

# **THE INSTITUTES OF VISHNU**

**TRANSLATED BY JULIUS JOLLY**

# THE INSTITUTES OF VISHNU

» THE INSTITUTES OF VISHNU«, translated by Julius Jolly,  
Oxford, the Clarendon Press, 1880

© Bird Publisher

DP, založništvo, d.o.o., Levčeva ulica 13, I234 Mengeš, Slovenija.

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji  
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana  
233-428(0.034.2)  
233-74(0.034.2)

The INSTITUTES of Vishnu [Elektronski vir] / translated by  
Julius Jolly. - El. knjiga. - Mengeš : Bird Publisher, 2011

Način dostopa (URL): <http://www.bird-publisher.com>

ISBN 978-961-6763-78-3

255231488

Published by:  
Bird Publisher  
DP, založništvo, d.o.o.  
Levčeva ulica 13  
SI - I234 Mengeš  
Slovenia  
T: +386 (0)1 723 78 28  
Email: [bird.publisher@gmail.com](mailto:bird.publisher@gmail.com)  
<http://www.bird-publisher.com>

Published in electronic format, February 2011 by Bird Publisher

Available electronically at: [www.bird-publisher.com](http://www.bird-publisher.com)

Editor: Damjan Plut

Cover by Damjan Plut

Text editing: Damjan Plut

Electronic version made by Damjan Plut

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without prior written permission of the publisher.

## *List of more important abbreviations*

Âpast. - Âpastamba's Dharma-sûtra, ed. Bühler.

Âsv. - Âsvalâyana's *Grihya*-sûtra, ed. Stenzler.

Gaut. - Gautama's Dharmasâstra, ed. Stenzler.

Gobh. - Gobhila's *Grihya*-sûtra, in the *Bibl. Ind.*

M. - Mânava Dharmasâstra, Calcutta edition, with the Commentary of Kullûka.

Nand. - Nandapandita, the commentator of the *Vishnu*-sûtra.

Pâr. - Pâraskara's *Grihya*-sûtra, ed. Stenzler.

Sânkh. - Sâṅkhâyana's *Grihya*-sûtra, ed. Oldenberg, in the fifteenth volume of the *Indische Studien*.

Y. - Yâgñavalkya's Dharmasâstra, ed. Stenzler.

Âpast. and Gaut. refer also to Dr. Bühler's translation of these two works in the second volume of the *Sacred Books of the East*.

## Table of contents

List of more important abbreviations .....	3
INTRODUCTION .....	7
Vishnu and the Goddess of the Earth.....	22
I.....	22
The Four Castes .....	28
II.....	28
Duties of a King.....	29
III.....	29
Weights and Measures .....	34
IV.....	34
Criminal and Civil Law .....	35
V.....	35
Law of Debt .....	45
VI.....	45
Writings.....	47
VII.....	47
Witnesses .....	48
VIII.....	48
Ordeals .....	51
IX.....	51
X.....	53
XI.....	53
XII.....	54
XIII.....	55
XIV.....	55
Inheritance.....	56
XV.....	56
XVI.....	58
XVII.....	59
XVIII.....	61
Funeral Ceremonies .....	63
XIX.....	63
XX.....	65
Funeral Oblations.....	68
XXI.....	68
Impurity.....	70
XXII.....	70
XXIII.....	76
Women.....	80
XXIV.....	80
XXV.....	83
XXVI.....	84
Sacraments .....	84
XXVII.....	84
XXVIII.....	86
XXIX.....	89
XXX.....	90

XXXI.....	93
XXXII.....	94
Crimes.....	95
XXXIII.....	95
XXXIV.....	96
XXXV.....	96
XXXVI.....	96
XXXVII.....	97
XXXVIII.....	99
XXXIX.....	99
XL.....	100
XLI.....	100
XLII.....	100
Hells.....	101
XLIII.....	101
Transmigration.....	103
XLIV.....	103
XLV.....	106
XLV.....	107
Penances.....	109
XLVI.....	109
XLVII.....	111
XLVIII.....	111
XLIX.....	113
L.....	114
LI.....	117
LII.....	122
LIII.....	123
LIV.....	124
LV.....	127
LVI.....	129
LVII.....	130
<i>Duties of a Householder</i> .....	131
LVIII.....	131
LIX.....	132
LX.....	134
LXI.....	135
LXII.....	136
LXIII.....	137
LXIV.....	139
LXV.....	142
LXVI.....	143
LXVII.....	144
LXVIII.....	147
LXIX.....	150
LXX.....	150
<i>Rules for a Snâtaka</i> .....	151
LXXI.....	151
<i>Self-restraint</i> .....	156
LXXII.....	156

<i>Srâddhas</i> .....	156
LXXIII. ....	156
LXXIV. ....	159
LXXV. ....	160
LXXVI. ....	161
LXXVII. ....	161
LXXVIII. ....	161
LXXIX. ....	164
LXXX. ....	166
LXXXI. ....	166
LXXXII. ....	168
LXXXIII. ....	169
LXXXIV. ....	170
LXXXV. ....	171
LXXXVI. ....	174
<i>Pious Gifts</i> .....	175
LXXXVII. ....	175
LXXXVIII. ....	176
LXXXIX. ....	176
XC. ....	177
XCI. ....	179
XCII. ....	180
XCIII. ....	182
<i>The Hermit</i> .....	183
XCIV. ....	183
XCV. ....	183
<i>The Ascetic</i> .....	184
XCVI. ....	184
<i>Meditation on Vishnu</i> .....	189
XCVII. ....	189
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	191
XCVIII. ....	191
XCIX. ....	195
C. ....	197

## **INTRODUCTION**

The *Vishnu-smṛiti* or *Vaiṣṇava Dharmasâstra* or *Vishnu-sûtra* is in the main a collection of ancient aphorisms on the sacred laws of India, and as such it ranks with the other ancient works of this class which have come down to our time<sup>1</sup>. It may be styled a *Dharma-sûtra*, though this ancient title of the *Sûtra* works on law has been preserved in the MSS. of those *Smṛitis* only, which have been handed down, like the *Dharma-sûtras* of *Āpastamba*, *Baudhâyana*, and *Hiranyakesin*, as parts of the respective *Kalpa-sûtras*, to which they belong. The size of the *Vishnu-sûtra*, and the great variety of the subjects treated in it, would suffice to entitle it to a conspicuous place among the five or six existing *Dharma-sûtras*; but it possesses a peculiar claim to interest, which is founded on its close connection with one of the oldest Vedic schools, the *Kathas*, on the one hand, and with the famous code of *Manu* and some other ancient law-codes, on the other hand. To discuss these two principal points, and some minor points connected with them, as fully as the limits of an introduction admit of, will be the more necessary, because such a discussion can afford the only safe basis for a conjecture not altogether unsupported regarding the time and place of the original composition of this work, and may even tend to throw some new light on the vexed question as to the origin of the code of *Manu*. Further on I shall have to speak of the numerous interpolations traceable in the *Vishnu-sûtra*, and a few remarks regarding the materials used for this translation, and the principles of interpretation that have been followed in it, may be fitly reserved for the last.

There is no surer way for ascertaining the particular Vedic school by which an ancient Sanskrit law-book of unknown or uncertain origin was composed, than by examining the quotations from, and analogies with, Vedic works which it contains. Thus the *Gautama Dharmasâstra* might have originated in any one among the divers *Gautama Karanas* with which Indian tradition acquaints us. But the comparatively numerous passages which its author has borrowed from the *Samhitâ* and from one *Brâhmana* of the *Sâma-veda* prove that it must belong to one of those *Gautama Karanas* who studied the *Sâma-veda*<sup>2</sup>. Regarding the code of *Yâgñavalkya* we learn from tradition that a Vedic teacher of that name was the reputed author of the *White Yagur-veda*. But this coincidence might be looked upon as casual, if the *Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti* did not contain a number of *Mantras* from that Vedic *Samhitâ*, and a number of very striking analogies, in the section on funeral ceremonies particularly, with the *Gṛihya-sûtra* of the *Vâgasaneyins*, the *Kâtiya Gṛihya-sûtra* of *Pâraskara*<sup>3</sup>. In the case of the *Vishnu-sûtra* an enquiry of this kind is specially called for, because tradition leaves us entirely in the dark as to its real author. The fiction that the laws promulgated in Chapters II-XCVII were communicated by the god *Vishnu* to the goddess of the earth, is of course utterly worthless for historical purposes; and all that it can be made to show is that those parts of this work in which it is started or kept up cannot rival the laws themselves in antiquity.

Now as regards, first, the Vedic *Mantras* and *Pratîkas* (beginnings of *Mantras*) quoted in this work, it is necessary to leave aside, as being of no moment for the present purpose, 1. very well-known *Mantras*, or, speaking more precisely, all such *Mantras* as are frequently

<sup>1</sup> This was first pointed out by Professor Max Müller, *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 134. His results were confirmed and expanded by the subsequent researches of Dr. Bühler, *Introduction to Bombay Digest*, I, p. xxii; *Indian Antiquary*, V, p. 30; *Kasmir Report*, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> See Bühler, *Introduction to Gautama* (Vol. II of the *Sacred Books of the East*), pp. xlv-xlvi.

<sup>3</sup> Bühler, *Introduction to Digest*, p. xxxii; Stenzler, *On Pâraskara's Gṛihya-sûtra*, in the journal of the German Oriental Society, VII, p. 527 seq

quoted in Vedic works of divers Sâkhâs; 2. the purificatory texts enumerated under the title of Sarva-veda-pavitranî in LVI. The latter can afford us no help in determining the particular Sâkhâ to which this work belongs, because they are actually taken, as they profess to be, from all the Vedas indiscriminately, and because nearly the whole of Chapter LVI is found in the Vâsishtha-smṛiti as well (see further on), which probably does not belong to the same Veda as this work. Among the former class of Mantras may be included, particularly, the Gâyatrî, the Purushasûkta, the Aghamarshana, the Kûshmândîs, the Vyâhritis, the Gyeshtha Sâmans, the Rudras, the Trinâkiketa, the Trisuparna, the Vaishnava, Sâkra, and Bârhaspatya Mantras mentioned in XC, 3, and the Mantra quoted in XXVIII, 51 (= Gautama's 'Retasya'). Among the twenty-two Mantras quoted in Chapters XLVIII, LXIV, LXV (including repetitions, but excluding the Purushasûkta, Gâyatrî, Aghamarshana) there are also some which may be referred to this class, and the great majority of them occur in more than one Veda at the same time. But it is worthy of note that no less than twelve, besides occurring in at least one other Sâkhâ, are either actually found in the Samhitâ of the Kârâyanîya-kâthas, the Kâthaka<sup>4</sup> (or Karaka-sâkhâ?), or stated to belong to it in the Commentary, while one is found in the Kâthaka alone, a second in the Atharva-veda alone, a third in the Taittirîya Brâhmana alone, and a fourth does not occur in any Vedic work hitherto known<sup>5</sup>. A far greater number of Mantras occurs in Chapters XXI, LXVII, LXXIII, LXXIV, LXXXVI, which treat of daily oblations, Srâddhas, and the ceremony of setting a bull at liberty. Of all these Mantras, which, - including the Purushasûkta and other such well-known Mantras as well as the short invocations addressed to Soma, Agni, and other deities, but excluding the invocations addressed to Vishnu in the spurious Sûtra, LXVII, 2, - are more than a hundred in number, no more than forty or so are found in Vedic works hitherto printed, and in the law-books of Manu, Yâgñavalkya, and others; but nearly all are quoted, exactly in the same order as in this work, in the Kârâyanîya-kâthaka Grihya-sûtra, while some of them have been traced in the Kâthaka as well. And what is even more important, the Kâthaka Grihya does not contain those Mantras alone, but nearly all the Sûtras in which they occur; and it may be stated therefore, secondly, that the Vishnu-sûtra has four long sections, viz. Chapter LXXIII, and Chapters XXI, LXVII, LXXXVI, excepting the final parts, in common with that work, while the substance of Chapter LXXIV may also be traced in it. The agreement between both works is very close, and where they differ it is generally due to false readings or to enlargements on the part of the Vishnu-sûtra. However, there are a few cases, in which the version of the latter work is evidently more genuine than that of the former, and it follows, therefore, that the author of the Vishnu-sûtra cannot have borrowed his rules for the performance of Srâddhas &c. from the Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra, but that both must have drawn from a common source, i. e. no doubt from the traditions current in the Katha school, to which this work is indebted for so many of its Mantras as well.

For these reasons<sup>6</sup> I fully concur in the view advanced by Dr. Bühler, that the bulk of the so-called Vishnu-smṛiti is really the ancient Dharma-sûtra of the Kârâyanîya-kâthaka Sâkhâ of the Black Yagur-veda. It ranks, like other Dharma-sûtras, with the Grihya and Srauta-sûtras of its school; the latter of which, though apparently lost now, is distinctly referred to in the Grihya-sûtra in several places, and must have been in existence at the time when the

<sup>4</sup> In speaking of this work I always refer to the Berlin MS.

<sup>5</sup> XLVIII, 10. Cf., however, Vâgas. Samh. IV, 12.

<sup>6</sup> For details I may refer the reader to my German paper, Das Dharmasûtra des Vishnu und das Kâthakagrihyasûtra, in the Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Science for 1879, where the sections corresponding in both works have been printed in parallel columns, the texts from the Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra having been prepared from two of the MSS. of Devapâla's Commentary discovered by Dr. Bühler (Kasmir Report, Nos. 11, 12), one in Devanâgarî, and the other in Sârâdâ characters.



Commentaries on Kâtyâyana's Srâuta-sûtras were composed, in which it is frequently quoted by the name of *Katha-sûtra* on divers questions concerning Srâuta offerings, and at the time, when the Kasmîrian Devapâla wrote his Commentary on the *Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra*, which was, according to the Kasmîrian tradition, as explored by Dr. Bühler, before the conquest of Kasmîr by the Mahommedans. Devapâla, in the Introduction to his work, refers to 'thirty-nine Adhyâyas treating of the Vaitânika (= Srâuta) ceremonies,' by which the *Grihya-sûtra* was preceded, from which statement it may be inferred that the *Kâthaka Srâuta-sûtras* must have been a very voluminous work indeed, as the *Grihya-sûtra*, which is at least equal if not superior in extent to other works of the same class, forms but one Adhyâya, the fortieth, of the whole *Kalpa-sûtra*, which, according to Devapâla, was composed by one author. It does not seem likely that the *Vishnu-sûtra* was composed by the same man, or that it ever formed part of the *Kâthaka Kalpa-sûtra*, as the *Dharma-sûtras* of Baudhâyana, Âpastamba, and Hiranyakesin form part of the *Kalpa-sûtras* of the respective schools to which they belong. If that were the case, it would agree with the *Grihya-sûtra* on all those points which are treated in both works, such as e. g. the terms for the performance of the *Samskâras* or sacraments, the rules for a student and for a *Snâtaka*, the enumeration and definition of the *Krikkhras* or 'hard penances,' the forms of marriage, &c. Now though the two works have on those subjects a number of such rules in common as occur in other works also, they disagree for the most part in the choice of expressions, and on a few points lay down exactly opposite rules, such as the *Vishnu-sûtra* (XXVIII, 28) giving permission to a student to ascend his spiritual teacher's carriage after him, whereas the other work prescribes, that he shall do so on no account. Moreover, if both works had been destined from the first to supplement one another, they would, instead of having several entire sections in common, exhibit such cross-references as are found e. g. between the Âpastamba *Grihya* and *Dharma-sûtras*<sup>7</sup>; though the absence of such references might be explained, in the case of the *Vishnu-sûtra*, by the activity of those who brought it into its present shape, and who seem to have carefully removed all such references to other works as the original *Dharmasûtra* may have contained. Whatever the precise nature of the relations between this work and the other *Sûtra* works of the *Kârâyânîya-kâthaka* school may have been, there is no reason for assigning to it a later date than to the *Kâthaka Srâuta* and *Grihya-sûtras*, with the latter of which it has so much in common, and it may therefore claim a considerable antiquity, especially if it is assumed, with Dr. Bühler, that the beginning of the *Sûtra* period differed for each Veda. The Veda of the *Kathas*, the *Kâthaka*, is not separated from the *Sûtra* literature of this school by an intermediate: *Brâhmana* stage; yet its high antiquity is testified by several of the most eminent grammarians of India from Yâska down to Kaiyata<sup>8</sup>. Thus the *Kâthaka* is the only existing work of its kind, which is quoted by the former grammarian (*Nirukta* X, 5; another clear quotation from the *Kâthaka*, XXVII, 9, though not by name, may be found, *Nirukta* III, 4), and the latter places the *Kathas* at the head of all Vedic schools, while Patatañgali, the author of the *Mahâbhâshya*, assigns to the ancient sage *Katha*, the reputed founder of the *Katha* or *Kâthaka* school of the Black Yagur-veda, the dignified position of an immediate pupil of *Vaisampâyana*, the fountain-head of all schools of the older or Black Yagur-veda, and mentions, in accordance with a similar statement preserved in the *Râmâyana* (II, 32, 18, 19 ed. Schlegel), that in his own time the '*Kâlâpaka* and the *Kâthaka*' were 'proclaimed in every village<sup>9</sup>.' The priority of the *Kathas* before all other existing schools of the Yagur-veda may be deduced from the statements of the *Karanavyûha*<sup>10</sup>, which work assigns to them one

<sup>7</sup> Bühler, Introduction to Âpastamba, Sacred Books, II, pp. xi-xiv.

<sup>8</sup> See Weber, Indische Studien XIII, p. 437 seq.

<sup>9</sup> *Mahâbhâshya*, Benares edition, IV, fols. 82 b, 75 b.

<sup>10</sup> See Weber, *Ind. Stud.* III, p. 256 seq.; Max Müller, *Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 369. I have consulted, besides, two Munich MSS. of the *Karanavyûha* (cod, Haug 45).

of the first places among the divers branches of the *Karakas*, whom it places at the head of all schools of the *Yagur-veda*. Another argument in favour of the high antiquity of the *Kathas* may be derived from their geographical position<sup>11</sup>. Though the statements of the *Mahâbhâshya* and *Râmâyana* regarding the wide-spread and influential position of the *Kathas* in ancient times are borne out by the fact that the *Karanavûtha* mentions three subdivisions of the *Kathas*, viz. the *Kathas* proper, the *Prâkya Kathas*, and the *Kapishthala Kathas*, to which the *Kârâyanîyas* may be added as a fourth, and by the seeming identity of their name with the name of the {Greek *Kaḍaîoi*} in the *Pañgâb* on the one hand, and with the first part of the name of the peninsula of *Kattivar* on the other hand, it seems very likely nevertheless that the original home of the *Kathas* was situated in the north-west, i. e. in those regions where the earliest parts of the *Vedas* were composed. Not only the {Greek *Kaḍaîoi*}, but the {Greek *Kambísḍoloi*} as well, who have been identified with the *Kapishthala Kathas*<sup>12</sup>, are mentioned by Greek writers as a nation living in the *Pañgâb*; and while the *Prâkya Kathas* are shown by their name ('Eastern *Kathas*') to have lived to the east of the two other branches of the *Kathas*, it is a significant fact that adherents of the *Kârâyanîya-kâthaka* school survive nowhere but in *Kasmîr*, where all *Brâhmanas* perform their domestic rites according to the rules laid down in the *Grihya-sûtra* of this school<sup>13</sup>. *Kasmîr* is moreover the country where nearly all the yet existing works of the *Kâthaka* school have turned up, including the *Berlin MS.* of the *Kâthaka*, which was probably written by a *Kasmîrian*<sup>14</sup>. It is true that some of the geographical and historical data contained in that work, especially the way in which it mentions the *Pañkâlas*, whose ancient name, as shown by the *Satapatha Brâhmana* (XIII, 5, 4, 7) and *Rig-veda* (VIII, 20, 24; VIII, 22, 12), was *Krivi*, take us far off from the north-west, the earliest seat of *Aryan* civilization, into the country of the *Kuru-Pañkâlas* in *Hindostân* proper. But it must be borne in mind that the *Kâthaka*, if it may be identified with the '*Karaka-sâkhâ*,' must have been the *Veda* of all the *Karakas* except perhaps the *Maitrâyanîyas* and *Kapishthalas*, and may have been altered and enlarged, after the *Kathas* and *Karakas* had spread themselves across *Hindostân*. The *Sûtras* of a *Sâkhâ* which appears to have sprung up near the primitive home of *Âryan* civilization in *India*, which was probably the original home of the *Kathas* at the same time, may be far older than those of mere *Sûtra* schools of the *Black Yagur-veda*, which have sprung up, like the *Âpastamba* school, in *South India*, i. e. far older than the fourth or fifth century B. C.<sup>15</sup>

But sufficient space has been assigned to these attempts at fixing the age of the *Kâthaka-sûtras* which, besides remaining only too uncertain in themselves, can apply with their full force to those parts of the *Vishnu-sûtra* only, which have been traced in the *Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra*. It will be seen afterwards that even these sections, however closely connected with the sacred literature of the *Kathas*, have been tampered with in several places, and it might be argued, therefore, that the whole remainder of the *Vishnu-sûtra*, to which the *Kâthaka* literature offers no parallel, may be a subsequent addition. But the antiquity of the great majority of its laws can be proved by independent arguments, which are furnished by a comparison of the *Vishnu-sûtra* with other works of the same class, whose antiquity is not doubted.

<sup>11</sup> See Weber, *Über das Râmâyana*, p. 9: *Ind. Stud.* I, p. 189 seq.; III, p. 469 seq.; XIII, pp. 375, 439; *Ind. Litteraturgeschichte*, pp. 99, 332; Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 102 seq.

<sup>12</sup> See, however, Max Müller, *Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 333.

<sup>13</sup> Bühler, *Kasmîr Report*, p. 20 seq.

<sup>14</sup> This was pointed out to me by Dr. Bühler.

<sup>15</sup> See Bühler, *Introd. to Âpastamba*, p. xliii.

In the foot-notes to my translation I have endeavoured to give as complete references as possible to the analogous passages in the Smritis of Manu, Yâgñavalkya, Âpastamba, and Gautama, and in the four *Grihya-sûtras* hitherto printed. A large number of analogous passages might have been traced in the *Dharma-sûtras* of Vâsishtha<sup>16</sup> Baudhâyana as well, not to mention Hiranyakesin's *Dharma-sûtra*, which, according to Dr. Bühler, is nearly identical with the *Dharma-sûtra* of Âpastamba. Two facts may be established at once by glancing at these analogies, viz. the close agreement of this work with the other *Sûtra* works in point of form, and with all the above-mentioned works in point of contents. As regards the first point, the *Sûtras* or prose rules of which the bulk of the *Vishnu-sûtra* is composed, show throughout that characteristic laconism of the *Sûtra* style, which renders it impossible in many cases to make out the real meaning of a *Sûtra* without the help of a Commentary; and in the choice of terms they agree as closely as possible with the other ancient law-books, and in some cases with the *Grihya-sûtras* as well. Numerous verses, generally in the Sloka metre, and occasionally designed as 'Gâthâs,' are added at the end of most chapters, and interspersed between the *Sûtras* in some; but in this particular also the *Vishnu-sûtra* agrees with at least one other *Dharma-sûtra*, the *Vâsishtha-smṛiti*, and it contains in its law part, like the latter work, a number of verses in the ancient *Trishtubh* metre<sup>17[1]</sup>. Four of these *Trishtubhs* are found in the *Vâsishtha-smṛiti*, and three in Yâska's *Nirukta* as well, and the majority of the *Slokas* has been traced in the former work and the other above-mentioned law-books, and in other *Smritis*. In point of contents the great majority both of the metrical and prose rules of the *Vishnu-sûtra* agrees with one, or some, or all of the works named above. The *Grihya-sûtras*, excepting the *Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra*, naturally offer a far smaller number of analogies with it than the *Smritis*, still they exhibit several rules, in the *Snâtaka-dharmas* and otherwise, that have not been traced in any other *Smṛiti* except the work here translated. Among the *Smritis* again, each single one maybe seen from the references to contain a number of such rules, as are only met with in this work, which is a very important fact because, if the laws of the *Vishnu-sûtra* were found either in all other *Smritis*, or in one of them only, its author might be suspected of having borrowed them from one of those works. As it is, meeting with analogous passages now in one work, and then in another, one cannot but suppose that the author of this work has everywhere drawn from the same source as the other *Sûtrakâras*, viz. from ancient traditions that were common to all Vedic schools.

There are, moreover, a number of cases in which this work, instead of having borrowed from other works of the same class, can be shown to have been, directly or indirectly, the source from which they drew, and this fact constitutes a third reason in favour of the high antiquity of its laws. The clearest case of this kind is furnished by the *Vâsishtha-smṛiti*, with which this work has two entire chapters in common, which are not found elsewhere. I subjoin in a note the text of *Vâsishtha* XXVIII, 10-15, with an asterisk to those words which contain palpable mistakes (not including blunders in point of metre), for comparison with Chapter LVI of this work in the Calcutta edition, which is exceptionally correct in this chapter and in Chapter LXXXVII, which latter corresponds to *Vâsishtha*

---

<sup>16</sup> See the Benares edition (1878), which is accompanied with a Commentary by *Krishnapandita Dharmâdhikârin*, I should have given references to this {footnote p. xvii} work, the first complete and reliable edition of the *Vâsishtha-smṛiti*, in the footnotes to my translation, but for the fact that it did not come into my hands till the former had gone to the press. For Baudhâyana I have consulted a Munich MS. containing the text only of his *Sûtras* (cod. Haug 163).

<sup>17</sup> XIX, 23, 24; XXIII, 61; XXIX, 9, 10; XXX, 47 (see *Nirukta* 11, 4; *Vâsishtha* II, 8-10); LVI, 27 see *Vâsishtha* XXVIII, 15); LIX, 30; LXXII, 7; LXXXVI, 16.

XXVIII, 18-22<sup>18</sup>. In both chapters *Vishnu* has mainly prose Sûtras and throughout a perfectly correct text, whereas *Vâsishtha* has bad Slokas which, supported as they are by the Commentary or by the metre or by both, can only be accounted for by carelessness or clerical mistakes in some cases, and by a clumsy versification of the original prose version preserved in this work in others. Another chapter of the *Vishnu-sûtra*, the forty-eighth, nowhere meets with a parallel except in the third Prasna of the *Dharma-sûtra* of *Baudhâyana*, where it recurs almost word for word. An examination of the various readings in both works shows that in some of the Slokas *Baudhâyana* has better readings, while in one or two others the readings of *Vishnu* seem preferable, though the unsatisfactory condition of the MS. consulted renders it unsafe to pronounce a definitive judgment on the character of *Baudhâyana*'s readings. At all events he has a few Vedic Mantras more than *Vishnu*, which however seem to be very well-known Mantras and are quoted by their *Pratîkas* only. But he omits the two important Sûtras 9 and 10 of *Vishnu*, the latter of which contains a Mantra quoted at full, which, although corrupted (see *Vâgas. Samh.* IV, 12) and hardly intelligible, is truly Vedic in point of language; and he adds on his part a clause at the end of the whole chapter, which inculcates the worship of *Ganesa* or *Siva* or both, and would be quite sufficient in itself to cast a doubt on the genuineness and originality of his version. It is far from improbable that both *Vâsishtha* and *Baudhâyana* may have borrowed the sections referred to directly from an old recension of this work, as *Baudhâyana* has borrowed another chapter of his work from *Gautama*, while *Vâsishtha* in his turn has borrowed the same chapter from *Baudhâyana*<sup>19</sup>. It may be added in confirmation of this view, that as far as *Vâsishtha* is concerned, his work is the only *Smṛiti*, as far as I know, which contains a quotation from the '*Kâthaka*' (in XXIX, 18). The *Dharma-sûtras* of *Âpastamba* and *Gautama* have nowhere a large number of consecutive Sûtras in common with the *Vishnu-sûtra*, but it is curious to note that the rule, which the latter (X, 45) quotes as the opinion of 'some' (eke), that a non-Brahmanical finder of a treasure, who announces his find to the king, shall obtain one-sixth of the value, is found in no other law-book except in this, which states (III, 61) that a *Sûdra* shall 'divide a treasure-trove into twelve parts, two of which he may keep for himself. Of the metrical law-books, one, the *Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti*, has been shown by Professor Max Müller<sup>20</sup> to have borrowed the whole anatomical section (III, 84-104 including the simile of the soul which dwells in the heart like a lamp (III, 109, III, 201), from this work (XCVI, 43-96; XCVII, 9); and it has been pointed out by the same scholar, that the verse in which the author of the former work speaks of the *Âranyaka* and of the *Yoga-sâstra* as of his own works (III, 110) does not occur in the *Vishnu-sûtra*, and must have been added by the versificator, who brought the *Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti* into its present metrical form. Several other Slokas in *Yâgñavalkya*'s description of the human body (111, 99, 105-108), and nearly the whole section on *Yoga* (Y. III, 111-203, excepting those Slokas, the substance of which is found in this work and in the code of *Manu*, viz. 131-140, 177-182, 190, 198-201) may be traced to the same source, as may be also the omission of *Vishnu*'s enumeration of the 'six limbs' (XCVI, 90) in the *Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti*, and probably all the minor points on which it differs from this work. Generally speaking, those passages which have been justly noticed as marking the comparatively late period in

<sup>18</sup> *Vishnu* LVI, 15, 16, the best MSS. read but the Calc. ed. and one London MS. have like *Vâsishtha*. Of *Vishnu* LXXXVII the latter has an abridged version, which contains the faulty readings ('the skin of a black antelope,' Comm.) and (as an epithet of the earth = *Vishnu* LXXXVII, 9).

<sup>19</sup> See Bühler, Introduction to *Gautama*, pp. l-liv.

<sup>20</sup> *Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 331.

which that law-book must have been composed<sup>21</sup> - such as the allusions to the astrology and astronomy of the Greeks (Y. I, 80, 295), which render it necessary to refer the metrical redaction of the Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti to a later time than the second century A. D.; the whole passage on the worship of Ganesa and of the planets (I, 270-307), in which, moreover, a heterodox sect is mentioned, that has been identified with the Buddhists; the philosophical doctrines propounded in I, 349, 350; the injunctions regarding the foundation and endowment of monasteries (II, 185 seq.) - all these passages have no parallel in this work, while it is not overstating the case to say that nearly all the other subjects mentioned in the Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti are treated in a similar way, and very often in the same terms, in the Vishnu-sûtra as well. Some of those rules, in which the posteriority of the Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti to other law-books exhibits itself, do occur in the Vishnu-sûtra, but without the same marks of modern age. Thus the former has two Slokas concerning the punishment of forgery (II, 240, 241), in which coined money is referred to by the term *nânaka*; the Vishnu-sûtra has the identical rule (V, 122, 123; cf. V, 9). but the word *nânaka* does not occur in it. Yâgñavalkya, in speaking of the number of wives which a member of the three higher castes may marry (I, 57), advocates the Puritan view, that no Sûdra wife must be among these; this work has analogous rules (XXIV, 1-4), in which, however, such marriages are expressly allowed. The comparative priority of all those Sûtras of Vishnu, to which similar Slokas of Yâgñavalkya correspond, appears probable on general grounds, which are furnished by the course of development in this as in other branches of Indian literature; and to this it may be added, as far as the civil and criminal laws are concerned, that the former enumerates them quite promiscuously, just like the other Dharma-sûtras, with which he agrees besides in separating the law of inheritance from the body of the laws, whereas Yâgñavalkya enumerates all the laws in the order of the eighteen 'titles of law' of Manu and the more recent law-books, though he does not mention the titles of law by name.

However much the Vishnu-sûtra may have in common with the Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti, there is no other law-book with which it agrees so closely as with the code of Manu. This fact may be established by a mere glance at the references in the foot-notes to this translation, in which Manu makes his appearance far more frequently and constantly than any other author, and the case becomes the stronger, the more the nature of these analogies is inquired into. Of Slokas alone Vishnu has upwards of 160 in common with Manu, and in a far greater number of cases still his Sûtras agree nearly word for word with the corresponding rules of Manu. The latter also, though he concurs in a very great number of points with the other law authors as well, agrees with none of them so thoroughly as with Vishnu. All the Smritis of Âpastamba, Baudhâyana, Vâsishtha, Yâgñavalkya, and Nârada contain, according to an approximate calculation, no more than about 130 Slokas, that are found in the code of Manu as well. The latter author and Vishnu differ of course on a great many minor points, and an exhaustive discussion of this subject would fill a treatise; I must therefore confine myself to notice some of those differences, which are particularly important for deciding the relative priority of the one work before the other. In a number of Slokas Manu's readings are decidedly older and better than Vishnu's. Thus the latter (XXX, 7) compares the three 'Atigurus' to the 'three gods,' i.e. to the post-Vedic Trimûrti of 'Brahman, Vishnu, and Siva,' as the commentator expressly states, whereas Manu in an analogous Sloka (II, 230) refers to the 'three orders' instead. At the end of the section on inheritance (XVIII, 44) Vishnu mentions

---

<sup>21</sup> See Stenzler, in the Preface to his edition of Yâgñavalkya; Jacobi, on Indian Chronology, in the Journal of the German Oriental Society, XXX, 305 seq., &c. Vishnu's rules (III, 82) concerning the wording &c. of royal grants, which agree with the rules of Yâgñavalkya and other authors, must be allowed a considerable antiquity, as the very oldest grants found in South India conform to those rules. See Burnell, South Indian Palæography, 2nd ed., p. 95.]

among other indivisible objects 'a book,' *pustakam*; Manu (IX, 219) has the same Sloka, but for *pustakam* he reads *prakakshate*. Now *pustaka* is a modern word<sup>22</sup>, and Varâhamihira, who lived in the sixth century A. D., appears to be the first author, with a known date, by whom it is used. It occurs again, *Vishnu-sûtra* XXIII, 56 (*prokshanena ka pustakam*), and here also Manu (V, 122) has a different reading (*punahpâkena mrinmayam*). The only difference between *Vishnu-sûtra* XXII, 93 and Manu V, 110 consists in the use of singular forms (*te, srinu*) in the former work, and of plural forms (*vah, srinuta*) in the latter. Now there are a great many other *Smritis* besides the *Manu-smṛiti*, such as e. g. the *Yâgñavalkya* and *Parâsara Smritis*, in which the fiction is kept up, that the laws contained in them are promulgated to an assembly of *Rishis*; but there are very few *Smritis* of the least notoriety or importance besides the *Vishnu-sûtra*, in which they are proclaimed to a single person. Other instances in which Manu's readings appear preferable to *Vishnu's* may be found, LI, 60 (*pretya keha ka nishkritim*) = Manu V, 38 (*pretya ganmani ganmani*); LI, 64 (*iti kathañkana*) = M. V, 41 (*ity abravînmanuh*); LI, 76 (*tasya*) = M.V, 53 (*tayoh*); LIV, 27 (*brâhmanyât*) = M. XI, 193 (*brahmanâ*); LVII, 11 (*purastâd anukoditâm*) = M. IV, 248; *Vâsishtha* XIV, 16; *Âpastamba* I, 6, 19, 14 (*purastâd aprakoditâm*); LXVII, 45 (*sâyamprâtas tvatithaye*) = M. III, 99 (*samprâptâya tvatithaye*), &c. But these instances do not prove much, as all the passages in question may have been tampered with by the *Vishnuitic* editor, and as in sonic other cases the version of *Vishnu* seems preferable. Thus 'practised by the virtuous' (*sâdhubhiska nishevitam*, LXXI, 90) is a very common epithet of 'âkâra,' and reads better than Manu's *nibaddham sveshu karmasu* (IV, 155); and *krikkhrâtikrikkhram* (LIV, 30) seems preferable to *Baudhâyana's* and Manu's *krikkhrâtikrikkhrau* (XI, 209). What is more important, the *Vishnu-sûtra* does not only contain a number of verses in the ancient *Trishtubh* metre, whereas Manu has none, but it shows those identical three *Trishtubhs* of *Vâsishtha* and *Yâska*, which Dr. Bühler has proved to have been converted into *Anushtubh* Slokas by Manu (II, 114, 115, 144)<sup>23</sup> and Manu seems to have taken the substance of his three Slokas from this work more immediately, because both he (II, 144) and *Vishnu*, (XXX, 47) have the reading *âvrinoti* for *âtrinatti*, which truly Vedic form is employed both by *Vâsishtha* and *Yâska*. The relative antiquity of *Vishnu's* prose rules, as compared to the numerous corresponding Slokas of Manu, may be proved by arguments precisely similar to those which I have adduced above in speaking of the *Yâgñavalkya-smṛiti*. As regards those points in the code of Manu, which are usually considered as marks of the comparatively late date of its composition, it will suffice to mention, that the *Vishnu-sûtra* nowhere refers to South Indian nations such as the *Dravidas* and *Andhras*, or to the *Yavanas*; that it shows no distinct traces of an acquaintance with the tenets of any other school of philosophy except the *Yoga* and *Sânkhya* systems; that it does not mention female ascetics disparagingly, and in particular does not contain Manu's rule (VIII, 363) regarding the comparatively light punishment to be inflicted for violation of (*Buddhist* and other) female ascetics; and that it does not inveigh (see XV, 3), like Manu (IX, 64-68), against the custom of *Niyoga* or appointment of a widow to raise offspring to her deceased husband. It is true, on the other hand, that in many cases *Vishnu's* rules have a less archaic character than the corresponding precepts of Manu, not only in the Slokas, but in the *Sûtra* part as well. Thus written documents and ordeals are barely mentioned in the code (if Manu (VIII, 114, 115, 168; IX, 232); *Vishnu* on the other hand, besides referring in divers places to royal grants and edicts, to written receipts and other private documents, and to books, devotes to writings (*lekhya*) an entire chapter, in which he makes mention of the caste of *Kâyasthas*, 'scribes,' and he lays down elaborate rules for the performance of five species of ordeals, to which recourse should be had, according to him, in all suits of some

<sup>22</sup> See Max Müller, *Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 512.

<sup>23</sup> Introduction to *Bombay Digest*, I, p, xxviii seq.

importance. But in nearly all such cases the antiquity of Vishnu's rules is warranted to a certain extent by corresponding rules occurring in the Smritis of Yâgñavalkya and Nârada; and the evidence for the modifications and entire transformations, which the code of Manu must have undergone in a number of successive periods, is so abundant, that the archaic character of many of its rules cannot be considered to constitute a sufficient proof of the priority of the whole code before other codes which contain some rules of a comparatively modern character. To this it must be added that the Nârada-smṛiti, though taken as a whole it is decidedly posterior to the code of Manu<sup>24</sup>, is designated by tradition as an epitome from another and more bulky recension of the code of Manu than the one which we now possess; and if this statement may be credited, which is indeed rather doubtful, the very particular resemblance between both works in the law of evidence and in the rules regarding property (see LVIII) can only tend to corroborate the assumption that the Vishnu-sûtra and the Manu-smṛiti must have been closely connected from the first.

This view is capable of further confirmation still by a different set of arguments. The so-called code of Manu is universally assumed now to be an improved metrical edition of the ancient Dharma-sûtra of the (Maitrâyanîya-) Mânava, a school studying the Black Yagur-veda; and it has been shown above that the ancient stock of the Vishnu-sûtra, in which all the parts hitherto discussed may be included, represents in the main the Dharma-sûtra, of the Kârâyanîya-kathas, another school studying the Black Yagur-veda. Now these two schools do not only belong both to that Veda, but to the same branch of it, as may be seen from the Kârânavyûha, which work classes both the Kathas and Kârâyanîyas on the one hand, and the Mânava together with the six or five other sections of the Maitrâyanîyas on the other hand, as subdivisions of the Karaka Sakhâ of the Black Yagur-veda. What is more, there exists a thorough-going parallelism between the literature of those two schools, as far as it is known. To begin with their respective Samhitâs, it has been shown by L. Schröder<sup>25</sup> that the Maitrâyanî Samhitâ has more in common with the Kâthaka, the Samhitâ of the Kathas, than with any other Veda. As the Kathas are constantly named, in the Mahâbhâshya and other old works, by the side of the Kâlâpas, whereas the name of the Maitrâyanîyas does not occur in any Sanskrit work of uncontested antiquity, it has been suggested by the same scholar that the Maitrâyanîyas may be the Kâlâpas of old, and may not have assumed the former name till Buddhism began to prevail in India. However this may be, the principal Sûtra works of both schools stand in a similar relation to one another as their Samhitâs. Some of those Mantras, which have been stated above to be common to the Vishnu-sûtra and Kâthaka Grihya only, and to occur in no other Vedic work hitherto printed, have been traced in the Mânava Srauta-sûtra, in the chapter on Pinda-pitriyagña (I, 2 of the section on Prâksoma)<sup>26</sup>, and the conclusion is, that if the Srauta-sûtra of the Kâthaka school were still in existence, it would be found to exhibit a far greater number of analogies with the Srauta-sûtra of the Mânava. The Grihya-sûtra of this school<sup>27</sup> agrees with the Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra even more closely than the latter agrees with the Vishnu-sûtra, as both works have not only several entire chapters in common (the chapter on the Vaisvadeva sacrifice among others, which is found in the Vishnu-sûtra also), but concur everywhere in the arrangement of the subject-matter and in the

---

<sup>24</sup> See the evidence collected in the Preface to my Institutes of Nârada (London, 1876), to which the important fact may be added that Nârada uses the word dinâra, the Roman denarius. It occurs in a large fragment discovered by Dr. Bühler of a more bulky and apparently older recension of that work than the one which I have translated; and I may be allowed to mention, incidentally, that this discovery has caused me to abandon my design of publishing the Sanskrit text of the shorter recension, as it may be hoped that the whole text of the original work will soon come to light.]

<sup>25</sup> On the Maitrâyanî Samhitâ, journal of the German Oriental Society, XXXIII, 177 seq.

<sup>26</sup> Cod. Haug 53 of the Munich Library.

<sup>27</sup> Codd. Haug 55 and 56 of the Munich Library. For details, see my German paper above referred to.

choice of expressions and Mantras. The Brâhmana stage of Vedic literature is not represented by a separate work in either of the two schools, but a further argument in favour of their alleged historical connection may be derived from their respective geographical position. If it has been rightly conjectured above, that the original seats of the *Kathas* were in the north-west, whence they spread themselves over Hindostân, the *Maitrâyanîyas*, though now surviving nowhere except in some villages 'near the Sâtpuda mountain, which is included in the *Vindhya*<sup>28</sup> must have been anciently their neighbours, as the territory occupied by them extended 'from the *Mayûra* mountain into *Gugarât*,' and reached 'as far as the north-western country (*vâyavyadesa*)<sup>29</sup>. Considering all this evidence regarding the original connection between the *Kathas* and *Mânava*s, it may be said without exaggeration, that it would be far more surprising to find no traces of resemblance between their respective *Dharma-sûtras*, such as we possess them, than to find, as is actually the case, the contrary; and it may be argued, vice versâ, that the supposed connection of the two works with the Vedic schools of the *Kathas* and *Mânava*s<sup>30</sup>, respectively, is confirmed by the kinship existing between these two schools.

In turning now from the ancient parts of the *Vishnu-sûtra* to its more recent ingredients, I may again begin by quoting Professor Max Müller's remarks on this work, which contain the statement, that it is 'enlarged by modern additions written in *Slokas*'<sup>31</sup>. After him, Dr. Bühler pointed out<sup>32</sup> that the whole work appears to have been recast by an adherent of *Vishnu*, and that the final and introductory chapters in particular are shown by their very style to have been composed by another author than the body of the work. If the latter remark were in need of further confirmation, it might be urged that the description of *Vishnu* as 'the boar of the sacrifice' (*yagñavarâha*) in the first chapter is bodily taken from the *Harivamsa* (2226-2237), while most of the epithets given to *Vishnu* in I, 49-61 and *XCVIII*, 7-100 may be found in another section of the *Mahâbhârata*, the so-called *Vishnu-sahasranâma*. Along with the introductory and final chapters, all those passages generally are distinctly traceable to the activity of the *Vishnuitic* editor, in which *Vishnu* (*Purusha*, *Bhagavat*, *Vâsudeva*, &c.) is mentioned, or his dialogue with the goddess of the earth carried on, viz. I; V, 193; *XIX*, 24; *XX*, 16-21; *XXII*, 93; *XXIII*, 46; *XXIV*, 35; *XLVII*, 10; *XLIX*; *LXIV*, 28, 29; *LXV*; *LXVI*; *LXVII*, 2; *XC*, 3-5, 17-23; *XCVI*, 97, 98; *XCVII*, 7-21; *XCVIII-C*. The short invocation addressed to *Vishnu* in *LXVII*, 12 is proved to be ancient by its recurrence in the corresponding chapter of the *Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra*, and Chapter *LXV* contains genuine *Kâthaka* Mantras transferred to a *Vishnuitic* ceremony. Chapter *LXVI*, on the other hand, though it does not refer to *Vishnu* by name, seems to be connected with the same *Vishnuitic* rite, and becomes further suspected by the recurrence of several of its rules in the genuine Chapter *LXXIX*. The contents of Chapter *XCVII*, in which it is attempted to reconcile some of the main tenets of the *Sânkhya* system, as propounded in the *Sânkhya-kârikâ*, *Sânkhya-pravakanabhâshya*, and other works, with the *Vaishnava* creed and with the *Yoga*; the fact that the two *Slokas* in *XCVI* (97, 98) and part of the *Slokas* in *XCVII* (15-21) have their parallel in similar *Slokas* of the *Bhagavad-gîtâ* and of the *Bhâgavata-purâna*; the terms *Mahatpati*, *Kapila*, and *Sânkhya-kârya*, used as epithets of *Vishnu* (*XCVIII*, 26, 85, 86); and

<sup>28</sup> *Bhâu Dâjî*, journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, X, 40.

<sup>29</sup> See a passage from the *Mahârâna*, as quoted by Dr. Bühler, Introduction to *Âpastamba*, p. xxx seq. The same readings are found in a Munich MS. of the *Karanavyûha-vyâkhyâ* (cod. Haug 4.5). With the above somewhat unclear statement Manu's definition of the limits of *Brahmâvarta* (*II*, 17) may not unreasonably be compared.

<sup>30</sup> The code of Manu has very little in common with the *Mânava Grihya-sûtra*, both in the Mantras and otherwise. Both *Vishnu* and Manu agree with the *Kâthaka* in the use of the curious term *abhinimrukta* or *abhinirmukta*; but the same term is used by *Âpastamba*, *Vâsishtha*, and others.

<sup>31</sup> *Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 134.

<sup>32</sup> Introduction to *Bombay Digest*. p. xxii.



some other passages in the Vishnuitic chapters seem to favour the supposition that the editor may have been one of those members of the Vishnuitic sect of the Bhâgavatas, who were conspicuous for their leaning towards the Sâṅkhya and Yoga systems of philosophy. The arrangement of the Vishnu-sûtra in a hundred chapters is no doubt due to the same person, as the Commentary points out that the number of the epithets given to Vishnu in XCVIII is precisely equal to the number of chapters into which the laws promulgated by him are divided (II-XCVII); though the number ninety-six is received only by including the introductory and final invocations (XCVIII, 6, 101) among the epithets of Vishnu. It seems quite possible, that some chapters were inserted mainly in order to bring up the whole figure to the round number of a hundred chapters, and it is for this reason chiefly that the majority of the following additions, which show no Vishnuitic tendencies, may also be attributed to the Vishnuitic editor.

1. Most or all of the Slokas added at the end of Chapters XX (22-53) and XLIII (32-45) cannot be genuine; the former on account of their great extent and partial recurrence in the Bhagavad-gîtâ<sup>33</sup>, Mahâbhârata, and other works of general note, and because they refer to the self-immolation of widows and to Kâla, whom the commentator is probably right in identifying with Vishnu; the latter on account of their rather extravagant character and decidedly Purânic style, though the Gârûḍa-purâna, in its very long description of the hells, offers no strict parallel to the details given here. The verses in which the Brâhmanas and cows are celebrated (XIX, 22, 23; XXIII, 57-61) are also rather extravagant; however, some of them are Trishubhs, and the verses in XIX are closely connected with the preceding Sûtras. The two final Slokas in LXXXVI (19, 20) may also be suspected as to their genuineness, because they are wanting in the corresponding chapter of the Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra; and a number of other verses in divers places, because they have no parallel in the Smṛiti literature, or because they have been traced in comparatively modern works, such as the Bhagavad-gîtâ, the Pañkatantra, &c. 2. The week of the later Romans and Greeks, and of modern Europe (LXXVIII, 1-7), the self-immolation of widows (XXV, 14; cf. XX, 39), and the Buddhists and Pâsupatas (LXIII, 36) are not mentioned in any ancient Sanskrit work. Besides, the passages in question may be easily removed, especially the Sûtras referring to the seven days of the week, which form clearly a subsequent addition to the enumeration of the Nakshatras and Tithis immediately following (LXXVIII, 8-50), and the rule concerning the burning of widows (XXV, 14), which is in direct opposition to the law concerning the widow's right to inherit (XVII, 4) and to other precepts regarding widows. That the three terms kâshâyin, pravragita, malina in LXIII, 36 refer to members of religious orders seems clear, but it may be doubted whether malina denotes the Pâsupatas, and even whether kâshâyin (cf. pravragita XXXVI, 7) denotes the Buddhists, as dresses dyed with Kashâya are worn by Brahmanical sects also, and prescribed for students, and for ascetics likewise, by some of the Grihya- and Dharma-sûtras. Still the antiquity of the Sûtra in question can hardly be defended, because the acquaintance of the Vishnuitic editor with the Buddhistic system of faith is proved by two other Sûtras (XCVIII, 40, 41), and because the whole subject of good and evil omens is not treated in any other ancient Smṛiti. On the other hand, such terms as vedanindâ and nâstikatâ (XXXVII, 4, 31, &c.) recur in most Smṛitis, and can hardly be referred to the Buddhists in particular. 3. The Tîrthas enumerated in LXXXV, some of which are sacred to Vishnu and Siva, belong to all parts of India, and many of them are situated in the Dekhan, which was certainly not included within the limits of the 'Âryâvarta' of the ancient Dharma-sûtra (LXXXIV, 4). As no other Smṛiti contains a list of this kind, the whole chapter may be viewed as a later addition. 4. The ceremonies described in XC are not

<sup>33</sup> Besides the passages quoted in the notes, 50-53 nearly Bhag.-gîtâ II, 22-26.

mentioned in other Smritis, while some of them are decidedly Vishnuitic, or traceable in modern works; and as all the Sûtras in XC hang closely together, this entire chapter seems also to be spurious. 5. The repetitions in the list of articles forbidden to sell (LIV, 18-22); the addition of the two categories of atipâtakâni, 'crimes in the highest degree,' and prakîrntakam, 'miscellaneous crimes' (XXXIII, 3,5; XXXIV; XLII), to Manu's list of crimes; the frequent references to the Ganges river; and other such passages, which show a modern character, without being traceable in the Smritis of Yâgñavalkya and Nârada, may have been added by the Vishnuitic editor from modern Smritis, either for the sake of completeness, or in order to make up the required number of chapters. 6. All the passages hitherto mentioned are such as have no parallel in other ancient Smritis. But the Vishnuitic editor did evidently not confine himself to the introduction of new matter into the ancient Dharma-sûtra. That he did not refrain, occasionally, from altering the original text, has been conjectured above with regard to his readings of some of those Slokas, which are found in the code of Manu as well; and it can be proved quite clearly by comparing his version of the *Vrishotsarga* ceremony (LXXXVI) with the analogous chapter of the *Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra*. In one case (LI, 64; cf. XXIII, 50 = M. V, 131) he has replaced the words, which refer the authorship of the Sloka in question to Manu, by an unmeaning term. The superior antiquity of Manu's reading (V, 41) is vouched for by the recurrence of the same passage in the *Grihya-sûtra* of *Sânkhâyana* (II, 16, 1) and in the *Vâsishtha-smriti* (IV, 6), and the reference to Manu has no doubt been removed by the Vishnuitic editor, because it would have been out of place in a speech of Vishnu. References to sayings of Manu and other teachers and direct quotations from Vedic works are more or less common in all Dharma-sûtras, and their entire absence in this work is apparently due to their systematical removal by the editor. On the other hand, the lists of Vedic and other works to be studied or recited may have been enlarged in one or two cases by him or by another interpolator, namely, XXX, 37 (cf. V, 191), where the Atharva-veda is mentioned after the other Vedas by the name of 'Âtharvana' (not Atharvângirasas, as in the code of Manu and most other ancient works), and LXXXIII, 7, where *Vyâkarana*, 'Grammar,' i. e. according to the Commentary the grammars of Pânini and others, is mentioned as distinct from the *Vedângas*. The antiquity of the former passage might indeed be defended by the example of Âpastamba, who, though referring like this work to the 'three Vedas' both separately and collectively, mentions in another place the 'Âtharvana-veda'<sup>34</sup>. Besides the above works, and those referred to in LVI, the laws of Vishnu name no other work except the *Purânas*, *Itihâsas*, and *Dharmasâstras*. 7. As the Vishnuitic editor did not scruple to alter the import of a certain number of passages, the modernisation of the language of the whole work, which was probably as rich in archaic forms and curious old terms as the *Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra* and as the *Dharma-sûtra* of Âpastamba, may be likewise attributed to him. As it is, the *Vishnu-sûtra* agrees in style and expressions more closely with the Smritis of Manu and Yâgñavalkya than with any other work, and it is at least not inferior to the former work in the preservation of archaic forms. Thus the code of Manu has seven aorist forms<sup>35</sup>, while the *Vishnu-sûtra* contains six, not including those occurring in Vedic Mantras which are quoted by their *Prâtikas* only. Of new words and meanings of words the *Vishnu-sûtra* contains also a certain number; they have lately been communicated by me to Dr. von Böhlingk for, insertion in his new Dictionary.

All the points noticed render it necessary to assign a comparatively recent date to the Vishnuitic editor; and if the introduction of the week of the Greeks into the ancient Dharma-sûtra has been justly attributed to him, he cannot be placed earlier than the third or fourth

<sup>34</sup> See Bühler, Introduction to Âpastamba, p. xxiv.

<sup>35</sup> Whitney. Indische Grammatik, § 826.

century A. D.<sup>36</sup> The lower limit must be put before the eleventh century, in which the Vishnu-sûtra is quoted in the Mitâksharâ of Vigñânesvara, From that time downwards it is quoted in nearly every law digest, and a particularly large number of quotations occurs in Aparârka's Commentary, on Yâgñavalkya, which was composed in the twelfth century<sup>37</sup>. Nearly all those quotations, as far as they have been examined, are actually found in the Vishnu-sûtra; but the whole text is vouched for only by Nandapandita's Commentary, called Vaigayantî, which was composed in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. The subscriptions in the London MSS. of the Vaigayantî contain the statement, which is borne out by the Introduction, that it was composed by Nandapandita, the son of Râmapandita, Dharmâdhikârin, an inhabitant of Benares, at the instigation of the Mahârâga Kesavanâyaka, also called Tammâsanâyaka, the son of Kodapanâyaka; and a passage added at the end of the work states, more accurately, that 'Nandasarman (Nandapandita) wrote it at Kâsî (Benares) in the year 1679 of the era of Vikrâmbhâsvara (= A. D. 1622), by Command of Kesavanâyaka, his own king. These statements regarding the time and place of the composition of the Vaigayantî are corroborated by the fact that it refers in several cases to the opinions of Haradatta, who appears to have lived in the sixteenth century<sup>38</sup>, while Nandapandita is not among the numerous authors quoted in the Vîramitrodaya of Mitrâmisra, who lived in the beginning of the seventeenth century<sup>39</sup>, and who was consequently a contemporary of Nandapandita, if the above statement is correct; and that he attacks in a number of cases the views of the 'Eastern Commentators' (Prâkyas), and quotes a term from the dialect of Madhyadesa.

The subjoined translation is based upon the text handed down by Nandapandita nearly everywhere except in some of the Mantras, which have been rendered according to the better readings preserved in the Kâthaka Grihya-sûtra. The two Calcutta editions of the Vishnu-sûtra, the second of which is a mere reprint of the first, will be found to agree in the main with the text here translated. They are doubtless based upon the Vaigayantî, as they contain several passages in which portions of Nandapandita's Commentary have crept into the text of the Sûtras. But the MS. used for the first Calcutta edition must have been a very faulty one, as both Calcutta editions, besides differing from the best MSS. of the Vaigayantî on a very great number of minor points, entirely omit the greater part of Chapter LXXXI (3-22), the genuineness of which is proved by analogous passages in the other Smritis<sup>40</sup>. An excellent copy of the Vaigayantî in possession of Dr. Bühler has, together with three London MSS. of that work and one London MS. containing the text only, enabled me to establish quite positively nearly in every case the readings sanctioned by Nandapandita. I had hoped to publish a new edition of the text prepared from those MSS., and long ready for the press, before publishing my English version. This expectation has not been fulfilled, but it is hoped that in the mean time this attempt at a translation will be welcome to the students of Indian antiquity, and will facilitate the understanding of the text printed in Givânanda Vidyâsâgara's cheap edition, which is probably in the hands of most Sanskrit scholars. The precise nature of the relation in which the text of my forthcoming edition stands to the Calcutta editions may be gathered from the large specimens of the text as given in the best MSS., that have been

<sup>36</sup> See Jacobi, journal of the German Oriental Society. XXX, 306. The first author with a known date who shows an acquaintance with the work of the Greeks, is Varâhamihira (sixth century A. D.).

<sup>37</sup> See Bühler, Kasmîr Report. p. 52. The MSS. used are from the Dekhan College, Puna.

<sup>38</sup> Bühler, Introduction to Âpastamba, p. xliii.

<sup>39</sup> Bühler loc. cit.

<sup>40</sup> The first edition of the 'Vaishnava Dharmasâstra' was published in Bengali type by Bhavânîkârana; the second, in Devanâgarî type, is contained in Givânanda Vidyâsâgara's Dharmashâstrasangraha (1816).

edited by Dr. Bühler in the Bombay Digest, and by myself in two papers published in the Transactions of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Science.

Nandapandita has composed, besides the Vaigayantî, a treatise on the law of adoption, called Dattaka-mîmâmsâ<sup>41</sup>, a commentary on the code of Parâsara, a work called Vidvanmanoharâ-smritisindhu, one called Srâddhakalpa-latâ, and commentaries on the Mitâksharâ and on Adityâkârya's Âsaukanirnaya. All these works belong to the province of Hindu law, and both his fertility as a writer in that branch of Indian science, and the reputation enjoyed by some of his works even nowadays, must raise a strong presumption in favour of his knowledge of the subject. The general trustworthiness of his Commentary on the Vishnu-sûtra is further confirmed by the frequent references which it contains to the opinions of earlier commentators of that work; and the wide extent of his reading, though he often makes an unnecessary display of it, has been eminently serviceable to him in tracing the connection of certain chapters and Mantras with the Kâthaka literature<sup>42</sup>. On the other hand, his very learning, combined with a strict adherence to the well-known theory of Hindu commentators regarding the absolute identity between the teaching of all Smritis, has frequently misled him into a too extensive method of interpretation. Even in commenting the Slokas he assigns in many cases an important hidden meaning to such particles as *ka*, *vâ*, *tathâ*, and others, and to unpretending epithets and the like, which have clearly been added for metrical reasons only<sup>43</sup>. This practice, besides being contrary to common sense, is nowhere countenanced by the authority of Kullûka, in his remarks on the numerous identical Slokas found in the code of Manu. With the Sûtras generally speaking the case is different: many of them would be nearly or quite unintelligible without the explanatory remarks added, in brackets from Nandapandita's Commentary<sup>44</sup>, and in a number of those cases even, where his method jars upon a European mind, the clauses supplied by him are probably correct<sup>45</sup>. The same may be said of his interpretations of the epithets of Vishnu, excepting those which are based on utterly fanciful etymologies<sup>46</sup>, as the style of the introductory and final chapters is as artificial, though in another way, as the Sûtra style. Though, however, in works composed in the latter style, every *ka*, *vâ*, or *iti*, &c., which is not absolutely required by the sense, was probably intended by their authors to convey a special meaning<sup>47</sup>, it is a question of evidence in every single case, whether those meanings which Nandapandita assigns to these and other such particles and expletive words are the correct ones. In several cases of this or of a similar

---

<sup>41</sup> This work has been published repeatedly at Calcutta and Madras, and translated into English by Sutherland (1821), which translation has been reprinted in Stokes' Hindu Law Books. The rest of the above list is made up from an enumeration of Nandapandita's Tikâs at the end of Dr. Bühler's copy of the Vaigayantî, from an occasional remark in the latter work itself (XV, 9), and from professor Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS.

<sup>42</sup> See the notes on LXV, 2 seq.; LXXIII, 5-9; LXXXVI, 13. In his Commentary on LXVII also Nandapandita states expressly that the description of the Vaisvadeva is according to the rites of the *Katha-sâkhâ*.

<sup>43</sup> For instances, see the notes on XX, 45; LXIV, 40.

<sup>44</sup> See e. g. Chapter V passim.

<sup>45</sup> Thus nearly all the 'intentionally's' and 'unintentionally's,' &c., as supplied in the section on penances might seem superfluous, or even wrong; but as in several places involuntary crimes are expressly distinguished from those intentionally committed (see e. g. XXVIII, 48, 51; XXXVIII, 7), and as in other cases a clause of this kind must needs be supplied (see XXXIX, 2; LII, 3; LIII, 5, &c.), Nandapandita is probably right in supplying it from other Smritis in most remaining cases as well. This method has occasionally carried him too far, when his explanations have not been given in the text.

<sup>46</sup> See I, 51, 55; XCVIII, 40, 41, 46, &c.

<sup>47</sup> For instances of this in the Dharma-sûtras of Âpastamba and Gautama. see Bühler, Âpast. I, 2, 7, 24; 8, 5; Gaut. V, 5, 14, 17; IX, 44; XIV, 45; XIX, 13-15, 20; XXI, 9, &c.; and see also Dr. Bühler's remarks on Gñâpaka-sûtras, Âpast. I, 3, II, 7; Gaut. I, 31, notes.

kind he is palpably wrong<sup>48</sup>, and in many others the interpretations proposed by him are at least improbable, because the authoritative passages he quotes in support of them are taken from modern works, which cannot have been known to the author of the *Vishnu-sûtra*. Interpretations of this class have, therefore, been given in the notes only; and they have been omitted altogether in a number of cases where they appeared quite frivolous, or became too numerous, or could not be deciphered completely, owing to clerical mistakes in the MSS. But though it is impossible to agree with some of his general principles of interpretation, or with his application of them, Nandapandita's interpretations of difficult terms and *Sûtras* are invaluable, and I have never deviated from them in my translation without strong reasons to the contrary, which have in most cases been stated in the notes<sup>49[3]</sup>. Besides the extracts given in the notes, a few other passages from the Commentary and several other additions will be given in p. 312; and I must apologize to my readers for having to note along with the Addenda a number of Corrigenda, which will be found in the same page. In compiling the Index of Sanskrit words occurring in this work, which it has been thought necessary to add to the General Index, I have not aimed at completeness except as regards of deities and of penances. My forthcoming edition of the Sanskrit text will be accompanied by a full Index of words.

In conclusion I have to express my thanks in the most cordial manner to Dr. Bühler, who has constantly assisted me with his advice in the preparing of this translation, and has kindly lent me his excellent copy of the *Vaigayantî*; and to Dr. von Böhlingk and Professor Max Müller, who have favoured me with valuable hints on divers points connected with this work. My acknowledgments are due, in the second place, to K. M. Chatfield, Esq., Director of Public Instruction, Bombay, to Dr. von Halm, Chief Librarian of the Royal Library, Munich, to Professor R. Lepsius, Chief Librarian of the Royal Library, of Berlin, and to Dr. R. Rost, Chief Librarian of the India office Library, London, for the valuable aid received from these gentlemen and the great liberality, with which they have placed Sanskrit MSS. under their care at my disposal.

---

<sup>48</sup> See V, 117; VII, 7; XXVII, 10; LI, 26; LXXI, 88; LXXIII, 9; LXXIV, 1, 2, 7, &c.

<sup>49</sup> See e. g. XVII, 22; XVIII, 44; XXIV, 40; XXVIII, 5, II; LV, 20; LIX, 27, 29; LXIII, 36; LXIV, 18; LXVII, 6-8; XCII, 4; XCVII, 7.

## Vishnu and the Goddess of the Earth

### I.

1. The night of Brahman being over, and the God sprung from the lotus (Brahman) having woke from his slumber, Vishnu purposing to create living beings, and perceiving the earth covered with water.

2. Assumed the shape of a boar, delighting to sport in water, as at the beginning of each former Kalpa, and raised up the earth (from the water).

3. His feet were the Vedas; his tusks the sacrificial stakes; in his teeth were the offerings; his mouth was the pyre; his tongue was the fire; his hair was the sacrificial grass; the sacred texts were his head; and he was (endowed with the miraculous power of) a great ascetic.

4. His eyes were day and night; he was of superhuman nature; his ears were the two bundles of Kusa grass (for the *Ishtis*, or smaller sacrifices, and for the animal offerings); his ear-rings were the ends of those bundles of Kusa grass (used for wiping the ladle and other sacrificial implements); his nose (the vessel containing) the clarified butter; his snout was the ladle of oblations; his voice was similar in sound to the chanting of the *Sâma-veda*; and he was of huge size.

5. He was full of piety and veracity; beautiful; his strides and his strength were immense (like those of Vishnu); his large nostrils were penances; his knees the victim; and his figure colossal.

6. His entrails were the (three) chanters of the *Sama-veda*<sup>50</sup>, his member was the burnt-oblation; his scrotum was the sacrificial seeds and grains; his mind was the altar (in the hut for the wives and domestic uses of the sacrificer); the hindparts (of Vishnu) in his transformation were the Mantras; his blood was the Soma juice.

7. His shoulders were the (great) altar; his smell was that of the (sacrificial cake and other) oblations; his speed was the oblations to the gods and to the manes and other oblations; his body was the hut for the wives and domestic uses of the sacrificer; he was majestic; and instructed with the initiatory ceremonies for manifold sacrifices (lasting one, or two, three, or twelve years, and others).

8. His heart was the sacrificial fee; he was possessed of the (sacrificial and other) great Mantras employed in order to effect the union of the mind with the Supreme; he was of enormous size (like the long sacrifices lasting more than one day); his lovely, lips were the beginnings of the two hymns recited at the beginning of the animal sacrifice; his ornaments were the whirlpool of the milk poured into the heated vessel (at the *Pravargya* ceremony introductory to the Soma-sacrifice).

9. All sorts of sacred texts (the *Gâyatrî* and others) were his path in marching; the mysterious Upanishads (the *Vedânta*) were his couch; he was accompanied by his consort *Khâyâ* (*Lakshmî*); he was in size like the *Manisringa* mountain.

---

<sup>50</sup> This is because the vital breaths, by which the sound of the voice is effected, pass through them, it having been said (in 4) that the sound of his voice was like the chanting of the *Sâma-veda*. (Nand.)

10. The lord, the creator, the great Yogin, plunging into the one ocean from love of the world,

11. Raised up, with the edge of his tusks, the earth bounded by the sea together with its mountains, forests, and groves, which was immersed in the water of (the seven oceans now become) one ocean, and created the universe anew.

12. Thus the whole earth, after having sunk into (the lower region called) Rasâtala, was in the first place raised in the boar-incarnation by Vishnu, who took compassion upon the living beings.

13, 14. Then, after having raised the earth, the destroyer of Madhu placed and fixed it upon its own (former) seat (upon the oceans) and distributed the waters upon it according to their own (former) station, conducting the floods of the oceans into the oceans, the water of the rivers into the rivers, the water of the tanks into the tanks, and the water of the lakes into the lakes.

15. He created the seven (lower regions called) Pâtâlas<sup>51</sup> and the seven worlds, the seven Dvîpas and the seven oceans, and fixed their several limits<sup>52</sup>.

16. (He created) the rulers of the (seven) Dvîpas and the (eight) guardians of the world (Indra and the rest<sup>53</sup>), the rivers, mountains, and trees, the seven Rishis, who know (and practise) the law, the Vedas together with their Angas, the Suras, and the Asuras.

17. (He created) Pisâkas (ogres), Urugas (serpents), Gandharvas (celestial singers), Yakshas (keepers of Kubera's treasures), Rakshasas (goblins), and men, cattle, birds, deer and other animals, (in short) all the four kinds of living beings, and clouds, rainbows, lightnings, and other celestial phenomena or bodies (such as the planets and the asterisms), and all kinds of sacrifices.

18. Bhagavat, after having thus created, in the shape of a boar, this world together with all animate and inanimate things in it, went away into a place hidden from the world.

19. Ganârdana, the chief of the gods, having become invisible, the goddess of the earth began to consider, 'How shall I be able to sustain myself (henceforth)?'

20. 'I will go to Kasyapa to ask: he will tell me the truth. The great Muni has my welfare under constant consideration.'

---

<sup>51</sup> The seven Pâtâlas are, Atala, Vitala, Sutala, Mahâtala, Rasâtala, Talâtala, and Pâtâla; the seven worlds are, Bhûr-loka, Bhuvar-loka, Svar-loka, Mahar-loka, Ganar-loka, Tapar-loka, and Satya-loka; the seven Dvîpas or divisions of the terrestrial world, are, Gambu, Plaksha, Sâlmali, Kusa, Krauñka, Sâka, and Pushkara; each Dvipa is encircled by one of the seven oceans, viz. the seas of Lavana (salt-water), Ikshu (syrup), Sarpîh (butter), Dadhi (sour milk), Dugdha (milk), Svâdhu (treacle), and Udaka (water), (Nand.) The enumerations contained in the *Vishnu-purâna* and other works differ on two or three points only from that given by Nand.

<sup>52</sup> Besides the interpretation followed in the text, Nand proposes a second explanation of the term 'sthânâni,' as denoting Bhâratavarsha (India) and the other eight plains situated between the principal mountains.

<sup>53</sup> The eight 'guardians of the world' (Lokapâlas) are, Indra, Agni, Yama, Sûrya, Varuna, Pavana, Kubera, and Soma (M.V., 96). The seven *Rishis*, according to the *Satapatha-brâhmana*, are, Gotama, Bharadvâga, Visvâmitra, Gamadagni, Vasishtha, Kasyapa, and Atri. The six *Vedângas* are, Sikshâ (pronunciation), *Khandas* (metre), *Vyâkarana* (grammar), *Nirukta* (etymology), *Kalpa* (ceremonial), and *Gyotisha* (astronomy). See Max Müller, *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 108, &c.

21. Having thus decided upon her course, the goddess, assuming the shape of a woman, went to see Kasyapa, and Kasyapa saw her.

22. Her eyes were similar, to the leaves of the blue lotus (of which the bow of Kâma, the god of love, is made); her face was radiant like the moon in the autumn season; her locks were as dark as a swarm of black bees; she was radiant; her lip was (red) like the Bandhugîva flower; and she was lovely to behold.

23. Her eyebrows were fine; her teeth exceedingly small; her nose handsome; her brows bent; her neck shaped like a shell; her thighs were constantly touching each other; and they were fleshy thighs, which adorned her loins.

24. Her breasts were shining white, firm<sup>54</sup>, plump, very close to each other, (decorated with continuous strings of pearls) like the projections on the forehead of Indra's elephant, and radiant like the gold (of the two golden jars used at the consecration of a king).

25. Her arms were as delicate as lotus fibres; her hands were similar to young shoots; her thighs were resplendent like golden pillars; and her knees were hidden (under the flesh), and closely touching each other.

26. Her legs were smooth and exquisitely proportioned; her feet exceedingly graceful; her loins fleshy; and her waist like that of a lion's cub.

27. Her reddish nails shone (like rubies); her beauty was the delight of every looker-on; and with her glances she filled at every step all the quarters of the sky as it were with lotus-flowers.

28. Radiant with divine lustre, she illuminated all the quarters of the sky with it; her clothing was most exquisite and perfectly white; and she was decorated with the most precious gems.

29. With her steps she covered the earth as it were with lotuses; she was endowed with beauty and youthful charms; and made her approach with modest bearing.

30. Having seen her come near, Kasyapa saluted her reverentially, and said, 'O handsome lady, O earth, radiant with divine lustre, I am acquainted with thy thoughts.'

31. 'Go to visit Ganârdana, O large-eyed lady; he will tell thee accurately, how thou shalt henceforth sustain thyself.'

32. For thy sake, O (goddess), whose face is lovely and whose limbs are beautiful, I have found out, by profound meditation, that his residence is in the Kshîroda (milk-ocean).'

33. The goddess of the earth answered, 'Yes, (I shall do as you bid me), saluted Kasyapa reverentially, and proceeded to the Kshîroda sea, in order to see Kesava (Vishnu).'

34. She beheld (then) the ocean, from which the Amrita arose. It was lovely, like the rays of the moon, and agitated by hundreds of waves produced by stormy blasts of wind.

---

<sup>54</sup> Or 'equal in size,' according to the second of the two explanations which Nand. proposes of the term 'samau.'



35. (With its waves) towering like a hundred Himâlayas it seemed another terrestrial globe, calling near as it were the earth with its hands; the rolling waves.

36. With those hands it was as it were constantly producing the radiancy of the moon; and every stain of guilt was removed from it by Hari's (Vishnu's) residence within its limits.

37. Because (it was entirely free from sin) therefore it was possessed of a pure and shining frame; its colour was white; it was inaccessible to birds and its seat was in the lower regions.

38. It was rich in blue and tawny gems (sapphires, coral, and others), and looking therefore as if the atmosphere had descended upon the earth, and as if a number of forests adorned with a multitude of fruits had descended upon its surface.

39. Its size was immense, like that of the skin of (Vishnu's) serpent Sesha. After having seen the milk-ocean, the goddess of the earth beheld the dwelling of Kesava (Vishnu) which was in it:

40. (His dwelling), the size of which cannot be expressed in words, and, the sublimity of which is also beyond the power of utterance. In it she saw the destroyer of Madhu seated upon Sesha.

41. The lotus of his face was hardly visible on account of the lustre of the gems decorating the neck of the snake Sesha; he was shining like a hundred moons; and his splendour was equal to the rays of a myriad of suns.

42. He was clad in a yellow robe (radiant like gold); imperturbable; decorated with all kinds of gems; and shining with the lustre of a diadem resembling the sun in colour, and with (splendid) ear-rings.

43. Lakshmî was stroking his feet with her soft palms; and his attributes (the shell, the discus, the mace, and the lotus-flower) wearing bodies were attending upon him on all sides.

44. Having espied the lotus-eyed slayer of Madhu, she knelt down upon the ground and addressed him as follows:

45. 'When formerly I was sunk into the region of Rasâtala, I was raised by thee, O God, and restored to my ancient seat, O Vishnu, thanks to thy benevolence towards living beings.

46. 'Being there, how am I to maintain myself upon it, O lord of the gods?' Having been thus addressed by the goddess, the god enunciated the following answer:

47. 'Those who practise the duties ordained for each caste and for each order, and who act up strictly to the holy law, will sustain thee, O earth; to them is thy care committed.'

48. Having received this answer, the goddess of the earth said to the chief of the gods, 'Communicate to me the eternal laws of the castes and of the orders.

49. I desire to learn them from thee; for thou art my chief stay. Adoration be to thee, O brilliant<sup>55</sup> chief of the gods, who annihilatest the power of the (Daityas and other) enemies of the gods.

50. 'O Nârâyana (son of Nara), O Gagannâtha (sovereign of the world); thou holdest the shell, the discus, and the mace (in thy hands); thou hast a lotus (Brahman) springing from thy navel; thou art the lord of the senses; thou art Most powerful and endowed with conquering strength.

51. 'Thou art beyond the cognisance of the senses; thy end is most difficult to know; thou art brilliant; thou holdest the bow Sârṅga; thou art the boar<sup>56</sup>; thou art terrible; thou art Govinda<sup>57</sup> (the herdsman); thou art of old; thou art Purushottama (the spirit supreme).

52. 'Thy hair is golden; thy eyes are everywhere; thy body is the sacrifice; thou art free from stain; thou art the "field." (the corporeal frame); thou art the principle of life; thou art the ruler of the world; thou art lying on the bed of the ocean.

53. 'Thou art Mantra (prayer); thou knowest the Mantras; thou surpassest all conception; thy frame is composed of the Vedas and Vedāṅgas; the creation and destruction of this whole world is effected through thee.

54. 'Thou knowest right and wrong; thy body is law; law springs from thee; desires are gratified by thee: thy powers are everywhere; thou art (imperishable like) Amrita (ambrosia); thou art heaven; thou art the destroyer of Madhu and Kaitasa.

55. 'Thou causest the increase of the great thou art inscrutable; thou art all thou givest shelter to all; thou art the chief one thou art free from sin; thou art Gîmûta; thou art inexhaustible; thou art the creator.<sup>58</sup>

56. 'Thou increasest the welfare (of the world), the waters spring from thee; thou art the seat of intelligence; action is not found in thee; thou presidest over seven chief things<sup>59</sup> thou art the teacher of religious rites; thou art of old; thou art Purushottama.

---

<sup>55</sup> This is Nand.'s interpretation of the term 'deva,' but it may also be taken in its usual acceptance of 'god.'

<sup>56</sup> This is the third of the three interpretations of the term varâha, which Nand. proposes. According to the first, it would mean 'one who kills his worst or most prominent foes;' according to the second, 'one who gratifies his own desires.' But these two interpretations are based upon a fanciful derivation of varâha from vara and â-han. Of many others among the epithets Nand. proposes equally fanciful etymologies, which I shall pass over unnoticed.

<sup>57</sup> This epithet, which literally means 'he who finds or wins cows,' is usually referred to Vishnu's recovering the 'cow,' i.e. the earth, when it was lost in the waters: see Mahâbh. XII, 13228, which verse is quoted both by Nand. and by Saṅkara in his Commentary on the Vishnu-sahasranâma. It originally refers, no doubt, to Vishnu or Krishna as the pastoral god.

<sup>58</sup> 'The great (*brîhat*) means time, space, and the like. . . . He is called "all" because he is capable of assuming any shape.' (Nand.) The sense of the term 'gîmûta,' as an epithet of divine beings, is uncertain. According to Nand., it would mean 'he who sprinkles living beings;' but this interpretation is based upon a fanciful derivation, from gîva and mûtrayati.

<sup>59</sup> This refers either to the seven divisions of a Sâman; or to the seven species, of which each of the three kinds of sacrifices, domestic offerings, burnt-offerings, and Soma-sacrifices, consists (cf. Gaut. VIII, 18-20); or to the seven worlds (see 15, note), Bhûr and the rest. (Nand.)

57, 'Thou art not to be shaken; thou art undecaying; thou art the producer of the atoms; thou art kind to faithful attendants; thou art the purifier (of sinners); thou art the protector of all the gods thou art the protector of the pious.

58. 'Thou art also the protector of those who know the Veda, O Purushottama. I have come, O Gagannâtha, to the immovable Vâkaspati (the lord of holy speech), the lord;

59. 'To him, who is very pious; invincible; Vasushena (who has treasures for his armies); who bestows largesses upon his followers, who is endowed with the power of intense devotion; who is the germ of the ether; from whom the rays (of the sun and moon) proceed;

60. 'To Vâsudeva; the great soul of the universe; whose eyes are like lotuses; who is eternal; the preceptor of the Suras and of the Asuras; brilliant; omnipresent; the great lord of all creatures;

61. 'Who has one body and four faces; who is the producer of (the five grosser elements, ether, air, fire, water, and earth), the producers of the world. Teach me concisely, O Bhagavat, the eternal laws ordained for the aggregate of the four castes,

62. 'Together with the customs to be observed by each order and with the secret ordinances.' The chief of the gods, thus addressed by the goddess of the earth, replied to her as follows:<sup>60</sup>

63. Learn from me, in a concise form, O radiant goddess of the earth, the eternal laws for the aggregate of the four castes, together with the customs to be observed by each order, and with the secret ordinances,

64. 'Which will affect the final liberation of the virtuous persons, who will support thee. Be seated upon this splendid golden seat, O handsome-thighed goddess.

65. 'Seated at ease, listen to me proclaiming the sacred laws.' The goddess of the earth, thereupon, seated at ease, listened to the sacred precepts as, they came from the mouth of Vishnu.

---

<sup>60</sup> According to Nand., the term rahasya, 'secret ordinances or doctrines,' has to be referred either to the laws regarding the occupations lawful for each caste in times of distress see II, 15), or to the penances (XLVI seq.) The latter interpretation seems to be the more plausible one, with the limitation, however, that rahasya is only used to denote the penances for secret faults, which are termed rahasya in LV, 1.