

Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa

Indian tradition unanimously considers Jaimini as the author of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, and the founder of the Mīmāṃsā (lit. “Investigation”) as one of the six systems (*darśanas*, views) of orthodox philosophy. Mīmāṃsā is therefore also called Jaiminidarśana. Bādarāyaṇa is almost unanimously considered as the author of the *Brahmasūtra* and the founder of the Vedānta system of philosophy.

There is no biographical information about Jaimini, excepting a singular and late verse in *Pañcatantra* 2.33: a lion took the life of Pāṇini the grammarian; sage Jaimini, the Mīmāṃsā author, was trampled to death by an elephant; and a crocodile killed Piṅgala, authority on metrics.

Mīmāṃsā as a philosophical system is coupled with Vedānta: they interpret the two parts of the *Veda*, the *karmakāṇḍa* dealing with the performance of vedic rituals, prescribed in the vedic *saṃhitā* and *brāhmaṇa* texts, and the *jñānakāṇḍa* dealing with knowledge concerning *brahman* (the absolute), discussed in the *upaniṣads*, the final part of the *Veda* (*vedānta*). Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta have been seen as two sides of one system (Aklujkar, 2009): Bodhāyana, an early commentator known only from quotations, argued for the *śāstraikatva* (unity of the treatise) of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*. The two systems have accordingly been called (since Yāmuna, c. 950–1000 CE) Pūrvamīmāṃsā and Uttaramīmāṃsā. Their respective foundational texts, the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* attributed to Jaimini and the *Brahmasūtra* (or *Vedāntasūtra*) attributed to Bādarāyaṇa, have also been called *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*. Jaimini would thus have continued the twofold Mīmāṃsā of vedic sages: they discussed and debated both the ritual procedures and the mystic nature of *brahman* (Parpola, 1981, 158–162). The two philosophies have other names, too, such as Karmamīmāṃsā (from *karman*, ritual action) and Śārīrakamīmāṃsā (from *śārīraka*, dealing with embodied soul). The topics announced in their respective first *sūtras* are *dharmajijñāsā* (investigation of the duty [prescribed in the *Veda*]) and *brahmajijñāsā* (investigation of *brahman*).

The extensive *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* consists of 2,745 *sūtras* in 12 chapters (*adhyāyas*) and nearly thousand topics of discussion (*adhikaraṇas*). In an *adhikaraṇa* one or more preliminary views (*pūrvapakṣas*) of the problem are presented, then refuted (*uttarapakṣa*) for the final conclusion (*siddhānta*; see Clooney, 1990). Necessary for the understanding of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* is the earliest preserved commentary, the voluminous *Śābarabhāṣya* of Śābara (or Śābarasvāmīn; c. 400 CE). Śābara’s commentary contains around 2,000 quotations from vedic and post-vedic texts, only partly traced to their sources and evaluated (Garge, 1952).

The *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* has a supplement called *Samkarṣakāṇḍa* (or *Samkarṣanakāṇḍa*, Collecting Section; also known as *Devatākāṇḍa*) consisting of 465 *sūtras* in four *adhyāyas*. This work, too, has been generally ascribed to Jaimini, but also explicitly to Kāśakṛtsna – it is likely to be the *Kāśakṛtsnī* mentioned as a Mīmāṃsā work in Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya* (Aklujkar, 2012). Kāśakṛtsna is quoted in the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*, but not in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*.

The *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* has 555 *sūtras* in four *adhyāyas*. Śāṅkara’s student Sureśvara in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* (1.91) says that Jaimini composed also the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*, but Sureśvara is alone in his testimony. The tradition is otherwise unanimous in ascribing the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* to Bādarāyaṇa. Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa are prominent among the authorities quoted both in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and in the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*, and the views attributed to Jaimini in the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* do concern the interpretation of the *upaniṣads*. The *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* prolongs the contents of *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and contains references to the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*. L. Renou (1962, 196), among others, has therefore been willing to credit Jaimini with an earlier version of the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*, later partially replaced by Bādarāyaṇa’s work. Jaimini’s authorship of an early version of the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* is supported by the fact that Jaimini three times opposes and rejects

the opinion of Bādari in the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*, just as he does in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*. Moreover, Jaimini's interpretation of the *upaniṣads* in the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* is not yet vedantic, but rather reflects a Mīmāṃsaka view (Bronkhorst, 2007). In most of the eleven cases where Jaimini is quoted in the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* (including the three cases where Jaimini opposes Bādari), his view is overruled by Bādarāyaṇa.

The views of Bādarāyaṇa are in some essential respects radically different from those of Jaimini. Jaimini emphasizes the performance of rituals as the means to achieve liberation in a godlike existence in heaven, while knowledge of *brahman* only assists in achieving this goal. Bādarāyaṇa holds the fully vedantic view that liberation is achieved through clear knowledge that one's self is identical with *brahman*. A liberated person may lead an ascetic life devoted to meditation. Jaimini opposes asceticism as not prescribed in the *śruti* (i.e. the revealed texts of the *Veda*). Bādarāyaṇa is therefore supposed to be considerably later than Jaimini (Nakamura, 1983, 414–423; Yoshimizu, 2021, 23–31). After Bādarāyaṇa, the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* may have been further revised before it got its present shape of often cryptical brevity. The current *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* may date as late as the 5th century CE (Bronkhorst, 2007).

An important argument for Jaimini's authorship of an early version of the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* is that the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* quote numerous teachers, who to a large extent are the same in both texts (see Parpola, 1981, 156–157). In the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* Jaimini's opinions represent the final view, excepting one case (*PMS*. 6.3.4) where Jaimini's view is rejected. Therefore Jaimini himself cannot have composed (the final version of) the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* (Nakamura, 1983, 391; Yoshimizu, 2021, 4–6, 31). A similar argument has been expressed with regard to Bādarāyaṇa and the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*. In the parallel case of Baudhāyana, quoted as an authority (often together with Śāliki, who holds a differing opinion) in the *Baudhāyanaśrautasūtra*, the *Baudhāyanagr̥hyasūtra*, the *Baudhāyanapit̥rmedhasūtra*, and the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra*, the final redaction is likely to have taken place in the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* branch founded by Baudhāyana (Caland, 1903, 5–6).

In the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* the passages for discussion (*viṣayavākya*s) are generally quoted from the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*, while the quotations from the *Śuklayajurveda* are much fewer. According to

K. Yoshimizu (2021, 7) this may indicate that the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* was compiled predominantly by the scholars of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*, and that the scholars of the *Śuklayajurveda* took the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* into account when they compiled the *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra*, making its first chapter containing the rules of interpretation (*paribhāṣā*s) their own basic manual of exegesis. K. Yoshimizu ponders why was the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* ascribed to Jaimini, though he was a *sāmavedin* (i.e. scholar belonging to the *Sāmaveda*). He sees one possible reason in Jaimini's refutation of Bādari's extremist views, especially Bādari's willingness to grant the right to perform vedic sacrifices to Śūdras: this may have been welcomed by the majority of Mīmāṃsakas who belonged to the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda* and who wanted to keep the Brahmanical social order (Yoshimizu, 2021, 11). As another reason he sees Jaimini's fame as the author of the *Anupadasūtra* (see below).

The *śrautasūtras* (text describing the solemn vedic rituals) of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*, notably that of Baudhāyana with its *Dvaidhasūtra* and *Karmāntasūtra*, the *brāhmaṇa*-like *Anvākhyāna* part of the *Vādhūśrautasūtra*, and the *Paribhāṣā* section of the *Āpastambaśrautasūtra* (24.1–4), are important forerunners of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* (Parpola, 1981, 162–164). Nevertheless the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* was ascribed to Jaimini because it was composed by Jaimini and his immediate successors in the Kauthuma branch (*śākhā*) of the *Sāmaveda*. The Kauthumas had literary Mīmāṃsā activity before, around, and after the time when the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* was put together (one approximately contemporaneous Kauthuma text is the *Anupadasūtra* ascribed to Jaimini; Parpola, 1968, 65–66). The *Nidānasūtra*, a Kauthuma text ascribed to Patañjali (different from the authors of the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Yogasūtra*), is largely in *śrautasūtra* style but discusses from Mīmāṃsā angle problems connected with *sāmavedic* texts and rituals. Thus *Nidānasūtra* 2.1 ponders were the *Ūhas* (i.e. the *Ūhagānas*, modified song books, of *Sāmaveda*) created by *ṛṣis* (seers) or not. The *Nidānasūtra* is probably slightly earlier or later than the *Lātyāyanaśrautasūtra* (Parpola, 1968, 133–136), and should predate 500 BCE (Parpola, 2019).

A most important early Mīmāṃsā text of the Kauthuma branch is the still unpublished *Anupadasūtra*, which step by step (*anupada*) explains problematic passages of the *Tāṇḍya-brāhmaṇa*, applying Mīmāṃsā analysis and terminology. The Mīmāṃsā teacher Kumārila in

his *Tantravārttika* (on PMS. 1.3.3) quotes a *Chāndogyānupada* authored by Jaimini; Kumārila's quotation has an exact counterpart in *Anupadasūtra* 5.12, and Chāndogya denotes the Kauthuma branch. The *Anupadasūtra* is an important missing link between the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*, which discursively discusses problematic *śruti* passages of different vedic texts, and the *śrautasūtras*, which follow their own *śrutis*, but remain silent about their Mīmāṃsā interpretations. In his *Anupadasūtra*, Jaimini gives explicit reasons for his explanations of his own *śruti*. He also demonstrates his mastery of all the *Vedas* by quoting an unparalleled number of *brāhmaṇas*, including many that have since been lost (Parpola, 1968, 58–62, 136–137; 2012).

Kauthuma scholars collaborated with scholars of the *Śuklayajurveda*. In the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*, Jaimini's views are coupled only with those of Bādari, who belonged to the *Śuklayajurveda* (Parpola, 1994, 294; Yoshimizu, 2021, 8, 12–19). The *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra*, considered to be the latest of all *śrautasūtras* (see Parpola, 2019), is the most concise of all the *śrautasūtras* and closest to the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*; Kātyāyana uses the Mīmāṃsā argumentation and most of Mīmāṃsā technical terms. Besides, the *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra* has the greatest number of *sūtras* parallel to those of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*. Their comparison shows that the *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra* is based on the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and thus later (Garge, 1952, 16–17; Parpola, 1994, 302–304). *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra* books 22–24 is a condensation of *Lāṭyāyanaśrautasūtra* 8–10, which is a Kauthuma text (Parpola, 1994, 305). Kātyāyana is also credibly accredited with the authorship of some other texts of *Śuklayajurveda* and the Kauthuma branch of the *Sāmaveda*, the latter including the *Upagranthasūtra* (Parpola, 1996). The identity of Kātyāyana the grammarian and Kātyāyana the ritualist is widely supported. In their style, reasoning, and vocabulary, Kātyāyana's *Vārttika* (commentary on Pāṇini's grammar) closely resembles the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* (Paranjpe, 1922). The *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* may therefore be a little earlier than 250 BCE, which is the date commonly assigned to Kātyāyana.

In *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* 5.2.17–20 Bādarāyaṇa is coupled with an authority Ālekhana, and here the Bādarāyaṇa quoted is very probably an early teacher of the Hiranyakeśi branch of the *Kṛṣṇayajurveda*. But in the quotations where Bādarāyaṇa's views overrule those of Jaimini, he is likely to be posterior to Jaimini, and to belong to either *Śuklayajurveda*

or the Kauthuma branch of *Sāmaveda*. Bādarāyaṇa is a patronym denoting the son, grandson, or more distant descendent of Bādari (son of Badara), in this case possibly the *Śuklayajurveda* teacher with whom Jaimini is coupled in both the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* (Kane, 1960, 132; Yoshimizu, 2021, 29–30). In favor of the *Sāmaveda* alternative is the teacher lineage at the end of the late Kauthuma text *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa* (3.9.8), where Vyāsa, the son of Parāśara, is said to have handed the tradition to Jaimini, this to Pauṣpiṅjya, this to Pārāśaryāyaṇa (a descendant of Vyāsa Pārāśarya), this to Bādarāyaṇa, and Bādarāyaṇa to the Tāṇḍin and Śātyāyanin branches of the *Sāmaveda* (see below).

This lineage (*vaṃśa*) of the *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa* already knows the epic-puranic legend of Vyāsa Dvaipāyana (or Veda Vyāsa), who divided (*vivyaśa*) the *Veda* into four and taught the *Rgveda* to Paila, the *Sāmaveda* to Jaimini, the *Yajurveda* to Vaiśampāyana, and the *Atharvaveda* to Sumantu, and his own composition, the epic *Mahābhārata* as the fifth *Veda* meant for common people, to his own son Śuka (Sullivan, 1990). In the *Mahābhārata* the legend is mentioned in numerous passages, but none of these expressly connects Jaimini with *Sāmaveda*, yet the *Vedas* assigned by Vyāsa to his pupils are particularized in the *purāṇas* (Renou, 1947). However, in the listing of the officiating priests of king Janamejaya's snake sacrifice (*sarpasattra*) in *Mahābhārata* 1.48.6, Jaimini is said to have performed the duty of the *udgātṛ*, the chief samavedic priest.

Jaimini must have been the most famous *sāmavedin* when the Vyāsa legend came into being. Pāṇini (c. 400–350 BCE) knows old parts of the *Mahābhārata* (mentioning *Mahābhārata*, Vāsudeva, Arjuna, Yudhiṣṭhira) but not yet Vyāsa or Jaimini. Kātyāyana (c. 250 BCE) in his *Vārttika* on Pāṇini 4.1.97 mentions Vaiyāsaki, and Patañjali (c. 150 BCE) Vaiyāsaki Śuka. In the *vaṃśa* of the *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa*, Bādarāyaṇa is two generations younger than Jaimini. Eventually – between about 800 and 980 CE – Bādarāyaṇa as the author of the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra* was identified with Vyāsa himself (Nakamura, 1983, 404–405; Uskokov, 2022, 65–66). In the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (composed c. 800–950 CE; Uskokov, 2022, 84–85), Vyāsa is several times called the venerable Bādarāyaṇa, while the narrator is Vyāsa's son Śuka Bādarāyaṇi. Why? The authors of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* wanted “to promote its message as the epitome of Vedānta and everything

else” (Uskokov, 2022, 88). The *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* initiates the *bhakti* literature in Sanskrit, and its association with the Vyāsa legend may explain the ascription of the medieval *bhakti* versions of the great epics to Jaimini: the *Jaiminībhārata* (which comprises only the *Aśvamedhaparvan*, book 14 of the *Mahābhārata*) and the *Jaiminirāmāyaṇa* (Koskikallio, 1992). Jaimini as the author of an astrological *Jaiminisūtra* may be due to the interpolated chapter on planetary deities at the end of the *Jaiminīyagrhyasūtra*.

The lineage of the *Sāmavidhānabrāhmaṇa* mentions the Tāṇḍins (i.e. Kauthumas) and the Śātyāyanins as the two main branches of the *Sāmaveda*. Jaimini’s appearance as the inheritor of the *Sāmaveda* in the Vyāsa legend must be the reason why the samavedic branch of Śātyāyanins decided to change its name into Jaiminīya, and to assign the authorship of all its major texts to Jaimini, although this famous teacher actually belonged to the Kauthuma branch. Jaimini is not mentioned anywhere in *brāhmaṇas* or *sūtras* of the Jaiminīya branch, including the so far unpublished *Jaiminīkalpa* and *Jaiminīparyadhyāya* (Parpola, 2016), except in one single place, *Jaiminīyagrhyasūtra* 1.13.9. Here Jaimini Talavakāra (“Music Maker”) is placed, as the teacher par excellence, at the beginning of the list of 13 samavedic teachers who are to be satiated with water libations. In the corresponding *tarpaṇa* (satiation) list of the Kauthumas, Jaimini is the last (most recent) of 13 teachers (Weber, 1886, 27–28). For later Jaiminīya authors, such as the commentator Bhavatrāta (c. 700 CE), their teacher (*ācārya*) Jaimini is the author of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*, too.

In the *Mahābhārata*, the *udgātṛ* priest of Janamejaya’s *sarpasattra* is called Kautsārya Jaimini. Kautsa occurs as the name of a samavedic authority in several old Kauthuma texts. The only two lists of *pravaras* (subdivisions of clans) to record Jaimini as a *gotra* (clan) name have different information: in *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra* 12.10.8 Jaimini is a descendant of the *ṛṣi* Bhṛgu, but the *Mānavaśrautasūtra* (van Gelder, 1961, 244) derives Jaimini from the *ṛṣi* Viśvāmītra. In the latter list Jaimini is preceded by Sumantu, so this information postdates the Vyāsa legend.

According to A. Weber (1876, 257) the name Jaimini has been formed irregularly from *jeman* (victorious) – one would have expected Jaimani. Jaimani is attested as a variant reading for Jaimini, and manuscript colophons of various *Sāmaveda*

texts of the Jaiminīya branch have the variant Jaimuni and even Jayamuni.

To conclude, the name Jaimini first occurs in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* datable to about 300–250 BCE. Here and in the subsequent literature it seems to refer to one and the same person, a samavedic *ācārya* who was the author of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra* and the earliest version of the *Uttaramīmāṃsāsūtra*, as well as the still unpublished *Anupadasūtra*, an important work of both *Sāmaveda* and *Mīmāṃsā*. Bādarāyaṇa as the author of the *Brahmasūtra* may have lived a couple of generations later than Jaimini, and he was eventually identified with Veda Vyāsa.

Bibliography

- Aklujkar, A., “Authorship of the Saṅkarṣa-kāṇḍa,” in: F. Voegeli et al., eds., *Devadattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*, Bern, 2012, 191–227.
- Aklujkar, A., “Unity of the Mīmāṃsās: How Historiography Hides History,” in: S. Kumar, ed., *Vācaspatīvaibhavam: In felicitation of Professor Vachaspati Upadhyaya*, New Delhi, 2009, 821–900.
- Bronkhorst, J., “Vedānta as Mīmāṃsā,” in: J. Bronkhorst, ed., *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta: Interaction and Continuity*, Delhi, 2007, 1–91.
- Caland, W., *Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana*, Leipzig, 1903.
- Clooney, F.X., *Thinking Ritually: Rediscovering the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā of Jaimini*, Vienna, 1990.
- Garge, D.V., *Citations in Śabara-bhāṣya: A Study*, Poona, 1952.
- Gelder, J.M. van, trans., *The Mānava Śrauta Sūtra belonging to the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, New Delhi, 1961.
- Kane, P.V., “Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-sūtra, Brahma-sūtra, Jaimini, Vyāsa and Bādarāyaṇa,” *BDCRI* 20, 1960, 119–139.
- Koskikallio, P., “Jaiminībhārata and Aśvamedha,” *WZKS* 36, 1992, 111–119.
- Nakamura, H., *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*, part 1, Delhi, 1983.
- Paranjpe, V.G., *Le Vārttika de Kātyāyana: Une étude du style, du vocabulaire et des postulats philosophiques*, Heidelberg, 1922.
- Parpola, A., “The Mirror in Vedic India: Its Ancient Use, and Its Present Relevance in Dating Texts,” *StOE* 7, 2019, 1–29.
- Parpola, A., “References to Ritual Authorities and Vedic Schools in the Jaiminīya-Śrautasūtra and Its Commentary, Collected and Evaluated,” in: J.E.M. Houben et al., eds., *Vedic Śākhās: Past, Present and Future*, Cambridge MA, 2016, 665–689.
- Parpola, A., “The Anupadasūtra of Sāmaveda and Jaimini: Prolegomena to a Forthcoming Edition and Translation,” in: F. Voegeli et al., eds., *Devadattīyam: Johannes Bronkhorst Felicitation Volume*, Bern, 2012, 363–403.
- Parpola, A., “On the Upagrantha(sūtra) of the Sāmaveda: 1. Contents and Textual Divisions,” in: N. Balbir & G.-J.

- Pinault, eds., *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien: Centenaire de Louis Renou*, Paris, 1996, 91–121.
- Parpola, A., "On the Formation of the Mimāṃsā and the Problems Concerning Jaimini, with Particular Reference to the Teacher Quotations and the Vedic Schools (Part II)," *WZKS* 38, 1994, 293–308.
- Parpola, A., "On the Formation of the Mimāṃsā and the Problems Concerning Jaimini, with Particular Reference to the Teacher Quotations and the Vedic Schools," *WZKS* 25, 1981, 139–177.
- Parpola, A., *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and Their Commentaries: An English Translation and Study*, vol. I/1, Helsinki, 1968.
- Renou, L., "Sur la forme des Brahmasūtra," in: E. Bender, ed., *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown*, New Haven, 1962, 195–203.
- Renou, L., *Les écoles védiques et la formation du Veda*, Paris, 1947.
- Sullivan, B.M., *Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa and the Mahābhārata: A New Interpretation*, Leiden, 1990.
- Uskokov, A., "The Black Sun that Destroys Inner Darkness, Or, How Bādarāyaṇa Became Vyāsa," *JOS* 142/1, 2022, 63–92.
- Weber, A., *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit- und Prākṛit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. II/1, Berlin, 1886.
- Weber, A., *Akademische Vorlesungen über indische Literaturgeschichte*, Berlin, 1876.
- Yoshimizu, K., "Jaimini, Bādari, and Bādarāyaṇa in the Mimāṃsāsūtra and the Brahmasūtra," in: V. Eltschinger et al., eds., *A Road Less Travelled: Felicitation Volume in Honor of John Taber*, Vienna, 2022, 505–540.

ASKO PARPOLA

Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism

HANDBOOK OF ORIENTAL STUDIES
HANDBUCH DER ORIENTALISTIK

SECTION TWO
INDIA

edited by

Muzaffar Alam (*University of Chicago, USA*)
Johannes Bronkhorst (*University of Lausanne, Switzerland*)
Knut A. Jacobsen (*University of Bergen, Norway*)

VOLUME 22/7

Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism

Volume VII:
Supplement

Edited by
Knut A. Jacobsen
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

Associate Editors
Helene Basu
Angelika Malinar
Vasudha Narayanan



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON
2023

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <https://catalog.loc.gov>.
LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2009023320>.

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-9377

ISBN 978-90-04-67740-1 (hardback)

Copyright 2023 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schöningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher. Requests for re-use and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill NV via brill.com or copyright.com.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.