The tree adoption ritual as presented in the Dharmanibandhas

Amandine Wattelier-Bricout

The tree adoption ritual as presented in the *Dharmanibandhas*

Amandine Wattelier-Bricout

Keywords : *Dharmanibandha* - *Dāna* - tree adoption - *Skandapurāṇa* - tree ritual - Lakṣmīdhara Hemādri - Ballālasena - Madanasiṃha - *Matsyapurāṇa* - *Padmapurāṇa* - *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*

According to V. Narayanan,[1] the proverb 'One tree is equal to ten sons' found in Indian tradition can inspire today's ecologist behaviours in India. Actually, the first occurrence of this phrase is not found in the *Matsyapurāṇa* (154.512), but in the unpublished chapter 158 of the original *Skandapurāṇa* (SP), probably composed near the end of the sixth century in the centre of North India. In their section about trees, *Dharmanibandha* authors quote, inter alia, this proverb, some verses in chapters SP158 and other sources, including lost works, which all suggest the existence of a particular ritual dedicated to trees, which is neither the gift nor the planting of a tree, but its adoption as a son.

What is the aim and the particularity of this ritual? How can one adopt a tree? What are the differences between the procedures described? Is it possible to sketch a historical survey of this ritual?

By studying how *Dharmanibandha* authors handle their tree chapters, the article offers a new assessment on the value of each *Nibandhas* work and enables reliable identification of sources dealing with tree adoption. Once these sources are determined, their comparative study first reveals that one can save one's ancestors through tree adoption which could be understood as another soteriology. Then, working through the complexity of the ritual procedures, it establishes a relative chronology of the different occurrences of the tree adoption. Finally, it tries to trace the continuation of this ritual in later sources, showing its impact on Indian culture.

Introduction

The aim of this article is to evaluate the scope of a particular ritual dedicated to trees, which is neither the gift nor the planting of a tree, but its adoption as a son. *Dharmanibandha* works, which are compendia of quotations from various *smṛti* works, such as *dharmaśāstras* or *purāṇas*, organised in thematic order, offer evidence of this ritual described in several *Purāṇas,* including lost works. Given that the different Nibandha authors did not quote the same works and did not arrange their quotations in the same manner, their comparison will enable us to access a wide variety of sources in the textual tradition available to them, to fully appreciate the value of their

[1] Narayanan (1997).

references to this ritual and to understand why some of them merely mention tree-adoption while others do not touch upon it.

In this study, my objective is threefold: first, to understand the aim and particularity of a tree adoption; second, to compare the adoption procedures described, in order to establish a relative chronology of the different occurrences of this ritual; and, third, to trace the impact and the continuation of this ritual in later sources.

To do this, I will compare the passages concerning the gift, the planting and the adoption of trees as found in the *Dharmanibandha* literature, as well as in the non-quoted parts of Purāṇic literature, in order to establish the theoretical basis of tree adoption, the procedure and the material used during this ritual. In this way, I will be able to observe which features are specific to the tree adoption, how these evolved in time and how they influenced other ritual practices and myths.

Presentation of the text material

The *Dānanibandha* literature which is a part of *Dharmanibandha* literature dedicated to gifts is very extensive and not completely accessible.[2] Among these prolific works,[3] I consulted Lakṣmīdhara's *Dānakāṇḍa* in his *Kṛtyakalpataru*, Ballālasena's *Dānasāgara*, Hemādri's *Dānakhaṇḍa* in his *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, Madanasiṃha's *Dānavivekoddyota*, part of his *Madanaratnapradīpa*, Govindānanda's *Dānakriyākaumudī* and Nilakhaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa's *Dānamayūkha* for the purpose of the present study.

Of these six authors,[4] four are particularly notable because they devote a whole chapter to rituals about trees: Lakṣmīdhara, Ballālasena, Hemādri and Madanasiṃha. Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru* (henceforth KKT) is not the first compilation,[5] but 'of the numerous extant works that deal exclusively with *Dāna* (the Sanskrit term for "gift/giving"), the *Dānakāṇḍa* is almost

---

[2] One can find a very useful list of works on *Dāna* in Aiyangar's edition of Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru* (1941: 127–9).

[3] In comparison with the talk presented in September 2017 which included a study based on three authors (Lakṣmīdhara, Ballālasena and Hemādri), this article offers new conclusions, a wider range of sources having been consulted. So this paper deals with some *Skandapurāṇa* quotations which are not in the list of *Dharmanibandha* testimonies established by Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacon (1998: 5–16). The references of *Skandapurāṇa*'s quotations discovered through this research and not belonging to the tree-ritual thematic were forwarded to the *Skandapurāṇa* project team.

[4] Surveying the *Dānanibandha* literature has helped me to discover about 50 quotations of the *Skandapurāṇa* and a chapter entitled *taruputrakavidhiḥ* in the *Dānavivekoddyota* of Madanasiṃha (part of the *Madanaratnapradīpa*, edited by Deśapāṇḍe K. (1964–7), Sanskrit Academy Series 10, 15–16, 3 vols. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy, Ousmania University).

[5] Aiyangar 1941: 120–3.

certainly the oldest'.[6] His KKT was perhaps[7] written in Kannauj under the reign of Govindacandra, between AD 1109 and 1168. According to Aiyangar (1941: 127), Ballālasena wrote his *Dānasāgara* (DS) in AD 1168, whereas Hemādri composed his *Dānakhaṇḍa*, part of his *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* (CVC), in Devagiri between AD 1260 and 1270. As for Madanasiṃha, the editor of his *Dānavivekoddyota,* part of his *Madanaratnapradīpa* (MRP), informs us that the author must belong to the 14th or 15th centuries, whereas KĀṆE (1930: 363–5) argues that the work was composed 'probably about 1425–50' near Delhi.[8] Therefore, this study presents tree adoption in texts whose date of composition[9] ranges from that of the *Purāṇas* to the 15th century, the latest date of the relevant *Dharmanibandha* literature. As said before, *Dharmanibandha* literature has the advantage of showing textual traditions in thematic manner, but I did not settle for this literature when searching tree-ritual evidences. I will examine some evidence of tree-rituals from *Purāṇas* not quoted by the *Nibandha* authors. As far as these sources are concerned, three scenarios are possible: either these texts had not been written when the *Dharmanibandhas* were composed, they were ignored by the compilers or they were simply unknown to them.

How do the four authors deal with tree rituals?

In this type of literature it is very common to use the works of predecessors and the share of copying is so important that many scholars have more often emphasised the similarities of two works than their independent nature and agenda. For example, it is often agreed that Hemādri used the work of his predecessor Lakṣmīdhara and that he largely drew on the *Kṛtyakalpataru* to write his *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*.[10] This raises the following questions: is it interesting to compare several compilers just to obtain more sources on tree rituals or can we learn more about these rituals by comparing the layout of their quotations?

To answer these questions, I will observe in a chronological order how each compiler handles tree rituals in relation to his predecessor(s). Lakṣmīdhara is the oldest of the four compilers

---

[6] Brick 2009: 62.

[7] For more information about the date of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* and the biography of Lakṣmīdhara, see Brick (2009: 63–70): he lays out the different points of view and arguments of several scholars, including those of Aiyangar (1941) and Kāṇe (1968).

[8] Kāṇe (1930: 390) bases his conclusions on a single manuscript (the critical edition dates from 1964). He also says that the MRP is 'quoted as a great authority by the writers of the 16th and 17th centuries, such as Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, Nīlakaṇṭha and Mitramiśra'. Mitramiśra knew the MRP and referred to it, which raises new questions about the quotations of the SP in his *Virāmitrodaya.* In the part titled 'The *Dharmanibandha* citations' of the introduction of the volume 4 of the critical edition of the SP (2018: 13–8), this potential borrowing from the MRP by Mitramiśra was not considered since the quotations of the SP in the MRP were not known.

[9] The dates of composition of the *Purāṇas* are very difficult to establish. In this respect the work of Rocher (1986) is very useful because for each *Purāṇa* he gives a complete panorama of the points of view of different scholars.

[10] Brick (2009: 5) explains this fact about Lakṣmīdhara, Hemādri, Ballālasena and Madanasiṃha: 'Significantly, each of these *dānanibandhas* consists primarily of citations from earlier scriptures, which their authors draw together, arrange in some order, and comment upon as they see fit.'

studied in this paper. As Kāṇe points out, Lakṣmīdhara probably quoted from his predecessors, 'but as those works are not yet available, no positive conclusion can be drawn about its borrowing for the present'.[11] So I will consider here the KKT as the oldest compilation dealing with tree rituals.

The index of Ballālasena's *Dānasāgara* informs us that he used works of his predecessors, but not the KKT. After studying them, the quotations of Ballālasena's *Dānasāgara* will be not retained in my analysis. Indeed, his two chapters on trees are extremely short and give no evidence of an adoption ritual.[12] Nevertheless, this very absence is interesting in itself because it shows that this author selected his sources. Brick (2009: 78) confirms this selective approach of Ballālasena and describes it as a kind of religious puritanism, while De Simini (2015: 613–4) highlights the fact that Ballālesana 'tries to find connections between the instructions given by his authorities and the actual religious performance, an attempt that has to be read in the context of the restauration of orthodox beliefs that this monarch was promoting' and he 'wishes to expunge the "impure" elements derived from the influence of Tantric Śaivism on the Smārta Tradition'. For example, Ballālasena considers the *Devīpurāṇa* as an 'heretical work', a point that is quoted by Lakṣmīdhara and Hemādri in their chapter dedicated to tree rituals. Ballālasena quoted the *Skandapurāṇa*[13] and *Nandipurāṇa* in other parts of his DS, so these *purāṇas* are considered as authoritative sources for him. However, while these two *purāṇas* contain evidences of tree adoption, Ballālasena skips this topic. If we take this remark into account and the fact that Ballālasena quoted the SP, the MP, the NP† and the PP elsewhere in his *Dānasāgara* as authoritative sources, his silence on tree adoption is perhaps not due to neglect but a purposeful rejection. Several hypotheses can be suggested: Ballālasena may have considered tree adoption a heterodox ritual showing a kind of heretical feature, because trees are said to be superior to real sons or because of the female gender of the adopter in the SP's evidence. One last hypothesis could be that tree adoption may not have been practised in his region, but this seems to be less convincing. In any case, Ballālasena's silence on tree adoption highlights the fact that this kind of ritual does not elicit unanimity amongst the compilers.

---

[11] Kāṇe (1962: vol.5, part.II, 885) says about the editor of the *Kṛtyakalpataru*, Aiyangar: 'He has been assiduous in pointing out how Hemādri, Caṇḍeśvara and Mitramiśra have copied wholesale from the *Kalpataru*. It is not impossible that even the *Kalpataru* might have done the same to some extent as regards its predecessors such as the Pārijāta, Prakāśa, Smrtimañjarī, and Kāmadhenu. But as those works are not yet available, no positive conclusion can be drawn about its borrowing for the present.'

[12] Chapters 48 and 49 of Ballālasena's Dānasāgara, entitled *Vanaspatidaivatāramadānāvartaḥ* and *Vanaspatidaivatavṛkṣadānāvartaḥ,* cite two verses from the *Ādityapurāṇa*, two verses from the *Mahābhārata*, 12 *pādas* from the *Nandipurāṇa* and five verses from the *Viṣṇudharmottara.* While *Matsyapurāṇa, Padmapurāṇa* and *Skandapurāṇa* contain material about tree rituals and Ballālasena quotes these sources in other parts of his work, he does not use these works for the tree topic.

[13] Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson 1998: 8–9, in particular the note 26, which gives the detail of the SPBh quotations in the DS.

As Brick noted,[14] Hemādri copies Lakṣmīdhara, quoting the same works and even including his glosses and comments. A thorough review of the tree chapters of these two authors, Lakṣmīdhara and Hemādri, throws some new light on Hemādri's quotations.[15]

Lakṣmīdhara gathers all his sources on trees in the 21st chapter, entitled *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhā* 'the establishment of trees'. As is often the case, it is up to the reader to find an order in the layout of quotations. In the 20th chapter, Lakṣmīdhara compiles the prescribed rules on the establishment of ponds, wells, tanks, etc. and closes it with a long quotation of the *Devīpurāṇa*. The next chapter, the one dedicated to tree rituals, begins with the same *Devīpurāṇa*[16] and seems to be a transition from the previous chapter by presenting a quotation about the plantation of a tree park in watery place.[17] Then, the next four quotations[18] are on the same topic and also discuss the

[14] Brick 2009: 74–6. From the fact that Lakṣmīdhara is quoted by name in other *Dharmanibandha* works, Brick concludes that 'at one time, the text enjoyed a rather wide circulation despite the absence of extant South Indian manuscripts'. He adds that 'Lakṣmīdhara's work was one literary source with which these later texts on gifting were familiar'. Then he gives a table in which he compares the glosses of Hemādri to his predecessor, Lakṣmīdhara, and he concludes : 'The clear similarities between these passages—especially in the commentarial sections— can hardly be a coincidence and strongly suggest the underlying influence of the *Dānakāṇḍa* upon the later *Dānakhaṇḍa* of Hemādri.'

[15] The study of De Simini (2015: 609) shows examples in which Lakṣmīdhara is more accurate in his choices of sources than Hemādri. She observes that Lakṣmīdhara is 'more in accordance with our knowledge of the extant texts'(2015: 610). She gives also several examples in which Hemādri copied Lakṣmīdhara including his glosses (2015: 612–3). Nevertheless, she concludes this observation with the following remark: 'What seems to emerge from these brief examples, though, is a dynamic in which the clear reliance on the predecessors is contrasted with the attempt to differentiate their own works even just by rearranging passages that were already cited in the earlier *Nibandhas*'(2015: 613).

[16] *Devīpurāṇa* KKT21.1–23.

[17] As for the other compilers, one could argue that the chapter titles are later additions and the result of scribal task. But, given that the aim of these compilations is to order the quotations in thematic order, it is very unlikely that it can be the case.

[18] *Nandipurāṇa* KKT21.24–6; *Skandapurāṇa* KKT21.27–8; *Mahābhārata* KKT21.29–31; *Matsyapurāṇa* KKT21.32–49.

benefits obtained by planting a tree. Since the last four explain how a tree can be a substitute for a son, these four concern tree adoption ritual.[19]

It is an undeniable fact that Hemādri quotes the same *purāṇas* as Lakṣmīdhara, including the latter's glosses and comments, but it must also be pointed out that Hemādri is selective in his borrowing. For example, he quotes a shorter passage from the SPBh111 and repeatedly uses longer passages or verses than those cited by Lakṣmīdhara.[20] He also refers to other works not used by Lakṣmīdhara.[21] Finally, he organises his quotations in a different, thematic and structured sequence.

Thus, contrary to Brick's view and first impression, I claim that Hemādri is not a poor copycat, but composes an original work by introducing a new layout of quotations and by adding some other relevant texts.

While Lakṣmīdhara devotes only one chapter to tree rituals, Hemādri deals with this topic by identifying five main subjects:

(i) the benefit to be enjoyed from planting a tree;[22]

---

[19] *Padmapurāṇa* KKT21.50–60 in particular KKT21.50:
aputrasya ca putratvaṃ pādapā iha kurvate /
yacchanti ropakebhyas te sattīrthe tarpaṇādikam
In this world, trees perform the role of sons for a sonless man. To their planters they offer refreshments, etc. at an illustrious pilgrimage site. (BRICK's translation)
Nandipurāṇa KKT21.61:
taruputraṃ tu yaḥ kuryād vidhivad vahnisaṃnidhau /
sa mahāpātakair yuktaḥ samuddhṛtya kulatrayam /
narakebhyo naro yāti prajāpatipuraṃ śubham //
When a man plants a tree as a son, following the prescribed rules, in the presence of fire, even if he is guilty of great sins, he saves three of his family- members from hells and goes to the auspicious city of Prajāpati. (BRICK's translation)
Skandapurāṇa KKT21.62–73 in particular KKT21.62 and 71:
śṛṇuṣva yena vidhinā gṛhyate 'vanijaḥ sutaḥ […]
tatas tair apy anujñātaṃ taṃ taruṃ taruṇāyuṣi /
bhūmidevasamakṣaṃ vai gṛhṇīyāt tanayaṃ priye //
'Now hear the rules through which a tree is accepted as son!' […] Then, permitted by them, O beloved, she should accept that tree in its youthful state as her son in the presence of the gods on earth. (BRICK's translation)
Matsyapurāṇa KKT21.74:
daśakūpasamā vāpī daśavāpīsamo hradaḥ /
daśahradasamaḥ putro daśaputrasamo drumaḥ //
A pond is equal to ten wells, a lake is equal to ten ponds, a son is equal to ten lakes, and a tree is equal to ten sons. (BRICK's translation)

[20] We can find about 20 *ślokas* of the *Mahābhārata* not cited in KKT, two additional verses from the *Matsyapurāṇa* and about 15 additional lines of the *Skandapurāṇa*. Brick's edition of Lakṣmīdhara's *Dānakāṇḍa* makes the question of the loss of verses in the transmission mostly improbable. (See the list of the manuscripts collected by him and his philological principles 2009: 276–84). Nevertheless the absence of critical edition of the CVC leaves the question open.

[21] In his chapters on tree rituals, Hemādri cites about ten verses of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, about 30 verses of the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, about 40 verses of the *Vāyupurāṇa* and about 30 of the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*, giving a total of more than 100 verses not borrowed.

[22] The introductory title is *vṛkṣāropaṇam* on page 1029 and the final title is *vṛkṣāropanikaphalam* on page 1033.

(ii)the gift of a tree;[23]
(iii) how to plant trees in a garden;[24]
(iv) the consecration of a tree;[25]
(v) tree adoption.[26]
This five section are detailed in the following five tables. One can compare Hemādri's quotations in front of those of his predecessor, Lakṣmīdhara, and their location in the KKT.

CVC *vṛkṣāropanikaphalam*	KKT
Mahābhārata 13.99.23-24 and 26	21.29–31
Mahābhārata 13.99.28–31	not quoted
Viṣṇusmṛti 91.5–8	20.8-12
Padmapurāṇa 28.22–32	21.50–60
Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa not identified but the first two *pādas* match SPBh158.4cd	not quoted

Table A: *vṛkṣāropanikaphalam* by Hemādri

CVC *vṛkṣadānavidhiḥ*	KKT
Skandapurāṇa SPBh111.38	21.27
not quoted	21.28 *Skandapurāṇa* SPBh111.39ab–40
Nandipurāṇa†	21.25–26
Mahābhārata not identified except Mbh13.57.36	not quoted
Vāyupurāṇa not identified	not quoted

Table B: *vṛkṣadānavidhiḥ* by Hemādri

CVC *ārāmaropaṇam*	KKT
Nandipurāṇa†	21.24
Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa (= *Vṛkṣāyurveda* 14, *khaṇḍa* II, chapter 300, 1-33)	not quoted
Devīpurāṇa	21.1–23

[23] The introductory title is *vṛkṣadānam* on page 1033 and the final title is *vṛkṣadānavidhiḥ* on page 1041.

[24] The introductory title is *vṛkṣārāmaropaṇam* on page 1041 and the final title is *ārāmaropaṇam* on page 1047.

[25] The introductory title is *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhā* on page 1047 and the final title is *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhāvidhiḥ* on page 1049.

[26] The introductory title is *taruputradānavidhiḥ* on page 1049 and the final title is *taruputravidhiḥ* on page 1056.

Table C: *ārāmaropaṇam* by Hemādri

CVC *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhāvidhiḥ*	KKT
Matsyapurāṇa 59.1–2	not quoted
Matsyapurāṇa 59.3–19	21.32–49

Table D: *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhāvidhiḥ* by Hemādri

CVC *taruputravidhiḥ*	KKT
Matsyapurāṇa 154.512	21.73
Nandipurāṇa†	21.61
Skandapurāṇa 10 *pādas* not identified	not quoted
Skandapurāṇa 2 *pādas* not identified	21.62ab
Skandapurāṇa SPBh158.45–47, 48cd and 58–68	21.62cd–73
Skandapurāṇa SPBh162.57–64ab and 67–68	not quoted
Brahmavaivartapurāṇa† (does not match the printed edition)	not quoted

Table E: *taruputravidhiḥ* by Hemādri

A quick look on this tables (A, B, C, D and E) immediately shows that, while Hemādri quotes almost all of KKT's sources, he compeletly shakes their order up and gives them a new layout. Moreover, he regularly quotes longer passages,[27] on one occasion cuts a quotation and moves it according to his point of view[28] and frequently uses sources not quoted by Lakṣmīdhara.[29]
Concerning the last part entitled *taruputravidhiḥ,* whose subject is the matter of this paper, the following table shows that the consistency of each compiler varies:

KKT	CVC *taruputravidhiḥ*

[27] For examples, see four additional verses from *Mahābhārata* in the *vṛkṣāropanikaphalam* part, two additional verses from *Matsyapurāṇa* in the *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhāvidhiḥ* part or ten additional *pādas* and ten *ślokas* from *Skandapurāṇa* in the *taruputravidhiḥ* part.

[28] In KKT, one of the quotations of the *Nandipurāṇa* is composed by three *ślokas* (KKT21.24, 25 and 26). In the CVC, the first *śloka* is quoted in the *ārāmaropaṇam* part, while the other two are cited together earlier in the *vṛkṣadānavidhiḥ* part. Given that *Nandipurāṇa* is a lost source, it is not possible to determine wether these three *ślokas* form continuous text or not.

[29] *Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa* (maybe understand *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*?), *Vāyupurāṇa, Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa and Brahmavaivartapurāṇa.*

Padmapurāṇa 28.22–32 in particular verse 22: *aputrasya ca putratvaṃ pādapā iha kurvate /* *yacchanti ropakebhyas te sattīrthe tarpaṇādikam* In this world, trees perform the role of sons for a sonless man. To their planters they offer refreshments, etc. at an illustrious pilgrimage site. (BRICK's translation)	*Matsyapurāṇa* 154.512: *daśakūpasamā vāpī daśavāpīsamo hradaḥ /* *daśahradasamaḥ putro daśaputrasamo drumaḥ //* A pond is equal to ten wells, a lake is equal to ten ponds, a son is equal to ten lakes, and a tree is equal to ten sons. (BRICK's translation).
Nandipurāṇa KKT21.61: *taruputraṃ tu yaḥ kuryād vidhivad vahnisaṃnidhau /* *sa mahāpātakair yuktaḥ samuddhṛtya kulatrayam /* *narakebhyo naro yāti prajāpatipuraṃ śubham //* When a man plants a tree as a son, following the prescribed rules, in the presence of fire, even if he is guilty of great sins, he saves three of his family-members from hells and goes to the auspicious city of Prajāpati. (BRICK's translation);	*Nandipurāṇa*† : almost the same *taruputraṃ tu yaḥ kuryād vidhivad vahnisaṃnidhau /* *sa mahāpātakair muktaḥ samuddhṛtya kulatrayam /* *narakebhyo naro yāti prajāpatipuraṃ śubham //* When a man adopts a tree as a son, following the prescribed rules, in the presence of fire, free from his great sins, he saves three of his family-members from hells and goes to the auspicious city of Prajāpati. (all translations are mine unless stated otherwise);
Skandapurāṇa KKT21.62–73 in particular KKT21.62 and 71: *śṛṇuṣva yena vidhinā gṛhyate 'vanijaḥ sutaḥ […]* *tatas tair apy anujñātaṃ taṃ taruṃ taruṇāyuṣi /* *bhūmidevasamakṣaṃ vai gṛhṇīyāt tanayaṃ priye //* "Now hear the rules through which a tree is accepted as son!" […] Then, permitted by them, O beloved, she should accept that tree in its youthful state as her son in the presence of the gods on earth. (BRICK's translation);	*Skandapurāṇa* : the same passage with near 10 *ślokas* added.
Matsyapurāṇa KKT21.74: *daśakūpasamā vāpī daśavāpīsamo hradaḥ /* *daśahradasamaḥ putro daśaputrasamo drumaḥ //* A pond is equal to ten wells, a lake is equal to ten ponds, a son is equal to ten lakes, and a tree is equal to ten sons. (BRICK's translation).	*Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*† 32 verses beginning by : *ataḥ praraṃ* (read *paraṃ*?) *pravakṣyāmi vṛkṣasyodyāpane vidhim |* *sarvapāpapraśamanaṃ sarvāśubhavināśanaṃ ||* *aputrayā purā pārtha pārvatyā mandarācale |* *aśokaḥ śokaśomanaḥ putratve parikalpitaḥ ||* From here I will explain the supreme rule of tree's accomplishment, which protects from all sins and destroys all bad acts. Once Pārvatī adopted on Mandara mountain, an *aśoka* tree, which softens the sorrow, o son of Pṛtha.

Table F: comparison between Lakṣmīdhara's and Hemādri's layouts

Lakṣmīdhara begins with two quotations (*Padmapurāṇa* and *Nandipurāṇa*) that claim trees can substitute sons when they are planted by prescribed rules as sons, then he quotes the *Skandapurāṇa,* which details the adoption ceremony and finally he uses the proverb of the *Matsyapurāṇa,* whose the substance emphasises the tree adoption merit, in order to close his chapter. As for Hemādri, he chooses the latter sentence to introduce his part devoted to adoption and, in this way, establishes the relevance of the following quotations. Then, quoting

Nandipurāṇa,[30] he gives the main purpose to adopt a tree by the means of a *vidhi*. Finally, he gives two examples of the latter *vidhi* by the means of two long extracts of *purāṇas* (*Skandapurāṇa* and *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*†), which describe two different *vidhi* to adopt a tree. Hemādri's part on tree adoption *taruputravidhiḥ* is more comprehensive than that of Lakṣmīdhara and provides his reader with two ways to perform the ritual, one performed by a woman (*Skandapurāṇa*) and the other by a man (*Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*†).
Comparing quotations of these two compilers on the same topic offers us a new perspective on Hemādri's work and shows us that to appreciate the relevance of a compiler, a more thorough analysis is often required. The compilers clearly chose their quotations and arranged them according a rigorous plan.

Turning to the *Dānavivekoddyota*, its appendix states that Madanasiṃha knew and used the compilations of Lakṣmīdhara and Hemādri, but not that of Ballālasena. Now the question of how he handles his sources arises. First, it is interesting to note that he only deals with tree adoption and not with the other tree rituals, and that his chapter is called *taruputrakavidhiḥ,* as if Hemādri's. His point of view seems to be the opposite of Ballālasena's. All the texts quoted by Madanasiṃha had already been used by his predecessors. By studying the different readings contained in MRP,[31] it seems that MRP used both KKT and CVC while introducing its own layout and selection of sources. To sum up, Madanasiṃha selects only three sources but clearly claims that they testify to a tree-adoption ritual : the first (*Nandipurāṇa*) tells the reader about the general merit of adopting and about the requirement to perfom a *vidhi;* the second (*Padmapurāṇa*) develops the topic of the merit obtained by a tree adoption depending on the tree species, while the third details how one can adopt a tree. Madanasiṃha's chapter is more concise, follows a rigorous plan and features the essence of the topic (see Table G).

MRP *taruputrakavidhiḥ*	KKT	CVC *taruputravidhiḥ*

[30] I suggest a new translation of the expression *taruputraṃ kṛ* for the *Nandipurāṇa's* quotation. Indeed, BRICK (2009: 258) translates it as the act of planting a tree as a son. His choice is influenced by the earlier quotation (*Padmapurāṇa* 28.22–32), which really speaks about plantation. But given that the CVC and the MPR both consider the NP† passage as an evidence of tree adoption and given that another verb could be used than *kṛ* for meaning the plantation, I suggest to translate it by 'a man adopts a tree as a son'.

[31] Among the 57 lines of its chapter, MRP agrees entirely with KKT's readings ten times, with CVC's readings eight times, with the common readings of both KKT and CVC 19 times and finally gives its own readings 20 times. In the absence of a critical edition of CVC, this observation cannot lead to a meaningful conclusion. Nevertheless, it should be noted what MRP omits or adds. In this matter, MRP shows us that it chooses the verses it quotes and its comments (for example, among the common references used by the three authors, MRP reproduces two of Lakṣmīdhara's comments that had been deleted by Hemādri; it omits one of Lakṣmīdhara's comment and two *pādas* of the PP (PP28.23cd), as does Hemādri; it quotes six *pādas* of the SP (SPBh158.47cd,65ab,65cd) found in CVC but not in KKT and finally no verses of the SPBh162 quoted by Hemādri). Moreover, it arranges the sources in a different layout and does not quote all the testimonies of the ritual of tree adoption. This brief overview of the MRP's manner of quoting seems to match De Simini's conclusion in her article (De Simini 2015: 621): 'From this sketch, it emerges that the authors' approach to the quoted sources was less rigid and more dynamic than expected. The text of the authorities was from time to time rearranged, juxtaposed with that of other sources, reduced in size when not almost completely omitted, paraphrased.'

Nandipurāṇa† = KKT21.61	*Padmapurāṇa* 28.22–32	*Matsyapurāṇa* 154.512
Padmapurāṇa 28.22–32	*Nandipurāṇa*† KKT21.61	*Nandipurāṇa*† = KKT21.61
Skandapurāṇa 2 *pādas* non identified + SPBh158.45–47, 48cd and 58–68	*Skandapurāṇa* 2 *pādas* non identified + SPBh158.45–47, 48cd and 58–68	*Skandapurāṇa* 12 *pādas* non identified + SPBh158.45–47, 48cd and 58–68 + SPBh162.57–64ab and 67–68
	Matsyapurāṇa 154.512	*Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*† (does not match the printed edition)

Table G: Madanasiṃha's layout

Amongst our four compilers, three of them (Lakṣmīdhara, Hemādri and Madanasiṃha) emphasise the merit of having a tree son, two of them (Hemādri and Madanasiṃha) certify four sources as evidence of tree adoption by calling their chapter *taruputravidhiḥ*, while one of them, Ballālasena, seems to pass over this ritual in silence and another, Madanasiṃha, only deals with this tree ritual without mentioning the planting or donation of a tree. Could this discrepancy between these perspectives be explained by the purpose of adopting a tree? How is the merit of tree adoption different from planting or giving a tree?

The purpose of adopting a tree

By cross-checking the quotations of KKT, CVC and MRP, at least five *purāṇas* talk about a tree adoption:[32] the *Padmapurāṇa* (PP28.22–32); six *pādas* of the *Nandipurāṇa* (NP), a lost *purāṇa*; the *Skandapurāṇa* (verses from the chapters SPBh158 and SPBh162); one single verse of the *Matsyapurāṇa* (MP154.512); and about 30 verses of the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa* (BVP), which does not agree with anything in the text of the current edition. To understand as much as possible the tree-adoption ritual, I have consulted the context of the quotations whenever it was possible, for the PP, MP and SP.

The different presentations of the topic of tree rituals by the four selected *Nibandha* authors raise the question whether there is a difference between planting, giving and adopting a tree: is the adoption of a tree a specific ritual or one equivalent to a donation or a plantation? Does one of these rituqls hqve more merit thqn the others?

The sources agree that the purpose of the tree adoption is the same as that of the gift of a tree: one who adopts a tree makes a very pious act and thus ensures a favourable situation in the afterlife, which is also the usual benefit of a gift in general. The argument of the NP†, although a lost source, can be reconstructed through the KKT's quotations :

> KKT21.61 *Nandipurāṇa* (CVC1059)
> *taruputraṃ tu yaḥ kuryād vidhivad vahnisaṃnidhau*
> *sa mahāpātakair yuktaḥ samuddhṛtya kulatrayam*
> *narakebhyo naro yāti prajāpatipuraṃ śubham /61/*

[32] The details of the quotations in each *Nibandha* author are given in the Table 1 in the Appendix.

When a man adopts a tree as a son, following the prescribed rules, in the presence of fire, free from his great sins, he saves three of his family members from hell and goes to the auspicious city of Prajāpati.

KKT20.19 *Nandipurāṇa* (not quoted in CVC nor in MRP):

Vāpyās tīre tu yaḥ kuryāt sacchāyaṃ taruputrakam |
tarudānād daśaguṇaṃ vāpīdānāc caturguṇam |
saṃyogadānena phalaṃ labhate puruṣaḥ sa vai ||

In addition, if a man then adopts a shady tree as a son on the bank of that pond, he obtains a reward ten times greater than the gift of a tree and four times greater than the gift of a pond, by giving the combination of both.[33]

According to the NP†, the merit of adopting a tree is clearly superior to offering a tree, and the tree son substitutes a real son by freeing his father from his sins and by saving his ancestors. MP154.506–12 also expresses these two ideas: first, the tree adoption is presented as the safest way to reach paradise;[34] second, it is a fundamental injunction made by Pārvatī.[35] The dialogue between Pārvatī and the assembly of wise men suggests that this ritual is a way to heaven for sonless people (MP154.509cd). The PP affirms this very clearly in the first verse quoted by the three *Nibandha* authors:

aputrasya ca putratvaṃ pādapā iha kurvate
'In this world, trees perform the role of sons for a sonless man.'

---

[33] Here I change the translation of the expression *taruputrakam kṛ* as before and disagree on Brick's translation (2009: 242): 'In addition, if man then *plants* a shady tree as a son on the bank of that pond, he obtains a reward ten times greater than the gift of a tree and four times greater than the gift of a pond by giving the combination of both.' See my argument above.

[34] MP154.511–12cd:
evaṃ nirudake deśe yaḥ kūpaṃ kārayed budhaḥ
bindau bindau ca toyasya vaset saṃvatsaraṃ divi || *511* ||
daśakūpasamā vāpī daśavāpīsamo hradaḥ
daśahradasamaḥ putro daśaputrasamo drumaḥ
So a wise man who orders the digging of a well in an arid area, will live in heaven for as many years as there are drops of water in it. One pond is equal to ten wells, one lake is equal to ten ponds, one son is equal to ten lakes and one tree is equal to ten sons.

[35] MP154.512ef : *eṣaiva mama maryādā niyatā lokabhāvinī*
This is really the law existing in the world, the law established by me.

The remaining part of the PP's quotation comprises a long list of tree species and the benefit they provide to those who plant and adopt one of them.[36] It ends with this following sentence:[37]

> *ity ādayas tathānye ca ye noktās te'pi dāyakāḥ*
> *pratiṣṭhāṃ te gamiṣyanti ye narā vṛkṣadāyakāḥ*
> These trees and also the others that have not been mentioned are heirs. Men who possess a tree-heir will attain accomplishment.

As for the BVP†, the tree adoption destroys all the sins and provides the fulfilment of all desires now and hereafter.[38] The SP's passage offers the longest explanation on the aim of tree adoption.[39] The superiority of this ritual is demonstrated in a dialogue between Śiva and Pārvatī. Śiva explains to his wife that only a tree is able to save ancestors from hell and one tree is worth more than 100 sons. The superiority of the trees is based on a traditional and philosophical idea: they are provided with obscurity/inertia (*tamas*)[40] and are deprived of sensory organs (*karaṇa*).[41] Because of this, they cannot commit sins and therefore are more virtuous than human sons. Here the tree adoption is not something one makes in addition to having sons and doing other virtuous things; rather, it is a special way to be saved from hell. For the adopted tree is the only true son, the only one guaranteed to be virtuous, a *satputra*:

---

[36] Brick (2009: 258) translates as follows: 'These and other trees that have not been mentioned are givers. Men who give such trees will become very established.' Here Brick's translation is not clear maybe because he does not take this quotation to refer to the practice of tree adoption. According to Apte (1998: 810), the word *dāyakaḥ* means first 'an heir, inheritor' and secondly 'a donor'. My translation considers *vṛkṣadāyakāḥ* a Bahuvrīhi compound 'men who possess a tree-heir', which makes a better sense in the context. Indeed the function of the tree is to replace the son, as it has been said in the beginning of the quotation : *aputrasya ca putratvaṃ pādapā iha kurvate*. Madanasiṃha who quotes this text as an evidence of tree adoption has chosen the reading *vṛkṣadāyakāḥ,* while Hemādri's text shows a different reading for *vṛkṣadāyakāḥ*: *vṛkṣaropakāḥ* 'those who plant trees', which really explains why Hemādri does not quote the PP in his chapter devoted to tree adoption.

[37] This sentence concludes the chapter 28 in the current edition of the PP. The translation of Deshpande, Shastri and Bhatt (1988: 359–62) understands *dāyakaḥ* as givers. They seem to have the same reading as Hemādri.

[38] BVP† (CVC1052):
ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi vṛkṣasyodyāpane vidhiḥ
sarvapāpapraśamanaṃ sarvāśubhavināśanaṃ
Henceforth I will expose the supreme rule to bring tree to accomplishment, rule which protects from all sins and which destroys all bad acts.
BVP† (CVC1055)
etat te kathitaṃ pārtha vṛkṣāṇāṃ sumahotsavaṃ
sarvān kāmān avapnoti iha loke paratra ca
I told you the very great festival of trees, O son of Pṛtha; one (who performs it) obtains all his desires here and hereafter.

[39] On the originality of the theoretical basis of the tree adoption according to the SP, see Wattelier-Bricout (2018) 'Adopter un arbre : un rite unique décrit dans les chapitres 158 et 162 du *Skandapurāṇa'*, Actes du colloque international 'L'arbre en Asie' des 8 et 9 décembre 2016 organisé par la Société Asiatique et l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris.

[40] *Manusmṛti* 1.49ab expresses the idea according to which plants are covered by darkness due to the result of former acts:
tamasā bahurūpeṇa veṣṭitāḥ karmahetunā

[41] SPBh158.16 and SPBh158.21ab.

pitṝṃs tathāśubhair ghorair veṣṭitān rākṣasārditān
satputras trāyate devi netaraḥ pāpaniścayaḥ || 10 ||
narasya na ca satputrāḥ sarva eva bhavanty uta
eka evātra bhavati yaḥ pitṝṃs trāyate bhayāt || 11 ||
indriyāṇāṃ tu prābalyāt tatputreṣv api pārvati
pāpakāny api kurvanti te'satputrā bhavanty uta || 15 ||
ime hi taravo devi dakṣaśāpād hatendriyāḥ
pāpakāni na kurvanti saṃvṛtaiḥ karaṇaiś ca ha || 16 ||
etasmāt kāraṇād devi koṣṭhajānāṃ śatād api
eko bhūmiruhaḥ putraḥ śasyate na tu koṣṭhajaḥ || 17 ||[42]

10. O Devī, only a true son can save these ancestors, covered with their terrible inauspicious [karmas] and tormented by Rākṣasas. No other, evil-minded person can do so.

11. All of the sons of a man are not virtuous sons; among these sons, there is only one who is able to save the fathers from calamity. […][43]

15. But some of these sons commit sins because of the predominance of the senses and they are not true sons, O Pārvatī.

16. In fact, the trees have lost their senses due to Dakṣa's curse, O Goddess. Having their sense organs blocked, they do not commit any sins.

17. For this reason, O Goddess, it is taught that one son born from the earth is [better] than even a hundred sons born from the womb, but not an uterine son.[44]

Among the other presentations on this topic, the SP is unique. First, it is only the SP that gives a theoretical justification for the superiority of tree adoption above having a natural son. Second, tree adoption appears in the SP as almost the only guarantee, or at least the ideal way, to be saved from hell. Contrarily, the NP† and BVP† stress the value of the ritual to prove that this act is really auspicious, but without any real justification; the MP merely describes tree adoption as a possibility for sonless people and affirms the value of this act; and the PP presents this rite as a way to ensure a path to heaven for sonless men by comparing fruits, leaves and refreshments offered by a tree to the duties of a son.

---

[42] SPBh158.10–1 and SPBh158.15–7.

[43] SPBh158.12–4 depict some of these bad sons and explain the meaning of the word *putra* in the same way as *Manusmṛti* 9.138:
puṃnāmno narakād yasmāt trāyate pitaraṃ sutaḥ
tasmāt putra iti proktaḥ svayam eva svayaṃbhuvā
The son is called '*pu-tra'* by the Self-existent himself because the son saves his father from the hell called *Puṃs*.

[44] A critical edition of chapters 158 and 162 is in preparation and will be a part of my doctoral thesis. In this article I refer to the text established by Bhaṭṭarāī (1988).

In conclusion, the *Nibandha*'s quotations simply state the superiority of a tree son[45] and do not give explanations.

Now, although the sources agree on the major benefits of a tree adoption, the question arises as to whether they describe the same practicalities involved in adopting a tree.

The procedure to adopt a tree: A standard adoption?

On the basis of the *Nibandha* quotations, three of the five *purāṇas* that mention tree adoption describe the ritual of adopting a tree as a son. If one checks the current editions of these *purāṇas*, it turns out that Chapter 59 of the current MP constitutes the first 20 verses of Chapter 28 of the current PP; and that this passage of MP59–PP28.1–21 describes a tree ritual entitled 'consecration of a tree'[46] by CVC. Kāṇe (1962: vol. 2, 893) already observed the fact that the MP and the PP share some verses,[47] raising some questions concerning the history of the transmission of these two *purāṇas*. He concludes that the PP borrows from the MP and approximately dates this borrowing[48] before AD 1000. The KKT quotes MP59 as *Matsyapurāṇa* and immediately after the passage PP28.22–32 as *Padmapurāṇa.* Although the title *Padmapurāṇa* separated the text, it seems to make a whole in the KKT.[49] The CVC quotes Chapter MP59 as *Matsyapurāṇa* and the passage PP28.22–32 as *Padmapurāṇa,* but the two texts are clearly regarded as different due to Hemādri's reading of PP28.32. The MRP only cites the passage PP28.22–32 as *Padmapurāṇa* in his chapter entitled *taruputrakavidhiḥ* whereas he quotes about 80 times the MP in all other chapters. So it seems that in the period between the composition of the CVC and the MRP, MP59 was separated from PP28.22–32, while the situation is not clear in the KKT.

However if the ritual described in MP59/PP28.1–21 is read as forming a whole with the remaining part PP28.22–32, it can be considered a testimony of tree adoption and included in the comparison of the procedure to adopt a tree. Consequently, we have four descriptions of the ritual of tree adoption to compare.

Among these four descriptions, one of them, the NP†, is very short and belongs to a lost *purāṇa*. Nevertheless, it provides us with some interesting information: adoption in general

---

[45] PP28.32; NP† KKT21.61ef; SPBh158.67; MP154.512cd; BVP† CVC1055.

[46] Hemādri only quotes the MP59 in his part entitled *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhāvidhiḥ*.

[47] Kāṇe (1962: vol. 2, 893): 'one remarkable fact is that hundreds of verses are common to *Matsyapurāṇa* and *Padmapurāṇa* and some writers like Hemādri quote long extracts from the *Padmapurāṇa*, which other quote from the *Matsyapurāṇa*'.

[48] Kāṇe (1962: vol. 2, 893): 'there are no materials to assign a definite date for the borrowing, but it is likely that it was before 1000 AD'.

[49] If we take a look at the critical apparatus of Brick's edition, we can see that in one of the four main recensions (the U manuscripts), the KKT quotes MP59.3, then omits the remaining part of MP59 till the end and continues from PP28.23cd to PP28.32 without a title-insertion. So in this recension MP59 and PP28 are a single text attributed to the MP. We cannot affirm that chapters MP59 and PP28 were formerly a single text but U recension shows that it will be one of several possible scenarios of transmission.

follows prescribed rules including a fire sacrifice,[50] but it is not stated what rules are prescribed in order to adopt a tree.

To answer this question, I first compared the tree adoption in the three other testimonies (PP28, SPBh158–62, BVP†) to the standard procedure[51] of adoption. The practicalities of the standard adoption require a donor, a son, an adopter, auspicious time and space, the pouring of water which symbolises the giving up of property rights, *mantra*, fees for Brahmins, the declaration of the auspicious day *puṇyāha*, an optional fire oblation and gifts for the adopted son, including clothes, golden rings and earrings.

As Table 2 in the Appendix shows, most of these practicalities can be found in the four testimonies, except the donor, which is not mentioned in PP28, SPBh158–62 or BVP†. This could be explained by the fact that the son to be adopted is a tree, so it has no previous family. The fire oblation is not mentioned in the SP, but KĀṆE (1946: vol. 3, 687) states 'it is not necessary that the *dattahoma* must be performed immediately after the giving and the taking, but it may be performed later and its performance may be delegated to others when the giver or the taker is a widow or a *śūdra* or is ill etc […]'. The tree adoption clearly follows the ceremony of adoption but adds some details.

A minor addition is the mention of the appropriate dress that the person performing the sacrifice must wear: the three excerpts (SP, BVP†, MP–PP) prescribe a white cloth. The lack of donor seems to be offset by the requirement to perform the *saṃskāras* for the tree as if it were a real son[52]. Indeed, in a standard adoption, the donor, that is to say the father who gives his natural son to another, have already performed the *saṃskāras* of his natural son. Here the adoptive son is replaced by a tree already born, but not recognised by sacrements. In the SP, the husband of the woman who adopts the tree performs all the *saṃskāras,* while in the BVP†, the *saṃskāras* seem to be done by the Brahmins.[53] For the SP and the BVP†, all the *saṃskāras* have to be

---

[50] NP† (KKT21.61ab; CVC1050; MRP293): *taruputraṃ tu yaḥ kuryād vidhivad vahnisaṃnidhau.*

[51] The standard procedure of adoption is described by Kāṇe (1946: vol.3, 687–9). I applied this methodology to the sole SP in a previous article entitled 'Adopter un arbre : un rite unique décrit dans les chapitres 158 et 162 du *Skandapurāṇa'* (2018).

[52] As discussed above, the NP† prescribes an adoption and not a planting of a tree by the expression *taruputraṃ kṛ,* but the quotation only mentions that it will be done according to the prescribed rules, *vidhivad.* As for SP and BVP†, the tree is an already existing one, already planted. The BVP† (CVC 1053.5-6) specifies that the tree will be young and healthy and then that all the trees around the chosen tree must be decorated with banners (CVC1053.12ab: *patākālaṅkṛtāḥ sarve kāryās tatsaṃnidhau drumāḥ*). In the SP, Pārvatī chooses an *aśoka* tree seen on the Mandara mountain and the ceremony takes place where the tree is located:
SPBh158.70 : *proṣite tvayi deveśa bhramantyā mandare mayā* |
aśokataruko dṛṣṭaḥ komalaḥ sumanoramaḥ ||
In your absence, O Lord of the Gods, when I was walking on Mount Mandara, I saw a tender and charming *Aśoka* tree.
SPBh162.41cd: *umāmāha prayāmeti yatrāśokaḥ sutaḥ* ||
He (i.e. Śiva) said Umā: Let's go where the aśoka [will be taken as] a son.

[53] All verbs are in the third person of the singular of the optative. So this impersonal structure seems to refer to Brahmin(s) performing the whole ceremony.

celebrated,[54] while the MP–PP only prescribes the *karṇavedha*. Performing one or all *saṃskāras* ensures the regular status of the tree. By this way, the presence of the donor, which guarantees the initiated state of the son, is useless. Finally we can observe a major addition: the performance of a great festival called *aśokatarukotsavam* (SPBh162.74), *tarukotsavam* (SP162.107), *mahotsavaṃ* (BVP†-CVC1055.28), *vṛkṣāṇāṃ sumahotsavaṃ* (BVP†–-CVC1055.31), *utsavaḥ* and *vṛkṣotsavaḥ* (MP59.15–17–PP28.15–17). A last point to be noticed is the gender of the adopter. The ceremony of tree adoption has to be performed by a man in the NP†, the BVP† and MP59–PP28, whereas the SP suggests an adoption in two steps: the sonless man performs the *saṃskāras* of the tree (SPBh158.40) while the ceremony of adoption is celebrated by a sonless woman (SPBh158.45–64 and SPBh162.57–69). As already noted earlier, the SP slightly differs from other attestations: on the one hand, the authors logically demonstrate that tree is superior to a real son, and, on the other hand, the main part of the ritual is performed by a woman.

The detailed ceremony: Agreement or disagreement of the sources on tree adoption ritual ?

Comparing the performance of the tree adoption in each *purāṇa* will help us to determine the relationships between our three rituals. By focusing especially on the following aspects —the preparation of the tree and that of the sacrificer, the objects required, including offerings and gifts, the timings to perform the whole ritual and finally what must be said during the ceremony — a relative chronology between our descriptions of tree adoption can be established. To obtain a synoptic view of each aspect, the reader can refer to the following detailed tables in the Appendix: Table 3a, The preparation of the tree; Table 3b, The preparation of the sacrificer; Table 3c, Objects, offerings and gifts; Table 3d, The time of the ceremony; Table 3e, Ritual formulas.[55]

Concerning the preparation of the tree, in all rituals, the tree must wear clothing, be decorated by ribbons, banners or garlands, be anointed and sprinkled. Parasols are required by the SP and the BVP†, but not by MP59–PP28. As for the adopter, he must be clean and in a peaceful state of mind. The way to obtain this purification differs slightly: the SP suggests a fast and a night on the ground in the *añjali* posture, whereas the BVP† and the MP59–PP28 prescribe a bath. In the BVP†, the sacrificer makes the *añjali* posture in front of the tree just before the statement of a ritual sentence. Thus, here the BVP† shares common features with both the SP and MP59–PP28. All in all, the testimonies sketch almost the same preparations of the tree and the adopter.

In contrast, the disagreements concerning the objects are more numerous. All agree on *bali* offerings and food offerings. On this last point, the SP again offers a theoretical explanation arguing that food offerings to Brahmins are the best gift (SPBh158.49–50) and justifying this by a semantic etymology linking the suffix *-aṇa* of the word *brāhmaṇa* with the word *anna-*

[54] BVP†–CVC1054 details the names of the *saṃskāras* to perform and adds that a wedding of the tree with a creeper can be performed: *vivāhaṃ kecid icchanti mādhavīlatayā taroḥ.*

[55] Tables 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d and 3e are in the Appendix.

'food' (SPBh158.52). *Bali*, food offerings and incense are the only objects required by the SP ritual. The two other rituals require more objects and resources: to adopt a tree, a man needs golden or silver fruits, pots and jars, a milk-yielding cow and the payment of the fees of the Brahmins, including gold. In MP59–PP28, the pots should contain gold, the cow should be adorned with ornaments made of gold and having horns covered with gold, the Brahmins' fees include cows, golden threads, bracelets, rings and other valuable items. Here there is a striking contrast between the testimonies: the SP ritual seems to be very simple to perform and accessible to everyone, while to adopt a tree requires substantial funds in the BVP† and even more in MP59–PP28. The prescribed duration of the ritual corresponds to this contrast of funds: in the SP–BVP†, two days are enough to perform the ritual, while MP59–PP28 requires at least four days.

Concerning the ritual formulas to declare, the SP's ritual is again very plain. The *mantras* are only those of the *saṃskāras* and they are not included in the tree adoption performed by the sonless woman. A Brahmin or the adopting woman herself has to declare the day auspicious *puṇyāha*[56] and then she has to state:[57]

> *aputrā bhagavanto'haṃ putraprakṛtakaṃ tarum*
> *grahiṣye tadanujñāṃ vai kartum arhata me'naghāḥ* ||*63*||
> I am a sonless woman, O Lords, I shall take this tree as my son, may you deign to accept my demand, O sinless beings!

The role played by Brahmins in the SP is only to be witnesses of the adoption and to authenticate it. Apart from the mantras for the *saṃskāra* rituals, the formulas to pronounce in the BVP† are also non-vedic *mantras* and they must be muttered by the adopter, whereas there is no non-vedic sentence in MP59–PP28. Nevertheless, the Brahmins play a more important role in the BVP† than in the SP: they have to make an oblation to Indra, the Lokapālas, Vanaspati and others. The latter is a strong common feature between the BVP† and MP59–PP28. If we consider this detail and the other previously common features, we can assert a close relationship between the testimonies of the MP and the BVP†. In view of this, it does not seem too far-fetched to say that MP59 makes a whole with PP28.22, and that they both offer an evidence of the tree adoption.

To summarise the results of the detailed comparison of the three excerpts: they agree on the goal of the ritual, follow a standard procedure of adoption and share numerous details in their ceremonies. It can now be asserted that the SP shows some special features that distinguish it from the others: it furnishes a theoretical explanation to justify the tree adoption and describes a very plain ceremony involving limited time and funds. The most important discrepancy is perhaps that the leading role is played by a woman in the ceremony, while no other document gives such a prominent role to a woman.

On this point, it must be added that the ritual prescription is introduced in a very didactic manner in SPBh158 and SPBh162. In SPBh158, Śiva himself explains the rite to Pārvatī, and in

---

[56] SPBh158.61.

[57] SPBh158.63.

SPBh162, Pārvatī herself performs the ritual adoption of an aśoka tree.[58] Thus, the SP offers an additional explanation of the origin of the ritual, and a model for its performance provided by the goddess herself. All this forms a cohesive whole in the SP.

The myth of *aśoka* adoption by Pārvatī is clearly known by BVP†:[59]

> *aputrayā purā pārtha pārvatyā mandarācale*
>
> *aśokaḥ śokaśamanaḥ putratve parikalpitaḥ*
>
> At the top of Mount Mandara, O son of Pṛthā, the *aśoka*, which softens sorrow, was once adopted by the sonless goddess Pārvatī.[60]

There is no mention of it in MP59–PP28, but in chapter 154 of the current edition whose verse 512 is quoted by Lakṣmīdhara and Hemādri, Pārvatī rears a sprout of *aśoka* before stating that 'a tree is equal to ten sons'. So, the cohesive whole found in the SP seems to disintegrate in the MP: the ritual is transformed into a consecration of trees found in MP59, while the myth ends in a proverb without explanation in MP154. Hence it is possible to conceive that a cohesive whole prevailed in a previous state of the MP text, but in the current edition, it is clearly not the case. It is also conceivable that the MP borrowed[61] the tree ritual and the myth of the *aśoka* as Pārvatī's son from the SP.

Among these versions, the SP's testimony of tree adoption seems to be the oldest one. The mention of the *aśoka* myth by the BVP† and other common features shared with the SP suggest that the BVP†'s testimony might be placed before the disintegration of the MP's version, if (but that remains highly hypothetic) MP59, PP28 and MP154 once constituted a whole. The increase in ritual objects and required funds (even more conspicuously in MP59–PP28), the *mantras* to be recited by Brahmins and the addition of the fire sacrifice complicate the ritual[62] and give Brahmins a more prominent role.

Conclusion

---

[58] On the parallels of this myth in earlier Sanskrit literature, see Wattelier-Bricout A. (2017) and (2018).

[59] BVP†–CVC1053.2

[60] By this way, here, as described in Kālidāsa's *Kumārasaṃbhava* V.14 and the SPBh158–62, the *aśoka* tree is Pārvatī's first-born son.

[61] Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson (1998: 22) and Bisschop (2002: 239) also consider the borrowing of SP by MP as possible.

[62] Pradhan (2002: 113–14) talks about the purāṇic testimonies of *vṛkṣotsava* in his article. He refers to MP59.1–20 and PP5.24.192–211 (a passage at which I could not look because he does not mention the edition consulted) and states that 'the requirement of *homa* in all these texts is an attempt to vedicise an original Dāsa ritual which does not involve *homa*. […] Invoking gods like Indra and the Lokapālas too along with the trees in the *Vṛkṣotsava* is also part of the vedicisation of a Dāsa ritual'. For my part, I have no decisive element that would enable me to argue that tree adoption was originally a Dāsa ritual. SP testimony is a cohesive and constructed whole, but it is also possible that it was based on a ritual which previously existed. In all the cases, it does not include *homa* and suggests a very plain procedure in which Brahmins played a minor role against MP59–PP28 and BVP†.

Taking into account several *Dharmanibandha* authors and their entire chapters dedicated to trees allowed us to sketch an array of tree adoption and to understand that each *Nibandha* author suggests his own vision of the subject, including a kind of rejection of this heterodox ritual.[63] Their analyses shows that the study of *Nibandha* literature is crucial for us in order to understand the history of text transmission and the evolution of ritual practices. On this subject it can now be affirmed that tree adoption was a ritual prescription performed at least from the 6th—7th century AD (the date of the SP's composition) to the 15th century (the date of its quotation by Madanasiṃha), but which probably did not always enjoyed the same popularity or obey the same rules.

Applying a systematic comparison of the described rituals reveals the relationships between them and outlines their chronological order as much as possible in the absence of critical editions of some *purāṇas*. It appears that the SP seems to be the oldest text, not only because of its relatively early date, but also because of its consistency and its ease with which it can be performed. The comparison between the *Nibandha* quotations and the current editions of the MP and the PP points to the compelling need to critically edit these.

Further development of tree adoption

Finally, I would like to add some remarks on the spread of the tree adoption from parts of the current edition of the PP which are not quoted by *Nibandha* authors. Chapter I.43.432ss of the PP in its current edition tells the same story as that of chapter 154 of the MP, except for the following point: Pārvatī says that a tree is equal to ten girls and not ten sons. Thus we may remark that this discrepancy in Pārvatī's story introduces a version that points out some evolutions of the purpose of the ritual. In the same way, PP.II.102 relates the story of Aśokasundarī, which is very close to the myth of *aśoka* adoption by Pārvatī: during a walk in *Nandanavana* with Śiva, Pārvatī sees a shining tree, a *kalpadruma.* Śiva says to her that the tree can give her everything she wants. She wishes a child and, with Śiva's consent, she obtains a daughter called Aśokasundarī. The vision of a tree during a walk, Śiva's consent and Pārvatī's delight are three common features shared by this story and that of the SP, but not by that of MP154. Thus, this seems to be a new story based on the older topic of the *aśoka* tree adoption. Finally, in the current edition of the PP, an entire chapter, PP.I.58, is dedicated to tree planting. Verses 3 to 11 explained the benefits of planting a tree on the bank of a lake or a pond: the leaves falling in the water are like *Bali* offerings and the fruits eaten by birds (*dvija*) are like food offerings presented to Brahmins (*dvija*). Planting a tree is therefore better than having 100 sons. Then (PP.I.58.12–28) the passage describes how to worship the holy fig tree, which is conceived of as a *trimūrti* representation.[64] This chapter may be a regional development on the topic of tree rituals, a later development or a ritual discarded by the *Nibandha* authors consulted.

---

[63] See above the development on the interpretation of the lack of tree adoption in Ballālasena's *Dānasāgara*.

[64] In the root resides Viṣṇu, in the middle stays Śiva, while Brahmā lives at the top.

As for the BVP†, it has already been pointed out that the BVP† passage quoted by Hemādri is not found in the current edition and must therefore refer to a lost text[65] already entitled *Brahmavaivarta purāṇa*. In order to clarify the history of this *purāṇa*, manuscripts 3820 and 3821 mentioned by SHASTRI (1928: 490–3) should be consulted and compared with the numerous quotations of this *purāṇa* in *Nibandha* literature.

To conclude on the development of tree adoption, a rather fascinating parallel to the story of *aśoka* adoption by Pārvatī may be cited, which relates the birth of Gaṇeśa. The story is found in the current BVP, in chapters 2–9 of the *Gaṇeśa Khaṇḍa*: Pārvatī is sad (*śoka*) because she is a barren woman. She really wants a son and complains to her husband. Śiva then teaches her a vow, a *vrata*, to perform in order to obtain a son who will eliminate her pain (she will become without pain: *aśoka*). This *puṇyakavrata* is then explained in many details, Pārvatī accomplishes it and ends up discovering an infant on her bed. Chapter 9 closes with Pārvatī nursing her child. He is none other than Gaṇeśa, the eldest son of Pārvatī and Śiva. In this story, the *aśoka*, the first-born son of Pārvatī, gives its place away to the elephant-headed god.[66]

References

Aiyangar Kumbakonam Viraraghava Rangaswami (ed.). *Kṛtyakalpataru of Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara*. Baroda, Oriental Institute, vol. 5, 1941.

Bakker, Hans T. *The world of the Skandapurāṇa: Northern India in the Sixth and Seventh centuries*. Leiden, Brill, 2014.

Bakker, Hans T. *Origin and growth of the purāṇic text corpus: with special reference to the Skandapurāṇa.* Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 2004.

BVP = *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa.* (1) *Brahmavaivarta Mahāpurāṇa.* Muṃbayī, Śrī Veṅkaṭeśvara Yantrālaya, 1951. (2) Bhatt, G.P (ed.) : *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa.* Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2016.

Bisschop, Peter C. 'On a quotation of the *Skandapurāṇa* in the *Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍa* of Lakṣmīdhara's *Kṛtyakalpataru*. Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa* V.' *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 45(3), 2002, pp. 231–43.

Bisschop, Peter C. *Early Śaivism and the Skandapurāṇa: sects and centres*. Groningen, Forsten, 2006.

BVP = Sen, Rajendra Nath. *Brahmavaivarta Puranam, Part 2 Ganesa and Krisna Janma Khandas*. Sudhindra Nath Vasu, Bahadurganj, Allahabad, 1992.

---

[65] On this matter, see Rocher (1986: 160–4).

[66] I would like to thank J. Törzsök and I.Ratié and the reviewers of the Puṣpikā team for their comments and for their help in revising the content and the English text of the draft of this paper.

BVP† = the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, which is quoted by the *Nibandha* and is not the text of the current edition of the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa.*

CVC = (*dānakhaṇḍa* part of the) *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*: Hemādri. B. Śiromaṇi (ed.): *Chaturvarga Chintámani.* vol. 1, Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta 1873.

De Simini, Florinda. 'Observations on the Use of Quotations in Sanskrit *Dharmanibandha*s.' *Journal of Indian Philosophy*. 43, 2015, pp. 601–24.

DS = *Dānasāgara*: Ballāla Sena. B. Bhattacharya (ed.) : *Dānasāgara of Ballāla Sena*. Calcutta, Asiatic Society, 1953.

Harimoto, Kengo. 'The original *Skandapurāṇa*, Lakṣmīdhara and Caṇḍeśvara. Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa* VIII.' *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 49(1/2), 2006, pp. 23–38.

Kāṇe, Pandurang V. *History of Dharmaśāstra.* (Ancient and mediaeval religious and civil law). Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental research Institute, vol.1, 3, 5 (part II), 1930, 1946, 1962.

Khera, Krishan Lal. *Index to history of Dharmaśāstra by Pandurang Vaman Kane: comprehensive guide to Hindu rites and rituals.* New Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1997.

Kṣemarāja Kṛṣṇadāsa and al. *The Skandamahāpurāṇam aṣṭam bhāga bhūmikā evaṃ ślokānukramaṇī.* Delhi, Nag Publishers, 1989.

KKT = (*dānakāṇḍa* part of) *Kṛtyakalpataru*: Lakṣmīdhara. D. Brick (ed. tr.): *Brahmanical theories of the gift: a critical edition and annotated translation of the Dānakāṇḍa of the Kṛtyakalpataru*.Harvard University Press, Cambridge 2009.

MP = *Matsyapurāṇa.* Singh and al. *The Matsyamahāpurāṇam text in devanagari, translation & notes in English part I and part II.* Delhi, Nag Publishers, 1983.

MRP = the *Dānavivekoddyota*, part of Madanasiṃha's *Madanaratnapradīpa.* Deśapāṇḍe, K. (ed.): *Śrīmadanasiṃhadevaviracite Madanaratnapradīpe Dānavivekoddyotaḥ.* Sanskrit Academy Series 10, 15–16, 3 vols. Hyderabad, Sanskrit Academy, Ousmania University, 1964-7.

Narayan, V. ''One Tree Is Equal to Ten Sons': Hindu Responses to the Problems of Ecology, Population and Consumption,' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion,* vol. 65, No. 2 (Summer, 1997), pp. 291- 332, Oxford University Press, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1465767.

NP† refers to *Nandipurāṇa*, a lost *purāṇa* quoted by the *Nibandha*.

PP = *PadmaPurāṇa:* (1) Mandlik, V.N. *Padmapurāṇa.* Pune, Anandashram Press, 1894. (2) NA. Deshpande; J. L. Shastri; G. P Bhatt, (eds.): *The Padma-Purāṇa*. Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1988.

Pradhan, Shruti. 'The Biography of Caitya.' *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 83*, 2002, pp. 91–120.

Rocher, Ludo. *The Puranas*. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1986.

Shastri, H. P. *A descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Government collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.* Calcutta, Baptist Mission Press, vol. 5, 1928.

SP = *Skandapurāṇa*. (1) R. Adriaensen; H.T. Bakker; H. Isaacson (eds.): *The Skandapurāṇa. Adhyāyas 1–25: critically edited with prolegomena and English synopsis, v*ol. 1, Egbert Forsten, Groningen 1998. R. Adriaensen; H.T. Bakker (eds.):*The Skandapurāṇa: critically edition with prolegomena and English synopsis*, vol. 2A.Forsten, Groningen 2004. H.T. Bakker; P.C. Bisschop; Y. Yokochi (eds.): *The Skandapurāṇa. Adhyāyas 31–52: The Vāhana and Naraka cycles*, vol. 2B.Forsten, Groningen 2014.

SPBh = Bhaṭṭarāī (ed.): *Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍa.* Śrīmahendrasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālayagranthamālā.Mahendra Saṃskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, Velajhuṇḍī 1988.

Śrīdatta Upādhyāya and Śāstrī, Aśoka Caṭṭopādhyāya. *Pitṛbhakti of Śrīdattopādhyāya*. Vārāṇasī, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1972.

Vedavyas, K.D. *Padma Purāṇam by Shrimanmaharshi Krishna Dwaipayan Vedavyas part VI containing śloka index.*Varanasi, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 2007.

Wattelier-Bricout, Amandine. ‘Les fonctions du stéréotype d'adoption par l'allaitement dans le *Skandapurāṇa* chap.158 et 162.’ *Traits-d'Union*, Le stéréotype: fabrique d'identité. ⟨hal-01630307⟩, 2017.

Wattelier-Bricout, Amandine. ‘Adopter un arbre : un rite unique décrit dans les chapitres 158 et 162 du *Skandapurāṇa.’ L’arbre en Asie,* edited by FILLIOZAT, Pierre-Sylvain and ZINK, Michel, Actes du colloque international organisé par l’Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres, la Société Asiatique et l’INALCO, Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres, Paris, 2018.

Appendix

Table 1 Details of the references quoted as *taruputravidhiḥ* in Lakṣmīdhara’s *Dānakāṇḍa* of his *Kṛtyakalpataru* (KKT),[67] Hemādri’s *Dānakhaṇḍa* of his *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* (CVC) and Madanasiṃha’s *Dānavivekoddyota* of his *Madanaratnapradīpa* (MRP)[68]

[67] I used the numbering established by BRICK(2009) in his edition.

[68] In the absence of numbering in the current editions of CVC and MRP, only the page number is given. Nevertheless one can clearly observe the verses quoted by comparison with the KKT’s references.

Purāṇa	KKT	CVC	MRP
PP28.22–23ab	21.50	1030 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	293
PP28.23cd	21.51ab	1030 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	not quoted
PP28.24ab	21.51cd	1030 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	293
PP28.24cd–25ab	21.52	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	293
PP28.25cd	21.53	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	293
PP28.26ab	21.54	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	293
PP28.26cd–27ab	21.55	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	293
PP28.27cd–28ab	21.56	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	294
PP28.28cd–29ab	21.57	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	294
PP28.29cd–30ab	21.58	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	294
PP28.30cd–31	21.59	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	294
PP28.32	21.60	1031 (part titled *vṛkṣaropaṇam)*	294
NP†	21.61	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	293
Skandapurāṇa	not quoted	four *pādas* not found in the SPBh	not quoted
SPBh158.44cd45cd	21.62	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	294
SPBh158.45ab	not quoted	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh158.46ab	21.63ab	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.46cd	21.63cd	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.47ab	21.64ab	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.47cd	not quoted	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.48cd	21.64cd	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.58	21.65	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.59	21.66	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.60	21.67	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.61	21.68	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295

Purāṇa	KKT	CVC	MRP
SPBh158.62	21.69	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.63	21.70	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	295
SPBh158.64	21.71	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	296
SPBh158.65	not quoted	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	296
SPBh158.66	21.72	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	296
SPBh158.67	21.73	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	296
SPBh158.68	not quoted	1051 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.57	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.58	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.59	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.60	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.61	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.62	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.63	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.64ab	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.67	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
SPBh162.68	not quoted	1052 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
MP154.512	21.74	1050 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted
BVP† (32 ślokas)	not quoted	1052–6 (part titled *taruputravidhiḥ*)	not quoted

Table 2 The standard procedure of adoption applied to tree adoption

Standard practicalities	SPBh158 and 162	BVP† (CVC1052–1056)	PP28.1–22 = MP59
Donor	none	none	none
Object to give	young tree / a tender aśoka	CVC1053.5: a young tree covered with buds	MP59.4: trees
Time	SPBh 158.46 : to make a fast the day before the day of adoption	CVC1053.9: preparation of the tree the day before the adoption	MP59.3 refers to MP58.4–5 which indicates the proper time
Space	SPBh 158.59 : the place where the tree is to be found (158 and 162 : on Mandara Moutain)	CVC1053.7: purification of the place where the tree is to be found	MP59.3 refers to MP58.4–5 which indicates the choice of the place
Watering	SPBh158,72 and SPBh162.62: Pārvatī sprinkles the tree by the milk of her breasts	CVC1053.10 & 11: watering with jugs	MP59.5: to sprinkle the trees with water mixed with All–Herb
Mantra	SPBh158.41: *mantravad vidhitaś caiva*	CVC1054.19 *mantras* belonging to the *saṃskāras* ceremonies CVC1055.24 & 25: quotation of a non vedic *mantra*	MP59.12: different kind of *mantras*
Fees	SPBh 158.59: food for Brahmins	CVC1055.28: food but also a milk–yielding cow, clothes, *dakṣiṇā*	MP59.4: gold, clothes and ointments MP59.13–14: cows, golden threads, bracelets, rings, sacred clothes, beds household utensils and sandals
Auspicious day	SPBh 158.61: *puṇyāha* declared by the woman or the Brahmins	CVC1053.8: auspicious day declared by the *vipras*	MP59.3 refers to MP58.4–5 in which there is a declaration of auspicious day
Oblation	SPBh 162.64: *Bali* offerings	CVC1054.14, 18: *Bali* and *caru* offerings ;	MP59.9: Bali offering MP59.14: oblations of ghee, barley, and black sesame seeds
State of mind : sacrificer	SPBh158.46 and 61–62	CVC1054.23: bathed, purified and wearing a white cloth	MP59.17: free from envy
Preparation of the tree	SPBh158.60: ribbons, parasol, ornaments	CVC1053.9: banners, red clothes and red string	MP59.5: to adorn the trees with perfumed powder, decorate them with garlands and cover them with cloth
Fire sacrifice	none	CVC1054.17 *homa*	MP59.16: kindling of *Palāśa* is prescribed

Standard practicalities	SPBh158 and 162	BVP† (CVC1052–1056)	PP28.1–22 = MP59
gifts for the son	SPBh162.62: white clothes	CVC1053.9 : red clothes and CVC1053.13 : fifteen golden fruits	MP59.7: seven or eight golden fruits
Additions			
***Utsava* / Festival**	SPBh162.74 and 107	CVC1055.28: *mahotsavaṃ* and CVC1055.31: *vṛkṣāṇāṃ sumahotsavaṃ*	MP59.16 and MP59.18: a Tree Festival
***Saṃskāras* made as if the tree was a real son**	SPBh158.41–42: all the *saṃskāras* made by the sonless man; not detailed	CVC1052.3 and CVC1054,18–22: all the *saṃskāras* made by the man who wants to adopt the tree, they are detailed (including ear piercing)	MP59.5 (KKT21.34–CVC1048) *karṇavedha*
sacrificer	SPBh158.58: the sacrificer is purified and wears white clothes, *añjali* posture with *darbha* grass in the hands	CVC1054.23: bathed and wearing white clothes, *añjali* posture with flowers in the hands	MP59.13: bathed sacrificer should don white garments
Adopter	man and woman	man	man

Table 3a The detailed ritual: the preparation of the tree

Preparation of the tree	SPBh158 and SPBh162	BVP†	MP59	PP28.1–32
number of trees	one *aśoka*	one tree but surrounded by others trees decorated for the occasion CVC1053.12	MP59.5 several trees MP59.5 All decorated MP59.18 a single tree	PPI.28..5 several trees PPI.28.5 All decorated PPI.28.18 a single tree
saṃskāra	SPBh158.41–42 *garbhādhāna* till the end	CVC1053.3 *Jātakarmādikās* CVC1054.18–22 *jātaka nāmakaraṇa annapraśanna cuḍakarma godana vivāha* (optional)	MP59.5 (KKT21.34–CVC1048) *karṇavedha*	PPI.28.5 *karṇavedha*
ointments	SPBh162.59 (CVC1052) santal	CVC1053.7 CVC1053.11 santal ointment	MP59.5 & 8 (KKT21.34 & 37 – CVC1048) perfumed powders MP59.6 *añjana*	PPI.28.5 & 8 PPI.28.6

Preparation of the tree	SPBh158 and SPBh162	BVP†	MP59	PP28.1–32
"watering » the tree	SPBh158.72 SPBh162.65 Pārvatī sprinkles the tree by the milk of her breasts	CVC1053.10 *snāpita* CVC1054.19 *pādapaṃ snapayitvā*	MP59.5 (KKT21.34–CVC1048) with water mixed herbs	PPI.28.5
clothes for the tree	SPBh162.62 (CVC1052) white clothes	CVC1053.9 red clothes and red thread	MP59.5 & 8 (KKT21.34 & 37 – CVC1048) on the branches and at the tree stump	PPI.28.5 & 8
ribbons/banners on the tree	SP158.60 (KKT21.67 – CVC1051) SP162.60 (CVC1052) ribbons adorned with gems	CVC1053.9 banners	MP59.5 (KKT21.34 – CVC1048) garlands	PPI.28.5
parasol	SP158.60 (KKT21.67 – CVC1051) SP162.58 (CVC1052) made with peacock feathers	CVC1053.11 with gems	none	none

Table 3b The detailed ritual: the preparation of the sacrificer

Preparation of the sacrificer	SPBh158 and SPBh162	BVP†	MP59	PP28.1–32
***añjali* posture**	SP158.58 (KKT21.65–CVC1051) *darbha* grass	CVC1054.23 *puṣpa*	none	none
State of mind and purification of the sacrificer	SP158.46 (KKT21.63–CVC1050) SP158.61–62 (KKT21.68–69–CVC1051)	CVC1054.23	MP59.13 (KKT21.42–CVC1049)	PPI.28.
a white cloth for the sacrificer	SP158.58 (KKT21.65–CVC1051)	CVC1054.23	MP59.13 (KKT21.42–CVC1049)	PPI.28.
bathed	none	CVC1054.23	MP59.12–13	PPI.28.12–13
fast	SPBh158.46	none	none	none
Spend a night on the ground	SPBh158.58 SPBh162.40	none	none	none

Table 3c The detailed ritual: objects, offerings and gifts

Objects, offerings, gifts	SPBh158 and SPBh162	BVP†	MP59	PP28.1–32
incense	SP162.63 (CVC1052) *guggula*	none	MP59.8 (KKT21.37 – CVC1048) *guggula*	PPI.28.8
golden or silver fruits	none	CVC1053.13 fifteen fruits	MP59.7(KKT21.36 –CVC1048) seven or eight fruits	PPI.28.7
food-offerings	SP158.59 (KKT21.66– CVC1051) SP158.61 (KKT21.68– CVC1051) SP162.4	CVC1055.29–30	MP59.14–15 (KKT21.43–44 – CVC1049) during four days	PPI.28.14–15
cup/jar or bawl	none	CVC1053.10–12	MP59.8 (KKT21.37 – CVC1048)	PPI.28.8
a cow given to Brahmins	none	CVC1055.28	MP59.11(KKT21.40–CVC1048)	PPI.28.11
bali offering	SP162.64cd	CVC1054.14 *bali* and CVC1054.18 : *caru*–offering	MP59.9 (KKT21.38– CVC1048) *balinivedana*	PPI.28.9
Fees	none	CVC1054.16 and CVC1055.28	MP59.15	PPI.28.15

Table 3d The detailed ritual: the time of the ceremony

Time	SPBh158 and SPBh162	BVP†	MP59	PP28.1–32
the day before	SPBh158.46 (KKT21.63– CVC1050) SPBh162.5 preparation of the sacrificer	CVC1053.9 : preparation of the tree the day before	none	none
time of the tree-preparation	SPBh158.60 the same day than the adoption	CVC1053.9 : preparation of the tree the day before	MP59.5–9 the first day of the ceremony	PPI.28.5–9

Time	SPBh158 and SPBh162	BVP†	MP59	PP28.1–32
time for music	SPBh162.64ab (CVC1052) with *bali* offerings	CVC1054.14 music with *bali* offerings	MP59.12 (KKT21.41–CVC1049) without *bali* offerings, with the bath of the sacrificer	PPI.28.12 without *bali* offerings, with the bath of the sacrificer
Festival time	SPBh162.38 and 71–74 : the festival begins the night before the adoption and closes just after the adoption	CVC1055.31 the same day than the adoption	MP59.15 the fourth day	PPI.28.15 the fourth day

Table 3e The detailed ritual: ritual formulas

Ritual formulas	SPBh158 and SPBh162	BVP†	MP59	PP28.1–32
Day declared auspicious	SPBh158.61 (KKT21.68–CVC1051) SPBh162.67–68 (CVC1052)	CVC1053.8	none	none
mantras	SPBh158.41–42 those of the *saṃskāras*' ceremonies	CVC1054.19 *mantras* belonging to *saṃskāras* rituals	MP59.12 (KKT21.41–CVC1049) *abhiṣekamantreṇa ṛgyajuḥsāmamantrais*	PPI.28.12 *abhiṣekamantreṇa ṛgyajuḥsāmamantrais*
ritual request	SPBh158.63 (KKT21.70–CVC1051) SP162.69	CVC1055.24–25 and 27 : specific and non-vedic *mantras* quoted and said after the *saṃskāras*' ceremonies	none	none
Offerings made to Indra Lokapāla Vanaspati by Brahmins	none	CVC1054.15 Lokapālas beginning with Indra as during the *grahayajña*	MP59.10(KKT21.39–CVC1048) Lokapālas beginning with Indra and Vanaspati	PPI.28.10