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was in answer to Śaṅkara’s denial of the authority of the Agamas. On this basis Yāmuna justified the temple worship and rituals (Cf. Āgama-prāmāṇya).

2. Rejection of Śaṅkara’s doctrine of Advaita (monism) and expounding the doctrine of qualified monism (Visishṭādvaita).

3. Rejection of Śaṅkara’s concept of Nirguṇa-Brahman and description of the Lord as the embodiment of all auspicious qualities (Sarvākalyāṇa-guṇa Sampānnaḥ).

4. Glorification Śri or Lakshmi as the embodiment of mercy and grace (Chatuśloki) and as complementary to the Lord.

5. Preaching of the Bhakti and prapatti-mārga as the only effective means of salvation (Stōtraratna).

6. Glorification of the Tamil saints Āḻvārs and their sacred hymns as revelations worthy of equal veneration. In one of the verses in the Stotraratna, he describes Nammāḻvār as his father, mother, consort, child, wealth and in short, everything.

Thus, Yāmuna, following his preceptor Nāthamuni was profoundly influenced by the inspired Tamil hymns of Nammāḻvār and other Āḻvārs and his works are replete with their teachings and ideas. Actually, some of the stanzas seem to be Sanskrit renderings of the Tamil hymns. All these ideas and precepts mentioned above inspired Rāmānuja and helped in the crystallisation of his philosophy. The galaxy of āchāryas who followed Rāmānuja continued this tradition and expanded the Divyapra-bandhas in the light of Rāmānuja’s tenets. Thus, we can say that Rājarāja’s period witnessed a very important and formative period in the history of Sri Vaishnavism thanks to Yāmuna-āchārya’s exposition. This was a prelude to a period which witnessed a new form of religion centering round the temple and the idol (arcā form) within it, reticent to the vedic orthodoxy and accepting the Āgama as also valid and authoritative, venerating Tamil saints Āḻvārs and their inspired hymns as divine revelations, preaching the path of devotionalism (Bhakti) and surrender which could be practised irrespective of caste status.
Aghorasivacarya and the Dvaita School of Saivism in Chola Period

PIERRE - SYLVAIN FILLIOZAT

The importance of Śaivism, i.e. not only monuments, cult and bhakti but also the philosophical doctrine of Śaivasiddhānta, in Tamilnadu in Cōla period, is well-established through inscriptions. Inscriptions are indeed the best documentary source and they allow us to approach the most authentic reality in the past. But there are other documents which can be taken into consideration. Our purpose here is to present two documents of a different nature and to examine their validity and interest.

They are two short Sanskrit texts. One is already known and published. It is an account which Aghoraśivācārya has himself given of religious, intellectual and even familial lineage. It is a chapter of his magnum opus, Kriyākramadyotikā, and is entitled “gotrasaṃptatih” (55 verses). It comes at the end of the section on mahotsavavidhi. The second document is less known because to our knowledge it is available in only one unpublished manuscript preserved in Tiruvadudurai Math, a transcript of which is in the collection of the French Institute of Pondicherry. It contains a story about the same Aghoraśivācārya and establishment of a śaiva maṭha in Cidambaram: it is entitled “Aghoraśivācāryacaritam”.

The first text contains in the beginning an exposition of the theoretical organization of Śaiva lineages, what is common to all lineages in the first 23 verses and then the particular lineage of the author, Aghoraśiva, as an example of an application of the theory. To summarize briefly the theory there are four gotras and 16 gocaras or kula, 4 gotra muniś and 36 bhrātrs, 4 sthānas, 15 (?) maṭhas and four vrkṣas. There is a regular correspondence between one gotra, 4 kulas, 1 muni, 9 bhrātrs etc.

Then Aghoraśiva gives his own lineage. The first part is mythical. It starts from supreme Śiva. From Śiva residing in non-agitated kuṇḍalī-śakti comes the Śiva-kula which is supported by Gāyatri-śakti and which descends in Durvāsas. The dwelling
of rṣi who received the grace of this sage, is Āmardaka embellished by a kadamba tree. The mythical origin is thus: Śivagotra, Bharadvāja-muni, his ninth brother (bhrātr) Durvāsas, Prājapatyā-gocara, Āmardakamaṭha, kadamba tree. Āmardaka is non-mythical. Aghoraśiva says himself: “sthānam atrābhavad bhūmau bhārate mokṣasādhanam (it was a place on this earth, in Bhārata (khaṇḍa), a means to achieve liberation)”. Then he gives his own guru-saṃti on the human and historical level. It starts with Vyāpakaśīva, chief of Āmardaka, and hailing from Lāṭa. For all gurus in the line Aghoraśiva gives indications on their origin and place of residence, occasionally a few historical facts. We will see that the line covers all parts of India. The line is:

Vyāpakaśīva, residing in Āmardaka.

Disciple, Sarvesāpāṇḍita from Gaṇḍa, residing in Nilalāṭa (?).

Disciple, Uttuṅgaśīva from Lāṭa; resided in kalyāṇa; author of a paddhati; his younger brother was guru of King Bhoja “who determined the meaning of all āgamas”, and who is probably the author of Tattvapraṅkṣika and earlier than King Bhoja of Dhārā, as he is very early in the long lineage coming before Aghoraśiva in the middle of 12th century and this line may have covered more than a century which is the distance between Aghoraśiva and King Bhoja of Dāhrā.

Disciple, Somaśīva, of Lāṭa (?)

Disciple Pūrṇaśīvācārya, honoured by a King of Vārāṇasī.

Disciple, Āryottuṅgaśīva of Āryadeśa.

Disciple, Vidyeśānasīva of Āryadeśa.

Disciple, Vidyāntaśīva of Coḍadeśa, guru of the King of Vārāṇasī.

Disciple, Brahmaśīva of Lāṭa.

Disciple, Mūrtiśīva residing in Vijayapura.

Son, Sarvātmadeśika residing in Māyiāpurī.

Disciple, Śrīkanṭhaśīvadeśika from Gaṇḍa. By his desire to see the Lord of citsabā in Cidambaram he came to Coḍadeśa
and Cōla Kings, Vikrama and others, appointed him as their guru. If Vikrama Cōla is referred to here, Śrīkaṇṭhaśāva came to Tamilnadu in the beginning of 12th century.

Disciple, Dhyānaśīva from Gauḍa, ‘skilled in commenting the 28 tantras; honoured by a Cōla King.

Disciple or son, Ṣrīdayaśaṃkara; the relation between this guru and the previous one is expressed by the imprecise words ‘tasmād babhūva’; therefore we have no certainty about his origin; it appears that he was settled in Tamilnadu; he is the elder son of the paternal uncle of Aghoraśīva’s grandfather.

The next guru which is mentioned is Parameśvara. His relation with the previous one is problematic. It is expressed by the verse: “mātulo ‘smatpito tasya kanisthah parameśvaraḥ’” If “tasya” refers to Ṣrīdayaśaṃkara mentioned in the previous verse, Parameśvara appears to be a younger brother of Ṣrīdayaśaṃkara and the maternal uncle of Aghoraśīva’s father. It implies that Aghoraśīva’s grandfather had married a sister of Parameśvara, i.e. a cousin in the same gotra. If “tasya” qualifies only “asmatpituḥ”, Parameśvara has no connection with Ṣrīdayaśaṃkara, has another gotra, and is the younger brother of the mother of Aghoraśīva’s father. Parameśvara is told to have received ācāryābhiṣeka from Dhyānaśīva and to have resided in Kaţī. Aghoraśīva has a special reverence for him and for Ṣrīdayaśaṃkara He eulogizes them in longer verses, vasantiḻilā and śārdūlavikriḍita. He probably received dikṣa from Parameśvara as he qualifies him as madbandhavicchedakā. He had himself the name Parameśvara, Aghoraśīva being his dikṣā name.

At the end Aghoraśīva introduces his own Kriyākramadityotikā by saying that he has composed it after the model of his spiritual ancestors, of Uttuṅgapaddhati, Siddhāntasārāvalī and the teachings of Sarvāṭmaśīva. The final verses give the date of composition in šaka era, 1080/1158 A.D. and describes the paddhati as composed in 3500 granthuś at the order of his guru.

The second document to be presented here is entitled “śrīmad aghoraśīvaśāryacaritam” but it also claims to be an extract of a larger text of puranic nature “cidambarasāre brahmānandaśaṃkaryatiśvarasamaṃvāde”. Therefore no composer is acknow-
ledged for it. It is not found in the different mahāmyas and legendary accounts of Cidambaram. Nor is a Cihmbarasarāra known to us. And we may suspect that it is in fact an independent text asserting its subordination to the literature devoted to the glorification of the holy place. It is very short. What we have consists in 31 anuṣṭubh verses. We suspect that there is a lacuna in the unique manuscript, as we shall see below.

It narrates the following story. A teacher explains to his disciples the story of a matha situated outside the temple of Cidambaram, to the South-East of it. There were in Cidambaram Trisahasra brahmins who followed the cult of Naṭesa and won fame for their generosity in giving food to all. Durvāsas, the irascible sage, wants to test it. He goes to Tilvaraṇya when everybody is asleep. He approaches the liṅga worshipped by Śeṣa and asks three times for bhikṣā. No woman comes to give him food, because of sleep. He gets angry and begins to say some derogatory sentences about Tilvaraṇya. At that moment Nṛttagaṇapati thinks of his mother...

Here there must be a lacuna in the manuscript, because without continuity, we come to a scene in which Durvāsas receives the desired bhikṣā, recognizes Gaurī and worships her. It implies that in the gap Gaurī had appeared for some reason determined by Gaṇapati. Then it is told that Gaurī addresses Durvāsas, asking him to instal in this place his disciple, as a naiśṭhikabrahmacarīn, with the name Aghoraśiva, so that he will give dikṣā to śūdra devotees. At the behest of Gaurī Durvāsas builds a residence and with the necessary preparations performs the paitdhīṣeka of Aghoraśiva. Then he brings his disciple in the eitṣabha, accomplishes different worships of the god in front of Trisahasra brahmans. Then he returns to the house, instals a liṅga and asks Aghoraśiva to worship it and, after studying the Agamas, to establish the rule of liṅga mūrtis and śakti worship; the rules of different dikṣās for twice-borns and for śūstras. Aghoraśiva obeys the order of his guru and composes the Kriyākramadyotikā.

An important detail is the mention of the date of the abhīṣeka. The details of the date are given is: śrīmukha year, śuklapaśa, pusyaṇakṣatra, 5th tiṭhi, vaiśākha month, Thursday. In Swami-
kannu Pillai's Ephemeres we find all these details, with the exception of the nakṣatra, occurring on Thursday 10th April 1153. We have seen that the date of composition of the paddhati is 1158.

Now we may examine the historical validity of these two documents. It is clear that they contain a large part of myth. But when Aghoraśiva gives himself the history of his family and his religious lineage at a not-too-far-away distance in the past, we have no reasons to doubt the historicity of the tradition he records. There is no impossibility or inadequacy in his account. The other text has certainly taken more distance from reality. But still we find in it some interesting historical information, by interpreting the myth as a mythical transposition of some reality. There is in Cidambaram still now, a matha which claims to have been established by Aghoraśiva. This text has certainly been composed there. When we compare its contents with the gotrasamātati of Aghoraśiva, we see that the guru of ācāryabhiseka who is actually Parameśvara, has been transposed into the mythical sage Durvāsas. And Durvāsas has been selected, because he is the original sage of the mythical lineage. The installation of the matha may be accepted as a historical fact. Its date fits well with the date of composition of the paddhati. The present matha which claims to have been established by Aghoraśiva is connected with a temple of Ananteśvara. This reminds us of the “Liṅga worshipped by Śesā” near which the story of Durvāsas and the establishment of the maṭha are located in the text.

We have thus enough corroboration to accept these two texts as documents for history. And we may infer some historical value of the line of gurus given by Aghoraśiva, a few of these names such as King Bhoja being known by their works or by other sources. An interesting point which can be drawn from Aghoraśiva's gotrasamātati is that the Śaivasiddhānta movement spread all over India. The Āmardaka-maṭha was not the only one. The Golakī-maṭha has had in the same and later periods a great number of ramifications from Central India upto the South. The presence and activities of these mathas in Tamilnadu is one of the great contributions of this land to the overall Śaiva movement.
The name of Śaivasiddhānta is primarily attached to the group of 28 āgamas beginning with Kāmika. The basic āgamas are mainly manuals of religious practice. Their main purpose is to describe the activities of devotees, i.e. their private rituals or temple rituals. The doctrine contained in vidyāpādas is the formulation of the basic principles, the theory of creation, the six adhyāns etc. which have an application in rituals. It is presented at length only in a few āgamas or upāgams. Because of their practical destination āgamas do not contain much of philosophical matter. And the activities in the temple can be conducted without adoption of particular ontological views.

The important development of philosophical speculation in Śaivasiddhānta is found in a later stage of the literature. It appears to be the contribution of śaivācāryas residing in mathas. Philosophical matter is presented mostly in commentaries on āgamas and in short treatises or prakaraṇas generally written in a very refined and polished literary form. The best part of it seems to have been written in Kāśmīr in 10th and 11th century. The prominent figure in Kashmirian Śaivasiddhānta is Bhaṭṭa Rāmakanṭha, a great śāstrin and polemist. He has defended with great dialectical power his dualistic and realistic doctrine against the idealistic views of Buddhists. The contribution of Tāmilnādu to the same movement is equally important and it occurred through the person of Aghoraśivācārya.

We cannot speak of Śaivasidhānta as a unitary doctrine. There are basic principles common to all authors. But there are also many differing fundamental ontological views, so that every author has to be examined with care. Aghoraśiva has written several commentaries on prakaraṇas of Sadyojyoti and Rāmakāṇṭha, and an important sub-commentary on Mṛgendrāgama's vidyāpāda, to mention only those works of his which are available to us. His style is very clear and his thought very well systematized. Sometimes he is really forcing the interpretation of an original text he claims to explain. These passages are particularly interesting for the historian, because in such cases the originality of the commentator appears more clearly. To show the originality of Aghoraśiva we have to compare his conceptions with those of his predecessors. I may give as an example his conception of jātivas or fundamental entities of creation.
In āgamas there is no established number of tattvas. It varies from āgama to āgama. Rauravāgama's vidyāpāda gives several times a list of 30 tattvas. It enumerates 28 material tattvas, the well-known 24 of Sāmkhya school and, above that, rāga, vidyā, kalā and the basic māyā. Two more tattvas are spiritual entities, Śiva and Puruṣa. Rauravāgama knows also several spiritual entities such as Mantrēśvaras, Mantras, Rudras headed by Virabhadra, etc. He introduces them as emanating from Śiva, Śiva being their material cause (upādānakāraṇa). Thus in Rauravāgama the difference between matter and Śiva is clearly marked. But nothing is told nor can be directly inferred about the relation of Puruṣa and Śiva.

Sadyojyoti an early ācārya (before Somānanda of 9th cent.), has written a Tattvasamgraha which is an exposition of the contents of Rauravāgama on the subject of tattvas. He gives the same number and list. He presents a more definite ontological position. He upholds a view according to which there is complete difference between matter and Śiva. Śiva is made of cit which is kriyā and jñāna. Cit is that by which a being is animate and has knowledge. Matter or māyā is acit and it is an eternal entity, having the same deree of reality as cit entities. Sadyojyoti is the first ācārya to assert with clarity this realism and dualism.

Chronologically we find next the Tattvaprakāśika of King Bhoja on the same subject. This text gives a list of 36 tattvas, adding kāla and niyati in the material sphere and a few spiritual entities, Śakti, Sādāśiva, Śvara and Śuddhavidyā at the top of the scale. Bhoja accepts the dualism of cit and acit, but he admits in the scale of tattvas spiritual entities above the material ones.

Aghoraśiva has commented on these two Prakaraṇas. In spite of the difference between the two, in spite of their unequal number of tattvas, he interprets them as presenting the same conception. In addition to this he makes an important modification in the doctrine. He conceives the scale of tattvas as comprising only acit or material entities. His dualism is extreme. The cit principle Śiva is only an efficient cause (kartrī). It cannot be a material cause (upādānakāraṇa) and cannot have any contact with matter. Therefore it cannot have any place in the scale of
creation. In a realistic view where the matter principle is an eternal entity, creation is not the making of new entities, it is only a process of transformation. Now Aghora has to comment a text which places pure spiritual entities in the scale of tattvas of creation. He interprets that the name Śiva denotes bindu or mahāmāya, a duplicate of māyā in the pure sphere at the top of the scale, that the name Śakti denotes nāda, the primordial sound conceived as matter and first evolute of mahāmāya, etc.

Bhoja defines Śivatattva as:

“vyāpakam ekam nityam akhilasya tattvajātasya /

jñānakriyāsvabhāvam śivatattvaṃ jagadur ācaryāḥ //

“Teachers have told that Śivatattva is all-pervasive, unique, eternal, cause of all the class of tattvas and having the nature of knowledge and action.”

Aghoraśiva reads the words of this definition as referring to the pure material entity bindu. The words vyāpaka, etc. can be applied to this material entity. But “jñānakriyāsvabhāvaṃ” in its obvious sense of bahuvrihi compound “whose nature is knowledge and action” cannot be applied to matter. Therefore Aghoraśiva takes it as an upapadasamāsa of a kṛdanta,—bhāva with two upapadas, one signifying the object (karman) jñānakriya-, the other signifying the location (adhikaraṇa) sva-: “jñānakriye svasmin sthite ātmanām bhāvayatīti (it makes the knowledge and action of souls to be placed in itself)”. It means that matter allows the powers of knowledge and action of souls to stand in itself. The separation of cit and acit is thus preserved.

Aghoraśiva is a śāstrin. He uses etymology for the purpose of asserting his dualistic conception. He uses logic to establish on rational grounds all his concepts. He has not devoted much of his talent to polemics with rival schools. His main contribution is the systematizing and establishment of an extreme form of dualism with the instrument of Sanskrit śāstras. The main trend of ancient Śaivasiddhānta is dualistic. But I have not seen in any other author such an extreme and systematic form exposition. This conception of tattvas as pure material entities, even at the top of the scale, does not appear in other authors. Śaivasiddhānta is an original and independent system with
dualistic and realistic inclinations directly opposed to the general monistic and idealistic trends of other systems. And in Śaivasiddhānta Aghoraśiva stands as an extremist drawing the dualistic and realistic tendency to its farthest consequences.

To conclude a word has to be told on the influence of Aghoraśiva. His influence has been maintained up to our days in the field of rituals, by his Pāddhati which is still remembered and used by priests in temples of Tamilnadu. Many manuscripts of his Kriyākramadyottika, complete or in the form of extracts, are found only in South India, especially in Tamilnadu, unlike manuscripts of Somaśambhupaddhati, which has been current in Tamilnādu but also elsewhere in India, as manuscripts of it are found in Kaśmīr and Nepal. In the field of the doctrine Aghoraśiva does not seem to have been followed. The prominent trend after him is also a kind of dualism, but blended with monism. The main movement is that which has its origins in the Sanskrit āgamic literature, but which has taken Tamil as a medium of exposition, from the time of Meykaṇḍadevar in 13th century. It has different ontological foundations.

Tamil Śaivasiddhānta literature is a great contribution of Tamilnadu. Earlier in Coḷa times Tamilnadu had already contributed a lot to the history of Śaivasiddhānta and produced the most extreme and pure form of the doctrine in the philosophical works of Aghoraśivācārya.

Appendix.

We give below the text of the Aghoraśivācāryacaritam from a transcript preserved in the French Institute of Pondicherry, of the unique known manuscript belonging to Tiruvadudurai Matha:

Cidāmbarasaḍre brahmānandaśaṃkarayatśavaraśamvāde
ṣrīmadaghorāśivācāryacaritam

yatrat pratiṣṭhitam liṅgam patañjalimahātmanā
tatra gatvā mahādevam śīṣyaṁ sākaṁ yatāśvaram // 1 //
phala-puṣpākṣatair gandhāḥ samabhyaarcyā yathāvidhi
dvārād bahuḥ samāgacchan brahmānandayatīśvaram // 2 //
“śivā! ayasya purato vahnikoṇe virājitam
dṛṣyamānām idaṁ sthānām viṣṇor vā śaṃkarasya vā // 3 //
iti teṣām vacaḥ śrutvā tatkalām gurur abravit
trisahasramunindrāś ca cidambarapure vare // 4 //
śrautasmārtadikarmāṇi prakuranto yathāvidhi
naṭeśārdhānaṁ kṛtvā vedenoditavartmanā // 5 //
tatrāgatēbhyah sarvebhyo dvijātibhyo yathākramam
tebhyo ‘nnām samprayacchanti nivasanti dvijottomāḥ // 6 //
saṃtataṁ sarvavarṇebhyo dadāty annām cidambaraṁ
evāṃ vadanti lokēsu [manu] gandharvanirjarāḥ // 7 //
durvāsās tadvacah śrutvā śisyena sahito muniḥ
annadānāparakṣārthaṁ sarvalokeṣu viśrutam // 8 //
suṣupteṣu ca sarvesu tilvaranyam samāyayau
śeṣapūjitaliṅgasya nikaṭe munipumgavaḥ // 9 //
bhavati bhikṣām dehitī trīvāraṁ samudīrayat
bhikṣām dātuṁ kāpi nārī nāyayau nidrayā taya // 10 //
munis tadānīṁ durvāsāḥ kopasaṃtaptamānasah
‘t ilvaranye ‘rkabhūyisṭhasamaṁ tat paridṛṣyate // 11 //
iti pūrvaṁ samuccārya cottaṁ gaṇidotum tataḥ
na vidyate śivas tilva iti vaktum samudyataḥ // 12 //
tadā nṛttagaṇādhyakṣaḥ svamātaram acintayat
bhikṣām ādāya tāṁ gaurī iti matvā mudānī vitah // 13 //
pradakṣiṇānamskārah stotraṁ sāmpūṣya sādaram
mūrdhānjaliputās tiṣṭhan śivakāmīṁ hṛdā smaran // 14 //
gaury uvāca
“he vatsa śṛṇu bhadrāṁ te lokānugrahakāriṇam
aghoraśīvanāmānam naisthikabrahmacāriṇam // 15 //
śīvāgamārthatattvajñāṁ tvačchisyaṁ suddhamāna [sa]ṁ
śūdrāṇām śivabhattānāṁ dīkṣāṁ kartāṁ yathvādhi // 16 //
asmin sthale sthāpaya [tvam] bhaktivāṁ hitakāmyayā
ty ity uktvāntardadhe gaurī cidambarasabhāntare // 17 //
saśiyo munīśārududilas tāṁ diśāṁ samprāṇamya ca
saṃkalpya vāsasadanaṁ sarvālaṃkārasobhitam // 18 //
grham praviśya vidhivad vāstusāntipurahsaram
śrīmukhābdē śuklapakṣe puṣyarkṣe paṇcamitithau // 19 //
vaid̄khe guruvāre ca śubhalagnasamanvite
gauryās cājaṁ hrdi dhīyatvā durvāso munipuṇgavaḥ // 20 //
sambhṛtya sambhārān ānayitvā tṛṣin tataḥ
paṭṭābhiṣekam akarod aghoraśivanāmakam // 21 //
tataḥ śīṣyaṁ samāṇīya citsaḥhāyāṁ muniśvaraḥ
puśpāṇjaliṁ kārayitvā trisahasramuniśvaraiḥ // 22 //
naṭeśasya naṭeśasyai ca phalādini nivedya ca
cidambaram dārsayitvā nīrājanapurahsaram // 23 //
śivārpitaśaṅkhatoiyair elāgandhādhivāsitaiḥ
prokṣayitvā śīṣyamūrdhni devasya tveti mantrataḥ // 24 //
aghoraśivācārya iti nāmadheyam cakāra saḥ
trisahasramunindrebhyah svarṇapuṣpaṁ samarpya ca // 25 //
pradakṣiṇanamaskāraiḥ prīṇayitvā saṃhāpatim
tataḥ svamāśramaṁ prāpya saṅīṣyo munipuṇgavaḥ // 26 //
tatra liṅgam pratiṣṭhāpya samabhīarcyayatuḥāvidhi
"aghoraśiva he vatsa liṅgam enaṁ supūjayā // 27 //
śivadvijānaṁ śarvesām śudrāṇaṁ ca yathāvidhi
dīkṣāṇaṁ samayādīnāṁ tattadvānānaśārataḥ // 28 //
īṅgānaṁ śivāberāņaṁ saktināṁ ca tathaiva ca
āgamāni samālokyā paddhatiḥ kuru suvrata." // 29 //
ity uktaṁ sthāpayāmāsa naisthikabrahmacārinam
tataḥ kailāsam agamat paṅcāksaraparāyanah // 30 //
tathaiva paddhatiṁ kṛtvā dīkṣākarma karoti ca
caritraṁ śivabhaktasya bhaktānāṁ avadad guruh // 31 //