

## BHṚṄĀRA IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE

1. The first meaning given in the *Larger Petrograd Dictionary* for the Sanskrit noun *bhṛṅgāra*—m. is “a golden water jug”. But in the “Corrections and Addenda to the Whole Work”, at the end of volume VII, it is stated that the attribute “‘golden’ has to be *deleted* inspite of the lexicographers”, and this correction is duly taken into account in the smaller version as well as in the dictionaries dependant on it.<sup>1</sup>

In the original entry itself Böhtlingk and Roth add, however, the further information that “according to the *Yuktikalpataru* in the *Śabdakalpādruma*” another, or rather a more special, meaning of *bhṛṅgāra*—m. is “a vase used at the inauguration of a king made of 8 different substances and having 8 different forms”. It is understandable that the reference to the *Yuktika*,<sup>2</sup> etc., is omitted by Monier-Williams e.g.; but the information retained, viz. that this latter meaning is listed by (a) lexicographer(s) only, cannot but provoke the doubt whether this particular meaning is at all actual usage.

2. Such a doubt is not, however, justified. The *Yuktikalpataru* of/ascribed to Bhoja (11th century) has meanwhile been edited, and it is now possible<sup>3</sup> to convince oneself that the *Śabdakalpādruma* is in fact correct (cf. below §§ 3.1 and 3.2). And the situation seems to have improved in other regards also since the times of Böhtlingk and Roth, thanks to the lexicographical work done by P.K. Gode and

1. It was, however, apparently overlooked by Debrunner (cf. J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1: Die Nominalsuffixe, by A. Debrunner, Göttingen 1954 p. 287) and M. Mayrhofer, *A Concise Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. II, Heidelberg 1963, p. 519 —The fact that attributes meaning “gol'en” are often (cf. below) found added to “bhṛṅgāra” is sufficient proof that Böhtlingk and Roth are right and the lexicographers wrong.

2. This is the siglum used in: *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles*. Indologists should in my view consider adopting its sigla.

3. If one is able to get a copy of it which turned out to be difficult in Germany. Perhaps this edition should be reprinted.—All the sections referred to in this study are, however, quoted in full in the *Dharmakośa* (cf. fn. 83).

C.G. Karve to whom we owe the revised and enlarged edition of Apte's *Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*.<sup>4</sup> For this contains further references which I now propose to study (in the order of their enumeration).

2.1. *Pratijñāyauḡandharāyaṇa* 4.21:

*kāraṇair bahubhūir yuktaiḥ kāmam nāpakṛtaṃ tvayā /  
guṇeṣu na tu me dveṣo bhṛṅgārah<sup>5</sup> pratigṛhyatām //*

This verse is spoken by Bādarāyaṇa, the chamberlain of king Pradyota Mahāsena, the father of Vāsavadatta; the other persons present are Bharatarohaka, king Pradyota's counsellor, and Yaugandharāyaṇa, the minister of Udayana, king of Vatsa, who has finally succeeded in escaping from Pradyota's captivity together with Vāsavadatta who requites his love. Evidently these are not the chamberlain's own words, but a message of Mahāsena's which he only delivers to Yaugandharāyaṇa. Likewise there cannot be the least doubt that with these words Pradyota wants to show himself not only forgiving, but that he also wants to honour Udayana's minister. The assumption that the vessel offered to Yaugandharāyaṇa could be "a vase used at the coronation of the king"<sup>6</sup> is therefore completely unfounded and the translation of this verse as given by Woolner and Sarup<sup>7</sup> is on the whole,<sup>8</sup> quite correct: "Though many wiles were used, you did no wrong I have no quarrel with your qualities, pray accept the chalice". And to be sure, it is not this particular vessel itself which Yaugandharāyaṇa is requested to "accept"—as a gift, i.e. as a token of Pradyota's favour; but he is given a drink in accordance with age-

4. Poona 1957 (reprinted in reduced format Tokyo 1978)

5. *ṣṛṅgārah* as read in S. Sharma's edition. (*Pratijñāyauḡandharāyaṇam* of Bhāsa..., Delhi, Patna, Varanasi 1965) is, of course, a printing error.

6. This is the meaning given in Apte's dictionary (cf. fn. 4).

7. Thirteen plays of Bhāsa, translated into English (*Punjab University Oriental Series* 13), London 1930 (reprinted Delhi, Varanasi, Patna, Madras 1985), p. 34.

8. The reservation is necessary because *yuktaiḥ* is left out, and this in spite of the fact that this attribute has clearly a causal connotation—as rightly stated by Gaṇapati Śāstri in his commentary (*The Pratijñāyauḡandharāyaṇa* of Bhāsa with the commentary of....., Trivandrum 1920<sup>9</sup>, p. 124): *tvayā kāmam nāpakṛtām, bahuprakāram chalam prayuktavaiṭpi bhavatā mamāpakāro 'na kṛta ity anumanyel madbaidhavaṣarājumocanam taddharaṇam matkanyāhāraṇam ca tvayā kṛtam nāham opakāram manyā iti bhāvaḥ / kutaḥ, yuktaiḥ upapannaiḥ / bahubhiḥ kāraṇaiḥ / tāni ca.....*].

old custom and rules for the hospitable treatment of a guest.<sup>9</sup> This is also so clearly stated by the author himself that nothing remains to be desired for it is thus that Yaugandharāyaṇa reacts to the message (4.22):

*hā dhik /  
gṛhā na nirvānti mayā dīpitās  
tathaiva tāvad dīḡdayāni mantriṇam /  
iyaṃ tu pūjā mama daṇḍadhāriṇaḥ  
kṛtāparādhasya hi satkṛtir vadhaḥ //*

This is rendered by Woolner and Sarup:<sup>10</sup>

"Ah me! The houses I had fired still smoulder, so it is with the hearts of ministers. Here am I honoured, who should be punished, while the best honour for an offender is death."

This is quite faithful a translation except perhaps for last line; the particle *hi* has apparently been ignored and a "while" in the sense of "in spite of the fact that" as well as a superlative have been smuggled in as it were.<sup>11</sup> Yet what the minister says in this line is rather: "for being treated hospitably [as I am by Pradyota in this way] is death for an offender [like me] (i.e. the just punishment by which his complete defeat is sealed because he is not by any means worthy of such a treatment)"; or perhaps: "the death i.e. the usual capital or corporal punishment) of an offender [like me] certainly (*hi*) is (i.e. consists in) hospitable treatment", in which case the *arthāntara-nyāsa* figure of speech would be clearer still, for the emphasis would lie on the disparity between the treatment to be expected under normal conditions and that actually given. In any case Yaugandharāyaṇa himself uses the keyword *satkṛti* and declares himself, explicitly or implicitly, to be overwhelmed by the king's most gracious<sup>12</sup> treatment of him. He accepts the favour, though as if ashamed of it, and thus asks himself to be given the vase called *bhṛṅgāra*—which is therefore,

9. Cf. P. Thieme, *Der Fremdling im Rgveda...*, (AKM XXIII. 2), Leipzig 1938 (Repr. Nendeln 1966), p. 24 f.

10. Woolner and Sarup apparently follow Gaṇapati Śāstri who takes the interjections *hā dhik* to indicate that Y. does not want to accept the *bhṛṅgāra* (cf. o. c., p. 125: *b'ṛṅgōrasatkāram arocayamāna āha—heti [...]* [ato *bhṛṅgārasatkāram* prati-grahitum necchāmiṭy abhiprāyaḥ // .)

11. O. c. (cf. fn. 7), 1. c.

12. Cf. *PratiYau* (cf. fn. 2) 4. 25/26: *yadi me mahāsenaḥ prasannaḥ, kim ataḥ param icchāmi.*

to be sure, a particular drinking vessel, or chalice, if this is the right word, most probably a precious one, but not necessarily a *svaṇṇara-citapātra* (-vīṣa) as C. D. Devadhar would have it.<sup>13</sup>

2.2. The next passage quoted in Apte's dictionary is from a text of comparatively late date, viz. the so-called *Śivabhārata*<sup>14</sup> of Paramānanda (who died probably in 1687).<sup>15</sup> The narration of Śivaji's victory over Kār Talab Khān, a general of Shāyista Khān, in 1661<sup>16</sup> is wound up by a description of the loot: "Elephants and horses left in the middle of the forest by the flying enemies are brought by (his) soldiers" (29.57: *vimukteṣu aṇṇagarbhe ripubhiḥ prapalayibhiḥ sainyaṁ āṇṇamāneṣu gajeṣu turageṣu ca* //), "and at many places his servants pile up large heaps of [various vessels] left behind by the enemies when taking to flight because they were afraid of [their] weight, [viz. heaps] of plates, goblets and *bhṛṅgāras* of manifold types (?) as well as of various other golden vessels" (29.58-59: *bhārabhītyavamuktānām apayātair arātibhiḥ/ sthālānām caṣakānām ca bhṛṅgārānām ca bhūṛitah/ anyeṣām cāpy amatrānām sauvarṇānām anekasāḥ/ svabhṛtyaiḥ kriyamāneṣu parvateṣu ca sarvataḥ* //).

Even if the attribute *sauvarṇānām* qualifies *bhṛṅgārānām*, too, there cannot be the least doubt that what the latter expression refers to here is, again, simply a particular type of vessel and, to be sure, one which is not at all connected with a/the coronation ceremony. On the contrary, it evidently forms part of the usual equipment of officers and soldiers while on an expedition, as indispensable as forage.

And this conclusion is strikingly confirmed by Kālhaṇa; for, in his account of king Jayāpīḍa's (751-782 A.D.) fighting a battle against his brother-in-law, Jajja, who had usurped the throne during his absence, he introduces at IV. 476 the *caṇḍāla* soldier who finally succeeds in killing Jajja with the following words:

*śrīdevo grāmacaṇḍālāḥ prāpto grāmyaiḥ saha yudhi/  
ko 'tra jajja iti bhrāmyan yodhān papraccha sarvataḥ* //

13. *Bhāsanājakacakram: Plays Ascribed to Bhāsa...* (Poona O. S. 54), Poona 1952, p. 582.

14. Ed. by V. S. Apte and M. C. Apte. *ASS Extra 5*, Poona 1930.

15. Cf. G. S. Sardesai's "Foreword" to his edition of the *Paramānandakāvya* of Kavindra Paramānanda, (GOS No. CXX) Baroda 1952, p. 1 ff.

16. Cf. e. g. Sir Jadunath Sarkar, *Shivaji*, Calcutta 1961<sup>6</sup>, p. 83 f.

And the enquiries of this brave man are not in vain, for (IV. 477):<sup>17</sup>

*īṣṇārtam svaṇabhṛṅgārāt pibantam vāri tasya te /  
raṇamādhye hayarūḍham tam dūrāt samadarśayan* //,

"they showed him from afar that [prince] who, pained by thirst, was drinking water from a golden jug in the midst of battle, while mounted on a horse",<sup>18</sup> so that he is able to kill him with a stone discharged with a sling.

2.3. The last of the passages quoted in Apte's dictionary is *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra* 1.12 (to be precise: 1.12.7). When dealing with the employment of secret servants it is said of the "desperadoes" (*tikṣṇa*),<sup>19</sup> forming a subgroup of the "roving spies (*saṃcāra*):<sup>20</sup> *teṣāṁ bahyaṁ cāram chatrabhṛṅgāravyajonapādukāsanayānavāhanopagrahīṇas tikṣṇa vidyuh*. This is rendered by R. P. Kangle quite correctly thus:<sup>21</sup> "Braves (serving as) bearers of umbrella, water-vessel, fan, shoes, seat, carriage and riding animal, should (spy on and) ascertain the out-of-door activity of those (officers)." Of course, it is to be understood that this type of *gūḍhapuruṣas* fulfill their duties as servants of the persons referred to by the initial pronoun,<sup>22</sup> viz. the *mahāmātras*, alias *tīrthas*, the high dignitaries enumerated in the preceding sentence.<sup>23</sup> It is further to be noted

17. This is one of the passages referred to already in the *Larger Petrograd Dictionary*.

18. Quoted from M. A. Stein, *Kālhaṇa's Rājatarangīnī...*, Westminster 1900, (Repr. Delhi-Patna-Vārānasi 1961), p. 164.

19. Defined in 1. 12. 2 as "those in the land who are brave, have given up all (thought of) personal safety (and) would fight, for the sake of money, an elephant or a wild animal..." (*ye janapade tūrās tyaktāmano hastinaṁ vyālam vā dravyahetoḥ pratiyodhayeyuḥ te tikṣṇāḥ*). The translation quoted is Kangle's (see fn. 21); in view of the expression *tyaktajivitayodhin* [*Mbh.* (Poona) 3.51.15] *tyaktāmāṇa* should not perhaps be co-ordinated but rendered "who fight..., ready to lose their lives / not caring for their lives."

20. Cf. H. Scharfe, *Untersuchungen zur Staatsrechtslehre des Kauṭilya*, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 246 f.

21. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, Pt. II, Bombay 1963, p. 28.

22. Cf. also Scharfe's translation of this passage, o. c. (cf. fn. 20), p. 253 and 267.

23. Cf. Scharfe, o. c., p. 215 ff. as well as F. Wilhelm, "The Eighteen Dignitaries (*tīrthas*)" in: *ALB Vols. XXXI-XXXII*, 1967-68, Dr. V. Reghavan *Felicitation Volume*, pp. 152-157; and "Die achtzehn Würdenträger" in: *ZDMG, Supplementa I: XVII, Deutscher Orientalistentag.....* Würzburg, hrsg. von W. Voigt, Wiesbaden 1969, pp. 894-897.

that—in contradistinction to the “poisongivers” (*rasada*) whose attention is focussed on the indoor activity of the *tirthas* the *tikṣṇas* have a secret mission to spy out the *bāhya cāra* of this group of people, i.e. the king’s confidants and assistants. It is because of this ‘division of labour’, this specialization, that one is amazed to read in the *Jayamaṅgalā* commentary<sup>24</sup> that the *tikṣṇas* as bearers of umbrella etc. are : *antaḥpraveśanārhaḥ*, “[permitted and hence] able to enter [the house of their master]”, as well as : *pratyāsannavartino marmajñāḥ*, “stay near [to their masters and thus] know [their] weak points.”

But it is necessary to realize that the unknown commentator is here not primarily concerned with explaining how and why a *tikṣṇa* is especially qualified to keep (secret) watch on the outdoor activities of his master; rather he wants to emphasize that a *tikṣṇa* having been employed as bearer of umbrella, etc. is in fact able to gain information. The conclusion suggesting itself is hence that the author of the *Jayamaṅgalā* did not deem it necessary to address himself to this point in particular, perhaps because he took it for granted that the titles of occupation enumerated by Kauṭilya are self-explanatory. In fact, it is quite clear that a high dignitary like a minister, etc., expects his bearer-of-umbrella to his functions especially when he leaves the house; and this holds equally good for the bearer-of-fan and those responsible for the carriage and the riding animal; and as for the other servants, this passage of the *Arthaśāstra* is itself evidence of the fact that they, too, usually accompanied their masters in order to fulfill their (rather) specialized duties if need be. In any case all the *tikṣṇas*’ duties must have been such that they could gain information about their masters *bāhya cāra* even if they were not eye-witnesses; as it was at least part of their duty to accompany their masters when leaving the house they were not only the very persons for spying out their outdoor activity, but also the only among the servants who could at all gather direct information about it which does not, of course, mean that their work as spies was exclusively limited to this field.

Now, as regards the *bhṛṅgāropagrāhin*—and it is, of course, he to whom our attention has to be turned above all—, there is no

24. *Arthaśāstra-Vyākhyā Jayamaṅgalā*, ed. with Introduction by G. Harihara Sastri, Madras 1958, p. 381, 14 f.

likelihood whatsoever that the vessel committed to his care has anything to do with the particular “vase used at the coronation of a king,” except perhaps for its form. Evidently all the objects mentioned at *Aś* 1. 12. 7, including the riding animals, serve, at least first of all, practical purposes of every-day life, though on a markedly high level of prosperity or affluence: It is the well-being and comfort of the master which is to be secured with their help: he is to be protected against the parching rays of the sun, his thirst is to be quenched, he is to be fanned, and he needs the appropriate means of transport, etc. All this, together with the specialized bearer, is clearly in keeping with his extraordinarily high social position. Beyond the practical purposes which they serve, the umbrella etc. are also status symbols signaling high rank in the political hierarchy—which is by no means necessarily identical with that of caste. It is even probable that by keeping such a domestic staff, or part of it,<sup>25</sup> the *mantrin*, *purohita* etc. imitate the royal household. But, to repeat the final conclusion, nothing warrants the assumption that what is referred to by the expression *bhṛṅgāra* is not an ordinary, though certainly precious, drinking vessel, but the particular one used in the ritual of *abhiṣeka*.

This conclusion—and the deliberations on which it is based—is strikingly confirmed by a passage of Bāṇa’s *Harṣacarita*.<sup>26</sup> It forms part of the description of prince Rajyavardhana’s arrival from his successful war against the Hūṇas, at the beginning of the sixth *ucchvāsa*; Harṣa is said to have seen his elder brother (... *jyeṣṭham bhrātaram apaśyat*), amid a “throng of servants” (*parijānena parivṛtam*) “reduced in numbers by their long and rapid march” (*dūradrutāgama-namuṣitabāhulyena*), and this ‘reduction’ is specified by stating that the umbrella-bearer was wanting, the superintendent of the wardrobe legged behind, the pitcher-carrier had collapsed, the spittoon-bearer was prostrate, the betel-bearer panted and the sword-bearer ‘limped’<sup>27</sup>

25. For the enumeration at *Aś* 1. 12. 7 need not imply that all the dignitaries referred to employ each and every type of servant mentioned.

26. It is listed by R. Schmidt, *Nachträge zum Sanskrit Wörterbuch*....., Leipzig 1928, s. v. *bhṛṅgāropagrāhin*. The reference (196. 11) is to the ‘Bombay edition (1892)’, but it can easily be located in any edition as the passage is from the second paragraph of the 6th *ucchvāsa*.

27. Quoted from the translation of E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, *The Harṣacarita of Bāṇa*, London 1897 (Repr. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna 1968), p. 165.

(*vicchinachattradhāreṇa lambitāmbaravāhinā bhraṣṭabhr̥ṅgārāgrāhiṇā cyutā-camaradhāriṇā tām̐yattāmbūlikena khañjatkhadgagrāhiṇā*). Clearly this *bhr̥ṅgārāgrāhin*, the descendant so to say of Kauṭalya's *bhr̥ṅgārōpa-grāhin*, is but one of the *prakāśadāserakas* mentioned immediately after the compounds quoted now; and it is even tempting to take this latter expression to mean—otherwise than the commentator Śaṅkara who explains it by *atūraṅgatvān niścīyamānāḥ*, “being recognized as such because of [their] not riding on horse back”, and his colleague Rāṅganātha<sup>28</sup> who takes it to be equivalent to “known [by name]”<sup>29</sup> (*prakāśaḥ prasiddhiḥ/ nāmagrahaṇena vyapadeśya ity arthaḥ*)—rather “public servant,” i.e. servant appearing publicly (in the company of his master), as distinct from and to some extent opposed to a domestic in the strict sense of the term. Yet, be that as it may, this much is quite certain: The vessel mentioned by Bāṇa, even if it be made of gold as e.g. Rāṅganātha would have it,<sup>30</sup> has nothing to do with the coronation of a king.

In passing only it should be noted here that Kāmandaki still knew the “bearer-of-umbrella” and his fellow servants, but significantly he comes to speak of them in the section on the various types of spies (*cāravikalpaparakaraṇa*), viz. at 13.46:<sup>31</sup>

*chatravayajanabh̥ṅgārāyānavāhanadhāriṇoḥ |  
mahāmātrā-(read:tra-)<sup>31a</sup> bahirvārtam̐ vidyur  
anye ca tadvidhāḥ ||*

28. Cf. *Harṣa Carita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa with the Commentary Marmābodbhīni of Rāṅganātha*, ed. by Śūranāḍ Kuṅjan Pijlāi, (University of Kerala Sanskrit Series, No. 187), Trivandrum 1958, p. 261.
29. Cf. also Kane's “well known (servants)” (*The Harṣacarita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa with Exhaustive Notes*, Delhi-Patna-Varanasi 1965<sup>2</sup>, p. 117 (of the second part).
30. For he (o.c., l.c.) explains *bhr̥ṅgāra* as *sauvarṇakarakā* of course, following the example of the lexicographers (cf. fn. 39).
31. The reference of the *Larger Petrograd Dictionary* “12.44” is of course, to Rajendralala Mitra's edition of *The Nitisaṛa or the Elements of Polity by Kāmandaki* (BI 19 and 179), Calcutta 1861. The edition used by me is that published in the ASS (No. 136), 1964.
- 31a. It is noteworthy that the author of the *Upādhyāyanirapekṣā* commentary understood the term *mahāmātrā* correctly (.....*taddhāriṇoḥ | mahāmātrā-* (read with the BI edition *\*tra-*) *bahirvārtam̐*.....*mahāmātrā mantripurohitādāyāḥ teṣāṃ bahirgatām̐ vārtam̐ bāhyavacaraṇam̐ viduḥ |*), whereas Śaṅkarārya, misled by the wrong reading *mahāmātrā*, regards this as a plural and takes it to mean *hasiṣikṣāni-yuktāḥ*!

2.4. The foregoing examination thus yields the—rather disappointing—result that the word *bhr̥ṅgāra* does not have the meaning ascribed to it by Gode and Karve in any of the three passages. One is hence given the idea that these references have somehow been put at the wrong point by them when preparing their revised edition of Apte's dictionary in any case it has become evident that they belong to the second meaning given there, viz: “a pitcher of a particular shape”.

In addition it has to be noted that this semantic paraphrase is in its turn also not entirely satisfactory. For the two passages which the Chief Editors quote for it, viz. *Rām(āyaṇa)* 5.18.12 (=5.16. 12 in the critical edition)<sup>32</sup> and *Ve(niṣaṃhāra)* 6 (*recte*: 6<sup>1/2</sup>),<sup>33</sup> clearly show that the particular vessel denoted is if not exclusively then at least mainly used to keep water in.<sup>34</sup> And that this is in fact its (primary) function can likewise be seen in the three passages examined above (§ 2.1-2.3). Indian commentators seem to have been aware of this fact; thus, e.g. Rāma remarks in his *Tilaka* on the *R.* passage referred to just now:<sup>35</sup> *bhr̥ṅgārāḥ kalaśaiḥ/ dhātūrakusumasadyajalapatiraiti artha itī tīrthaḥ*,—and (Maheśvara)tīrtha's explanation<sup>36</sup> deserves attention in other respects, too, as we shall see later. That *bhr̥ṅgāra* denotes a particular vessel for water is stated also by the authors of commentaries on the *Amarakoṣa*, e.g. by Liṅgayasūrin<sup>37</sup>, who explains (and thereby implicitly refers to *Uṇādisūtra* 3.136)<sup>38</sup>: *bhriyate pūryate*

32. *kāñcanair api bhr̥ṅgārair jahruḥ salilam agrataḥ |  
(maṇḍalāgrāṇ asīṃś caiva gṛhyānyān pṛṣṭhato yayuḥ |)*

33. *mahārāja! śiṣirasurabhisalilaseṣpūrṇo' aṃ bhr̥ṅgārāḥ pānabhājancṇ cedam |.*

34. This its function is perhaps the clue to the interpretation of the appellative meaning of the name *śuṣkabhr̥ṅgāra* (*KauṣU* 2.6), “one whose water container is dry, i. e. empty” or “empty drinking vessel”. The occurrence of this name does not, however, warrant the conclusion that the vessel meant is necessarily already Vedic; it is also not mentioned in W. Rau's monograph: *Töpferei und Tongeschirr im vedischen Indien*, (Akad. d. Wissenschaften u. d. Literatur Mainz), Wiesbaden 1972.

35. *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki with the Commentary (Tilaka) of Rāma*, ed. by V. L. Śāstri Paṇḍikar, Bombay 1930, p. 622.

36. What Maheśvaratīrtha says is in fact: *kāñcanair bhr̥ṅgārāḥ kanakā-lukābhīḥ, bhr̥ṅgārāḥ dhātūrakusumasadyajalapatirāṇi ||*

37. *Amarakoṣa* with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries *Amarapadavivṛti* of Liṅgayasūrin and the *Amarapadapārijāta* of Mallinātha, ed. by A. A. Ramana-thān, Vol. I (ALS No. 101), Madras 1971, p. 503.

38. Which reads: *śṛṅgārabhr̥ṅgārau*.

*jalam atreṭi bhṛṅgāraḥ*.<sup>39</sup> This derivation is as such, of course, not acceptable etymologically; but it is nevertheless very interesting as a further piece of evidence for the fact that water as its (normal) contents is quite often associated with *bhṛṅgāra*. To give but one more example from a commentary: In the *Upādhyāyānirapekṣā* on *Kām. Nitis*, 13.46 quoted above (§ 2.3) the word is likewise explained by *jalapātra*.

2.5. Our sources, however, even permit us to form an idea about at least some; perhaps the main, of the various purposes which a *bhṛṅgāra* qua *jalapātra* can serve.

The water kept in such a vessel is used as drinking water as is shown by the passages discussed above (§ 2.1-2.3), especially verse 3.477 of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. The prose passage of the *Veṇīsamhāra* mentioned in the preceding paragraph is equally clear.<sup>40</sup> In addition attention may be drawn to *Caraka S.* 1.14<sup>41</sup> (to be precise: *Sūtrasthāna* 15.7): In a chapter on the preparations to be made by a medical doctor (*upakalpantiya*) it is said that *śayonāśanāḍini copanyastabhṛṅgārapratigrohāni*, i.e. that "the bed, the chair and similar pieces of furniture—meant for the sick person—should have a *bhṛṅgāra* and a chamber vessel<sup>42</sup> (or rather: a spittoon) placed by their side"; for, in all probability *bhṛṅgāra* denotes a drinking vessel here too.<sup>43</sup>

Another occasion for using the *bhṛṅgāra* type of vessel is foot washing, as an integral part of the honours due to a guest. This is

39. Cf. also *Padacondrikā*, A Commentary on the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* of Amara... by Rāyamukūṭa, ed. by K. K. Dutta, Vol. II, Calcutta 1973, p. 571: *bibhary udakaṃ bhṛṅgāraḥ* | 'śṛṅgārabhṛṅgārau ca' [Uṇādis. 3. 136] iti bhṛṅgā arannumāgamaḥ gamāś ca nipātyante || .....dve (i.e. *bhṛṅgāra* and *kanakālūkā*) *suvarṇoghaṭṭajalapātrasya*.—That the *bhṛṅgāra* is made of gold is maintained also by Malliṅgtha (cf. o. c. [fn. 37] l.c.: *kattakakarānāmanī*).

40. Note also that the *rākṣasa* in the disguise of a *muni* repeatedly declares himself to be thirsty (*ṭṣṭiṭṭo 'smi*), that he asks to be given water (and shade) (*saṃbhāvayatu mām kaścij jalacchāyāpradānena*) and that the prose passage quoted above is immediately preceded by a corresponding order by Yudhiṣṭhira (*kaḥ ko'tra bhoh, salilam upanaya*).

41. Cf. fn. 17.

42. This is the meaning given for *pratigraha* in Monier-Williams' dictionary referring to the *Caraka S.*, while in the *Smaller Petrograd Dictionary* we read: "basin or pot meant for the various needs of a diseased person, in particular spittoon."

43. The rendering "(flower) vase" of Priyavrat Sharma (*Caraka-Saṃhitā*. (Text with English Translation), Varanasi 1981, p. 105) is in any case not at all justifiable.

particularly evident at *Ja* III. 10. 86 f.:<sup>44</sup> *raja...aggamahesiṃ pakkosa-petvā "bhodde, sahāyassa me pāde dhova" 'ti āha. Sa tassa pāde dhovi. Rāja suvāṇṇabhīmīkāreṇa udakaṃ āsiṃci. Devī pāde dhovitvā gāndhatelena makkhesi*. The king.....called his queen-consort and asked her: 'My dear, wash the feet of friend!' She then washed his feet [and] the king poured water [on them] with a golden pitcher. Having washed [his] feet queen anointed them with scented oil."

Quite similar is *Harivaṃśa* 7139<sup>45</sup> (=No. 29 [312 f.] in the critical edition):

*pādaḥ prakṣālayāṇ cakra muneḥ sātrajitiḥ svayam |  
jalam devaḥ svayam kṛṣṇo bhṛṅgāreṇa dadau tadā ||*

For seen in the light of the *Jātaka* passage the second line of this verse is quite naturally taken to mean that Kṛṣṇa himself assists Satyabhama in washing Nārada's feet by pouring water from a *bhṛṅgāra*—and not to refer to his offering drinking water to the *muni*. The same type of vessel is mentioned at *Mahābhārata* 13 2729<sup>46</sup> (=13. 52.14 in the critical edition):

*(kutiko bhāryayā sārddham ājagāma yato muniḥ || 13)*

*pragṛhya rāja bhṛṅgāraṃ pādyam asmai nyavedayat |;*

but in this case the service is most probably not rendered by the royal couple itself, since *pādas* cd run thus:

*kārayāmāsa sarvaś ca kriyās tasya mahātmanaḥ ||*

A *bhṛṅgāra* is "used to wash the feet of an honourable guest" also in the *Vāsudevāhīṇḍī* according to A.P. Jamkhedkar.<sup>47</sup>

The same source contains the further information that from this very type of vessel "holy water is sprinkled over the head of a newly married couple"; though it is not expressly stated which purpose this ceremonial or customary act serves. In any case it is in this connection that *DN*<sup>48</sup> II. 172.19 ff. comes to one's mind, i.e. the story, of a fairy-tale character, of Sudassana and the appearance

44. Pali texts, I use the abbreviations of the *Critical Pali Dictionary*.

45. Cf. fn. 17.

46. Cf. fn. 17.

47. A. P. Jamkhedkar, *Vāsudevāhīṇḍī: A Cultural Study*, Delhi 1984, p. 113.

48. The reference to this and the other relevant passages in Pali texts I owe to the PTS's *Pali-English Dictionary*.

to him of the heavenly treasure of the wheel, whereupon<sup>49</sup> "the king... rose from his seat, and reverently uncovering from one shoulder his robe, held in his left hand a pitcher, and with his right hand sprinkled water up over the wheel."<sup>50</sup> In this case, too, some form of consecration seems to be intended.

Yet, there is still another ceremony in connection with which a *bhṛṅgāra*-vessel is mentioned several times in Pali as well as Sanskrit sources, a ceremony at that of even greater significance in terms of the history of ideas, viz that of touching or pouring out water when making a donation. This custom, "ascertainable not only in India but everywhere where Indian culture has spread",<sup>51</sup> has long been misunderstood. The (basically) correct interpretation has been given by H. Lüders in a work published as late as 1951.<sup>52</sup> According to him "the donation is conceived of as a treaty", and he refers to the fact that in an old formula the "lie in connection with a donation" is mentioned<sup>53</sup>, by pouring out water, says Lüders, the donor confirms his donation.

Lüders' rather brief remarks have, of course, to be supplemented by what he says in the whole of his introduction about the connection between Varuṇa (who is to him the god of the oath) and water, and between the latter and the oath. Nevertheless I am far from being convinced that he is right as regards his interpretation of the donation being a treaty. A treaty *per definitionem* regulates the rights and duties of two parties, and I fail to see any such reciprocal commitment in the case of a donation.<sup>54</sup> The problem with the latter is rather, at least from the viewpoint of the donee, whether what the

donor says when making his donation, or even when only promising to make it, can really be trusted; or whether the donee has to be prepared for the worst, viz. to expect that the donation is not made in the end, or claimed back, or that he is accused of having unlawfully taken possession of it, etc. That is to say, the essential point, I think, is—just like in the case of a statement made by a witness in court—to ensure that what is said by the donor is equally 'the truth, and nothing but the truth'. Therefore the donor is expected to solemnly confirm that his statement, "I hereby give you...", is true; and like a person taking an oath he simultaneously touches water or pours out water, and this certainly meant originally, as has been shown by Lüders,<sup>55</sup> that he exposes himself to a cause should his word be not the truth.<sup>56</sup>

In a foot-note Lüders refers to *Ja* VI. 344.10 ff., where "the king takes a golden jug full of scented water and pours water on the hand of the merchant receiving the gift and while doing so he proclaims the donation of the village." What the king really says is (VI. 344.11): *pācīmayavamajjhakagāmaṃ rājabhogena bhuñja*, but this is indeed nothing but a solemn and ceremonial—and as regards the rights of the future proprietor entirely precise—formulation by which the village is verbally made over to the merchant. That the king in addressing him in this manner speaks the truth, is confirmed by the accompanying act of pouring out water, and note that he does so on the hand of the person who is to receive the donation. And—what is particularly interesting in the context of the present study—the water is poured from a *suvaṇṇabhīmāra*!

This very ceremony is described with similar words e.g. at *Ja* II. 371.13 f.: ... *suvaṇṇabhīmāreṇa pupphagandhavāsitaṃ udakaṃ*

statement. However, if Alsdorf is in fact right, what is referred to implicitly at *Ja* VI. 309.31 is ingratitude; and its counterpositive cannot be said to form one of the objects of a donation qua treaty; besides Alsdorf himself stresses that the idea he finds expressed in this *Jātaka* is a singular one, "to my knowledge not attested elsewhere so far."

55. Cf. *Varuṇa...II: Varuṇa und das Rta*, Göttingen 1959, p. 655 ff. and the article published from the papers left by Lüders in: *ZDMG* 98, 1944, pp. 1-14. Cf. also B. Kölver, *Textkritische und philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājatarāṅgiṇī des Kalhaṇa*, Wiesbaden 1971, p. 175 ff. (Appendix 3: Eine Eidesvorstellung des nordindischen Mittelalters).

56. With various problems posed by the donation ceremony I hope to be able to deal in the near future in a more detailed and comprehensive manner.

49. Quoted from: *Dialogues of the Buddha*, 3rd Ed., translated from the Pali...by T. W. and C. A. F. Rhys Davids, London 1951, p. 202.

50. The original runs thus: *aṭṭha kho Ānanda rājā Mahā-sudassano uṭṭhāy' āsanaṃ, ekaṃsaṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ karitvā, vāmena hatthena bhīmāreṇa gahetvā, dakkhiṇeṇa hatthena cakkaratanam abbhukkiri.....*; cf. *Pj* I. 175, 17. ff., *Pv-a* 75,5 ff. as well as *Saddh* 513.

51. Quoted from H. Lüders (cf. fn. 52), l. c.

52. The reference is to: *Varuṇa. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von L. Alsdorf I: Varuṇa und die Wasser*, Göttingen 1951.

53. O. C., p. 32—The Translation is mine—as in other cases where German secondary literature is quoted in the present study.

54. A passage of the *Vidhuraṇḍita-Jātaka* discussed by L. Alsdorf (*WZKS* 15, 1971 p. 46 = *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1971, p. 403) seems to contradict this

*pāteṭvā adāsi*<sup>57</sup>, namely the Bodhisattva his royal elephant to certain brahmins; or at *Ja* I. 85. 6 ff. (...*suvaṇṇabhiṅkāreṇa pupphagandhavāsitaṇṇivāṇṇaudakaṃ ādāya veḷuvamuyyānaṃ pariccajanto dasabalassa hatthe udakaṃ pātesi* (cf. also I. 93.13 f.), The *locus classicus* for the donation of the Veḷuvana garden, however, is *Vin* I. 39. 14 ff., a passage which deserves attention also in that it again clearly shows that what is confirmed by the pouring of water is the truth of the words by which the donation is proclaimed; for it runs thus: *atha kho rājā Māgadho Seniyo Bimbisāro sovaṇṇamayāṃ bhikkhāraṃ gaheṭvā bhagavato onojesi etāhaṃ bhante Veḷuvanaṃ uyyānaṃ buddhapamukkhassa bhikkhusaṃghassa dammiti*.

Thus the material from Pali sources suggests that the vessel normally used in this ceremony is precisely our *bhṛṅgāra*: and this assumption is supported by Sanskrit texts; too,<sup>58</sup> e.g. *Harivamśa* 14237 (= No. 42 B [2813] in the critical edition) where in a section which is partially rather difficult to understand Bali is said to have taken a golden *bhṛṅgāra* with his hand (*grhya hastena sambhṛānto bhṛṅgāraṃ kanakodbhavam*) in order to pour water (cf. 2822: *evam uktvā baliḥ śiḥram pātayāṃ āsa vai jalam*).<sup>59</sup> and thereby to confirm that what he has said (viz. *dāsyāmi devadeva yad yad icchaty ayam prabhuḥ*) is indeed true: Clearly in this case, too, the *bhṛṅgāra* is used in a donation ceremony. There is hence a certain likelihood that the vessel which can be seen in pictorial representations of this ceremony in Indian art—their existence is mentioned e.g. by Lüders and Waldschmidt<sup>60</sup>—is a *bhṛṅgāra*.

In addition to throwing light on the various purposes which a *bhṛṅgāra* can serve, the passages drawn upon so far also warrant the conclusion that the vessel denoted by this expression should be of medium size, i.e. large enough to contain the quantity of water necessary for its various functions, but still so small that it can, most probably without exertion, be lifted and, in general, handled also with one sole hand. Besides one can hardly fail to notice that among the purposes attested by our sources not a few evidently belong to

57. Cf. also Cp. 1.3.5.

58. Cf. also E. Waldschmidt, *Die Überlieferung vom Lebensende des Buddha*,...pt. 1, Göttingen 1944, p. 58.

59. Cf. also the half verse *tato vārisamāpūrṇaṃ bhṛṅgāraṃ sa parāṇṣat* quoted in the apparatus (196. 4) of the critical edition (p. 759).

59a. In the books referred to in fn. 52 and 58 respectively.

the sphere of solemn, at least ceremonial acts: It seems that a particular utensil used in the household as a drinking vessel - and in this regard also as a water container—is resorted to in certain formal acts prescribed by protocol, convention, or ritual which are essentially connected with pouring out water; but for evident reasons the *bhṛṅgāra* used for such 'higher' purposes is made of more valuable or the most precious material available (the 'gold' the lexicographers associate with it) and for ordinary water a more 'refined' liquid is substituted

Taken together all these observations and conclusions lend no little weight to the question one cannot but finally ask oneself, viz. why this particular type of vessel should not indeed have been used likewise in the royal consecration as affirmed by the author of the *YuktiKa*.

3. 1. For what he says is quite unequivocal, viz.:

*rājño'bhīṣekapātram yad bhṛṅgāra iti tan matam |*

"[as] vessel [used at, or rather: appropriate for, i.e. to be used at] the coronation of a king, is considered that called *bhṛṅgāra*." The *YuktiKa*. then gives a relatively detailed description of the *bhṛṅgāra* as *abhīṣekapātra*, introduced by the statement that there are eight varieties and that its measure(s) and its shape are also eight-fold (*tad aṣṭadhā tasya mānam akṛṣṭaṃ cāpi cāṣṭadhā*). What is referred to by the first *aṣṭadhā* is the material from which the vessel is made, viz. gold, silver, earth (i.e. clay), copper, [rock] crystal, sandalwood, iron and horn [of a rhinoceros ?].<sup>60</sup> In the subsequent pair of *śloka*s its height and its circumference are given—but not the unit of measure intended—and it is made clear that these data refer to the eight varieties of *bhṛṅgāra* mentioned in the preceding verse so that the possibility that a total of 512 subspecies is taught can safely be ruled out.<sup>61</sup> Next the author comes to speak of various precious

60. *Yuktikalpataruḥ Mal āraja-Śrībhaja-vīracītaḥ*, ed. by Pt. Isvara Chandra Śāstri, Calcutta 1917, p. 76, verse 76:

*s uvaṇṇaṃ rājataṃ bhaumaṃ tāmraṃ sphāṇikam eva ca |  
cāṇḍaṃ lahaṇaṃ śārāṅgaṃ etad aṣṭavīdhaṃ matam ||*

61. Verse 77-78:

*bhānūdik-nava-ṣaṭtāṣṭa - rudraloka - suronmitāḥ |  
aṣṭāv aṣṭau samākhyātā āyāmapariṇāhayoh ||  
dvī - caturbāṇa - vedābdhi - bāṇasaptātmavṛttitā |  
yathākramaṃ samuddiṣṭaṃ ādityādi-daśabhuvāṃ ||*



stones, etc., like ruby, diamond, beryl, pearls, etc., i.e. of the decoration of the *bhṛṅgāra* with such precious stones somehow permanently fixed to it;<sup>62</sup> his attention then turns to the question which of the eight varieties of *bhṛṅgāra* should be decorated in this manner, and to similar questions including the species of flowers to be fastened to the head of the king at the coronation and the types of precious stones to be put into the *secanāmbhas*.<sup>63</sup> The description is wound up by the promise:

*ittham niscitya yaḥ kuryān nṛpatiḥ sekam ātmaṇaḥ |*  
*sa cirāyur bhaved bhogī ito 'nyas tv anyathā caran ||*

What is said in the *bhṛṅgāroddēśa* of the *YuktiKa* does not hence give the impression of being fanciful. It seems rather to be largely based on real custom and tradition of course, of a particular period; and this assumption is supported among others by the observation that the author takes it for granted that a king may belong to any of the four castes.<sup>64</sup> In any case there is no reason whatsoever to doubt that the statement at the very beginning, viz. that the *bhṛṅgāra* is the *abhiṣekapātra* par excellence, is historically correct and trustworthy.

3.2. Yet, in one respect the *YuktiKa* does not come up to the expectations it itself creates: It does not give a description of the shape of a *bhṛṅgāra*. What this kind of vessel looks like cannot at all be learned from it;<sup>65</sup> obviously it is taken for granted that the vessel as such is well known to the reader. In fact, the expression *akṛti*—so one realizes when the author specifies what he had in mind

62. Verse 79 f.:

*padmarāgaḥ tathā vajraṃ vaidūryaṃ mauktikan tathā |*  
*nilaṃ marakatau caiva muktā ca sapta kīrtitrāḥ ||*  
*bhṛṅgārasaptake nyāsyā na bhāumo maṇim arhati |*

63. Verse 84:

*hīrakam padmarāgaḥ ca valdūryaṃ nilam eva ca |*  
*catvāra maṇayo dheyāḥ caturṇām secanāmbhasi ||*

64. The expressions “four/fourfold (kings)”, occurring in verses 82, 83(b) and 84, are explained by *caturjātmahibhuḥ* of verse 83 f.

65. The expression *pratyasaṃ* in verse 81 does not, of course, imply that the *bhṛṅgāra* has “corners” in the proper sense of the word. It is equally possible, nay even much more probable, that what is referred to by this expression are the four cardinal points projected upon the round *bhṛṅgāra*, the spout perhaps providing the point which is considered as the front.

when using it—refers only to one aspect of its “shape” or “appearance,” viz. its decoration with precious stones.

But there are other sources which come to our help here. According to Maheśvaratīrtha (cf. above § 2.4) a *bhṛṅgāra* “is similar to the flower of a *dhattūra*.” The plant denoted has been identified as three species of the genus *Datura*,<sup>66</sup> a characteristic of which is the funnel-shaped corolla. N. S. Mooss’s *Ayurvedic Flora Medica*<sup>67</sup> contains a drawing showing also the flower of *Datura metel* Linn., and the corolla is described as “tubular-infundibuliform, 15-18 cm long or even more, often 10-12, 5 cm across at the mouth...” A vessel of this shape, and size, can indeed be used to drink out of, and it can be placed provided its bottom is flat. As Maheśvara states it only to be “similar” to a *Datura* flower, it is least possible that the *bhṛṅgāra* he has in mind is some what bulbous, if not even big-bellied, and if this be true, it could well contain enough water for washing a guest’s feet. On the other hand it should not be forgotten that in India there has not been a tradition of exact and detailed descriptions of objects of the natural environment or products of human workmanship. And even if such a tradition could be found, one is left with the intricate problem posed by Maheśvara’s statement in itself: We don’t know what exactly he means by *sadṛśa*, i.e. to what extent he at all intended to give a precise description of the type of vessel called *bhṛṅgāra*. His testimony, though quite interesting as such, is not clear enough to bridge the gap between “Wörter und Sachen,” i.e. to arrive at a clear visual idea of the object denoted. A practicable way is, however, shown by Buddhaghosa (5th century) in his commentary on the *DN* passage referred to above (§ 2.5). For he adds to the expression *suvaṇṇabhīṅkāra* of the *mūla* text the explicatory attribute *hatthi-sonḍa-sadisa-panāli* (*Sv* 620.20f.), “with a spout similar [in shape] to the trunk of an elephant.” Evidently this feature was regarded by him as really characteristic of a *bhṛṅgāra*. And obviously the author of the *Vasudeva hīṇḍī*<sup>68</sup> also had in view the same feature when he characterized the

66. Cf. G. J. Meulenbeld, *The Mādhavavidyā and its Chief Commentary*, Chapters 1-10. Introduction, Translation and Notes, 1974, p. 564.

67. (Vaidya Sarathy Series Book No. E 2), sec. ed., Fasciculus I, Kottayam 1978, p. 89 f.

68. O. c. (cf. fn. 47), 1. c.

*bhṛṅgāra* as being *gajamuho* (= *gajamukha*). To compare the spout of a vessel to the trunk of an elephant makes sense only if a particular similarity is referred to, i.e. if not the trunk as such is meant, but the trunk in particular position considered to be specific to this pachyderm, or perhaps the peculiar tapering form of the trunk. Unfortunately, however, quite a few positions meeting this condition come instantly to the mind of everybody only superficially familiar with elephants. The position tacitly referred to might e.g. be that of holding up the trunk so that it looks somewhat like the letter 's',<sup>69</sup> e.g. adopted by this animal when it trumpets. In a roll painting from Nepal in the possession of the Museum of Indian Art in Berlin (West) the Viśvantara legend is depicted. It has been published by Lienhard in 1980<sup>70</sup> in an exemplary manner. Table XXIV (p.231) shows among other things the *abhiṣeka* of prince Jālini. In his detailed description and analysis of the relevant scene<sup>71</sup> Lienhard states, after having dealt with the prince himself, that "two men in red frock-coats stand to the left and right of the prince... Each of the two men holds a carafe with both hands<sup>72</sup> and is ready to pour the water it contains over the head of the prince to be consecrated as king. A third man.....waves<sup>73</sup> a parasol of golden yellow colour, a symbol of royal dignity and might." An identical vessel is found depicted at another point of the roll also, viz as part of a scene showing Madrī in swoon.<sup>74</sup> Lienhard's identification of this vessel



Illustration No. 1

By courtesy of the Museum für Indische Kunst,  
Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin (West)

69. Cf. Budhasvāmin's *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṃgraha* 2.37 where a wild elephant, trumpeting as if challenging the opposing elephant to battle, is said to be *klmēid ākūṇṇcitāṅgulih*; cf. also the expressions *kare kūṇṇcitapūṣkare* and *saṃvellitakaraḥ kari*—ibid., 3.14 and 15.

70. Die Legende vom Prinzen Viśvantara. Eine nepalesische Bilderrolle aus der Sammlung des Museums für Indische Kunst Berlin, Berlin 1980.

71. O. c., p. 228 f.

72. This seems to have ritual or ceremonial rather than practical reasons but cf. fn. 79.

73. It seems that Lienhard has here been carried away by his imagination. All the picture shows is that a parasol is held above the prince so that the sun is (in accordance with a corresponding rule, [cf. J. Gonda, *Ancient Indian Kingship...* [cf. fn. 87], p. 37) prevented from shining directly on him.

74. O. c., plate XVI; the description is given on p. 176: "...the prince, making strenuous effort to awake her from her swoon, sprinkles Madrī's body with water," viz. with his right hand while he holds the vessel in his left. Cf. also *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṃgraha* 3.78:

*athāṅgāraṇavāṭīm mūḍhām paṭrāpaharaṇaśraṇāt |*  
*hlādayām āsātur vākyaiḥ sacivau sajalānilaiḥ ||*

as a "carafe for water"<sup>75</sup> is evidently correct; but I think in this case it is definitely possible to go a step further, i.e. to do more than just determine its function, namely to connect it with its proper designation which cannot but be *bhṛṅgāra*,<sup>76</sup> for one of the "carafe's" peculiarities is precisely the "elephant-trunk-like" spout, i.e. a spout which has the form of the letter "s". On the other hand it has to be taken into account that the Berlin roll painting is dated 1837 and thus more than 1300 years younger than the information gleaned from the famous Pali commentator. And such a distance in time cannot be simply passed over as entirely insignificant however marked the traditionalism of Indian culture.

Fortunately, however, there are much older pictorial testimonies which can in a similar manner be connected with Buddhaghosa's remark. For Lüders draws attention to "one of the most beautiful reliefs from Bharhut" showing "Anāthapeḍika when donating the Jetavana to the Buddha, and the donation is confirmed by pouring water from a vessel similar in shape to a teapot."<sup>77</sup> In a foot-note he refers to Cunningham's well-known work on the Stūpa of Bharhut,<sup>78</sup> viz. p. 14 (ff.) and plate XXVIII. In view of the text of the inscription found immediately below the sculpture the correctness of the identification of the scene is beyond any doubt. This means that it can be taken for granted that what is depicted here is a particular donation ceremony, i.e. an act with which the *bhṛṅgāra* has been found to be intimately connected. Now, the vessel which Anāthapeḍika carries placed on his left hand, holding its handle with his right (or perhaps carries by the handle with his right hand, merely supporting it by his left hand)<sup>79</sup> is admittedly different from the one depicted by the Nevar artists of the Berlin roll. It has not only an (arched) handle, but it is indeed similar to a teapot also in

75. O. c. p. 42.

76. Its Nepali name, however, is *ghaṇā* (<Skt. *ghaṇa*(ka)).

77. Quoted from his *Varuṇa* (cf. fn. 52), l. c.

78. *The Stūpa of Bharhut : A Buddhist Monument ...*, by A. Cunningham. Repr. Varanasi 1962.

79. In contradistinction to what is seen on the painted scroll from Nepal (cf. fn. 72), the impression one cannot help gathering here is that use of both hands is provoked, if not primarily then at least also, by the practical needs of safe and steady carriage.

that it is much flatter and clearly big-bellied, covered by a lid<sup>80</sup> and provided with a flat base; in addition the spout is here straight, rising at an angle of appr. 45° from the bottom a little beyond the level of the lid; but it evidently also tapers off towards the top, to some extent at least, and it is in this respect that it, too, is, or could be regarded as, similar to the trunk of an elephant, but perhaps in another regard also, viz. when the trunk is stretched out straight in spouting water. It is, hence, certainly possible, nay even highly probable that what Buddhaghosa had in mind was a vessel of this type which can thus be identified as the (ancient) *bhṛṅgāra*.

Whether this teapot-like vessel represents the (direct) or one of the historical precursors of the 'carafe' of the roll painting from Nepal remains to be seen. It is anyway not possible to pursue this problem further in the course of the present study: The pictorial testimonies—of which there is obviously no dearth—call for an independent treatment.<sup>81</sup> In the present context it is, however, important to repeat by way of summary that thanks to a particular textual information about the vessel called *bhṛṅgāra* a bridge can be thrown across the gap between text and picture, and that pictorial testimonies confirm what is stated in the *YuktiKa*, viz. that the *bhṛṅgāra* is indeed used at the coronation of a king.<sup>82</sup>

3.2. But this vessel was not only used in such an *abhiṣeka* ceremony. Obviously there is more to it. For it is noteworthy that the *bhṛṅgārodeṣa* section of the *YuktiKa* is quoted in the

80. It may be noted here that the golden *bhṛṅgāra* (which king Jālauka throws into the Sodara spring according to Kalhaṇa's *Rājataranginī* 1.128 in order to carry out what could be styled an anticipation of modern underground water tests) is not only *śuśīrodara* (for which M. A. Stein's [cf. fn. 18, p. 25] "empty" is perhaps too colourless), but also *sapīdhāṇḍanah*, "closed at its mouth with a lid."

81. Which would also have to examine the relation between the *bhṛṅgāra* or in general the *abhiṣekapāṭa*, and the *pūṣṇaghaṭa* as a symbol of prosperity. In passing only attention may be drawn to the fact that according to the *Paṇḍarīkā* (cf. fn. 39, II, p. 571) on *Amarak.* 2. 8, 32: *dve* 'i.e. *bhadrakumbha* and *pūrṇakumbha rājyābhiṣekāya nānātirthādijalakanakaghaṭasya* [scil. *nāmanī*].

82. This conclusion is not of course, reversible: not each and every vessel that happens to be used at the coronation of a king, or an *abhiṣeka* ceremony (ultimately) modelled on it, can be identified as *bhṛṅgāra*—as may also be seen from B. N. Sharma's article on "Abhiṣeka in Indian Art" in *JOI*, Baroda; XXI. 1971-72, pp. 108-113; cf. also fn. 120.



Illustration No. 2

Source: A. K. Coomaraswamy, *La Sculpture de Bharhut*, Paris 1956, Plate XXVI (Fig. 67)

*Dharmakośa*<sup>83</sup> in a chapter entitled “*rājacilnāni rājopakaraṇāni ca.*” This heading—and the distinction between *cilmas* and *upakaraṇas* of the king—is also based on a corresponding statement of the *YuktiKa*, viz. the following one:<sup>84</sup>

*chatradhvajasiṃhāsanaṇāḍibhyo yad anyat syāt |*  
*rājyāṅgaṃ tad upakaraṇaṃ tasmāl loke viśeṣās tu ||.*

According to it there are certain “constitutive elements, i.e. paraphernalia or insignia, of kingship”<sup>85</sup>, different from the umbrella, the banner, the throne, the riding animal [viz. the elephant, etc.]<sup>86</sup>, etc., and that they form “utensils for use.”<sup>87</sup> Though the essential distinction between an *upakaraṇa* and the umbrella and the other *rājyāṅgas* is not made much clearer by the subsequent three lines either, they give at least a complete enumeration of the former:

*cāmarāś cātha bhṛṅgāraś caṣakaṃ ca prasādhani[m] ||<sup>88</sup>*  
*vitāuś cātha śayyā ca vyajanaṃ darpaṇāmbaram |*  
*etan navakam uddiṣṭaṃ rājopakaraṇākhyayā ||.*

The group of nine paraphernalia forming the *upakaraṇas* of a king are hence chowrie, *bhṛṅgāra*, cup,<sup>89</sup> comb, canopy, bed, fan, mirror and garment. It is highly questionable whether the difference between these *upakaraṇas* and the non-*upakaraṇas* among the *rājyāṅgas* really consists in the fact that the former are “utensils for use” only and the latter merely “signs of the king” (*rājacilma*) as the author of the *Dharmakośa* would seem to have it—though it cannot be denied that what is marked here as different from each other seems to be the private sphere, on the one hand, and that of appearing in public, on

83. *Rājanītikāṇḍa*, ed. by Laxmanshasīri Joshi, Vol. IV, Pt. V, 1979, p. 2829 and 2841a.

84. P. 72, verse 33.

85. The expression *rājyāṅga* is here evidently not used in the special terminological sense it usually has in *Nīti*—and related texts.

86. The *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṃgraha* (2.45) knows an *abhiṣekahastin*; cf. also § 5.1. It should however be noted that *yāna* may have the meaning “vehicle”, too, and could therefore refer to the state chariot (cf. fn. 137).

87. Thus it is that J. Gonda, *Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View* (Reprinted from *NUMEN* III and IV with Addenda and Index), Leiden 1966, p. 37, renders *upakaraṇa* as found at *Mbh.* 12.67.86. In the *Nītikalpataru* (cf. fn. 105, p. 174 f.) *upakaraṇa* (in the compound *rājatadupakaraṇa*) seems to refer not only to inanimate objects, but also to all the officers and servants of a king.

88. Of course, the emendation *prasāddhanam* would also be possible; but the feminine is met with again at *YuktiKa*, p. 78 verse 91.

89. Cf. also the quotation from the *Śivabhārata* (§ 2.2).

the other. For it has to be taken into account that the chowrie, or to be precise: the pair of fly-whisks, together with the (white) umbrella constitute "the emblems par excellence", as rightly stressed by Gonda.<sup>90</sup> There is not only textual evidence for this,<sup>91</sup> but it is also strikingly confirmed by art<sup>92</sup>. Hence the question arises if not at least the *bhṛṅgāra*, too—the other *upakaraṇas* are less likely candidates except for the fan—has likewise to be regarded as an emblem of royalty, i.e. an identifying mark of a king. For it may be taken for granted that not an ordinary vessel of this type is meant, but one conforming to the description given subsequently, i.e. in the *bhṛṅgāroddēśa* of the *YuktiKa*. That is to say, it has to be kept in mind that neither the chowrie nor the *bhṛṅgāra* nor any other of the *upakaraṇas*—and the umbrella, etc., certainly don't form an exception in this regard—are as such specific to a king. It is always the material, the decoration, etc., that makes a particular object one of the royal paraphernalia; and Bhoja takes quite some pains to clearly

90. O. c. (cf. fn. 87), I. c.

91. E. g. *Kālidāsa, Raghuv.* 3.16 c/d (*adeyam āsit trayam eva bhūpateḥ śaṣiprabhaṃ chattram ubhe ca tāmara*). It should be remembered that umbrella and chowrie are also named in the first place in the two sets of the *YuktiKa*. —Note that at 2.13 Dīlpa is nevertheless described as *anātapotram* (*ātapaklāntam*), but that Mallinātha explains: *vratārtham pariḥṭacchatram*; the only king without any insignia whom I happened to meet in the course of my study is the lion of the verse quoted by O. Böhtlingk in his anthology *Indische Sprüche, Sanskrit und Deutsch*, St. Petersburg 1870-73<sup>2</sup>, as no. 1395 (539):

*ekākinī vānavāsiny arājalakṣmaṇy anūtiśāstrojñe |  
sattvotkate nṛgapatou rājete girāḥ pariṇamanti ||*

rendered by the editor: "In ... the lord of the animals the title 'king' .... acquires its full significance." —In this connection it should also be mentioned that there are indications of the (white) umbrella being the only ensign of royalty or the ensign par excellence. Thus e. g. the meaning of the expression *nṛpatīkakuda* at *Raghuv.* 3.70 (see also fn. 109) is made explicit by *Kālidāsa* himself by the subsequent *śīrātapavāraṇa*; and at *Ja* III. 11.7 ff. the king who wants to share his kingdom with a friend of his divides his umbrella into two halves in order to demonstrate this his decision. Last but not least, *Amarakośa* 2.8.32, too, has to be taken into account here (*.. chattram tv ātapatram rājās tu nṛpalakṣṇid tar*), though the final words of this verse need not be interpreted as stating that the umbrella is the only ensign of a king, but could also be taken to mean that the umbrella of a king, i. e. if it belongs to a king and is hence carried over his head, is an ensign, i.e. one of the royal insignia.

92. Cf. the article of B. N. Sharma's referred to in fn. 82 and that of G. H. Khare (cf. fn. 95), plate I.

describe the difference between its ordinary and its royal character. Similarly it is not necessary to give much thought to the—theoretical—possibility that what is referred to here by the expression *bhṛṅgāra* is but the royal drinking vessel; for, this passage of the *YuktiKa*. cannot by any means be dislinked from the *bhṛṅgāroddēśa* section which after all is part of the detailed description of all the nine *upakaraṇas* enumerated at the outset: *bhṛṅgāra* as a *rājopakaraṇa* is therefore the *abhiṣekapātra* which evidently remains with the king after his coronation and is perhaps even used by him albeit not as drinking vessel.<sup>93</sup> And as to the *abhiṣekapātra*, it is perfectly understandable that it should have been regarded as another ensign of royalty in view of its extraordinary significance in the context of the royal consecration.

On the other hand it has to be admitted that usually one looks in vain for the *bhṛṅgāra*, or a vessel equivalent to it, in lists or enumerations of the paraphernalia or emblems of royalty. E. g. Gonda<sup>94</sup> does not refer to it. But clearly his outline does not exhaust the (primary) material—nor aim at reconstructing the historical development. The assumption that this particular emblem has so far simply been overlooked by most scholars is strikingly confirmed by a recent article of G. H. Khare's.<sup>95</sup> But before turning to the source drawn upon by him attention should first be focussed on another piece of evidence, viz. one which inspite of certain philological problems it poses is nevertheless ultimately so clear that any doubts one might still entertain as to the *bhṛṅgāra* forming one of the insignia of royalty once and for all.

4. I. What I am alluding to is a passage in Bhārucci's commentary on the *Manusmṛti*, a text which has unfortunately come down to us only in a fragmentary state, and the transmission of the only extant portion, viz. the *Mānu-Śāstra-Vivaraṇa* on *adhyāyas* 6-12, is also far from being good.

93. Cf. also the *caṣakoddeśa* of the *YuktiKa*. (p. 78, verse 86 ff.) as well as the *kumbha*-, *arghyapātra*-, *pādyapātra*- and *ācamanapātra-lakṣaṇas* in the *Vīramitrodaya, Lakṣaṇaprakāśa*, p. 641 ff.

94. Viz. in his work on kingship (cf. fn. 87), p. 37 ff.

95. "Emblems of Royalty in Art and Literature" in: *ABORI* LVIII and LIX, Diamond Jubilee Volume, ed. by R. N. Dandekar, Poona 1978, pp. 683-689.

*Manu* 7.6, a verse particularly interesting in the context of the ideas about kingship in ancient India, runs thus:

*tapaty ādityavac caīṣa<sup>96</sup> cakṣūṃṣi ca mañāṃsi ca /  
na cainam bhuvi śoknoti kaścid apy abhivikṣitum //*

and Bhāruci gives the following remarkable explanation:<sup>97</sup> *mahārāja-liṅgena cāmara-cchatra-bhṛṅgādīnā yukto dīptimattvāc cakṣū-  
ṃṣy ādityavat tāpayati, mañāṃsi daṇḍapātanaṭ*. The question apart whether the characterization of the king as being furnished with the emblems of royalty is meant as reason for his “burning the eyes” or as a restriction of this effect to a legally enthroned king or to the king insofar as he acts with authority, one is puzzled by the last member of the compound *cāmara-cchatrabhṛṅga*—. J. D. M. Derrett has taken the text as it stands, but his proposal to interpret it to mean “with his flywhisks, umbrella, and ‘bees’, etc.” poses questions. And that he himself didn’t feel happy about it becomes clear by his footnote “attendants?”.

After what has been said so far in the course of this study, it can hardly come as a surprise that I, on my part, should like to suggest a conjecture here, viz. to read *•bhṛṅgārādīnā* instead of *•bhṛṅgādīnā*. This implies that just one *akṣara* has dropped out, and it further starts from the assumption that the contention of the lexicographer Mathureṣa (17th century)<sup>98</sup> that the word *bhṛṅga* is used among others in the sense of *bhṛṅgara*<sup>99</sup> is at best based on a crux like that in Bhāruci’s commentary and not at all confirmed by actual usage. That instead of *bhṛṅgādīnā* one should read *śṛṅgādīnā* can also safely be ruled out, for the remark found in the *Vācāspatya* s.v. *rajaśṛṅga*, viz. that this expression is semantically equivalent to *rājacilnacchatra*,<sup>100</sup> is of no relevance here since the “umbrella [as

96. Note that Bhāruci seems to have read *caīva* which may indeed be regarded as the older/original reading

97. The edition used is, of course, that of J. D. M. Derrett, Bhāruci’s Commentary on the *Manusmṛiti* (*The Manu-Śāstra-Vivarṇa*, Books 6-12), Vol. I: The Text, Wiesbaden 1975, p. 50.

98. Cf. C. Vogel, *Indian Lexicography* (*A History of Indian Literature*, ed. by J. Gonda, V. 4), Wiesbaden 1979, p. 365 ff.

99. Cf. also the *Larger Petrograd Dictionary* s.v. *bhṛṅga*-. In the edition of the *Śabdaratnāvalī* itself (ed. by Pdt. Manindra Mohan Chaudhuri, Calcutta 1970), the corresponding statement is found on p. 192.

100. Cf. *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* 2. 8. 32.

one of emblems]”<sup>101</sup> is already mentioned by Bhāruci, and in a quite unequivocal manner at that; for a similar reason the contention of Puruṣottama, the author of the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*,<sup>102</sup> that *śṛṅga*-n. has among others the meaning of *cilna*, can remain unchecked: In an explanation of the expression *mahārājaliṅga*, given by the author himself, what one is alone justified in expecting are the names of individual ensigns, and not at all the notion “sign” as such. Therefore I should think that the emendation proposed by me is the most natural one in the context, hence I take Bhāruci to give the following explanation: “He, (i.e. the great king) burns the eyes like the sun because he [too] is characterized by dazzling splendour insofar as/if/when he is furnished with the emblems of a great king, [viz.] the [pair of] fly-whisks, the umbrella, the vessel-used-for-his-coronation, etc. [and he burns] the minds because he causes punishment to be inflicted.”<sup>103</sup> There is no doubt hence that Bhāruci (between 600 and 650 A.D. according to Derrett)<sup>104</sup> enumerates the *bhṛṅgāra* among the emblems of royalty, and among the most important ones at that.

4.2 That is to say, I regard it as definitely established that the vessel called *bhṛṅgāra* forms qua *abhiṣekapātra* one of the distinctive marks of a king. But I should like to stress at the same time that I neither ignore nor want to dispute the fact that this its role and function is attested to in our sources but sporadically—though it will be shown later that there is more textual evidence than has been realized until now. Nonetheless in my opinion this quantitative argument does not carry much weight and this for the following reasons:

1. In most, nay practically all cases when commentators, etc., explain expressions like *rāja* (etc.)—*lakṣman*, —*cilna*, etc.<sup>105</sup>, or

101. The semantic development is not clear to me

102. Viz. at 3. 3. 70; cf. also (according to the *Larger Petrograd Dictionary* s.v. *śṛṅga*-n.) Hem. on *Medinī* 2. 3. 25-26.

103. The latter sentence has been quoted from Derrett’s translation (Bhāruci’s *Commentary on the Manusmṛiti*... Vol. II..., Wiesbaden 1975, p. 34) which seems a bit strange as regards the remaining part.

104. O. c. (cf. fn. 97), Introduction p. 9 ff.

105. Note that *rājalakṣaṇa* is also used in the sense of “[bodily] marks [indicating a future] king” (cf. e. g. *Daśakumāracarita*, ed., N R. Ācārya, NSP, Bombay 1951, p. 14. l. 12 as well as H. Kohlbrugge, “Glücks und Unglücks zeichen

*kakud* (a), they confine themselves to mentioning just two, or at the utmost three, individual ensigns, and it is perfectly understandable that they adduce by name only those which are by far the most important or best known, definitely coming to one's mind first when the concept "emblem of royalty" is mentioned<sup>100</sup>, and in spite of Bharuci's testimony it is highly improbable that the *bhṛṅgāra* ranked among the first two or three.

2. In a number of cases an author may well have had in mind the *bhṛṅgāra*, too, when speaking of "the signs of a king" but there is no way to find this out for sure.

3. The denotatum of *bhṛṅgāra* or this expression itself may have been replaced by another one, expressions often met with in comparable contexts are in particular *kalāṣa*, *ghaṭa* and (*pūrṇa*-)*kumbha*.

4. Last but not least one has to reckon with the possibility that the role of the *bhṛṅgāra* as an emblem of royalty was limited in terms of its historical and/or its regional diffusion.

To give a few examples:

4.2.1. The explicate *rājaliṅga* of *Amarakoṣa* 3.3.92 is in its turn made clear in the *Padacandrikā*<sup>101</sup> by *chattrādi*, and in the

am menschlichen Körper" in: *Acta Orientalia* XX, 1948, pp. 36-80) as well as in the sense of "characterization, i. e. description, of the king" cf. *Vīramitrodaya* (cf. fn. 110) XX, p. 165, *Rājadharmakaustubha* (cf. fn. 113) p. 243 and *Nītikalpataru* (ed. by V. P. Mahajan, Poona 1956), p. 177.

106. This holds good equally when individual emblems themselves are mentioned. Likewise it should be taken into account that even if an *ādi* or a similar expression is lacking, those ensigns which are expressly named need not be meant to form an exhaustive enumeration of the ensigns in their entirety. The verse *Ja* 6.22. 28-29, to which my attention has kindly been drawn by me friend O. v. Hintuber remains difficult in spite of K. R. Norman's (cf. *CPD* s. v. *upādhi*—*ratham*) endeavours to solve the problems (cf. also O. v. Hintuber, "Two Jātaka Manuscripts from the National Library in Bangkok" in: *JPTS* Vol. X, 1985, 19 ff.).—Cf. also Mallinātha on the passages from the *Raghuv.* referred to in fns. 91 and 109.

107. *Padacandrikā: A Commentary on the Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanam of Amara* by Rāyamukha, ed. by K. K. Dutta, Vol. III, Calcutta 1978, p. 226.

*Vivaraṇa*<sup>108</sup> by *kanakacchatracamarādi*.<sup>109</sup> At *Vīramitrodaya* VI<sup>110</sup> (*Rājēnitiprakāṣa*) 443.19 the expression *cihnāni rājño* is explained by the immediately following *dhvajapatakādini*.

4.2.2. *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* II. 158.4—to which attention has been drawn by J. J. Meyer<sup>111</sup>—

*tatraivāyudhāvarmādyāṃ chatraṃ ketum ca pūjayet /  
rājaliṅgāni sarvāṇi tathāstrāṇi ca pūjayet //*

might prescribe the worshipping of the *abhiṣekapātra*, too, as part of the *nirājana* ceremony—although in this particular case there are some doubts since the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*<sup>112</sup> teaches *mantras* for other emblems only and ignores our vessel. But *Bhāg. P.* 1.16. 4 and 5 may be quoted as an example without hesitation for the last member of the compounds *hr̥paliṅgadharā* and *nṛdevacihnadhṛk* is not at all indication enough that only such signs are meant here which a king bears on himself in the narrower sense of the word.

4.2.3. The *Rāmāyaṇa* commentator Rāma 'of. § 2.4 above) paraphrases *bhṛṅgāra* of R. 5.16.12 by *kalāṣa*, and this latter expression is indeed very often met with in the context of passages dealing with the royal consecration. E.g. in his *Vīramitrodaya* (VI. 42. 18f.) Mitrāmīśra starts his brief exposition of the "abhiṣeka according to the *Ātharvaṇagopathabrahmaṇa*" by stating: *bilvaprabhṛtīṃ sambhārāṇ sambhṛtya ṣoḍaśa kalāṣāṇ ṣoḍaśa bilvāni valmīkasya ca mṛttikāṃ sarvāṇaṃ sarvāṣaṇ sarvabījāni / tatra catvāraḥ sauvarṇāś catvāro rājāṣaṣ catvāraś tāmraś catvāro mṛṇmayāḥ /...* And (a) golden *kalāṣa* (s) is (are) mentioned in Anantadeva's *Rājadharmakaustubha*,<sup>113</sup> in

108. *Amarakoṣa with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries...*, ed. by A. A. Ramanathan, Vol. II, Madras 1978, p. 352.

109. Apparāya then quotes *Ragh.* V. 3.70 b, viz. (*sa* [= *Dilīpaḥ*] *sūnave*) *nṛpotikakudam dattvā yūne sitātapavāraṇam*).

110. *Vīramitrodayaḥ Lakṣaṇaprakāśaḥ Mahāmahopādhyāyaśrīmitrāmīśraviracitaḥ sāhityopādhyāyaḥ nṛpasādaśarmaṇāsaṃśodhitaḥ*, Benares 1916.

111. *Trilogie altindischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation...* Zürich-Leipzig, p. 127 (of Pt. II), fn. 2.

112. *Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Śrī Hemādri*, Vol. II; *Vṛatakhanda*, Pt. II, p. 619 ff.

113. *Rājadharmakaustubha of Anantadeva*, ed. by M. Kamala Kṛṣṇa Smṛtīrthā, Baroda 1935, p. 318, verse 5 and 321, v. 29.



Nilakaṇṭha's *Nītimayūkha*<sup>114</sup> and in Caṇḍeśvara's *Rājantīratnākara*<sup>115</sup> and the subsequent instruction in the latter, viz:

*pūrayet sarvatīrthadbhir gāṅgena payasāthavā /*,<sup>116a</sup>

clearly indicates that the *abhiṣekapātra* itself is referred to. Equally plain is *Veṇīsaṃhāra* 6.12 where Pañcalaka, addressing Yudhiṣṭhira and Draupadī, asks them to abandon all doubt and then adds:

*pūryantāṃ salilena ratnakalāsā rājyabhiṣekāya te /*.

At other places or in other works of the same kind, instead of *kalāsa* the expression *ghaṭa* is found, e.g. in the *Vīramitrodaya* (VI. 44.10). In the *Mahābhārata* (1.126.36) Karna is consecrated king of the Aṅgas "with golden *ghaṭas* [to the water contained in which] parched grain and flowers have been added" (*saṭajakusumair ghaṭair kañcanaih... abhiṣikto...*).<sup>118</sup> It seems that *ghaṭa* and *kālāsa* are interchangeable in such contexts<sup>117</sup> yet this holds good for *kumbha*, too, or even *pūrṇakumbha*. As to the former expression, see e.g. *Vīramitrodaya* VI. 51.4 or 57.3, *Rājadharmakaustubha* 320 verse 25 ff. or *Kṛtyakalpataru*<sup>118</sup>, *Rājadharmakhaṇḍa* 14. 12; as for the latter, *Kṛtyakalpataru* 16.7.<sup>119</sup>

114. *Nīti Mayūkha* by Nilakaṇṭha Bhāṭṭa, ed. M. G. Bakre and V. P. Lele, Bombay 1921 (Repr. Delhi 1985); p. 17 l. 5.

115. *The Rājantī-Ratnākara* by Caṇḍeśvara, ed. by Kashi-Prasad Jayaswal, Patna 1924, p. 83.

115a. Cf. also fn. 81. On the unction fluid consisting of 16 or 17 different sorts of "water" and its preparation in Vedic times cf. J. C. Heesterman, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*.....s-Gravenhage 1957, pp. 79 ff. It should be noted that this is one of the traits of the Vedic royal consecration that has been preserved practically until the present day (cf. the study of Witze)'s referred to in fn. 121). There is much evidence to be found also in the *Nibandha* texts; in passing only I further note *Bṛhatkathāślokaśaṃgraha* 1.89 cd: *sarvatīrthāmbukalāśair abhyāṣiṇat sa* (i.e. *Gopālāh*) *pālakam* ||. In J. Sarkar's (cf. fn. 76) description of Śivāji's coronation ceremony it is stated (p. 208): "Then the eight ministers of his cabinet..., who stood ready at the eight points of the horizon with gold jugs full of the water of the Ganges and other holy rivers, emptied them over the heads of the king, queen and crown-prince..."

116. Cf. also the verse from the *Prapañcasāra* quoted by B. N. Sharma in his article "Abhiṣeka in Indian Art" (cf. fn. 82).

117. At other places they are distinguished; cf. e.g. *Mbh.* 14. 64. 12 and *Veṇīsaṃhāra* 6.12 *bhṛṅgāra* (cf. fn. 33) versus 6. 12 *kālāsa* (cf. § 4. 2. 3). Cf. also fn. 119.

118. *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Bhāṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara, Vol. XI: *Rājadharmakhaṇḍa*, Baroda 1943.

119. In the *Aupapātikasūtra* (cf. fn. 138) the compound *pūrṇakalāsa-bhṛṅgāra* is found

Of course, further and less hurried investigations are necessary in order to arrive at a well-founded interpretation of this terminological fluctuation,<sup>120</sup> but a comprehensive and detailed study of the post-Vedic development of the royal consecration has anyway still to be undertaken by somebody,<sup>121</sup> and *Nibandha* texts like those drawn upon by me will then be of special importance. Nevertheless it is, I think, legitimate to state that mere non-occurrence of the expression *bhṛṅgāra* itself in these sources does not at all warrant the conclusion that this particular type of vessel was not considered by their authors as an/the *abhiṣekapātra*. Besides, this non-occurrence is also not a total one. There is after all a passage in the *Kṛtyakalpataru* where the word is used, viz. in an enumeration of the various *ābhiṣecanika dravyas*,<sup>122</sup> among which figures a *hiraṇmaya bhṛṅgāra* also (16.5), though side by side with many "decorated golden *pūrṇakumbhas*". A similar list of things required for a coronation is transmitted at *Dīp.* 11.32 f; and all of them are expressly stated to "have been sent [by Aśoka] for the coronation"<sup>123</sup> (*rājabhiseke pesitā*)<sup>124</sup>, and, significantly, they include a *bhṛṅkāra*, too.<sup>125</sup>

(§ 49, II), explained by the commentator Abhayadevasūri to mean: *jalapari-pūrṇau ghṛhābhṛṅgārau*. An interesting information is given by Apparāya (*Amarakoṣa* with the unpublished South Indian commentaries..., Vol. I. Madras 1971, p. 503) for according to him *bhadrakumbha* and *pūrṇakumbha* are *rājadvāranikṣiptapūraṇakalāsanāmant*.

120. In the section entitled *abhiṣekapātralakṣaṇa* of the *Vīramitrodaya* (cf. fn. 110), p. 646 three different vessels are described (following a "Vaikhāṇasagrantha"); the third one is said to be *śaṅkhanibhākāram* and *ograto jalānālakam*, i. e. to have a spout—in all probability the specific mark of a *bhṛṅgāra* proper.

121. Much progress has, however, been achieved in this regard by M. Witze in his contribution "The Coronation Rituals of Nepal", to: *Heritage of the Kathmandu Valley*, ed. by N. Gutschow and A. Michaels, St. Augustin 1987.

122. Viz. p. 15 l. 15; this passage is part of a section said to be borrowed from the *Rāmāyaṇa* (cf. p. 13. l. 19 and fn. 3); this seems to be only partially true since the parts in question are not found in the critical edition nor in any other edition of the *R.* I was able to check.

123. Cf. also 12.1. A parallel is *Mhv.* 11.28.

124. I fail to understand Oldenberg's query (*The Dipavamsa*..., London-Edinburgh 1879, p. 166): "all that being worthy(?) of a royal coronation".

125. As *Dīp.* 11.39 (*dutyāṃ abhiṣiṇ-ītha...* *dutyābhiseko...*) shows, the coronation referred to is a "second" one.

But it has to be admitted that the present argument (§ 4.2.3) is rather weak in that all it can at best be adduced for is the statement that the *bhṛṅgāra* was in fact used as an *abhiṣekapatra*. There are, however, also passages which clearly confirm Bharuci, and it is to these that attention will now be drawn.

5.1. Among the material utilized by G. N. Khare<sup>126</sup> "the story of Mūladeva as narrated in Jacobi's *Hindu Tales*<sup>127</sup> and translated by Meyer in (sic!) English"<sup>128</sup> is of relevance here. Its contents are summarized by Khare thus: "It is said that Mūladeva while residing at Bennāyāḍa, the king of the country died without issue. The ministers and other state officers, therefore, let loose the five divine things of the five emblems of royalty to select the future king. When these divine things appeared before Mūladeva who was sitting in a garden in the capital at the time, the elephant trumpeted, the steed neighed, the golden pitcher sprinkled him, the chowrie fanned him, and the parasol shaded his head. Here an elephant, a horse, a golden pitcher, (a pair of) chowries, and a parasol are enumerated as the five emblems of royalty..."

The sentence to be considered here in the first place runs thus;<sup>129</sup> *taṃ pecchiya gulugulyaṃ haṭṭhiṇā, hesiyaṃ turangeṇā, aḥisitto bhṛṅgāreṇa (=abhiṣikto bhṛṅgāreṇa), vīṇo camarehiṃ, śhiyaṃ uvari puṇḍarīyaṃ*, and this is perfectly clear. This part of the story of Mūladeva opens, however, with (62.34): *io ya tte nayarie aputto rāyā kālagao*, "now the king of that city had died sonless", immediately followed by the phrase: *taṭṭha aliyāsīyāṇi pañca divvāni*, and the precise meaning of these few words has given a number of scholars quite a headache. Meyer renders *aliyāsīa-* by "deputed" and refers<sup>130</sup> to "*Indische Studien* XV. 359 (where we find the correct translation *pañca divyāni adhiṣītāni*)": that is to say, he disagrees with Jacobi who derives

126. Cf. fn. 95.

127. Actually the title of H. Jacobi's work is: *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī*, Leipzig 1886; the story is found there on pp. 56 ff.

128. J. J. Meyer's *Hindu Tales*. London 1909, are "An English Translation of Jacobi's" reader; for the story of Mūladeva see pp. 193 ff.

129. Quoted from Jacobi's edition, p. 62 l. 36, p.

130. Viz. in fn. 3 on p. 131.

Prakrit *aliyāśei* from Skt. *adhyāśayati* - and proposes the rendering "to rule as a symbol" - as for the Skt. original, viz. *adhiṣita*, he refers to Weber (who quotes the phrase *pañce divyāny adhiṣītāni* from *Simhāsanadvatrimśikā*, but interprets it to mean "[they asked] five fateful questions") and to Tawney's translation of the *Kathākośa*<sup>131</sup> (who renders *divyāni* by "ordeals" and the verb under discussion by "appointed").

The problem involved have been taken up for a fresh and much closer study by Edgerton<sup>132</sup>; and he has convincingly shown that the phrase in question means "the five divine instruments were imbued (with the superhuman power they were expected to use)" > "they were consecrated", a meaning according well also with the expression *pañca divyāny abhiṣīktāni* of the *Parīṣiṣṭaparvan*<sup>133</sup>. Jacobi's translation of *pañca divyāni* by the "five insignia of royalty" - to which Khare also has obviously fallen a prey - has been criticized already by Meyer who deems it "hardly correct", the reason being that "with the Jaina too these are: Sword, parasol, crown, shoes, chowries", whereas here "we have: Elephant, steed, golden pitcher, chowries, parasol"; similarly Edgerton<sup>134</sup> warns against confusing the five ensigns of royalty with the *pañcadivyāni*: he notes<sup>135</sup> that "the neuter noun *divya* is frequently found in the law-books in the sense of 'ordeals'" and argues that in the passages examined by him "the word is used in a concrete instead of an abstract sense", viz. that

131. *The Kathākośa or Treasure of Stories* (Oriental Translation Fund, New Series II) London 1895; see pp. 4, 128 and 155.

132. Viz. in an article of his entitled "Pañcadivyādhivāsa or Choosing a King by Divine Will" published in: *JAOS* 33, 1913, pp. 158-166; this is also referred to in Edgerton's valuable notes on Jacobi's reader, viz. his "Notes on Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī" in: *Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman*, Cambridge Mass. 1929, pp. 27-30.

133. Cf. *Śtevivāraṇī Charita or Parīṣiṣṭaparvan*..., by H. Jacobi, Calcutta 1891, p. 166. This passage is already referred to (among many others which are partially not accessible to me) by Meyer. o. c., p. 131, fn. 3.

134. Viz. in fn. 1 on p. 160 of the article referred to in fn. 132.

135. P. 166. - Cf. also *Kathākośa Prakaraṇa* of Śrī Jīneśvara Sūri, ed. by Jina Vijaya Muni (Singhi Jain Series No. 11), Bombay 1949, p. 73, l. 31.

instead of 'divine ordeal or test' it means 'the instrument of divine test'.<sup>136</sup>

I do not at all want to contradict either of the two scholars; but there are two points which I should nevertheless like to make:

1. It cannot be taken for granted that throughout the whole of Indian history the ensigns of royalty have been none other than the very five enumerated by Meyer and Edgerton indeed sources have been adduced in the foregoing which testify to the contrary.

2. Of the two pentads; viz. the *rājakakudāni* and the *divyāni*, it cannot be disputed that the latter set is divided into two subsets, viz. the two state animals, on the one side, and "the golden pitcher, the chowries and the parasol", i.e. three inanimate objects, on the other, and that out of these three the latter two form part of the ensigns of royalty (and not only the allegedly fixed set of five *rājaka-kudas*). There is hence no scope for any serious doubt that the "pitcher", i.e. *bhṛṅgāra*, too, is here equally regarded as one of the insignia: On its part the "golden pitcher" chooses the new king in that it by itself "sprinkles him", i.e. indicates that he is to be consecrated king in a ceremony in which it will function as the *abhiṣeka-pātra*. Yet in thus selecting the person who is to rule the country the *bhṛṅgāra* symbolizes royalty to the same degree as the parasol and the chowries, the state elephant and the royal steed or the royal chariot<sup>137</sup>—so that from this angle the distinction between the ensigns, on the one hand, and the *pañca divyāni*, on the other, becomes ultimately insignificant in substance.

5.2. And this latter conclusion is, if I am not mistaken, fully confirmed by the *Aupapātikasūtra*.<sup>138</sup> For, in the description of

136. Note however that in the *Aupapātikasūtra* (cf. fn. 138), p. 55 (§ 49. II) the flags of the umbrella are given the attribute *divya*.—This particular use of the legal-term *divya* has apparently been not taken notice of by R. W. Lariviere, *The Divyatattva of Raghunandana Bhāṭṭācārya, Ordeals in Classical Hindu Law*, Delhi 1981.

137. On the "state chariot" (*puṣyāratha* etc.) see e. g. Meyer, o. c., p. 131. fn. 3. and Edgerton, l. c., p. 160.

138. E. Leumann, *Das Aupapātika Sūtra, erstes Upāṅga der Jaina*, I. Theil: Einleitung, Text und Glossar. (AKM VIII, 2), Leipzig, 1883, p. 57 (§ 52).

Kūṇika's ceremonious setting out from the city of Campā this king, seated on his elephant, is not only said to be surrounded by excellent horses, elephants and many chariots, but he is also characterized as "one above whom a white umbrella is raised" (*usaviya-seya-chaitte*), "one who is fanned with (a) chowrie (s)" (*pavia-vala-viyanīye*), and "one towards / by whom/whose a/the *bhṛṅgāra* is lifted up" (*abbhug-gayabhṛṅgāre*).<sup>139</sup> Their possible or even probable practical functions apart, the umbrella and the chowrie(s) are clearly meant here, too, as insignia of royalty: In order to honour Mahāvīra the king sets out in a procession in which all the royal splendour is displayed—and which forms the model, so to say, of that of ministers and other state officers as referred to by Kauṭilya (cf. § 2. 3. above). Therefore it is highly improbable that nothing but a drinking vessel should be meant by the expression *bhṛṅgāra*, i. e. an object serving a practical purpose only, however precious the materials from which it is made. Rather there is every likelihood that this *bhṛṅgāra* also represents, and in the first place at that, an ensign of regal dignity.

5.3. Clearer still is the text to which I should now like to draw attention, viz. the *Markaṇḍeya P.* The passage I have in mind is referred to already in the *Larger Petrograd Dictionary*<sup>140</sup>, but, obviously Böhtlingk and Roth have failed to recognize its full significance. It occurs in the story of king<sup>141</sup> Hariścandra who in order to keep his plighted word not only gives away the whole of his kingdom as

139. E. Leumann renders this *bahuvrīhi* compound, (o. c., p. 97), referring to the explanation given by the Skt. commentator, by "[the king] in whose direction the golden water jug is raised." In any case it is quite probable that the action denoted by *abhy-ud-gam* here is not performed by the king himself; cf. also *Rām* 5.18.11 (partially quoted in fn. 32).

140. It owes this information, however, to Th. Aufrecht, *Halāyudha's Abhidhānatna-mālā*, London-Bonn-Paris 1861, p. 299.—The particular *Pārśvanāthacarita* also referred to by Aufrecht, s. v. *bhṛṅgāra*, has as far as I know not yet been published.

141. That he is a king (*rājan*) is stated already at the very outset; see *Mārķ.* P. 8.3.

*dakṣiṇā* to Viśvāmitra, but is also able to clear his debts with this Rṣi only with the price he gets by selling his wife, Śaivyā and his son to a brahmin and in the end selling himself also as servant to a *caṇḍāla*. He is then forced to work at a cremation ground in the most abject state for more than a year when the corpse of his son, bitten by a snake, is brought there by the mother, the former queen. At first the parents do not recognize each other (cf. 8, 175: *sa tāṃ rorudatiṃ bhāryāṃ nabhyajānāt tu pārthivaḥ*..... and 176: *sāpi taṃ cārukeśāntaṃ purā dṛṣṭvā jaṭālakaṃ / nabhyajānān nṛpasuta śuṣkavṛkṣo-pamaṃ nṛpam ||*)<sup>143</sup>, but soon both of them become aware of the horrible truth and fall into a swoon. When they regain consciousness, the queen, after having fainted a second time, exclaims (202-203):

*ha rājan jātasantāpāṃ itthaṃ māṃ daaraṇītalai /  
utthāpya nādyā paryāṅkaṃ āroheti kim ucyate ||  
nādyā paśyami te chatraṃ bhṛṅgāraṃ athavā punaḥ ||<sup>144</sup>  
cāmaraṃ vyajānaṃ cāpi ko 'yaṃ vidhiviparyayaḥ ||*

This is aptly rendered thus by Pargiter:<sup>144</sup> "Ah, O king. Why dost thou not now raise me, who am thus afflicted, from the ground and tell me to mount to thy couch? I do not see this day thy regal umbrella, nor yet thy golden<sup>145</sup> vase, thy chowrie or fan; what is this revolution?"

The "contrariety of fate", the total change in Hariścandra's circumstances is described by the author by contrasting his former

142. Cf. verse 8.127 f. for the description of Hariścandra when working at the cremation ground.

143. Note that the parallel in the *Devībhāgavata*, Skandha 7, adhyāya 26 verse 42 c/d runs thus: *nādyā paśyami te chatraṃ śiṃhāsanam athāpi vā ||*.

144. The *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* transl. with notes by F. E. Pargiter (BI 125), Calcutta 1904, p. 53.

145. Obviously Pargiter still took *bhṛṅgāra* to mean "golden vessel"; cf. fn. 1

with the actual<sup>146</sup> state, and this is done in an artistically skilful manner in verse 203 by making Śaivyā expressly state that she looks in vain for what formerly used to indicate her husband's special dignity and might, viz. the insignia of royalty, and clearly *bhṛṅgāra*, too, is one of these. For what else should be the reason for mentioning the *abhiṣekapātra* along with the umbrella, the chowrie and the fan?

5.4. The observation that, particularly in *Nibandha* texts, the expression *kalāṣa* is often met with instead of *bhṛṅgāra* (cf. § 4.2.3 above) permits us to present still another piece of evidence. The *Kṛtyakalpataru* contains also what is called a '*cilnavidhi*',<sup>147</sup> and one of the effects ascribed to this ritual is the following one (198.3 f.):

*cāmaraṃ kalāṣaṃ śaṅkham sātapaṭraṃ vitanakaṃ /  
bhavet tu siddhikāmasya nṛpasya phaladāyakam ||*

Enumerated as it is together with other "utensils for use", which are clearly ensigns of royalty<sup>148</sup> and are mentioned here for none but this very reason, the vessel called *kalāṣa* cannot but have the same emblematic function; It, too, is one of the *cilmas* of the king, and thus indirectly confirms the result achieved with regard to the *bhṛṅgāra*. For, whatever the exact relation between the *kalāṣa* and the *bhṛṅgāra* in terms of the history of Indian arts and crafts, there should no longer be any doubt that if in fact two different vessels, i. e. vessels of different shape, are referred to by these expressions, one of them has taken the place of the other in the course of time, although their function has remained the same and this function was

146. Cf. also verse 8.204 ff.

147. Cf. also the section called *cilneṣu devīpūjāvidhi* in the *Vīramitrodaya* (cf. § 4.2.2. p. 442; both these *Nibandha* works assert that they are quoting from the *Devīpurāṇa*).

148. On the conch see e. g. *Dīp.* 11.32 and 12.2 (cf. § 4.2.3); as for the canopy see § 3.2 and e. g. *YuktiKa*, 79 verse 98 ff. *virāṇa-lakṣaṇam*).

to serve as an *abhiṣekapātra* and therefore, to be sure, also as another of the many insignia of royalty in India<sup>149</sup>.

149. There are at least two more passages which are likely to further corroborate what forms the main result of the present study. The first is *AV Parīṣṭya* LXIV. 7.6 (*The Parīṣṭyas of the Atharvaveda*, ed. by G. M. Bolling and J. von Negelein, Leipzig 1909-1910, p. 413), and the second one is *Viṣṇusmṛti* 63.32; the latter forms part of a chapter in which things, etc. are enumerated the sight of which is considered inauspicious when the king starts on an expedition (cf. also P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmasāstra*, Vol. III, Poona 1973, p. 227 f.); and the former belongs to the vast subject of dream and its interpretation in India. But I have first to consult books not available at Hamburg or in Germany before a final conclusion can be arrived at regarding this material so that I have to postpone this to a later addendum.

## ADDENDA

Page 1 § 2: On "The Sources and Authorship of the Yuktikalpataru", cf. S. R. Sarma in: *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies* III, 1986, 39-54.

Page 12, first paragraph:

Cf. two recent articles of H. Scharfe's, viz. "Nomadisches Erbgut in der indischen Tradition", in: *Hinduismus und Buddhismus, Festschrift für U. Schneider*, hrsg. von H. Falk, Freiburg 1987, 300-308, and "Zur Einsetzung des Königs im vedischen Indien", in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14 = *Festschrift W. Rau*, hrsg. von H. Brückner, D. George, C. Vogel u. A. Wezler, Reinbek 1988, 185-193.

## CORRIGENDA

[Wrong divisions of words are, as a rule, not taken into account here, nor the non-spacing of what should have been spaced, nor the erroneous substitution of a hyphen by a dash, etc.; references are to pages and lines, the latter extending to the foot-notes also.]

	WRONG	RIGHT
1. 14	<i>Yuktika.</i>	<i>YuktiKa.</i>
24	cf	cf.
25	II,	II,2
25	A Debrunner	A. Debrunner
26	1 54	1954
27	p 519	p. 519.
27	gol en	golden
30	<i>Encylopaedic</i>	<i>Encyclopaedic</i>
2. 5	<i>Pratijñā°</i>	<i>Pratijñā°</i>
12	V savadattā	Vāsavadattā
15	nddharāyaṇa	ndharāyaṇa.
22	wrong	wrong.
24	i e	i.e.
26	1978)	1978).
35	<i>nāpakṛtām</i>	<i>nāpakṛtaṃ</i>
37	<i>tvavā</i>	<i>trayā</i>
3. 3	desired	desired;
14	for last	for the last
21	"the death i.e.	"the death (i.e.
30	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i>

35	<i>b ṛiṅgāra°</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāra°</i>
38	<i>prasannaḥ.</i>	<i>prasannaḥ,</i>
4. 11	<i>prapaḷāyibhiḥ</i>	<i>prapaḷāyibhiḥ </i>
17	<i>bhṛṅgārāṇāṃ</i>	<i>bhṛṅgārāṇām</i>
18	<i>sauvarṇāṇām</i>	<i>sauvarṇāṇām</i>
5. 3	<i>tṛṣṇārtam</i>	<i>tṛṣṇārtam</i>
10	<i>deāiṅg</i>	<i>dealing</i>
13	<i>cāram</i>	<i>cāram</i>
29	<i>tyaktajivita°</i>	<i>tyaktajivita°</i>
37	<i>Reghavan</i>	<i>Raghavan</i>
39	<i>Würzburg</i>	<i>Würzburg</i>
6. 1	“poisongivers”	“poison-givers”
6	<i>Jayamaṅgalā</i>	<i>Jayamaṅgalā</i>
21	to his functions	to perform his functions
26	if need be	if need be.
29	wistnesses;	witnesses;
7. 14	hierarchv-	hierarchy-
25	<i>...jyestham</i>	<i>...jyestham</i>
8. 15	<i>Raṅgaāntha</i>	<i>Raṅganātha</i>
20	<i>(cāravikalpaparakaraṇa)</i>	<i>(cāravikalpaparakaraṇa)</i>
21	<i>dhāriṇaḥ</i>	<i>dhāriṇaḥ</i>
29	<i>sauvarṇakaraka</i>	<i>sauvarṇakaraka,</i>
30	39.	39).
9. 6	dictionary	dictionary;
11	5.16. 12	5.16.12
19	deservest	deserves
39	<i>Liṅgayasūrin</i>	<i>Liṅgayasūrin</i>
41	<i>bhṛṅgārau</i>	<i>bhṛṅgārau.</i>
10. 13	<i>Veṇisamhāra</i>	<i>Veṇisamhāra</i>
20	plaeed	placed
34	salilam upanaya).	<i>salilam upanaya).</i>
11. 2	<i>dhovā°</i>	<i>dhovā°</i>
4	“The	“The
5	feet of friend	feet of my friend
7	feet queen	feet the queen
16	13 2729	13.2729
19	<i>bhṛṅgāram</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāram</i>
12. 4	wheel:	wheel.
7	<i>bhṛṅgāra-vessel</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāra-vessel</i>
9	viz	viz.
16	mentioned <sup>68</sup> ,	mentioned <sup>68</sup> ;
34	Nachless	Nachlass
36	O.C., p	O.c., p.
13. 12	cause	curse
14. 3	<i>veḷu°</i>	<i>Veḷu°</i>
9	<i>bhīṅkāram</i>	<i>bhīṅkāram</i>
17	<i>bhṛṅgāram</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāram</i>

18	cf	cf.
19	<i>ṣighram</i>	<i>ṣighram</i>
20	<i>ayam</i>	<i>ayam</i>
35	Überlieferung	Überlieferung
37	<i>bhṛṅgāram</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāram</i>
15. 22	<i>ākṛtiḥ</i>	<i>ākṛtiḥ</i>
31	<i>Malārāja-</i>	<i>Mahārāja-</i>
34	<i>cānd nam</i>	<i>cāndanam</i>
34	<i>lahajam</i>	<i>lohajam</i>
16. 9	<i>ittham</i>	<i>ittham</i>
11	<i>YuktiKa</i>	<i>YuktiKa.</i>
13	tradition	tradition,
32	<i>catvāra</i>	<i>catvāro</i>
17. 7	N. S. Mooss's	N. S. Mooss's
10	10-12, 5 cm	10- 12, 5 cm
13	is least	is at least
14	some what	somewhat
32	<i>Vasudeva</i>	<i>Vasudeva-</i>
18. 4	in particular	in a particular
14	<i>Jālini,</i>	<i>Jālini.</i>
22	viz	viz.
25	said to he	said to be
26	° <i>puṣkare</i>	° <i>puṣkare</i>
19. 5	i.e	i.e.
9	commentator	commentator.
24	connected	connected.
32	cf	cf.
36	that use	that the use
20. 22	used In such	used in such
23	note-worthy	noteworthy
31	<i>pūṇaghaṭa</i>	<i>pūṇaghaṭa</i>
33	<i>bhadrakumbha</i>	<i>bhadrakumbha</i>
37	on it. can	on it. can
21. 3	<i>YuktiKa,</i>	<i>YuktiKa.,</i>
5	<i>chatradhvaja°</i>	<i>chatradhvaja°</i>
15	<i>vitānaś</i>	<i>vitānaś</i>
22. 41	G H. Khare	G.H. Khare
23. 25	of royalty	of royalty disappear
29	trasmission	transmission
24. 3	<i>manāṃsi</i>	<i>manāṃsi</i>
16	“attendants?”.	“attendants?”.
38	p 192.	p 192.
25. 9	context,	context;
20	4 2	4.2.
30	to me	to me.

35	a bit	a bit
39	Glücks und	Glücks- und
26. 1	<i>kakud</i> (a)	<i>kakud</i> (a)
12	another one,	another one;
16	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i>
19	<i>rājaliṅga</i>	<i>rājaliṅga</i>
20	the	the
29	me	my
27. 6	<i>ketum</i>	<i>ketum</i>
12	hesitation	hesitation;
16	Rāma of.	Rāma (cf.
24	<i>kalaśa</i> (s)	<i>kalaśa</i> (s)
28. 3	<i>sarvatīrthadbhir</i>	<i>sarvatīrthadbhir</i>
13	<i>abhiśikto</i>	<i>abhiśikto</i>
13	<i>kalaśa</i>	<i>kalaśa</i>
14	contexts <sup>117</sup>	contexts; <sup>117</sup>
18	16.7, <sup>119</sup>	16.7. <sup>119</sup>
27	Witze 's	Witzel's
33	wrtcr	water
38	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i>	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i>
29. 18	too: <sup>125</sup>	too. <sup>125</sup>
23	° <i>pūrṇa</i> °	° <i>pūrṇa</i> °
24	<i>abhiśekapātralakṣaṇa</i>	<i>abhiśekapātralakṣaṇa</i>
26	said ro be	said to be
30. 1	admittied	admitted
6	material	material
12	things of the	things or the
20	<i>gulugulyam</i>	<i>gulugulyam</i>
21	(= <i>abhiśikto</i>	(= <i>abhiśikto</i>
25	phrase; <i>tattḥa</i>	phrase: <i>tattḥa</i>
31. 2	— as for	—; as for
3	<i>pañca</i>	<i>pañca</i>
8	problem	problems
13	Pariśiṣṭaparvan <sup>132</sup>	Pariśiṣṭaparvan. <sup>133</sup>
32. 7	Edgerton	Edgerton;
24	<i>pañca</i>	<i>pañca</i>
33. 4	( <i>isaviya</i> —	( <i>isaviya</i> —
31	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i> .	<i>bhṛṅgāra</i> ,
34. 2	Śaivya	Śaivya,
13	<i>daarani</i> °	<i>dharani</i> °
15	<i>paśyami</i>	<i>paśyāmi</i>
28	<i>Mārkaṇḍeya</i>	<i>Mārkaṇḍeya</i>
35. 13	<i>saṅkham</i>	<i>saṅkham</i>
18	function; It	function; it
25	same and	same; and
27	4.2.2	4.2.2.)
31	98ff	98ff. (
36. 7	, etc are	, etc , are