

“ Thus have we told you why the Lord Viṣṇu, though successful, assumed human forms : hear now the sequel thereof.”

The feathered philosophers thus left the question exactly where it was. They simply repeated the dogma that Vāsudeva was both devoid and possessed of qualities, and that he was both *nirguṇa* and *saguṇa*. How the two characters could consist in the same individual,—and which was the very question that troubled the imagination of Jaimini—they did not undertake to solve.

The above description of the Supreme Vāsudeva and his quadruple form shows that the section under review was composed by a disciple of the school of the *Nārada-pancha-rātra*, which propounds the same doctrine, and to which Śaṅkarāchārya has given an elaborate reply in his commentary on the Brahma Sūtras. It involved a theory in theosophy of which no traces can be found in the second division of the Purāṇa.

The second question is also disposed of in a few words. Indra, the king of the gods, had on various occasions committed diverse atrocities, and had consequently lost portions of his personal energy, which had got into other divinities. The five sons of Pāṇḍu were no other than sons of himself and the other deities which had thus been pervaded by his energy. The Pāṇḍavas were therefore themselves pervaded by Indra's personality, and their common wife Draupadī could not be guilty of polyandry, since she married but one personality of which her five husbands were only portions. The question and the answer only show that the Hindus were rather uncomfortable under the notion that there should be, in one of their most respected families, such a gross case of conjugal impropri-