

Albrecht WEZLER

A note on the class of ascetics called *unmajjaka**

1. The well-known dichotomy of the *vānaprasthas* into *pacamānakas*¹ and *apacamānakas* of BaudhDhS 3.3.1f.² is so obviously based on the distinction between an essential property of the food taken by these two classes of ascetics, respectively, that one hesitates to state this explicitly. Similarly it need hardly be added that the *apacamānakas* can not by any means be regarded as forerunners of the modern “Roh-köstler”, i.e. people who (only or partially) live on uncooked fruits and vegetables — as part of a dietetic treatment prescribed by a medical doctor or voluntarily for various reasons —; and it is certainly not necessary either to mention that the eating of raw vegetables and fruits exclusively as part of or as the very substance of an ascetic practice can still be observed in present-day India. It is evidently the extraordinary and very special significance attached by the Vedic Indians to the fire, the God Fire, its/his polyvalent manifestations and the various kinds of fireplaces belonging to the house and to the sacrificial ground, which led them to pay all this attention to the manner in which

* This is the slightly revised version of a paper which I had the pleasure of reading at the Institut d'Extrême-Orient of the Collège de France on the 19th of May 1992, at the kind invitation of Association Française pour les Etudes Sanskrites and URA 1058 “LACMI” (University of Paris-3/CNRS [head: Prof. Dr. Nalini Balbir]). In it most of the suggestions given and questions put by my French colleagues on this occasion are reflected in one way or the other.

1. Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik* II,2, Göttingen 1954, p. 538 (§ 362d) notes that “-ka- tritt ... schon früh gern auch an Partizipien”, but the only example he adduces where this suffix is added to an *ātmanepada* participle is *pravartamānakā* (cf. RV 1.191.16), and as for its meaning, he does not say more than “und zwar zunächst nur in deminutiver Bedeutung”. With the help of W. Schwarz, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Reverse Index of Old Indian*, Wiesbaden 1974-1978, p. 18, however, more relevant examples can be found, and some of them (e.g. *vardhamānaka*) confirm the assumption, suggested by (a) *pacamānaka*, that -ka- is added in order to distinguish a particular group of people characterized by a common practice, or lack of it, from persons who “cook for themselves”, i.e. that it forms what nowadays would be called a designation of an occupation. — Note that the *ātmanepada* makes real sense only in the case of *pacamānaka*. — C. Lévi-Strauss, *Mythologica I. Le cru et le cuit*, Paris 1964, does not deal with this Indian dichotomy.

2. The text reads: *atha vānaprasthadvaividhyam // 1 // pacamānakā apacamānakāś ceti // 2 //*.

vānaprasthas took along “fire” when ‘leaving the world’, i.e. their home (in the village or town). As many other features of Indian asceticism (in general), renouncing the use of fire, too, gives the impression of leading back to a much earlier stage in the cultural development of mankind, viz. when man had not yet learned to ‘tame fire’³. To try to imagine this stage, and the later one when man had acquired enough knowledge about this elementary force to be himself able to produce fire at his own will, etc., helps in any case to achieve a fuller and deeper understanding of the Aryan and Vedic ideas about *agni/Agni*.

As for the *adhyāya* of the BaudhDhS at issue here, the dichotomy just mentioned is noteworthy also because the principle on which it is based is followed consistently when subdividing the *pacamānakas*⁴ into five subgroups; but it is now their particular type of food by which the *sarvāranyakas*, etc., are defined and distinguished from each other: the use of fire to prepare their respective food is, of course, *per definitionem* common to all of them. The subdivision of the class of the *apacamānakas*⁵, however, is much less clear in itself, i.e. is not also based on this, or a similarly consistent and plausible, element of the (physical) ‘basic needs’⁶. Only in two cases, viz. that of the *toyāhāras*⁷ and that of the *vāyubhakṣas*⁸, what is decisive is once again what these ascetics take. In two other cases, viz. those forming the second and the third sub-

3. In reality, however, one of the reasons for regarding a diet consisting of uncooked food as ascetic in substance may have been that the Indians of those early days were still conscious of what it means to be able to prepare food by cooking it in so far as fire, not to speak of other forms of energy, was after all not so easily available as nowadays, even if we do have good reason to assume that the forest covering in the subcontinent then was far more extensive than it is today. Most probably it was a common experience for a rather large group of the population not to eat a warm meal every day.

4. For sūtra 3.3.3 reads: *tatra pacamānakāḥ pañcavidhāḥ sarvāranyakā vaituṣikāḥ kṣandamūlabhakṣāḥ phalabhakṣāḥ śakabhakṣāś ceti* //.

5. Taught at 3.3.9: *pañcaivāpacamānakā unmajjakāḥ pravṛttāśino mukhenādāyinas toyāhārā vāyubhakṣāś ceti* //.

6. In contradistinction to the use made of this term in recent years by officials of so-called ‘developing countries’, what I mean is nothing than the quantity of food (of any kind) and of water absolutely necessary to keep a person alive.

7. Cf. sūtra 3.3.13: *toyāhārāḥ kevalaṃ toyāhārāḥ* //.

8. Cf. sūtra 3.3.14: *vāyubhakṣā nirāhārāś ca* //. See on these two latter sūtras, but also on 3.3.11 and 12, the important remarks by my friend S.A. Srinivasan, *Studies in the Rāma Story* ..., Wiesbaden 1984, notes 154–156, (Vol. II, p. 46f.). — As for *nirāhārāś ca* I am, however, not convinced that Srinivasan is right when he states (note 153) that “This introduces a sixth group of ascetics not covered by the five groups only enumerated at ... sūtra 9”; to me it would seem that *nirāhārāś* in fact is meant to explain *vāyubhakṣā* — just as *kevalaṃ toyāhārāḥ* the *definiendum toyāhārāḥ* in the preceding sūtra —, i.e. that in both cases, though in different ways, it is made clear that the ascetics referred to do not take in anything but water or air (“wind”) in accordance with the less problematic paraphrase given by Patañjali, the *Mahābhāṣyakāra* (see note 11). The *ca* may have crept in secondarily, or even have been repeated by the author himself, in view of the function it has in sūtra 3.3.9 (cf. also 3.3.3), viz. to mark the end of the enumeration or explanation, though no *ca* is admittedly found at the end of 3.3.8. Note, however, that 3.3.15 (*iti vaikhānasānāṃ vihitā daśa dīkṣāḥ*) shows that the classification as a whole is completed by 3.3.14.

category, however, it is not the (raw) food itself that distinguishes these ascetics from each other and from the others, but the manner in which it is gathered or taken⁹. Yet the latter pair as such not only forms a reasonable subdivision by itself, but can also be said to refer at least indirectly to ingestion of food¹⁰. The fifth subcategory — according to the sequence of enumeration of the BaudhDhS it is actually the first of the 5 types of *apacamānakas* —, however, is of an entirely different nature, i.e. does not at all go with what clearly serves as the basis of the dichotomy as well as of its corresponding subdivisions. For *unmajjakāḥ* of BaudhDhS 3.3.9 is, rightly to some extent, not explained semantically in the subsequent sūtra — in contradistinction to the terms denoting other classes of ‘non-cooking’ *vānaprasthas*: there cannot be any doubt that this expression was regarded by the author as sufficiently clear in itself in that it is immediately recognized as a *nomen agentis*¹¹ of *ud-√majj* meaning “one who emerges (out of water)”. Clearly this designation has nothing at all to do with food or the manner it is gathered or taken.

Unfortunately sūtra 3.3.10 (*tattronmajjakā nāma lohāśmakaraṇavarjam*)¹² does not give any clue for understanding the nature of this class of ascetics, and Govinda-svāmin is equally of no help at all¹³. Bühler¹⁴ simply retains the Sanskrit term, and P.V. Kane¹⁵ in fact follows his example.

9. Srinivasan’s critical remarks apart (for which see the reference in note 8), in the case of the *mukhenādāyins* at least a more appropriate expression than German “essen” would certainly be “fressen”. For, to be sure, the manner of eating typical of animals is **deliberately** imitated by these ascetics; cf. in this connection not only the verse

mṛgaiḥ saha parisandah, etc.,

found at BaudhDhS 3.2.19 and 3.3.22, but also the *pāda* Mbh. 12.250.19d as well as 7 App. 8, 170 post.

mṛgaiḥ saha cacāra sā //.

10. On food as a ‘cultural construct’ in India see now P. Olivelle’s contribution “From Feast to Fast: Food and the Indian Ascetic” to the book *Rules and Remedies in Classical Indian Law*, ed. by J. Leslie (Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference Vol. IX), Leiden (etc.), 1991, pp. 17-35.

11. And at the same time as a designation like (*a*)*pacamānaka* (on which see above note 1)? Note also that it cannot be simply taken for granted that it is a fixed, i.e. well established and generally known, term; after all instead of *toyāhāra* Patañjali, e.g., uses *abbhakṣa* (Mahābhāṣya I 6.23; III 180.15 and 333.6). — The remark of Sprockhoff (“*Āraṇyaka and Vānaprastha in der vedischen Literatur ... Zweiter Hauptteil*” in *WZKS XXVIII* (1984), p. 27), “Daß die *unmajjakāḥ* durch Untertauchen im Wasser baden, besagt bereits ihr Name”, I fail to understand for more than one reason.

12. Note that *tatra* (“among them”) and *nāma* (“[those] called ...”) are together used in sūtra 3.3.4, too, and *nāma* alone in 3.3.5f.

13. For he confines himself to explaining only *lohāśmakaraṇavarjam*; see below note 95.

14. *Sacred Laws of the Āryas as taught in the schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāsishttha and Baudhāyana*, Pt. II, (SBE Vol. XVI), Oxford 1882, p. 292f.

15. *History of Dharmasāstra ...*, Vol. II, 2nd ed., Poona 1974, p. 922.

2. Of the dictionaries it is, if I am not mistaken, only Apte's¹⁶ which really contributes to a clarification. For he quotes the verse

*kaṇṭhadadhne jale sthitvā
tapah kurvan pravartate /
unmajjakāḥ sa vijñeyas
tāpaso lokapūjitaḥ //*

and in a later edition¹⁷ the reference "Rām. 3.6.3" is added. But this is obviously an error because the passage of the Rāmāyaṇa referred to (Baroda Ed. 3.5.3) is entirely different although in a long list of designations of various ascetics¹⁸ it does contain our *unmajjakāḥ* also. The commentator Rāma, however, in his Tilaka seems to quote¹⁹ the beginning of this verse²⁰, the text of which is given in full also in the Vācaspatya²¹ and in the Śabdastomamahānidhi²², but without any indication of the source. Other commentators substantially agree with Rāma, but add also some further interesting details. Thus Mādhavayogin²³ explains: *kaṇṭhadadhnajale hemanteṣu sthitvā tapas-sādhakāḥ* (= *unmajjakāḥ*); Govindarāja says²⁴: *śiromātram uddhṛtya sadā jalāvagādhāḥ*, while Śivasahāya²⁵ formulates the same facts in yet another manner, viz. thus: *kaṇṭha-parimitajale sthitirūpataponirataḥ*.

16. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* ..., 2nd ed., Bombay 1912.

17. Viz. The Revised and Enlarged Edition prepared by P.K. Gode and E.G. Karve, Poona 1957.

18. Cf. also M.G. Bhagat, *Ancient Indian Asceticism*, Delhi 1976, p. 262.

19. He does not, however, use an *iti*.

20. Viz. from *kaṇṭhadadhne* to *kurvantaḥ* (he uses, of course, the plural).

21. Ed. by Sri Taranatha Tarkavachaspati, repr. Varanasi 1962; most probably this was also Apte's source!

22. Compiled by Tarkavāchaspati Śrī Tārānātha Bhaṭṭāchārya, Varanasi 1967, s.v.

23. *Śrīmadvālmikīrāmāyaṇa* with Amṛtakataka of Mādhavayogi (Vol. IV - Aranyakāṇḍa), ed. by N.S. Venkatanathacharya, Mysore 1965, p. 41.

24. *Srīmad Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa*, A Critical Edition with the Commentary of Sri Govindarāja ..., ed. by T. R. Krishnacharya and T. R. Vyasacharya, Bombay 1981, Aranyakāṇḍa, p. 20. — Cf. also the verse

*hemante jāhnavītōye
harakāmy adhiṣṭale /
ākaṇṭhamagnā dhyāyanti
samsthitā candraśekhara //*

quoted by M.R. Kale at the end of his notes on Kumāras. 5.26 (see below p. 226) (*Kālidāsa's Kumārasambhava* ... ed. by M.R. Kale, repr. Delhi (etc.) 1967, p. [88]). His reference "S.P." (= Śivapurāṇa) I have not however been able to verify.

25. *Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki with the Commentaries Tilaka of Rāma, Rāmāyaṇaśiromaṇi of Śivasahāya and Bhūṣaṇa of Govindarāja*, ed. by Shastri Shrinivasa Katti Mudholakara (repr. Parimal Sanskrit Series No. 11), Delhi 1983, Vol. III Aranyakāṇḍa, p. 1065.

The verse quoted by Apte and the explanations given by the Rāmāyaṇa commentators are important first of all for the following reason: An examination of all the passages listed in the *Vaidika-Padānukrama-Koṣa* s.v. *un-majj*²⁶ yields the result that this verb, even if it is used alone, i.e. does not stand in explicit opposition to a form of *ni-majj* or *majj*, seems always to imply that the act of emerging is preceded by the contrary act of submerging²⁷. Therefore one cannot help asking oneself the question whether the class of ascetics called *unmajjaka* is characterized by repeated submergence — and perhaps remaining submerged as long as possible — and emergence from the water — perhaps only for that much of time which is necessary for breathing²⁸. It is precisely this (not only semantically possible) assumption that is ruled out by the explanations quoted by me just now²⁹. For all the commentators are unanimously of the opinion that the essential characteristic of this class of ascetics is, on the contrary, that they stand in water which reaches up to their throat, and do not move, at least not up and down. And this is tantamount to stating that these ascetics are *unmajjakas* not in the literal sense of people who carry out the action of emerging from water, but only look like such people in so far as their head and perhaps part of their neck are above the surface of the water in which they in reality remain standing upright, most probably for a considerable period of time. It would seem that it is this practice which constitutes

26. Three of them, viz. “Baudh 1.5.110” and “Baupi 3.4.16; 6,6”, I was not able to identify. The others are AV 10.4.4 (= Paipp. 16.15.3), TB 1.1.3.6., JB 3:43, Tripādvibhūti Mahānārāyaṇa Up. 5.13, ĀgñiveśyaGS 2.6.2:13; 3.4.4:19 (*unmajjya* only); BaudhDhS 2.5.7 and Śāṅkhalikhita [for the edition used see note 65] no. 103.

27. As is also explicitly stated in the Udāna-aṭṭhakathā (74,26: *ummujjanaṃ pana nimajjanaṃ antarena n’atthi*). The — wrong — meaning “to dive” given among others by Monier-Williams with reference to “ĀśvGr IV,4,10” has been induced by a corresponding misunderstanding.

28. The exhaling could after all be done by the ascetic while still under water.

29. Note that this statement of mine is not falsified by the “500 hundred matted hair ascetics” who according to Vin. I 31.36 (cf. Udāna 6.15) “on the cold winter nights between the eights in a time of snowfall ... were plunging into the river Nerañjarā, then emerging and repeatedly plunging in and out” (... *te jaṭilā sitāsu hemantikāsu rattisu antaraṭṭhakāsu himapātasamaye najjā Nerañjarāyaṃ nimujjanti pi, ummujjanti pi, ummujjanimujjam pi karonti*.) For, these ascetics not only tend the sacred fires (Vin I 31.6f., 16, 26f.) — and carry implements for fire-worship (Vin I 33.6: *aggihuttamissa*) —, but also warm themselves, having come up from the river, at 500 fire-vessels (miraculously created for them by the Buddha) so that the interpretation offered by the Udāna (6.16), and the Udāna-aṭṭhakathā (74.25ff.), is very convincing indeed, viz. that what these ascetics want to achieve by this practice is *pāpasuddhi* — and not the accumulation of *tapas*-substance. Cf. also I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline ...*, Vol. IV (Mahāvagga), London 1951 (from whose translation I have also quoted in this note), p. 42 n. 1. In any case, I do not think that this passage, isolated as it is, can be assumed to prove quite another nature of the ascetic practice than the one I am arguing for in the present note. The Jain parallels pointed out to me by Prof. Balbir are of a somewhat similar character in that they, too, do not permit to gain an entirely clear idea about the differences in ascetic practice between the *unmajjakas*, on the one hand, and the *sammajjakas* and *nimajjakas*, on the other (cf. E. Leumann, *Das Aupapātika Sūtra, erstes Upāṅga der Jaina ...*, Leipzig 1883, p. 68f. (§ 74) as well as Jagdishchandra Jain, *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canon and Commentaries ...*, Delhi 1984 (repr.), p. 300ff.), in spite of the explanations given by Abhayadeva in his commentary on the Viyāhapaṇṇattisutta (cf. *Vihāyapaṇṇattisuttaṃ*, Pt. II ed. by Pt. Bechardas J. Joshi assisted by Pt. Amritlal Mohanlal Bhojak, Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 4 (Part 2)), Bombay 1978, p. 517).

the specific means of self-mortification³⁰ in their case.

3. The assumption that hence suggests itself as immediately plausible is that *un-majjaka* refers to the ascetic practice technically called *udavāsa* elsewhere. To render the latter expression by “residing in water” (“Aufenthalt im Wasser”), as it is done in the Larger Petrograd Dictionary, amounts to a literalness with an almost touching naivety in that the essential element of the semantic content is not even mentioned by way of explanation, viz. that a particular practice of self-mortification is referred to.

The compound as such, i.e. the substitution of *uda-* for *udaka-* as prior member, is already taught by Pāṇini in 6.3.58. There is no proof that Pāṇini had in view the ascetic practice at issue, as the expression is obviously not attested in Vedic literature. But the opposite possibility, too, viz. that he did in fact know this practice and *udavāsa* as the term used to denote it, cannot, of course, be precluded just for this reason³¹. After all the evidence of the Mahābhārata has also to be taken into account, as rightly stated by Oberlies³² although there are more relevant passages than the two mentioned by him³³. Most, if not all of them have, I suppose, been mentioned by M. Shee in her doctoral dissertation³⁴, including those where the expression *udavāsa* itself is not attested but a similar one, or where the corresponding practice is described in other words. I do not deem it necessary on my part to examine these passages in detail here, but regard it nevertheless as advisable to take a closer look at some of them with a view of possibly gathering additional information about the *udavāsa* form of *tapas*.

Among the various kinds of “superhuman” self-mortificatory practices (*atimānuṣa*³⁵ *tapah*) taken up by Ambā one after the other, *udavāsa* in the Yamunā, i.e. a river, is the second one; the attribute *nirāhārā*, however, she is given in this connection

30. I agree with Dr. A. Roṣu that Indian asceticism, or at least some of its practices, have to be studied also from the point of view of psychology and psychopathology (which knows of similar phenomena although generally individual cases only, in Western societies). But I don't deem the present note the right place to address this problem, too, and not so much because I would then certainly need the help of specialists in the field.

31. I could not find any explanatory remark on this compound in works of the Pāṇinīyan tradition; worthy of note is the *vigraha* given in the Kāśikā (on Pāṇ. 6.3.58), viz. *udakasya vāsaḥ*. I do not, however, know why the *genitivus objectivus* (alone) is assumed.

32. *Studie zum Cāndravyākaraṇa. Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2*, Stuttgart 1989, p. 212f.

33. Viz. Mbh. 13.7.11 and 50.3.

34. *Tapas und tapasvin in den erzählenden Partien des Mahābhārata*, Reinbek 1986, p. 249ff.

35. One wonders whether this attribute is meant to express that the various practices as such are beyond what a human ascetic could perform or whether it refers to the periods of time for which they are said to have been followed by Ambā. But ultimately one cannot help gathering the impression that the expression is rather not to be taken literally as it seems primarily meant to emphasize the — allegedly — extraordinary vigour of Ambā's ascetic practices.

(Mbh. 5.187.20) is almost certainly not meant to point out something which by itself forms a constituent trait of *udavāsa*, but is rather added to emphasize that in addition to the latter practice she observed at the same time also a quite different one, viz. complete fasting. This is confirmed by the fact that Ambā is characterized as *nirāhārā*, among others, already in the preceding verse (5.187.19) in which quite a different form of *tapas* is described. The impression one cannot fail to gather is that the Epic poet mentions *udavāsa* here as one of various ascetic practices not just because it is a traditional element of the topic ‘asceticism’, but that he really knew what he was talking about and started from the assumption that those listening to him are equally familiar with this practice, too, so that he need not say more about it.

In the narration about Mahādeva’s *tapas* (Mbh. 10.17.8ff.) the characterizations of the god as *magna arimhasi* (11 and 13) and *jale magna* (14) are evidently not to be taken as indicating that he is completely immersed in water³⁶; they are rather to be interpreted in the light of what has been said above (§ 2) about the *unmajjaka*, viz. that, at least, Mahādeva’s head rises above the surface of the water.

Similarly in the description of the ascetic practices of the Goddess Mṛtyu it is not the term *udavāsa* itself that is met with; but what it denotes is expressed differently, viz. by saying that “she observed complete silence in the water (most probably of a river³⁷) for 8000 years” (12.250.20: ... *maunam ātiṣṭhad uttamam / apsu varṣasahasrāṇi sapta caikaṃ ca pārthiva*). Jājali³⁸ is among other things³⁹ said to have practised *tapas* as *jalavāsa* (12.253.4) and *jalamadhye* (12.253.5; cf. also 6)⁴⁰, but it is not immediately clear whether the statement that “he went to the region of the sea” (*sāgaroddeśam āgamyā*: 12.253.2) warrants drawing the conclusion that the *udavāsa* is performed by him in the sea, i.e. where he can still stand, — just as one wonders whether his inspecting (cf. 12.253.4) the worlds with the swiftness of thought should be regarded as a result or even as the result of his self-mortificatory practice. Yet, as it is stated in verse 9 that the demons “took him out of the sea” in order to bring him to Tulādhāra at Vārāṇasī, at

36. And does not therefore see what Brahmā is doing meanwhile? The latter element of the story is rather meant to indicate the degree of Śiva’s concentration (most probably on his practice of *udavāsa tapas* and not as part of a yogic practice).

37. The *ūrtha* Dhenuka is mentioned in verse 15, but it is not clear that the goddess has returned to it when she starts her *udavāsa tapas*. The parallel passage (Mbh. 7 App. I No. 8,171) makes her perform it in the river Nandā (said to be *puṇyā* and *śītāmalodakā*). As for the relative chronology between the two versions of this story, see critical ed. Vol. 8, p. [264] (after 7.49).

38. I. Proudfoot’s rendering (cf. *Ahimsā and a Mahābhārata Story*, Canberra 1987, p. 99) of the verse I quote in full is, to say the least, not satisfactory: who could understand “one day ... [as he] stood in the water ...” correctly as referring to a very special ascetic practice?

39. That he is characterized as *malapaṅkadhara* at 12.253.3 has to be explained as either referring to a different *tapas* practice or as an *epitheton ornans* (of an ascetic).

40. Viz. *apsu vaihāyasaṃ gacched* ...; note also that the parallel of 12.250.20 in the 7th *parvan* (cf. note 37) reads *ānayat* instead of *pārthiva* at the end of the śloka.

least the first of these questions can be answered clearly⁴¹. The continuation of the narrative is interesting also in that in verses 15 and 16 Jājali is characterized as *varṣāsv ākāśasāyī*⁴² *sa hemante jalasamśrayaḥ*⁴³ // *vātātapasaho grīṣme ...*, reminding us thus of the passage quoted from Mādhavayogin's commentary on Rām. 3.5.3⁴⁴, i.e. ultimately of the problem whether the practice of *udavāsa* was confined to the cold season or whether statements like that of Mbh. 12.253.15 are not rather to be considered as aiming at a marked intensification of the self-mortificatory practice called *udavāsa*.

M. Shee is undoubtedly right, too, when she draws attention also to Mbh. 12.278.22:

*purā so (= Śiva) 'ntarjalagataḥ
sthāṇubhūto mahāvrataḥ /
varṣāṇām abhavad rājan
prayutāny arbudāni ca //;*

for the ascetic practice referred to cannot in fact be but that under discussion in the present note. The passage is instructive in so far as it confirms the assumption (suggested already by other deliberations)⁴⁵ that immobility (being "stiff as a poker") forms an essential element of *udavāsa*⁴⁶. It is mainly for this reason that one has to render the finite verb in the subsequent verse (*udatiṣṭhat tapas taptvā duścaram sa mahā-hradāt*)⁴⁷, not, to be sure, by "to stand up (from a sitting position)" but rather by "to step/come upwards out of the water (i.e. onto the land which is as a matter of course higher)"⁴⁸.

The last passage drawn upon by my former student is the *Cyavanopākhyāna*, a story mentioned also by S. A. Srinivasan⁴⁹ who however comes to speak of it in the

41. Cf. also 12.253.48 (cf. Shee, o.c. [note 34], p. 250, note 43): *sāgarānūpam āśrītya tapas taptam tvayā mahat /*.

42. Cf. the expression *ākāśanilaya* at Rām. 3.6.3 and Bhagat, o.c. [note 18], l.c.

43. I disagree with M. Shee who voices (o.c. [note 34], p. 251 note 51) the opinion that the practice referred to in this verse is "another one", i.e. to be distinguished from that of 12.253.3. The season itself, i.e. *hemanta*, is admittedly no clear indication (see also below § 4), but *jalasamśraya* can hardly mean anything else than what is elsewhere called *udavāsa*.

44. See above p. 220.

45. See above § 2.

46. Hence *sthāṇu* at Mbh. 10.17.14 referred to above p. 223 could be deliberately used not only as a name of Śiva, but also in its appellative meaning.

47. Note that the *udavāsa* is here performed in a lake.

48. Note that the same expression (*udatiṣṭhat*) is used also at Mbh. 10.17.20, and that at Vin I 31.38 *uttarati* is used.

49. O.c. [cf. note 8], Vol. II, p. 410 note 41.

context of discussing quite a different problem, but takes also into account the testimony of Aśvaghoṣa⁵⁰. This *ākhyāna* should rather be classed with legends, mythical stories or fairy tales; in any case it goes far beyond what is possible or realistic, and is in a way distinctly different from the 'superhumanly' long periods of ascetic practice(s) which are mentioned in some of the passages examined in the foregoing, for we are told that "Cyavana for twelve years remained asleep under water⁵¹ at the point where the Ganges and the Jumna meet [and] was fished out by fishers⁵²", his body being completely covered by aquatic plants, mussels and shells⁵³. Nevertheless this *ākhyāna* is of no little significance in that it throws considerable light on an aspect that is not mentioned elsewhere in the relevant material as far as I can see, viz. the relation between the ascetic practising *udavāsa* and the living beings whose natural biosphere after all is water. Thus it is stated of Cyavana that *jalaukasām sa sattvānām babhūva priyadarśanaḥ* (13.50.10ab) and that "(the) fishes sniffed at him⁵⁴ rejoicingly" (*upājighranta ca tadā matsyās taṁ hr̥ṣṭamānasāḥ*: 10cd). This may, of course, be due, to some extent at least, to transferring the idyllic image, or *topos*, of the peaceful coexistence (of not only *vānaprasthas* and wild animals but also of animals otherwise hostile among themselves)⁵⁵ from the *āśrama* to this very special place of "ascetic efforts"; but nonetheless even this *ākhyāna* clearly testifies to the idea that the relation between this class of ascetics and the element in and with the help of which they perform their austerities has been considered to be a particularly intimate one.

4. Another relevant passage referred to already in the Larger Petrograd Dictionary s.v. *udavāsa*⁵⁶ is Kumāras. 5.26. In the course of the description of Pārvatī's extended and variegated *tapas* it is said in the first half of this verse:

50. Viz. *Buddhacarita* VII.17.

51. Mbh. 13.50.9cd (*tataś cordhvasthito dhīmān abhavad bharatarṣabha /*) could, of course, be taken to state that Cyavana afterwards emerges out of the water. But if this is true, why is he not seen by the fishers?

52. Quoted from S. A. Srinivasan, o.c. [see note 8], l.c., note 41.

53. The reading *koṣṭhaiḥ* is marked in the critical edition as being not certain; this is true of its meaning, too.

54. This gives very much the impression of being a wrong, anthropomorphic, interpretation of a basically correct observation of the behaviour of fishes.

55. Clearly this *topos* is the Indian expression, or one of the Indian expressions, of man's age-old dream of an entirely peaceful nature, i.e. a nature which lacks one of its most essential characteristics, viz. the 'law of the jungle'. In the European tradition this *topos* is, as is well-known, primarily connected with the description of paradise.

56. As well as in Apte's Dictionary [cf. notes 16 and 17] and by Oberlies, o.c., l.c. [cf. note 32].

*nināya sātyantahimotkirānilāḥ
sahasyarātrīr udavāsataṭparā* /⁵⁷,

viz. that “she passed the nights of the [winter month of] Pauṣa, during which the wind whirls up snow in large masses, fully intent on staying in water”. Neither Vallabhadeva⁵⁸ nor Mallinātha have anything to say on *udavāsa* not already known to us⁵⁹. Unfortunately, however, they do not offer any explanation of the fact that Kālidāsa speaks of the nights only. Are we to assume that at daytime she does not practise this form of asceticism, or perhaps none at all? Or is not the verse rather to be interpreted, just as the particular season⁶⁰ mentioned⁶¹, as meant to emphasize the uncompromisingly firm resolution of Pārvatī and the extraordinary harshness of her, a female’s, self-mortification by stating that she does not interrupt it even at night when it gets still colder⁶²?

At the end of his commentary on this verse of Kālidāsa’s Mallinātha quotes

*‘apsu vāsas tu hemante /
kramaśo vardhayet tapaḥ //*
iti Manuḥ //.

57. The corresponding verse in the Śivapurāṇa (Rudrasaṃhitā 2.3.22.42) reads:

*śīte jalāntare śaśvat
tasthau sā bhaktitaṭparā /
anāhārātapat tatra
nīhāreṣu niśāsu ca //*;

see also note 24 above.

58. The first line as attested by Vallabhadeva however reads:

nināya sātyarthahimottarānilāḥ.

Note that both the editions now available, viz. that by M.S. Narayan Murti (Vallabhadeva’s Kommentar (Śāradā-Version) zum Kumārasambhava des Kālidāsa, Wiesbaden 1980 (VOHD Supplementband 20,1)) as well as that of Dr. Gautam Patel (Mahākavikālidāsaviracitaṃ Kumārasaṃbhavam [with the Commentary of Vallabhadeva], Ahmedabad 1986), are of such a quality that the reader is compelled to use both side by side (and sometimes to reconstruct the correct text for himself).

59. It should, however, be noted that they dissolve the compound not as is done in the Kāśikā (cf. note 31), but instead as *udake vāsah*.

60. Both, Vallabhadeva on Kumāras. 5.26 (actually 5.25 according to his counting) as also Medhātithi, and other commentators, on Manu 6.23 (with which I deal in the next paragraph) emphasize that *śiśira* is in fact included; Vallabhadeva also explains why other months, or seasons, are not also mentioned. Note that explanations to the same effect are found also in Nibandha works.

61. See also above note 43.

62. But the former interpretation seems to me more plausible also in view of the context which, by the way, clearly stands against taking *rātrīr* here to mean “for 24 hours”.

In the editions of the Kumāras. accessible to me the precise point in the Manusmṛti is not indicated. By a circuitous route⁶³ I was finally led to Manusmṛti 6.23cd which, however, reads:

(grīṣme pañcatapās tu syād
varṣāsv abhrāvakāśikah /)
ādravāsās tu hemante
kramaśo vardhayaṃs tapaḥ //.

And the reading *ādravāsās* is attested also by those commentators who give a full explanation of the verse, viz. Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Kullūka⁶⁴, as also in the parallel passages of other Dharmaśāstra texts⁶⁵. The reading (the only one?) known to Mallinātha — in view of the predicate it has, of course, to be interpreted as *apsuvāsas*⁶⁶ — is not noted by Jolly⁶⁷ and G. Jha⁶⁸. Now it cannot by any means be disputed that wearing wet clothes in winter — most probably because of not changing after taking a bath — has in fact been regarded in ancient India as one of the many forms of *tapas*, and of asceticism practised for its own sake⁶⁹ and not only as a means of atonement⁷⁰. But in view of the special clothes prescribed for *vānaprasthas*⁷¹ common to which is their non-textile character, one wonders if the reading *ādravāsās* of Manu 6.23 is really the original one. In this connection it should also be noted that the number of passages

63. M.R. Kāle repeating this statement of Mallinātha's in his own commentary on Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* [Pūrvabhāga Complete] ..., repr. Delhi (etc.) 1968, p. 45 (of the text) is, of course, of no help. The same holds good of the Manusmṛtipadyānukrama, attached to the NSP-ed. (with Kullūka's commentary), as it contains only the first pādas; Manasukharāy Mor's edition (with Medhātithi's Bhāṣya, in two parts, Calcutta 1967 and 1971) though includes an alphabetically arranged list of all the pādas, but *apsu vāsas* ... does not appear in it. Thus I finally consulted the Larger Petrograd Dictionary s.v. *hemanta*.

64. See *Manu-Smṛiti with nine commentaries* ..., ed. by J. H. Dave, Vol. III, Bombay 1978, p. 193f.

65. Viz. Viṣṇu 95.1-4, Yājñ. 3.52 and Śaṅkha (ed. P.V. Kane, *ABhORI* VII (1926) and VIII (1926)), no. 159). Note however that the passage quoted by Aparārka on Yājñ. 3.52 (cf. Kane no. 369) clearly refers to *udavāsa*, too, for the expression *jalaśayana* can hardly be interpreted in any other way.

66. Cf. e.g. *apsuyoni*.

67. *Mānava Dharma-Śāstra. The Code of Manu* ..., London 1887.

68. *Manu-Smṛiti. Notes*, by G. Jha, Pt. 1: Textual, Calcutta 1924.

69. Note that *ādrapaṭavāsas* is mentioned at Rām. 3.6.5 as a separate group of ascetics (Bhagat, o.c., l.c. [note 18]) and cf. also M. Shee, o.c. [note 34], p. 251 note 46.

70. See e.g. GautDhS 3.1.15 (*ardravastratā* enumerated together with other forms of *tapas* in a definition of the latter term as used in sūtra 11); "coils of matted hair soaked with water" are also mentioned by Aśvaghoṣa, *Buddhacarita* VII 17. See also above n. 29.

71. Bāṇa, however, refers in his *Kādambarī* (p. 49 l. 4; for the edition used see note 80) to *tāpasas* who wash their *valkalas* in lake Pampā and thereby colour its water. But there is no indication whatsoever that they are conceived of as putting on their wet clothes nor is there any connection between them and the *udavāsītāpasas* (on which see below p. 15).

in later Sanskrit texts (i.e. younger than the two Epics) in which the practice called *udavāsa* or the ascetics called *unmajjakas* are mentioned, is to all appearances conspicuously small. It is hence possible that this practice became not obsolete in the strict sense of the word, but receded into the background, so to say⁷², and that the textcritical problem posed by the Manu verse can be solved accordingly by assuming that the reading *apsuvāsas* was secondarily replaced by *ādravāsās*. But as there is only the testimony of Mallinātha, I do not, of course, want to overstate my point although I find it difficult to believe that he himself should have invented the reading he quotes just in order to be able to adduce an authoritative passage which supports what Kālidāsa says about Pārvatī's 'winter asceticism'.

Manu 6.23 as attested in the MSS. of this work as well as by the commentators, however, gives cause for still other considerations.

1. Are we really to follow Bühler⁷³ in interpreting *kramaśo vardhayams* to mean "(thus) gradually increasing (the vigour of) his austerities"? Why is this interpretation to be preferred to the alternative one which (in my view) suggests itself even more naturally, viz. "gradually/step by step making [his *tapas* substance] grow/accumulating"⁷⁴ [ascetic power/might]?"

2. Not to be doubted at all is that this verse testifies to the idea that a *vāna-prastha* should alter his ascetic practice in accordance with the — astronomically determined — course of the year, i.e. the sequence of seasons⁷⁵. But how old is this idea of what could be called the 'seasonal conception' of *tapas* in India? Or when and

72. My attention has kindly been drawn by my friend Catharina Kiehle to Rāmdās who, at any rate according to V.P. Bokil (*Rajguru Ramdas*, Poona 1979, p. 58f. and 61f.), is said to have "decided to complete a cycle of ... thirteen crores of Rama-nama-mantra in twelve years" and to have performed the ascetic practice of muttering the mantra about thirty thousand times every day while "he stood in waist-deep water in the confluence of the two rivers", viz. Nandini and Godavari. This may indeed be a 'survival' of the practice of *udavāsa*. And most probably this holds equally good for the brahmin giving away the merit (*punya*) which he had previously gained by muttering the three names "in the water of the river Godāvarī for a period of 12 years", mentioned in the *Vikramacarita* (see my article "On the Gaining of Merit and the Incurring of Demerit through the Agency of others: I. Deeds by Proxy" in the *Felicitations Volume for Prof. Botto* to be published in 1992).

Finally attention should be drawn here to J. Campell Oman, *The Mystics, Ascetics and Saints of India* ..., London 1905, p. 50 and to R. Schmidt, *Fakire und Fakirtum im alten und modernen Indien* ..., Berlin 1908, p. 191 — both of which are evidence for the survival of this particular ascetic practice even at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. — Prof. K.L. Sharma (Jawaharlal Nehru University) kindly drew my attention to cases of a so-called *jalasamādhi* about which Indian newspapers occasionally report. As far as I can see, if what is meant by this expression is deliberate suicide by drowning in water, for whatever reason, be it basically religious or not, then a connection with the tradition of the ascetic practice of the *unmajjakas* does not seem very likely at all. This is even more true if what is really referred to is accidental death in water (which one does not want to call an accidental death for reasons of reverence, tact, etc.).

73. O.c. [see note 14], p. 293.

74. Cf. also M. Hara's article "Tapo-Dhana" in *Acta Asiatica* [Tokyo] 19 (1970), pp. 58-76 as also his book *Koten-into no kugyō*, Tokyo 1979.

75. See also note 57. It should be noted that in his description of Pārvatī performing various kinds of *tapas* Kālidāsa too follows this sequence at one point.

why was it developed? Did the *udavāsa* practice have this 'seasonal character' right from the beginning, or are not at least some of the Mbh. passages examined above (§ 3) clear evidence that *udavāsa* was practised by some *vānaprasthas* through the whole year, even continuously for a number of years?

But one should not, of course, for this reason jump to the conclusion that the 'seasonal conception' cannot but be of later origin. For it is immediately plausible that e.g. the 'five-fire-*tapas*' is, and hence was most probably also in fact considered to be, most effective (as regards "drying up the body", *śarīraśoṣaṇa*) when the sun sends out heat at its strongest, i.e. in summer; and it is equally clear that practising this kind of *tapas* at this time of the year was accordingly expected to give the best, i.e. quantitatively largest, result in the shape of accumulated *prabhāva/tejas* (etc.) substance. Hence it cannot be denied that the connection between certain forms of *tapas* and certain seasons is indeed a natural one, i.e. suggests itself to anyone who wishes to achieve a maximum by mortifying his flesh in the extreme. It is then not less natural for an ascetic to bring his self-mortification in line with the sequence of the seasons and to make an optimal use of what they offer him.

A further point has also be taken into consideration in connection with the 'seasonal conception' of *tapas*. The testimony of the Epics, at least of their narrative parts, in contradistinction to that of the normative and — in the case of BaudhDhS 3.3.1ff. only too evident — systematic⁷⁶ character of Dharmaśāstra texts⁷⁷, clearly points in the direction that at least certain *vānaprasthas* did not, as the BaudhDhS would seem to suggest⁷⁸, practise just one form of *tapas* only for whatever period they decided to mortify themselves and to accumulate *prabhāva/tejas*, etc., but rather followed various practices one after the other, sometimes perhaps in accordance with the rotation of seasons and/or even intensifying their *tapas* in one way or other.

76. S.A. Srinivasan rightly regards BaudhDhS 3.3. even "to have a certain artificiality about it" (o.c. [see note 8], p. 63).

77. That is to say, that in spite of 'doctrinal' agreements between the Mbh. and Dharmaśāstra texts I am less reluctant than Sprockhoff seems to be (l.c. [see note 11], p. 23ff.) to assign to the Epic, i.e., of course, its narrative parts, an independent testimonial value, in principle capable of supplementing and correcting the information of the normative and often also systematic Dharmasūtras and -smṛtis. In passing only I should like to mention here that Jājali who among other ascetic practices performs that of *udavāsa*, too, (see above § 3) is said at Mbh. 12.253.40 to have taken a bath *tarpayivā hutāśanam*.

78. In that it distinguishes between different types of ascetics (and not different kinds of ascetic practices).

As noted already by Böhtlingk⁷⁹, Bāṇabhaṭṭa mentions in his *Kādambarī*, viz. in the description of lake Pampā⁸⁰, *udavāsātāpasas* — who use the flowers of the trees on its banks for paying homage to deities⁸¹ —, but it is by no means sure that he himself still knew such *vānaprasthas*; this may well be just the skilful use of a knowledge acquired from ‘classical texts’⁸².

The reference to still another relevant expression I owe to my friend Oberlies⁸³, viz. to *antarudakavāsin* as it is used at *Arthaśāstra* 13.2.16. The whole chapter deals with “Drawing out (the Enemy) by means of Stratagems” (*yogavāmana*), and among these are various allegedly miraculous events that are calculated to persuade a king to stay for seven nights at a particular place outside his fort and thus to offer an opportunity to assassinate him⁸⁴. The sentence reads:

jaṭilavyañjanam antarudakavāsinam vā sarvaśvetam taṭasuruṅgābhūmigrhāpa-saraṇam varuṇam nāgarājaṃ vā sattriṇaḥ kramābhinūtam rājñāḥ kathayeyuḥ //;

it has been translated by R.P. Kangle⁸⁵ thus: “Or, as an agent appearing as an ascetic with matted locks, all white, is staying in water, with the means of getting away to an underground tunnel or chamber under the bank, secret agents should tell the king, after gradually making him believe, that he is Varuṇa or the King of Nāgas.” This certainly already contains elements of interpretation, but in my view it is acceptable by and large,

79. Smaller Petrograd Dictionary (s.v. *udavāsin*); cf. also Oberlies, o.c., l.c. [see note 32]; as for his interpretation of the word, I should like to just note in passing 1) that it could also be a *kṛt*-formation (cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik*, II,2, Göttingen 1954, p. 346 (§ 217 c)) and 2) that the *taddhita* suffix *-in* does not in each and every case have the meaning analysed and described by P. Thieme (cf. *Kleine Schriften*, ed. by G. Buddruss, Wiesbaden 1971, p. 670ff.).

80. The reference given in the Smaller P.D. viz. 24.23, I for one could not identify even with the help of the concordances in A.A.M. Scharpé’s *Bāṇa’s Kādambarī*, Leuven 1937 (see p. 407 and p. 484) as the NSP-ed. used by him is that published in 1932, and the edition of 1948 (which I have in my own collection) has a different pagination. The expression is found there on p. 49 l. 6 (= p. 23.1 in Peterson’s ed., etc., see Scharpé, p. 484).

81. The relevant part of the long sentence reads: *...udavāsītāpasānām devatārcanopayuktakusumābhīr ... vanarājibhir uparuddhaṭīram ... pampābhīdhānam padmasarāḥ /*.

82. In any case the explanation of the commentator Bhānucandra, viz. *udavāsinām tatra sthitiṣūṣām (tāpasānām)* is not apt to dispel such doubts. What M.R. Kāle [see note 63] says in his Sanskrit commentary (*udake vastum śīlam yesām te udavāsinas te tāpasāś ca, teṣām / ‘peṣamvāsavāhanadhiṣu ca’ [Pāṇ. 6.3.58] ity udādeśaḥ / atra Manuḥ - apsu vāsas tu hemante kramaśo varḍhayet tapah’ iti /*) and in his ‘Notes’ (p. [42]: “*udavāsi* — (practising penance by) standing in water; (this is an approved kind of penance during winter). Cf. *nināya* ... / Kum. V.26”), is clearly different, viz. the outcome of modern scholarship.

83. O.c., l.c. [see note 32].

84. Cf. H. Scharfe, *Untersuchungen zur Staatsrechtslehre des Kauṭilya*, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 206. — On *suruṅgā* see idem, p. 316f.

85. *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, Pt. I, Bombay 1960, p. 259 and Pt. II, Bombay 1963, p. 555.

however surprising the English expression may be. On *sarvaśvetam* T. Gaṇapati Shastri⁸⁶ aptly remarks (in his Sanskrit commentary based on the Malayalam Bhāṣya) among other things: *sarvaśvetatvaṃ ca devatāvarṇaviśvāsārtham*. It is at least probable that an *unmajjaka* ascetic, turned agent, is used here to create the impression that he is the “Lord of the Waters” or a Nāga king by seemingly disappearing and reappearing in water. But the alternatively possible interpretation cannot also be entirely ruled out, namely that simply an agent who is especially trained in swimming and diving is selected for this job, and, to be sure, the expression *jaṭilavyañjana* speaks clearly in favour of this alternative⁸⁷.

Besides *udavāsa* the *Vaidika-Padānukrama-Koṣa* (Vedāṅgas) has also an entry *udakavāsa*, and refers for this un-Pāṇiniyan compound to VāsDhS 29.6 *nāgādhipatir udakavāsāt*, translated by Bühler⁸⁸ “by staying (constantly) in water he becomes a lord of elephants”. Indeed, the context strongly supports the assumption that it is the particular ascetic practice under discussion in the present note which is referred to here. Bühler’s interpretation of *nāgādhipatir*, however, is most probably, nay clearly wrong. What one expects, and by no means only because of the passage from the AŚ examined just now, is a close relation between the *unmajjakas* and the Nāgas inhabiting the waters under the earth, or rather representing them⁸⁹. The second reference is to SumantuDhS⁹⁰: *gobrāhmaṇaśarīre rudhiram utpādya udakavāsam kuryāt /*, the only passage where the practice of *udavāsa* is prescribed as a *prāyaścitta*⁹¹; but on the many and close links between *tapas* qua asceticism and qua atonement I need not dwell here.

86. I use the reprint, viz. *The Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya with the Commentary “Śrīmūla”* ... With an elaborate Introduction by N.P. Unni, Delhi-Varanasi 1984, Pt. III, p. 186.

87. Cf. also Gaṇapati Shastri’s explanation (i.e., see note 86) *antarudakavāsinam udakacaranavidyayodakāntarvāsaśīlam /*.

88. O.c. [see note 14], p. 136.

89. Cf. e.g. Mbh. 1.206.13 (kingdom of Nāgas located *antarjale*). — In this connection it is also interesting to note that according to Mbh 10.17 (see above p. 223) Mahādeva by his *udavāsa* practice creates the plants and other food necessary for life.

90. Ed. by T.R. Chintamani, JOR Madras (1934), pp. 75-88.

91. A second instant I have however chanced upon in the meantime, is the verse

*brahmacārī yo ’śniyān
madhumāṃsam kathamcana /
so trīṇy ahāny upavased
ekāhaṃ codake vaset //*

quoted from Manu (*yathā manuh*) by Vṛṣabhadeva in commenting on the passage *yāni loke tapastvenābhikhyātāni brahmacaryādhaḥśayanodavāsacāndrāyaṇādīni* of the so-called Svopajñavṛtti on Vākyapadīya I. 11 (ed. K.A. Subrahmanya Iyer, Poona 1966, p. 40.5). Vṛṣabhadeva seems to have fallen prey to a failure of his memory, for the first half of the verse he quotes corresponds to Manu 11.158ab (followed there by *sa kṛtvā prākṛtaṃ kṛcchraṃ vrataśeṣaṃ samāpayet /*) and the second half is actually Manu 11.157cd (preceded there by *māsikānnaṃ tv yo ’śniyād asamāvartako dvijaḥ /*).

5. The main result of the foregoing examination of — mostly — Epic text material is, no doubt, that the expression *unmajjaka* of the BaudhDhS (to which I should like now to return) in fact denotes that class of ascetics who are in the other sources said to practice *udavāsa*. Apart from this the results are rather to be styled as disappointingly meagre⁹²: that *udavāsa* can be performed in running and also in stagnant water, that the ascetic does not move, only his head, and throat, reaching out of the water, that the season considered to be particularly 'suitable' is winter, etc.

Many problems, however, remain unresolved. E.g. what do the *unmajjakas* live on? Do they leave their place in the water temporarily, e.g. in order to collect food? Indeed, just like the root *vas* itself and its derivatives so does *°vāsa* as secondary member of the compound *udavāsa* not necessarily imply semantically that any change of place whatsoever is entirely excluded⁹³, nor does it only intend "staying overnight"⁹⁴. That is to say, this compound may refer, and most probably does in fact refer, to nothing but a person's staying for most part of time in water; that he stands upright etc., is not directly expressed, but clearly associated with this term.

This assumption is supported by the fact that at BaudhDhS 3.3.10 "(the use) of iron and stone implements" is prohibited for the *unmajjakas* (*lohāśmakaraṇavarjam*). For this statement makes sense (practically) only when it is — in accordance with Govindasvāmin⁹⁵ — taken to mean that only wooden implements are allowed them. And the fact that nothing else is said in this sūtra or elsewhere in the BaudhDhS about the *unmajjakas* is indeed strong evidence that Bühler is right when he takes this prohibition to refer to the collection and preparation (of course not by cooking) of food by these *vānaprasthas*. Yet he does not give any explanation for this peculiarity⁹⁶.

Now, I do not think that the prohibition of the use of implements made out of these two kinds of material is due to the idea that an implement meant for people who stand more or less all the time up to their neck in water should have one very important trait, viz. that of floating, i.e. not instantly sinking down to the ground. That is to say, I do not think that the wooden implement, ladle or whatever it may be, is used by the *unmajjakas* in order to collect and eat food while standing in water. For, if these ascetics live on certain aquatic plants, one expects that this kind of foodstuff is also made the essential criterion of classification. Besides Buddhacarita VII 14 shows that *annam salile*

92. Because — as already noted above — the author(s) do not give a detailed description, but rather seem to start from the assumption that their listeners are anyway familiar with this and the other forms of *tapas*.

93. As can be observed also in the case of similar compounds such as *vanavāsa*, *antevāsa/-vāsin*, *pañkavāsa*, "crab" (according to lexicographers).

94. As it is given for *durgavāsa* with reference to Mbh. III 12344 (= 3.174.6 a) in Monier-Williams's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (following the Smaller Petrograd D.) in that this expression is rendered by "staying overnight in an unhospitable place".

95. For his commentary on 3.3.10 reads thus: *lohakaraṇam darvyādi / āśmakaraṇam apy evamākṛtikam eva kiñcit / kāṣṭhāny eva karaṇam ādāna ity arthaḥ //*.

96. And this holds good also for what is said by Sprockhoff, l.c. [see note 11], p. 27.

prarūḍham forms part of ascetic diet in general. Therefore I deem it a much more plausible solution that the *unmajjakas* are allowed to use only implements that are made of a material which is directly and intimately connected with, and dependent on water, viz. material obtained from vegetal life, plants in general and in particular the largest and most important among them, namely trees. It is in this connection that I regard the 'myth' about Cyavana as particularly instructive: The relation between the *vānaprasthas* practising *udavāsa* and 'their' chosen element⁹⁷, water, is so intimate, their becoming a part of aquatic life so intensive, that any material alien or even opposed to water is ruled out as a matter of course, so to say.

In concluding the present note let me draw attention to yet another problem connected with this particular form of self-mortification which too seems to have been overlooked in previous research, if I am not mistaken. It is true that in India since of old fire and water have not been viewed exclusively, perhaps not even mainly, as elements opposed to each other, but fire even as originating from water. Nevertheless, even if Vedic mythical ideas should still have been a living tradition at the time when the practice of the *unmajjakas* came into existence, the very idea of *tapas* as accumulation of heat, fiery energy, within oneself is not really, at least not simply, compatible with a practice of self-mortification that consists in *udavāsa*. But that this latter practice formed part of what was called *tapas* stands beyond doubt. One cannot hence help drawing the final conclusion — that is suggested by other forms of asceticism, too, like e.g. living on water or air only, etc. — that the conception of *tapas* qua asceticism did not, or perhaps did not any longer at a certain period of time, by itself exclusively refer to the practice of heating oneself up in the literal sense of the word, — and this is what is also actually attested in the texts at our disposal. But it is quite possible that one has to go even a step further and to draw the — more far reaching — conclusion that the subtle substance accumulated by practising *tapas* was not only, or always, considered as having a fiery nature, and that hence text passages which speak of *tapasvins* sending forth flames of fire, etc., are to be relativized as regards their testimonial value: they may simply be due to the fact that the old, and original, idea of asceticism as *tapas*, i.e. "heating oneself up", was kept alive as just one of the various ideas, or strands, which taken together have ultimately formed the highly complex phenomenon which continued to be called *tapas* in spite of the fact that it had assumed a markedly different character in the course of its historical development.

97. On the elements water, fire and wind as welcome means for ascetics to end their life by see e.g. Mbh. 15.45.27.