

gained good fortune by means of Rudrādhyāya II. 27.274;
being requested to destroy one's sins I. 82.68;
Viṣṇu was seen by II. 6.82;
name of Bilva tree; liṅga made of which was worshipped by Lakṣmī I. 74.8;
one of those who extolled Nandin I. 42.23;
liṅga as the support for II. 46.17;
worshipping Pārvatī always, being requested to destroy one's sins I. 82.19;
has habitat Bilvavana in the mts. north of Mahābhadrā tank I. 49.60.

- w. one of the twenty-four daughters of Prasūti and Dakṣa I. 5.20;
married by Dharma Prajāpati I. 5.23;
70.284;
Darpa born to I. 70.293.
- Lakṣmidāna description of mode of making a gift of II. 36.1.
- Lakṣmīpati d. as an epithet of Śiva I. 21.24.
- Laghimā d. w. one of the eight worshipped in between Yāmya and Pāvaka II. 27.56.
- Laghimāvyūha the deities worshipped in the enclosures of II. 27.102; 27-106.
- Laghu k. l. r. one of the sons of Yadu I. 68.2.
- Laṅkāvarṇā d. w. one of the eight energies worshipped in the first enclosure of Gomukhivṛyūha II. 27.90.
- Lajjā w. one of the twentyfour daughters of Prasūti and Dakṣa I. 5.21; married by Dharma Prajāpati I. 5.23; 70.285;
Vinaya born to I. 70.296.
one of those who praised Nandin I. 42.23.
- Lampaṭā d. w. one of the deities worshipped in the first enclosure of the Dākṣavyūha II. 27.136.
- d. w. one of the sixteen worshipped in the second enclosure of the Paitāmahavyūha II.27.223.

25

Purānam

पुराणम्
PURĀṆA



(Half-yearly Bulletin of the Purāṇa-Department)

Published with the financial assistance from the Ministry of Education,
Government of India

VYĀSA PŪRṆIMĀ NUMBER

आत्मा पुराणं वेदानाम्



ALL-INDIA KASHIRAJ TRUST
FORT RAMNAGAR, VARANASI

times and as such might have some peripheral internal divisions, and adopted different names due to historical exigencies. Indian tradition⁷⁵ knows only of one tradition of foreign priests of the Sun-cult and Alberuni⁷⁶ who mentions about the Magas does not know of any such two groups among them. The difference in origin, variations in cult-practices and dissimilarity in social status may be explained on the grounds of historical logics of acculturation, Indianization, socio-religious changes in early medieval India. As such it is difficult to subscribe to the thesis of two distinct groups of Indian Sun-priests of foreign origin—a myth created by Stietencron which is far from historical reality.

PURANIC HELP IN CORRECTING CORRUPT PASSAGES
OCCURRING IN PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS.

By

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

In the Purāṇas we sometimes find such statements as afford help in correcting corrupt passages occurring in philosophical works. An example of this kind is given in my article 'A corrupt reading in the Parimala commentary on the Bhāmatī corrected with the help of the Purāṇas.'¹ A second example is given here.

The Bhāmatī commentary of Vācaspati reads : तथाहू रागमिनः—को हि योगप्रभावादृते अगस्त्य इव समुद्रं पिबति स इव दण्डकारण्यं सृजति (on Śāriraka-bhāṣya 4.4.9).² It is clear that Vācaspati connects सृजति with Agastya. A similar passage is found in Vācaspati's Tātparyatikā : यथाहुरत्रभवन्तः को हि योगप्रभावाद् ऋते अगस्त्य इव समुद्रं पिबति स इव च दण्डकारण्यं सृजति (on Nyāyabhāṣya 1.1.1).³

It is perfectly clear that both of these two passages of the same author speak of the results of two supernormal powers, namely (i) the drinking of the water of the ocean by the sage Agastya and (ii) the creation of the forest Daṇḍaka⁴ (by Agastya).

1. Published in the J. of G. N. Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Allahabad; Vol. XXXV. 3-4.
2. The sub-commentary Kalpataru of Amalānanda explains the passage as : अगस्त्यो हि समुद्रं संकल्पमात्रेण पपी । कस्यचिद् ऋषेः शापात् प्राणिनिवासानर्हमपि दण्डकारण्यं निवासयामास.
3. Udayana in his Parisuddhi explains the passage as : विभूतिमता अनेककालोपभोग्यमपि एकदा भुज्यत इत्यत्र समुद्रपान मुदा-हरणम् । योगधिप्रभावसंपन्नो विविधफलभोगिनो विचित्रस्वभावान् एकदैव बहून् कायान् इच्छामात्रेणैव निर्मिमीत इत्यत्र दण्डकारण्यसृष्टिरुदाहरणम् (p. 90, Mithila Institute Series).
4. Śaṅkaramiśra in his Upaskāra refers to these two incidents as the results of yogic power : योगज एव धर्मः प्रत्यासत्तिस्ततः अगस्त्यसमुद्रपानं दण्डकारण्यनिर्माणं चेति दृष्टान्तः (9.1.14).

75. Tradition as preserved in the Purāṇas and the foreign notices know only of one foreign priesthood of the Sun-cult—see Elliot and Dowson, *History of India as told by its own Historians*. Vol. 1. 77-218.

76. Sachau, Tr. *Kitāb-ul-Hind and Athār-al-Bāquīa of al-Birūnī (Alberuni's India)*, London, 1914, Vol. I., 21.

It is needless to say that the original source of these two incidents is Puranic literature comprising the Purāṇas, the Upapurāṇas and the two Epics. (These incidents are found to have been referred to by the authors of non-Puranic works also, who obviously came to know of these incidents from Puranic tradition).

But if we go through Puranic literature we come across a discrepancy; to be explicit : while Agastya's drinking of oceanic water is described in various ways in this literature⁵ we find no mention of the creation of the Daṇḍaka forest by Agastya in it, though it says many things about this forest.⁶ It is to be noted here clearly that the only incident about this forest that may be put as an example of the result of some supernormal power is its destruction (and not creation) by the curse of the sage Śukra (and not of the sage Agastya) to the king Daṇḍa (son of Ikṣvāku), who violated Arajās, daughter of the sage.⁷

5. See Sk. Nāgarakhaṇḍa. 35.30-41 (through *viśoṣiṇi vidyā*); Nāgarakhaṇḍa 36.36-47 (by uttering the *mantra* 'काली कराली....'); Nāgarakhaṇḍa 60.2-3 (through *Śoṣaṇi vidyā* with the help of an *Ātharvaṇa mantra*); see also Mbh. Vana-p. 105.3-6; Viṣṇudharmottara-p. 1.213.5. The incident has been alluded to in some Purāṇas : Liṅga-p. 1.29.29 (क्षीरोदञ्च....ह्यपेयो ब्राह्मणैः कृतः), Brahmaṇḍa-p. 2.52.16 (अगस्त्यपीतसलिले....).
6. As for example, see Śānti-p. 29.137 (यमम्यसिञ्चन् संभूय महारण्ये महर्षयः; according to Nil. *mahāraṇya* is Daṇḍakāraṇya and 'yam' refers to 'pṛthum').
7. See Rāmāyaṇa (7.81.1-18), Padma-p. (5.34. 49-59) and Vāmana-p. (63.19-37; 66.1-18). It is said here that Daṇḍa, son of Ikṣvāku, violated Arajās, daughter of Śukra. Consequently Śukra pronounced a curse on account of which Daṇḍa's kingdom was buried deep in an ash-hill in a week. The incident is alluded to in Mbh. Anuśāsana-p. 153.11 (दण्डकानां महद् राज्यं ब्राह्मणेन विनाशितम्) and 151.7 (येषां कोपाग्निरद्यापि दण्डके नोपशाम्यति). The significance of *ब्रह्मापि* (even to-day) remains to be disclosed by competent scholars. See also Arthaśāstra 1.6 and Kāmasūtra 1.2.44 with their commentaries.

Since there is no mention of the creation of the Daṇḍaka forest in the Puranic works by Agastya or even by Śukra, it may reasonably be concluded that the printed reading of the above two passages is corrupt.

The corrupt reading may however be corrected in the light of Puranic literature. Since Śukra is said to be the agent of the act of destroying the forest Daṇḍaka, the printed reading स इव (in both the passages) which connects Agastya with the act of destruction may be corrected to शुक्र इव. The finite verb सृजति is to be corrected to a word expressing the sense of destruction or an act similar to it that has been stated in the relevant Puranic passages.

It is a pity that the authors of the two sub-commentaries expressed no doubt about the correctness of the reading. Amalānanda's comment shows that he was aware of the ruined condition of the forest on account of the curse of 'some' sage. I have every reason to believe that Amalānanda knew that the sage was no other than Śukra. But since he read the reading as shown above and regarded it as valid he explained सृजति not by its synonym जनयति or उत्पादयति but by निवासयामास (in लिट् लकार) so that the meaning would be in consonance with the nature of a forest.⁸ Udayana's explanation of दण्डकारण्यसृष्टि is not at all clear. Is there any similarity between बहुकायनिर्माण and दण्डकारण्यनिर्माण (both through yoga) ?

The corruptness of the readings of the above two passages may be known from another source also. It may be easily observed that Vācaspati begins his statement by saying तथाहु रागमिनः and यथाहुरत्रभवन्तः. This undoubtedly shows that Vācaspati is referring here to the statement of some ancient authority. Fortunately this authority is known to us. It is the Vyāsabhāṣya (on Yogasūtra 4.10) which reads : दण्डकारण्यं च चित्तबलव्यतिरेकेण कः शरीरेण कर्मणा शून्यं कर्तुमुत्सहेत समुद्रमगस्त्यवद् वा पिबेत्.

Though in this passage there is no mention of the agent of the act of emptying the Daṇḍaka forest, yet the wording of the passage clearly shows that this agent must be different from

8. निवासयामास—from the root नि + वस् (णिच्) 'to found', cp. माहिष्मतीं पुरी निवासयामास (Viṣṇu-p. 4.11.9).

Agastya. Though the Tattvavaiśārādi comm. of Vācaspati is silent on this point, yet the comm. Yogavārttika of Vijñānabhikṣu refers to the incident by giving the name of the agent of destruction as Śukra (दण्डकदेशं तद्राजे क्रोधान्विते शुक्रः सप्तदिनशिलावृष्ट्या जनशून्यं चकार) obviously on the basis of Puranic works.

Since Vācaspati was a commentator of the Vyāsabhāṣya and since he was well-versed in the Epic-Puranic tradition,¹⁰ it would be wrong to hold that Vācaspati was ignorant of the nature and author of the incident concerning the forest Daṇḍaka. This also strengthens our view that the printed readings of the Bhāmatī and the Tātparyatikā are corrupt and that they are to be corrected with the help of Puranic literature—the original source of the two *ākhyānas* relating to Agastya and Śukra.

Since both the acts, namely अगस्त्यकृतसमुद्रजलपान and शुक्रकृत-दण्डकारण्यशून्यीकरण were well-known episodes of the Purāṇas, a question may be raised about the reason that gave rise to the corrupt reading in a later period. It is not easy to show the reason.

Following factor may be considered in this connection. The Vivaraṇa comm. (which is not by Ādi-Śaṅkarācārya but by some later Śaṅkarācārya) on the Vyāsabhāṣya says: दण्डकारण्यं चित्तबलव्यतिरेकेण कः कर्तुं शक्नोति कश्च पिबेत् समुद्रमगस्त्यवदिति (4.10). (This shows that the commentator read the Bhāṣya-passage as दण्डकारण्यं कर्तुं मुत्सहेत (in the place of दण्डकारण्यं शून्यं कर्तुं उत्सहेत). This reading (which seems to be an emended form of the original reading शून्यं कर्तुं)

9. Vijñānabhikṣu seems have written क्रोधान्वित inadvertently; he should have written कामान्विते; cp. दण्डकयो नाम भोजः कामाद् ब्राह्मणकन्यामभिमन्यमानः सबन्धुराष्टो विननाश (Kāmasūtra 1.2.44).
10. Vācaspati is found to have quoted from the Viṣṇupurāṇa and Vāyu-purāṇa. He seems to have known some of the other Purāṇas also, for while explaining Nandiśvara's acquiring of a divine body (as stated in the Vyāsabhāṣya 2.13), he added that Nandin was 'eight years old' at that time—a fact not stated in the works on yoga but in the Purāṇas (Sk. Kāśikhaṇḍa 11.106, Śiva-p. 3.6.49-52 and other Purāṇas).

may be supposed to have some regional basis. Since only Agastya is mentioned in this Bhāṣya-passage, दण्डकारण्यसृष्टि came to be wrongly considered as connected with Agastya.¹¹ Agastya's connection with the Daṇḍaka (as mentioned in Rāmāyaṇa 1.1.42-43) may have strengthened the notion of Agastya's destroying the Daṇḍaka forest. Some scholars seem to have 'corrected' the original sentence, being influenced by this notion.

This however is a conjecture only and the conjecture is very weak, for it is based only on the printed reading of the Vivaraṇa commentary, which has not been edited properly with the help of several manuscripts. It may be further noted that Puranic tradition knew of the creation of the Daṇḍaka¹² forest also, but that is not through yogic power but through kingly power (Harivaṁśa 1.10.24-25). A fruitful discussion on the reason for the corrupt readings seems to depend on the older manuscripts of Bhāmatī and Tātparyatikā.

11. The commentator Nilakaṇṭha seems to hold the view that Agastya's curse fell on the Daṇḍaka forest: अगस्त्यादिर-प्राकृतोऽपि बहुहिंसाकरं दण्डकारण्यशापाख्यम् अधर्मं चकार (Śānti-p. 260.6).
12. It may be noted that Daṇḍakā is also used for Daṇḍaka, vide Gaṇaratnamahodadhi 1.61 "दण्डका अरण्यम् । 'वर्षाणि तिष्ठतु चतुर्दश दण्डकायाम्' (अनर्घराघव ४।६६) । 'प्राप्तानि दुःखान्यपि दण्डकेषु संचिन्त्यमानानि सुखी बभूवुः' इति रघुकाव्ये (१४।२५) चिन्त्यम्".