

## REFLECTIONS ON THE *SAHYĀDRIKHAṆḌA*'S *UTTARĀRDHA*

Stephan Hillyer Levitt

This paper provides a brief review of Gajanan Shastri Gaitonde's corrected edition of J. Gerson Da Cunha's 1877 text for the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*. It covers the import of O'Hanlon (2013) on the dating of various sections of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*'s *uttarārdha* and the support it gives to earlier conclusions by Levitt. Furthermore, it covers the fragmentary text of *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha* 15, which, it turns out, is about Sārasvata Brahmans at a much earlier date, and the import that this chapter's generally fragmentary state has with regard to the transmission of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*. Finally, it briefly discusses the topic of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*, a separable section of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*'s *uttarārdha*, and the historical nature of the text. My edition and translation of this have recently been released by Motilal Banarsidass as no. 6 in their Hindu Tradition Series.

My edition and translation of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*, 'a discussion of communities of fallen Brahmans', that is, of polluted Brahmans of untouchable status, a separable text which appears as *adhyāyas* 9–19 in the *uttarārdha*, or 'latter part', of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, 'the book of the Sahyādrī range of mountains', in both Da Cunha's and Gaitonde's editions of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, has now appeared as no. 6 in Motilal Banarsidass's Hindu Tradition Series (Levitt 2017).

I would like to take this opportunity to make a few comments with regard to the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, and the *uttarārdha* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* in particular.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this paper is threefold: 1) to bring the publication of my edition of a separable section of the *uttarārdha* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* to the attention of the scholarly community; 2) to underscore a few significant points on the one hand regarding the standing editions of the entire *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, and on the other hand specifically regarding this separable section of the *uttarārdha* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, the text of which in the manuscripts is exceedingly corrupt; and 3) to discuss some significant matters that have come to my attention since the manuscript for the edition was finalized, or on which further reflection has clarified my opinion.

While I was originally preparing my edition, a new edition of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* was undertaken by Gajanan Shastri Gaitonde. This edition, which purports to be a corrected edition of Da Cunha's earlier 1877 edition, has been used now by Deshpande (2010) and by Patil (2010), rather than the original edition by Da Cunha, which was judged to be deficient already in 1878 (E. 1878;

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for *Studia Orientalia Electronica* for his/her helpful and learned comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank the editor of *Studia Orientalia Electronica*, Dr. Albion M. Butters, for his help and useful comments.

see also Rocher 1986: 6, 6–7, n. 28; Levitt 2017: 20–23). In the course of his preparation of this edition of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, I briefly corresponded with Gaitonde. In fact, I think it was my request for a microfilm of a manuscript of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* in the Library of the Asiatic Society in Mumbai that spurred Gaitonde's edition.

A few words are in order about this new edition.

## 1. GAITONDE'S EDITION OF THE SAHYĀDRĪKHAṆḌA

Rocher (1986: 6–7, n. 28) gives a word of warning with regard to so-called revised and, therefore, expectedly improved editions of *purāṇas* published before and just after the beginning of the twentieth century. He quotes a scholar who used three successively improved editions of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* as noting that many mistakes had been corrected and totally unintelligible passages had been made more legible, but that he had good reason to believe that the overall “emendation” in many cases actually led to less justifiable texts.

This may perhaps be so with regard to Gaitonde's edition as well. First, Gaitonde places the *Reṇukāmāhātmya* up front, for reasons that are not entirely clear. He follows this with the *uttarārdha*, or *uttararahasya*, ‘the latter secret doctrine’, of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, which he refers to as the “*Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*”. He then follows with other *māhātmyas*, or ‘glorifications’, traditionally attached to the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* as given by Da Cunha, in the same order. This is then followed by the *ādirahasya*, ‘the initial secret doctrine’, or *pūrvārdha*, ‘the prior section’, of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, which is the main body of the text.

Gaitonde only presents those *māhātmyas* given by Da Cunha, though there are other *māhātmyas* traditionally attached to the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* as well, such as the *Āmalakīgrāmamāhātmya*, which, according to Prof. V. Raghavan, treats Citpāvan Brahmans (Raghavan et al. 1966: 146a), the *Vānavāsīkṣetramāhātmya* (Vānavāsī having been the capital of the Kadamba dynasty), and the *Harihareśvaramāhātmya*. For a fuller discussion of this, see Levitt (2017: 31–35).

But this is to be expected, as the edition purports to be a corrected edition of Da Cunha's earlier edition.

On the whole, Gaitonde presents in the various texts in his edition the same number of chapters as in Da Cunha's earlier edition of these texts, though names are given to all of the various chapters (for many of which Da Cunha's colophons give none). Inexplicably, however, Gaitonde has added eleven extra *adhyāyas*, or ‘chapters’, to the *uttarārdha* between *adhyāyas* 20 and 21 (as in Da Cunha's edition). These appear to be topically unrelated to a discussion of the Brahmans of the region, which is the general topic of the *uttarārdha* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*.

As I have noted elsewhere (Levitt 1977: 15; 1982: 130), *adhyāyas* 20 and 21 (as in Da Cunha's edition) appear to be from the *Rāmakṣetramāhātmya* and the *Reṇukāmāhātmya*.

In the colophons given by Gaitonde, the colophons of the *adhyāyas* given by Da Cunha as being in the *uttarārdha* are referred to (as in the colophons given in Da Cunha's edition) as being in the *uttararahasya* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, which is to say, the *uttarārdha*. *Adhyāya* 20 and the extra *adhyāyas* added by Gaitonde, on the other hand, simply refer to themselves in their colophons as being in the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa*. As noted, it is not clear as to why these extra *adhyāyas* have been added here, except that they seem to treat Paraśu-Rāma, who is also mentioned in many places in the *uttarārdha*.

It is no doubt Gaitonde's organization of his edition which leads Patil (2010: 36–38) to incorrectly construe the various *māhātmyas*, together with the *uttarārdha*, as all comprising the *uttarārdha*, or *uttararahasya*. And it is this, no doubt, which leads her to judge the

*Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* to be a *sthalapurāṇa*, or a *purāṇa* that eulogizes the origin and glory of regional *sthalas* or *tīrthas*, ‘places’ and ‘places of pilgrimage on the banks of sacred streams’, respectively (as do most of the separable *māhātmyas* here). The *uttarārdha*, though, is not a *sthalapurāṇa*; rather, it is a caste *purāṇa*. And the *pūrvārdha* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* treats the five topics that *purāṇas* by tradition have been said to treat – though most do not, and in the main is the same text as the *Jñānayogakhaṇḍa*, with the addition of a treatment of the *kṣatriyas* of the region (see Levitt 1977 and 1979a; 2017: 23–29, Appendix H).

With regard to Gaitonde’s text, while he does give at the foot of his pages readings as in Da Cunha’s text when these are different from his adopted text, it is not clear whence his adopted text is coming – whether it is an emendation or “correction” to Da Cunha’s text, or whether it is from one of the manuscripts he consulted. For instance, in *adhyāya* 11, verses 24c–26b, Da Cunha and all of our manuscripts (with the exception of one of our best manuscripts) read *parastrīṇām* ‘of the wives of others’ in verse 25c. Our best manuscript at this point reads *kulastrīṇām*, probably for *kulastrīyaṃ* ‘a wife’. Gaitonde substitutes *svadārāṃśca* ‘and ... [having] their own wives’. It is not clear where Gaitonde is getting his reading from.

Furthermore, he does not always note the differences between his adopted readings and Da Cunha’s text. For example, in the case of *adhyāya* 9, verse 5ab, Gaitonde adopts a text of “*yadyadasti ...*”, whereas Da Cunha has “*yadastīti ...*”. Da Cunha’s reading is not noted in the footnotes. And none of the manuscripts which I have consulted read like Gaitonde’s adopted text – and at this point my best manuscripts are both present.

With regard to the eleven added *adhyāyas* in his adopted text for the *uttarārdha*, or *uttara-rahasya*, which he refers to simply as the “*Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*”, he gives no footnotes – as one might expect.

I would also note that his text is often very different from the adopted readings I chose on the basis of manuscript evidence. Thus, whereas I reconstructed *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha* 9, verse 2cd, to read:

*ataḥ kathāmr̥taṃ puṇyaṃ pāyayasva bhavārtiḥaṃ //*

Gaitonde just corrects Da Cunha’s unmetrical reading:

*ataḥ kathāmr̥taṃ puṇyapāpātibhayārtiḥaṃ //*

to read, also unmetrically:

*ataḥ kathāmr̥taṃ puṇyaṃ pāpātibhayārtiḥaṃ //*

Or, compare *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha* 15, the text of which was set with the help of Ludo Rocher, which readings were then supported by a fuller manuscript of this *adhyāya* in Malayalam script. This latter manuscript, in the British Library’s India Office collection, was pointed out to me by V. Raghavan after the edition was originally completed. It is noted in both Aufrecht (1891; 1896; 1903/III: 71a) and Raghavan et al. (1988: 24b) to be a manuscript of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*. However, Keith (1935: 1033 [No. 6914]), in a comment authored by A.C. Burnell, notes that this identification is erroneous. And of the two chapters that do style themselves “*Grāmanirṇaye Pātitye*” in this manuscript of extracts from what purports to be the *uparibhāga* (‘latter portion’ = *uttarārdha*) of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, it is only our *adhyāya* referred to here that appears to be in the compilation of chapters represented in Da Cunha’s edition. As it ends up, this *adhyāya* treats Sārasvata Brahmans negatively. And Gaitonde is a

Sārasvata Brahman. With the exception of six minor “corrections”, Gaitonde prints Da Cunha's text, which is unintelligible and very questionable at points.

## 2. THE DATE OF THE TEXT ACCORDING TO O'HANLON (2013)

I have argued elsewhere (Levitt 1982) that the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha's Pātityagrāmanirṇaya, adhyāyas 9–19* of the *uttarārdha*, as in both Da Cunha's and Gaitonde's editions, consists of three sections, each with a different author; that the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha adhyāyas 7* and *8* are by a still different author, perhaps the same author as *adhyāya 15* of the *uttarārdha* – though I now tend to think that *adhyāya 15* is independent of *adhyāyas 7* and *8*; and that *adhyāyas 20* and *21* of the *uttarārdha* were imported from the *Rāmakṣetramāhātmya* and the *Reṇukāmāhātmya*, as in some manuscripts of this latter text.

Furthermore, I have suggested (Levitt 1993: 89; 2017: 99, for instance) that there are paleographic grounds for viewing the core text of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya, adhyāyas 9–14* of the *uttarārdha*, to have been written before the eleventh to twelfth centuries on the basis of confusion between ‘bh’ and ‘t’ in the manuscript tradition (see Levitt 1979b). And in part suggesting the plausibility of such a date, on the basis of an interpolation in *adhyāya 12*, the core text can be seen to be in the manuscript tradition before the ascendancy of Madhva's thought in the region, which itself would date the text to before the middle of the thirteenth century (see Levitt 2017: 97–98).

I have also argued (Levitt 1977: 18, Table II, 36–37; 2017: 3–4, 26, Appendix H, esp. 429–430) that, in part on the basis of the speakers, the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa's uttarārdha* is itself composed of four discrete sections, with *adhyāyas 1–6*, which are the *adhyāyas* most frequently pointed to in the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* on account of their scandalous content, being independent of what follows.

In the opinion of O'Hanlon (2013: 103), the stories of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* are older than the narratives of *adhyāyas 1–6*, and they “are likely to have been written before or around the end of the first millennium, since they describe Brahmans simply by their village of origin and their *gotra* or exogamous patrilineal descent group”. Chapters 1–6, on the other hand, “[identify] Brahmans by vernacular language region, a mode that gradually became common during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and emerged thereafter as the basis for the tenfold regional classification” (O'Hanlon 2013: 103). Karve (1932: 121–123) mentioned that these latter chapters are regarded as a recent interpolation according to Guṃjīkar, a Sārasvata scholar writing in the late nineteenth century, in his *Sarasvatīmaṇḍala* (1884: 145; see also Patil 2010: 74).

Furthermore, Patil notes that nowhere does the *Koṅkaṇākhyāna*, composed in 1721 CE, refer to the derogatory description of Citpāvan and Karhāḍe Brahmans as found in our present *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*. Patil (2010: 184–185) argues: “There are two possible explanations for this: either the poet had access to a different manuscript of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, or he used an oral version”. These latter points support the observation made by O'Hanlon.

This is also in agreement with the evidence of the *Tuluagrāmapaddhati* (see Saletore 1936a; 1936b), which contains *uttarārdha 7–8, 11–12, 14–17* + either *9–10* or *18–19*, and perhaps *18–19* or *20–21*. The readings of Saletore's best manuscript of this text from the Puttige *maṭha* in Uḍipi fall in with the less preferred readings of my two best manuscripts of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* (my manuscripts L1a and L1c), both with only early *adhyāyas* of the text, and with the most preferred manuscript of my second grouping of manuscripts (my manuscript L2). This latter manuscript, in Telugu script, contains five sections, one of which includes the *adhyāyas* of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* standing alone: that is, *adhyāyas 9–19* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa's uttarārdha*.

Again supporting O'Hanlon's observation, *adhyāyas 1–6* would appear to be of a later date.

This evidence also suggests that *adhyāyas* 16–17, and 18–19, which on stylistic grounds are seen by me to be later additions to the other *adhyāyas* of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* (Levitt 1982), were already added to the core text by the time it was placed in its new environment in the *Tuluvagrāmapaddhati* and by the time that my second grouping of manuscripts were written.

O'Hanlon's observation also supports that the core text of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*, and *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha* 7 and 8, and 15, are perhaps to be dated before the tenth century by which time, it would seem, the Kadamba dynasty (having re-emerged from obscurity) had lost sight of its early history (see Levitt 2017: 99 for references; see also Moraes 1931: ix, 7).

Gail (1977: 204) argues, however, that the important literary tradition regarding Mayūrarman bringing Brahmans from Ahichatra in northern India to the region is first found in epigraphical sources in the eleventh century. And in the very earliest epigraphical material, the later name "Mayūrarman" appears as "Mayūrasarman". Nevertheless, Logan (1887/I: 276) notes that the forms °*sarman* and °*varman* were used interchangeably by kings of this region.

In the translation in Levitt (2017), at the editor's suggestion I changed all the identifications of the speakers to read, "Śaunaka said:", "The holy Bhārgava said:", "The women said:", etc., from simple statements regarding the identity of a speaker (i.e. "Śaunaka:", "The holy Bhārgava:", "The women:"). As indicated clearly by the manuscript tradition, the latter is as the text ought to read. And this is the way the adopted text reads.

The significance of this is not clear to me. We might observe that such a manner of introducing speakers, as indicated by the manuscript tradition, might possibly suggest that originally the text was intended to be spoken. Such is the way speakers are indicated in modern theatrical literature, for instance. Note also Patil's comment, mentioned above, regarding the possibility of the existence of an oral version of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa's uttarārdha*. Such might also fit in with the early date for the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*, or perhaps for the core text of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*, as suggested by O'Hanlon.

### 3. SAHYĀDRĪKHAṆḌA UTTARĀRDHA 15 AND THE SĀRASVATA BRAHMANS

*Adhyāya* 15 of the *uttarārdha* is clearly fragmentary, as in Da Cunha's and in Gaitonde's editions. Many of its readings are also questionable. Gaitonde makes just six minor "corrections". In the case of at least one of these, in my critically edited text there is in fact on the basis of manuscript evidence no difficulty with Da Cunha's reading (Gaitonde's *prītibhojane* for Da Cunha's *pratibhojane*). In its context in his questionable text, Gaitonde's reading does nothing but spread scorn, as it would seem to refer to 'eating joyfully' a diet with meat.

The text of the *adhyāya* standing alone, as found in the Malayalam script manuscript in the India Office Library, contains two additional verses, one of which helps to clarify the text considerably. The readings of this manuscript are also appreciably better than elsewhere, and they support emendations based on manuscript evidence available at the time, as suggested by Ludo Rocher.

One main difficulty with the text, as in Da Cunha's and Gaitonde's editions, involves the names of the villages. The manuscripts consulted for my edition contain a number of variants, and it is not clear what is to be accepted. The Malayalam script manuscript clears this up by substituting "*kuśasthālīm tathā sāṣṭi maṭināgapuraṃ tathā*" for what the other manuscripts appear to reconstruct as "*kuḍālakam ca padikam madim nāgābhidham tathā*". This clearly identifies the group of polluted Brahmans of untouchable status being discussed as Sārasvata



Brahmans, as the place name “Kuśasthālī” is clearly associated with them in the literature (see, for instance, Patil 2010: 65).

If we look at the names for some of the original Sārasvata settlements cited in Patil (2010) as being given in the first few *adhyāyas* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*'s *uttarārdha* and in the *Koṅkaṇākhyāna*, this clears up some of the names, as given in the listing in *adhyāya* 15 in Da Cunha's edition and the other manuscripts. Thus, Patil (2010: 65) mentions as being associated with Kuśasthālī (present-day Kutthali) the Trihotra deity Nāgeśa, as well as the place names “Maṭhagrāma” (present-day Madgaon) and “Kardalīpura” (present-day Quartalim). Patil (2010: 66) additionally mentions as being associated with these a residential place name “Padmatīrtha”. And again she mentions the place names “Kardalī”, “Kuśasthālī”, and “Maṭhagrāma”. Patil (2010:178, 180–181) mentions the names of quarrelling Sārasvata as including Kudaleshkars and Padnemkars, which names referred originally to their geographic location in Goa. On the basis of copperplates issued by Vijayanagar's kings, Patil also points out here that the town now known as Kuḍavāla was originally Kuśasthālī. With regard to the names of some of the original Sārasvata settlements, see as well the 1991 reprint of Da Cunha (1881: 9).

It would thus appear that the place name “Kuḍālaka” in all of our manuscripts (other than the Malayalam script manuscript) refers to Kuśasthālī. The Malayalam script manuscript's reading may, in fact, be a gloss.

Furthermore, the names of the towns we originally reconstructed as Madi and Nāga, with variants Maṭṭī and Maddi, and which two names we took together in the final edition, would appear to refer to Maṭhagrāma and to a town then known by the name of the god it worshipped, the Trihotra deity Nāgeśa. Padika may possibly refer to the residential place name “Padmatīrtha”.

The fragmentary and overly corrupt condition of this *adhyāya*, I would suggest, is due to the transmission of this text being for a time in the hands of Sārasvata Brahmans, whom the chapter is about. Interestingly, even in the Malayalam script manuscript, the text would still appear to possibly be incomplete, as it does not mention one of the important reasons for these Brahmans being considered to be *pātitya*, or polluted Brahmans of untouchable status: their eating of fish.<sup>2</sup> But it is not clear whether or not there ought be a specific statement to this effect. There is an oblique reference to it when it is stated that Brahmans, in general, are known by their paying homage to the gods, by their practicing what is enjoined by *Śruti* and *Smṛti*, and by their eating a prescribed diet, with uncooked vegetables being forbidden.

Bhattacharya (1896: 84) mentions that the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* appears to be the work of a Deśastha Brahman. This follows Guṃjīkar (1884: 145), who originally made this speculation (see Patil 2010: 74). As noted by Patil, and as mentioned above, Guṃjīkar was a Sārasvata scholar. More recently, Deshpande (2010: 45) has argued that the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* is rather a Sārasvata text:

Even granting the dislike for the Citpāvan and Karhāde Brahmans on the part of the Deśastha Brahmans, there was no love lost among the Deśasthas for the Sārasvatas, and one would not expect a Deśastha Brahmin writing an avowedly pro-Sārasvata text like the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*.

One must understand that when these authorities are referring to the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*, they are basing their observations on the *uttarārdha*'s *adhyāyas* 1–6, which are the chapters of the

---

2 In the area from which these Brahmans come – northern and eastern Bihar (Mithila) – and in Bengal, fish are considered to be “vegetables from the sea”. Arguments used in justification for the eating of fish by Sārasvata Brahmans are that it was a regional custom in the area from which they came, and therefore it ought to be sanctioned. Regarding such an argument, see, for instance, O'Hanlon (2013: 104–106).

*Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* that have gained notoriety. O'Hanlon (2013: 103–106) follows Deshpande's conclusion specifically with regard to *adhyāyas* 1–6, and views the first six *adhyāyas* to have been composed by a Sārasvata Brahman. The fragmentary and overly corrupt condition of *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha* 15 also supports Deshpande's position, and it further suggests that the transmission of the *uttarārdha* of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa* was in Sārasvata hands for at least a time. What we appear to have with Sārasvata Brahmans is a good example of a community which improved its status, not unlike some other communities in India, such as the Kayasths in Bengal or Rabindranath Tagore's community.

#### 4. THE PURPOSE OF THE *PĀTITYAGRĀMANIRŪYAYA* (*SAHYĀDRĪKHAṆḌA UTTARĀRDHA* 9–19)

On seeing Levitt (1993), Eleanor Zelliott asked (correspondence dated 29 January 1994), “For what purpose was the *Pātityagrāmanirūyaya* written? ... [Are the stories] cautionary tales to encourage proper Brahman behavior?”

With regard to this, we might note that the *uttarārdha*'s *adhyāya* 12, verse 2 seems to suggest that the text is an attempt to avoid societal confusion and thus perpetuate a status quo.

The preliminary words spoken by Śātānīka for *adhyāya* 15, though, found only in the Malayalam script manuscript of this chapter, confirms Eleanor Zelliott's conjecture as well, as it implies that the purpose of these stories is to teach what not to do.

#### 5. HISTORICITY OF THE STORIES IN THE *PĀTITYAGRĀMANIRŪYAYA*

Many castes, perhaps in part initially encouraged by British interests and endeavours, claim original higher status. For instance, the Tamil Kammālans, made up of five occupational types – goldsmiths, brass-smiths, carpenters, stonemasons, and blacksmiths – claim original Brahman origin, tracing their ancestry to the architect and artificer of the gods, Viśvakarman. The Idaiyans, or Kōnāns, a Tamil pastoral and herding caste, claim original *kṣatriya* status, identifying themselves with the North Indian Yādavas, from which group the god Kṛṣṇa came. The Tamil Khatris are a caste of silk weavers who also claim original *kṣatriya* status. They relate that their ancestors hid during the general massacre of *kṣatriyas* by the god Paraśu-Rāma. This was also the case, if I remember correctly, with a number of other artisan castes in India. (See Thurston 1909/II and III; and anonymous articles on the Internet, updated last in 2017, on “Khatris” (2 articles), “Kōnar (Caste)”, and “Viśwakarma (Caste)”.) In such instances, the stories are used for purposes of jockeying for position in the overall caste system.

Many of the stories in the *Pātityagrāmanirūyaya* also involve Paraśu-Rāma, used as a *deus ex machina*, who, on the other hand, raises the status of Brahmans who have sinned.

Other than this, though, the stories appear to have historical basis. Four of the stories, for instance, clearly involve Brahmans of the 32 villages established in South Kanara for Brahmans King Mayūrarman brought from Ahichatra, the capital of Pañcāla, in northern India. A story similar to one of these stories is told by a small community of Kōta Brahmans in Karnataka reported by Thurston (1909/IV: 31) and Ananthakrishna Iyer (1928–1936/II: 313–314). Another story has a parallel with regard to the history of a Kerala community of fallen Brahmans, or polluted Brahmans of untouchable status, reported by Thurston (1909/IV: 32), and of a different group reported by Enthoven (1920–1922/I: 249). The two stories of pregnant widows also find parallels. See, for instance, the same reference in Enthoven (1920–1922/I: 249).

The bringing of Brahmans from Ballabhī in Saurashtra by King Mayūrarvarman, mentioned in *adhyāya* 15, is noted elsewhere in a text in verse treating the life of Mayūrarvarman in a manuscript of fragments in the India Office Library (Keith 1935: 1570a–1571b (MS. 4104)). This manuscript notes as well that Mayūrarvarman was born in Ballabhī, where his father had gone on pilgrimage and then ended his days (Warder 1972–2011/VI: 31–32). Ballabhī was an important centre of learning in Saurashtra, and it is where the Śvetāmbara Jain canon was settled on and put into writing in the fifth century. It was destroyed in the eighth century (Basham 1954: 289; Warder 1972–2011/VI: 32).

That Mayūrarvarman brought Brahmans from the north, though, is standardly taken to refer to his having brought Brahmans from Ahichatra, as mentioned above. For instance, Gail (1977: 204) notes that the arrival of Brahmans from Ahichatra is a historical fact of which we have inscriptional evidence from the tenth century. Gail notes that the tradition that it was Mayūrarvarman who first brought Brahmans from Ahichatra to the region was first set down in epigraphical sources in the eleventh century. The important literary tradition regarding this settlement of Brahmans from Ahichatra by Mayūrarvarman in his kingdom is related in many versions. For such literary tradition, see, for instance, the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa's uttarārdha, adhyāya* 8 and the last few verses of *adhyāya* 7, which mention that these Brahmans were settled in South Kanara in 32 villages. That such a literary tradition may have its origin before the mid-tenth century Kadamba dynasty, which had lost sight of its origins, may explain the simple Sanskrit of *adhyāya* 8. Alternatively, such a tradition may be dated to some time after the mid-tenth century.<sup>3</sup>

Warder suggests that the tradition of Mayūrarvarman bringing Brahmans from Ballabhī is a rival tradition to that of Mayūrarvarman bringing Brahmans from Ahichatra, and is the older of the two. The two groups of Brahmans were settled in different areas, though: those from Ballabhī were settled in Goa on the basis of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa's uttarārdha, adhyāya* 15, while those from Ahichatra were settled in South Kanara.

Of clear historical basis is one of the stories added to the core of the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* in *uttarārdha adhyāyas* 16–17, which relates to the famous judge Mariadi-ramen (Mariyātairāman). Saleore (1936a: 346–347) appears to be familiar with this story, which, although he does not relate it to Mariadi-ramen, states that the judicial procedure described occurred in the court of the Vijayanagar viceroy Vīra Bhūpati, who was given dominion over a city in Karnataka, his “provincial capital”, in 1386 CE.

In short, these stories do not appear to be of the same nature as the narratives about Citpāvam and Karhāde Brahmans in the *uttarārdha's adhyāyas* 1–6, the purpose of which involved status jockeying by another Brahman group (in this case, Sārasvatas). Regarding this phenomenon, see Patil (2010), which treats the subject thoroughly.

It must be emphasized that historical facts must be extracted from such texts as the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*, and the *Tuluvagrāmapaddhati* with the utmost care, due to the corrupt nature of the manuscripts. See, for instance, Rao (2005), who takes the readings in such unedited

3 Originally there were 64 villages, 32 in South Kanara and 32 in northern Kerala, but they separated from one another (see Levitt 2017: 121–122; Logan 1887/I: 264–265). With regard to the significance of there having been originally a grouping of 64 villages, see Volwahren (1969: 43–58) and Levitt (1991–1992: 539; 2011: 53b–54a). Such reflects the most common of the architectural grids laid out in northern India before the construction of important buildings or the setting up of towns. For the stories of *adhyāyas* 9 and 10, and perhaps 11 and 12, to have occurred a period of time must have elapsed since the original settlement. It is these stories that refer to Brahmans of the 32 villages.



or poorly edited texts at face value, and because of this compares corrupt lists of village names and takes differences to indicate differences in tradition. Additionally, he takes interpolations in the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* regarding Madhva and Madhvites to be integral parts of the narrative, and on this basis suggests a dating for the text after Madhva (Rao 2005: 149–150, 159). Or, he presents in English translation what are garbled narrations in Da Cunha's text. For instance, in *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa uttarārdha*, *adhyāya* 15, discussed above, he would have Brahmans created by Paraśu-Rāma to have been kept in a place called Ballabhī by King Mayūravarman (Rao 2005: 157), instead of having learned Brahmans being brought from Ballabhī by Mayūravarman, who then parcelled out a few villages to the Brahmans who had been brought to the area by Paraśu-Rāma at an earlier date.

## 6. CLOSING REMARKS

The *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya* is about communities of fallen Brahmans, which is to say, polluted Brahmans of untouchable status, in southwestern India. Such groups can be found throughout India, though, with surprising frequency. References to them can be found in the various Caste and Tribe volumes from the British period. There are also references to such groups, though to a lesser extent, in the various gazetteers from that era.

The standing dictum is that Brahmans are at the top in the South Asian social hierarchy. But the status of a particular Brahman community depends in part on the non-Brahman castes that they service, and on their occupational endeavours and duties. It is also based on their behaving in accord with prescribed rules and regulations. If there are infractions, the punishment is severe. To date, this topic has not been treated adequately.

It is that which this text treats. And it is perhaps for this reason that the manuscripts of this text are so corrupt – and, as the textual evidence would suggest, corrupt already before being incorporated into the present compilation of the *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa's uttarārdha* as its main, or one of its main, constituent sections.

## REFERENCES

2017. Khatri. In: *PG India*. <peoplegroupsindia.com/profiles/khatri/>, accessed on 7 Feb. 2017.
2017. Khatri. In: *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. <en.wikipedia.org/wiki/khatri>, accessed on 7 Feb. 2017.
2017. Konar (Caste). In: *Rediff Pages*. <pages.rediff.com/konar--caste-/1271140>, accessed on 7 Feb. 2017.
2017. Vishwakarma (Caste). In: *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. <en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vishwakarma\_(caste)>, accessed on 7 Feb. 2017.
- ANANTHAKRISHNA IYER, L. Krishna 1928–1936. *The Mysore Tribes and Castes*, I–IV + Index. Mysore: Published under the auspices of the Mysore University.
- AUFRECHT, Theodor 1891, 1896, 1903. *Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical register of Sanskrit works and authors*, I–III. Leipzig: Brockhaus. (Repr., 3 vols. in 2, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner 1962.)
- BASHAM, Arthur Llewellyn 1954. *The Wonder That Was India*. NY: The Macmillan Co. (Repr. NY: Evergreen 1959.)
- BHATTACHARYA, Jogendra Nath 1896. *Hindu Castes and Sects: An Exposition of the origin of the Hindu caste system and the bearing of sects towards each other and towards other religious systems*. Calcutta: Thacker.
- DA CUNHA, J. Gerson 1877. See *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa A*.
- DA CUNHA, J. Gerson 1881. *The Koṅkaṇī Language and Literature*. Bombay: Government Central Press. (Repr. New Delhi and Madras: Asian Educational Services 1991.)
- DESHPANDE, Madhav M. 2010. Pañca Gauda and Pañca Drāviḍa: Contested borders of a traditional classification. In: K. KARTTUNEN (ed.), *Anantaṁ Śāstram: Indological and linguistic studies in honour of Bertil Tikkanen* (Studia Orientalia 108): 29–58. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.

- E. 1878. Review of the Sahyādrī-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa: A Mythological, historical and geographical account of Western India, first edition of the Sanskrit text with various readings. Ed. J. Gerson Da Cunha, 1877. Bombay: Thacker, Vining & Co. *Indian Antiquary* 7: 208ab.
- ENTHOVEN, Reginald Edward 1920–1922. *The Tribes and Castes of Bombary*, I–III. Bombay: Printed at the Government Press.
- GAIL, Adalbert 1977. *Paraśurāma, Brahmane und Krieger: Untersuchung über Ursprung und Entwicklung eines Avatāra Viṣṇus und Bhakta Śivas in der indischen Literatur*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GAITONDE, Gajanan Shastri [1992; pref. 1991]. See *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa B*.
- KARVE, Irawati 1932. The Paraśu-Rāma Myth. *Journal of the University of Bombay* 1: 115–139.
- KEITH, Arthur Berriedale 1935. *Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prākṛit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, II. Oxford: Published by order of the Secretary of State for India in Council at the Clarendon Press.
- LEVITT, Stephan Hillyer 1977 and 1979a. The *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*: Some problems concerning a text-critical edition of a Purāṇic text. *Purāṇa* 19(1): 8–40; 21(1): 77–79.
- LEVITT, Stephan Hillyer 1979b. Orthographic Confusion Between ‘bh’ and ‘t’ in *Devanāgarī* manuscripts. *Journal of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta* [4th ser.] 21: 27–30.
- LEVITT, Stephan Hillyer 1982. The *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*: Style and context as indices of authorship in the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*. *Purāṇa* 24(1): 128–145.
- LEVITT, Stephan Hillyer 1991–1992. Chess: Its South Asian origin and meaning. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72–73: 533–547, 6 figures (unnumbered).
- LEVITT, Stephan Hillyer 1993. Pollution and *karman* in the *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*. *Purāṇa* 35(1): 88–105.
- LEVITT, Stephan Hillyer 2011. McKim Marriott’s Theory of “Coded Substance” as an Explanation of Formulaic Turns of Phrase in Certain Vedic and Hindu Prayers, and Its Relationship to Mircea Elidade’s Theory of “The Sacred”. *Anthropos* 106(1): 49–55.
- LEVITT, Stephan Hillyer 2017. See *Pātityagrāmanirṇaya*.
- LOGAN, William 1887. *Malabar Manual*, I. Madras: R. Hill. (Repr. Trivandrum: Charithram Publications 1981.)
- MORAES, George M. 1931. *The Kadamba Kula: A History of Ancient and Mediaeval Karnataka*. Pref. by Rev. H. Heras, S.J. (Studies in Indian History of the Indian Historical Research Institute, St. Xavier’s College 5) Bombay: B.X. Furtado.
- O’HANLON, Rosalind 2013. Performance in a World of Paper: Puranic histories and social communication in Early Modern India. *Past & Present* 219 (May): 87–126.
- PATIL, Urmila Rajshekhar 2010. *Conflict, Identity and Narratives: The Brahman communities of Western India from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin. <repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/ETD-UT-2010-12-2082/PATIL-DISSERTATION.pdf>, accessed 6 Nov. 2015.
- Pātityagrāmanirṇaya: The Pātityagrāmanirṇaya: A Purāṇic history of some Brahman communities: Includes introduction, the text of Pātityagrāmanirṇaya, Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa, Skandapurāṇa, translation and critical apparatus*. Ed. and tr. Stephan Hillyer Levitt, 2017. (Hindu Tradition Series 6) Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- RAGHAVAN, Venkatarama et al. 1966. *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical register of Sanskrit and allied works and authors*, II. (Madras University Sanskrit Series 26) Madras: University of Madras.
- RAGHAVAN, Venkatarama et al. 1988. *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical register of Sanskrit and allied works and authors*, XII. (Madras University Sanskrit Series 38) Madras: University of Madras.
- RAO, Nagendra 2005. *Brahmans of South India*. Foreword by Kesavan Veluthat. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- ROCHER, Ludo 1986. *The Purāṇas*. (History of Indian Literature 2(3)) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa A: The Sahyādrī-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa: A Mythological, historical and geographical account of Western India, first edition of the Sanskrit text with various readings*. Ed. J. Gerson Da Cunha, 1877. Bombay: Thacker, Vining & Co.
- Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa B: Śrī Skandapurāṇa, Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa: Dō. Jarsana da Kunha sampādita granthācī samśodhita, samvardhita āvṛtti, Marāṭhī arthāsaha*. Ed. Gajanan Shastri Gaitonde [Gajānaśāstrī Gāyatoṇḍe], [1972; pref. 1971]. Mumbaī: Śrī Kātyāyanī Publikeśansa: mukhya vikrete, Mējestika Buka Depo.

- SALETORE, Bhasker Anand 1936a. *History of Ancient Karnāṭaka*, I: *History of Tuḷuva*. (Poona Oriental Series 53) Poona: Oriental Book Agency.
- SALETORE, Bhasker Anand 1936b. The Tuluva Gramapaddhati. In: *S. Aiyangar Commemoration Volume*: 116–117. Madras: The Committee.
- THURSTON, Edgar, assisted by K. Rangachari 1909. *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, I–VII. Madras: Government Press. (Online repr., [place of publication not identified]: Project Gutenberg 2013.)
- VOLWAHSEN, Andreas 1969. *Living Architecture: Indian*. Foreword by Walter Wenn; tr. Ann E. Keep. NY: Grosset & Dunlap.
- WARDER, Anthony Kennedy 1972–2011. *Indian Kāvya Literature*, I–VIII. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.