

In Memoriam

Prof. J. W. de Jong*

The Death of the Hero

Minoru Hara

As is well-known, the Smṛti-literature prescribes for the ancient Indian Kṣatriya-caste the protection of their subjects (*prajā-pālana*, *prajā-rakṣaṇa*) as their prime duty (*sva-dharma*)¹⁾. This duty, however, involves exposing their lives to danger, when their country is devastated by aggressive enemy (*ātatāyin*)²⁾, for in such a case it becomes their sublime duty to fight with the invader unflinchingly (*aparāṇ-mukha*)³⁾ or selflessly (*nirahaṃkāra*)⁴⁾ even without regard for their own life (*tyakta-jīvita-yodhin*)⁵⁾. Their fight with aggressive invaders for the protection of people in general and of Brahmins in particular is called “the righteous fight” (*dharmya yuddha*)⁶⁾. This categorical imperative for Kṣatriyas of the serious pursuit of their duty, that is selfless engagement in battle, inevitably implies the possibility of their bodies being seriously wounded, or even themselves being killed in a battle. Then, how were the wounds and death of the Kṣatriya in battle considered in ancient India?

It is out of great respect to Professor J. W. de Jong, who devoted his whole life to South-asian and Buddhist Studies, and met a heroic death as a scholar, that here the present writer collects material from the Epic and classical Sanskrit literature and discusses the relevant problems in memory of this great scholar.

I Wounds in Battle

(1-1) Wounds that one incurs from one's adversary on a battle field are considered as a bodily ornament of the heroic warrior. Thus, people do not hold in high esteem the warrior who returns woundless from the battle-field.

avikṣatena dehena samarād yo nivartate

kṣatriyo nāsya tat karma praśaṃsanti purāvidaḥ (MBh.12.60.16)

“Those acquainted with the traditional lore do not praise his act, when a Kṣatriya returns from battle with his body unwounded.”

Similarly, it is not praise-worthy for a Kṣatriya to die with his body woundless. A variation of the above passage reads as follows,

avikṣatena dehena pralayaṃ yo 'dhigacchati

kṣatriyo nāsya tat karma praśaṃsanti purāvidaḥ

(MBh.12.98.24)⁷⁾

“Those acquainted with the traditional lore do not praise the act of a Kṣatriya who dies with his body unwounded.”

(1-2) The blame of a warrior who returns woundless from the battle-field is tantamount to the praise of a soldier who is wounded by the enemy's weapon. Here the wound is further endowed with a religious significance.

tasya yāvanti śastrāṇi tvacaṃ bhindanti saṃyuge

tāvataḥ so 'śnute lokān sarva-kāmaduho 'kṣayān (12)

na tasya rudhiraṃ gātrād āvedhebhyaḥ pravartate

sa ha tenaiiva raktena sarva-pāpaiḥ pramucyate (13)

yāni duḥkhāni sahate vraṇānām abhitāpane

na tato 'sti tapo bhūya iti dharmavido viduḥ (MBh.12.98.14)

“As many weapons break his skin in battle, so many worlds does he enjoy, the worlds which are imperishable and capable of granting every wish.

The blood does not flow (vainly) from the pierced portions of his body. By this (blood) he is indeed delivered from all sorts of sins. Those who are conversant with *dharma* know that there is no asceticism (*tapas*) superior to the pains that he endures in the affliction of his wounds.”

The blood (*rudhira, rakta*), gushing out of his wounds, purifies the heroic warrior from all the sins (*pāpa*) he has committed in the past⁸⁾, and it is termed the highest asceticism (*tapas*) for him to endure the pains caused by his wounds.

II Death in Battle

The same weapon (*śastra*) which causes wounds on the warrior's body (*śastrāṇi tvacaṃ bhindanti*: MBh.12.98.12 above) may slay the warrior himself. Then, how were those who die a glorious death in a battle considered in ancient India?

(2-1) As is suggested in the previous passages, it was a warrior's ideal that, being seriously wounded by the enemy's weapons, he finally breathes his last on the battle-field. Thus, we read in Bhīṣma's discourse to Yudhiṣṭhira as follows.

raṇeṣu kadanam kṛtvā jñātibhiḥ parivāritaḥ

tikṣṇaiḥ śastraiḥ suvikliṣṭaḥ kṣatriyo mṛtyum arhati

(MBh.12.98.28)

“Having performed slaughter in a number of battles, surrounded by relatives, and being afflicted by sharp weapons, the warrior should die.”

It was considered as his highest duty (*dharma*) to die in battle.

*eṣa mukhyatamo dharmah kṣatriyasyeti naḥ śrutam
yad ājau nihataḥ sete sadbhiḥ samabhipūjitaḥ* (MBh.8.27.92)

“We read in scripture that it is the top-most duty of a warrior that he lies slain on the battle-field, honoured by the nobles.”

Two passages of the Smṛti-literature promise for those heroic warriors the attainment of heaven. First, they are expected to do their best on the battle field.

*āhaveṣu mitho 'nyonyam jighāṃsanto mahīkṣitaḥ
yudhyamānāḥ paraṃ śaktyā svargaṃ yānty aparāṅ-mukhāḥ*
(MS.7.89)

“Those kings who, seeking to slay each other in battle, fight with the utmost exertion and do not turn back, go to heaven” (Bühler)

Heaven is promised for them if they are killed in battle, as long as they fight bravely.

*ya āhaveṣu vadhyante bhūmy-artham aparāṅ-mukhāḥ
akūṭair āyudhair yānti te svargaṃ yogino yathā* (YS.1.324)

“Those (kings) who are slain by the fraudless weapons, (fighting) for the sake of territory without turning back, proceed to heaven as yogins do.”

When it took place in Kurukṣetra, it was considered particularly rewarding.

*tasmiṃ mahā-puṇyatame trailokyasya sanātane
saṃgrāme nidhanaṃ prāpya⁹⁾ dhruvaṃ svargo bhaviṣyati*
(MBh.9.54.6)

“He, who dies in battle on that most meritorious and eternal spot in the three worlds, is sure to obtain heaven¹⁰⁾.”

In a battle, it was believed that there is nothing futile (*nāsti niṣphalatāraṇe*), because if one wins the battle, one gains the enemy’s territory and if he loses it, the slain warrior is promised the attainment of heaven¹¹⁾.

(2-2) Warriors who are slain by the enemy’s weapon are also termed as *śastra-pūta* (purified by a weapon). Being sanctified by a weapon, they are entitled to obtain heaven.

Seeing Yudhiṣṭhira, grieving for dead soldiers, Kṛṣṇa says,

*sarve tyaktvātmanaḥ prāṇān yuddhvā vīrā mahāhave
śastra-pūtā divaṃ prāptā na tāñ śocitum arhasi* (MBh.12.29.11)

“All these heroes, having cast off their life-breath, fighting in a great battle and being sanctified by weapons, proceeded to heaven. You need not grieve for them”.

The word *div*¹²⁾ is occasionally replaced by *parā gati* (the highest destination).

mā tvam evaṃ-gate kiṃcit kṣatriyarṣabha śocithāḥ

gatās te kṣatra-dharmaṇa śastra-pūtāḥ parāṃ gatim

(MBh.12.22.14)

“Do not grieve even a little in this situation, o bull among warriors, for they went to the highest destination, being sanctified by a weapon in accordance with the rules prescribed for the warrior-caste¹³.”

The destination *gati* itself is also termed “cleansed by a weapon.”

gatās te kṣatradharmaṇa śastra-pūtāḥ gatim śubhām

yathā dṛṣṭās tvayā putrā yathā-kāma-vihāriṇaḥ (MBh.15.44.9)

“As you have seen, (all) these sons of yours went in accordance with the rules prescribed for the warrior-caste to the highest destination which is sanctified by a weapon, and now behave themselves as they like¹⁴.”

(2-3) In contrast, we have the compound *aśastra-pūta maraṇa* in Duryodhana’s statement.

*jaitraṃ me ratham upakalpaya tāvat / yāvad aham api tasya
pragalbhasya pāṇḍavasya jayadratha-parirakṣaṇena mithyā-prati-
jñā-vailakṣya-saṃpāditam aśastra-pūtaṃ maraṇam upadiśāmi*

(Veṅiśaṃhāra 2.27.1-3)

“Make ready at once my triumphal car, so that by my act of protecting Jayadratha I may teach that boastful Pāṇḍava how to die¹⁵ not being sanctified by a weapon, but in the agony of the shame of his vow which turned out only false!”

(2-4) If a weapon sanctifies a warrior, it is endowed with religious significance. That is to say, the weapon annihilates not only the body

of the warrior, but also his spiritual defilements. Hence the compound *deha-pāpma-pranāśana* and the like (destroying the body as well as evils), which illustrate a battle (*yuddha*, *niyuddha*, *suyuddha*, *saṃprahāra*, *saṃgrāma*).

*śṛṇu rājan yathā-vṛttaṃ saṃgrāmaṃ bruvato mama
vīrāṇāṃ śatrubhiḥ sārthaṃ deha-pāpma-praṇāśanam
(MBh.8.12.2)*

“O king, hear from my mouth the encounter between the heroes and their adversaries as it took place, that annihilates one’s body as well as evils.”

In the following passage, *pranāśana* is replaced by *vināśana*.

*kacā-kaci babhau yuddhaṃ dantā-danti nakhā-nakhi
muṣṭi-yuddhaṃ niyuddhaṃ ca deha-pāpma-vināśanam
(MBh.8.33.60)*

“There took place fighting, hair to hair, teeth to teeth, nail to nail, fist-fighting, that destroys body as well as evils.”

The compound *dehāsu-pāpma-kṣapaṇa* also appears.

*teṣāṃ ca pārthasya mahat tadāsīd
dehāsu-pāpma-kṣapaṇaṃ suyuddham
trailokya-hetor asurair yathāsīd
devasya viṣṇor jayatāṃ varasya (MBh.8.55.5)*

“There took place a great battle between Arjuna and them, which destroyed body, life-breath and evils. It was like that between the god Viṣṇu, the best of victors, and demons for the sake of (the sovereignty of) the three worlds.”

III Death-bed

(3) But if a warrior is expected to die in battle, what sort of bed (*śayyā, śayana*) would it be upon which he may most suitably lie down? Often, it is called *vīra-śayana* (the bed of a hero).

(3-1) When Duryodhana died a glorious death in battle, his mother Gāndhārī addressed Kṛṣṇa as follows.

*amarṣaṇaṃ yudhāṃ śreṣṭhaṃ kṛtāstraṃ yuddha-durmadam
śayānaṃ vīra-śayane paśya mādharma me sutam* (MBh.11.17.9)

“Behold, o Mādharma, the best of warriors, trained in the science of arms, that impetuous son of mine, who is ferocious in battle, now lying on the hero’s bed.”

She continued,

*taṃ paśya kadanam kṛtvā śatrūṇāṃ madhusūdana
śayānaṃ vīra-śayane rudhiraṇa samukṣitam* (MBh.11.22.2)

“O Madhusūdana, behold him, having destroyed his enemies, now lying on the hero’s bed, sprinkled with blood.”

Similarly, Bhīṣma in the same situation is described as follows,

*taṃ vīra-śayane vīraṃ śayānaṃ kuru-sattamam
abhivādyopatasthur vai kṣatriyāḥ kṣatriyarṣabham* (MBh.6.116.2)

“(All the) Kṣatriyas stood around the hero, saluting respectfully the best of Kurus, the bull among the Kṣatriyas, now lying on the hero’s bed¹⁷⁾.”

Occasionally, *vīra-śayana* is paraphrased by *vīra-sevita śayana* and the like.

dhruvaṃ duryodhano vīro gatiṃ nasulabhāṃ gataḥ
tathā hy abhimukhaḥ śete śayane vīra-sevite (MBh.11.17.11)

“Certainly, the hero Duryodhana went to the region not easily attained (that is, heaven), for he, turning his face only to the front, lies on the bed resorted to by heroes¹⁸.”

(3-2) Next, we may ask, of what material is this *vīra-śayana* composed? The oft-recurring compound *śara-talpa* answers this question, indicating that it is composed of arrows. The same Gāndhārī addresses Kṛṣṇa, pointing out the hero Bhīṣma as follows.

śara-talpa-gataṃ vīraṃ dharme devāpinā samam
śayānaṃ vīra-śayane paśya śūra-niṣevite (MBh.11.23.17)

“Behold that hero, equal to Devāpi in his act of righteousness, on a bed of arrows, now lying on the bed of a hero (*vīra-śayana*) which is resorted to only by brave men (*śūra*).”

The same Bhīṣma is described in the actual war-book as follows,

sa śete śara-talpa-stho medinīm asprśaṃs tadā
bhīṣmo rathāt prapatitaḥ pracyuto dharaṇī-tale (MBh.6.115.8)

“At that time, Bhīṣma lies on the arrow-bed without touching the ground¹⁹, fallen down from his chariot upon the surface of the earth²⁰.”

Occasionally, *śara-talpa* is replaced by another compound of the same meaning, *śara-śayā*. Though scorched and pained by arrows

(*śarābhitapta-kāya...śara-saṃtāpa-mūrchita*), the same Bhīṣma refused to accept any object of human enjoyment, waiting for the proper hour of his death.

nādyā tāta mayā śakyaṃ bhogān kāṃś cana mānuṣān (12cd)

upabhoktuṃ manuṣyebhyaḥ śara-śayyā-gato hy aham

(MBh.6.116.13ab)²¹⁾

“O sire, now I am not able to take any object of human enjoyment from human beings, staying on the bed of arrows.”

One can multiply the number of examples of *śara-talpa* from Epic literature, for the war-books are replete with these expressions²²⁾.

This arrow-bed is often modified by auspicious adjectives of various sorts. The same Bhīṣma on the *śara-talpa* which is called *śubha* is greeted respectfully by both the Kuru and Pāṇḍava lords.

upagamyā mahātmānaṃ śayānaṃ śayane śubhe

te 'bhivādya tato bhīṣmaṃ kṛtvā cābhipradakṣiṇam

(MBh.6.116.58)

“Approaching the great Bhīṣma lying in the auspicious bed, and greeting him with the respectful circumambulation from left to right...²³⁾”

(3-3) At this point, mention might be made of the hero's pillow (*upadhāna*). That is to say, it was not only the bed of a hero, but also his pillow (*upadhāna*) that is composed of arrows. When Bhīṣma was seriously wounded, staying on the arrow bed (*śara-talpa*) with his head hanging down, he asked the people around to be provided with a pillow.

abhinandya sa tān evaṃ śirasā lambatābravīt

śiro me lambate 'tyartham upadhānaṃ pradīyatām

(MBh.6.115.32)

“Having greeted, he said to them with his head hanging: ‘My head is hanging down extremely. Give me a pillow.’”

At this request they brought fine (*tanu*) and soft (*mṛdu*) pillows of the best quality (*mukhya*) (33), but he rejected these pillows with a laugh (*prahasan*) and said,

naitāni vīra-śayyāsu yukta-rūpāṇi pārthivāḥ (MBh.6.115.34cd)

“O kings, these (pillows) are not suitable for the hero’s bed (*vīra-śayyā*)!”

He summoned Arjuna, acquainted with the *kṣatra-dharma*, and requested him to prepare suitable pillow. Then, Arjuna, holding the bow Gāṇḍīva and taking three sharp arrows, sanctified with a mantra (*āmantrya*), made a pillow for him.

anumānya mahātmānaṃ bharatānām amadhyamam

tribhis tīkṣṇair mahāvegair udagrḥāc chiraiḥ śaraiḥ

(MBh.6.115.42cd)

“Begging permission of the great man, the illustrious (*amadhya-ma*?) among the Bharata race, he (Arjuna) raised his (Bhīṣma’s) head (=provided a pillow) by means of three arrows which were sharp and of great speed.”

Bhīṣma was highly gratified, saying that this was indeed a pillow suitable (*anurūpa*) to him, lying on the hero’s bed (45a).

IV Home Death

Toward the end of the sixth book, Bhīṣma, waiting on his arrow-bed for the time when the sun turns to the northern solstice, requested Duryodhana to dismiss the physicians who were well-trained (*kuśala, suśikṣita*) and skilled in plucking out arrows (*śalyoddharaṇa-kovida*), saying,

datta-deyā visrjyantāṃ pūjayitvā cikitsakāḥ (52cd)

evaṃ-gate na hīdānīm vaidyaiḥ kāryam ihāsti me

kṣatra-dharma-praśastāṃ hi prāpto 'smi paramāṃ gatim (53)

naiṣa dharmo mahīpālāḥ śara-talpa-gatasya me

etair eva śaraiś cāhaṃ dagdhavyo 'nte narādhipāḥ (MBh.6.115.54)

“Let these physicians be dismissed, having given suitable gifts and paid due respect to them. Now, in this situation there is no need for me of these physicians, for I have attained the highest state ordained in the *Kṣatra-dharma*. It is not the right thing (*dharma*) for me staying on the arrow-bed. O kings, I should be scorched by these arrows till the end.”

As is evident in Bhīṣma's statement, the heroic warrior made up his mind to remain on the battle-field, staying on the arrow-bed and enduring the pains caused by his wounds. He refused the surgeons' treatment and declined to be taken home. Now, the hero's bed (*vīra-śayana*) which is made of arrows (*śara-talpa*) stands in sharp contrast to an ordinary bed at home.

(4-1) As it is praise-worthy for a warrior to die in battle, so it is condemned for him to die at home (*gṛhe maraṇa*).

*na gr̥he maraṇam tāta kṣatriyāṇām praśasyate
śauṭīrāṇām aśauṭīram adharmyaṃ kṛpaṇam ca tat*
(MBh.12.98.25)

“It is not praised for Kṣatriyas to die at home. It is unheroic (act) of the heroes and is the unrighteous and miserable (behaviour of them)²⁴⁾.”

(4-2) Dying at home is further specified as meeting natural death from illness (*vyādhi-maraṇa*) at home. At the opening of the great Bharata war, Bhīṣma addressed all the soldiers as follows,

*adharmah kṣatriyasyaiṣa yad vyādhi-maraṇam gr̥he
yad ājau nidhanam yāti so 'sya dharmah sanātanaḥ*
(MBh.6.17.11)

“It is an unjust act (*adharmā*) for a Kṣatriya to die at home of illness. It is his eternal duty (*dharma*) to meet his death in battle.”

Glorious death in battle-field is thus contrasted to ignoble death at home.

(4-3) Death by disease (*vyādhi-maraṇa*) is replaced by death on the bed (*śayyā-maraṇa*). The same Bhīṣma expatiates upon the point to Yudhiṣṭhira as follows.

*adharmah kṣatriyasyaiṣa yac chayyā-maraṇam bhavet
viśṛjāñ śleṣma-pittāni kṛpaṇam paridevayan (23)
idaṃ duḥkham aho kaṣṭam pāpīya iti niṣṭanan
pratidhvasta-mukhaḥ pūtir amātyān bahu śocayan (26)
arogāṇām spr̥hayate muhur mṛtyum apīcchati
vīro dr̥pto 'bhimānī ca nedṛśam mṛtyum arhati (MBh.12.98 27)*

“It is an unjust act for a warrior that he should die on his bed,

while ejecting phlegm and bile, and lamenting miserably, uttering (such words as) 'it is unpleasant, painful, and it now becomes worse!' and with his face down-cast and stinking, lamenting much to his relatives (*amātya*). He envies healthy people and even desires instant death. The heroic warrior with pride and self-respect must not meet such a sort of death."

A contamination of *śayyā-maraṇa* and *gr̥he maraṇa* is found in a dialogue between Duryodhana and Kṛpa.

*gr̥he yat kṣatriyasyāpi nidhanaṃ tad vigarhitam
adharmah̥ sumahān eṣa yac chayyā-maraṇaṃ gr̥he (30)
araṇye yo vimuñceta saṃgrāme vā tanuṃ narah̥
kratūn āhr̥tya mahato mahimānaṃ sa gacchati (31)
kr̥paṇaṃ vilapann āрто jarayābhipariplutaḥ
mriyate rudatāṃ madhye jñātīnāṃ na sa pūruṣaḥ (MBh.9.4.32)*

"It is censured for a Kṣatriya to meet death at home. It is a seriously unjust for him to die on his bed at home. The man who would cast away his body, either in a forest or in battle, after having performed great sacrifices, obtains glory. Such a person, who dies in the midst of crying kinsmen, lamenting miserably, sick and overwhelmed by old age, is not a man (in the strict sense of the term) (*puruṣa*)²⁵).

These condemnations expressed by such compounds as *gr̥he nidhana*, *gr̥he maraṇa*, *vyādhi-maraṇa* and *śayyā-maraṇa* eloquently speak about the ideal form of death for Kṣatriyas, that is death on the battlefield (*ājau nidhana*, *saṃgrāme nidhana*).

V

We may conclude this modest contribution by proposing an interpretation of a passage of the *Pratimā-nāṭaka* ascribed to Bhāsa.

When Bharata was summoned to the capital city of Ayodhyā by his mother Kaikeyī, he was surprised to discover the family and city in a disgraceful situation due to his mother's intrigue. He reproached Kaikeyī as follows,

*vayam ayaśasā, cireṇāryo, nṛpo grha-mṛtyunā
pratata-ruditaiḥ kṛtsnāyodhyā, mṛgaiḥ saha lakṣmaṇaḥ
dayita-tanayāḥ śokenāmbāḥ snuśādhva-parikramair
dhig iti vacasā cogreṇātmā tvayā nanu yojitāḥ*
(*Pratimā-nāṭaka* 3.17)

Sarup and Woolner translated this verse as follows,

“Thou hast covered me with infamy, and my elder brother with
bark. Thou hast brought the king to his death too soon, and all
Ayodhyā to endless lamentation. Thou hast sent Lakṣmaṇa to
dwell with beasts, and mothers doting on their sons to dwell with
sorrow. Thou hast laden thy daughter in law with the toils of
travel, and thyself with harsh words of reproach.”

The same translators further gave the following comment on the
compound *grha-mṛtyu* (house-death):

“death while still a householder and not arrived at the later
stages²⁶.”

Despite a minute semantic difference between *maraṇa* and *mṛtyu*²⁷⁾, we may take this compound *gṛha-mṛtyu* of the Pratimā-nāṭaka in the sense of *gṛha-maraṇa*, as we have seen above. Though the word *mṛtyu* scarcely appears in connection with *saṃgrāma* in the Epics²⁸⁾, we have a compound *saṃgrāma-mṛtyu* in the Devī-māhātmya 4.18(=Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa 81.18), which may be contrasted to *gṛha-mṛtyu* in the Pratimā-nāṭaka²⁹⁾.

No matter whether it is *gṛha-mṛtyu* or *gṛha-maraṇa*, it is a disgraceful act for a honourable Kṣatriya to breathe his last at home (*gṛha*) instead of on a battle-field (*saṃgrāma*). One may wonder that such an old king as Daśaratha might be allowed to breathe his last on an ordinary bed at home (*gṛha-mṛtyu*), but we must remember the following two passages, the one in the MBh. as we have seen above (*araṇye yo vimuñceta saṃgrāme vā tanuṃ naraḥ* :MBh.9.4.31ab) and the other in the Manusmṛti, which prescribes for the ruling class to die in battle even after retirement in their old age,

*dattvā dhanam tu viprebhyaḥ sarva-daṇḍa-samutthitam
putre rājyaṃ samāsṛjya kurvīta prayāṇam raṇe* (MS 9.323)

“But (a king who feels his end drawing nigh) shall bestow all his wealth accumulated from fines on Brāhmaṇas, make over his kingdom to his son, and then seek death in battle.” (Bühler)

According to Medhātithi, if the king cannot die in battle, he may burn or drown himself (*yadi kathamcid antyāvasthāyāṃ raṇam nopalabhe-ta tadāgny-udakādīnā śarīraṃ jahyāt*), and Kullūka says that he may kill himself by starvation (*āsanna-mṛtyuḥ phalātiśaya-prāptaye saṃgrāme prāṇa-tyāgam kuryāt/saṃgrāmāsambhave tv anaśanādī-nāpi*).

In view of these strict prescriptions of the mode of death for the honourable warrior, the readers of Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa 2.57-59³⁰⁾ will be fully convinced of the fact that, though under the curse of an ascetic, the old king Daśaratha died indeed a miserable and disgraceful death, which is never expected for a warrior. The bed suitable for the honourable hero at the last moment (*rājñāṃ paścima-kāla-vīra-śayana* Ūrubhaṅga 4c) is always to be found on the battle-field, no matter whether he be young or old.

Notes

1) Cf.

āsāṃ prajānāṃ paripālanena svaṃ kṣatra-dharmaṃ paripālayāmi
(MBh.1.3.183ab)

sarva-bhūta-paritrāṇaṃ kṣatra-dharma ihocyate (MBh.12.347.6ab)

kṣatriyasya smṛto dharmah prajā-pālanam āditaḥ (47ab)

prajāḥ pālayate yo hi dharmeṇa manujādhipaḥ

tasya dharmārjitāḥ lokāḥ prajā-pālana-saṃcitāḥ (MBh.13.128.48)

kṣatriyasya paro dharmah prajānām eva pālanam

nirdiṣṭa-phala-bhoktā hi rājā dharmeṇa yujyate (MS.7.144)

pradhānaṃ kṣatriye karma prajānāṃ paripālanam (YS.1.119ab)

vedābhyāso brāhmaṇasya kṣatriyasya ca rakṣaṇam

vārtā-karmaiva vaiśasya viśiṣṭāni svakarmasu (MS.10.80)

brāhmaṇasya tapo jñānaṃ tapaḥ kṣātrasya rakṣaṇam

vaiśasya tu tapo vārtā tapaḥ sūdrasya sevanam (MS.11.235)

Cf. also MS.8.302-310, 10.118 and YS.1.334-6.

2) Kane p.57-58

3) Cf. MBh.3.51.16b

4) Cf. MBh.6.117.32a

5) Cf. MBh.3.51.15d

6) Cf. my paper to be published in Ingalls' Gedenkschrift.

7) Scharfe, p. 177 note 26.

8) Blood of women's menstruation has a similar effect of purification.

striyas tv āśaṅkitāḥ pāpair nopagamyā hi jānatā

rajasā tā viśudhyante bhasmanā bhājanaś yathā (MBh.12.36.27)

striyaḥ pavitram atulam etad duḥṣanta dharmataḥ

māsi māsi rajo hy āsāṃ dūritāny apakarṣati (MBh.1.673*1-2, p.315)

Cf. Meyer 1971 pp.219-220 and Gonda p.208,

mṛt-toyaiḥ śudhyate śodhyaṃ nadī vegena śudhyati

rajasā strī mano-duṣṭā saṃnyāsena dvijottamaḥ (MS.5.108=VS.22.91)

vyabhicārād ṛtau śuddhir garbhe tyāgo vidhīyate

garbha-bharṭṛ-vadhādau ca tathā mahati pātaka (YS.1.72)

For further references, see G. J. Meulenbeld, pp. 91-106. I owe this reference to H. Scharfe *JAOS* 119.4 (1999) p.616 note 57.

9) For the phrase *saṃgrāme nidhanam prāpya* and the like, cf.

kṣatriyāṇāṃ mahārāja saṃgrāme nidhanam smṛtam

viśiṣṭam bahubhir yajñaiḥ kṣatradharmam anusmara (3)

brāhmaṇāṇāṃ tapas tyāgaḥ pretya-dharma-vidhiḥ smṛtaḥ

kṣatriyāṇāṃ ca vihitam saṃgrāme nidhanam vibho (4)

kṣatra-dharmo mahāraudraḥ śastra-nitya iti smṛtaḥ

vadhaś ca bharata-śreṣṭha kāle śastrena saṃyuge (MBh.12.22.5)

mā śuco na hi śocyās te saṃgrāme nidhanam gatāḥ (MBh.11.15.19cd)

go-brāhmaṇārthe vikrāntaḥ saṃgrāme nidhanam gataḥ

aśvamedhajitāṃ lokān prāpnoti tridivālaye (MBh.13.128.52c-f)

Cf. also, Kane p.58, Meyer 1926 p. 870-871, Hopkins 1972 p.131,137. Scharfe p.177. [He (the king) is above all a warrior whose most splendid end is to die in battle (VS 3.44, Gaut X.16, MS.7.87-9 YS.1.322-3)] Lingat, p.223. Occasionally, we meet another compound *saṃgrāma-mṛtyu*. Cf *Devīmāhātmya* 4.18.

10) There is no alternative but to slay the enemy, that is victory (*jaya*) or to be slain (*vadha*) by the enemy in a battle.

jayo vāstu vadho veti kṛta-buddhir mahārathaḥ (MBh.9.15.15ab)

avaśyam yudhi vīrāṇāṃ vadho vā vijayo 'tha vā

(Abhiṣeka-nāṭaka 3.9ab)

This idea is responsible for the production of the Epic phrase, *mṛtyum kṛtvā nivartanam*. cf. Hara, 1993-1994, pp. 153-154.

11) For this, see my article to be published in *Gedenkschrift D.H.H. Ingalls*. Cf. also

hato 'pi labhate svargaṃ jivā tu labhate yaśaḥ

ubhe bahumate loke nāsti niṣphalatā raṇe (Karuṇabhāra 12)

tatraiva yotsye vairāte nāsti yuddham nirāmiṣam (MBh.4.48.12cd)
raṇa-śīrasi gavārthe nāsti moghaḥ prayatno
nidhanam api yaśaḥ syān mokṣayitvā tu dharmah (Pañcarātra 2.5cd)

12)

dhṛtarāṣṭrātmajāḥ sarve yātudhānā balotkaṭāḥ
rddhimanto mahātmānaḥ śastra-pūtā divaṃ gatāḥ (MBh.18.5.19a-d)

13) The destination is further termed as *svarga* (MBh.12.2.4) and *nirjita loka* in the plural.

14) Cf. MBh.14.60.23.

15) I refer to Wezler p. 98 note 10: [Man beachte, dass *maraṇa*, wenn es explizit oder implizit in Opposition zu *mṛtyu* steht, den Vorgang des "Sterbens" bezeichnet].

16) Cf.

tato gajā rathās cāśvāḥ pattayaś ca mahāhave
saṃprahāraṃ paraṃ cakrur deha-pāpma-praṇāśanam (MBh.8.8.2)
teṣāṃ antakaram yuddham deha-pāpma-praṇāśanam
śūdra-viṭ-kṣatra-vīrāṇāṃ dharmyaṃ svargyaṃ yaśaskaram
 (MBh.8.32.18)

17) The Epic literature is never short of examples, which describe various heroes (*vīra*) lying on *vīra-śayana*.

taṃ vīra-śayane vīraṃ śayānaṃ puruṣarṣabham
bhīṣmam ādhirathir dṛṣṭvā bharatānām amadhyamam (MBh.7.3.7)
śayānaṃ vīra-śayane vīram ākranda-sāriṇam
āvantyam abhito nāriyo rudatyah paryupāsate (MBh.11.22.4)
śalyaṃ śaraṇadaṃ śūraṃ paśyainaṃ ratha-sattamam
śayānaṃ vīra-śayane śarair viśakalī-kṛtam (MBh.11.23.9)
yaṃ purā paryupāsīnā ramayanti vara-striyaḥ
taṃ vīra-śayane suptaṃ ramayanty aśivāḥ śivāḥ (MBh.11.51, * p.64)
śayāne vīra-śayane bhīṣme śaṃtanu-nandane
gāṅgeye puruṣa-vyāghre pāṇḍavaiḥ paryupasthite (MBh.12.55.2)

śayānaṃ vīra-śayane kālākāṅkṣiṇam acyutam
ājagmur bharata-śreṣṭhaṃ draṣṭu-kāmā maharṣayaḥ (MBh.13.27.3)
śayānaṃ vīra-śayane dadarśa nṛpatī tataḥ
tato rathād avārohad bhrātrbhiḥ saha dharma-rāṭ (MBh.13.153.15)

Cf. also,

rājñāṃ paścima-kāla-vīra-śayana ... raṇa-saṃjñam āśrama-padam
 (Ūrubhaṅga 4)

“We have arrived at the penance-grove called battle ... the hero’s bed
 [suitable] for the last moment for kings”.

18) Cf.

MBh.11.23.17 (*vīra-śayane... śūra-niṣevite*).

19) For this idea of not touching the ground, cf. Hara, 1993, pp.4-5.

20) Cf.

iti sma śara-talpa-sthaṃ bharatānām amadhyamam
ṛṣayaḥ paryadhāvanta sahitāḥ siddha-cāraṇaiḥ (MBh.5.115.14)
śara-talpa-gate bhīṣme kauravāṇāṃ dhuraṃdhare
ājagmur ṛṣayaḥ siddhā nārada-pramukhā nṛpa (MBh.12.54.4)

Cf. also,

śayānaḥ śara-talpe ’smin sva-śoṇita-pariplutaḥ
śara-jālais cito bhāti bhāskaro ’stam iva vrajan (R.6.39.15)

21) Cf. Edgerton, p. 246.

22) Cf. 6.115.54, 7.122.15, 6.117.3, 11.23.17, 12.47.7, 12.50.5, 12.153.24, 7.124.23,
 6.14.4, 5.125.16, 12.54.1, 8.6.24, 6.115.46, 12.54.4, 12.46.11, 12.160.9, 14.59.12,
 13.115.1, 6.114.91, 8.51.37, 9.55.31, 7.3.1, 9.32.40, 6.114.85, 12.47.1, 12.53.27, 8.
 5.49.

23) Cf. MBh.1.100.3, 12.200.10 (*śubha*), 3.194.14 (*divya*) and 10.9.13 (*dharma*).

24) Cf. Kane p. 58, Hopkins 1924 p. 104 note 21.

25) A contaminated form of MBh.9.4.30cd and 6.17.11cd is met with in the
 Udyoga-parvan.

*adharmah sumahān eṣa yac chayyā-maraṇaṃ gṛhe
yad ājau nidhanaṃ yāti so 'sya dharmah sanātanaḥ* (MBh.5.579* , p.
606)

26) Woolner and Sarup, p.177.

27) Wezler *loc.cit.*

28) We have *saṃgrāme nidhana* instead. Cf. note 9 above.

29)

*ebhir hatair jagad upaiti sukhaṃ tathaite kurvantu nāma narakāya
cirāya pāpam saṅgrāma-mṛtyum adhigamya divaṃ prayāntu matvet
i nūnam ahitānvinihaṃsi devi* (Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa 81.18)

30) Cf. Hara, 1980 pp. 339-347 and 1983 pp. 354-355.

[Abbreviations]

ABORI	: Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
IT	: Indologica Taurinensia (Torino)
JAOS	: Journal of the American Oriental Society.
MBh.	: The Mahābhārata (Poona Critical Edition)
MS.	: Manu-smṛti (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay 1946)
R.	: The Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa (Baroda Critical Edition)
YS.	: Yājñavalkya-smṛti (Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay 1949)

[Original Texts]

Abhiṣeka-nāṭaka	: Bhāsa-nāṭaka-cakram (Poona Oriental Series 54, Poona 1951)
Karṇabhāra	: "
Pañcarātra	: "
Pratimā-nāṭaka	: "

Urubhaṅga : “
Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa : The Venkateshwar Press (Bombay)

[Secondary Literature]

- Edgerton : F. Edgerton, “The Hour of Death,” *ABORI* 8 (1926-7) pp.219-249.
- Gonda : J. Gonda, *Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism* (Utrecht 1954)
- Hara 1980 : M. Hara, “Textual Theme of Rāmāyaṇa in Japan.” *The Rāmāyaṇa Tradition in Asia*, ed., by V. Raghavan (New Delhi 1980) pp. 334-347.
- 1983 : M. Hara, “Rāma Stories in China and Japan: a Comparison,” *Asian Variations in Rāmāyaṇa*, ed., by K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar (New Delhi 1983) pp. 340-356.
- 1993 : M. Hara, “Namida (tears),” *Journal of the Department of Oriental Philosophy* (Waseda Univ.) 10 (1993) pp.1-20.
- 1993-4 : M. Hara, “On the Phrases not shared by the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa,” *IT* 19-20 (Torino 1997) pp.147-168.
- Hopkins 1972 : E. W. Hopkins, *The Social and Military Position of the Ruling Caste in Ancient India as Represented by the Sanskrit Epic* (Indian reprint of *JAOS* 13, 1889, Varanasi 1972)
- 1924 : E. W. Hopkins, *Ethics of India* (New Haven 1924)
- Kane : P. V. Kane, *History of Dharma-śāstra* III (2nd ed., Poona 1973)
- Lingat : R. Lingat, *The Classical Law of India*, Translated from the French, with additions by J. Duncan M.

Derrett (New Delhi 1993)

- Meulenbeld : G. J. Meulenbeld, "The Constraints of Theory in the Evolution of Nosological Classifications: A Study on the Position of Blood in Indian Medicine," in *Panels of the VII World Sanskrit Conference* (Leiden 1991), 8-9 pp.91-106.
- Meyer 1926 : J. J. Meyer, *Das altindische Buch vom Welt- und Staatsleben, Das Arthaśāstra des Kauṭilya* (Leipzig 1924)
- 1971 : J. J. Meyer, *Sexual Life in Ancient India* (Indian Reprint, Motilal Banarsidass 1971)
- Scharfe : H. Scharfe, *The State in Indian Tradition*, Handbuch der Orientalistik II-III-2 (E. J. Brill, Leiden 1989)
- Wezler : A. Wezler, "Der Tod als Mittel der Entsühnung," *Im Tod gewinnt der Mensch sein Selbst*, herausgegeben von G. Oberhammer (Wien 1995) pp.97-140.
- Woolner and Sarup : *Thirteen Plays of Bhāsa*, translated into English by A. C. Woolner and L. Sarup (Lahore 1929)

*Post Script.

It was in 1956, when my teacher at Harvard, the late Professor Daniel H.H. Ingalls, recommended my small article, entitled *Nakulīśa-pāśupata-darśanam*, to the *Indo-iranian Journal*, that I received my first letter from Professor de Jong. From that time onward, for the next 44 years, he never failed to help me in supporting my academical activities.

Early in the 1960s, a group of young Indologists in Japan who had been trained in the West soon after the Second World War, Kitagawa, Ojihara, Hattori and Kajiyama, were ambitious enough to make our Japanese Indology in its infancy acceptable to that of the West which had an age-honoured long tradition behind it since the 18th century, and I joined this group from Tokyo as its youngest member. Despite the economic situation at that time, we tried to do our best by various means, inviting scholars of eminence from abroad, pushing ourselves to attend International Conferences, sending students abroad and so forth.

It was around that time when scholars like Professors de Jong and Brough kindly accepted our invitations, and enlightened us with a series of inspiring lectures. Thus, Professor de Jong came to Tokyo in the spring of 1963 and we met each other in person for the first time. Later he was kind enough to invite me to Canberra (1972 and 1973) and to introduce me to the international circle of western Indologists by requesting me to join the editorial board of the *Indo-iranian Journal* in 1975. Meanwhile, he repeated his journeys to Japan (1973, 1983, 1993) and we had the honour to have him as the first Guest Professor in our College in 1996. It was his last visit to our country. During all these years, we were always in close contact through correspondence and he was also kind enough to accept and train several of my pupils in

Canberra.

Without the thoughtful cooperation of my senior colleagues in Japan and the constant encouragement of these teachers and friends abroad, I can scarcely imagine how I have been able to continue my academical activities for the past fifty years. Reflecting on those years, I renew my gratitude to those teachers and friends abroad for their kindness, and among them I feel particularly indebted to Professor de Jong. His contribution to the development of Japanese Indology in general and Buddhist Studies in particular is immense, and we would like to commemorate it for ever in the history of Japanese Indology.

It was in his letter dated 25 October 1999 that he confidentially told me about his major operation, which, however, did not remove the cause which had been bothering him since January 1998. In his last letter dated 10 November, he said that his life span was now limited, but he begged not to tell anybody else because he did not like to receive letters of sympathy! Early in February 2000, when I read Mrs de Jong's letter which described the last days of Professor de Jong that indolently, (in a painfree moment) he was discussing a problem in Sanskrit with me (probably the *Lalitavistara*), I was once again impressed by his friendship.

Since 21 January 2000, when he passed away to our great regret, I have thought of contributing a modest paper to his *Gedenkschrift*, but I have not so far heard of such a project being prepared. In view of the approaching first anniversary of his death, I have decided to publish here a draft of a paper in his memory, which, I hope, will be revised in the future in the light of suggestions made by my respected colleagues.

Tokyo, 21 January 2001