which is why we so often hear that *pāṣaṇḍas* destroy peoples’ mental faculties and are a particular danger to those of “little intelligence”; see, for example, Vdha 25.25, Appendix 2, p. 134.

but another way of phrasing a theory of the ‘self.’”<sup>12</sup> I would go so far as to say that the heretic and the *mleccha* are precisely so anxiety-provoking because the Other is *never “other” enough*; they are too similar to us, and too near. They overlap with our own definitions of ourselves, and are always already directly in our midst, revealing the insider-outsider binary to be flimsy and unsalvageable. Reality is always a confusing hybridity where Vedic/non-Vedic, Śūdra/twice-born, tribal, *caṇḍāla*, barbarian, and *pāṣaṇḍa* all bleed into each other.

### Does “heresy” come with too much baggage?

Apart from these criticisms arising from technical issues in defining heresy, Andrew Nicholson has cautioned against employing a non-Indian term to an Indian context:

The most common translations of *āstika* and *nāstika* are “orthodox” and “heterodox.”...[U]se of these two terms transposes Indian discourses of the Other into a Christian heresiological context that inevitably obscures as much as it elucidates. Because of the different heresiological presuppositions in Indian doxography and in Christian heresiography, it is best to avoid as much as possible such terms drawn from Christian traditions.<sup>13</sup>

As seen here, Nicholson raises the issue in an examination of “*nāstika*” rather than “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” but, of course, the point still applies. The two terms “*āstika*” and “*nāstika*” may be literally translated as “one who says (or teaches, or believes) there *is* (something)” and “one who says there *is not* (something)”; however, they are more commonly translated as “theist” and “atheist,” “believer” and “denier,” or as Nicholson indicates above. Nicholson demonstrates that just what exactly *is* or *is not* varies by time period, text, and religious group; it may be belief in an afterlife, belief in the fruits of karma, belief in the gods, belief in the efficacy of ethical or ritual action,

---

<sup>12</sup> Jonathan Z. Smith, *Differential Equations: On Constructing the “Other,”* Thirteenth Annual University Lecture in Religion, March 5, 1992 (pamphlet) (Temp, AZ: Department of Religious Studies, Arizona State University, 1992), 14.

<sup>13</sup> Andrew Nicholson, *Unifying Hinduism: Philosophy and Identity in Indian Intellectual History*, South Asia Across the Disciplines (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 165.

belief in the authority of the Vedas, belief in reality itself, or some combination of these.<sup>14</sup> In Buddhist and Jain contexts, *nāstika/natthika* usually signifies various kinds of nihilistic philosophical positions. In any case, as we have already discussed in Part One, the term *nāstika* is always a pejorative.<sup>15</sup> Nicholson never directly addresses the word “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” but routinely translates it as “infidel” without further discussion the four times it appears in his study.<sup>16</sup>

While I recognize the perils that accompany any act of translation, of trying to map Western words onto non-Western concepts, I believe that in cases like “*haíresis*” and “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” where two words have evolved along remarkably similar trajectories, drawing the two words into juxtaposition can indeed elucidate quite a bit, with the understanding that each one has its own cultural specificity. With a word like “*pāṣaṇḍa*,” which became, at its most fundamental, an insult, one must also consider the emotion behind the word. For example, in Bhavabhūti’s *Mālatīmādhava*, where Mādhava addresses the murderous Kāpālika Aghoraghaṇṭa as “*durātmanpāṣaṇḍacaṇḍāla*,” H. H. Wilson translates the phrase, “Wretch accursed, impious and vile.”<sup>17</sup> I feel we come much closer to the mark with something like, “you evil, filthy heretic!” To translate “*pāṣaṇḍa*” otherwise would be to destroy its entire dramatic effect.

---

<sup>14</sup> Nicholson, *Unifying Hinduism*, 168–179.

<sup>15</sup> See Section 1.5.2 above.

<sup>16</sup> This is despite Nicholson expressing reservations about the word “infidel” for the same reasons of it being “too fraught with Western connotations”; see Nicholson, *Unifying Hinduism*, 179.

<sup>17</sup> Bhavabhūti, *Malati and Madhava or the Stolen Marriage, a Drama*, Selected Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus 3, trans. H. H. Wilson (Calcutta: H.C. Das Elysium Press, 1826), 63.

# Appendix One

## An Annotated Translation of *Vāyu Purāṇa* Chapter 58, Collated with Parallel Verses

The event which provides the narrative frame for the description of the Kali Yuga in VāP (and the narrative frame for the main body of VāP in general) is the great multi-year sacrifice of King Asīmakṛṣṇa of the Paurava dynasty.<sup>1</sup> The various sages who had gathered in the Naimiṣa forest to perform the sacrifice are met by the Sūta Lomahaṛṣaṇa, a great reciter of Purāṇic lore. The sages entreat Lomahaṛṣaṇa to recite the Purāṇa to them, and he agrees to recite the same Purāṇa which the god Vāyu had recited in that very Naimiṣa forest when the gods held a sacrifice there at the creation of the world.<sup>2</sup> In the course of that recitation, the sages ask Lomahaṛṣaṇa to describe the four Yugas (beginning at VāP 57), which leads to the discussion of the Dvāpara and Kali Yugas at VāP 58.

---

<sup>1</sup> See VāP 1.12. Asīmakṛṣṇa is the sixth or seventh-generation grandson of Arjuna (i.e. the third of the five Pāṇḍava brothers) thus connecting the narration of VāP to the mythical time-frame of MBh. Various alternate spellings of this king's name are found in epic and Purāṇic literature, including Adhisīmakṛṣṇa and Adhisāmakṛṣṇ. For example, he is called Adhisāmakṛṣṇa at VāP 99.258, and is again identified there as the current ruler who is performing the multi-year *dīrghasatra* at the time of VāP's recitation. VāP 99.257–258 state him to be the sixth-generation grandson of Arjuna; BhP 9.22.39 makes him seventh-generation with the insertion of Sahasrānīka as his grandfather rather than Śatānīka. Note that MtP 50.66, which is likely corrupt, seems to make Asīmakṛṣṇa (there called Adhisomakṛṣṇa) the son rather than the grandson of Śatānīka. See Pargiter, 4. Asīmakṛṣṇa is the great-grandson of Janamejaya Pārīkṣit, whose snake sacrifice forms the narrative frame of MBh.

<sup>2</sup> See VāP 2.5. The sacrifice performed by the gods presumably happened at the beginning of the *manvantara*.

- K Kolkata edition edited by Rājendralāla Mitra for the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, published in two vols., 1880, 1888 (Veṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press edition follows this); corresponds to Pargiter’s CVā. and ऋ of ĀnSS VāP.
- V Mairal manuscript of Vadodara; corresponds to Pargiter’s a<sup>1</sup>Vā and ञ of ĀnSS VāP.
- P<sup>1</sup> Pune manuscript of Khajgiwale; corresponds to Pargiter’s a<sup>2</sup>Vā and ण of ĀnSS VāP.
- P<sup>2</sup> Pune manuscript of B. M. Potnis; corresponds to Pargiter’s a<sup>3</sup>Vā and ष of ĀnSS VāP.
- M Miraj manuscript of G. G. Patwardhan; corresponds to Pargiter’s a<sup>4</sup>Vā and ढ of ĀnSS VāP.
- C Chinmaya International Foundation manuscript digitized as part of the British Library’s Endangered Archives Programme (beginning on p. 392 of the digitization, or p. 196 by the manuscript’s own pagination): <https://eap.bl.uk/archive-file/EAP729-1-2-154>  
Written on country paper, showing frequent use of *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā/paḍimātrā* forms of the vowels *-e* and *-o*, although the usual forms with top-strokes (e.g., के, को) sometimes also appear.
- T Tod Collection manuscript held at the Royal Asiatic Society (RAS Tod MS 14). Presented to the RAS by then Major James Tod on February 21, 1824. Provenance unknown, but likely from Western India. Dated Saṃvat 1675/1618 CE. Written on country paper. Frequently leaves out *anusvāras* and *-ā mātrās*; also frequently confuses *anusvāras* with the *mātrā* for *-e*; frequently confuses *sa* (स) and *śa* (श). Many cases of dittography and many verses accidentally omitted. Does not use *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā/paḍimātrā* forms.

To utilize the critical apparatus, read backward from the position of the footnote. Where a verse is significantly different, I give it in full. Note that the chapter/verse numbering of the Ānandāśrama VāP, which was published in one volume, often differs widely from two-volume editions separating the text into a *purvārdha* and *uttarārdha* (e.g., the *Bibliotheca Indica* and Veṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press editions).



## *Vāyu Purāṇa*, Chapter 58: Description of the Four Ages

1 Sūta said:

From here onward, I will relate the development of the Dvāpara Age. When the Tretā Age is over, the Dvāpara Age is there entered upon.

2 Although the [mental] accomplishment<sup>1</sup> of the people at the beginning of the Dvāpara Age is as it is in the Tretā Age, as the age rolls on, that (accomplishment) then disappears.

3–4 Then, there is furthermore amongst those people in the Dvāpara Age an outbreak of greed, instability, fighting amongst merchants, uncertainty regarding facts, mixing of the *varṇas*, lack of certainty regarding religious duties, begging, murder, gambling, violence, intoxication, deceit, impatience, and weakness.<sup>2</sup> This outbreak, linked to *rajas* and *tamas*, is held<sup>3</sup> [by tradition to exist] in the Dvāpara Age.

5 Initially, in the Kṛta Age, there is no dharma [and no *adharmā*]<sup>4</sup>; in the Tretā Age, it comes forth; having become confounded in the Dvāpara Age, it vanishes in the Kali Age.

---

<sup>1</sup> The *siddhis* being referred to here are mental abilities of some sort, possibly similar to those spiritual abilities or powers attained from ascetic practice. It is not clear if all or any of the traditional eight *siddhis* (viz. *aṇimā*, *mahimā*, *laghimā*, etc.) are meant in this chapter (or, indeed, anywhere else *siddhis* of yugas are mentioned in VāP). Each of the eight *siddhis* is mentioned by name at VāP 13.3–17, but in the context of the achievements of yogic practice. *Siddhis* which are somehow characteristic to each yuga are, however, obliquely referred to in several verses of VāP's eighth chapter; there, they are repeatedly said to be "mental" (*mānasī*). See, for example, VāP 8.48; 8.72; 8.74. VāP 8.72–73 would appear to indicate that even here, the eight *siddhis* are somehow implied. On the differing lists and definitions of the eight *siddhis*, see Knut A. Jacobsen, "Introduction: Yoga Powers and Religious Traditions," in *Yoga Powers: Extraordinary Capacities Attained Through Meditation and Concentration*, ed. Knut A. Jacobsen, Brill's Indological Library 37 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 20–25.

<sup>2</sup> Following the alternate reading of "*kāryāṇām cāvinirṇayaḥ*" from K. BḍP and MtP both have "*viparyayaḥ*" here, which would mean "an inversion or perversion (of religious duties)." Instead of "*yācñā vadhaḥ paṇo daṇḍo*," K reads "*yajñauśadheḥ paśor daṇḍo*," "violence towards animals (and) towards plants (used) for sacrifice."

<sup>3</sup> *Smṛtaḥ* literally means remembered, recollected, handed down, i.e., just as *smṛti* texts are those which are "remembered" after being handed down by their human, divine, or semi-divine promulgators. Here, it indicates what traditional authority teaches or declares about the Kali Age.

<sup>4</sup> No reading is possible for "*ne*" as given in the ĀnSS edition. If "*ne*" is a misprint for "*na*" as given in C, then this passage follows VāP 8.50 "*dharmādharmāu na tasv āstāṃ kalpātau tu kṛte yuge*," "There was no dharma and adharmā among those beings (*prajāsu*) in the Kṛta Age at the beginning of the *kalpa*." In other words, in the Kṛta Age, there was no identifiable "thing" like dharma because dharma was everywhere naturally performed; dharma

6 The complete dissolution of the *varṇas* is praised, likewise of the *āśramas*; and difference of opinions arises in this age regarding the Śruti and Smṛti.<sup>5</sup>

7 Because of doubt regarding the Śruti and Smṛti, certainty is not reached. Because of not arriving at certainty, the essence of dharma is nowhere to be found. There will be discord among those people who are divided regarding the essence of dharma.

8 Because they are divided against each other and because of the confusion of views, certainty like “this is dharma, this is not dharma” is not arrived at.

9 Because of the lack of basic facts and uncertainty about what a basic fact even is, and on account of difference of opinion, there would be confusion in the views of those people.

10 Therefore, this number of *śāstras* is made by those people whose views are divided. One Veda in four parts is put forth here in the Tretā times.

11 And it occurs in the Dvāpara times<sup>6</sup> that, because of the lessening of lifespan, [the one Veda] is split fourfold by the arrangers of the Veda in the Dvāpara and later ages.

12 The Vedas are further divided by the seers’ descendants who are of confused views, who redact [them into] the Mantras and Brāhmaṇas by means of alterations in the accents and syllables.

---

did not need to be defined because everyone abided by it automatically. In parallel verses, BḍP has “*yo dharmo*,” MtP has “*nādharmo*,” and LiṅP has “*tu dharmo*.” Cf. VāP 8.61: “*apavṛttiḥ kṛtayuge karmaṇoḥ śubhapāpayoḥ*.”<sup>5</sup> The correct reading (vs. VāP’s *saṃkīṛtyate*), and possible evidence of a Hybrid Sanskrit original, may be reflected in the parallel verse from BḍP. There, we find “*varṇānām viparidhvaṃsaḥ saṃkīyata tathāśramāḥ*,” “There is the complete dissolution of the *varṇas* (in the Kali Yuga), and likewise the *āśramas* are corrupted/confused/impure.” Here, we see something like (although not precisely) a Prakrit ppp. (cf. Pāli *saṃkīyati*); the correct Sanskrit form from *saṃ* + √*kī* would be *saṃkīṛṇāḥ*. Indeed, we see this reading confirmed in the parallel verse at MtP 144.6, “*saṃkīryante tathāśramāḥ*.” VāP’s “*saṃkīṛtyate*” may thus be a wrong Sanskritization from a Hybrid Sanskrit original; “*āśramāḥ*” in the singular is also difficult to construe.

<sup>6</sup> D. R. Patil cautions us to take note of this switching from singular to plural forms of the names of the ages. I have translated “*dvāpareṣu*” as “in the Dvāpara times” in order to preserve the ambiguity of whether the text is referring to the present Dvāpara (and Kali) times, or to every Dvāpara (and Kali) Age that has occurred, or will ever occur, in every *manvantara*. We should be open to the idea that the text is describing both the present times and all times simultaneously. See D. R. Patil, *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa* (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1946), 74.

**13** The compilations of the *R̥k*, *Yajur*, and *Sāma Vedas* were put together, sometimes similarly, sometimes differently, by the [various] Śrutar̥ṣis (i.e. the pupils of the original ṛ̥ṣi seers,), being of differing views.

**14** With regard to the Br̥h̥maṇas, the Kalpasūtras, the Mantras and their expositions, some [people] were turned towards them by religious teachers and some were turned against them.

**15** In the Dvāpara times, twice-born people who are of different practices and āśramas [from the standard ones] rise up. Previously there was one *Yajur Veda*, and then it was split in two.

**16** This number of śāstras is created with [both] similar and contradictory meanings. Confusion is repeatedly created by the eulogies of the *Yajur Veda*.

**17** The same [is done] to the *Atharva*, *R̥k*, and *Sāma Vedas* by those who are in doubt; and yet, they are still not completely destroyed. Confusing dissension is created by those whose views are divided in the Dvāpara Age.

**18** Divisions and subdivisions [are made] to them because of uncertainties; and yet, they are still not completely destroyed. They spread in the Dvāpara Age, then are destroyed in the Kali Age.

**19** Just as there occur perversions of them (i.e. the Vedas) in the Dvāpara Age, there similarly occur [calamities like] drought, death, and, likewise, disease and injuries.

**20** Because of suffering caused by speech, thought, or deed, there then arises world-weariness. Because of world-weariness, there arises for those people reflection on liberation from suffering.

**21** From [this] reflection, detachment [arises], and from [this] detachment [arises] the perceiving of the evils [of existence]. And thus, from the perceiving of the evils [of existence], there is the possibility of wisdom in the Dvāpara Age.

**22** And there arise in the Dvāpara Age opponents to those śāstras formerly honored in the beginning in the Svāyaṃbhava period.

**23** [There arise] doubts regarding Āyurveda and the Vedāṅgas, doubt regarding astrology, doubt regarding *arthaśāstra* and doubtfulness regarding the science of logic.

**24** In the Dvāpara times, there break out subdivisions in the science of Smṛti (i.e., law) and many separate ways of thinking, as well as divided opinions among people.

**25** In the Dvāpara Age, a livelihood is obtained with difficulty, by thought, by deed, [or] by speech, and is accompanied by bodily pain for all beings.

**26** There will be greed, instability, fighting amongst merchants, uncertainty regarding facts, the composition of [altered] Vedas and Śāstras and the mixing up of [caste] duties, as well.

**27** In the Dvāpara times, disease, greed, and murder break out, and likewise lust, hatred, and adulterations of the *varṇas* and *āśramas*.

**28** The longest lifespan of people [in the Dvāpara Age] is then a full two thousand years. When that Dvāpara Age is finished without remainder, there is, step by step, the interstitial period.

**29** There is that established dharma of the Dvāpara Age which is without good qualities. Likewise, the closing interstitial period of that (Dvāpara Age) continues with a part of the interstitial period (dharma).<sup>7</sup>

**30** And upon the turning of the Dvāpara Age, hear now of the Tiṣya<sup>8</sup> (i.e. Kali) Age. At the end of the closing interstitial period of the Dvāpara Age, there is from that time on the beginning of the Kali Age.

**31** Violence, envy, dishonesty, deception, killing of ascetics, these are the inherent qualities of the Kali Age, and they bring the people under [their] power.

---

<sup>7</sup> Recall that the interstitial periods are supposed to share in the yuga's dharmas to varying degrees.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of the terms "*tiṣya*" and "*puṣya*" as alternate names for the Kali Age, see Luis González-Reimann, *The Mahābhārata and the Yugas: India's Great Epic Poem and the Hindu System of World Ages* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 106–8.

**32** There is that dharma which is proper and whole; that dharma is lost. By thought, by deed, [or] by praise, a livelihood may or may not be attained.

**33** In the Kali Age, there certainly exist, continuously, deadly disease, dangers of famine, the dreadful danger of drought, and misfortune in the lands.

**34** The authority of the Smṛti, [which exists] in the world from age to age, does not exist in the Kali Age. One person dies in the womb, likewise another dies in puberty. Indeed, the people die in old age [or] in the midst of adolescence in the Kali Age.<sup>9</sup>

**35** Indeed, people who are without dharma, who are without proper conduct, who are of little dignity because of delusion and anger, and who are of untrue speech are continuously born in the Kali Age.

**36** Danger arises because of these faults in the deeds of Brahmin folk: [because they are] of bad desires, poorly learned, of bad conduct, and of bad doctrines.<sup>10</sup>

**37** In the Kali Age, violence, deception, envy, anger, dishonesty, intolerance, lust, and greed exist (on the part) of everybody everywhere.

**38** The Kali Age having been reached, unrest certainly arises to a great degree. At that time, the Vedas are not learned and the twice born do not perform sacrifice. People who are Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas gradually disappear.

**39** Here, in this Kali Age, there occur [instances of] intercourse of Śūdras or someone born as an outcaste with Brahmins, (intercourse) through beds and seats and food.

---

<sup>9</sup> Another possible meaning of the second part of this verse is that those who live until the middle of adolescence before dying are considered old. See n. 68 below.

<sup>10</sup> “*Duriṣṭaiḥ*,” which I have translated here as having “bad desires,” could also imply doing bad or incorrect sacrifices or rituals.

40 Kings are mostly Śūdras and promoters of heretics. There are people at that time who are killers of embryos/Brahmins<sup>11</sup>; people exist in that way.

41 Long life, intelligence, strength, beauty, and lineage as well are lost. The Śūdras possess the customary practices of Brahmins and the Brahmins possess the customary practices of Śūdras.

42 Thieves are established in the role of the king and kings have the behavior of thieves.

Servants are bereft of friends<sup>12</sup> when the final age has arrived.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *Bhrūṇahatyā* being one of the gravest crimes according to Hindu religious law. This originally meant the killing of a fetus, especially a fetus of *dvija* parentage, and, among *dvijas*, especially a fetus of Brahmin parents. Because that fetus (assumed to be male) had at least the potential to become a Vedic priest, the killing of such a fetus came over time to be held as tantamount to the murder of a learned, fully grown Brahmin. In this way, *bhrūṇahatyā* eventually came mean both the killing of a fetus and the killing of an adult Brahmin. In the *Māgaṇḍiya Sutta* (MN 75), the ascetic Māgaṇḍiya calls the Buddha a *bhūṇahu*, stating that the teachings of his sect (presumably a rival ascetic sect hostile to the Buddhists) declare the Buddha to be thus (*evañhi no sutte ocarati*). This is arguably because young *dvijas* were ordaining as Buddhist monks and nuns instead of living as householders and having children—causing the “non-existence” of those children in another sense (compare, in a slightly different context, YDh 1.64 and BDh 4.1.17–21). For a detailed analysis of *bhrūṇahatyā* and how the term developed over time, see Albrecht Wezler, “A Note on Sanskrit *bhrūṇa*, and *bhrūṇahatyā*,” in *Festschrift für Klaus Bruhn zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, eds. Nalini Balbir and J. K. Bautze (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen, 1994), 623–646.

<sup>12</sup> The variant reading of “*asubhṛto*” given in BḍP clarifies what is meant here: servants are not cherished or well maintained.

<sup>13</sup> LiṅP has a lengthy insertion here (LiṅP 1.40.9cd–22ab), running some thirteen verses long. To paraphrase these verses, it is stated that in the Kali Age, faithful wives no longer exist (*ekapatnyo na śiṣyanti*), and that women with many lovers will increase (*vardhiṣyanty abhisārikāḥ*; the distinction being made is between an *ekapatnī* and an *abhisārikā*, that is, between a monogamous woman devoted to one husband and a courtesan who keeps many lovers). All Śūdras are praised as wise men (*jñāninaḥ*) by Brahmins. Foolish Śūdras do not rise from their seats upon seeing the twice born (*na calanty alpabuddhayaḥ*); instead the twice born are physically beaten by them (*tādayanti dvijendrāmś ca*). Even knowing that Śūdras are placed on high seats in the midst of the twice born, the king does no harm to the Śūdras in the Kali due to the influence of the times (*na hiṃsate rājā kalau kālavaśena tu*). Śūdras are worshipped with flowers and other scented, auspicious, and pleasant things (*puspais ca vāsitaś caiva tathānyair maṅgalaiḥ śubhaiḥ*) by people possessing power and affluence but having little knowledge (*alpaśrutabhāgyabalānviṭāḥ*). The twice born stand at the doorways of the Śūdras, having watched for an opportunity to serve them (*sevāvasaram ālokyā*) when they return in their vehicles. Brahmins serve the Śūdras and sing their praises (*stuvanti stutibhiḥ*). The fruits of ascetic practice and religious sacrifice are for sale (*tapoyajñaphalānām ca vikretāro*). In the Kali Age, the twice born defame Vedic learning and rituals (*nindanti vedavidyām ca...karmāni*). Śiva will manifest as deformed (*vikṛtākṛtiḥ*, probably referring to his Bhikṣātana form) for the sake of the support of dharma. Whatever Brahmins worship Śiva in the Kali Age attain the highest station, having defeated the defilements of that Age (*kalidoṣān vinirjitya prayānti paramaṃ padam*; “*paramaṃ padam*” here presumably refers to ultimate salvation). See n. 261 below.

43 Women are immoral, irreligious<sup>14</sup>, and fond of meat and liquor. They will be nothing but deceitful when the final age has arrived.

44 There is the mightiness of wild beasts and also the wasting away of cattle; and you should know the disappearance of holy men [to occur] in that Kali Age.<sup>15</sup>

45 Because of laxity with regard to the four *āśramas*, the subtle, greatly rewarding, difficult to obtain dharma which has gifts as its roots<sup>16</sup> will get disordered.

46 At that time, indeed, the great earth goddess would be [yielding] few fruits. Śūdras will perform *tapas* when the final age has arrived.

47 At that time, just one day of [doing] dharma equals a month of that in the Dvāpara Age; and (one) continuous year [of doing dharma] in the Tretā Age is surpassed by one day [of doing dharma in the Kali Age].

48 Kings are not protectors [but] seizers of taxes. In the end times, they will be intent [only] on self-preservation.

49 Kings are not Kṣatriyas. The people live dependent upon the śūdras. All the best of the twice-born (i.e. Brahmins) are greeters<sup>17</sup> of śūdras in the final age.

50 Ascetics will be numerous in that Kali age. It will indeed be the end of time when that deva (i.e. Indra) is making rain abnormally.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Literally, “without *vratas*”; for the special significance of Purāṇic *vratas* to the religious practice of women, see Kunal Chakrabarti, *Religious Process: The Purāṇas and the Making of a Regional Tradition* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2018), 239–261.

<sup>15</sup> Following the reading in BḍP.

<sup>16</sup> Recall the special relationship between *dāna* and dharma in the Kali Age.

<sup>17</sup> There were strict rules governing methods of salutation laid down in Hindu legal texts, dictating who would greet whom first, and how, based on *varṇa*. See R. S. Sharma, *Śūdras in Ancient India: A Survey of the Position of the Lower Orders Down to circa A.D. 500*, 3rd ed. (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990), 125–6; Y. B. Singh, *Social Life in Ancient India* (New Delhi: Light & Life Publishers, 1981), 211. This verse indicates that Brahmins would pay respects to or salute Śūdras as equals or superiors in the Kali age.

<sup>18</sup> “*Citravarṣin*” here could mean that rain is erratic both in the sense of being “spotty” or unseasonal, and in the sense of being “unnatural,” as in raining hailstones, fire, etc. Parallel verses make clear that Indra is the deva being

**51** And all will be merchants in the worst age. Śūdras are ascetics and are living disguised as ones who do *tapas*.<sup>19</sup> [The people] who have lost their way are covetous for the wives of others in the Kali age. The people mainly sell merchandise<sup>20</sup> through false weights and measures.

**52** When the final age has arrived, it is beset with heretics of bad character and conduct whose appearance is false<sup>21</sup>; it has a paucity of men and an overabundance of women.

**53** The world will have an abundance of beggars [begging] from one another. (All the world) eats meat, has cruel speech, is dishonest, and is not free from jealousy.<sup>22</sup>

**54** All the world will be poor and will not be a repayer of [good] deeds. [When] there is fearlessness<sup>23</sup> in an outcaste, it is indeed a mark of that final age.

**55** The earth is barren and empty of men. There are gangs<sup>24</sup> in the lands and in the cities at this time.

**56** The earth will have little water and [bear] few fruits. Moreover, protectors (i.e. kings) who are not [really] protectors will rule without punishing [those deserving of punishment].<sup>25</sup>

---

referred to, calling him by his epithet *parjanya*. Cf. HV 116.18cd. See E. W. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde III, 1B (Strasbourg: K. J. Trübner, 1915), 129.

<sup>19</sup> I.e., they only have the outward appearance of true *tapasvins*. “*Vāsa*” in Pāli can mean clothing or, as an adjective, “clothed in.” Thus, “*gūḍhāvāsa*” may simply mean having clothing which is disguised.

<sup>20</sup> Following the reading in C and BḍP. The reading given in the ĀnSS edition seems out of place: “Most merit is destroyed by the people because of (their) bad ideas,” using a liberal translation of “*kūṭamāna*.”

<sup>21</sup> “*Vṛthārūpa*” here could be read in connection with other passages indicating that heretics only have the deceptive guise of, but are not truly, ascetics.

<sup>22</sup> “*Asūyā*” could also be translated as contempt, spite, or peevishness.

<sup>23</sup> The word “*aśaṅkā*” could also be rendered “unscrupulousness”; the meaning is, however, clear: in the Kali age outcastes will act in a shameless and brazen way.

<sup>24</sup> The BrP/HV read “*maṅḍalaiḥ*” in parallel verses; Nīlakaṅṭha’s commentary glosses “*maṅḍalaiḥ*” in HV with “*saṃghaśaḥ*,” reflected in the translation given here. See n. 312 below. The *Śivatoṣiṇī* glosses “*maṅḍalāni*” in the parallel verse at LiṅP 1.40.30 with “*janaśūnyasthalāni*,” but I can find no support for this interpretation.

<sup>25</sup> “*Cāpi*” here could also mean “both protectors and non-protectors,” but I believe the more likely meaning is that kings in the Kali age are not truly kings, specifically because they do not punish those who deserve punishment. Criminal punishment is a primary component of *daṇḍanīti*, the enforcement of which is the dharma of a king.



57–58 [Men are] seizers of the riches of others, molesters of the wives of others, lustful-natured and evil natured, fond of violence through adharma. Men who are without intelligence have [their] hair loose or in a topknot.<sup>26</sup> They beget offspring before the age of sixteen in the endtime.

59 Śūdras with white teeth, with senses unsubdued, bald, and having red garments, will be engaged in dharma when the final age has arrived.<sup>27</sup>

60 There will be thieves of grain and also seizers<sup>28</sup> of the garments [of others], as well as thieves [who steal from] a thief and plunderers who are plunderers of plunderers.

61 When wisdom and duty<sup>29</sup> have disappeared in the world [which has] fallen into inaction, insects, rodents, and snakes will harass humans.

62 Abundance of food, ease, freedom from illness, and strength would be difficult to obtain [at that time]. Owls<sup>30</sup> will dwell in the lands which are oppressed by the danger of hunger.

---

<sup>26</sup> Possibly meaning that they do not care about their appearance. Parallel verse at BrP 231.10/HV 116.11.

<sup>27</sup> This verse presents many challenges, while simultaneously being of no small significance. It is difficult to tell if “*śukladantājitākṣāḥ*” or “*śukladantā jitākṣāḥ*” is the correct reading here. The reference to white teeth is puzzling, but may have to do with the belief that Śūdras normally have black teeth as opposed to Brahmins’ white ones (see Sharma, *Śūdras in Ancient India*, 230). What is more likely, however, is that this is a misreading for “*śulkādāna*,” which is indeed what we find in the similar verse at Vdha 105.51; cf. Vdha 105.43, “*rājaśulkaharāḥ kṣudrā*,” “*kṣudrā*” being a frequent variant reading for “*śūdra*.” The meaning is that Śūdra heretics are “eaters of taxes” which ought rightfully to be going to Vedic Brahmins and Śaiva/Vaiṣṇava temples. KūP, like C, gives “*jinākhyās ca*,” “and called *jinās*.” LiñP gives “*śukladantājinākṣās ca*,” with the *Śivatoṣinī* glossing “*ajinaṃ*” as “*kṛṣṇājinaṃ*,” possibly referring to the blackness of the eyes. BḍP gives the same reading as VāP. HV 116.15 reads “*śukladantājitākṣāḥ*,” but with a variant reading of “*śukladantāñjitākṣāḥ*” in seven manuscripts, “having smeared/decorated/shining eyes” (possibly indicating eyes smeared with kohl, Pāli *añjana*). HV 116.15 also replaces “*yugante paryupastithe*” with “*śākyabuddhopajīvināḥ*,” thus explicitly identifying the red-robed Śūdras as Buddhists; there is, however, an alternate reading for this term given in both HV and BrP: “*śāṭhyabuddhyopajīvināḥ*.” It should be noted that both “*ākhyā*” and “*akṣā*” would be rendered “*akkha*” in Prakrits like Pāli, providing further evidence that the variant readings point to a Hybrid original. It is, perhaps, no coincidence that “*śūdrā dharmam carisyanti*” could also be read “*śūdrādharmam carisyanti*,” “they will spread the *adharma* of the Śūdras.”

<sup>28</sup> Reading “*abhimarśinaḥ*”; *abhi* + *√mṛś* means both to touch/to seize and to assault physically/sexually. While the salient reading is clearly that, in the Kali Age, people’s possessions (in this case, their garments) will be subject to theft, it is interesting to note this possible secondary meaning.

<sup>29</sup> The alternate reading of “*yajñakarmaṇī*” from HV/BrP would tend to indicate that the inaction or neglect being indicated here is specifically with regard to religious and ritual duties/obligations.

<sup>30</sup> The second half of this verse, which appears to have been corrupt even in antiquity, is problematic. LiñP and HV/BrP give “*kauśikīm*,” which has been interpreted as meaning the river Kauśikī (the modern day Koshī River which flows through Tibet, Nepal, and Bihar), with HV 117.28 / BrP 231.69 giving “*pratariṣyanti/samtariṣyanti*” in place of “*prativatsyanti*.” HV 117.29–30 / BrP 231.70–71 go on to say that people will cross the Kauśikī and settle

**63** The longest lifespan of [those people], who are flooded with sorrow, would [then] be a hundred [years]. The complete Vedas are [sometimes] found, [sometimes] not found in the Kali Age.

**64–66** Likewise, sacrifices, completely suppressed by adharma, fall into decay. Indeed, heretics [like] the red robed ones,<sup>31</sup> the Jains, and the ones with skulls,<sup>32</sup> other heretics who are sellers of the Vedas, [still] other heretics who are sellers of holy sites: these and other heretics [who are] followers of paths [which go] against the *varṇas* and the *āśramas* certainly arise when the Kali Age has fully arrived. The Vedas are not studied then, [and] Śūdras are skilled in matters of dharma.

**67** Kings born of Śūdra wombs do not worship with the Aśvamedha sacrifice.<sup>33</sup> Having committed murder of women and murder of cows, and having killed one another, the kings would destroy each other and subjugate the people.

**68** Because of the prevalence of suffering, there is shortness of lifespan, ruination of the land, and diseasedness. Delusion, impairment, and likewise delight [in] behavior [related to] *tamas* is held [by tradition to exist] in the Kali Age.

---

amongst *mlecchas* like the Aṅgas, Vaṅgas, Kaliṅgas, Kāśmīras, Kośalas, etc., in the Himalayas, at the seacoasts, in the forests, etc. Cf. VāP 99.402–403. No such reading is possible in VāP 58.62 / BḍP 1.31.63. Here we have *kauśikas*, owls (or is it referring to members of the Brahmin *gotra* descended from Kuśika, or to the followers of the Pāśupata guru Kuśika?). The interpretation of “owl” is perhaps made somewhat more likely by the previous verse’s mention of various animals, and by the fact that owls are generally held to be inauspicious creatures in Indian culture. Arriving at a clear interpretation is further complicated by differences in the grammatical cases of the various terms as given in VāP vs. BḍP and LiṅP.

<sup>31</sup> I.e., Buddhists. See above, n. 27.

<sup>32</sup> I.e., Kāpālikas.

<sup>33</sup> BḍP, LiṅP, and MtP state that Śūdra kings *will* perform the Aśvamedha sacrifice. Both situations would be abhorrent to an orthodox Brahmin, the main point being that the kings themselves are Śūdras.

69 Moreover, the murder of embryos/Brahmins<sup>34</sup> frequently takes place among the people.

Because of that, lifespan, strength, [and] beauty are lost, having arrived at the Kali Age. The longest lifespan of [those] people, who are flooded with sorrow, is indeed a hundred [years].

70 The complete Vedas are [sometimes] found, [sometimes] not found in the Kali Age.

Sacrifices, completely suppressed by adharma, fall into decay.<sup>35</sup>

71 Then, men will reach [mental] accomplishment<sup>36</sup> in a short time. [Those] fortunate ones who are the best of the twice born will follow dharma at the end of time.

72 Those people without jealousy<sup>37</sup> who follow the dharma declared in the Śruti and Smṛti— [such a] wise one following [dharma] to the extent of his abilities would attain that in a day in the Kali [which is] held [by tradition] to be a year [of doing] dharma in the Tretā Age, [and] a month in the Dvāpara Age.<sup>38</sup>

73 Such is the situation in the Kali Age. Listen to me now regarding the interstitial period.<sup>39</sup> Age after age, the [mental] accomplishments [correspondingly] decrease each time by three quarters.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> See above, n. 11.

<sup>35</sup> On the repetition of VāP 58.63–64ab, see below, n. 376.

<sup>36</sup> See above, n. 1.

<sup>37</sup> See above, n. 22.

<sup>38</sup> A grammatically difficult passage, but the meaning is fairly clear. After the parallel verses at SkP 1.2.40.247, there follows a strange and idiosyncratic chronicle of dynasties taking up the remainder of SkP 1.2.40. In this section, Pramiti and Kalkin are mentioned separately as two different future kings of the present twenty-eighth Kali Yuga of the Vaivasvata Manvantara (see SkP 1.2.40.260–261; SkP 1.2.40.270–273). Curiously, Pramiti is not stated there to be created from a part of Viṣṇu. Furthermore, Kalkin is not mentioned by name, but is only identifiable by the fact that he *is* explicitly stated to be an avatar of Viṣṇu, and by the fact that he is said to be the son of Viṣṇuyaśas. At VāP 98.104, Kalkin is said to be *named* Viṣṇuyaśas, the son of Parāśara, attended by Yājñavalkya (*yājñavalkyapurāḥsarah*). Precisely who the Parāśara and Yājñavalkya being referred to here are is entirely uncertain. See nn. 44 and 64 below. Note that parallel verses to the ones referring to Pramiti in VāP 58 and Kalkin in VāP 98 are found in some manuscripts of HV inserted at 31.148, where Kalkin is mentioned in a list of Viṣṇu's avatars. This list itself is said at HV 31.149 to have already been recorded in “the Purāṇas,” so it should not surprise us to see verses potentially borrowed from VāP added there.

<sup>39</sup> It is significant that MtP gives a dual “*samdhyaṃśau*” here.

<sup>40</sup> There is a parallelism here, “*yuge yuge...trīms trīn*,” literally “in age to age...three and three.” There is some ambiguity with regard to the “decrease by three quarters.” Is this referring to the fact that by the arrival of the Kali Yuga, three quarters of the total dharma of the world have vanished (or, in the simile of dharma as a quadruped, it

74 From the inherent qualities of the ages, [those accomplishments] partially remain in [the first part of the interstitial periods]. From the inherent qualities of [the first part of the interstitial periods], they are partially lasting into [the second part of the interstitial periods].<sup>41</sup>

75 Thus indeed, when the time of the interstitial period is fully reached at the end of the age, a punisher of those very same wicked ones is born into the family of the Bhārgavas.<sup>42</sup>

76 By clan name, he is called Candramasa, by personal name, he is called Pramiti.<sup>43</sup> Previously, in the Svāyambhuva period, he was indeed (created?) out of a fragment of Mādhava (i.e., Viṣṇu).<sup>44</sup>

77–78 Indeed, roaming the earth for a full twenty years,<sup>45</sup> indeed, he drew<sup>46</sup> an army [furnished] with horses, chariots, and elephants, and then, moreover, with hundreds, with thousands of Brahmins who have taken up weapons, he, surrounded by [those troops], kills barbarians by the thousands.

---

would only be standing on one foot)? Or does this three-quarter reduction of dharma also somehow apply to the passage from main yuga to interstitial period?

<sup>41</sup> The readings found in BḍP, LiñP, and MtP are largely preferable to the one found in VāP for this verse. Firstly, reading a locative “*saṃdhyāsu*,” as seen in BḍP and MtP, makes better sense than VāP’s “*saṃdhyās tu*,” especially given that there should be a parallel with “*cāṃśeṣu*” in the second half of the verse. Secondly, VāP’s feminine plural “*imāḥ*” must be referring back to the “*siddhayaḥ*” of the previous verse, and yet we find a masculine plural “*te*” in the second half of the verse where we would expect “*tāḥ*.” The parallel verse at MtP 144.49, for example, would be translated: “the inherent qualities of the [respective] yugas partially remain in the *saṃdhyās*, [and] the inherent qualities of the *saṃdhyās* thusly remain by a part in [their] own *aṃśās*,” reading a present tense verb for MtP’s curious perfect “*avatasthire*.”

<sup>42</sup> Literally, “the family of the Bhṛgus.” “*Nidhana*” here means family, clan, line, or lineage.

<sup>43</sup> Thus giving his full *nāmagotra* appellation. Alternatively, “by clan, he is of the moon,” i.e. of lunar lineage.

<sup>44</sup> Purāṇic sources mention several incarnations of Viṣṇu during the Svāyambhuva Manvantara, the chief of whom is arguably Yajña/Suyajña, who is said at ViP 3.1.36 to be the incarnation presiding over that entire *manvantara*. Yajña was a grandchild of Svāyambhuva Manu through his daughter Ākūti, which would fit the variant reading of “*mānavasya*” here and at VāP 58.85 below. See, however, n. 64.

<sup>45</sup> MtP reads thirty years; on the frequent confusion of “*viṃśati*” and “*triṃśati*” in manuscripts of the MtP, VāP, and BḍP, however, see F. E. Pargiter, *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* (London: Humphrey Milford, 1913), xxiii.

<sup>46</sup> BḍP gives a present participle (*anukarṣan*), which we would expect; VāP, however, begins a number of sudden switches to past tense with the perfect “*ācakarṣa*.”

79 Having indeed gone everywhere [and] killed those kings born of Śūdra wombs, the Sovereign (Pramiti) then caused<sup>47</sup> [the destruction of] all the heretics down to the very last.

80–83 He kills completely all those who are not especially pious, as well as those born contrary<sup>48</sup> to *varṇa*<sup>49</sup> and those who are [their] dependents, those of the Northern-region<sup>50</sup> and those of the Middle-country; and likewise those of the Mountain-region; those of the Eastern-region and those of the Western-region; also, those of the Vindhya Range and the Western coast; and, likewise, the Southerners, the Dravidians along with the Siṃhalas; and likewise also the

---

<sup>47</sup> Literally, “he made them without any remainder.” Again, a curious shift to past tense with the past active participle “*kṛtavān*.”

<sup>48</sup> “*Vyatyāsa*” implies being reversed, opposite to or against the proper direction.

<sup>49</sup> What follows is a list of regions into which the South Asian subcontinent was divided at the time the VāP was composed, as well as a list of groups deemed outsiders, barbarians living outside the Vedic homeland of Āryāvarta. All of these groups refer back grammatically to “*varṇavyatyāśajātān*”; recall that at MDhŚ 10.43–45, many of these same groups are named and defined as fallen Kṣatriyas who suffered a loss of status due to their impiety. Somewhat similarly, *Gautama-Dharmasūtra* 4.21 defines the Yavanas, for example, as being the product of a mixed-*varṇa* union between a Kṣatriya father and a Śūdra mother.

<sup>50</sup> A similar system of dividing the subcontinent into regions was used at least as early as the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, which, at AB 8.14.1–3, lists five regions named Prācyā, Dakṣiṇā, Prañcīyā, Udīcyā, and Madhyadeśā. By the time of the VāP, this list was expanded to seven, with the addition of Vindhyaṛṣṭha (lit., the Vindhya Ridge or Plateau) and the Parvatīyā country, land of the mountain tribes (the Pārvatīyas). For a parallel list of regions, see MrP 57.33–59, where Prañcīyā seems to be replaced by Aparānta/Aparāntika; the latter terms appear to refer to the western coast of India, including the Konkan and possibly stretching up to and including Sindh. For a discussion of all the regions, see B. C. Law, *India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism* (London: Luzac & Co., 1941), 14–21. For the Pārvatīyas, see Buddha Prakash, *Studies in Indian History and Civilization* (Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co., 1962), 30–32. For Aparānta, see H. C. Chakladar, *Social Life in Ancient India: Studies in Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra* (Calcutta: Greater India Society, 1929), 87–91.

Gāndhārāns,<sup>51</sup> Pārādas, Parthians,<sup>52</sup> and Greeks,<sup>53</sup> the Tokharians,<sup>54</sup> the Barbaras,<sup>55</sup> the Chinese,<sup>56</sup> the Sogdians,<sup>57</sup> the Dards,<sup>58</sup> the Khaśas,<sup>59</sup> the Lampākas,<sup>60</sup> and, moreover, the Ketas.<sup>61</sup> And there are tribes of the Kirātas.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> On the Gāndhārāns, see E.E. Kuz'mina, *The Origin of the Indo-Iranians*, ed. J. P. Mallory (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 311–320.

<sup>52</sup> On the Pahlavas/Pahnavas, see F. W. Thomas, "IX. Sakastana," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 38, no. 1 (1906): 215. See also T. Foulkes, "The Pallavas," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 17, no. 2 (1885): 218–220; M. Witzel, *Das Alte Indien* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2003), 96; Hassan Rezai Baghbidi, "Iranian elements in Sanskrit," in *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics: Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*, eds. B. Tikkanen and H. Hettrich (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2006), 154. It is likely that these appellations would have also been applied to the Sassanians, who continued to use Pahlavi as their official state language.

<sup>53</sup> For a lengthy study on Yonas/Yavanas in ancient Indian history, see Klaus Karttunen, *Yonas and Yavanas in Indian Literature*, *Studia Orientalia* 116 (Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society, 2015). See also A. K. Narain, *The Indo-Greeks* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957).

<sup>54</sup> For a study on the Tokharians, see A. K. Narain, *The Tokharians: A History Without Nation-State Boundaries* (Shillong: North-Eastern Hill University Publications, 2000). W. B. Henning, "The First Indo-Europeans in History," in *Society and History: Essays in Honor of Karl August Wittfogel*, ed. G. L. Ulman (The Hague: Mouton, 1978), 215–230.

<sup>55</sup> On the Barbaras see J. M. Campbell, *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, vol. 1, pt. 1, *History of Gujarāt* (Bombay: Government Central Press, 1896), 174–175; J. W. McCrindle, *McCrindle's Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy*, ed. S. M. Śāstrī (Calcutta: Chuckervertty, Chatterjee and Co., 1927), 148; 370–371. On Barbaricum/Barbarikon of the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*, see P. H. L. Eggermont, *Alexander's Campaigns in Sind and Baluchistan and the Siege of the Brahmin Town of Harmatelia*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 3 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), 31–43; Lionel Casson, "Introduction," in *The Periplus Maris Erythraei: Text with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, trans. L. Casson (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 22–26. Efforts to identify the Barbaras with various tribes from the Punjab up to Afghanistan (Babbars, Bābars) remain inconclusive.

<sup>56</sup> For a recent reconsideration of the origin of the name "Cīna," see Geoff Wade, "The Polity of Yelang (夜郎) and the Origins of the Name 'China,'" *Sino-Platonic Papers*, no. 188 (May 2009).

<sup>57</sup> For a discussion of the Śūlikas, see R. S. Satyasray, *Studies in Rājput History*, vol. 1, *Origin of the Chālukyas* (Calcutta: S. C. Ghosh, 1937), 41–52; H. W. Bailey, *Indo-Scythian Studies, Being Khotanese Texts*, vol. 7 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 76–79.

<sup>58</sup> On the question of the Dards, see G. E. Clarke, "Who Were the Dards? A Review of the Ethnographic Literature of the North-Western Himalaya," *Kailash* 5, no. 4 (1977): 323–356; S. Hussain, *Remoteness and Modernity: Transformation and Continuity in Northern Pakistan*, Yale Agrarian Studies Series (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 38–39. See also M. R. Singh, *Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas: A Critical Study* (Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1972), 168–169; McCrindle, *McCrindle's Ancient India*, 107.

<sup>59</sup> On the Khasas/Khaśas, see Raj Kumar, *History of the Chamar Dynasty: from 6th Century A. D. to 12th Century A. D.*, vol. 1 (Delhi: Kalpaz Publications, 2008), 231–232 n. 159; 335–336 n. 269; 397–398. See also P. C. Bagchi, "The Geographical Catalogue of the Yakṣas in the Mahāmāyūrī," *Sino-Indian Studies* 3 (1946): 73; S. B. Chaudhuri, *Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India: a Study on the Puranic Lists of the Peoples of Bharatavarsa*, pt. 1, *Northern India* (Calcutta: General Printers and Publishers, 1955), 128–129; Singh, *Geographical Data*, 365–366.

<sup>60</sup> On Lampāka, now generally identified with modern day Laghman/Laḡmān province in Afghanistan, see Bagchi, "Geographical Catalogue," 54–56; 64–65; McCrindle, *McCrindle's Ancient India*, 106. On the relationship between the Lampākas and the Muruṇḍas, see T. R. Sharma, *Personal and Geographical Names in the Gupta Inscriptions* (Delhi: Concept Publishing Co., 1978), 153–154.

<sup>61</sup> Shastri takes "ketān" and "sakatakān" (the variant reading from BḍP) to be a corruption of MtP's "āndhrakān," which he holds to be the correct reading. See A. M. Shastri, "The Purāṇic King Pramati: Some Reflections," in *Reappraising Gupta History: for S. R. Goyal*, ed. B. C. Chhabra et al. (New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1992), 136. If

**84** The Sovereign (Pramiti), the world-conqueror,<sup>63</sup> the mighty one, causer of the end of the barbarians, who is invulnerable to all beings, roamed the earth.

**85** And he was certainly produced from a fragment of the god Mādhava. He was called Pramiti by the knowers of the ways of previous births.<sup>64</sup>

**86** In the previous Kali Age, the Sovereign (Pramiti) was indeed [called] Candramasa by clan name.<sup>65</sup> When the thirty-second year (of his reign?) had arisen, he had marched forth (in battle?) for twenty years.

**87–88** Killing thousands of human beings; having made the [whole] earth one in which only seeds<sup>66</sup> were left by [his] cruel action, out of rage that was [either] mutually prompted [or] had no cause; having conquered the Śūdras who were mostly unrighteous, he together with his following attained perfection (i.e., died) in the middle of the Ganges and the Yamuna.

---

Keta is a variant of Kōṭa, then this might indeed be referring to the Āndhrakas. If we amend “*sakatakān*” to “*sakaṭakān*,” we would get “...along with [their] encampments.”

<sup>62</sup> On the Kirātas, see T. B. Subba, *Politics of Culture: A Study of Three Kirata Communities in the Eastern Himalayas*. (Chennai: Orient Longman, 1999), 31–37. See also McCrindle, *McCrindle's Ancient India*, 192–194.

<sup>63</sup> “*Pravṛttacakrah*” means much the same thing as and is, in fact, a transposition of the components of the term *cakravartin*.

<sup>64</sup> The accounts of Pramati/Pramiti (here I will mostly use Pramiti as that is the form given in VāP) found in the Purāṇas present many difficulties and show several signs of corruption. The significant alternate reading of “*mānava*” for “*mādhava*” here and at VāP 58.76 above make it unclear whether Pramiti is created out of a fragment of Manu or of Viṣṇu. It is also unclear when Pramiti is supposed to have existed. Several verses across the different versions collated here seem to indicate that Pramiti existed in the Svāyambhuva Manvantara and not in the present Vaivasvata. MtP 144.51 is perhaps the clearest statement of this point. As far as Pramiti being both a Bhārgava and a descendant of Manu, both of those criteria are met by the Pramati who is mentioned at MBh 1.8.1–2 (*mahātmānaṃ pramatiṃ dīptatejasam*), his father Cyavana being Bhr̥gu’s son and his mother Sukanyā being Vaivasvata Manu’s granddaughter; however, this would again put us in the wrong *manvantara*. Cf. Emil Abegg, *Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran: auf Grund der Quellen dargestellt* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928), 61 n. 1. One possible solution to at least some of these problems would be to follow VāP 98.110 in viewing Pramiti as Kalkin in a previous birth, with both Pramiti and Kalkin being created out of fragments of Viṣṇu, but with Pramiti existing in the Svāyambhuva Manvantara and Kalkin coming at the end of our Vaivasvata Manvantara. Regardless, both Pramiti and Kalkin are meant to set an example for Hindu kings to follow in defending their kingdoms from the onslaught of *pāṣaṇḍas*, *mlecchas*, and Śūdras in general, by exterminating them.

<sup>65</sup> Note that neither the name Viṣṇuyaśas nor the fact of being the son of Parāśara are mentioned anywhere in VāP 58 in connection with Pramiti, although they are mentioned in connection with Kalkin at VāP 98.104.

<sup>66</sup> The reading of “*bīja-*” is almost certainly to be preferred over “*vīrya-*” in “*bījāvaśeṣām*”; the nature of the “seeds” is explained below at VāP 58.105: the few Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, etc. remaining from the Kali Age become the “seeds” of the *varṇas* in the following Kṛta Age as they repopulate the world.

**89–91** Then, when that one had died together with [his] ministers and army,<sup>67</sup> and having destroyed all the barbarian kings, on that occasion when the time of the remainder of the twilight period is fully reached at the end of the age, when there are few remaining people in existence here and there, then indeed, those [people] whose behavior in the world is unrestrained strike one another and surrender to each other in groups.

**92** When doubt and anarchy have appeared as a result of the influence of the age, then indeed all those people are tormented by fear of one another.

**93** They are confused and weary, having abandoned [their] wives and households. They are without compassion and very sorrowful, looking after their own lives.

**94** When the dharma of the Śruti and Smṛti is destroyed, then [the people] are killers of each other, are without moral boundaries, without [giving] protection, without [feeling] love, without [feeling] shame.

**95** When the rain has disappeared, [the people become] impaired, short, [having a lifespan] of twenty-five [years].<sup>68</sup> After they have abandoned [their] wives and sons, [their] senses [become] completely overwhelmed by despair.

**96** And indeed, [those] sorrowful [people], stricken by drought, having abandoned [their] livelihoods, resort to the frontier-lands, having abandoned their own countries.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Following the reading of “*sāmātyaiḥ sahasainikaiḥ*” from VāP 98.117.

<sup>68</sup> BrP 231.80 / HV 117.38 give 30 years as the uppermost age limit of humans during this time. However, even within individual texts, we find different age limits given. VāP 99.409 states that no one lives beyond 23 years of age; BrP 230.42 / ViP 6.1.42 state that no one lives to be older than 20 years of age. MBh 3.188.47 gives 16 as the longest lifespan at the end of the Kali. Also note that these lifespans only apply to the very end of the Kali Age; at VāP 58.69 above, human lifespans at the beginning of the Kali Age are said to reach 100 years.

<sup>69</sup> “*Pratyanta*” indicates wild, dangerous frontier territories inhabited by barbarians.



97 Then they live at the rivers, ocean shores, and mountains. [Those] very sorrowful [people] subsist on honey, meat, roots, and fruits.<sup>70</sup>

98 They wear tree bark, leaves,<sup>71</sup> or animal hides, [they go] without leaves (i.e., naked), without putting anything on. They are fallen from the [observation of] the *varṇas* and *āśramas* [and] are engaged in horrible intermixing.

99 Thus, the few remaining people who had reached this [utmost] limit, and who were overcome by old age, disease, and hunger, came to weariness<sup>72</sup> because of their suffering.<sup>73</sup>

100 And from weariness, there is contemplation. From contemplation, there is a state of [mental] balance. In states of balance, there is complete awakening. From complete awakening, there is the morality of dharma.<sup>74</sup>

101 Indeed, when those [people] remaining in the Kali Age, of their own accord, are connected with that [spiritual] attainment,<sup>75</sup> then indeed in [one] day and night the age changes for them.

---

<sup>70</sup> I.e., they live by foraging in the wilderness. Instead of “*sāgarānupān*,” K has “*sāgarān kūpān*,” “oceans (and) caves.”

<sup>71</sup> I follow the reading “*cīrapatrājinadharā*,” both because it appears to be the most common reading found in VāP/parallel verses, and because it helps make sense of “*niṣpatrāḥ*.”

<sup>72</sup> It becomes clear in the following line that “*nirveda*” here means something similar to *nirveda* as “disgust with the world” in a Buddhist context, preceding a desire to renounce worldly life and achieve liberation.

<sup>73</sup> Between the verses parallel to VāP 58.99 and 58.100 in MtP (144.73cd/144.74ab and 144.89), there is a long excursus stating that these people wander around in circles (*cakravatparivartanāḥ*) hunting wild deer, boar, and bulls in the forest or eating fish, in the case of those who settle by rivers and oceans. Because of eating anything, regardless of whether it is allowed or not, they all become one *varṇa* (*ekavarṇagatāḥ*), which is to say, they all become Śūdras (*śūdrībhūtāḥ*; cf. MBh 3.188.41). The Kali’s *saṃdhyāṃśa* is stated to last for 36,000 years, during which time all the remaining wild animals are eaten, leaving the surviving people to turn to eating fruits and roots. They then begin to mate with each other and repopulate the earth, bringing about the next Kṛta Age. Note that no mention is made of the Kṛta beginning with a *saṃdhyā*.

<sup>74</sup> Cf., in a Buddhist context, the connecting of moral shame (*hiri*) and dread (*ottappa*) with the arising of disgust, dispassion, and liberation in the *Hirōttappasutta*, AN IV.99. See also the lists frequently encountered in the *Nikāyas* which connect *nibbidā*, *virāga*, and *sambodha*; for example, in the *Paṭhamavaggo* of the *Ekadhammapāḷi*, AN I.30: “*Ekadhammo bhikkhave bhāvito bahulīkato ekantanibbidāya virāgāya nirodhāya upasamāya abhiññāya sambodhāya nibbānāya saṃvattati. Katamo ekadhammo? Buddhānussati.*”

<sup>75</sup> The reading in BḍP of “*upāsama*,” “tranquility,” for VāP’s “*upagama*” may make more sense here.

**102** After creating the complete stupefaction of their minds, through them, there is that seventh (manvantara?). The Kṛta Age then arrived through the power of the cause of the future.<sup>76</sup>

**103** But when that Kṛta Age has indeed begun again, the remaining [people] of the Kali Age who have come forth are then the people of the Kṛta Age.<sup>77</sup>

**104** And those *siddhas* who remain here are overjoyed and roam about.<sup>78</sup> And those Seven Seers are indeed always present there.

**105** It is recorded here that, those Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras [from the Kali Age being used] as seeds, then (i.e., in the Kṛta) they were all indistinguishable from [those] of the Kali.<sup>79</sup>

**106** The Seven Seers explain dharma to them, among other things. That (i.e., dharma) is divided in two parts, [one] based on Śruti and [one] based on Smṛti, [and] is filled with rules of conduct for the *varṇas* and *āśramas*.

**107** Then the people in the Kṛta depend on those who perform correct rituals. The dharma taught by the Seven Seers to those [people] of the Kṛta Age is based on the Śruti and Smṛti.

---

<sup>76</sup> VāP 58.102 shows clear signs of being corrupt. Perhaps the reading in BḍP and LiṅP is to be preferred: “Having created the complete stupefaction of their minds, which is just a temporary sleep...”

<sup>77</sup> The alternate reading from BḍP and MtP, which is probably to be preferred here, gives “the people of the Kṛta Age are born to the remaining (people) from the Kali Age.” Between the verses parallel to VāP 58.102 and 103, MtP (at 144.91–92ab) inserts “*atītānāgatāni syur yāni manvantareṣv iha | ete yugasvabhāvās tu mayoktās tu samāsataḥ || vistareṇānupūrvyāc ca namaskṛtya svayambhuve*” (“The natures of the Ages in the *manvantaras* which are passed and yet to come are recounted here, in brief and at length, in due order, by me, having paid homage to the Self-existent One”), as if the end of the chapter had been reached.

<sup>78</sup> I.e., those *siddhas* who remain from the Kali Age. The variant reading “*sudrṣṭā*” would give, “And those *siddhas* who remain here are easily seen and roam about.” On the *siddhas*, see David Gordon White, “Mountains of Wisdom: On the Interface Between Siddha and Vidyādhara Cults and the Siddha Orders in Medieval India,” *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 1, no. 1 (April 1997), 80–83. On the Seven Ṛṣis, see John E. Mitchiner, *Traditions of the Seven Ṛṣis* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000).

<sup>79</sup> I.e., the seeds which give rise to the Kṛta’s Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras are those Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras who remain from the Kali Age; as a result, the Kṛta’s *varṇas* are identical in appearance to how those *varṇas* looked in the Kali. See n. 66 above.

**108** They remain here among those [people] up to the end of the (Kṛta) age for the sake of the perpetuation of dharma. But the sages<sup>80</sup> abide by the rules of the manvantara.

**109–110** Just as, when grasses are burnt by fire here in the hot season, there is indeed the birth of new [shoots] first seen at their roots, so is there the birth here of the people of the Kṛta Age indeed from the people of the Kali.<sup>81</sup> Thus there is here the continuous flow of [one] age from [another] age, indeed, from one to another. It proceeds with no interruption until the end of the manvantara.

**111** Happiness, lifespan, strength, beauty, dharma, wealth, and likewise love, these are lost in the yugas, indeed, three quarters by a series of stages.<sup>82</sup>

**112** In the first together with the second interstitial period, the accomplishments and the dharma of the ages are lost. Thus, this interstitial period is declared by me to you, oh twice-born ones.<sup>83</sup>

**113–115** With that, the arrangement of all [cycles] of four ages [is explained]. After the passing of a thousand of them occurs, that is known as a day of Brahma. And a night (of Brahma) is declared [to be] just as long. The uprightness and stupidity of beings up to the end of the ages: that and likewise the marks of all ages is declared. And a counting of seventy-one of these four-age [cycles], passing by stages, indeed is called an interval of Manu (i.e. a *manvantara*).

**116** Thus, in one four-age [cycle], it is here as [just] heard; and so, indeed, is it also, successively, in other [four-age cycles].

---

<sup>80</sup> I.e., the Seven Ṛṣis. What may be meant here is that the Seven Ṛṣis must leave the earth (becoming stars in the sky) to allow for time and the natural devolution of the world to take its course.

<sup>81</sup> Following the readings of “*kalijaṣu*”/“*kalijeṣu*” from BḍP and LiñP. The word “*dr̥ṣṭāḥ*” does not fit well grammatically, which may indicate another corruption in the verse; the alternate reading “*dr̥ṣṭvā*” may be preferable.

<sup>82</sup> A difficult verse to construe, and, based on the variant readings from other Purāṇas, possibly corrupt.

<sup>83</sup> On the *siddhis*, see n. 1 above. On the interstitial periods, see VāP 58.29.

117 In creation after creation, as divisions arise, it is indeed thus, that they are limited to twenty-five, no more, no less.<sup>84</sup>

118 Thus, [all] eons, together with [all] ages, have the same characteristics.<sup>85</sup> And this indeed is a characteristic of all manvantaras.

119 In this way, the long-standing cycles of the ages [takes place], because of the ages' intrinsic nature; in this way, the world of the living does not stay fixed, revolving through destruction and arising.

120 So, indeed, this description in brief of the past and future ages in all the manvantaras here has truly been declared.

121–122 And the discussion of the future (manvantaras) is to be known in that same manner by a wise person. And with regard to all the past and future manvantaras here, by (the description) of one manvantara, all the intervals (of Manu) indeed are described. And likewise, indeed, with regard to an eon, you should know by [the description of any one] eon.

123–124 [From one age to another,] all of the presiding deities<sup>86</sup> are indeed similar with respect to names and forms; and so are the eight kinds of gods,<sup>87</sup> and the lords of the *manvantaras*

---

<sup>84</sup> Although not made explicitly clear here, the “twenty-five divisions” are the twenty-five *tattvas* of classical Sāṃkhya metaphysics, which were adapted and assimilated by both Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sectarian philosophical systems. Cf. LiñP 2.16.26–27. See Stella Kramrisch, *The Presence of Śiva* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 184–187; Gerald James Larson, *Classical Sāṃkhya: an Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, 2nd ed. (New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998), 289–291.

<sup>85</sup> E.g., one Kali Yuga will have the same characteristics as any other Kali Yuga in a given *kalpa*. Following the alternate reading “*kalpā yugaiḥ*” from BḍP and LiñP.

<sup>86</sup> “*Tulyābhimāninah*” is almost certainly the correct reading. Compare a similar verse at VāP 50.66: “*abhimānivyatīta ye tulyās te sāmpratāir iha | devā ye vai hy atītās te rūpair nāmabhir eva ca.*” See also the parallel verse at BḍP 1.21.10. The “Abhimānins” referred to here are deities which preside over or “claim for themselves as their domains” certain elements, physical principles, etc. On *abhimānidevatās*, see H. N. Raghavendrachar, “Madhva's Brahma-Mīmāṃsā,” in *The Cultural Heritage of India*, 2nd. ed. Vol. 3, *The Philosophies*, ed. Haridas Bhattacharyya (Calcutta: Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, 1953), p. 324, 328–329. Vāyu is called an Abhimānin at VāP 2.44.

<sup>87</sup> An originally Sāṃkhya concept. See, for example, Knut A. Jacobsen, *Kapila: Founder of Sāṃkhya and Avatāra of Viṣṇu, with a translation of Kapilāsurisaṃvāda* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2008), 42.

here.<sup>88</sup> And also the Seers and the Manus are all the same with respect to [their] purposes. So, too, is the division of the *varṇas* and *āśramas* [the same] from age to age.

**125–126** And thus, the Lord indeed always creates according to the ages' nature. The divisions of the *varṇas* and *āśramas* and the ages and the accomplishments of the ages are declared.<sup>89</sup>

Listen [now] to the creation of creation. The condition in the ages will be told here in detail and in order.<sup>90</sup>

The fifty-eighth chapter, called “The Description of the Ages,” in the blessed Mahāpurāṇa  
proclaimed by Vāyu [is finished].

---

<sup>88</sup> Are the *manvantareśvaras* the Manus? This would make the following verse repetitive.

<sup>89</sup> Following the reading “*yugasiddhayaḥ*” from BḍP and LiṅP.

<sup>90</sup> The following chapter also gives some details about various differences between one age or manvantara and another; however, except for VāP 59.4–7, the fifty-ninth chapter gives no further information about the Kali Age.

## Caturyugākhyānam

### Sūta uvāca:

Ata ūrdhvaṃ pravakṣyāmi dvāparasya vidhiṃ punaḥ | tatra tretāyuge kṣiṇe dvāparaṃ  
pratipadyate || 1<sup>91</sup>

Dvāparādaḥ prajānāṃ tu siddhis tretāyuge tu yā | parivṛtte yuge tasmimṣ tataḥ sā  
saṃpraṇāśyati<sup>92</sup> || 2

Tataḥ pravartate tāsāṃ prajānāṃ dvāpare punaḥ | lobho ‘dhṛtir vaṇigyuddhaṃ tattvānāṃ  
aviniścayaḥ || 3<sup>93</sup>

Sam̐bhedaś caiva varṇānāṃ kāryānāṃ ca vinirṇayaḥ<sup>94</sup> | yācñā<sup>95</sup> vadhaḥ paṇo<sup>96</sup> daṇḍo mado  
dambho<sup>97</sup> ‘kṣamābalaṃ<sup>98</sup> || Eṣāṃ<sup>99</sup> rajastamoyuktā pravṛttir<sup>100</sup> dvāpare smṛtā || 4<sup>101</sup>

Ādye kṛte ne<sup>102</sup> dharmo ‘sti tretāyāṃ saṃprapadyate<sup>103</sup> | dvāpare vyākuli<sup>104</sup> bhūtvā praṇāśyati  
kalau yuge<sup>105</sup> || 5<sup>106</sup>

Varṇānāṃ viparidhvamsaḥ saṃkīrtyate tathāśramaḥ<sup>107</sup> | dvaidham utpadyate caiva<sup>108</sup> yuge

---

<sup>91</sup> VāP 58.1 corresponds to BḍP 1.31.1 and MtP 144.1.

<sup>92</sup> BḍP *tatas tābhiḥ praṇāśyati* MtP *vai praṇāśyati*.

<sup>93</sup> The parallel verse at BḍP 1.31.3 is missing VāP 58.3cd. VāP 58.3cd is repeated at VāP 58.26ab.

<sup>94</sup> K *kāryānāṃ cāvinirṇayaḥ* BḍP *viparyayaḥ* MtP *pradhvamsaś caiva varṇānāṃ karmaṇāṃ tu viparyayaḥ*

<sup>95</sup> C *vācā* T *yācñā* MtP *yātrā*

<sup>96</sup> K *yajñausadheḥ paśor* BḍP *yajñāvadhāraṇaṃ* MtP *paro*

<sup>97</sup> T *madaitaḥ* (?) MtP *māno darpo*

<sup>98</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M BḍP *dambhaḥ kṣamābalaṃ* C *māno dambhaḥ kṣamābalaṃ*

<sup>99</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T BḍP KūP LiṅP *eṣā*

<sup>100</sup> KūP LiṅP *vṛttir vai*

<sup>101</sup> VāP 58.4ef–5 corresponds to KūP 1.27.56cd–57 and LiṅP 1.39.69–70. At the parallel verse to VāP 58.4ef, MtP 144.5ab gives, “*tathā rajastamo bhūyaḥ pravṛtte dvāpare punaḥ.*”

<sup>102</sup> K *ca* C T *na* BḍP *yo* KūP LiṅP *tu* MtP *nā*

<sup>103</sup> BḍP KūP LiṅP *sa tretāyāṃ pravartate* MtP *sa tretāyāṃ pravartitaḥ*

<sup>104</sup> MtP *vyākulo*

<sup>105</sup> MtP *punaḥ*

<sup>106</sup> KūP 1.27 and LiṅP 1.39 end with this verse (KūP 1.27.57 / LiṅP 1.39.70). KūP 1.28 and LiṅP 1.40 pick up at VāP 58.31.

<sup>107</sup> BḍP *saṃkīyata tathāśramāḥ* MtP *dvāpare dharmāḥ saṃkīyante tathāśramāḥ*

<sup>108</sup> BḍP *dvaividhyaṃ pratipadyete*

tasmiñ śrutau smṛtau<sup>109</sup> || 6

Dvaidhāc chruteḥ smṛteś<sup>110</sup> caiva<sup>111</sup> niścayo<sup>112</sup> nādhigamyate | aniścayādhigamanād

dharmatattvaṃ na vidyate<sup>113</sup> || Dharmatattve tu bhinnānām<sup>114</sup> matibhedo bhaven

nṛṇām<sup>115</sup> || 7<sup>116</sup>

Parasparavibhinnais tair<sup>117</sup> dṛṣṭīnām vibhramaṇa ca<sup>118</sup> | ayaṃ dharmo hy ayaṃ neti niścayo

nābhigamyate<sup>119</sup> || 8<sup>120</sup>

Kāraṇānām ca vaikalyāt kāraṇasyāpy<sup>121</sup> aniścayāt | matibhede ca<sup>122</sup> teṣām vai dṛṣṭīnām

vibhramo bhavet || 9

Tato dṛṣṭivibhinnais taiḥ<sup>123</sup> kṛtaṃ śāstrakulaṃ tv idam | eko vedaś catuspādas<sup>124</sup> tretāsv iha

vidhīyate<sup>125</sup> || 10<sup>126</sup>

Samrodhād āyusaś caiva dṛśyate<sup>127</sup> dvāpareṣu ca<sup>128</sup> | vedavyāsaiś<sup>129</sup> caturdhā tu vyasyate

---

<sup>109</sup> BḍP MtP *śrutismṛtau*

<sup>110</sup> MtP *dvidhā śrutih smṛtiś*

<sup>111</sup> C T BḍP *dvaidhāt tathā śrutismṛtyor*

<sup>112</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M *dvaidhād atha śrutismṛtyoniṃś ca yo*

<sup>113</sup> K T *dharmatattvaṃ nigadyate*

<sup>114</sup> BḍP *dharmāsattvena mitrānām*

<sup>115</sup> MtP *hy avijñāte matibhedas tu jāyate*

<sup>116</sup> T omits VāP 58.7ef–8.

<sup>117</sup> MtP *parasparaṃ vibhinnās te*

<sup>118</sup> MtP *tu*

<sup>119</sup> MtP *ato dṛṣṭivibhinnais taiḥ kṛtam atyākulaṃ tvidam*

<sup>120</sup> At MtP 144.9, the parallel verses to VāP 58.8cd–10ab seem to be partially garbled but mostly omitted.

<sup>121</sup> C *vaikalyāt kāraṇām cāpy* BḍP *vaikalpyāt kāryānām cāpy*

<sup>122</sup> T BḍP *matibhedena*

<sup>123</sup> BḍP *tu*

<sup>124</sup> BḍP *catuspāddhi*

<sup>125</sup> MtP *catuspādaḥ samhrtya tu punaḥ punaḥ SkP catuspādaiḥ kriyate dvijahetave*

<sup>126</sup> KūP 1.27.50–53ab parallels VāP 58.10cd–14ab, but omits VāP 58.11ab. LiñP 1.39.57–60 parallels VāP 58.10cd–14. SkP 1.2.40.198ab parallels VāP 58.10cd.

<sup>127</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T *vyasyate* BḍP *saṃkṣayād āyusaś caiva vyasyate* LiñP *saṃkṣayād āyusaś caiva vyasyate*

<sup>128</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T LiñP *saḥ* MtP *saṃkṣepād āyusaś caiva vyasyate dvāpareṣv iha*

<sup>129</sup> MtP *vedaś caikaś*

dvāparādiṣu<sup>130</sup> || 11<sup>131</sup>

Ṛṣiputraih punar vedā<sup>132</sup> bhidyante<sup>133</sup> dṛṣṭivibhramaiḥ | mantrabrāhmaṇavinyāsaiḥ

svaravarṇaviparyayaiḥ<sup>134</sup> || 12

Samhitā<sup>135</sup> ṛgyajuḥsāmnām samhanyante śrutarṣibhiḥ<sup>136</sup> | sāmānyād vaikṛtāc caiva

dṛṣṭibhinnaiḥ<sup>137</sup> kvacit kvacit<sup>138</sup> || 13

Brāhmaṇaṃ kalpasūtrāṇi mantrapravacanāni<sup>139</sup> ca | anye tu prahitās tīrthaiḥ<sup>140</sup> kecit tān

pratyavasthitāḥ || 14<sup>141</sup>

Dvāpareṣu pravartante bhinnavṛttāśramā<sup>142</sup> dvijāḥ<sup>143</sup> | ekam ādhvaryavaṃ pūrvam āsīd dvaidham

punas tataḥ<sup>144</sup> || 15

Sāmānyaviparītārthaiḥ<sup>145</sup> kṛtaṃ śāstrakulaṃ<sup>146</sup> tv idam | ādhvaryavasya prastāvair bahudhā

vyākulaṃ kṛtam<sup>147</sup> || 16

---

<sup>130</sup> SkP *tadā vyāsaiś caturdhā ca vyasyate dvāparāt tataḥ*

<sup>131</sup> The parallel verse at BḍP 1.31.11 omits VāP 58.11cd, apparently moving it to BḍP 1.31.28cd, which reads, “*vedaṃ vyāsaiś caturdhā tu vyasyate dvāparādiṣu.*” LiñP 1.39.58 likewise omits VāP 58.11cd, moving it to LiñP 1.39.56cd, which reads “*vedo vyāsaiś caturdhā...*” SkP 1.2.40.197cd parallels VāP 58.11cd.

<sup>132</sup> V C *rṣibhis taiḥ punar bhedā* P<sup>2</sup> *rṣibhis tu punar bhedā* T LiñP *bhedā* KūP *bhedād*

<sup>133</sup> BḍP *rṣimantrāt punar bhedād bhidyate*

<sup>134</sup> MtP *te tu brāhmaṇavinyāsaiḥ svarakramaviparyayaiḥ*

<sup>135</sup> MtP *saṃhṛtā*

<sup>136</sup> BḍP *saṃpaṭhyante maharṣibhiḥ* MtP *saṃhitās tair maharṣibhiḥ* LiñP *manīṣibhiḥ*

<sup>137</sup> C T *dṛṣṭibhinne* BḍP *sāmānyā vaikṛtās caiva dṛṣṭibhinne* KūP *dṛṣṭibhedaiḥ*

<sup>138</sup> LiñP *sāmānyā vaikṛtās caiva draṣṭrbhis taiḥ pṛthak pṛthak*

<sup>139</sup> MtP *bhāṣyavidyās tathaiva*

<sup>140</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T MtP LiñP *prasthitās tān vai* BḍP *‘pi prasthitās tān vai*

<sup>141</sup> After VāP 58.14 (LiñP 1.39.60), LiñP inserts the following five and a half verses listing various Purāṇas and Dharmaśāstras: “*itihāsapurāṇāni bhidyante kālagauravāt brāhmaṇ pādmaṇ vaiṣṇavaṃ ca śaivaṃ bhāgavataṃ tathā || bhaviṣyaṃ nāradīyaṃ ca mārkandēyam atah param āgneyaṃ brahmavaivartaṃ laiṅgaṃ vārāham eva ca || vāmanākhyam tataḥ kūrmaṃ mātsyaṃ gāruḍam eva ca skāndaṃ tathā ca brahmāṇḍaṃ teṣāṃ bhedah prakathyate || laiṅgam ekādaśavidham prabhinnam dvāpare śubham manvatriviṣṇuhārītayājñavalkyośano ‘ṅgirāḥ || yamāpastambasamvartāḥ kātyāyanabrhaspatī parāśaravyāsaśaṅkhalikhitā dakṣagautamau || śātātapo vasiṣṭhaś ca evam ādyaiḥ sahasraśah.*” Directly following these verses, LiñP omits VāP 58.15–19ab and picks up at VāP 58.19cd (LiñP 1.39.66cd). Cf. the even longer list at SkP 1.2.40.198–210.

<sup>142</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> C *bhinnavṛttāśramānvitāḥ*

<sup>143</sup> BḍP *nivartante kalau yuge* MtP *bhinnārthais taiḥ svadarśanaiḥ*

<sup>144</sup> BḍP *tv āsīt punar dvaidham ajāyata* MtP *tu tat punaḥ*

<sup>145</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> M T *sāmānyāvīparītārthaiḥ* P<sup>2</sup> *sāmānyād viparītārthe* C *sāmānyāvīparītārthe*

<sup>146</sup> BḍP *kṛtāśāstrākulaṃ* MtP *śāstrākulaṃ*

<sup>147</sup> BḍP *prasthānair bahudhā vyākulīkṛtaiḥ* MtP *ādhvaryavaṃ ca prasthānair bahudhā vyākulīkṛtam*



Tathaivātharvaṅksāmnāṃ vikalpaiś cāpy asaṃkṣayāḥ<sup>148</sup> | vyākulaṃ dvāpare bhinnāṃ<sup>149</sup> kriyate

bhinnadarśanaiḥ || 17

Teṣāṃ bhedāḥ prabhedāś ca<sup>150</sup> vikalpaiś cāpy asaṃkṣayāḥ<sup>151</sup> | dvāpare saṃpravartante

vinaśyanti<sup>152</sup> punaḥ<sup>153</sup> kalau || 18<sup>154</sup>

Teṣāṃ viparyayāś caiva<sup>155</sup> bhavanti dvāpare punaḥ | avṛṣṭir<sup>156</sup> maraṇaṃ caiva tathaiva

vyādhyupadravāḥ<sup>157</sup> || 19<sup>158</sup>

Vānmanaḥkarmajair<sup>159</sup> duḥkhair nirvedo jāyate punaḥ<sup>160</sup> | nirvedāj jāyate teṣāṃ

duḥkhamokṣavicāraṇā<sup>161</sup> || 20

Vicāraṇāc ca vairāgyaṃ vairāgyād doṣadarśanam | doṣāṇāṃ darśanāc<sup>162</sup> caiva dvāpare

jñānasambhavaḥ<sup>163</sup> || 21<sup>164</sup>

Teṣāṃ ca mānināṃ<sup>165</sup> pūrvam ādye<sup>166</sup> svāyaṃbhuve ‘ntare | utpadyante hi<sup>167</sup> śāstrāṇāṃ dvāpare

paripanthinaḥ || 22

Āyurvedavikalpās<sup>168</sup> ca<sup>169</sup> aṅgānāṃ jyotiṣasya ca | arthaśāstravikalpās ca

---

<sup>148</sup> C T *asaṃkṣayaiḥ* BḍP *cāpi saṃjñayā* MtP *tathaivātharvaṅāṃ sāmānāṃ vikalpaiḥ svasya saṃkṣayaiḥ*

<sup>149</sup> K P<sup>1</sup> T *bhinne* BḍP *vyākule dvāpare nityaṃ* MtP *vyākulo dvāpareṣv arthaḥ*

<sup>150</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> M C T *bhedapratibhedā*

<sup>151</sup> BḍP *pratibhedā vikalpās cāpi saṃkhyāyā*

<sup>152</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> C T *vinaśyante*

<sup>153</sup> BḍP *tataḥ* MtP *saṃnivr̥tte te vedā naśyanti vai*

<sup>154</sup> The parallel verse at MtP 144.17 omits VāP 58.18ab.

<sup>155</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T BḍP MtP *viparyayotpannā*

<sup>156</sup> C T MtP *adr̥ṣṭir*

<sup>157</sup> KūP *vāyādhyupadravāḥ* LiñP *tathā vyādhyādyupadravāḥ*

<sup>158</sup> KūP 1.27.54–55 and LiñP 1.39.66cd–68 parallel VāP 58.19cd–21.

<sup>159</sup> KūP *vānmanaḥkāyajair* MtP *vānmanaḥkarmabhir*

<sup>160</sup> KūP *nṛṇām* LiñP MtP *tataḥ*

<sup>161</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> C *dukhaṃ mokṣavicāraṇaṃ*

<sup>162</sup> BḍP *doṣadarśanatas*

<sup>163</sup> MtP *jñānotpattis tu jāyate*

<sup>164</sup> VāP 58.21ab is garbled in T.

<sup>165</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> M C T BḍP *teṣāṃ ajñānināṃ*

<sup>166</sup> MtP *medhāvināṃ pūrvam martye*

<sup>167</sup> MtP *utpasyantīha*

<sup>168</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> M C T *āyurvedavikalpāc*

<sup>169</sup> BḍP *ca hy*

hetuśāstravikalpanam<sup>170</sup> || 23<sup>171</sup>

Smṛtiśāstraprabhedāś<sup>172</sup> ca prasthānāni pṛthak pṛthak | dvāpareṣv abhivartante<sup>173</sup> matibhedās

tathā<sup>174</sup> nṛṇām || 24<sup>175</sup>

Manasā karmaṇā vācā kṛcchrād vārtā prasidhyati | dvāpare<sup>176</sup> sarvabhūtānām

kāyakleśapuraskṛtā<sup>177</sup> || 25<sup>178</sup>

Lobho ‘dhṛtir<sup>179</sup> vaṇigyuddham<sup>180</sup> tattvānām aviniścayaḥ<sup>181</sup> | vedaśāstrapraṇayanam<sup>182</sup>

dharmāṇām saṃkaras<sup>183</sup> tathā || 26<sup>184</sup>

Dvāpareṣu<sup>185</sup> pravartante rogo<sup>186</sup> lobho vadhas<sup>187</sup> tathā | varṇāśramaparidhvamsāḥ<sup>188</sup>

kāmadveṣau<sup>189</sup> tathaiva ca<sup>190</sup> || 27<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> M *hetuśāstre vikalpanam*

<sup>171</sup> The parallel verses at BḍP 1.31.24ab and MtP 144.23ab both insert “*prakriyā kalpasūtrāṇām bhāṣyavidyāvikalpanam*” after VāP 58.23.

<sup>172</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> M C *smṛtiśāstraprabhedāc* P<sup>2</sup> *smṛtiśāstravibhedāc* BḍP *smṛtiśāstraprabhedas*

<sup>173</sup> LiñP *api vartante*

<sup>174</sup> BḍP *matibhedāśrayān* LiñP *tadā* SkP *dvāpare ca pravartante matibhedās tato*

<sup>175</sup> LiñP 1.39.53–56ab parallels VāP 58.23cd–27ab. Starting at SkP 1.2.40.195cd (VāP 58.24cd), SkP includes a number of verses which loosely parallel VāP 58.24cd through VāP 58.95ab, but with frequent insertions and omissions and much reordering.

<sup>176</sup> LiñP *tadā tu*

<sup>177</sup> LiñP *kāyakleśavaśāt kramāt* MtP *kālah kleśaparah smṛtaḥ*

<sup>178</sup> SkP 1.2.40.196ab = VāP 58.25ab.

<sup>179</sup> LiñP *bhṛtir*

<sup>180</sup> BḍP *vṛtir vaṇikpūrvā*

<sup>181</sup> SkP *śivaṃ tyaktvā dharmāṇām saṃkaras tathā*

<sup>182</sup> LiñP *vedaśākhāpraṇayanam*

<sup>183</sup> K reads “*śaṃkaras*” here, but this is likely a printing error.

<sup>184</sup> T reads “*lobho...*” but the rest of VāP 58.26 is omitted. KūP 1.27.49 apparently joins VāP 58.24cd with VāP 58.26ab/27ab, giving “*dvāpareṣv atha vidyante matibhedāḥ sadā nṛṇām | rāgo lobhas tathā yuddham tattvānām aviniścayaḥ.*” SkP 1.2.40.196cd = VāP 58.26ab.

<sup>185</sup> LiñP *dvāpare tu*

<sup>186</sup> Both K and the Venkaṭeśvara Steam Press edition read *rogo* here, while the ĀnSS edition reads *rāgo* and makes no mention of any variant readings; C and T also have *rogo* here. BḍP, KūP, and LiñP have *rāgo*, while MtP omits VāP 58.27ab at MtP 144.26.

<sup>187</sup> LiñP *madas*

<sup>188</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP *varṇāśramaparidhvamsaḥ*

<sup>189</sup> C *kāmadveṣam* BḍP *kāmakrodhau*

<sup>190</sup> SkP *pravartante ca dvāpare*

<sup>191</sup> C switches the first two pādas with the second two pādas, so that the verse begins “*varṇāśramaparidhvamsāḥ...*” It is to be noted that the order of these pādas is similarly reversed at BḍP 1.31.27cd–28ab and LiñP 1.39.55cd–56ab. T omits VāP 58.27cd. SkP 1.2.40.197ab parallels a collapsed VāP 58.27.

Pūrṇe varṣasahasre dve<sup>192</sup> paramāyus tathā<sup>193</sup> nṛṇām | niḥśeṣe dvāpare tasmimṣ tasya saṃdhyā tu  
pādataḥ<sup>194</sup> || 28<sup>195</sup>

Pratiṣṭhate<sup>196</sup> guṇair hīno dharmo ‘sau dvāparasya tu<sup>197</sup> | tathaiva saṃdhyāpādena aṃśas  
tasyāvatiṣṭhate<sup>198</sup> || 29

Dvāparasya ca varṣe yā tiṣyasya tu<sup>199</sup> nibodhata | dvāparasyāṃśaśeṣe tu<sup>200</sup> pratipattiḥ kaler  
ataḥ<sup>201</sup> || 30

Himśāsūyānṛtaṃ<sup>202</sup> māyā vadhaś<sup>203</sup> caiva tapasvinām | ete svabhāvās<sup>204</sup> tiṣyasya<sup>205</sup> sādhayanti ca  
vai<sup>206</sup> prajāḥ<sup>207</sup> || 31<sup>208</sup>

Eṣa dharmāḥ kṛtaḥ<sup>209</sup> kṛtsno dharmāś ca parihīyate | manasā karmaṇā stutyā<sup>210</sup> vārtā sidhyati vā  
na vā || 32<sup>211</sup>

---

<sup>192</sup> BḍP vai

<sup>193</sup> BḍP MtP tadā

<sup>194</sup> BḍP yādrśī

<sup>195</sup> The parallel verse at BḍP 1.31.29 omits VāP 58.28ab, although these two pādas curiously reappear at BḍP 1.31.38cd, which reads, “pūrṇe varṣasahasre vai paramāyus tadā nṛṇām.”

<sup>196</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> C T pratiṣṭhitair

<sup>197</sup> MtP guṇahīnās tu tiṣṭhanti dharmasya dvāparasya tu |

<sup>198</sup> P<sup>2</sup> tasyāvatiṣṭhate T tasyāvatiṣṭhati BḍP hy aṅgaḥ saṃdhyā itīṣyate MtP aṃśas tasyām pratiṣṭhitāḥ

<sup>199</sup> C vāryeṣā tiṣyasati (?). The ĀnSS edition of VāP mentions no variant readings here. The ĀnSS edition of MtP has “dvāparasya tu paryāye puṣyasya ca nibodhata,” but also lists the alternate reading of “paryeṣā” for “paryāye.” Both manuscripts of MtP in the Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan collection have this alternate reading of “paryeṣā.” In the handwriting of these manuscripts, “va” and “pa” are easily mistaken for each other; this may explain the reading we have in C. This leads me to consider “paryeṣā” as a possible reading; see F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. 2, *Dictionary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), 336. In any case, the entire group of verses 29–31 seems to have been problematic and possibly already corrupt in antiquity. For comparison, BḍP has “dvāparasyāvāśeṣeṇa tiṣyasya tu nibodhata.”

<sup>200</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> M C T dvāparasyāṃśaśeṣeṣu BḍP dvāparasyāṃśaseṣaṇa

<sup>201</sup> BḍP api MtP atha

<sup>202</sup> MtP himśā steyānṛtaṃ

<sup>203</sup> KūP LiṅP SkP tiṣye māyām asūyām ca vadham MtP dambhaś

<sup>204</sup> C svabhāvā

<sup>205</sup> MtP svabhāvāḥ puṣyasya

<sup>206</sup> MtP tāḥ

<sup>207</sup> KūP sādhayanti narā nityam tamasā vyākulīkṛtāḥ LiṅP SkP sādhayanti narās tatra tamasā vyākulendriyāḥ

<sup>208</sup> LiṅP 1.40.1–1.40.9ab loosely parallels VāP 58.31–42ab. KūP 1.28.1–7 loosely parallels VāP 58.31–40. SkP 1.2.40.218 loosely parallels VāP 58.31. See n. 106 above.

<sup>209</sup> MtP smṛtaḥ

<sup>210</sup> One would expect “vācā” here, and indeed that is the reading found in MtP. It would seem that something more sinister than simple speech is being implied.

<sup>211</sup> VāP 58.32 is omitted at KūP 1.28.2 and LiṅP 1.40.2.

Kalau<sup>212</sup> pramāra<sup>213</sup> rogaḥ<sup>214</sup> satataṃ kṣudbhayāni vai<sup>215</sup> | anāvṛṣṭibhayaṃ ghoram<sup>216</sup>

deśānām<sup>217</sup> ca viparyayaḥ<sup>218</sup> || 33<sup>219</sup>

Na pramāṇaṃ smrter<sup>220</sup> asti tiṣye loke yuge<sup>221</sup> yuge<sup>222</sup> | garbhastho<sup>223</sup> mriyate kaścid

yauvanasthas tathāparaḥ || sthāvire<sup>224</sup> mādhyakaumāre<sup>225</sup> mriyante vai<sup>226</sup> kalau

prajāḥ || 34<sup>227</sup>

Adhārmikās tv anācārā<sup>228</sup> mohakopālpatejasah<sup>229</sup> | anṛtabruvās ca satataṃ tiṣye jāyanti vai

prajāḥ<sup>230</sup> || 35<sup>231</sup>

Duriṣṭair duradhītais ca durācāir<sup>232</sup> durāgamaiḥ | viprāṇām karmadoṣais taiḥ<sup>233</sup> prajānām jāyate

bhayaṃ<sup>234</sup> || 36<sup>235</sup>

---

<sup>212</sup> MtP *kalih*

<sup>213</sup> LiñP *pramāda*

<sup>214</sup> SkP *pramāthako rāgaḥ*

<sup>215</sup> C T BḍP LiñP SkP ca KūP *kṣudbhayaṃ tathā MtP cāpi kṣudbhayaṃ*

<sup>216</sup> MtP *caiva*

<sup>217</sup> K T *darśanaṃ*

<sup>218</sup> K *viparyayam*

<sup>219</sup> SkP 1.2.40.219 parallels VāP 58.33.

<sup>220</sup> SkP *śruter*

<sup>221</sup> BḍP *lokeṣu vai*

<sup>222</sup> LiñP *na prāmāṇyaṃ śruter asti nṛṇām cādharmaśevanam MtP na prāmāṇe sthitir hy asti puṣye ghore yuge kalau SkP nṛṇām cādharmaśevanāt*

<sup>223</sup> T *garbhasthe*

<sup>224</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T MtP *sthāviryē*

<sup>225</sup> BḍP *sthavirāḥ ke 'pi kaumāre*. Note: the ĀnSS edition shows “*mādhyakaumāre*” without indicating any alternate readings; K and C, however, both have “*madhyakaumāre*,” as does MtP.

<sup>226</sup> MtP *ca*

<sup>227</sup> KūP omits VāP 58.34. LiñP 1.40.3 and SkP 1.2.40.220 apparently combine VāP 58.34ab and 58.35ab, omitting the intervening *pādas*.

<sup>228</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M T *adhārmikatve 'nācārā KūP adhārmikā anācārā*

<sup>229</sup> KūP LiñP *mahākopālpacetasaḥ SkP mahākopālpatejasah*. MtP 144.34cd has, “*alpatejobalāḥ pāpā mahākopā hy adhārmikāḥ*.”

<sup>230</sup> KūP *anṛtaṃ vadanti te lubdhās tiṣye jātāḥ suduhprajāḥ LiñP anṛtaṃ bruvate lubdhās tiṣye jātās ca duṣprajāḥ MtP anṛtavratalubdhās ca puṣye caiva prajāḥ sthitāḥ SkP anṛtaṃ bruvate lubdhā nārīprāyās ca duṣprajāḥ*

<sup>231</sup> VāP 58.35 is omitted by C and BḍP. SkP 1.2.40.221 combines VāP 58.35cd and VāP 58.36ab.

<sup>232</sup> BḍP *duṣkṛtaiś ca*

<sup>233</sup> KūP SkP *karmadoṣaiś ca LinP karmadoṣeṇa*

<sup>234</sup> SkP *kṣayaḥ*

<sup>235</sup> LiñP 1.40.5 combines VāP 58.36cd and VāP 58.38cd, omitting VāP 58.37–38ab. SkP 1.2.40.222 combines VāP 58.36cd and VāP 58.38ef, omitting VāP 58.37–38cd.

Himsā māyā tathersyā<sup>236</sup> ca krodho ‘sūyākṣamānṛtam<sup>237</sup> | tiṣye<sup>238</sup> bhavanti jantūnām rāgo

lobhaś<sup>239</sup> ca sarvaśaḥ || 37

Samkṣobho jāyate ‘tyartham kalim āsādyā vai yugam | nādhīyante tadā vedā<sup>240</sup> na yajante<sup>241</sup>

dvijātayaḥ || utsīdanti narās caiva kṣatriyāḥ saviśaḥ<sup>242</sup> kramāt<sup>243</sup> || 38<sup>244</sup>

Śūdrāṇām<sup>245</sup> antyayones<sup>246</sup> tu saṁbandhā<sup>247</sup> brāhmaṇaiḥ saha | bhavantīha<sup>248</sup> kalau tasmiñ

śayanāsanabhojanaiḥ || 39<sup>249</sup>

Rājānaḥ śūdrabhūyiṣṭhāḥ pāṣaṇḍānām pravartakāḥ<sup>250</sup> | bhrūṇahatyāḥ<sup>251</sup> prajāḥ tatra prajā evam

pravartate<sup>252</sup> || 40<sup>253</sup>

Āyurmedhā balaṁ rūpaṁ kulaṁ caiva prahīyate<sup>254</sup> | śūdrās ca brāhmaṇācārāḥ<sup>255</sup> śūdrācārās ca

brāhmaṇāḥ || 41<sup>256</sup>

---

<sup>236</sup> MtP *mānas tathersyā*

<sup>237</sup> BḍP ‘*sūyākṣamā nṛṣu* MtP ‘*sūyākṣamādhṛtiḥ*

<sup>238</sup> MtP *puṣye*

<sup>239</sup> MtP *lobho mohaś*

<sup>240</sup> BḍP *nādhīyate tadā vedān* KūP *nādhīyate kalau vedān* LiñP *vedān* MtP *nādhīyate tathā vedān*

<sup>241</sup> KūP LiñP *yajanti*

<sup>242</sup> BḍP LiñP *kṣatriyās ca viśaḥ*

<sup>243</sup> MtP 144.38cd reads, “*utsīdanti tathā caiva vaiśyaiḥ sārḍham tu kṣatriyāḥ.*” SkP 1.2.40.222cd has, “*utsīdanti kṣatraviśo vardhate śūdraviprakāḥ.*”

<sup>244</sup> KūP omits VāP 58.37–38ab and 38ef, expanding VāP 58.38cd into a full verse with the insertion of “*yajanty anyāyato vedān paṭhante cālpabuddhayaḥ*” at KūP 1.28.5cd. LiñP 1.40.6 combines VāP 58.38ef and VāP 58.39ab.

<sup>245</sup> K *kṣūdrāṇām*

<sup>246</sup> C *anyayonis*

<sup>247</sup> KūP *mantrayaunaiś ca saṁbandho* LiñP *mantrayogena saṁbandho* MtP *mantrayonis tu sambandho*

<sup>248</sup> KūP *bhaviṣyati*

<sup>249</sup> SkP 1.2.40.223 collapses VāP 58.39 and combines it with VāP 58.41cd, giving: “*śūdrā vipraiḥ sahāsamte śayanāsanabhojanaiḥ | śūdrās ca brāhmaṇācārāḥ śūdrācārās ca brāhmaṇāḥ.*”

<sup>250</sup> KūP *brāhmaṇān bādhayanti ca* LiñP *brāhmaṇān bādhayanti te* MtP *pravṛttayaḥ*

<sup>251</sup> C T *bhrūṇahatyā*

<sup>252</sup> BḍP 1.31.41cd has, “*guṇahīnāḥ prajāś caiva tadā vai sampravartate.*” KūP 1.28.7cd has, “*bhrūṇahatyā vīrahatyā prajāyete nareśvare.*” LiñP 1.40.8ab has, “*bhrūṇahatyā vīrahatyā prajāyante prajāsu vai.*”

<sup>253</sup> VāP 58.40cd–41ad seem to be repeated (although phrased slightly differently) at VāP 58.69 below. MtP omits VāP 58.40cd at MtP 144.40 and only has the latter rephrasing at MtP 144.45cd–46ab. From MtP 144.40ab (VāP 58.40ab), MtP stops directly paralleling VāP, only to start paralleling again at MtP 144.42cd. See n. 359 below.

<sup>254</sup> BḍP *pranaśyati*

<sup>255</sup> T *brāhmaṇāvīśāḥ*

<sup>256</sup> The parallel verse at LiñP 1.40.8 omits VāP 58.41ab.

Rājavṛtte<sup>257</sup> sthitās<sup>258</sup> caurās cauravṛttās<sup>259</sup> ca pārthivāḥ | bhṛtyās ca naṣṭasuhṛdo yugānte

paryupasthite<sup>260</sup> || 42<sup>261</sup>

Aśīlino ‘vratās cāpi<sup>262</sup> striyo madyāmiṣapriyāḥ | māyāmātrā<sup>263</sup> bhaviṣyanti yugānte

pratyupasthite<sup>264</sup> || 43<sup>265</sup>

Śvāpadaprabalatvaṃ ca gavāṃ caivāpyupakṣayaḥ<sup>266</sup> | sādḥūnām vinivṛttiś<sup>267</sup> ca vidyāt tasmin

kalau<sup>268</sup> yuge<sup>269</sup> || 44<sup>270</sup>

Tadā sūkṣmo mahodarko<sup>271</sup> durlabho<sup>272</sup> dānamūlavān<sup>273</sup> | cāturāśramaśaithilyād<sup>274</sup> dharmāḥ

pravicaliṣyati<sup>275</sup> || 45<sup>276</sup>

Tadā hy alpaphalā devī bhaved bhūmir mahīyaśī<sup>277</sup> | sūdrās tapaś carīṣyanti yugānte

---

<sup>257</sup> SkP *rājavṛtṭiyām*

<sup>258</sup> T *sthitā* LiñP *rājavṛtṭisthitās*

<sup>259</sup> BḍP *rājavṛtṭāḥ sthitās corās corācārās* LiñP SkP *caurācārās*

<sup>260</sup> P<sup>1</sup> M C *pratyupasthite*; compare BḍP 1.31.43, “*bhṛtyā ete hy asubhṛto yugānte samavasthite*.” VāP 58.42 is the first verse from VāP 58 to have a parallel in HV, found at HV 116.9 / BrP 231.8. BrP 231.8 gives: “*rājavṛtṭisthitās caurā rājānaś cauraśīlinaḥ | bhṛtyā hy anirdiṣṭabhujo bhaviṣyanti yugakṣaye*”; compare HV 116.9, “*rājavṛtte sthitās corā rājānaś coraśīlinaḥ | bhṛtyā anirviṣṭabhujo bhaviṣyanti yugakṣaye*.” SkP 1.2.40.224ab parallels VāP 58.42ab.

<sup>261</sup> After VāP 58.42ab, LiñP inserts thirteen verses, LiñP 1.40.9cd–22ab. See n. 13 above. After the inserted verses, LiñP continues paralleling VāP at LiñP 1.40.22cd (VāP 58.44ab). Compare the inserted verses with KūP 1.28.17–23, SkP 1.2.40.227–230ab.

<sup>262</sup> BḍP ‘*ṛtās caiva*

<sup>263</sup> BḍP *māyāvinyo*

<sup>264</sup> BḍP *munisattama*

<sup>265</sup> VāP 58.43 is missing from C and has no parallel verse in LiñP. After VāP 58.43, the parallel verse at BḍP

1.31.45ab inserts, “*ekapatnyo na śiṣyanti yugānte munisattama*.” Cf. LiñP 1.40.9cd, “*ekapatnyo na śiṣyanti vardhiṣyanty abhisārikāḥ*,” BrP 231.6cd, “*ekapañktyām aśiṣyanti yugānte munisattamāḥ*.” HV 116.7cd reads as BrP but has “*janamejaya*” instead of “*munisattamāḥ*.” SkP 1.2.40.224cd reads as LiñP but has “*vardhayanty*.”

<sup>266</sup> BḍP *caiva hy upakṣayaḥ* SkP *cāpi parikṣayaḥ*

<sup>267</sup> C T BḍP *vinivṛtṭim*

<sup>268</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> T *gate*

<sup>269</sup> C *yuge yuge* BḍP *vidyās tasmin yugakṣaye*

<sup>270</sup> BrP 231.14 / HV 116.16 parallel VāP 58.44: “*śvāpadapracuratvaṃ ca gavāṃ caiva parikṣayaḥ | sādḥūnām parivṛttiś ca vidyād antagate yuge*” (HV has “*svādūnām vinivṛttiś*” instead of “*sādḥūnām parivṛttiś*”). SkP 1.2.40.234ab parallels VāP 58.44ab.

<sup>271</sup> BḍP *dharmo mahodarke*

<sup>272</sup> HV *dustaro*

<sup>273</sup> K *bhōginān tathā*

<sup>274</sup> BḍP *cāturāśramaśaithilyo* LiñP *cāturāśramaśaithilye* HV *cāturāśramyaśithilo*

<sup>275</sup> BḍP *pravicaliṣyati* LiñP *praticaliṣyati*

<sup>276</sup> HV 115.44 parallels VāP 58.45.

<sup>277</sup> BḍP *bhūmiḥ kvacic cāpi mahāphalā*

pratyupasthite || 46<sup>278</sup>

Tadā hy aikāhniko<sup>279</sup> dharmo dvāpare yaś ca māsikaḥ<sup>280</sup> | tretāyāṃ vatsarasthaś ca ekāhnād<sup>281</sup>

atiricyate || 47

Arakṣitāro hartāro<sup>282</sup> balibhāgasya pārthivāḥ | yugānteṣu<sup>283</sup> bhaviṣyanti<sup>284</sup>

svarakṣaṇaparāyaṇāḥ || 48<sup>285</sup>

Akṣatriyaś ca<sup>286</sup> rājāno viśaḥ<sup>287</sup> śūdropajīvinaḥ | śūdrābhivādinaḥ sarve yugānte

dvijasattamāḥ<sup>288</sup> || 49<sup>289</sup>

Yatayaś ca bhaviṣyanti bahavo ‘smin kalau yuge<sup>290</sup> | citravarṣī tadā devo yadā syāt tu

---

<sup>278</sup> BḍP omits VāP 58.46cd–47 at BḍP 1.31.48. LiñP 1.40.10cd, which reads; “*tadā svalpaphalā bhūmiḥ kvacic cāpi mahāphalā,*” appears to loosely parallel VāP 58.46ab. SkP 1.2.40.225 combines VāP 58.46ab and VāP 58.48ab to give: “*tadā hy alpaphalā bhūmiḥ kvacic cāpi mahāphalā | arakṣitāro hartāro rājānaḥ pāpanirbhayāḥ.*” T similarly omits VāP 58.47 and combines VāP 58.46cd and VāP 58.48ab to give, “*śūdrā paraś ca hartāro balibhāgasya pārthivāḥ.*”

<sup>279</sup> K aikāhiko C ekāhiko V P<sup>2</sup> ekāgniko

<sup>280</sup> C māsikāḥ

<sup>281</sup> K ekāhād

<sup>282</sup> BḍP na rakṣitāro baktāro

<sup>283</sup> BḍP yugānte ca

<sup>284</sup> BrP HV yugānte prabhaviṣyanti

<sup>285</sup> LiñP 1.40.11–12ab seems to loosely parallel VāP 58.48ab, combining it with VāP 58.49 to give: “*arakṣitāro hartāraḥ pārthivāś ca śilāśana | śūdrā vai jñāninaḥ sarve brāhmaṇair abhivanditāḥ || akṣatriyaś ca rājāno viprāḥ śūdropajīvinaḥ.*” LiñP then curiously repeats VāP 58.48ab at LiñP 1.40.24cd. HV 116.5–6ab / BrP 231.4–5ab parallel VāP 58.48–49ab. Cf. ViP 6.1.34.

<sup>286</sup> BḍP arakṣitāro

<sup>287</sup> P<sup>2</sup> BrP BḍP HV LiñP viprāḥ

<sup>288</sup> SkP 1.2.40.226 loosely parallels VāP 58.49: “*akṣatriyaś tu rājāno viprāḥ śūdropajīvinaḥ | śūdrā vivādinaḥ sarve brāhmaṇair abhinanditāḥ.*” HV 116.6cd / BrP 231.5cd give, “*śūdrāś ca brāhmaṇācārā bhaviṣyanti yugakṣaye.*”

<sup>289</sup> Here, BḍP inserts the following verses not found in VāP: “*adrśūlā janapadāḥ śivaśūlā dvijāstathā | pramadāḥ keśaśūlāśca yugānte samupasthite | tapoyajñaphalānāṃ ca vikretāro dvijottamāḥ.*” The first four pādas closely mirror HV 116.12, BrP 231.11, KūP 1.28.12, LiñP 1.40.25cd–26ab, MtP 47.258, and SkP 1.2.40.235cd–236ab, while the last two are paralleled at HV 116.14ab, KūP 1.28.23ab, LiñP 1.40.18cd, and SkP 1.2.40.231cd. Cf. PdP 2.100.134. In various parallels, we find “*aṭṭaśūlā*” in place of “*adrśūlā*.” For an examination of these verses, see P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra: Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 3, Government Oriental Series/B 6 (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941), 893 n. 1753; Kalanath Jha, *Figurative Poetry in Sanskrit Literature* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975), 72–73. A *śūlā* is a prostitute; in Kannada, “*sūle*” still means prostitute, and is especially connected with the tradition of sacred prostitutes dedicated to particular temples. See Aloka Parasher and Usha Naik, “Temple Girls Of Medieval Karnataka,” *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 23, no.1 (1986): 65–6.

<sup>290</sup> SkP bahavaḥ koṭiśaḥ kalau

yugakṣayaḥ<sup>291</sup> || 50<sup>292</sup>

Sarve vāṇijakās cāpi bhaviṣyanty adhame yuge<sup>293</sup> | śūdrās ca yatinaś caiva gūḍhavāsās  
tapasvinaḥ | lolupāḥ paradāreṣu naṣṭamārgāḥ kalau yuge | bhūyiṣṭhaṃ kūṭamānais ca  
puṇyaṃ vikrīyate janaiḥ<sup>294</sup> || 51<sup>295</sup>

Kuśīlacaryāpāṣaṇḍair<sup>296</sup> vṛthārūpaiḥ<sup>297</sup> samāvṛtam<sup>298</sup> | puruṣālpam bahustrīkaṃ yugānte  
paryupasthite<sup>299</sup> || 52<sup>300</sup>

Bahuyācanako<sup>301</sup> loko bhaviṣyati parasparam<sup>302</sup> | kravyādanaḥ<sup>303</sup> krūravākyo ‘nāṛjavo<sup>304</sup>  
nānasūyakaḥ || 53<sup>305</sup>

Na kṛte pratikartā ca kṣīṇo loko<sup>306</sup> bhaviṣyati | aśānkā caiva patite tadyugāntasya<sup>307</sup>  
lakṣaṇam || 54<sup>308</sup>

---

<sup>291</sup> BḍP 1.31.52ab has, “*citravarṣī yadā devas tadā prāhur yugakṣayam.*” LiṅP 1.40.26cd follows VāP 58.50, but ends with, “*...prāhur yugakṣayam.*” SkP 1.2.40.237cd collapses VāP 58.50cd and VāP 58.51ab to give: “*sarve vaṇigjanās cāpi citravarṣī ca vāsavaḥ.*” HV 116.18cd, “*citravarṣī ca parjanya yuge kṣīṇe bhaviṣyati,*” may loosely parallel VāP 58.50cd.

<sup>292</sup> LiṅP 1.40.19 and SkP 1.2.40.232 combine VāP 58.50ab with VāP 58.52cd. KūP 1.28.23ab apparently parallels VāP 58.50ab and reads, “*yatayaś ca bhaviṣyanti śataśo ‘tha sahasraśaḥ.*”

<sup>293</sup> BrP *caiva bhaviṣyanti yugakṣaye* HV *caiva bhaviṣyanti kalau yuge*

<sup>294</sup> *K puṇyaṃ vikrīyate janaiḥ* C T BḍP *puṇyaṃ vikrīyate janāḥ*

<sup>295</sup> VāP 58.51cd–51ef are missing from K, P<sup>2</sup>, M, C, T, and all other Purāṇic parallels. LiṅP 1.40.27 combines VāP 58.51ab with VāP 58.52ab. BrP 231.20ef / HV 116.19ef parallel VāP 58.51ab.

<sup>296</sup> *C kuśīlavarṣāpāṣaṇḍair* KūP LiṅP *kuśīlacaryāḥ pāṣaṇḍair* HV *kuśīlānāryabhūyiṣṭhaṃ*

<sup>297</sup> C T *vṛthārūpe* BḍP *vyādhārūpaiḥ*

<sup>298</sup> P<sup>1</sup> M HV *vṛthārūpasamāvṛtam* BrP *kuśīlānāryabhūyiṣṭhā vṛthārūpasamanvitāḥ* KūP LiṅP SkP *samāvṛtāḥ*

<sup>299</sup> BḍP LiṅP *samupasthite* BrP HV *tad yugāntasya lakṣaṇam* SkP *puruṣālpabahustrīko nṛṇām cāpatyasambhavaḥ*

<sup>300</sup> BrP 231.24 / HV 116.23 parallel VāP 58.52. Somewhat similar to LiṅP, KūP and SkP combine VāP 58.52ab and VāP 58.53ab at KūP 1.28.11 and SkP 1.2.40.238.

<sup>301</sup> LiṅP *bahuyājanako*

<sup>302</sup> SkP *parasparī* BrP *bahuyācanako loko na dāsyati parasparam* HV *bahuyācanakā lokā dāsyante ca parasparam.* It is worth noting that some texts of KūP read “*bahuyācanakā lokā bhaviṣyanti.*”

<sup>303</sup> C T *kāvyādataḥ*

<sup>304</sup> BḍP *avyākartā krūravākyā nāṛjavo* LiṅP *nāvyāhṛtakrūravākyo nāṛjavī*

<sup>305</sup> BrP 231.25ab / HV 116.24ab parallel VāP 58.53ab.

<sup>306</sup> *C loko* BḍP *yuge kṣīṇe* LiṅP *yugakṣīṇe*

<sup>307</sup> BḍP *yugānte tasya*

<sup>308</sup> SkP 1.2.40.239 combines VāP 58.54cd and VāP 58.57ab. SkP 1.2.40.239ab gives, “*aśānkāś caiva pāpeṣu tadā loko bhaviṣyati.*” SkP 1.2.40.239cd reads as in VāP.



Narasūnyā<sup>309</sup> vasumatī śūnyā caiva bhaviṣyati<sup>310</sup> | maṇḍalāni bhavanty atra<sup>311</sup> deśeṣu nagareṣu  
ca || 55<sup>312</sup>

Alpodakā cālpaphalā bhaviṣyati vasundharā | goptāraś cāpy agoptāraḥ prabhaviṣyanti<sup>313</sup>  
aśāsanāḥ<sup>314</sup> || 56<sup>315</sup>

Hartāraḥ pararatnānāḥ<sup>316</sup> paradārapradharśakāḥ<sup>317</sup> | kāmātmāno durātmāno hy adharmāt<sup>318</sup>  
sāhasapriyāḥ<sup>319</sup> || 57<sup>320</sup>

Pranaṣṭacetanāḥ<sup>321</sup> puṃso muktakeśās tu cūlikāḥ<sup>322</sup> | ūnaṣoḍaśavarśās<sup>323</sup> ca prajāyante  
yugakṣaye || 58<sup>324</sup>

Śukladantājitākṣās<sup>325</sup> ca muṇḍāḥ kāśyavāśasaḥ | śūdrā dharmam carīṣyanti yugānte  
paryupasthite<sup>326</sup> || 59<sup>327</sup>

---

<sup>309</sup> C T na ca śūnyā

<sup>310</sup> LiñP has, “*nṛpaśūnyā vasumatī na ca dhānyadhanāvṛtā.*”

<sup>311</sup> C ātra (?) LiñP *maṇḍalāni bhaviṣyanti*

<sup>312</sup> BḍP 1.31.56cd apparently collapses VāP 58.55–56ab into, “*tataḥ śūnya vasumatī bhaviṣyati vasundharā.*” BrP 231.67cd / HV 117.26cd seem to parallel VāP 58.55cd: “*maṇḍalaiḥ sambhaviṣyanti deśe deśe pṛthak pṛthak*” (HV has “*prabhaviṣyanti*” instead of “*sambhaviṣyanti*”).

<sup>313</sup> LiñP *sambhaviṣyanti*

<sup>314</sup> V *prabhaviṣyanti śāsanāḥ* BḍP *prabhaviṣyanti śāsakāḥ*

<sup>315</sup> BrP 231.73 / HV 117.31 loosely parallel VāP 58.55ab+56cd. BrP 231.73 gives “*naiva śūnyā navāranyā bhaviṣyati vasundharā | agoptāraś ca goptāro bhaviṣyanti narādhipāḥ*”; HV 117.31 gives “*naiva śūnyā na cāsūnyā bhaviṣyati vasundharā | goptāraś cāpy agoptāraḥ prabhaviṣyanti śāsināḥ.*”

<sup>316</sup> LiñP *paravittānāḥ*

<sup>317</sup> BḍP *paradāravimarśakāḥ*

<sup>318</sup> BḍP LiñP *adhamāḥ*

<sup>319</sup> BrP HV *durātmānaḥ sopadhāḥ priyasāhasāḥ*

<sup>320</sup> BrP 231.59 / HV 117.18 parallels VāP 58.57.

<sup>321</sup> C *prānaṣṭacetanāḥ* BḍP LiñP *pranaṣṭaceṣṭanāḥ*

<sup>322</sup> Cf. Pāḷi *cūḷaka*. LiñP *śūlināḥ*. BḍP 1.31.58cd has, “*pranaṣṭaceṣṭanā dhūrtā muktakeśās tv aśūlināḥ.*”

<sup>323</sup> LiñP *janāḥ ṣoḍaśavarśās*

<sup>324</sup> P<sup>2</sup> is missing VāP 58.58d–58.61c, from “*prajāyante...*” through “*kīṭamūṣikarsarpās ca.*” BrP 231.10 / HV 116.11 loosely parallel VāP 58.58. BrP gives: “*pranaṣṭanāsāḥ puruṣā muktakeśā virūpiṇāḥ | ūnaṣoḍaśavarśās ca prasoyanti tathā striyaḥ*”; cf. HV “*pranaṣṭacetanā martyā muktakeśā vicūlināḥ | unaṣoḍaśavarśās ca prajāsyanti narās tadā.*” SkP 1.2.40.240ab = VāP 58.58cd.

<sup>325</sup> C KūP *śukladantājinākhyās* LiñP *śukladantājinākṣās*

<sup>326</sup> BḍP KūP LiñP *samupasthite* BrP *vadiṣyanti śāṭhyabuddhyopajīvināḥ* HV *śākyabuddhopajīvināḥ*

<sup>327</sup> BrP 231.13 / HV 116.15 parallel VāP 58.59. KūP 1.28.13–16 loosely parallels parts of VāP 58.59–68, with many omissions and with several changes to the order in which the verses appear. See n. 331 below.

Sasyacaurā<sup>328</sup> bhaviṣyanti tathā cailābhimarśanāḥ<sup>329</sup> | caurās caurasya hartāro hartuhartāra

eva ca<sup>330</sup> || 60<sup>331</sup>

Jñānakarmaṇy<sup>332</sup> uparate loke niṣkriyatāṃ gate<sup>333</sup> | kīṭamūṣikasarpās<sup>334</sup> ca dharṣayiṣyanti

mānavān || 61<sup>335</sup>

Subhikṣam<sup>336</sup> kṣemam ārogyaṃ sāmartyam<sup>337</sup> durlabham bhavet<sup>338</sup> | kauśikāḥ<sup>339</sup>

pratīvatsyanti<sup>340</sup> deśān kṣudbhayapīḍitān<sup>341</sup> || 62<sup>342</sup>

Duḥkhenābhiplutānāṃ ca paramāyuh śataṃ bhavet<sup>343</sup> | dṛṣyante na ca<sup>344</sup> dṛṣyante vedāḥ kaliyuge

‘khilāḥ || 63<sup>345</sup>

---

<sup>328</sup> BḍP *sasyacorā*

<sup>329</sup> C *cailābhimarśinaḥ* BḍP *cailāpahāriṇaḥ* KūP *cailābhimarśinaḥ* LiṅP *dr̥dhacailābhilāṣinaḥ*

<sup>330</sup> BḍP *corāc corās ca hartāro hartur hartā tathāparaḥ* BrP *hantā hantur bhaviṣyati* KūP SkP *hartur hartā tathāparaḥ* LiṅP *caurās corasvahartāro hartur hartā tathāparaḥ*

<sup>331</sup> BrP 231.62–63/HV 117.21–22 seem to be an expansion of this verse; at HV 117.21ab, both readings of *cailābhimarśinaḥ* and *cailāpahāriṇaḥ* are attested. After VāP 58.60 (KūP 1.28.14), KūP skips to VāP 58.68 (KūP 1.28.15) and then combines VāP 58.64cd and 65ab (KūP 1.28.16). VāP 58.61 is moved to KūP 1.28.26. SkP 1.2.40.241 combines VāP 58.60cd and VāP 58.61ab.

<sup>332</sup> LiṅP *yogyakarmaṇy* BrP HV *yajñakarmaṇy*. The VāP and all variant readings (BḍP is identical to VāP here) have a technically incorrect sandhi of a *praḥr̥hya* vowel, namely, the “-ī” of the neuter dual ending “-aṅī” being changed to “-y” before the following word-initial vowel. On cases of sandhi of *praḥr̥hya* vowels in Epic Sanskrit, see Thomas Oberlies, *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*, Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 5 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 29.

<sup>333</sup> BrP HV *rakṣāṃsi śvāpadāni ca*

<sup>334</sup> C BḍP KūP LiṅP HV *kīṭamūṣakasarpās*

<sup>335</sup> BrP 231.65 / HV 117.24 parallels VāP 58.61. SkP 1.2.40.242 combines VāP 58.61cd and VāP 58.65cd.

<sup>336</sup> BḍP *abhikṣnam*

<sup>337</sup> C *rāmartyam* HV *sāmagryam atha bandhubhiḥ* BrP *sāmagryam caiva bandhuṣu*

<sup>338</sup> BḍP *tathā* LiṅP *tadā*

<sup>339</sup> BḍP *kauśikān* LiṅP BrP HV *kauśikīm*

<sup>340</sup> C *pratipatsyanti* LiṅP *pratipatsyante*

<sup>341</sup> BḍP *deśāḥ kṣudbhayapīḍitāḥ* LiṅP *deśān kṣudbhayapīḍitāḥ*

<sup>342</sup> VāP 58.62ac corresponds to BrP 231.66ab / HV 117.24ab, “*kṣemam subhikṣam ārogyaṃ sāmagryam caiva bandhuṣu*” (HV ends with “*atha bandhubhiḥ*”); VāP 58.62cd corresponds to BrP 231.69cd / HV 117.28cd, “*kauśikīm saṃtariṣyanti narāḥ kṣudbhayapīḍitāḥ*” (HV has “*saṃśrayiṣyanti*” instead of “*saṃtariṣyanti*”).

<sup>343</sup> BḍP LiṅP *tadā*

<sup>344</sup> BḍP *ca na*

<sup>345</sup> In C, this verse and 58.64ab were apparently skipped due to scribal error and added in the same hand at the bottom margin.

Utsīdanti<sup>346</sup> tathā yajñāḥ<sup>347</sup> kevalādharmapīḍitāḥ | kaṣāyīṇaś<sup>348</sup> ca<sup>349</sup> nirgranthās<sup>350</sup> tathā  
kāpālīnaś ca ha<sup>351</sup> || 64<sup>352</sup>

Vedavikrayīnaś<sup>353</sup> cānye tīrthavikrayīṇo ‘pare<sup>354</sup> | varṇāśramāṇāṃ ye cānye<sup>355</sup> pāṣaṇḍāḥ  
paripanthīnaḥ || 65

Utpadyante tathā<sup>356</sup> te vai samprāpte tu kalau yuge | nādhīyante tadā<sup>357</sup> vedāḥ sūdrā<sup>358</sup>  
dharmārthakovidāḥ || 66<sup>359</sup>

Yajante nāśvamedhena<sup>360</sup> rājānaḥ sūdrayonayaḥ | strīvadhaṃ govadhaṃ<sup>361</sup> kṛtvā hatvā caiva<sup>362</sup>  
parasparam || upahanyus<sup>363</sup> tadānyonyam sādhayanti tathā prajāḥ || 67

Duḥkhapracārato ‘lpāyur<sup>364</sup> deśotsādaḥ sarogata<sup>365</sup> | moho glānis tathā saukhyam<sup>366</sup> tamovṛttam

---

<sup>346</sup> BḍP *tat sīdante*

<sup>347</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T *utsīdati tathā yajñāḥ*

<sup>348</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T *kevalādharmapīḍitāḥ*

<sup>349</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M *keṣāyīnaś* BḍP KūP *kāṣāyīṇo ‘tha*

<sup>350</sup> BḍP *nirgranthā*

<sup>351</sup> KūP *kāpālīkāś ca ye* BḍP *kāpālīkāś ca ha* LiṅP *kāṣāyīṇo ‘py anirgranthāḥ kāpālībahulās tv iha*

<sup>352</sup> MtP 144.40bc appears to parallel VāP 58.64cd and reads, “*kāṣāyīṇaś ca niṣkacchās tathā kāpālīnaś ca ha.*” “*Niṣkaccha*” appears to be another term for a Jain, but its exact meaning is unclear. If “*kaccha*”=“*kakṣa*” in the meaning of girdle or loincloth (cf. Pā. *kacchā*), the term may be referring to the nakedness of Jain ascetics. After this, MtP inserts “*ye cānye devavratīnaś tathā ye dharmadūṣakāḥ | divyavṛttāś ca ye kecid vṛttiyarthaṃ śrutīlīṅgīnaḥ || evaṃvidhāś ca ye kecid bhavantīha kalau yuge*” at MtP 144.40–41ab.

<sup>353</sup> C *vedavikrīyīnaś* BḍP *vedavikrayīmaś*

<sup>354</sup> KūP LiṅP *tīrthavikrayīnaḥ pare.*

<sup>355</sup> In C, 58.65bc were apparently skipped due to scribal error and added in the same hand at the bottom margin. See above, n. 345.

<sup>356</sup> C BḍP *tadā*

<sup>357</sup> C *tathā*

<sup>358</sup> BḍP MtP *adhīyate tadā vedāñ chūdrā* LiṅP *adhīyante tadā vedāñ chūdrā*

<sup>359</sup> MtP picks up again here (beginning with MtP 144.42cd, which parallels VāP 58.66cd) and more or less directly parallels VāP 58 through MtP 144.104cd / VāP 58.117ab.

<sup>360</sup> BḍP LiṅP *cāśvamedhena* MtP *hy aśvamedhais tu*

<sup>361</sup> K *strībadhaṃ gobadhaṃ* BḍP LiṅP MtP *strībālagovadhaṃ*

<sup>362</sup> BḍP *hatvānye ca*

<sup>363</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T *upahanya* BḍP *apahatya tathānyonyam* LiṅP *upadravāṃś tathānyonyam* MtP *upahatya tathānyonyam*

<sup>364</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> M C T *duḥkhapracāratālpāyur* LiṅP *duḥkhaprabhūtam alpāyur* MtP *duḥkhapracuratālpāyur*

<sup>365</sup> BḍP *duḥkhapravacanālpāyur dehālpāyus ca rogataḥ*

<sup>366</sup> V *ity utpādītavṛtte ca* P<sup>1</sup> T *parasparaviruddhāś ca* BḍP KūP LiṅP *adharmābhīniveśitvāt* MtP *adharmābhīniveśitvaṃ*. No reading is possible for 58.68c in C, with a number of characters being crossed out and other characters not forming any recognizable words.

kalau smṛtam || 68<sup>367</sup>

Prajāsu bhrūṇahatyā ca<sup>368</sup> atha<sup>369</sup> vai sampravartate<sup>370</sup> | tasmād āyur balaṃ rūpaṃ kalim prāpya  
prahīyate<sup>371</sup> || duḥkhenābhiplutānām<sup>372</sup> vai<sup>373</sup> paramāyuh śataṃ nṛṇām || 69

Dṛśyante nābhidrśyante<sup>374</sup> vedāḥ kaliyuge ‘khilāḥ | utsīdante tadā yajñāḥ

kevalādharmapīḍitāḥ<sup>375</sup> || 70<sup>376</sup>

Tadā tv<sup>377</sup> alpena<sup>378</sup> kālena<sup>379</sup> siddhiṃ yāsyanti<sup>380</sup> mānavāḥ | dhanyā dharmaṃ carisyanti yugānte  
dvijasattamāḥ<sup>381</sup> || 71<sup>382</sup>

Śrutismṛtyuditaṃ dharmam ye caranty anasūyakāḥ | tretāyām vārṣiko<sup>383</sup> dharmo dvāpare

māsikaḥ smṛtaḥ || yathāśakti<sup>384</sup> caran prājñas tad ahnā prāpnuyāt<sup>385</sup> kalau || 72<sup>386</sup>

---

<sup>367</sup> SkP 1.2.40.243cd appears to parallel VāP 58.68ab: “*duḥkham putrakalatrādyam dehotsādaḥ sarogatā.*”

<sup>368</sup> K *prajā tu bhrūṇahatyāyam*

<sup>369</sup> C T *matha* LiñP *brahmahatyādi tadā*

<sup>370</sup> BḍP *tadā vairāt pravartate* MtP *bhrūṇahatyā prajānām na tathā hyevam pravartate.* See n. 253 above.

<sup>371</sup> MtP *prahīyante kalau yuge*

<sup>372</sup> C *duḥkhenādhiplutānām*

<sup>373</sup> MtP *ca*

<sup>374</sup> C *dṛśyante nām abhidṛśyam* MtP *bhūtvā ca na bhavantīha*

<sup>375</sup> MtP *tathā yajñāḥ kevalam dharmahetavaḥ*

<sup>376</sup> The repetition of VāP 58.63–64ab seen here only occurs in VāP. BḍP and LiñP have only the earlier appearance of these verses (i.e. directly before “*kāṣāyīṇas ca*” / “*kāṣāyīṇo...*” at BḍP 1.31.63cd–1.31.64 and LiñP 1.40.38–39ab), while MtP only has them in the position of this later repetition (at MtP 144.46cd–47).

<sup>377</sup> HV *hy*

<sup>378</sup> BḍP *cālpēna*

<sup>379</sup> C is missing the “-na” in *kālena*. HV *tapasā* BrP *tathā svalpena tapasā*

<sup>380</sup> BḍP LiñP *gacchanti*

<sup>381</sup> HV *janamejaya* BrP *munisattamāḥ*

<sup>382</sup> VāP 58.71 corresponds to HV 115.45/BrP 230.81. MtP omits VāP 58.72–73 at MtP 144.48. SkP 1.2.40.245 loosely parallels VāP 58.71: “*tadālpēnaiva kālena siddhiṃ gacchanti mānavāḥ | triyugīnā vadanty evam dhanyā dharmam caranti ye.*”

<sup>383</sup> C *vārṣikā* BḍP *ābdiko*

<sup>384</sup> LiñP *yathākleśam*

<sup>385</sup> LiñP *prāpnute*

<sup>386</sup> SkP 1.2.40.246–247ab loosely parallels VāP 58.72: “*śrutismṛtipurāṇoktam kalau śraddhāparāyaṇāḥ | tretāyām vārṣiko dharmo dvāpare māsikaḥ smṛtaḥ || yathā kleśam caran prājñas tad ahnā prāpyate kalau.*”

Eṣā kaliyuge ‘vasthā<sup>387</sup> saṁdhyāṁśam<sup>388</sup> tu nibodha me<sup>389</sup> | yuge yuge tu<sup>390</sup> hīyante<sup>391</sup> trīṁś<sup>392</sup>

trīn pādāṁś ca<sup>393</sup> siddhayaḥ || 73

Yugasvabhāvāt saṁdhyās tu<sup>394</sup> tiṣṭhantīmās<sup>395</sup> tu pādaśaḥ<sup>396</sup> | saṁdhyāsvabhāvāc cāṁśeṣu<sup>397</sup>

pādaśas te<sup>398</sup> pratiṣṭhitāḥ<sup>399</sup> || 74<sup>400</sup>

Evam saṁdhyāṁśake kāle saṁprāpte<sup>401</sup> tu yugāntike | teṣāṁ śāstā hy asādhūnāṁ bhṛgūnāṁ<sup>402</sup>

nidhanotthitāḥ<sup>403</sup> || 75

Gotreṇa<sup>404</sup> vai candramaso nāmnā pramitir<sup>405</sup> ucyate | mādhasya tu so ‘ṁśena<sup>406</sup> pūrvam<sup>407</sup>

svāyaṁbhuve ‘ntare || 76<sup>408</sup>

Samāḥ sa viṁśatiṁ<sup>409</sup> pūrṇāḥ<sup>410</sup> paryaṭan vai vasuṁdharām | ācarṣa<sup>411</sup> sa vai senām

savājirathakuñjarām<sup>412</sup> || 77<sup>413</sup>

---

<sup>387</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP *kaliyugāvasthā*

<sup>388</sup> MtP *saṁdhyāṁśau*

<sup>389</sup> BḍP MtP *nibodhata*

<sup>390</sup> LiñP *ca*

<sup>391</sup> V M C T *hīyante*

<sup>392</sup> C is missing “*trīṁś*” and thus reads only “*strīn*.”

<sup>393</sup> BḍP *trītripādās tu* LiñP *tu*

<sup>394</sup> See above, n. 41.

<sup>395</sup> LiñP *yugasvabhāvāḥ saṁdhyās tu tiṣṭhantīha*

<sup>396</sup> BḍP *saṁdhyāsu tiṣṭhantīha tu yādrśaḥ* MtP *yugasvabhāvāḥ saṁdhyāsu avatiṣṭhanti pādātāḥ*

<sup>397</sup> LiñP *saṁdhyāsvabhāvāḥ svāṁśeṣu*

<sup>398</sup> BḍP *saṁdhyāsvabhāvāḥ svāṁśeṣu pādaśeṣāḥ*

<sup>399</sup> MtP *saṁdhyāsvabhāvāḥ svāṁśeṣu pādenaivāvatasthire*

<sup>400</sup> C has many apparent errors in this verse, reading, “*yugasvabhāvā saṁdhyās tu tiṣṭhatīmās tu pādaśaḥ saṁdhyāsvabhāva cāṁśeṣu pādaśas te pratiṣṭhitā*.”

<sup>401</sup> C is missing the “*saṁ-*” in “*saṁprāpte*.”

<sup>402</sup> LiñP *bhūtānāṁ*

<sup>403</sup> MtP *adharmiṇāṁ śāstā bhṛgūnāṁ ca kule sthitāḥ*

<sup>404</sup> LiñP *gotre ‘smin*

<sup>405</sup> BḍP MtP *pramatir*

<sup>406</sup> LiñP *mānavasya tu so ‘ṁśena*

<sup>407</sup> MtP *kalisāṁdhyāṁśabhāgeṣu manoḥ*

<sup>408</sup> Cf. VāP 58.85–86ab below.

<sup>409</sup> C *viṁśati* BḍP LiñP *viṁśatiḥ* Note: since C often omits both *anusvāras* and *visargas*, C could be read as either “*viṁśatiḥ*” or “*viṁśatiṁ*” here.

<sup>410</sup> MtP *samās trīṁśat tu sampūrṇāḥ*

<sup>411</sup> BḍP LiñP *anukarṣan* MtP *aśvakarmā*

<sup>412</sup> MtP *hastyaśvarathasaṁkulām*

<sup>413</sup> VāP 98.105ab gives, “*anukarṣan sarvasenāṁ hastyaśvarathasaṁkulām*.”

Pragr̥hītāyudhair vipraih śataśo ‘tha sahasraśah<sup>414</sup> | sa tadā taiḥ parivr̥to mlecchān hanti

sahasraśah<sup>415</sup> || 78

Sa hatvā<sup>416</sup> sarvagaś<sup>417</sup> caiva rājñas tāñ sūdrayonijān<sup>418</sup> | pāṣaṇḍān sa<sup>419</sup> tataḥ<sup>420</sup> sarvān

niḥśeṣān<sup>421</sup> kṛtavān<sup>422</sup> prabhuh<sup>423</sup> || 79

Nātyarthaṃ<sup>424</sup> dhārmikā ye ca<sup>425</sup> tān sarvān hanti sarvaśah<sup>426</sup> | varṇavyatyāśajātāms<sup>427</sup> ca ye ca

tān upajīvinaḥ<sup>428</sup> || 80<sup>429</sup>

Udīcyān madhyadeśāms<sup>430</sup> ca pārvatīyāms<sup>430</sup> tathaiva ca | prācyān pratīcyāms<sup>430</sup> ca tathā

vindhyaṣṭhāparāntikān<sup>431</sup> || 81<sup>432</sup>

Tathaiva dākṣiṇātyāms<sup>433</sup> ca draviḍān siṃhalaiḥ saha<sup>433</sup> | gāndhārān pāradāms<sup>433</sup> caiva pahnavān

yavanāms<sup>434</sup> tathā<sup>434</sup> || 82

Tuṣārān barbarāms<sup>435</sup> cānyān<sup>436</sup> śūlikān<sup>437</sup> daradān khasān<sup>438</sup> | lampākān atha ketāms<sup>439</sup> ca<sup>439</sup>

---

<sup>414</sup> VāP 98.105cd gives, “pragr̥hītāyudhair viprair vṛtaḥ śatasahasraśah.”

<sup>415</sup> BḍP *sma sarvaśah* MtP *sarvān nijaghnivān*

<sup>416</sup> C is missing “*sa hatvā*” and instead repeats part of 58.78c, also missing the “-va” in “*caiva*.”

<sup>417</sup> BḍP *saha vā sarvaśas* LiñP *sarvaśas*

<sup>418</sup> MtP *sarvaśas caiva rājānaḥ sūdrayonayaḥ*

<sup>419</sup> BḍP LiñP *pākhaṇḍāms tu*

<sup>420</sup> MtP *sadā*

<sup>421</sup> BḍP LiñP *niḥśeṣam*

<sup>422</sup> MtP *akarot*

<sup>423</sup> BḍP *vibhuḥ*

<sup>424</sup> BḍP *nātyartha*

<sup>425</sup> MtP *adhārmikās ca ye kecit*

<sup>426</sup> LiñP *sarvataḥ*. VāP 98.106ab gives, “*nātyarthaṃ dhārmikā ye ca ye ca dharmadviṣaḥ kvacit*.”

<sup>427</sup> BḍP LiñP *varṇavyatyāśajātās*

<sup>428</sup> BḍP LiñP *anujīvinaḥ*

<sup>429</sup> VāP 58.80cd is missing from MtP.

<sup>430</sup> BḍP *parvatīyāms*

<sup>431</sup> BḍP *vindhyaṣṭhācarān api*

<sup>432</sup> The repetition of this verse at VāP 98.106cd condenses it into “*udīcyān madhyadeśāms ca tathā vindhyāparāntikān*.”

<sup>433</sup> Exactly as at VāP 98.107ab.

<sup>434</sup> BḍP MtP *pahlavān yavanān śakān*. VāP 98.107cd gives “*pahlavān yavanān śakān*.”

<sup>435</sup> K *varvarāms*

<sup>436</sup> P<sup>2</sup> *cānyān*

<sup>437</sup> MtP *chvetān halikān*

<sup>438</sup> BḍP *khasān*. VāP 98.108ab gives “*barbarāms caiva pulindān daradān khasān*.”

<sup>439</sup> C T *ketakān* BḍP *lampākārān sakatakān*

kirātānām ca jātayaḥ<sup>440</sup> || 83<sup>441</sup>

Pravṛttacakro<sup>442</sup> balavān mlecchānām antakṛd vibhuḥ<sup>443</sup> | adhr̥ṣyaḥ<sup>444</sup> sarvabhūtānām cacārātha  
vasuṃdharām<sup>445</sup> || 84

Mādhavasya<sup>446</sup> tu so ‘m̥sena devasya hi<sup>447</sup> vijajñivān<sup>448</sup> | pūrvajanmavidhijñais ca<sup>449</sup> pramitir<sup>450</sup>  
nāma vīryavān || 85<sup>451</sup>

Gotreṇa<sup>452</sup> vai candramasaḥ pūrve<sup>453</sup> kaliyuge prabhuḥ | dvātriṃśe ‘bhyudite varṣe prakrānte<sup>454</sup>  
viṃśatim<sup>455</sup> samāḥ || 86<sup>456</sup>

Vinighnan<sup>457</sup> sarvabhūtāni mānavāni<sup>458</sup> sahasraśaḥ<sup>459</sup> | kṛtvā vīryāvaśeṣān<sup>460</sup> tu<sup>461</sup> pṛthivīm<sup>462</sup>

---

<sup>440</sup> MtP āndhrakāṃś cāpi corajātīṃs tathaiva ca. VāP 98.108cd gives “lampakān andhrakān rudrān kirātāṃś caiva sa prabhuḥ.”

<sup>441</sup> LiñP is missing VāP 58.81–83.

<sup>442</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> pravṛttavaktro T pravṛttavacakro (?)

<sup>443</sup> BḍP antakṛt prabhuḥ LiñP sa tu MtP chūdrāṇām antakṛd babhau. The repetition of this verse at VāP 98.109ab reads “balī” instead of “vibhuḥ.”

<sup>444</sup> C adhr̥ṣyaḥ BḍP adhr̥ṣṭaḥ.

<sup>445</sup> MtP vidrāvya sarvabhūtāni cacāra vasudhām imām. VāP 98.109cd reads “adhr̥ṣyaḥ sarvabhūtānām pṛthivīm vicariṣyati.”

<sup>446</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T LiñP MtP mānavasya

<sup>447</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M T BḍP LiñP devasyeha C dehasyeva

<sup>448</sup> MtP vaṃśe tu nṛdevasyeha jajñivān

<sup>449</sup> LiñP pūrvajanmani viṣṇos tu

<sup>450</sup> BḍP pūrvajanmani viṣṇuś ca pramatir MtP pūrvajanmani vikhyātaḥ pramatir

<sup>451</sup> VāP 98.110 gives, “mānavah sa tu samjajñe devasyām̥sena dhīmataḥ | pūrvajanmani viṣṇur yaḥ pramitir nāma vīryavān.” VāP 98 does not feature the repetition of these verses seen at VāP 58.76.

<sup>452</sup> BḍP LiñP gotrato MtP sutah sa

<sup>453</sup> LiñP pūrṇe

<sup>454</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP prakrānto

<sup>455</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> C LiñP viṃśatīḥ BḍP viṃśatīḥ

<sup>456</sup> VāP 98.111 gives, “gātṛeṇa vai candrasamaḥ pūrṇe kaliyuge ‘bhavat | ityetās tasya devasya daśa sambhūtayaḥ smṛtāḥ.”

<sup>457</sup> MtP nijaghne

<sup>458</sup> LiñP śataśo ‘tha

<sup>459</sup> BḍP mānavān eva sarvaśaḥ MtP mānuṣāṇy eva sarvaśaḥ

<sup>460</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T LiñP bījāvaśeṣām BḍP bījāvaśeṣam

<sup>461</sup> MtP bījāvaśiṣṭām tām

<sup>462</sup> BḍP pṛthivyām

krūreṇa<sup>463</sup> karmaṇā<sup>464</sup> || parasparanimittena kopenākasmikena tu<sup>465</sup> || **87**<sup>466</sup>

Sa sādhayitvā<sup>467</sup> vṛṣalān prāyaśas tān adhārmikān<sup>468</sup> | gaṅgāyamunayor madhye niṣṭhām<sup>469</sup>  
prāptaḥ sahanuḡaḥ || **88**<sup>470</sup>

Tato vyatīte tasmimś<sup>471</sup> tu amātye satyasainike<sup>472</sup> | utsādyā pārthivān sarvān mlecchāmś caiva  
sahasraśaḥ || **89**<sup>473</sup>

Tatra<sup>474</sup> saṃdhyāṃśake kāle saṃprāpte tu yugāntike<sup>475</sup> | sthitāsv alpāvaśiṣṭāsu prajāsv iha  
kvacit kvacit || **90**

Apragrahās<sup>476</sup> tatās tā<sup>477</sup> vai lokaceṣṭās<sup>478</sup> tu<sup>479</sup> vṛndaśaḥ<sup>480</sup> | upahiṃsanti cānyonyam  
prapadyante<sup>481</sup> parasparam<sup>482</sup> || **91**<sup>483</sup>

---

<sup>463</sup> K *rūḍhena*

<sup>464</sup> LiñP *pṛthivīm krūrakarmaṇaḥ*

<sup>465</sup> MtP *kālenākasmikena ca*

<sup>466</sup> VāP 98.113cd–114ab gives “*vinighnan sarvabhūtāni mānuṣān eva sarvaśaḥ || kṛtvā bījāvaśeṣām tu mahīm krūreṇa karmaṇā*”; VāP 98.116ab then supplies the parallel pādas to VāP 58.87ef, “*akasmāt kupitā ‘nyonyam bhaviṣyanti ca mohitāḥ.*”

<sup>467</sup> BḍP *susādhayitvā*

<sup>468</sup> BḍP *adharmikān*

<sup>469</sup> LiñP *sthitim*

<sup>470</sup> MtP *saṃsthitā sahasā yā tu senā pramatinā saha | gaṅgāyamunayor madhye siddhiṃ prāptā samādhinā*. This and the following verse in MtP appear to be corrupt. The parallel pādas at VāP 98.114cd and 117ab give “*saṃśāyitvā vṛṣalān prāyaśas tān adhārmikān*” and “*gaṅgāyamunayor madhye niṣṭhām prāpsyati sānuḡaḥ.*” respectively. SkP 1.2.40.262ab parallels VāP 58.88ab: “*gaṅgāyamunayor madhye niṣṭhām yāsyati pārthivaḥ.*” T omits VāP 58.88–89a.

<sup>471</sup> BḍP *kalpe* LiñP *kale*

<sup>472</sup> BḍP *sāmānye sahasainikaḥ* LiñP *sāmātyaḥ sahasainikaḥ*

<sup>473</sup> MtP gives, “*tatas teṣu pranaṣṭeṣu saṃdhyāṃśe krūrakarmasu | utsādyā pārthivān sarvāṃś teṣv atīteṣu vai tadā.*” See above, n. 470. Parallel to VāP 58.89ab, VāP 98.117cd gives, “*tato vyatīte kalkau tu sāmānyaiḥ (or sāmātyaiḥ) sahasainikaiḥ.*” This is the last of the easily identifiable parallel passages in VāP 98.

<sup>474</sup> MtP *tataḥ*

<sup>475</sup> BḍP *yugāntake*

<sup>476</sup> BḍP *apagrahās*

<sup>477</sup> MtP *svāpradānās tadā te*

<sup>478</sup> T *lokāviṣṭās* BḍP LiñP MtP *lobhāviṣṭās*

<sup>479</sup> SkP *lobhāviṣṭās ca*

<sup>480</sup> LiñP *kṛtsnaśaḥ*

<sup>481</sup> BḍP *pothayantaḥ* LiñP *praṇipatya* MtP *pralumpanti*

<sup>482</sup> SkP *vyākulāḥ śramapīḍitāḥ*

<sup>483</sup> SkP 1.2.40.263cd–264ab parallels VāP 58.91.



Arājake yugavaśāt saṃśaye<sup>484</sup> samupasthite | prajāś tā<sup>485</sup> vai tataḥ<sup>486</sup> sarvāḥ

parasparabhayārditāḥ || 92

Vyākulās ca<sup>487</sup> pariśrāntās<sup>488</sup> tyaktvā dārān ḡhāṇi ca<sup>489</sup> | svān prāṇān samavekṣanto<sup>490</sup>

niṣkāruṇyāḥ<sup>491</sup> suduḥkhitāḥ<sup>492</sup> || 93

Naṣṭe śraute smṛte<sup>493</sup> dharme<sup>494</sup> parasparahatās tadā<sup>495</sup> | nirmayādā nirākrandā<sup>496</sup> nisneḥā<sup>497</sup>

nirapatrapāḥ || 94<sup>498</sup>

Naṣṭe varṣe<sup>499</sup> pratihatā<sup>500</sup> hrasvakāḥ pañcaviṃśakāḥ<sup>501</sup> | hitvā dārāṃś ca putrāṃś ca<sup>502</sup>

viṣādavyākulendriyāḥ<sup>503</sup> || 95

Anāvṛṣṭihatās caiva<sup>504</sup> vārtām utsrjya duḥkhitāḥ<sup>505</sup> | pratyantāṃś tān niṣevante<sup>506</sup> hitvā<sup>507</sup>

janapadān svakān || 96<sup>508</sup>

---

<sup>484</sup> BḍP *saṃkṣaye* MtP *yugāṃśe tu saṃkṣaye*

<sup>485</sup> T *te*

<sup>486</sup> MtP *tadā*

<sup>487</sup> MtP *tāḥ*

<sup>488</sup> BḍP LiñP *paribhrāntās* MtP *parāvṛttās*

<sup>489</sup> MtP *devaṃ ḡhāṇi tu*

<sup>490</sup> BḍP LiñP *anapekṣanto* MtP *svānsvān prāṇān avekṣanto*

<sup>491</sup> K *niṣṭhāṃ prāptāḥ* MtP *niṣkāruṇyāt*

<sup>492</sup> BḍP *niṣkāraṇasuduḥkhitāḥ*

<sup>493</sup> C MtP *śrautasṃrte* BḍP *smṛtau*

<sup>494</sup> LiñP *smārtadharme* SkP *śraute tathā smārte*

<sup>495</sup> MtP *kāmakrodhavaśānugāḥ*

<sup>496</sup> LiñP *nirākrāntā* MtP *nirānandā* SkP *niṣkaruṇā*

<sup>497</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP *niḥsneḥā*

<sup>498</sup> SkP 1.2.40.264cd–268 parallels VāP 58.94–98ab. This is the final portion of SkP 1.2.40 which clearly parallels VāP 58.

<sup>499</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP *dharme*

<sup>500</sup> SkP *ḡhadārāṇi saṃtyajya*

<sup>501</sup> BḍP *pañcaviṃśatim* SkP *pañcaviṃśatiḥ*

<sup>502</sup> BḍP LiñP *putrāṃś ca dārāṃś ca* SkP *hāhābhūtās cariṣyanti*

<sup>503</sup> LiñP *viṣādavyākulendriyāḥ* MtP *viṣādavyākulaprajāḥ*

<sup>504</sup> MtP *anāvṛṣṭihatās te vai*

<sup>505</sup> LiñP *dūrataḥ*

<sup>506</sup> LiñP *pratyantān upasevante* MtP *āśrayanti sma pratyantān* SkP *tā niṣevanti*

<sup>507</sup> T *hatvā*

<sup>508</sup> VāP 99.398cd–399ab appears to be an expansion of VāP 58.96ab.

Saritaḥ sāgarānūpān<sup>509</sup> sevante parvatāms tadā<sup>510</sup> | madhumāmsair mūlaphalair<sup>511</sup> vartayanti<sup>512</sup>

suduḥkhitāḥ || 97<sup>513</sup>

Cīrastraṛjīnadharā<sup>514</sup> niṣpatrā<sup>515</sup> niṣparigrahāḥ | varṇāśramaparibhraṣṭāḥ saṃkaram<sup>516</sup>

ghoram āsthitāḥ || 98<sup>517</sup>

Etām<sup>518</sup> kāṣṭhām<sup>519</sup> anuprāptā<sup>520</sup> alpaśeṣāḥ prajāḥ tathā<sup>521</sup> | jarāvyādhikṣudhāviṣṭā<sup>522</sup> duḥkhān

nirvedam āgaman<sup>523</sup> || 99<sup>524</sup>

Vicāraṇam<sup>525</sup> tu<sup>526</sup> nirvedāt sāmyāvasthā<sup>527</sup> vicāraṇāt<sup>528</sup> | sāmyāvasthāsu saṃbodhaḥ<sup>529</sup>

saṃbodhād dharmasīlatā || 100<sup>530</sup>

Tāsūpagamayuktāsu<sup>531</sup> kaliśiṣṭāsu<sup>532</sup> vai svayam | ahorātram<sup>533</sup> tadā tāsām yugaṃ tu

---

<sup>509</sup> K *kūpān* LiñP *saritsāgarakūpāmste* SkP *saritsāgarakūlāmś ca*

<sup>510</sup> BḍP LiñP SkP *tathā parvatān api*

<sup>511</sup> SkP *māmsair mūlaphalais caiva*

<sup>512</sup> BḍP *māmsair mūlaphalais caiva vartayantaḥ*

<sup>513</sup> The parallel verse at MtP 144.72 skips VāP 58.97cd. VāP 99.402ab reads exactly as VāP 58.97ab but ends with “*parvatāni ca*” instead of “*parvatāms tadā*.”

<sup>514</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T LiñP SkP *cīrapatrājinadharā* BḍP *cīrapatrācinadharā* MtP *cīrakṣṇājīnadharā* Note: the critical apparatus on p. 198 of the ĀnSS edition of VāP is incorrectly numbered for verses 58.100–109.

<sup>515</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP SkP *niṣkriyā*

<sup>516</sup> LiñP *saṃkaṣṭam*

<sup>517</sup> VāP 99.401ab reads exactly as VāP 58.98cd. After VāP 58.98ab/SkP 1.2.40.268, SkP no longer parallels any verses in VāP 58.

<sup>518</sup> K *etā*

<sup>519</sup> LiñP MtP *evaṃ kaṣṭam*

<sup>520</sup> MtP *anuprāptā hy*

<sup>521</sup> K *alpaśeṣās tathā prajāḥ* BḍP MtP *tataḥ* LiñP *tadā*

<sup>522</sup> MtP *jantavaś ca kṣudhāviṣṭā*

<sup>523</sup> LiñP *duḥkhān nirvedamānasāḥ*

<sup>524</sup> Here MtP inserts verses from 144.74cd–144.88, which are not found in any other Purāṇa, only to pick up again at MtP 144.89/VāP 58.100. See n. 73 above.

<sup>525</sup> BḍP LiñP *vicāraṇā* MtP *vicāraṇāt*

<sup>526</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T *vicārayatsu*

<sup>527</sup> P<sup>1</sup> M C T *sāmyāvasthām*

<sup>528</sup> LiñP *vicāraṇā* MtP *nirvedaḥ sāmyāvasthātmanā tathā*

<sup>529</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T BḍP LiñP *sāmyāvasthātmako bodhaḥ* MtP *tataś caivātmasambodhaḥ*

<sup>530</sup> Cf. BrP 231.45–46; HV 117.5.

<sup>531</sup> BḍP *tāsūpaśamayuktāsu*

<sup>532</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> M C T *kaliśiṣṭāt tu* LiñP *arūpaśamayuktās tu kaliśiṣṭā hi*

<sup>533</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C LiñP *ahorātrāt*

parivartate<sup>534</sup> || 101<sup>535</sup>

Cittasam̐mohanam̐ kṛtvā tāsām̐ taiḥ̐ saptamaḥ̐ tu tat<sup>536</sup> | bhāvino ‘rthasya ca balāt tataḥ̐ kṛtam̐  
avartata || 102

Pravṛtte tu<sup>537</sup> punas tasmim̐s tataḥ̐<sup>538</sup> kṛtayuge tu vai | utpannāḥ̐ kaliśiṣṭās̐ tu kārtayugyaḥ̐<sup>539</sup>  
prajāś<sup>540</sup> tadā<sup>541</sup> || 103

Tiṣṭhanti ceha ye siddhāḥ̐ suhr̥ṣṭā<sup>542</sup> vicaranti<sup>543</sup> ca | sadā<sup>544</sup> saptar̥ṣayaś<sup>545</sup> caiva<sup>546</sup> tatra te<sup>547</sup> ca<sup>548</sup>  
vyavasthitāḥ̐ || 104

Brahmakṣatraviśaḥ̐ sūdrā bījārthaḥ̐ ye smṛtā iha<sup>549</sup> | kalijaiḥ̐ saha te sarve<sup>550</sup> nirviśeṣās̐  
tadābhavan || 105

Teṣām̐ saptar̥ṣayo dharmam̐ kathayan̐tītareṣu<sup>551</sup> ca | varṇāśramācārayuktaḥ̐<sup>552</sup> śrautaḥ̐ smārto<sup>553</sup>  
dvidhā tu saḥ̐<sup>554</sup> || 106

Tatas teṣu<sup>555</sup> kriyāvatsu vartante vai prajāḥ̐ kṛte | śrautaḥ̐ smārtaḥ̐<sup>556</sup> kṛtānām̐<sup>557</sup> tu dharmāḥ̐

---

<sup>534</sup> BḍP *yugānte parivartini*

<sup>535</sup> MtP 144.90 has, “*kaliśiṣṭeṣu teṣv evaḥ̐ jāyante pūrvavat prajāḥ̐ | bhāvino ‘rthasya ca balāt tataḥ̐ kṛtam̐ avartata.*” This combines VāP 58.101ab with VāP 58.102cd, skipping VāP 58.101cd and VāP 58.102ab.

<sup>536</sup> BḍP LiñP *vai suptam̐ antavat* C contains many errors in this line.

<sup>537</sup>T *ca*

<sup>538</sup> BḍP *tatas tasmin̐ pūte* LiñP MtP *tatas tasmin̐ punaḥ̐*

<sup>539</sup> LiñP *kārtayugās̐*

<sup>540</sup> BḍP *kaliśiṣṭāsu prajāḥ̐ kārtayugās̐*

<sup>541</sup> MtP *kaliśiṣṭeṣu prajāḥ̐ kārtayugās̐ tathā*

<sup>542</sup> K P<sup>2</sup> C T *sudṛṣṭā* M *sudraḍā* (?) BḍP LiñP *siddhā adṛṣṭā*

<sup>543</sup> MtP *siddhā adṛṣṭā viharanti*

<sup>544</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> M C *sapta*

<sup>545</sup> BḍP *saha saptar̥ṣibhiś* LiñP *sapta saptar̥ṣibhiś*

<sup>546</sup> MtP *saha saptar̥ṣibhir ye tu*

<sup>547</sup> MtP *ye*

<sup>548</sup> LiñP *tu*

<sup>549</sup> MtP *iha smṛtāḥ̐*

<sup>550</sup> BḍP *saḥ̐ti* MtP *kārtayugabhavaḥ̐ sārḍham̐*

<sup>551</sup> LiñP *kathayan̐tītare ‘pi* MtP *kathayan̐tīha teṣu*

<sup>552</sup> LiñP MtP *varṇāśramācārayutaḥ̐*

<sup>553</sup> LiñP *śrautaḥ̐ smārtaḥ̐*

<sup>554</sup> LiñP *yam* MtP *śrautas̐mārtavidhānataḥ̐*

<sup>555</sup> T omits “*teṣu.*”

<sup>556</sup> BḍP *śrautas̐mārte*

<sup>557</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> C T *śrautas̐mārtakṛtānām̐* MtP *śrautas̐mārtasthitānām̐*

saptarṣidarśitaḥ<sup>558</sup> || 107

Tāsu<sup>559</sup> dharmavyavasthārthaṃ tiṣṭhantīhāyugakṣayāt<sup>560</sup> | manvantarādhikāreṣu tiṣṭhanti munayas  
tu vai<sup>561</sup> || 108

Yathā dāvapradagdheṣu tṛṇeṣv iha tape ṛtau<sup>562</sup> | navānām<sup>563</sup> prathamam dṛṣṭās<sup>564</sup> teṣām mūle tu<sup>565</sup>  
saṃbhavaḥ || 109

Tathā kārtayugānām tu kalimgeṣv<sup>566</sup> iha saṃbhavaḥ | evaṃ yugād<sup>567</sup> yugasyeha saṃtānas<sup>568</sup> tu  
parasparam || vartate hy<sup>569</sup> avyavacchedād<sup>570</sup> yāvan manvantarakṣayaḥ || 110<sup>571</sup>

Sukham āyur balaṃ rūpaṃ dharmārthau<sup>572</sup> kāma eva ca | yugeṣv etāni hīyante trīṇi  
pādakrameṇa tu<sup>573</sup> || 111

Sasaṃdhyāṃśeṣu<sup>574</sup> hīyante yugānām dharmasiddhayaḥ<sup>575</sup> | ity eṣa pratisaṃdhir<sup>576</sup> vaḥ<sup>577</sup> kīrtitas  
tu mayā dvijāḥ<sup>578</sup> || 112

Caturyugānām sarveṣām etenaiva<sup>579</sup> prasādhanam<sup>580</sup> | eṣām<sup>581</sup> caturyugāvṛttir ā sahasrāt

---

<sup>558</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> C T MtP *dharme saptarṣidarśite* BḍP *ca dharme saptarṣidarśite* LiñP *śrautasamāntakṛtānām ca dharme saptarṣidarśite*

<sup>559</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> C T *teṣu* BḍP LiñP *kecid* MtP *te tu*

<sup>560</sup> LiñP *tiṣṭhantīha yugakṣaye* MtP *tiṣṭhantīha kṛte yuge*

<sup>561</sup> MtP *ṛṣayas tu te*

<sup>562</sup> T *ṛtau* BḍP *tapena tu* LiñP *tataḥ kṣitau* MtP *evāparam tṛṇam*

<sup>563</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP *vanānām*

<sup>564</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T *dṛṣṭvā* BḍP LiñP MtP *vṛṣṭyā*

<sup>565</sup> BḍP LiñP MtP *mūleṣu*

<sup>566</sup> BḍP *kalijaṣv* LiñP *kalijeṣv*

<sup>567</sup> BḍP *yugo*

<sup>568</sup> LiñP *saṃtānaṃ*

<sup>569</sup> LiñP *ha*

<sup>570</sup> MtP *pravartate hy avicchedād*

<sup>571</sup> VāP 58.110ab is missing from K P<sup>2</sup> MtP.

<sup>572</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M T *dharmārthaḥ C dharmārthaṃ* BḍP LiñP *dharmo 'rthaḥ*

<sup>573</sup> BḍP *trītripādāḥ krameṇa ca* LiñP *trīṃstrīṇ pādān krameṇa tu* MtP *trayaḥ pādāḥ krameṇa tu*

<sup>574</sup> BḍP *sasaṃdhyāṃśeṣu*

<sup>575</sup> The parallel verse at MtP 144.101 skips VāP 58.112ab.

<sup>576</sup> C *pratisiddhir*

<sup>577</sup> BḍP *yaḥ*

<sup>578</sup> LiñP *pratisiddhir vai kīrtitaiṣā krameṇa tu*

<sup>579</sup> MtP *etad eva*

<sup>580</sup> LiñP *anenaiva tu sādhanam*

<sup>581</sup> K C T BḍP LiñP *eṣā*

pravartate<sup>582</sup> || 113<sup>583</sup>

Brahmaṇas tad ahaḥ proktaṃ rātriś ca tāvatī<sup>584</sup> smṛtā | atrārjavam<sup>585</sup> jaḍībhāvo bhūtānām ā  
yugakṣayāt || 114

Etad eva tu sarveṣāṃ yugānām lakṣaṇam smṛtam | eṣāṃ<sup>586</sup> caturyugānām tu<sup>587</sup> gaṇanā<sup>588</sup> hy  
ekasaptatiḥ || krameṇa parivṛttā tu<sup>589</sup> manor antaram ucyate || 115

Caturyuge tathaikasmin<sup>590</sup> bhavatīha yathāśrutam<sup>591</sup> | tathā cānyeṣu bhavati<sup>592</sup> punas tad vai  
yathākramam<sup>593</sup> || 116

Sarge sarge yathā<sup>594</sup> bhedā<sup>595</sup> utpadyante tathaiva tu<sup>596</sup> | pañcaviṃśatparimitā na nyūnā nādhikāś  
tathā<sup>597</sup> || 117<sup>598</sup>

Tathā kalpayugaiḥ<sup>599</sup> sārddham bhavanti samalakṣaṇāḥ<sup>600</sup> | manvantarāṇām sarveṣāṃ etad eva tu  
lakṣaṇam || 118

---

<sup>582</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> C BḍP LiñP *sahasrād guṇīkṛtā*

<sup>583</sup> The parallel verses at MtP 144.102 skip VāP 58.113cd–58.115ab. T reads, “*caturyugāvṛttir ā sahasrā yugānām lakṣaṇam smṛtam*,” combining VāP 58.113cd with VāP 58.115ab and skipping VāP 58.114.

<sup>584</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> M C BḍP LiñP *caitāvatī*

<sup>585</sup> LiñP *anārjavam*

<sup>586</sup> K C BḍP *eṣā*

<sup>587</sup> BḍP LiñP *ca*

<sup>588</sup> V C T MtP *gaṇitā* P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> *gaṇikā* BḍP LiñP *guṇitā*

<sup>589</sup> MtP *parivṛttāś tā*

<sup>590</sup> BḍP LiñP *yathaikasmin* MtP *yugākhyāśu tu sarvāśu*

<sup>591</sup> M *yathākṛta* C *yathā tu taṃ* BḍP *yathā tu yat* LiñP *yadā tu yat* MtP *yadā ca yat*

<sup>592</sup> MtP *tad eva ca tadanyāśu*

<sup>593</sup> BḍP *tadvad yathākramam*

<sup>594</sup> P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T *tathā*

<sup>595</sup> MtP *bhedā hy*

<sup>596</sup> MtP *ca*

<sup>597</sup> BḍP *nādhikāḥ smṛtāḥ*

<sup>598</sup> The parallel verse at MtP 144.104 is missing VāP 58.117cd. MtP 144 stops directly paralleling VāP 58 for the remainder of the chapter. In the final three verses of MtP 144, the topics dealt with at the beginning of MtP 145/VāP 59 are already introduced, namely, physical characteristics and lifespans of various beings (gods, humans, animals, etc.) as they change over various yugas.

<sup>599</sup> BḍP LiñP *kalpā yugaiḥ*

<sup>600</sup> T *samalakṣaṇāḥ* BḍP LiñP *saha lakṣaṇaiḥ*. Compare VāP 58.118ab to MtP 144.106cd: *yathākalpam yugaiḥ sārddham bhavante tulyalakṣaṇāḥ*

Tathā<sup>601</sup> yugānām parivartanāni cirapravṛttāni<sup>602</sup> yugasvabhāvāt | tathā na<sup>603</sup> samtiṣṭhati jīvalokaḥ

kṣayodayābhyām parivartamānaḥ || 119<sup>604</sup>

Ity etal lakṣaṇam proktaṃ yugānām vai samāsataḥ | atītānāgatānām vai<sup>605</sup> sarvamanvantareṣv

iha<sup>606</sup> || 120<sup>607</sup>

Anāgateṣu tadvac ca tarkaḥ kāryo vijānatā<sup>608</sup> | manvantareṣu sarveṣu atītānāgateṣv iha<sup>609</sup> || 121<sup>610</sup>

Manvantareṇa caikena sarvāṅy evāntarāṇi vai<sup>611</sup> | vyākhyātāni<sup>612</sup> vijānīdhvaṃ kalpe<sup>613</sup> kalpena

caiva hi<sup>614</sup> || 122

Asyābhimāninaḥ<sup>615</sup> sarve nāmarūpair bhavanty uta | devā hy aṣṭavidhā ye ca<sup>616</sup> iha<sup>617</sup>

manvantareśvarāḥ || 123<sup>618</sup>

Ṛṣayo manavaś caiva sarve tulyāḥ prayojanaiḥ<sup>619</sup> | evaṃ varṇāśramāṇāṃ tu pravibhāgo<sup>620</sup>

yuge<sup>621</sup> yuge || 124

---

<sup>601</sup> BḍP LiñP *yathā*

<sup>602</sup> V *ciraṃ pravṛttāni*

<sup>603</sup> LiñP *tu*

<sup>604</sup> Compare to MtP 144.107: “*manvantarāṇām parivartanāni cirapravṛttāni yugasvabhāvāt | kṣaṇam na samtiṣṭhati jīvalokaḥ kṣayodayābhyām parivartamānaḥ.*”

<sup>605</sup> BḍP *hi*

<sup>606</sup> KūP *yāvan manvantarakṣayaḥ* LiñP *hi sarvamanvantareṣu vai*

<sup>607</sup> KūP 1.28.51–53 loosely parallels VāP 58.120–123ab. Compare VāP 58.120ab to MtP 144.106ef: “*ity etal lakṣaṇam proktaṃ yugānām vai yathākramam.*”

<sup>608</sup> C *janataḥ*

<sup>609</sup> KūP *atītānāgateṣu vai*

<sup>610</sup> Note: BḍP and LiñP switch the order of VāP 58.121 and 122. KūP omits VāP 58.121ab and places VāP 58.121cd directly after VāP 58.122 (KūP 1.28.53ab).

<sup>611</sup> LiñP *ca*

<sup>612</sup> BḍP *khyātānīha*

<sup>613</sup> BḍP *kalpaṃ* KūP LiñP *na samdehaḥ kalpaḥ*

<sup>614</sup> BḍP *ha*

<sup>615</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> M C T BḍP KūP LiñP *tulyābhimāninaḥ*

<sup>616</sup> BḍP *vā*

<sup>617</sup> LiñP *ye ca*

<sup>618</sup> KūP contains no further parallel verses after KūP 1.28.53cd (VāP 58.123ab).

<sup>619</sup> LiñP *tulyaprayojanāḥ*

<sup>620</sup> V P<sup>2</sup> C T *pravibhāgam*

<sup>621</sup> BḍP *pravibhāgam purā*

Yugasvabhāvāc<sup>622</sup> ca tathā vidhatte vai sadā<sup>623</sup> prabhuḥ | varṇāśramavibhāgās ca yugāni

yugasiddhaye<sup>624</sup> || 125

Anuṣaṅgaḥ samākhyātāḥ<sup>625</sup> sṛṣṭisargaṃ nibodhata | vistareṇānupūrvyā ca sthitiṃ vakṣye yugeṣv

iha || 126<sup>626</sup>

Iti śrīmahāpurāṇe vāyuprokte caturyugākhyānaṃ nāmāṣṭapañcāśo ‘dhāyaḥ || 58 ||

---

<sup>622</sup> T LiñP *yugasvabhāvas* BḍP *yugasvabhāvāms*

<sup>623</sup> LiñP *tadā*

<sup>624</sup> BḍP LiñP *yugasiddhayaḥ*

<sup>625</sup> V P<sup>1</sup> P<sup>2</sup> M C T BḍP *anuṣaṅgāt samākhyātāḥ*

<sup>626</sup> LiñP ends on a completely different verse: “*yugānāṃ parimāṇaṃ te kathitaṃ hi prasaṅgataḥ | vadāmi devīputratvaṃ padmayoneḥ samāsataḥ.*”

## Appendix Two

### An Annotated Translation of Verses on Pāṣaṇḍas from the *Viṣṇudharmāḥ*<sup>1</sup>

#### **Vdha 3.14–20**

**14** If you wish to worship Viṣṇu, the chief of the gods, the Holy One without beginning or end, be a Bhāgavata, oh *asura*.

**15** Indeed, Viṣṇu cannot be truly known and praised or seen by a non-Bhāgavata. How can [that] be entered upon by [mere] mortals?

**16** People purified through many births, having minds intent upon him, become Bhāgavatas, indeed, and they enter into Viṣṇu.

**17** When the accumulation of evil amassed over many births in *samsāra* is diminished,<sup>2</sup> [then] a mind turned towards Govinda arises for [those] people.

**18** That person who arrives at hatred for Govinda, who disparages the Vedas and the twice-born: one should know him to be born from a fragment of demons.<sup>3</sup>

**19** Fondness for heretics and an inclination for logical disputation arises for those people who are evil-natured and fallen into the waters of Viṣṇu's deception.

**20** When there is the diminishing of evil in people, then, accordingly, there is [within them] faith in the Vedas, the twice-born, and in Viṣṇu, the being behind/within the sacrifice.

Yadī devapatim viṣṇum ārādhayitum icchasi | bhagavantam anādyantaṃ bhava bhāgavato

---

<sup>1</sup> Vdha is a text of Purāṇic nature, often classed as an Upapurāṇa. It contains many details about early Vaiṣṇava ritual, and shows both Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata elements. It is certainly older than the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, which is something of an expansion upon it. On the possible dating of Vdha to the third century CE, see Reinhold Grünendahl, *Viṣṇudharmāḥ: Precepts for the Worship of Viṣṇu*, Part 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 73.

<sup>2</sup> “*Nākṣīṇe*,” literally, “not undiminished.”

<sup>3</sup> In other words, heretics are themselves demonic; cf. Vdha 105.78–80.



‘sura || 14<sup>4</sup>

Na hy abhāgavatair viṣṇur jñātum stotum ca tattvataḥ | draṣṭum vā śakyate martyaiḥ praveṣṭum

kuta eva hi || 15

Janmabhir bahubhiḥ pūtā narās tadgatacetasah | bhavanti vai bhāgavatās te viṣṇum praviśanti

ca || 16

Anekajanmasaṃsāracite pāpasamuccaye | nākṣīṇe jāyate puṃsām govindābhimukhī matiḥ || 17

Pradveṣaṃ yāti govinde dvijān vedāṃś ca nindati | yo naras taṃ vijānīyād

asurāṃśasamudbhavam || 18

Pāṣaṇḍeṣu ratiḥ puṃsām hetuvādānukūlatā | jāyate viṣṇumāyāmbhaḥpatitānām durātmanām || 19

Yadā pāpakṣayaḥ puṃsām tadā vedadvijātiṣu | viṣṇau ca yajñapuruse śraddhā bhavati te

yathā || 20

### **Vdha 5.1cd–2ab**

He should not speak to heretics and outcastes, and, likewise, (should not speak to) those who live at the bottom [of society], deniers and (those) having abnormal lifestyles, and also evil (people)...

...pāṣaṇḍapatitāṃś caiva tathaivāntyāvasāyinaḥ nāstikān bhinnavṛttīṃś ca pāpinaś cāpi nālapet...

### **Vdha 25**

1 Dālbhya said:

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 30.129–134.

The avoidance of [physical] contact with and even the avoidance of conversing with heretics is a duty [which must be done] by people devoted to the worship of Viṣṇu who have fasted [for performing a vow].

**2–3** Please explain what the characteristic is for them [being] such that one [performing] a vow should avoid them. If speaking, viewing, touching, etc., with heretics somehow or other arises for people who have fasted, oh Brahmin, please tell the thing to be done in that case by which the vow would [remain] unbroken.<sup>5</sup>

**4** Pulastya said:

Having transgressed the dharma declared in the Śruti and Smṛti, which is born from the division of the *varṇas* and *āśramas*, they proceed by their own whims and treacherous reasoning.

**5** Those heretics are fools who are addicted to wrongful acts, who are infatuated with pride [in their own] reasoning, who have bad morals, the vilest men, men worthy of hell.

**6** Indeed, one should never even talk to those evil heretics, men established in wrongful acts [following] hypocritical religious vows.

**7** Having addressed them, a wise person should concentrate on the Imperishable One, [who is] abiding in purity<sup>6</sup>; and, having correctly made (his) mind inclined towards him, he should say this:

**8** May Lord Viṣṇu lead (my) body, which was harmed by an inner cause, and (my) speech to total tranquility. May He be my refuge from evil here after (my) heart has entered the Infinite One.

---

<sup>5</sup> This places heretics on par with *cāṇḍālas*, and mirrors the rituals given in *dharmaśāstra* texts for purification after instances of conversation, visual contact, or physical contact with a *cāṇḍāla*.

<sup>6</sup> I would translate the alternate reading of *śucipadam* here as “the source of purity.” See n. 12 below. For *śuciṣad*, cf. BḥP 4.24.37.

**9** May that Pure, Eternal One make for me inner purification and outer purification in my inner (being), that Stainless One within whom I am pure forever.

**10** May the Lord, who is stainless, the [inner] perceiver and mover, lead (me) from outer harm to purification. (May) Viṣṇu, the Infinite Self, be completely fixed within (my) mind.

**11** That is to be whispered by someone who has fasted [for a vow] after having conversed with a heretic. After saying, “Homage to the one abiding in purity,” he should look at the sun with a glance.

**12** And it is heard [that] formerly mortals were ones who went to heaven at will; they all became pure through maintaining (their) own [caste] duties.

**13** The gods were powerful because mortals were faithful to the duties of [their own] *varṇas*, and because men were persisting in sacrifice, [Vedic] recitation, and donations [to Brahmins].

**14** The descendants of Diti and the demons suffered defeat in dissatisfaction.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, Ṣaṇḍa and Marka, the chief priests of the leaders of the demons, did a very horrifying ritual for the destruction of the gods.

**15** On that occasion, [a being] was created having a body which was very black, full of darkness, very dreadful, [a being which was] a reservoir of deceit, [whose] essence was dishonesty, [whose] nature was sloth, [who was] immense.

**16** The terrifying [being], ghostlike, was called Mahāmoha. He was divided into four parts and then he was honored<sup>8</sup> by the two of them.

---

<sup>7</sup> Vdha 25.14ab is problematic, as are the two variant readings of “*alabdhā cāsurā*” and “*alaṃ vācāsurā*” for “*atuṣṭāv asurā*.”

<sup>8</sup> Rendering the present tense “*mahīyate*” in the past tense. All other present tense verbs are translated as such, giving the impression that Mahāmoha is still active in the world as the cause of all heresy.

**17** Through one [of these] parts, he causes the disparagement of the Vedas, gods, and twice-born. Through another part, he accomplishes no delight in yoga and (Vedic) rites.

**18** Through yet another part, he binds men to wrongful acts. Through another, he causes the removal of wisdom, oh best of the twice-born.

**19** And he regards ignorance as wisdom and knowledge, deluded by ignorance. Whatever speech is (in accordance with) opposition to the statements of the Vedas, that (speech) is delightful to him.

**20–21** Indeed, that very Mahāmoha [who was] brought about by Ṣaṇḍa and Marka, defiled by deceit, etc., having *adharmā* as (his) own form, maker of great fear: he through various stratagems with regard to people was thus established amongst the people. He makes [the people] worthless through [their] subjugation to delusion, oh best of the twice-born.

**22** The [mental] discretion of those deluded people quickly arrives at destruction. [Those people whose] wisdom has been destroyed do wrongful deeds daily, oh twice-born one.

**23** The bewildered [people], infatuated with ignorance, having given up the dharma belonging to (their) own *varṇas*, then do evil thinking that it is dharma.

**24** Then, the haughtiness of [possessing] wisdom arises there for them in such a way that [when] they are being restrained by merciful friends and teachers, the fools give replies full of treacherous reasoning.

**25** Then, they cause [both] (their) own selves [and] another person [who is one having] little intelligence to adhere to wrongful action and to abandon [acting] according to (their) own dharma.

**26** Heretics are ones of bad conduct, ones who speak of the good qualities of the food of others, who are eaters of wrongly prepared food, who are performers of vows, who have abandoned the sacred rites.

**27** Heretics are ones having evil intentions, deceitful ones, ones with dishonest minds, causers of the mixings of the *varṇas*, ones who make their living off of a false imitation of dharma,<sup>9</sup> unclean ones, ones with crooked minds, ones who say, “There is not anything else.”<sup>10</sup>

**28** They are such kinds [of people] situated outside the right path proclaimed in the Vedas. Disparaging all rites made known in the *Ṛk*, *Yaju*, and *Sāma Vedas*, they, indeed, make themselves and others situated in hell.

**29** Instances of viewing, addressing, or touching them are things which should always be rejected by people. It is proclaimed that when one has seen, addressed, or touched (a heretic), [that] wise person is pure having bathed. He should concentrate on the one abiding in purity (i.e. Viṣṇu).

**30** Hence it is [that] one should always avoid addressing and touching (heretics). How else [will] that person who has fasted and who wishes for good merit be one of great fortune?

**31** Indeed, wherever [Vedic] ritual is disparaged, as also recitation and pleasure [in doing yoga], there is the enmity of all heretics towards Vedic ritual.<sup>11</sup> They (i.e. heretics) indeed are declared to go to hell as ones who have resorted to a demonic way of being.

[The chapter] in the Laws of Viṣṇu [called] the penance for talking to heretics [is finished].

---

<sup>9</sup> Preferring the reading “*dharmavyājopajīvinah*” to the variant reading “*māyāvyājopajīvinah*.”

<sup>10</sup> Another way of identifying heretics as *nāstikas*. By saying there is not “anything else” (*nānyad asti*), this may be equating the materialist Lokāyatas to all other sects deemed heretical, with the “anything” being denied referring to the afterlife, the gods, the authority of the Vedas, etc.

<sup>11</sup> Vdha 25.31 is grammatically difficult.

Dālbhya uvāca:

Pāṣaṇḍibhir asaṃsparśam asaṃbhāṣaṇam eva ca | viṣṇor ārādhanaparair naraiḥ kāryam

upoṣitaiḥ || 1

Kiṃ brūhi lakṣaṇaṃ teṣāṃ yādṛśān varjayed vratī | kathaṃcid yadi

samlāpadarśanasparśanādikam || 2

Upoṣitānāṃ pāṣaṇḍair narāṇāṃ vipra jāyate | kiṃ tatra vada kartavyaṃ yenākhaṇḍaṃ vratam

bhaves || 3

Pulastya uvāca:

Śrutismṛtyuditaṃ dharmam varṇāśramavibhāgajam | ullaṅghya ye pravartante svecchayā

kūṭayuktibhiḥ || 4

Vikarmābhiratā mūḍhā yuktiprāgalbhyadurmadāḥ | pāṣaṇḍinas te duḥśīlā narakārḥā

narādhamāḥ || 5

Tāṃs tu pāṣaṇḍinaḥ pāpān vikarmasthāṃś ca mānavān | vaidālavratikāṃś caiva nityam eva tu

nālapet || 6

Saṃbhāṣyaitān śuciśadaṃ<sup>12</sup> cintayed acyutaṃ budhaḥ | idaṃ codāharet samyak kṛtvā

tatpravaṇaṃ manaḥ || 7

Śārīram antaḥkaraṇopaghātaṃ vācaś ca viṣṇur bhagavān aśeṣam | śamaṃ nayatv astu mameha

śarma pāpād anante hṛdi saṃniviṣṭe || 8<sup>13</sup>

Antaḥśuddhiṃ bahiḥśuddhiṃ śuddho ‘ntar mama yo ‘cyutaḥ | sa karotv amale tasmiñ śucir

evāsmi sarvadā || 9

---

<sup>12</sup> Four manuscripts give “śucipadaṃ” while the rest read “śuciśadaṃ”; likewise with “śuciśade” at Vdha 25.11. At Vdha 25.29, however, all read “śuciśadaṃ.”

<sup>13</sup> This verse is in *triṣṭubh*.

Bāhyopaghātād anagho boddhā ca bhagavān ajaḥ | śuddhiṃ nayatv anantātmā viṣṇuś cetasi  
saṃsthitaḥ || 10

Etat saṃbhāṣya japtavyaṃ pāṣaṇḍibhir upoṣitaḥ | namaḥ śuciṣadety<sup>14</sup> uktvā sūryaṃ paśyeta  
vīkṣitaḥ || 11

Śrūyate ca purā martyāḥ svecchayā svargagāminaḥ | babhūvur anaghāḥ sarve  
svadharmaparipālanāt || 12

Devās ca balino martyair varṇakarmaṇy anuvrataḥ | yajñādhyayanadāneṣu vartamānaiś ca  
mānavaiḥ || 13

Daiteyās ca parābhāvam atuṣṭāv asurā yayuḥ | tataś ca ṣaṇḍo markaś ca daityendrāṇāṃ  
purohitau | cakratuḥ karma devānāṃ vināśyātibhīṣaṇam || 14

Tatrotpanno ‘tikṛṣṇāṅgas tamaḥprāyo ‘tidāruṇaḥ | dambhādhāraḥ śāṭhyasāro nidrāprakṛtir  
ulvaṇaḥ || 15

Mahāmoha iti khyātaḥ kṛtyarūpo vibhīṣaṇaḥ | caturdhā sa vibhaktaś ca tābhyāṃ atra  
mahīyate || 16

Vedadevadvijātīnāṃ ekāṃśena sa nindanam | karoty anyena na ratiṃ yogakarmasu vindati || 17

Vikarmaṇy apareṇāpi saṃyojayati mānavān | jñānāpahāram anyena karoti dvijasattama || 18

Jñānabuddhyā tathājñānaṃ grhṇāty ajñānamohitaḥ | vedavādavirodhena yā kathā sāśya  
rocate || 19

Evaṃ sa tu mahāmohaḥ ṣaṇḍamarkopapāditaḥ | dambhādidūṣito ‘dharmaśvarūpo  
‘tibhayaṃkaraḥ || 20

Sa lokān vividhopāyair lokeṣv eva vyavasthitaḥ | mohābhībhavaniḥsārāṇ karoti dvijasattama || 21

---

<sup>14</sup> A case of double sandhi: “śuciṣade+iti,” which by standard sandhi rules should give “śuciṣada iti”; see Oberlies, *Epic Sanskrit*, 47. See also above, n. 12.

Tanmohitānām acirād viveko yāti saṃkṣayam | kṣīṇajñānā vikarmāṇi kurvanty aharaho  
dvija || 22

Nijavarṇātmakaṃ dharmam parityajya vimohitāḥ | dharmabuddhyā tataḥ pāpaṃ kurvanty  
ajñānadurmadāḥ || 23

Jñānāvalepas tatraiva tatas teṣāṃ prajāyate | suhr̥dbhir vāryamāṇās te paṇḍitais ca dayālubhiḥ |  
prayacchanty uttaram ṃūḍhāḥ kūtayuktisamanvitam || 24

Tatas te svayam ātmānam anyam cālpamatiṃ naram | vikarmaṇā yojayantaś cyavayanti  
svadharmataḥ || 25

Pāṣaṇḍino durācārāḥ parānnaḡuṇavādinaḥ | asaṃskṛtānnabhoktāro vrātyāḥ saṃskāravarjitāḥ || 26

Pāṣaṇḍāḥ pāpasamkalpā dāmbhikāḥ śaṭhabuddhayaḥ | varṇasamkarakartāro  
dharmavyājopajīvinaḥ | niḥśaucā vakramatayo nānyadastītivādinaḥ || 27

Evamvidhās te sanmārgād vedaproktād bahiḥsthitāḥ | kriyākalāpaṃ nindanta  
rgyajuḥsāmasamjñitam | ātmānam ca parāms caiva kurvanti narakasthitān || 28

Teṣāṃ darśanasambhāṣasparśanāni naraiḥ sadā | parityājyāni dṛṣṭe ca proktaḥ sambhāṣaṇe ca  
yaḥ | saṃsparśe ca budhaḥ snātvā śuciḥ śuciṣadam<sup>15</sup> smaret || 29

Bhavaty ataḥ sadaivaiṣām ālāpasparśanam tyajet | puṇyakāmo mahābhāgaḥ kiṃ punar yad  
upoṣitaḥ || 30

Yato hi nindite karmaṇy abhyāso ratir eva ca | pāṣaṇḍinām aśeṣāṇām aprītir vedakarmani | te hy  
adhogāminaḥ proktā āsuram bhāvam āsritāḥ || 31

|| Iti viṣṇudharmeṣu pāṣaṇḍālāpapṛāyaścittam<sup>16</sup> ||

---

<sup>15</sup> See above, n. 13.

<sup>16</sup> Alternate titles for this chapter given in individual manuscripts are “*pāṣaṇḍālāpapṛāyaścittavratam*,” “*pāṣaṇḍinindā*,” and “*pāṣaṇḍasvarūpavarṇanam*.”



## **Vdha 105**

Here, I give my translation of only those verses from Vdha 105 dealing with the Kali Yuga which are not paralleled at MBh 3.188. The paralleled portions, which very often duplicate each other verbatim, are as follows: Vdha 105.12–19 parallels MBh 3.188.14–21; Vdha 105.20 parallels MBh 3.188.23; Vdha 105.22 parallels MBh 3.188.26; Vdha 105.23 parallels MBh 3.188.30; Vdha 105.25 parallels MBh 3.188.35<sup>17</sup>; Vdha 105.26ab parallels MBh 3.188.42cd; Vdha 105.28 parallels MBh 3.188.43; Vdha 105.29ab parallels MBh 3.188.45cd. This leaves Vdha 105.21, 24, 26cd–27, and 29cd–53, most of which, to the best of my knowledge, have no parallels in any other text, with notable exceptions being parallel verses in the *Prakīrṇādhikāra* of the Vaikhānasa *Bhṛghu Samhitā* and the *Narasimha Purāṇa* (see footnotes). For the purposes of the present study, the contents of Vdha 105.29cd–53 are of particular importance.

**21** [Feelings] of kinship, indeed, will not be forthcoming (will not be produced?) from one's own gotra, oh bull among men. And the *śrāddha* ceremonies will not be forthcoming (will not be produced?) from the homes [of householders].

Aniṣkrāntās tu saṃbandhāḥ svagoṭrāt puruṣarṣabha | aniṣkrāntāni śrāddhāni bhaviṣyanti ca  
gehataḥ || **21**

**24** Men will delight in illegally seizing riches [of others]; women will delight in passion, beauty, and prostitution.

Anyāyopāttavitteṣu kariṣyanti narāḥ sṛḥām | veśyālāvanyabhāveṣu sṛḥām yoṣit kariṣyati || **24**

---

<sup>17</sup> Vdha 105.25 is a slightly looser parallel of MBh 3.188.35 compared to most of the other verses, but the meaning of Vdha 105.25 and MBh 3.188.35 is very much the same: girls will not be formally given in marriage, but men and women will instead embrace each other at will.

**26cd–27** Men, having abandoned the gods and the twice-born, will turn to something else.<sup>18</sup>

Those gods mentioned in the Vedas who eat their share of the sacrifice, [like] Brahma, etc., [and] those twice-born who have read the Vedas, [like] Brahmins, etc.—having abandoned them, men who are overpowered by the (Kali) age and who are devoted to logical disputation will then make the gods [their] enemies.<sup>19</sup>

**\*\*bhāryā na patiśusrūṣāṃ tadā kācit kariṣyati\*\*** | narā devadvijāṃs tyaktvā bhaviṣyanty  
anyatomukhāḥ || **26**<sup>20</sup>

yajñabhāgabhujo devā ye vedapaṭhitā dvijāḥ | brahmādyās tān parityajya narāḥ kālabalātkṛtāḥ |  
hetuvādaparā devān kariṣyanty aparāṃs tadā || **27**

**29** **\*\***And men will not even satisfy the ancestors through [performing] *śraddha***\*\***, nor will they highly regard [ritual] cleansing, even men devoted to purity.

**30** The mind of men will not be inclined towards devotion to Viṣṇu, oh king, when indeed the age which is black (and) marked by blackness is reached.

**31** In the first quarter [of the age], men will make a mockery of Hari, but at the end of the age, no one will even mention the name of Hari.<sup>21</sup>

**32** Oh tiger-like man, they are fortunate and sinless in an ocean of evil who in the Kali age even mention the name of Viṣṇu, the indestructible Self.

---

<sup>18</sup> Literally, they will be “facing elsewhere.”

<sup>19</sup> In the first part of this verse, there is ambiguity as to whether the gods or the twice-born are being referred to by “yajñabhāgabhujaḥ,” “vedapaṭhitāḥ,” and “brahmādyāḥ.” I believe this ambiguity to be intentional, as is reflected in my translation. In the second part of the verse, “para” is being juxtaposed with “apara”; those who are *devoted* to the wicked logicians are *opposed* to the gods.

<sup>20</sup> Vdha 105.26ab, which parallels MBh 3.188.42cd, is unrelated to the topic discussed at Vdha 105.26cd–27 and further highlights Vdha 105.26cd–27 as being a likely insertion.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.202ab; NsP 54.31cd–32ab.

**33** That [result] which one meditating on Hari obtains in the Kṛta Age, [and] which one sacrificing (to him) in the Treta and Dvāpara ages (obtains), one praising (Viṣṇu) by name in the Kali age (obtains) that very (result) one praising (him) with (his) name (obtains) in the Kali age.

**34** Hari takes away sins if (his) name is said with devotion, [but] people will not even utter that (name), “Vāsudeva.”

**35** If a righteous person will say “(homage) to Kṛṣṇa” in that Kali age, when the world is completely filled with many heretics, then the heretics who are enemies of the system of the four stages of life will cause delusion among the people at that time through the power of logical disputation and through trickery.

**37** Oh king, this world will be made evil then, having become excessively heretical [and] abounding in ones who have vainly gone forth (into asceticism).

**38** At that time, the Śūdras, [who will be] ones who vainly bear the marks of asceticism, will neither perform service for the twiceborn nor will they perform the keeping up of their own dharma.

**39** Then, the heretics will be such red [robed] mendicants as the corrupt Saugatas and likewise those devoted to the Mahāyāna.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Vdha 39–40 are of great significance, as they provide us with one of the few ancient sources where Mahāyāna Buddhism is referred to by name in a non-Buddhist text denouncing heretical groups. It is more common to find Buddhists referred to only indirectly, i.e., as “red-robed ones,” or by general terms like “Śākyas” or “Saugatas” (all of which are also seen here). But it is rare indeed to find a specific Buddhist group explicitly referred to by name, demonstrating that a) whoever composed these verses had some familiarity with the Buddhist sectarian nomenclature of the time and that b) Mahāyāna Buddhism had already gained some prominence when these verses were composed. Although it is true that the term “*kāpilā*” could also refer to followers of the Sāṃkhya school of philosophy, and that Sāṃkhya strode the thin line between orthodox acceptance and heresy, the context makes it unlikely that “*kāpilā/kapilā*” here is referring to Sāṃkhya followers. Rather, it most probably appears in the meaning of “red or tawny,” describing the robes of Buddhist monks. There is also a chance, however slight, that “*kāpilā*” is a corrupted reference to the Kāpālikas.

40 Likewise, other wicked Śūdras will become Śaivas, Jains, and sons of the Siddha in the Kali Age, oh king.<sup>23</sup>

41 At that time, the wicked Śūdra ascetics will be unclean ones, ones with crooked minds, eaters of food cooked by others.

42 There will be these and many other heretics, oh bull-like man. Likewise, other (heretics) will be Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas.

43 The vile (heretics) are ones who seize the taxes of the king, rob the householders, [and] live off of trade [while] covered in the appearance and clothing of a sage.

44 In the Kali Age, men will worship neither the twice-born nor the gods, but (will be) turned against<sup>24</sup> [them] by the logical disputations of treatises [written in] the languages of barbarians.

45 When (people) are thus extremely corrupted, they will be followers of the wrong path, [and] others [likewise] following their path [will also become] corrupted.

46 At that time, men will be speakers of vernacular<sup>25</sup> speech, revilers of the Vedas and the Śāstras, ones causing the world to go astray.

47 When the world is filled with people following that behavior, oh king, then the lifespan of the people there will be very short.

48 The longest lifespan [of humans] will then be sixteen years. After [that], they will lose their lives when the dark [age] has arrived in darkness.

---

<sup>23</sup> At Vdha 40, we seem to have a reference to Vṛddhaśrāvakas, a less common designation of Śaiva ascetics of one sect or another. Cf. KūP 2.21.34, where we also find “vṛddhaśrāvakanirgranthāḥ.” On the possibility that “vṛddhaśrāvaka” is another term for the Kāpālikas, see A. C. Barthakuria, *The Kāpālikas: A Critical Study of the Religion, Philosophy, and Literature of a Tantric Sect* (Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1984), 58. However, the peculiar splitting up of the term and the alternate reading of “śakyāḥ śrāvakanirgranthāḥ” adds an element of uncertainty as to how to correctly parse the word “vṛddhāḥ” here. “Siddhaputra” is entirely ambiguous; followers of both Jainism and Buddhism could be called sons of the Siddha, as the honorific title “Siddha” could refer to either the Buddha or to Mahāvīra. However, the term also appears in Śaiva and Jain tantric contexts, where a *siddhaputra* is often a sorcerer or magician. As such, I have chosen to preserve this ambiguity in my translation.

<sup>24</sup> *Vikūla* being the opposite of *anukūla*.

<sup>25</sup> Literally, they will not speak Sanskrit.

49 Then, a girl will give birth in the fifth or sixth year. At that time, men will beget [children] in the seventh or eighth year.

50 People will be ones having little wealth, ones marked<sup>26</sup> by falsehood, will be devoted to sex and violence, will be takers but not givers in the Kali Age.

51 The twice-born are lowly eaters of the food of others, devoted to seizing taxes. Likewise kings are then Vaiśyas and not born from Kṣatriya lineages.

52 Śūdras will be monks, [and] Brahmins (will be) practicing trade and service, oh best of men, when the dark [age] arrives in darkness.<sup>27</sup>

53 There will be neither student nor teacher anywhere, no father and no son, no wife and no husband in that confusion, oh king.

**\*\*Na śrāddhaiś ca piṭṛmś cāpi tarpaiṣyanti mānavāḥ\*\* | bahu maṃsyanti te snānaṃ nāpi  
śaucaparā narāḥ || 29<sup>28</sup>**

Na viṣṇubhaktipravaṇaṃ narāṇaṃ nrpa mānasam | bhavitā tu yuge prāpte kṛṣṇe  
kārṣṇyopalakṣite || 30

Vinindāṃ prathame pāde kariṣyanti harer narāḥ | yugānte tu harer nāma naiva kaścid  
grhīṣyati || 31

Dhanyās te puruṣavyāghra pāpāmbhodhāv apāpinaḥ | ye nāmāpi kalau viṣṇor grhīṣyanty  
akṣayātmanaḥ || 32

Dhyāyan hariṃ kṛtayuge tretādvāparayor yajan | yad āpnoti kalau nāmā tad eva

---

<sup>26</sup> The meaning of “*vṛthālīngāḥ*” is unclear here; it could also mean that they falsely wear the markings of *varṇas* or *āśramas* other than their own.

<sup>27</sup> A difficult verse, and possibly corrupt.

<sup>28</sup> Vdha 105.29ab is marked off here because it parallels MBh 3.188.45cd; the *cāpi/nāpi* mirroring may be an effort to make Vdha 105.29cd reflect the construction of Vdha 105.29ab.

parikīrtayan || 33

Harir harati pāpāni nāma bhaktyā yadīritam | vāsudeveti na janas tad evoccārayiṣyati || 34

Bahupāṣaṇḍasamkīrṇe jagaty asmin kalau yuge | kṛṣṇāyeti namo ‘stv atra sukrīti yadi

vakṣyati || 35

Hetuvādabalair moham kuhakais ca jane tadā | pāṣaṇḍinaḥ kariṣyanti cāturāśramyadūṣakāḥ || 36

Pāṣaṇḍabhūtam atyartham jagad etad asatkṛtam<sup>29</sup> | bhaviṣyati tadā bhūpa

vṛthāpravrajitokṣam || 37

Na tu dvijātiśūsṛṣāṃ na svadharmānupālanam<sup>30</sup> | kariṣyanti tadā sūdrāḥ pravrajyāliṅgino

vṛthā || 38

Utkocāḥ saugatās caiva mahāyānaratās tathā | bhaviṣyanti atha pāṣaṇḍāḥ kāpilā bhikṣavas

tathā || 39<sup>31</sup>

Vṛddhāḥ śrāvakanirgranthāḥ siddhaputrās tathāpare | bhaviṣyanti durātmānaḥ sūdrāḥ kaliyuge

nṛpa || 40

Niḥśaucā vakramatayaḥ parapākānnabhojanāḥ<sup>32</sup> | bhaviṣyanti durātmānaḥ sūdrāḥ pravrajitās

tadā || 41

Ete cānye ca bahavaḥ pāṣaṇḍāḥ puruṣarṣabha | brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyā vaiśyā bhaviṣyanti

tathāpare || 42

Rājaśulkaharāḥ kṣudrā grhasthaparimoṣakāḥ | muniveśākṛticchannā vāṇijyam upajīvikāḥ || 43

Na dvijān na kalau devān pūjayiṣyanti mānavāḥ | mlecchabhāṣānibandhais tu

hetuvādair vikūlitāḥ || 44

---

<sup>29</sup> Two manuscripts read “*asamskṛtam*” here, which is noteworthy given what is stated below at Vdha 105.46.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.90ab.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.56.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.54cd.

Evam teṣv atiduṣṭeṣu vimārgapathivartinaḥ | bhaviṣyanty apare duṣṭās teṣāṃ

mārgānuyāyinaḥ || 45

Asaṃskṛtoktīvaktāro vedaśāstravinindakāḥ<sup>33</sup> | jagadunmārgakartāro bhaviṣyanti tadā narāḥ || 46

Tacchīlavartibhir bhūpa manuṣyaiḥ paripūrite | jagaty atra tadā nṛṇāṃ svalpam āyur

bhaviṣyati || 47

Paramāyus ca bhavitā tadā varṣāṇi ṣoḍaśa<sup>34</sup> | tataḥ prāṇān prahāsyanti kṛṣṇe kṛṣṇatvam āgate || 48

Pañcame vātha ṣaṣṭhe vā varṣe kanyā prasūyate | saptavarṣāṣṭavarṣā vā prajāsyanti narās

tadā || 49<sup>35</sup>

Alpadravyā vrthālīṅgā hiṃsāratiparāyaṇāḥ | hartāro na tu dātāro bhaviṣyanti kalau narāḥ<sup>36</sup> || 50

Śulkādānaparāḥ kṣudrāḥ parapākāśino dvijāḥ | vaiśyās tathā tu rājāno na tu

kṣatriyavaṃśajāḥ || 51

Śūdrā bhikṣavatā viprāḥ śusrūṣāvīpaṇāśritāḥ | bhaviṣyanti nṛpaśreṣṭha kṛṣṇe kṛṣṇatvam āgate || 52

Na śiṣyo na guruḥ kaścin na putro na pitā tathā | na bhāryā na patir bhūpa bhavitā tatra

saṃkule || 53<sup>37</sup>

**78** This universe of beings is indeed of two kinds: godly and demonic. [The being] devoted to worship of Viṣṇu is godly, and [the being] opposed (to worship of Viṣṇu) is demonic.

**79** Even through giving instruction in the triple knowledge, a demonic being, who is one having indestructible sin, does not become devoted to Viṣṇu, oh king.

---

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.60ab; NsP 54.40ab.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.60cd.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.61.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.59ab; NsP 54.38ab.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. *Bhṛgu Saṃhitā* 37.68; NsP 54.45.

**80** When (given) teachings, that extremely proud fool, practiced in logical disputations, gives an undefeatable answer connected to logic.

Dvividho bhūtasargo ‘yaṃ daiva āsura eva ca | viṣṇubhaktiparo daivo viparītas tathāsurah || **78**

Upadeśapradānena saṃbhūtitraya āsurah | naiva viṣṇuparo bhūpa bhavaty akṣīṇakalmaṣah || **79**

Upadeśeṣu so ‘tyantaṃ saṃrambhī yuktijojitam | hetuvādāśrito mūḍho dadāty uttaram

akṣayam || **80**



## Bibliography

- A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, comp. R. L. Turner, 11 fascs. London: Oxford University Press, 1962–66, s.v. “*ātmán*.”
- Abegg, Emil, *Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran: auf Grund der Quellen dargestellt*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928.
- Aśoka, *Inscriptions of Asoka: New Edition*, ed. and trans. E. Hultzsch, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Bagchi, P. C., “The Geographical Catalogue of the Yakṣas in the Mahāmāyūrī,” *Sino-Indian Studies* 3 (1946).
- Baghbidi, Hassan Rezai, “Iranian elements in Sanskrit,” in *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics: Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*, eds. B. Tikkanen and H. Hettrich. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2006.
- Bailey, H. W., “Kusanica,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* vol. 14, no. 3 (1952).
- , *Indo-Scythian Studies, Being Khotanese Texts*, vol. 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Barthakuria, A.C, *The Kāpālikas: A Critical Study of the Religion, Philosophy, and Literature of a Tantric Sect*. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, 1984.
- Barua, B. M., *Aśoka and his Inscriptions*, Parts 1 and 2. Kolkata: New Age Publishers, 1946.
- Bauer, Walter and Strecker, Georg, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 10, 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964.
- Bhandare, Shailendra, “Historical Context,” in *Excavations at Paithan, Maharashtra, Beyond Boundaries: Religion, Region, Language and the State*, vol. 5, ed. Derek Kennet et al. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020.
- Bhandarkar, D. R., *Aśoka*, 1st ed. Kolkata: University of Calcutta, 1925.
- , *Aśoka*, 2nd ed. Kolkata: University of Calcutta, 1932.
- Bharata, *Bhāratīya-Nāṭya-Çāstram: Traité De Bharata Sur Le Théâtre*, vol. 1, *Texte Sanskrit*, ed. Joanny Grosset. Paris: E. Leroux 1898.
- , *The Nāṭyaśāstra Ascribed to Bharata-Muni: the Original Sanskrit Text Edited with Introduction and Various Readings from MSS. and printed texts*, vol. 2, ed. M. Ghosh – Calcutta: Calcutta Asiatic Society, 1956.
- Bloch, Jules, *Les Inscriptions d’Asoka*, Collection Émile Senart 8. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950.
- Bollée, W. B., *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa: Die Jainas und die anderen Weltanschauungen vor der*

- Zeitenwende: Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung, und Anmerkungen.* Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1977.
- Bowles, Adam, *Dharma, Disorder, and the Political in Ancient India: the Āpaddharmaparvan of the Mahābhārata*, Brill's Indological Library 28. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Brereton, Joel, "Pāṣaṇḍa: Religious Communities in the Aśokan Inscriptions and Early Literature," in *Gr̥hastha: The Householder in Ancient Indian Religious Culture*, ed. Patrick Olivelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Brockington, John, *The Sanskrit Epics*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 2: Indien, Part 12. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Buddhaghosa, *The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna: Being a Translation and Edition of the Bāhiraṇidāna of Buddhaghosa's Samantapāsādikā, the Vinaya Commentary*, trans. N. A. Jayawickrama, Sacred Books of the Buddhists 21. London: Luzac & Co., 1962.
- Bühler, G., "Aśoka's Twelfth Rock-Edict, According to the Shāhbāzgarhī Version," *Epigraphia Indica* 1 (1892).
- , "Correspondence: A New Asoka Inscription," *The Academy: A Weekly Review of Literature, Science, and Art* 823 (February 11, 1888).
- Burgess, James, *Report on the Elura Cave Temples and the Brahmanical and Jaina Caves in Western India*, Archaeological Survey of India, vol. 5. London: Trübner 1883.
- Burnouf, Eugène, Appendix X to *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi: traduit du Sanscrit, accompagné d'un commentaire et de vingt et un mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1852.
- Caldwell Ames, Christine, *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Campbell, J. M., *Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency*, vol. 1, pt. 1, *History of Gujarāt*. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1896.
- Casson, Lionel, "Introduction," in *The Periplus Maris Erythraei: Text with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, trans. L. Casson. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Chakladar, H. C., *Social Life in Ancient India: Studies in Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra*. Calcutta: Greater India Society, 1929.
- Chakrabarti, Kunal, *Religious Process: The Purāṇas and the Making of a Regional Tradition*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Chaudhuri, S. B., *Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India: a Study on the Puranic Lists of the Peoples of Bharatavarsa*, pt. 1, *Northern India*. Calcutta: General Printers and Publishers, 1955.
- Chauhan, D. V., *Understanding Ṛgveda*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1985.
- Chemburkar, Jaya, "Brāhmaṇised Pāsupata Sect in the Kūrma Purāṇa," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, n.s., 60–61 (1985–1986).

- Clarke, G. E., "Who Were the Dards? A Review of the Ethnographic Literature of the North-Western Himalaya," *Kailash* 5, no. 4 (1977).
- Cohen, Jeremy, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Colebrooke, H. T., *Cósha, or Dictionary of the Sanscrit Language by Amara Sinha: with an English Interpretation, and Annotations*. Serampore: n.p., 1808.
- Cort, John, *Framing the Jina: Narratives of Icons and Idols in Jain History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Dandamayev, Muhammad A., *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6. Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers, 1992.
- Darling, Gregory J., *An Evaluation of the Vedāntic Critique of Buddhism*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987.
- Davidson, Ronald M., *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Deb, H. K., "Was Candragupta low-born?," *Indian Historical Quarterly* 8, no. 3. (1932).
- Debrunner, Albert, *Jakob Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik: Nachträge zu Band I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Decker, Rodney J., "The Bauer Thesis: An Overview," in *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Early Christian Contexts: Reconsidering the Bauer Thesis*, ed. Paul A. Hartog. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 2015.
- Demiéville, P. "À Propos du Concile de Vaiśālī, *T'oung Pao*, 2nd ser., 4/5. (1951).
- Deshpande, Madhav M., "Interpreting the Aśokan Epithet *devānāmpīya*," in *Aśoka in History and Historical Memory*, ed. Patrick Olivelle. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2009.
- Deussen, Paul, *Die Philosophie der Upanishads*, Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Religion 1, pt. 2. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1899.
- Dimmitt, Cornelia and Buitenen, J. A. B. van, *Classical Hindu Mythology: a Reader in the Sanskrit Purāṇas*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978.
- Doniger O'Flaherty, Wendy, "The Origins of Heresy in Hindu Mythology," *History of Religions* 10, no. 4. (May 1971).
- , "The Origins of Heresy in Hindu Mythology". PhD diss., Oxford University, 1973.
- , *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- , "The Image of the Heretic in the Gupta Purāṇas," in *Essays in Gupta Culture*, ed. Bardwell L. Smith. Columbia, MO: South Asia Books, 1983.

- Doniger, Wendy, "Minimyths and Maximyths and Political Points of View" in *Myth and Method*, ed. Laurie L. Patton and Wendy Doniger. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996.
- , *On Hinduism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Dundas, Paul, *The Jains*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Edgerton, F., *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. 2, *Dictionary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- , *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol 1., *Grammar* William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Eggermont, P. H. L., *Alexander's Campaigns in Sind and Baluchistan and the Siege of the Brahmin Town of Harmatelia*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 3. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975.
- Eltschinger, Vincent, *Buddhist Epistemology as Apologetics: Studies on the History, Self-understanding, and Dogmatic Foundations of Late Indian Buddhist Philosophy*, *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte* 851, *Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens* 81. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014.
- Falk, Harry, *Schrift im alten Indien: Ein Forschungsbericht mit Anmerkungen*, *ScriptOralia* 56. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1993.
- Falk, Peter, "The Tidal Waves of Indian History: Between the Empires and Beyond," in *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*, ed. Patrick Olivelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Fisher, Elaine M., *Hindu Pluralism: Religion and the Public Sphere in Early Modern South India*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.
- Foulkes, T., "The Pallavas," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* vol. 17, no. 2. (1885).
- Franke, R. Otto, "Review of *Altindische Grammatik*, vol. 1, *Lautlehre*, by Jakob Wackernagel," *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 23. (1897).
- Fürer-Haimendorf, Christoph von "Freedom and Conformity in Tribal, Hindu and Buddhist Societies of India and Nepal," in *The Concept of Freedom in Anthropology*, ed. David Bidney. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1963.
- Fynes, R. C. C., "The Religious Patronage of the Satavahana Dynasty," *South Asian Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1 (1995).
- Geiger, Wilhelm, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* vol. 1, no. 7. Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner, 1916.
- Glasenapp, Helmuth von, *Der Jainismus: Eine indische Erlösungsreligion*. Berlin: Alf Hager Verlag, 1925.

- Glucker, John, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, Hypomnemata 56. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- González-Reimann, Luis, *The Mahābhārata and the Yugas: India's Great Epic Poem and the Hindu System of World Ages*. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.
- Gorden White, David, "Mountains of Wisdom: On the Interface Between Siddha and Vidyādhara Cults and the Siddha Orders in Medieval India," *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 1, no. 1. (April 1997).
- Grierson, G. A., "Linguistic Relationship of the Shahbazgarhi Inscription," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1904).
- Grünendahl, Reinhold, *Viṣṇudharmāḥ: Precepts for the Worship of Viṣṇu*, Parts 1–3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983–1989.
- Halder, Smita, "Revisiting the Naneghat Inscriptions," Proceedings of the Indian History Congress, 76th Session (2016).
- Harikai, Kunio, "Sanskrit text of the Tantravārtika, Adyāya 1, Pāda 3, Adhikaraṇa 1-3," *Annual Report of Medical Anthropology and Humanity, Saga Medical School*, no. 3 (2008).
- Harper, Kyle, *The Fate of Rome: Climate, Disease, and the End of an Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.
- Hawley, Michael, "Re-Orienting Tradition: Radhakrishnan's Hinduism," in *Historicizing "Tradition" in the Study of Religion*, ed. Steven Engler and Gregory P. Grieve. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Hazra, R. C., *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Dacca: University of Dacca, 1940.
- Henning, W. B., "The First Indo-Europeans in History," in *Society and History: Essays in Honor of Karl August Wittfogel*, ed. G. L. Ulman. The Hague: Mouton, 1978.
- Hiltebeitel, Alf, "Buddhism and the Mahābhārata: Boundary Dynamics in Textual Practice," in *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia*, ed. Federico Squarcini. Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2005.
- , *Rethinking the Mahābhārata: A Reader's Guide to the Education of the Dharma King*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- Hopkins, E. W., *Epic Mythology*, Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde III, 1B. Strasbourg: K. J. Trübner, 1915.
- Hultzsch, E., "Introduction: Asoka's Empire," in *Inscriptions of Asoka: New Edition*, CII 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
- , "Introduction: Grammar of the Girnar Rock-Edicts," in *Inscriptions of Asoka: New Edition*, CII 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

- Hussain, S., *Remoteness and Modernity: Transformation and Continuity in Northern Pakistan*, Yale Agrarian Studies Series. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Inden, Ronald, "Imperial Purāṇas: Kashmir as Vaiṣṇava Center of the World," in *Querying the Medieval: Texts and the History of Practices in South Asia*, eds. Ronald Inden, Jonathan Walters, and Daud Ali. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- , "The Ceremony of the Great Gift (mahādāna): Structure and Historical Context in Indian Ritual and Society," in *Asie Du Sud: Traditions Et Changements, Colloque Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, no. 582, ed. Marc Gaborieau. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1979.
- Jacobsen, Knut A., "Introduction: Yoga Powers and Religious Traditions," in *Yoga Powers: \ Extraordinary Capacities Attained Through Meditation and Concentration*, ed. Knut A. Jacobsen, Brill's Indological Library 37. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- , *Kapila: Founder of Sāṃkhya and Avatāra of Viṣṇu, with a translation of Kapilāsūrisaṃvāda*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2008.
- Jha, Kalanath, *Figurative Poetry in Sanskrit Literature*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975.
- Johansson, K. F., "Der Dialekt der sogenannten Shāhbāzgarhi-redaktion der vierzehn Edikte des Königs Açoka," in *Actes du Huitième Congrès International des Orientalistes, tenu en 1889 à Stockholm et à Christiania*, sect. 2, Aryenne, fasc. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1892.
- , "Indische Miszellen," *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde* 3 (1894).
- Johnson, W. J., *Harmless Souls: Karmic Bondage and Religious Change in Early Jainism with Special Reference to Umāsvāti and Kundakunda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1995.
- Johnston, E. H., *Early Sāṃkhya: An Essay on its Historical Development According to the Texts*. London: Royal Asiatic Society, 1937.
- Journal of the Royal Asiatic society of Great Britain and Ireland, "Notes of the Quarter," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, (1904).
- Kauṭilya, King, *Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya's Arthaśātra*, trans. Patrick Olivelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Kane, P. V., "Outlines of the History of Alamkāra Literature: The Chronology of Alamkāra Literature, \ Part II," *Indian Antiquary* 46. (1917).
- , *History of Dharmaśāstra: Ancient and Mediæval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 5, pt. 2, Government Oriental Series/B 6. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1962.
- , *History of Dharmaśāstra: Ancient and Mediæval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 2, pt. 1, Government Oriental Series/B 6. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941.
- , *History of Dharmaśāstra: Ancient and Mediæval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 1, pt. 1,

- 2nd rev. ed., Government Oriental Series/B 6. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1968.
- , *History of Dharmasāstra: Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law in India*, vol. 3, \ Government Oriental Series/B 6. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941.
- Karttunen, Klaus, *Yonas and Yavanas in Indian Literature*, Studia Orientalia 116. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- Kern, Hendrik, *Over de Jaartelling der Zuidelijke Buddhisten en de Gedenkstukken van Açoka den Buddhist*, Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen: Afdeeling Letterkunde 8. Amsterdam: C. G. Van der Post, 1873.
- Keune, Jon “Eknāth in Context: The Literary, Social, and Political Milieus of an Early Modern Saint-poet,” *South Asian History and Culture*, vol. 6, no. 1 (2015).
- Koskikallio, Petteri, “Baka Dālbhya: A Complex Character in Vedic Ritual Texts, Epics and Purāṇas,” *Studia Orientalia* 85 (1999).
- Kramrisch, Stella, *The Presence of Śiva*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Kumar, Raj, *History of the Chamar Dynasty: from 6th Century A. D. to 12th Century A. D.*, vol. 1. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications, 2008.
- Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache*, comp. C. C. Uhlenbeck. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 1898/1899.
- Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, comp. Manfred Mayrhofer, vol. 2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1963.
- Kuz'mina, E.E., *The Origin of the Indo-Iranians*, ed. J. P. Mallory. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Larson, Gerald James, *Classical Sāṃkhya: an Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, 2nd ed.. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1998.
- Law, B. C., *India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*. London: Luzac & Co., 1941.
- Lingat, Robert, *The Classical Law of India*, trans. J. Duncan M. Derrett. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Lorenzen, David N., *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Macdonnell, A. A., “Demons and Fiends,” in *Vedic Mythology*, Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 3, Heft A. Strasbourg: Karl J. Trübner, 1897.
- Manu, *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmasāstra*, trans. and ed. Patrick Olivelle and Suman Olivelle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- McClish, Mark, “Political Brahmanism and the State: A Compositional History of the *Arthasāstra*,” PhD diss.. University of Texas at Austin, 2009.

- McCrimdile, J. W., *McCrimdile's Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy*, ed. S. M. Śāstrī. Calcutta: Chuckerverty, Chatterjee and Co., 1927.
- Michelson, Truman, "Linguistic Notes on the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra Redactions of Asoka's Fourteen-Edicts: Second Part," *American Journal of Philology* 30, no. 4 (1909).
- , "The Interrelation of the Dialects of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka 2: The Dialect of the Girnār Redaction," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31, no. 3 (1911).
- Milinda's Questions*, vol. 2, trans. by I. B. Horner, Sacred Books of the Buddhists 23. London: Luzac & Co., 1969.
- Mirashi, V. V., *Inscriptions Of The Śilāhāras*, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. 6. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1977.
- Mitchiner, John E., *Traditions of the Seven Ṛṣis*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2000.
- Nicholson, Andrew, *Unifying Hinduism: Philosophy and Identity in Indian Intellectual History*, South Asia Across the Disciplines. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.
- Nakamura, Hajime *Ways of Thinking of Eastern Peoples: India-China-Tibet-Japan*, rev. ed. by Philip P. Wiener. Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1964.
- Narain, A. K., *The Indo-Greeks*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- , *The Tokharians: A History Without Nation-State Boundaries*. Shillong: North-Eastern Hill University Publications, 2000.
- Neelis, Jason, *Early Buddhist Transmission and Trade Networks: Mobility and Exchange within and beyond the Northwestern Borderlands of South Asia*, Dynamics in the History of Religion 2. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Norman, K. R., "Notes on the Greek Version of Aśoka's Twelfth and Thirteenth Rock Edicts," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* No. 2. (1972).
- Oberlies, Thomas, *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*, Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 5. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- , *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka, with a Concordance to Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
- Olivelle, Patrick, "Innovations of Manu: Mid-Second Century C.E.," in *A Dharma Reader: Classical Indian Law*, ed. and trans. Patrick Olivelle. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- , "The Ascetic and the Domestic in Brahmanical Religiosity," in *Asceticism and Its Critics: Historical Accounts and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Oliver Freiberger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- , *Introduction to King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya's Arthaśātra*, by Kauṭilya. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.



- , Introduction to *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmasāstra*, by Manu. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Ollett, Andrew, "Sātavāhana and Nāgārjuna: Religion and the Sātavāhana State," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 41 (2018).
- , *Language of the Snakes: Prakrit Sanskrit and the Language Order of Premodern India*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.
- Omvedt, Gail, *Buddhism in India: Challenging Brahmanism and Caste*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2013.
- Pal, P., "Siva as Dispenser of Royal Glory on Kushan Coins," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, n.s., vol. 2 (1988).
- Parasher, Aloka and Naik, Usha, "Temple Girls Of Medieval Karnataka," *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 23, no.1 (1986).
- Pargiter, F. E., *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*. London: Humphrey Milford, 1913.
- Patil, D. R., *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1946.
- Pischel, Richard, *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen*, GIAPA 1, no. 8. Strasbourg: Karl. J. Trübner, 1900.
- Powell, Adam, "Irenaeus, Joseph Smith, and the Sociology of Heresy," PhD diss., Durham University, 2013.
- Prakash, Buddha, *Studies in Indian History and Civilization*. Agra: Shiva Lal Agarwala & Co., 1962.
- Price, Todd L., "Collocations and Colligations – Part 1 ," in *Structural Lexicology and the Greek New Testament: Applying Corpus Linguistics for Word Sense Possibility Delimitation Using Collocational Indicators*, Perspectives on Linguistics and Ancient Languages 6. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2015.
- Prinsep, James, "On the Edicts of Piyadasi, or Asoka, the Buddhist monarch of India, preserved on the Girnar rock in the Gujerat peninsula, and on the Dhaulī rock in Cuttack; with the discovery of Ptolemy's name therein," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* vol. 7, no. 75 (March 1838).
- Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli "My Search for Truth," in *Religion in Transition*, ed. Vergilus Ferm. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937.
- Raghavendrachar, H. N., "Madhva's Brahma-Mīmāṃsā," in *The Cultural Heritage of India*, 2nd. ed. Vol. 3, *The Philosophies*, ed. Haridas Bhattacharyya. Calcutta: Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, 1953.
- Renou, Louis, "Introduction," trans. J. K. Balbir, in *Hinduism*, ed. Louis Renou. New York: George Braziller, 1961.
- , *L'Hindouisme: Les textes, les doctrines, l'histoire*, "Que sais-je?" Le point des connaissances

- actuelles 475. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1951.
- , *Le destin du Vēda dans l'Inde = Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, vol. 6, Publications de l'Insitute de civilization indienne, fasc. 10. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.
- Rocher, Ludo, *The Purāṇas*, History of Indian Literature, vol. 2, fasc. 3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986.
- Roth, Gustav, "Vergleichende Beobachtungen zu Asokas Felsenedikt XIII," in *Expanding and Merging Horizons: Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften 351, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 53, ed. Karin Preisendanz. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007.
- Rudolph, Lloyd I. and Hoeber Rudolph, Susanne *In Pursuit of Lakshmi: The Political Economy of the Indian State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Salomon, Richard, *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Sanderson, Alexis, "The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period," in *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, ed. Shingo Einoo. Tokyo: Sanbikō Busshorin, 2009.
- , "Tolerance, Exclusivity, Inclusivity, and Persecution in Indian Religion During the Early Mediaeval Period," in *Honoris Causa: Essays in Honour of Aveek Sarkar*, ed. John Makinson. London: Allen Lane, 2015.
- Sarma, I. K., "A Chaturmukha Liṅga from Amarāvātī and the Spread of Lakulīśa Pāśupatism," in *Madhu: Recent Researches in Indian Archaeology and Art History*, Shri M. N. Deshpande Festschrift, ed. M. S. Nagaraja Rao. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1981.
- Satyasray, R. S., *Studies in Rājput History*, vol. 1, *Origin of the Chālukyas*. Calcutta: S. C. Ghosh, 1937.
- Schadler, Peter, *John of Damascus and Islam: Christian Heresiology and the Intellectual Background to Earliest Christian-Muslim Relations*, History of Christian-Muslim Relations 34. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Scharfe, Hartmut, *Education in Ancient India*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 2: India, 16. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- , *The State in Indian Tradition*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Section 2: Indien, Part 3: Geschichte 2. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Schlier, H., "αἰρέματα," in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 1, ed. G. Kittel et al.. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Senart, E., "The inscriptions in the Caves at Nāsik," *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. 8. (1905–6).
- , "Notes d'Épigraphie Indienne I," *Journal Asiatique*, 8th ser., 11. (April–May–June 1888).

- , “Étude sur les Inscriptions de Piyadasi: Troisième article,” *Journal Asiatique*, 7th ser., 16 (August–September 1880).
- Sharma, R. S., *Śūdras in Ancient India: A Survey of the Position of the Lower Orders Down to circa A.D 500*, 3rd ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.
- Sharma, T. R., *Personal and Geographical Names in the Gupta Inscriptions*. Delhi: Concept Publishing Co., 1978.
- Shastri, A. M., “The Purāṇic King Pramati: Some Reflections,” in *Reappraising Gupta History: for S. R. Goyal*, ed. B. C. Chhabra et al. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1992.
- , “Purāṇas on the Sātavāhanas: An Archaeological-Historical Perspective,” in *The Age of the Sātavāhanas*, ed. Ajay Mitra Shastri (New Delhi: Aryan Books International, 1999).
- Simini, Florinda De *Of Gods and Books: Ritual and Knowledge Transmission in the Manuscript Cultures of Premodern India*, Studies in Manuscript Cultures 8. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2016.
- Simon, Marcel, “From Greek Hairesis to Christian Heresy,” in *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant*, *Théologie Historique* 54. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1979.
- Singh, M. R., *Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas: A Critical Study*. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1972.
- Singh, Upinder, *Inscribing Power on the Realm: Royal Ideology and Religious Policy in India c. 200 BCE–300 CE*. Amsterdam: J. Gonda Fund Foundation of the KNAW, 2022.
- , *Political Violence in Ancient India*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Singh, Y. B., *Social Life in Ancient India*. New Delhi: Light & Life Publishers, 1981.
- Smith, J. Z., *Differential Equations: On Constructing the “Other,”* Thirteenth Annual University Lecture in Religion, March 5, 1992 (pamphlet). Tempe, AZ: Department of Religious Studies, Arizona State University, 1992.
- Söhnen-Thieme, Renate, “Buddhist Tales in the Mahābhārata?” in *Parallels and Comparisons: Proceedings of the Fourth Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas*, ed. Petteri Koskikallio. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2009.
- Staden, Heinrich von, “Hairesis and Heresy: The Case of the *haireseis iatrikai*,” in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 3, *Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. Ben F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders. London: SCM Press, 1982.
- Subba, T. B., *Politics of Culture: A Study of Three Kirata Communities in the Eastern Himalayas*. Chennai: Orient Longman, 1999.
- Thapar, Romila, “Dissent and Protest in the Early Indian Tradition,” *Studies in History* 1, no. 2 (1979).
- , *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

- , *The Past Before Us: Historical Traditions of Early North India*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Tharoor, Shashi, *India: From Midnight to the Millenium*. New York: Arcade Publishing, 1997.
- , *Why I am a Hindu*. London: C. Hurst & Co., 2018.
- The Questions of King Milinda*, Part 2, trans. by T. W. Rhys Davids, Sacred Books of the East 36. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894.
- Thite, Ganesh, “Pāñcarātra and Heresy,” *Purāṇa* 18, no. 1 (January 1976).
- Thomas, F. W., “IX. Sakastana,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 38, no. 1 (1906).
- , “The D-Suffix,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* 5, pt. 2 (1900).
- Tripathi, G. C., “On the formation of the word Śakuntalā,” *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 31/32, no. 1/2. (1970–1971; 1971–1972).
- Vyāsa, *Vāyu-Purāṇam*, ed. N. Apte, Poona: Anandāśrama-mudraṇālaya, 1905.
- Vielle, Christophe, “From the *Vāyuprokta* to the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas*: Preliminary Remarks towards a Critical Edition of the *Vāyuprokta Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*,” in *Epics, Khilas, and Purāṇas: Continuities and ruptures. Proceedings of the Third Dubrovnik International Conference on the Sanskrit Epics and Purāṇas, September 2002*, ed. Petteri Koskikallio. Zagreb: Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2005.
- Visuvalingam, Sunthar, “The Transgressive Sacrality of the Dīkṣita: Sacrifice, Criminality and *Bhakti* in the Hindu Tradition,” in *Criminal Gods and Demon Devotees: Essays on the Guardians of Popular Hinduism*, ed. Alf Hiltebeitel. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.
- Visvanathan, Meera, “The First Land Grants: The Emergence of an Epigraphic Tradition in the Early Deccan,” in *Social Worlds of Premodern Transactions: Perspectives from Indian Epigraphy and History*, eds. Mekhola Gomes et al. Delhi: Primus Books, 2021.
- , “Uṣavadāta’s akhayanivi: the Eternal Endowment in the Early Historic Deccan,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, vol. 41 (2018).
- Wackernagel, Jakob, *Altindische Grammatik*, vol. 1, *Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896.
- Wade, Geoff, “The Polity of Yelang (夜郎) and the Origins of the Name ‘China,’” *Sino-Platonic Papers*, no. 188 (May 2009).
- Ward-Perkins, Bryan, “Specialisation, Trade, and Prosperity: An Overview of the Economy of the Late Antique Eastern Mediterranean,” in *Economy and Exchange in the East Mediterranean during Late Antiquity*, ed. Sean Kingsley and Michael Decker. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2015.
- Wezler, Albrecht, “A Note on Sanskrit *bhrūṇa*, and *bhrūṇahatyā*,” in *Festschrift für Klaus Bruhn zur Vollendung des 65. Lebensjahres dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*, eds.

Nalini Balbir and J. K. Bautze. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen, 1994.

Wilson, H. H., "On the Kapur-di-Giri Rock Inscription: Note by the Director," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 8 (1846)

-----, "On the Rock Inscriptions of Kapur di Giri, Dhauli, and Girnar," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 12. 1850.

Witzel, M., *Das Alte Indien*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 2003.

Young, Richard Fox, *Resistant Hinduism: Sanskrit Sources on Anti-Christian Apologetics in Early Nineteenth-Century India*. Vienna: Brill, 1981.

## Index

- Ājīvika, 53  
Antonine Plague, 64  
Aśoka, 17, 23, 25–27, 32–34, 36, 38–39, 41–44, 47–48, 67  
Āśramas, 17, 57, 68, 86–88, 91, 94, 101–102, 105, 134, 145  
Balaśrī, Gautamī, 65–68, 72–73  
Bhandarkar, D. R., 4, 9, 41–42, 71, 115  
Brahmins, 16, 27, 31, 46–48, 58, 61, 65–67, 73, 76, 89–91, 93, 95–96, 99, 102, 135, 142, 144–145  
Brereton, Joel, 42–45, 52, 56, 58  
Buddha, 9–10, 45, 47, 61, 90, 97, 144  
Buddhism, 9, 11, 13, 16–17, 20–21, 47–48, 58, 73–74, 97, 143–144  
Christianity, 5, 11, 22, 25, 28–31, 46, 78, 151  
Clement of Alexandria, 29  
*Dāna*, 72, 75–76, 91  
Demons, 13, 132, 135  
Doniger, Wendy, 5, 11–15, 21–22, 28–29  
Eltschinger, Vincent, 5, 11, 13, 15–17, 19–21, 31, 70, 78, 80  
Franke, Otto, 38, 39–40  
Galen, 24, 64  
*Hairesis*, 21–25, 27–29, 34–35, 77, 82  
Hāthīgumphā, 43–44  
Hell, 13, 134, 137  
Jainism, 9, 13, 17, 49, 58, 74, 97, 144  
John of Damascus, 78–79, 158  
Kalkin, 8, 16, 69, 95, 99  
Kāpālikas, 5, 18–19, 94, 143–144  
Kern, Hendrik, 34–40  
Khāravēla, 43–44, 67  
Kṣaharātas, 71–72  
Kumārila, 19, 32, 79  
Kundakunda, 49–51  
*Liṅga*, 50  
Mahāvīra, 9–10, 144  
Manicheans, 78  
Māyāmoha, 12–13, 28  
Mayrhofer, Manfred, 14, 41–42  
*Milindapañha*, 46  
*Mlecchas*, 16–17, 31, 61, 69–70, 75–76, 80–81  
*Mṛcchakaṭika*, 55  
Nāṇeghāt, 67–68  
Nāsik, 67–68  
*Nāstikas*, 58  
Orthodoxy, 9–10, 19, 30–31, 50, 62, 67, 70, 75–76, 80–81, 94, 143  
Pāli Canon, 44, 47  
Pāñcarātras, 4, 11, 15, 19, 31  
Pāsupatas, 5, 8, 15, 19, 31, 47  
Permanent endowment, 72  
Purāṇas, 4–5, 13, 15–20, 31, 49, 55, 58–60, 64, 66, 75, 95, 99, 103, 108  
Renou, Louis, 9–11, 29  
Rocher, Ludo, 4, 13  
Sātavāhanas, 65–66, 73–74  
Senart, Émile, 26, 36–37, 39, 68  
Sīsūpacālā, 44–47, 51  
Smith, J. Z., 80–81  
Śūdras, 4, 52, 59, 61, 70, 89–94, 99, 101–102, 143–145  
Thapar, Romila, 26, 41, 43  
*Therīgāthā*, 45  
Thomas, F. W., 36, 39–40, 98, 118  
*Vaṛṇas*, 17, 59, 68, 85–86, 88, 94, 99, 101–102, 105, 134–137, 145  
von Staden, Heinrich, 23–25, 27–29  
*Vṛṣala*, 52–53, 55–56, 60–61  
Zito, George, 80