

Received: 20 April 2022; Accepted: 28 July 2022
DOI: 10.47059/rr.v7i1.2407

Hindi Sahitya Sammelan's Gorakhbani

Sarvan Singh Baghel
*Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Maharishi University of Information
Technology*

*Dr. Ritu Singh Meena, Assistant Professor, Maharishi University of
Information Technology*

Abstract

Hindi Sahitya Sammelan is dedicated to the promotion of Hindi language, literature and Devanagari. Hindi Sahitya Sammelan was the first to launch the scheme of awards etc. on the works of Hindi writers to encourage them. His Mangalprasad Award, started in 1910, has considerable prestige in the Hindi world. The conference also encouraged women writers. For this he started Seksaria Mahila Purotsah. It cannot be denied that the disappearance of Avalisiluk and Kafirbodh from twentieth century Hindi literature has left an indelible mark on our modern understanding of the Nath sect. The erasure of these teachings has created a much less diverse portrayal of the community in the modern imagination of India and has served to further saffronize our understanding of the sect. It has also significantly reduced the complex historical background that the literary evidence supports. And yet, we are still unsure how both of these teachings came to be lost. Under this study, the importance of Avalisiluk and Kafirbodh as well as Gorakhbani has been discussed in Hindi literary history. The study has much to teach us about the pre-modern Nath sect. These unique codes reflect how different communities of Nath yogis viewed their identity, the many ways in which they interacted with early-modern Muslims, and how they wished to present themselves publicly to others.

Keywords: Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Gorakhbani, Gorakhnath, Avalisiluk and Kafirbodh etc.

I first chanced upon the names of the *AvaliSilūk* (A Discourse on the Greatest Song) and the *KaḥīrBodh* (The Knowledge of the Infidel), two orations attributed to Gorakhnath, in 2011 while doing research at the Indira Gandhi National Center for the Arts in Delhi. While at that time it was impossible for me to access these texts (IGNCA had not yet digitized them and I did not have the time to travel to the libraries in Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan where they were said to be located), the names of the teachings themselves were intriguing. They were unfamiliar to me and indicated a degree of Islamic influence that I had not previously seen within this already hybridized oeuvre of Hindavi Nath literature.¹⁴³ With my curiosity stoked about the nature of these teachings, and after consulting the *Gorakhbani*'s index and not finding mention of the texts there, I became even more captivated with their contents and sought to explain why they had not been included in what scholars such as Purushottam Agrawal consider the “only decent critical edition of that important text so far published”.¹⁴⁴ I soon found that the answer to this question would prove to be more complicated than I had anticipated.

¹⁴³According to Kabatiyal, who until his death, was responsible for keeping all of the family's historical artifacts of his father-in-law in order, Barthwal wrote the following in a letter dated March 6, 1938: “*anyaviṣayomkedi. liṭ. kesamakṣamujhevetannadiejanekakaraṇekhaidetahaiaurvahhaimerahindikasnatakhona.*” [Only one reason is apparent that I have not been given the salary that is comparative of doctorates for other subjects: it is because of my degree in Hindi.] “*JivanParicay*” (1995); Vibha Kabatiyal, personal communication, July, 2015.

¹⁴⁴Agrawal, “Naths in Hindi Literature” (2011), 11.

Without a doubt, from early in his career, Pitambar Datt Barthwal knew about these two texts and the implication that they had on understanding the theological ideology of the early- modern Nath *sampraday*. His earliest publication, *TraditionsofIndianMysticism* (based on his graduate thesis) states that certain Nath texts impressed upon him “that both the Hindus and the Mohammadans were the servants of the Lord, emphasizing at the same time that the Yogis made no distinction between the two and thus were not partial to any of

them,”¹⁴⁵ and he even mentions the names of these homilies in his writings. The religious and cultural importance of these teachings is further highlighted in Barthwal’s *Traditions*, as the author discusses them specifically in a section of his notes entitled “Gorakhnath as an instrument of Hindu and Moslem Unity.”¹⁴⁶ And yet, that is not the first mention we see of these texts by Banaras’ Hindi literati.

Interestingly, even Ramchandra Shukla mentions the *KafirBodh* in *HindiSahityakaItihas*. Of course, not in any complimentary way— as Shukla’s reaction to Nath literature was consistently adverse— but in a manner which does speak about the language of the Nath yogis and mentions that his student Pitambar Datt Barthwal is working on various texts like this.¹⁴⁷

Yet despite Barthwal’s knowledge of these teachings, his expressed interest in them, and, it appears, intellectual intent,¹⁴⁸ inspection of the *Gorakhbani* shows that by the release of its first publication, these teachings had disappeared from his compilation. What (or who) precipitated the mysterious disappearance of these texts from the Nath canon? As the names of these teachings illustrate, these songs which had been attributed to the Nath *sampraday* had comprised a mixture of Hindu and Islamic beliefs much more assertively than any of the other Hindavi Nath texts. Therefore, it should be of little surprise that their removal from the modern printed canon.

145 Pitambar Datt Barthwal, *Traditions of Indian Mysticism* (New Delhi: Heritage 1978), 8-9.

146 *Ibid.*, 287.

147 Shukla, *Hindi Sahitya ka Itihas* (2011), 21.

has influenced the manner in which the community has been understood in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. While traces of the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh* have been

fossilized in the Barthwal's *Bhūmika* or Introduction to the *Gorakhbani*, the teachings themselves have been almost completely wiped clean from modern memory.

Although few editions still exist of Barthwal's 1942 printing of the *Gorakhbani*, this book serves several different functions within the world of Hindi literary history. In its most basic sense, it is the first printed critical edition of ten seventeenth and eighteenth-century Hindavi Nath manuscripts from across north India. As a collection of Nath primary texts, it provides crucial insight into the extended manner in which the Nath *sampraday* wished to communicate its thoughts, ideologies, and sense of selfhood during the early-modern period. Previous to the modern publication of this edition of the collected Nath texts, however, these teachings were often only available either through performative tellings or in manuscript traditions (traditions which, Barthwal notes, often varied).¹⁴⁹ While both methods of communication would have been extensively available throughout India, intense study of these texts was hardly easy for the average person to access. This necessitated that often the transmission of these texts was left in the hands of holy men or the educated elite. Pitambar Datt Barthwal's research of Nath literature in the twentieth century, however, permanently changed the way in which Nath doctrine could be approached. This was now the age of print culture in India.

Barthwal's work with the Nath manuscripts and his composition of an edited volume of primary texts allowed the beliefs of the *sampraday* to be accessible and transmitted to large groups of people. Moreover, by providing a linguistic commentary for the more puzzling

philosophical sections of the teachings he becomes a teacher or guru of sorts, an indispensable part of learning in the Nath yogi tradition. In the *Sabadi* for example—by far

the most popular oration attributed to Gorakhnath as well as the most paradoxical—underneath the Hindavi texts (which are laden with technical concepts and early-modern dialectical spellings), Barthwal provides explanations in modern standard Hindi to help the reader comprehend the meaning of the teachings. Whereas formerly the audience of the text would have had to orally consult an adept with questions regarding the message of these teachings, the published *Gorakhbani* shifts this slightly. In the place of the Nath spiritual adept, the published *Gorakhbani* positions Barthwal, the modern Hindi scholar, as *theguru*. He is in charge of anticipating and answering any queries which may arise about the teachings.

However, it hardly needs to be said that not all audiences are the same, and different audiences require different levels of explanation. It is highly likely that the way the modern public reads Barthwal's *Gorakhbani*—as it is presented—is different from the way in which the teachings in this work would have been communicated and understood by publics in the past.

Yet the emergence of Barthwal's edition, its acceptance into the Hindi literary sphere, and its multiple re-publications, have firmly defined our modern conceptions of the teachings of this early-modern community.

It is imperative to remember that through multiple publications and the hardships of various life events, many hands were active in finishing the published compositions of the Nath community. Understanding who the major contributors to this project are is essential to understanding how the book was formed and how these two Islamic teachings went missing. While Barthwal is considered to be the author and compiler of this book, it is not only his ideas that shaped the modern conception of this community. As we have already seen,

Barthwal was heavily influenced by his mentors, Syamsundar Das and Ramchandra Shukla, when it came to the way in which he approached Hindi literary history. And these mentors were of the era where they felt the need to fix the narrative of Hindu history.

It is well known that due to Barthwal's illness and premature death his work on his critical edition of Nath works was left incomplete, but what exactly that means is, at first, somewhat vague. This confusion is not lessened when first examining the book, for there appear to be numerous discrepancies throughout it, making it at times inconsistent and baffling (although ironically not altogether inappropriate for its subject matter which itself prides itself on its paradoxical nature). In fact, simply reading the *Bhūmika* or Introduction to the *Gorakhbani*, which was written by Barthwal, we begin to see how the teachings found by Barthwal and attributed to Gorakhnath do not match up with those printed in the text. By evaluating the contents of this book, we can begin to piece together how two teachings were deleted and largely forgotten for over fifty years.

Using the second edition of the *Gorakhbani*, which was published in 1944, to study these teachings, I will begin with the front matter. While this is the shortest part of the publication, its importance is crucial to our understanding of *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh*, as it is here that evidence regarding the erasure of the Muslim teachings can be found. The book opens with the title page, followed by the publication date, the *PrakaśakkaVaktavya* (A Word From The Publisher), the *Viṣay-Sūci* (The Table Of Contents), and then finally the *Bhūmika*. It is in examining the *Viṣay-Sūci* with the *Bhūmika* that readers see how decisions and circumstances surrounding the manuscripts affected the manner in which the different teachings were incorporated into the publication. Critically, the *Bhūmika* illuminates a

number of texts attributed to Gorakhnath which Barthwal decided to remove from the *Gorakhbani*; among them were the

AvaliSilūk and the *KafirBodh*.

At first, the *Viṣay-Sūci* appears non-descript. It provides the first glance at the literary divisions made to the texts of the Nath *sampraday* in the *Gorakhbani*, listing the six different sections of Barthwal’s book and their corresponding page numbers. These sections are:

PrakaśakkaVaktavya, *Bhūmika*, *Gorakh-Bani*, *Pariśiṣṭ* (Appendix 1), *Pariśiṣṭ* (Appendix 2), and

Pariśiṣṭ (Appendix 3).¹⁵⁰ With the exception of the confusing repetitiveness of the name choice for the first group of teachings, the *Gorakh-Bani*, considering all of the teachings within this edition are said to be attributed to Gorakhnath, there is nothing particularly odd on these pages. As illustrated in table 2:1, the primary textual divisions are further subdivided into over twenty- five teachings of the Nath community such as the *Sabadi*, *Pad*, and the *ŚiṣyaDarśan* etc.

Table 2a: Barthwal’s table of contents in the *Gorakhbani*.

1.1: Viṣay-Sūci	<i>Prṣṭ</i>
<i>PrakaśakkaVaktavya</i>	...५
<i>Bhūmika</i>	...११
<i>Gorakh-Bani</i>	...१-२२१
<i>Sabadi</i> (Utterances)	...१

<i>Pad:RagRamagri</i> (Song)	...૮૫
------------------------------	-------

150 These primary divisions will be highlighted in bold in the following table below.

1.1:Vişay-Sūci	Prşṭ
<i>ŚiṣyaDarśan</i> (The Disciple’s Doctrine)	...૧૫૬
<i>PraṇSaṁkali</i> (Chain of Breath)	...૧૬૪
<i>NarvaiBodha</i> (Wisdom to the King)	...૧૬૯
<i>Atma-Bodh</i> (The Wisdom of Self)	...૧૭૪
<i>AbhaiMatraJog</i> (Yoga of Fearless Measure)	...૧૭૯
<i>PaṁdrahTiṭhi</i> (Fifteen Days)	...૧૮૧
<i>Saptavar</i> (Seven Days of the Week)	...૧૮૪
<i>MachiṁdraGoraşBodh</i> (The Knowledge of Macchindra To Gorakh)	...૧૮૯
<i>Romavali</i> (A Line of Hair)	...૨૦૩
<i>Gyan-Tilak</i> (The Mark of Knowledge)	...૨૦૭
<i>Paṁc-Matra</i> (Five Measures)	...૨૧૧

<i>Pariśiṣṭ(१)(Appendix1)</i>	...२२२-२४३
<i>GoraṣGaṇeśGuṣṭi</i> (A Discourse between Gorakhnath and Ganesh)	...२२२

1.1: Viṣay-Sūci	Prṣṭ
<i>GyanDipBodh (GoraṣaDattaGuṣṭi)</i> (The Understanding of the Lamp of Knowledge/ The Discourse between Gorakhnath and Datta)	...२२७
<i>MahadevGoraṣGuṣṭi</i> (A Conversation between Mahadev and Gorakh)	...२३३
<i>SiṣṭaPuraṇ (The Book of Creation)</i>	...२३६
<i>DayaBodh (The Knowledge of Compassion)</i>	...२३८
<i>KuchPad (Some Songs)</i>	...२५१
<i>Pariśiṣṭ(२)(Appendix2)</i>	...२४४
<i>SaptBar-Navagraha</i> (Seven Days of the Week-Nine Planets)	...२४४
<i>Brat (Religious Fast)</i>	...२४५
<i>AṣṭaMudra, (Eight Yogic Seals)</i>	...२४७

<i>CaubisSiddhi</i> (Twenty-Four Siddhi)	...२४८
<i>BattisLachan</i> (Thirty-Two Symbols)	...२४९
<i>AṣṭaCakra</i> (Eight Wheels)	...२४९
<i>RahRasi</i> (Path of Immortality)	...२५०
<i>Pariśiṣṭ</i> (Appendix 3)	...२५१-२५८

The *Bhūmika*, however, reveals a different compilation from what the *Gorakhbani*'s *Viṣay-Sūci* presents. This section of the book begins describing the social significance of the Nath yogis on India's cultural and literary history and the academic conversation surrounding this topic. In particular, Barthwal explains how his own academic journey studying the *sampraday* started with his paper, "*HindiKavyaMemYogPravah*" (The Stream of Yoga in Hindi Poetry).

Barthwal writes that after this paper had been highly praised, he had begun to examine the Nath literary tradition further and to collate its codices. Like his mentors, he also viewed this project as being of vital importance as it provided a critical connection for the burgeoning Indian nation to its Hindu and Hindi past. In a sentence which evokes Benedict Anderson's belief in imagined communities and is, nearly, identical to Shukla's own thoughts on the subject in *HindiSahityakaItihas*, Barthwal states

"...Nathyogiyomki 'baniyamhamaresahityakaursamṣkṛtikvikaskilaḍimemekmahatvapūrṅkaḍih aim.Isseunkesamgrahaursampadankiavaśyktaspaṣṭhai.¹⁵¹⁷' [The "Bani" of the Nath yogis is a

critical link in our literary and cultural chain of development. Because of this, the compilation and editing of these works is a clearly necessary.]

It is not surprising at all that Barthwal wished to connect India’s newly forming identity with a historical past, an approach used by many intellectuals in newly forming nations to authenticate the nation state. What is odd however, is the sentence directly following this.

Barthwal states, “*jiskaryakomaimneisgranth—‘jogesuribani’ kiyahai.*” [For this work, I have made this book: the *Jogesūri-Bani*.]¹⁵² About which book is he speaking? Since its first publication this book had been titled the *Gorakhbani*. What then is the *Jogesūri-Bani* (The Utterances of The Highest Yogi)? This nonchalant reference—sans any type of introduction— is

¹⁵¹ Barthwal, “*Bhūmika*” in *Gorakhbani* (1944), 11.

¹⁵²*Ibid.*, 14.

spectacularly confusing. Although the context within which Barthwal makes this statement indicates that he is commenting on the book that we have all come to know as the *Gorakhbani*, it raises questions, to say the least.

This matter becomes even more confounding as Barthwal proceeds to describe the *Jogesūri-Bani*. The next paragraph of the *Bhūmika* asserts, “*yahgranthdobhagoṃmeṃvibhakthai.*” [This book is divided into two parts].¹⁵³ Again, it appears that Barthwal is presenting information about the collection of Nath teachings that he is writing an introduction for, but how could that be? The *Gorakhbani*—while divided into the *Gorakh-Bani* and the *Parīśiṣṭ*—it is not precisely divided into two sections; rather, it is divided into four sections (with the *Parīśiṣṭ* itself divided into three separate sections).

What exactly does Barthwal mean to convey when he states, “*pahalebhagmemgorakhnathkibanisaṃgrahithaiaurdūsrebhagmemyogiyomkibanīyam*” [In the first section is a collection of the sayings by Gorakhnath and in the second section the sayings of yogis]?¹⁵³ Nowhere in this paragraph—or anywhere else in the *Bhūmika*—does Barthwal ascribe names to the two sections he mentions. It would make sense that the first section of the *Gorakhbani*—the *Gorakh-Bani*—could be the sayings of Gorakh, but what about the sayings of the other yogis?

As mentioned previously, few first editions of the *Gorakhbani* exist today, making the copy most everyone cites the second 1944 edition or later. However, within the pages of that first edition, it seems that a clue to the meaning of the *Jogesūri-Bani* can be found. During the summer of 2014, Francesca Orsini was able to access a first edition copy of the text for me in Allahabad. While there appeared to be very few differences between the first edition and second edition, one unusual distinction is that the 1942 edition that Orsini examined states that the

Gorakhbani was part one of two separate volumes.¹⁵⁴ This statement does not appear in any of the following editions of the book, but as the next section will reveal a suitable answer can be found in a book published nearly fifteen years later.

Next Barthwal explains that for this book, he has collected the teachings of the Nath community from ten different handwritten codices. Listing the manuscripts that he has used for his research, Barthwal provides the readers with details regarding their ownership, the locations where they were accessed at that time, their colophons, and other information which may be considered pertinent to their histories. From this information, we know that the earliest manuscript that Barthwal was personally able to examine and use in his study was a

1658 codex (labeled *cha* in his writings) which was from the Jaipur area of Rajasthan.¹⁵⁵ He puts particular emphasis on this codex, stating that because of its stature as oldest manuscript it is of the greatest importance of all the codices mentioned.¹⁵⁶

Perhaps more consequential about this list, though, is what it does not mention. It seems that at the time of Barthwal's research, the scholar was unaware of what is now considered the oldest extant Hindavi Nath manuscript; if he were aware of it, he had not been able to study it. What is currently believed to be the oldest surviving written teachings of the Nath *sampraday* is *pothi* 3190 located in Jaipur at the Sree Sanjay Sharma Museum and Research Institute. *Pothi* 3190 has a colophon that precedes Barthwal's oldest manuscript by over thirty-five years and dates back to 1614-1621CE.¹⁵⁷ Given how Barthwal felt about the importance of the manuscript.

153 Barthwal, "Bhūmika" in Gorakhbani (1944), 10.

154 Personal communication with many writers via email and vocal (7/27/21).

155 Barthwal, "Bhūmika" in Gorakhbani (1944), 13.

156 Ibid., 16.

157 Monika Horstmann "Nathyoga in the Dadūpanth (2019), 220-221. I was able to view pothi 3190 at its home in Jaipur in August of 2014, however, Sri Ram Kripalu Sharma has been hesitant about letting scholars access it, myself included. At the time, I was not permitted to read it in depth in its original form and, due to uncontrollable circumstances, I was not able to return

He believed was the oldest extant codex, it is likely that a study of this older manuscript would have changed the way he looked at this corpus.

Directly following the listing of codices which Barthwal examined for his edition, the book includes a comprehensive table cataloging each Nath teaching and song that he found in the within these ten different manuscripts. Additionally he catalogs which codex he located each teaching in.¹⁵⁸ This matter is of particular importance because among the

multiple names listed on these two pages is another hint that there is more to Barthwal's edition than initially appears.

Table 2b: Catalogue of all teachings attributed to Gorakh from Barthwal's researched codices.

1. <i>Sabadi</i>	7. <i>AbhayMatraJog</i>
2. <i>Pad</i>	8. <i>PandrahTithi</i>
3. <i>ŚiṣyaDarśan</i>	9. <i>Saptabar</i>
4. <i>PraṇṢaṃkali</i>	10. <i>MachindraGorakhBodh</i>
5. <i>NaravaiBodh</i>	11. <i>Romavali</i>
6. <i>AtmaBodh</i>	12. <i>GyanTilak</i>
13. <i>JñānCaumtisa*</i>	27. <i>Vrat</i>
14. <i>PañcMatra</i>	28. <i>NirañjanPuraṇ*</i>
15. <i>GorakhGaneśGoṣṭi</i>	29. <i>GorakhVacan*</i>
16. <i>GorakhDattaGoṣṭi</i>	30. <i>ImdriDevata*</i>

17. <i>MahadevGorakhGuṣṭi</i>	31. <i>MūlGarbhavali*</i>
18. <i>ŚiṣṭaPuraṇ</i>	32. <i>KhaṇiVaṇi*</i>
19. <i>DayaBodh</i>	33. <i>GorakhSat*</i>
20. <i>JatiBhaomravali*</i>	34. <i>AṣṭaMudra</i>
21. <i>Navagrah*</i>	35. <i>CaubisSiddh*</i>
22. <i>Navaratra*</i>	36. <i>ṢaḍṢkari*</i>
23. <i>Aṣṭaparchya*</i>	37. <i>PañcAgni</i>

24. <i>RahRasi</i>	38. <i>AṣṭaCakra</i>
25. <i>GyanMala</i> *	39. <i>AvaliSilūk</i> *
26. <i>AtmaBodh</i> (2)	40. <i>KafirBodh</i> *

to research them later. However, with the help of Jaroslav Strnad and Linda Hess, I was able to access digitally enhanced scanned copies of photographs of MS 3190. These photographs were taken in 1991-1993 by Winand Callewaert and are currently housed in Heidelberg University. Jaroslav Strnad scanned these photographs and worked extensively on them to make them easier to read. I am deeply indebted to Jaroslav Strnad for his kindness in sharing these teachings with me for my research on the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh*.

158 Barthwal, "Bhūmika" in Gorakhbani (1944), 14-15.

As one can see from the names on this table next to which I have placed asterisks, there are a significant number of songs and scriptures which were not included in the *Viṣay-Sūci*. The names include *GyanCautisa*, *JatiBhaumravali* (*ChamḍGorakh*), *Navagrah*, *Navaratra*, *AṣṭaParachya*, *GyanMala*, *NirañjanPuraṇ*, *GorakhVacan*, *IndriDevata*, *MūlGarbhavali*, *KhaṇiBaṇi*, *GorakhSat*, *Caubisiddh*, *ṢaḍSkari*, *AvaliSilūk*, and the *KafirBodh*. Barthwal explains the presence of these texts on his list and their subsequent omission from the rest of his book in the paragraphs immediately following.

He states that all of the texts included in the table were found within the ten manuscripts he researched, but for a variety of reasons he chose not to include some works in this book. For example, he states that although the *GyanCautisa* was present in the 1658 manuscript (*cha*), he had been unable to access it in time for the book's publication and therefore it could not be included. The *GorakhVacan* was not included because although it was attributed to Gorakhnath, Barthwal did not see it as a creation of Gorakh, but rather a glorification. Other orations such as *JatiBhaumravali*, *NiranjanPuraṇ*, *GorakhSat*, and

KhaṇiBaṇi are excluded from the Hindavi Nath canon because Barthwal believes they employ a language more modern than the rest of the text (and, therefore, unascrivable to Gorakhnath), were translations of Sanskrit manuscripts, or were simply included in too few manuscripts to be considered standard.¹⁵⁹ The *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh*, however, are said to be missing from the *Gorakhbani* for a completely different reason.

Unlike the other texts mentioned above, the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh* are not said to have been omitted from this book because of their linguistic distinction from the rest of the corpus or due to their insufficient inclusion in different codices—although he counts them in only one manuscript (*ka*). Instead, Barthwal specifies that these teachings are indeed a part of the Nath corpus as he envisions it; however, he feels that the placement of these teachings should be altered within his book. Barthwal contends that although these two texts have been attributed to Gorakhnath (and, hence, should be a part of the first section of this edition that collects his sayings), he regards them not to be the works of Gorakh, but of Ratannath: a Muslim Nath yogi who is said to have been a disciple of Bhartrihari.¹⁶⁰ Therefore, they deserve to be placed in the second portion of the *JogesūriBani*, a (ultimately unpublished) collection of sayings attributed to Nath yogis rather than the preceptor himself.

*‘AvaliSilūk’ aur ‘KafirBodh’ jo (ka) memhaim—
pichalagranthanyatrakabirkabhimanajatahai—
gorakhnathkenahokarsapaṣṭhiratannathkehaimjaiseasvayaminracanaomsep
atacalatahai.aurisiliejogesuribanikedūsare*

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 18.

¹⁶⁰ Briggs recounts a fascinating and Kabir-esque story of Ratannath’s descendent in his book *GorakhnathandtheKanphaṭaYogis*. He states, “Ratanath is famous for having created a boy out of the dirt of his body. This boy was afterwards known as Kayanath, and as Qaim ud Din. When Kayanath died, both Musalmans and Hindus claimed his body; but it disappeared, only the clothes remaining. Hindus built a samadh for him, and Musalmans a tomb.” (2009), 65-66.

bhagmemrakhegayehaim.
Aurisiliejogesuribanikedūsrebhagmemrakhegayehaim.

The *AvailiSiūk* and *KafirBodh* which are found in [manuscript] (ka)—the later text [the *KafirBodh*] also believed elsewhere to be attributed to Kabir— are not those of Gorakhnath but are clearly the [works] of Ratannath. As itself is known from these writings. And for this reason, they have been placed in the second part of the *JogesūriBani*.

Again, questions surrounding the *JogesūriBani* are brought to the forefront of Barthwal's *Bhūmika*. This time, however, it is obvious that the missing Islamic teachings are somehow connected with this other unknown part of Barthwal's book. The answer to this is not found within the pages of the *Gorakhbani* itself, but in Hazari Prasad Dvivedi's *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam* (TheSayingsoftheNathSiddhas).

HazariPrasadDvivediandtheNathSiddhomkiBaniyam

Born in 1907, Hazari Prasad Dvivedi grew up within the environs of Banaras. While he received his education at BHU with Shyamsundar Das and Ramchandra Shukla, it was his time teaching at Shantiniketan that influenced his life the most. Invited by Rabindranath Tagore— who had a keen interest in Hindi learning— to come and teach at his school, it was there that Dvivedi began to make a name for himself on the Hindi literary scene.¹⁶¹ Dvivedi published his first book on Surdas in 1936, followed by a 1940 publication on the history of Hindi literature called *HindiSahityakiBhūmika*. It was his 1942 publication, *Kabir*, however, which became a best seller and for which even today he is still most well-known.¹⁶² It was during his time at Shantineketan that Dvivedi also began to become interested in the connection between the Nath *sampraday* and Kabir.

¹⁶¹ Hawley, *AStormofSongs* (2015), 233.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 50.

In 1950 (the same year that his book *NathSampraday* was released), Dvivedi returned to Banaras to take over the Ramchandra Shukla's post at Banaras Hindu University, and although the two academics would become known as two of the most influential scholars in the world of Hindi literary history, Shukla and Dvivedi had very different approaches to their work. Shukla saw himself and his work on the front lines of the nationalist movement and, as John Stratton Hawley has stated, "was a senior spokesman for a mode of thought and behavior he believed to have been radically misrepresented by foreigners past and present—first things had to come first. He was in the business of defining what was truly 'Indian' (*bharatiya*)."¹⁶³ Dvivedi, on the other hand, was not only a generation, but nearly a whole world removed from these concerns. Whereas Ramchandra Shukla focused on what he believed to be the more literary *sagun* Bhakti works, Dvivedi—like his colleague at BHU, Pitambar Datt Barthwal—became more interested in looking at the *nirgun* traditions and the Nath *sampraday*. In many ways Dvivedi's career seems to illustrate what Barthwal might have had if he had not passed away at such an early age. Most important for the purposes of this chapter is Hazari Prasad Dvivedi's book *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam*.

In the introduction to *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam*, the mystery surrounding the *JogesuriBani* finally begins to clear up when we realize that intention for the publication was never accomplished. On the very first page of his *Bhumika*, Dvivedi states that this publication is an extension of Barthwal's own project which had been cut short before his death.¹⁶⁴ As the 1942 original publication of the *Gorakhbani* alluded to, Barthwal had intended his *Gorakhbani* to be not one, but two books, but Barthwal's premature passing made it impossible for him to finish his project. It was at that time that Dvivedi took it upon himself to complete Barthwal's work.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 269.

¹⁶⁴ Hazari Prasad Dvivedi, *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam* (Kashi: Nagari Pracharani Sabha, 1978), 1.

His *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam* is the first publication which gathers and publishes the works of the other Nath yogis, as Barthwal had promised in the introduction to the *Gorakhbani*. This—while named differently—should be, for all intents and purposes, the *JogesūriBani* that Barthwal had intended to complete. And yet, while Dvivedi may have intended the *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam* to be finishing the work that Barthwal had started, the reality is that he did not. The *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh*—although mentioned in the two *Bhūmikas* that Barthwal and Dvivedi composed—remain absent from both books.

Referencing the work that he is attempting to complete, on the first pages of his introduction to *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam*, Dvivedi copies Barthwal’s list of the teachings attributed to Gorakhnath. He notes that since Barthwal has already published the authoritative text on Gorakhnath’s utterances, he is not going to include homilies attributed to Gorakh in his compilation.¹⁶⁵ His book will, instead, give voice to the teachings ascribed to other Nath yogis in the early-modern Hindavi manuscript tradition. Yet, as previously discussed, not all of Gorakhnath’s teachings presented in Barthwal’s list were printed in his final publication of the *Gorakhbani*. It is difficult to imagine that Dvivedi, a scholar of the Nath *sampraday* who was attempting to finish the project of his colleague, would not have realized this. The *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh*, which Barthwal had credited Ratannath with composing, were, hence, excluded from both the scriptures of Gorakh, as well as the printed teachings of other yogis of the Nath *sampraday*. The twenty-five Siddhas and Nathas that Dvivedi lists, whose work he includes in his publication are:¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 2.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 16.

Table 2c: Catalogue of *Siddha*'s included in *NathSiddhomkiBaniyam*.

1. Ajaypal Ji	14. Parvati Ji
2. Kaneri	15. Pritvinath Ji
3. Garib Ji	16. Balnath Ji
4. Gopinchand	17. Balgundai
5. Ghorachauli	18. Bharathri
6. Charpathnath	19. Macchendra Nath Ji
7. Chaurangi Nath	20. Mahadev Ji
8. Chaonak Nath	21. Ramchandra Ji
9. Jalandhri Pau	22. Lasman Ji
10. Datta Ji	23. Satvanti Ji
11. Deval Ji	24. Sukul Hans Ji
12. Ghungalimal Ji	25. Hanavan Ji
13. Naga Arjun Ji	

Why were these two texts, found in some of the earliest extant manuscript traditions, not included in any of the compilations of Hindi teachings? It is possible that Dvivedi did not include the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh* in his text because he disagreed with Barthwal and believed that as these texts should be placed alongside the other works of the preceptor, Gorakhnath? If this were the case, why wouldn't Dvivedi include these as an addendum to the end of his own work with an explanatory note? It is not possible that Dvivedi did not

know that Barthwal believed these were the works of Ratannath, as he quotes Barthwal almost verbatim in his 1950 publication, *NathSampraday*, stating why the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh* were not included in the *Gorakhbani*. All that is known is that these two Islamic Nath texts were excluded. Could the answer to why these texts disappeared be found within the walls of the *NagariPracaraṇiSabha*?

When Dvivedi details where he accessed the manuscripts that he used in order to compile this publication, he says that a vast majority of the oratures in this book came from the three protected handwritten codices located at the *AryabhaṣaPustakalay* (The Library of Indo-Aryan Languages) at the *NagariPrachariṇiSabha*.¹⁶⁷ Dvivedi even goes on to extensively list the names and works included in these manuscripts.¹⁶⁸ In listing the details of each of these three codices, it becomes obvious that while Gorakhnath's works may be included in these manuscripts, the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh* are not. And while, Ratannath is indeed mentioned within Dvivedi's *NathSiddhom*, no works attributed to him are listed in any of the manuscripts listed in the introduction to this book.

Conclusion

There can be no denying that the disappearance of the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh* from twentieth-century Hindi literature has left an unmistakable imprint on our modern understandings of the Nath *sampraday*. The erasure of these teachings created a far less diverse portrayal of this community in India's modern imagination and worked to color our understanding of the *sampraday* a touch more saffron. It has also significantly minimized the complex historical background that literary evidence supports. And yet, we are still unsure as to how these two teachings came to be under erasure.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 2.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 2-4, 16.

While we may never know exactly who or what was responsible for the disappearance of the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh* in twentieth-century Hindi literary history, study of these Islamic Nath teachings has essential things to teach us about pre-modern Nath *sampraday*. These unique codices illustrate how different communities of Nath yogis viewed their identity, the multiple ways in which they interacted with early-modern Muslims, and how they wished to present themselves in public to others. The following chapter will examine the early-modern teachings of the Nath *sampraday*, paying particular attention to the *AvaliSilūk* and the *KafirBodh*.

Bibliography

GovernmentRecords

National Archives of India (NAI), New Delhi

Nehru Memorial Library (NML), New
Delhi All India Hindu Mahasabha Papers

UnpublishedManuscripts

Buchanan, Francis. "An Account of the Northern Part of the District of Gorakhpur, 1812." MSS. D91-D93. Nehru Memorial Library, New Delhi.

AvaliSilūk. MS 217/45. Jaipur, City Palace.

AvaliSilūk. MS 12. Jaipur,

RājasthanPrācyāVidyāPratiṣṭhān.AvaliSilūk. MS 74. Jaipur,

RājasthanPrācyāVidyāPratiṣṭhān.AvaliSilūk. MS. 67.

Jaipur, *RājasthanPrācyāVidyāPratiṣṭhān*.

AvaliSilūk. MS. 3190. Jaipur, Shree Sanjay Sharma Museum and Research

Institute. Hindi MS 371. London, Wellcome Library.

KāfirBodh. MS 217/45. Jaipur, City Palace.

KāfirBodh. MS 12. Jaipur,

RājasthanPrācyāVidyāPratiṣṭān.KāfirBodh. MS 74. Jaipur,

RājasthanPrācyāVidyāPratiṣṭān.KāfirBodh. MS. 67.

Jaipur, *RājasthanPrācyāVidyāPratiṣṭān*.

KāfirBodh. MS. 3190. Jaipur, Shree Sanjay Sharma Museum and Research Institute.

Primary Sources in English

Ahmad Ali Shah Miyan Sahib. Trans. Farhat Nasreen.

KashfulBaghaavatGorakhpur: Unveiling the Revolt at Gorakhpur. New Delhi: Rupa, 2010.

An Introduction to Nath-Yoga. Gorakhpur: Gorakhnath Mandir Press, n.d.

Alexander, E. *Statistical, Descriptive and Historical Account of the Gorakhpur District*.

Allahabad: North-Western Provinces and Oudh Government Press, 1880.

Banerjea, Akshaya Kumar. *Discourses on Hindu Spiritual Culture*. New Delhi: S. Chand & Co., 1967.

—. *The Nath-Yogi Sampradaya and The Gorakhnath Temple*. Gorakhpur: Gorakhnath Temple, 1964.

—. *Philosophy of Gorakhnath: With Gorakhsa-Vacana-Sangraha*. 1961. Reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1999.

—. *Yogiraj Gambhīrnath*. Gorakhpur: Gorakhnath Temple, 1954.

Faisal, Abul. *Akbarnāma*. trans. H. Beveridge. Vol III. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1939.

Final Report on the Revision of Settlement in the Gorakhpur District, United Provinces (Tahsils Padrauna, Hata, and Deoria). Allahabad, Superintendent, Government Press United Provinces, 1919.

Goswami, C.L. “Our Greetings” in *The Kalyana-Kalpataru: A monthly for the propagation of spiritual ideas and love of God*. 1. (1934): 9-11.

Martin, Robert Montgomery.
The History, Antiquities, Topography, and the Statistics of Eastern India, Vol. 2 Bhagulpur, Goruckpooor, and Dinajepoor: In Relation to their Geology, Mineralogy, Botany, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufacturers, Fine Arts, Population, Religion, Education, Statistics, etc. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1838.

Monserrate, Antonio.
The Commentary of Father Monserrate: S.J., On His Journey to the Court of Akbar. trans. John S. Hoyland and S.N. Banerjee. London: Oxford University Press, 1922.

Nevill, H.R.
Gorakhpur: A Gazetteer Being Volume XXVI of the District Gazetteers of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. Allahabad: Government Press, United Provinces, 1909.

North Indian notes and Queries. Allahabad: Pioneer Press, 1892.

Pantanjali, *The Yoga Sūtras of Pantañjali*. Ed., Trans., and Commentary by Edwin F. Bryant New York: North Point Press, 2009.

Santinath, Nathyogi. *Experiences of a Truth-Seeker*. Ed. And Trans. Askhaya Kumar Banerjea. n.d. Reprint, Gorakhpur: Gorakhnath Temple, 1989.

Tod, James. *Annals and antiquities of Rajasthan*. 1829. Reprint. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1920.

Primary Sources in Indian Languages

Banerjea. Akshay Kumar. *Ādarś-Yogī*. Trans. Raghunath Shukla. Gorakhpur: Digvijaynath Trust, Gorakhnath Mandir, n.d.

_____. *Gorakh-Darśan*: “*ŚrīAkshayKumārBanarjīKṛt ‘PhilāsaphīĀphGorakhnāth’kāHindīRupāntar.*” Ed. Bhavati Prasad Singh. Trans. Sham Bihari Svarup. Gorakhpur: Mahant Avaidyanath Digvijaynath Nyas, Gorakhpur Mandir, n.d.

———. *Nāth-Yog*. Trans. Ramchandra Tiwari. N.D. Reprint, Gorakhpur: Digvijaynath Trust, Gorakhnath-Mandir, 1986.

———. *SrīSrīYogirājGambhīrnāth*. Pheni High School: Sri Mahendra Candra Mukhopadhyay, 1925.

———. *Yog-Rahasya*. N.D. Reprint, Gorakhpur: Sri Mahant Digvijaynath Trust, Gorakhsnath Mandir, 1978.

Digvijaynath, Mahant. *YugPuruṣMahantDigvijaynāthNeKahā...* Ed. Yogi Adityanath. Gorakhpur: Gorakhnath Mandir: n.d.

Digvijaynath, Mahant. “*Bhūmikā.*” in *Ādarś-Yogī*. Gorakhpur: Digvijaynath Trust Gorakhnath Mandir, n.d.

Gorakhcarit. Ed. Ramlal Srivastay. Gorakhpur Temple Press. 1986.

Gorakhnath, *Gorakhbānī*. Ed. Pitambar Datt Barthwal. 1942. Reprint, Prayag: Hindi Sahitya Sammelan. 1944.

MahantDigvijaynāthSmṛti-Granth. Gorakhpur: Gorakhnath Mandir. n.d.

Singh, Somesvar. “*MahantDigvijaynāth-VyaktitvaEvamKṛtitva*” in *MahantDigvijaynāthSmṛti-Granth*. Gorakhpur: Gorakhnath Mandir, n.d.

Vilasnath, Yogi. *ŚrīNāthRahasya*. Vol- 1-3. Rohtak: Sri Baba Mastnath Math, 2012.