

## SIVA AS LAKULISA.

Among the Śaivas there has been an important sect, that of the Lakulīśa-Pāśupatas, which has hardly received the attention that it merits. It is mentioned and its doctrine is explained by Sāyana, in his Sarvadarśanasamgraha, written in the latter half of the fourteenth century. In our historical researches, however, we have hitherto had occasion to notice it only in connexion with the mention of it in an inscription which, after some preliminary treatments by other scholars, was critically edited by Professor Bühler some fifteen years ago (EI, 1. 271 ff.). The record in question is the so-called Cintra Praśasti, so named because the stone which bears it was removed to Cintra in Portugal; but it seems to have originally belonged to a Śaiva temple at Sōmnāth-Pāṭaṇ in Kāṭhiāwād. It was composed during the period A.D. 1274 to 1296. And in its introductory verses it speaks of the founder of the sect in question as an incarnation of Śiva. It says that that god “descended (*avātarat*) in the form of Bhaṭṭāraka-Śrī-Lakulīśa in order to favour the universe; and in order to favour the boys of Ulūka, who were for a long time without sons in consequence of a curse laid upon (*his*) father,<sup>1</sup> having come to the Lāṭa country (Gujarāt in Bombay), he settled (*adhyvāsa*) at Kārōhaṇa: in this place there descended (*avatēruḥ*), for the performance of special Pāśupata vows, his four pupils, Kuśika, Gārgya, Kaurusha, and Maitrēya, whose class spread out into four branches.”

<sup>1</sup> The words here are:—*anugrahitum cha chiram viputrakān=Ulūka-bhūtān=abhiśapataḥ pituḥ*. There is no substantial reason for questioning the accuracy of the lithograph in respect of them.

Professor Bühler took *bhūtān* in the sense of *udbhūtān*, and translated “the offspring of Ulūka.” For my rendering, “the boys of Ulūka,” I use the Śabdakalpadruma, which cites the Mēdinī as assigning to *bhūta* the meaning of *kumāra*, ‘a child, boy, youth, son.’

It is questionable whether the author of the Praśasti did not intend this clause to be taken in connexion with the preceding one:—“ . . . . . Ulūka . . . . . father; having come to Lāṭa, he settled at Kārōhaṇa.” However, following Professor Bühler, I construe and punctuate according to the arrangement of the verses.

And the place mentioned here, Kārōhaṇa, was identified by Professor Bühler with the modern Kārvān near Dabhōi in the Baroda State.

Six or seven years ago, there appeared to be good reasons (EI, 5. 226 ff.; IA, 1901. 1 f.) for believing that the date of the foundation of this sect was closely fixed by an inscription at Baḷagāmi in Mysore, which registers a grant made in A.D. 1035, for the purposes of a temple at that place, to a great Śaiva teacher named Lakuliśvarapaṇḍita, who is described in the record in very grandiloquent terms. It seemed that we had in this person the founder of the sect, the alleged incarnation of Śiva. The matter, however, has recently been placed in a very different light by a paper which may be noticed in some detail, because the results will carry us further, in the historical line, than is contemplated in it. I consider it only from that point of view; for more information about the sect itself, reference may be made to the original paper.

In the last received number of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 22, p. 151 ff., Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has edited an inscription from the Ēklingjī temple near Udaipur in Mēwār,—called in the record itself “a temple of Lakuliśa,”—which is dated in A.D. 971–72 and already mentions the incarnation of Śiva as Lakuliśa. This record is unfortunately somewhat mutilated in the passage which interests us; but the following matter can be made out. Verse 9 mentions Bhrigukachchha (Broach), and says that the sage Bhrigu, who had been cursed by Viṣṇu, propitiated Śiva. Verse 10 mentions the Lāṭa country and the river Narbadā, and says that, in the presence of the sage himself, Śiva descended into a bodily form (*kāyāvatāraṃ pratyagrahīt*) in which he was characterized by having a club in his hand (*lakul-ōpalakshita-karaḥ*).<sup>1</sup> Verse 11, mentioning a town named Kāyāvarōhaṇa,

<sup>1</sup> The word *lakula*, of which we have also the variants *lakūla*, *lakuṭa*, *laguḍa*, and apparently *lagura*, means ‘a club.’ The name Lakulin means ‘he who has

perhaps says that it was so called because the incarnation took place there, or perhaps says that thereafter the god became attached to that place, so much so that he thought no more of his abode Kailāsa. And verse 13 mentions Kuśika "and others," who practised the Pāsupata *yōga*. Further, Mr. Bhandarkar has produced a still earlier mention of Lakulīśa from an inscription at Hēmāvati in Mysore (EC, 12. Si, 28); this record, dated in A.D. 942 or 943, says that "Lakulīśa, fearing that his name and doctrine might be forgotten, descended upon earth again, being born as the great saint Chilluka,"—by which it means, however, not to assert really a second incarnation, but only to praise, in hyperbolical style, the local priest Chilluka, whose feet were laved at the time when the grant registered by the record was made.

These two records of course dispose of the view that the founder of the sect of the Lakulīśa-Pāsupatas flourished in the eleventh century; the Lakulīśvarapaṇḍita of the Baḷa-gāmi inscription was only a namesake of the original teacher. From other sources of information, Mr. Bhandarkar has taken the matter further still.

He has shewn that the Vāyu and Liṅga Purāṇas mention the same incarnation. They name it as the twenty-eighth and latest incarnation of Śiva, his incarnation in the current Kali age. And they introduce it, in the usual prophetic style of the Purāṇas, by representing Śiva as saying (in outline):—"I, whose essence is the *yōga*, will by the magic power of the *yōga* assume the form of a Brahmachārin, and, entering an unowned corpse thrown out into a cemetery,

or carries a club.' The name Lakulīśa, Lakulīśvara, means 'Īśa, Īśvara (the lord, Śiva), as he who has or carries a club.' With a not infrequent interchange of *l* and *n*, the name sometimes appears as Nakulīśvara (e.g., PSOCI, No. 189, line 25); and Nakulin is the form given in the two published texts of the Vāyu-Purāṇa, and the Sarvadarśanasamgraha seems to give Nakulīśa. The doctrine is mentioned in inscriptions as the Lakulāgama and Lākulasiddhānta.

The *lakula* of Śiva seems to be identical with his *khaṭvāṅga*, which is explained in dictionaries as 'a club shaped like the foot of a bedstead.' If so, evidence of the early popularity of the cult of Lakulīśa in Southern India is afforded by the fact that the Pallava kings had the *khaṭvāṅga*-banner: see EI, 5. 204, line 41; and H.SII, 1. 146 : 2. 357, translation of verse 24.

will live under the name of Lakulin. At that time Kāyārōhaṇa (according to the Vāyu-Purāṇa), Kāyāvātāra (according to the Liṅga), will become famous as a sacred place.<sup>1</sup> And there there will be born my sons (disciples), the ascetics Kuśika, Garga, Mitra, and Kaurushya; these Pāsupatas, their bodies smeared with ashes, having attained the Māhēśvara *yōga*, will depart to the world of Rudra, whence it is difficult to return."

Now, there are held to be good reasons for regarding the Vāyu-Purāṇa—(not necessarily that Purāṇa exactly as we have it now, but a Purāṇa bearing that name)—as one of the earliest of the Purāṇas. But, irrespective of the comparative question, an allusion to it in the Harshacharita of Bāṇa, who flourished in the first half of the seventh century, shews that there was then already the practice of reciting it. The work must have existed for some considerable time, in order to have become so far recognized. And there is a reason for thinking that it must have been finished off in the first half of the fourth century. In its account of the great dynasties of India, it mentions last the Guptas, in respect of whom it says, in the usual prophetic style, that they would reign over Sākēta and the Magadha country and along the Ganges as far as Prayāga (Allahābād). And this, taken as applying to the Early or Imperial Gupta dynasty, can only refer to the territories held by Chandragupta I., A.D. 320 to about 335, before the great extension of the dominions of that dynasty under

<sup>1</sup> These two names are not exactly synonymous, and seem to indicate two distinct places which subsequently became confused: Kāyāvātāra, "the (*place of*) descending into the (*human*) body," i.e., the place where the incarnation of Śiva as Lakuliśa was manifested, the place at which the teacher Lakulin made his first appearance; Kāyārōhaṇa, "the (*place of*) ascending into the (*divine*) body," i.e., the place at which Lakulin eventually settled, established his school, and died. And the local Māhātmya, mentioning Kārvān as Kāyavirōhaṇa, appears only to claim (see EI, 1. 274; Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, 7. 550) that it was there that the god disappeared when the incarnation came to an end.

A record of A.D. 706 (IA, 13. 77) mentions Kāyāvātāra as a camp of the Gurjara prince Jayabhata III., and necessarily locates the place in the same territory with Kārvān, with which in fact it was identified by Professor Bühler (IA, 18. 176). This record does not mention the incarnation. But the name itself seems to shew that the event was already localized in that neighbourhood.

his successor Samudragupta. It is hence inferred that the Vāyu-Purāṇa was completed in or shortly after the time of Chandragupta I.

Following that line of argument, Mr. Bhandarkar arrives at the conclusion that, in order to have become an article of general belief and to be mentioned in the Vāyu-Purāṇa in the early part of the fourth century, the incarnation of Śiva as Lakulīśa must be placed in the first century A.D. at the latest.

In connexion with this incarnation of Śiva, there is a point on which Mr. Bhandarkar lays some stress. At the Ēklingjī temple itself and in many other old temples in Rājputānā, he has seen sculptures which are evidently representations of Śiva as Lakulīśa. They all exhibit the god as two-armed, and as holding a club in one of his hands. These have not been specially illustrated yet. But a similar sculpture in the Dumar Iēṇa cave at Ellōrā has been shewn, on a small scale but very clearly, by Dr. Burgess (ASWI, plate 37, fig. 1, left): it exhibits a seated two-armed god, holding a club upwards in his left hand; and Dr. Burgess has described it (*ibid.*, 42) as “Śiva as a Yogi or ascetic, with a club in his left hand, and seated on a lotus upheld by Nāga figures, with two females worshipping behind each, — an evident copy from the figures of Buddha.”<sup>1</sup> The point on which Mr. Bhandarkar lays stress is the feature that these images always represent Śiva as having only two arms, quite exceptionally in comparison with the usual treatment of that god in at any rate the same temples. He understands the

<sup>1</sup> Vishṇu, also, had a club, — or according to some translators a mace, — called in his case *gadā*. And according to Varāhamihira the rule was that, if he was to be represented as four-armed or eight-armed, the club should be in one of his right hands; if he was to be represented as two-armed, the club seems to have been omitted: see the *Bṛihat-Samhitā*, 58/57. 31 to 35. For Śiva, whom he treats only as two-armed, Varāhamihira mentions (verse 43) only the trident and the bow *Pināka*.

A good illustration of the club of Vishṇu has been given by Dr. Burgess in his photograph of the Narasiṃha form as shewn in the Bādāmi Cave No. 3; see ASWI, 1, plate 29. There, however, the god is represented with one of his left arms leaning on the club. And the sculptures at the top of an inscription at Baḷagāmi (PSOCI, No. 183) shew Vishṇu, as Kēśava, holding the club downwards in one of his left hands.

Purāṇas as clearly implying that Lakulin was originally a Brahmachārin, a celibate ascetic. And he holds that the invariable practice of representing him with only two arms "means that his human origin was prominent before the mind of his followers and that consequently he was an historical personality like Buddha or Mahāvīra."

I presume that I am right in understanding Mr. Bhandarkar as meaning that, at some time not later than the first century A.D., there appeared a great Śaiva teacher, who carried a club and so became known as Lakulin, and who preached a new manifestation of Śiva as Lakulīśa, "the lord who bears the club;" and that that teacher subsequently became identified with the god himself, and was regarded as an incarnation of the god. And such a result is so reasonable, and fits in so well with what can be learnt from other sources, that we could hardly refuse to accept it.

Some scholars hold that the Dionysos and Hēraklēs of the Greek writers about India mean, respectively, Śiva and Kṛishṇa. Others would rather connect Kṛishṇa with Dionysos and Śiva with Hēraklēs. Whatever may be the general case in that respect, we can hardly doubt that the club of Śiva as Lakulīśa is the club of Hēraklēs. The limit arrived at by Mr. Bhandarkar for the appearance of Lakulin is precisely the time at which, as we learn from the coins of Huvishka and Vāsudēva in one series and from those of Kadphisēs I. and II. in another series, Hēraklēs was disappearing from the Indian coinage and Śiva was replacing him. And we have a representation of Śiva with the club on coins of Huvishka, whose known dates, taken as dates of the era of B.C. 58, range from B.C. 25 to 7 or perhaps A.D. 3. I refer to coins which have been illustrated by Gardner in his *Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India*, plate 28, No. 15, and by Smith in his *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, plate 12, No. 14. It is true that Śiva is there shewn as four-armed, and with one of his left hands resting on the

club instead of holding it upwards. But we have there an unmistakable association of the club with Śiva.

The allusion to Ulūka in the Cintra Praśasti is obscure, and will require to be elucidated so that we may fully understand the historical bearing of this incarnation of Śiva as Lakulīśa, that is, the appearance of the teacher Lakulin as the originator of a new development of Śaivism.

Mr. Bhandarkar has drawn attention to the point that one of the four disciples of Śiva in each of his preceding two incarnations bore the name Ulūka. And, citing certain instances of the use of the terms *putra* and *śishya* indifferently, to express the relationship between certain persons and their teachers, he has apparently contemplated rendering *viputrakān* by "without disciples." But there is nothing in the passages in the Vāyu and Liṅga Purāṇas to suggest either that a curse was laid on the disciple Ulūka or by him on his pupils, or that there was any interruption in the regular appearance of the four disciples—(apparently the same persons constantly reborn under different names)—with each successive incarnation of the god.

I am inclined to find the explanation in the history, given in the Mahābhārata, of Śakuni, son of Subala king of Gandhāra, and of his son Ulūka. Śakuni, "the Cheat," who had a hundred tricks at his command (7, § 14. 516), who was born to become through the provocation of the gods a destroyer of religion (1, § 63. 2440 f.), was "the root of the feud and the gambling" which led to all the trouble between the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas (1, § 1. 206; compare 5, § 161. 5609 f.; 9, § 29. 1562). His misdeeds made him "the slayer of his own family" (*svakulaghna*; 5, § 161. 5611). And in the great battle there were slain, first, nine or ten of his brothers (6, § 91. 3997–4016; 7, § 157. 6944–6); then his son Ulūka (9, § 29. 1532 f.); and then Śakuni himself (*ibid.*, 1562). I do not at present find a distinct record of a formal curse having been laid upon Śakuni. But the above indications, tantamount to it, are plain enough. As far as the epic goes, there seem to

have remained alive, out of his family, only the following ; perhaps a brother of Śakuni named Vṛishabha, who escaped, badly wounded, when five of the brothers were slain (6, § 91. 4017), and a son of Śakuni (unnamed), who was king of Gandhāra when Arjuna followed into that territory the horse which was destined for the *āsvamēdha*-sacrifice (14, § 83. 2484 f., and § 84). But a combination of the Cintra Praśasti with the epic suggests that there was an understanding that there were also left some young sons of Ulūka, who, under the doom entailed by Śakuni's misdeeds, were unable to continue their race.

If we are to find thus the explanation of the obscure allusion, how can we do otherwise than associate the incarnation of Śiva as Lakuliśa, the appearance of the teacher Lakulin, particularly with the Gandhāra country? Though we may not actually place the manifestation of the incarnation in that territory, we must attribute to special encouragement received there the success that attended the founder of the new Śaiva school, and find in the history of the north-west corner of India the full significance of the event. Indications that we should do so are not wanting. But the further exposition of the matter must be left over for a subsequent note.

J. F. FLEET.

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE DEVANAGARI ALPHABET.

The numbers of the *Indian Antiquary* last received, for September and October, 1906, contain the opening instalments, with plates, of a disquisition by Mr. R. Shamasastri which is entitled "a Theory of the Origin of the Devanāgarī Alphabet." Mr. Shamasastri joins issue with that school, represented last by Professor Bühler, which holds that the Indian alphabets of the Brāhmī class, in which the Dēvanāgarī—more correctly, the Nāgarī—was developed, were of foreign and in fact Semitic origin. He maintains that they had an independent indigenous origin.